Sir,

Allow me to call, through the medium of your paper, the attention of the public to a fact in which the honour of the British nation is, perhaps, more or less interested.

You are aware that the different continental governments, after the defeats of the movement party in 1849, succeeded in driving the numerous political refugees, more particularly the Germans, the Hungarians, the Italians and the Poles, from one place of asylum to another, until they found protection and tranquillity in this country.

There are certain governments on the Continent, whose animosity against their political opponents seems not to be satisfied with this result. The Prussian government is of this number. After having succeeded in concentrating most of the Prussian refugees in this country the Berlin Cabinet is evidently trying to make them, somehow or other, depart for America. The same parties who at home, in their own newspapers (witness the Neue Preussische Zeitung\(^a\) and the Assemblée nationale), represent the English government as a committee of Jacobins and of conspirators against the conservatives of all Europe—these same parties affect a most suspicious anxiety for the tranquillity of this country, by denouncing to the British government the foreign refugees as interfering with English politics and as being connected with the attempt at assassinating the King of Prussia.\(^b\)

I have the honour of belonging to those, whom the persecution of the Prussian government has followed everywhere they went. Editor of the Rheinische Zeitung (of Cologne) in 1842, and of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung in 1848 and 1849, both of which papers were directly or indirectly stopped by the forcible interference of the Prussian government, I have been expelled from France in 1845 and

---

\(^a\) The Neue Preussische Zeitung Nos. 116, 117, May 24 and 25, 1850.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^b\) Frederick William IV.—\textit{Ed.}
1849, from Belgium in 1848, upon the direct request and by the influence of the Prussian embassy; and during my stay in Prussia, in 1848 and 1849, I had about a dozen political actions brought against me, the whole of which were, however, abandoned after my having been twice acquitted by the jury.284

That even in this country, I am not lost sight of by the Prussian government, is proved to me by numerous warnings which I received of late, stating that the English government, upon the ground of similar denunciations, intended to take steps against me; and by the fact that for several days past some individuals place themselves at my very door, taking down notes every time any one comes or leaves the house. It is further proved by the Neue Preussische Zeitung, a which stated, some time ago, that I was travelling through Germany and had stayed a fortnight in Berlin, whilst I can prove by my landlords and other Englishmen that I never for a moment left London since I arrived here last year. This same ultra-royalist paper, after the attempt of the madman Sefeloge, brought my pretended journey to Berlin into connexion with that attempt; and yet this paper ought to know best who, if anyone, is connected with this affair, inasmuch as Sefeloge is a member of Section No. 2 of the ultra-royalist society the Treubund, and never was connected with any but staff-officers employed in the Berlin War Office. It is moreover proved by the presence, here in London, of Prussian agents provocateurs who, a fortnight before Sefeloge’s attempt, presented themselves to me and some of my friends, preaching the necessity of such an attempt and hinting even at the existence of a conspiracy got up, in Berlin, for this purpose; and who, after having found it impossible to make their dupes of us, now frequent Chartist meetings, in order to induce the public to believe that the foreign refugees take an active part in the English Chartist movement.

In conclusion allow me to ask you, Sir, and through you the public, whether it would be desirable that, upon such authority, the British government should be induced to take steps which might more or less interfere with the conviction, universally spread, that the British laws afford equal protection to whosoever puts his foot upon British soil?

I am, etc.

Written in mid-June 1850


Printed according to the original in Engels’ hand

Published in English for the first time

a The Neue Preussische Zeitung No. 117, May 25, 1850.—Ed.
Sir,

In your newspaper’s article of June 22 this year you reproached me for advocating the rule and the dictatorship of the working class, while you propose, in opposition to myself, the abolition of class distinctions in general. I do not understand this correction.

You know very well that on p. 16 of the Manifesto of the Communist Party (published before the February Revolution of 1848) it is stated that:

“If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled, by the force of circumstances, to organise itself as a class, if, by means of a revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such, sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class.”

You know that I defended the same point of view in my Misère de la philosophie against Proudhon, before February 1848.

Finally, in the very article you criticise, p. 32, No. 3, the Neue Rheinische Zeitung [.Politisch-ökonomische Revue], it is stated:

“This Socialism” (i. e. communism) “is the declaration of the permanence of the revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary transit point to the abolition of class distinctions generally, to the abolition of all the relations of

---

a See present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 505-06.—Ed.
b Ibid., p. 212.—Ed.
c See this volume, p. 127.—Ed.
production on which they rest, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the revolutionising of all the ideas that result from these social relations."

June 1850

K. Marx

In your newspaper's article of June 22 you very kindly acknowledge that a "noticeable gap" arose in the German daily press as a result of the suppression of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, but you protest against "Herr Engels' claim" that the Neue Rheinische Zeitung was the only organ of the press to represent the proletariat not merely in words or out of benevolence.

It is true that in my article on the campaign for the German Imperial Constitution, the Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 1, I declared that the Neue Rheinische Zeitung was the only paper in which the German proletariat was supported not merely out of benevolence or in words. Should you be of the opinion that this statement is in any way detrimental to the Neue Deutsche Zeitung, the former official organ of the extreme Left in Frankfurt, then you will doubtless earn the gratitude of the workers by showing when, where and how the Neue Deutsche Zeitung has represented the German proletariat or its class interests.

London, June 25, 1850

F. Engels

Published in the Neue Deutsche Zeitung No. 158, July 4, 1850

Printed according to the newspaper Published in English for the first time

\[a\] See this volume, p. 156.— Ed.
Karl Marx

TO THE CHAIRMAN OF A REFUGEE MEETING
IN LONDON

[Rough copy]

[London.] June 30 [,1850]

Citizen Chairman,

While the June Revolution was attacked by all the watchdogs of the bourgeois class, I publicly defended those terrible days, which for me are the greatest manifestation of the struggle which the working class is pursuing against the capitalist class.

If I am absent from this refugee celebration today, it is because I am completely prevented by illness from being in your midst; my heart is with you.

Greetings and fraternity,

Karl Marx

---


Printed according to the original

Translated from the French
In your issue of June 22 this year there is a dispatch from London in which the following passage occurs:

"Karl Marx, Frederick Engels and August Willich ... have written to The Spectator that spies from the Prussian embassy are following every step they take, etc. The Spectator comments briefly upon their long letter of complaint, as follows: ‘This class of people (namely political refugees) errs very frequently in such matters, and in fact their error springs from two sources: vanity, which deludes them into thinking that they are much more important than is really the case, and secondly the consciousness of their own guilt. The suspicions expressed by the refugees against the liberal-minded and hospitable English Government are nothing more and nothing less than an impertinence.’"⁴⁹⁴

One does not have to be intimately acquainted with the general attitude and the firmly established conventional forms of the English daily press to discover immediately that no English paper, and least of all the accomplished and witty Spectator, could make a comment so clumsily Prussian in both content and form. The whole of the above “comment” from The Spectator is a shameless forgery by the correspondent. Not only does not a word of it appear in The Spectator, but on the contrary, the editors of this newspaper make the following remark in the same issue that contains our statement.

"A letter in another page makes an extraordinary charge against our own Government. We know nothing more than is to be obtained from a perusal of the letter itself; but a charge publicly made, in so circumstantial a manner with so much verisimilitude of particulars, ought not to be unregarded. The charge is that of

---

⁴⁹⁴ Italicised by the authors of the statement.—Ed.
favouring the operations of Prussian bloodmen in London, in order to [obtain] an application of the Alien Act against German patriots." (The Spectator, June 15, p. 554.)

The praises accorded to Herr Bunsen in the same article give sufficient indication of the interests in which your correspondent perpetrated this forgery. Incidentally, Prussian cunning deserves the highest marks for this manoeuvre.

We expect that by publishing this statement in your next issue you will leave to your correspondent alone the honour of the authorship of this ingenious stratagem.

London, July 2, 1850

Karl Marx, Frederick Engels

Published in the Tages-Chronik No. 314, July 10, 1850

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

---

a The authors translate this word as Blutmenschen and give the English equivalent in brackets.—Ed.
The all-engrossing topic now in Germany is, of course, the Schleswig-Holstein affair. As this affair is in your country, as well as in France, very little understood, you will allow me to give a rapid view of it.

It has been shown clearly enough that the small independent states by which Germany is surrounded are, under a more or less liberal form, the chief seats of reaction. Thus Belgium, the model state of Constitutionalism, was the first to resist the shock of February, the first to proclaim martial law and to pass sentences of death upon patriots. Thus Switzerland shifted herself in a far from honourable way through the revolutionary storm, hiding behind the Chinese wall of neutrality as long as revolution was in the ascendant, and playing the subservient tool of the Holy Alliance against disarmed refugees, when reaction was again rife throughout Europe. It is evident that the petty national egotism of those impotent states must induce them to rely upon the support principally of old-established, i.e. reactionary governments, the more so as they cannot but be aware that every European revolution puts their own national independence in question, an independence which to uphold none are interested but the supporters of the old political system.

Denmark is another of these petty states sharing this pride of a national independence and this exorbitant desire to aggrandise

---

a The Revolution of February 1848 in France.—Ed.
themselves.* The independence and power of Denmark, a state living only upon the plunder of universal commerce by the Sound Dues, is of interest to none but Russia and a certain fraction of English politicians. Denmark is literally the slave of Russia, by a series of treaties agreed to in the last century; and through Denmark Russia lays hold upon the Dardanelles of the Baltic. The old school of English politicians, too, take an interest in the aggrandisement of Denmark, according to their old policy of cutting up central Europe into a set of small states quarrelling with each other, and thus leaving England to apply to them the principle "Divide and conquer".

The policy of the revolutionary party in all countries has, on the contrary, always been to strongly unite the great nationalities hitherto cut up in small states, and to ensure independence and power, not to those small wrecks of nationalities—such as Danes, Croats, Czechs, Slovaks, &c., &c., counting from one to three millions each at the very outset, or to those mongrel would-be nations, such as the Swiss and Belgians—but to the large and healthy nationalities now oppressed by the ruling European system. An European confederacy of republics can only be formed by great and equally powerful nations; such as the French, English, German, Italian, Hungarian, and Polish nations, but never by such miserably powerless so-called nations as the Danes, the Dutch, the Belgians, Swiss, &c.

Besides, will the revolutionary party allow the most important maritime position of the north, the inlet of the Baltic, to remain for ever at the mercy of Danish egotism? Will they allow the Danes to make up the interest of their national debt by imposing heavy tolls upon every vessel trading across the Sound and Belt? Certainly not.

Denmark, by that precious hereditary right which treats a people as so many chattels, became united with two German countries, Schleswig and Holstein. They had separate constitutions, common to both of them, and old-established rights granted by their princes, "that these countries should for ever remain together and undivided". The law of succession, besides, is different in Denmark to what it is in the two duchies. In 1815, at the infamous congress of Vienna, where nations were cut up and sold by auction, Holstein was incorporated with the German confederacy, but Schleswig was not. From that day the Danish national party tried, but in vain, to incorporate Schleswig into Denmark. At last 1848 arrived. In March

* It is a fact not generally known that the annexation of Savoy to Switzerland was in 1848-49 much discussed in the latter country, and that the Swiss hoped to see this realised by the defeat of the Italian revolution.—Note by Engels.
a popular movement took place in Copenhagen, and the national and liberal party got into office. They instantly decreed a constitution, and the incorporation of Schleswig into Denmark. The consequence was the insurrection of the duchies, and the war between Germany and Denmark.291

While German soldiers in Posen, in Italy, and in Hungary, fought against the revolution, this war in Schleswig was the only revolutionary war Germany ever carried on. The question was whether the Schleswigers were to be forced to follow the fate of small, impotent, half-civilised Denmark, and to be the slaves of Russia for ever, or whether they should be allowed to re-unite themselves to a nation of forty millions, which was then just engaged in the struggle for its freedom, unity, and consequent recovery of its strength. And the German princes, particularly the royal drunkard of Prussia,a knew the revolutionary signification of this war too well. The noteb is well known by which the Prussian embassy, Major Wildenbruch, proposed to the king of Denmark to carry on the war for show, just as much as was necessary to allow the Danish and German revolutionary enthusiasts who engaged on both sides as volunteers, to devour each other.292

Consequently the war was, on the German side, one continued series of treasons, down to the battle of Fredericia, where the republican Schleswig-Holstein corps, 10,000 men, were surprised and cut up by three times their number of Danes, while 40,000 Prussians and others were only a few miles off and left them in the scrape; and down to the treacherous peace concocted at Berlin,293 a peace which allows Russia to land troops in Schleswig, and Prussia to march into Holstein to put down the rebellion, she herself has aided and abetted at least officially.

If there was any doubt as to which side was the revolutionary, or which the reactionary interest, there can be none now. Russia sends her fleet to fraternise with the Danes and to blockade, in common with them, the shores of Schleswig-Holstein. All the “powers that be” are arrayed against this small German tribe of not more than 850,000 souls; and nothing but the sympathies of the revolutionists of all countries is there to assist this small but brave people. They will fall no doubt; they may resist a time, and even overthrow the treacherous bourgeois government which Prussia has forced upon them, they may beat Danes and Russians, but at last they will be crushed, unless the Prussian army, which is sure to march into

---

a Frederick William IV.—*Ed.*
b Handed by Ludwig Wildenbruch on April 8, 1848.—*Ed.*
c Frederick VII.—*Ed.*
Holstein, refuses to act. And if this, which is not at all impossible, should come to pass, you would see things in Germany take another turn. Then there would be a general outbreak, and such a one that 1848 would be nothing compared to it; for the acts of the Holy Alliance have told well upon the German people; and if in '48 even the federative republic was impossible, now nothing would be accepted short of the German republic, one and indivisible, democratic and—within six months—Social.

Written on July 21, 1850

Reprinted from the journal

First published in The Democratic Review,
August 1850
FREDERICK ENGELS

THE PEASANT WAR IN GERMANY
Written in the summer and autumn of 1850

First published in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue No. 5-6, 1850

Signed: Frederick Engels

Printed according to the 1875 edition and checked with the journal and the 1870 edition
The German people, too, have their revolutionary tradition. There was a time when Germany produced characters that could match the best men in the revolutions of other countries, when the German people displayed an endurance and vigour which would in a more centralised nation have yielded the most magnificent results, and when the German peasants and plebeians were full of ideas and plans that often make their descendants shudder.

In face of the slackening that has now ensued almost everywhere after two years of struggle, it is high time to remind the German people of the clumsy yet powerful and tenacious figures of the Great Peasant War. Three centuries have passed and many a thing has changed; still the Peasant War is not so impossibly far removed from our present struggle, and the opponents who have to be fought are still essentially the same. We shall see the classes and fractions of classes which everywhere betrayed 1848 and 1849 in the role of traitors, though on a lower level of development, already in 1525. In any case, it is no credit to the modern insurrection that the robust vandalism of the Peasant War was seen only here and there in the movement of the past few years—at Odenwald, in the Black Forest, and in Silesia.
To begin with, let us briefly review the situation in Germany at the beginning of the sixteenth century.

German industry had made considerable progress in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The local village industry of the feudal type was superseded by the guild system of industry in the towns, which produced for wider circles, and even for remoter markets. The weaving of coarse woollen fabrics and linens had become a permanent and widespread branch of industry, and even finer woollen and linen fabrics and silks were manufactured in Augsburg. Along with the art of weaving especial growth was witnessed in industries which were nurtured by the ecclesiastic and secular luxury of the late medieval epoch and verged on the fine arts: those of the gold- and silver-smith, the sculptor and engraver, etcher and wood-carver, armourer, engraver of medals, wood-turner, etc. A succession of more or less important discoveries, the most prominent of which were the invention of gunpowder* and printing, had contributed substantially to the development of the crafts. Commerce kept pace with industry. By its century-long monopoly of sea navigation the Hanseatic League\(^{295}\) ensured the elevation of all Northern Germany from medieval barbarism. Even though since the end of the fifteenth century the League had quickly begun to succumb to the competition of the English and Dutch, the great trade route from India to the north still lay through Germany,

* As has now been shown beyond doubt, gunpowder came to the Arabs through India from China, and they brought it through Spain to Europe along with fire-arms.—*Note by Engels to the 1875 edition.*

---

\(^{a}\) This word is missing in the 1850 edition.—*Ed.*
Vasco da Gama’s discoveries notwithstanding, and Augsburg still remained the great market of Italian silks, Indian spices, and all Levantine products. The towns of Upper Germany, particularly Augsburg and Nuremberg, were centres of an opulence and luxury quite remarkable for that time. The production of raw materials had also considerably increased. The German miners of the fifteenth century were the most skilful in the world and the flowering of the towns had also elevated agriculture from its early medieval crudity. Not only had large stretches of land been put to the plough, but dye crops and other imported plants were introduced, whose careful cultivation had favourable influence on farming in general.

Still, the progress of Germany’s national production had not kept pace with the progress in other countries. Agriculture lagged far behind that of England and the Netherlands, and industry far behind that of Italy, Flanders and England, while the English, and especially the Dutch, had already begun ousting the Germans from the sea trade. The population was still very sparse. Civilisation existed only here and there, concentrated round the several centres of industry and commerce; but the interests of even these centres were highly divergent, with hardly any point of contact. The trade relations and export markets of the South differed totally from those of the North; the East and the West stood outside almost all traffic. Not a single city was in a position to be the industrial and commercial centre of the whole country, such, for instance, as London had already become for England. All internal communications were almost exclusively confined to coastal and river navigation and to the few large trade routes from Augsburg and Nuremberg via Cologne to the Netherlands, and via Erfurt to the North. Away from the rivers and trade routes there was a number of smaller towns which lay outside the major traffic and continued to vegetate undisturbed in the conditions of the late Middle Ages, needing only few foreign goods and providing few products for export. Of the rural population only the nobility came in contact with wider circles and with new needs; in their relations, the peasant masses never went beyond their immediate locality and its horizons.

While in England and France the rise of commerce and industry had the effect of intertwining the interests of the entire country and thereby brought about political centralisation, Germany had not got any further than grouping interests by provinces, around merely local centres, which led to political division, a division that was soon made all the more final by Germany’s exclusion from world commerce. In step with the disintegration of the purely feudal...
Empire, the bonds of imperial unity became completely dissolved, the major vassals of the Empire became almost independent sovereigns, and the cities of the Empire, on the one hand, and the knights of the Empire, on the other, began entering into alliances either against each other or against the princes or the Emperor. Uncertain of its own position, the imperial government vacillated between the various elements comprising the Empire, and thereby lost more and more authority; in spite of all its intrigues and violence, the attempt at centralisation in the manner of Louis XI was only just able to hold together the Austrian hereditary lands. Who finally won and were bound to win in this confusion, in these countless and interrelated conflicts, were the bearers of centralisation amidst the disunity, the bearers of local and provincial centralisation—the princes, at whose side the Emperor himself became more and more of a prince like the others.

In these circumstances, the position of the classes inherited from the Middle Ages had changed considerably, and new classes had emerged beside the old.

The princes came from the high nobility. They were already almost independent of the Emperor and possessed most of the sovereign rights. They made war and peace on their own, maintained standing armies, convened Diets, and levied taxes. They had brought a large part of the lesser nobility and most of the towns under their sway, and resorted continuously to all possible means of incorporating in their dominion all the remaining imperial towns and baronial estates. They were centralisers in respect to these towns and estates, while acting as a decentralising force in respect to the imperial power. Internally, their government was already highly autocratic. They convened the estates only when they could not do without them. They imposed taxes and borrowed money whenever it suited them; the right of the estates to ratify taxes was seldom recognised and still more seldom practised. And even when practised, the prince usually had the majority by virtue of the knights and prelates, the two tax-exempted estates that participated in the benefits enjoyed from taxes. The princes’ need for money grew with their taste for luxury, the expansion of their courts, the standing armies, and the mounting costs of government. The taxes became ever more oppressive. The towns were mostly protected from them by their privileges, and the full impact of the tax burden fell upon the peasants, the subjects of the princes, as well as upon the serfs, bondsmen and tithe-paying peasants [Zinsbauern]\(^a\) of their vassal knights. Where direct taxation

\(^a\) This word is missing in the 1850 and 1870 editions.—*Ed.*
proved insufficient, indirect taxes were introduced. The most refined devices of the art of finance were called into play to fill the anaemic treasury. When nothing availed, when there was nothing to pawn and no free imperial city was willing to grant any more credit, the princes resorted to currency operations of the basest kind, coined depreciated money, and set high or low compulsory exchange rates at the convenience of their treasuries. Furthermore, trade in urban and other privileges, later forcibly withdrawn only to be resold at a high price, and the use of every attempt at opposition as an excuse for all kinds of extortion and robbery, etc., etc., were common and lucrative sources of income for the princes of the day. Justice, too, was a perpetual and not unimportant merchandise. In brief, the subjects of that time, who, in addition, had to satisfy the private avarice of the princely bailiffs and officials, had a full taste of all the blessings of the “paternal” system of government.

The middle nobility of the medieval feudal hierarchy had almost entirely disappeared; it had either risen to acquire the independence of petty princes, or sunk into the ranks of the lesser nobility. The lesser nobility, or knighthood, was fast moving towards extinction. Much of it was already totally impoverished and lived in the service of the princes, holding military or civil offices; another part of it was in the vassalage and under the sway of the princes; and a small part was directly subject to the Emperor. The development of military science, the growing importance of the infantry, and the improvement of fire-arms dwarfed the knighthood’s military merits as heavy cavalry, and also put an end to the invincibility of its castles. Like the Nuremberg artisans, the knights were made redundant by the progress of industry. The knights’ need for money considerably hastened their ruin. The luxury of their palaces, rivalry in the magnificence of tournaments and feasts, the price of armaments and horses—all increased with the development of society, while the sources of income of the knights and barons increased but little, if at all. As time went on, feuds with their attendant plunder and extortion, highway robbery and similar noble occupations became too dangerous. The payments and services of their subjects yielded the knights hardly more than before. To satisfy their growing requirements, the gracious knights had to resort to the same means as the princes. The peasantry was plundered by the nobility with a dexterity that increased every year. The serfs were sucked dry, and the bondsmen were burdened with ever new payments and services on a great variety of pretexts and on all possible occasions. Statute

---

a The 1850 and 1870 editions have “civilisation” instead of “society”.—Ed.
labour, tributes, rents, land-sale taxes, death taxes, protection moneys, etc., were raised at will, in spite of all the old agreements. Justice was denied or sold for money, and when the knight could not get at the peasant's money in any other way, he threw him into the tower without further ado and forced him to pay a ransom.

The relations between the lesser nobility and the other estates were also anything but friendly. The knights bound by vassalage to the princes strove to become vassals of the Empire, the imperial knights strove to retain their independence; this led to incessant conflicts with the princes. The knight regarded the arrogant clergy of those days as an entirely superfluous estate, and envied them their large possessions and the wealth held secure by their celibacy and the church statutes. He was continually at loggerheads with the towns, he was always in debt to them, he made his living by plundering their territory, robbing their merchants, and by holding for ransom prisoners captured in the feuds. And the knights' struggle with all these estates became the more violent the more the money question became to them as well a question of life.

The clergy, that bearer of the medieval feudal ideology, felt the influence of historic change just as acutely. Book-printing and the claims of growing commerce robbed it of its monopoly not only in reading and writing, but also in higher education. The division of labour also made inroads into the intellectual realm. The newly rising juridical estate drove the clergy from a number of the most influential offices. The clergy was also on its way to becoming largely superfluous, and demonstrated this by its ever greater laziness and ignorance. But the more superfluous it became, the more it grew in numbers, due to the enormous riches that it still continuously augmented by all possible means.

There were two entirely distinct classes among the clergy. The clerical feudal hierarchy formed the aristocratic class: the bishops and archbishops, abbots, priors, and other prelates. These high church dignitaries were either imperial princes or reigned as feudal lords under the sovereignty of other princes over extensive lands with numerous serfs and bondsmen. They exploited their dependants as ruthlessly as the knights and princes, and went at it even more wantonly. In addition to brute force they applied all the subterfuges of religion; in addition to the fear of the rack they applied the fear of ex-communication and denial of absolution; they made use of all the intrigues of the confessional to wring the last penny from their subjects or to augment the portion of the church. Forgery of documents was for these worthies a common and favourite means of swindling. But although they received tithes from their subjects in
addition to the usual feudal services and quitrents, these incomes were not enough for them. They fabricated miracle-working sacred images and relics, set up sanctifying prayer-houses, and traded in indulgences in order to squeeze more money out of the people, and for quite some time with eminent success.

It was these prelates and their numerous *gendarmerie* of monks, which grew constantly with the spread of political and religious witch-hunts, on whom the priest-hatred not only of the people, but also of the nobility, was concentrated. Being directly subject to the Emperor,\(^a\) they were a nuisance for the princes. The life of luxurious pleasure led by the corpulent bishops and abbots, and their army of monks excited the envy of the nobility, and the more flagrantly it contradicted their preaching, the more it inflamed the people, who had to bear its cost.

The *plebeian* part of the clergy consisted of rural and urban preachers. These stood outside the feudal church hierarchy and had no part in its riches. Their work was less controlled, and, important though it was for the church, it was for the moment far less indispensable than the police services of the barracked monks. They were, therefore, the worse paid by far, and their prebends were mostly very meagre. Of burgher or plebeian origin, they were close enough to the life of the masses to retain their burgher and plebeian sympathies in spite of their clerical status. For them participation in the movements of the time was the rule, whereas for monks it was an exception. They provided the movement with theorists and ideologists, and many of them, representatives of the plebeians and peasants, died on the scaffold as a result. The people’s hatred of the clergy turned against them only in isolated cases.

What the Emperor was to the princes and nobility, the *Pope* was to the higher and lower clergy. Where the Emperor received the “general pfennig”\(^297\) or the imperial taxes, the Pope received the universal church taxes, out of which he paid for the luxury of the Roman court. And in no country were these church taxes collected more conscientiously and exacting than in Germany—thanks to the power and number of the clergy. Particularly the *annates*,\(^298\) collected on the bestowal of bishoprics. The growing needs led to the invention of new means of raising revenues, such as trade in relics and indulgences, jubilee collections, etc. Large sums of money flowed yearly from Germany to Rome in this way, and the consequent increased oppression not only heightened the hatred for

\(^a\) Instead of *reichsunmittelbar* (directly subject to the Emperor) the 1850 edition has *souverän* (sovereign).—*Ed.*
the clergy, but also roused the national sentiments, particularly of the nobility, the then most nationalistic estate.

In the medieval towns three distinct groups developed from the original citizenry with the growth of commerce and the handicrafts.

The urban society was headed by the patriciate, the so-called honourables. They were the richest families. They alone sat in the town council, and held all town offices. Hence, they not only administered but also consumed all the town revenues. Strong by virtue of their wealth and time-honoured aristocratic status recognised by Emperor and Empire, they exploited the town community and the peasants belonging to the town in every possible way. They practised usury in grain and money, seized monopolies of all kinds, gradually deprived the community of all rights to communal use of town forests and meadows and used them exclusively for their own private benefit, exacted arbitrary road-, bridge- and gate-tolls and other imposts, and trafficked in trade, guild, and burgher privileges, and in justice. They treated the peasants of the town precincts with no more consideration than did the nobility and clergy. On the contrary, town bailiffs and village officials, patricians all, added a certain bureaucratic punctiliousness to aristocratic rigidity and avarice in collecting imposts. The town revenues thus collected were administered in a most arbitrary fashion; the accounts in the town books, a mere formality, were neglected and confused in the extreme; embezzlement and deficit were the order of the day. How easy it was at that time for a comparatively small, privileged caste bound by family ties and common interests, to enrich itself enormously out of the town revenues, is easily seen from the many embezzlements and swindles which 1848 brought to light in so many town administrations.

The patricians took pains everywhere to let the rights of the town community fall into disuse, particularly in matters of finance. Only later, when their machinations transcended all bounds, the communities came into motion again to at least gain control over the town administration. In most towns they actually regained their rights, but due to the eternal squabbles between the guilds, the tenacity of the patricians, and the protection the latter enjoyed from the Empire and the governments of the allied towns, the patrician council members soon in effect regained their former undivided dominance, be it by cunning or force. At the beginning of the
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*The 1850 and 1870 editions have Tripotagen (knavery) instead of Schwindeleien (swindles).—Ed.*
sixteenth century the communities in all the towns were again in the opposition.

The town opposition to the patricians broke up into two factions which took quite distinct stands in the Peasant War.

The *burgher opposition*, forerunners of our present-day liberals, included the richer and middle burghers, and, depending on local conditions, a more or less appreciable section of the petty burghers. Their demands did not overstep purely constitutional limits. They wanted control over the town administration and a share in legislative power, to be exercised either by an assembly of the community itself or by its representatives (big council, community committee); further restriction of the patrician nepotism and the oligarchy of a few families which was coming to the fore ever more distinctly within the patriciate itself. At best, they also demanded several council seats for burghers from their own midst. This party, joined here and there by the dissatisfied and impoverished part of the patriciate, had a large majority in all the ordinary community assemblies and in the guilds. The adherents of the council and the more radical part of the opposition together formed only a small minority among the real *burghers*.

We shall see how this “moderate”, “law-abiding”, “well-to-do” and “intelligent” opposition played exactly the same role, with exactly the same effect, in the movement of the sixteenth century, as its successor, the constitutional party, played in the movement of 1848 and 1849.\(^{99}\)

Beyond that, the burgher opposition declaimed zealously against the clergy, whose idle luxury and loose morals roused its bitter scorn. It urged measures against the scandalous life of those worthy men. It demanded the abolition of the clergy’s special jurisdiction and tax exemption, and particularly a reduction in the number of monks.

The *plebeian opposition* consisted of ruined burghers and the mass of townspeople without civic rights—journeymen, day labourers, and the numerous precursors of the lumpenproletariat, who existed even in the lowest stages of urban development. The lumpenproletariat is, generally speaking, a phenomenon that occurs in a more or less developed form in all the so far known phases of society. The number of people without a definite occupation and permanent domicile increased greatly at that time due to the decay of feudalism in a society in which every occupation, every sphere of life, was still fenced in by countless privileges. In all the developed countries vagabonds had never been so numerous as in the first half of the sixteenth century. In war time some of these tramps joined the armies, others begged their way across the countryside, and still
others eked out a meagre living in the towns as day labourers or from whatever other occupation that was not under guild jurisdiction. All three groups played a part in the Peasant War—the first in the armies of princes which overpowered the peasants, the second in the peasant conspiracies and in peasant gangs where its demoralising influence was felt at all times, and the third in the clashes of the urban parties. It will be recalled, however, that a great many, namely those living in the towns, still had a substantial share of sound peasant nature and had not as yet been possessed by the venality and depravity of the present “civilised” lumpenproletariat.

As we see, the plebeian opposition in the towns of that day was a very mixed lot. It brought together the depraved parts of the old feudal and guild society with the undeveloped, budding proletarian elements of the germinating modern bourgeois society. There were impoverished guild burghers, on the one hand, who still clung to the existing burgher system by virtue of their privileges, and the dispossessed peasants and discharged vassals as yet unable to become proletarians, on the other. Between these two groups were the journeymen, who still stood outside official society and whose condition was as close to that of the proletariat as this could be with the contemporary state of industry and the guild privileges; but due to these privileges they were, at the same time, almost all prospective burgher artisans. The party affiliation of this conglomeration was therefore highly uncertain, and varied from locality to locality.

Before the Peasant War the plebeian opposition took part in the political struggles not as a party, but as a noisy marauding tagtail of the burgher opposition, a mob that could be bought and sold for a few barrels of wine. The peasant revolts turned it into a party, and even then it remained almost everywhere dependent on the peasants in its demands and actions—a striking proof of how much the town of that time still depended on the countryside. In their independent actions, the plebeians demanded extension of the monopoly in urban handicrafts to the countryside, and had no wish to see a curtailment of town revenues come about through the abolition of feudal burdens within the town precincts, etc.; in brief, they were reactionary in their independent actions, and delivered themselves up to their own petty-bourgeois elements—a typical prelude to the tragicomedy staged in the past three years by the modern petty bourgeoisie under the trade mark of democracy.

Only in Thuringia under the direct influence of Münzer, and in a few other localities under that of his pupils, was the plebeian faction of the towns carried away by the general storm to such an extent that the embryonic proletarian element in it gained the upper hand for a
time over all the other factions\(^a\) of the movement. This episode grouped round the magnificent figure of *Thomas Münzer*, was the culmination point and also the briefest episode, of the Peasant War. It stands to reason that the plebeian factions were the quickest to collapse, that they had a predominantly fantastic outlook, and that the expression of their demands was necessarily extremely uncertain; in the existing conditions they found the least firm ground to stand on.

Beneath all these classes, save the last one, was the exploited bulk of the nation, the *peasants*. It was on the peasant that the whole arrangement of social strata reposed: princes, officials, nobles, clergymen, patricians and burghers. No matter whose subject the peasant was—a prince's, an imperial baron's, a bishop's, a monastery's or a town's—he was treated by all as a thing, a beast of burden, and worse. If a serf, he was entirely at the mercy of his master. If a bondsman, the legal levies stipulated in the agreement were enough to crush him; yet they were daily increased. He had to work on his lord's estate most of his time; out of what he earned in his few free hours he had to pay tithes, tributes, the quitrent, princely levies [*Bede*], road (war) tolls, and local and imperial taxes. He could neither marry nor die without paying something to the lord. Besides his statute labour he had to gather litter, pick strawberries and bilberries, collect snail-shells, drive the game in the hunt, and chop wood, etc., for his gracious lord. The right to fish and hunt belonged to the master; the peasant had to look on quietly as his crop was destroyed by wild game. The common pastures and woods of the peasants were almost everywhere forcibly appropriated by the lords. The lord did as he pleased with the peasant's own person, his wife and daughters, just as he did with the peasant's property. He had the right of the first night. He threw the peasant into the tower when he wished, and the rack awaited the peasant there just as surely as the investigating attorney awaits the arrested in our day. He killed the peasant or had him beheaded when he pleased. There was none out of the edifying chapters of the *Carolina*\(^\text{500}\) dealing with "ear clipping", "nose cutting", "eye gouging", "chopping of fingers and hands", "beheading", "breaking on the wheel", "burning", "hot irons", "quartering", etc., that the gracious lord and patron would not apply at will. Who would defend the peasant? It was the barons, clergymen, patricians or jurists who sat in the courts, and they knew
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\(^a\) The 1850 edition has *Faktoren* (agents) instead of *Fraktionen* (factions).—*Ed.*
perfectly well what they were being paid for. After all, every official estate of the Empire lived by sucking the peasants dry.

Though gnashing their teeth under the terrible burden, the peasants were still difficult to rouse to revolt. They were scattered over large areas, and this made collusion between them extremely difficult. The old habit of submission inherited by generation from generation, lack of practice in the use of arms in many regions, and the varying degree of exploitation depending on the personality of the lord, all combined to keep the peasant quiet. For this reason we find so many local peasant insurrections in the Middle Ages but, prior to the Peasant War, not a single general national peasant revolt, at least in Germany. Moreover, the peasants were unable to make revolution on their own as long as they were confronted by the united and organised power of the princes, the nobility and the towns. Their only chance of winning lay in an alliance with other estates. But how could they join with other estates if they were exploited to the same degree by all of them?

As we see, in the early sixteenth century the various estates of the Empire—princes, nobles, prelates, patricians, burghers, plebeians and peasants—formed an extremely confusing mass with their varied and highly conflicting needs. The estates stood in each other's way, and each was continually in overt or covert conflict with all the others. The division of the nation into two large camps, as seen in France at the outbreak of the first Revolution and as witnessed today on a higher level of development in the most advanced countries, was thus a rank impossibility. Anything like it could only come about if the lowest stratum of the nation, the one exploited by all the other estates, the peasants and plebeians, would rise up. The entanglement of interests, views and aspirations of that time will be easily understood from the confusion brought about in the last two years by the present far less complicated structure of the German nation, consisting of the feudal nobility, the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie, the peasants and the proletariat.
The grouping of the then numerous and different estates into bigger entities was made virtually impossible by decentralisation, local and provincial independence, the industrial and commercial isolation of the provinces from each other, and poor communications. It came about only with the general spread of revolutionary political and religious ideas during the Reformation. The various estates that either embraced or opposed those ideas, concentrated the nation—only very laboriously, to be sure, and only approximately—into three large camps: the Catholic or reactionary, the Lutheran bourgeois reformist, and the revolutionary. If we discover little logic in this great division of the nation, and if we find partly the same elements in the first two camps, this is explained by the dissolution of most of the official estates handed down from the Middle Ages, and by the decentralisation which, for the moment, imparted to these estates in different localities opposing tendencies. In recent years we have so often encountered similar facts in Germany that this apparent jumble of estates and classes in the much more complicated environment of the sixteenth century cannot surprise us.

In spite of the latest experiences, German ideology still sees nothing except violent theological bickering in the struggles that brought the Middle Ages to an end. Should the people of that time, say our home-bred historians and political sages, have only come to an understanding concerning divine matters, there would have been no reason whatever for quarrelling over the earthly affairs. These ideologists are so gullible that they accept unquestioningly all the illusions that an epoch makes about itself or that ideologists of an epoch make about that epoch. People of that kind see in, say, the
Revolution of 1789 nothing but a somewhat heated debate over the advantages a constitutional monarchy has over absolutism, in the July Revolution a practical controversy over the untenability of justice "by the grace of God", and in the February Revolution an attempt at solving the problem: "republic or monarchy?", etc. To this day our ideologists have hardly any idea of the class struggles fought out in these upheavals, of which the political slogan on the banner is every time a bare expression, although the tidings about them are carried discernibly enough not only from abroad, but also by the rumble and grumble of many thousands of native proletarians.

Even the so-called religious wars of the sixteenth century mainly concerned very positive material class interests; those wars were class wars, too, just as the later internal collisions in England and France. Although the class struggles of those days were clothed in religious shibboleths, and though the interests, requirements, and demands of the various classes were concealed behind a religious screen, this changed nothing at all and is easily explained by the conditions of the times.

The Middle Ages had developed altogether from the raw. They wiped the old civilisation, the old philosophy, politics and jurisprudence off the slate, to begin anew in everything. The only thing they kept from the shattered old world was Christianity and a number of half-ruined towns divested of all civilisation. As a consequence, just as in every primitive stage of development, the clergy obtained a monopoly in intellectual education and education itself became essentially theological. In the hands of the clergy politics and jurisprudence, much like all other sciences, remained mere branches of theology, and were treated in accordance with the principles prevailing in the latter. Church dogmas were also political axioms, and Bible quotations had the validity of law in any court. Even when a special estate of jurists had begun to take shape, jurisprudence long remained under the patronage of theology. This supremacy of theology in the entire realm of intellectual activity was at the same time an inevitable consequence of the fact that the church was the all-embracing synthesis and the most general sanction of the existing feudal order.

It is clear that under the circumstances all the generally voiced attacks against feudalism, above all the attacks against the church, and all revolutionary social and political doctrines were necessarily

a Of 1830.—Ed.
b Of 1848.—Ed.
also mostly theological heresies. The existing social relations had to be stripped of their halo of sanctity before they could be attacked.

The revolutionary opposition to feudalism was alive throughout the Middle Ages. It took the shape of mysticism, open heresy, or armed insurrection, depending on the conditions of the time. It is well known how much sixteenth-century reformers depended on mysticism. Münzer himself was indebted to it. The heresies gave expression partly to the patriarchal Alpine shepherds' reaction to the feudalism advancing upon them (Waldenses, partly to the opposition of the towns that had outgrown feudalism (the Albigenses, Arnold of Brescia, etc.), and partly to direct peasant insurrections (John Ball and, among others, the Hungarian teacher in Picardy). We can here leave aside the patriarchal heresy of the Waldenses and the Swiss insurrection, which was in form and content a reactionary, purely local attempt at stemming the tide of history. In the two remaining forms of medieval heresy we find already in the twelfth century the precursors of the great antithesis between the burgher and peasant-plebeian oppositions, which caused the defeat of the Peasant War. This antithesis is seen throughout the later Middle Ages.

The town heresies—and those are the actual official heresies of the Middle Ages—were directed primarily against the clergy, whose wealth and political station they attacked. Just as the present-day bourgeoisie demands a gouvernement à bon marché (cheap government), the medieval burghers chiefly demanded an église à bon marché (cheap church). Reactionary in form like any heresy that sees only degeneration in the further development of church and dogma, the burgher heresy demanded the revival of the simple early Christian Church constitution and abolition of exclusive priesthood. This cheap arrangement would eliminate monks, prelates, and the court in Rome; in short, all the expensive element of the church. The towns, which were republics themselves, albeit under the protection of monarchs, were the first to enunciate in general terms through their attacks upon the Papacy that a republic was the normal form of bourgeois rule. Their hostility to some of the dogmas and church laws is explained partly by the foregoing, and partly by their living conditions. Their bitter opposition to celibacy, for instance, has never been better explained than by Boccaccio. Arnold of Brescia in Italy and Germany, the Albigenses in Southern France, John Wycliffe in England, Hus and the Calixtines in Bohemia, were the principal exponents of this trend. The towns were then already a recognised estate sufficiently capable of fighting secular feudalism with its privileges by force of arms or in the assemblies of the estates.
This explains quite simply why here the opposition to feudalism amounted only to opposition to ecclesiastical feudalism.

We also find in Southern France and in England and Bohemia that most of the lesser nobility joined the towns in their struggle against the clergy and in their heresies—which is explained by the dependence of the lesser nobility on the towns, and by their common interests as opposed to the princes and prelates. We shall encounter the same thing in the Peasant War.

The heresy that lent direct expression to peasant and plebeian needs and was almost invariably associated with an insurrection was of a totally different nature. Though it shared all the demands of the burgher heresy in relation to the clergy, the Papacy and the revival of the early Christian Church constitution, it went infinitely further. It demanded the restoration of early Christian equality among members of the community and recognition of this equality also as a prescript for the burgher world. It invoked the “equality of the children of God” to infer civil equality, and partly even equality of property. Equality of nobleman to peasant, of patrician and privileged burgher to the plebeian, abolition of statute labour, quitrents, taxes, privileges, and at least the most crying differences in property—those were the demands advanced with more or less determination as naturally consistent with the early Christian doctrine. At the time when feudalism was at its zenith there was little to choose between this peasant-plebeian heresy of the Albigenses, for example, and the burgher heresy, but in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries it developed into a clearly distinctive party opinion and usually occupied an independent place alongside the heresy of the burghers. This was so in the case of John Ball, preacher of Wat Tyler’s rebellion in England, and the Wycliffe movement, and of the Taborites and the Calixtines in Bohemia. In the case of the Taborites there was even already a republican tendency under the theocratic cloak, a view further developed by the plebeians in Germany in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

The fanaticism of mystically-minded sects, the Flagellants and Lollards, etc., which continued the revolutionary tradition in times of suppression, was contiguous with this form of heresy.

At that time the plebeians were the only class that stood outside the existing official society. They had no access to either the feudal or the burgher association. They had neither privileges nor property; they did not even have the kind of heavily-taxed property possessed by the peasant or petty burgher. They were propertyless and rightless in every respect; their living conditions never even brought
them into direct contact with the existing institutions, which ignored them completely. They were a living symptom of the decay of the feudal and guild-burgher society, and at the same time the first precursors of the modern bourgeois society.

This explains why even then the plebeian faction could not confine itself to fighting only feudalism and the privileged burghers; why, in fantasy at least, it reached beyond the then scarcely dawning modern bourgeois society; why, an absolutely propertyless faction, it questioned the institutions, views and conceptions common to all societies based on class antagonisms. In this respect, the chiliastic dream-visions of early Christianity offered a very convenient starting point. On the other hand, this sally beyond the present and even the future could be nothing but violent and fantastic, and was bound to slide back at its first practical application to within the narrow limits set by the contemporary situation. The attack on private property and the demand for community of property was bound to dissolve into a primitive organisation of charity; vague Christian equality could at best dissolve into civic “equality before the law”; elimination of all authority would finally end in the establishment of republican governments elected by the people. The anticipation of communism in fantasy became in reality an anticipation of modern bourgeois conditions.

This violent anticipation of coming historical developments, easily explained by the living conditions of the plebeians, is first seen in Germany, with Thomas Münzer and his party. True, the Taborites had a kind of chiliastic community of property, but that was a purely military measure. Only in the teachings of Münzer did these communist notions express the aspirations of a real section of society. He was the first to formulate them with a certain definiteness, and only after him do we find them in every great popular upheaval, until they gradually merge with the modern proletarian movement; just as the struggles of free peasants in the Middle Ages against the increasing feudal domination merged with the struggles of serfs and bondsmen for the complete abolition of the feudal system.

The first of the three large camps, the conservative Catholic, embraced all the elements interested in maintaining the existing conditions, i.e. the imperial authorities, the ecclesiastical and a section of the lay princes, the richer nobility, the prelates and the city patricians, while the camp of Lutheran reform, moderate in the burgher manner, attracted all the propertied elements of the opposition, the mass of the lesser nobility, the burghers, and even some of the lay princes who hoped to enrich themselves through confiscation of church estates and wanted to seize the opportunity of gaining
greater independence from the Empire. As for the peasants and plebeians, they formed a revolutionary party whose demands and doctrines were most forcefully set out by Münzer.

Luther and Münzer each fully represented his party by his doctrine, as well as by his character and behaviour.

Between 1517 and 1525 Luther changed just as much as the present-day German constitutionalists did between 1846 and 1849, and as every bourgeois party does when, placed for a time at the head of the movement, it is overwhelmed by the plebeian or proletarian party standing behind it.

When in 1517 Luther first opposed the dogmas and statutes of the Catholic Church his opposition was by no means of a definite character. Though it did not overstep the demands of the earlier burgher heresy, it did not and could not rule out any trend which went further. At that early stage it was necessary that all the opposition elements should be united, the most resolute revolutionary energy should be displayed, and the sum of the existing heresies against the Catholic orthodoxy should be represented. In exactly the same way our liberal bourgeois of 1847 was still revolutionary, called itself socialist and communist, and clamoured for the emancipation of the working class. Luther’s sturdy peasant nature asserted itself in the stormiest fashion in that first period of his activity.

“If the raging madness” (of the Roman churchmen) “were to continue, it seems to me no better counsel and remedy could be found against it than that kings and princes apply force, arm themselves, attack those evil people who have poisoned the entire world, and put an end to this game once and for all, with arms, not with words.” Since we punish thieves with the sword, murderers with the halter, and heretics with fire, why do we not turn on all those evil teachers of perdition, those popes, cardinals and bishops, and the entire swarm of the Roman Sodom with arms in hand, and wash our hands in their blood?”

But this initial revolutionary zeal was short-lived. Luther’s lightning struck home. The entire German people was set in motion. On the one hand, peasants and plebeians saw the signal to revolt in his appeals against the clergy, and in his sermon of Christian freedom; on the other, he was joined by the moderate burghers and a large section of the lesser nobility. Even princes were drawn into the maelstrom. The former believed the day had come to settle
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a The last three words are italicised by Engels.—Ed.
b Luther wrote: “punish thieves with the halter, murderers with the sword”.—Ed.
c *Epitoma responsionis ad Martinum Luther* [1520]. Engels quotes according to W. Zimmermann, *Allgemeine Geschichte des grossen Bauernkrieges*, Th. 1, S. 364-65.—Ed.
scores with all their oppressors, the latter only wished to break the power of the clergy, the dependence upon Rome, to abolish the Catholic hierarchy and to enrich themselves on the confiscation of church property. The parties stood aloof from each other, and each had its spokesmen. Luther had to choose between them. He, the protégé of the Elector of Saxony, the revered professor of Wittenberg who had become powerful and famous overnight, the great man with his coterie of servile creatures and flatterers, did not hesitate for a single moment. He dropped the popular elements of the movement and took the side of the burghers, the nobility, and the princes. His appeals for a war of extermination against Rome resounded no more. Luther now preached *peaceful progress* and *passive resistance* (cf., for example, *An den Adel teutscher Nation*, 1520, etc.). Invited by Hutten to visit him and Sickingen in the castle of Ebern, where the nobility conspired against the clergy and the princes, Luther replied:

"I do not wish the Gospel defended by force and bloodshed. The World was conquered by the Word, the Church is maintained by the Word, the Word will also put the Church back into its own, and Antichrist, who gained his own without violence, will fall without violence."

From this reversal or, to be more exact, from this more definite explication of Luther's policy sprang that bartering and haggling over institutions and dogmas to be retained or reformed, that disgusting diplomatising, conciliating, intriguing and compromising, which resulted in the Confession of Augsburg, the finally importuned articles of a reformed burgher church. It was quite the same kind of petty bargaining as was recently repeated in political form *ad nauseam* at the German national assemblies, agreement assemblies, chambers of revision, and Erfurt parliament. The philistine nature of the official Reformation was most distinctly on display at these negotiations.

There were good reasons for Luther, henceforth the recognised representative of the burgher reform, to preach lawful progress. The bulk of the towns espoused the cause of moderate reform, the lesser nobility became more and more devoted to it, and a section of the princes joined in, while another section vacillated. Success was as
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*a* Frederick III.—*Ed.*

*b* The 1850 edition has *Vertilgungsrufe* (appeals for extermination) instead of *Aufrufe zum Vertilgungskampfe* (appeals for a war of extermination).—*Ed.*

*c* A passage from Luther's letter to Hutten quoted in his letter to Spalatin dated January 16, 1521. Intaliced by Engels. (See W. Zimmermann, op. cit., Th. 1, S. 366.)—*Ed.*
good as won, at least in a large part of Germany. The remaining regions could not in the long run withstand the pressure of moderate opposition in the event of continued peaceful development. On the other hand, any violent upheaval was bound to bring the moderate party into conflict with the extremist plebeian and peasant party, to alienate the princes, the nobility, and many towns from the movement, leaving the alternative of either the burgher party being overshadowed by the peasants and plebeians or all the parties to the movement being crushed by a Catholic restoration. We have seen examples enough of late of how, after gaining the slightest victory, bourgeois parties sought to steer a lawful course between the Scylla of revolution and the Charybdis of restoration.

Since in the social and political conditions of that time the results of every change were bound to benefit the princes and inevitably increased their power, it came about that the burgher reform fell the more completely under the control of the reformed princes, the more sharply it broke away from the plebeian and peasant elements. Luther himself became more and more their vassal, and the people knew perfectly well what they were doing when they accused him of having become just another flunkey of the princes, and when they stoned him in Orlamünde.

When the Peasant War broke out, and this in regions where the nobility and the princes were mostly Catholic, Luther tried to strike a mediatory pose. He resolutely attacked the authorities. He said it was their oppression that was to blame for the rebellion, that it was not the peasants but God himself who had risen against them. Yet, on the other hand, he said, the revolt was ungodly and contrary to the Gospel. In the end he advised both parties to yield and reach an amicable understanding.\(^\text{a}\)

But in spite of these well-meaning mediatory offers, the revolt spread swiftly and even involved Protestant regions dominated by Lutheran princes, lords and towns, rapidly outgrowing the “circumspect” burgher reform. The most determined faction of the insurgents under Münzer made its headquarters in Luther’s immediate proximity in Thuringia. A few more successes and the whole of Germany would be in flames, Luther surrounded and perhaps piked as a traitor, and the burgher reform swept away by the tide of a peasant-plebeian revolution. This was no time for circumspection. All the old animosities were forgotten in the face of the revolution. Compared with the hordes of peasants, the servants

\(^a\) M. Luther, Ermanunge zum fride auff die zwelff artikel der Bawrschaft ynn Schwaben, Wittemberg, 1525.— Ed.
of the Roman Sodom were innocent lambs, sweet-tempered children of God. Burgher and prince, noble and clergyman, Luther and the Pope, all joined hands "against the murderous and plundering peasant hordes".\footnote{Part of the title of the pamphlet: M. Luther, Wyder die mördische unnd reubischen Rottenn der Paurenn [Wittenberg, 1525]. The passage that follows is quoted according to the text given by W. Zimmermann (op. cit., Th. 3, S. 870). Italics by Engels.—\textit{Ed.}}

"They must be \textit{knocked to pieces, strangled and stabbed, covertly and overtly}, by everyone who can, just as one must kill a \textit{mad dog}!" Luther cried. "Therefore, dear sirs, help here, save there, stab, knock, strangle them everyone who can, and should you lose your life, bless you, no better death can you ever attain." There should be no false mercy for the peasant. Whoever hath pity on those whom God pityes not, whom He wishes punished and destroyed, belongs among the rebels himself. Later the peasants themselves would learn to thank God when they had to give up one cow in order to enjoy the other in peace, and the princes would learn through the upheaval the spirit of the mob that must be ruled by force only.\footnote{An indirect quotation from M. Luther, \textit{Ein Sendbrief von dem harten Büchlein wider die Bauern} [1525].—\textit{Ed.}} "The wise man says: \textit{cibus, onus et virga asino}.\footnote{Latin for "food, pack, and lash to the ass".—\textit{Ed.}} The peasants must have nothing but chaff. They do not hearken to the Word, and are foolish, so they must hearken to the rod and the gun, and that serves them right. We must pray for them that they obey. Where they do not there should be little mercy. \textit{Let the guns roar among them}, or else they will do it a thousand times worse."\footnote{M. Luthers Schreiben an Johann Rühel, May 30, 1525. Italics by Engels. Quoted according to W. Zimmermann, op. cit., Th. 3, S. 714.—\textit{Ed.}}

Our late socialist and philanthropic bourgeoisie said the same things when the proletariat claimed its share of the fruits of victory after the March events.

Luther had put a powerful tool into the hands of the plebeian movement by translating the Bible. Through the Bible he contrasted the feudalised Christianity of his day with the moderate Christianity of the first centuries, and the decaying feudal society with a picture of a society that knew nothing of the ramified and artificial feudal hierarchy. The peasants had made extensive use of this instrument against the princes, the nobility, and the clergy. Now Luther turned it against the peasants, extracting from the Bible such a veritable hymn to the God-ordained authorities as no bootlicker of absolute monarchy had ever been able to match. Princedom by the grace of God, resigned obedience, even serfdom, were sanctioned with the aid of the Bible. Not the peasant revolt alone, but Luther's own mutiny against religious and lay authority were thereby disavowed; not only the popular movement, but the burgher movement as well, were betrayed to the princes.
Need we name the bourgeois who recently provided examples of the same disavowal of their own past?

Let us now compare the plebeian revolutionary, Münzer, with Luther, the burgher reformer.

Thomas Münzer was born in Stolberg, in the Harz, somewhere around 1498.311 His father is said to have died on the scaffold, a victim of the obstinacy of the Count of Stolberg. In his fifteenth year Münzer organised a secret union at the Halle school against the Archbishop of Magdeburg and the Roman Church in general. His learning in the theology of his time brought him an early doctor's degree and the position of chaplain in a Halle nunnery. Here he treated the church dogmas and rites with the greatest contempt. At mass he omitted the words of the transubstantiation and, as Luther said, devoured the almighty gods unconsecrated. The medieval mystics, and particularly the chiliastic works of Joachim the Calabrese, were the main subject of his studies. The millennium and the Day of Judgment of the degenerated church and corrupted world propounded and described by that mystic seemed to Münzer imminently close, what with the Reformation and the general unrest of his time. He preached in his neighbourhood with great success. In 1520 he went to Zwickau as the first evangelist preacher. There he found one of those fanatical chiliastic sects that continued their existence on the quiet in many localities, whose momentary humility and detachment concealed the increasingly rampant opposition to the prevailing conditions of the lowest strata of society, and who were now, with the unrest growing, coming into the light of day ever more boldly and persistently. It was the sect of the Anabaptists headed by Niklas Storch. They preached the approach of the Day of Judgment and of the millennium; they had "visions, transports, and the spirit of prophecy" and soon came into conflict with the Council of Zwickau. Münzer defended them, though he never joined them unconditionally and would much rather have brought them under his own influence. The Council took drastic measures against them; they had to leave the town, and Münzer with them. This was at the close of 1521.

He went to Prague and sought to gain a foothold there by joining the remnants of the Hussite movement. But all that he accomplished with his proclamation was that he had to flee from Bohemia as well.

---

311 Th. Müntzer, Ankündigung mit eigner Hand geschrieben, und in Prag 1521 angeschlagen wider die Papisten. (See W. Zimmermann, op. cit., Th. 2, S. 64-67.) — Ed.

312 M. Luther's Schrift von der Winkelmesse. (See W. Zimmermann, op. cit., Th. 2, S. 55.) — Ed.

---

Ernst.— Ed.
In 1522 he became preacher at Allstedt in Thuringia. The first thing he did here was to reform the cult. Even before Luther dared to go so far, he entirely abolished the Latin language and ordered the entire Bible, and not only the prescribed Sunday Gospels and epistles, to be read to the people. At the same time, he organised propaganda in his locality. People flocked to him from all directions, and Allstedt soon became the centre of the popular anti-priest movement of all Thuringia.

Münzer was as yet more theologian than anything else. He still directed his attacks almost exclusively against the priests. He did not, however, preach quiet debate and peaceful progress as Luther did at that time, but continued Luther’s earlier violent sermons, calling upon the princes of Saxony and the people to rise in arms against the Roman priests.

“Does not Christ say, ‘I came not to send peace, but a sword’? What must you” (the princes of Saxony) “do with that sword? Only one thing if you wish to be the servants of God, and that is to drive out and destroy the evil ones who stand in the way of the Gospel. Christ ordered very earnestly (Luke 19:27): ‘bring hither mine enemies and slay them before me’.... Do not shallowly pretend that the power of God will do it without the aid of your sword, for then it would rust in its sheath. Those who stand in the way of God’s revelation must be destroyed mercilessly, as Ezekiel, Cyrus, Josiah, Daniel and Elijah destroyed the priests of Baal, else the Christian Church will never come back to its source. We must uproot the weeds in God’s vineyard at harvest time. God said in the Fifth Book of Moses, 7, ‘thou shalt not show mercy unto the idolaters, but ye shall destroy their altars, and break down their images and burn them with fire that I shall not be wroth at you’.”

But these appeals to the princes were of no avail, while revolutionary sentiments among the people grew day by day. Münzer, whose ideas became ever sharper and ever more bold, now resolutely broke away from the burgher Reformation, and henceforth also became an out-and-out political agitator.

His philosophico-theological doctrine attacked all the main points not only of Catholicism, but of Christianity generally. In the form of Christianity he preached a kind of pantheism, which curiously resembled modern speculative contemplation and at times even approached atheism. He repudiated the Bible both as the only and as the infallible revelation. The real and living revelation, he said, was reason, a revelation that has existed at all times and still exists among all peoples. To hold up the Bible against reason, he maintained, was to kill the spirit with the letter, for the Holy Spirit of which the Bible speaks is not something that exists outside us—the Holy Spirit is our

\[ a \] Th. Müntzer, Die Fürstenpredigt. Auslegung des andern unterschyds Danielis dess propheten gepredigt auffm schlos zu Alstet vor den tetigen thewren Herzogen vnd vorstehern zu Sachsseen durch Thomä Müntzer diener des wordt gottes, Alstedt, MDXXIII.—Ed.
reason. Faith is nothing but reason come alive in man, and pagans could therefore also have faith. Through this faith, through reason come to life, man became godlike and blessed. Heaven is, therefore, nothing of another world and is to be sought in this life. It is the mission of believers to establish this Heaven, the kingdom of God, here on earth. Just as there is no Heaven in the beyond, there is also no Hell and no damnation. Similarly, there is no devil but man’s evil lusts and greed. Christ was a man as we are, a prophet and a teacher, and his supper is a plain meal of commemoration wherein bread and wine are consumed without any mystic garnish.

Münzer preached these doctrines mostly concealed in the same Christian phraseology behind which the present-day philosophy has had to hide for some time. But the arch-heretical fundamental idea is easily discerned in all his writings, and he obviously took the biblical cloak much less in earnest than many a disciple of Hegel does in modern times. Yet three hundred years separate Münzer from modern philosophy.

Münzer’s political doctrine was very closely aligned to these revolutionary religious conceptions, and overstepped the directly prevailing social and political conditions in much the same way as his theology overstepped the conceptions current in his time. As Münzer’s religious philosophy approached atheism, so his political programme approached communism, and even on the eve of the February Revolution more than one present-day communist sect lacked as comprehensive a theoretical arsenal as was “Münzer’s” in the sixteenth century. This programme, which was less a compilation of the demands of the plebeians of that day than a brilliant anticipation of the conditions for the emancipation of the proletarian element that had scarcely begun to develop among the plebeians—this programme demanded the immediate establishment of the kingdom of God on Earth, of the prophesied millennium, by restoring the church to its original status and abolishing all the institutions that conflicted with the purportedly early Christian but in fact very novel church. By the kingdom of God Münzer meant a society with no class differences, no private property and no state authority independent of, and foreign to, the members of society. All the existing authorities, insofar as they refused to submit and join the revolution, were to be overthrown, all work and all property shared in common, and complete equality introduced. A union was to be established to realise all this, and not only throughout Germany, but throughout Christendom. Princes and lords would be invited to join, but should they refuse the union was to take up arms and overthrow or kill them at the first opportunity.
Münzer set to work at once to organise the union. His sermons became still more militant and revolutionary. He thundered forth against the princes, the nobility and the patricians with a passion that equalled the fervour of his attacks upon the clergy. He depicted the prevailing oppression in burning colours and countered it with his dream-vision of the millennium of social republican equality. Also, he published one revolutionary pamphlet after another, and sent emissaries in all directions, while personally organising the union in Allstedt and its vicinity.

The first fruit of this propaganda was the destruction of St. Mary's Chapel in Mellerbach near Allstedt, according to the command of the Bible (Deut. 7 [5], 6): “Ye shall destroy their altars, and break down their images ... and burn their graven images with fire for thou art an holy people.” The princes of Saxony came in person to Allstedt to quell the unrest and bid Münzer come to the castle. There he delivered a sermon the like of which they had not heard from Luther, whom Münzer described as “that easy-living flesh of Wittenberg”.a Münzer maintained that ungodly rulers, especially priests and monks who treated the Gospel as heresy, should be killed, and referred to the New Testament for confirmation. The ungodly had no right to live save by the mercy of the elect. Should the princes not exterminate the ungodly, God would take their sword from them, because the entire community had the power of the sword. The princes and lords are the prime movers of usury, thievery and robbery; they take all creatures into their private possession—the fish in the water, the birds in the air, and the plants in the soil. And then they preach to the poor the commandment, “Thou shalt not steal,” while they themselves take everything they find, and rob and oppress the peasant and the artisan. If, however, one of the latter commits the slightest transgression, he has to hang, and Dr. Lügner says to all this: Amen.

“The masters themselves are to blame that the poor man becomes their enemy. If they do not remove the causes of the upheaval, how can things go well in the long run? Oh, dear sirs, how the Lord will smite these old pots with an iron rod! But for saying so, I am regarded a rebel. So be it!” (Cf. Zimmermann’s Bauernkrieg, Th. 2, S. 75.)b

---

a This phrase is part of the title of Th. Münzer’s pamphlet directed against Luther, Hochverursachte Schutzrede und antwort / wider das Gaitlosse Sanfft lebende fleysch zu Wittenberg.... Thomas Münzer Alstedter... Anno MDXXIII. (In this pamphlet Münzer refers to Luther as Dr. Lügner, the German for Dr. Liar.)—Ed.

b This quotation from Münzer’s speeches (see the above-quoted Hochverursachte Schutzrede... and Die Fürstenpredigt...) is given according to Zimmermann’s book.—Ed.
Münzer had the sermon printed. Duke Johann of Saxony punished his Allstedt printer with banishment, and ordered all Münzer’s writings to be censored from then on by the ducal government in Weimar. But Münzer paid no heed to this order. He hastened to publish a highly inciting paper* in the imperial city of Mühlhausen, wherein he called on the people

“to widen the hole so that all the world may see and understand who our great personages are that have blasphemously turned our Lord into a painted manikin”.

It ended with the following words:

“All the world must suffer a big jolt. There will be such a game that the ungodly will be thrown off their seats, and the downtrodden will rise.”

Thomas Münzer, “the man with the hammer”, wrote the following motto on the title page:

“Beware, I have put my words into thy mouth that thou mayest uproot, destroy, scatter and overthrow, and that thou mayest build and plant. A wall of iron against the kings, princes, priests, and against the people hath been erected. Let them fight, for victory will wondrously lead to the perdition of the strong and godless tyrants.”

Münzer’s breach with Luther and his party had taken place long before. Luther had had to accept some of the church reforms which Münzer had introduced without consulting him. He watched Münzer’s activities with a moderate reformer’s nettled mistrust of a more energetic, ambitious party. Already in the spring of 1524, in a letter to Melanchthon, that model of a zealous stick-in-the-mud philistine, Münzer wrote that he and Luther did not understand the movement at all. He said they sought to choke it by the letter of the Bible, and that their doctrine was worm-eaten.

“Dear brethren,” he wrote, “cease your waiting and hesitation. It is time, for summer is at the door. Keep not friendship with the ungodly who hinder the Word from working its full force. Flatter not your princes, or you will perish with them. Ye tender scholars, be not wroth, for I can do nothing else.”

Luther had more than once challenged Münzer to an open debate. The latter, however, always ready to take up the battle before the people, had not the least desire to let himself in for a theological

---


*b In the 1850 edition there follows a phrase missing in the 1870 and 1875 editions: “I have put you over the people and over the empires.” — Ed.

*c From Münzer’s letter to Melanchthon of March 27, 1522. (Zimmermann erroneously dated it March 29, 1524.) — Ed.
squabble before the partisan public of Wittenberg University. He did not wish “to bring the testimony of the Spirit exclusively before the high school of learning”. If Luther were sincere, he should use his influence to stop the chicaneries against his, Münzer’s, printer, and lift the censorship so that their controversy might be freely fought in the press.

But now, when Münzer’s above-mentioned revolutionary brochure appeared, Luther denounced him publicly. In his published *Brief an die Fürsten zu Sachsen von dem auffrurischen geyst* he declared Münzer to be an instrument of Satan and called upon the princes to intervene and drive the instigators of the turmoil out of the country, since they did not confine themselves to preaching their evil doctrine but also incited to insurrection, to violent action against the authorities.

On August 1, Münzer was compelled to appear before the princes in the castle of Weimar on the charge of incitement to mutiny. Highly compromising facts had been obtained against him; they were on the scent of his secret union; his hand was detected in the societies of the miners and the peasants. He was threatened with banishment. No sooner had he returned to Allstedt than he learned that Duke George of Saxony demanded his extradition. Union letters in his handwriting had been-intercepted, wherein he called George’s subjects to armed resistance against the enemies of the Gospel. Had he not left the town, the Council would have extradited him.

In the meantime, the growing unrest among the peasants and plebeians had made it incomparably easier for Münzer to carry on his propaganda. In the Anabaptists he found invaluable agents for this purpose. This sect, which had no definite and positive dogmas, held together only by its common opposition to all ruling classes and by the common symbol of the second baptism, ascetic in its mode of living, untiring, fanatical and intrepid in carrying on propaganda, had grouped itself more and more closely around Münzer. Made homeless by persecutions, its members wandered all over Germany and carried word everywhere of the new teaching, in which Münzer had made their own demands and wishes clear to them. Countless Anabaptists were put on the rack, burned at the stake or otherwise executed, but the courage and endurance of these emissaries was unshakable, and the success of their activities amid the people’s rapidly growing unrest was enormous. Thus, after his flight from Thuringia, Münzer found the ground prepared wherever he went.

---

*a Th. Müntzer, *Aussgetrückte emplössung des falschen Glaubens der ungetrewen welt...,* quoted according to W. Zimmermann, op. cit., Th. 2, S. 77.—*Ed.*
Near Nuremberg, where Münzer went first, a peasant revolt had been nipped in the bud hardly a month before. Münzer conducted his propaganda surreptitiously; soon people appeared who defended his most audacious theological ideas on the non-obligatory nature of the Bible and the meaninglessness of sacraments, who declared Christ a mere human and the power of the lay authorities ungodly. "There is Satan stalking, the Spirit of Allstedt!" Luther exclaimed. In Nuremberg Münzer printed his reply to Luther. He accused him of flattering the princes and supporting the reactionary party by his insipid moderation. But the people would free themselves all the same, he wrote, and it would go with Dr. Luther as with a captive fox. — The Council ordered the paper confiscated, and Münzer had to leave Nuremberg.

Now he went across Swabia to Alsace, then to Switzerland, and then back to the Upper Black Forest, where an insurrection had broken out several months before, largely precipitated by his Anabaptist emissaries. This propaganda tour of Münzer's had doubtless substantially contributed to the establishment of the people's party, to the clear definition of its demands and to the final general outbreak of the insurrection in April 1525. It was through this tour that the dual effect of Münzer's activities became particularly apparent—on the one hand, on the people, whom he addressed in the only language they could then comprehend, that of religious prophecy; and, on the other hand, on the initiated to whom he could disclose his ultimate aims. Even before his journey he had assembled in Thuringia a circle of resolute men from among the people and the lesser clergy, whom he had put at the head of the secret society. Now he became the soul of the entire revolutionary movement in Southwestern Germany, organised ties from Saxony and Thuringia through Franconia and Swabia up to Alsace and the Swiss border, and counted such South German agitators as Hubmaier of Waldshut, Konrad Grebel of Zurich, Franz Rabmann of Griessen, Schappeler of Memmingen, Jakob Wehe of Leipheim, and Dr. Mantel in Stuttgart, who were mostly revolutionary priests, among his disciples and the heads of the union. He himself stayed mostly in Griessen on the Schaffhausen border, journeying from there across the Hegau, Klettgau, etc. The bloody reprisals by the alarmed princes and lords everywhere against this new plebeian

---

a From Luther's letter to Johannes Briessmann, dated February 4, 1525. Quoted according to Zimmermann, op. cit., Th. 2, S. 81.—Ed.

b Th. Müntzer, Hochverursachte Schutzrede vnd antwwort/wider das Gaistlosse Sanfft lebende sleysch zu Wittenberg...—Ed.
heresy contributed not a little to fanning the spirit of rebellion and consolidating the ranks of the union. In this way Münzer conducted his agitation for about five months in Upper Germany and returned to Thuringia when the culmination of the conspiracy was near at hand, because he wished to lead the movement himself. There we shall find him later.

We shall see how truly the character and behaviour of the two party leaders reflected the attitude of their respective parties, how Luther's indecision and fear of the movement, which was assuming serious proportions, and his cowardly servility to the princes fully corresponded to the hesitant and ambiguous policy of the burghers, and how Münzer's revolutionary energy and resolution was reproduced among the most advanced section of the plebeians and peasants. The only difference was that while Luther confined himself to expressing the ideas and wishes of the majority of his class and thereby won very cheap popularity among it, Münzer, on the contrary, went far beyond the immediate ideas and demands of the plebeians and peasants, and organised a party of the élite of the then existing revolutionary elements, which, inasmuch as it shared his ideas and energy, always remained only a small minority of the insurgent masses.
III

The first signs of a budding revolutionary spirit appeared among the German peasants about fifty years after the suppression of the Hussite movement.*

In 1476 the first peasant conspiracy occurred in the bishopric of Würzburg, a land impoverished by the Hussite wars, “by bad government, manifold taxes, payments, feuds, enmity, war, fire, murder, prison and the like”,a and continually and shamelessly plundered by bishops, priests and the nobility. A young shepherd and musician, Hans Böheim of Niklashausen, also called the Drum-Beater and Hans the Piper, suddenly appeared as a prophet in the Tauber valley. He declared that he had had a vision of the Virgin Mary, that she had commanded him to burn his drum, to stop serving the dance and sinful sensuality, and to exhort the people to penance. Everyone should purge himself of sin and the vain lusts of the world, forsake all ornaments and finery, and make a pilgrimage to the Madonna of Niklashausen to obtain forgiveness.

Already here, with the first precursor of the movement, we find the asceticism typical of all medieval uprisings tinged with religion and, in modern times, of the early stages of every proletarian movement. This ascetic austerity of morals, this demand to forsake all joys of life and all entertainments, opposes the ruling classes with

* In our chronology we are following the data given by Zimmermann, upon which we are obliged to rely in the absence of adequate sources abroad and which are quite satisfactory for the purposes of the present work.— Note by Engels to the 1850 edition. (In the 1870 and 1875 editions this note was omitted since Engels pointed out in the Preface that he was using Zimmermann’s data.— Ed.)

a Engels quotes an extract from a 15th-century manuscript preserved in the Würzburg archive. See W. Zimmermann, Allgemeine Geschichte des grossen Bauernkrieges, Th. 1, S. 118.— Ed.
the principle of Spartan equality, on the one hand, and is, on the other, a necessary stage of transition without which the lowest stratum of society can never set itself in motion. In order to develop its revolutionary energy, to become conscious of its own hostile attitude towards all other elements of society, to concentrate itself as a class, it must begin by stripping itself of everything that could reconcile it with the existing social system; it must renounce the few pleasures that make its wretched existence in the least tolerable for the moment, and of which even the severest oppression could not deprive it. This plebeian and proletarian asceticism differs both in its wild fanatical form and in its essence from the bourgeois asceticism of the Lutheran burgher morality and of the English Puritans (as distinct from the Independents and the more radical sects), whose entire secret amounts to bourgeois thrift. It stands to reason, however, that this plebeian-proletarian asceticism gradually sheds its revolutionary nature when the development of modern productive forces infinitely multiplies the luxuries, thus rendering Spartan equality superfluous, and when the position of the proletariat in society, and thereby the proletariat itself, become more revolutionary. This asceticism disappears gradually from among the masses, and in the sects, which relied upon it, it degenerates either directly into bourgeois parsimony or into a high-sounding virtuousness which, in practice, degenerates to a philistine or guild-artisan meanness. Besides, renunciation of pleasures need hardly be preached to the proletariat for the simple reason that it has almost nothing more to renounce.

Hans the Piper's call to penitence found a ready response; all the prophets of rebellion began with this call, and, indeed, only a violent exertion, a sudden renunciation of all this habitual mode of existence could set this disunited and widely scattered peasant species, raised in blind submission, into motion. The pilgrimages to Niklashausen began and rapidly increased, and the more massive the stream of pilgrims, the more openly the young rebel spoke out his plans. The Madonna of Niklashausen had told him, he preached, that henceforth there should be neither king nor prince, neither papal nor any other ecclesiastic or lay authority. Each should be a brother to the other and win his bread by the toil of his own hands, and none should have more than his neighbour. All tributes, rents, services, tolls, taxes and other payments and duties should be for ever abolished, and forest, water and pasture should everywhere be free.

The people received this new gospel with joy. The fame of the prophet, "the message of our Lady", spread far and wide; pilgrim throngs flocked to him from Odenwald, from the Main, Kocher and
Jagst, even from Bavaria and Swabia, and from the Rhine. Miracles said to have been performed by the Piper were recounted; people fell to their knees before him, praying to him as to a saint, and then fought for tufts from his cap for relics or amulets. In vain did the priests speak against him, denouncing his visions as the devil's delusions and his miracles as diabolic swindles. The mass of the believers increased precipitously, a revolutionary sect began to take shape, the Sunday sermons of the rebel shepherd drew gatherings of 40,000 and more to Niklashausen.

Hans the Piper preached to the masses for a number of months, but he did not intend to confine himself to preaching. He had secret connections with the pastor of Niklashausen and with two knights, Kunz von Thunfeld and his son, who held to the new teaching and were to become the military leaders of the planned insurrection. Finally, on the Sunday before the day of St. Kilian, when his power appeared to be great enough, the shepherd gave the signal.

"And now go home," he closed his sermon, "and weigh in your mind what our holiest Lady has announced to you, and on the coming Saturday leave your wives and children and old men at home, and you, men, come back to Niklashausen on the day of St. Margaret, which is next Saturday, and bring your brothers and friends, as many as they may be. Do not come with pilgrim's staves, however, but with armour and arms, a candle in one hand, and a sword, pike or halberd in the other, and the Holy Virgin will then tell you what she wishes you to do."

But before the peasants arrived in their numbers, the bishop's horsemen seized the rebel prophet at night and brought him to the castle of Würzburg. On the appointed day almost 34,000 armed peasants appeared, but the news of the Piper's detention crushed them. Most of them went home, while the initiated kept about 16,000 together, with whom they marched to the castle under the leadership of Kunz von Thunfeld and his son Michael. The bishop persuaded them with promises to turn back, but no sooner had they begun to disperse than they were attacked by the bishop's horsemen and many of them taken captive. Two were decapitated, and Hans the Piper was burned at the stake. Kunz von Thunfeld escaped and was allowed to return only after ceding all his estates to the bishopric. The pilgrimages to Niklashausen continued for some time, but were finally also suppressed.

After this initial attempt, Germany remained quiet for some time. Only towards the close of the century were there any new peasant revolts and conspiracies.

---

a From a free rendering of the sermon as given by W. Zimmermann (op. cit., Th. I, S. 121-22).—Ed.
b Rudolf II von Scherenberg.—Ed.
We shall pass over the Dutch peasant revolt of 1491 and 1492, which was suppressed by Duke Albrecht of Saxony in the battle of Heemskerk, the simultaneous peasant revolt in the Abbey of Kempten in Upper Swabia, and the Frisian revolt under Sjoerd Aylva, about 1497, which was also suppressed by Albrecht of Saxony. These revolts were partly too far from the scene of the Peasant War proper, and partly uprisings of hitherto free peasants against the attempt to force feudalism upon them. We pass on to the two great conspiracies which laid the ground for the Peasant War: the *Bundschuh* and the *Poor Konrad*.

The same famine that had precipitated the peasant revolt in the Netherlands, brought about a secret alliance of peasants and plebeians in Alsace in 1493; people of the purely burgher opposition took part in it, and it even enjoyed some sympathy among the lesser nobility. The seat of the alliance was in the region of Schlettstadt, Sulz, Dambach, Rosheim, Scherweiler, etc., etc. The conspirators demanded plunder and extermination of Jews, whose usury then, as now, fleeced the peasants of Alsace, proclamation of a jubilee year, whereby all debts would expire, repeal of duties, tolls and other imposts, abolition of the ecclesiastical and Rottweil (imperial) court, the right of the estates to ratify taxes, reduction of the priests’ prebend to fifty or sixty guilders, abolition of the auricular confession, and self-elected courts for every community. When they were strong enough the conspirators planned to overpower the stronghold of Schlettstadt, to confiscate the treasuries of the monasteries and of the town, and from there to arouse the whole of Alsace. The banner of the Union, which was to be unfurled at the start of the uprising, depicted a peasant’s clog with a long leather thong, the so-called *Bundschuh*, which served peasant conspiracies as an emblem and name in the following twenty years.

The conspirators were wont to hold their meetings at night on the lonesome Hunger Hill. Initiation into the Bundschuh involved the most mysterious of ceremonies and the severest threats of punishment for betrayal. But the affair got abroad about Easter Week of 1493, the time appointed for the attack on Schlettstadt. The authorities stepped in immediately. Many of the conspirators were arrested and tortured, some were quartered or decapitated, and others had their hands or fingers cut off and were driven out of the country. A great many fled to Switzerland.

---

*a* The Frisian peasant revolt occurred in 1500. Engels gives the date 1497 as in Zimmermann.—*Ed.*
The Bundschuh, however, was far from crushed by this first blow. On the contrary, it continued in secret and the numerous fugitives scattered all over Switzerland and South Germany became as many emissaries. Finding the same oppression and, consequently, the same inclination to revolt everywhere they went, they propagated the Bundschuh in the whole of the present-day Baden. The tenacity and stamina with which the peasants of Upper Germany conspired for about thirty years after 1493, with which they surmounted all the obstacles arising from their scattered way of life on the road to a larger, more centralised organisation, and with which they renewed their conspiracies over and over after countless dispersions, defeats, and executions of their leaders, until an opportunity came at last for a mass uprising—the tenacity is truly admirable.

In 1502 there were signs of a secret movement among the peasants of the bishopric of Speyer, which at that time also included the locality of Bruchsal. The Bundschuh had reorganised itself there with really considerable success. About 7,000 men belonged to the society, whose centre was in Untergrombach, between Bruchsal and Weingarten, and whose ramifications reached down the Rhine to the Main, and up to the Margraviate of Baden. Its articles said: neither rent nor tithe, neither tax nor toll are to be paid any longer to the princes, the nobility, or the clergy; serfdom is to be abolished; the monasteries and other church estates are to be confiscated and divided among the people, and no other ruler is to be recognised save the Emperor.

Here we find for the first time expressed by peasants the two demands—secularising church estates in favour of the people, and a united and indivisible German monarchy—which will henceforth be advocated regularly by the more advanced peasants and plebeians, until Thomas Münzer changes distribution of church estates to confiscation and conversion into community of property, and a united German Empire to a united and indivisible republic.

The revived Bundschuh, like the old, had its own secret meeting place, its oath of silence, its initiation ceremonies, and its union banner with the legend, "Nothing but God's Justice!" Its plan of action was similar to that of the Alsatian union. Bruchsal, most of whose inhabitants belonged to the Bundschuh, was to be captured and a Bundschuh army organised there and sent into the surrounding principalities as an itinerant meeting point.

The plan was betrayed by a clergyman who had learned of it from one of the conspirators in the confessional. The authorities instantly took countermeasures. How widespread the Bundschuh had become is evident from the terror that seized the various imperial estates in Alsace and the Swabian League. Troops were concen-
trated, and mass arrests were made. Emperor Maximilian, "last of the knights", issued bloodthirsty punitive decrees against the unheard-of peasant undertaking. Throngs of peasants assembled here and there and offered armed resistance, but the isolated peasant troops could not hold out for long. Some of the conspirators were executed, others escaped, but secrecy was so well preserved that, in their own localities and in the possessions of the neighbouring lords, the majority, even the leaders, remained unharmed.

After this new defeat there followed a long period of apparent calm in the class struggle. But work went on underground. In the first years of the sixteenth century Poor Konrad appeared in Swabia, evidently with the support of the scattered members of the Bundschuh. In the Black Forest the Bundschuh continued in small isolated groups until, ten years later, an energetic peasant leader succeeded in gathering the various threads into a major conspiracy. Both conspiracies became public one after the other in the restless years of 1513-15, in which the Swiss, Hungarian and Slovenian peasants rose simultaneously in a series of major insurrections.

The man who revived the Upper Rhine Bundschuh was Joss Fritz of Untergrombach, a fugitive of the conspiracy of 1502, a former soldier, and in all respects an outstanding figure. After his flight he stayed in various localities between Lake Constance and the Black Forest, and finally settled in Lehen near Freiburg in Breisgau, where he even became a forester. Most interesting facts are contained in the court records about the manner in which he reorganised the Bundschuh from that vantage point and how ingeniously he recruited people of different kinds. The diplomatic talent and tireless perseverance of this model conspirator helped him enrol a great number of people of various classes into the Bundschuh — knights, priests, burghers, plebeians and peasants, and it appears almost certain that he even organised several more or less sharply divided grades of the conspiracy. All serviceable elements were utilised with the greatest circumspection and skill. Apart from the more initiated emissaries who traversed the country in various disguises, vagrants and beggars were employed for subordinate missions. Joss stood in direct contact with the beggar kings, and through them held the numerous vagabond population in the palm of his hand. The beggar kings played a considerable role in his conspiracy. They were very bizarre figures: one roamed the country with a girl whose seemingly wounded feet were his pretext for begging; he had more than eight insignia on his hat—the Fourteen Deliverers, St. Ottilie, Our Mother in Heaven, etc.—and, besides, wore a long red beard and carried a big knotty stick with a dagger
and pike. Another, who begged in the name of St. Velten, had spices and wormseeds for sale, and wore a long iron-coloured coat, a red barret with the insignia of the Infant of Trient attached to it, a sword at his side, and many knives and a dagger in his girdle. Others had bleeding wounds, which they deliberately did not allow to heal, and their attire was also picturesque. There were at least ten of them, and for the price of two thousand guilders they were simultaneously to set aflame Alsace, the Margraviate of Baden, and Breisgau, and to put themselves, with at least 2,000 of their kind, under the command of Georg Schneider, a former captain of the mercenaries, on the day of the Zabern parish fair in Rosen, in order to take possession of that town. A courier service from station to station was established by members of the Bundschuh, and Joss Fritz and his chief emissary, Stoffel of Freiburg, rode continually from place to place to hold nocturnal military reviews of the neophytes. The court records offer ample evidence of the spread of the Bundschuh in the Upper Rhine and Black Forest regions. They contain countless names and descriptions of members from the various localities of that region—most of them journeymen, then peasants and innkeepers, a few nobles, priests (like the one from Lehen), and breadless mercenaries. This composition of the Bundschuh is evidence of the more developed character of the society under Joss Fritz. The urban plebeian element was asserting itself more and more. The ramifications of the conspiracy spread throughout Alsace, the present-day Baden, up to Württemberg and the Main. From time to time large gatherings were held on secluded mountains such as the Kniebis, etc., to discuss the affairs of the Union. The meetings of the chiefs, in which local members and delegates of remoter localities often participated, took place on the Hartmatte near Lehen, and it was there that the fourteen articles of the Bundschuh were adopted. The articles agreed upon were: no master besides the Emperor and (according to some) the Pope; abolition of the Rottweil imperial court and restriction of the church court to religious affairs; abolition of interest after it had been paid for so long that it equalled the capital; top interest rate of five per cent; freedom of hunting, fishing, pasture, and woodcutting; restriction of priests each to one prebend; confiscation of church estates and monastery treasures for the Bundschuh war chest; abolition of all inequitable taxes and tolls; eternal peace in all Christendom; determined action against all opponents of the Bundschuh; Bundschuh taxes; seizure of a strong town, such as Freiburg, to serve as Bundschuh headquarters; negotiations with the Emperor as soon as the Bundschuh troops are gathered, and with Switzerland in case the Emperor declines. It was
evident that, on the one hand, the demands of the peasants and plebeians were becoming more definite and firm, and that, on the other, concessions had had equally to be made to the moderate and timid.

The blow was to be struck about autumn 1513. Only a Bundschuh banner was lacking, and Joss Fritz went to Heilbronn to have it painted. Besides all sorts of emblems and pictures, it bore the peasant's clog emblem and the legend, "God Help Thy Divine Justice". While he was away a premature attempt was made to overwhelm Freiburg, which was discovered. Some indiscretions in the conduct of propaganda put the Council of Freiburg and the Margrave of Baden on the right scent, and the betrayal by two conspirators completed the series of disclosures. The Margrave, the Council of Freiburg, and the imperial government at Ensisheim instantly sent spies and soldiers; some Bundschuh members were arrested, tortured and executed. But again the majority escaped, Joss Fritz among them. This time the Swiss Government sternly persecuted the fugitives, and even executed many of them. However, it had just as little success as its neighbours in preventing the greater part of the fugitives from remaining continually in the vicinity of their former homes and even returning to them after some time. The Alsace Government in Ensisheim behaved more brutally than the others. It ordered very many to be decapitated, broken on the wheel, and quartered. Joss Fritz himself kept mainly to the Swiss bank of the Rhine, but often crossed to the Black Forest, without ever being apprehended.

Why this time the Swiss made common cause with the neighbouring governments against the Bundschuh is made apparent by the peasant revolt that broke out the following year, 1514, in Berne, Solothurn and Lucerne, resulting in a purge of the aristocratic governments and the patriciate generally. The peasants also won certain privileges for themselves. The success of the local Swiss revolts was due to the simple fact that there was even less centralisation in Switzerland than in Germany. In 1525 the peasants managed to dispose of their local lords everywhere, but succumbed to the organised armies of the princes, and it was these latter that Switzerland did not have.

Simultaneously with the Bundschuh in Baden, and apparently in direct association with it, a second conspiracy was formed in Württemberg. Documents indicate that it had existed since 1503, but
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\[b\] Its first outbreaks began in 1513.— Ed.
since the name Bundschuh became too dangerous after the setback of the Untergrombach conspirators, it adopted the name Poor Konrad. Its main seat was the valley of the Rems at the foot of the mountain of Hohenstaufen. Its existence had been no secret for a long time, at least to the people. The merciless oppression of Duke Ulrich's government coupled with several famine years, which contributed greatly to the outbreak of the movements of 1513 and 1514, had increased the number of conspirators. The newly imposed taxes on wine, meat and bread, and a capital tax of one pfennig yearly on every guilder, provoked the uprising. The town of Schorndorf, where the heads of the complot met in the house of a cutler named Kaspar Pregizer, was to be seized first. In the spring of 1514, the rebellion broke out. Three thousand—and according to some, five thousand—peasants gathered before the town, but were persuaded by the amicable promises of the Duke's officers to withdraw. Duke Ulrich, who had agreed to abolish the new taxes, arrived posthaste with eighty horsemen to find everything quiet in consequence of the promise. He promised to convene a Diet to examine all complaints. But the chiefs of the society knew very well that Ulrich sought only to keep the people quiet until he recruited and concentrated enough troops to be able to break his word and collect the taxes by force. From Kaspar Pregizer's house, "Poor Konrad's chancery", they issued a call for a society congress, and sent emissaries in all directions. The success of the first uprising in the Rems valley had everywhere stimulated the movement among the people. The appeals and the emissaries found a favourable response everywhere, and the congress held in Untertürkheim on May 28 was attended by a large number of representatives from all parts of Württemberg. It was decided to proceed at once with propaganda and to strike in the Rems valley at the first opportunity, in order to spread the uprising from that point in every direction. While Bantelhans of Dettingen, a former soldier, and Singerhans of Würtlingen, an esteemed peasant, were bringing the Swabian Jura into the society, the uprising broke out on every side. Though Singerhans was attacked and seizing, the towns of Backnang, Winnenden, and Markgröningen fell into the hands of the peasants who had joined forces with the plebeians, and the entire area from Weinsberg to Blaubeuren, and from there to the border of Baden, was in open revolt. Ulrich was compelled to yield. However, while calling the Diet for June 25, he wrote to the surrounding princes and free towns asking for aid against the uprising, which, he said, threatened all princes, authorities and nobles in the Empire, and which "bore an uncommon resemblance to the Bundschuh".
In the meantime, the Diet, i.e. the deputies of the towns, and many delegates of the peasants who also demanded seats in the Diet, came together as early as June 18 in Stuttgart. The prelates had not yet arrived. The knights had not even been invited. The city opposition of Stuttgart, as well as two threatening peasant throngs at Leonberg and in the Rems valley, supported the demands of the peasants. Their delegates were admitted, and it was decided to depose and punish the three hated councilors of the Duke—Lamparter, Thumb and Lorch—and appoint for the Duke a council of four knights, four burghers and four peasants, to grant him a fixed civil allowance, and to confiscate the monasteries and endowments in favour of the state treasury.

Duke Ulrich countered these revolutionary decisions with a coup d’état. On June 21 he rode with his knights and councilors to Tübingen, where he was followed by the prelates, ordered the burghers to come there as well, which they did, and there continued the Diet without the peasants. The burghers, confronted with military terror, betrayed their peasant allies. On July 8 the Tübingen agreement came about, saddling the country with almost a million of the Duke’s debts, laying some restrictions on the Duke which he never observed, and disposing of the peasants with a few meagre general phrases and a very definite penal law against insurrection and association. Naturally, nothing was said any more about peasant representation in the Diet. The peasantry cried treason, but the Duke, who had acquired new credit after his debts were taken over by the estates, soon gathered troops, and his neighbours, particularly the Elector Palatine, a also sent him military aid. The Tübingen agreement was thus accepted all over the country towards the end of July, and a new oath was taken. Only in the Rems valley Poor Konrad offered resistance. The Duke, who again rode there in person, barely escaped with his life. A peasant camp was set up on the mountain of Kappel. But as the affair dragged on, most of the insurgents dispersed for lack of food, and the rest also went home after an ambiguous agreement with some of the Diet deputies. In the meantime, Ulrich, his army strengthened with companies willingly placed at his service by the towns, which, having attained their demands, turned fanatically against the peasants, attacked the Rems valley in spite of the agreement and plundered its towns and villages. Sixteen hundred peasants were taken prisoner, sixteen of them instantly decapitated, and most of the others made to pay heavy fines into Ulrich’s treasury. Many remained in prison for a long
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time. Strict penal laws were enacted against a revival of the society, against all gatherings of peasants, and the nobility of Swabia formed a special league for the suppression of all attempts at insurrection.—The top leaders of Poor Konrad had meanwhile succeeded in escaping to Switzerland, whence after a few years they returned home, most of them singly.

At the time of the Württemberg movement, signs of new Bundschuh activity were observed in Breisgau and in the Margraviate of Baden. In June, an insurrection was attempted near Bühl, but it was quickly throttled by Margrave Philip, and its leader, Gugel-Bastian, was seized in Freiburg and beheaded.

In the spring of the same year, 1514, a general peasant war broke out in Hungary. A crusade against the Turks was preached, and freedom was promised as usual to the serfs and bondsmen who would join it. About 60,000 gathered under the command of Georg Dózsa, a Szekler, who had distinguished himself in previous Turkish wars and attained nobility. The Hungarian knights and magnates, however, looked with disfavour upon the crusade, which threatened to deprive them of their property and bondsmen. They overtook isolated peasant groups, took back their serfs by force and maltreated them. When this reached the ears of the army of crusaders the fury of the oppressed peasants broke loose. Two of the most enthusiastic advocates of the crusade, Laurentius and Barnabás, fanned the hatred against the nobility in the army by their revolutionary speeches. Dózsa himself was as angered with the treacherous nobility as his troops. The army of crusaders became an army of revolution and Dózsa put himself at the head of the new movement.

He camped with his peasants in the Rákos field near Pest. Clashes with men of the noblemen's party in the surrounding villages and the suburbs of Pest opened the hostilities. It soon came to skirmishes, and then to Sicilian Vespers for all the noblemen who fell into the hands of the peasants, and to destruction by fire of all the castles in the vicinity. The court made its threats in vain. After the first acts of popular justice against the nobility had been accomplished under the walls of the capital, Dózsa proceeded with further operations. He divided his army into five columns. Two were sent to the mountains of Upper Hungary to rouse the populace and exterminate the nobility. The third, under Ambros Száleresi, a citizen of Pest, remained on the Rákos to watch the capital, while the fourth and fifth were led by Dózsa and his brother Gregor against Szegedin.  
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In the meantime, the nobility gathered in Pest, and summoned to its aid Johann Zápolya, the voivode of Transylvania. Joined by the burghers of Budapest, the nobility attacked and annihilated the army on the Rákos, after Száleresi and the burgher elements in the peasant force had gone over to the enemy. A host of prisoners was executed in the most cruel fashion, and the rest sent home minus their noses and ears.

Dózsa failed at Szegedin and marched on Csanád, which he captured on defeating an army of noblemen under István Batory and Bishop Csáky. He took bloody revenge on the prisoners, among them the bishop and the royal Chancellor Teleki, for the Rákos atrocities. In Csanád he proclaimed a republic, abolished the nobility, declared general equality and sovereignty of the people, and then marched against Temesvár, to which Bátory had fled. But while he besieged this fortress for two months and was reinforced by a new army under Anton Hosszú, his two army columns in Upper Hungary were defeated by the nobility in several battles. Johann Zápolya with his Transylvanian army advanced against him, attacked and dispersed the peasants. Dózsa was taken prisoner and roasted alive on a red-hot throne. His flesh was eaten by his own people, this being the condition on which their lives were spared. The dispersed peasants, reassembled by Laurentius and Hosszú, were again defeated, and those who fell into enemy hands were either impaled or hanged. The peasants' corpses hung in thousands along the roads or on the edges of gutted villages. About 60,000, it is said, either fell in battle or were massacred. The nobility saw to it that at the next Diet serfdom was again recognised as the law of the land.

The peasant revolt in the "Wendish mark", that is, Carinthia, Carniola and Styria, which broke out at about the same time, reposed on a Bundschuh-like conspiracy that had taken shape and precipitated a rising in this region—wrung dry by the nobility and imperial officials, ravaged by Turkish invasions, and plagued by famines—as far back as 1503. Already in 1513, the Slovenian and German peasants of this region once more raised the battle standard of the Stara Prawa (The Old Rights). If they allowed themselves to be placated that year, and if in 1514, when they gathered anew in larger masses, they were again persuaded to go home by Emperor Maximilian's explicit promise to restore the Old Rights, the war of revenge of the perpetually deceived people broke out with redoubled vigour in the spring of 1515. Just as in Hungary, castles
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and monasteries were destroyed everywhere, and the captured nobles were tried by peasant juries and decapitated. In Styria and Carinthia the Emperor's captain, Dietrichstein, soon succeeded in crushing the revolt. In Carniola it was only suppressed by a sudden onslaught on Rain (autumn of 1516) and the subsequent countless Austrian atrocities, which duplicated the infamies of the Hungarian nobility.

It is clear why, after this series of decisive defeats and the mass atrocities of the nobility, the German peasants long remained quiet. Yet conspiracies and local uprisings did not cease altogether. Already in 1516 most of the fugitives of the Bundschuh and the Poor Konrad returned to Swabia and the Upper Rhine, and in 1517 the Bundschuh was again in full action in the Black Forest. Joss Fritz himself, still hiding the old Bundschuh banner of 1513 on his chest, again travelled the length and breadth of the Black Forest and developed energetic activity. The conspiracy was revived. Just as four years before, gatherings were held on the Kniebis. However, the secret was discovered, the authorities learned of the matter, and took action. Many conspirators were captured and executed. The most active and intelligent were compelled to flee, among them Joss Fritz, who, though he again evaded capture, seems to have died soon thereafter in Switzerland, for he is not heard of again.
At the time when the fourth Bundschuh conspiracy was suppressed in the Black Forest, Luther in Wittenberg gave the signal for the movement that was to draw all the estates into the vortex and shake the whole Empire. The theses of the Augustinian from Thuringia had the effect of a match held to a powder keg. The multifold and conflicting aspirations of the knights and burghers, peasants and plebeians, princes craving for sovereignty, and the lesser clergy, the clandestine mystic sects and the scholarly, satirical and burlesque literary opposition, found in Luther's theses a momentarily general and common expression, and fell in with them with astounding rapidity. Formed overnight, this alliance of all the dissident elements, however brief its duration, suddenly revealed the enormous power of the movement, and drove it forward very rapidly.

However, precisely this rapid growth of the movement was also very quickly bound to develop the seeds of discord that lay concealed in it. At least, it was bound to tear asunder the constituent parts of that agitated mass which, by their very place in life, were directly opposed to each other, and to return them to their normal, hostile state. This polarisation of the motley opposition at two centres of attraction was observed in the very first years of the Reformation. The nobility and the burghers grouped themselves unconditionally around Luther. Peasants and plebeians, as yet failing to see in Luther a direct enemy, formed as before a separate revolutionary party of the opposition. Yet the movement became much more general, more far-reaching, than it had been before Luther, which made sharp contradictions and an open conflict between the two parties inevitable. This direct antithesis soon became apparent. While
Luther and Münzer attacked each other in the press and from the pulpit, the armies of princes, knights and towns that for the most part consisted of Lutherans or elements at least gravitating towards Lutherism, attacked the throngs of peasants and plebeians.

How strongly the interests and requirements of the various elements behind the Reformation diverged is seen from the attempt of the nobility to compel the princes and the clergy to meet their demands even before the Peasant War.

We have already examined the situation of the German nobility early in the sixteenth century. It was on the point of losing its independence to the ever more powerful lay and clerical princes. It saw at the same time that the decline of imperial power, the Empire breaking up into a number of sovereign principalities, was keeping pace with its own decline. It thought that its own collapse meant the collapse of the Germans as a nation. Furthermore, the nobility, and particularly that section of it which owed allegiance to the Empire, was the estate that by virtue of its military profession and its attitude towards the princes, directly represented the Empire and imperial rule. It was the most national of the estates, and the mightier the imperial power, the weaker and less numerous the princes and the stronger the unity of Germany, the more powerful became the nobility. This was the reason for the general discontent of the knighthood with Germany’s pitiful political situation, with the weakness of the Empire in foreign affairs which increased as the imperial family added to the Empire one inherited province after another, with the intrigues of foreign powers inside Germany, and with the plots of German princes and foreign countries against imperial rule. The demands of the nobility, therefore, had to be above all concentrated on the demand for an imperial reform whose victims were to be the princes and the higher clergy. Ulrich von Hutten, the theorist of the German nobility, took it upon himself to formulate the demand for reforms together with Franz von Sickingen, the nobility’s military and diplomatic representative.

The imperial reform demanded on behalf of the nobility was conceived by Hutten in very clear and radical terms. Hutten demanded nothing short of eliminating all princes, secularising all church principalities and estates, and establishing a noblemen’s democracy headed by a monarch, much like the late Polish republic in its best days. Hutten and Sickingen hoped to make the Empire united, free and powerful again through the rule of the nobility, a predominantly military class, elimination of princes, those bearers of disunity, annihilation of the power of the priests, and Germany’s liberation from the dominance of Rome.
Founded on serfdom, this noblemen's democracy as fashioned in Poland and, in somewhat modified form, in the early centuries of the states conquered by the Germanic tribes, is one of the most primitive forms of society and quite normally matures into a highly developed feudal hierarchy, a considerably higher stage. Such a pure type of noblemen's democracy was therefore impossible in the sixteenth century. It was impossible if only because of the important and powerful German towns. On the other hand, an alliance of the lesser nobility and the towns that in England brought about the transformation of the monarchy of feudal estates into a bourgeois-constitutional monarchy, was also out of the question. In Germany the old nobility still survived, while in England it had been exterminated in the Wars of the Roses down to twenty-eight families, and replaced by a new nobility of bourgeois extraction and with bourgeois tendencies; in Germany serfdom was still rampant and the nobility drew its income from feudal sources, while in England serfdom had been virtually abolished and the nobles had become ordinary bourgeois landowners with a bourgeois source of income—the rent. Finally, the centralisation of absolute monarchy which we saw in France and which continuously developed since Louis XI in the conflict between the nobility and the burghers was impossible in Germany if only because the conditions for national centralisation were totally absent or existed in a very rudimentary form.

Under the circumstances, the further Hutten went in putting his ideal into practice, the more concessions he was compelled to make, and the more indefinite became the outlines of his imperial reform. The nobility was not strong enough to carry out the reform on its own. This was evident from its increasing weakness as compared with the princes. Allies were needed, and these could only be found in the towns, among the peasants and the influential theorists of the Reformation movement. But the towns knew the nobility too well to trust it, and rejected every offer of alliance. The peasants rightly considered the nobility, which exploited and maltreated them, as their bitterest enemy, while the theorists of the Reformation held either with the burghers, the princes, or the peasants. What advantages, indeed, could the nobility promise the burghers and the peasants from an imperial reform that was mainly intended to aggrandise the nobility? Under the circumstances Hutten had no other choice but to say little or nothing in his propaganda about the future relations between the nobility, the towns and the peasants. He

---

a The 1850 edition has “in sixteenth-century Germany”. — Ed.
put all blame on the princes, the priests, and the dependence upon Rome, and showed the burghers that it was in their interests to remain at least neutral in the coming struggle between the nobility and the princes. He said nothing of abolishing serfdom or the services imposed upon the peasants by the nobility.

The attitude of the German nobility towards the peasants was at that time exactly the same as that of the Polish nobility towards its peasants in the insurrections of 1830-46. As in the modern Polish uprisings, the movement in Germany could be sustained only through an alliance of all the opposition parties, particularly the nobility and the peasants. Yet it was just this alliance that was impossible in both cases. The nobility deemed it unnecessary to give up its political privileges and its feudal rights vis-à-vis the peasants, while the revolutionary peasants would not be drawn by vague and general prospects into an alliance with the nobility, the estate which oppressed them the most. The nobility could no more win over the peasants in Germany in 1522 than it could in Poland in 1830. Only total abolition of serfdom, bondage and all the privileges of the nobility could have induced the rural population to side with the nobility. But like every privileged estate the nobility had not the slightest desire voluntarily to give up its privileges, its highly exclusive position, and most of its sources of income.

Thus, when the struggle finally broke out the nobles had to face the princes alone. And it came as no surprise that the princes, who had for two centuries been cutting the ground from under the nobility, gained another easy victory.

The course of the struggle is well known. In 1522 Hütten and Sickingen, who was already recognised as the political and military chief of the Middle-German nobility, organised in Landau a union of the Rhenish, Swabian and Franconian nobility for a term of six years, ostensibly for self-defence. Sickingen assembled an army, partly on his own, and partly with the neighbouring knights, organised recruitment and reinforcements in Franconia, along the Lower Rhine, in the Netherlands and Westphalia, and in September 1522 opened hostilities by declaring a feud against the Elector-Archbishop of Trier. However, while he was stationed near Trier, his reinforcements were cut off by a swift intervention of the princes. The Landgrave of Hesse and the Elector Palatine came to Trier's
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aid and Sickingen was compelled to retreat to his castle of Landstuhl. In spite of all Hutten's efforts and those of his other friends, the united nobility, intimidated by the concerted and swift moves of the princes, left Sickingen in the lurch. Sickingen was mortally wounded, surrendered Landstuhl, and died soon after. Hutten had to flee to Switzerland, where he died a few months later on the Isle of Ufnau in the Lake of Zurich.

This defeat and the death of the two leaders broke the power of the nobility as a body independent of the princes. From then on the nobility acted only in the service and under the leadership of the princes. The Peasant War, which broke out soon after, compelled the nobles to seek the direct or indirect protection of the princes. Also, it proved that the German nobility would rather continue exploiting the peasants under the dominance of the princes than overthrow the princes and priests in an open alliance with emancipated peasants.
Not a year passed since Luther's declaration of war against the Catholic hierarchy set in motion all the opposition elements in Germany without the peasants again and again bringing forward their demands. Between 1518 and 1523 one local peasant revolt followed another in the Black Forest and in Upper Swabia, and after the spring of 1524 revolts became systematic. In April 1524 the peasants of the Abbey of Marchthal refused to do statute labour and to pay tributes; in May the peasants of St. Blasien refused to make serf payments; in June the peasants of Steinheim, near Memmingen, announced that they would pay neither tithes nor other duties; in July and August the peasants of Thurgau revolted and were quelled partly by the mediation of Zurich and partly by the brutality of the Confederacy, which executed many of them. Finally, a more determined uprising, which may be regarded as the direct beginning of the Peasant War, took place in the Landgraviate of Stühlingen.

The peasants of Stühlingen suddenly refused to deliver anything to the Landgrave, assembled in strong numbers, and on August 24, 1524, moved towards Waldshut under the command of Hans Müller of Bulgenbach. Here they founded an evangelist fraternity jointly with the burghers. The latter joined the organisation the more willingly because they were at odds with the government of the Austrian Forelands over the religious persecution of their preacher, Balthasar Hubmaier, Thomas Münzer's friend and disciple. A weekly tax of three kreutzers was imposed by the Union—an enormous figure, considering the value of money at that time. Emissaries were sent to Alsace, the Moselle, the entire Upper Rhine and Franconia to bring peasants everywhere into the Union. The Union announced that its purpose was to abolish feudal rule, destroy all castles and monasteries and to eliminate all lords except the Emperor. The German tricolour was the banner of the Union.
The uprising gained momentum rapidly in all of what is now Upper Baden. Panic seized the nobility of Upper Swabia, whose armed forces were almost all in Italy, making war against Francis I of France. They had no choice but to drag out the affair by means of negotiations and, in the meanwhile, to collect money and recruit troops until strong enough to punish the peasants for their audacity with "fire and destruction, plunder and carnage". There began that systematic betrayal, that continuous deceit and malice, which were typical of the nobility and the princes throughout the Peasant War and which were their strongest weapon against the decentralised peasants whom it was hard to organise. The Swabian League, consisting of the princes, the nobility and the imperial cities of South-West Germany, put itself between the warring forces, but did not guarantee the peasants any real concessions. The latter remained in motion. From September 30 to the middle of October Hans Müller of Bulgenbach marched through the Black Forest to Urach and Furtwangen, increased his troops to 3,500 men and took up positions near Ewattingen (in the vicinity of Stühlingen). The nobility had no more than 1,700 men at their disposal, and even those were divided. They had to seek an armistice, which was, indeed, concluded in the camp at Ewattingen. The peasants were promised an amicable settlement either directly between the parties concerned or through arbitrators, and an investigation of their grievances by the provincial court at Stockach. The troops of the nobility and of the peasants dispersed.

The peasants worked out sixteen articles which they would press for in the court at Stockach. The articles were very moderate, and went no further than abolition of hunting rights, statute labour, oppressive taxes and the privileges of lords in general, and protection against arbitrary imprisonment and biassed, arbitrary courts.

But no sooner had the peasants gone home than the nobility demanded the restoration of all controversial tributes pending the court decision. Naturally, the peasants refused and referred the lords to the court. The conflict flared up anew, the peasants reassembled and the princes and lords concentrated their troops. This time the movement spread farther beyond Breisgau and deep into Württemberg. The troops under Georg Truchsess of Waldburg, the Alba of the Peasant War, watched the manoeuvres of the
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peasants, attacked their contingents one by one, but did not dare to attack the main force. In the meantime, Georg Truchsess negotiated with the peasant chiefs and reached agreements here and there.

By the end of December proceedings began at the Stockach provincial court. The peasants objected to the court being composed entirely of noblemen. An imperial edict was read to them in reply. The proceedings were drawn out, and in the meantime the nobility, the princes and the Swabian League armed themselves. Archduke Ferdinand who ruled Württemberg,\footnote{After Duke Ulrich was banished in 1519.—Ed.} the Black Forest of Baden and Southern Alsace in addition to the hereditary lands which still belong to Austria, called for the utmost severity against the rebel peasants. They were to be captured, tortured and mercilessly slain in whatever manner was the most convenient, their possessions were to be burned and devastated, and their wives and children driven off the land. This shows how the princes and lords observed the armistice and what they meant by amicable arbitration and investigation of grievances. Archduke Ferdinand, to whom the house of Welser, of Augsburg, advanced money,\footnote{After Duke Ulrich was banished in 1519.—Ed.} armed himself in all haste. The Swabian League ordered money and a contingent of troops to be raised in three phases.

These above rebellions coincided with the five months of Thomas Münzer’s presence in Upper Baden.\footnote{After Duke Ulrich was banished in 1519.—Ed.} Although there are no direct proofs of the influence he had on the outbreak and course of the movement, it is completely established indirectly. The more resolute peasant revolutionaries were mostly his disciples, and put forward his ideas. The twelve articles and the Letter of Articles of Upper Baden peasants are ascribed to him by all his contemporaries, although beyond any doubt he had no part in composing at least the former. When still on his way back to Thuringia he addressed a decidedly revolutionary manifesto to the insurgent peasants.

Duke Ulrich, exiled from Württemberg in 1519, conspired meanwhile to regain his land with the aid of the peasants. In fact, he had been trying to utilise the revolutionary party ever since he was exiled, and had supported it continuously. His name was associated with most of the local disturbances between 1520 and 1524 in the Black Forest and in Württemberg. Now he was arming for an attack on Württemberg from his castle, Hohentwiel. However, he too was only being used by the peasants, had no influence over them and, even less, their trust.
The winter passed but nothing decisive was undertaken by either side. The princely masters went into hiding. The peasant revolt was gathering momentum. In January 1525 the entire country between the Danube, the Rhine and the Lech was in great ferment, and in February the storm broke.

While the Black Forest and Hegau Troop under Hans Müller of Bulgenbach was conspiring with Ulrich of Württemberg and shared in a part of his unsuccessful march on Stuttgart (February and March 1525), the peasants in Ried, above the Ulm, rose on February 9, assembled in a camp near Baltringen protected on all sides by marshes, hoisted the red flag, and formed the Baltringen Troop under the leadership of Ulrich Schmid. This troop was 10,000 to 12,000 strong.

On February 25, the 7,000-strong Upper Allgäu Troop assembled at Schussen, stimulated by the rumour that an armed force was marching against the discontented elements who had appeared in this locality as everywhere else. The people of Kempten, who had been at odds with their archbishop a all winter, assembled the next day and joined the peasants. The towns of Memmingen and Kaufbeuren joined the movement after laying down their conditions; yet the ambiguous attitude of the towns to this struggle was already apparent. On March 7 twelve articles were adopted in Memmingen for all the peasants of Upper Allgäu.

Tidings from the Allgäu peasants prompted the formation of a Lake Troop under Eitel Hans on Lake Constance. It also grew very quickly and established its headquarters in Bermatingen.

Similarly, early in March the peasants rose in Lower Allgäu, in the region of Ochsenhausen and Schellenberg, in Zeil and Waldburg, the estates of Truchsess. This Lower Allgäu Troop, which consisted of 7,000 men, had its camp near Wurzach.

These four troops accepted all the Memmingen articles, incidentally more moderate even than the Hegau articles because they showed a remarkable lack of determination in points relating to the attitude of the armed troops towards the nobility and the governments. Such determination as was shown appeared only in the course of the war, after the peasants had experienced the behaviour of their enemies.

At the same time, a sixth troop formed on the Danube. Peasants from the entire region, from Ulm to Donauwörth, from the valleys of the Iller, Roth and Biber, came to Leipheim and set up camp there. Every able-bodied man from fifteen localities had come, while
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a Sebastian von Breitenstein.—Ed.
reinforcements were drawn from 117. The leader of the Leipheim Troop was Ulrich Schön, and its preacher was Jakob Wehe, the pastor of Leipheim.

Thus, in the beginning of March there were 30,000 to 40,000 insurgent Upper Swabian peasants under arms in six camps. The peasant troops were a mixed lot. Münzer's revolutionary party was in the minority everywhere. Yet it formed the backbone of all the peasant camps. The bulk of the peasants were always ready to come to terms with the lords wherever they were promised the concessions they had hoped to gain by their menacing attitude. As the uprising dragged on and the princes' armies drew nearer, they became war-weary and most of those who still had something to lose went home. Moreover, a vagabond mass of the lumpenproletariat had joined the troops and this undermined their discipline and demoralised the peasants, because the vagabonds came and went as they pleased. This alone explains why the peasants at first remained everywhere on the defensive, why their morale deteriorated in the camps and why, aside from their tactical shortcomings and the shortage of good leaders, they were no match for the armies of the princes.

While the troops were still assembling, Duke Ulrich invaded Württemberg from Hohentwiel with recruited detachments and a few Hegau peasants. The Swabian League would have been lost if the peasants had used the opportunity to attack the troops of Truchsess von Waldburg from the other flank. But because of the defensive attitude of the peasantry, Truchsess soon succeeded in concluding an armistice with the Baltringen, Allgäu and Lake peasants, starting negotiations and fixing Judic a Sunday (April 2) as the day on which the whole affair was to be settled. This gave him a chance to march against Duke Ulrich, to occupy Stuttgart and compel him to abandon Württemberg again on March 17. Then he turned against the peasants, but the mercenaries in his own army revolted and refused to march against them. Truchsess succeeded in placating the mutineers and moved towards Ulm, where new reinforcements were being formed. He left an observation post at Kirchheim near Teck.

The Swabian League, its hands at last free and its first contingents gathered, now threw off its mask, declaring itself

"determined to end with arms in hand and with the aid of God that which the peasants have wilfully undertaken". 

---

a From the decision made at a conference of League authorities at Ulm in March 1525. (It is recorded in a document from the Ulm archive and quoted by Zimmermann, op. cit., Th. 2, S. 167.) — Ed.
The peasants had meanwhile faithfully observed the armistice. They had drawn up their demands, the famous Twelve Articles, for the negotiations on Judica Sunday. They demanded the right to elect and depose clergymen through the communities; abolition of the small tithe and utilisation of the great tithe,\(^3\) after subtraction of the pastors' salaries, for public purposes; abolition of serfdom, death tolls, fishing and hunting rights; restriction of excessive statute labour, taxes and rents; restitution of forests, pastures and privileges forcibly withdrawn from communities and individuals, and an end to arbitrary justice and administration. Clearly, the moderate conciliatory party still had the upper hand among the peasant troops. The revolutionary party had formulated its programme earlier in the Letter of Articles. It was an open letter to all peasant communities, calling on them to join the “Christian Alliance and Brotherhood” for the purpose of removing all burdens either through goodwill, “which was unlikely”, or by force, and threatening all shirkers with “lay excommunication”, i. e. with expulsion from society and ostracism by members of the league. All castles, monasteries and priests' endowments were also to be placed under lay anathema, the letter said, unless the nobility, the priests and monks relinquished them of their own accord, moved into ordinary houses like other people, and joined the Christian Alliance.—This radical manifesto, obviously composed before the spring insurrection of 1525, thus speaks above all of revolution, of complete victory over the still reigning classes, while the “lay excommunication” is designed for the oppressors and traitors who were to be killed, for the castles that were to be burned, and the monasteries and endowments that were to be confiscated and whose treasures were to be turned into cash.

But before the peasants came to present their Twelve Articles to the appointed courts of arbitration, they learned that the Swabian League had violated the armistice and that its troops were approaching. Instantly, they took countermeasures. A general meeting of all Allgäu, Baltringen and Lake peasants was held at Gaisbeuren. The four troops were combined and reorganised into four new columns. A decision was taken to confiscate the church estates, to sell their treasures in favour of the war chest, and to burn the castles. Thus alongside the official Twelve Articles, the Letter of Articles became the statute of warfare, and Judica Sunday, the day designated for the conclusion of peace, became the date of a general uprising.

The mounting unrest everywhere, continuous local conflicts between peasants and nobility, tidings of the uprising in the Black Forest, which had been brewing in the preceding six months, and of
its spread to the Danube and the Lech, are enough to explain the rapid succession of peasant revolts in two-thirds of Germany. But that the individual\(^a\) revolts broke out simultaneously proves that there were men at the head of the movement who organised them through Anabaptist and other emissaries. Already in the second half of March disorders broke out in Württemberg, in the lower reaches of the Neckar, in Odenwald, and in Lower and Middle Franconia. However, April 2, Judica Sunday, was named everywhere beforehand as the day of the general uprising, and everywhere the decisive blow, the revolt \textit{en masse}, was delivered in the first week of April. The Allgäu, Hegau and Lake peasants also sounded the bells on April 1 and called mass meetings to summon all able-bodied men to their camp; they opened hostilities against the castles and monasteries simultaneously with the Baltringen peasants.

In \textit{Franconia}, where the movement had six centres, the insurrection broke out everywhere in the first days of April. At about the same time two peasant camps were formed near Nördlingen, with whose aid the revolutionary party of the town under \textit{Anton Forner} gained the upper hand, appointed Forner town mayor, and consummated a union between the town and the peasants. In the region of \textit{Ansbach} the peasants revolted everywhere between April 1 and 7, and from here the uprising spread as far as Bavaria. In the region of \textit{Rothenburg} the peasants had been under arms since March 22. In the town of Rothenburg the rule of the honourables was overthrown by the petty burghers and the plebeians under \textit{Stephan von Menzingen} on March 27, but since peasant dues were the chief source of revenue for the town, the new government also vacillated and acted ambiguously towards the peasants. A general uprising of the peasants and the townships broke out early in April in the Grand Chapter of \textit{Würzburg},\(^3\) and in the bishopric of \textit{Bamberg} a general insurrection compelled the bishop\(^b\) to yield in five days. And a strong \textit{Bildhausen peasant camp} formed in the North, on the border of Thuringia.

In \textit{Odenwald}, where \textit{Wendel Hipler}, nobleman and former chancellor of the Counts von Hohenlohe, and \textit{Georg Metzler}, an innkeeper from Ballenberg near Krautheim, headed the revolutionary party, the storm broke out already on March 26. The peasants marched from all directions towards the Tauber. The two thousand men of the Rothenburg camp joined them as well. Georg Metzler took

\(^a\) The 1850 and 1870 editions have \textit{partiellen} (partial) instead of \textit{einzellen} (individual).—\textit{Ed.}\n
\(^b\) Weigand von Redwitz.—\textit{Ed.}\n
command and after the arrival of all reinforcements marched on April 4 to the monastery of Schönthal on the Jagst, where he was joined by the peasants of the Neckar valley. The latter, led by Jäcklein Rohrbach, an innkeeper from Böckingen near Heilbronn, had begun their insurrection in Flein, Sontheim, etc., on Judica Sunday, while Wendel Hipler took Öhringen by surprise with a number of conspirators and drew the peasants in the vicinity into the movement. In Schönthal the two peasant columns combined into the Gay Troop, accepted the Twelve Articles and made a few raids on castles and monasteries. The Gay Troop was about 8,000 strong and had cannon and 3,000 muskets. Florian Geyer, a Franconian knight, joined the force and formed the Black Troop, a select corps recruited mainly from the Rothenburg and Öhringen army reserve.

The Württemberg magistrate in Neckarsulm, Count Ludwig von Helfenstein, opened the hostilities. He ordered all captured peasants to be executed on the spot. The Gay Troop marched to meet him. The peasants were embittered by the massacres and by news of the defeat of the Leipheim Troop, of Jakob Wehe’s execution, and the Truchsuss atrocities. Von Helfenstein, who had moved into Weinsberg, was attacked there. The castle was stormed by Florian Geyer, the town seized in a prolonged battle and Count Ludwig taken prisoner along with several knights. On the following day, April 17, Jäcklein Rohrbach and the most resolute members of the troop held court over the prisoners and made fourteen of them, with von Helfenstein at their head, run the gauntlet, this being the most humiliating death they could think of. The capture of Weinsberg and Jäcklein’s terroristic revenge on von Helfenstein did not fail to have their effect on the nobility. The Counts von Löwenstein joined the peasant alliance. The Counts von Hohenlohe, who had joined previously but had given no aid, immediately sent the desired cannon and powder.

The chiefs debated among themselves whether they should make Götz von Berlichingen their commander, “since he could bring to them the nobility”. The proposal found sympathy, but Florian Geyer, who saw the seeds of reaction in this mood of the peasants and their chiefs, separated from the Gay Troop and marched on his own with his Black Troop, first through the Neckar and then the Würzburg region, everywhere destroying castles and the lairs of the priesthood.

The rest of the troops marched first of all against Heilbronn. In this powerful free imperial town the patriciate was, as almost everywhere, confronted by a burgher and revolutionary opposition. In secret agreement with the peasants, the latter opened the gates to
Georg Metzler and Jäcklein Rohrbach on April 17 during a disturbance. The peasant chiefs and their people took possession of the town, which was then admitted to their brotherhood and delivered 1,200 guilders in cash and a squad of volunteers. Only the possessions of the clergy and the Teutonic Order were pillaged. On April 22, the peasants moved out, leaving a small garrison. Heilbronn was to become the centre of the various troops, the latter actually sending delegates and conferring over joint actions and the common demands of the peasantry. But the burgher opposition and the patricians, who had joined forces after the peasant invasion, regained the upper hand in the town, preventing decisive steps and waiting only for the approach of the princes' troops to openly betray the peasants.

The peasants marched toward Odenwald. Götz von Berlichingen, who had a few days before offered himself to the Elector Palatine, then to the peasantry, and then again to the Elector, was to join the Evangelist Fraternity on April 24 and assume supreme command of the Gay Bright Troop (as distinct from the Black Troop of Florian Geyer). At the same time, however, he was the prisoner of the peasants, who mistrusted him and bound him to a council of chiefs, without whose approval he could undertake nothing. Götz and Metzler marched with the bulk of the peasants across Buchen to Amorbach, where, during their stay from April 30 to May 5, they roused the entire Mainz region. The nobility was everywhere compelled to join in, and its castles were thus spared. Only the monasteries were burned and pillaged. The troop had become visibly demoralised. The most energetic men had gone away with Florian Geyer or with Jäcklein Rohrbach who, after the capture of Heilbronn, also separated from the troop, apparently because he, the judge of Count von Helfenstein, could no longer remain with a body that was inclined towards reconciliation with the nobility. This gravitation towards reaching an understanding with the nobility was in itself a sign of demoralisation. Soon Wendel Hipler proposed a very sound reorganisation of the troop. He suggested that the mercenaries, who had been offering their services daily, should be taken on. He also suggested that the troop should no longer be renewed monthly through the arrival of fresh contingents and the dismissal of old ones, and that the men under arms, who had received a certain amount of military training, should be retained. But a community meeting rejected both proposals. The peasants had already become volatile and viewed the war as little more than
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pillage, where the competition of the mercenaries held no advantage for them and where they wanted to be free to go home as soon as their pockets were filled. In Amorbach matters came to a point where Hans Berlin, a Heilbronn councillor, induced the chiefs and troop councillors to accept a Declaration of the Twelve Articles, a document wherein the remaining arrowheads of the Twelve Articles were blunted and words of humble supplication were put into the mouths of the peasants. But this was too much for the peasants; they rejected the Declaration with a display of vehemence and insisted upon the original Articles.

In the meantime, a decisive change had taken place in the Würzburg area. The bishop, who had withdrawn to fortified Frauenberg near Würzburg after the first peasant uprising early in April and had vainly sent messages in all directions asking for aid, was finally compelled to make temporary concessions. On May 2 a Diet opened in which the peasants were represented, but letters proving the bishop's treacherous moves were intercepted before any results could be achieved. The Diet broke up at once, and hostilities began between the insurgent townsmen and peasants, on the one hand, and the bishop's forces, on the other. The bishop escaped to Heidelberg on May 5, and on the following day Florian Geyer with his Black Troop entered Würzburg, and with him came the Franconian Tauber Troop, which consisted of the peasants of Mergentheim, Rothenburg and Ansbach. On May 7 Götz von Berlichingen arrived with his Gay Bright Troop, and the siege of Frauenberg began.

In Limburg and the Ellwangen and Hall regions another contingent was formed by the end of March, and in early April that of Gaildorf, or the Common Gay Troop. It showed considerable violence, roused the entire region, burned down many monasteries and castles, including the castle of Hohenstaufen, compelled all the peasants to join it, and forced the nobles, and even the cup-bearers of Limburg, to enter the Christian Brotherhood. Early in May it invaded Württemberg, but was compelled to withdraw. As in 1848 the separatism of the German system of small states obstructed joint action by the revolutionaries of the various states. The Gaildorf Troop, restricted to a small area, was naturally bound to disperse when all resistance within that area was broken. It concluded an agreement with the town of Gmünd and went home, leaving only 500 under arms.

\[a\] Konrad III.— Ed.
In the Palatinate peasant troops were formed on either bank of the Rhine by the end of April. They destroyed many castles and monasteries, and on May 1 took Neustadt on the Haardt after the Bruchrain peasants had crossed the river on the previous day and forced Speyer to conclude an agreement. Marshal von Habern at the head of the Elector's small force was powerless against them, and on May 10 the Elector was compelled to come to an agreement with the insurgent peasants, guaranteeing them redress of grievances through a Diet.

Finally, in Württemberg the revolt had already broken out early in some localities. The peasants of the Urach Jura formed a union against priests and lords already in February and the peasants of Blaubeuren, Urach, Münsingen, Balingen and Rosenfeld revolted at the end of March. The Württemberg region was invaded by the Gaildorf Troop at Göppingen, by Jäcklein Rohrbach at Brackenheim and by the remnants of the beaten Leipheim Troop at Pfullingen, inciting the rural population to revolt. There were also serious disturbances in other localities. Already on April 6 Pfullingen surrendered to the peasants. The Austrian Archduke's\(^a\) government was driven to the wall. It had no money and only few troops. The cities and castles were in a bad state and had neither garrisons nor munition. Even Asperg was practically defenseless.

The government's attempt to call out the town reserves against the peasants caused its instant defeat. On April 16 the Bottwar\(^b\) reserves refused to obey orders. Instead of marching to Stuttgart, they turned to Wunnenstein near Bottwar, where they formed the nucleus of a camp ofburghers and peasants whose number increased rapidly. The rebellion in Zabergäu broke out on the same day. The Maulbronn monastery was pillaged and a few more monasteries and castles were laid waste. Reinforcements marched from neighbouring Bruchrain to join the local peasants.

The Wunnenstein troop was under the command of Matern Feuerbacher, a Bottwar town councillor. He was a leader of the burgher opposition, but was so strongly compromised that he was compelled to go with the peasants. However, he remained at all times very moderate, prevented the implementation of the Letter of Articles against the castles, and sought everywhere to reconcile the peasants with the moderate burgherdom. He prevented the amalgamation of the Württemberg peasants with the Gay Bright Troop, and later likewise prevailed on the Gaildorf Troop to withdraw from

\(^a\) Ferdinand I.—Ed.

\(^b\) Or Grossbottwar.—Ed.
Württemberg. On April 19 he was deposed for his burgher tendencies but again made commander the next day. He was indispensable, and even when Jäcklein Rohrbach arrived with 200 determined men to join the Württemberg peasants on April 22, he had no choice but to leave Feuerbacher in command and confined himself to rigid supervision of his actions.

On April 18 the government attempted to negotiate with the peasants stationed at Wunnenstein. The peasants insisted on the Twelve Articles, but naturally the government's representatives could not accept them. The troop set itself in motion. On April 20 it reached Lauffen, where, for the last time, it turned down the proposals of the government delegates. On April 22 the troop, numbering 6,000, appeared in Bietigheim and threatened Stuttgart. Most members of the Stuttgart Council had fled and a citizens' committee took over the administration. Among the citizenry there was the same division as everywhere else into parties of the honourables, the burgher opposition, and the revolutionary plebeians. On April 25 the latter opened the gates to the peasants and Stuttgart was instantly taken. Here the organisation of the Gay Christian Troop, as the Württemberg insurgents now called themselves, was completed and the rules of pay, division of booty, maintenance, etc., were rigidly defined. A detachment of Stuttgarters under Theus Gerber joined the troop.

On April 29 Feuerbacher marched with all his men against the Gaildorferers who had entered Württemberg region at Schorndorf. He drew the entire area into his alliance and thereby prevailed on the Gaildorferers to withdraw. In this way he prevented Rohrbach's revolutionary element in his troop from joining hands with the reckless Gaildorferers and thus being dangerously strengthened. Upon receiving news of Truchsess' approach, he left Schorndorf to meet him, and on May 1 made camp near Kirchheim unter Teck.

We have herewith traced the origin and development of the uprising in the part of Germany that should be regarded as the territory of the first group of peasant armies. Before we proceed to the other groups (Thuringia and Hesse, Alsace, Austria and the Alps) we must give an account of the military operations of Truchsess, in which he, alone in the beginning and later supported by various princes and townships, annihilated this first group of insurgents.

We left Truchsess near Ulm, where he had come late in March after leaving an observation corps in Kirchheim unter Teck under the command of Dietrich Spät. Truchsess' corps, which, including the League reinforcements concentrated in Ulm, had not quite
10,000 men, of whom 7,200 were infantry, was the only army available for an offensive war against the peasants. Reinforcements came to Ulm very slowly, due partly to the difficulties of recruiting in insurgent localities, partly to the governments' lack of money, and partly to the fact that the few available troops were everywhere more than indispensable for manning the fortresses and castles. We have already taken note of the small number of troops at the disposal of the princes and towns outside the Swabian League. Everything therefore depended upon Georg Truchsess and his League army.

Truchsess turned first against the Baltringen Troop, which had in the meantime begun to destroy castles and monasteries in the vicinity of Ried. The peasants, who withdrew at the approach of the League troops, were outflanked and driven out of the marshes, crossed the Danube and plunged into the ravines and forests of the Swabian Jura. In this region the cannon and cavalry which formed the backbone of the League army were of little avail against them, and Truchsess did not pursue them farther. He marched against the Leipheim Troop which had 5,000 men stationed at Leipheim, 4,000 in the Mindel valley, and 6,000 at Illertissen. The Leipheim Troop was fomenting rebellion in the entire region, destroying monasteries and castles, and preparing to march against Ulm with all its three columns. It seems that a certain degree of demoralisation had set in among the peasants here as well, undermining their military morale, for Jakob Wehe tried at the very outset to negotiate with Truchsess. The latter, however, backed by a sufficient military force, declined to negotiate and on April 4 attacked and routed the main troop at Leipheim. Jakob Wehe, Ulrich Schön and two other peasant leaders were captured and beheaded; Leipheim capitulated, and several expeditions to the adjacent countryside subdued the entire region.

A new mutiny of mercenaries, who demanded plunder and additional pay, delayed Truchsess again until April 10, when he marched south-west against the Baltringen Troop which had, in the meantime, invaded his estates, Waldenburg, Zeil and Wolfegg, and besieged his castles. Here, too, he found the peasants disunited, and defeated them on April 11 and 12 successively in several battles, which completely disrupted the Baltringen Troop. Its remnants withdrew under the command of priest Florian and joined the Lake Troop. Truchsess now turned against the latter. The Lake Troop, which had not merely roved through the countryside all this time, but had also drawn the towns of Buchhorn (Friedrichshafen) and Wollmatingen into the brotherhood, held a big military council in the monastery of Salem on April 13 and decided to move against Truchsess. Alarm bells were sounded at once, and 10,000 men
joined by the defeated Baltringen Troop assembled in the Bermatingen camp. On April 15 they stood their ground in a battle with Truchsess, who did not want to risk his army in a decisive battle and preferred to negotiate, strengthened in this purpose by news of the approach of the Allgäu and Hegau troops. On April 17 he therefore concluded an agreement with the Lake and Baltringen peasants in Weingarten. On the face of it, the agreement was quite favourable for the peasants, and they accepted it without hesitation. Ultimately, he also prevailed on the delegates of the Upper and Lower Allgäu peasants to accept this agreement, and marched towards Württemberg.

Here Truchsess' cunning saved him from certain defeat. Had he not succeeded in fooling the weak, dull-witted, and for the most part already demoralised peasants and their mostly incapable, timid and venal leaders, he and his small army would have been enveloped by four columns of at least 25,000 to 30,000 men, and would have faced inevitable disaster. It was his enemies' narrow-mindedness, always unavoidable when peasants gather in a mass, that enabled him to dispose of them at the very moment when they could have ended the war with one blow, at least in Swabia and Franconia. The Lake peasants observed the agreement, which naturally was turned against them in due course, so rigidly that they later took up arms against their allies, the Hegau peasants. Although the Allgäu peasants, drawn into the betrayal by their leaders, soon renounced the agreement, Truchsess was by then out of danger.

Though not bound by the Weingarten agreement, the Hegau peasants soon gave a new display of the infinite parochial bigotry and stubborn provincialism that proved the undoing of the entire Peasant War. When, after futile negotiations with them, Truchsess marched off to Württemberg, they followed him and were continually on his flank, but it did not occur to them to unite with the Württemberg Gay Christian Troop, and this because previously the peasants of Württemberg and the Neckar valley had refused them assistance. When Truchsess had marched far enough from their home country, they simply turned back and marched on Freiburg.

We left the Württemberg peasants under the command of Matern Feuerbacher at Kirchheim unter Teck, from where the observation corps left by Truchsess under the command of Dietrich Spät had withdrawn towards Urach. After an unsuccessful attempt to take Urach, Feuerbacher turned towards Nürtingen and sent messages to all insurgent troops in the vicinity to assist him in the decisive battle. And considerable reinforcements did come from both the Württem-
berg lowlands and from Gäu. The Gäu peasants, who had joined the remnants of the Leipheim Troop that had withdrawn to West Württemberg and roused the valleys of the Upper Neckar and Nagold up to Böblingen and Leonberg, came in two strong columns to join Feuerbacher at Nürtingen on May 5. Truchsess stumbled upon the united troop at Böblingen. Its number, its artillery and position perplexed him. As was his custom, he at once began to negotiate and concluded an armistice with the peasants. But no sooner had he thus secured his position than he attacked them on May 12 during the armistice and forced a decisive battle on them. The peasants offered long and courageous resistance until Böblingen finally surrendered to Truchsess owing to betrayal by the burghers. The peasants' left wing, deprived of its base of support, was forced back and outflanked. This decided the issue. The poorly disciplined peasants were thrown into confusion and fled in disorder; those who were not killed or captured by League horsemen threw away their weapons and hurried home. The Gay Christian Troop, and with it the whole Württemberg insurrection, were crushed. Theus Gerber fled to Esslingen and Feuerbacher to Switzerland, while Jäcklein Rohrbach was taken prisoner and dragged in chains to Neckargartach, where he was bound to a stake, surrounded with firewood and roasted to death on a slow fire, while Truchsess, carousing with his knights, gloated over this knightly spectacle.

From Neckargartach Truchsess supported the operations of the Elector Palatine by invading Kraichgau. On receiving word of Truchsess' success, the Elector, who meanwhile had gathered an army, immediately broke his agreement with the peasants, attacked Bruchrain on May 23, captured and burned Malsch in spite of its vigorous resistance, pillaged a number of villages, and garrisoned Bruchsal. At the same time Truchsess attacked Eppingen and captured the chief of the local movement, Anton Eisenhut, whom the Elector immediately executed along with a dozen other peasant leaders. Bruchrain and Kraichgau were thus subdued and compelled to pay an indemnity of about 40,000 guilders. Both armies, that of Truchsess—reduced to 6,000 men in the preceding battles—and that of the Elector (6,500 men), united and moved against the Odenwalders.

Word of the Böblingen defeat spread terror everywhere among the insurgents. The free imperial cities which had come under the heavy hand of the peasants, heaved a sigh of relief. The city of Heilbronn was the first to seek reconciliation with the Swabian League. In Heilbronn the peasants' chancellory and delegates of the various troops deliberated over the proposals they would make to the
Emperor and the Empire in the name of all the insurgent peasants. These negotiations, whose outcome was to apply to all Germany, revealed again that none of the estates, including the peasants, was sufficiently developed to alter the situation in Germany according to its own lights. It was obvious at once that the support of the nobility and particularly of the burghers had to be gained for this purpose. **Wendel Hipler** took charge of the negotiations. Of all the leaders of the movement he had the best grasp on the existing situation. He was not a far-seeing revolutionary like Münzer, nor a peasant representative like Metzler or Rohrbach; his extensive experience and his practical knowledge of the attitude of the various estates towards each other prevented him from representing any one of the estates involved in the movement in opposition to the others. Just as Münzer, a representative of the budding proletariat, a class which then stood totally outside the official organisation of society, was driven to anticipate communism, Wendel Hipler, the representative of what may be described as the cross-section of the nation's progressive elements, anticipated modern bourgeois society. The principles he represented and the demands he made were not really immediately practicable. They were the somewhat idealised and inevitable result of the dissolution of feudal society. And the peasants, having set themselves to drafting legislation for the whole Empire, were compelled to accept them. In Heilbronn, therefore, the centralisation demanded by the peasants assumed a more definite form which was, however, worlds removed from the peasants' own idea. For instance, it was much more clearly expressed in the demands for a standard currency, standard weights and measures, abolition of internal customs, etc., that is, in demands that were far more in the interest of townsmen than in that of the peasants. Concessions were made to the nobility that substantially approached the modern system of redemption and that would in the long run transform feudal into bourgeois landownership. In short, since the peasants' demands were composed as an "imperial reform", they necessarily complied with the definitive interests rather than the immediate demands of the burghers.

While this imperial reform was still being debated in Heilbronn, the author of the Declaration of the Twelve Articles, Hans Berlin, was already on his way to meet Truchsess and negotiate the surrender of the township on behalf of the honourables and burghers. Reactionary movements within the town supported this betrayal, and Wendel Hipler was obliged to flee with the peasants.

---

a Charles V.—Ed.
He went to Weinsberg, where he attempted to assemble the remnants of the Württemberg Troop and the small mobile unit of Gaildorferers. But the approach of the Elector Palatine and Truchsess drove him from there as well, and he was compelled to go to Würzburg to rouse the Gay Bright Troop into action. In the meantime, the armies of the League and the Elector subdued the entire Neckar region, compelled the peasants to renew their oath of allegiance, burned many villages, and slayed or hanged all runaway peasants who fell into their hands. Weinsberg was burned to avenge the execution of von Helfenstein.

The peasant troops assembled near Würzburg had in the meantime laid siege to Frauenberg, and on May 15, before even a breach was made in the wall of the fortress, they bravely but unsuccessfully attempted to storm it. Four hundred of the best men, mostly of Florian Geyer's Troop, were left behind in the ditches, dead or wounded. Two days later, on May 17, Wendel Hipler arrived and ordered a military council. He proposed to leave only 4,000 men at Frauenberg, and to encamp with the main force of about 20,000 men at Krautheim on the Jagst under the very nose of Truchsess, so that all reinforcements might be concentrated there. It was an excellent plan. Only by keeping the masses together and securing numerical superiority could the peasants hope to defeat the princely army, which now numbered about 13,000 men. The demoralisation and discouragement of the peasants, however, was too far gone to contemplate any energetic action. Besides, Götz von Berlichingen, who soon turned traitor, may have helped to hold the troop in check, and Hipler's plan was thus never executed. Instead, the forces were split up as usual. Not until May 23 did the Gay Bright Troop go into action after the Franconians promised to follow without delay. On May 26 the Ansbach detachments encamped in Würzburg were induced to return home on receiving word that their Margrave had opened hostilities against the peasants. The rest of the besieging army, along with Florian Geyer's Black Troop, occupied positions at Heidingsfeld in the vicinity of Würzburg.

On May 24 the Gay Bright Troop, not really ready for battle, arrived in Krautheim. Many learned here that in their absence their villages had sworn allegiance to Truchsess, and used this as a pretext to go home. The troop moved on to Neckarsulm, and on May 28 started negotiations with Truchsess. At the same time messengers
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a Casimir, Margrave of Brandenburg, who was in possession of Ansbach and Bayreuth.—Ed.
were sent to the peasants of Franconia, Alsace and Black Forest-Hegau to ask for reinforcements as quickly as possible. From Neckarsulm Götz [von Berlichingen] marched back to Öhringen. The troop steadily melted away. Götz von Berlichingen also disappeared during the march. He had gone home, having previously negotiated with Truchsess through his old brother-in-arms, Dietrich Spät, on going over to the other side. At Öhringen a false rumour of the enemy’s approach threw the perplexed and discouraged peasantry into panic. The troop dispersed in utter confusion, and it was with difficulty that Metzler and Wendel Hipler succeeded in keeping together about 2,000 men, whom they again led toward Krautheim. In the meantime, the Franconian army of 5,000 men had come, but due to a side march through Löwenstein towards Öhringen, ordered by Götz with obviously treacherous intents, it missed the Gay Troop and moved towards Neckarsulm. This town, occupied by several detachments of the Gay Bright Troop, was besieged by Truchsess. The Franconians arrived at night and saw the fires of the League camp, but their leaders had not the courage to venture an attack and retreated to Krautheim where they at last found the remainder of the Gay Bright Troop. In the absence of aid, Neckarsulm surrendered to the League force on May 29. At once Truchsess had thirteen peasants executed and set out against the other peasant troops, burning and ravaging, pillaging and murdering along the way. His route through the valleys of the Neckar, Kocher and Jagst was marked with ruins and the corpses of peasants hanging on trees.

At Krautheim the League army encountered the peasants who had been forced by a flanking movement by Truchsess to withdraw towards Königshofen on the Tauber. Here they took up their position, 8,000 strong and with 32 cannon. Truchsess approached them behind the cover of hills and forests. He sent out columns to envelop them, and on June 2 attacked in such greatly superior force and with so much energy that they were defeated and dispersed in spite of the stubborn resistance of several of their troops that lasted into the night. As everywhere, it was the League horsemen, the “Peasants’ Death”, who were mainly instrumental in annihilating the insurgent army, charging down upon the peasants who were shaken by artillery and musket fire and lance attacks, breaking their ranks completely and slaying them one by one. The fate of 300 Königshofen burghers who had joined the peasant army serves as an illustration of the warfare led by Truchsess and his horsemen. All but fifteen of them were killed in the battle and four of the survivors were subsequently beheaded.
Having thus settled with the peasants of Odenwald, the Neckar valley and Lower Franconia, Truchsess subdued the whole region in a series of punitive expeditions, burning down whole villages and executing countless people. Then he marched against Würzburg. On the way he learned that the second Franconian Troop under Florian Geyer and Gregor von Burgbernheim was stationed at Sulzdorf, and instantly turned against it.

After his unsuccessful storming of Frauenberg, Florian Geyer had mainly devoted himself to negotiating with the princes and towns, especially with Rothenburg and Margrave Casimir of Ansbach, urging them to join the peasant brotherhood. But the negotiations were brought to an abrupt end by the news of the Königshofen defeat. His troop was joined by that of Ansbach under Gregor von Burgbernheim. The Ansbach troop had only recently been formed. Margrave Casimir had managed to keep in check the peasant revolt in his possessions in true Hohenzollern style, partly with promises and partly by means of a threatening mass of troops. He maintained complete neutrality towards all outside troops as long as they did not recruit Ansbach subjects, and tried to direct the hatred of the peasants mainly against the church endowments, through whose ultimate confiscation he hoped to enrich himself. In the meantime he kept arming and biding his time. As soon as he learned of the Böblingen battle he opened hostilities against his rebellious peasants, pillaging and burning their villages and hanging or otherwise killing many of them. But the peasants rallied quickly and defeated him at Windsheim under the command of Gregor von Burgbernheim on May 29. The call of the hard-pressed Odenwald peasants reached them as they were still pursuing him, and they headed at once for Heidingsfeld and from there, with Florian Geyer, again towards Würzburg (June 2). With no word arriving from the Odenwald troop, they left behind 5,000 peasants in Würzburg and with 4,000—the rest having deserted—they followed the others. Made complacent by false news of the outcome of the Königshofen battle, they were attacked by Truchsess at Sulzdorf and completely defeated. Truchsess’ horsemen and mercenaries staged a terrible bloodbath. Florian Geyer rallied the remainder of his Black Troop, 600 in number, and fought his way to the village of Ingolstadt. Two hundred occupied the church and churchyard, and 400 took the castle. The Elector Palatine’s forces pursued Geyer, and a column of 1,200 men captured the village and set fire to the church. Those who did not perish in the flames were slaughtered. The Elector’s troops then breached the dilapidated castle wall and attempted to storm the fortress. Turned back twice by the peasants, who had taken cover
behind an inner wall, they shot up the inner wall as well, and tried a third assault, which was successful. Half of Geyer’s men were massacred, but Geyer managed to escape with the other 200. Their hiding place, however, was discovered on the following day (Whit-Monday). The Elector Palatine’s soldiers surrounded the woods in which they lay hidden, and slaughtered all of them. Only seventeen prisoners were taken during those two days. Again Florian Geyer fought his way out of the encirclement with a few of his most intrepid fighters and set out to join the Gaildorf peasants, who had again assembled a body of about 7,000 men. But upon his arrival he found them mostly dispersed by the crushing news from every side. He made a last attempt to assemble the peasants dispersed in the woods, but was surprised by enemy forces at Hall on June 9 and laid down his life fighting.

Truchsess, who had sent word to besieged Frauenberg on the heels of the Königshofen victory, now marched towards Würzburg. The Council came to a secret understanding with him, so that on the night of June 7 the League army was allowed to surround the city where 5,000 peasants were stationed, and the following morning marched with sheathed swords through the gates opened by the Council. This betrayal of the Würzburg “honourables” caused the last troop of the Franconian peasants to be disarmed and all its leaders to be arrested. Truchsess immediately ordered 81 of them decapitated. The various Franconian princes arrived in Würzburg one after the other, and among them the Bishop of Würzburg himself,\(^a\) the Bishop of Bamberg\(^b\) and the Margrave of Brandenburg-Ansbach. The gracious lords distributed the roles among themselves. Truchsess marched with the Bishop of Bamberg, who presently broke the agreement concluded with his peasants and opened his land to the fierce and murderous hordes of the League army. Margrave Casimir devastated his own land. Deiningen was burned and numerous villages were pillaged or gutted. In every town the Margrave held a bloodthirsty court. He ordered eighteen rebels beheaded in Neustadt on the Aisch and in Bergel forty-three suffered the same fate. From there he went to Rothenburg where the honourables had already made a counter-revolution and arrested Stephan von Menzingen. The Rothenburg petty burghers and plebeians now had to pay heavily for behaving so ambiguously towards the peasants, refusing them all help until the very last, insisting in their local narrow-minded egotism on the suppression of
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\(^a\) Konrad III.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) Weigand von Redwitz.—*Ed.*
countryside crafts in favour of the city guilds, and only unwillingly giving up the city revenues flowing in from the feudal services of the peasants. The Margrave ordered sixteen of them executed, Menzingen naturally first of all.—The Bishop of Würzburg marched through his region in a similar manner, pillaging, ravaging and burning everything on his way. He had 256 rebels decapitated on this triumphal march, and upon returning to Würzburg crowned his handiwork by beheading another thirteen Würzburg rebels.

In the Mainz region the viceregent, Bishop Wilhelm von Strassburg, restored order without resistance. He executed only four men. Rheingau, which had also been in revolt but where everybody had long since come home, was eventually invaded by Frowin von Hutten, a cousin of Ulrich, and fully “pacified” by the execution of twelve ringleaders. Frankfurt, which also experienced considerable revolutionary unrest, was held in check first by the conciliatory attitude of the Council and later by recruited troops. In the Rhenish Palatinate about 8,000 peasants had assembled anew after the Elector’s breach of faith, and had again burned monasteries and castles, but the Archbishop of Trier came to the aid of Marshal von Habern and made short work of them on June 23 at Pfeddersheim. A series of atrocities (eighty-two were executed in Pfeddersheim alone) and the capture of Weissenburg on July 7 put an end to the insurrection.

Of all the peasant troops only two were still unvanquished: the Hegau-Black Forest Troop and that of Allgäu. Archduke Ferdinand had tried intriguing against both. Just as Margrave Casimir and other princes sought to utilise the insurrection to annex church lands and principalities, Ferdinand wished to use it for the aggrandisement of the House of Austria. He had negotiated with the Allgäu commander, Walter Bach, and with the Hegau commander, Hans Müller of Bulgenbach, in the hope of prevailing on the peasants to declare allegiance to Austria, but though both chiefs were venal they could not talk their troops into anything more than an armistice between the Allgäu Troop and the Archduke, and neutrality towards Austria.

Retreating from the Württemberg region, the peasants of Hegau destroyed a number of castles and gathered reinforcements in the provinces of the Margraviate of Baden. On May 13 they marched on Freiburg, bombarded it from May 18, and entered it triumphantly when the town surrendered on May 23. From there they moved

\[\text{Richard von Greifenklau.—Ed.}\]
towards Stockach and Radolfzell, and waged a long but unsuccessful small war against the garrisons of those towns. Together with the nobility and other surrounding towns, the latter appealed to the Lake peasants for help in accordance with the Weingarten agreement. The former rebels of the Lake Troop rose, 5,000 strong, against their confederates. These peasants were so narrow-minded and short-sighted that only 600 refused to fight, expressing their wish to join the Hegau peasants, for which they were massacred. Meanwhile, persuaded by Hans Müller of Bulgenbach, who had sold himself to the enemy, the Hegau peasants lifted their siege, and when thereupon Hans Müller ran away, most of them dispersed. The remainder entrenched themselves on the Hilzingen Steep, where they were beaten and annihilated on July 16 by troops that had in the meantime become available. The Swiss cities negotiated an agreement on behalf of the Hegau peasants, which, however, did not prevent the other side from capturing and beheading Hans Müller in Laufenburg, his betrayal notwithstanding. In Breisgau the town of Freiburg also deserted the peasant union (July 17) and sent troops against the peasants, but due to the weakness of the princely force an agreement was reached here as elsewhere, known as the agreement of Offenburg (September 18), which also applied to Sundgau. The eight Black Forest groups and the Klettgau peasants, who were not as yet disarmed, were again compelled to rebel by the tyranny of Count von Sulz, and were defeated in October. On November 13 the Black Forest peasants were forced to conclude an agreement, and Waldshut, the last bulwark of the insurrection in the Upper Rhine, fell on December 6.

After Truchsess' departure the Allgäu peasants renewed their campaign against the monasteries and castles and wreaked vengeance for the ravages caused by the League army. They were confronted by few troops, who risked only insignificant isolated skirmishes and never followed them into the woods. In June, a movement against the honourables broke out in Memmingen, which had hitherto been more or less neutral. This movement was defeated only due to the accidental presence in the vicinity of some League troops, who came in time to aid the honourables. Schappeler, preacher and leader of the plebeian movement, took refuge in St. Gallen. The peasants appeared before the town and were about to begin shooting breaches in its wall when they learned that Truchsess was approaching from Würzburg. On June 27 they set out against him in two columns across Babenhausen and Obergünzburg. Archduke Ferdinand again attempted to win the peasants for the House of Austria. On the strength of the armistice concluded with
them, he demanded of Truchsess to march no farther against them. The Swabian League, however, ordered Truchsess to attack, but to refrain from pillaging and burning. But Truchsess was too clever to relinquish his prime and most effective weapon even if he were able to hold in check the mercenaries whom he had led from Lake Constance to the Main, from one atrocity to another. The peasants, numbering about 23,000, took up battle positions across the Iller and Leubas. Truchsess opposed them with 11,000 men. The positions of both armies were very strong. The cavalry was ineffective due to the terrain, and if the Truchsess mercenaries were superior to the peasants in organisation, ammunition and discipline, the Allgäu peasants had in their ranks a host of former soldiers and experienced commanders, and many well-manned cannon. On July 19 the League army opened fire, which was continued on both sides through July 20, but with no result. On July 21 Georg von Frundsberg joined Truchsess with 3,000 mercenaries. He knew many of the peasant commanders, for they had served under him in the Italian military expeditions, and entered into negotiations with them. Treason succeeded where military resources proved insufficient. Walter Bach and several other commanders and artillerymen sold out. They set fire to the powder stores of the peasants and induced the troop to attempt an enveloping movement, but as soon as the peasants left their strong positions they ran into an ambush engineered by Truchsess in collusion with Bach and the other traitors. The peasants' ability to defend themselves was impaired since their traitorous commanders had left them under the pretext of reconnoitring and were already on their way to Switzerland. Thus, two of the peasant columns were routed, while a third, under Knopf of Leubas, was able to withdraw in good order. It resumed its position on the mountain of Kollen near Kempten, where it was surrounded by Truchsess. But the latter did not dare attack the peasants; he cut off their supply routes and tried to demoralise them by burning about 200 villages in the vicinity. Hunger and the sight of their burning homes finally brought the peasants to their knees (July 25). More than twenty were immediately executed. Knopf of Leubas, the only leader of this troop who did not betray his banner, fled to Bregenz. There he was captured and hanged after a long imprisonment.

This brought the Peasant War in Swabia and Franconia to an end.
Directly after the outbreak of the first movement in Swabia, Thomas Münzer again hurried to Thuringia, and in late February or early March stayed in the free imperial town of Mühlhausen, where his party was stronger than elsewhere. He held the threads of the whole movement and knew that a storm was brewing in South Germany. So he set out to turn Thuringia into the centre of the movement in North Germany. He found the soil extremely fertile. Thuringia itself, the main scene of the Reformation movement, was in great ferment. The misery of the downtrodden peasants and the prevailing revolutionary, religious and political doctrines had also made a general uprising imminent in the neighbouring provinces of Hesse and Saxony, and in the Harz region. In Mühlhausen itself the bulk of the petty burgherdom was won over to Münzer's extreme standpoint and could hardly wait to assert its superiority over the arrogant honourables. To prevent premature action, Münzer was compelled to act as a moderator, but his disciple, Pfeifer, who held the reins of the movement there, had committed himself so greatly that he could not hold back the outbreak, and as early as March 17, 1525, before the general uprising in South Germany, Mühlhausen made its revolution. The old patrician Council was overthrown and the government handed over to the newly elected "eternal council", with Münzer as president.\textsuperscript{337}

The worst thing that can befall the leader of an extreme party is to be compelled to assume power at a time when the movement is not yet ripe for the domination of the class he represents and for the measures this domination implies. What he can do depends not on his will but on the degree of antagonism between the various classes,
and on the level of development of the material means of existence, of the conditions of production and commerce upon which the degree of intensity of the class contradictions always reposes. What he ought to do, what his party demands of him, again depends not on him, but also not on the degree of development of the class struggle and its conditions. He is bound to the doctrines and demands hitherto propounded which, again, do not follow from the class relations of the moment, or from the more or less accidental level of production and commerce, but from his more or less penetrating insight into the general result of the social and political movement. Thus, he necessarily finds himself in an unsolvable dilemma. What he can do contradicts all his previous actions and principles and the immediate interests of his party, and what he ought to do cannot be done. In a word, he is compelled to represent not his party or his class, but the class for whose domination the movement is then ripe. In the interests of the movement he is compelled to advance the interests of an alien class, and to feed his own class with talk and promises, and with the asseveration that the interests of that alien class are their own interests. He who is put into this awkward position is irrevocably lost. We have seen examples of this in recent times, and need only recall the position in the last French Provisional Government of the representatives of the proletariat, though they themselves represented only a very low stage of development of the proletariat. He who can still speculate with official posts after the experiences of the February government—to say nothing of our own noble German provisional governments and imperial regencies—is either foolish beyond measure or belongs to the extreme revolutionary party at best in word only.

Münzer's position at the head of the "eternal council" of Mühlhausen was indeed much more precarious than that of any modern revolutionary regent. Not only the movement of his time, but also the age, were not ripe for the ideas of which he himself had only a faint notion. The class which he represented was still in its birth throes. It was far from developed enough to assume leadership over, and to transform, society. The social changes of his fancy had little root in the then existing economic conditions. What is more, these conditions were paving the way for a social system that was diametrically opposite to what he envisioned. Nevertheless, he was still committed to his early sermons of Christian equality and evangelical community of property, and was compelled at least to
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a The 1850 edition has "industrial" instead of "social".—Ed.
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attempt their realisation. Community of property, the equal obligation of all to work, and abolition of all authority were proclaimed. But in reality Mühlhausen remained a republican imperial city with a somewhat democratised constitution, a senate elected by universal suffrage and controlled by a forum, and with a hastily improvised system of care for the poor. The social upheaval that so horrified its Protestant burgher contemporaries actually never went beyond a feeble, unconscious and premature attempt to establish the bourgeois [bürgerliche] society of a later period.

Münzer himself seems to have sensed the chasm between his theories and the surrounding realities, a chasm that he must have felt the more keenly, the more his visionary aspirations were distorted in the crude minds of his mass of followers. He devoted himself to extending and organising the movement with a zeal rare even for him. He wrote letters and sent messengers and emissaries in all directions. His writings and sermons breathed a revolutionary fanaticism astonishing even when compared with his former works. The naive youthful humour of Münzer's revolutionary pamphlets was totally gone. The placid explicative language of the thinker typical of his earlier years was gone too. Münzer became a positive prophet of the revolution. He untiringly fanned hatred against the ruling classes, he stimulated the wildest passions, and used only the forceful language that the religious and nationalist delirium had put into the mouths of the Old Testament prophets. The style he now had to adopt reflected the educational level of the public he sought to influence.

The example of Mühlhausen and Münzer's propaganda had a rapid and far-reaching effect. In Thuringia, Eichsfeld, the Harz, the duchies of Saxony, in Hesse and Fulda, in Upper Franconia and in Vogtland, the peasants arose, assembled in troops, and set fire to castles and monasteries. Münzer was recognised as the leader of more or less the entire movement, and Mühlhausen remained its centre, while a purely burgher movement won in Erfurt and the ruling party there kept acting ambiguously towards the peasants.

The princes in Thuringia were at first just as perplexed and helpless against the peasants as they had been in Franconia and Swabia. Only in the last days of April did the Landgrave of Hesse succeed in assembling a corps. It was the same Landgrave Philip whose piety is praised so much by the Protestant and bourgeois histories of the Reformation, and of whose infamies against the
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peasants we shall presently have a word to say. By a series of swift movements and decisive actions, Landgrave Philip quickly subdued the major part of his land, called up new contingents, and then marched into the region belonging to the Abbot of Fulda,a who had hitherto been his feudal lord. On May 3 he defeated the Fulda peasant troop at Frauenberg, subdued the whole land, and seized the opportunity not only for freeing himself from the sovereignty of the Abbot, but also for making the Abbey of Fulda a vassalage of Hesse, naturally pending its subsequent secularisation. He then took Eisenach and Langensalza, and advanced against Mühlhausen, the headquarters of the rebellion, jointly with the ducal Saxon troops. Münzer assembled his forces, comprising some 8,000 men and several cannon, at Frankenhausen. The Thuringian troop had little of the fighting power which a part of the Upper Swabian and Franconian troops had developed in their struggle with Truchsess. It was poorly armed and badly disciplined; it had few ex-soldiers in its ranks and lacked sorely in leadership. It appears Münzer himself had not the slightest military knowledge. All the same, the princes thought it best to use the same tactics against him that so often helped Truchsess to victory: breach of faith. They launched negotiations on May 16, concluded an armistice, and then suddenly attacked the peasants before the armistice had elapsed.

Münzer had stationed his people on a mountain still called Schlachtberg,b behind a barricade of wagons. Discouragement was spreading rapidly among his men. The princes promised them indulgence if they delivered Münzer alive. Münzer called a general assembly to debate the princes’ proposals. A knight and a priest spoke in favour of surrender. Münzer had them both brought inside the circle and decapitated. This act of terrorist energy, jubilantly received by resolute revolutionaries, instilled a certain order among the troop, but most of the men would still have gone away without resistance had it not been noticed that the princes’ mercenaries, who had encircled the mountain, were approaching in closed columns in spite of the armistice. A front was hurriedly formed behind the wagons, but already shells and bullets were showering upon the half-defenseless peasants unaccustomed to battle, and the mercenaries had reached the barricade. After a brief resistance the line of wagons was breached, the peasant cannon captured, and the peasants dispersed. They fled in wild disorder to fall into the hands
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of the enveloping columns and the cavalry, who loosened an appalling massacre. Out of 8,000 peasants over 5,000 were slaughtered. The survivors went to Frankenhausen, and the princes' cavalry came hot on their heels. The city was captured. Münzer, wounded in the head, was discovered in a house and taken prisoner. On May 25 Mühlhausen also surrendered. Pfeifer, who had remained there, escaped, but was captured in the region of Eisenach.

Münzer was put on the rack in the presence of the princes, and then decapitated. He went to his death with the courage he had shown throughout his life. He was twenty-eight at the most when executed. Pfeifer was also beheaded, and many others besides. In Fulda Philip of Hesse, that holy man, opened his bloody court. He and the Saxon princes had many killed by the sword, among them in Eisenach, 24; in Langensalza, 41; after the battle of Frankenhausen, 300; in Mühlhausen, more than 100; at Görmär, 26; at Tüngeda, 50; at Sangerhausen, 12; in Leipzig, 8, not to speak of mutilations and more moderate measures, pillaging and burning of villages and towns.

Mühlhausen was compelled to give up its imperial liberty, and was incorporated in the Saxon lands just as the Abbey of Fulda was incorporated in the Landgraviate of Hesse.

The princes now marched through the forest of Thuringia, where Franconian peasants of the Bildhausen camp had joined the Thuringians and had burned many castles. A battle took place outside Meiningen. The peasants were beaten and withdrew towards the town, which suddenly closed its gates to them and threatened to attack them from the rear. Thrown into confusion by its allies' betrayal, the troop surrendered to the princes and ran off in all directions while the negotiations were still under way. The Bildhausen camp had long since dispersed, and after the troop's defeat the remaining insurgents in Saxony, Hesse, Thuringia and Upper Franconia were annihilated.

In Alsace the rebellion broke out later than on the right bank of the Rhine. The peasants of the Bishopric of Strassburg rose up as late as the middle of April. Soon after, there was an uprising of peasants in Upper Alsace and Sundgau. On April 18 a contingent of Lower Alsace peasants pillaged the monastery of Altdorf. Other troops formed near Ebersheim and Barr, as well as in the Willer and Urbis valleys. These soon amalgamated into a large Lower Alsace troop and seized towns and hamlets and destroyed monasteries. Everywhere, one out of every three men was called to serve in the troop. The troop's Twelve Articles were much more radical than those of the Swabians and Franconians.
While early in May one column of Lower Alsatians concentrated near St. Hippolite and after a futile attempt to take that town occupied Berckon on May 10, Rappoltsweiler on May 13, and Reichenweier on May 14 by an understanding with their citizens, a second column under Erasmus Gerber moved in for a surprise attack on Strassburg. The attempt failed, and the column now turned towards the Vosges, destroyed the monastery of Mauersmünster and besieged Zabern, which surrendered on May 13. From here it moved towards the Lorraine frontier and roused the adjacent section of the duchy, and at the same time fortified the mountain passes. Big camps were formed at Herbitzheim on the Saar and at Neuburg. Nearly 4,000 German-Lorraine peasants entrenched themselves at Saargemünd. Finally, two advanced troops, the Kolben troop in the Vosges at Stürzelbronn and the Kleebug troop at Weissenburg, covered the front and the right flank, while the left flank hugged the Upper Alsatians.

The latter, on the march since April 20, had forced Sulz into the peasant brotherhood on May 10, Gebweiler on May 12, and Sennheim and its vicinity on May 15. Though the Austrian Government and the surrounding imperial towns lost no time to join forces against them, they were too weak to offer serious resistance, not to speak of attacking. Thus, the whole of Alsace, with the exception of a few towns, fell into the hands of the insurgents by the middle of May.

But the army that was to break the mischievous spirit of the Alsatians was already approaching. It was the French who here restored the power of the nobility. On May 6 Duke Anton of Lorraine marched with an army of 30,000, among them the flower of the French nobility and Spanish, Piedmontese, Lombardic, Greek and Albanian auxiliaries. On May 16 at Lützelstein he engaged 4,000 peasants, whom he defeated without effort, and on May 17 he forced Zabern, which was occupied by the peasants, to surrender. But even while the Lorrainers were entering the city and the peasants were being disarmed, the terms of the surrender were violated. The defenseless peasants were attacked by the mercenaries and most of them slain. The remaining Lower Alsace columns disbanded, and Duke Anton marched on to engage the Upper Alsatians. The latter, who had refused to reinforce the Lower Alsatians at Zabern, were now attacked at Scherweiler by the entire force of Lorrainers. They put up a plucky fight, but the enormous numerical superiority of 30,000 against 7,000, and betrayal by a number of knights, especially that of the magistrate of Reichenweier, reduced their daring to nought. They were beaten and dispersed to the last man. The Duke
now proceeded to subdue the whole of Alsace with the usual cruelty. Only Sundgau was spared his presence. By threatening to call him into the land, the Austrian Government persuaded the peasants to conclude the Ensisheim agreement early in June. But it broke the agreement very soon and hanged the preachers and leaders of the movement en masse. The peasants rebelled anew, and Sundgau was finally drawn into the Offenburg agreement (September 18).

Now it only remains to describe the Peasant War in the Alpine regions of Austria. These regions and the adjoining Archbishopsric of Salzburg had been in continuous opposition to the government and the nobility since the Stara Prawa. As a result, the Reformation doctrines found a fertile soil there. Religious persecution and arbitrary oppressive taxation precipitated a rebellion.

The city of Salzburg, supported by peasants and pitmen, had been in conflict with the Archbishop since 1522 over its city privileges and religious practices. Late in 1524 the Archbishop attacked the city with recruited mercenaries, terrorised it with the cannon of the castle, and persecuted the heretical preachers. At the same time he imposed new crushing taxes and thereby irritated the population to the extreme. In the spring of 1525, simultaneously with the Swabian-Franconian and Thuringian uprisings, the peasants and pitmen of the whole country suddenly rose up in arms, organised under the commanders Prassler and Weitmoser, liberated the city and besieged the castle of Salzburg. Like the West-German peasants, they organised a Christian Alliance and formulated their demands in articles, of which they had fourteen.

In Styria, Upper Austria, Carinthia and Carniola, where new extortionate taxes, duties and edicts had severely injured the basic interests of the people, the peasants rose up in the spring of 1525. They took a number of castles and at Goyss defeated Dietrichstein, the old field commander and conqueror of the Stara Prawa. Although the government succeeded in placating some of the insurgents with false promises, the bulk of them stayed together and united with the Salzburg peasants, so that the entire region of Salzburg and the bigger portion of Upper Austria, Styria, Carinthia and Carniola were in the hands of the peasants and pitmen.

In Tirol the Reformation doctrines had also found numerous adherents. Münzer's emissaries had been successfully active here, even more so than in the other Alpine regions of Austria. As elsewhere, Archduke Ferdinand persecuted the preachers of the

---

a See this volume, p. 439.— Ed.
b Matthäus Lang.— Ed.
new doctrine and impinged on the rights of the population by means of new arbitrary financial regulations. The result, as everywhere, was an uprising that broke out in the spring of 1525. The insurgents commanded by Geismayer, a Münzer man who was the only one of the peasant chiefs to possess any military talent, took a great number of castles, and carried on energetically against the priests, particularly in the South, in the Etsch¹ region. The Vorarlberg peasants also rose up and joined the Allgäu peasants.

The Archduke, hard pressed from all sides, now began to make concession after concession to the rebels whom a short time before he had wished to annihilate by fire and destruction, plunder and carnage. He summoned the Diets of the hereditary lands and pending their opening concluded an armistice with the peasants. In the meantime he was arming for all he was worth, in order to be able to speak to the blasphemers in a different tongue in the nearest possible future.

Naturally, the armistice was not observed for long. Having run short of cash, Dietrichstein began to levy contributions in the duchies; besides, his Slavic and Magyar troops indulged in the most disgraceful brutalities against the population. This incited the Styrians to a new revolt. The peasants attacked Dietrichstein at Schladming in the night of July 3, and slaughtered everybody who did not speak German. Dietrichstein himself was captured. In the morning of July 3 the peasants called a jury and sentenced to death forty Czech and Croatian nobles among their prisoners. They were beheaded on the spot. That had its effect; the Archduke immediately consented to all the demands of the estates of the five duchies (Upper and Lower Austria, Styria, Carinthia and Carniola).

The demands of the Diet were also granted in Tirol, and thus the North was pacified. The South, however, stood firm on its original demands, scorning the much more moderate decisions of the Diet, and remained under arms. Only in December was the Archduke able to restore order by force. He did not fail to execute a great number of the instigators and leaders of the upheaval who fell into his hands.

Ten thousand Bavarians moved in August against Salzburg under Georg von Frundsberg. This impressive show of strength and the quarrels that broke out in their ranks persuaded the Salzburg peasants to conclude an agreement with the archbishop on September 1, which was also accepted by the Archduke. However, the two princes, who had meanwhile considerably strengthened their troops, soon violated the agreement and thereby compelled the

¹ The Italian name is Adige.—Ed.
Salzburg peasants to start a new uprising. The insurgents held their own throughout the winter. In the spring Geismäier came to them and launched a splendid campaign against the forces approaching from every side. In a series of brilliant battles in May and June 1526, he successively defeated the Bavarian, Austrian and Swabian League troops and the mercenaries of the Archbishop of Salzburg, and for a long time prevented the various corps from uniting. He also found time to besiege Radstadt. Surrounded finally by superior forces, he was compelled to withdraw and fought his way out of the encirclement, leading the remnants of his troop across the Austrian Alps into Venetian territory. The Republic of Venice and Switzerland served the indefatigable peasant chief as starting points for new intrigues. For a whole year he endeavoured to involve them in a war with Austria, which would have given him an opportunity to begin a new peasant uprising. The hand of an assassin struck him down, however, in the course of these negotiations. Archduke Ferdinand and the Archbishop of Salzburg could not rest as long as Geismäier was alive. They hired an assassin who succeeded in ending the life of the dangerous rebel in 1527.\(^a\)

\(^a\) According to more precise data Geismäier was assassinated on April 15, 1532.—*Ed.*
The epilogue of the Peasant War closed with Geismayer's withdrawal into Venetian territory. The peasants were everywhere brought back under the sway of their ecclesiastical, noble or patrician overlords. The agreements concluded with them here and there were violated and the heavy services augmented by the enormous indemnities imposed by the victors on the vanquished. The most magnificent revolutionary effort of the German people ended in ignominious defeat and, for the time being, in redoubled oppression. In the long run, however, the situation of the peasants was not made any worse by the suppression of the uprising. Whatever the nobility, princes and priests could wring out of the peasants year after year, had been wrung out even before the war. The German peasant of that time has this in common with the present-day proletarian, that his share in the products of his labour was limited to a subsistence minimum necessary for his maintenance and the propagation of the peasant race. On the whole, nothing more could be wrung out of the peasants. True, some of the better-off middle peasants were ruined, hosts of bondsmen were forced into serfdom, whole stretches of community land were confiscated, and a great many peasants were forced into vagabondage or became city plebeians due to the destruction of their homes, the devastation of their fields and the general dislocation. But war and devastation were everyday phenomena at that time and, in general, the peasant class was at too low a level for increased taxation to cause any lasting deterioration of its condition. The subsequent religious wars and, finally, the Thirty Years' War with its recurrent general devastation and depopulation affected the peasants much more painfully than the Peasant War. Notably, it was the Thirty Years' War which
destroyed the most important part of the productive forces in agriculture, through which, as well as through the simultaneous destruction of many towns, the peasants, plebeians and ruined burghers were for a long time reduced to a state of Irish misery at its worst.

Those who suffered most from the Peasant War were the clergy. Their monasteries and endowments were burned, their treasures plundered, sold abroad or melted down, and their stores consumed. They were everywhere the least capable of resistance, and yet they were the main target of the people's wrath. The other estates—princes, nobles and burghers—even experienced a secret joy at the distress of the hated prelates. The Peasant War had made popular the idea of secularising the church estates in favour of the peasants. The lay princes, and partly the towns, determined to secularise the estates for their own benefit, and soon the possessions of the prelates in Protestant regions were in the hands of the princes or the honourables. But the power of the ecclesiastical princes, too, was impaired, and the lay princes knew how to exploit the people's hatred in this respect. We have seen, for instance, how the Abbot of Fulda\(^a\) was relegated from feudal lord to vassal of Philip of Hesse. The town of Kempten forced its prince-abbot\(^b\) to sell it a number of the precious privileges he had enjoyed in the town for a ridiculous trifle.

The nobility had also suffered considerably. Most of the noblemen's castles were destroyed and some of the most respected families were ruined and found a living only in the employ of the princes. Their weakness in face of the peasantry had been proved. They had been beaten everywhere and had been forced to surrender. Only the armies of the princes had saved them. The nobility was bound to lose more and more of its significance as an estate of the Empire, and to fall under the dominion of the princes.

The towns, too, generally gained nothing from the Peasant War. The rule of the honourables was almost everywhere re-established; the burgher opposition was broken for a long time. The old patrician routine dragged on in this way, tying up commerce and industry hand and foot up to the time of the French Revolution. Moreover, the towns were made responsible by the princes for the momentary successes the burgher or plebeian parties had gained within their borders during the struggle. The towns that had even previously belonged to princely estates had to pay heavy indemnities, to give up their privileges, and became defenceless prey to the avarice and

\(^a\) Johann Henneberg.—Ed.
\(^b\) Sebastian von Breitenstein.—Ed.
whims of the princes (Frankenhausen, Arnstadt, Schmalkalden, Würzburg, etc.). Towns of the Empire were incorporated into the territories of the princes (Mühlhausen, for example) or at least made morally dependent on the neighbouring princes, as was the case with many imperial towns in Franconia.

Under the circumstances, the princes alone had benefited from the Peasant War. We have seen at the very beginning of our account that the deficient development of industry, commerce and agriculture in Germany ruled out any centralisation of Germans into a nation, that it allowed only local and provincial centralisation, and that the princes, representatives of centralisation within disruption, were the only estate to profit from all the changes in the existing social and political conditions. The development of Germany in those days was at so low a level and at the same time so dissimilar in the various provinces that alongside the lay principalities there could still exist ecclesiastical sovereignties, city republics, and sovereign counts and barons. Simultaneously, however, this development was continually, though slowly and feebly, pressing for provincial centralisation, i.e. for the subordination of all the other imperial estates to the princes. That is why only the princes could have gained from the outcome of the Peasant War. And that is exactly what had happened. They gained not only relatively, from a weakening of their opponents—the clergy, nobility and the towns—but also absolutely, since they carried off the spolia opima (the main spoils) of all the other estates. The church estates were secularised in their favour; part of the nobility, fully or partly ruined, was obliged gradually to accept vassalage; the indemnities they received from the towns and peasant communities swelled their treasuries and, furthermore, the abolition of so many town privileges now afforded much greater scope to their favourite financial operations.

The chief result of the Peasant War, the deepening and consolidation of German disunity, was also the reason for its failure. We have seen that Germany was split not only into countless independent, almost totally alien provinces, but that in every one of these provinces the nation was broken up into a multifold structure of estates and fractions of estates. Besides princes and priests we find nobles and peasants in the countryside, and in the towns we find patricians, burghers and plebeians, whose interests as estates differed radically even where they did not cross each other or come into conflict. Besides all these complicated interests there were still the interests of the Emperor and the Pope. We have seen how ponderously, imperfectly, and how differently in the various localities, all these interests finally gave shape to three major groups.
We have seen that in spite of this painful grouping each estate opposed the line indicated by circumstances for the national development, that each estate acted on its own, coming into conflict not only with all the conservative, but also with the other opposition estates, and that it was bound to fail in the end. That was the fate of the nobility in Sickingen's uprising, of the peasants in the Peasant War, and of the burghers in all of their insipid Reformation. Thus, even the peasants and plebeians in most parts of Germany failed to unite for joint action and stood in each other's way. We have also seen the causes of this fragmentation of the class struggle and the resulting total defeat of the revolutionary and partial defeat of the burgher movements.

How local and provincial disunity and the consequently inevitable local and provincial narrow-mindedness ruined the whole movement; how neither burghers, peasants nor plebeians could unite for concerted national action; how the peasants of every province acted only for themselves, as a rule refusing aid to the insurgent peasants of the neighbouring regions, and were consequently annihilated in separate battles one after another by armies which in most cases were hardly one-tenth the total number of the insurgent masses—all this should be sufficiently clear from this account. The various armistices and agreements concluded by individual troops with their adversaries represent just as many acts of betrayal of the common cause, and the fact that the only co-operation possible between the different troops was not according to the greater or lesser unity of their action, but to that of the particular enemy to whom they succumbed, is the most striking proof of the degree of the peasants' mutual alienation in the various provinces.

Here also the analogy with the movement of 1848-50 leaps to the eye. In 1848 as well, the interests of the opposition classes conflicted and each class acted on its own. The bourgeoisie, too developed to suffer any longer the feudal and bureaucratic absolutism, was, however, not as yet powerful enough at once to subordinate the claims of other classes to its own interests. The proletariat, much too weak to count on a rapid passage through the bourgeois period and on an early conquest of power, had already learned too well under absolutism the honeyed sweetness of the bourgeois regime and was generally much too developed to identify for even a moment its own emancipation with that of the bourgeoisie. The mass of the nation—petty burghers, their associates (artisans), and peasants—was left in the lurch by its as yet natural ally, the bourgeoisie, because it was too revolutionary, and partly by the proletariat, because it was not sufficiently advanced.
Divided against itself the mass achieved nothing and opposed fellow opponents on the Right and Left. As to provincial narrow-mindedness, it could hardly have been greater among the peasants in 1525 than it was among the classes participating in the movement of 1848. The hundred local revolutions as well as the consequent and unhindered hundred local reactions, survival of the separation of numerous small states, etc., etc.—all this is eloquent testimony indeed. *He who still dreams of a federated republic after the two German revolutions of 1525 and 1848 and their results, belongs nowhere else but in a lunatic asylum.*

Still the two revolutions, that of the sixteenth century and that of 1848-50, are, in spite of all analogies, essentially different. The Revolution of 1848 speaks for the progress of Europe, if not of Germany.

Who profited from the Revolution of 1525? The *princes.* Who profited from the Revolution of 1848? The *big* princes, Austria and Prussia. Behind the minor princes of 1525 stood the petty burghers, who chained the princes to themselves by taxes. Behind the big princes of 1850, behind Austria and Prussia, there stand the modern big bourgeois, rapidly getting them under their yoke by means of the national debt. And behind the big bourgeois stand the proletarians.

The Revolution of 1525 was a domestic German affair. The English, French, Bohemians and Hungarians had already had their peasant wars when the Germans began theirs. If Germany was disunited, Europe was much more so. The Revolution of 1848, on the other hand, was not a domestic German affair, and was an episode in a great European event. Its motive forces throughout its duration transcended the narrow limits of one country and even those of one part of the world. In fact, the countries which were the arena of revolution were the least active in producing it. They were more or less unconscious and hesitant raw material, moulded in the course of the movement in which the entire world participates today, a movement which under the existing social conditions may appear to us only as an alien power but which, in the end, is nothing but our own. This is why the Revolution of 1848-50 cannot end like the Revolution of 1525.
Karl Marx and Frederick Engels
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To the Tuesday President of the Society in Great Windmill Street.
Sir,

The undersigned herewith give notice of their resignation from the Society.

London, September 17, 1850

H. Bauer, K. Pfänder,
J. G. Eccarius, S. Seiler,
K. Marx, K. Schramm, F. Engels,
F. Wolff, W. Liebknecht,
Hain, Haupt, G. Klose

First published in the Anklageschrift
gegen P. G. Roeser, J. H. G. Bürgers,
P. Notthung,... [Köln, 1852]

Printed according to the manuscript in Engels' hand

Published in English for the first time
TO MESSRS. ADAM, BARTHÉLEMY AND VIDIL

Gentlemen,

We have the honour of informing you that we have, long since, considered the association you speak of as dissolved by fact. The only thing remaining to be done would be the destruction of the fundamental contract. Perhaps Mr. Adam or Mr. Vidil will have the kindness to call on Sunday next October 13th at noon, on Mr. Engels at Nr. 6, Macclesfield Street Soho, in order to witness the burning of the same.

We have the honour to be, Gentlemen, your most obedient servants,

London, October 9th, 1850

Engels, Marx, Harney

Reprinted according to the rough copy in Engels’ hand
Published in English for the first time

---

a See this volume, pp. 614-15.—Ed.
The author of this article is himself a worker in one of London's tailoring shops. We ask the German bourgeoisie how many authors it numbers capable of grasping the real movement in a similar manner?

Before the proletariat fights out its victories on the barricades and in the battle lines it gives notice of its impending rule with a series of intellectual victories.

The reader will note how here, instead of the sentimental, moral and psychological criticism employed against existing conditions by Weitling and other workers who engage in authorship, a purely materialist understanding and a freer one, unspoilt by sentimental whims, confronts bourgeois society and its movement. Whereas craftsmen resist the collapse of their semi-medieval position and would like to unite as craftsmen, particularly in Germany and to a great extent also in France, the subjection of craft labour to large-scale industry is comprehended here as a step forward and celebrated, while at the same time, in the results and productions of large-scale industry, the real preconditions of the proletarian revolution, generated by history itself and daily generating themselves anew, are recognised and revealed.

Written in October 1850

First published in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Politisch-ökonomische Revue No. 5-6, 1850, marked by the editors "Editorial Comment"
Frederick Engels

[ON THE SLOGAN OF THE ABOLITION OF THE STATE AND THE GERMAN "FRIENDS OF ANARCHY"]

"The abolition of the state has meaning with the Communists, only as the necessary consequence of the abolition of classes, with which the need for the organised might of one class to keep the others down automatically disappears. In bourgeois countries the abolition of the state means that the power of the state is reduced to the level found in North America. There, the class contradictions are but incompletely developed; every clash between the classes is concealed by the outflow of the surplus proletarian population to the west; intervention by the power of the state, reduced to a minimum in the east, does not exist at all in the west. In feudal countries the abolition of the state means the abolition of feudalism and the creation of an ordinary bourgeois state. In Germany it conceals either a cowardly flight from the struggles that lie immediately ahead, a spurious inflating of bourgeois freedom into absolute independence and autonomy of the individual, or, finally, the indifference of the bourgeois towards all forms of state, provided the development of bourgeois interests is not obstructed. It is of course not the fault of the Berliners Stirner and Faucher that this abolition of the state ‘in the higher sense’ is being preached in so fatuous a way. La plus belle fille de la France ne peut donner que ce qu’elle a."

(The most beautiful girl in France can only give what she has.—Ed.

See this volume, pp. 333-34.—Ed.)
Regency,

now altogether vanished, have appropriated to themselves, each in his own fashion, this savage-looking slogan.

All of these factions agree in the maintenance of existing bourgeois society. Along with bourgeois society they therefore necessarily advocate the rule of the bourgeoisie and in Germany even the conquest of power by the bourgeoisie; they are distinguished from the true representatives of the bourgeoisie only by the strange form which gives them the appearance of “going further”, of “going further than anybody”. In all practical collisions this appearance vanished; confronted by the real anarchy of revolutionary crises, where the masses [and the state power] fought each other with ‘brute force’, these representatives of anarchy on each occasion did their best to control the anarchy. In the end the content of this much-vaunted “anarchy” amounted to the same thing as is expressed by the word “order” in more developed countries. The “Friends of Anarchy” in Germany are in complete entente cordiale with the “Friends of Order” in France.

Insofar as the friends of anarchy are independent of the Frenchmen Proudhon and Girardin, insofar as their way of viewing things is of German origin, they all have a common source: Stirner. The period of dissolution of German philosophy has in general supplied the democratic party in Germany with most of its rhetorical commonplaces. The notions and phrases of the last of the German scripturists, namely Feuerbach and Stirner, had already before February, in a somewhat dissolve form, passed into the general literary awareness and journalistic writing, and these again formed the principal source for the post-March democratic spokesmen. Stirner’s sermon on statelessness in particular is excellently suited to give the ‘superior consecration’ of German philosophy to Proudhon’s anarchy and Girardin’s abolition of the state. Stirner’s book Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum is forgotten, it is true, but its manner of thinking, especially its criticism of the state, appears again in the friends of anarchy. Although we have already investigated the

---

\[a\] Here the word “political” is crossed out in the manuscript.—Ed.

\[b\] The words “where the state power disappeared before the might of the people” (wo die Staatsmacht vor der Macht der Massen verschwand) are crossed out in the manuscript.—Ed.

\[c\] In the manuscript the following words are crossed out here: “have taken power into their own hands” (sich der Gewalt bemächtigen); judging from the context it should be replaced by: “und die Staatsmacht” (and the state power) as is reproduced by the editors in square brackets.—Ed.

\[d\] i.e. before the February 1848 Revolution in France.—Ed.
sources of these gentlemen insofar as they are of French origin, we are once more constrained to descend into the depths of antediluvian German philosophy to examine their German sources. If one must, for one reason or another, concern oneself with day-to-day German polemics, it is always more pleasant to deal with the original inventor of a conception than with its second-hand pedlars.

Saddle me my Hippogryph once more, O Muse,
For a ride into th' old, romantic land.\(^b\)

Before we take up Stirner's above-mentioned book we carry ourselves back into the "old, romantic land" and into the forgotten time in which this book appeared. The Prussian bourgeoisie, fastening upon the financial embarrassments of the government, began to conquer political power while simultaneously, alongside the bourgeois-constitutional movement, the communist movement of the proletariat was daily gaining ground. The bourgeois elements of society, still needing proletarian support to attain their own goals, had everywhere to affect a kind of socialism; the conservative and feudal party was similarly forced to make promises to the proletariat. Alongside the struggle of the bourgeois and the peasants against feudal aristocracy and bureaucracy, we had the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, and in between these a series of intermediate stages of socialism, embracing all kinds of socialism, reactionary, petty-bourgeois and bourgeois socialism; all these struggles and endeavours held down, damped down in their expression by the pressure of the ruling power, by the censorship, by the prohibition of associations and assemblies—such was the situation of the parties in the period in which German philosophy celebrated its last meagre triumphs.

Right from the start the censorship forced the most abstract mode of expression upon all more or less unpopular elements; the German philosophical tradition, which had just reached the complete dissolution of the Hegelian school, provided this expression. The struggle against religion was still being pursued. The more difficult the political struggle against established power became in the press, the more eagerly it was carried on in the form of the religious and philosophical struggle. German philosophy in its most dissolve form became the common property of the "educated", and the more it became common property, the more dissolute, confused and stale the philosophers became, and this dissoluteness and staleness

---

\(^a\) See this volume, pp. 326-37.—\(Ed.\)

\(^b\) From Wieland's poem "Oberon".—\(Ed.\)
again gave it a so much higher reputation in the eyes of the "educated" public.

The confusion in the heads of the "educated" was terrifying, and it increased with every moment. It was a real mongrelising of ideas of German, French, English, antique, medieval and modern origin. The confusion was so much the greater because all the ideas were only possessed at second, third and fourth hand, and thus circulated in a form distorted beyond recognition. This fate was not only shared by the thoughts of the French and English liberals and socialists, but also by the ideas of Germans, for instance of Hegel. The whole literature of this period, and especially, as we shall see, Stirner's book, provides countless proofs of this, and present-day German literature is still labouring under the consequences.

In this confusion, the philosophical shadow-boxing served as an image of the real struggles. Every "new turn" in philosophy excited the general attention of the "educated", who in Germany comprised a vast number of idle heads, articed clerks, aspirants to school posts, failed theologians, out-of-work medicos, literati, etc., etc. For these people a historical stage of development was superseded and done for for ever with every such "new turn". Bourgeois liberalism, for instance, as soon as any philosopher had criticised it in any way, was dead, erased from historical development and also annihilated as far as practice was concerned. Likewise republicanism, socialism and so on. How far these stages of development were "annihilated", "dissolved" and "done for" was subsequently shown in the revolution, when they played the most important part and when there was suddenly no more talk of their philosophical annihilators.

The slovenliness in form and content, the arrogant platitudes and inflated insipidity, the unfathomable triviality and dialectical poverty of these latest German philosophers exceed anything that has previously existed in this discipline. It is only equalled by the unbelievable gullibility of the public, which took all these things at face value, for brand new, for "never seen before". The German nation, the "thorough"...

Written not later than October 1850
First published in Russian in the journal Pod Znamenem Marksizma No. 6, 1927

Printed according to the manuscript
Published in English for the first time

---

The manuscript breaks off here.—Ed.
The political turmoil of the last six months is fundamentally different from that which immediately preceded it. Everywhere the revolutionary party has been forced off the stage and the victors are quarrelling over the fruits of victory. Thus it is in France with the various factions of the bourgeoisie and in Germany with the various princes. The quarrel is being conducted with a great deal of noise, and it appears inevitable that there will be an open break and that the issue will be decided by force of arms; however what is inevitable is that the arms will remain unused and that peace treaties will time and again be used to conceal the indecision, so as to prepare for another sham war.

Let us first examine the underlying reality beneath this superficial turbulence.

The years 1843-45 were years of industrial and commercial prosperity, necessary consequences of the almost uninterrupted depression of industry in the period 1837-42. As always, prosperity very rapidly gave rise to speculation. Speculation regularly occurs at times when over-production is already in full swing. It provides channels by which this over-production may temporarily be diverted, whilst by this very process hastening the onset of the crisis and magnifying its impact. The crisis itself first breaks out in the field of speculation and only seizes hold of production later. Not over-production, but over-speculation, itself only a symptom of over-production, therefore appears to the superficial view as the cause of the crisis. The subsequent disruption of production appears not as a necessary consequence of its own previous exuberance, but merely as a repercussion of the collapse of speculation. However, as we cannot at the present moment give a complete history of the
In the years of prosperity from 1843 to 1845 the principal targets for speculation were railways, where it was based on a real need; corn, following the price rises of 1845 and the potato blight; cotton, after the bad harvest of 1846; and trade with East India and China, where it followed hard upon the opening up of the Chinese market by Great Britain.

The expansion of the British railway system had already begun in 1844 but did not develop fully until 1845. In that year alone the number of registered bills for the setting up of railway companies amounted to 1,035. In February 1846, after a vast number of these registered projects had already been abandoned, the moneys which were required to be deposited with the government for the remaining projects still totalled the enormous sum of £14,000,000 and even in 1847 the sum total of moneys called for exceeded £42,000,000, of which over 36 million were for railways in Britain and later £5½ million for those abroad. This speculation had its heyday in the summer and autumn of 1845. Share prices rose continuously, and the speculators' profits soon drew every class of society into the whirlpool. Dukes and earls vied with merchants and manufacturers for the lucrative honour of sitting on the boards of the various lines; the members of the Lower House, the Bar and the Church were represented in strength on these bodies. Anybody who had a penny in savings, or who had the merest glimmer of credit to dispose of, speculated in railway shares. The number of railway newspapers rose from 3 to more than 20. Some large daily newspapers would often earn £14,000 in a week from railway advertisements and prospectuses. Engineers were simply not to be had in sufficient numbers and received enormous salaries. Printers, lithographers, bookbinders, stationers, etc., etc., who were set to preparing prospectuses, plans, maps, etc., etc., and furniture manufacturers who furnished the spate of offices of the countless new boards of management, provisional committees and the like, were paid munificently. Based on the real expansion of the British and continental railway systems and the speculation which was bound up with it, there gradually arose during this period a superstructure of fraud reminiscent of the time of Law and of the

\[ a \] In a copy of the "Review" containing Engels' corrections the word "crisis" is replaced by the word "period".—*Ed.*

\[ b \] The authors use the English word.—*Ed.*

\[ c \] In a copy of the "Review" containing Engels' corrections the word *später* (later) is replaced by *über* (over).—*Ed.*
South Sea Company. There were projects for hundreds of lines which had not the slightest chance of success, which their very authors never had any intention of really carrying out, and whose sole purpose indeed was to enable the directors to squander the deposits, and to make fraudulent profits from the sale of the shares.

In October 1845 the reaction set in and grew in intensity until it soon became complete panic. Even before February 1846, when the deposits had to be paid to the government, the least viable projects had gone bankrupt. In April 1846 the repercussion had already reached the continental share markets. In Paris, Hamburg, Frankfurt and Amsterdam there was forced selling at very reduced prices, which brought bankruptcies of bankers and brokers in its train. The railway crisis dragged on into the autumn of 1848, prolonged by successive bankruptcies even of less unsound projects, as these were gradually affected by the general pressure and as invested money was called in, and accentuated by the spreading of the crisis to the other areas of speculation, trade and industry, as well, which progressively depressed the price of the older and sounder shares until these reached their lowest level in October 1848.

It was in August 1845 that the public first became aware of the potato blight which was appearing not only in Great Britain and Ireland but on the Continent as well—the first symptom that the roots of existing society were rotten. At the same time reports were coming in which no longer left any room for doubt about the expected grave deficiency in the corn harvest too. The price of corn rose significantly on all European markets as a result of these two circumstances; in Ireland there was universal famine which forced the British Government to make a loan of £8 million to that province—exactly one pound sterling for each Irishman. In France, where the calamity was further aggravated by the floods which caused damage to the value of some £4 million, the harvest failure was unusually severe. No less so in Holland and Belgium. The poor harvest of 1845 was followed by a worse one in 1846, and the potato blight also reappeared, although on a smaller scale. Thus speculation in grain was given an entirely real basis and it developed all the more powerfully since the abundant harvests of 1842-44 had long held it down almost completely. In the years 1845-47 more grain was imported into Britain than ever before. The price of corn rose continuously until the spring of 1847, when varying reports from the different countries about the new harvest and the measures taken by various governments (opening of the ports to the free import of corn, etc., etc.) ushered in a period of fluctuation, and prices finally
reached their peak in May 1847. In that month the average price of a quarter of wheat in Great Britain rose to 102½ shillings and on some days to 115 and 124 shillings. But soon decidedly favourable reports came in about the weather and the ripening harvest; prices fell, and by mid-July the average price stood at only 74 shillings. Less favourable weather in some parts caused prices to rise again somewhat, until it was finally clear towards the middle of August that the 1847 harvest would be above average. The downward trend was now no longer to be contained; supplies to Great Britain increased beyond all expectation, and by September 18 the average price had been reduced to 49½ shillings. Within the space of 16 weeks the average price had thus fluctuated by no less than 53 shillings.

Throughout this period there had not only been a continuation of the railway crisis, but at the very moment when corn prices were at their highest, in April and May 1847, the credit system was also completely dislocated and the money market completely disrupted. The speculators in corn nevertheless withstood the fall in prices until August 2. On that day the Bank raised its lowest rate of discount to 5 per cent and for all bills of exchange at over two months to 6 per cent. There immediately followed a series of the most sensational bankruptcies on the Corn Exchange, headed by that of Mr. Robinson, Governor of the Bank of England. In London alone eight large corn companies failed, their liabilities together amounting to more than £1½ million. The provincial corn markets were completely paralysed; bankruptcies followed hard upon each other here, especially in Liverpool, with equal speed. The corresponding business failures on the Continent in this field occurred with greater or lesser rapidity, depending on the distance from London. By September 18, the date of the lowest corn prices, the corn crisis in England can however be regarded as over.

We now come to the commercial crisis proper, the money crisis. In the first four months of 1847 the general condition of trade and industry still appeared satisfactory, with the exception however of iron production and the cotton industry. Iron production, inflated to an enormous degree by the railway bubble of 1845, naturally suffered in proportion as the outlets diminished for the excess quantity of iron produced. In the cotton industry, the main branch of industry for the East Indian and Chinese markets, there had been over-production for these markets as early as 1845, and a relative recession had occurred very soon. The poor cotton harvest of 1846, the rise in the price both of the raw material and of the finished product, and the reduced consumption this entailed, increased the pressure on this industry. In the early months of 1847 production
was cut back considerably throughout Lancashire, and the cotton workers were already affected by the crisis.

On April 15, 1847, the Bank of England raised its lowest rate of discount on very short bills to 5 per cent; it restricted the total value of the bills to be discounted, and this without regard to the nature of the businesses on which the bills were drawn; finally it abruptly announced to the merchants to whom it had made advances that it would no longer renew these advances when they fell due, as it had usually done before, but [would] demand repayment. Two days later the publication of its weekly balance showed that the reserve fund of the Banking Department had fallen to £2½ million. The Bank had thus taken the above measures to stem the outflow of gold from its vaults and increase its liquidity once more.

Various causes underlay the outflow of gold and silver from the Bank. Firstly, consumption and the significantly higher prices of almost all goods required an increase in circulation, especially of gold and silver, for retail trade. Then the continuing investment in railway construction, which in April alone had totalled £4,314,000, had made necessary the withdrawal of a mass of deposits from the Bank. A portion of the money called in, being destined for railways abroad, flowed directly overseas. The significant excess of imported sugar, coffee and other colonial products, whose consumption and whose prices had been pushed up even more by speculation, of cotton following speculative buying now that a poor harvest had become a certainty, and especially of corn following the repeated crop failures, had to be paid for largely in cash or bullion, which also resulted in a significant outflow of gold and silver overseas. This outflow of precious metals from Great Britain incidentally continued until the end of August despite the above measures taken by the Bank.

The Bank’s decisions and the news of the low level of its reserves immediately created pressure on the money market and panic throughout commerce in Great Britain of an intensity only seen in 1845. In the last weeks of April and the first four days of May almost all credit transactions were paralysed. There were, however, no abnormal bankruptcies; businesses survived by enormous interest payments and forced sales of stocks, government securities, etc., at ruinous prices. Even some of the sounder businesses merely prepared the ground for their later collapse by their escape from this first act of the crisis. The overcoming of the first, most menacing
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b In Engels’ copy: “whose consumption and especially whose prices had been pushed up by speculation”.—Ed.
danger contributed considerably to an increase of confidence; from May 5 the pressure on the money market slackened visibly, and towards the end of May the alarm was more or less over.

A few months later, however, at the beginning of August, there occurred the above-mentioned bankruptcies in the corn trade, which continued into September, and hardly had they run their course when the crisis broke out with redoubled fury throughout commerce, especially in the East Indian, West Indian and Mauritius trade, and indeed simultaneously in London, Liverpool, Manchester and Glasgow. During September twenty businesses failed in London alone, their total liabilities amounting to between £9 and £10 million.

"There were uprootings of commercial dynasties in England not less striking than the fall of those political houses" on the Continent "of which we have lately heard so much," said Disraeli on August 30, 1848, in the Lower House.

The failures in the East Indian business continued without respite until the end of the year and began again in the early months of 1848 when the news came in of the bankruptcy of corresponding companies in Calcutta, Bombay, Madras and Mauritius.

This series of bankruptcies, unprecedented in the history of commerce, was caused by the general over-speculation and by the excessive importing of colonial products that this involved. The prices of these goods, which had long been kept artificially high, fell in some cases even before the panic of April 1847, but fell generally and significantly only after this panic, when the whole credit system collapsed and one business after another was driven to make massive forced sales. This downward trend was so steep, especially from June and July until November, that even the oldest and soundest businesses could not escape being ruined by it.

The bankruptcies in September were still confined exclusively to actual commercial enterprises. On October 1 the Bank raised its lowest discount for short bills to 5½ per cent and declared at the same time that henceforth it would make no more advances on any government securities of whatever kind. Now the joint-stock banks and private bankers could no longer withstand the pressure either. The Royal Bank of Liverpool, the Liverpool Banking Company, the North and South Wales Bank, the Newcastle Union Joint-Stock Bank, etc., etc., succumbed one after the other within a few days. At the same time declarations of insolvency were made by a number of minor private bankers in every corner of Great Britain.

Consequent upon this general closure of the banks which characterised October in particular, there followed in Liverpool, Manchester, Oldham, Halifax, Glasgow, etc., a significant number of
bankruptcies of stock-, bill-, share-, ship-, tea- and cotton-brokers, iron producers and iron-merchants, cotton and wool spinners, calico-printers, etc. According to Mr. Tooke these bankruptcies were unprecedented in the history of British commerce, both in terms of their number and the amount of capital involved, and far exceeded those of the 1825 crisis. The crisis had reached its peak on October 23-25, and all commercial transactions had come to a complete standstill. At this point a deputation from the City obtained a suspension of the Bank Act of 1844, that brainchild of the late Sir Robert Peel. This suspension temporarily put an end to the division of the Bank into two completely independent departments with two separate cash accounts; if the old system had continued for a few days longer, one of these departments, the Banking Department, would inevitably have failed, whilst the Issue Department had gold reserves of six million.

The first repercussions of the crisis appeared on the Continent as early as October. Major bankruptcies occurred simultaneously in Brussels, Hamburg, Bremen, Elberfeld, Genoa, Leghorn, Courtrai, St. Petersburg, Lisbon and Venice. As the crisis abated in intensity in Great Britain, so it increased on the Continent and affected places that it had not hitherto reached. In the worst period the exchange rate favoured Great Britain, which consequently attracted a constantly increasing flow of gold and silver from November onwards, not only from Russia and the Continent, but also from America. The immediate result of this was that as the money market eased in Great Britain, it contracted elsewhere in the commercial world and the crisis spread there to an equal extent. The number of bankruptcies outside Great Britain thus rose in November; major insolvencies now also occurred in New York, Rotterdam, Amsterdam, Le Havre, Bayonne, Antwerp, Mons, Trieste, Madrid and Stockholm. In December the crisis also broke out in Marseilles and Algiers, and acquired renewed vigour in Germany.

We have now reached the point at which the February Revolution broke out in France. If one looks at the list of bankruptcies which Mr. D. M. Evans gives as an appendix to his Commercial Crisis 1847-1848 (London, 1848), one finds that in Britain not a single business of any note collapsed as a result of this revolution. The only insolvencies connected with it occurred on the stock market, as a result of the
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sudden devaluation of all continental government stock. Similar bankruptcies of stock-brokers in Amsterdam, Hamburg, etc., as well, of course. British consols fell by 6 per cent, whereas they had fallen by 3 per cent after the July Revolution. For stockjobbers therefore the Republic of February was only twice as dangerous as the July monarchy.

The panic which broke out in Paris after February and spread throughout the Continent at the same time as the revolutions, had a great deal of similarity to the London panic of April 1847. Credit suddenly vanished, and business transactions almost all came to a halt; in Paris, Brussels and Amsterdam everybody rushed to the Bank to exchange notes for gold; by and large, however, very few bankruptcies occurred outside the stock market, and even these few cannot easily be shown to be necessary consequences of the February Revolution. The Paris bank closures, which were mostly only of brief duration, were in part connected with the stock market, in part merely precautionary measures and certainly not the result of real insolvency, and finally in part the product of deliberate machinations to harass the Provisional Government and compel it to make concessions. In the case of failures of bankers and traders in other places on the Continent, it is impossible to decide to what extent they arose from the continuation and gradual spread of the commercial crisis, to what extent the conditions of the day were at the same time used by businesses which had long been on the road to ruin in order to effect a judicious exit, or to what extent they were really consequences of losses resulting from the revolution panic. However, this much at least is certain, that the commercial crisis contributed infinitely more to the revolutions of 1848 than the revolution to the commercial crisis. Already between March and May Britain derived direct advantage from the revolution, which brought her large amounts of continental capital. From this moment on the crisis there must be regarded as over; in every branch of business an improvement came about, and the new industrial cycle began with a marked tendency towards prosperity. Just how little the revolution on the Continent hindered this upsurge of industry and trade in Great Britain is demonstrated by the fact that the quantity of cotton manufactured there rose from £475 million (1847) to £713 million (1848).

This renewed prosperity made visible progress in Great Britain during the three years 1848, 1849 and 1850. For the eight months from January to August, Great Britain's total exports amounted to
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£31,633,214 in 1848; to £39,263,322 in 1849; to £43,851,568 in 1850. Besides this significant rise, which was manifest in all branches of business with the exception of iron production, there were also the universally good harvests of these three years. The average price of wheat for 1848-50 fell to 36 shillings per quarter in Great Britain and to 32 shillings in France. What distinguishes this period of prosperity is that three main outlets for speculation were blocked. Railway construction had reverted to the slow development of an ordinary industry; with a series of abundant harvests, grain offered no scope; the revolutions had deprived government stock of its characteristic reliability, which is a prerequisite for the large-scale speculative turnover of stock. In every period of prosperity, capital is increased. On the one hand, increased production creates new capital; on the other hand, existing capital which was lying dormant during the crisis, is brought out of its inactivity and cast on to the market. In the absence of outlets for speculation between 1848 and 1850, this additional capital was of necessity injected into industry itself, and thus increased production even more rapidly. How striking this is in Great Britain, although no one can explain it, is demonstrated by the naive observations of The Economist on October 19, 1850.

"It is remarked that the present prosperity differs substantially from that of all former periods, in all of which there was some baseless speculation exciting hopes that were destined not to be realised. At one time it was foreign mines, at another more railways than could be conveniently made in half a century. Even when such speculations were well founded, they contemplated a realisation of income, from raising metals or creating new conveniences and markets, at the end of a considerable period, and afforded no immediate reward. But at present our prosperity is founded on the production of things immediately useful, and that go into consumption nearly as fast as they are brought to market, returning to the producers a fair remuneration and stimulating more production."

The most striking demonstration of the great increase in industrial production in 1848 and 1849 is provided by the most important sector of industry, cotton manufacturing. The cotton harvest of 1849 in the United States was more abundant than any previous one. It amounted to 2½ million bales or approximately 1,200 million pounds. The expansion of the cotton industry kept pace with this increased supply to such an extent that at the end of 1849 stocks were lower than they had been even after years of bad harvest. In 1849 over 775 million pounds of cotton were spun, whereas in 1845,
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the year of the greatest prosperity hitherto, only 721 million had been manufactured. The expansion of the cotton industry is further demonstrated by the great rise in the price of cotton (55 per cent) as a result of a comparatively insignificant decline in the yield in 1850. At least equal progress is manifested in all the other branches, such as spinning and weaving of silk, wool, mixtures and linen. The export of the products of these industries rose so considerably, especially in 1850, that it brought about the great rise in overall exports of that year (12 million compared with 1848, 4 million compared with the first eight months of 1849), although the export of cotton goods decreased noticeably in 1850 as a result of the poor cotton harvest. Despite the significant rise in the price of wool, which speculation appeared to be causing as early as 1849 and which has nevertheless continued until the present, the woollen industry has been continuously expanding and new looms are brought into commission daily. In 1844, the year of the highest linen exports hitherto, exports of linen fabrics totalled 91 million yards, having a value of £2,800,000, and in 1849 they reached the level of 107 million yards, having a value of over £3,000,000.

Another demonstration of the growth of British industry is provided by the constantly increasing consumption of the main colonial products, especially of coffee, sugar and tea, at a time of continuously rising prices, at least of the first two items. This increase in consumption is all the more directly a consequence of the expansion of industry as the exceptional market since 1845, which was produced by the extraordinary investment in railways, has long been reduced to its normal dimensions, and the low corn prices of the last few years have not permitted any increased consumption in agricultural areas.

The great expansion in the cotton industry in 1849 led in the last few months of that year to a renewed attempt to make use of the East Indian and Chinese markets. But the quantity of old stocks that had not yet been disposed of in those areas soon imposed restraints on this attempt once more. At the same time, with the rising consumption of raw materials and colonial products, an attempt was made to speculate also in these articles, but that too was soon terminated by a temporary increase in supplies and by the memory of the still too recent wounds of 1847.

The prosperity of industry will be further increased by the recent opening up of the Dutch colonies, by the imminent establishment of new lines of communication in the Pacific Ocean, of which we shall have more to say, and by the great industrial exhibition of 1851. This exhibition had already been announced by the British bourgeoisie in
1849, with the most astounding sang-froid, when the dreams of the whole Continent were still haunted by revolution. Under its auspices the British bourgeoisie is summoning every one of its vassals from France to China to gather for a great examination at which they will have to show how they have used their time; and even the omnipotent Tsar of Russia\(^a\) cannot but command his subjects to appear in large numbers at this great test. This great world congress of products and producers has an altogether different significance from the absolutist congresses of Bregenz and Warsaw,\(^{351}\) which are putting our democratic philistines on the Continent into such a sweat, or the European democratic congresses which the various provisional governments *in partibus*\(^b\) are constantly planning anew for the salvation of the world. This exhibition is a striking demonstration of the concentrated power with which modern large-scale industry is breaking down national barriers everywhere and increasingly blurring local peculiarities of production, social relations and the character of each individual nation. By displaying, narrowly confined within a small space, the whole mass of the productive forces of modern industry, precisely at a time when modern bourgeois relations have already been undermined from every side, it is at the same time exposing to view the material which has been produced amidst these conditions of decay and is still being produced each day for the building of a new society. By means of this exhibition the bourgeoisie of the world is erecting in the modern Rome its Pantheon in which to exhibit with proud self-satisfaction the gods it has made to itself. In so doing it is proving in practice that the "impotence and annoyance of the citizen", about which German ideologists have been preaching year in, year out, is only the impotence of these gentlemen themselves to comprehend the modern movement, and their own annoyance at this impotence. The bourgeoisie is celebrating this, its greatest festival, at a moment when the collapse of all its glory is at hand, a collapse which will demonstrate more conclusively than ever to it that the powers it has brought into being have grown beyond its control. At a future exhibition the bourgeoisie will perhaps no longer figure as owners of these productive forces but only as their ciceroni.

Just as the potato blight in 1845 and 1846, since the beginning of this year the deficiency of the cotton harvest is spreading universal terror amongst the bourgeoisie. This terror has been further

\(^a\) Nicholas I.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) Here governments *in partibus* means governments with nobody to govern, by analogy with Roman Catholic bishops *in partibus infidelium*, i.e. bishops appointed to dioceses in non-Christian countries.—*Ed.*
considerably intensified since it has become clear that the cotton harvest of 1851 will certainly not prove to be much more abundant than that of 1850 either. The deficiency, which would have been insignificant in former times, is of major proportions in view of the present size of the cotton industry and has already had a most restrictive effect on its activity. The bourgeoisie, which had scarcely recovered from the depressing discovery that one of the basic pillars of its whole social order, the potato, was in danger, now sees its second pillar, cotton, threatened as well. If but a single moderately poor cotton harvest and the prospect of a second one could provoke grave alarm amid the jubilation of prosperity, a few years in succession of outright failure in cotton will inevitably hurl the whole of civilised society temporarily back into barbarism. The golden age and the iron age are long past; it remained for the nineteenth century with its intelligence, its world market and its colossal productive forces to create the cotton age. The British bourgeoisie at the same time felt more than ever before what an oppressive domination the United States has over them through its as yet unbroken monopoly of cotton production. They at once set about the business of breaking this monopoly. Not only in East India but also in Natal and the northern parts of Australia and indeed in every part of the world where climate and conditions permit the cultivation of cotton, they have decided to promote it by every means. At the same time the British bourgeoisie who sympathise with the Negroes are discovering that "the prosperity of Manchester dependent on the treatment of slaves in Texas, Alabama and Louisiana, is as curious as it is alarming". (The Economist, September 21, 1850.) The fact that the crucial sector of British industry is based on the existence of slavery in the southern states of the American Union and that a Negro revolt in those areas can ruin the whole present system of production is of course very depressing for the people who a few years ago spent £20 million on the emancipation of the Negroes in their own colonies. This fact, however, at the same time leads to the only feasible solution to the slave question, which has now once more led to such long and heated debates in the American Congress. American cotton production is based on slavery. As soon as industry has developed to the point when the cotton monopoly of the United States has become intolerable to it, cotton will be successfully produced in vast quantities in other countries, which almost everywhere can now only be done through free workers.

a "Slavery in the United States. To the Editor of The Economist", The Economist No. 369, September 21, 1850.— Ed.
But as soon as the free labour of other countries provides industry with its cotton supplies in sufficient quantity and more cheaply than the slave labour of the United States, American slavery will have been broken at the same time as the American cotton monopoly, and the slaves will be emancipated because as slaves they will have become unusable. In exactly the same way wage labour will be abolished in Europe as soon as it not only ceases to be a necessary form of production, but has even become a hindrance to it.

If the new cycle of industrial development which began in 1848 follows the same course as that of 1843-47, the crisis would break out in 1852. As a symptom of the fact that the over-speculation which is produced by over-production, and which precedes every crisis, can no longer be far away, we would mention here that for two years the Bank of England's rate of discount has stood no higher than 3 per cent. If however the Bank of England keeps its interest rate low in times of prosperity, the other money merchants must set theirs even lower, just as in times of crisis, when the Bank raises the interest rate significantly, they keep it above that of the Bank. The additional capital which, as we saw above, is regularly cast on to the loan market in times of prosperity, by itself depresses the rate of interest significantly, according to the laws of competition; this rate is however reduced to a much greater degree by the credit, which has been enormously swollen by the general prosperity, as this diminishes the demand for capital. In these periods the government is enabled to bring down the interest rate on its consolidated debts and the landowner to renew his mortgages on more favourable conditions. Thus, at a time when the income of all the other classes is rising, the capitalists of the loan market see their own diminished by a third or more. The longer this state of affairs lasts, the more they are compelled to look around for a more profitable investment for their capital. Over-production gives rise to numerous new projects, and the success of a few of them suffices to propel a whole series of capital investments in the same direction, until the bubble gradually becomes universal. At this moment there are, however, as we have seen, only two possible major outlets for speculation: cotton growing and the new world market links which have been created by the development of California and Australia. One can see that it will have vastly greater scope for its activity this time than it had in any previous period of prosperity.

Let us also take a look at the situation in the agricultural areas of Great Britain. Here the abolition of the duty on corn and the
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simultaneous abundant harvests have made the general pressure chronic, though to some extent reduced by the significantly increased consumption resulting from prosperity. Furthermore, farm workers at least always find themselves in a relatively improved position when corn prices are low, although this improvement is less marked in Great Britain than in countries where fragmentation of landed property predominates. In these conditions the protectionists continue to agitate in the farming districts for restoration of the duty on corn, although less explicitly, more covertly than before. It is obvious that their agitation will have no significance at all as long as industrial prosperity and the relatively more tolerable situation of the farm workers last. However as soon as the crisis breaks out and has repercussions on the farming districts, the depression in agriculture will rouse feelings in the countryside to an unusually high degree. On this occasion for the first time the industrial and commercial crisis will coincide with a crisis in agriculture, and in all questions in which town and country, manufacturers and landowners are opposed to one another, both parties will be supported by two great armies; the manufacturers by the mass of industrial workers, the landowners by the mass of agricultural workers.

We now come to the *United States of North America*. The crisis of 1836, which had its first and most violent manifestations there, lasted almost without interruption until 1842 and resulted in a complete revolution in the American credit system. On this sounder basis, trade in the United States recovered, admittedly very slowly at first, until from 1844 and 1845 onwards prosperity grew there significantly too. Both the rise in prices and the revolutions in Europe were for America simply sources of profit. From 1845 to 1847 it profited from the enormous export of corn and from the increased price of cotton after 1846. It was only little affected by the crisis of 1847. The 1849 cotton harvest was its largest yet, and in 1850 it profited by about $20 million from the poor cotton harvest, which coincided with the new upsurge in the European cotton industry. The revolutions of 1848 resulted in a great outflow of European capital to the United States, which in part arrived with the immigrants themselves and in part was invested from Europe in American government stock. This increased demand for American consolidated stocks raised the price of the latter to such an extent that speculators in New York have recently been falling over themselves in pursuit of them. Despite all assurances to the contrary from the reactionary bourgeois press, we therefore persist in our opinion that the only form of state in which our European capitalists have confidence is the *bourgeois republic*. Indeed, bourgeois confidence in any form of state only
expresses itself in one way: by its quotation on the Stock Exchange.

The prosperity of the United States was increased even more however by other factors. The inhabited area, the market of the North American Union, was expanding in two directions with surprising rapidity. The growth of the population, both by natural increase and by the constant rise in immigration, led to the effective control\(^a\) of whole states and territories. Wisconsin and Iowa became comparatively densely populated within a few years, and all the upper Mississippi states received immigrants in significantly larger numbers. The working of the mines on Lake Superior and the rising corn production in the whole area of the Lakes gave trade and shipping on this major inland waterway system a new impulse which will be further increased as a result of an act passed by the last session of Congress greatly facilitating trade with Canada and Nova Scotia. Whilst the north-western states have thus acquired importance of a quite new order, Oregon has been colonised within a few years, Texas and New Mexico annexed and California conquered. The discovery of the Californian gold-mines set the seal on the prosperity of America. In the second issue of this *Revue*\(^b\) we have already pointed out, before any other European periodical, the importance of the discovery and the consequences it is bound to have for the whole of world trade. This importance lies not in the increase in the amount of gold through the discovery of new mines, although this increase in the means of exchange could certainly not fail to have a positive effect on trade in general either. It lies in the incentive which the mineral wealth of California gave to capital on the world market, in the activity which was generated throughout the west coast of America and the east coast of Asia, in the new market for goods which was created in California and in all the countries within California's influence. The Californian market is considerable enough by itself; a year ago there were 100,000 and now at least 300,000 people there producing scarcely anything but gold, and exchanging this gold for all their requirements from markets else where. But the Californian market is insignificant compared with the continuing expansion of all the markets of the Pacific Ocean, compared with the striking growth in trade in Chile and Peru, in Western Mexico and on the Sandwich Islands,\(^c\) and compared with the sudden development of Asian and Australian traffic with

\(^a\) In Engels' copy of the "Review" the word Überwachung (control) is replaced by Urbarmachung (reclamation).— *Ed.*

\(^b\) See this volume, pp. 265-66.— *Ed.*

\(^c\) Now the Hawaiian Islands.— *Ed.*
California. California has created a need for totally new lines of world communication, lines which are bound shortly to exceed all others in importance. The main trade route to the Pacific Ocean, which has only now really been opened up and which is becoming the most important ocean in the world, will henceforth cross the Isthmus of Panama. The establishment of communications on this isthmus by means of roads, railways and canals has now become the most urgent requirement of world trade and is already being tackled in some places. The railway from Chagres to Panama is already being built. An American company is having the area of the San Juan de Nicaragua River surveyed in order to connect the two oceans initially by an overland route and subsequently by a canal at this point. Other routes, such as that across the Isthmus of Darien, the Atrato route in New Granada\(^a\) and that across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, are being discussed in British and American papers. In view of the whole civilised world's newly and suddenly revealed ignorance of the nature of the terrain in Central America, it is impossible to decide which route is the most advantageous for a large canal; to judge by the few facts that are known, the Atrato route and the route across Panama are the most promising. In connection with the communications across the isthmus, the rapid expansion of ocean steam navigation has become equally pressing. Steamships already ply between Southampton and Chagres, New York and Chagres, Valparaiso, Lima, Panama, Acapulco and San Francisco; but these few lines with their small number of steamers are far from adequate. It is becoming daily more necessary to supplement the steamship services between Europe and Chagres, and the growing traffic between Asia, Australia and America is demanding new, large-scale steamship services from Panama and San Francisco to Canton, Singapore, Sydney, New Zealand and the most important port-of-call in the Pacific Ocean, the Sandwich Islands. Of all areas of the Pacific Ocean, Australia and New Zealand in particular have made the greatest advance, both on account of the rapid progress of colonisation and on account of the influence of California, and will not stand a moment longer being isolated from the civilised world by a four- to six-month voyage by sail. The total population of the Australian colonies (not including New Zealand) rose from 170,676 (1839) to 333,764 in 1848, thus increasing by \(95^{1/2}\) per cent in 9 years. Great Britain herself cannot leave these colonies without a steamer connection; the government is negotiating at this moment for a line to join up with the East Indian overland post, and whether

\(^a\) Name changed to Colombia in 1863.—Ed.
this comes about or not, the need for a steamer connection with America and especially California, which was the destination of 3,500 emigrants from Australia last year, will soon take care of itself. One can really say that the earth has only begun to become round since this world-wide ocean steam navigation has become necessary.

This imminent expansion of steamship services will be further intensified by the above-mentioned opening up of the Dutch colonies and by the increased number of propeller-driven steamships which, it is becoming more and more evident, can transport emigrants faster, relatively more cheaply and more conveniently than sailing ships. In addition to the propeller-driven steamers which already go from Glasgow and Liverpool to New York, new ones are to be brought into service on this line, and a line is to be established between Rotterdam and New York. The extent indeed to which ocean steam navigation at present tends to be a target for capital is demonstrated by the continuing increase in the number of steamers competing on the run between Liverpool and New York, the establishment of quite new lines from Great Britain to the Cape and from New York to Le Havre, and a whole series of similar projects which are now being peddled about in New York.

With this flow of capital into overseas steamship services and the canalisation of the American isthmus, the foundation has already been laid for over-speculation in this field. The centre for this speculation is inevitably New York, which receives the bulk of the gold from California and which has already attracted most of the trade with California to itself and indeed plays the same role relative to the whole of America as London does relative to Europe. New York is already the centre for all the transatlantic steamship services; all the steamships in the Pacific Ocean belong to New York companies, and almost all new projects in this field emanate from New York. Speculation in overseas steamer services has already begun in New York. The Nicaragua Company, which originated in New York, likewise represents the beginning of speculation in the isthmus canals. Over-speculation will develop very soon, and even if British capital becomes involved on a large scale in all such undertakings, even if the London Stock Exchange is overwhelmed with similar projects of every kind, nevertheless this time New York will remain the centre of the whole swindle and, as in 1836, will be the first to suffer when it collapses. Countless projects will be ruined, but like the British railway system in 1845, this time the outline at least of world-wide steam navigation will emerge from this
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over-speculation. However many companies go bankrupt, the steamships which are doubling traffic across the Atlantic, which are opening up the Pacific Ocean and are linking Australia, New Zealand, Singapore and China with America and reducing the length of a voyage round the world to four months—these will remain.

The prosperity of Great Britain and America soon had repercussions on the European continent. As early as the summer of 1849 factories in Germany, especially in the Rhine Province, were once more fairly busy, and from the end of 1849 the revival of business was general. This renewed prosperity, which our German burghers naively attribute to the establishment of peace and order, is in reality based solely on the renewed prosperity of Great Britain and the increased demand for industrial goods on the American and tropical markets. In 1850 industry and trade made yet further advances; exactly as in Great Britain there occurred a momentary surplus of capital and an extraordinary easing of the money market, and reports on the autumn fairs in Frankfurt and Leipzig sound extremely satisfactory to those members of the bourgeoisie who have a stake in them. Not for an instant were the disturbances in Schleswig-Holstein and Hesse-Cassel, the disputes concerning the union and the threatening notes sent by Austria and Prussia able to hold up the development of all these symptoms of prosperity, as The Economist indeed observed in its supercilious cockney way.

The same symptoms have shown themselves in France since 1849, and particularly since the beginning of 1850. The Parisian industries are abundantly employed and the cotton factories of Rouen and Mulhouse are also doing pretty well, although here, as in England, the high prices of the raw material have exercised a retarding influence. The development of prosperity in France was, in addition, especially promoted by the comprehensive tariff reform in Spain and by the reduction of the duties on various luxury articles in Mexico; the export of French commodities to both markets has considerably increased. The growth of capital in France led to a series of speculations, for which the large-scale exploitation of the Californian gold-mines served as a pretext. A swarm of companies has sprung up, the low denomination of whose shares

---

a "Spirit of the Trade Circulars", The Economist No. 366, August 31, 1850.
b The authors use the English word.—Ed.
c In 1895 Engels included the section on the economic position of France up to the words "We now come to the political events..." in Chapter IV of Marx's The Class Struggles in France (see this volume, pp. 132-35).—Ed.
and whose socialist-coloured prospectuses appeal directly to the purses of the petty bourgeois and the workers, but which one and all result in that sheer swindling which is characteristic of the French and Chinese alone. One of these companies is even patronised directly by the government. The import duties in France during the first nine months of 1848 amounted to 63,000,000 francs, of 1849 to 95,000,000 francs and of 1850 to 93,000,000 francs. Moreover, in the month of September 1850, they again rose by more than a million compared with the same month of 1849. Exports also rose in 1849, and still more in 1850.

The most striking proof of restored prosperity is the bank's reintroduction of specie payment by the law of August 6, 1850. On March 15, 1848, the bank had been authorised to suspend specie payment. Its note circulation, including the provincial banks, amounted at that time to 373,000,000 francs (£14,920,000). On November 2, 1849, this circulation amounted to 482,000,000 francs, or £19,280,000, an increase of £4,360,000, and on September 2, 1850, to 496,000,000 francs, or £19,840,000, an increase of about £5,000,000. This was not accompanied by any devaluation of the notes; on the contrary, the increased circulation of the notes was accompanied by the steadily increasing accumulation of gold and silver in the vaults of the bank, so that in the summer of 1850 its metallic reserve amounted to about £14,000,000, an unprecedented sum in France. That the bank was thus placed in a position to increase its circulation and therewith its active capital by 123,000,000 francs, or £5,000,000, is striking proof of the correctness of our assertion in an earlier issue\(^a\) that the finance aristocracy has not only not been overthrown by the revolution, but has even been strengthened. This result becomes still more evident from the following survey of French bank legislation during the last few years. On June 10, 1847, the bank was authorised to issue notes of 200 francs; hitherto the smallest denomination had been 500 francs. A decree of March 15, 1848, declared the notes of the Bank of France legal tender and relieved the bank of the obligation of redeeming them in specie. Its note issue was limited to 350,000,000 francs. It was simultaneously authorised to issue notes of 100 francs. A decree of April 27 prescribed the merging of the departmental banks in the Bank of France; another decree, of May 2, 1848, increased the latter's note issue to 452,000,000 francs. A decree of December 22, 1849, raised the maximum of the note issue to 525,000,000 francs.

---
\(^a\) See pp. 114-18 (the reference is to the third issue of the Revue).—Ed.
Finally, the law of August 6, 1850, re-established the exchangeability of notes for specie. These facts, the continual increase in the circulation, the concentration of the whole of French credit in the hands of the bank and the accumulation of all French gold and silver in the bank’s vaults, led M. Proudhon to the conclusion that the bank must now shed its old snakeskin and metamorphose itself into a Proudhonist people’s bank. He did not even need to know the history of the restriction on the English bank from 1797-1819; he only needed to direct his glance across the Channel to see that this fact, for him unprecedented in the history of bourgeois society, was nothing more than a very normal bourgeois event, which now only occurred in France for the first time. One sees that the allegedly revolutionary theoreticians who, after the Provisional Government, talked big in Paris, were just as ignorant of the nature and the results of the measures taken as the gentlemen of the Provisional Government themselves.

In spite of the industrial and commercial prosperity that France momentarily enjoys, the mass of the people, the twenty-five million peasants, suffer from a great depression. The good harvests of the last few years have forced the prices of corn in France much lower even than in England, and the position of the peasants under such circumstances, in debt, sucked dry by usury and crushed by taxes, must be anything but splendid. The history of the last three years has, however, provided sufficient proof that this class of the population is absolutely incapable of any revolutionary initiative.

Just as the period of crisis occurs later on the Continent than in England, so does that of prosperity. The original process always takes place in England; it is the demiurge of the bourgeois cosmos. On the Continent, the different phases of the cycle through which bourgeois society is ever speeding anew occur in secondary and tertiary form. First, the Continent exported incomparably more to England than to any other country. This export to England, however, in turn depends on the position of England, particularly with regard to the overseas market. Then England exports to the overseas lands incomparably more than the entire Continent, so that the quantity of Continental exports to these lands is always dependent on England’s overseas exports at the time. While, therefore, the crises first produce revolutions on the Continent, the foundation for these is, nevertheless, always laid in England. Violent outbreaks must naturally occur rather in the extremities of the bourgeois body than in its heart, since the possibility of adjustment is greater here than there. On the other hand, the degree to which Continental revolutions react on England is at the same time the
barometer which indicates how far these revolutions really call in question the bourgeois conditions of life, or how far they only hit their political formations.

With this general prosperity, in which the productive forces of bourgeois society develop as luxuriantly as is at all possible within bourgeois relationships, there can be no talk of a real revolution. Such a revolution is only possible in the periods when both these factors, the modern productive forces and the bourgeois forms of production, come in collision with each other. The various quarrels in which the representatives of the individual factions of the Continental party of Order now indulge and mutually compromise themselves, far from providing the occasion for new revolutions are, on the contrary, possible only because the basis of the relationships is momentarily so secure and, what the reaction does not know, so bourgeois. All reactionary attempts to hold up bourgeois development will rebound off it just as certainly as all moral indignation and all enthusiastic proclamations of the democrats. A new revolution is possible only in consequence of a new crisis. It is, however, just as certain as this crisis.

We now come to the political events of the last six months.

As far as Great Britain is concerned, each spell of prosperity is a time when Whiggery comes into its own, having its proper incarnation in Lord John Russell, the smallest man in the kingdom. The ministry brings before Parliament little hole-and-corner reform bills which it knows will be rejected by the Upper House or which it withdraws itself at the end of the session on the pretext of insufficient time. The lack of time however always arises because of the preceding superabundance of tedium and empty talk, which the Speaker terminates as late as possible with the observation that that is not the matter before the House. The struggle between Free-traders and Protectionists degenerates into pure humbug at such times. The majority of Free-traders are too busy with the material exploitation of free trade to have the time or inclination to fight more astutely a for its political implications; the Protectionists, faced with the upsurge of urban industry, are reduced to the most absurd cries of woe and threats. The parties continue their war simply for the sake of appearances, so that neither side shall ever forget the existence of the other. Before the last session the industrial bourgeoisie made a great noise in favour of financial reform; in Parliament itself they confined themselves to theoretical expostulations. Before the session Mr. Cobden repeated his declaration of war on the Tsar apropos of
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a Engels in his copy replaced the word *weiser* (more astutely) by *weiter* (further).— Ed.
the Russian loan and could not find sarcasms enough to heap on the
great pauper\textsuperscript{a} of Petersburg; six months later he descended to the
scandalous farce of the Peace Congress,\textsuperscript{356} whose only outcome was
that an Ojibway Indian\textsuperscript{b} handed a pipe of peace to Mr. Jaup, to the
great horror of Herr Haynau, who was present on the platform,
and that the Yankee moderation-monger Elihu Burritt went to
Schleswig-Holstein and Copenhagen to assure the governments
concerned of his good intentions. As though the whole Schleswig-
Holstein war could ever take a serious turn as long as Herr von Ga-
gern is involved in it and Venedey is not!

In fact the great political issue of the past session was the \textit{Greek
debate}\textsuperscript{357} All the absolutist reactionaries on the Continent had
formed a coalition with the British Tories to overthrow Palmerston.
Louis Napoleon had even recalled the French Ambassador\textsuperscript{c} from
London, as much to flatter Tsar Nicholas as French national vanity.
The whole National Assembly fanatically applauded this bold break
with the traditional British alliance. The affair gave Mr. Palmerston
the opportunity to present himself in the Lower House as the
champion of civil liberty throughout Europe; he obtained a majority
of 46 votes, and the result of the coalition, which was as powerless as
it was silly, was the non-renewal of the Alien Bill.\textsuperscript{358}

If in his display against Greece and in his speech in Parliament
Palmerston adopted a bourgeois-liberal stand vis-à-vis the reactionaries of Europe, the British people used the presence of Herr
\textit{Haynau} in London for a striking display of \textit{their} foreign pol-
icy.\textsuperscript{359}

If the people harried Austria's military representative through the
streets of London, Prussia experienced in the person of its
diplomatic representative a misfortune equally appropriate to its
position. One remembers how Britain's most comic figure, the
loquacious littérateur Brougham, drove the littérateur \textit{Bunsen} from
the galleries of the Upper House for his tactlessly importunate
behaviour, amid general laughter from all the ladies. Herr Bunsen,
very much in the spirit of the Great Power he was representing, took
this humiliation calmly. He refuses to leave Britain, come what may.
All his private interests bind him to Great Britain; he will continue to
exploit his diplomatic post for the purpose of speculation in English
religion and to find a niche for his sons in the English Church and
for his daughters in one of the echelons of the English gentry.

\textsuperscript{a} "Mr. Cobden and the Russian Loan", \textit{The Times} No. 20390, January 19,
1850.— \textit{Ed.}
\textsuperscript{b} Kah-Ge-Ga-Gah-Bowh.— \textit{Ed.}
\textsuperscript{c} Drouyn de Lhuys.— \textit{Ed.}
The death of Sir Robert Peel significantly helped to hasten the dissolution of the old parties. The party which formed his main support since 1845, the so-called Peelites, has subsequently fallen apart completely. Since his death Peel himself has been most fulsomely apotheosised by almost all the parties as Britain's greatest statesman. It is true he has the advantage over the "statesmen" of the Continent of not being merely a job-hunter. Apart from that, the statesmanship of this son of the bourgeoisie who rose to be leader of the landed aristocracy consisted in the realisation that nowadays there remains only one real aristocracy, and that is the bourgeoisie. Having this in mind, he continually used his leadership of the landed aristocracy to force it to make concessions to the bourgeoisie. Thus it was with the Catholic emancipation and the police reform, by which he increased the political power of the bourgeoisie; with the bank laws of 1818 and 1844, which strengthened the finance aristocracy; with the tariff reform of 1842 and the free-trade laws of 1846, by which the landed aristocracy was positively sacrificed to the industrial bourgeoisie. The second main pillar of the aristocracy, the "Iron Duke", the hero of Waterloo, stood like a disappointed Don Quixote loyally by the side of the cotton-knight Peel. From 1845 Peel was treated as a traitor by the Tory party. Peel's power over the Lower House was based on the unusual plausibility of his eloquence. If one reads his most famous speeches, one finds that they consist of a massive accumulation of commonplaces, skilfully interspersed with a number of statistical data. There is scarcely a town in England which does not want to set up a monument to the man who abolished customs duty on corn. A Chartist paper, alluding to the police force developed by Peel in 1829, observed: What need have we of all these monuments to Peel? Every policeman in Britain and Ireland is a living monument to him.a

The most recent event to have excited public interest in Great Britain is the appointment of Mr. Wiseman as Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster and the division of Britain into thirteen Catholic bishoprics by the Pope.b This act of Christ's vicar on earth, which caused the Church of England great astonishment, is a further demonstration of the illusion to which all the reactionaries on the Continent are prey, as though the victories which they have recently won in the service of the bourgeoisie would automatically entail the establishment of a whole feudal-absolutist social order with all its religious trappings. Catholicism's sole support in Britain is to be
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a "The Peel Monument", The Red Republican No. 9, August 17, 1850.— Ed.
b Pius IX.— Ed.
found at the two extremes of society, the aristocracy and the lumpen-proletariat. The lumpenproletariat, the riff-raff of Irish origin or descended from Irishmen, is Catholic by descent. The aristocracy has for so long, indulged in the fashionable flirtation with Puseyism that ultimately actual conversion to the Catholic Church began to become the fashion. At a time when the struggle against the advancing bourgeoisie was increasingly driving the British aristocracy to display its feudal character, the struggle against the theologians of the bourgeois dissenting religion was of course increasingly forcing the aristocracy's religious ideologists, the orthodox theologians of the High Church, inevitably to acknowledge the implications of their semi-Catholic dogma and rites, and actual conversions of individual reactionary Anglicans to that first Church which alone assures salvation inevitably became more and more common. These insignificant events generated the most sanguine hopes in the minds of Catholic priests in Britain that the whole of Great Britain would soon be converted. The recent Papal Bull which already treats Great Britain once more as a province of Rome and which was intended to lend new impetus to this wave of conversions, is however producing precisely the contrary effect. The Puseyites, suddenly confronted with the grave consequences of their medieval dallyings, are starting back in horror, and the Puseyite bishop of London has at once issued a declaration in which he recants all his errors and declares a war to the death on the papacy.—As far as the bourgeoisie is concerned the whole farce is of interest only insofar as it provides an opportunity for new attacks on the High Church and its universities. The Commission of Enquiry which is to report on the state of the universities will provoke violent debates in the next session. The mass of the people has of course no feelings either for or against Cardinal Wiseman. The newspapers, on the other hand, find the material he is providing for long articles and violent diatribes against Pio Nono most welcome, in view of the present dearth of news. The Times even demanded that by way of punishment for his presumption the government should incite an insurrection in the Papal States and let loose Mr. Mazzini and the Italian émigrés on him. The Globe, Palmerston's paper, drew an extremely witty parallel between the Papal Bull and Mazzini's latest
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a Of September 29, 1850.—Ed.
b Charles James Blomfield.—Ed.
c Reply of the Bishop of London to the Memorial from the Westminster Clergy.—Ed.
d Pius IX.—Ed.
e The Times No. 20634, October 31, 1850.—Ed.
manifesto. The Pope, it said, lays claim to spiritual supremacy over Great Britain and is appointing bishops in partibus infidelium. Here in London there is an Italian Government in partibus infidelium, with the Antipope, Mr. Mazzini, at its head. The supremacy which Mr. Mazzini not merely lays claim to but actually exercises in the Papal States, is at present likewise purely spiritual. The Papal Bulls are purely religious in content; Mazzini's manifestos likewise. They preach a religion, they appeal to faith, their motto is: Dio ed il popolo, God and the people. We would ask, is there any other difference between the claims of the two parties than this, that Mr. Mazzini at least represents the religion of the majority of the people he is addressing—for there is scarcely any other religion left in Italy now than that of Dio ed il popolo—whereas the Pope does not? Mazzini incidentally has used this opportunity to progress a step further. In conjunction with the other members of the Italian National Committee, he has in fact now announced from London the 10 million fr. loan, approved by the Constituent Assembly in Rome, in the form of 100 fr. shares, for the express purpose of obtaining arms and military equipment. It cannot be denied that this loan has a greater chance of success than the Austrian Government's unsuccessful voluntary loan in Lombardy.

A really serious blow which Great Britain has recently dealt Rome and Austria is its trade agreement with Sardinia. This agreement shatters Austria's project for an Italian customs union and ensures an important field of activity for British trade and Britain's bourgeois policies in Upper Italy.

The present organisation of the Chartist Party is similarly in a state of dissolution. The members of the petty bourgeoisie who still adhere to the party, together with the labour aristocracy, form a purely democratic faction whose programme is limited to the People's Charter and a number of other petty-bourgeois reforms. The mass of the workers who live in truly proletarian conditions belong to the revolutionary Chartist faction. The leader of the former faction is Feargus O'Connor, and the leaders of the latter are Julian Harney and Ernest Jones. The elderly O'Connor, an Irish squire and self-styled descendant of the old kings of Munster, is a true representative of Old England, despite his origin and his political tendencies. His whole nature is conservative and he most emphatically hates both industrial progress and revolution. All his ideals are patriarchal and petty-bourgeois to the core. He unites in
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*The Globe and Traveller* No. 15318, October 26, 1850.—*Ed.*
himself countless contradictions which are resolved and harmonised in the form of a certain banal common sense and which enable him year in, year out to write his endless weekly letters in *The Northern Star*, each of which is in open conflict with its predecessor. And that is precisely why O'Connor claims to be the most consistent man in the three kingdoms and to have predicted every event for the past twenty years. His shoulders, his bellowing voice, his enormous skill as a boxer, with which he is reputed to have once held his own against over twenty thousand people at Nottingham market, all make him a typical representative of Old England. It is obvious that a man like O'Connor is bound to be a great obstacle in a revolutionary movement; but such people are useful precisely because with them and against them a number of ingrained prejudices are frittered away, and because the movement, if it eventually prevails against these people, is once and for all rid also of the prejudices they represent. O'Connor's fate is sealed in the movement, but for that reason he will be able to lay claim to the title of a "martyr to the good cause" with as much right as Messrs. Lamartine and Marrast.

The main bone of contention between the two Chartist factions is the land question. O'Connor and his party want to use the Charter to accommodate some of the workers on small plots of land and eventually to parcel out all the land in Great Britain. We know how his attempt to organise this parcelling out on a small scale by means of a joint-stock company failed. That propensity which every bourgeois revolution has to break up large landed estates gave the British workers the impression for a while that this parcelling out was something revolutionary, although its regular corollary is the unfailing tendency of small properties to become concentrated and succumb in the face of large-scale farming. The revolutionary faction of the Chartists opposes this demand for parcelling out with the demand for the confiscation of all landed property, and insists that it should not be distributed but remain national property.

Despite this split and their more extreme demands, the memory of the circumstances in which the abolition of the Corn Laws went through is responsible for the Chartists' persisting notion that in the next crisis they will once again have to ally themselves with the industrial bourgeoisie, the financial reformers, and help them to crush their enemies, in return for which they will have to extract concessions from them for themselves. This will in any case be the Chartists' position in the approaching crisis. The revolutionary movement proper cannot begin in Britain until the Charter has been
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a The authors give the words "common sense" in English.—Ed.
carried through, just as in France the battle of June only became possible when the republic had been won.

Let us now turn to France.\(^a\)

The victory that the people, in conjunction with the petty bourgeois, had won in the elections of March 10 was annulled by it itself when it provoked the new election of April 28. Vidal was elected not only in Paris, but also in the Lower Rhine. The Paris Committee, in which the Montagne and the petty bourgeoisie were strongly represented, induced him to accept for the Lower Rhine. The victory of March 10 ceased to be a decisive one; the date of the decision was once more postponed; the tension of the people was relaxed; it became accustomed to legal triumphs instead of revolutionary ones. The revolutionary meaning of March 10, the rehabilitation of the June insurrection, was finally completely annihilated by the candidature of Eugène Sue, the sentimental petty-bourgeois social-fantasist, which the proletariat could at best accept as a joke to amuse the grissettes. As against this well-meaning candidature, the party of Order, emboldened by the vacillating policy of its opponents, put up a candidate who was to represent the June victory. This comic candidate was the Spartan pater familias Leclerc,\(^a\) from whose person, however, the heroic armour was torn piece by piece by the press, and who experienced a crushing defeat in the election. The new election victory on April 28 put the Montagne and the petty bourgeoisie in high feather. They already exulted in the thought of being able to arrive at the goal of their wishes in a purely legal way and without again pushing the proletariat into the foreground through a new revolution; they reckoned positively on bringing M. Ledru-Rollin into the presidential chair and a majority of Montagnards into the Assembly through universal suffrage in the new elections of 1852. The party of Order, rendered perfectly certain, by the prospective elections, by Sue's candidature and by the mood of the Montagne and the petty bourgeoisie, that the latter were resolved to remain quiet no matter what happened, answered the two election victories with an election law which abolished universal suffrage.

The government took good care not to make this legislative proposal on its own responsibility. It made an apparent concession to the majority by entrusting the drafting of the bill to the high dignitaries of this majority, to the seventeen burgraves.\(^a\) Thus, it was not the government that proposed the repeal of universal suffrage to the Assembly; the majority of the Assembly proposed it to itself.

\(^a\) In 1895 Engels included the passage relating to the events in France in Chapter IV of Marx's The Class Struggles in France (see pp. 135-45 of this volume).—Ed.
On May 8, the project was brought into the Chamber. The entire social-democratic press rose as one man in order to preach to the people dignified composure, *calme majestueux,* passivity and trust in its representatives. Every article of these journals was a confession that a revolution would, above all, annihilate the so-called revolutionary press and that, therefore, it was now a question of its self-preservation. The allegedly revolutionary press betrayed its whole secret. It signed its own death warrant.

On May 21, the *Montagne* put the preliminary question to debate and moved the rejection of the whole project on the ground that it violated the constitution. The party of Order answered that the constitution would be violated if it were necessary; there was, however, no need for this at present, because the constitution was capable of every interpretation, and because the majority alone was competent to decide on the correct interpretation. To the unbridled, savage attacks of Thiers and Montalembert the *Montagne* opposed a decorous and refined humanism. It took its stand on the ground of law; the party of Order referred it to the ground on which the law grows, to bourgeois property. The *Montagne* whimpered: Did they really want, then, to conjure up revolutions by main force? The party of Order replied: One should await them.

On May 22, the preliminary question was settled by 462 votes to 227. The same men who had proved with such solemn profundity that the National Assembly and every individual deputy would be renouncing his mandate if he renounced the people, his mandator, stuck to their seats and now suddenly sought to let the country act, through petitions at that, instead of acting themselves; and still sat there unmoved when, on May 31, the law went through in splendid fashion. They sought to revenge themselves by a protest in which they recorded their innocence of the rape of the constitution, a protest which they did not even submit openly, but smuggled into the President’s pocket behind his back.

An army of 150,000 men in Paris, the long deferment of the decision, the appeasing attitude of the press, the pusillanimity of the *Montagne* and of the newly elected representatives, the majestic calm of the petty bourgeois, but, above all, the commercial and industrial prosperity, prevented any attempt at revolution on the part of the proletariat.

Universal suffrage had fulfilled its mission. The majority of the people had passed through the school of development, which is all
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*a* An allusion to Victor Hugo’s appeal to keep “majestic calm”, made in his speech in the Legislative Assembly on May 21, 1850.— Ed.

*b* The President of the Assembly.— Ed.
that universal suffrage can serve for in a revolutionary period. It had to be set aside by a revolution or by the reaction.

The Montagne developed a still greater display of energy on an occasion that arose soon afterwards. From the tribune War Minister d'Hautpoul had termed the February Revolution a baneful catastrophe.\textsuperscript{a} The orators of the Montagne, who, as always, distinguished themselves by their morally indignant bluster, were not allowed by the President, Dupin, to speak. Girardin proposed to the Montagne that it should walk out at once \textit{en masse}. Result: the Montagne remained seated, but Girardin was cast out from its midst as unworthy.

The election law still needed one thing to complete it, a new press law. This was not long in coming. A proposal of the government, made many times more drastic by amendments of the party of Order, increased the caution money, put an extra stamp on feuilleton novels (answer to the election of Eugène Sue), taxed all publications appearing weekly or monthly up to a certain number of sheets and finally provided that every article of a journal must bear the signature of the author. The provisions concerning the caution money killed the so-called revolutionary press; the people regarded its extinction as satisfaction for the abolition of universal suffrage. However, neither the tendency nor the effect of the new law extended only to this section of the press. As long as the newspaper press was anonymous, it appeared as the organ of a numberless and nameless public opinion; it was the third power in the state. Through the signature of every article, a newspaper became a mere collection of literary contributions from more or less known individuals. Every article sank to the level of an advertisement. Hitherto the newspapers had circulated as the paper money of public opinion; now they were resolved into more or less bad \textit{solo} bills, whose worth and circulation depended on the credit not only of the drawer but also of the endorser. The press of the party of Order had agitated not only for the repeal of universal suffrage but also for the most extreme measures against the bad press. However, in its sinister anonymity even the good press was irksome to the party of Order and still more to its individual provincial representatives. As for itself, it demanded only the paid writer, with name, address and description. In vain the good press bemoaned the ingratitude with which its services were rewarded. The law went through; the specification of the names of authors hit it hardest of all. The names of republican journalists were pretty well known; but the

\textsuperscript{a} This statement was made by the Minister of Justice Eugène Rouher.—\textit{Ed.}
respectable firms of the *Journal des Débats*, the *Assemblée nationale*, the *Constitutionnel*, etc., etc., cut a sorry figure in their high protestations of state wisdom, when the mysterious company all at once disintegrated into purchasable penny-a-liners of long practice, who had defended all possible causes for cash, like Granier de Cassagnac, or into old milksops who called themselves statesmen, like Capefigue, or into coquetish fops, like M. Lemoinne of the *Débats*.

In the debate on the press law the *Montagne* had already sunk to such a level of moral degeneracy that it had to confine itself to applauding the brilliant tirades of an old notability of Louis Philippe's time, M. Victor Hugo.

With the election law and the press law the revolutionary and democratic party exits from the official stage. Before their departure home, shortly after the end of the session, the two factions of the *Montagne*, the socialist democrats and the democratic Socialists, issued two manifestos, two *testimonia paupertatis*, in which they proved that while power and success were never on their side, they nonetheless had ever been on the side of eternal justice and all the other eternal truths.

Let us now consider the party of Order. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* had said (Heft 3, p. 16): "As against the hankering for restoration on the part of the united Orleanists and Legitimists, Bonaparte defends his title to his actual power, the republic; as against the hankering for restoration on the part of Bonaparte, the party of Order defends its title to its common rule, the republic. As against the Orleanists, the Legitimists, and as against the Legitimists, the Orleanists, defend the *status quo*, the republic. All these factions of the party of Order, each of which has its own king and its own restoration *in petto*, mutually enforce, as against their rivals' hankering for usurpation and revolt, the common rule of the bourgeoisie, the form in which the special claims remain neutralised and reserved—the republic.... And Thiers spoke more truly than he suspected when he said: 'We, the royalists, are the true pillars of the constitutional republic.'"

This comedy of the *républicains malgré eux*, the antipathy to the *status quo* and the constant consolidation of it; the incessant friction
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a This expression is given in English in the original.—*Ed.*

b "Compte-rendu de la Montagne au Peuple" and "Au Peuple!", published in the newspaper *Le Peuple de 1850* No. 6, August 11, and No. 7, August 14, 1850.—*Ed.*

c See this volume, p. 113-14.—*Ed.*

d Republicans in spite of themselves. (Allusion to Molière's comedy *Le Médecin malgré lui.*)—*Ed.*
between Bonaparte and the National Assembly; the ever renewed threat of the party of Order to split into its separate component parts, and the ever repeated conjugation of its factions; the attempt of each faction to transform each victory over the common foe into a defeat for its temporary allies; the mutual petty jealousy, chicanery, harassment, the tireless drawing of swords that ever and again ends with a baiser-Lamourette—this whole unedifying comedy of errors never developed more classically than during the last six months.

The party of Order regarded the election law at the same time as a victory over Bonaparte. Had not the government abdicated when it handed over the editing of and responsibility for its own proposal to the Commission of Seventeen? And did not the chief strength of Bonaparte as against the Assembly lie in the fact that he was the chosen of six millions?—Bonaparte, on his part, treated the election law as a concession to the Assembly, with which he claimed to have purchased harmony between the legislative and executive powers. As reward, the vulgar adventurer demanded an increase of three millions in his civil list. Dared the National Assembly enter into a conflict with the executive at a moment when it had excommunicated the great majority of Frenchmen? It was roused to anger: it appeared to want to go to extremes; its Commission rejected the motion; the Bonapartist press threatened, and referred to the disinherited people, deprived of its franchise; numerous noisy attempts at an arrangement took place, and the Assembly finally gave way in fact, but at the same time revenged itself in principle. Instead of increasing the civil list in principle by three millions per annum, it granted him an accommodation of 2,160,000 francs. Not satisfied with this, it made even this concession only after it had been supported by Changarnier, the general of the party of Order and the protector thrust upon Bonaparte. Therefore it really granted the two millions not to Bonaparte, but to Changarnier.

This sop, thrown to him de mauvaise grâce, was accepted by Bonaparte quite in the spirit of the donor. The Bonapartist press blustered anew against the National Assembly. When, now in the debate on the press law, the amendment was passed on the signing of names, which, in turn, was directed especially against the less important papers, the representatives of the private interests of Bonaparte, the principal Bonapartist paper, the Pouvoir, published an open and vehement attack on the National Assembly. The ministers had to disavow the paper before the Assembly; the managing editor of the Pouvoir was summoned before the bar of the
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* With a bad grace.—*Ed.*
National Assembly and sentenced to pay the highest fine, 5,000 francs.\(^a\) Next day, the *Pouvoir* published a still more insolent article against the Assembly, and, as the government's revenge, the public prosecutor promptly prosecuted a number of Legitimist journals for violating the constitution.

Finally there came the question of proroguing the Chamber. Bonaparte desired this in order to be able to operate unhindered by the Assembly. The party of Order desired it, partly for the purpose of carrying on its factional intrigues, partly for the pursuit of the private interests of the individual deputies. Both needed it in order to consolidate and push further the victories of reaction in the provinces. The Assembly therefore adjourned from August 11 until November 11. Since, however, Bonaparte in no way concealed that his only concern was to get rid of the irksome surveillance of the National Assembly, the Assembly imprinted on the vote of confidence itself the stamp of want of confidence in the President. All Bonapartists were kept off the permanent commission of twenty-eight members, who stayed on during the recess as guardians of the virtue of the republic.\(^b\) In their stead, even some republicans of the *Siècle* and the *National* were elected to it, in order to prove to the President the attachment of the majority to the constitutional republic.

Shortly before and, especially, immediately after the prorogation of the Chamber, the two big factions of the party of Order, the Orleanists and the Legitimists, appeared to want to be reconciled, and this by a fusion of the two royal houses under whose flags they were fighting. The papers were full of reconciliation proposals that were said to have been discussed at the sickbed of Louis Philippe at St. Leonards, when the death of Louis Philippe suddenly simplified the situation. Louis Philippe was the usurper; Henry V, the dispossessed; the Count of Paris,\(^b\) on the other hand, owing to the childlessness of Henry V, his lawful heir to the throne. Every pretext for objecting to a fusion of the two dynastic interests was now removed. But now, precisely, the two factions of the bourgeoisie first discovered that it was not zeal for a definite royal house that divided them, but that it was rather their divided class interests that kept the two dynasties apart. The Legitimists, who had made a pilgrimage to the residence of Henry V at Wiesbaden just as their competitors had to St. Leonards, received there the news of Louis Philippe's death. Forthwith they formed a ministry *in partibus infidelium*, which con-
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\(^a\) See this volume, pp. 39-40 and 140.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) Louis Philippe Albert d'Orléans.—*Ed.*
sisted mostly of members of that commission of guardians of the virtue of the republic and which on the occasion of a squabble in the bosom of the party came out with the most outspoken proclamation of right by the grace of God. The Orleanists rejoiced over the compromising scandal that this manifesto called forth in the press, and did not conceal for a moment their open enmity to the Legitimists.

During the adjournment of the National Assembly, the Councils of the Departments met. The majority of them declared for a more or less qualified revision of the constitution, that is, they declared for a not definitely specified monarchist restoration, for a "solution", and confessed at the same time that they were too incompetent and too cowardly to find this solution. The Bonapartist faction at once construed this desire for revision in the sense of a prolongation of Bonaparte's presidency.

The constitutional solution, the retirement of Bonaparte in May 1852, the simultaneous election of a new President by all the electors of the country, the revision of the constitution by a Chamber of Revision in the first months of the new presidency, is utterly inadmissible for the ruling class. The day of the new presidential election would be the day of rendezvous for all the hostile parties, the Legitimists, the Orleanists, the bourgeois republicans, the revolutionists. It would have to come to a violent decision between the different factions. Even if the party of Order should succeed in uniting round the candidature of a neutral person outside the dynastic families, he would still be opposed by Bonaparte. In its struggle with the people, the party of Order is compelled constantly to increase the power of the executive. Every increase of the executive's power increases the power of its bearer, Bonaparte. In the same measure, therefore, as the party of Order strengthens its joint might, it strengthens the fighting resources of Bonaparte's dynastic pretensions, it strengthens his chance of frustrating a constitutional solution by force on the day of the decision. He will then have, as against the party of Order, no more scruples about the one pillar of the constitution than that party had, as against the people, about the other pillar in the matter of the election law. He would, seemingly even against the Assembly, appeal to universal suffrage. In a word, the constitutional solution questions the entire political status quo and behind the jeopardising of the status quo the bourgeois sees chaos, anarchy, civil war. He sees his purchases and sales, his promissory notes, his marriages, his agreements, duly acknowledged before a notary, his mortgages, his ground rents, house rents, profits, all his contracts and sources of income called in
question on the first Sunday in May 1852, and he cannot expose himself to this risk. Behind the jeopardising of the political status quo lurks the danger of the collapse of the entire bourgeois society. The only possible solution in the sense of the bourgeoisie is the postponement of the solution. It can save the constitutional republic only by a violation of the constitution, by the prolongation of the power of the President. This is also the last word of the press of Order, after the protracted and profound debates on the “solutions” in which it indulged after the session of the general councils. The high and mighty party of Order thus finds itself, to its shame, compelled to take seriously the ridiculous, commonplace and, to it, odious person of the pseudo-Bonaparte.

This dirty figure likewise deceived himself concerning the causes that clothed him more and more with the character of the indispensable man. While his party had sufficient insight to ascribe the growing importance of Bonaparte to circumstances, he believed that he owed it solely to the magic power of his name and his continual caricaturing of Napoleon. He became more enterprising every day. To offset the pilgrimages to St. Leonards and Wiesbaden, he made his round trips through France. The Bonapartists had so little faith in the magic effect of his personality that they sent with him everywhere as claqueurs people from the Society of December 10, that organisation of the Paris lumpenproletariat, packed en masse into railway trains and post-chaises. They put speeches into the mouth of their marionette which, according to the reception in the different towns, proclaimed republican resignation or perennial tenacity as the keynote of the President’s policy. In spite of all manoeuvres these journeys were anything but triumphal processions.

When Bonaparte believed he had thus enthused the people, he set out to win the army. He caused great reviews to be held on the plain of Satory, near Versailles, at which he sought to buy the soldiers with garlic sausages, champagne and cigars. Whereas the genuine Napoleon, amid the hardships of his campaigns of conquest, knew how to cheer up his weary soldiers with outbursts of patriarchal familiarity, the pseudo-Napoleon believed it was in gratitude that the troops shouted: Vive Napoléon, vive le saucisson! that is, hurrah for the sausage [Wurst], hurrah for the buffoon [Hanswurst]!

These reviews led to the outbreak of the long suppressed dissension between Bonaparte and his War Minister d’Hautpoul, on the one hand, and Changarnier, on the other. In Changarnier, the party of Order had found its real neutral man, in whose case there could be no question of his own dynastic claims. It had designated
him Bonaparte's successor. In addition, Changarnier had become the great general of the party of Order through his conduct on January 29 and June 13, 1849, the modern Alexander, whose brutal intervention had, in the eyes of the timid bourgeois, cut the Gordian knot of the revolution. At bottom just as ridiculous as Bonaparte, he had thus become a power in the very cheapest manner and was set up by the National Assembly to watch the President. He himself played the coquette, e.g., in the matter of the salary grant, with the protection that he gave Bonaparte, and rose up ever more overpoweringly against him and the ministers. When, on the occasion of the election law, an insurrection was expected, he forbade his officers to take any orders whatever from the War Minister or the President. The press was also instrumental in magnifying the figure of Changarnier. With the complete absence of great personalities, the party of Order naturally found itself compelled to endow a single individual with the strength lacking in its class as a whole and so puff up this individual to a prodigy. Thus arose the myth of Changarnier, the "bulwark of society". The arrogant charlatanry, the secretive air of importance with which Changarnier condescended to carry the world on his shoulders, forms the most ridiculous contrast to the events during and after the Satory review, which irrefutably proved that it needed only a stroke of the pen by Bonaparte, the infinitely little, to bring this fantastic offspring of bourgeois fear, the colossus Changarnier, back to the dimensions of mediocrity, and transform him, society's heroic saviour, into a pensioned-off general.

Bonaparte had for some time been revenging himself on Changarnier by provoking the War Minister to disputes in matters of discipline with the irksome protector. The last review of Satory finally brought the old animosity to a climax. The constitutional indignation of Changarnier knew no bounds when he saw the cavalry regiments file past with the unconstitutional cry: Vive l'Empereur! In order to forestall any unpleasant debate on this cry in the coming session of the Chamber, Bonaparte removed the War Minister d'Hautpoul by appointing him Governor of Algiers. In his place he put a reliable old general of the time of the empire, a one who was fully a match for Changarnier in brutality. But so that the dismissal of d'Hautpoul might not appear as a concession to Changarnier, he simultaneously transferred General Neumayer, the right hand of the great saviour of society, from Paris to Nantes. It
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a J. P. Schramm.—Ed.
had been Neumayer who at the last review had induced the whole of the infantry to file past the successor of Napoleon in icy silence. Changarnier, himself hit in the person of Neumayer, protested and threatened. To no purpose. After two days' negotiations, the decree transferring Neumayer appeared in the *Moniteur*, and there was nothing left for the hero of order but to submit to discipline or resign.

Bonaparte's struggle with Changarnier is the continuation of his struggle with the party of Order. The re-opening of the National Assembly on November 11 will, therefore, take place under threatening auspices. It will be a storm in a teacup. In essence the old game must go on. Meanwhile the majority of the party of Order will, despite the clamour of the sticklers for principle of its different factions, be compelled to prolong the power of the President. Similarly, Bonaparte, already humbled by lack of money, will, despite all preliminary protestations, accept this prolongation of power from the hands of the National Assembly as simply delegated to him. Thus the solution is postponed; the *status quo* continued; one faction of the party of Order compromised, weakened, made impossible by the other; the repression of the common enemy, the mass of the nation, extended and exhausted, until the economic relations themselves have again reached the point of development where a new explosion blows into the air all these squabbling parties with their constitutional republic.

For the peace of mind of the bourgeois it must be said, however, that the scandal between Bonaparte and the party of Order has the result of ruining a multitude of small capitalists on the Bourse and putting their assets into the pockets of the big wolves of the Bourse.

In Germany the political events of the last six months are epitomised by the spectacle of Prussia duping the liberals and Austria duping Prussia.

In 1849 it appeared to be Prussia's hegemony in Germany that was at issue; in 1850 it was a question of the division of power between Austria and Prussia; in 1851 it will only be a question of the form in which Prussia submits to Austria and returns as a penitent sinner to the fold of the totally restored *Federal Diet*. The Little Germany which the King of Prussia had hoped to negotiate as compensation for his disastrous imperial procession through Berlin on March 21, 1848, has turned into Little Prussia; Prussia has had to take every humiliation meekly and has vanished from the ranks of the Great
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*a Le Moniteur universel* No. 303, October 30, 1850.—*Ed.*
Powers. Even the modest dream of the Union has been once more dispelled by the usual perfidious narrow-mindedness of her policies. She falsely claimed a liberal character for the Union and thus duped the wise men of the Gotha party with constitutional phantasmasories that were never seriously meant; and yet she herself had become so bourgeois even by virtue of her whole industrial development, her permanent deficit and her national debt that for all her squirming and struggling her surrender to constitutionalism was becoming increasingly irrevocable. If the wise men of Gotha at length discovered how disgracefully Prussia had trampled on their honour and their ideas, if even men like Gagern and Brüggemann finally turned their backs in noble indignation on a government which played so contemptuously with the unity and freedom of the fatherland, Prussia herself found no greater joy in those little chicks she had gathered beneath her protecting wing, the small princes. The petty princes had only entrusted themselves at a moment of extreme distress and vulnerability to the avidly mediatising talons of the Prussian eagle; Prussian interventions, threats and demonstrations to restore their subjects to their former obedience, had cost them dear in the form of oppressive military agreements, expensive quartering of troops and the prospect of imminent mediatisation by the constitution of the Union. But Prussia herself had taken care that they would once more escape this new danger. Everywhere Prussia had brought the forces of reaction back to power, and the greater the progress of the forces of reaction, the more the petty princes deserted Prussia and threw themselves into the arms of Austria. Once they were able to rule again as they had before March, they found absolutist Austria more congenial than a power which was as incapable of being absolutist as it was reluctant to be liberal. Furthermore, Austrian policy did not lead to the mediatisation of the small states but on the contrary to their maintenance as integral parts of a Federal Diet which was to be restored. Prussia thus watched herself being deserted by Saxony, whom Prussian troops had saved not many months before, by Hanover, by Hesse-Cassel, and now Baden too, despite her Prussian garrisons, was following the others. That Prussia's support for the forces of reaction in Hamburg, Mecklenburg, Dessau, etc., etc., was not to her advantage but to Austria's, she can now clearly see from the events in the two Hesses. Thus the German Emperor manqué at least learnt that his is an age of disloyalty, and if he now has to tolerate the amputation of "his right arm, the Union", this arm had already been withered for some considerable time. Thus Austria has now already brought the whole of South Germany under her hegemony, and in North
Germany too the most important states are Prussia’s opponents.

Austria had now advanced sufficiently to be able with Russia’s support to challenge Prussia openly. She did so over two issues: Schleswig-Holstein and Hesse-Cassel.

In Schleswig-Holstein the “sword of Germany” had concluded a genuinely Prussian separate peace and delivered its allies into the hands of a more powerful enemy. Great Britain, Russia and France determined to put an end to the independence of the duchies and expressed this intention in a protocol, to which Austria also subscribed. Whilst Austria and the German governments allied to her advocated Federal intervention in Holstein in Denmark’s favour at the restored Federal Diet, in accordance with the London protocol, Prussia sought to continue her double-dealing policy and to persuade the parties to submit to a Federal Arbitration Court which was as yet completely non-existent, indefinable and rejected by most of the governments, including the most important, and with all her manoeuvres managed only to incur the suspicion of the Great Powers that she was indulging in revolutionary intrigues and to be sent a series of threatening notes which will soon spoil her taste for an “independent” foreign policy. The people of Schleswig-Holstein will shortly get their lord and master back, and a people that allows itself to be governed by Messrs. Beseler and Reventlow, despite the fact that it has the whole army on its side, shows that it still needs the strictness of Danish tutelage for its education.

The movement in Hesse-Cassel provides us with a unique example of what a “rising” in a small German state can achieve. The virtuous burgher opposition to the fraud Hassenpflug had accomplished all that could be expected of such a display: the Chamber was unanimous, the country was unanimous, the civil service and the army were on the side of the citizenry, all recalcitrant elements had been removed, “Out with the Princes” had been realised of its own accord, the fraud Hassenpflug had disappeared with his whole ministry; everything went without a hitch, all the parties kept strictly within the bounds of the law, all excesses were avoided, and without lifting a finger the opposition had carried off the most splendid victory recorded in the annals of constitutional opposition. And now, when the burghers had all power in their hands, when their burghers’ committee was encountering not the slightest resistance anywhere, only now were they really needed. Now they saw that instead of the Electoral troops, foreign troops were at the frontier, ready to move in and put an end within twenty-four hours to all this burgher glory. Only now did indecision and humiliation commence;
if they had previously been unable to retreat, now they were unable to advance. The tax refusal in Hesse-Cassel demonstrates more forcibly than any previous event that all conflicts within the small states terminate as pure farce, their only outcome in the end being foreign intervention and the elimination of the conflict by the elimination of both the ruling prince and the constitution. It demonstrates how absurd all those highly important battles are in which the petty bourgeoisie of the small states seek with patriotic loyalty to their ideals to save every little achievement of March from its inevitable ruin.

In Hesse-Cassel, a state which belonged to the Union and which was to be snatched from the Prussian embrace, Austria challenged her rival directly. It was Austria which positively incited the Elector\(^a\) to attack the constitution and then immediately placed him under the protection of her Federal Diet. With the intention of giving this protection greater force, using the Hesse-Cassel affair to break Prussia's opposition to Austrian hegemony and blackmailing Prussia back into the Federal Diet, Austrian and South German troops were now mobilised in Franconia and Bohemia. Prussia is likewise arming. The newspapers are overflowing with reports of marches and countermarches of the army corps. None of this noise will lead to anything, any more than does the bickering of the French party of Order with Bonaparte. Neither the King of Prussia nor the Emperor of Austria is sovereign, but the Russian Tsar\(^b\) alone. At his command rebellious Prussia will eventually submit without a drop of blood being shed and the parties will come together peaceably on the benches of the Federal Diet, without there being the slightest diminution in their petty mutual jealousies, nor in their dissensions with their subjects, nor in their irritation at Russian supremacy.

We now come to the land as such, to the people of Europe, to the émigré people. We shall say nothing of the individual groups of émigrés, the German, French, Hungarian, etc.; their \textit{haute politique} amounts to no more than pure \textit{chronique scandaleuse}. But the European people as a whole \textit{in partibus infidelium} have recently acquired a provisional government in the shape of the \textit{European Central Committee}, consisting of Giuseppe Mazzini, Ledru-Rollin, Albert Darasz (a Pole) and—Arnold Ruge, who, to justify his existence, modestly puts after his name: Member of the Frankfurt

\(^{a}\) Frederick William I.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^{b}\) Frederick William IV, Francis Joseph I, Nicholas I.—\textit{Ed.}
National Assembly. Though there is no saying what democratic council summoned these four evangelists to their office, it still cannot be denied that their manifesto represents the credo of the great mass of émigrés and provides a fitting summary of the intellectual achievements which this mass owes to the recent revolutions.\(^a\)

The manifesto begins with a resounding enumeration of the strengths of democracy.

"What does democracy lack for victory? ... organisation .... We have sects but no Church, incomplete and contradictory philosophies, but no religion, no collective faith which rallies the faithful beneath a single banner and harmonises their labour .... The day on which we find ourselves all united, marching together beneath the gaze of the best of us ... will be the eve of the struggle. On that day we shall have counted our number, we shall know who we are, we shall have the consciousness of our strength."

Why has the revolution failed so far? Because the organisation of revolutionary power was weaker. That is the first decree of the provisional émigré government.

This deficiency is now to be remedied by the organisation of an army of faith and the foundation of a religion.

"But, for this, two great obstacles must be overcome, two great errors eradicated: exaggeration of the rights of individuality, and petty exclusivity in matters of theory .... We must not say: I; we must learn to say: we; ... Those who, following their individual susceptibilities, refuse the small sacrifice which organisation and discipline require, are denying, on account of the habits of the past, the all-embracing faith they preach ... exclusivity in point of theory is the negation of our basic dogma. Whoever says: I have found the political truth, and whoever makes acceptance of his system a condition of acceptance of fraternal association, is denying the people, the only progressive interpreter of the world-law, solely in order to assert his own self. Whoever claims in these days to have discovered by the isolated application of his intellect, however powerful it may be, the ultimate solution to the problems which agitate the masses, is condemning himself to error by incompleteness, because he is leaving untapped one of the eternal springs of truth, the collective intuition of the people immersed in action. The ultimate solution is the secret of victory .... Our systems can for the most part be no more than the dissection of corpses, a discovery of evil, an analysis of death, powerless to apprehend or comprehend life. Life is the people in motion, it is the instinct of the masses, raised to an uncommon power by mutual contact, by the prophetic feeling of great things which are to be accomplished, by involuntary, sudden, electric association in the streets; it is action, exciting to the highest point all capacities for hope, self-sacrifice, love and enthusiasm which are now dormant and which reveal man in the unity of his nature, in the full power of his procreative potential. The hand-clasp of a worker in one of these historic moments which inaugurate an epoch will teach us more about the organisation of the future than could be taught today by the cold and unfeeling travail of the intellect or knowledge of the dead magnificence of the last two millennia—the old society."
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\(^a\) "Aux Peuples! Organisation de la démocratie", July 22, 1850, *Le Proscrit* No. 2, August 6, 1850.—Ed.
All this pompous nonsense thus amounts in the end to the most ordinary philistine view that the revolution failed because of the ambition and jealousy of the individual leaders and the mutually hostile views of the various popular educators.

The struggles of the various classes and factions of the classes against each other, whose progress through their individual stages of development actually constitutes the revolution, are in the view of our evangelists only the unfortunate consequences of the existence of divergent systems, whilst in reality the reverse is true, the existence of various systems is the consequence of the existence of the class struggles. This itself shows that the authors of the manifesto deny the existence of the class struggles. Under the pretext of combating dogmatists, they do away with all specific content, every specific party point of view, and forbid the individual classes to formulate their interests and demands vis-à-vis the other classes. They expect them to forget their conflicting interests and to become reconciled under the flag of a vagueness as shallow as it is unblushing which only conceals beneath the apparent reconciliation of all party interests the domination of the interest of one party—the bourgeois party. After the experiences which these gentlemen must have acquired in France, Germany and Italy in the last two years, one cannot even say that the hypocrisy with which the bourgeois interest is here wrapped up in Lamartinesque clichés of fraternity is unconscious. The extent of these gentlemen's acquaintance with the "systems" incidentally emerges even from the fact that they imagine each of these systems is merely a fragment of the wisdom put together in the manifesto and has one-sidedly taken as its basis just a single one of the clichés liberty, equality, etc., which are here collected. Their ideas of social organisations are most strikingly expressed: a mass gathering in the streets, a riot, a hand-clasp, and it's all over. In their view indeed revolution consists merely in the overthrow of the existing government; once this aim has been achieved "the victory" has been won. Movement, development and struggle then cease, and under the aegis of the European Central Committee that would then be in control, there begins the golden age of the European republic and somnolence proclaimed for evermore. These gentlemen also abhor thinking, unfeeling thinking, just as they do development and struggle—as though any thinker, Hegel and Ricardo not excepted, had ever attained the degree of unfeelingness with which this sentimental drivel is poured over the heads of the public! The people shall have no thought for the morrow and must strike all ideas from its mind; come the great day of decision, and it will be electrified by mere contact, and the
riddle of the future will be solved by a miracle. This appeal to mindlessness is a direct attempt at duping precisely the most oppressed classes of the people.

"Are we thereby saying" (asks one member of the European Central Committee of another) "that we should march onward without a flag, are we saying that we intend to inscribe a mere negation on our banner? No such suspicion can fall on us. Being men of the people, long involved in its struggles, we have no intention of leading it into vacancy."

In order to demonstrate on the contrary their plenitude, these gentlemen parade before us a positively Leporellian register of eternal truth and the achievements of the whole of past history as the present common ground of "democracy". This register is summarised in the following edifying paternoster:

"We believe in the progressive development of human ability and powers towards the moral law which has been imposed on us. We believe in association as the only regular means which can attain this end. We believe that the interpretation of the moral law and of the rule of progress can be entrusted neither to a caste nor to an individual, but to the people, enlightened by national education and led by those from its midst whom virtue and genius show to it to be the best. We believe in the sanctity of both individuality and society, which may neither exclude nor conflict with each other, but harmonise for the betterment of all by all. We believe in liberty, without which there can be no human responsibility, in equality, without which liberty is only a shame, in fraternity, without which liberty and equality would be means without an end, in association, without which fraternity would only be an unrealisable programme, in family, community and state and fatherland as being a progression of as many spheres in which man must successively grow up in the recognition and practice of liberty, equality, fraternity and association. We believe in the sanctity of labour, in property which arises from it as its mark and fruit, in the duty of society to provide the element of material labour through credit and of intellectual and moral labour through education.... To sum up, we believe in a social condition which has God and His law as its highest point and the people as its base...."  

Thus: progress—association—moral law—liberty—equality—fraternity—association—family, community, state—sanctity of property—credit—education—God and the people—Dio e Popolo. These clichés figure in all the manifestos of the 1848 revolutions, from the French to the Wallachian, and for that very reason they figure here too [as] the common foundations of the new revolution. Nor did any of these revolutions dispense with the sanctity of property, which is here sanctified as the result of labour. To just what an extent all bourgeois property is "the fruit and mark of labour" Adam Smith already knew far better than our revolutionary initiators eighty years after him. Concerning the socialist concession
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that society shall through credit provide everyone with the material for his work, every manufacturer is accustomed to giving his worker credit for as much material as he can make up in one week, the credit system is as widespread nowadays as is compatible with the inviolability of property, and finally credit itself is only a form of bourgeois property.

The gist of this gospel is a social condition in which God represents the highest point and the people, or, as it is put later, humanity, the base. In other words, they believe in present society, in which as we all know God represents the highest point and the mob the base. If Mazzini's motto, God and the people, Dio e Popolo, may have meaning in Italy, where God is set against the Pope and the people against the princes, it is going rather far to present this plagiarism by Johannes Ronge, the shallowest scum of the German so-called enlightenment, as the dictum which is to solve the riddle of the century. Just how easily one becomes accustomed in this school of thinking, incidentally, to the little sacrifices which organisation and discipline require, just how obligingly one gives up petty exclusivity in matters of theory, is demonstrated by our Arnold Winkelried Ruge, who on this occasion, to Leo's great delight, is prepared to pay proper tribute to the distinction between divinity and humanity.382

The manifesto ends with the words:

"It is a question of the constitution of European democracy, the establishment of a budget, a treasury of the people. It is a question of the organisation of the army of initiators."

Ruge, setting out to be the first initiator of this people's budget, has turned to "de demokratische Jantjes van Amsterdam" and explained to them their special vocation for paying out money. Holland beware!

London, November 1, 1850

First published in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue No. 5-6, 1850

Printed according to the journal

Published in English in full for the first time
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a Nickname for the Dutch (from: Jan).—Ed.
1) The Society\(^a\) has been totally changed in character by the emigration, caused by the political situation, of members who were for financial reasons readily accepted by Messrs. Schapper and Willich, and by honorary members accepted with the right to vote, who pay no contributions at all. The payment of moneys to the Society would only lead to their being used for purposes entirely contrary to the original intention.

2) We have taken over the moneys as Trustees of the Society. The position of trustees is laid down in English law. A trustee can use the money at his discretion provided he is able to pay it after the customary notice.

3) Concerning the present use of the moneys, Citizens Schapper and Willich, who now for private considerations insist on the repayment of the moneys, know very well that at all times the Society has been backed, without the prior knowledge of most members, by a secret committee with unlimited powers to dispose of the Society's funds. Herr Schapper knows this the better as he has more than once received money from the Society for personal purposes through the medium of the committee.

4) The money was nevertheless offered to the Society by us and as the Society, after seemingly accepting our proposals, suddenly took us to court—without success—we have deposited the money with a London citizen\(^b\) in whose hands it will remain until the Society offers adequate guarantees for its use in accordance with the original intention.
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\(^a\) The German Workers' Educational Society in London.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) Probably with W. P. Roberts.—*Ed.*
5) Concerning the refusal to put things in writing, such writing would have no validity in law. Even a written declaration would not bind the signatories legally vis-à-vis a moral person. Such a written declaration would have no other purpose than to be put to a use contrary to contract.

The undersigned are workers and not used to live by exploiting the Society, like Herr Schapper, or by using the refugee fund like Herr von Willich.

Written at the end of 1850

Printed according to the manuscript in Engels' hand
Published in English for the first time
In an article from London dated January 13 the *Bremer Tages-Chronik* of January 17 this year has imported a whole cargo of badly-written stupidities, of fabricated and misunderstood gossip, of clumsy insinuations and moral posturing against the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* and against the undersigned.

"Prominent and decided men"\(^a\) of the calibre of this London correspondent have from time immemorial responded to superior criticism in the manner of apes. They bombard their enemy with their own excrement. *Chacun selon ses facultés*.\(^b\)

We let this "decided and prominent" man off with his nicely fabricated little stories about the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. In answer to his well-meaning insinuations on our resignation from the Great Windmill Society\(^c\) we declare:

Neither before nor after their resignation from this Society have Engels and Marx ever had the slightest connection with the management of its funds. They took part in the management of the refugee fund, and resigned only after their administration up to that point had been audited and found correct.\(^d\) That the resignation occurred to avoid the payment of a monthly contribution of ninepence—this is the notion of a Reichs-Stüber\(^e\) which has been thrown out of circulation! And for this purpose one of them is said to have moved to Manchester and the other to have wished to travel

---

\(^a\) Quoted from Ruge's article.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) Each according to his capabilities.—*Ed.*

\(^c\) German Workers' Educational Society in London.—*Ed.*

\(^d\) See this volume, p. 632.—*Ed.*

\(^e\) Small coin of the Lower Rhine, in circulation until 1824.—*Ed.*
overseas. What pure pearls rest in the depths of morally incensed souls!

The *real motives* for our resignation from the Society and for our parting with its leaders are known to our party comrades in Germany. They are approved and shared by them, they do not concern the general public. Under existing German conditions a more skilful *agent provocateur* would not have given us cause for further explanations, much less the bearishly⁴ clumsy one of the *Bremer Tages-Chronik*.

It suffices in conclusion to indicate that the man besmirching the *Bremer Tages-Chronik* from London with his own guano is none other than that Pomeranian thinker to whom the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* has constantly returned with a kind of artistic preference, whom we have characterised elsewhere on the basis of his writings as “the gutter into which all the rhetorical refuse and all the contradictions of German democracy flow together”, in a word, that the fellow in Bremen is no less a person than “Arnold Winkelried Ruge”, the fifth wheel on the carriage of state of European central democracy.³⁸⁵

Now one can understand the depravity of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*.

London, January 27, 1851

*Karl Marx, Frederick Engels*

---

³⁸⁵ Allusion to Arnold Ruge, who was represented as a trained bear in Heinrich Heine’s *"Atta Troll".*— *Ed.*
Some wretched deceivers of the people, the so-called Central Committee of European Social-Democrats, in truth a committee of the European central mob, presided over by Messrs. Willich, Schapper, etc., celebrated in London the anniversary of the February Revolution. Louis Blanc, representative of sentimental phrase-socialism, joined this clique of second-rate pretenders in an intrigue against another traitor to the people, Ledru-Rollin. At their banquet they read out various addresses supposedly received by them. All their efforts notwithstanding, they had not succeeded in wheedling a single address from Germany. A propitious sign of the development of the German proletariat!

They wrote also to Blanqui, the noble martyr of revolutionary communism, requesting an address. He replied with the following toast:

**WARNING TO THE PEOPLE**

What is the pitfall that menaces tomorrow's revolution? The same which caused the downfall of yesterday's, the deplorable popularity of bourgeois disguised as champions of the people.

Ledru-Rollin, Louis Blanc, Crémieux, Marie, Lamartine, Garnier-Pagès, Dupont (de l'Eure), Flocon, Albert, Arago, Marrast!

An ominous list! Sinister names written in letters of blood on all the streets of democratic Europe.

The Provisional Government has killed the Revolution! On its head rests the responsibility for all the disasters, for the blood of so many thousands of victims!
Reaction only did its job when it strangled democracy. The crime lies with the traitors whom the trusting people accepted as leaders and who delivered the people up to reaction.

Miserable government! In spite of all the entreaties and cries of anguish it hurls at the peasants the 45-centime tax and drives them to desperation and insurrection.

It kept in being the royalist general staffs, the royalist magistrates, and the royalist law. Treason!

It fell on the workers of Paris on April 16, it imprisoned those of Limoges, fired on those of Rouen on the 27th; it let loose all its hounds, it tracked down all true republicans. Treason! Treason!

It, and it alone, bears the terrible responsibility for all the calamities which have almost annihilated the 1848 Revolution!

Ah, they are very guilty men, but the guiltiest of all are those in whom the people, deceived by their fine phrases, saw its sword and shield; those whom it enthusiastically proclaimed the arbiters of its future.

Woe betide if on the day of the approaching triumph of the people the forgetful indulgence of the masses were to allow to regain power a single one of the men who have forfeited their mandate! That would be the end of the revolution for the second time!

May the workers always keep in mind this list of cursed names, and if a single one, yes, a single one were ever to appear again in a revolutionary government, let them all cry with one voice: Treason!

Speeches, sermons, programmes would again be nothing but lies and deceit; the same conjurers would only come back to produce the same tricks from the same bag; they would form the first link in a new chain of more ferocious reaction. Curse and vengeance upon them, should they ever dare to appear again! Shame and pity on the simple masses who would be caught in their nets again!

But it is not enough that the conjurers of February are for ever banned from the Hôtel de Ville; one must insure against new traitors.

Rulers would be traitors if, raised to power on the workers' shoulders, they did not at once put in practice:

1) the general disarming of the bourgeois guards;
2) the arming and military organisation of all the workers.

No doubt there are many other indispensable measures, but they naturally flow from this first act which is the preliminary guarantee, the sole pledge of security for the people.

Not a single weapon must remain in the hands of the bourgeoisie. Without that there is no salvation!

The various doctrines which today vie for the sympathy of the masses may well one day be able to keep their promises of improvements and well-being, but only on condition that they do not abandon the prize for the shadow.

They would lead to nothing but a miserable miscarriage if the people, exclusively preoccupied with theories, were to neglect the only practical element of security: force.

Arms and organisation are the decisive ingredients of progress, and the only serious means of putting an end to misery!

He who has arms has bread. One falls on one's knees before bayonets; unarmed crowds are swept away like chaff. France bristling with workers in arms, that is the coming of socialism.

In the face of armed proletarians all obstacles, all resistance, all impossibilities will disappear.

But proletarians who let themselves be amused by ridiculous promenades on the
streets, by the planting of "trees of liberty", by the ringing phrases of lawyers, must
epect holy water to begin with, injuries to follow, eventually bullets, and always
misery.

Let the people choose!

Prison of Belle-Île-en-Mer
February 10, 1851

First published as a leaflet:
Trinkspruch gesandt durch den Bürger
L. A. Blanqui an die Kommission
der Flüchtlinge zu London
für die Jahresfeier des 24. Februar 1851.
Veröffentlicht durch die Freunde
der Gleichheit, Bern, 1851
(real place of publication: Cologne)

Printed according to the leaflet

The introduction is published
in English for the first time
Sir,

In your paper of to-day, I find a letter from M. Louis Blanc, referring to the Banquet des Egaux, held in London on the 24th of February, and to a certain toast sent thither by M. Blanqui, the prisoner in Belle-Île-en-mer. Allow me to make a few observations upon this letter.

At the banquet the name of Blanqui was inscribed in large characters on the wall, amongst the names of other heroes and martyrs of democracy. At that same meeting, a toast was brought forward to "the martyrs to calumny": to Marat, Robespierre... and—Blanqui! All the toasts and speeches brought forward on this occasion, had to be submitted to the committee of the organisers of that beautiful and imposing manifestation as early as the 15th of February. M. Blanc was a member of that committee, he must, therefore, have approved beforehand of this toast to M. Blanqui. How can M. Blanc now make M. Blanqui again "a martyr to calumny" by calling him

"one of those unhappy beings, who in their rage attempt violence against renown, and who would lose the best of causes if it were possible to lose them"?

M. Blanc states the toast not to be sent by the prisoners of Belle Île, but to be the exclusive work of M. Blanqui. Of course, M. Blanqui is to be presumed the author of toasts and documents put forward under his name. But the toast in question, as is well known in France, was adopted and published by the Société des amis de

---

a The Times No. 20741, March 5, 1851.—Ed.
l'Egalité which society comprises those prisoners of Belle Île, who hold with M. Blanqui; for this gentleman has his friends amongst the prisoners quite as well as M. Barbès, the protector of M. Louis Blanc.

As to the “imposing and beautiful manifestation” and the “union of more than a thousand individuals belonging to different nations”, it should not be forgotten that this touching scene was, as far as M. Blanc was concerned, nothing but a “fraternal” demonstration against M. Ledru-Rollin, in order to take vengeance—as he, M. Blanc, has publicly stated—for having been excluded from the Central European Democratic Committee of Messrs. Ledru-Rollin, Mazzini and others.

As respects the “renown” of M. Louis Blanc, it would be more prudent for him not to touch upon that delicate subject, until this “renown” had recovered from the terrible blows which M. Proudhon, some time ago, inflicted upon it.388

M. Blanc, it seems, would shelter himself from the attacks of M. Blanqui by blazoning forth his capacity of exile and proscribed. And are not the sons of Louis Philippe exiles too? And has M. Blanc restrained the violence of his attack against that same M. Proudhon, who was, not an exile living comfortably at 87 Piccadilly—an abode certainly far from being fit for Ovidian Tristia to be written in, but who was a prisoner in the hands of the law?389

M. Blanc seems to reproach M. Blanqui with having given publicity to his toast in “counter-revolutionary journals”. M. Blanc knows well enough that since May 1850 a “revolutionary” press exists no longer in France. And pray, M. Louis Blanc, you who address yourself with all your “civilities” to the Editor of The Times, since when is The Times, in your eyes, a democratic, socialist and revolutionary paper?

In order, however, to enable the public to judge of that extraordinary document which so excites the indignation of M. Blanc, and which even now forms the general theme of the French press, I submit to you a translation in full and hope that it will be not without interest to the English public.

I am, Sir, your most ob-t servant

Veritas

Written on March 5, 1851


Reprinted from Engels’ rough draft

Published in English for the first time
Frederick Engels

[CONDITIONS AND PROSPECTS OF A WAR OF THE HOLY ALLIANCE AGAINST FRANCE IN 1852] 990

I take it for granted that any victorious Parisian revolution in 1852 will immediately result in a war of the Holy Alliance against France. This war will be quite different from that of 1792-94, and the events which occurred at that time can in no way serve as a parallel.

I

The miracles of the Convention in the military defeat of the Coalition are much diminished on closer examination, and Napoleon's contempt for the fourteen armies of the Convention is comprehensible and in many respects even justified; Napoleon used to say that the chief part was played by the blunders of the Coalition, which is quite correct, and even when on St. Helena he still regarded Carnot as a mediocrity.

In August 1792, 90,000 Prussians and Austrians swooped down on France. The King of Prussia a wanted to march directly on Paris, but Brunswick and the Austrian generals did not want to. There was no unity of command; sometimes hesitation, sometimes rapid advance, plans always being changed. After the Allies had passed through the Argonne defiles, they were opposed by Dumouriez at Valmy and St. Menehould. They could have bypassed him and left him where he was; he would have had to follow them to Paris, and with any moderately sensible procedure he would not have been a danger to them even in the rear. But they could also have acted more safely and defeated him in battle, which was not difficult since they had more and better troops, as the French themselves admit. Instead

a Frederick William II.—Ed.
they unleashed the ridiculous cannonade of Valmy, where during the battle, indeed even during the attack by the columns, more than once the generals jumped from a more audacious to a more hesitant attitude. The two attacks themselves were pitiful as regards mass, vigour and spirit. It was not the soldiers who were to blame, but the vacillations in the command; the attacks were hardly worthy of the name, they were at most demonstrations. A resolute advance along the whole line would certainly have overthrown the French volunteers and the demoralised regiments. After the battle, the Allies again remained where they were without knowing what to do, until the soldiers became ill.

In the Jemappes campaign, Dumouriez triumphed because he at first half instinctively counterposed a mass concentration of forces to the Austrian system of cordons and endlessly long fronts (from Ostende to the Maas). In the following spring, however, he committed the same mistake—owing to his whim of wanting to conquer Holland; the Austrians, on the other hand, advanced in concentrated formation; the result was the battle of Neerwinden and the loss of Belgium. At Neerwinden, and particularly also in the smaller engagements of this campaign, it was seen that when the French volunteers, these much vaunted heroes, were not constantly under the eye of Dumouriez they did not fight better than the South German “people’s militia” of 1849.

Then, in addition, Dumouriez defected, Vendée revolted, the army was split and discouraged, and if the 130,000 Austrians and British had marched determinedly on Paris, the revolution would have been bankrupt and Paris conquered—exactly as in the previous year, if such stupidities had not taken place. Instead, these gentlemen laid siege to the fortresses and set about achieving the most minute advantages en détail, one after the other, with the greatest expenditure of strategic pedantry, and frittered away six whole months.

The French army, which still held together after Lafayette’s defection, can be estimated at 120,000 men, and the volunteers of 1792 at 60,000. In March 1793, 300,000 men were conscripted. In August therefore, when the levée en masse was decreed, the French army must have been at least 300,000-350,000 strong. The levée en masse raised it by about 700,000. Taking into account all deductions, in the beginning of 1794 the French put about 750,000 men in the field against the Coalition, considerably more than the Coalition put against France.

---

a This word is in English in the original.—Ed.
From April 1793 until October, the French were beaten everywhere, only the blows had no decisive effect thanks to the Coalition's systematic delays. From October onwards there were alternating successes. In winter the campaign was suspended, in the spring of 1794 the levées en masse came into the line of battle with full effect; the result was victories in all areas in May, until finally in June the victory of Fleurus decided the fate of the revolution.\(^{396}\)

Therefore the Convention, and the Ministry of August 10 before it, had time enough for arming. From August 10, 1792, to March 1793 nothing happened—the volunteers hardly count. In March 1793, the 300,000 men were conscripted—from then until the following March the Convention had plenty of time and freedom for arming, a whole year, during ten months of which the revolutionary party was freed from all obstacles by the overthrow of the Girondists. And in a country of 25 million, which had the normal proportion of the population capable of bearing arms, when a whole year was available, it did not require a miracle to mobilise a million soldiers, 750,000 being active combatants (3 per cent of the population), against a foreign foe, however much of a novelty it was at that time.

With the exception of the Vendée, I consider the internal revolts of no account from the military point of view. Except Lyons and Toulon, they were quelled within six weeks without a blow being struck. Lyons was captured by the levées en masse, Toulon owing to Napoleon's striking incursion by means of a resolute storm and because of the mistakes of the defenders.

The 750,000 men who were led against the Coalition in 1794 included at least 100,000 old soldiers from the time of the monarchy and 150,000 other soldiers, derived partly from the volunteers and partly from the levée of 300,000, who had become accustomed to war in the continual fighting for eighteen or twelve months respectively. In addition, at least half of the 500,000 new recruits had already taken part in the fighting during September, October and November of 1793, and the youngest of them must have been at least three months in the battalions when they were led against the enemy. In his Spanish campaign, Napoleon estimated at 3-4 weeks the time required for training: the école de bataillon.\(^a\) Not counting the subalterns and staff officers, who at that time were on the average certainly better among the Coalition forces, the French army of

1794, thanks to the time allowed it for organisation, and thanks to the Allies' eternally inconclusive system of combat—a system which demoralises a well-tried, particularly aggressive army, and which disciplines that of the enemy, if it is a young army and on the defensive, and makes it accustomed to war—the French army of 1794 was therefore no raw, noisy, enthusiastic band of volunteers ready “to die for the Republic”, but a very fair army, certainly a match for the enemy. In 1794, the French generals were in any case much superior, although they made blunders enough; but the guillotine ensured unity of command and harmonious operations where the representatives [of the Convention] did not commit stupidities on their own account, which only exceptionally occurred. 

_Le noble Saint-Just en fit plusieurs._

Marginal notes on mass tactics:

1. The first crude notion of them arose from the successful manoeuvre at Jemappes, which was the result of instinct rather than military calculation. It arose from the chaotic state of the French army, which needed numerical superiority in order to have any degree of military self-confidence; mass had to take the place of discipline. Carnot's share in this discovery is not at all clear.

2. These mass tactics remained in the crudest of states and in 1794 at Tourcoing and Fleurus, for example, were not applied at all (the French, and Carnot himself, committed the most flagrant blunders), until finally Napoleon in 1796 by the six days' Piedmont campaign and the actual annihilation _en détail_ of a superior force showed people the goal towards which they were moving without having previously had any clear idea of it.

3. As regards Carnot himself, he is a fellow about whom I am increasingly suspicious. Of course, I cannot make a definitive judgment, I do not have his dispatches to the generals. But from what is available his chief merit seems to have consisted in the boundless ignorance and incapacity of his predecessors Pache and Bouchotte, and in the total unfamiliarity with military matters of all the rest of the _Comité de salut public_. _Dans le royaume des aveugles, le borgne est roi._ Carnot, an old officer of the Engineers, who himself had been a representative [of the Convention] with the Northern Army, knew what a fortress or an army required in the way of material etc., and particularly what the French lacked. He had necessarily, too, a certain understanding of the way to mobilise the

---

_a_ Engels gives this phrase in English.—_Ed._

_b_ The noble Saint-Just committed several.—_Ed._

_c_ In the kingdom of the blind the one-eyed man is king.—_Ed._
military resources of a country like France, and since, in connection with a revolutionary *levée en masse*, where in any case there is considerable waste,\(^a\) a certain amount of squandering of resources does not matter as long as the main aim, the speedy mobilisation of these resources, is achieved, it follows that there is no need to ascribe to Carnot any great degree of genius to explain his results. What makes me doubtful *pour sa part*\(^b\) in the invention of mass warfare that is ascribed to him is, in particular, that his most far-reaching plans of 1793-94 were based on precisely the opposite mode of warfare; he *divided* the French armies instead of concentrating them, and he operated against the flanks of the enemy in such a way that the latter *himself* became *concentrated*. And then there is his later career, his display of knightly virtue under the Consulate, etc., his vaunted defence of Antwerp—the defence of a fortress is on the average the best post in which an officer who is mediocre, methodical but endowed with a certain tenacity can achieve distinction, and after all the siege of Antwerp in 1814 did not last three months, and finally his attempt to force the methods of 1793 on Napoleon in 1815 when confronted by the centralised 1,200,000 soldiers of the Coalition, and that under a totally altered system of warfare, and his philistinism in general; all that does not testify to Carnot's genius. And then, when has a decent fellow been known to have bluffed his way, as he did, through Thermidor, Fructidor, Brumaire,\(^998\) etc.

*Summa summarum.* The Convention was saved solely and exclusively because the Coalition was not centralised and therefore the Convention was given a full year in which to arm. It was saved, as old Fritz\(^c\) was saved in the Seven Years' War,\(^999\) and as Wellington was saved in Spain in 1809, although the French were quantitatively and qualitatively at least three times as strong as all their opponents together, and their colossal power was paralysed only because in Napoleon's absence the marshals played all kinds of dirty tricks on one another.

II

By now the Coalition has long ago got over the stupidities of 1793. It is splendidly centralised. It was centralised already in 1813. The Russian campaign of 1812 made Russia the centre of gravity of the entire Holy Alliance for a war on the Continent.

---

\(^a\) Engels uses the English "waste".—*Ed.*  
\(^b\) For his part.—*Ed.*  
\(^c\) Frederick II.—*Ed.*
Russian troops formed the main mass around which only later the Prussians, Austrians, etc., were grouped, and they continued to be the main mass all the way to Paris. Alexander was in fact the commander-in-chief of all the armies (that is to say, the Russian general staff behind Alexander). But since 1848 the Holy Alliance has been built on an even much more solid basis. The development of the counter-revolution in 1849-51 had reduced the Continent, apart from France, to the same position in relation to Russia as that of the Rhenish Federation and Italy in relation to Napoleon, one of pure vassalage. Nicholas, i.e. Paskevich, is the inevitable dictator of the Holy Alliance en cas de guerre just as Nesselrode is en temps de paix.

Furthermore, as far as the modern art of war is concerned, it has been completely developed by Napoleon. Until certain conditions come into effect, which we shall deal with below, there remains no other course than to imitate Napoleon as far as conditions allow. This modern art of war, however, is universally known. In Prussia it has been drilled into every second lieutenant already before his ensign's examination, insofar as it can be drilled in. As for the Austrians, they came to know their bad, specifically Austrian, generals in the Hungarian campaign and got rid of them—such as Windischgrätz, Welden, Götz and other old women. On the other hand—since we no longer have any Neue Rheinische Zeitung in which to write, we need no longer harbour any illusions—there are Radetzky's two campaigns in Italy, the first excellent, the second a masterly one. Who helped him in this connection is of no consequence, in any case the old fellow has bon sens enough to grasp the excellent ideas of other people. His defensive position in 1848 between the four fortresses of Peschiera, Mantua, Legnago and Verona, all four sides of the rectangle well protected, and his defence of this position until help arrived, in the midst of an insurgent country, would be a masterpiece if his ability to hold out had not been tremendously facilitated by the pitiful leadership, disunity and endless vacillation of the Italian generals, the intrigues of Charles Albert and the support of the reactionary aristocrats and clergy in the enemy camp. Nor should it be forgotten that he was sitting in the most fertile country in the world and had no worries over provisions for his army.

For the Austrians, however, the campaign of 1849 was unprecedented. The Piedmontese, instead of barring the road to Turin at Novara

---

a In case of war.—Ed.  
b In time of peace.—Ed.  
c Common sense.—Ed.
and Mortara (a line three miles long) with a concentrated mass of troops, which would have been the best course, or of advancing from there on Milan in two or three columns, took up positions from Sesto to Piacenza—a line of twenty miles—with 70,000 men, only 3,500 men per German mile, and involving 3 to 4 days' hard march from one wing to the other. A miserable concentric operation against Milan, for which they were everywhere too weak. Radetzky, seeing that the Italians were using the old Austrian system of 1792, operated against them exactly as Napoleon would have done. The Piedmontese line was cut into two pieces by the Po, a glaring blunder. Radetzky broke through the line close to the Po, separated the two southern from the three northern divisions by driving in between them a wedge of 60,000 men, swiftly attacked the three northern divisions (a concentration of scarcely 35,000 men) with his whole force, threw them back into the Alps, and separated the two corps of the Piedmontese army from each other and from Turin. This manoeuvre, which ended the campaign in three days, and was almost literally copied from that conducted by Napoleon in 1809 at Abensberg and Eggmühl, the most brilliant of all Napoleon's manoeuvres, proves at any rate that the Austrians are far from continuing to act in accordance with the old motto "always slowly forward". It was precisely speed that decided everything here. The treacherous acts of the aristocrats and Ramorino made things easier, especially owing to accurate information about the position and plans of the Italians, and also because of the meanness of the Savoy brigade at Novara, which did not fight but plundered. But from the military aspect, the pitiful disposition of the Piedmontese forces and Radetzky's manoeuvre fully suffice to explain the latter's success. Under all circumstances, these two facts were bound to have this result.

Finally, by the very nature of their army, the Russians are compelled to adopt a system of warfare which comes very close to the modern one. The main strength of their army consists of massed, semi-barbaric, and therefore clumsy, infantry, and a numerous force of semi-barbaric, light, irregular cavalry (Cossacks). In decisive encounters, in large-scale battles, the Russians have never operated with other than massed forces; Suvorov understood that already when storming Ismail and Ochakov. The mobility they lack is partly made up for by the irregular cavalry, which swarms around

---

\[a\] 7,420 metres; 1 German mile equals 4.87 English miles.—*Ed.*

\[b\] From the refrain to a German song popular during the liberation war of 1813.—*Ed.*
them on all sides and masks any movement of the army. But it is precisely this ponderous massive character of the Russian army that makes it pre-eminently suited to form the core and backbone, the pivot, of a coalition army, the operations of which are always bound to be slower than those of a national army. This role the Russians played with distinction in 1813 and 1814 and in those years hardly any battle plan occurs in which the massive Russian columns do not at once stand out from all others by their depth and density.

Since 1812 the French can hardly be regarded as the pre-eminent bearers of the Napoleonic tradition. This tradition has more or less passed to all the big European armies; in each of them, for the most part already in the last years of the Empire, it has resulted in a revolution; each of these armies in its strategy and tactics has adopted the Napoleonic system, insofar as this is in harmony with the character of the army. The levelling influence of the bourgeois epoch is also apparent here; the old national peculiarities are disappearing in the armies as well, and the French, Austrian and Prussian armies, and even to a great extent the British army, are more or less equally well-organised machines for carrying out Napoleonic manoeuvres. This does not prevent them from having very diverse qualities in regard to fighting, and so on. Of all the (big) European armies, however, only the Russian, semi-barbaric, army is capable of having its own tactics and strategy, for it alone is not yet ripe for the completely developed modern system of warfare.

As for the French, owing to the little war in Algeria⁴⁰⁴ they have interrupted even the continuity of the Napoleonic tradition of large-scale war. It remains to be seen whether in this predatory war the disadvantageous consequences for discipline are outweighed by the advantages of inuredness to war, whether the war accustoms men to hardship or breaks them by over-exertion; and finally, whether it does not also ruin the generals' coup d'œil⁴ in a large-scale war. In any case, the French cavalry is being ruined in Algeria, it is forgetting what constitutes its force, the compact choc⁵ and it is becoming accustomed to a system of harassment in which the Cossacks, Hungarians, and Poles will always remain superior to it. Among the generals, Oudinot made a fool of himself before Rome, and only Cavaignac distinguished himself in June—but all that still does not amount to any grandes épreuves.⁶

---

⁴ Sure-sightedness.— Ed.
⁵ Onslaught.— Ed.
⁶ Great tests.— Ed.
On the whole, therefore, the chances of superiority in strategy and tactics are at least as much in favour of the Coalition as in favour of the revolution.

III

But will not a new revolution which brings to power an entirely new class give rise, like the first one, to new means and ways of waging war, compared with which the present Napoleonic ones will appear just as obsolete and ineffective as those of the Seven Years' War compared with those of the first Revolution?

The modern warfare is the necessary product of the French Revolution. Its precondition is the social and political emancipation of the bourgeoisie and small peasants. The bourgeoisie provides the money, the small peasants supply the soldiers. The emancipation of both classes from feudal and guild fetters is required in order to provide the colossal armies of the present day; and the degree of wealth and education connected with this stage of social development is equally required in order to provide the material in the way of weapons, munitions, provisions, and so on, necessary for modern armies, and in order to provide the required number of trained officers and to give the soldier himself the required degree of intelligence.

I deal with the modern system of war as fully developed by Napoleon. Its two pivots are: the mass character of means of attack in men, horses and guns, and the mobility of these means of attack. Mobility is the essential consequence of massiveness. Modern armies cannot, like the small armies of the Seven Years' War, march to and fro for months on an area of twenty miles. They cannot bring in their train stores containing their total food requirements. They must swoop down on a region like a swarm of locusts, ravage all its food supplies within reach of the cavalry, and must depart when everything has been devoured. The stores are adequate if they suffice only for unforeseen contingencies; they are continually depleted and replenished; they have to follow the rapid march of the army and therefore seldom suffice to cover the needs of the army even for a single month. The modern system of war is, therefore, impossible for a long period in a poor, semi-barbaric, thinly populated country. Owing to this impossibility, the French perished slowly in Spain and rapidly in Russia. On the other hand, however, the Spaniards were also ruined owing to the French, their country was very largely sucked dry. Even in Poland the Russians cannot make use of their own clumsy system of mass warfare for a long
period, and in Russia itself they cannot make use of it at all as long as they have no railways. The defensive at the Dnieper and the Dvina would spell ruin for Russia.

But this degree of mobility requires also a certain degree of education of the soldier, who in many cases must know how to look after himself. The considerable extension of patrol and foraging expeditions, outpost duties, etc., the greater activity demanded of every soldier, the more frequent recurrence of cases in which the soldier has to act on his own and has to rely on his own intellectual resources, and, finally, the great importance of skirmish engagements in the fighting, the success of which depends on the intelligence, the coup d'œil and the energy of each individual soldier—all this presupposes a greater degree of education of the non-commissioned officer and rank-and-file soldier than was the case under old Fritz. A barbaric or semi-barbaric nation, however, is unable to offer a degree of education of the masses such that 500,000-600,000 men recruited at random could, on the one hand, become disciplined and trained to act like machines, and at the same time acquire or retain this coup d'œil for small-scale warfare. The barbarians, e.g. the Cossacks, are by nature gifted with this coup d'œil of the robber; but on the other hand, they are as much incapable of regular military duties as the Russian serf infantrymen, on the contrary, are proper skirmishing.

This universal average degree of education which the modern system of war requires in every soldier is to be found only in the most developed countries: in Britain, where the soldier, however raw a yokel he was, goes through the civilising school of the towns; in France, where the emancipated small peasants and the astute mob of the towns (remplaçants*) constitute the army; in North Germany, where feudalism likewise has either been destroyed or has assumed plus ou moinsbourgeois forms, and where the towns provide a considerable contingent for the army; finally, after the last wars, it seems to exist also in at least that part of the Austrian army which is recruited from the least feudal areas. Apart from Britain, small peasant farming is everywhere the basis of the army, and the army is the more fitted for the modern system of war the closer the position of the small peasant comes to that of the free owner.

But the mobility of the masses, as well as that of the individual soldier, presupposes the degree of civilisation of the bourgeois epoch. The sluggishness of the pre-revolutionary armies is closely
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*a Substitutes for those who have bought exemption from military service.—Ed.
*b More or less.—Ed.
bound up with feudalism. The mass of officers' conveyances was by itself a hindrance to all movement. The armies crawled along just as slowly as all movement. The rising bureaucracy of the absolute monarchies introduced rather more order into the management of army materials, but at the same time its alliance with *haute finance* led to organised fraud *en gros*, and where the bureaucracy was of some benefit to the armies it did them twice as much harm by infecting them with a spirit of schematism and pedantry. Witness the All-Highest old Fritz himself. Even now Russia is suffering from all these evils; the Russian army, which is everywhere cheated and fleeced, is starving, and on the march the men die like flies. Only a bourgeois state feeds its troops tolerably and therefore can count on the mobility of its army.

As regards mobility, therefore, this is in every respect a characteristic of the bourgeois armies. But mobility is not only the necessary complement to the mass character of the army, it often replaces it (Napoleon in Piedmont, 1796).

Mass character, however, is just as much a special characteristic of modern civilised armies as is mobility.

However diverse the methods of recruitment may be—conscription, the Prussian army reserve, the Swiss militia, the *levée en masse*—the experience of the last sixty years proves that under the regime of the bourgeoisie and free small peasants not more than 7 per cent of the population can be put under arms in any people's war; hence about 5 per cent can be actively utilised. Accordingly France in the autumn of 1793, with an estimated population of 25 million, could have mustered 1,750,000 soldiers and 1,250,000 active combatants. At that time, these 1,250,000 were more or less present at the frontiers, before Toulon, and in the Vendée, taking both sides into account here. In Prussia—with at present 16 million inhabitants—7 per cent and 5 per cent would amount to 1,120,000 and 800,000 men respectively. But the entire Prussian forces, regular army and army reserve, hardly amount to 600,000 men. This example shows how much even 5 per cent involves for a nation.

*Eh bien*—whereas France and Prussia can easily call under arms 5 per cent of their population, and in case of need even 7 per cent, Austria in the most extreme case can call up at most 5 per cent, and Russia hardly 3 per cent. For Austria, 5 per cent would be 1,750,000, out of an estimated 35 million. In 1849, Austria strained itself to the utmost. It had about 550,000 men. The Hungarians, whose forces had been doubled as the result of the Kossuth notes, had perhaps
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*This word is in English in the original.—Ed.*
350,000. I calculate in addition 50,000 Lombards who had escaped conscription or were serving in the Piedmontese army—making a total of 950,000 men, consequently not even $2^{2/3}$ per cent of the population; at the same time the Croat borderers, who lived under exceptional conditions, furnished at least 15 per cent of their population. Russia, at a low estimate, has 72 million inhabitants; therefore at 5 per cent it should be able to raise 3,600,000 men. Instead of this, it has never been able to muster more than 1,500,000, including both regular and irregular troops, and in its own country it has been able to lead at most 1,000,000 of these against the enemy, i.e. its total force was never above $2^{1/12}$ per cent, and its active force never above $17^{1/18}$ or 1.39 per cent. The sparse population over an enormous area, the lack of communications and the small national production explain this easily enough.

Like mobility, the mass character of means of attack is necessarily the result of a higher stage of civilisation, and, in particular, the modern proportion of the armed mass to the total population is incompatible with any state of society inferior to that of the emancipated bourgeoisie.

Hence modern warfare presupposes the emancipation of the bourgeois and peasants; it is the military expression of this emancipation.

The emancipation of the proletariat, too, will have its particular military expression, it will give rise to a specific, new method of warfare. Cela est clair. It is even possible already to determine the kind of material basis this new warfare will have.

But just as the mere conquest of political power by the present ill-defined French and German proletariat, which partly forms the tail-end of other classes, is a long way from the real emancipation of the proletariat, which consists in the abolition of all class contradictions, so the initial warfare in the coming revolution is equally far removed from the warfare of the truly emancipated proletariat.

The real emancipation of the proletariat, the complete abolition of all class distinctions and the complete concentration of all the means of production, in Germany and France presupposes the co-operation of Britain and at least a doubling of the means of production now existing in Germany and France. But precisely that is the pre-condition also for a new form of warfare.

Napoleon's magnificent discoveries in the science of war cannot be wiped out by a miracle. The new science of war must be just as much a necessary product of the new social relations as the science of war created by the revolution and Napoleon was the necessary result of
the new relations brought about by the revolution. But just as in the proletarian revolution the question for industry is not one of abolishing steam machines but of multiplying them, so for warfare it is a question not of diminishing but of intensifying the mass character and mobility of armies.

Increased productive forces were the precondition for the Napoleonic warfare; new productive forces must likewise be the precondition for every new perfection in warfare. The railways and the electric telegraph will already today provide a talented general or Minister of War with an occasion for quite new combinations in a European war. The gradual increase of the productive forces, and of the population along with them, has likewise provided the opportunity for greater accumulation of masses. In France, with 36 instead of 25 million inhabitants, 5 per cent yields now not 1,250,000 but 1,800,000 men. In both cases the power of the civilised countries has increased compared with that of the barbaric countries. The former alone have large railway networks and their population has grown twice as fast as that of Russia, for example.

All these calculations prove, incidentally, that a lasting subjection of Western Europe to Russia is quite impossible and becomes more impossible every day.

The power of the new kind of warfare that will result from the abolition of classes cannot, however, lie in the fact that with the growth of the population the available 5 per cent constitute ever more considerable masses. It must lie in the fact that it will become possible to call under arms not 5 per cent or 7 per cent of the population, but 12-16 per cent, i.e. half or two-thirds of the male adults—healthy persons of from 18 to 30, or eventually 40 years of age. But just as Russia cannot increase its available force from 2-3 per cent to 5 per cent without a complete revolution of its entire internal social and political organisation, and, above all, of its production, so Germany and France cannot raise their available force from 5 per cent to 12 per cent without revolutionising their production and more than doubling it. Only if, by means of machinery, etc., the labour of each individual on the average becomes worth twice as much as at present, can the number of those who can be spared from production be doubled—even for a short time, for no country has ever kept the 5 per cent afoot for a long time.

If the necessary conditions for it are fulfilled, if national production has been sufficiently increased and centralised, if classes have been abolished, which is absolutely essential—owing to his social, aristocratic position, the Prussian one-year volunteer, as long as he is not an N. C. O. or officer of the army reserve, will never
be a useful soldier alongside the peasants and workers—then the only restriction to the actual levy is the number of the population capable of bearing arms, that is to say, in an extreme emergency for a short time 15-20 per cent of the population can be armed and 12-15 per cent actually led against the enemy. These enormous masses, however, presuppose a degree of mobility quite different even from that of the present-day armies. Without a complete railway network, they can be neither concentrated nor fed, nor can they be kept supplied with munitions, or able to move. And without the electric telegraph it is quite impossible to direct them; and since in the case of such masses it is impossible for the strategist and the tactician (who is in command on the battlefield) to be one and the same person, division of labour comes into effect here. Strategic operations, the co-operation of the various corps, have to be directed from the central point of the telegraph lines; tactical operations have to be directed by the individual generals. It is clear that under these conditions, wars can and must be decided in a much shorter time than they were even by Napoleon. The expense factor requires it, the necessary decisive effect of each blow with such masses makes it inevitable.

In mass and strategic mobility, therefore, these armies must be quite unprecedentedly formidable. With such soldiers, tactical mobility (in patrolling, skirmishing, and on the battlefield) must likewise be considerably greater, they are more robust, agile and intelligent than anything that present-day society can offer.

Unfortunately, however, all this can be put into effect only after a long period of years and at a time when, owing to lack of an adequate enemy, such wars on a mass scale can no longer occur. The primary conditions for all this do not exist in the first period of the proletarian revolution, least of all in the year 1852.

The proletariat in France at present is certainly barely double the percentage of the population that it was in 1789. At that time—at least between 1792 and 1794—the proletariat was in such a state of ferment and tension as will only recur in the near future. At that time it already became evident that in revolutionary wars with violent internal convulsions the mass of the proletariat is needed for use within the country. The same thing will now be the case once again and probably more so than ever, since the chances of the immediate outbreak of civil wars increase as the Allies advance. Hence the proletariat will be able to send only a small contingent to the active army; the main source of the levy remains the mob and the peasants. That is to say, the revolution will have to wage war with the means and by the methods of the general modern warfare.
Only an ideological theorist could ask whether it would not be possible with these means, i.e. with an active army of 4-5 per cent of the population, to devise new combinations and discover new surprising methods of application. Just as it is impossible to increase the output of the loom fourfold without replacing the motive power, hand labour, by steam, without discovering a new means of production that has little in common with the old hand loom, so it is impossible in the art of war to produce new results by the old means. Only the production of new, more powerful means makes it possible to achieve new, more magnificent results. Every great general who marks an epoch in the history of war owing to new combinations, either himself invents new material means or first discovers the correct use of new material means invented before him. Between Turenne and the old Fritz lies the revolution in the use of infantry, the supersession of the pike and matchlock by the bayonet and flintlock—and old Fritz’s epoch-making achievement in the science of war lies in the fact that in general, within the limits of the warfare of that time, he transformed and developed the old tactics in conformity with the new instruments. Just as Napoleon’s epoch-making achievement lies in the fact that he found the sole correct tactical and strategic application for the more colossal army masses made possible by the revolution, and moreover developed this application so completely that on the whole modern generals, far from being able to go further than he did, in their most brilliant and cleverest operations only try to copy him.

*Summa summarum,* the revolution will have to fight with modern means of war and the modern art of war against modern means of war and the modern art of war. The chances of military talent are at least as great for the Coalition as they are for France: *Ce seront alors les gros bataillons qui l’emporteront.*

IV

Let us now see what battalions can be broug’it into the battle line, and how they can be used.

1. Russia. The Russian army on a peace footing consists nominally of 1,100,000 men; in reality about 750,000. Since 1848 the government has continually worked to attain a force of 1,500,000 men on a war footing, and Nicholas and Paskevich have themselves carried out a revision as far as possible throughout. At a low estimate, therefore, Russia has now actually attained its full peace time
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*Then the big battalions will win.—Ed.*
effective of 1,100,000 men. From this must be deducted, on a high estimate:

For the Caucasus ............................................................... 100,000 men
" Russia proper ............................................................... 150,000 "
" the Polish provinces ..................................................... 150,000 "
" the sick, detached, etc. .................................................. 150,000 "

__550,000 men__.

There remain 550,000 men available for active service against external enemies. That is an estimate hardly greater than the number Russia actually sent across the frontiers in 1813.

2. **Prussia.** The splendid army, if the entire army reserve of the first and the second call-up, the supernumeraries, and everything are called up, amounts to a least 650,000 men. At the present moment, however, the government can mobilise at most 550,000 men. I put the figure at only 500,000. These need to detach only a little in excess of the second call-up (150,000 men) for garrisons, etc., since everywhere the gradual calling up of supernumeraries and of the new conscripts for next year—which Nicholas will already be taking steps to ensure—as well as the Russian troops continually on the march through the country, would form a sufficient reserve against any internal attempt at an uprising. Moreover, the Prussians have fewer sick, since they are concentrated in their own country and have a lesser distance to march to the Rhine than the Russians. Nevertheless, as in the case of the Russians, I deduct half, leaving available the other half, amounting to 250,000 men.

3. **Austria.** At a low estimate, Austria has under arms and on leave, the latter being as quickly available for the army as the Prussian army reserve, 600,000 men. Here, too, I deduct half, since for at least two-thirds of the monarchy, until the formation of new reserves, the advancing Russians serve as a reserve within the country and keep the hotbeds of insurrection in check. There remain 300,000 men available for use against the enemy.

4. **The German Confederation.** Since the gentlemen live close to the Rhine and the whole Coalition marches through their territory, they hardly require any garrison against the interior, all the less because with the first successes of the Coalition against France the reserve armies would take their stand right across Germany, from north to south. The German Confederation provides at least 120,000 men.

5. The forces of the Italian governments, the Danes, Belgians, Dutch, Swedes, etc., I put for the time being at 80,000 men.
Accordingly the total mass of the Coalition troops amounts to 1,300,000 men, who are either already under arms or can be immediately called up. All the estimates are intentionally put too low. The deductions for the sick alone are so considerable that merely from the convalescent, etc., two months after the beginning of operations a second army of 350,000 men can be formed at the French frontier. But as nowadays, no government is so imprudent as to begin a war without at the same time as it deploys the active army raising new levies, as strong as possible, and sending them in the wake of the first army, this second army should prove to be considerably stronger than the above figure.

The concentration of the first army (the 1,300,000 men) can be completed in about two months, as follows. That the Prussians and Austrians can have their above-mentioned contingents available within two months is no longer open to doubt after the arming carried out last November. As regards the Russians, their three definitive concentration points are, in the first place, Berlin, Breslau\(^a\) and Cracow or Vienna (see below). From St. Peters burg to Berlin is approximately 45 days' march, and from Berlin to the Rhine 16 days, making a total of 61 days' march, at 5 German miles per day. From Moscow to Breslau is 48 days' march, from Breslau to Mainz 20, together 68 days. Kiev to Vienna requires 40 days, Vienna to Basle 22, together 62 days. Add to this the rest-days, which in the case of the Russian troops and the above strenuous marches must on no account be omitted, it is clear that even the troops stationed in Moscow, St. Petersburg, and Kiev can comfortably reach the Rhine in three months, even supposing that the troops move exclusively on foot and that no use is made of railways or vehicles. But such means can be used in Germany almost everywhere, and in Russia and Poland at least partially, which would in total certainly shorten the transport of the troops by 15-20 days. The main mass of the Russian troops, however, are at present already concentrated in the Polish provinces, and as soon as the political conditions make a crisis probable, more troops will be sent there, so that the starting points of the line of march will not be St. Petersburg, Moscow and Kiev, but Riga, Vilna, Minsk, Dubno and Kamieniec, which means that the line of march will be shortened by about 60 miles—12 days' march plus 4 rest-days. Moreover, a large part of the infantry—especially that coming from the more remote stations—can be conveyed a distance of five miles on every third or rest-day at least, so that for this part of the infantry the rest-days will count as march-days. The railways

\(^{a}\) The Polish name is Wroclaw. — Ed.
would then be kept free for artillery material, munitions and stores, while the artillery gun-crews and servicing personnel would either march or be conveyed, and thus in any case would arrive earlier than in the way hitherto adopted.

In view of all the above, it seems to me that there is nothing to prevent the concentration of the Coalition army on the Rhine taking place two months after the outbreak of the revolution, as follows:

First army

1. First line on the Rhine and before Piedmont:
   Prussians, Austrians, etc. ...................... 750,000 men
   Russians ........................................ 300,000 men
   \[\text{Total} \quad \frac{1,050,000}{\text{men}}\]

2. Second line, reserve,
   10 days' march behind, Russians ............ \[250,000 \text{ men}\]
   \[\text{Total} \quad \frac{1,300,000}{\text{men}}\] (as above)

Second army

1. Reserve of the smaller Coalition members,
   Prussians, Austrians, etc., included in the concentration ..................... 200,000 men
   \[\text{Total} \quad \frac{350,000}{\text{men}}\]

2. Russian reserve on the march,
   20 days' march behind ......................... 150,000 men
   \[\text{Total of both armies} \quad \frac{1,650,000}{\text{men}}\]

Basically, under present conditions hardly 5-6 weeks are needed to bring 300,000 Russians to the Rhine, and in the same period Prussia, Austria and the smaller Allies can bring their contingents as above mentioned to the Rhine; but in order to take due account of the unforeseen obstacles which occur in every coalition, I assume a full two months. At the moment when Napoleon came from Elba, the disposition of the Allied troops in relation to a march towards France was hardly as favourable as the present one, yet the Russians were at the Rhine when Napoleon was fighting the British and Prussians at Waterloo.407

What resources has France to oppose to those of the Allies?

1. The troops of the line amount to about 450,000 men, 50,000 of whom cannot be spared from Algeria. From the remaining 400,000 must be deducted the sick, the minimum necessary to garrison fortresses, and smaller detachments for doubtful areas of the interior, leaving available at most 250,000 men.

2. The favourite means adopted by the present reds, viz. to recall to the colours soldiers who have served their time, can successfully be
applied by force to at most six age classes, i.e. from 27 to 32 years of age. Each age group on conscription amounts to 80,000 men. The ravages of the Algerian war and climate, the normal death-rate during twelve years, the deduction of those who have become unfit or have emigrated, and those who in one way or another have succeeded in evading re-enlistment at a time when in any case the administration gets into a state of disorder, will reduce the 480,000 former recruits of these six age classes to at most 300,000 re-enlisting. From these must be deducted 150,000 to garrison fortresses, who will be drawn mainly from this class of older, mostly married men, leaving 150,000 men. Given any degree of skilled direction, these could be mobilised without difficulty in two months.

3. The people's militia, volunteers, *levée en masse*, or whatever other term is used to denote this subordinate cannon-fodder. With the exception of about 10,000 of the *Garde Mobile* who can be assembled, none of the above are more acquainted with weapons than any member of the German civic militia. The French are quicker at learning to handle weapons, but two months is a very short time, and if Napoleon could ensure that his recruits passed through the battalion school in four weeks, he achieved that only with outstanding cadres, whereas the first result of the coming revolution will be the disorganisation of the cadres in the line. Moreover, our French revolutionaries are known to follow tradition and their first cry will be: *Levée en masse! Deux millions d'hommes aux frontières!* The two million men would be all very well if one could again expect from the Coalition such stupidities as those of 1792 and 1793 and if one had time for gradually training these two million men. But there is no question of that. One must be prepared to encounter a million active enemy soldiers on the frontier within two months, and it is a matter of opposing this million with a chance of success.

If the French comport themselves again as traditional imitators of 1793, they will be undertaking to repeat the experience with the two million, which means that they will undertake so much that the actual result in the short time available will come to nil. The training and organisation of 2,500,000 men in eight weeks without skilled cadres amounts in practice to a senseless squandering of all resources without strengthening the army by even a single usable battalion.

If, on the other hand, the French have a good Minister of War who has some knowledge of revolutionary warfare and the methods of
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*a Mass levy! Two million men to the frontiers! — Ed.*
creating an army rapidly, and if no stupid obstacles due to ignorance and a craze for popularity are put in the way, then he will keep within the limits of the possible and can do a great deal. The outcome will have to be something more or less in accordance with the following plan:

The armed forces consist, to begin with, of two components: 1. The proletarian guard in the towns, the peasant guard in the countryside, insofar as the latter can be relied upon for service in the interior; 2. the regular army against invasion.

Fortress duty is performed by the proletarian and peasant guard; the army provides only the most essential detachments. Paris, Strasbourgh, Lyons, Metz, Lille, Valenciennes, the most important fortresses, which are at the same time large towns, will require for their defence, besides their own guard and a few peasant detachments from the environs, only a few troops of the line. The proletarian guard available in the interior, insofar as they consist of unemployed workers, will be assembled in a training camp and trained by old officers and N.C.O.s who are unfit for service in the field, to fill gaps in the ranks of the active army. The camp could be situated near Orleans, where at the same time it would be a threat to the Legitimist areas.

The troops of the line, insofar as they are in France, must be tripled, being brought from 400,000 to 1,100,000 men. This is done as follows: each battalion is converted into a regiment—the unavoidable general promotion will be not less effective than the guillotine and courts martial in inspiring respect for the revolution among the officers and N.C.O.s. The unavoidable extension of cadres is at the same time carried out as gradually as possible and what can be gained as regards officers is gained. This is very important in view of the fact that it is impossible to produce officers by magic in two months. Moreover, so much national sentiment still prevails among the middle and lower grades of the French army that with a certain amount of promotion, energetic management of the war departments and some chance of success, these men at the start will turn out quite well, especially if a few examples are made of mutineers and deserters. The pupils of the military schools and the officials of the ponts-et-chaussées \(^a\) make excellent artillery and engineer officers, and after a few actions those talented men among the lower ranks, so frequent among the French, who are capable of leading a company once they have been under fire, will begin to develop.

\(^a\) Administration of roads and bridges.—Ed.
As regards the soldiers themselves, there will be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the line</td>
<td>400,000 men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those recalled to the army</td>
<td>300,000 men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those still to be called up and trained</td>
<td>500,000 men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,200,000 men</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deduct for the sick

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>there remain</td>
<td>1,100,000 men</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these are available for active service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the line</td>
<td>250,000 men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those recalled to the army</td>
<td>150,000 men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recruits</td>
<td>400,000 men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>800,000 men</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What can be achieved with these will be seen. But the training within two months of 400,000-500,000 men as recruits for the army of the line, men who will be fused with the already existing and recalled soldiers in the regiments and battalions, is not so excessively difficult if the work is taken in hand speedily, *le lendemain de la révolution*. All these reinforcements would accrue to the infantry and artillery; in two months it is certainly possible to train an infantryman, or an artilleryman capable at least of simple gun duties, but not a cavalryman. Hence the increase of the cavalry would be very weak.

The whole plan for developing the army presupposes that there will be a good Minister of War, who is able to assess the political conditions, possesses strategic, tactical and detailed knowledge of all weapons, has the appropriate degree of energy, speed and decisiveness, and is given a free hand by the asses who will rule along with him. But where has the "Red" party in France such a man? The odds are in favour of the opposite, that as usual an ignorant fellow, who is thought and thinks himself, of course, to be a *bon démocrate* competent to fill any part, will try to play the Carnot, decree mass levies, completely disorganise everything, and very soon be at his wit's end, whereupon he will leave everything to the routine of the old subordinate officials and allow the enemy armies to come
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*a* On the morrow of the revolution.—*Ed.*

*b* Engels uses the English word.—*Ed.*
right up to Paris. Nowadays, however, to be able to withstand a European coalition, one would have to be, not Pache or Bouchotte, or even Carnot, but Napoleon, or to have terribly stupid enemies and a terribly large measure of luck.

It should not be overlooked that all these calculations of the armed forces of the Coalition assume a minimum figure for the total force and a maximum figure for the deductions, so that with merely tolerably good leadership, the available mass of troops will be greater, and the time required for their concentration less than the estimates given here. In the case of France, on the other hand, the opposite assumptions have been made; the time available has been assumed as long as possible, the total force that can possibly be organised has been put very high, and the deductions low, and therefore the available mass of troops is estimated at the highest possible figure. In short, leaving out of account unforeseen events and great blunders on the part of the Allies, all these calculations present the most favourable case possible for the revolution.

In addition, it is assumed that the revolution and invasion will not immediately give rise to a civil war in the interior of the country. At present, sixty years after the last civil war in France, it is impossible to determine to what extent the fanaticism of the Legitimists is capable of a more than ephemeral insurrection; it is clear, however, that in proportion as the Allies advance, the chances of an uprising like that of 1793 in Lyons, Toulon, etc., of a temporary alliance of all politically overthrown classes and factions, will also increase. Here, too, however, let us assume the most favourable case for the revolution, namely, that the revolutionary proletarian and peasant guard is capable of successfully disarming the rebellious départements and classes.

We shall deal presently with the prospects which the revolution could be given by risings in Germany, Italy, etc.

V

We come now to the actual conduct of the war.

If one places one leg of a pair of compasses on the map on Paris and describes a circle round the city with the distance from Paris to Strasbourg as the radius, then in the south the circumference of this circle touches the French frontier between Grenoble and Chambéry at Pont de Beauvoisin, follows it in a northerly direction through Geneva, the Jura, Basle, Strasbourg and Hagenau, and then follows the course of the Rhine down to its estuary. If it is at a distance from
the Rhine at some points, this distance never exceeds the length of two days' march. If the Rhine were France's frontier, then from the point where the Alps cease to protect this frontier right up to the North Sea Paris would be at an equal distance from this frontier. The military system of France, with Paris at the centre, would have satisfied all the geographical conditions for it. This simple arc from Chambéry to Rotterdam, which reduces all points of France's only open frontier, and moreover of the frontier nearest to the capital, to an equal distance of about 70 German miles—14 days' march—from Paris, and at the same time protects the frontier by a broad river, this is the real military basis of the assertion that the Rhine is France's natural frontier.

The same peculiar configuration of its course, however, makes the Rhine also the starting point of all concentric operations against Paris, for in order that the various armies may arrive simultaneously in front of Paris and simultaneously threaten it from various sides, they must set out simultaneously from points equally distant from it. The operations of any counter-revolutionary coalition army against France must be concentric, however dangerous all concentric operations are in which the concentration point lies within the territory of the enemy or even forms the latter's basis of operations: 1. because with Paris the whole of France is conquered; 2. because no part of the frontier lying within the sphere of operations of French armies can be allowed to be exposed, as otherwise the French, by, sending armed forces, could provoke insurrections in the territory of the Coalition, in the rear of the latter's armies; 3. because the mass forces which any coalition is bound to hurl against France require multiple lines of operation for their food supply.

For both armies, the frontier which has to be covered runs from Chambéry to Rotterdam. For the time being, the Spanish frontier can be disregarded. The Italian frontier from Var to the Isère is protected by the Alps and goes farther and farther away from Paris since it forms the tangent to the above-mentioned circle. It can only come into consideration: 1. if the fortified defiles of the Savoy Alps, particularly of Mont Cenis, are in the hands of the French; 2. if it is desired to make a diversion on the coast, for which there would have to be special reasons; 3. if the French armies, after the frontier has been safeguarded at all other points, want to launch an offensive as Napoleon did in 1796. In all other cases it is too far away.

Active operations, therefore, both for the Coalition and for France, are restricted to the line from Chambéry or the Isère up to the North Sea, and to the region lying between this line and Paris. And precisely this part of France offers a terrain which is, as it were,
created for defence, and possesses a mountain and river system which from a military point of view could hardly be improved upon.

From the Rhône to the Moselle, the frontier is protected by a long mountain range which is crossed with difficulty and only at certain points—the Jura, adjoining which are the Vosges, which in turn have their prolongation in the Hochwald and Idarwald. Both mountain ranges run parallel to the frontier and, in addition, the Vosges are protected by the Rhine. Between the Moselle and the Maas, the route to Paris is covered by the Ardennes, and on the other side of the Maas by the Argonnes. Only the region from the Sambre to the sea lies open, but here the position of any advancing army becomes more dangerous with every step forward—in the event of at all skilful operations by a strong French army, the enemy army risks being cut off from Belgium and driven into the sea.

Furthermore, the whole line from the Rhône to the North Sea is dotted with fortresses, some of which, e.g. Strasbourg, command whole provinces.

From the junction of the Jura and the Vosges, in a south-westerly direction towards Auvergne, runs a mountain range forming the watershed between the North Sea and the ocean, on the one hand, and the Mediterranean, on the other. From it flows to the south the Saône, and to the north, parallel to one another, the Moselle, the Maas, the Marne, the Seine, and the Yonne. Between each two of these rivers, as between the Yonne and the Loire, long mountain chains branch off, separating the individual river valleys from one another and traversed by only a few roads. It is true that this whole mountainous territory for the most part is practicable for all arms, but it is very infertile and no great army can maintain itself long on it.

If these mountains, too, have been surmounted, as well as the equally infertile mountainous zones of Champagne which separate the region of the Maas from that of the Seine, the enemy army enters the Seine region. And it is only here that the striking military advantages of the position of Paris become fully evident.

The Seine basin downstream to the mouth of the Oise is formed by a number of rivers running in almost parallel arcs in a north-westerly direction—the Yonne, the Seine, the Marne, the Oise and the Aisne—each of which also has tributaries running in a similar direction. All these arc-shaped valleys join fairly closely with one another, and at the centre of these junctions is Paris. The main roads to Paris from all land frontiers between the Mediterranean Sea and the Scheldt run through these river valleys and join up with them concentrically in Paris. Hence the army which defends Paris can always be concentrated and moved from one threatened point to
another in a shorter time than the attacking army, because of two concentric circles the inner one has the smaller circumference. Admirable utilisation of these advantages, tireless movement along the circumference of the inner circle, enabled Napoleon in his brilliant campaign of 1814 to hold the entire Coalition in check in the Seine region with a handful of soldiers for two whole months.\textsuperscript{a}

Written in April 1851
First published in \textit{Die Neue Zeit} Nos. 9 and 10, December 4 and 11, 1914

\textsuperscript{a} The manuscript breaks off here.—\textit{Ed.}
A rhetorical preamble introduces the Constitution, in which the following passages deserve notice:

1. France declares itself a republic. 2. The French republic is *democratic*, one and indivisible. 3. Its principles are Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, and its foundations are Family, Labour, Property, and Public Order. 5. It respects the independence of other nations, and will make its own respected also. It will undertake no aggressive war, and will never employ its force against the liberty of any people.

Before the Insurrection of June, the National Assembly had drawn up a constitution, which contained among many other recognitions of the rights and duties of man, the following articles.

Art. 6. The right to education is the right possessed by all citizens to the means for the full development of their physical, moral, and intellectual faculties, by a *gratuitous* education at the hands of the state.

Art. 7. The right of labour is the right of every member of society to live by labour. Therefore it is the duty of society to supply with work all able-bodied persons who cannot otherwise obtain it.

Art. 9. The Right to support is the right of the orphan, the infirm and the aged to be maintained by the state.¹

After the victories of June 1848 had given courage to the middle-class, they erased these three articles from

---

¹ See “Projet de constitution présenté à l’Assemblée nationale”, *Le Moniteur universel* No. 172, June 20, 1848. The italics are by Marx.—*Ed.*
THE CONSTITUTION,

which now stands as follows:—

"Cap. I. [§ 1.] Sovereign power rests in the entirety of French citizens. It is inalienable and eternal. No individual, no fraction of the people has the right to its exercise."

"Cap. II. [§ 2.] Rights guaranteed by the constitution:—No one can be arrested or imprisoned, except as prescribed by the laws.

"§ 3. The residence of every one on French territory is inviolable—and it is not allowed to enter it otherwise than in the forms prescribed by law."

Observe here and throughout that the French constitution guarantees liberty, but always with the proviso of exceptions made by law, or which may still be made! and all the exceptions made by the Emperor Napoleon, by the restoration, and by Louis Philippe, have not only been retained, but, after the June Revolution, immeasurably multiplied. Thus, for instance, the law of the 9th August 1849, relative to the State of Siege, which the Assembly, and during its prorogation, the President can enact, and which gives to the military authorities the right of bringing all political offenders before a court-martial. It further grants them the power to enter and search any house by day or night, to seize all arms, and to remove all persons not having a domicile in the place declared under a state of siege.

As to strangers, the only "right" they enjoy on French soil, is to be arrested and driven out of it, as often as the police authorities think proper.

As to Frenchmen, any French citizen can be arrested, if a single functionary issues his mandate to that effect!

"§ 4. No one can be judged by others than his natural judges. Exceptional tribunals can be formed under no denomination or pretext."

We have already seen that, under "the state of siege", a military tribunal supersedes all others. Besides this, the Assembly established an "exceptional tribunal", called the "High Court", in 1848 for a portion of the political offenders; and, after the insurrection in June, transported 15,000 insurgents without any trial at all!

"§ 5. Capital punishment for political offences is annulled."

But they transport to fever-stricken settlements, where they are executed, only a little more slowly, and far more painfully.

"§ 8. Citizens have a right to associate, to meet peacefully and unarmed, to petition, and express their opinions through the press and elsewhere. The enjoyment of these rights has no other limit, than the equal rights of others, and the public safety."
That the limitation made by the "public safety", takes away the
enjoyment of the right altogether, is clearly shewn by the following
facts:—

1. The liberty of the Press.—By the laws of August 11, 1848, and of
July 27, 1849, not only securities for newspapers were redemanded,
but all the restrictions made by the Emperor Napoleon, and since,
were renewed and made more stringent.

The law of July 23, 1850, raises the security-money! and extends
the enactment of all weekly journals, magazines, periodicals, &c.
Besides which it demands that every article be signed by the name of
the writer, and reintroduces the stamp for newspapers. Not content-
ed with this, it imposes a stamp on the feuilleton roman, the mere
literary pamphlet, as well; and enforces all this under the penalty of
enormous fines! After the enactment of the last-named law, the
revolutionary press disappeared altogether. It had long fought up
against persecution: week by week, paper after paper and pamphlet
after pamphlet, were accused, fined, suppressed. The middle-class
sat in the jury-box, and they crushed the working-man's press.

The climax was put on the system by the law of July 30, 1850,
which restored the censorship of the drama. Thus freedom of
opinion was banished from its last literary refuge.

2. The right of association and public meeting.—By the decrees of July
28, to August 2, 1848, the clubs are subjected to a mass of police
regulations, denying them almost every liberty. For instance, they
are not allowed to pass resolutions in a legislative form, &c. By the
same law, all non-political circles and private reunions are thrown
entirely under the supervision and caprice of the police.

By the law of June 19-22, 1849, government is authorised, for the
period of one year, to suppress all clubs and meetings of which it may
not approve. By the law of June 6-12, 1850, this power is granted to
government for another year, and actually extended to those
reunions and meetings relative to the election of Deputies, that may
displease the government! The result is that, virtually, since July,
1848, all clubs and public meetings have ceased, with the exception
of the Royalist and Bonapartist cercles.

By the law of November 29, 1849, imprisonment for a period not
exceeding three months, and a fine to an amount not exceeding
3,000 francs, is decreed against all working-men who may unite for a
rise in wages. And, by the same law, these working-men are sub-
jected to five years' surveillance of the police (which means beggary,
ruin, and persecution) after the completion of their sentence.

So much for the right of association and of public meeting.
"§ 9. The right of tuition is free. The freedom of tuition shall be enjoyed on the conditions fixed by law, and under the supervision of the state."

Here the old joke is repeated. "Tuition is free", but "under the conditions fixed by law"; and these are precisely the conditions that take away the freedom altogether.

By the law of March 15, 1850, the whole system of tuition is placed under the supervision of the clergy.

At the head of this branch of government stands a conseil supérieur de l'instruction publique, presided over by four French archbishops. It subjects all the provincial schoolmasters, although elected by the common councils or parochial councils, to the will of the recteurs, or rectors. The teachers are placed in a state similar to military subordination and discipline, under the rectors, mayors, and parsons, and the freedom of education consists according to the law already quoted, in this: that no one has the right to teach without the permission of the civil and clerical authorities.

"§ 11. The rights of property are inviolable."

"§ 14. The national debt is guaranteed."

"§ 15. Taxes are levied only for the public service. Every citizen contributes according to his property and ability."

CAP. III.—ON THE AUTHORISATION OF OFFICE

This Chapter affirms—

"1." That all public authority is derived from the people, and cannot be made hereditary."

"2. That the division of powers is the primary condition of a free government."

Here we have the old constitutional folly. The condition of a "free government" is not the division, but the unity of power. The machinery of government cannot be too simple. It is always the craft of knaves to make it complicated and mysterious.

CAP. IV.—ON THE LEGISLATIVE POWER

The legislative power is vested in a single assembly of 750 representatives, including those of Algeria and the colonies. Any assemblies that may be called to revise the constitution must consist of 900 persons. The electoral system is based on the population. Four paragraphs now follow, which it will be requisite to give in full:

"§ 24. The electoral franchise is direct and universal, the form of voting, secret."

"§ 25. All Frenchmen, 21 years of age, in possession of their political and civil rights, are electors without reference to any electoral census."

a This and the next paragraph are numbered 18 and 19 in the Constitution.— Ed.
"§ 26. All electors, 25 years of age, are eligible to be elected as representatives, without domiciliary limitation."

"§ 27. The Electoral Law will ascertain the causes which can deprive a French citizen of the right to elect and to be elected."

The above articles are conceived in exactly the same spirit, as all the rest of the constitution. "All Frenchmen are electors, who enjoy their political rights"—but "the electoral law" is to decide what Frenchmen shall not enjoy their political rights!

The electoral law of March 15, 1849, reckoned under this category all criminals, but not political offenders. The electoral law of May 31, 1850, added not only the political offenders, all those who had been convicted of "offending against old-established opinions", and against the laws regulating the press, but it actually established domiciliary restrictions, by which two-thirds of the French people are incapable of voting!

That is what "the electoral franchise, direct and universal", means in France.

"§ 28. No paid public functionary can at the same time be a representative of the people. No representative can become the holder of a paid function dependent on the constitution during the continuance of the legislative assembly."

These two provisions have been limited by later decisions, and are, virtually, almost nullified.

"§ 30. The elections take place by departments, at the principal place of the district, and by means of voting tickets."

"§ 31. The National Assembly is elected for three years, when a new election must take place."

"§ 32. Its session is permanent, but it is empowered to adjourn, and must then name a commission as its representatives consisting of 25 Deputies, and the members of the bureau of the assembly. This commission is empowered to summon the assembly in cases of emergency."

§§ 33-38. The representatives are re-eligible. They are not to be bound by any fixed instructions, they are inviolable, and cannot be prosecuted or convicted for the opinions they may express in the assembly, and they receive a salary which they are not permitted to refuse.

As to the "inviolability of the representative", and his "freedom of expressing his opinions", the majority passed a new règlement after the 13th of June, empowering the president of the National Assembly to decree the censure against a representative, to fine him, to deprive him of his salary, and temporarily to expel him—thus utterly annihilating the "freedom of opinion". In 1850 the assembly

---

a June 13, 1849 (see pp. 105-06 of this volume).—Ed.
passed a law by which representatives can be arrested for debt even during the session of the house, and if they do not pay within a given time, forfeit their functions as representatives.

Thus neither the freedom of debate nor the inviolability of the representative exists in France—but only the inviolability of the creditor.

§§ 39-42. The sittings of the assembly shall be public. Nevertheless, the assembly can resolve itself into a private committee, at the request of the requisite number of representatives. To make a law valid, it must be voted by one more than the half of the representatives. Except in pressing cases no bill can be passed that has not been read three times, with an interval of five days between each reading.

This form, borrowed from the English "constitution", is not observed in France on any important occasions—indeed, on those on which it might be supposed most requisite. For instance, the electoral law of May 31\(^a\) was passed after one reading.

CAP. V.—ON THE EXECUTIVE POWER

§§ 43-44. The executive power is entrusted to a president. The president must be a born Frenchman, at least 30 years of age, and must never have lost his qualification as a French citizen.

The first president of the French republic, L. N. Bonaparte, had not only lost his qualification as a French citizen, had not only been an English special constable,\(^411\) but was a naturalised Swiss.

§§ 45-70. The president of the republic is elected for four years, and not re-eligible till after four years from the expiration of his term of office. The same restriction applies to his relatives to the 6th degree inclusive. The election is to take place on the second Sunday in May. Should the president have been elected at any other time, his powers cease on the second Sunday in May, in the fourth year after his election. He is elected by secret vote, and by an absolute majority. If no candidate has more than half the number of recorded votes, but at least two million, the national assembly may elect the president out of those five candidates who have polled the largest number.

The president must swear fealty to the constitution, may submit propositions to the assembly, through his ministers, can dispose of the army, without commanding it in person, is not allowed to cede

\(^a\) May 31, 1850 (see p. 136-44 of this volume).—Ed.
THE CONSTITUTIONS OF EUROPE,

No. I. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC ADOPTED NOVEMBER, 4, 1848.

A rhetorical preamble introduces the Constitution, in which the following passages deserve notice:

1. France declares itself a republic. 2. The French republic is democratic, one and indivisible. 3. Its principles are Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, and its foundations are Family, Labour, Property, and Public Order. 5. It respects the independence of other nations, and will make its own respected also. It will undertake no aggressive war, and will never employ its force against the liberty of any people. [Rome !]

Before the Insurrection of June, the National Assembly had drawn up a constitution, which contained among many other recognitions of the rights and duties of man, the following articles.

Art. 6. The right to education is the right possessed by all citizens to the means for the full development of their physical, moral, and intellectual faculties, by a gratuitous education at the hands of the state.

Art. 7. The right of labour is the right of every member of society to live by labour. Therefore it is the duty of society to supply with work all able bodied persons who cannot otherwise obtain it.

Art. 9. The Right to support is the right of the orphan, the infirm and the aged to be maintained by the state.

After the victories of June 1848 had given courage to the middle-class, they erased these three articles from the Constitution, which now stands as follows:

"CAP. I. Sovereign power rests in the entirety of French citizens. It is inalienable and eternal. No individual, no fraction of the people has the right to its exercise."

"CAP. II. Rights guaranteed by the constitution:—No one can be arrested or imprisoned, except as prescribed by the laws."

"§ 3. The residence of every one on French territory is inviolable—and it is not allowed to enter it otherwise than in the forms prescribed by law."

Observe here and throughout that the French constitution guarantees liberty, but always with the proviso of exceptions made by law, or which may still be made! and all the exceptions made by the Emperor Napoleon, by the restoration, and by Louis Philippe, have not only been retained, but, after the June-Revolution, immeasurably multiplied. Thus, for instance, the law of the 9th August 1849, relative to the State of Siege, which the Assembly, and during its prorogation, the President can enact, and which gives to the military authorities the right of bringing all political offenders before a court-martial. It further grants them the power to enter and search any house by day or night, to seize all arms, and to remove all persons not having a domicile in the place declared under a state of siege.

As to strangers, the only "right" they enjoy on French soil, is to be arrested and driven out of it, as often as the police authorities think proper.

As to Frenchmen, any French citizen can be arrested, if a single functionary issues his mandate to that effect!

"§ 4. No one can be judged by others than his natural judges. Exceptional tribunals can be formed under no denomination or pretext."

We have already seen that, under "the state of siege," a military tribunal supersedes all others. Besides this, the Assembly established an "exceptional tribunal," called the "High Court," in 1848 for a portion of the political offenders; and, after the Insurrection in June, transported 15,000 insurgen ts without any trial at all!

"§ 5. Capital punishment for political offences is annulled."

But they transport to fever-stricken settlements, where they are executed, only a little more slowly, and far more painfully.

"§ 6. Citizens have a right to associate, to meet peacefully and unarmed, to petition, and express their opinions through the press and elsewhere. The enjoyment of these rights has no other limit, than the equal rights of others, and the public safety."

That the limitation made by the "public safety," takes away the enjoyment of the right altogether, is clearly shown by the following facts:

1. The liberty of the Press.—By the laws of August 11, 1848, and of July 27, 1849, not only securities for newspapers were redemanded, but all the restrictions made by the Emperor Napoleon, and since, were renewed and made more stringent.

The law of July 23, 1850, raises the security—

The first page of Karl Marx’s article “The Constitution of the French Republic”, which appeared in Notes to the People
any portion of the French territory, nor to dissolve or prorogue the assembly, neither may he suspend the authority of the constitution. He negotiates and ratifies all treaties, which, however, do not become definitively binding till sanctioned by the assembly. He is not allowed to undertake any war without the consent of the assembly—may exercise the prerogative of pardoning, but is not allowed to grant an amnesty. Those condemned by the Haute Cour can be pardoned only by the national assembly. The president may postpone the promulgation of a law, and demand that the assembly deliberate thereon again. But such deliberation then becomes definitive. He appoints ambassadors and ministers, and may suspend, during three months, the mayors, departmental councils, national guards, etc., elected by the citizens. All his decrees must be countersigned by the ministers, with exception of the dismissal of the ministers themselves. The president, ministers, and public officers are severally answerable in their own departments for every act of the government. Every act whereby the president may influence, delay, or prevent the due exercise of the functions of the assembly, is an act of high treason. By such an act the president is at once deprived of his authority—it becomes the duty of every citizen to refuse obedience to his mandates, and the power of his office devolves forthwith on the assembly, the judges of the Haute Cour de Justice are to meet without loss of time, and to summon the juries to a given place, to judge the president and his accomplices.

The president has the use of an official residence, and an annual salary of 600,000 francs, or £24,000. [He now receives 2,160,000 francs, or £86,400.] The ministers have a seat ex officio in the national assembly, and may speak as often as they choose. The national assembly elects a vice-president of the republic, out of three candidates which the president may name within one month after his own election. The vice-president takes the same oath as the president, must not be a relation of the president, takes the president's place where the latter is prevented from acting, and officiates as president of the Council of State. If the presidential chair becomes vacated through death, or any other cause, a new election is to take place within one month.

CAP. VI.—THE COUNCIL OF STATE

§§ 71-75. The Council of State is merely a deliberative body, for considering the propositions to be submitted by the cabinet—and those that may be forwarded from the assembly.
CAP. VII.—THE INTERNAL ADMINISTRATION

This chapter deals with the clergy, the principal magistrates, the common and provincial councils. The only article of consequence, and one that is made use of to the fullest possible extent, is the following:

§ 80. The general councils, the cantonal councils, and the common councils, may be dissolved by the President with sanction of the Council of State.

CAP. VIII.—ON THE JUDICIAL POWER

Generally speaking, this chapter merely reproduces the enactments of the Emperor Napoleon. The following additions are, however, deserving notice:

"§ 81. Justice is exercised gratuitously, in the name of the French people."

This is so little the case, that one is not even beheaded for nothing!

§§ 91-100, treat of the Haute Cour de Justice, which is alone empowered to judge the President, before which the ministers can be arraigned, and all political offenders the National Assembly may think proper to send before that tribunal.

This "High Court" consists of five judges that the court of Cassation (the highest tribunal of France) elects out of its own members, and of thirty-six jury-men taken from the general councils of the departments, by an entirely aristocratic body. The only individuals hitherto tried by this tribunal, are the accused of May 15, 1848—(here the names of Barbès, Blanqui, and others rise up in judgment! 412) and the deputies compromised on June 13, 1849.

By the law of August 7, 1848, all those who cannot read and write are erased from the jury list, thus disqualifying two-thirds of the adult population!

CAP. IX.—OF THE ARMED POWER

The entire of the old military law is left in existence. The crimes of the soldier are not cognisable before the civil tribunals. The following paragraph illustrates the spirit of this constitution.

"§ 102. Every Frenchman is liable to military service, and to serve in the national guard, with exception of those cases provided by the law."

Every man having money, can absolve himself from the obligation of service.

The working classes are entirely excluded from the ranks of the national guard, by the law now under consideration, the second

---

a Presumably a slip of the pen: "officials" rather than "clergy" would seem to be the right word here.—Ed.
reading of which has been already carried! Moreover the President has the right to suspend for one year the national guards of every parish—and, actually, throughout half France, the national guard has been dissolved!

CAP. X.—SPECIAL ENACTMENTS

"§ 110. The National Assembly confides the Constitution to the vigilance and patriotism of the entire people"

—and confides the "vigilant" and "patriotic" to the tender mercies of the Haute Cour!—June 13!

CAP. XI.—ON THE REVISION OF THE CONSTITUTION.

"§ 111. Should the Assembly, at the close of its session, express a desire for a total or partial change in the Constitution, the revision shall be proceeded with in the following manner:—The wish expressed by the Assembly cannot become law till after three successive debates, which must take place after the interval of one month between each, and can be carried only by three-fourths of the votes, those voting being not less than 500 in number. The assembly called for the purpose of the revision is elected for only three months, and must not, except in very pressing cases, entertain any other question."

Such is the "Constitution of the French Republic", and such is the manner in which it has been used. The reader will at once see that from beginning to end it is a mass of fine words, hiding a most treacherous design. From its very wording, it is rendered impossible to violate it, for every one of its provisions contains its own antithesis—utterly nullifies itself. For instance:—"the vote is direct and universal",—"excepting those cases which the law shall determine".

Therefore it cannot be said that the law of May 31, 1850 (disfranchising two-thirds of the people) at all violates the Constitution.

The Constitution constantly repeats the formula, that the regulation and limitation of the rights and liberties of the people (e. g., the right of association, of the Franchise, the Freedom of the Press, of Tuition, etc.) shall be determined by a subsequent organic law,—and these "organic laws" "determine" the promised freedom by destroying it. This trick of granting full liberty, of laying down the finest principles, and leaving their application, the details, to be decided by subsequent laws, the Austrian and Prussian middle-classes, have borrowed from their French prototypes, the same thing had been done in the French Constitution of 1830—and in those previously enacted.
People! Make up your minds as to details,\textsuperscript{415} as well as to principles, before you come to power. Therefore the struggle was fought in the English convention on this very point!

The only clauses in the whole constitution that are positive and definite, are those on the election of the President (§ 45) and the Revision of the Constitution (§ 111). These are the only provisions that \textit{can} be violated, for they are the only ones that do not carry their own contradiction with them.

They were aimed by the Constituent Assembly of 1848, directly against Bonaparte—whose intrigues for the presidential office alarmed the deputies.

The eternal contradictions of this Constitution of Humbug, show plainly enough, that the middle-class can be democratic in \textit{words}, but will not be so in deeds—they will recognise the truth of a principle, but never carry it into practice—and the real “Constitution” of France is to be found, not in the Charter we have recorded, but in the \textit{organic laws} enacted on its basis, an outline of which we have given to the reader. The \textit{principles} were there—the \textit{details} were left to the future, and in those details a shameless tyranny was re-enacted!

The excess of despotism reached in France will be apparent by the following regulations as to working men.

Every working man is supplied with a book by the police—the first page of which contains his name, age, birthplace, trade or calling, and a description of his person. He is therein obliged to enter the name of the master for whom he works, and the reasons why he leaves him. But this is not all: the book is placed in the master’s hands, and deposited by him in the \textit{bureau} of the police with the character of the man by the master. When a workman leaves his employment, he must go and fetch this book from the police office; and is not allowed to obtain another situation without producing it. Thus the workman’s bread is utterly dependent on the police. But this again, is not all: this book serves the purpose of a passport. If he is obnoxious, the police write “\textit{bon pour retourner chez lui}”\textsuperscript{a} in it, and the workman is obliged to return to his parish! No comment is needed on this terrific revelation! Let the reader picture to himself its full working, and trace it to its actual consequences. No serfdom of the feudal ages—no pariahdom of India has its parallel. What wonder if the French people pant for the hour of insurrection. What wonder if their indignation take the aspect of a storm. They were merciful in 1830, they were merciful in 1848; but since then their

\textsuperscript{a} “To be sent home”.—\textit{Ed.}
liberty has been trafficked away, their blood has been shed in torrents, every prison in France is crowded with life-long captives,—15,000 were transported in one mass and the dreadful despotism we have described rests on them now. What wonder that the middle-class should fear the people, and that they should strain their last nerve to keep the hour of retribution in abeyance. But they are divided among themselves. They have too many conflicting ambitions, and foremost on the cards stands

THE GAME OF NAPOLEON.

The question now is, shall the presidential powers be prolonged, and shall the constitution be revised. Napoleon cannot be re-elected, without an open breach of the constitution for 1stly, he cannot be re-elected until after a period of four years from the expiration of his term of office; and, 2ndly, the constitution cannot be revised except by a majority of two-thirds. Such a majority in favour of that question does not exist, therefore, a constitutional re-election is not possible.

The only alternative for Bonaparte is, therefore, to defy the constitution, take up arms, and fight it out, or a legitimate surrender of his functions at the time prescribed. In the latter case Cavaignac will become President, and the republic of the middle-class will be perfected. In the former the issues are more complicated.

The game of Napoleon, therefore, now is, to work on the discontent of the people. The middle-class are the enemies of Napoleon,—the people know it, and there is one bond of sympathy between them. He, however, shares the odium of oppression jointly with the middle-class; if he can cast it off his shoulders entirely on theirs, one great obstacle will have been removed.

This he is endeavours to do—as proved by his recent speech at Dijon, where he says:

"Every bad law has been enacted by the assembly, every good law that I proposed has been rejected or mutilated by that body. They have thwarted me in every attempt to better your condition, and raised obstacles against improvement where none existed." 414

Thus he is endeavouring to guide the lightning, from his own head on to that of the assembly. Meanwhile, the army are more with him than with the latter body,—and such is the misery of the people that almost any change would be for the better in the estimation of the many, while the enlightened are but the minority.
Therefore, supposing the middle-class to risk the struggle under Cavaignac, on finding Bonaparte determined, the people would certainly fight against them—and Bonaparte would be fighting with the people. Combined, they would prove too strong for the assembly. But then would come the critical time; the assembly finding that the people were about to conquer, would prefer the lesser of two evils. They would prefer an Empire or a Dictatorship of Napoleon, to a Democratic and Social Republic, and would, therefore, come to terms with the President. The latter dreading, as much as they, the democratic power, would accept their aid. The army, or a portion of it at least, would have become still more attached to Napoleon by the excitement, peril, and “glory” of strife; and the struggle would then assume a new aspect, that of the army and the bourgeoisie against the People. The issue depends on the courage, sense, and union of the latter. The game of Napoleon, is, first to play off the People against the middle-class. Then to play off the middle-class against the people and to use the army against them both.

The future is pregnant with great events, and the present of France is one of the most interesting studies history affords.

Written between May 24 and June 8, 1851
Reprinted from the journal
First published in the Notes to the People
No. 7, June 14, 1851
FROM THE PREPARATORY MATERIALS
NOTE FOR THE "REVIEW" (MAY-OCTOBER 1850)

1) Supremacy of Russia emerging openly. Hegemony divided between Prussia and Austria. The minor states formally secured once more thanks to their rivalry, true. But the princes of the minor states (e. g. Hesse, Baden) disgraced in the eyes of most Germans, and thus the differences between the various houses and small townships, which were still being so keenly asserted as recently as 1848, smashed. Equally, in consequence of the results of the 1848 movement, the authority of all existing official powers diminished.

2) Prussia. Although excluded from the government, humiliated, sham Constitution, the bourgeoisie achieved everything and more than it dared demand in 1847.

3) Austria—hitherto the peasantry given preference, reaped the results of the revolution. Protectionism.

4) Trade policy differences between Austria and Prussia. Free trade; in Prussia nobility, as in England industrial bourgeoisie.

Written in September and October 1850
Printed according to the manuscript
Published in English for the first time
There is a division of trade into trade between dealers and dealers on the one hand, and between dealers and consumers on the other. Transfer of capital takes place in the former case, exchange of income for capital in the latter; the former has its own money, the latter its own coin. This distinction, which was made by Adam Smith, is very important and has been emphasised by Tooke, and even earlier by the Report of the Bullion Committee. What is missing however is an examination of the relationship between these two kinds of trade and of money.

(1) All crises show in fact that the trade between dealers and dealers constantly exceeds the bounds set by the trade between dealers and consumers. All propositions advanced by economists to prove the impossibility of over-production, or at any rate universal over-production, deal only with trade between dealers and dealers, as already Sismondi rightly pointed out in his polemic against McCulloch. This becomes even more evident when one considers that at least three-quarters of the exchange between dealers and consumers consists of exchange between workers on the one hand and retail traders and artisans on the other; this exchange however depends in turn on the exchange between workers and industrial capitalists, which in its turn is determined by the exchange between dealer and dealer—_cercle vicieux._

(2) It is true that, as Adam Smith says, the exchange between dealers and dealers is bound to be circumscribed by the exchange

---

\(^a\) Report, together with Minutes of Evidence, and Accounts, from the Select Committee Appointed to Inquire into the Cause of the High Price of Gold Bullion. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 8 June 1810.—Ed.

\(^b\) Simonde de Sismondi, _Nouveaux principes d'économie politique ou de la richesse dans ses rapports avec la population_, T. IV, Paris, 1827.—Ed.
between dealers and consumers, since the prices at which the commodities are sold to the latter are the final prices, which must retrospectively balance the costs of production expended in the preceding transactions as well as the profits. However on the basis of Adam Smith's proposition, the whole economy has been inanely over-simplified by Proudhon and others. The matter is not so simple. First, the trade between dealers and dealers in England, for example, is by no means circumscribed by the trade between dealers and consumers in England, but more or less by that between dealers and consumers on the world market as a whole. For instance, the India Company or East India merchants send indigo to the London market. There it is auctioned. This is a transaction between dealers and dealers. The purchaser of the indigo sells part of it in France, Germany, etc., where it is bought by various dealers and manufacturers. Whether they will in the end recover the price of the indigo, will depend on how the final product is sold to the consumer, who lives perhaps on the Ionian Islands or in Afghanistan or in Adelaide. It would therefore be wrong to say that the trade between dealers and dealers in one country is limited by the trade between dealers and consumers in that country. If this trade is universal, it is limited by the trade between dealers and consumers on the world market, and this is all the more the case when the trade between dealers and dealers is conducted on a large scale and the country occupies a prominent position on the world market.

Secondly. Because the working class forms the largest section of consumers, one could say the fact that the income of the working class decreases—not in one country, as Proudhon thinks, but on the world market—leads to an imbalance between production and consumption, and hence over-production. This is largely correct. But it is modified by the growing extravagance of the propertied classes. It would be wrong to put forward this proposition unconditionally—as though the trade of the planter were determined by the consumption of his Negroes.

Thirdly. The trade between dealers and dealers largely creates the trade between dealers and consumers. For example, when manufacturers receive very large orders from speculators, workers are fully employed, their wages rise and so does their consumption. Speculative railway construction enterprises actually create large-scale consumption, which in the end proves to be entirely "unproductive". We also find that in fact the trade between dealers

---

\textsuperscript{a} Probably a reference to Proudhon's book \textit{Système des contradictions économiques, ou Philosophie de la misère}, T. 1-2, Paris, 1846. For a critical examination of this book see Marx's \textit{The Poverty of Philosophy} in Vol. 6 (pp. 105-212) of the present edition.—Ed.
and consumers is in most cases ultimately thwarted by that between dealers and dealers. The crisis always begins in the former, often of course after the demand of the limited forces of consumption has been met, but often simply because supply exceeds ostensible estimates (e.g. in the case of speculations in corn).

Fourthly. Over-production must not be attributed solely to disproportionate production, but to the relationship between the class of capitalists and that of workers.

(3) As to the currency which is found in the two distinct forms of trade—the currency used in trade properly speaking and the currency used in the exchange of income for commodities, i.e. for particles of capital—it is insufficient to state that a division exists between the two currencies, it is also a question of their connection and interaction. The money of private individuals, of the consumers, that is in the first place of all political and ideological strata, secondly of those who live on the rent of land, thirdly of so-called (non-industrial) capitalists, of the public creditors, etc., even of the workers (in the savings-banks), in short the surplus of the receipts of the non-trading classes of the population over their everyday expenditure and over that part of their money which they themselves think they must always have at their disposal, that is which they keep (hoard) at home as a reserve—this surplus is the chief source of deposits, which in their turn form the main basis of commercial money. Transfers, credit operations, in short the entire monetary movement within this commercial world, depend on the deposits of that part of the population that consists mainly not of tradespeople. In [...] of credit failure the deposits are withdrawn from commerce. Capital becomes unproductive, because the means enabling the classes that direct production to use this capital are destroyed in their hands. On the other hand, since these classes need money for their transactions with one another and the banker no longer lends money to the grocer and the manufacturer, the income of the consumers diminishes and consequently also the amount of money in their hands, thus the complaints about lack of money move from the commercial world into the world of the consumers.

(4) It would be wrong to say that lack of credit is of paramount importance in times of crisis, and currency is of no importance. It is evident from the reasons mentioned earlier that the amount of currency is then at its lowest ebb precisely because on the one hand its velocity has decreased and secondly because cash is required in numerous transactions where it was not required previously. But it is

---

a Illegible in the manuscript, presumably "times".—Ed.
precisely this which accentuates the great difference between the amount of money and the value of the operations transacted with a relatively small quantity of currency. There is therefore in fact a lack of currency and not a lack of capital. Capital loses its value and cannot be turned to account. But what does cannot be turned to account mean in this context? It cannot be transformed into currency, and it is precisely its convertibility which constitutes its value. But in spite of all that, capital exists.

The thing shows itself primarily in the refusal to discount bills of exchange, even those based on bona fide transactions. And the bill of exchange is commercial money, its value represents commercial capital. The convertibility of bank-notes into gold is a minor matter, the failure of bank-notes merely aggravates the commercial crises. The real difficulty is the inconvertibility of commodities, i.e. of the actual capital, into gold and bank-notes. It is for this reason that when these phenomena appeared in 1793, 1825 and 1847, it was possible to remedy them where capital actually existed, by issuing exchequer bills and bank-notes. Moreover, it cannot be asserted that these bills and bank-notes were capital. They were merely currency. The crisis did not end, but the currency crisis did. The convertibility of bank-notes, therefore, is based on the convertibility of securities, and not only in banking but also in commerce. But even securities which by their very nature are considered to be convertible, such as government securities and short bills, cease to be convertible. It seems that this is by no means a question of commodities, but of the convertibility of the tokens of value which represent them. Commodities cease to be money, they are not convertible into money. The blame for this is of course put on the monetary system, on a particular form of this system. It is due to the existence of the monetary system, just as the latter is based on the present mode of production. But the convertibility of bank-notes into gold is in the end necessary, because the convertibility of commodities into money is necessary, in other words because commodities have exchange value, and this requires a special equivalent distinct from the commodities, i.e. because in fact the system of private exchange prevails.

Actually the depreciation of money is even in inverse proportion to the depreciation of commodities. But bank-notes can depreciate in terms of gold only because commodities can depreciate in terms of bank-notes. In any case, what does depreciation of bank-notes mean? That at any particular moment, commodities, i.e. their value, cannot be transformed into gold or silver, and that each intermediate link between the commodities and gold, or each substitute remains only a
substitute and hence without value. The principal question therefore always remains the inconvertibility of commodities, of capital itself. It is rubbish if some say, there is no lack of currency but lack of capital. Currency is of no consequence. For what matters here is precisely the difference between capital, i.e. commodities, and currency. What matters is the fact that the former does not necessarily entail the latter as its representative, that is as its price in the commercial world; that capital ceases to be currency, that it can no longer circulate and has no longer value. When capital appears to be a secondary matter, it is ridiculous to present currency as a secondary matter. However there is even more nonsense on the other side. They acknowledge the inconvertibility of capital and make fun of the convertibility of bank-notes. But they want to offset this by some artifice or other and by modifying the monetary system. As if the inconvertibility of capital were not already contained in the existence of any monetary system, indeed as if it were not contained even in the existence of products in the form of capital. Trying to alter this on the existing basis means depriving money of its monetary qualities, without conferring on capital the quality of always being exchangeable, and moreover at its fair price.

The existence of a monetary system entails not only the possibility but even the reality of this separation, and the fact that this system exists proves that the inconvertibility of capital, because it is appropriate to money, is already entailed by the existence of capital, and therefore by the entire organisation of production. It would be just as wrong however to say that the pressure on the money market was simply caused by fraudulent credit operations. Money as such implies the credit system. Or both are produced by the same cause. The Birmingham men, who want to do away with the inconveniences of money by putting large quantities of money into circulation, or by lowering the standard of money, are of course fools. Proudhon, Gray and others who want to retain money but in such a way that it should no longer have the properties of money, are also fools. Since it is in the money market that the entire crisis erupts and all the features of bourgeois production recur as symptoms, which, it is true, become incidental causes, nothing is simpler to understand than the fact that it is money that narrow-minded reformers who stick to the bourgeois standpoint want to reform. Because they want to retain value and private exchange, they retain the division between the product and its exchangeability. But they want to modify the token of this division in such a way that it expresses identity.\(^a\)

\(^a\) Marx marked the last two sentences with a vertical line in the margin.—Ed.
(5) The complete simpletons, i.e. the staunch ignorant democrats, are familiar only with *money* as used in the trade between dealers and consumers. They therefore do not know the sphere in which the collisions take place, the tempests of monetary crises and big financial transactions. Thus the problem, just as everything else, appears to these simpletons to be as simple and silly as they themselves are. They regard the trade between dealers and consumers as a straightforward exchange of values, in which the freedom of each individual receives its supreme practical confirmation. Class antagonism is in no way involved in this exchange. One trader confronts another, one moneyled individual confronts another. The precondition that every individual must be moneyed to be able to participate in the consumer goods trade, i.e. to be able to live, this precondition is of course automatically given by the fact that every individual must work and let his talent* act, as Stirner says.\(^{b}\)

First of all it is a historical fact, which no one can deny, that in all hitherto existing social formations which were based on separation and contradiction between castes, tribes, social estates, classes, etc., money was an essential component of this organisation, and the monetary system was always symptomatic of the heyday or decline of this organisation. It is therefore not our task to prove that the monetary system is based on class contradictions, it is up to the simpletons to prove that, in spite of all previous historical experience, the monetary system can make sense even where there are no class contradictions, and that this particular element present in all social formations up to now will be able to survive in a situation that negates all hitherto existing social formations. To confront complete simpletons with such a task would be too simple. They deal with everything in monosyllables and this constitutes their specific talent. The monetary system and the entire present system are in their opinion as straightforward and as stupid as they themselves are.

But let us again visualise their beloved trade between consumers and dealers. They do not look beyond it, neither sideways nor forward and backward.

What does the free individual use to pay for his purchases at the grocer? He uses an equivalent—or token of value—of his income. The worker exchanges his wages, the manufacturer his profit, the

---

* To be understood both in the old sense of "money", "wealth", and in the modern sense of "ability, aptitude", etc., for the German word *Vermögen* used here means "ability", "capability" as well as "wealth", "fortune", "riches", "property".—Ed

capitalist his interest, the landowner his rent—transformed into gold and silver and bank-notes—at the grocer, the cobbler, the butcher, the baker, etc. And what does the cobbler, the grocer, and so on, exchange for the money which represents wages, rent, profit and interest? He exchanges his capital for it. He replaces his capital, reproduces it and expands it in this transaction.

Thus to begin with in this seemingly so simple transaction all class relations manifest themselves and are presupposed, [i.e.] the classes of workers, of landowners, and of industrial and non-industrial capitalists. On the other hand, it first and foremost presupposes the existence of these specific social relations, which give wealth the form of capital, and separate capital from revenue. The simplicity disappears with the transformation into money.

The fact that the worker receives his wages in money—and likewise the landowner his rent and the manufacturer his profit—and not as provisions in kind, payment in kind or by means of barter, merely shows that the monetary system presupposes a high level of development and greater differentiation and separation of classes than does the absence of a monetary system in the pre-monetary stages of society. There is no wage labour without money, and therefore also no profit and interest in the latter form, and accordingly no rent of land either as this is simply a part of profit.

It is true that income in the form of money, i.e. in the form of gold, silver or bank-notes, no longer shows that it appertains to an individual exclusively as a member of a definite class, as a class individual, unless someone has obtained it by begging or stealing, that is to say by misappropriating an income of this type, and thus represents a class individual as a result of rather drastic measures. The transformation into gold or silver blurs the class character and veils it. Hence the apparent equality—apart from money—in bourgeois society. Hence in a society with a completely developed monetary system, there is, on the other hand, actually real civil equality of individuals insofar as they have money, irrespective of their source of income. In such a society, as distinct from ancient society where only the privileged strata could exchange certain things, everything is available to any person, any kind of material exchange can be carried out by everybody, in accordance with the amount of money into which his income can be converted. Whores, science, patronage, decorations, rent of land, lickspittles, all these are objects of exchange, just as coffee, sugar and herrings are. In the case of the estate system, the consumption of the individual, his material exchange, depends on the particular division of labour to
which he is subordinated. In the class system it depends only on the
universal medium of exchange which he is able to acquire. In the
first case, he as a socially circumscribed person takes part in
exchange operations which are circumscribed by his social position.
In the second case he as an owner of the universal medium of
exchange is able to obtain everything that society can offer in
exchange for this token of everything. In the exchange of money for
commodities, in this trade between dealers and consumers, the
manufacturer, when he buys at the grocer, is just as much a consumer
as his worker, and the servant obtains the same commodities for
the same amount of money as his master. Thus the specific nature of
the income which has been transformed into money disappears in
this exchange and the class characteristics of all individuals are
blurred and merge in the category of buyer, who in this transaction
faces the seller. Hence the illusion of seeing not an individual
member of a class in this act of buying and selling, but the
purchasing individual as such without class characteristics.

Now let us disregard for the moment the specific nature of the
income, which is not evident in gold and silver any more than is the
smell of urine in the tax on brothels, of which the Roman Emperor
Hadrian said: *non olet!* This nature emerges however in the amount
of money which is at the person's disposal. The range of the
purchases is in the main determined by the nature of the income.
The quantity and the kind of articles bought by the largest class of
consumers, the workers, is indicated by the nature of their income.
It is however true that the worker can squander his wages on liquor
for himself instead of buying meat and bread for his children, a
thing he cannot do when he is paid in kind. His personal freedom
has thereby been extended, i.e. more latitude has been allowed to
the rule of liquor. On the other hand, the money the workers are
able to spare after paying for the most essential means of subsistence,
can be used by them to buy books, lecturers and meetings, instead of
meat and bread. They are in a better position to acquire the universal
powers of society, such as the intellectual ones. Where the nature of
the income is still determined by the type of occupation, not only as
at present by the quantity of the universal medium of exchange, but
also by the nature of his occupation, the ways in which the individual
can enter into relations with society and appropriate it are extremely
limited, and the social organisation for the interchange of the
material and intellectual products of society is from the outset

---

a It doesn't smell! (These words are usually attributed to Emperor Vespasianus,
who introduced a tax on public lavatories.) — Ed.
From the Preparatory Materials

restricted to a definite method and a particular content. Money, which is the supreme expression of class contradiction, therefore also obscures religious, social, intellectual and individual differences. When confronting the bourgeoisie, the feudal barons for example made futile attempts, by means of luxury laws, politically to check or break this universal levelling power of money. Thus in the commercial transactions between consumers and dealers, the qualitative class differences are transformed into the *quantitative* difference of a larger or smaller amount of money at the disposal of the buyer; and within a single class it is the quantitative difference which constitutes the *qualitative* difference. Hence big bourgeoisie, middle bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie.
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APPEAL FOR SUPPORT FOR GERMAN POLITICAL REFUGEES

Ever since, accompanied by the savage din of war, "peace and order" have been re-established in Germany; ever since, atop the ruins of smouldering cities and amidst the murderous thunder of cannon, the "security of property and person" has been restored; ever since the court-martial has scarcely sufficed to consign one "rebel" after the other with smashed head to the grave; ever since the prisons have no longer proved large enough to accommodate all the "traitors"; ever since the only remaining form of justice has been martial law—since that time thousands upon thousands of people have been wandering without shelter in foreign lands.

From day to day their number grows and with it the misfortune of those without a homeland; turned away from one place to the next, they do not know in the morning where they will lay their heads that evening, nor in the evening where tomorrow's food is coming from.

There is an emigration of countless numbers filling Switzerland, France and England. Those wretched people have come from all the provinces of Germany.

Anyone who mounted the barricades in Vienna against the black and yellow\(^a\) "league" and grappled with Jellachich's Serezhans\(^425\); anyone who fled from the soldiery of Wrangel and Brandenburg in Prussia; anyone who in Dresden took up the musket to defend the Imperial Constitution, and anyone who in Baden saw action as a republican soldier against the united crusading army of the princes—whether liberal, democrat, republican or socialist: supporters of the most varied political doctrines and interests, they are all united in the same exile and the same misery.

Dressed in rags, half a nation is begging at the doors of foreigners.

Our fugitive compatriots are also wandering on the cold pavement of the resplendent metropolis, London. Every ship that crosses the

\(^a\) Black and yellow were the official colours of the Austrian Empire.—Ed.
Channel brings from across the sea a new multitude of people without a homeland; in every street of the city one can hear the grief of an exile lamenting in our tongue.

This distress has deeply stirred many German friends of liberty in London. Therefore on September 18 of this year a general meeting was held of the German Workers' Educational Society and the refugees from our nation who had arrived here, in order to set up a Committee of Support for Democrats in Need. Those elected were:

Karl Marx, former editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung;
Karl Blind, former envoy in Paris of the Baden-Palatinate Government;
Anton Füster, former member of the Austrian Imperial Diet in Vienna;
Heinrich Bauer, master shoemaker in London; and
Karl Pfänder, a painter here.

This Committee will render a public account every month, both at the general meeting and in the form of extracts in German newspapers. In order to avoid any misinterpretation it has been decided that no member of the Committee may draw any assistance whatsoever from the fund. Should a member of the Committee ever be in need of assistance in the future, then he will cease to be a member of the Committee.

We ask you now, friends and brothers, to do whatever lies in your power. If you are concerned that liberty, crushed and enchained, should rise again, and if you have a feeling in your hearts for the sufferings of your best champions, then there will be no great need of exhortations from us.

All donations should be addressed to: "Heinrich Bauer, master shoemaker, 64 Dean Street, Soho Square, London." Whatever is enclosed should be marked "for the Refugee Committee".

London, September 20, 1849

The Committee of Support for German Political Refugees:

Anton Füster, Karl Marx, Karl Blind,
Heinrich Bauer, Karl Pfänder

Published in the Westdeutsche Zeitung
No. 106, September 25, 1849:
the Neue Deutsche Zeitung No. 228,
September 26, 1849; the Deutsche Londoner Zeitung No. 238, September 28, 1849;
the Demokratische Zeitung No. 220,
September 30, 1849, and in other newspapers

Printed according to the Neue Deutsche Zeitung
Published in English for the first time
RECEIPT OF THE COMMITTEE OF SUPPORT FOR GERMAN POLITICAL REFUGEES IN LONDON

November 13, 1849

We acknowledge receipt through Herr G. Tichen in Stettin of £11.14s. for which we express our gratitude on behalf of the needy German political refugees.

London, November 13, 1849

The Committee of Support for German Political Refugees

Signed: Dr. Karl Marx, Henry Bauer, Karl Pfänder

First published in the Norddeutsche Freie Presse No. 208, November 23, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper Published in English for the first time

---

a The Polish name is Szczecin.—Ed.
On November 18 of this year the German Workers' Society in London held a general meeting, attended by the majority of the political refugees there, to adopt the accounts of the Committee of Support [for refugees] formed at an earlier meeting.a

Total receipts since September 22 of this year were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. From the Workers' Society in London</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. From the German Readers' Society in London</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. From the editorial board of <em>The Northern Star</em> in London</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. From Citizen Eddäus in London</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Collected by Citizen Siefert in London</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. From Citizen Görringer in London</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Collected by Citizen H. Bauer in London</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. From German workers in Paris, through Citizen Heidecker</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. From Huddersfield through Citizen Krepp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. From Stettin in Prussia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong>...</td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>5½</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a See this volume, p. 597.—Ed.
Expenditures on refugees from September 22 to November 18 of this year were: £ s d

1. Kleiner ............................................. 3 17 2
2. Zschinski .......................................... 3 17 4
3. Fröhlich .......................................... 2 2 1
4. Hensor ............................................. 3 7 6
5. Egener ............................................ 1 19 —
6. W. Töpffer ........................................ 1 11 7
7. J. Töpffer .......................................... 1 4 4
8. To the refugees Blei, Bergmann, Osoba, Wessely, Braulichy and Klein, together .......... 2 8 10
9. To the refugee merchant Schopp and family, against an I. O. U. ......................... 4 — —
10. Costs of printing and subscription lists ..................................................... 1 15 2 1/2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>3 1/2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total receipts</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12 5 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash in hand</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clothing has also been received which has been distributed to the refugees.

The above accounts were adopted unanimously by the meeting. Receipts are to hand for all expenditures and the donors from Huddersfield and Stettin who were not represented have been requested to nominate representatives in London to inspect the receipts.

As the Committee had been depleted by the departure of two members, A. Füster and K. Blind, and as, moreover, an attempt is being made here to set up a counter-committee, independent of the Workers’ Society and of the refugees of the social-democratic trend, the Committee returned its mandate to the Society.

The Society thereupon resolved:
1. That the German Workers’ Society, acknowledging the work of the hitherto existing Committee, appoints a new committee of five of its members under the title “Social-Democratic Committee of Support for German Refugees”. This Committee takes over the balance of the former Committee.
2. The Committee will give priority to members of the social-democratic party but, as far as its funds allow, will not exclude refugees of other trends from its support.
3. The Committee will present monthly accounts to the Workers' Society and will thereupon be reappointed. The accounts will be published in the Deutsche Londoner Zeitung, in The Northern Star, in the Frankfurt Neue Deutsche Zeitung, in Cologne in the Westdeutsche Zeitung, in the Norddeutsche Freie Presse in Hamburg, in the Berlin Demokratische Zeitung, in the Schweizerische National-Zeitung, in the Schnellpost and in the Staatszeitung in New York.a

4. Contributors will be entitled to be personally present at the monthly presentation of accounts, or, if they are not in London, to send a representative to check the books, receipts, and cash in hand.

5. The Workers' Society appoints as committee members Karl Marx, August Willich, Frederick Engels, Heinrich Bauer, Karl Pfänder.

In publishing the above accounts and the decisions of the Workers' Society, the undersigned Committee requests that contributions be sent to Heinrich Bauer, 64 Dean Street, Soho, London.

London, December 3, 1849

The Committee:
Karl Marx, August Willich, Frederick Engels, Heinrich Bauer, Karl Pfänder

Published in the Deutsche Londoner Zeitung No. 245, December 7, 1849; the Westdeutsche Zeitung No. 173, December 12, 1849, and the Demokratische Zeitung No. 258, December 15, 1849

Printed according to the Westdeutsche Zeitung
Published in English for the first time

---
a Deutsche Schnellpost and New-Yorker Staatszeitung.—Ed.
Besides the above-named accused, the tailor Peter Nothjung is also accused of the main crime of the attempt, although he was neither on the Army Reserve Committee nor on the Public Safety Committee. He was von Mirbach's adjutant, and as such was close to the whole movement and, according to his own statement, knew its purpose. At the time of the uprising he went from Cologne, his place of residence, to Elberfeld, where he was asked by the newspaper editor Engels and Hühnerbein, with whom he was already acquainted, to help the Military Committee with the reception of the men and the writing out of billeting orders. On the same day von Mirbach appointed him his adjutant and provided him with a black, red and gold sash as a mark of distinction. According to his own statement the aim of the whole movement was declared by the members of the Public Safety and Military Committees to be the recognition of the German Constitution, and for that reason the citizens should be armed. He fulfilled the functions of adjutant until von Mirbach's departure; he was arrested in the neighbourhood of Ronsdorf....

Frederick Engels, a newspaper editor, is also said to have taken part in putting up barricades. Witness Heinrich Meininghaus states in particular that a young man with spectacles and a small moustache who was pointed out to him by an armed volunteer as the editor Engels, and who conducted himself as one of the leaders, gave the order to strengthen the barricade at the Wunderbau. The

---

a The charge brought by the judicial authorities was worded: "attempt to overthrow the government".—Ed.
b The Neue Rheinische Zeitung.—Ed.
c Colours symbolising the unity of Germany.—Ed.
above-mentioned witnesses Simon and Sauer also speak of a young man with a small moustache and a check coat who took part in erecting the barricade in front of von der Heydt's house....

The royal arsenal at Gräfrath was repeatedly attacked and looted by armed bands during the disorders in Elberfeld. The first marches of this kind took place on May 10 and 11 but were carried out not by the Elberfeld bands, but by inhabitants of Solingen and the neighbourhood for the purpose of arming those localities and then partly supporting the uprising in Elberfeld and partly spreading it further in the province. These marches on Gräfrath are the objects of a special charge in another investigation into the disorders which took place at the same time in Solingen and the neighbourhood, whereas here it is mainly a matter of the looting of the arsenal which was carried out on May 15 and from Elberfeld. According to statements by several persons who took part in this march, on that day the accused Karl Jansen ordered part of his detachment, some 30-40 men, to make a sortie, as he said, against Wald to get weapons there. This detachment was headed by Jansen as a captain and Wohlmeiner as a lieutenant, and the editor Engels joined the two of them. Engels and Jansen procured themselves two cart-horses on the way at the copper works and rode on them at the head of the detachment as far as the estate of the merchant Jung at Hammerstein, where Engels exchanged his horse for Jung's saddle-horse, and both he and Jansen had riding saddles given to them. After Hammerstein, according to the statement of another of the accused, Wilhelm Rausch, Jansen gave the order to proceed to Gräfrath to see whether weapons and uniforms which they could use were to be found in the arsenal there. According to the testimony of sergeant Starke to the local army reserve administration, and of non-commissioned officer Steiniger, 6-8 riflemen in the vanguard of the detachment arrived first at the arsenal and then the armed band of 30-40 men headed by Engels and Jansen, both on horseback and armed with sabres and pistols. The detachment immediately formed up in front of the arsenal and placed sentries at the doors. Then Engels went up to sergeant Starke with his pistol drawn, asked him whether any weapons were still available and, on receiving the answer that the weapons had already been taken by force by the Solingen and Wald detachments, ordered him to go into the arsenal with him. Personal resistance by the two army men to the armed band of 30-40 would have been useless, the more so as the doors of the arsenal could not be locked as a result of the earlier attacks by the Solingen detachment. The two army men therefore had to yield to force and allow the arsenal to be entered. There Engels chose several
items of armament and uniform and had them brought out into the yard. For these two receipts, not quite identical in wording, were written out over the signature of Captain Karl Jansen...

According to these, the items taken out of the arsenal consisted of haversacks, helmets, trousers, cartridge-pouches, pistols, sabres, drums, footwear, and one rifle. On Jansen's order each man of the band took from these the items of clothing which fitted him and the necessary weapons. Jansen himself does not deny that he led part of his armed detachment, 36-37\(^a\) strong, to Gräfrath for the above-mentioned purpose; he only asserts that he did so on the basis of a written order which he received from von Mirbach on the morning of May 15 for the requisition of equipment on the way to Wald via Gräfrath. He also confirms that Engels placed himself with him at the head of the detachment and, on arriving at Gräfrath, posted sentries at the arsenal doors and entered with the sergeant. He maintains that while Engels was busy in the arsenal, he himself, leaving Lieutenant Wohlmeiner with the detachment, made a reconnaissance of the terrain in the neighbourhood of the arsenal and on his return saw some of the various items of equipment already lying in the square.

... accordingly accused, namely:

... 7. Frederick Engels, Johann Gottfried Wohlmeiner and Karl Jansen

a) of having in May 1849 in Elberfeld placed themselves at the head of an armed band, or having made the relevant arrangements, plundering the state-owned arsenal in Gräfrath; or

b) of having in May 1849 with a band and with open use of force plundered various articles of equipment from the royal arsenal in Gräfrath....

First published in the Westdeutsche Zeitung Nos. 93 and 95 (supplements), April 19 and 21, 1850

Printed according to the newspaper Published in English for the first time

---

\(^a\) The Westdeutsche Zeitung says "39-40".—Ed.
As is generally known, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* appeared from June 1, 1848, to May 19, 1849, under the editorship of *Karl Marx* as a daily newspaper in *Cologne on the Rhine*. It represented the most resolute democratic trend in Germany with such success that in spite of all suspensions and states of siege, in spite of all press trials and persecutions, hostility and obstacles of all kinds it numbered 5,600 subscribers after appearing for only eleven months. After the editorial board was twice acquitted by a jury, the Prussian Government had no other means of suppressing this dreaded paper than the use of force: When the partial uprisings in Rhenish Prussia were suppressed in May last year, the temporary rule of the sabre was used to remove the editorial board from Prussia by force and thus to make the continued appearance of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* impossible.

After taking part in the revolutionary movements of last summer, either in South Germany or in Paris, the majority of the editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* assembled again in London and decided to continue the paper from there. At first the paper can only appear as a review in monthly issues of approximately five sheets. But it will only fully serve its purpose of exercising an uninterrupted and lasting influence on public opinion, and create new opportunities also from the financial point of view, when the editorial board is in a position to produce issues in more rapid succession. It is therefore intended that, as soon as funds allow, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* should appear as a fortnightly of five sheets or, if possible, as a big weekly journal like the American and English weeklies and, as soon

---

* See this volume, pp. 5-6.—Ed.
as conditions permit its return to Germany, at once to transform it again from a weekly journal into a daily newspaper.

A provisional estimate shows that with only fortnightly issues and a sale of 3,000 copies the Revue will yield an annual net profit of 1,900 talers.

To put the enterprise on a secure basis and to enable the Revue to appear fortnightly or weekly, a capital of £500 is needed, and an issue of shares for this amount is hereby opened on the following conditions:

1. Every share is worth 50 francs and will be paid up at once against a provisional receipt later exchangeable for the original share.
2. Every shareholder is liable only for the amount of his share.
3. Shareholders have the right to nominate representatives in London to inspect the conduct of the business.
4. A quarterly general meeting will be called to receive a report on the progress of the enterprise and the accounts and to take decisions on the future control of the conduct of the business. A lithographed business report will be sent to individual shareholders.
5. Profits accruing from the business will be added to the capital until the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* can appear weekly. When the enterprise has prospered thus far, the profit will be divided into three equal parts, one remaining in a reserve fund, one distributed to shareholders as dividend, and the last going to the editorial board.

London, January 1, 1850

*K. Schramm,*

Manager of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*

Written with the participation of Marx and Engels
Printed according to the manuscript
Published in English for the first time
ABOUT ENGELS' SPEECH
AT A BANQUET HELD ON FEBRUARY 25, 1850,
IN HONOUR OF THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY
OF THE FEBRUARY REVOLUTION
IN FRANCE
(From a Newspaper Report)

Citizen Engels, editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, made a speech in French which he ended, amidst thunderous applause, with a toast to the June insurgents.

First published in the Westdeutsche Zeitung
No. 51, March 1, 1850

Printed according to the newspaper
Published in English for the first time
ACCOUNTS OF THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC REFUGEE COMMITTEE IN LONDON

1. Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 1849</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>@ 7s</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7s</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4s</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6s</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3s</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5s6d</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8s</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12s</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10s</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1850</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7s</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2s6d</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4s</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1 to 23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7s</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13s</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1s3d</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

114 grants totalling 38 13 6

Postage, stamp duty, bank charges and writing materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 39 18 7
The expenses include £26 advances to various refugees, who in the meantime have found work, for the purchase of tools, clothing, etc., which they have promised to repay later.

2. Receipts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>From / Through</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 19</td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>£10 9s 5d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1</td>
<td>From the Workers' Society</td>
<td>— 3s 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through the <em>Westdeutsche Zeitung</em> in Cologne</td>
<td>£4 1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 talers minus costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From German workers in Paris</td>
<td>£2 5s 10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through Professor Türk in Rostock</td>
<td>£16 12s 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 11</td>
<td>From the Cincinnati Aid Committee</td>
<td>£20 18s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From workers in Schwerin</td>
<td>3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£57 10s 3d</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minus the above expenditures</td>
<td><strong>£39 18s 7d</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cash in hand</strong></td>
<td><strong>£17 11s 8d</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above accounts were presented to the meeting of the local German Workers' Society of March 4 and were found correct. The receipts and the books of the Committee are ready at the Treasurer's for inspection by the donors or their representatives.

Since these accounts were balanced two more items have been received from Cologne and New York, which will be entered in the next account. On the other hand, the number of refugees here needing support has been greatly increased by the constant expulsions from Switzerland and France. New refugees are arriving here almost daily, most of them in a state in which they need not only the usual scanty aid but also urgent outlays for clothes. In these circumstances the funds of the undersigned Committee are used all the more the less successful the attempts to procure means to support the refugees here from other sources appear to have been, and the more often, therefore, all the refugees arriving here are at once directed to the Committee. The efforts of the German workers here and of the refugees themselves have succeeded in finding work for many of these. But a large number of jobs which are available to refugees elsewhere are for various reasons closed to them here, in particular because of the fierce competition in overcrowded London.
Moreover, the rush of new arrivals is so great that in spite of these efforts the list of persons needing support is swelling every week. Although the greatest economy has been observed in spending the money contributed to the Committee, and regular aid can only cover the most urgent needs, because of the high prices of the necessaries of life prevailing here, the funds of the Committee were bound to shrink very rapidly in these circumstances. We must even fear that we may soon be unable to protect the local unemployed refugees from homelessness and the most extreme misery.

We are therefore appealing once more to the party in Germany itself for funds. We cry out to it that as the number and hence the need of the refugees in Switzerland and France declines, it increases in the same degree in London, and we hope that it will not come to such a pass that people who fought arms in hand for the freedom and honour of the German nation will have to beg for their bread on the street corners of London.

All contributions are requested at the address of

Mr. Henry Bauer
64 Dean Street, Soho
London

London, beginning of March 1850

The Social-Democratic Refugee Committee:

Karl Marx, Fr. Engels, H. Bauer,
A. Willich, Karl Pfänder

Published in Die Hornisse No. 67, March 20, 1850 (abridged) and in the Westdeutsche Zeitung No. 68, March 21, 1850

Printed according to the Westdeutsche Zeitung

Published in English in full for the first time
ABOUT ENGELS'
SPEECH AT A MEETING OF FRATERNAL DEMOCRATS
ON APRIL 5, 1850,
COMMEMORATING ROBESPIERRE'S BIRTHDAY
ANNIVERSARY
(From a Newspaper Report) 431

Frederick Engels did justice to the revolutionary spirit of the English. He pointed out that a party of Levellers 432 had already existed at the time of the English Revolution, and ended with the health of the English workers.

First published in Die Hornisse No. 89, April 17, 1850
Citizen Kleiner declares that Citizen R. Schramm has assured him that he does not belong to a refugee committee, but has merely received a number of lottery tickets from Galeer in Geneva with instructions to send the money to Geneva. The other committee meets at Hillmann's, is merely posing as a committee and, he believes, has no money.

Read, approved and signed

W. Kleiner
Beyerle

Citizen Gnam: Citizen Struve declares that he has no money for refugees. He has received a hundred lottery tickets from Galeer but has not yet disposed of them. Should he receive the money for them, he will either pay the money in to some committee that might be set up, or use his own judgment in giving the money to the refugees in return for a receipt. He regrets the splits that exist amongst the German émigrés; if these splits did not exist thousands of guilders would find their way here. For this reason he would advise the refugees to form a committee among themselves.

Read, approved and signed

Gnam
Josef Leoni
Jakob Klein

Citizen Struve then donated £1, which Gnam suggested should be given to the committee—at which Citizen Struve said: No, not to a
committee, I am giving that to those who are here just now, and they are to divide it amongst themselves.

Gnam
Josef Leoni
Lucas

The minutes were written by Engels on April 8, 1850


Printed according to the manuscript

Published in English for the first time
ARTICLE 1

The aim of the association is the downfall of all privileged classes, the submission of those classes to the dictatorship of the proletarians by keeping the revolution in continual progress until the achievement of communism, which shall be the final form of the constitution of the human family.

ARTICLE 2

To contribute to the realisation of this aim, the association will form ties of solidarity between all sections of the revolutionary communist party, causing national divisions to disappear according to the principle of republican fraternity.

ARTICLE 3

The founding committee of the association is constituted its Central Committee, and, wherever necessary for the accomplishment of the work, it will establish committees which will be in correspondence with the Central Committee.

ARTICLE 4

The number of association members is not limited, but no member may be admitted unless he has been voted in unanimously. In no case can the election be held by secret ballot.

ARTICLE 5

All the association members pledge themselves by solemn oath to preserve absolutely in these terms Article 1 of the present rules. Any modification which might lead to the weakening of the intentions
expressed in Article 1 releases members of the association from their obligation.

ARTICLE 6

All the society's decisions are taken by a majority of two-thirds of the voters.

(Signed:) J. Vidil, Auguste Willich, G. Julian Harney, Adam, Ch. Marx, F. Engels

Drawn up in mid-April 1850

First published in Russian (Papers of the Marx-Engels Institute No. 1, Moscow-Leningrad, 1926)

Printed according to the manuscript

Translated from the French

Published in English for the first time
ACCOUNTS OF THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC REFUGEE COMMITTEE IN LONDON

Receipts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 25</td>
<td>Balance in hand</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From the Social Reform Association in London</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 13</td>
<td>From the Cologne Refugee Committee</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From A. F., member of the Workers' Society</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 18</td>
<td>Through Herr Wichmann in Hamburg</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 16</td>
<td>Through &quot; Rempel in Bielefeld ... &quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot; Engels of E.B. (^a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20</td>
<td>From several English workers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>53 grants @ 7s</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>7 &quot; 10s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1 &quot; 9s 6d</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1 &quot; 2s 8(1/2)d</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8(1/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>6 &quot; 5s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2 &quot; 1s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2 &quot; 4s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1 &quot; 2s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Advances</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Postage and petty expenses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10(1/2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Presumably Elberfeld-Barmen.—Ed.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April</th>
<th>56 grants @ 6s</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  |                  | 58| 10| 3 |

|                  |                  | 85| 17| 1 1/2 |

Balance in hand                9 | 4 | 11 1/2 |

The Committee, set up on September 18, 1849, has since its foundation supported about a hundred refugees for shorter or longer periods, and the total sum of moneys passed through its hands amounts to £161 3s 8 1/2d. In addition, the Workers' Society here has catered for the exceptional needs of individual refugees by collections, found work for others and put its premises with newspapers at the disposal of all refugees.

The books and receipts concerning the above accounts, which were submitted to and adopted by the German Workers' Society, are available with the Treasurer of the Committee for inspection by the donors or their representatives.

Messrs. Struve, Bobzin, Bauer (Stolpe) and others have lately seen fit to use their names to attract from Germany adequate funds for the refugees. Accordingly they have grouped around themselves a number of refugees and formed their own committee at a meeting yesterday. It goes without saying that this renewed project to form a parallel committee can no more divert us from our work for the refugees than the earlier projects which failed.

As the accounts show, the Committee's funds are so depleted that they barely suffice for the needs of one more week. But more refugees apply for support every day. We therefore call on the German social-democratic party once again not to let down their
refugees and as soon as possible to send their contributions to the Treasurer, K. Pfänder,\textsuperscript{435} 21 King Street, Soho, London.

London, April 23, 1850

The Social-Democratic Refugee Committee:

\textit{K. Marx, President,}
\textit{August Willich, K. Pfänder,}
\textit{Frederick Engels, Heinrich Bauer}

Published in the \textit{Deutsche Londoner Zeitung} No. 265, April 26, 1850 (abridged); the \textit{Westdeutsche Zeitung} No. 104 (supplement), May 2, 1850; the \textit{Neue Deutsche Zeitung} No. 106, May 3, 1850, and the \textit{Norddeutsche Freie Presse} No. 349, May 10, 1850

Printed according to the \textit{Norddeutsche Freie Presse} and checked with the \textit{Westdeutsche Zeitung}

Published in English for the first time
For some time funds have been coming in so scantily for the German refugees here that these latter have suffered the greatest misery. A number of them, who so far have been unable to find any work in their trade here, have been sleeping in the streets and parks for almost a week and are suffering hunger. In various quarters the differences between the committees and allegations of biassed distribution of funds have been made a pretext for not sending any money for the refugees. Messrs. Struve, Bobzin and others have contributed to this situation by declaring that the undersigned Committee supports only “Communists”.

We declare once again that we have supported everybody without distinction who proved his status as a German refugee in need of support. Our books and receipts are there to prove it, and are available at any time for inspection by donors or their representatives. At a full meeting of the committee of Messrs.Struve, Bobzin and others, co-signatory Willich asked the refugees who had received support which of them had been asked whether he was a “Communist”. Not one raised his hand!

We declare the above claims of Messrs. Struve, Bobzin and others to be lies and slander.

This declaration removes the pretext under which the London refugees have hitherto been deprived of support from various quarters.

London, June 14, 1850

The Social-Democratic Refugee Committee:
K. Marx, F. Engels, K. Pfänder,
A. Willich, H. Bauer
Letters and contributions are requested at the address of K. Pfänder, 21 King Street, Soho, London.

Published in the Westdeutsche Zeitung No. 149, June 25, 1850; Die Hornisse No. 146, June 25, 1850; the Neue Deutsche Zeitung No. 152, June 27, 1850

Printed according to the Westdeutsche Zeitung

Published in English for the first time
## ACCOUNTS
OF THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC REFUGEE COMMITTEE
IN LONDON FOR MAY, JUNE AND JULY 1850

### Receipts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash in hand according to previous account</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Hanau through Citizen Schärttnner, £13 less 7s 9d income tax</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From an Englishman</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfurt am Main £5 and £20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Trier</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Paris (German workers)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Citizen Betzler</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Frankfurt am Main</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Cologne</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Wiesbaden (Workers’ Association)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Hamburg (Norddeutsche Freie Presse)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; London Workers’ Society</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Frankfurt am Main</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Neustadt a.d. Haardt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Hamburg (Despatch Dept. of the Freischütz)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; La Chaux-de-Fonds</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Hamburg (Workers’ Association of St. Georg)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 24 to May 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 grants @ 3s 6d</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 &quot;  &quot; 3s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 &quot;  &quot; 2s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 &quot;  &quot; 1s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 &quot;  &quot; 5s</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional grants</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers' work for refugees</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58 grants @ 2s</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 &quot;  &quot; 1s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 &quot;  &quot; 1s 6d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional grants</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty expenses</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>July</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 grants @ 2s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 &quot;  &quot; 1s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 &quot;  &quot; 6d</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional grants</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the refugees' board and lodging

\[
\begin{align*}
£7 & \quad 9s 6d \\
£5 & \quad — \\
£5 & \quad 10s \\
£5 & \quad 10s \\
£6 & \quad — \\
£6 & \quad —
\end{align*}
\]

For working equipment

6 — —

Advances to refugees

7 12 6

Advances to a refugee with family

1 — —

Petty expenses

— 19 3½

Total expenditure

109 10 8½

Total receipts

155 16 2½

Less expenditure

109 10 8½

Cash in hand

46 5 6

The above accounts were submitted to the meeting of the Workers' Society on July 30 of this year and were approved. Books and
receipts are ready and available for inspection by the donors or their representatives.

Since in the month of June contributions received were very scanty and the need of the refugees was often unbearable, it was decided to set up a communal lodging and eating-house for them. The local Workers' Society and a section of the refugees who had already found work made it possible by their contributions to begin the execution of this plan. From funds received later the house could be provided with the necessary utensils and furniture. Up to now 18 refugees have found lodgings there and about 40 have received meals. At first the unemployed shoemakers among the refugees were used to provide their comrades with the necessary footwear. Later the Committee allocated funds and took the steps necessary to equip a common workshop for the refugees on the same premises and so to enable them to earn part of their living expenses themselves.

If the first attempt proves a success, the thing will be done on a larger scale and the public will be further informed about it at the appropriate time. The Committee expects that this double enterprise of providing aid and employment for the refugees will be supported by a great many contributions from Germany until the refugees are able to support themselves.

London, July 30, 1850

The Social-Democratic Refugee Committee: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, August Willich, Karl Pfänder, Heinrich Bauer

Published in the Norddeutsche Freie Presse No. 425, August 7, 1850; the Deutsche Londoner Zeitung No. 280, August 9, 1850; Der Freischütz No. 98, August 15, 1850

Printed according to the Norddeutsche Freie Presse

Published in English for the first time
ABOUT ENGELS' SPEECH
AT A MEETING ORGANISED BY FRATERNAL
DEMOCRATS ON SEPTEMBER 10, 1850
(From a Newspaper Report)\textsuperscript{437}

Mr. Engels, formerly editor of a German newspaper, and who was introduced by the Chairman (John Pettie) as one who had fought and bled for freedom, addressed the meeting. He said that about thirty months ago there had been a fine lot of gentlemen sent over to England, Louis Philippe, Prince Metternich, Prince William of Prussia, and others—and foreign patriots had thought it a disgrace to England that she should so readily shelter them. But, he said, wait—the people of England, at their own time would act justly, and had done so now. (Hear, hear!) The treatment of Haynau would produce a greater effect upon the Continent than anything which had been done in England for the last ten years.

His treatment was worse than if they had torn his epaulettes from his shoulder, or broken his sword and thenceforth he would be driven from the society of his equals with contempt (Hear, hear). There would shortly be another revolution on the Continent, and the enemies of the people who would otherwise have fled to this country, would now be afraid to do so, and would go somewhere else, probably to their friend Nicholas of Russia who would perhaps give them a small kingdom in Siberia. (Loud laughter!)

In the name of his country he thanked the people of London for their treatment of Haynau which he hoped, would be imitated in any future place the monster might visit. (Applause.)

Published in The Times No. 20591, September 11, 1850; The Morning Chronicle No. 26139, September 12, 1850; the Deutsche Londoner Zeitung No. 285, September 13, 1850; The Northern Star No. 673, September 14, 1850; the Reynold's Weekly Newspaper No. 5, September 15, 1850, and Die Hornisse No. 218, September 18, 1850

Printed according to the Reynold's Weekly Newspaper
MEETING OF THE CENTRAL AUTHORITY
SEPTEMBER 15, 1850


Fränkel is excused.

As this is an extraordinary meeting the minutes of the last meeting are not here and are therefore not read.

Marx: The Friday meeting could not take place because of a clash with a meeting of the commission of the Society. As Willich has called a meeting of the district, a meeting whose legality I will not go into, this meeting must be held today. I wish to make the following proposal which is in three parts:

1. The Central Authority shall be transferred from London to Cologne and its powers will be transferred to the district authority there as soon as this meeting is over. This decision shall be reported to League members in Paris, Belgium and Switzerland. The new Central Authority will itself notify members in Germany.

Explanation: I was opposed to Schapper's motion to set up a district authority in Cologne for the whole of Germany because this might disrupt the unity of the Central Authority. Our motion does away with this objection. There are a number of new reasons which support the motion. The minority in the Central Authority is in open rebellion against the majority both in the motion of censure during the last meeting, in the general meeting now called by the district as well as in the Society and among the refugees. Therefore the Central Authority cannot possibly remain here. Its unity cannot be maintained any longer, there would be a split and there would then be two leagues. As the interests of the party must come first I propose this way out.

---

\( ^a \) German Workers' Educational Society in London, called below the Great Windmill Street Society.— Ed.

\( ^b \) The second copy of the minutes has: "called for Monday".— Ed.
2. The existing League Rules shall be declared null and void. The new Central Authority shall be responsible for drawing up new rules. Explanation: The Rules of the 1847 Congress were amended by the London Central Authority in 1848. Circumstances have now changed yet again. The latest London Rules weakened the principal articles of the original Rules. Both Rules are in force in different places, in some places there are no Rules at all or there are unauthorised ones, so that there is complete anarchy in the League. Moreover the latest Rules have become public and so can no longer be used. My proposal, therefore, essentially is that effective rules be introduced in place of the present lack of rules.439

3. Two districts shall be formed in London to be entirely independent of each other and the only bond between them will be that they belong to the League and correspond with the same Central Authority.

Explanation: It is necessary to form two districts here for the very reason that the unity of the League must be preserved. Quite apart from personal disagreements we have witnessed also differences of principle even in the Society. In the last debate on “the position of the German proletariat in the next revolution” views were expressed by members of the minority on the Central Authority which directly clash with those in the last circular but one and even the Manifesto. A German national standpoint was substituted for the universal outlook of the Manifesto, and the national feelings of the German artisans were pandered to. The materialist standpoint of the Manifesto has given way to idealism. The revolution is seen not as the product of realities of the situation but as the result of an effort of will. Whereas we say to the workers: You have 15, 20, 50 years of civil war to go through in order to alter the situation and to train yourselves for the exercise of power, it is said: We must take power at once, or else we may as well take to our beds. Just as the democrats abused the word “people” so now the word “proletariat” has been used as a mere phrase. To make this phrase effective it would be necessary to describe all the petty bourgeois as proletarians and consequently in practice represent the petty bourgeois and not the proletarians. The actual revolutionary process would have to be replaced by revolutionary catchwords. This debate has finally laid

---

a The second copy has: “of the Central Authority”.— Ed.
b This refers to the Address of the Central Authority to the League, March 1850, and Manifesto of the Communist Party (see this volume, pp. 277-87, and present edition, Vol. 6).— Ed.
c The second copy reads: “this view”.— Ed.
bare the differences in principle which lay behind the clash of personalities, and the time for action has now arrived. It is precisely these differences that have furnished both parties with their battlecries and some members of the League have called the defenders of the Manifesto reactionaries, seeking thereby to make them unpopular, which however does not worry them in the least, as they do not seek popularity. The majority would therefore be justified in dissolving the London district and expelling the members of the minority as being in conflict with the principles of the League. I do not put a motion to that effect as it would cause a pointless scandal and because these people are still Communists in their convictions even though the opinions they are now expressing are anti-communist and could at best be described as social-democratic. It is obvious, however, that it would be a mere waste of time, and a harmful one at that, for us to remain together. Schapper has often spoken of separation—very well then, I am seriously in favour of it. I think that I have found the way for us to separate without splitting the party.

I wish to state that, for my own part, I should like to have at most twelve people in our district, as few as possible, and gladly leave the minority in possession of the great throng. If this proposal is accepted we shall obviously be unable to remain in the Society; I shall resign from the Great Windmill Street Society together with the majority. After all it is not a matter of the hostile relationship between the two groups, but, on the contrary, of eliminating the tension and so all relationships. We remain together in the League and in the party but we are not going to maintain a relationship that is plainly harmful.

Schapper: Just as in France the proletariat parts company with the Montagne and La Presse so it is here also: the people who represent the party in principle part company with those who organise the proletariat. I am in favour of moving the Central Authority and also of making alterations in the Rules. The Cologne members are familiar with the situation in Germany. I also think that the new revolution will produce people who will lead themselves better than all those who made a name for themselves in 1848. As far as disagreements of principle are concerned, it was Eccarius who raised the question that provided the occasion for this debate. I have voiced

---

[a] The second copy reads: “the minority of the Central Authority”.—Ed.
[b] The second copy reads: “in the same Society”.—Ed.
[c] See this volume, p. 483.—Ed.
[d] The second copy has: “to Cologne”.—Ed.
[e] The second copy has: “take the lead”.—Ed.
the opinion attacked here because I am in general an enthusiast in this matter. The question at issue is whether we ourselves chop off a few heads right at the start or whether it is our own heads that will fall. In France the workers will come to power and thereby we in Germany too. Were this not the case I would indeed take to my bed; in that event I would be able to enjoy a different material position. If we come to power we can take such measures as are necessary to ensure the rule of the proletariat. I am a fanatical supporter of this view but the Central Authority favours the very opposite. You want to have nothing more to do with us—very well, let us part company now. I shall certainly be guillotined in the next revolution, nevertheless I shall go to Germany. You want two districts—very well, but that will be the end of the League. We shall meet again in Germany and then perhaps be able join forces again. Marx is a personal friend of mine but you are in favour of separation—very well, we shall each go our separate ways. But in that case there should be two leagues, one for those who work with the pen and one for those who work in other ways. I do not share the view that the bourgeoisie in Germany will come to power and on this point I am a fanatical enthusiast—if I weren’t I wouldn’t give a brass farthing for the whole affair. But if there are two districts here in London, two societies and two refugee committees then we should prefer also to have two leagues and complete separation.

Marx: Schapper has misunderstood my motion. If the motion is adopted we shall separate, the two districts shall separate and the people concerned will have no relations with each other. However, they will belong to the same League and be under the same Authority. You can even retain the greater part of the League membership. As for personal sacrifice, I have given up as much as anyone; but for the class and not for individuals. And as for enthusiasm, not much enthusiasm is needed to belong to a party when you believe that it is on the point of seizing power. I have always defied the momentary opinions of the proletariat. We are devoted to a party which, most fortunately for it, cannot yet come to power. If the proletariat were to come to power the measures it would introduce would be petty-bourgeois and not directly proletarian. Our party can come to power only when the conditions allow it to put its own views into practice. Louis Blanc is the best instance of what happens when you come to power prematurely. In France, moreover, it isn’t the proletariat alone that gains power but the peasants and the petty bourgeois as well, and it will have to

---

a The second copy reads: “Central Authority”.—Ed.
carry out not its, but their measures. The Paris Commune\textsuperscript{443} shows that one need not be in the government to accomplish something. And incidentally why do we hear nothing from the other members of the minority, especially Citizen Willich, who approved the circular unanimously at the time? We cannot and will not split the League: we wish merely to divide the London district into two districts.

\textit{Eccarius:} It was I who raised the question and it certainly was my intention to have the whole matter discussed. I have explained it in the Society why I think that Schapper's view is based on an illusion and why I do not think that our party can come to power immediately in the next revolution. Our party will then be more important in the clubs than in the government.

Citizen Lehmann walks out without comment. Citizen Willich likewise.

First part of the motion: all in favour, Schapper abstains.
Second part: all in favour, Schapper abstains.
Third part: all in favour, Schapper abstains.

Schapper makes a protest against us all: We are now completely separated. I have my own acquaintances and friends in Cologne who follow me rather than you.

\textit{Marx:} We have acted in accordance with the Rules. The resolutions of the Central Authority are valid.

After the minutes are read out both Marx and Schapper declare that they have not written to Cologne on this matter.\textsuperscript{a}

Schapper is asked whether he has any objection to the minutes. He says he has no objection as he thinks all objections are superfluous.

Eccarius proposes that everyone should sign the minutes. Accepted. Schapper declares that he will not sign.

Dated, London, September 15, 1850
Read, approved and signed.\textsuperscript{b}

Signed: \textit{K. Marx}, Chairman of the Central Authority
\textit{F. Engels}, Secretary
\textit{Henry Bauer, K. Schramm, J. G. Eccarius, K. Pfänder}

First published in the \textit{International Review}
of Social History, Vol. 1, Part 2, 1956
Printed according to the manuscripts

---

\textsuperscript{a} This sentence is missing in the second copy.—\textit{Ed}.

\textsuperscript{b} These words are missing in the second copy.—\textit{Ed}.
THE RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL AUTHORITY
OF THE COMMUNIST LEAGUE

September 15, 1850

1. The Central Authority will be transferred from London to Cologne and a new Central Authority will be formed by the Cologne district.

2. The existing League Rules are declared null and void and the new Central Authority is instructed to draft new ones.

3. Two districts will be formed from the existing London district. They will be independent of each other and will deal only with the common Central Authority.

Drawn up on September 15, 1850, with
the participation of Marx and Engels

First published in the Dresdner Journal
und Anzeiger No. 180, June 22, 1851

Printed according to the newspaper
Published in English for the first time
ACCOUNTS OF THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC REFUGEE COMMITTEE IN LONDON
FROM AUGUST 1 TO SEPTEMBER 10 [1850]445

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Receipts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collected by Miss Berg</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the Workers' Association in St. Georg, Hamburg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the same</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Neustadt an der Haardt</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Mr. C. Flory through the editorial board of the Deutsche Londoner Zeitung</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the German Workers' Association in Paris</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collected by Herr John Berg</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the refugees' board and lodging</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the brushmakers' workshop</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For leather, etc.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 grants 6d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 1s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 2s 6d</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 grants 10s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advances to refugees</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To four refugees for the voyage to America</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Travelling expenses to Schleswig-Holstein £ 7 s 3 d
Petty expenses, postage, bank charges, etc. — 11 3

September
For board and lodging 14 4 8
39 grants of 6 d — 19 6
2 " of 1 s — 2 —
1 " of 10 s and 1 of 5 s — 15 —
Distributed according to the donor's (Herr Berg's) instructions 8 15 —
Advances to refugees 1 18 —
Petty expenses — 6 10

Total 90 3 6

Since the four undersigned members of the hitherto existing Social-Democratic Committee, on submitting these accounts, declared their resignation from the Committee, the Society in Great Windmill Street appointed a commission to check the books and receipts, which reported on the 15th that it had found everything in order.

The undersigned saw fit to leave all books and receipts concerning their administration with the hitherto treasurer, K. Pfändler, 21 King Street, Soho Square, since they had resigned not only from the Committee but from the Society and the documents cannot be dispensed with in case enquiries are made by members of the public.

Donors are therefore requested to appoint representatives in London to inspect the books and receipts at the above-mentioned hitherto treasurer's.

London, September 18, 1850

Karl Marx, H. Bauer, K. Pfändler, Fr. Engels

Published in the Deutsche-Londoner Zeitung
No. 287, September 27, 1850

Printed according to the newspaper
Published in English for the first time

---

a The German Workers' Educational Society in London.— Ed.
PROPOSAL FROM THE LONDON DISTRICT OF THE COMMUNIST LEAGUE TO THE CENTRAL AUTHORITY IN COLOGNE

To expel all members of the Sonderbund and in particular Schapper, Willich, Schärtner, Lehmann, Dietz (Oswald), Gebert, Fränkel (the last seven by name) and to inform all League districts and communities of this decision as well as the Sonderbund in London and its leaders. [...] 1. They have communicated reports, and false reports at that, concerning the split in London to leaders of secret societies outside the League and to refugees of various nationalities. 2. They are in a state of open rebellion against the legally constituted Central Authority in Cologne; they act in defiance of the latter's decisions and have an emissary travelling around Germany to found a Sonderbund. 3. They have violated, and still violate, in their relations with the members of the London district, all obligations binding on the members of secret societies. 4. They have, since the separation, broken all the laws of secret societies and to permit them to remain in the League any longer would only serve them to hasten its disintegration.

Drawn up on November 11, 1850, with the participation of Marx and Engels. Printed according to the newspaper the Dresdner Journal und Anzeiger No. 180, June 22, 1851

a Gaude.— Ed.
1. The aim of the Communist League is to bring about the destruction of the old society—and the overthrow of the bourgeoisie—the spiritual, political and economic emancipation of the proletariat, the communist revolution, using all the resources of propaganda and political struggle towards this goal. In the various stages of development through which the struggle of the proletariat has to pass, the League shall represent at all times the interest of the movement as a whole, just as it shall seek at all times to unite and organise all the revolutionary forces of the proletariat within itself; as long as the proletarian revolution has not attained its ultimate goal the League shall remain secret and indissoluble.

2. Membership shall be open only to those who comply with the following conditions:
   a. be emancipated from all religion, sever connections with any church organisation and not participate in any ceremony not required by civil law;
   b. understand the conditions, the course of development and the ultimate goal of the proletarian movement;
   c. stand aloof from all organisations and particular strivings that oppose or obstruct the progress of the League towards its goal;
   d. show ability and zeal in propaganda, unswerving devotion to convictions and revolutionary energy;
   e. maintain the strictest secrecy in all matters concerning the League.

3. Admission shall be granted by the unanimous vote of the community. A new member shall normally be admitted by the chairman in the presence of the whole community. Members will swear to abide unconditionally by the decisions of the League.

4. Whoever violates the conditions of membership shall be expelled. A majority vote of the community is required for the
expulsion of individuals. The Central Authority can expel whole communities where expulsion has been proposed by a district community. The whole League shall be notified of expulsions and shall keep those expelled under surveillance just like any suspect individual.

5. The League is organised in communities, districts, a Central Authority and a congress.

6. A community consists of at least three members of the same locality. It shall elect a chairman, who will conduct the meetings, and a deputy, who will act as treasurer.

7. Above the communities of a country or a province there shall be a chief community, the district, to be nominated by the Central Authority. The communities shall deal directly only with their districts, the districts in turn deal with the Central Authority.

8. The communities shall meet regularly, not less than once a fortnight, they shall correspond at least once a month with their districts; the latter shall communicate with the Central Authority at least once every two months; every three months the Central Authority shall report on the state of the League.

9. The chairman and deputy of the communities and districts shall be elected for one year and can be deposed at any time by their electorate; the members of the Central Authority can only be deposed by the congress.

10. Every League member shall pay a monthly contribution whose minimum shall be determined by the congress. Half of the sums so raised will go to the districts and half to the Central Authority; they will be used to cover administration costs, the distribution of propaganda material and the dispatching of emissaries. The districts shall bear the cost of the correspondence with their communities. Contributions shall be sent every three months to the districts, which will forward half of the total income to the Central Authority and, at the same time, give an account of their income and expenditure to their communities. The Central Authority shall account to the congress for monies it has received. Extraordinary expenses shall be met by extraordinary contributions.

11. The Central Authority is the executive organ of the whole League. It shall consist of at least three members and shall be elected and augmented by the district which the congress has assigned as its seat. It shall be responsible only to the congress.

12. The congress is the legislative organ of the whole League. It shall consist of the delegates of the district assemblies, which will elect one deputy for every five communities.
13. The district assembly is the representative body of the district. It shall be convened in the district centre regularly every quarter by the committee of the chief community to debate the affairs of the district. To this assembly each community shall send one delegate. The district assembly shall invariably be convened in the middle of July each year for the election of the League delegates.

Article 5 Community
Article 6 District
Article 7 Central Authority
Article 8 The Congress
Article 9 Admission to the League
Article 10 Expulsion from the League (money....)²

14. A fortnight after the close of the district election assemblies the congress shall meet as a rule at the seat of the Central Authority unless the latter decides upon another venue.

15. The congress shall receive from the Central Authority, which has a seat in it but no vote, a report on all its activities and on the state of the League; it shall lay down the principles governing the policy to be followed by the League, decide upon amendments to the Rules and determine the seat of the Central Authority for the coming year.

16. In cases of emergency the Central Authority can summon an extraordinary congress which will consist in that event of the delegates last elected by the districts.

17. Disputes between individual members of the same community shall be settled conclusively by that community; disputes between members of the same district by the district community; those between members of different districts by the Central Authority; personal complaints about members of the Central Authority shall be brought before the congress. Disputes among communities belonging to the same district shall be resolved by the district community, those between communities and their district or between different districts, by the Central Authority; but in the first case an appeal may be made to the district assemblies and in the second, to the congress. The congress shall also resolve all conflicts between the Central Authority and the lower committees of the League.

First published in Russian in the journal Voprosy Istorii No. 11, 1948
Printed according to a copy of the manuscript with remarks by Marx

— Articles 5-10 were written by Marx at the bottom of the third page of the manuscript.— Ed.
ABOUT ENGELS' SPEECH
AT A NEW YEAR'S PARTY
OF THE FRATERNAL DEMOCRATS SOCIETY
DECEMBER 30, 1850
(From a Newspaper Report)

M. Engels (who, with Carl Schapper, attended as a deputation from the German Society) also responded to this sentiment, thanked them in the name of his brethren for their sympathy, and expressed his best wishes for the prosperity of the English people. He then entered into a long and elaborate statement of the causes of the failures abroad, and the consequent reaction, showing that it equally arose from the ignorance of the people and the treachery of their leaders.

First published in *The Northern Star*
No. 689, January 4, 1851

Reprinted from the newspaper
NOTES
AND
INDEXES
NOTES

1 This statement was written by Engels soon after his arrival in London from Switzerland on approximately November 10, 1849. In July 1849, Engels crossed into Switzerland, together with the retreating Baden-Palatinate insurgent army, and then left for London via Genoa by sea around the Iberian Peninsula. Marx, who had emigrated to London in August 1849, carried on extensive work there to restore the Communist League and to assist revolutionary refugees coming to England. Engels, too, immediately joined in and was brought into the League's Central Authority which Marx had restored.

Engels' statement to the Chartist newspaper The Northern Star was prompted by articles of the petty-bourgeois journalist Karl Heinzen, with whom Marx and Engels had had a controversy as far back as 1847 (see present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 291-306), and the fact that Heinzen's articles were used by English Conservative circles for the persecution and expulsion of political refugees from Britain. Thus, Heinzen's pamphlet Lehren der Revolution (Lessons of the Revolution) reprinted in the Deutsche Londoner Zeitung Nos. 241 and 242 of November 9 and 16, 1849, contained gross demagogic statements compromising the German revolutionary refugees. Referring to those statements, the author of a letter published in The Times of November 23, 1849, and signed Anti-Socialist suggested to the Home Secretary that "the writer of such hellish doctrines" should be ordered "to quit the English dominions within 24 hours".

Marx wrote to Joseph Weydemeyer on December 19, 1849: "You will have seen what-you-may-call-him Heinzen's inane bragging in the newspapers. This fellow, who was done for by the revolution in Germany—before that his things enjoyed a certain vogue because the petty bourgeois and the commercial traveller liked to see printed in black and white the idiocies and rodostatines they themselves might utter in tones of mystery between biscuits and cheese at the wine-shop—is endeavouring to rehabilitate himself by compromising the other refugees in Switzerland and England—those who have really worked—in the eyes of those countries' governments, by kicking up a row, and by threatening shortly to gobble up a hundred thousand of millions of men at déjeuner à la fourchette, thus earning himself a lucrative martyrdom."

2 After the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, which had been published by Marx and Engels in Cologne from June 1, 1848, till May 19, 1849, was banned Marx did not give up
the idea of resuming, in one way or another, the publication of a paper that would continue the revolutionary traditions of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. He wrote about this to Engels in Switzerland on August 1, 1849, inviting him to London to help start one up. Marx succeeded in raising funds and finding a publisher, and in mid-December 1849 a contract to publish the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Politisch-ökonomische Revue* was signed between the responsible publisher Konrad Schramm and Schuberth and Co., a Hamburg bookselling firm. The periodical’s aims were to assess the results of the 1848-49 revolution, to reveal the nature of the new historical situation, and to develop further the proletarian party’s tactics. Most of the articles and literary and international reviews were written by Marx and Engels, who also drew contributions to the *Revue* from their followers Wilhelm Wolff, Joseph Weydemeier, and Johann Georg Eccarius. Issue No. 1 also carried an item by Karl Blind, “Oesterreichische und preussische Parteien in Baden”, and issue No. 4—verses by the French democrat Louis Ménard.

The cover named the places of publication as London, where Marx and Engels lived at the time, Hamburg, where the journal was printed, and New York since a great number of those who had participated in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany emigrated to America, and Marx and Engels hoped to find suitable ground there for distributing the journal. Presuming the possibility of a new revolutionary upsurge, they intended shortly to make their publication a weekly, and later a daily newspaper (see this volume, pp. 605-06). This plan was not, however, carried out. Altogether six issues were published; the last issue, a double one (5-6), came out at the end of November 1850. All further attempts to continue publication were blocked by police persecution in Germany and lack of funds.

Marx sent the text of the *Announcement* to Joseph Weydemeyer in Frankfurt am Main on December 19, 1849, with a request to publish it in the *Neue Deutsche Zeitung*. It was printed in Nos. 14, 23 and 31 of January 16 and 26, and February 5, 1850.

It was also printed in the *Berner Zeitung* No. 361 of December 27, 1849; in the *Westdeutsche Zeitung* (published by Hermann Becker in Cologne) on January 8, 9, 11 (supplement), 12 and 13 (supplement), 1850; in the *Schweizerische National-Zeitung*, Basle, No. 8, January 10, 1850; in the *Düsseldorfer Zeitung* No. 9, January 10, 1850; in the *Norddeutsche Freie Presse*, Hamburg-Altona, No. 254, January 18, 1850; in *Der Volksfreund*, Lemgo, No. 3, January 18, 1850. p. 5

3 In May 1849, when the counter-revolution was on the upsurge, the Prussian Government issued an order expelling Marx and the other editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* from Prussia. This measure, prepared well in advance, was applied when the main uprisings in the Rhine Province had been virtually suppressed. On his return to Cologne in April 1848, Marx applied for Prussian citizenship which he had been forced to renounce in 1845 when he was living in Belgium as an emigrant. Despite the Cologne Magistrate’s favourable reply to his application, however, the Cologne royal district authorities and the Minister of the Interior refused to grant it, and Marx remained a “foreigner”, who could at any moment be accused of abusing hospitality and expelled. The royal district authorities’ note to this effect followed on May 11, 1849, and on May 16 Marx was given 24 hours to leave Prussia. Weerth and Dronke, who did not enjoy Prussian citizenship either, received similar orders. Legal proceedings were instituted against Engels for his part in the Elberfeld uprising. The last issue, No. 301, of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* appeared on May 19, 1849. p. 5

4 *Letters from Germany* by Engels, as well as his series of articles *Letters from France*, were written for the Chartist journal *The Democratic Review of British and Foreign
Politics, History and Literature published by George Julian Harney in 1849 and 1850. Harney had invited Engels to make regular contributions to the new journal as early as March 1849 (see The Harney Papers, Assen, 1969, pp. 249-50). But Engels was only able to start contributing in November 1849, when he came to London. In London Marx and Engels established close contacts with the revolutionary wing of the Chartist party and used The Democratic Review to disseminate the ideas of scientific communism and explain the character of events on the Continent to the English working people.

The content of the Letters from Germany and the Letters from France, the way events are analysed, and the fact that appraisal of these events coincides, sometimes even textually, with that given in later works by Marx and Engels (e.g., the first and second letters from Germany and the first international review; Letters from France and The Class Struggles in France) show that their author was not only well informed of Marx's work at the time, but also took part in it. Marx did not yet know English well enough to write articles for The Democratic Review, so the author could only be Engels.

Engels wrote the Letters from Germany from personal observations while actively participating in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany. He used material in the German and English press and information provided by Communist League members, some of whom emigrated to London at that time. In conformity with current journalistic practice, the letters were marked Cologne.

The letters from Germany and France met with a broad response in the Chartist press. The Northern Star in its reviews of the new issues of The Democratic Review always stressed the particular significance of these letters. Thus, in its review of the issue which opened the series, The Northern Star (No. 637 of January 5, 1850) wrote that letters from France and Germany "will do much towards promoting the good work of international fraternity". As regards the next of The Democratic Review issue The Northern Star (No. 641, February 2, 1850) stated: "Letters from France and Germany are decidedly the most important of the contents of this number of the Democratic Review. The disclosures concerning the designs of the European despots, and the proofs given to the progress of the revolutionary spirit in France and Germany, stamp these letters as inexpressibly valuable. The letter from France has but one fault—its comparative brevity." Noting that the Letters expose the policy of the counter-revolutionary powers and their instrument—President Bonaparte, the Chartist newspaper concluded its review of the March issue as follows: "The Letters in the present number show that great events are at hand" (The Northern Star, March 2, 1850). Further comments on the Letters appeared in The Northern Star of April 6 and May 4, 1850. Another paper, People, commented on the current issue of The Democratic Review, that original and very important letters from France and Germany had appeared (People, II, 1850, p. 304).

The Democratic Review published four letters from Germany. The first three, containing cross references, were published in the January, February and March issues. In this volume they are published under the general title Letters from Germany. The fourth letter, written later and containing no direct references to the first three, appeared in the August issue of the journal. In this volume it is published in chronological order (see pp. 392-95).

Footnotes give references to passages in later works by Marx and Engels with similar assessments of events and facts. The numbers of the letters have been supplied by the editors of this edition.

p. 7

5 The term Ordermongers is formed on the pattern of the words "profitmongers" and "moneymongers" often met in the Chartist press. Engels uses it here for the
first time. In the *Letters from France* (see this volume, pp. 24, 25, 26, 28 et seq.) Engels used this term to denote the members of the party of Order (see Note 32). p. 7

6 The *Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation* (962-1806) included, at different times, German, Italian, Austrian, Hungarian and Bohemian lands, Switzerland and the Netherlands, forming a motley conglomeration of feudal kingdoms and principalities, church lands and free towns with different political structures, legal standards and customs. p. 7

7 The *Federal Diet*—a representative body of the German Confederation, an ephemeral union of German states, founded in 1815 by decision of the Congress of Vienna. Though it had no real power, it was nevertheless a vehicle for feudal and monarchical reaction. During the 1848-49 revolution in Germany, reactionary circles made vain attempts to revive the Federal Diet, intending to use it to prevent the democratic unification of Germany. After the defeat of the revolution, the Federal Diet received its former rights in 1850 and survived till 1866. p. 7

8 The *German National Assembly*, which opened on May 18, 1848, in St. Paul's Church in the free city of Frankfurt am Main, was to unify the country and to draw up a Constitution. The liberal deputies, who were in the majority, turned the Assembly into a mere debating club. At the decisive moments of the revolution, the liberal majority condoned the counter-revolutionary forces. In spring 1849, the liberals left the Assembly after the Prussian and other governments rejected the Imperial Constitution it had drawn up. What remained of the Assembly moved to Stuttgart and was dispersed by the Württemberg forces on June 18. The *Imperial Vicar or Regent* (Archduke John of Austria) and the *Imperial Ministry* constituted a provisional Central Authority set up by the Frankfurt National Assembly on June 28-29, 1848. The provisional Central Authority had neither a budget nor an army of its own, possessed no real power, and was an instrument of the counter-revolutionary German princes. p. 7

9 The *Interim* (a temporary agreement) was concluded in September 1849 between Prussia and Austria on joint administration in Germany until the question of the German Constitution was settled. Under this agreement, the Austro-Prussian commission was established, which actually meant the revival of a kind of Federal Diet. While reflecting the counter-revolutionary aspirations of both governments, the agreement conflicted with Prussia's claims for supremacy in Germany. p. 7

10 The following editorial note is supplied to this passage: "Since the above letter came to hand, intelligence has reached this country of the abdication of the 'Vicar', and the resignation of his authority (?) into the hands of Austrian and Prussian commissioners. Thus has ended the Frankfort farce.—Ed. D.R." This note was presumably written by Engels. p. 7

11 The Left wing of the Frankfurt National Assembly consisted of two factions: the *Left* (Robert Blum, Karl Vogt and others) and the *extreme Left*, known as the radical-democratic party (Arnold Ruge, Friedrich Wilhelm Schloëfl, Franz Zitz, Samuel Trüzschler and others), which, in the main, represented the petty bourgeoisie, but was nevertheless supported by a section of the German workers. The extreme Left vacillated and took a halfway position on the basic problems of the German revolution—abolition of the remnants of feudalism and unification of the country. In April and May 1849, after the conservative and most of the liberal deputies had left the Assembly, the Left and the extreme Left gained the majority. But they, too, continued the policy of curbing the revolutionary actions of the masses.
The **Regency of the Empire** was formed in Stuttgart on June 7 by what remained of the Frankfurt National Assembly, instead of the Central Authority headed by the Imperial Regent, Archduke John, who was openly counter-revolutionary. The Regency consisted of five deputies representing the Left faction (moderate democrats): Franz Raveaux, Karl Vogt, Ludwig Simon, Friedrich Schuler, August Becher. They failed in their attempts to carry by parliamentary means the Imperial Constitution that had been worked out by the Frankfurt Assembly and rejected by the German princes: The Regency virtually ceased its activities after the Frankfurt Assembly was finally dispersed on June 18, 1849. Some of its former deputies emigrated to Switzerland.

12 The *Three-Kings’-League*—an agreement concluded in Berlin on May 26, 1849, between Prussia, Saxony and Hanover. Based on the Prussian project of reorganising the German Confederation, it was an attempt by Prussia to gain hegemony in Germany. By trying to make other German princes join this League (known as the Prussian Union), Prussia’s ruling circles hoped to unify the German states, without Austria, under Prussian rule. However, under pressure from Austria, supported by Russia, the Prussian Government was forced to give up its plans in 1850.

13 On May 28, 1849, the Prussian Government appealed to the German governments to join the Three-Kings’-League. The appeal, together with a new draft of the Imperial Constitution, revised in a counter-revolutionary spirit, was published in the German press at the end of May and the beginning of June 1849.

14 Engels is referring to the acquittal for high treason by jury in Berlin and Königsberg in December 1849 of Benedikt Waldeck and Johann Jacoby, the leaders of the Left wing of the Prussian National Assembly, which was dissolved by the government on December 5, 1848.

15 The *Orangemen*—members of the Orange Society (Order), a Protestant terrorist organisation founded in Ireland in 1795 and employed by the authorities, Protestant landlords and the clergy against the Irish national liberation movement. The name was derived from William III, Prince of Orange, who suppressed the Irish uprising of 1689-91 for restoration of the Stuart monarchy. The Order had an especially strong influence in Ulster, Northern Ireland, with a mainly Protestant population.

16 On December 5, 1848, the Prussian National Assembly was dissolved and the Constitution imposed by the King made public. The dispersal of the Assembly was the culmination of the counter-revolutionary coup d’etat that began in November with the order to transfer the Assembly from Berlin to the remote town of Brandenburg. The Constitution introduced a two-chamber system; the age and property qualifications made the First Chamber a privileged Chamber of Gentry (“House of Lords”); by the electoral law of December 6, 1848, the right to vote in the two-stage elections to the Second Chamber was granted only to the so-called independent Prussians. The royal authority was vested with very wide powers—the King was authorised to convene and dissolve the Chambers, appoint ministers, declare war and conclude peace. He was vested with full executive power, while sharing legislative power with the Chambers.

Later, anti-democratic revisions of the Constitution were made repeatedly on the initiative of Prussian ruling circles. Thus, after dispersing on April 27, 1849, the Second Chamber of the Prussian Diet, which included a large number of opposition deputies—liberals and moderate democrats, on May 30 Frederick William IV promulgated a new electoral law introducing elections based on high
property qualifications and unequal representation of different sections of the population. The electorate was divided into three classes according to property status. Thus the King succeeded in having an obedient majority elected to the Second Chamber.

17 The reference is to a message by Frederick William IV of January 7, 1850, with new amendments to the imposed Constitution revised by the government and adopted by the Chambers (Friedrich Wilhelm IV. Allerhöchste Botschaft in the Preussischer Staats-Anzeiger No. 10 of January 10, 1850, and the Neue Preussische Zeitung No. 9 of January 11, 1850).

18 Engels draws an analogy with English absolutist legal institutions. The Star Chamber (the name of a meeting-place of the king's councillors in the royal palace of Westminster derived from stars fashioned on the ceiling of the hall) was established by Henry VII in 1487 as a special court to try rebellious feudal lords. Under Elizabeth 1, it became a political court; it was abolished during the English revolution of the seventeenth century.

19 This refers to Frederick William IV's New-Year message “To My Army” (“An mein Heer”) signed in Potsdam on January 1, 1849, and published in the Preussischer Staats-Anzeiger of January 3, 1849. The Neue Rheinische Zeitung used this document to expose the counter-revolutionary actions of the Prussian military (see Marx's article "A New-Year Greeting", present edition, Vol. 8).

20 This refers to the second revised version of the imposed Constitution adopted by the Chambers on January 31, 1850, including the King's amendments to the previous version. In the new version, the reactionary monarchist traits of the Constitution became more prominent and new concessions were made to the aristocracy and the Junker landowners. On February 6, 1850, Frederick William IV took the oath to the Constitution.

21 On March 19, 1848, during the revolutionary events in Berlin, the armed people compelled King Frederick William IV to come out onto the balcony of his palace and bare his head before the bodies of the insurgents who had fallen at the barricades.

Further, Engels refers to Frederick William IV's speech on February 6, 1850, concerning the oath to the Prussian Constitution.

22 This expression is from the speech from the throne made by Frederick William IV at the opening of the First United Diet in Berlin on April 11, 1847 (Allgemeine Preussische Zeitung No. 101, April 12, 1847).

23 The Holy Alliance—an association of European monarchs founded in 1815 to suppress revolutionary movements and preserve feudal monarchies in European countries. During the 1848-49 revolution, and in subsequent years, counter-revolutionary circles in Austria, Prussia and Tsarist Russia attempted to revive the Holy Alliance's activities in a modified form.

24 From 1707 to 1806 the principality of Neuchâtel and Valangin (in German: Neuenburg and Vallendis) was a dwarf state under Prussian rule. In 1806, during the Napoleonic wars, Neuchâtel was ceded to France. In 1815, by decision of the Vienna Congress, it was incorporated into the Swiss Confederation as its 21st canton, at the same time retaining its vassalage to Prussia. On February 29, 1848, a bourgeois revolution in Neuchâtel put an end to Prussian rule and a republic was proclaimed. Up to 1857, however, Prussia laid constant claims to Neuchâtel and only pressure from France forced her to renounce it officially.
The Sonderbund—a separatist union of the seven economically backward Catholic cantons of Switzerland formed in 1843 to resist progressive bourgeois reforms and to defend the privileges of the church and the Jesuits. The decree of the Swiss Diet of July 1847 dissolving the Sonderbund served as a pretext for the latter to start hostilities against the other cantons early in November. On November 23, 1847, the Sonderbund army was defeated by the federal forces. Attempts by Austria and Prussia to interfere in Swiss affairs in support of the Sonderbund failed.

The Federal Constitution of the Swiss Confederation was adopted on September 12, 1848. The new Constitution ensured a certain centralisation of the country, which had been turned from a confederation of cantons (the confederation treaty of 1814 sanctioned by the Congress of Vienna restricted the power of central government to the utmost) into a federative state. p. 16

When publishing the series of articles Letters from France the editor of The Democratic Review, Harney, tried to present them as reports received directly from Paris. At the same time, the articles were based not only on French material, but on British press reports and other information (private letters to Engels from Paris, and reports by a member of the Communist League, Ferdinand Wolff, who had been expelled from Paris and came to London in December 1849).

The fourth letter of the series was written by Engels while Marx was working on the third chapter of The Class Struggles in France (March 1850), which appeared in instalments in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Politisch-ökonomische Revue. The facts and appraisal of the events given in Letters from France often coincide with what Marx wrote about France in The Class Struggles (the footnotes give references to relevant places), in the third international review (see this volume, pp. 507-09 and 516-25) and later in The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte (present edition, Vol. 11). Coincidence of thought and of approach testifies to the fact that Letters from France reflected Marx's and Engels' common point of view. The numbers of the letters have been supplied by the editors of this edition. p. 17

The reference is to the French Provisional Government formed on February 24, 1848, as a result of the overthrow of the July monarchy. Most ministerial posts were held by moderate republicans (Lamartine, Dupont de l'Eure, Crémieux, Arago, Marie, and two members of the oppositional Republican Party, which was associated with Le National—Marrast and Garnier-Pagès). There were, besides, three leaders of the petty-bourgeois party of democrats and socialists grouped round La Réforme—Ledru-Rollin, Flocon and Louis Blanc—and also a mechanic, Albert (real name Martin). The Provisional Government existed till May 10, 1848, when it was replaced by the Executive Commission set up by the Constituent National Assembly. p. 17

Droit d'octroi—a right, originating from feudal times, of cities to levy tolls on imported consumer goods. It was repealed in 1791 during the French Revolution, but later reintroduced on some foodstuffs (salt, wine, fish, etc.). p. 18

The reference is to the repeal in June 1846 of the Corn Laws by the Peel Government in the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie.

The Corn Laws (first introduced in the fifteenth century) imposed in the interests of landowners high import duties on agricultural produce in order to maintain high prices for these products on the home market. The struggle between the industrial bourgeoisie and the landed aristocracy over the Corn Laws ended in their repeal. p. 19

The revolution of February 1848 in France was sparked off by the authorities' prohibition of a banquet organised by the opposition and fixed for February 22 and of a peaceful demonstration in support of the freedom of assembly. p. 20
31 The party of the National included moderate republicans, under Armand Marrast, who were supported by the industrial bourgeoisie and a section of liberal intellectuals associated with it; in the 1840s they adherents of this party grouped around the newspaper Le National.

The most prominent representatives of this trend in the Provisional Government were Marrast, editor of Le National, and Garnier-Pagès, Minister of Finance.

32 At the elections to the French Legislative Assembly held on May 13, 1849, the monarchist groups—the Legitimists, Orleanists, and Bonapartists who had formed the party of Order, gained the majority.

33 Tuileries—the royal palace in Paris; prior to the February revolution, the residence of Louis Philippe.

The Elysé-National—the residence (from December 1848) of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, President of the French Republic.

34 Freeholders—a category of English small landowners originating from feudal times. Engels often used this term, familiar to English workers, when writing of conditions in France.

35 A tax of 45 additional centimes upon every franc of direct taxes was adopted by the French Provisional Government on March 16, 1848.

36 In December 1849, the Minister of Education Parier proposed a Bill making schoolmasters in primary schools subordinate to the prefects, who could dismiss or appoint them at will. The law was adopted on January 11, 1850.

37 Following the death of the Right-wing monarchist deputy de Beaune, by-elections were held in the department of the Gard on December 20, 1849. Favand, the candidate of the petty-bourgeois socialist democratic party (Montagne), was elected by a majority vote of 20 thousand out of 36 thousand.

38 The Legitimists—supporters of the Bourbon dynasty overthrown in 1830, who upheld the interests of the big hereditary landowners and the claim to the French throne of Count Chambord, King Charles X's grandson, who took the name of Henry V.

39 The reference is to the draft law on education, submitted on June 18, 1849, by the Minister of Education, Falloux (hence its name). This law confirming the dominant position of the Catholic Church and religious organisations in public education was adopted by the Legislative Assembly on March 15, 1850.

40 The June insurrection of the Paris proletariat against the bourgeois régime of the Second Republic (June 23-26, 1848) was the culmination of the 1848 revolution in France and exerted a strong influence on revolutionary events in other European countries.

41 The trees of liberty were planted in the streets of Paris following the victory of the February revolution of 1848. The planting of trees of liberty—mainly oaks and poplars—has been a tradition in France ever since the French Revolution.

In January 1850, the trees of liberty on the boulevards were felled by the order of Paris Prefect Carlier because they allegedly hindered street traffic. The authorities thus tried to provoke mass disturbances and to stage a new massacre of revolutionary elements.

42 By-elections to the Legislative Assembly were to be held on March 10, 1850, in connection with the annulment of the powers and the conviction by the Supreme
Court of the Left deputies who participated in the anti-government demonstration on June 13, 1849. To influence the voters, the government divided the territory of France into five big military areas; as a result, Paris and its neighbouring departments were surrounded by the other four areas, which were under the command of counter-revolutionary generals. Comparing the powers of these generals with those of Turkish pashas, the republican press called these areas pashalics.

This measure was illegitimate because, under Article 76 of the Constitution, changes in the administration of the departments of France could be effected only by special legislation of the National Assembly. p. 25

43 The Orleanists—supporters of the House of Orleans, overthrown by the February revolution of 1848; they represented the interests of the financial aristocracy and the big industrial bourgeoisie. p. 25

44 The issue of The Democratic Review containing Engels' fourth letter also carried the beginning of his Two Years of a Revolution. This was a synopsis of the first chapter of Marx's The Class Struggles in France (see this volume, pp. 48-70).

Part of the first paragraph of the letter beginning with the words: “really, this composition is significant”, up to the words: “the total and entire emancipation of the working men”, was printed under the title “Election of Carnot, Vidal and de Flotte” in The Northern Star No. 650, April 6, 1850, in the review of The Democratic Review's April issue. p. 27

45 On May 15, 1848, Paris workers led by Blanqui, Barbès and others took revolutionary action against the anti-labour and anti-democratic policy pursued by the bourgeois Constituent Assembly which opened on May 4. The participants in the mass demonstration forced their way into the Assembly premises, demanded the formation of a Ministry of Labour and presented a number of other demands. An attempt was made to form a revolutionary government. National Guards from the bourgeois quarters and regular troops succeeded, however, in restoring the power of the Constituent Assembly. The leaders of the movement were arrested and put on trial. p. 27

46 Bourgeois Lacedemonian is an ironical nickname for the Paris businessman and member of the National Guard Alexandre Leclerc who was awarded the Legion of Honour for his part, together with his sons, in suppressing the June 1848 insurrection of Paris workers. p. 32

47 Letter Six was apparently not completed in time or left unfinished by Engels. An excerpt from it was published by the editor of The Democratic Review in the June number in his own article “Tactics and Programme of the Counter Revolutionists” with the comment (to make the readers think the Letters came directly from Paris): “We had begun to fear the arrest of our Paris correspondent, his Letter not having reached us until several days after the usual time. It was received only as we were going to press. It is impossible for us to give more than the following brief extracts.” Then came the three paragraphs by Engels reproduced in this volume under the heading VI. p. 33

48 Engels has in mind the results of the preliminary debates held from May 21 to 23, 1850, on the law abolishing universal suffrage (462 votes for and 227 against). For details see this volume, pp. 136-37. The law was finally adopted on May 31; it introduced a property qualification camouflaged by stipulating three years' permanent residence in a given locality and the payment of personal tax. p. 33
The Mountain (Montagne)—representatives in the Constituent and subsequently Legislative Assembly of a bloc of democrats and petty-bourgeois socialists grouped round the newspaper La Réforme. They called themselves Montagne by analogy with the Montagne in the Convention of 1792-94.

Dronke wrote to Engels from Paris (February 21 and the beginning of May, 1850) that the prestige enjoyed among the French workers by prominent representatives of petty-bourgeois socialism and revolutionary democratism (Louis Blanc, Proudhon, Albert and Barbès) was declining. He held a different view of Blanqui, however, saying that he had the same great influence over the French workers as previously.

This refers to the prospectus for the pamphlet by a certain Daniel Borne, a French chemist of royalist convictions: Borne fils. Le Rideau est levé!!! Grande lanterne magique des pâtissiers politiques des 24 février, 15 mai et 24 juin 1848, dédiée aux paysans, aux ouvriers laborieux et aux honnêtes gens par M. Borne fils, ex-accusé du 15 mai [Paris], impr. de M'ne Lacombe [1850] im 4°, 2 p. The prospectus told of Borne’s part in organising royalist actions in March-May 1848 and also about the Bourges trial.

From March 7 to April 3, 1849, the leaders of the Paris workers’ uprising of May 15, 1848, were tried at Bourges, accused of conspiracy against the government. Barbès and Albert were sentenced to exile, Blanqui to ten years solitary confinement and the rest of the accused to various terms of imprisonment or exile.

Instead of increasing the civil list by 3 million per annum, the Assembly granted Louis Bonaparte a lump sum of 2,160,000 francs (see this volume, p. 140).

The reference is to the article “A Gradual Decline of the National Assembly” printed in the newspaper Le Pouvoir No. 195, July 15, 1850, for which Felix de Lamartinière, the publisher, was fined (see Le Moniteur universel Nos. 197 and 200 of July 16 and 19, 1850). The further reference is to the leading article in Le Pouvoir No. 199, July 19, 1850.

As stipulated by Article 32 of the Constitution of the French Republic, during the recess a permanent commission had to be set up of 25 elected deputies and members of the Bureau of the Legislative Assembly. In 1850 this commission consisted of 39 members: eleven Bureau members, three questors and 25 elected deputies.

It is not by chance that Engels gives May 1852 as the deadline for any possible attempt to upset the Republic. According to the French Constitution (Article 45) Louis Napoleon’s term of presidency expired on the second Sunday in May 1852 and he was not re-eligible for another four years (see this volume, p. 572). The Bonapartist coup d’état took place on December 2, 1851.

The Announcement, written by Marx and Engels concerning the delay in printing the first issue of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue (see Note 2), the material for which was sent from London to Hamburg early in February 1850, was forwarded to Hamburg not later than February 20. It was published at the beginning of the first number with the following note: “The Neue Rheinische Zeitung is a monthly of no less than five signatures. Subscription for three months is 25 silver groschen. Separate numbers ten silver groschen. Responsible publisher K. Schramm.”
The second chapter "June 13, 1849" of Marx's work *The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850*, mentioned here (initially published as "1848-1849"), came out in the second issue of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung: Politisch-ökonomische Revue*; the third chapter mentioned in the Announcement—"Repercussions of June 13 on the Continent"—was published in No. 3 of the *Revue*, entitled "Consequences of June 13, 1849". Marx realised his plans for the fourth and partly for the third chapter by writing some other material for the *Revue*, in particular in the international reviews written jointly with Engels.

Chapter IV of Engels' *The Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution, "To Die for the Republic*", was published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue* No. 3, which came out about April 17, 1850.

Marx did not prepare his lectures on political economy for publication as he had intended.

The *German Workers' Educational Society in London* was founded in February 1840 by Karl Schapper, Joseph Moll and other members of the League of the Just (an organisation of German craftsmen and workers, and also of emigrant workers of other nationalities). After the reorganisation of the League of the Just in the summer of 1847 and the founding of the Communist League, the latter's local communities played the leading role in the Society. During various periods of its activity, the Society had branches in working-class districts in London. In 1847 and 1849-50, Marx and Engels took an active part in the Society's work, but on September 17, 1850, Marx, Engels and a number of their followers withdrew because the Willich-Schapper sectarian and adventurist faction had temporarily increased its influence in the Society causing a split in the Communist League. In the late 1850s, Marx and Engels resumed their work in the Educational Society, which existed up to 1918, when it was closed down by the British Government.

The article by Wilhelm Wolff was published in No. 4 of the *Revue* under the title "Nachträgliches aus dem Reich" (Additional News from the Empire).

The article on the financial state of Prussia was to be written by G. A. Bergenroth, a German democrat who took part in the 1848-49 revolution. This article was however never received by the journal.

Marx's *The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850* consists of a series of articles written between January and October 1850 specially for the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue* and published in it under the general title "1848-1849". This is a most important work summing up the results of the 1848-49 revolution. In preparation for this work, Marx used French newspaper reports, reports published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, and accounts given by witnesses—French and German revolutionary refugees, among them Ferdinand Wolff, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* Paris correspondent, and another Communist League member, Sebastian Seiler, who was a stenographer to the French National Assembly in 1848 and 1849 and wrote a pamphlet on the events of June 13, 1849, which he presented to Marx. Marx was also probably familiar with Ledru-Rollin's pamphlet on the same subject.

According to the original plan (see this volume, p. 41) the work was to consist of four articles: "The Defeat of June 1848", "June 13, 1849", "Repercussions of June 13 on the Continent" and "Current Situation; England". However, in Nos. 1, 2 and 3 of the journal only three articles were published: "The Defeat of June 1848", "June 13, 1849" and "Consequences of June 13, 1849". The influence of the June 1849 events on the Continent and the situation in England were treated
in other items of the journal, particularly in the international reviews written jointly by Marx and Engels.

The work was not reprinted in full during Marx's lifetime. In 1895 it came out in book form in Berlin, with an Introduction by Engels. The title *The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850* was given by Engels and the work has since appeared under this title in various languages. In the 1895 edition, Engels added the fourth chapter, which included the sections of the third international review dealing with events in France (see this volume, pp. 507-09 and 516-25). Engels entitled this chapter "The Abolition of Universal Suffrage in 1850". Engels wrote to Richard Fischer on February 13, 1895, that the fourth chapter "will serve as a factual conclusion to the work as a whole, without which it would have remained a fragment". At the same time, the headings of the first three chapters were changed: I. "From February to June 1848", II. "From June 1848 to June 13, 1849", III. "From June 13, 1849, to March 10, 1850". In the present edition, the headings of the first three chapters are given according to the journal, while the heading of the fourth chapter is given as in the 1895 edition.

The publication of the series of Marx's articles drew the attention of the press. A short announcement of No. 1 of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue* and quotations from Marx's work were published in the *Freischütz*, Hamburg, No. 40, April 2, 1850; a review in the *Wochenblatt der Hörnisse*, Cassel, No. 3, April 15, 1850. The preface and the first article were reprinted in the *Deutsche Londoner Zeitung* Nos. 262, 263 and 264, April 5, 12 and 19, 1850. On January 1, 1852, the *Tum-Zeitung*, published by German socialist emigrants in the USA, carried an article by Joseph Weydemeyer "On the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", written under the direct influence of Marx's work, the first work by Marx and Engels in which the term "the dictatorship of the proletariat" was used. On the other hand, the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat brought criticism of the author from the petty-bourgeois democrats. The *Neue Deutsche Zeitung*, whose editor was a former "true socialist", Otto Lüning, published a review (Nos. 148-51, June 22-23, 25 and 26, 1850) of the four numbers of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue* with unfavourable comments on this proposition and an incorrect interpretation of it. Marx was obliged to write Lüning a special letter rebuffing attempts to distort and dispute the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat (see this volume, pp. 387-88).

Marx and Engels attached great importance to the popularisation of the ideas contained in *The Class Struggles in France* among the English workers. Engels used this work in his *Letters from France* published in *The Democratic Review* (see this volume, pp. 17-40) and, on the basis of the first article in the series, wrote *Two Years of a Revolution*, which was published in the same journal (see this volume, pp. 353-69). Excerpts from Marx's work were cited by his contemporaries (Hermann Becker, Proudhon).


In this volume, the work is published after the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue* text, checked with that of the 1895 edition prepared by Engels. The *Revue* published it from the manuscript and since Marx's handwriting was difficult to decipher, mistakes cropped up. In the present edition, all changes in style, spelling, punctuation and other corrections made by Engels have been taken into account, as well as errata printed in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue* (to the first number in the second, and to the second and third in the fourth).
Account has also been taken of the analysis, carried out by the editorial commission working on the Marx/Engels, Gesamtausgabe (MEGA), erste Abteilung, 10. Bd. and kindly made available to us, of the marks and corrections made by Marx and Engels in their copies of the journal. Engels' corrections apparently date from 1895 when he republished The Class Struggles (in the 1895 edition, however, they were only partly taken into account). It is also probable that Engels intended to republish the Revue in full. Some corrections by Marx and Engels coinciding with the errata printed in the Revue have been silently inserted in the text of the present edition. Changes in meaning are indicated in footnotes.

Besides this, obviously inaccurate dates and factual data, including those in the 1850 and 1895 editions, have also been silently corrected. Comments are not usually made on Marx's free translation of quotations, except when the words Marx puts in quotation marks are not true quotations but convey the general meaning of the cited passages.

The Paris uprising of June 5 and 6, 1832, was prepared by the Left republicans and by secret revolutionary societies including the Society of the Friends of the People. The uprising flared up during the funeral of General Lamarque, an opponent of Louis Philippe's Government. The insurgent workers threw up barricades and defended them with great courage; the red flag was hoisted over them for the first time.

The uprising of Lyons workers in April 1834, directed by the secret republican Society of the Rights of Man and the Citizen, was one of the first mass actions by the French proletariat. The uprising, supported by republicans in several other towns including Paris, was brutally suppressed.

The Paris uprising of May 12, 1839, in which the revolutionary workers played a leading part, was prepared by the secret republican socialist Society of the Seasons led by Auguste Blanqui and Armand Barbès; it was suppressed by troops and the National Guard.

Robert Macaire—a character portraying a clever swindler, created by the famous French actor Frédéric Lemaître and immortalised in the caricatures of Honoré Daumier. The figure of Robert Macaire was a biting satire on the domination of the financial aristocracy under the July monarchy.

The reference is to the repercussions of the suppression of the uprising in the free city of Cracow (the Cracow Republic) which, by decision of the Congress of Vienna, came under the joint control of Austria, Prussia and Russia, who had partitioned Poland at the end of the eighteenth century. The insurgents succeeded in seizing power in Cracow on February 22, 1846, established a National Government of the Polish Republic and issued a manifesto abolishing feudal services. The Cracow uprising was suppressed at the beginning of March; in November 1846, Austria, Prussia and Russia signed a treaty incorporating Cracow into the Austrian Empire.

On the Swiss Sonderbund see Note 25.

On the Holy Alliance see Note 23.

In the spring of 1847 at Buzançais (department of the Indre) the starving workers and the inhabitants of neighbouring villages looted storehouses belonging to profiteers, which led to a clash between the population and troops. Four of those who took part were executed and many others sentenced to hard labour.

The dynastic opposition—an opposition group in the French Chamber of Deputies during the July monarchy (1830-48). The group, headed by Odilon Barrot, expressed the sentiments of the liberal industrial and commercial bourgeoisie and
favoured a moderate electoral reform, which they regarded as a means to prevent revolution and preserve the Orleans dynasty.  
On the National party see Note 31.  

During the first days of the revolution, the workers of Paris demanded that the French Republic's flag should be red, the colour of that hoisted in the workers' suburbs of Paris during the June uprising of 1832. Bourgeois representatives insisted on the tricolour (blue-white-and-red) which had been the national standard during the French Revolution and under Napoleon I. It had been the emblem of the bourgeois republicans grouped around the newspaper National even before 1848. In the end, the tricolour was accepted as the national standard with a red rosette fixed to the flagstaff; later, the rosette was removed.  

In 1848 Le Moniteur universel printed reports on the sittings of the Luxembourg Commission alongside official documents.  
The reference is to the sum assigned by the King in 1825 as compensation for aristocrats whose property had been confiscated during the French Revolution.  
The Mobile Guards, set up by a decree of the Provisional Government on February 25, 1848, with the secret aim of fighting the revolutionary masses, were used to crush the June uprising of the Paris workers. Later they were disbanded on the insistence of Bonapartist circles, who feared that if a conflict arose between Louis Bonaparte and the republicans, the Mobile Guards would side with the latter.  

Lazzaroni—a contemptuous nickname for declassed proletarians, primarily in the Kingdom of Naples, who were repeatedly used in the struggle against the liberal and democratic movement.  
The Poor Law adopted in England in 1834 provided for only one form of relief for the able-bodied poor: workhouses with a prison-like regime in which the workers were engaged in unproductive, monotonous and exhausting labour. The people called these workhouses "Bastilles for the poor". Here and later Marx uses the English word "workhouses".  
The reference is to the elections to the National Guard and the Constituent Assembly which were to be held on March 18 and April 9, 1848, respectively. Paris workers, grouped around Blanqui, Dézamy and others, insisted on a postponement of the elections arguing that they should be prepared by thorough explanatory work among the population. As a result of the popular demonstration on March 17 in Paris, regular troops were withdrawn from the capital (after the events of April 16 they were brought back), and elections to the National Guard were postponed till April 5 and to the Constituent Assembly till April 23.  

Commission du pouvoir exécutif (the Executive Commission)—the Government of the French Republic set up by the Constituent Assembly on May 10, 1848, to replace the Provisional Government which had resigned. It existed until June 24, 1848, when Cavaignac's dictatorship was established during the June proletarian uprising. Moderate republicans predominated on the Commission; Ledru-Rollin was the sole representative of the Left.
Under the decree prohibiting congregations of people adopted by the Constituent Assembly on June 7, 1848, the organisation of gatherings and meetings in the open was punishable by imprisonment of up to ten years.

On June 22, 1848, *Le Moniteur universel* No. 174 in the section “Partie non officielle” reported an order of the Executive Commission of June 21 on the expulsion of workers between the ages of 17 and 25 from the national workshops and their compulsory enrolment in the army. On July 3, 1848, after the suppression of the June insurrection of the Paris workers, the government passed a decree dissolving the national workshops.

In the German original, the term *Haupt- und Staatsaktion* ("principal and spectacular action", "main and state action") is used, which has a double meaning. First, in the seventeenth and the first half of the eighteenth century, it denoted plays performed by German touring companies. The plays were rather formless historical tragedies, bombastic and at the same time coarse and farcical.

Second, this term can denote major political events. It was used in this sense by a trend in German historical science known as "objective historiography". Leopold Ranke was one of its chief representatives. He regarded *Haupt- und Staatsaktion* as the main subject-matter.

The reference is to the by-elections to the Constituent Assembly in Paris on September 17, 1848 (to replace former deputies, including those who were deprived of their powers after the June insurrection was suppressed). Among the newly elected was the revolutionary socialist François Raspail, imprisoned after the events of May 15, 1848.

This refers to a system of general treaties set up by the Congress of Vienna (September 1814-June 1815), embracing the whole of Europe, apart from Turkey. The Congress decisions helped to restore feudal order, perpetuated the political fragmentation of Germany and Italy, sanctioned the incorporation of Belgium into Holland and the partition of Poland, and outlined measures to combat the revolutionary movement.

The *Projet de constitution présenté à l'Assemblée nationale* drafted by the commission was submitted to the National Assembly by Marrast on June 19, 1848. The draft was published in *Le Moniteur universel* No. 172, June 20, 1848. A German translation of the draft was published in the supplement to No. 24 of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* on June 24, 1848. After the June insurrection, this draft was thoroughly revised by its authors in a conservative spirit. The Constitution of the French Republic was finally adopted on November 4, 1848.

The *lily*—a heraldic emblem of the Bourbon dynasty; the *violet*—a Bonapartist emblem.

By a decree of the Senate (*Senatus consult*) of May 18, 1804, Napoleon I, the founder of the Bonaparte dynasty, was proclaimed Emperor of the French.

During the February uprising of 1848, King Louis Philippe and the monarchist circles were compelled to make Guizot and other unpopular ministers tender their resignations, and tried to form a government of moderate liberals to save the monarchy. On the morning of February 24 Odilon Barrot was authorised to head
the Cabinet, but Louis Philippe was compelled to abdicate and flee by the victory of the popular revolution. The Barrot Ministry survived till that afternoon.  

On January 26, 1849, the Minister of Public Works Léon Faucher submitted and demanded urgent discussion of a Bill on the right of association, prohibiting clubs. The Constituent Assembly, however, refused to discuss the Bill as an urgent matter. In spite of opposition from the Left deputies, who demanded the Ministry's resignation, accusing it of a breach of the Constitution, the first clause of the Bill (better known as the Bill on Clubs) was adopted by the National Assembly by a monarchist and moderate republican vote on March 21, 1849 (see this volume, p. 569). This decision dealt a serious blow at the freedom of assembly and association, primarily at the workers' associations.  

An allusion to the similarity between the schemes for restoring the monarchy in December 1848, when Changarnier assumed command of the National Guard and the Paris garrison, and the part General Monk played in restoring the Stuarts in 1660.  

In April 1849, President Louis Bonaparte and the French Government sent an expeditionary corps to Italy under General Oudinot to intervene against the Roman Republic proclaimed on February 9, 1849, and to restore the secular power of the Pope. On April 30, 1849, the French troops were driven back from Rome. The main blow was dealt by Garibaldi's volunteer corps. Oudinot violated the terms of the armistice signed by the French, however, and on June 3 started a new offensive against the Roman Republic, which had just completed a military campaign against Neapolitan troops in the south and was engaged in rebuffing the Austrians in the north. After a month of heroic defence, Rome was captured by the interventionists and the Roman Republic ceased to exist.  

The reference is to the defeat of the Piedmontese army during the second stage of the Austro-Italian war which broke out on March 25, 1848, as a result of the national liberation uprising in Lombardy and Venice against Austrian rule. However, the Piedmontese were compelled by military setbacks, particularly the defeat at Custozza on July 25 and 26, 1848, and the capture of Milan by the Austrians, to conclude an onerous armistice with Austria on August 9, 1848. On March 12, 1849, under public pressure, Charles Albert, King of Sardinia, cancelled the armistice and on March 20 hostilities were resumed. Despite national enthusiasm in Austrian-occupied Lombardy and throughout Italy, the Piedmontese army was defeated at Novara on March 23. Charles Albert abdicated. Victor Emmanuel II, the new King, concluded an armistice with the Austrians on March 26, and on August 6 a peace treaty was signed restoring Austrian rule in Northern Italy and the Austrian protectorate over a number of states of Central Italy (Parma, Tuscany, etc.).  

Engels gives a detailed account of the Austro-Italian war of 1848-49 in his articles in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung (see present edition, Vols. 7-9).  

Le Comité de salut public (the Committee of Public Safety) established by the Convention on April 6, 1793; during the Jacobin dictatorship (June 2, 1793-July 27, 1794) it was the leading body of the revolutionary government in France. It lasted until October 26, 1795.  

See Note 53.  

General Bréa, who commanded some of the troops that suppressed the June insurrection of the Paris proletariat, was killed by the insurgents at the gates
of Fontainebleau on June 25, 1848, for which two of the insurgents were executed.  

96 The reference is to the revolutionary events in Hungary and Germany in the spring and summer of 1849. A counter-offensive by the Hungarian revolutionary army, which routed the Austrian troops and almost cleared the Austrian invaders from the whole country, began in April. Hungary declared its independence on April 14, the Habsburg dynasty was officially dethroned and Kossuth elected head of state. However, a change unfavourable to the revolutionary movement shortly took place in the Hungarian campaign. In mid-June 1849 the Tsarist army entered Hungary to assist the Austrian counter-revolution. The Tsarist intervention was in effect approved by the ruling circles of France and England. The combined forces of the Habsburgs and the Tsar suppressed the Hungarian revolution.  

Almost simultaneously with the counter-offensive by the Hungarians, popular uprisings broke out in Saxony, Rhenish Prussia, the Palatinate and Baden in defence of the Imperial Constitution drafted by the Frankfurt National Assembly but rejected by the King of Prussia and other German princes. On the development of these uprisings see Engels' essays *The Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution* (this volume, pp. 147-239).

97 The reference is to the bombardment of Rome by Oudinot's expeditionary corps on June 3, 1849. Rome was repeatedly subjected to fierce bombardments during the French siege, which lasted until July 3, 1849.

98 Article V belongs to the introductory part of the Constitution. The articles of the principal part of the Constitution are numbered in Arabic figures.

99 The meeting of the Montagne leaders was held on the premises of the Fourierists' daily *La Démocratie pacifique* on the evening of June 12, 1849. (Using the expression *friedfertige [pacific] Demokratie*, Marx plays on the title of the newspaper and its trend.) The participants refused to resort to arms and decided to confine themselves to a peaceful demonstration.

100 In the manifesto published in *Le Peuple* No. 206, June 13, 1849, the Democratic Association of the Friends of the Constitution—an organisation of moderate bourgeois republicans formed by the National party members during the Legislative Assembly election campaign—called upon the citizens of Paris to participate in a peaceful demonstration to protest against the "presumptuous pretensions" of the executive authorities.

101 The *Declaration of the Montagne* was published in *La Réforme* and in *La Démocratie pacifique* and also in Proudhon's newspaper *Le Peuple* No. 206, June 13, 1849.

102 The events in Paris sparked off an armed uprising of Lyons workers and craftsmen on June 15, 1849. The insurgents occupied the Croix-Rousse quarter and erected barricades, but were suppressed by troops after several hours of staunch struggle.

103 On August 10, 1849, the Legislative Assembly adopted a law under which "instigators and supporters of the conspiracy and the attempt of June 13" were liable to trial by the Supreme Court. Thirty-four deputies of the Mountain (Ledru-Rollin, Félix Pyat and Victor Considérant among them) were deprived of their mandates and put on trial (some of them, those who emigrated, were tried by default). On June 13, the editorial offices of democratic and socialist news-
papers were raided and the main of these papers were banned. Repressions were extended to emigrants residing in France, including Marx, who was ordered to leave Paris for the department of Morbihan, a remote swampy area in Brittany (on this see present edition, Vol. 9, p. 527). At the end of August 1849 Marx left France for England, not wishing to submit to the arbitrary police decision.

104 The reference is to the Municipal Guard of Paris formed after the July 1830 revolution and subordinated to the Prefect of Police. It was used to suppress popular uprisings and was disbanded after the February 1848 revolution.

105 In the battle of Waterloo (June 18, 1815) Napoleon's army was defeated by British and Prussian troops commanded by Wellington and Blücher.

106 The reference is to the commission of three cardinals (who traditionally wore scarlet mantles) which, after the suppression of the Roman Republic by the French army and relying on support from the interventionists, restored the reactionary clerical regime in the papal states.

107 See Note 56.

108 Alongside Wiesbaden, Ems was a permanent residence of Count Chambord, the Legitimist pretender to the French throne (who called himself Henry V).

109 Louis Philippe, who had fled from France after the February revolution of 1848, lived in Claremont.

110 “Motu proprio” (of his own motion)—initial words of a special kind of papal encyclical adopted without the preliminary approval of the cardinals and usually concerning the internal political and administrative affairs of the papal states. Here this refers to the statement of Pope Pius IX “To My Beloved Subjects” of September 12, 1849 (the French text was published in Le Moniteur universel No. 271, September 28, 1849).

111 The proposition that the proletarian revolution could only be victorious in several advanced capitalist countries simultaneously and not in a single country alone was most clearly formulated by Engels in his work Principles of Communism (1847) (see present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 351-52). By developing further the Marxist theory and drawing on the law of uneven economic and political development of capitalism in the era of imperialism, in 1915 Lenin came to the conclusion that under the new historical conditions, the victory of the socialist revolution would be possible initially in a few or even in a single country.

112 The figures do not tally: the text reads 538,000,000 instead of 578,178,000, apparently a misprint. This does not, however, affect the general conclusion, for the net per capita income is less than 25 francs in both cases.

113 Lagarde, a supporter of the Mountain party, was elected to the Legislative Assembly in the by-elections held in the department of the Gironde on October 14, 1849, to replace the deceased Right-wing deputy Ravez.

On the elections in the department of the Gard see Note 37.

114 See Note 42.

115 See Note 39.
In his message of November 10, 1849, Carlier, the newly appointed Paris Police Prefect, called for a "social anti-socialist league" to be set up for the protection of "religion, labour, family, property and loyalty". The message was published in Le Moniteur universel No. 315, November 11, 1849.

See Note 41.

The July column erected in Paris on Bastille Square in 1840 in memory of those who fell in the July revolution of 1830 has been decorated with wreaths of immortelles ever since the February revolution of 1848.

May 4, 1848—the Constituent Assembly was convened; December 20, 1848—Louis Bonaparte became President; May 13, 1849—elections were held to the Legislative Assembly; July 8, 1849—by-elections took place in Paris as a result of which the party of Order strengthened its position in the Legislative Assembly.

Coblenz—a city in Western Germany; it was the centre of counter-revolutionary emigration during the French Revolution.

The reference is to the discovery of gold in California in 1848. Along with the discovery of rich deposits of gold in Australia in 1851, the Californian discovery added to the industrial and stock-exchange agitation in capitalist countries.

Proudhon expressed this point of view in his polemics against the bourgeois economist Frédéric Bastiat, published in La Voix du peuple from November 1849 to February 1850 and reproduced in a separate edition which appeared in Paris in 1850 under the title Gratuité du crédit. Discussion entre M. Fr. Bastiat et M. Proudhon.

In 1797 the British Government issued a special Bank Restriction Act making bank-notes legal tender and suspending the payment of gold for them. Convertibility was reintroduced only in 1821 in conformity with a law passed in 1819.

See Note 46.

The reference is to the commission of 17 Orleanists and Legitimists—deputies to the Legislative Assembly—appointed by the Minister of the Interior on May 1, 1850, to draft a new electoral law. Its members were nicknamed burggraves, a name borrowed from the title of Victor Hugo's historical drama as an allusion to their unwarranted claims to power and their reactionary aspirations. The drama is set in medieval Germany where the Burggraf was governor of a Burg (city) or a district, appointed by the Emperor.

See Note 48.

Baiser-Lamourette (Lamourette's kiss)—an allusion to an incident during the French Revolution. On July 7, 1792, Lamourette, deputy to the Legislative Assembly, proposed to end all party dissension with a fraternal kiss, and the representatives of the hostile parties, in accordance with this proposal, embraced one another. The following day, however, the struggle among the parties flared up with fresh vigour.

See Note 56.
Chambord. It was to consist of de Lévis, de Saint-Priest, Berryer, de Pastoret and d'Escars.

The reference is to the so-called Wiesbaden Manifesto—a circular drawn up in Wiesbaden on August 30, 1850, by de Barthélemy, secretary of the Legitimist faction in the Legislative Assembly, on the instruction of Count Chambord (de Barthélemy, *La conspiration légitimiste avouée*, in *Le Peuple de 1850* No. 24, September 22, 1850). The circular was the Legitimists' policy statement in case they came to power. Count Chambord declared that he “officially and categorically rejects any appeal to the people, because it will signify a negation of the great national principle of hereditary monarchy”. This statement evoked protests among the Legitimists themselves, notably from a group headed by La Rochejaquelein, and polemics in the press.

An allusion to the expiration of Louis Bonaparte's presidential powers. In the text the date is not exact. According to the Constitution of the French Republic, presidential elections were to be held every four years on the second Sunday in May, on which day the powers of the incumbent President expired (see this volume, p. 572).

The *Society of December 10 (Dix Décembre)*—a Bonapartist organisation founded in 1849 and consisting mainly of declassed elements, political adventurists, the reactionary military. Many of its members helped to elect Louis Bonaparte as President of the Republic on December 10, 1848, hence its name. This organisation played an active part in the Bonapartist coup d'état on December 2, 1851. Marx describes the society in his *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (see present edition, Vol. 11).

The *Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution* is a series of essays on the history of an uprising in support of the Imperial Constitution which took place in Rhenish Prussia, the Bavarian Palatinate and Baden in the spring and summer of 1849. Engels started working on his essays in July 1849, soon after arriving in Switzerland together with the last units of the defeated Baden-Palatinate army. In June 1849, while in the Palatinate, Engels wrote an article, “The Revolutionary Uprising in the Palatinate and Baden”, rebuffing criticism of the insurgents by the German conservative and liberal press (see present edition, Vol. 9). Later, in Switzerland, he wrote a rough version of the “Repudiation” (ibid.) in answer to attempts by some petty-bourgeois emigrants to cast suspicion on the officers and men of the volunteer corps commanded by Willich, which consisted mainly of workers and was the staunchest unit in the insurgent army. Engels was Willich's adjutant. Willich's corps covered the retreat of other units of the Baden-Palatinate army after its defeat at Rastatt and was the last to cross the Swiss border on July 12, 1849.

Soon after this Engels decided to write his essays. He intended to describe the revolutionary struggle during the final stage of the German bourgeois-democratic revolution and to criticise the movement's petty-bourgeois leaders, whose vacillations and helplessness were one of the main reasons for its failure. In a letter from Paris in early August (before his move to London) Marx suggested that he stress these aspects and produce the work in pamphlet form.

His personal experience of the campaign and knowledge of relevant documents provided Engels with ample material for analysing the character of the movement, the position of various classes and parties in it, and the reasons for its failure. He used insurgents' accounts and literature on the Baden-Palatinate uprising that had appeared by the end of 1849, including works by the petty-bourgeois leaders of the uprising, whom he subjected to criticism. To
characterise their policy he made use of appeals, proclamations and articles published in the *Karlsruher Zeitung*, the organ of the Baden Provisional Government.

Engels foresaw that his essays would be met with hostility by petty-bourgeois emigrants, as they contrasted sharply with the publications and reminiscences they were preparing for the press. “My work...” wrote Engels to Jakob Schabelitz in August 1849, “will present a different understanding of this history from that expressed in other publications that are due to appear.”

At first Engels intended to publish his work in pamphlet form and was helped by the Communist League members Jakob Schabelitz and Joseph Weydemeyer to find a publisher. But as Marx was making preparations to publish his own journal at the time, he changed his mind. In Switzerland Engels apparently devoted most of his efforts to collecting the material; in October his departure for England interrupted his work. In London he resumed work on the essays and the first two chapters—“Rhenish Prussia” and “Karlsruhe”—were published in the first number of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue*. The work was completed in February. Chapters Three and Four under the title “The Baden-Palatinate Uprising” were published in abridged form in the *Trier’sche Volksstimme* Nos. 23-27, 30-37 of May 29 to June 7 and June 14 to 30, 1850. Marx’s and Engels’ supporters expressed a high opinion of the literary and polemical value of Engels’ work. Weerth wrote jokingly to Marx on May 2, 1850: “...The articles on Baden could not have been better even if I myself had written them. This is, of course, the highest praise I can afford Engels” (G. Weerth, *Sämtliche Werke*, Bd. 5, S. 356).


The essays were not reprinted during Engels’ lifetime. They were reprinted in full by Mehring in 1902 in the collection *Aus dem literarischen Nachlass von Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels und Ferdinand Lassalle*. On the basis of documents in his possession, Mehring pointed out several alterations made by the Hamburg publishers (Schuberth and Co.) for censorship reasons. In this volume these alterations are indicated in footnotes.

Misprints in numbers 1-3 of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue* corrected in the errata given in numbers 2 and 4 of the *Revue* have been taken into account in this volume. At the end of the last errata it was stated, in particular, “Besides, in numbers 2 and 3, in the articles ‘The Palatinate’ and ‘To Die for the Republic’, the general title ‘The Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution’ was missing, and the name of the author—Frederick Engels—was not given at the end of the article.” In the first number, with the general introduction and Chapters One and Two—“Rhenish Prussia” and “Karlsruhe”—the general title and the author’s name were given. The name was also given at the end of Chapter Three: “The Palatinate” (second number). Due account has also been taken of notes and marks made by Engels in his copy of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue* (see Note 63), which are indicated in footnotes.

The *Imperial Constitution* was adopted by the Frankfurt National Assembly on March 28, 1849. While proclaiming a number of civil liberties and introducing national central institutions, the Constitution nevertheless shaped the united
German state as a monarchy. On March 28 the Prussian King Frederick William IV was elected “Emperor of the Germans” by the Frankfurt National Assembly. Prussian-oriented liberal deputies of the Assembly in particular insisted on handing the imperial crown to the Hohenzollerns. However, Frederick William IV refused to accept the offer. Apart from the Prussian Government, those of almost all the larger German states (including Saxony, Bavaria and Hanover) refused to recognise the Constitution. Afraid of revolutionary action, liberals and democrats in the Frankfurt National Assembly proved incapable of upholding the Constitution. The people themselves were its sole defender, and in the spring and summer of 1849, they started an armed struggle led by petty-bourgeois democrats. Despite its limitations, the Constitution was seen by the people as the only remaining achievement of the revolution. On May 3, an armed uprising broke out in Dresden and later in a number of towns in Rhenish Prussia; however, these uprisings were rapidly suppressed by troops. The most powerful struggle in support of the Imperial Constitution developed in the Bavarian Palatinate and Baden, where workers, urban petty bourgeoisie and peasants rose in its defence. They were soon joined by military units, especially mounted units. In the middle of May provisional governments were set up, Leopold, the Grand Duke of Baden, fled, and the separation of the Palatinate from Bavaria was proclaimed. The leadership of the movement, however, fell mainly into the hands of moderate petty-bourgeois democrats, who were hesitant and refused to proclaim a republic. They chose passive defensive tactics confining the movement to local limits and preventing the uprising from spreading outside the Palatinate and Baden. Nevertheless, the combined Palatinate-Baden insurgent army, in which there were many workers’ units, put up a strong resistance to the Prussian-Bavarian-Württemberg troops who greatly exceeded the insurgents in numbers and strength. The insurgents’ last stronghold—Rastatt—fell on July 23. The uprisings in the Palatinate and Baden in the spring and summer of 1849 were the closing events of the German revolution.

135 The March Association, thus named after the March 1848 revolution in Germany, was founded in Frankfurt am Main at the end of November 1848 by Left-wing deputies to the Frankfurt National Assembly and had branches in various towns in Germany. Fröbel, Simon, Wesendonck, Eisenmann, Vogt and other petty-bourgeois democratic leaders of the March associations confined themselves to revolutionary phrase-mongering and showed indecision and inconsistency in the struggle against counter-revolutionaries, for which Marx and Engels criticised them sharply (see present edition, Vol. 8, p. 185).

136 The reference is to a legend of the Swiss Confederation the origin of which dates back to the agreement between the three mountain cantons of Uri, Schwyz and Unterwalden in 1291. The legend runs that representatives of the three cantons met in the Grütli (or Rütli) meadow in 1307 and took an oath of loyalty in the joint struggle against Austrian rule.

137 See Note 11.

138 Presumably Engels himself intended to write this work to complement his essays on the campaign for the German Imperial Constitution, but no article on this was ever published in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue.

139 From May 3 to 9, 1849, Dresden, the capital of Saxony, was the scene of an armed uprising caused by the refusal of the Saxon King to recognise the Imperial
Constitution. The insurgents captured a considerable part of the city, with the workers playing the most active part in the barricade fighting, and formed a Provisional Government headed by the radical democrat Samuel Tzschriner. The moderate line pursued by the other members of the Provisional Government, the desertion of the bourgeois civic militia and the treacherous actions of the bourgeoisie in Leipzig where they suppressed the workers' solidarity movement, weakened the insurgents' resistance to the counter-revolutionary forces. The uprising was crushed by Saxon and Prussian troops. The Russian revolutionary Mikhail Bakunin, the German working-class leader Stephan Born and the composer Richard Wagner took an active part in the uprising. 

140 On May 6 and 7, 1849, workers and other democratic elements in Breslau (Wroclaw) erected barricades in protest to the dispatch of artillery to suppress the Dresden uprising, but they were defeated by vastly superior counter-revolutionary forces. 

141 See Note 6.

142 The *Napoleonic Code* (*Code Napoléon*)—Napoleon's 1804 civil code which he introduced into the conquered regions of Western and South-Western Germany. It remained in force in the Rhine Province after its incorporation into Prussia in 1815.

143 *Prussian Law* (*Allgemeines Landrecht für die Preussischen Staaten*) was promulgated in 1794. It included criminal, state, civil, administrative and ecclesiastical law and bore the distinct imprint of obsolete feudal legal standards.

After the annexation of the Rhine Province to Prussia in 1815, the Prussian Government tried to introduce Prussian Law into various legal spheres there to replace the French bourgeois codes in force in the province. This was done by introducing a series of laws, edicts and instructions aimed at restoring the feudal privileges of the nobility (primogeniture), Prussian criminal and marriage law, etc. These measures were resolutely opposed in the province and were repealed after the March revolution by special decrees issued on April 15, 1848.

144 The army reserve (*Landwehr*) was formed in Prussia at the time of the struggle against Napoleonic rule. In the 1840s it was made up of persons up to 40 years of age who had served three years in the army and been on the reserve list for at least two years. As distinct from the regular troops, the army reserve was mobilised only in special emergencies (war or threat of war).

145 On May 1, 1849, the Cologne Municipal Council, composed mainly of representatives of the liberal bourgeoisie, issued an appeal for the convocation, on May 5, 1849, of a meeting of all the municipal councils of the Rhine Province to discuss the new situation in Prussia resulting from the dissolution by the Prussian Government on April 27 of the Second Chamber of the Prussian Provincial Diet, which had approved the Imperial Constitution despite the King's intention to reject it. The Prussian Government banned the meeting. Even so, the Cologne Municipal Council convoked a congress in Cologne of delegates from the Rhine cities on May 8, 1849. The congress came out in support of the Imperial Constitution and demanded that the dissolved Diet be convoked. It was made clear that, if the Prussian Government ignored the resolution of the congress (Engels quotes it below), the Rhine Province would consider secession from Prussia. This threat, however, proved empty as it was not backed up by resolute
action on the part of the liberal majority of the congress, which rejected a proposal for arming the people and offering resistance to the authorities. p. 158

146 See Note 8. p. 158

147 The description of revolutionary events given below deals mainly with Elberfeld, which was one of the main centres of the uprising in Rhenish Prussia in defence of the Imperial Constitution.

The Elberfeld uprising involved mainly workers and petty-bourgeois strata. It flared up on May 9, 1849, and served as a signal for armed struggle in a number of towns in the Rhine Province (Düsseldorf, Iserlohn, Solingen and others). The immediate cause of the uprising was the Prussian Government's attempt to suppress the revolutionary uprising on the Rhine with arms, crush democratic organisations and the press and disarm those army reserve units which had refused to take orders and backed the demand for the Imperial Constitution (the army reserve had been mobilised by the Prussian Government itself). After the expulsion of the Prussian troops who tried to capture the city, power in Elberfeld passed into the hands of the Committee of Public Safety, composed mainly of moderate democrats and liberals. In contrast to Elberfeld, the uprising that broke out in Düsseldorf on May 9 was suppressed by troops on the following day. In Elberfeld and other towns the insurgents were able to hold out longer. p. 159

148 Engels arrived in Elberfeld on May 11, 1849, from insurgent Solingen, where, the day before, he had formed a detachment of workers to help the Elberfeld insurgents. In Elberfeld he worked for a reform of the bourgeois civic militia, the imposition of a war tax on the bourgeoisie and the extensive arming of workers with a view to creating the nucleus of a Rhenish revolutionary army and uniting localised uprisings. These efforts were counteracted by the Committee of Public Safety, in which considerable influence was wielded by representatives of the bourgeoisie.

Under pressure from bourgeois circles, Engels was deported from the city on the morning of May 15. On May 17, the Neue Rheinische Zeitung carried an article, entitled “Elberfeld”, describing the situation in the insurgent city and Engels' activities there (see present edition, Vol. 9). Later an action was brought against Engels for his part in the Elberfeld uprising (see this volume, pp. 602-04). Engels also touches on his stay in Elberfeld during the uprising in this series of articles. p. 163

149 The arsenal in Prüm was stormed by democrats and workers from Trier and neighbouring townships on May 17 and 18, 1849. Their aim was to seize the arms and extend the uprising in defence of the Imperial Constitution to the areas on the left bank of the Rhine. The insurgents succeeded in capturing the arsenal, but government troops soon arrived on the scene and the movement was suppressed. p. 163

150 The tricolour—the black-red-and-gold flag, symbolising Germany's national unity, was the banner of the movement in support of the Imperial Constitution. p. 163

151 As a result of behind-the-scenes negotiations between a delegation of the Elberfeld bourgeoisie and the government, and the defeatist attitude of the Committee of Public Safety, the Committee was dissolved by the city authorities on May 16, 1849. On the night of May 17, the workers' detachments, including reinforcements from other towns, were led out of Elberfeld under false pretences and the previous order was restored in the city. The failure of the Elberfeld uprising brought the triumph of reaction throughout Rhenish Prussia. p. 169
Immediately after the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* ceased publication, Marx and Engels went to Frankfurt am Main and then to insurgent Baden and the Palatinate. Their attempts to convince the Left deputies to the Frankfurt Assembly and members of the Baden and Palatinate provisional governments of the need to extend the movement throughout Germany, to mount a resolute offensive, and to persuade the Assembly openly to join in the uprising proved, however, unavailing. In late May 1849, Marx and Engels arrived in Bingen (Hesse) where they parted. Marx went on to France to establish contacts with French democrats and socialists, while Engels returned to the Palatinate to take a direct part in the impending armed struggle against the concentrating counter-revolutionary troops. Besides Marx, two other editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, Ferdinand Wolff and Ernst Dronke, went to Paris, where the Montagne party and the revolutionary clubs were preparing for mass actions against the ruling party of Order (see this volume, pp. 104-09).

On May 12, 1849, in conditions of general popular ferment and mounting unrest in the army, the leaders of democratic organisations assembled in Offenburg (Baden) and took preparatory measures for calling a popular meeting. The decisions of the assembly, reflecting the attitude of the moderate democrats, were confined to a demand for the resignation of the reactionary Beck Ministry and the convocation of a Constituent Assembly. By the time the popular meeting opened on the following day, however, news had arrived that the army had sided with the people everywhere, that insurgent garrisons had captured the Rastatt fortress on May 11 and later Karlsruhe and other cities, and that Grand Duke Leopold had fled. As a result, more radical decisions were adopted at the meeting, which voted for the dissolution of the Baden Diet, universal arming of the people, liberation of political prisoners, the return of refugees, and other far-reaching measures. At the same time, the republican wing failed to secure approval for a resolution on the introduction of a republican government. A Baden provincial committee was set up, composed mainly of moderate democrats. The committee soon formed a provisional government, the Executive Committee, headed by Lorenz Peter Brentano. Its policy, however, was very moderate and irresolute, and gave rise to differences between the moderate democrats and more radical elements. On June 10, the Constituent Assembly was called in Karlsruhe, which consolidated the dominant position of the moderate democrats. Brentano was again appointed head of the provisional government and vested with extensive powers.

The *Senate* was one of the governing bodies of the free city of Frankfurt; it had both legislative and administrative functions.

The Prussian Major Schill first distinguished himself during brave guerrilla actions in the war against Napoleon's army in 1806-07. In April 1809, during Napoleon's war against Austria, Schill, leading a regiment of hussars and a company of riflemen, set out from Berlin on his own account with the aim of drawing "neutral" Prussia into a war against Napoleonic rule. After an abortive attempt to capture Magdeburg, he tried to fight his way to the Baltic, hoping for British support from the sea. At the end of May, his forces were routed at Stralsund, Schill himself falling in action.

Fickler was sent to Württemberg for talks to ensure the neutrality of the Württemberg royal government. On June 3, 1849, he was arrested in Stuttgart by the Württemberg authorities.
The Club of Resolute Progress, founded in Karlsruhe on June 5, 1849, was the more radical wing of the petty-bourgeois democratic republicans (Struve, Tzschrinner, Heinzen and others) discontented with the conciliatory policy of the Brentano Government and the increasing strength of the Rightist elements within it. The Club suggested that Brentano should extend the revolution beyond Baden and the Palatinate and introduce radicals into his government. Brentano refused, so the Club tried, on June 6, to force the government to comply by threatening an armed demonstration. The government, however, supported by the civic militia and other armed units, proved the stronger party in the conflict. The Club of Resolute Progress was disbanded.

The six scourges of humanity was the phrase used by Gustav Struve in a letter published in the Deutscher Londoner Zeitung No. 238 (supplement), October 26, 1849, referring to the monarchy, the hereditary nobility, officialdom, the standing army, the clergy, and finance magnates.

The Rastatt fortress on the Murg was the scene of the last major battle of the insurgent army against Prussian and imperial forces (June 29 and 30, 1849). The 13,000 Baden soldiers held out for 24 hours against the 60,000-strong enemy, but were ultimately forced to retreat to the Swiss border to avoid encirclement. Engels describes the battle in Chapter Four of his essays (see this volume, pp. 227-31).

In the Ständehaus (House of the Social Estates) in Karlsruhe, sittings of the Brentano Government were held.

At Waghäusel, a major battle took place on June 21, 1849, between the insurgent army and Prussian troops who had captured the Palatinate and invaded Baden. By a vigorous counterattack the insurgents held up the Prussians, thus avoiding encirclement, but they were unable to prevent the Prussian army from advancing. Engels describes the battle in Chapter Four of his essays (see this volume, p. 219).

This refers to the strategic miscalculation by Görgey, the commander-in-chief of the Hungarian revolutionary army, in refusing to take advantage of the victories scored by the Hungarians during their spring offensive in 1849 to extend the fighting to Austria and launch operations to capture Vienna (see Note 96).

The Central Committee of German Democrats was elected at the Second Democratic Congress, held in Berlin from October 26 to 30, 1848. It included d’Ester, Reichenbach and Hexamer. Marx was handed a mandate of the Central Committee by d’Ester at the end of May 1849.

The French social-democrats—the party of petty-bourgeois democrats and socialists grouped round the newspaper La Réforme (see Note 50).

At the time of Marx’s trip to France a clash was brewing between the Montagne, which represented the Réforme party in the Legislative Assembly, and conservative circles. The Montagne took action on June 13, 1849.

The Fruchthalle—a covered fruit and vegetable market in Kaiserslautern where the central administration of the Palatinate revolutionary Provisional Government had its offices in 1849.

Chevaux-légers (literally: light horses)—light cavalry armed with sabres, pistols and carbines in some West-European countries.
On June 14, 1848, Berlin workers and craftsmen, outraged by the National Assembly's renunciation of the March revolution, took the arsenal by storm in an attempt to uphold the revolutionary gains. This action, however, was spontaneous and unorganised, and army reinforcements and units of the bourgeois civic militia were soon able to push back and disarm the people.

An allusion to the participation of some N.C.O.s of Willich's German refugee volunteer corps in France's colonial war in Algeria, which ended on the eve of the February 1848 revolution. The war, waged with intermissions from 1830 to 1847, aimed at the conquest and subjugation of Algeria.

An allusion to "wailers" (Heuler)—the name the republican democrats in Germany applied to the moderate constitutionalists who, in turn, called their opponents "agitators" (Wühler).

See Note 19.

An allusion to the statement made by Frederick William IV in his speech at the opening of the First United Diet on April 11, 1847, that he was "heir to an unimpaired crown" and must pass it on unimpaired to his successors (see Der Erste Vereinigte Landtag in Berlin 1847, erster Teil).

See Note 158.

This refers to a speech Franz Heinrich Zitz, an extreme Left-wing deputy to the Frankfurt parliament, made at a meeting in Frankfurt am Main on September 17, 1848, on the eve of the popular uprising sparked off by the parliament's ratification of the Malmö armistice, which jeopardised the liberation movement in Schleswig-Holstein and Germany's national interests. Zitz condemned the parliament's stand and objected to sending petitions to it, declaring that the time had come for resolute action.

The Cologne Workers' Association—a workers' organisation founded by Andreas Gottschalk on April 13, 1848. By early May its members numbered about 5,000, mostly workers and artisans. The Association was led by the President and the committee, which consisted of representatives of various trades, and had several branches.

Most of the Association's leaders (Gottschalk, Anneke, Schapper, Moll, Lessner, Jansen, Röser, Noth Jung, Bedorf) were members of the Communist League. After Gottschalk's arrest, Moll was elected President (on July 6). On October 16, Marx agreed to assume this post temporarily at the request of Association members. From February to May 1849 the post was held by Schapper.

In the beginning, the Workers' Association was influenced by Gottschalk, who, ignoring the proletariat's tasks in the democratic revolution, pursued a policy of boycotting elections to representative bodies and came out against an alliance with democratic forces. He combined ultra-Left talk with very moderate actions (petitions, etc.) and support for the demands of the workers affected by craft prejudices. From the outset, Gottschalk's sectarian attitude was challenged by the supporters of Marx and Engels. At the end of June 1848 they brought about a radical change in the Association's activities, making it a centre of revolutionary agitation among the workers, and from the autumn of that year, also among the peasants. By studying Marx's works, members of the Association familiarised
themselves with scientific communism. The Association maintained contacts with other workers' and democratic organisations.

In January and February 1849, Marx, Schapper and other leaders reorganised the Association with a view to strengthening it. On February 25, new Rules were adopted, proclaiming the Association's main task as raising the class consciousness of the workers.

The mounting counter-revolution and intensified police reprisals prevented the Cologne Workers' Association from continuing its work of rallying and organising the working masses. After the Neue Rheinische Zeitung ceased publication and Marx, Schapper and other leaders of the Association left Cologne, it gradually turned into an ordinary workers' educational society.

On September 26, 1848, the authorities, frightened by the upsurge of the revolutionary and democratic movement in Cologne, declared a state of siege in the city to ensure "security of property and person". An order of the military command prohibited all associations pursuing "political and social aims", banned meetings, disbanded and disarmed the civic militia, introduced courts-martial and suspended publication of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung and several other democratic newspapers. A protest campaign forced the Cologne military authorities to lift the state of siege on October 2. On October 12, the Neue Rheinische Zeitung resumed publication.

On June 23, 1849, during the retreat of the Baden-Palatinate insurgent army, one of its units mutinied. The soldiers, led by their commander Thome, made an attempt to arrest Mieroslawski and Sigel and turn them over to the Prussian army.

This refers to the battle of Hohenlinden (December 3, 1800), in which General Jean Victor Moreau of the French Republic defeated the Austrian army.

On September 18, 1849, a German Refugee Committee was set up on Marx's initiative under the auspices of the German Workers' Educational Society in London. Besides Marx and other members of the Communist League, it included a number of petty-bourgeois democrats. At a meeting of the Society on November 18, the Committee was transformed into the Social-Democratic Refugee Committee, the aim being to dissociate the proletarian section of the London refugees from the petty-bourgeois elements. The new Committee included only members of the Communist League: Karl Marx (who was elected chairman), Heinrich Bauer, August Willich, Karl Pfänder and Frederick Engels (see document on pp. 599-601 of this volume). Besides providing material assistance for the refugees, predominantly those belonging to the proletarian wing, the Committee played an important part in restoring ties between members of the Communist League, in uniting the supporters of Marx and Engels in London and in reorganising the Communist League. In mid-September 1850, following the split in the Communist League, when most members of the Educational Society, to which the Committee was accountable, came under the influence of the Willich-Schapper sectarian group, Marx and Engels, together with their followers, withdrew from the Committee (see this volume, pp. 483 and 631-32).

Appended to the letter were certificates—signed by Ferenc Pulszky, the Committee's agent in London in the spring of 1849—testifying that the persons
named belonged to the unit of Hungarian hussars that had been sent, via Sardinia, to reinforce the Hungarian revolutionary army, but arrived too late to join it and, after the suppression of the Hungarian revolution, was forced to return to London.

p. 240

182 The reviews of Marx and Engels published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Politisch-ökonomische Revue* contain a critical analysis of a number of historical, sociological and economic works that appeared after the revolution of 1848-49 and influenced the views of bourgeois ideologists. Their criticism is also directed against the petty-bourgeois participants in and interpreters of these events.

The reviews were published unsigned in the literary section of the second and fourth issues of the journal. In 1892 Engels wrote in his biographical essay on Marx: "...Besides he wrote (together with Engels) a number of literary and political reviews." In 1886, the journal *Die Neue Zeit*, which for a long time had the benefit of Engels' counsel and direction, reprinted the review of the pamphlets by Chenu and de la Hodde, giving Marx and Engels as the authors. It may be assumed that some of the reviews, such as those dealing with the books of Girardin and Guizot, were written by Marx, while the review of Carlyle's book was probably by Engels, who had discussed this author's writings previously (see present edition, Vol. 3, pp. 444-68). Since this cannot be established with absolute certainty, however, all the reviews in this volume are published as the joint works of Marx and Engels.

Appended to the first group of reviews, published in the second issue, was an editorial note saying: "All the works indicated here may be obtained in London at Mr. D. Nutt's, 270, the Strand, two doors from St. Clement's Church."


p. 241

183 Presumably a case of double irony: by calling Daumer's statements in the book suras (the Arab name for chapters in the *Koran*), the authors stress their assertive didacticism reminiscent of religious preaching, and at the same time hint at Daumer's book *Mahomed und sein Werk*, Hamburg, 1848 (to which there is a direct reference later in the review).

p. 243

184 The *prophecies of Nostradamus*, the famous sixteenth-century French astrologer and physician-in-ordinary to Charles IX, were couched in verse and were extremely vague and cryptic.

*Second sight in Scotsmen*—the ability, attributed by superstition to Scottish highlanders, to divine the future and events concealed from ordinary people.

*Animal magnetism*—the theory of the Austrian physician Friedrich Anton Mesmer (1734-1815) that a man's behaviour can be influenced by hypnotism ("animal magnetism").

p. 245

185 *In St. Paul's Church*, Frankfurt am Main, the Frankfurt National Assembly (see Note 8) met in 1848 and 1849.

p. 247

186 On March 28, 1849, the Frankfurt National Assembly, having drawn up an all-German Imperial Constitution and elected—by the votes of the liberals and moderate democrats—the Prussian King Frederick William IV "Emperor of the Germans", sent a deputation to Berlin to offer him the Crown. Frederick William rejected it, however (announcing his final decision on April 28, 1849), pleading that the Imperial Constitution was unacceptable because of its revolutionary origin and contents.

p. 247
187 On June 26, 1849, the liberal deputies of the Frankfurt National Assembly, who had walked out after the Prussian King's refusal to accept the Imperial Crown, met in Gotha for a three-day conference which resulted in the formation of the Gotha party. It expressed the interests of the pro-Prussian German bourgeoisie and supported the policy of Prussian ruling circles aimed at uniting Germany under the hegemony of Hohenzollern Prussia. p. 249

188 In his pamphlet Simon wrote that the deputies to the Frankfurt National Assembly who had not renounced their powers (most of them belonged to the Left wing) had condemned the Württemberg King's denunciation of the Imperial Constitution and pronounced their solidarity with the armed struggle waged in the Palatinate and Baden in defence of the Constitution. In particular, Simon mentioned the resolution adopted by the remnants of the Assembly on June 8, 1849, after it had moved from Frankfurt to Stuttgart. It placed Baden under the protection of the Empire, i.e. the Assembly. The resolution was, however, no more than a declaration. Fearing a broad popular movement, the remaining members of the Assembly gave no specific support to the insurgents and refused to call the insurrectionary troops of Baden and the Palatinate to their defence. p. 249

189 This refers to the establishment of the Bank of England (1694). The founders loaned its fixed capital to the government. This was the beginning of the national debt. p. 252

190 The parliaments in France—judicial institutions that came into being in the Middle Ages. The Paris parliament was the highest court of appeal and also performed important administrative and political functions, such as registering of royal decrees, without which they had no legal force. The parliaments enjoyed the right to remonstrate against government decrees. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries their members were officials of high birth called the "nobility of the mantle". They ultimately became a bulwark of Right-wing opposition to absolutism and of resistance to moderate reforms, and were abolished during the French Revolution, in 1790. p. 253

191 The States General—a body representing the social estates in medieval France. It consisted of clergymen, nobles and burghers. Convened in May 1789, after a 175-year interval, at a time when the bourgeois revolution was maturing in France, the States General were on June 17 transformed by decision of the deputies of the third estate into the National Assembly, which on July 9 proclaimed itself the Constituent Assembly and became the supreme organ of revolutionary France. p. 253

192 This refers to popular uprisings against Spanish rule that took place in Lisbon in 1640, in Naples in 1647 and 1648 and in Messina between 1674 and 1676. p. 254

193 The reference is to the Reform Bill of 1832, which was directed against the political monopoly of the landed and financial aristocracy and gave representatives of the industrial bourgeoisie access to Parliament. The proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie, the main forces in the struggle for the reform, received no electoral rights. p. 255

194 The international reviews in the second, the fourth and the double fifth-sixth issues of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue were simply entitled "Revue" ("Review") and were not signed. The authors provided the third
of these reviews with the subheading “May to October”. In the present edition the editors have therefore added corresponding subheadings to the first and second reviews. Numerous passages in the works and letters of Marx and Engels show that they wrote the reviews together.

The first review was intended for the first issue of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Politisch-ökonomische Revue* (see Engels’ letter to Jakob Schabelitz of December 22, 1849) and the greater part of it dated January 31, 1850, but for lack of space the review was transferred to the second issue, the reader being notified of this by an editorial note. The closing part of the review was written in February.

Excerpts from the first review were first published in English in the collection: K. Marx and F. Engels, *On Colonialism*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1960. In the present edition, account has been taken of the corrections in the list of misprints appended to the fourth issue of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, as well as those made later by Engels in his copy of the journal (see Note 63).

195 See Note 16

196 See Note 20.

197 The *United Diet*—an assembly of representatives from the eight Provincial Diets of Prussia, similarly based on the estate principle. It sanctioned new taxes and loans, discussed Bills, and had the right to petition the King.

The First United Diet, which opened on April 11, 1847, was dissolved in June, following its refusal to vote a new loan. The Second United Diet, convened on April 2, 1848, passed a law on elections to the Prussian National Assembly and sanctioned the loan. The United Diet session closed on April 10, 1848. p. 258

198 This refers to the trials of Benedikt Waldeck in Berlin (see Note 14) and Karl Grün in Trier. The two were Left-wing deputies to the Prussian National Assembly who were put on trial in 1849 for their political activities. The trials showed that the Prussian authorities were using forgeries to fight their opponents. On the other hand, Waldeck and Grün were doing everything to prove their loyalty to the Prussian Government.

p. 258

199 This refers to Frederick William IV’s attempts, supported by the sovereigns of the Prussian Union (see Note 12), to unite Germany under Prussian hegemony, to the exclusion of Austria (the plan for a “Little Germany”, as against the plan for a “Great Germany” advocated by pro-Austrian circles). These attempts were backed by the liberals who had walked out of the Frankfurt National Assembly and formed, in June 1849, the so-called Gotha party (see Note 187). The latter took part in the elections to the German parliament which was to revise the draft German Constitution drawn up by the Frankfurt National Assembly in a way convenient for Prussian ruling quarters. The parliament met in Erfurt on March 20, 1850, but counteraction by the Austrian Court and the Russian Emperor forced the Prussian Government temporarily to abandon its unification plans and dissolve the Erfurt parliament (April 29, 1850).

p. 258

200 See Note 185.

p. 258

201 See Note 9.

p. 259

202 The reference is to the *Preussische Seehandlungsgesellschaft* (Prussian Maritime Trading Company), a trade and credit society founded in 1772 and enjoying a number of important state privileges. It granted large credits to the government
and from 1820 actually acted as its banker and broker. In 1904 it was made the official Prussian State Bank.

203 The borderers were inhabitants of what was known as the Military Border Area, i.e. the southern border region of the Austrian Empire under a military administration. The area included part of Croatia and Southern Hungary. Its population was made up of Serbs, Croats and other nationalities who were allotted land in return for military service, the fulfilment of other obligations and payment of duties. The borderers often rose in revolt against this system of military and feudal oppression.

204 This refers to the rupture of diplomatic relations between Russia and Turkey in the autumn of 1849 caused by the Turkish Government's refusal to extradite the Polish and Hungarian political refugees as demanded by the Russian and Austrian emperors. Unwilling to incur the hostility of Britain and France, Nicholas I thought it wiser to settle his conflict with Turkey. Towards the end of the year diplomatic relations were resumed.

205 Saint-Jean d'Acre—a fortress in Syria—was taken by the Egyptians in 1832, during the Turco-Egyptian war of 1831-33.
San Juan de Ulua—a fortress in Veracruz, Mexico, the Spaniards' last stronghold during Mexico's war of independence—was taken in 1825.

206 The continental blockade of the British Isles was proclaimed by Napoleon in November 1806. All the European states dependent on Napoleonic France were forced to join. Russia and Prussia acceded in 1807 (under the Peace of Tilsit) and Austria in 1809. The forced rupture of trade with Britain greatly harmed Russia's economic interests, which was one of the causes of the Franco-Russian war of 1812.

207 The Federal Council—the central executive of the Swiss Republic, a body established under the Constitution of September 12, 1848. Its chairman acted as President of the Republic.

208 Here reference is made to the agreements under which the Swiss cantons supplied mercenaries to European states. They were concluded in the period from the fifteenth to the mid-nineteenth century. In many West-European countries Swiss mercenaries were used by counter-revolutionary monarchist forces.

In 1848 Berne and other cantons concluded a series of such agreements with the counter-revolutionary government of Ferdinand II, King of Naples. The employment of Swiss troops against the revolutionary movement in Italy aroused great indignation among the Swiss progressive circles, and this eventually led to the annulment of these agreements.

209 The Sonderbund—see Note 25.

Neuchâtel's independence—see Note 24.

210 See Note 37.

211 This refers to the June 1846 Act of the British Parliament repealing the Corn Laws (see Note 29).

212 At the end of 1849 and the beginning of 1850 Karl Friedrich August Gützlaff delivered a series of lectures on China at London University and a number of learned societies. One of these lectures was related in a report published by the conservative Neue Preussische Zeitung (known also as the Kreuz-Zeitung) in its issue
No. 7, January 9, 1850. Marx and Engels may have drawn on this report in writing this section of their review.

213 This refers to one of the main provisions of the Nanking Treaty Britain concluded with China as a result of the Anglo-Chinese war of 1840-42 (known as the first Opium War). It was the first of a series of unequal treaties imposed on China by the Western powers, treaties that reduced it to the status of a semi-colony. Under the Nanking Treaty five Chinese cities—Canton, Shanghai, Amoy, Ninbo and Fuchou—were opened to English trade. In 1844 unequal treaties were imposed on China by the USA and France.

214 The reference is to the popular unrest then rife in several provinces of China. In mid-1850 it erupted into a peasant war that resulted in the insurgents establishing a state of their own over a considerable part of China's territory. The state was called Taiping Tango (hence the name of the movement—the Taiping uprising). The leaders of the movement put forward a utopian programme calling for China's feudal social order to be transformed into a paramilitary patriarchal system based on egalitarianism in production and consumption. The Taiping uprising lasted until 1864.

215 'The Ten Hours' Bill, the struggle for which had been waged for many years, was passed by Parliament in 1847, against a background of the sharply intensified contradictions between the landed aristocracy and the industrial bourgeoisie generated by the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. In revenge against the industrial bourgeoisie, a section of the Tory M.P.s supported the Bill. Its provisions applied only to children and women. Nevertheless, many manufacturers evaded it in practice. Engels also discussed the ten-hour working day in earlier writings, in particular in his book *The Condition of the Working-Class in England* (see present edition, Vol. 4, pp. 460, 461, 465-66). In the present article he took it up in connection with a fresh campaign against the Ten Hours' Bill launched by manufacturers, who worked in different ways to secure its *de facto* annulment.

The article, written for the Chartist journal *The Democratic Review*, evoked a lively response in the British working-class press. In its survey of the journal, *The Northern Star* wrote (No. 645, March 2, 1850): "The *Ten Hours' Question* is the title of an article which is sure to excite great interest, and, possibly, some discussion. We venture to predict that, while it will not greatly please those who are purely and simply Ten Hours Bill-men, it will meet with more than the approval of those who are 'Ten Hours Bill-men, *and Something more*.' It is an article which all classes may read with advantage, although, most likely, it will call down on its author's head the hot indignation of those who live by speculating in the labour and making profit of the blood and sinews of the wealth-producers."

Both this article and the article "The English Ten Hours' Bill" published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue* (see this volume, pp. 288-300) show that Marxist political economy had not yet been fully developed. This was reflected in a certain underestimation of the struggle for shorter working hours and of the positive effects of legal limitation of the working day. Marx and Engels gave an exhaustive description of the 'Ten Hours' Bill in their later works. See, e.g., Marx's *Inaugural Address of the International Working-Men's Association* and *Capital* (Vol. I, Chapter X, Sections 5, 6, 7).

216 The *Manchester School*—a trend in economic thought reflecting the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie. It advocated Free Trade and non-interference by the state in economic affairs. In the 1840s and 1850s, the Free Traders constituted the Left wing of the Liberal Party in England.
This refers to the *People's Charter*, which formulated the demands of the Chartists. It was published on May 8, 1838, as a Bill for submission to Parliament. The Charter contained six demands: universal suffrage (for men on reaching the age of 21), annual elections to Parliament, a secret ballot, equal constituencies, abolition of the property qualification for candidates to Parliament, salaries for M.P.s. Petitions for the Charter were rejected by Parliament in 1839 and 1842.

The *relay system*—a system for using the labour of women and juveniles applied by English manufacturers, especially from 1847 onwards, in an attempt to circumvent the Ten Hours' Bill. Under the relay system; women and juveniles stayed at work for the full length of the working day for adult men (up to 15 hours), but worked at intervals. The length of their actual work did not apparently exceed the legal limit.

On February 8, 1850 the Court of Exchequer acquitted a group of manufacturers accused of violating the Ten Hours' Bill. This ruling created a precedent unfavourable to the workers and was tantamount to a repeal of the Bill. It was resisted by the workers, and on August 5, 1850, Parliament passed a new Bill, fixing a 10 1/2 hour working day for women and juveniles and setting the time when work was to begin and end.

The *Court of Exchequer*, one of England's oldest courts, initially dealt mainly with financial matters. In the nineteenth century it became one of the country's highest judicial bodies.

The *Address of the Central Authority to the League* contained fundamental propositions of the Marxist programme and tactics. It played an important part in restoring and reorganising the Communist League after the defeat of the 1848-49 revolution, as a result of which the activities of the League had fallen off, the ties between its members had weakened and many of its communities and district branches had fallen apart. The *Address* contained detailed instructions for the emissaries of the Central Authority, which had been reconstituted by Marx, and for local League leaders in their work in restoring the League. The *Address* was written by Marx and Engels at the end of March (not later than the 24th) and unanimously approved by Central Authority members in London.

According to recent findings, the *Address* reached a fairly wide circle of League members. At the end of March, Heinrich Bauer, Central Authority emissary, brought a manuscript copy to Cologne; later the document was secretly circulated in handwritten form in Germany, Switzerland and other countries. The Prussian police seized a number of copies from League members and in 1851 the *Address* was printed in a number of German newspapers, in particular in the *Dresdner Journal und Anzeiger* No. 177, June 28, the *Allgemeiner Polizei-Anzeiger* (special supplement) No. 52, Dresden, June 30, the *Kölnische Zeitung* No. 156, July 1 and the *Schwäbischer Merkur* No. 158, July 4, and also in the Hungarian-language *Magyar Hirlup*, published in Pest (Nos. 503 and 504, July 8 and 9).

During the trial of Communists in Cologne, the *Address*, together with other Communist League documents, was reprinted in the Bill of Indictment (put out as a separate edition under the title *Anklageschrift gegen 1) P.G. Roeser, 2) J. H. G. Bürgers...* [Köln, 1852]) and published in several newspapers. Later it appeared in the book by the two police officials Wermuth and Stieber, *Die Kommunisten-Verschwörungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Th. 1, Berlin, 1853, which had been compiled for the purpose of compromising the Communist League.
The first authoritative edition of the Address came out in 1885, when Engels appended it to the German edition of Marx's *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne* (Karl Marx, *Enthüllungen über den Kommunisten-Prozess zu Köln*, Hottingen-Zürich, 1885). Engels reviewed the text published in the book by Wermuth and Steiber, and supplied it with a footnote. The present publication is based on the 1885 edition.


221 The *agreers* was the name given by Marx and Engels to the liberal majority of the Prussian National Assembly convened in Berlin on May 22, 1848, to draw up a Constitution and introduce a constitutional system by "agreement with the Crown". In November 1848, with counter-revolutionary forces on the offensive in Prussia, the liberals and democrats secured a resolution calling for the non-payment of taxes. Confining themselves to passive resistance, however, they failed to rebuff a monarchist coup d'état. On December 5, 1848, the National Assembly was disbanded.

222 The *Stuttgart parliament*—those deputies to the all-German Frankfurt Assembly (mostly Leftists) who did not relinquish their powers during the conflict with the Prussian and other German governments in May and June 1849, but moved to Stuttgart (see Note 8).

223 The proposition advanced here on turning the confiscated landed estates into state property and handing them over to associations of agricultural workers is an elaboration of the respective provisions of the agrarian programme set forth by Marx and Engels in the *Demands of the Communist Party in Germany*, which also called for the break-up of feudal relations in the interests of the peasants: the abolition of corvée and other feudal duties without compensation, etc. (see present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 3-4). Stressing this proposition in the new document, Marx and Engels proceeded from the idea that the proletarian revolution was at hand, a notion partly due to their overestimation of the factors conducive to revolution at the time. They considered that the measure in question would facilitate the future socialist transformation of agriculture, relieving the peasant masses from the threat of ruin. Far from regarding this measure as an absolute necessity, however, Marx and Engels, and all their followers, made it dependent on actual historical conditions. Later events showed that, in countries with deep-rooted survivals of feudalism, the need for a stronger alliance with the peasantry sometimes makes it necessary for the working class to support the demand for confiscated landed estates to be handed over to the peasants, without, however, abandoning the idea of a subsequent socialist transformation of agriculture on the basis of collective property.

224 Engels wrote this article soon after the article “The Ten Hours' Question”, which was published in the Chartist *Democratic Review* (see this volume, pp. 271-76). The present article was intended for the German reader, who was less familiar with life in Britain. Engels therefore goes into greater detail on the history of the struggle for the 'Ten Hours' Bill and the campaign waged against it by the manufacturers. The present publication takes account of corrections made by Engels in his copy of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Politisch-ökonomische Revue*.

In the 1830s and 1840s a series of laws against trading in jobs and granting sinecures to aristocrats were passed in Britain, under pressure from the industrial bourgeoisie.

For the Poor Law of 1834 see Note 75.

This refers to the Nanking Treaty of 1842. See Note 213.

The Navigation Acts passed in 1651 and subsequent years set up a system for Asian, African or American produce to be imported for consumption into the United Kingdom or its colonial possessions only in ships under the British national flag, and for European produce to be carried either in English ships or in those belonging to the exporting country. These laws were repealed in 1854.

On the reviews written by Marx and Engels for the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Politisch-ökonomische Revue see Note 182.


In their review of Thomas Carlyle's pamphlets, The Present Time and Model Prisons, the authors continue their critical analysis of Carlyle's sociological and historical conception which Marx and, particularly, Engels (see present edition, Vol. 3, pp. 444-68) began in their earlier works. In the Manifesto of the Communist Party, they criticised "feudal socialism" (see present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 507-08), of which Carlyle was an exponent. Their criticism became more intense as Carlyle moved to the right after the revolution of 1848-49.

During the lifetime of Marx and Engels the review was reprinted unsigned in Der Volksstaat, Leipzig, 1871, Nos. 93 and 94, November 18 and 22.

In quotations from Carlyle's pamphlets, the authors of the review do not always follow Carlyle's italics; they silently omit some paragraphs, change punctuation and introduce their own italics. In the given publication, in places where part of the text was left out, the editors have introduced marks of omission.

The Freemasons (called more fully Free and Accepted Masons)—members of a religious and ethical movement that arose in England at the beginning of the eighteenth century and spread to other European countries and America. Freemasons condemned the feudal system and the Established Church and sought to set up a world-wide new religion. The Order of Freemasons had secret lodges in various countries, and a mystical ritual copied from the ritual of medieval masons' guilds (hence the name). Members of the Order set themselves the task of ethically purifying and improving people in order to renovate the world. Freemasons believed in eternal and immutable laws of nature known only to the wisest leaders of the Order who enjoyed unquestionable authority and brought up rank-and-file members in obedience to these laws and in the spirit of fraternity, justice and enlightenment.
The *Illuminati* (from the Latin *illuminatus*)—members of a secret society founded in Bavaria in 1776, a variety of Freemasonry. The society consisted of opposition elements from the bourgeoisie and nobility, who were dissatisfied with princely despotism. In 1785 the society was banned by the Bavarian authorities. Similar societies also existed in Spain and France.

Mozart was a Freemason and his opera, *The Magic Flute* (*Die Zauberflöte*) (text by Emmanuel Schikaneder, first staged in 1791), embodies Masonic ideals in the form of a naive fairy-tale. p. 306

234 *Laissez-faire, laissez-aller*—the formula of economists who advocated Free Trade and non-intervention by the state in economic relations. p. 308

235 See Note 75. p. 310

236 This review, slightly abridged, was reprinted during Engels' lifetime in the theoretical organ of the German Social-Democratic Party, *Die Neue Zeit*, Stuttgart, 1886, 4. Jg., H. 12.

While preparing the given publication, the editors checked quotations from Chenu and de la Hodde according to the 1850 edition of the pamphlets. The authors of the review may have used a different edition published in the same year, hence the different page numbers. In the text, the pages given by the review's authors are followed by those of the edition used by the editors of the present publication, which are given in square brackets. p. 311

237 The secret *Société des nouvelles saisons* came into being soon after the rout (in 1839) of the *Société des saisons* led by Auguste Blanqui and Armand Barbès, and was virtually its successor. Workers formed the main body of the society, which also included students. Its members adhered to revolutionary Babouvism and were strongly influenced by the utopian communist ideas of Théodore Dézamy. p. 312

238 See Note 64. p. 315

239 An allusion to attempts by a small group of conspirators, members of secret revolutionary societies, to commit terrorist acts using home-made incendiary bombs. Police agents were also involved in the venture, giving regularly information about the conspirators' movements. This enabled the police to arrest all those involved. Their trial in 1847 revealed that police agents had succeeded in infiltrating deeply into secret societies. p. 315

240 Among Fourier's posthumous works there is the unfinished manuscript *Des trois unités externes* which deals partially with the problems of trade. It was published in 1845 in the journal *La Phalange*. Lengthy passages from this work were translated by Engels into German and published in 1846 in the *Deutsches Bürgerbuch* (see present edition, Vol. 4, pp. 613-44). p. 322

241 See Note 45. p. 323

242 On the by-elections to the Legislative Assembly (March 10, 1850) see this volume, pp. 129-31. p. 325

243 This review of the book by Émile Girardin, an exponent of bourgeois socialism, is in effect a critique of bourgeois socialism. Here the authors go on to analyse in greater detail the trend in bourgeois social thinking which they described in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* as an expression of the bourgeoisie's desire to redress "social grievances, in order to secure the continued existence of bourgeois society".
When quoting passages from Girardin's work, the authors in a number of cases combined texts from different pages, omitted paragraphs and changed the punctuation. They also introduced their own italics. This form of quotation has been preserved. The pages of the quoted book are given in square brackets. In a number of instances, when part of the text is omitted, the editors of this volume have introduced omission marks not in the review itself.

244 Droit d'enregistrement—a tax imposed on the registration and drawing up of various documents: sale and purchase contracts, deeds, court decisions, etc. Apart from confirming the authenticity of documents, such registration was also a source of revenue for the Exchequer.

p. 328

245 See Note 28.

p. 328

246 The bulk of this review was written by Marx and Engels for the Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue No. 3 in the middle of March 1850, and forwarded to Hamburg not later than April 5. Lack of space prevented the material from being published in No. 3. Only part of the review dealing with England, as well as a small addendum written later and dated April 18, were included in No. 4 of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue.

p. 338

247 See Note 29.

p. 340

248 This article, together with other material for the fourth issue of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue, was sent to Hamburg before April 18, 1850. Marx wrote it as an addendum to his series of articles “1848-1849” (later known as The Class Struggles in France). Marx’s main source of information was an article published in the newspaper of the French socialists and democrats, La Voix du peuple (No. 166, March 17, 1850), which quoted several passages from the monarchist newspaper La Patrie. Journal du commerce (from March 7 to 15). Even though the editors of La Voix du peuple avoided giving names of the stock-exchange speculators in their commentaries to the quoted passages, Marx found corroboration in them for the conclusions he drew in the third article from the “1848-1849” series concerning the connection existing between President Louis Bonaparte and stock-exchange circles.

p. 342

249 Union électorale—the name used by the bloc of all monarchist groupings in the by-elections to the French Legislative Assembly held in March 1850. It united Orleanists, Legitimists, Bonapartists, Catholics, etc. The leading role in the bloc was played by the so-called party of Order, embracing the main monarchist factions.

p. 342

250 Dealing on the Paris Stock Exchange went on between one and three p.m.

p. 343

251 The reference is to the Café Tortoni on the Boulevard des Italiens; when the Stock Exchange was closed, business transactions were carried on in and around this café. As distinct from the official Stock Exchange, the Café Tortoni and the adjacent district became known as the “small Stock Exchange”.

p. 344

252 This article was written in response to Gottfried Kinkel’s speech in his own defence at the court-martial in Rastatt (August 1849). He was a representative of the Left in the Frankfurt National Assembly, a participant in the campaign for the Imperial Constitution and taken prisoner by the Prussians. (Kinkel’s speech was
published in the newspaper *Abend-Post* Nos. 78 and 79, April 5 and 6, 1850, and later in A. Strodtmann's *Gottfried Kinkel. Wahrheit ohne Dichtung*, Bd. 2, Hamburg, 1851.) The article, in which the authors criticised petty-bourgeois democrats for their subservience, cowardice and lack of principles, was censured by Otto Lüning in his comments on the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue*, published in the *Neue Deutsche Zeitung* (No. 151, June 26, 1850). These comments, as well as other accusations, induced Marx and Engels to make a refutation (see this volume, pp. 387-88). The members of the Communist League welcomed the article in which Marx and Engels exposed Kinkel's behaviour in court.

Later Marx and Engels gave a satiric description of Kinkel in their pamphlet *The Great Men of the Exile* (see present edition, Vol. 11).

Most of the italics in the passages from Kinkel's speech quoted according to the *Abend-Post* are by the authors.

253 See Note 198.

254 In the spring of 1848, Mainz was the scene of bloody clashes between the civic militia and Prussian soldiers. These had repercussions throughout Germany and became a subject for discussion at the Frankfurt National Assembly; the latter merely appointed a committee which only submitted its report once the Mainz civic militia had already been disarmed by Prussian soldiers.

255 This statement, as well as the letter to the editor of *The Times* that follows, was occasioned by the attempts of the petty-bourgeois democrats Gustav Struve, Rudolf Schramm and others to strengthen their position among German political refugees in London against the influence of the Social-Democratic Refugee Committee (see Engels' letter to Weydemeyer of April 22, 1850). The manuscript of the statement in Engels' hand is extant. The statement was circulated in London and was also published by a number of democratic newspapers in Germany. The *Neue Deutsche Zeitung* of April 28, 1850, carried an abridged version dated April 20, 1850; the signature was followed by a request to democratic papers to reprint it. The Cologne *Westdeutsche Zeitung* and the Berlin *Abend-Post* published it under the date of April 18, 1850. In this volume the document is dated as in Engels' manuscript.

256 See Note 180.

257 This refers to a decision adopted on November 18, 1849, at the general meeting of the German Workers' Educational Society in London and German political refugees in London. It is to be found in the report of the Committee of Support for German Refugees in London of December 3, 1849 (see this volume, pp. 599-601).

258 This refers to attempts by Gustav Struve, Karl Heinzen, Rudolf Schramm, Arnold Ruge, and other German democrats who moved from Switzerland to England in October 1849, to rally all German political refugees around the Democratic Association, which they founded in London in the spring of 1850, and to enlist their support in setting up a general European democratic organisation of refugees. These attempts were accompanied by intrigues against proletarian refugees and against the Communist League led by Marx and Engels.

259 Gustav Struve and Thomas Fothergill, claiming to represent German political refugees in London, approached the acting Lord Mayor of London, Alderman
Gibbs, with a request for employment to be provided for one hundred German refugees who were unable to find work to earn a living. Gibbs refused on the grounds that many English workers were in the same plight. An item to this effect appeared in The Times of May 24, 1850.

Engels wrote this work with a view to popularising in England a series of Marx's articles published in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Politisch-ökonomische Revue under the title of "1848-1849", which later became widely known as The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850. It was a sort of conspectus or synopsis of Marx's work, from which Engels quoted long passages; in some cases he summarised the text that followed, gave relevant explanations (some of them in the form of remarks to the quoted text given in parenthesis), adding his own words and phrases. In the three numbers of The Democratic Review (for April, May and June), Engels gave an exposition of the first article from Marx's series (Chapter One of The Class Struggles in France, see this volume, pp. 48-70). He apparently planned to continue popularising Marx's work, for the remark "to be continued" appeared at the end of the article in the June number of The Democratic Review just as it did in the preceding numbers. However, various circumstances, probably his involvement in writing other works, prevented Engels from continuing his synopsis.

The fact that Engels wrote this conspectus is corroborated by the author's excellent knowledge of Marx's work and by the conspectus being written—at least the first part—and numerous quotations from Marx's work being translated into English within only a fortnight of the publication of the first issue of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Politisch-ökonomische Revue (March 6, 1850), which carried the beginning of Marx's work. In addition, all inaccuracies in the Revue were corrected in the translation.

In quoting Marx, Engels sometimes omitted the author's italics and paragraphs, but introduced his own; he also added his own explanatory words, in some cases omitting the author's words and phrases. By these changes Engels sought to make the text more comprehensible to the English reader.

In the present publication passages from Marx's work are given in small type and in inverted commas. They are quoted according to Engels, the most significant divergencies of Engels' translation from Marx's original German text being indicated in footnotes; whenever Engels made considerable omissions in quotations the editors of this volume have inserted omission marks in square brackets.

On the suppression of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung see Note 3.

Early in June 1849 Marx came to Paris with a mandate from the Central Committee of Democrats. He took up his contacts with representatives of the French democratic and socialist movement and with leaders of clubs and secret workers' organisations. Apart from Marx, three other editors of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung (Georg Weerth, Ferdinand Wolff and Ernst Dronke) were in Paris at the time and took part in the events of June 13, 1849 (on these see this volume, pp. 105-09).

An allusion to the Guizot Government's refusal to make diplomatic moves against the suppression of the Cracow uprising of 1846 and against Austria's annexation of the free city of Cracow (see Note 66), and to its political interference in Switzerland's internal affairs in favour of the reactionary Sonderbund (see Note 25) in 1844.
See Note 67. p. 358

See Note 68. p. 359

This phrase is missing in the text published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Politisch-ökonomische Revue*. Engels may have written his synopsis from the original version of Marx's manuscript in which it appeared. p. 362

On the demonstration in Paris on March 17, 1848, see Note 76.

On April 16, 1848, a peaceful procession of Paris workers marched towards the Town Hall to submit a petition to the Provisional Government on “organising labour” and “eliminating the exploitation of man by man”. The workers encountered battalions of the bourgeois national guard and were forced to retreat. p. 367

On the events of May 15, 1848, see Note 45.

The *June uprising* of the Paris proletariat is dealt with in Note 40. p. 368

This letter was written in connection with the campaign against German political refugees started by the Prussian conservative papers and taken up by the English press. The campaign was intensified particularly after the attempt on the life of the Prussian King Frederick William IV in Berlin on May 22, 1850, by Max Sefeloge, a retired soldier. He later died in a lunatic asylum. An item in the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* on May 25, 1850, alleged that while this attempt was being prepared Marx made a trip to Germany, including Berlin. The letter is written in English in Engels' handwriting. He addressed the envelope to his Excellency Chevalier Bunsen, Prussian Ambassador in London. Bunsen disregarded the request contained in the letter, so Marx and Engels made a statement to the press (see this volume, p. 384). p. 370

The *June Address of the Central Authority to the League* was written while the League was in the final stages of being reorganised. It was based on information contained in reports submitted by the emissaries of the Central Authority (among others, by Heinrich Bauer who had distributed the March Address of the Central Authority in Germany, returning to London in mid-May 1850) and in letters sent by League members from various European countries.

Handwritten copies of the *Address* were carried to Germany by Karl Wilhelm Klein, emissary of the League's Central Authority, and other confidential agents and to Switzerland by Ernst Dronke to be distributed secretly.

Somewhat later, extracts from the *Address* or summaries of it were published by a number of newspapers, such as the *Leipziger Zeitung* No. 192 (special supplement), July 11, 1850; the *Karlsruher Zeitung* No. 172, July 24, 1850; the *Norddeutsche Correspondent*, Rostock, No. 177, July 31, 1850. In their letters written in 1850 and 1851, the members of the Communist League, Stumpf, Dronke and Weydemeyer, informed Marx and Engels that the *Address* was published in other newspapers as well.

It was also published in the Bill of Indictment against the League members at the Cologne trial of Communists—*Anklageschrift gegen 1) P. G. Roesser, 2) J. H. G. Bürgers... [Köln, 1852]* and in *Die Kommunisten-Verschwörungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Th. 1, Berlin, 1853, by Wermuth and Stieber. In the USA part of the *Address* was published by Karl Heinzen in *Der Pionier*, Boston, Jg. 17, No. 17, April 24, 1870.

In 1885 Engels published the *June Address* as a supplement to a new edition of the pamphlet: Karl Marx, *Enthüllungen über den Kommunisten-Prozess zu Köln,*
The reference is to the Revolutionary Centralisation, a secret organisation founded at the beginning of 1850 by German refugees in Switzerland, most of whom were petty-bourgeois democrats.

Its Central Committee, based in Zurich, was headed by Tzschirner, a leader of the Dresden uprising in May 1849; prominent members were Fries, Greiner, Sigel, Techow, Schurz and J. Ph. Becker, all participants in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising. Members of the Communist League, d'Ester, Bruhn and others, as well as Wilhelm Wolff also belonged to this organisation. In July and August 1850 the leaders of the Revolutionary Centralisation approached the representatives of the Communist League Central Authority with a proposal to amalgamate. On behalf of the League’s Central Authority, Marx and Engels rejected their proposal as detrimental to the class independence of the proletarian party. By the end of 1850, the Revolutionary Centralisation had disintegrated due to the mass expulsion of German refugees from Switzerland. Marx and Engels drew information concerning the activities of the Revolutionary Centralisation and the intrigues of its agents against Communist League leaders (referred to in the Address) from Wilhelm Wolff’s letter of May 9, 1850. They later received similar information from Dronke, the emissary of the League’s Central Authority in Switzerland.

This refers to an attempt by German democrats, Gustav Struve among others, to set up a Democratic Association. In April 1850, Struve and others distributed in England and Germany a Circular Letter Addressed to All Friends of German Refugees, which reported that a single German organisation of all democratic refugees was to be set up under the guidance of the Central Bureau of the United German Emigration. In the summer of the same year, they called upon German refugees to unite with the Central Committee of European Democracy. However, none of these plans for unification materialised.

The Central Committee of European Democracy was set up in London in June 1850 on the initiative of Giuseppe Mazzini, who took steps to organise it at the end of 1849 while still in Switzerland. His endeavours were supported by Gustav Struve and Arnold Ruge, the latter joining the Committee as a representative of the German democratic party. The Central Committee members held sharply different ideological views and the strained relations between Italian and French democratic refugees led to its dissolution in March 1852. The Inaugural Manifesto of the Central Committee of European Democracy issued on July 3, 1850, under the title “Aux peuples!” was criticised by Marx and Engels in their international review (see pp. 529-32 of this volume).

Early in 1846 Marx and Engels, who were living in Brussels at the time, organised a Communist Correspondence Committee there to rally the more progressive German and Belgian socialists. In August 1847 this Committee served as the basis on which the communities of the Communist League were organised. Following the February 1848 revolution in France, the Belgian Government started repressions against Karl Marx, Wilhelm Wolff and other German revolutionary refugees and expelled them from Belgium. Tedesco and other Belgian members of the Communist League were prosecuted in connection with the so-called Risquons-Tout trial, which was a fabrication by the Government of Leopold, the King of the Belgians, against the participants in the revolutionary movement. The pretext was a clash, which took place on March 29, 1848, between the Belgian
Republican Legion bound for its home country from France and a detachment of soldiers near the village of Risquons-Tout, not far from the French border. The trial was held in Antwerp from August 9 to 30, 1848. Mellinet, Ballin, Tedesco and other principal accused were sentenced to death, but this was later commuted to 30 years imprisonment, and still later they were pardoned. p. 374

274 The *German Workers' Society* in Brussels was founded by Marx and Engels at the end of August 1847, its aim being to provide a political education for German workers living in Belgium, and to spread the ideas of scientific communism among them. With Marx, Engels and their followers at its head, the Society became the legal centre rallying German revolutionary proletarian forces in Belgium, and maintained direct contact with Flemish and Walloon workers' clubs. Its most active members belonged to the Brussels community of the Communist League. The Society played an important part in founding the Brussels Democratic Association. Its activities ceased soon after the February 1848 revolution in France, when its members were arrested and deported by the Belgian police. p. 374

275 The *Workers' Fraternity*, founded at the Workers' Congress which met in Berlin between August 23 and September 3, 1848, united many workers' associations. Under the influence of Stephan Born, the Fraternity at first limited its activities to implementing narrow craft-union demands. Towards the end of 1848, however, its leaders were drawn into the revolutionary events and admitted the necessity for the workers to take an active part in the political struggle. Voices were raised for setting up an all-German workers' organisation. In the spring of 1849 the Workers' Fraternity and several regional congresses of workers' associations put forward a proposal to convene a national workers' congress in Leipzig to found a General Workers' Union. However, these plans were frustrated by a counter-revolutionary offensive. The Fraternity was suppressed in 1850-51, though some of its branches survived for a number of years. p. 375

276 See Note 61. p. 376

277 In mid-April 1850, with a view to consolidating the international unity of the revolutionary representatives of the working class in the context of the expected new revolutionary tide, Marx and Engels concluded an agreement with the French Blanquist refugees then residing in London and with the leaders of the revolutionary wing of the Chartist movement to set up a Universal Society of Revolutionary Communists. The parties to this agreement signed a special treaty of 6 articles, written in Willich's hand and signed by Marx, Engels and Willich on behalf of the Communist League, by Adam and Vidil for the Blanquists, and by Harney for the Chartists (see this volume, pp. 614-15). p. 377

278 Apart from *The Sun*, this letter was published in *The Northern Star* No. 660, June 15, 1850, and also in some German democratic papers—the *Westdeutsche Zeitung*, Cologne, No. 145, June 20, 1850 (reprinted from *The Northern Star*); the *Tages-Chronik*, Bremen, No. 298, June 21, 1850; *Die Hornisse*, Cassel, No. 144, June 22, 1850. p. 378

279 The *Alien Bill*, enacted by the British Parliament in 1793, was renewed in 1802, 1803, 1816, 1818 and, finally, in 1848 (An Act to Authorise for One Year, and to the End of the Then Next Session of Parliament, the Removal of Aliens from the Realm) in connection with revolutionary developments on the Continent and the Chartist manifestation of April 10, 1848. In 1850 public opinion obstructed the renewal of this Bill despite Conservative efforts. p. 378
On Sefeloge’s attempt on the life of the Prussian King see Note 269.

*Treu bund* (the Union of the Loyal)—Prussian monarchical society founded in Berlin at the close of 1848. Late in 1849 a split occurred between ultra-royalists and supporters of the constitutional monarchy. p. 378

This is a rough copy of the letter sent to Robert Stephen Rintoul, editor of *The Spectator*, together with the article “Prussian Spies in London” written in the form of a statement and signed by Marx, Engels and Willich (see this volume, pp. 381-84). The rough copy is in Engels’ handwriting. p. 380

*The Spectator* editors published this statement and commented on it in a note carried in the same issue in the “News of the Week” section. Some time later Marx and Engels quoted this note in their letter of July 2, 1850, to the editors of the *Weser-Zeitung* (see this volume, pp. 390-91).

A somewhat abridged version of the statement was reprinted from *The Spectator* in *Galignani’s Messenger*, Paris, No. 11030, June 18, 1850, where it was supplied with editorial comments hostile to revolutionary refugees. These comments were also printed by the *Weser-Zeitung*, Bremen, No. 2057, June 22, 1850, the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, Augsburg, No. 173, June 22, 1850, and the *Neue Prewissische Zeitung*, Berlin, No. 144, June 26, 1850, which attributed them to *The Spectator*. This was why Marx and Engels wrote the letter to the editors of the *Weser-Zeitung*. Part of the rough copy of the statement in Engels’ handwriting is extant. p. 381

Marx’s statement to the editor of *The Globe* was, apparently, translated into English by Engels, since Marx had a poor knowledge of the language at the time. The statement was not published in the newspaper, and only a rough copy of it in Engels’ handwriting is extant. p. 385

This refers to the court decisions during the two trials that took place in Cologne on February 7 and 8, 1849. In the first, legal proceedings were brought against Marx, editor-in-chief of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, Engels, its co-editor, and Korff, the newspaper’s responsible publisher, all of them being accused of having insulted the Chief Public Prosecutor and having labelled the police. In the second trial, charges were brought against members of the Rhenish District Committee of Democrats, Marx, Schapper and the lawyer Schneider, who were accused of inciting a riot. In both cases the jury acquitted the accused. For Marx’s and Engels’ speeches made at the trials see present edition, Vol. 8, pp. 304-22. p. 386

This statement, in fact two statements, one by Marx and the other by Engels, are published as one document in this edition. They were occasioned by a review of the four numbers of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue*, that appeared in the *Neue Deutsche Zeitung* (Nos. 148-51, June 22, 23, 25 and 26, 1850). It was written by the paper’s editor, the petty-bourgeois democrat Otto Lüning, whose criticisms were directed mainly against Marx’s “1848-1849” (*The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850*) and Engels’ *The Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution*. Initially Marx and Engels intended to reply to Lüning in the *Revue* itself (see Marx’s letter to Weydemeyer of June 27, 1850), but due to the unfavourable prospects for continuing publication of the journal, they wrote directly to the *Neue Deutsche Zeitung*. p. 387

This statement was written as a result of the following: the Bremen *Weser-Zeitung* (No. 2037, June 22, 1850) reprinted comments from *Galignani’s Messenger* on the letter written by Marx and Engels about Prussian spies in London. Moreover,
these comments, hostile to revolutionary German refugees, were attributed to *The Spectator* (see Note 282). Marx and Engels, who were not aware of the publication in *Galignani's Messenger*, addressed their protest directly to the *Weser-Zeitung*. Their statement was not printed. However, in No. 2052, July 10, 1850, the editors of the *Weser-Zeitung* were forced to admit that the comments came from *Galignani's Messenger* and not from *The Spectator*.

The same day, July 10, the full text of the statement made by Marx and Engels was published in the *Tages-Chronik*, Bremen, No. 314.

287 This article belongs to the *Letters from Germany* series (see this volume, pp. 7-16) but was written later than the other articles of the series and deals with a separate subject. It was the last of Engels' contributions to *The Democratic Review*. From July 1, 1850, its editor George Julian Harney began to publish *The Red Republican*, a weekly journal that merged with *The Democratic Review*, which appeared until September 1850. The weekly carried the first English translation of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Its publication ceased in November 1850. Between December 1850 and the summer of 1851, Harney published another weekly, *Friend of the People*, for which Engels promised to write a series of articles criticising petty-bourgeois democracy. Before long, however, Marx and Engels decided to break off their friendly relations with Harney, who took a dubious position with respect to the split in the Communist League and maintained close contacts with petty-bourgeois émigrés. At the same time Marx and Engels were in close touch with Ernest Jones and enlisted Johann Georg Eccarius, Konrad Schramm, and Wilhelm Pieper as contributors to the *Notes to the People*, a weekly founded by Jones in May 1851. By assisting the Chartist press, Marx and Engels wanted to strengthen revolutionary Chartist traditions in the English labour movement.

288 An allusion to the so-called *Risquons-Tout* trial (see Note 273).

289 This refers to money exacted by the Danish monarchy from foreign vessels passing through the Sound (from the early half of the fifteenth century to 1857).

290 This evidently refers to a secret Russo-Danish treaty concluded in 1767 and endorsed in 1773. Under this treaty, Pavel, the heir to the throne (who later became Emperor Paul I), relinquished his hereditary rights to the Duchy of Gottorp (part of Schleswig-Holstein) in favour of the Danish royal family in exchange for Oldenburg and Delmenhorst in Northern Germany. As a result, the whole of Schleswig-Holstein came into the possession of the Danish Crown.

291 By decision of the Congress of Vienna (1815), the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein were incorporated into the Kingdom of Denmark (the personal union of Schleswig, Holstein and Denmark had existed since 1499), even though the majority of the population in Holstein and in Southern Schleswig were Germans. Under the impact of the March 1848 revolution in Prussia, the national liberation movement among the German population of the duchies grew in strength, becoming radical and democratic and forming part of the struggle for the unification of Germany. Volunteers from all over the country rushed to the aid of the local population when it took up arms against Danish rule.

Prussia and other states of the German Confederation also sent federal troops to the duchies. However, the Prussian Government, which feared a popular outbreak and an intensification of the revolution, sought an agreement with the Danish monarchy to the detriment of overall German interests. An armistice
between Prussia and Denmark was concluded on August 26, 1848, at Malmö. At the end of March 1849, Prussia resumed hostilities, but under pressure from England and Russia who interfered in favour of Denmark, was forced to conclude a peace treaty (July 2, 1850), temporarily relinquishing its claims to Schleswig and Holstein and abandoning them to continue fighting alone. The Schleswig-Holstein troops were defeated and gave up all resistance. As a result, the two duchies remained part of the Kingdom of Denmark.

292 On April 8, 1848, during his secret mission on behalf of the King of Prussia, Major Wildenbruch handed a Note to the Danish Government stating that Prussia was not fighting in Schleswig-Holstein to rob Denmark of the duchies, but merely to combat radical and republican elements in Germany. The Prussian Government tried every possible means to avoid official recognition of this compromising document.

293 The Danish army routed the Schleswig-Holstein troops in the battle at Fredericia on July 6, 1849.

The peace treaty between Prussia and Denmark concluded in Berlin on July 2, 1850, restored the pre-war status quo. Prussia withdrew its troops from Schleswig-Holstein, abandoning the Schleswig-Holstein army to face the superior forces of the Danes.

294 Engels wrote The Peasant War in Germany in London in the summer and autumn of 1850. It was published in the double issue of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Politisch-ökonomische Revue (No. 5-6). In this momentous work the author generalises the experience of the 1848-49 revolution in Germany by comparing it with the revolutionary events of the period of the Reformation and the Great Peasant War of 1525. It is also one of the principal Marxist works on the liberation struggle led by the peasant and plebeian masses.

Engels' main source of facts was the book Allgemeine Geschichte des grossen Bauernkrieges, Th. 1-3, Stuttgart, 1841-43, by Wilhelm Zimmermann, a German democratic historian. In 1870 Engels wrote that for a long time this book had been "the best compilation of factual data". He found it an extremely useful large collection of documents, either quoted in full or in long excerpts. Engels thus quoted most original sources (Luther's writings, Münzer's pamphlets, leaflets listing the demands of the insurgent peasants) from Zimmermann's book. (In the footnotes and the Index of Quoted and Mentioned Literature, the editors of this volume supply bibliographical data on the first editions of the quoted material in the transcription of the time and indicate the pages of Zimmermann's book from which the quotations are taken.)

The Peasant War in Germany appeared repeatedly during Engels' lifetime. It was reprinted in the Turn-Zeitung, New York, Nos. 3-20 (January 1852-February 1853). In 1870, Engels and Wilhelm Liebknecht prepared the second edition of The Peasant War, originally as a reprint in the 29 numbers of Der Volksstaat, Leipzig (April 2-October 15, Nos. 27-83, at irregular intervals). Numbers 27 and 28 of the newspaper carried Engels' February 1870 Preface to this edition. Engels was not satisfied with the explanatory footnotes by Liebknecht (see Engels' letter to Marx of May 8, 1870).


Excerpts from Chapter VI of Engels' *Peasant War* were also printed in the *Sozialdemokratische Monatsschrift*, Wien, 1890, No. 10-11, November 30, and in the *Népszava*, Budapest, 1891, February 6 (translated from the *Sozialdemokratische Monatsschrift*).

In the 1880s Engels intended to revise his *Peasant War in Germany* and incorporate extensive supplementary material on the history of Germany. In his letter to Sorge dated December 31, 1884, Engels wrote: "I am radically revising my *Peasant War*. The war of the peasants will be presented as the cornerstone of German history in its entirety." Work on the second and third volumes of *Capital* and other urgent matters prevented Engels from carrying out his intentions. In the 1890s he made another attempt at the supplement, but failed to complete it. Only an unfinished manuscript and several rough notes are extant. (The former was published under the editorial heading "Decay of Feudalism and Rise of National States".)

In this edition sources are quoted in the form given by Engels; whenever he introduces his own italics, this is mentioned in a footnote. Where the meaning differs significantly from that of the last authorised edition of 1875 and the previous author's publications of 1850 and 1870, this is also indicated in footnotes. Account is also taken in this edition of corrections made by Engels in his copy of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue* (see Note 63). Obvious misprints and inaccuracies in dates, geographical and personal names are silently corrected.

295 The *Hanseatic League*—a commercial and political alliance of medieval German towns along the southern coasts of the North and Baltic Seas, and their feed rivers; its aim was to establish a trade monopoly in Northern Europe. The Hanseatic League was in its prime in the latter half of the fourteenth century and the early half of the fifteenth century, and began to decay at the end of the fifteenth century.

296 *Tributes*—one of the feudal obligations imposed on the holders of small plots of land.

Death taxes (*Sterbefall, Todfall*) were levied on the land and property inherited from the deceased peasant on the basis of the feudal lord's right (in France, "the right of the dead hand"). In Germany the feudal lords usually took the best cattle.

Protection moneys (*Schutzgelder*)—a tax levied by the feudal lord in payment for the "judicial protection" and "patronage" which he claimed to extend to his subjects.

297 The "general pfennig" (*der gemeine Pfennig*)—a tax collected in German lands in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and appropriated by the Emperor; it was a combination of a poll-tax and a property tax, the main burden of which fell on the peasantry.

298 *Annates* were lump sums paid to the Pope by persons appointed to church offices. In the fourteenth century they equalled half the first year's income or more. Holders of church benefices made up this loss by levying additional taxes and by extortions from the population.

299 Engels is alluding to the German liberals who were in the majority in the Frankfurt National Assembly and in the assemblies of some German states during the revolution of 1848-49. In the first months of the revolution, liberals headed "constitutional governments" in a number of states (Prussia, for example), but were later replaced by members of the bureaucracy and nobility. The conciliatory
tactics of the liberals were one of the chief reasons for the defeat of the German revolution. p. 407

300 The reference is to Charles V's criminal statutes (Constitutio criminalis Carolina), adopted by the Imperial Diet in Regensburg in 1532; the statutes prescribed extremely harsh punishments. p. 409

301 The reference is to a religious philosophical doctrine opposed to the medieval Catholic Church and its orthodox teaching; mysticism was widespread in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Mystics, who believed it possible to know God through direct intercourse with the divine spirit, undermined the faith in the need for a church hierarchy. Particularly radical ideas were preached by the Italian twelfth-century monk Joachim of Calabria and other plebeian and peasant ideologists, with whom they assumed the form of a chiliastic dream of a millennium of equality (see Note 308). p. 413

302 The Waldenses—a religious sect that originated among the urban lower classes of Southern France at the end of the twelfth century and later spread to Northern Italy, Germany, Bohemia, Spain and Switzerland. Its founder is said to have been Petrus Waldus (or Peter Waldo), a Lyons merchant who gave his wealth to the poor. The Waldenses repudiated property and advocated insubordination to the ecclesiastical and secular authorities; they condemned the accumulation of wealth by the Catholic Church and called for a return to the customs of early Christianity. Among the backward rural population of the mountainous regions of South-Western Switzerland and Savoy, the heresy of the Waldenses amounted to a defence of the survivals of the primitive communal system and patriarchal relations. p. 413

303 The Albigenses—a religious sect that existed in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in the towns of Southern France (particularly in Provence and Toulouse) and in Northern Italy. This movement took the form of a “heresy”, being directed against the power and doctrine of the Catholic Church, as well as against the secular power of the feudal state. Its adherents—the townspeople and the lesser nobility, supported by the peasants—were called Albigenses from the city of Albi, one of the sect's main centres. Between 1209 and 1229 the feudal magnates of Northern France, together with the Pope, waged wars against the Albigenses that wiped out the movement and resulted in a considerable part of Southern France being annexed to the lands of the French kings. p. 413

304 The Hungarian teacher in Picardy—a preacher by the name of Jakob said to be born in Hungary. He was one of the leaders of the anti-feudal peasant revolt in France in 1251, known as the shepherds' revolt, whose participants called themselves “God's shepherds”. p. 413

305 The Calixtines (from Calix, the Latin for cup)—a moderate trend in the Hussite national liberation and reformation movement in Bohemia (first half of the fifteenth century) against the German nobility, the German Empire and the Catholic Church. The Calixtines (who maintained that the laity should receive the cup as well as the bread in the Eucharist, i.e. "sub utraque specie"—for which they were also known as Utraquists), supported by the burghers and part of the Czech nobility, sought no more than a national Czech church and the secularisation of church estates. p. 413

306 The Taborites (so called from their camp in the town of Tabor, in Bohemia)—a radical trend in the Hussite movement. In contrast to the Calixtines, they formed a revolutionary, democratic wing of the Hussites and their demands reflected the
desire of the peasantry and the urban lower classes for an end to all feudal oppression, all manifestations of social and political arbitrariness. The Taborites were the core of the Hussite army. The betrayal of the Taborites by the Calixtines led to the suppression of the Hussite movement. p. 414

307 The Flagellants (from flagellantis in Latin, one who whips himself)—an ascetic religious sect widespread in Europe in the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries. They propounded self-castigation as a means of expiating sins.

The Lollards (from the middle Dutch lollaert, literally, one who is murmuring prayers)—a religious sect (that originated in the fourteenth century) widespread in England and other European countries, which bitterly opposed the Catholic Church. The Lollards were followers of Wycliffe, the English reformer, but they drew more radical conclusions from his teaching and their opposition to feudal privileges took a religiously mystical form. Many Lollards, who came from the people and the lower clergy, were active participants in Wat Tyler's rebellion of 1381 and were cruelly persecuted in the late fourteenth century. p. 414

308 Chiliasm (from the Greek chilias, a thousand,—a mystical religious doctrine that Christ would come to earth a second time and usher in a millennium of justice, equality and well-being. Chiliastic dream-visions sprang up during the decay of slave-owning society; they were widespread among the oppressed during early Christianity and were continuously revived in the doctrines of the various medieval sects, which voiced the opinions of the peasants and plebeians. p. 415

309 The Confession of Augsburg (Augsburgische Konfession, Confessio Augustana)—a statement of the Lutheran doctrine read to Emperor Charles V at the Imperial Diet in Augsburg in 1530; it adapted the burgher ideas of a “cheap church” (abolition of lavish rites, modification of the clerical hierarchy, etc.) to the interests of the princes. A sovereign prince was to replace the Pope at the head of the church. The Confession of Augsburg was rejected by the Emperor. The war waged against him by princes who adopted the Lutheran Reformation ended in 1555 in the religious peace of Augsburg, which empowered the princes to determine the faith of their subjects at their own discretion. p. 417

310 See Notes 16 and 199. p. 417

311 This date was cited by Zimmermann in the first edition of his book. According to later data Thomas Münzer was born about 1490 (the first date known from his biography, October 1506, is mentioned in his matriculation as a student of Leipzig University, when he was apparently sixteen years of age). In various sources, both in his own works and in historical writings, his name is transcribed differently (Munczer, Muntzer, Müntzer). Engels writes Münzer, the way Zimmermann wrote it in Part Three of his book. p. 420

312 The Anabaptists (those who baptise over again) belonged to one of the most radical and democratic religious-philosophical trends spread in Switzerland, Germany and the Netherlands during the Reformation. Members of this sect were so called because they repudiated infant baptism and demanded a second, adult baptism. p. 420

313 Engels refers to the views of David Strauss and other Young Hegelians who treated questions of religion from a pantheist standpoint in their early writings. p. 421
According to later verified data Münzer went first to the imperial city of Mühlhausen, from where he was banished by municipal authorities in September 1524 for his part in disturbances among the city poor. From Mühlhausen Münzer came to Nuremberg.

The Puritans (from the Latin puritas—purity)—participants in a religious political movement in England and Scotland at the close of the sixteenth and in the early half of the seventeenth centuries. Their object was a Protestant Calvinist Reformation and purification of the Church of England of every trace of Catholicism (elimination of bishops, simpler church rites, etc.). They advocated modesty, abstinence, thrift, encouraged prudence and enterprise. The Puritans expressed the religious opposition of the bourgeoisie to absolutism and played an important part in the ideological preparations for the English bourgeois revolution.

The Independents—representatives of one of the Protestant trends in England. In the 1580s and 1590s they formed the Left wing of Puritanism and represented radical opposition to absolutism and the Church of England by the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie and the "new" bourgeois nobility. During the English revolution of the seventeenth century, the Independents formed a separate political party which came to power under Oliver Cromwell at the end of 1648.

The Swabian League of princes, noblemen and patricians of the imperial cities of South-Western Germany was founded in 1488. Its chief purpose was to combat the peasant and plebeian movement. The South- and West-German princes who headed this League also viewed it as a means to consolidate their oligarchic rule. The League had its own administrative and judicial bodies, and an army. It fell apart in 1534 due to internal squabbles.

This refers to the government of the viceregent of the Austrian Habsburgs in Ensisheim, the centre of the Austrian Forelands, the name used to denote the possessions of the Habsburgs and their immediate vassals in Upper Alsace, Upper Swabia and the Black Forest.

Szeklers—an ethnic group of Hungarians, mostly free peasants. In the thirteenth century their forefathers were settled by Hungarian kings in the mountain regions of Transylvania to protect the frontiers. The region inhabited by them was usually called Szekler land.

The reference is to a popular rising in Sicily against the French Anjou dynasty, which conquered Southern Italy and Sicily in 1267. On the evening of March 31, 1282, the population of Palermo took the vespers bell-toll as a signal to massacre several thousand French knights and soldiers. As a result, the whole of Sicily was freed from French domination and came under the Aragon King.

Engels refers to the 95 theses that Luther (who began his clerical career as a simple monk in the Augustinian monastery in Thuringia) nailed to a church door in Wittenberg on October 31, 1517. The theses contained a vigorous protest against the sale of indulgences and the abuses by the Catholic clergy. They also presented the initial outline of Luther's religious teaching in the vein of burgher ideals.

Burlesque—satirical literature and parodies by writers of the Renaissance and humanitarian ideologists who ridiculed the high-flown style of court poetry and the strict behaviour of upper feudal society.
The Wars of the Roses (1455-85)—wars between the feudal Houses of York and Lancaster fighting for the throne, the white rose being the badge of the House of York, and the red rose of the House of Lancaster. The Yorkists were supported by some of the big feudal landowners from the south-eastern, more economically developed part of the country and also by the knights and the townspeople, while the Lancastrians were backed by the feudal aristocracy of the backward north and of Wales. The wars almost completely wiped out the ancient feudal nobility and brought Henry VII to power to form a new dynasty, that of the Tudors, who set up an absolute monarchy in England. p. 443

The reference is to the Polish national liberation uprising in November 1830-October 1831, and also to that in Cracow in 1846 (see Note 66). p. 444

See Note 317. p. 446

This refers to the black-red-and-gold banner symbolising German unity. The information on such a banner provided by Zimmermann is not, however, corroborated by contemporary sources, i.e. chronicles, etc. The usual peasant colours were red-white, red-black, etc. p. 446

Emperor Maximilian's edict ruled that only representatives of "noble" estates could be members of provincial courts. p. 448

Another big credit was advanced to Archduke Ferdinand by the Augsburg banking house of Fuggers, who owned vast tracts of land north of Lake Constance and had a vital interest in suppressing the peasant insurrection. p. 448

The reference is to the southern mountainous part of Baden adjacent to Switzerland. In the sixteenth century, part of this region was owned by the Margrave of Baden and the rest of it either belonged to the Austrian land of Breisgau or to petty ecclesiastical and secular feudal lords. p. 448

Engels refers to the anonymous pamphlet printed in Nuremberg in early 1525, entitled An die Versammlung gemeiner Pauerschaft, so in Hochteutscher Nation und viel anderer Ort, mit empörung und uffruhr entstanden, ob ihr Empörung billlicher oder unbilllicher gestalt geschehn, und was sie der Oberkeit schuldig oder nicht schuldig seind, gegründet aus der heil. göttlichen Geschrift, von Oberlendischen Mitbrüdern guter maynung ausgangen und beschrieben (To the Assembly of All the Indignant and Insurgent Peasantry of the Upper German Nation and Many Other Places on Whether or Not Its Indignation Is Just and What It Should or Should Not Do to the Authorities. Based on the Holy Scripture, Composed and Rendered with the Full Approval of the Highland Brotherhood). Wilhelm Zimmermann believed this pamphlet to have been written by Thomas Münzer (Allgemeine Geschichte des grossen Bauernkrieges, Th. 2, S. 113). p. 448

Judica Sunday (from judex—judge, literally "judgment Sunday")—the fifth Sunday in Lent. p. 450

The small and the great tithe—two varieties of tax paid to the Catholic Church. The size and nature of this tax varied in different parts of Germany, and in most cases greatly exceeded a tenth of the peasants' produce. As a rule the great tithe (decima major) was imposed on the corn and vine harvest whereas the small tithe (decima minor) was imposed on other crops. p. 451
332 The *Grand Chapter of Würzburg*—an ecclesiastical collegium governing the Würzburg bishopric, whose head, the Bishop of Würzburg, also had the title of Duke of Franconia. p. 452

333 The *Teutonic Order*—a German religious Order of knights founded in 1190 during the crusades. The Order seized vast possessions in Germany and other countries. These were administered by dignitaries known as commandores (or commthurs). In the thirteenth century, East Prussia fell under the rule of the Order after it was overrun and the local population exterminated. In 1237 the Order amalgamated with the Livonian Order, which also had its seat in the Baltic area. The Eastern possessions of the Order became a seat of aggression against Poland, Lithuania and the adjoining Russian principalities. After the defeat at Chudskoye Lake in 1242 and in the battle at Grunwald in 1410, the Order rapidly declined and was only able to maintain a small part of its former possessions. p. 454

334 Later research into the Peasant War in Germany proves that the Heilbronn Councillor Hans Berlin who, as Engels describes, became a traitor and negotiated with Truchsess, military chief of the Swabian League, on behalf of patricians and wealthy burghers (see p. 461 of this volume), and the author of the Declaration of the Twelve Articles who induced the peasant leaders to accept it, were two different people, the latter being the Heilbronn notary and procurator Hans (Johannes) Berlin. p. 455

335 The *agreement of Offenburg*, concluded by the Breisgau insurgents and the Austrian Government on September 18, 1525, stipulated the restoration of former peasant services and the institution of harsh measures against peasant societies and “heretics”. For its part, the government undertook to pardon rank-and-file members of the movement and confine itself to relatively modest fines. The amnesty, however, did not extend to the leaders of the uprising. Even this agreement, unfavourable as it was to the peasants, was soon violated by the Austrian authorities and local feudal lords, who subjected the insurgents to bloody reprisals as soon as they had laid down their arms. p. 467

336 The agreement, concluded with the Austrian Government on November 13, 1525, forced the Black Forest peasants to repeat their oath of allegiance to the Habsburgs, to resume their former feudal services and not to interfere with the bloody reprisals of the victors against the town of Waldshut, headquarters of the movement. The defenders of Waldshut, however, stood their ground for several weeks, and the town fell only due to the treachery of the rich burghers. p. 467

337 Later research has proved that Münzer held no official post in the Mühlhausen “eternal council”, but his presence at its sittings and his advice to the council made him the virtual head of the new revolutionary government. p. 469

338 Engels refers to Louis Blanc and Albert (Alexandre Martin), who represented the proletariat in the bourgeois Provisional Government of the French Republic instituted in February 1848 (see this volume, p. 53). p. 470

339 See Note 11. p. 470

340 The Articles of the Alsatian peasants not only defined more sharply the anti-feudal demands of the Twelve Articles (see this volume, p. 451) of the Swabian and Franconian peasantry (abolition of serfdom, return of common lands usurped by the nobility, etc.), but in many respects went even further. They were also directed against usurers (the clause on the abolition of usurers' interest, and
others); they demanded the abolition not only of the small, but of the great tithe as well, and proclaimed the right of the local population to depose and replace officials with whom they were dissatisfied. p. 473

341 The Fourteen Articles of the insurgent peasants and pitmen of the Salzburg archbishopric in the main reproduced the demands of the Twelve Articles of the Swabian and Franconian peasants. In addition, they contained certain local demands. Among other things, the insurgents demanded that the independence of the courts from the influence of feudal lords and their puppets be secured, that the responsibility of the whole community for crimes committed on its territory be abolished and measures be taken to maintain roads in good repair and to protect trade. p. 475

342 The Thirty Years' War (1618-48)—a European war, in which the Pope, the Spanish and Austrian Habsburgs and the Catholic German princes rallied under the banner of Catholicism and fought the Protestant countries: Bohemia, Denmark, Sweden, the Republic of the Netherlands and a number of Protestant German states. The rulers of Catholic France—rivals of the Habsburgs—supported the Protestant camp. Germany was the main battle arena or the object of plunder and territorial claims. The Treaty of Westphalia (1648) sealed the political dismemberment of Germany. p. 478

343 This document reflects an acute struggle waged by Marx, Engels and their followers against sectarian elements in the Communist League. By August 1850, Marx and Engels realised that, in the context of the general economic prosperity, there was no prospect for a new revolution in the near future (see this volume, pp. 509-10). They believed that most efforts should be concentrated on strengthening the proletarian party's independence from petty-bourgeois democracy, both ideologically and organisationally. This sober analysis and logical approach were opposed by Willich and Schapper, members of the Communist League Central Authority. Willich also disagreed with Marx's understanding of the theory of the proletarian revolution; he thought that communism could be enforced by the minority once and for all. Marx wrote to the Cologne Communists on their disagreements as far back as June 1850. The contents of his letter were recorded in the evidence of Peter Röser, one of the accused at the Cologne trial (1852), which he gave late in 1853 and early in 1854 while in prison. Willich, Schapper and their followers, instead of analysing objective reality as Marx and Engels did, proposed pseudo-revolutionary phrases and employed adventurist tactics in an attempt to provoke new insurrections in Germany. This led to disagreements in the Central Authority which became clear during its meetings in August and the early half of September, and intensified on September 15, 1850, when the Communist League split (see this volume, pp. 625-29).

This meeting decided to transfer the seat of the League's Central Authority to Cologne and instruct the local authority there to form a new Central Authority of the League (see this volume, p. 630). The factionalists, being in the minority, walked out, appealed to League members of the London district, and, with their support, formed their own central authority. The majority of the members of the German Workers' Educational Society in London (see Note 61) also sided with the separatist faction of Willich and Schapper, causing Marx, Engels and their followers to resign from this Society.

The statement was printed in Cologne in 1852 in the Bill of Indictment of the Cologne communist trial under the title: Marx, K., Engels, F., An den Dienstagspräsidenten der Gesellschaft in Great Windmill Street, London, 17. September,

Following the split in the Communist League, the Blanquist refugees in London supported the sectarian adventurer faction headed by Willich and Schapper. In view of this Marx and Engels, backed by the spokesmen of revolutionary Chartists, decided to cancel the agreement to found the Universal Society of Revolutionary Communists concluded with the Blanquisits and signed in mid-April 1850 (see Note 277). The letter published in this volume was written on this occasion. A rough copy of it in Engels' handwriting is extant. p. 484

Eccarius wrote his article "Die Schneiderei in London oder der Kampf des grossen und des kleinen Capitals" (which was published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue* No. 5-6) with Marx's direct assistance, Marx being the editor.

The editorial comment written by Marx and Engels follows directly after the article. It was later reproduced in Eccarius' Preface to his other work, also written with Marx's assistance: Eccarius, *Eines Arbeiters Wiederlegung der national-ökonomischen Lehren John Stuart Mill's*, Berlin, 1869, and also in the second German edition of this book published in Hottingen-Zürich, 1888. p. 485

This is an unfinished rough draft of an article intended for No. 5 of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue*. Engels wrote it in connection with the stand taken by some of the Young Hegelians (Eduard Meyen, Julius Faucher, Ludwig Buhl and Max Stirner), who in 1842 were members of the Berlin circle “The Free” and from the early 1850s rallied around the Berlin periodical *Abend-Post* and the Stuttgart *Deutsche Monatsschrift für Politik, Wissenschaft, Kunst und Lebens*. They preached extreme individualism and anarchy, claiming them to be products of "higher democracy" and the “free association of people”. Actually, however, this group championed Free Trade and rejected such democratic institutions as universal suffrage. The fact that, from April 1850 onwards, the subtitle “Democratic Paper” was omitted from the name of its organ was further proof that this group was becoming anti-democratic and anti-revolutionary. The *Abend-Post* frequently printed articles directed against “the law-abiding people among the democrats”, against socialism and communism, as well as against “the revolutionary terror”, the servile dependence of the individual on the masses, etc. These ideas were also current among some of the German petty-bourgeois refugees.

At the beginning of his article, Engels quotes passages from the review of Émile Girardin's *Le Socialisme et l'impôt*, which he wrote together with Marx and published in the *Revue* No. 4. The italics at the beginning of the quotation are introduced by Engels. Engels again refers to this review below. p. 486

Speaking about the "German disciples of Proudhon" Engels is apparently alluding to Karl Grün and Arnold Ruge, who translated some of Proudhon's works into German and popularised his ideas in the press.

The "'noblest minds of the nation' of the Stuttgart parliament and the Imperial Regency" refers to Ludwig Simon and Karl Vogt—deputies to the Stuttgart parliament (the remnants of the Frankfurt parliament that moved to Stuttgart in the summer of 1849—see Note 222). They were also among the five imperial regents appointed by the parliament (see Note 11). In 1850 Vogt and Simon used the Stuttgart journal *Deutsche Monatsschrift* to propagate anarchist ideas of abolishing every kind of state. p. 487
This, third, international review, just like the first and the second published in the previous issues of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Politisch-ökonomische Revue*, is a joint work by Marx and Engels (see Note 194), a fact corroborated by Marx's letter to Engels, dated October 20, 1857. Yet, when passages from this review were published during their lifetime, the only author mentioned was Marx. Marx, apparently, wrote the bulk of the text, particularly sections dealing with the economic situation in European countries, and also an analysis of the events in France which Engels later incorporated in the work *The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850*. In September and October 1850 Marx took extracts from David Morier Evans' *The Commercial Crisis 1847-1848*, London, 1848; and Thomas Tooke's *A History of Prices, and of the State of the Circulation, from 1839 to 1847 Inclusive*, London, 1848 (Vol. 4 of the five-volume history of prices), which were used for the review.

The full text of the review was never published during the authors' lifetime. Part of it dealing with England, France and Germany was published in the *Deutsche Londoner Zeitung* (Nos. 305-07, January 31, February 7 and 14, 1851) under the title “Revue der politischen Ereignisse der letzten sechs Monate” von Carl Marx. Another passage, entitled “Geschichte der Handelskrisis von 1845-47” nach Karl Marx, was reproduced in Weydemeyer's *New York weekly Die Revolution* Nos. 1 and 2 of January 6 and 13, 1852.

In 1895, when Engels was preparing a separate edition of Marx's *Class Struggles in France* for publication, he added a fourth chapter which included sections of the review dealing with the economic situation and events in France (see this volume, pp. 507-10 and 516-25). Only these sections, as part of *The Class Struggles*, have ever been published in English.

The editors of this volume have taken account of corrections made by Marx and Engels in the margin of their copies of the *Revue*.  

The reference is to the speculative machinations of the Scottish economist and financier John Law in France between 1716 and 1720; he dealt with the issue of securities and the foundation of joint-stock trading companies. The bank which he founded in 1716, and later transferred to the French Government, as well as a number of companies for trade with foreign countries, went bankrupt in 1720.

The *South Sea Company* was founded in England about 1711, officially for trade with South America and the Pacific islands, but its real purpose was speculation in state bonds. The government granted several privileges to the Company, including the right to issue paper money. The Company's large-scale speculation brought it to bankruptcy in 1720.

An Act to Regulate the Issue of Bank Notes, and for Giving to the Governor and Company of the Bank of England Certain Privileges for a Limited Period was introduced by Robert Peel on July 19, 1844. It envisaged the division of the Bank of England into two completely independent departments, each with its own cash account—the Banking Department which performed purely credit operations and the Issue Department which issued bank-notes. The Act established the maximum quantity of bank-notes in circulation guaranteed by definite reserve funds of gold and silver not to be used for the credit operations of the Banking Department. Additional issue of bank-notes was allowed only if the precious metal reserves were increased proportionally. During the 1847 monetary crisis the Act was suspended.

In mid-October 1850 the Emperor of Austria and the Kings of Bavaria and Württemberg met in Bregenz (on the shores of Lake Constance) to conclude a convention against Prussian claims to the hegemony in Germany.
On October 28, 1850, Warsaw was the scene of a meeting between the Russian Emperor Nicholas I, the Austrian Emperor Francis Joseph and the head of the Prussian Government, Count Brandenburg, during which Nicholas I resolutely took the side of Austria in the Austro-Prussian conflict.  

In 1833 the English Parliament adopted an Act for the Abolition of Slavery Throughout the British Colonies. A sum of £20 million was allocated to compensate slave-owners.

On the events in Schleswig-Holstein see Note 291.

In September 1850, a constitutional conflict flared up in the electorate of Hesse-Cassel between the Elector Frederick William I and the Chamber of Representatives. The head of the government, Hans Hassenpflug, who advocated absolutism, dissolved the Chamber and introduced a state of siege in the country, thus evoking vehement protests from the entire population. The Elector and Hassenpflug sought assistance from Austria, disregarding the fact that Hesse-Cassel belonged to the confederation of German states headed by Prussia. Austria and Prussia contended for the right to mount a punitive expedition against the Hesse constitutional movement and their rivalry in Germany became even more acute. Austria countered Prussia's plans by proposing a revival of the German Confederation of 1815, and early in September 1850, at a conference of minor German states in Frankfurt am Main, she secured the restoration of the Confederation and its Diet, where she exercised the predominant influence. Early in November 1850 there were even clashes between Prussian and Austrian detachments on Hesse-Cassel territory. Before long, however, Nicholas I forced Prussia to make concessions, temporarily abandon her plans for hegemony in Germany and let Austria fulfil the punitive mission in Hesse-Cassel.

This refers to the international congress of pacifists held in Frankfurt am Main in August 1850 and attended by such prominent figures as the American philanthropist Elihu Burritt, the leader of the English Free Traders Richard Cobden, and the former head of the liberal government in Hesse, Heinrich Jaup; representatives of the Quaker religious sect were also among the delegates.

The reference is to the debate on the Anglo-Greek conflict at the June 1850 session of the English Parliament. In 1850 the British Government presented Greece with an ultimatum and sent ships to blockade Piraeus using as a pretext the burning (in Athens in 1847) of the house of the Portuguese merchant Pacifico, who was a British subject. The real object of this move, however, was to make Greece surrender several strategically important islands in the Aegean Sea.

Russia and France protested and the French Government even recalled its Ambassador from London. During the debate, Lord Palmerston made a speech in the House of Commons demagogically exposing the policy of European states and presenting the Whig Government as the champion of civil rights and liberties.

During his stay in London in 1850, Julius Haynau, the Austrian field marshal notorious for his cruel repressive measures against the participants in the revolutionary movement in Hungary and Italy, visited the Barclay, Perkins &
Co. brewery, and was physically attacked and forced to flee by its indignant workers. The people of London warmly approved this news. p. 511

360 The enumerated reforms were enacted on Peel’s initiative (these included the Bank Act of 1844 and the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846—see Notes 350, 29).

The Bill submitted in 1818 and enacted in 1819 stipulated that the Bank of England was to resume the exchange of bank-notes for gold.

In 1829 the English Parliament passed an Act for Relief of His Majesty’s Roman Catholic Subjects. The Catholics, the majority of whom were Irishmen, were given the right to be elected to Parliament and to occupy certain official posts, while the property qualifications for the electorate were raised fivefold. By this would-be emancipation of the Catholics, the English ruling classes sought to enlist the support of Catholic landowners and the upper Irish bourgeoisie.

In 1829, Peel, the Home Secretary, secured the adoption of a law to form a special police corps in London, who were to be directly subordinate to the Home Office. The latter was granted the right to effect control over the police force throughout the country, a role previously fulfilled by the local authorities.

The tariff reform of 1842 lowered customs duties on corn and other imported goods, but introduced income tax as a compensation for the treasury. p. 512

361 Puseyism—a trend in the Anglican Church from the 1830s to the 1860s, named after one of its founders, Pusey, an Oxford University theologian. He advocated the restoration of Catholic rites and dogma in the Anglican Church. Many of the Puseyites were converted to Catholicism.

362 The High Church—a group in the Anglican Church, most of whom belonged to the aristocracy; they emphasised the doctrine of apostolic succession and attached great importance to ceremony and symbols. The Low Church included members of the middle classes and the lower ranks of the clergy and laid special stress on Christian morality.

Dissenters were members of Protestant religious sects and trends in England who to some extent rejected the dogmas and rituals of the official Anglican Church.

363 The constituent assembly that proclaimed the Roman Republic was elected on January 21, 1849; the majority of its deputies were democrats—supporters of Mazzini. The assembly deprived the Pope of his secular power and introduced a number of progressive social measures. After the downfall of the Republic in July 1849, some of the deputies emigrated to England where they formed a provisional Italian National Committee under Mazzini.

364 In the spring of 1850, the Austrian Government floated a so-called voluntary loan of 120 million lire in Lombardy and Venice. Since the population refused to subscribe voluntarily, however, it was enforced compulsorily.

365 The reference is to the Chartist Land Cooperative Society founded on the initiative of O’Connor in 1845 (later the National Land Company, that lasted till 1848). The aim of the Society was to buy plots of land with the money collected, and to lease them to worker shareholders on easy terms. Among the positive aspects of the Society were its petitions to Parliament and printed propaganda against the aristocracy’s monopoly of land. (These aspects were emphasised by Engels in 1847 in his article “The Agrarian Programme of the Chartists”, see present edition, Vol. 6.) However, the idea of liberating the workers from exploitation, of reducing unemployment, etc., by returning them to the land proved utopian. The Society’s activities were not successful in practice.
Following the victory of the popular uprising in Berlin on March 18, 1848, the Prussian King Frederick William IV rode on horseback through the streets of the capital (on March 21), wearing a black-red-and-gold armband symbolising German unity. The same day in an appeal "To My People and the German Nation" he swore to take the cause of unifying Germany into his own hands.

* The Federal Diet—see Note 7.
* The Little Germany—see Note 199.

In 1849 the Grand Duchy of Hesse-Darmstadt and the Hesse-Cassel electorate agreed to join the confederation of German states under the hegemony of Prussia (Prussian Union), but under pressure from Austria and Russia they withdrew in 1850 and sided with Austria.

An ironical allusion to what Frederick William IV said to the delegates of the Frankfurt National Assembly when he received them on April 3, 1849. He agreed to accept the Imperial Crown offered him by the delegation provided the other sovereigns were in agreement. It was virtually a refusal to accept the Crown, which the Prussian King accompanied with the pompous statement: "If the Prussian shield or sword is needed to Germany against external or internal enemies, I shall not be found wanting, even if I am not called upon."

The reference is to the Protocol signed on July 4, 1850, by the representatives of Austria, England, France, Denmark, Prussia, Russia and Sweden who met in London to discuss Schleswig-Holstein. The document supported the indivisibility of lands belonging to the Danish Crown, including the Duchy of Schleswig-Holstein. Only Prussia refused to sign the Protocol, since two days previously she had concluded a separate peace treaty with Denmark in violation of her allied commitments to the Provisional Government of Schleswig-Holstein. In 1852, however, Prussia too had to give official recognition to this document.

The reference is to the Central Committee of European Democracy (see Note 272).

An allusion to the polemic that developed in the late 1830s between the clerical historian and journalist Heinrich Leo and the Young Hegelian Arnold Ruge, who
is ironically referred to as Arnold Winkelried, the name of a semi-legendary hero of the Swiss liberation wars. In his pamphlet Die Hegelinger (Halle, 1838) Leo, who was a bitter opponent of the Hegelian philosophy, accused Ruge and other Young Hegelians of being atheists and, in particular, of not seeing the difference between divinity and humanity.

383 When the Communist League split and Marx, Engels and their followers withdrew from the German Workers’ Educational Society in London (see this volume, p. 483), the spokesmen of the Willich-Schapper faction brought a suit on behalf of the Society against Heinrich Bauer and Karl Pfänder, supporters of the majority of the League’s Central Authority, who, as trustees, held part of the Society’s money to be used under the Central Authority’s control for the needs of the League and to help political refugees. Bauer and Pfänder were willing to return the money in instalments, provided it was not spent by the factionists to the detriment of the Communist League. The latter insisted on a prompt return of the entire sum. On November 20, 1850, the English court rejected the Society’s suit, but the followers of Willich and Schapper did not halt their insinuations against Bauer and Pfänder and started a libel campaign in the press. (One of their statements was published in the Schweizerische National-Zeitung, January 7, 1851.)

This draft statement, intended to refute the insinuations spread by the Willich-Schapper faction, must have been written between December 24 and 31, 1850. In mid-November Engels moved to Manchester and started working for the Ermen and Engels firm (prompted by the necessity of providing material assistance to Marx’s family), but towards the end of December he returned to London for a couple of days. The draft, in Engels’ handwriting with Marx’s corrections, is written in Marx’s notebook.

In January 1852, Pfänder, probably with Marx’s assistance, drew up a further statement for the press concerning this affair (it was published in the Schweizerische National-Zeitung and the manuscript is extant). p. 533

384 This statement was written by Marx after discussion with Engels (see Marx’s letter to Engels of January 22 and Engels’ letter to Marx of January 25, 1851). It was aimed against Arnold Ruge, who attacked Marx and Engels in the press accusing them, among other things, of being party to the appropriation of the funds belonging to the German Workers’ Educational Society in London. (Ruge’s insinuations were partly provoked by the Willich-Schapper faction.) On January 27, Marx sent the text of the statement to Manchester for Engels to sign and forward to the press. Marx intended to publish it in the Bremen newspaper Weser-Zeitung and then in the New-Yorker Staatszeitung but it was not printed in either. The extant original is in Jenny Marx’s handwriting.

385 At the time Engels was working on a series of articles intended for the Friend of the People, the weekly edited by George Julian Harney, about leaders of European petty-bourgeois democrats. His intention did not materialise, however, owing to disagreements with Harney. At a later date Marx and Engels used this material for their pamphlet The Great Men of the Exile where, giving a satirical characteristic of Ruge, they employed such expressions as the “gutter”, “Arnold Winkelried Ruge” and the like, which originally must have occurred in the articles intended for the Friend of the People (see present edition, Vol. 11). In the pamphlet, just as in the given statement, Ruge is described as “the fifth wheel on the carriage of state of European central democracy” (this refers to his being a member of the Central Committee of European Democracy—see Note 272).
On February 24, 1851, London was the scene of an international rally known as the “banquet of the equal”. It was organised by some of the French refugees headed by Louis Blanc and by the society of Blanquist emigrants (Barthélemy, Adam and others), together with the Willich-Schapper faction, to celebrate the anniversary of the February revolution. Marx and Engels asked their followers Konrad Schramm and W. Pieper to attend the banquet, but the latter were driven from the hall. The organisers of the banquet deliberately concealed the toast sent by Auguste Blanqui, who was in prison at the time, exposing Louis Blanc and other members of the Provisional Government of the French Republic (see Engels’ letter to the editor of The Times). However, it was published on February 27 in La Patrie No. 58 and in a number of other French papers. Early in March, Marx and Engels translated the toast into German and English. The German version was sent to Cologne and printed in leaflet form (30,000 copies), with Berne given as the place of publication. The leaflet was circulated in Germany, where Blanqui’s toast was also printed in several German papers. What became of the English translation is not known.

In their letters and works Marx and Engels discuss the circumstances connected with Blanqui’s toast (The Great Men of the Exile, The Knight of Noble-Minded Consciousness, see present edition, Vols. 11 and 12).

For this volume the text of the toast itself was translated from the French original published in La Patrie (No. 58, February 27, 1851) and is given according to the German edition prepared by Marx and Engels.

This letter and the English translation of Blanqui’s toast attached to it (see this volume, pp. 537-39) were not published. Engels intended to send this letter to Blanqui (see Engels’ letter to Marx of March 10, 1851) but it is not known whether he did so. The extant manuscript is a rough copy of the letter.

Engels is apparently referring to the disputes over the question of the state which Proudhon and Louis Blanc carried on in La Voix du peuple from November 25, 1849, to January 18, 1850. Proudhon asserted that Blanc, in his capacity as the French Provisional Government Minister, was, more than any other person, responsible for the defeat of the revolution, and that he was a pseudo-socialist and a pseudo-democrat.

In March 1849 Proudhon was sentenced to three years imprisonment and a fine.

Engels worked on this manuscript in April 1851, without intending to publish it. As he promised Marx in his letter of April 3, 1851, he here gave a detailed analysis, from the military point of view, of the prospects of a war waged by the coalition of counter-revolutionary powers (the resurrected Holy Alliance according to Engels’ terminology) against a revolutionary France. Such an analysis of the military potential of the European powers and the correlation of forces between counter-revolutionary and revolutionary camps in the event of a new revolutionary outbreak was necessary as a basis for criticising the adventurist plans of the democratic refugees, including the sectarian group of Willich and Schapper, who gave a voluntarist and superficial appraisal of the prospects of military clashes in Europe and believed that the victory of the revolutionary army was inevitable (by analogy with the events of the French Revolution).

This work opened up a new stage in Engels’ regular studies of military theory and history in which he had engaged since his arrival in Manchester in November 1850. He studied thoroughly such works as W. P. Napier’s History of the War in the Peninsula and in the South of France, from the Year 1807 to the Year 1814, 6 vols., London, 1828-40, an atlas to Alsison’s Geschichte von Europa, A. Thiers’ Histoire du
Consulat et de l'Empire, and others. Engels elaborated many of the theoretical propositions in this manuscript in his later works.

The manuscript was published for the first time in 1914 in Die Neue Zeit, the theoretical organ of the German Social-Democratic Party. The editors gave a wrong date of writing and supplied the title—"Die Möglichkeiten und Voraussetzungen eines Krieges der Heiligen Allianz gegen Frankreich im Jahre 1852"—which did not quite correspond to the contents of the manuscript. A more exact title was given in Vol. 7 of the second Russian edition of the Collected Works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels published in 1956. In this volume the abbreviated words and dates are written out in full and subdivision into paragraphs is somewhat changed.

391 At Jemappes (Belgium) on November 6, 1792, the French army under General Dumouriez won a major victory over the Austrian troops. p. 543

392 At Neerwinden (Belgium) on March 18, 1793, the French army under General Dumouriez suffered a defeat from troops commanded by the Austrian field marshal, Duke of Coburg. p. 543

393 At Fleurus (Belgium) on June 26, 1794, the French troops defeated the Austrian army under the Duke of Coburg. This victory enabled the French revolutionary army to enter and occupy Belgium. p. 544

394 The reference is to the Girondist Ministry formed after the popular insurrection of August 10, 1792, triumphed and the monarchy was overthrown; it remained in power until June 2, 1793, when the Jacobin dictatorship was established. p. 544

395 At Tourcoing (France) on May 18, 1794, French troops under General Moreau defeated those of the Duke of Coburg. p. 545

396 An allusion to the initial stage of the Italian campaign undertaken by Napoleon Bonaparte in 1796-97. In April 1796 Bonaparte's army began its offensive from Nice and moved through mountain passes into Northern Italy. Between April 12 and 15, by bold manoeuvring of large military contingents, Bonaparte succeeded first in defeating the isolated groups of Austrians and then (on April 22) in routing their allies, the Piedmontese. By threatening to march on Turin, Bonaparte forced the Kingdom of Sardinia to dissociate itself from the anti-French coalition (April 28). p. 545

397 See Note 93. p. 545

398 Ninth Thermidor (July 27-28, 1794)—counter-revolutionary coup d'état that overthrew the Jacobin government and established the rule of the big bourgeoisie. Carnot took an active part in preparing this coup.

Eighteenth Fructidor (September 4, 1797)—coup d'état effected by the Directory, with the support of Napoleon Bonaparte, to thwart the restoration of the monarchy. Carnot, discredited by his association with royalist conspirators, fled from France.

Eighteenth Brumaire (November 9, 1799)—Napoleon Bonaparte's coup d'état that led to his dictatorship (first he was proclaimed First Consul and then, in 1804—Emperor). Carnot approved of the coup d'état, though on several occasions he made timid attempts to oppose Napoleon. p. 546

399 The Seven Years' War (1756-63)—a European war, in which England and Prussia fought against the coalition of Austria, France, Russia, Saxony and Sweden. In
1756-57, the Prussian troops of Frederick II won a number of victories over the Austrian and French armies; however, the success of the Russian forces in Prussia (1757-60) put Frederick II in a critical position, bringing the results of his victories to nought. The war ended with France having to cede some of her colonies (including Canada and almost all of her possessions in East India) to Britain, while Prussia, Austria and Saxony had to recognize the pre-war frontiers.  

The *Rhenish Federation*—a confederation of the states of Western and Southern Germany founded in 1806 under the protectorate of Napoleon. These states officially broke with the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation, which shortly ceased to exist. When Napoleon lost the military campaign of 1813 the confederation fell apart.

401 See Note 92.

402 In April 1809 the battle between Napoleon's army and Austrian troops raged for five days in the district of Regensburg in Bavaria. The engagements at Abensberg and Eggmühl were stages in this major battle, in which the Austrian army was defeated and had to retreat.

403 During the Russo-Turkish war (1787-91) Russian troops, under Alexander Suvorov, captured the fortress of Ochakov on December 17, 1788. The success of this operation was prepared by the utter defeat of the Turkish landing force at Kinburn on October 12, 1787. Suvorov himself took part in storming the fortress of Ismail, which was taken on December 22, 1790.

404 See Note 168.

405 See Note 203.

406 In Prussia, young educated people who could afford to buy uniform and weapons could be enlisted as volunteers and, after one year's service, could claim promotion to the rank of an officer in the army reserve.

407 See Note 105.

408 The article "The Constitution of the French Republic", printed in the organ of the revolutionary wing of the Chartist party, *Notes to the People* No. 7 for June 14, 1851, was to be the first of a series of articles dealing with the constitutions of European states, as shown by the general heading—"The Constitutions of Europe, Compiled from Original Sources; with the Assistance of Leading Continental Democrats", written above the title of the article. That it was Marx who wrote this article is proved by letters written to Marx by Ernest Jones, the editor of the journal, on May 23, 25 and 30, 1851, as well as by its ideological kinship with Marx's *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (see present edition, Vol. 11). The article may have been translated into English by Engels, since Marx did not know English well enough at the time. One more article from this series appeared in the *Notes to the People* under the title "The Prussian Constitution", but it was not written by Marx.

The text of the Constitution, which Marx analyses in the given article, was originally published in *Le Moniteur universel* No. 312, November 7, 1848. The same year it appeared in Paris as a pamphlet. We may assume that Marx used this separate edition. When quoting or rendering some article from the Constitution, Marx introduced his own italics. The articles of the Constitution quoted in the *Notes to the People* are designated as paragraphs (§§).
Marx is referring to the intervention against the Roman Republic undertaken by the French Government in 1849 (see Note 91).  

The reference is to the French press law adopted on June 9, 1819. Under this law, the amount of security-money to be invested by various periodicals depended on the frequency and place of their publication.

Under the law of July 23, 1850, the previous high rates were extended to publications printed in Lyons and the Rhone department. (This law was originally adopted on July 16, 1850, but it appeared in the press with Article 22 missing, which led the National Assembly to adopt on July 23 a decision to publish it once more. This was done in *Le Moniteur universel* No. 205, July 24, 1850.)

In 1832, Louis Bonaparte took Swiss citizenship in the canton of Turgau; during his stay in England in 1848 he volunteered as a special constable (the constabulary was a civilian police reserve); together with the police, special constables dispersed the workers' demonstration organised by the Chartists on April 10, 1848.

By *details* the English revolutionary Chartists meant, in their agitation, points 2-6 of the People's Charter: annual elections to Parliament, salaries for M.P.s, a secret ballot, equal constituencies and abolition of the property qualification for candidates. They believed these demands would guarantee the implementation of universal suffrage, which was the first point of the Charter.

This passage was omitted from the official publication of the speech made by Louis Bonaparte in Dijon on June 1, 1851 (*Le Moniteur universel* No. 154, June 3, 1851) as was pointed out in the newspaper *Le National* of June 3. It was included, however, in an interpellation addressed to the Minister of the Interior in the National Assembly (*Le Moniteur universel* No. 155, June 4, 1851). The full text of the speech appeared in *Le National* on June 4. English and German papers quoted this passage directly or indirectly. It is not yet known which source was used by Marx.

Marx wrote this note when he and Engels were preparing the third international review (see this volume, pp. 490-532). It is a sort of conspectus or plan of the section of the review in which the authors analyse developments in Germany. Some of the ideas were later developed thoroughly in the review itself, while others were left out of the final version, for instance the economic rivalry between Austria and Prussia.

Marx's work "Reflections" is to be found in Notebook VII (pp. 48-52), one of the twenty-four notebooks in which Marx wrote extracts between September 1850...
and August 1853. These notebooks contain Marx's excerpts from and synopses of various publications, with his own comments. But in "Reflections" (the text of which is separated from the preceding material and from what follows by horizontal lines), Marx gives a coherent exposition of his own thoughts in order to clear up a number of economic problems for himself. Such a digression from his rule may have been due to the passages from Thomas Tooke's *An Inquiry into the Currency Principle*, quoted in the same notebook, in which the difference between two kinds of trade — trade between various dealers and trade between dealers and consumers — is given according to Adam Smith. In his exposition, however, Marx went beyond this problem and gave a preliminary formulation of his views on certain other economic problems which he examined in detail in his later economic works.

In this work Marx occasionally uses English economic terms such as "dealers", "consumers", "money", "transfer", "trade", "retail dealers", "currency", "savings-banks", "convertibility", "securities" and "short bills". These have not been indicated in footnotes.

The editors have broken the text into smaller paragraphs to facilitate the reading.


420 This refers to the English East-India Company, founded in 1600, which for a long time enjoyed monopoly trading rights with India, China and other Asian countries. In India the Company maintained an army and exercised administrative functions. It was one of the principal initiators of territorial annexations and colonial subjugation of the population. During the popular insurrection in India in 1857-59 the British Government was forced to change the form of colonial administration, and in 1858 the East-India Company was liquidated.

421 The reference is to the economic crises that developed in England in 1793, 1825 and 1847. The 1847 crisis also enveloped other European countries and the USA.

422 The reference is to the standpoint of what was known as the "little shilling men" school, founded by the Birmingham banker Thomas Artwood. Their views were expressed in the book *The Currency Question. The Gemini Letters*, published in 1844. Its authors, Thomas Wright and John Harlow, wrote under the pseudonym of Gemini.

423 This document dates from the time of Engels' stay in Switzerland after the defeat of the Baden-Palatinate uprising (see Note 133). At first Engels lived in Vevey, then in the latter half of August 1849 moved to Lausanne. In his letters of August 1, 17 and 23, 1849, Marx invited Engels to London to take part in publishing the journal *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue*, as well as in
reorganising the (communist League. When he received his permit to leave Switzerland, Engels decided to travel to England via Italy, since the French authorities refused him the right of transit through France. On October 6, 1849, he sailed from Genoa, and after a five-week voyage around the Iberian Peninsula, reached London some time around November 10.

This and other documents published in this volume reflect Marx’s efforts to gather together revolutionary forces scattered after the defeat of the 1848-49 revolution and to render support to the revolutionary refugees suffering poverty and privation in England. (On the Committee of Support for German Democrats in Need which later became the Social-Democratic Refugee Committee see Note 180.)

The Appeal of the Committee of Support for German Refugees (which appeared in some of the German newspapers) evoked a response from broad democratic circles. The Workers’ Committee of Support for Political Refugees set up in Cologne published a pamphlet entitled Die Westdeutsche Zeitung und die Westkalmücken. On September 28, the Workers’ Association in Frankfurt, led by Weydemeyer, decided to render support to refugees and announced a collection of funds.

The Hamburg newspaper Der Freischütz (No. 86, October 26, 1849) carried the following item describing the activities of the London Committee: “Appeal for Support for German Refugees signed by Karl Marx ("former editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung"), Karl Blind ("former envoy in Paris of the Baden-Palatinate Government"), Anton Füster ("former member of the Austrian Imperial Diet in Vienna" who lived for some time in Hamburg), Heinrich Bauer (master shoemaker in London) and Karl Pfänder (painter in London).—Friendly donations should be addressed to: Heinrich Bauer, 64 Dean Street, Soho Square, and marked ‘for the Refugee Committee’. That the appeal yielded results is proved, inter alia, by the following receipt sent to us.

“Receipt:
“We acknowledge the receipt of a seven-pound bill on the London and Westminster Bank issued in the name of Herr E. Thiesen in Stettin and, on behalf of the German refugees, extend our gratitude to those who contributed.

“London, October 16, 1849. The Committee of Support for German Political Refugees.”

“Karl Marx, Karl Blind, Heinrich Bauer, Karl Pfänder.”

Serezhans and other South-Slav army formations performed compulsory military service on the Austro-Turkish border. In 1848 and 1849 the Austrian authorities and Right-wing bourgeois-landowning nationalist elements drew them into the war against revolutionary Hungary.

See Note 180.
urging him to leave Switzerland for London. "In any case your safety demands it. The Prussians would shoot you twice over: 1) because of Baden, 2) because of Elberfeld."  

428 This refers to the Military Commission of the Elberfeld Committee of Public Safety. The Commission was responsible for forming and equipping the insurgents' armed forces, as well as for preparing the city's defences against imminent invasion by Prussian forces. The Committee of Public Safety did all it could to obstruct and impede the work of the Military Commission.  

429 The reference is to the uprising in Solingen and the surrounding area that broke out early in May 1849 in support of the Imperial Constitution. On May 10 the insurgents stormed the arsenal at the neighbouring Gräfrath to obtain the necessary weapons. The municipal authorities were replaced by the Committee of Public Safety. A considerable number of workers took part in the Solingen uprising, but it was defeated owing to the treachery of the bourgeoisie.  

430 The banquet arranged by Blanquist refugees took place in London on February 25, 1850. It was attended by revolutionary refugees of various nationalities, including Karl Marx, Frederick Engels and Ferdinand Wolff. A report on the banquet was published in *The Northern Star* No. 645, March 2, 1850. Engels' toast was mentioned along with the others, but its author was not named. 

A more detailed report on the banquet appeared in the *Westdeutsche Zeitung* No. 51 (the newspaper bears the number 50, which is mistaken) on March 1, 1850, and was marked "London, February 26". This report was also reprinted in the *Dresdener Zeitung* No. 55, March 5, 1850. Other versions describing the banquet appeared in the *Neue Deutsche Zeitung* No. 55, March 5, 1850, and in *Die Hornisse* No. 54, March 5, 1850. The latter mentioned that the guests included the editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, Marx, Engels and Wolff, that Engels raised a toast in honour of the June insurgents, and Wolff of the revolution without phraseology.  

431 The report on the meeting, published in *Die Hornisse*, stated that "Karl Marx, editor of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, was also present among the guests". *The Democratic Review* for May 1850 carried the report but only the following was said concerning Engels’ speech: "A German exile responded and concluded an excellent speech with giving 'The Proletarians of England'". 

The *Fraternal Democrats*—an international democratic society founded in London on September 22, 1845. The society embraced representatives of the Left Chartists, German workers and craftsmen—members of the League of the Just—and revolutionary emigrants of other nationalities. Marx and Engels helped in founding this society, and later kept in constant touch with the Fraternal Democrats trying to influence the proletarian core of the society, which joined the Communist League in 1847, and through it the Chartist movement, in the spirit of proletarian internationalism. The society ceased its activities in 1853.  

432 *Levellers*—representatives of a radical-democratic trend during the English revolution of the mid-seventeenth century. In 1647 they became an independent group on the national scale. The Levellers wanted to transform England into a republic with a one-House Parliament elected by universal suffrage, to remove all inequalities and implement other democratic reforms.  

433 The minutes in Engels' handwriting mirror the struggle waged by the Social-Democratic Refugee Committee, led by Marx and Engels, against attempts
by Rudolf Schramm, Gustav Struve and other petty-bourgeois refugees to form their own committee and to utilise the assistance to the refugees in need for political intrigues against proletarian revolutionaries (see this volume, p. 617).

434 On the Universal Society of Revolutionary Communists see Note 277.

On the same issue of Der Freischütz (No. 98, August 15, 1850) that carried the present accounts, the editors published Karl Pfänder's letter and his receipt issued in the name of the Social-Democratic Refugee Committee. At the same time, the editors voiced their perplexity at not receiving a similar receipt from the other committee (the one consisting of petty-bourgeois refugee leaders).

435 In 1852 Marx quoted an excerpt from the minutes in his pamphlet Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne (see present edition, Vol. 11). The complete text of the minutes, however, remained unknown for a long time and only in 1956 appeared in the magazine of the Amsterdam International Institute of Social History, where it was published according to the two extant copies made from the original, which has not yet been discovered. One of the copies is written by Hermann Wilhelm Haupt who, following the split in the Communist League, was sent to Cologne to report on the London decisions; the other copy is in an unknown hand (probably Wilhelm Liebknecht's). In this volume the translation has been made from the copy written by Haupt and checked against the second copy. Essential differences in wording are mentioned in footnotes.

439 The Rules of the Communist League (see present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 633-38) were adopted at its Second Congress in December 1847. In the latter half of 1848, the London Central Authority of the League made changes in the Rules and gave this document the vague title of "The Rules of a Revolutionary Party". The clear formulation of the ultimate aims of the proletarian movement given in Article 1 (the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the rule of the proletariat and the foundation
of communist society without classes) was replaced by a demand for a social republic. The demand to acknowledge communism was omitted from Article 2, which formulated the conditions of membership. Marx and Engels resolutely opposed these changes. On Marx's initiative, the Central Authority formed in Cologne from the local authority worked out new Rules (see this volume, pp. 634-36).

440 The reference is to the following Communist League members who belonged to the London district: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, the district's President Johann Georg Eccarius, Heinrich Bauer, Hermann Wilhelm Haupt, August Hain, G. Klose, Wilhelm Liebknecht, Karl Pfänder, Konrad Schramm, Sebastian Seiler and Ferdinand Wolff.

441 See Note 50.

442 An allusion to Louis Blanc's participation in the bourgeois Provisional Government of France from February to May 1848 (see this volume, pp. 53, 55-56).

443 The reference is to the Paris Commune of 1789-94, which administered the French capital during the revolution. It played an important part in organising the revolutionary struggle of the masses and in implementing revolutionary measures introduced after the victory of the Jacobins on the eve of the popular uprising of August 10, 1792, up to the counter-revolutionary coup of 9 Thermidor (July 27), 1794.

444 The text of the resolution of the London Central Authority of the Communist League, similar in content to the proposals submitted by Marx to the Central Authority meeting of September 15, 1850 (see this volume, pp. 625-27), has come down to us as part of another document—the Address of the Cologne Central Authority issued on December 1, 1850. (The Cologne Central Authority was formed early in October 1850, its members being Röser, Bürgers and Otto; some time later they were joined by Daniels and Heinrich Becker.) The Address of the Cologne Central Authority did not fully expose the reasons for the split in the Communist League and even accused both conflicting parties of violating the Rules. Even so, it unequivocally condemned the splitting activities of the sectarian and adventurer faction led by Willich and Schapper and approved the policy of Marx and his followers. In May 1851 Peter Nothjung, emissary of the Cologne Central Authority, was arrested in Leipzig. The minutes found on him were confiscated by the Saxon police and sent to the official organ Dresdner Journal und Anzeiger (No. 171, June 22, 1851) to be published as evidence that democrats and Communists were involved in secret conspiratorial intrigues. In addition, both the Address and the resolution of the London Central Authority were published in the bourgeois Kölnische Zeitung No. 150, June 24, 1851, and at a later date in the Bill of Indictment against the Cologne Communists—Anklageschrift gegen 1) P. G. Roeser... [Köln, 1852] and in Wermuth-Stieber's Die Communisten-Verschwörungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, Th. 1, Berlin, 1853.

445 This document is the last account presented by the Social-Democratic Refugee Committee, which ceased its activities owing to the split in the Communist League and the resignation of Marx, Engels and their followers from the German Workers' Educational Society in London (see this volume, p. 483).

446 The proposal to expel the representatives of the sectarian faction from the Communist League was made after the factionalists had refused to abide by the
decision of the Cologne Central Authority to set up in London two independent
 districts of the League, directly subordinate to the Central Authority. Willich,
 Schapper and their followers formed their own central authority in an attempt to
 influence all the League organisations and isolate the supporters of Marx and
 Engels, whose expulsion they announced. In opposition to the Communist
 League, Willich and Schapper set up their own organisation, which in this and
 other documents is referred to as the Sonderbund, by analogy with the separatist
 union of seven Swiss cantons (see Note 25). On November 11, 1850, the London
 district formed from the supporters of Marx and Engels submitted the proposal in
 question to the Cologne Central Authority to expel members of the Sonderbund,
 and particularly its leaders, from the Communist League. The Central Authority
 endorsed the proposal and incorporated it in its Address of December 1. The text
 of the proposal has come down to us as part of this Address, which fell into the
 hands of the police in 1851 and later appeared in bourgeois semi-official
 periodicals and police-sponsored publications (see Note 444).

447 The Rules of the Communist League were drawn up by the Cologne Central
 Authority in November 1850 in conformity with the decision of the London
 Central Authority adopted on September 15, 1850 (see this volume, p. 630). A
 copy of the Rules in Heinrich Bürgers' handwriting as well as the Address of the
 Cologne Central Authority of December 1, 1850, and other documents, were
 received in London on December 18 (see Jenny Marx's letter to Engels of
 December 19, 1850). On January 5, 1851, the Rules were approved at a meeting of
 the London district of the Communist League, at which Marx was also present. He
 made several remarks in the copy of the Rules which in this volume are in bold
 type. These remarks may have been made at a later date (early in March 1852)
 when Marx forwarded the Rules to Weydemeyer in New York (see Marx's letter to
 Weydemeyer of March 5, 1852).

The police confiscated a copy of the Rules from Peter Nothung, one of the
 League members, when he was arrested in May 1851. Among other documents
 the Rules were printed in the police-sponsored edition: Wermuth-Stieber, Die
 Kommunisten-Verschwörungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. p. 634

448 The annual meeting and the New Year's party arranged by the Fraternal
 Democrats society were attended by delegations from the German Workers'
 Educational Society in London (Marx and Engels were no longer among its
 members), the Hungarian, Polish and other refugee organisations. Marx was
 present at the meeting together with his wife. Engels, who had come from
 Manchester for a few days, addressed the meeting in English. p. 637
NAME INDEX

A

Adam—French tanner, Blanquist, member of secret revolutionary societies during the July monarchy; committee member of the French society of Blanquist emigrants in London (1850).—484, 615

Albert (also named Martin, Alexandre) (1815-1895)—French worker, a leader of secret revolutionary societies during the July monarchy; member of the Provisional Government (1848).—53, 55, 66, 312-14, 316, 320, 323, 359, 360, 367, 537

Albert (Albrecht) III (1443-1500)—Duke of Saxony (1464-1500), commanded the army which suppressed the popular revolt in the Netherlands in 1491-92 and the Frisian peasant revolt in 1500.—431

Alexander I (1777-1825)—Emperor of Russia (1801-25).—260, 547

Alexander of Macedon (Alexander the Great) (356-323 B.C.)—general and statesman of antiquity.—143, 524

Alexandra Fyodorovna (Charlotte Louise) (1798-1860)—daughter of Frederick William III, wife of Emperor Nicholas I.—8

Alken, Nikolaus—German soldier, took part in storming the arsenal in Prüm; executed in October 1849.—171

Alva or Alba, Fernando Álvarez de Toledo, Duke of (1507-1582)—Spanish general and statesman, viceroy of the Netherlands (1567-73), brutally crushed the popular uprising in the Netherlands in the sixteenth century.—447

Anne (1665-1714)—Queen of Great Britain and Ireland (1702-14).—252

Anneke, Friedrich (1818-1872)—Prussian artillery officer discharged from the army for his political views; member of the Communist League; one of the founders of the Cologne Workers’ Association (1848), editor of the Neue Kölische Zeitung, member of the Rhenish District Committee of Democrats; lieutenant-colonel in the Baden-Palatinate revolutionary army (1849).—194, 196, 220

Antony (1489-1544)—Duke of Lorraine (1508-44), brutally suppressed the peasant uprising in Alsace (1525); opposed the Reformation.—474

Arago, Dominique François Jean (1786-1853)—French astronomer, physicist and mathematician, republican politician; member of the 1848 Provisional Government, helped to suppress the June uprising of the Paris proletariat.—537

Ariosto, Lodovico (1474-1533)—Italian poet of the Renaissance, author of L’Orlando furioso.—62, 86

Arndt, Ernst Moritz (1769-1860)—German writer, historian and philologist; took part in the liberation struggle against Napoleon’s rule; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly
Arnold of Brescia (c. 1100-1155)—Italian reformer, ideologist of the movement of the urban poor against the Pope and ecclesiastical feudalism; executed as a heretic.—413

Ashley (Cooper, Anthony Ashley, 7th Earl of Shaftesbury) (1801-1885)—English politician, Tory philanthropist.—272, 291, 293, 297-98

Aston, Luise (pseudonym of Meier, Luise) (1814-1871)—German democratic writer.—242

Athenaeus (late 2nd-early 3rd century)—Greek rhetorician and grammarian.—105

Auerbach, Berthold (1812-1882)—German liberal writer, later an apologist of Bismarck.—242, 244

Aylva, Sjoerd (d. 1509)—leader of the Frisian peasant revolt (1500).—431

Bach, Walter—mercenary who joined the insurgent peasants in South Germany in 1525; a leader of the Allgäu Troop, betrayed the peasants at the crucial moment.—466, 468

Baden, Grand Duke of—see Leopold Karl Friedrich

Ball, John (d. 1381)—English priest and social agitator, an inspirer of the peasant revolt of Wat Tyler (1381).—413, 414

Bamberger, Ludwig (1823-1899)—German journalist, democrat, took part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; subsequently a liberal, deputy to the Imperial Diet.—196, 224

Bantelhans (Bantel, Hans)—a leader of the Poor Konrad society and the peasant uprising in Württemberg and the mountain regions of Swabia in 1514.—436

Baraguay d'Hilliers, Achille, comte (1795-1878)—French general, deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic, Bonapartist.—109

Barnabás—Hungarian priest, took part in the peasant war in Hungary in 1514.—498

Baroche, Pierre Jules (1802-1870)—French lawyer and politician, deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies; procurator-general of the Court of Appeal in 1849, Bonapartist; member of several cabinets prior to and after the coup d'état of 1851.—38, 129

Barrot, Camille Hyacinthe Odilon (1791-1873)—French politician, leader of the liberal dynastic opposition until February 1848; from December 1848 to October 1849 headed a monarchist coalition ministry.—53, 73, 82-84, 86-89, 93, 102, 103, 109, 111, 113, 248

Barthélemy, Emmanuel (c. 1820-1855)—French worker, Blanquist, member of secret revolutionary societies during the July monarchy and participant in the June 1848 uprising in Paris; a leader of the French society of Blanquist emigrants in London; executed on a criminal charge in 1855.—484

Bastiat, Frédéric (1801-1850)—French economist and politician.—48

Bastide, Jules (1800-1879)—French politician and journalist, an editor of the newspaper Le National (1836-46); moderate republican, Minister of Foreign Affairs from May to December 1848.—76

Batory, Stefan VII de Ecséd (d. 1535)—representative of a feudal family in Transylvania, led an army which took part in squashing the peasant uprising in Hungary in 1514.—439

Bauer, Heinrich (b. 1813)—German shoemaker, prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement, a leader of the League of the Just, member of the Central Authority of the Communist
League; emigrated to Australia in 1851.—278, 351, 352, 371, 375, 483, 533, 597-99, 601, 610, 618, 619, 623, 625, 629, 632

_Bauer, Ludwig (Louis)—German physician, participant in the 1848-49 revolution, President of the London Democratic Association committee for support to refugees._—350, 617

_Beaumarchais, Pierre Augustin Caron de (1732-1799)—French dramatist._—89

_Beaune, Jean Baptiste Augustin de (1796-1849)—French lawyer and politician, deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies._—22, 122

_Becker, Johann Philipp (1809-1886)—German revolutionary, took part in the democratic movement of the 1830s and 1840s in Germany and Switzerland and in the 1848-49 revolution; commanded the Baden people's militia during the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; prominent figure in the First International in the 1860s and delegate to all its congresses; friend and associate of Marx and Engels._—180, 223, 224, 231-36

_Becker, Max Joseph (d. 1896)—German engineer, democrat, took part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849 and after its defeat emigrated to Switzerland and subsequently to the USA._—210

_Bem, Józef (1795-1850)—Polish general, prominent figure in the national liberation movement, took part in the Polish insurrection of 1830-31 and the revolutionary struggle in Vienna in 1848; a leader of the Hungarian revolutionary army (1848-49); after the defeat of the revolution emigrated to Turkey._—169

_Benz—Berne innkeeper._—249

_Berlichingen, Götz (Gottfried) von (1480-1562)—German knight, tried to use the peasant uprising of 1525 for his own ends; elected the leader of the Gay Bright Troop, he betrayed the peasants at the crucial moment._—453-55, 462, 463

_Berlin, Hans—town councillor of Heilbronn; tried to foil a moderate programme on the insurgent peasants after their capture of the town in 1525; deserted to the feudal camp._—461

_Berlin, Hans (Johannes) (died c. 1560)—in 1525 notary and procurator in Heilbronn, author of the Declaration of the Twelve Articles, interpreted the insurgent peasants' demands in a moderate vein._—455

_Bernigau (d. 1849)—German democrat, member of the Cologne Committee of Public Safety in 1848; took part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; sentenced by a Prussian court martial and executed._—346

_Berryer, Pierre Antoine (1790-1868)—French lawyer and politician, deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic, Legitimist._—113

_Bertin, Louis Marie Armand (1801-1854)—French journalist, Orleanist; publisher of the _Journal des Débats_ in 1841-54._—39

_Beseler, Wilhelm Hartwig (1806-1884)—Schleswig-Holstein politician; head of the Provisional Government of Schleswig-Holstein in 1848, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Right Centre)._—527

_Beust, Friedrich von (1817-1899)—Prussian officer, committee member of the Cologne Workers' Association (1848); an editor of the _Neue Kölnische Zeitung_ (September 1848-February 1849); took part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; emigrated to Switzerland, professor of pedagogy._—218

_Beyerle—refugee in London._—612

_Blanc, Jean Joseph Louis (1811-1882)—French petty-bourgeois socialist, historian, member of the Provisional Government and President of the Luxembourg Commission in 1848; pursued a policy of conciliation with the bourgeoisie; emigrated to England in August 1848._—53, 55, 59, 63-66, 73, 85, 97, 128, 307, 359, 360, 366, 367, 537, 540, 541, 628

_Blanqui, Louis Auguste (1805-1881)—French revolutionary, utopian communist, organised several secret socie-
ties and plots; adhered to the extreme Left of the democratic and proletarian movement during the 1848 revolution.—27, 35, 37, 64, 65, 88-89, 127, 128-29, 316, 322, 377, 537-40, 576

Blenker, Ludwig (1812-1863)—German democrat, former officer, took part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; subsequently emigrated to the USA and fought in the Civil War on the side of the Northerners.—149, 196-99, 206, 209, 226, 250, 232, 233, 234

Blind, Karl (1826-1907)—German journalist, democrat, took part in the revolutionary movement in Baden in 1848-49; a leader of the German petty-bourgeois emigrants in London in the 1850s; became a national-liberal in the 1860s.—175, 182, 354, 597, 600

Bloem, Anton (1814-1885)—German lawyer, deputy to the Prussian National Assembly (Left wing, later Left Centre) in 1848.—158

Blomfield, Charles James (1786-1857) —English theologian, bishop of London (1828-56).—513

Blum, Robert (1807-1848)—German democrat, journalist, leader of the Left in the Frankfurt National Assembly; took part in the defence of Vienna in October 1848; court-martialled and executed.—149, 198, 220, 222

Bobzin, Friedrich Heinrich Karl (b. 1826) —German artisan; member of the German Workers' Society in Brussels in 1847; took part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; together with Struve headed the German petty-bourgeois emigrants in London.—617, 619

Bocaccio, Giovanni (1313-1375)—Italian author of the Renaissance.—413

Bocquet, Jean Baptiste—French democrat, supporter of the newspaper La Réforme; took part in the 1848 revolution in France and emigrated to London after its defeat; friend of Alexander Herzen; member of the General Council of the First International (1864-65).—314

Boecker (Böker)—member of the Cologne Town Council.—158

Böheim, Hans (Pfeiferhäslein, Pauker) (d. 1476)—shepherd, popular preacher in Niklashausen, inspirer of the peasant movement in the bishopric of Würzburg and surrounding districts; burned at the stake.—428-32

Boisguillebert, Pierre Le Pesant, sieur de (1646-1714)—French economist, predecessor of the physiocrats, founder of classical political economy in France.—119

Bolingbroke, Henry St. John, 1st Viscount (1678-1751)—English deist philosopher and politician.—253

Bonaparte—see Napoleon III

Bonaparte, Jérôme (1784-1860)—younger brother of Napoleon I, King of Westphalia (1807-13).—112

Bonaparte, Napoléon Joseph Charles Paul, Prince (1822-1891)—son of Jérôme Bonaparte, cousin of Louis Bonaparte; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic.—112, 113

Borgia (Borja), Cesare, Duke of Valentinois and Romagna (c. 1475-1507)—member of an influential Italian feudal family, son of Pope Alexander VI, tried to establish a powerful absolutist state, famous for his unscrupulousness.—112

Borme, Daniel (called Borme fils) (1821-c. 1872)—French chemist, participant in political conspiracies, police agent.—37

Born, Stephan (real name Buttermilch, Simon) (1824-1898)—German typesetter, member of the Communist League; leaned towards reformism during the 1848-49 revolution; supreme commander of the Dresden uprising of 1849; turned his back on the workers' movement after the revolution.—215

Bötticher, Karl Wilhelm, from 1864 von (1791-1868)—Prussian statesman, Oberpräsident of Eastern Prussia (1842-48).—10

Bouchette, Jean Baptiste Noël (1754-1840)—French officer, prominent figure in the French Revolution, Jacobin, War Minister (1793-94).—545, 563
Bourbons—royal dynasty in France (1589-1792, 1814-15, 1815-30).—13, 16, 17, 36, 95, 112

Brandenburg, Friedrich Wilhelm, Count von (1792-1850)—Prussian general and statesman, head of the counter-revolutionary Ministry (November 1848-November 1850).—158, 596

Bréa Jean Baptiste Fidèle (1790-1848)—French general, took part in suppressing the June uprising of 1848, shot by the insurgents.—97

Breitenstein, Sebastian von (1464-1535)—Prince-abbot of Kempten (1523-35)—449, 479

Brentano, Lorenz Peter (1813-1891)—Baden democrat, lawyer; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848; headed the Baden Provisional Government in 1849; after the defeat of the uprising emigrated to Switzerland and then to the USA.—174-76, 178-80, 183-85, 188-90, 214, 215, 220, 234, 238, 239

Briessmann, Johannes (1488-1549)—German theologian, follower of Luther.—426

Bright, John (1811-1889)—English manufacturer, a leader of the Free Traders and founder of the Anti-Corn Law League.—19, 116, 272

Brougham and Vaux, Henry Peter, 1st Baron (1778-1868)—British statesman, lawyer and writer, Whig.—511

Brüggemann, Karl Heinrich (1810-1887)—German journalist, moderate liberal; editor-in-chief of the Kölnische Zeitung (1845-55).—526

Bruhn, Karl von (b. 1803)—German journalist, member of the League of Outlaws, the League of the Just, and subsequently of the Communist League from which he was expelled in 1850; later editor of the Lassallean paper Nordstern in Hamburg (1861-66).—372

Brunswick, Duke of—see Karl Wilhelm Ferdinand

Bucher, Lothar (1817-1892)—Prussian official, journalist; deputy to the Prussian National Assembly (Left Centre) in 1848; emigrated to London; subsequently a national-liberal, adherent of Bismarck.—349

Bugeaud de la Piconnerie, Thomas Robert (1784-1849)—Marshal of France, member of the Chamber of Deputies during the July monarchy, Orleanist; commander-in-chief of the army of the Alps, deputy to the Legislative Assembly in 1848-49.—83

Bunsen, Christian Karl Josias, Baron von (1791-1860)—Prussian diplomat, writer, theologian; Ambassador to London (1842-54).—370, 378, 382-83, 391, 511

Burg-Bernheim, Gregor—a leader of the peasant uprising in the Margraviate of Ansbach in 1525.—464

Burritt, Elihu (1810-1879)—American linguist, philanthropist and pacifist, organiser of several international pacifist congresses.—511

Cabet, Étienne (1788-1856)—French writer, utopian communist, author of Voyage en Icarie.—64-65, 320

Camphausen, Ludolf (1803-1890)—German banker, a leader of the Rhenish liberal bourgeoisie; Prime Minister of Prussia from March to June 1848; Prussian envoy to the Central Authority (July 1848-April 1849).—13, 156

Capefigue, Jean Baptiste Honoré Raymond (1801-1872)—French journalist and historian, monarchist.—39, 138, 519

Carlier, Pierre Charles Joseph (1799-1858)—Prefect of the Paris police (1849-51), Bonapartist.—124, 338

Carlyle, Thomas (1795-1881)—British writer, historian, philosopher, Tory; preached views bordering on feudal socialism up to 1848; later a relentless opponent of the working-class movement.—301-10

Carnap, Johann Adolph von (born c. 1793)—Prussian official, Chief Burgomaster of Elberfeld from 1837 to 1851.—165

Carnot, Lazare Hippolyte (1801-1888)—French journalist and politician,
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moderate republican; Minister of Education in the Provisional Government, deputy to the Constituent Assembly (1848); after 1851 a leader of the republican opposition to the Bonapartist regime.—27, 128-29, 344

Carnot, Lazare Nicolas Marguerite (1753-1823)—French mathematician, political and military figure in the French Revolution, Jacobin; took part in the Thermidor coup in 1794.—128, 545, 546, 562, 563

Carrière, Moritz (1817-1895)—German philosopher, professor of aesthetics.—242

Casimir (1481-1527)—Margrave of Brandenburg, Ansbach and Bayreuth, member of the Franconian line of the Hohenzollerns; organised the suppression of the peasant and urban uprising in Ansbach and Rothenburg.—462-66

Cato, Marcus Porcius (Cato the Elder) (234-149 B.C.)—Roman statesman and writer, upheld aristocratic privileges.—76

Caulaincourt, Armand Augustin Louis, Marquis de, from 1808 Duke of Vicenza (1772-1827)—French general and statesman, Ambassador to Russia (1807-11); Minister of Foreign Affairs (1813-14, 1815).—260

Caussidière, Marc (1808-1861)—French democrat, took part in the Lyons uprising of 1834; Prefect of the Paris police after the February revolution of 1848, deputy to the Constituent Assembly; emigrated to England in June 1848.—59, 73, 97, 311-16, 321-24

Cavaignac, Louis Eugène (1802-1857)—French general and politician, moderate republican; took part in the conquest of Algeria; after the February 1848 revolution, Governor of Algeria; from May 1848 War Minister of France, directed the suppression of the June uprising; head of the executive (June-December 1848).—34, 68, 69, 72, 75-82, 85, 87, 91, 92, 93, 98, 105, 549, 579-80

Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de (1547-1616)—Spanish writer.—174, 246, 512

Chambord, Henri Charles Ferdinand Marie Dieudonné d'Artois, duc de Bordeaux, comte de (1820-1883)—representative of the elder line of the Bourbons, pretender to the French throne under the name of Henry V.—13, 16, 36, 110, 141, 521

Changarnier, Nicolas Anne Théodole (1793-1877)—French general and politician, monarchist; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies; after June 1848 commanded the Paris garrison and national guard; took part in dispersing the demonstration of June 13, 1849, in Paris; banished from France in 1851.—25, 26, 83, 89, 90, 99, 106, 109, 140, 143-44, 520, 523-25

Charles I (1600-1649)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1625-49), executed during the English revolution.—253

Charles V (1500-1558)—Holy Roman Emperor (1519-56), King of Spain as Charles I (1516-56).—461

Charles X (1757-1836)—King of France (1824-30).—129

Charles Albert (Carlo Alberto) (1798-1849)—King of Sardinia and Piedmont (1831-49).—93, 547

Chenu, Adolphe (b. 1816)—took part in secret revolutionary societies in France during the July monarchy; agent provocateur of the secret police.—311-16, 319-24

Christoph I (1453-1527)—Margrave of Baden (1473-1527).—435, 466

Clement, Albert—battalion commander of the Baden-Palatinate insurgent army in 1849.—215, 218

Clement VII (Giulio de'Medici) (1478-1534)—Pope (1523-34).—405, 419, 480

Cobbett, William (1762-1835)—English politician and radical writer.—301

Cobden, Richard (1804-1865)—English manufacturer and politician, a leader of the Free Traders and founder of the Anti-Corn Law League.—11, 19, 116, 265, 299, 510, 511

Columbus, Christopher (Cristóbal Colón) (1451-1506)—Genoa-born navigator, discoverer of America.—332, 334
Cooper, James Fenimore (1789-1851)—American writer.—312-14
Copway, George (Kah-Ge-Ga-Gah-Bowh) (1818-c. 1863)—chief of the Ojibway Indian tribe, methodist missionary; took part in the Frankfurt am Main Pacifist Congress in August 1850.—511
Corvin-Wiersbitzki, Otto Julius Bernhard von (1812-1886)—German democrat, former Prussian lieutenant; took part in the republican uprisings in Baden in 1848; chief of the general staff in Rastatt during the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849.—224
Crémieux, Isaac Moïse (called Adolphe) (1796-1880)—French lawyer and politician, a liberal in the 1840s; member of the Provisional Government (February-May 1848); deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies.—53, 91, 359, 537
Cretan, Nicolas Joseph (1798-1864)—French lawyer; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic, Orleanist.—118
Cromwell, Oliver (1599-1658)—leader of the English revolution, became Lord Protector of England, Scotland and Ireland in 1653.—256, 301, 302
Csáky, Miklos (Nikolaus) (1465-1514)—bishop of Csanád (1500-14); killed by insurgents during the peasant uprising in Hungary.—439
Cubières, Amédée Louis Despans de (1786-1853)—French general, Orleanist; War Minister in 1839 and 1840; degraded in 1847 for bribery and shady dealings.—117
Cyrus the Great (Koresh) (d. 530 B.C.)—King of Persia (558-530 B.C.), founder of the Persian Empire.—421

D

Daire, Louis François Eugène (1798-1847)—French economist, publisher of works on political economy.—328
Dairnvaell, G. M.—French worker, author of pamphlets against the financial aristocracy.—51

Danton, Georges Jacques (1759-1794)—prominent figure in the French Revolution, leader of the Right wing of the Jacobins.—165, 302
Darasz, Albert (1808-1852)—prominent figure in the Polish national liberation movement, took part in the 1830-31 insurrection; belonged to the democratic circles of the Polish emigrants; member of the Central Committee of European Democracy.—528
Daru, Napoléon, comte (1807-1890)—French statesman, member of the Chamber of Peers (1832-48); deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies (Right wing) during the Second Republic and Vice-President of the Legislative Assembly (1850-51).—128
Daumer, Georg Friedrich (1800-1875)—German writer on the history of religion.—241-46
Delamarre, Théodore Casimir (1797-1870)—French banker; journalist; from 1844 onwards owner of the newspaper La Patrie; Bonapartist.—39, 342
Delane, John Thaddeus (1817-1879)—editor-in-chief of The Times (1841-77).—352, 540, 541
Delessert, Gabriel Abraham Marguerite (1786-1858)—Prefect of the Paris police (1836-48).—312, 319
Dembiński, Henryk (1791-1864)—Polish general and prominent figure in the national liberation movement, took part in the Polish insurrection of 1830-31; commander-in-chief of the Hungarian revolutionary army (February-April 1848) and the Northern Theiss army; after the defeat of the revolution emigrated to Turkey and later to France.—152, 169
Demosthenes (c. 384-322 B.C.)—Greek orator and politician.—113
Devaisse—participant in the 1848 revolution in France, member of the Mountain party.—321
Dickens, Charles John Huffam (1812-1870)—English novelist.—302
Didier, Heinrich—German emigrant to the USA; one of the editors of the Deutsche Schnellpost in 1850.—348
Dietrichstein, Sigmund, from 1515 Baron von (1484-1540)—Viceroy of Styria; suppressed the peasant uprising in the Alpine regions of Austria in 1515-16; taken prisoner by the insurgents during the 1525 uprising and later set free.—440, 475, 476

Dietz, Oswald (c. 1824-1864)—German architect, participated in the 1848-49 revolution; emigrated to London; Communist League member, belonged to the Willich-Schapper sectarian group; subsequently took part in the American Civil War.—633

Dingelstedt, Franz, from 1876 Baron von (1814-1881)—German poet and novelist, court dramatist from the mid-1840s.—242

Disraeli, Benjamin, 1st Earl of Beaconsfield (1822-1891)—British journalist, at first "true socialist", later member of the Communist League and an editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung; emigrated to England after the 1848-49 revolution; subsequently withdrew from politics.—353, 371, 373, 375, 376

Drouyn de Lhuys, Édouard (1805-1881)—French diplomat and politician; in the 1840s Orleanist; after 1851 Bonapartist; Minister of Foreign Affairs (1848-49, 1851, 1852-55, 1862-66), Ambassador to Britain (1849-50).—511

Duclerc, Charles Théodore Eugène (1812-1888)—French journalist and politician, moderate republican; member of the National editorial board (1840-46); Minister of Finance (May-June 1848).—91

Dufaud, Jules Armand Stanislas (1798-1881)—French lawyer and politician, Orleanist; deputy to the Constituent Assembly (1848), Minister of the Interior (October-December 1848) in the Cavaignac Government; one of the organisers of the suppression of the Paris Commune.—78, 81, 117

Dujarrier—French financier.—358

Dumouriez, Charles François du Périer (1739-1823)—French general, commanded the northern revolutionary army in 1792-93; betrayed the revolution in March 1793.—542-43

Dupin, André Marie Jean Jacques (1783-1865)—French lawyer and politician, Orleanist; deputy to the Constituent Assembly (1848-49), President of the Legislative Assembly (1849-51); subsequently Bonapartist.—26, 102, 137, 518

Dupont de l’Eure, Jacques Charles (1767-1855)—French liberal politician, participated in the French revolutions of 1789-94 and 1830; close to the moderate republicans in the 1840s; President of the Council of Ministers in the Provisional Government in 1848.—33, 359, 537

Dupaty, Michel Auguste (1797-1864)—French journalist, took part in publishing several republican-democratic newspapers.—312

Duprat, Pascal Pierre (1815-1885)—French journalist, politician, republican; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the
Second Republic, opponent of Louis Bonaparte.—25

E

Eccarius, Johann Georg (1818-1889)—German tailor, prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement, member of the League of the Just and later of the Communist League; a leader of the German Workers’ Educational Society in London; member of the General Council of the First International; later took part in the English trade union movement.—483, 485, 625, 627, 629

Eckermann, Johann Peter (1792-1854)—German writer, author of the Gespräche mit Goethe in den letzten Jahren seines Lebens.—242

Eichfeld, Karl—War Minister of the Baden Provisional Government in 1849.—180

Eisenhut, Anton (d. 1525)—clergyman at Eppingen (Palatinate); leader of the local peasant and urban uprising in 1525.—460

Eitel, Hans—leader of the Lake Troop of the insurgent peasants (Swabia) in 1525; signed the Weingarten Treaty with Truchsess after which disbanded his troop.—449

Elector Palatine—see Ludwig V

Emmermann, Karl—commander of riflemen in the Baden-Palatinate revolutionary army (1849).—229

Engelhard, Magdalene Philippine (née Gatterer) (1756-1831)—German poetess.—242


Ernest Augustus (1771-1851)—King of Hanover (1837-51).—8

Ernst (1464-1513)—archbishop of Magdeburg (1476-1513).—420

Estancelin, Louis Charles Alexandre (1823-1906)—French politician; deputy to the Legislative Assembly during the Second Republic, Orleanist.—109

D’Ester, Karl Ludwig Johann (1813-1859)—German socialist and democrat, physician, member of the Cologne community of the Communist League; deputy to the Prussian National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848; became member of the Central Committee of German Democrats in October 1848; played a prominent part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; subsequently emigrated to Switzerland.—186, 190, 192, 201, 220, 224, 233

Eugène of Savoy (François Eugène), Prince (1663-1736)—Austrian general and statesman.—198

Evans, David Morier (1819-1874)—British economist.—496

Ewerbeck, August Hermann (1813-1859)—German socialist and democrat, physician, member of the Cologne community of the Communist League; deputy to the Prussian National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848; became member of the Central Committee of German Democrats in October 1848; played a prominent part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; subsequently emigrated to Switzerland.—186, 190, 192, 201, 220, 224, 233

Falloux, Frédéric Alfred Pierre, comte de (1811-1886)—French politician, Legitimist and clerical; Minister of Education and Religious Affairs (1848-49); initiated the closure of national workshops and inspired the suppression of the June 1848 uprising of the Paris workers.—83, 92, 103, 113

Faucher, Julius (Jules) (1820-1878)—German writer, Young Hegelian; advocate of free trade, professed individualistic, anarchist views in the early 1850s.—334, 486

Faucher, Léon (1803-1854)—French writer and politician, Malthusian economist, Orleanist; Minister of the Interior (December 1848-May 1849); later Bonapartist.—48, 83, 88, 90

Favand, Étienne Edouard Charles Eugène
(1793-1854)—French politician, republican; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; supporter of the Mountain party; opposed the December 2, 1851, coup d'état.—22, 123, 263

Fenner von Feneberg, Daniel (1820-1863)—Austrian officer, commanded the Vienna national guard in 1848; later commander-in-chief and chief of staff of the Palatinate insurgent army.—195

Ferdinand I (1503-1564)—Austrian Archduke; Holy Roman Emperor (1556-64).—448, 456, 466, 467, 475-77

Feuerbach, Ludwig Andreas (1804-1872)—German philosopher.—487

Feuerbacher, Matern (c. 1484-c. 1567)—town councillor and a leader of the burgher opposition in Gross-Bottwar (Württemberg); in 1525 leader of the Gay Christian Troop of the insurgent Württemberg peasants and townsmen.—456, 457, 459, 460

Fickler, Joseph (1808-1865)—German journalist, a leader of the Baden democratic movement in 1848-49; member of the Baden Provisional Government (1849).—175

Flocon, Ferdinand (1800-1866)—French democratic politician and journalist, an editor of the newspaper La Réforme; member of the Provisional Government (1848).—53, 323, 359, 537

Florian—see Greisel, Florian

Flotte, Paul Louis François René de (Deflotte) (1817-1860)—French naval officer, democrat and socialist, Blanquist; took part in the 1848 revolution in France; deputy to the Legislative Assembly (1850-51).—27, 32, 128-29, 344

Forner, Anton—Burgomaster of the imperial city of Nördlingen (Franconia); joined the insurgent peasants in 1525 and headed the plebeian party in the town.—452

Fothergill, Thomas—British officer, honorary secretary of the London union of the German refugees (1850).—352

Fouché, Joseph, duc d'Otrante (1759-1820)—prominent figure in the French Revolution, Jacobin; took part in the Thermidor coup; Minister of Police under Napoleon I, notorious for his lack of principle.—124, 347

Fould, Achille (1800-1867)—French banker and politician, Orleanist, subsequently Bonapartist; Minister of Finance several times from 1849 to 1867.—20, 61, 75, 86, 114, 115, 117, 118, 342, 364-65

Fouquier-Tinville, Antoine Quentin (1746-1795)—figure in the French Revolution; Public Prosecutor of the Revolutionary Tribunal in 1793.—94

Fourier, François Marie Charles (1772-1837)—French utopian socialist.—322

Foy, Maximilien Sébastien Auguste Arthur Louis Fernand (1815-1871)—French politician; candidate of the party of Order for the Seine department during the by-elections to the Legislative Assembly on March 10, 1850.—344

Francis I (1494-1547)—King of France (1515-47)—328, 447

Francis Joseph I (1830-1916)—Emperor of Austria (1848-1916).—11, 528

Fränkel—German worker residing in London, member of the Communist League and of the London German Workers' Educational Society (1847); member of the Central Authority of the Communist League (1849-50); supporter of the Willich-Schapper sectarian group.—625, 633

Frederick II (the Great) (1712-1786)—King of Prussia (1740-86) —252, 546, 551, 552, 556

Frederick III (the Wise) (1463-1525)—Elector of Saxony (1486-1525); patron of Luther; one of Münzer's persecutors.—417

Frederick VII (1808-1863)—King of Denmark (1848-63).—394

Frederick Augustus II (1797-1854)—King of Saxony (1836-54).—8

Frederick William I (1802-1875)—Elector of Hesse-Cassel (1847-66); Regent (1831-47).—528

Frederick William II (1744-1797)—King of Prussia (1786-97).—542

Frederick William IV (1795-1861)—King of Prussia (1840-61).—8, 10, 12-16, 171, 207, 247, 257, 258, 261, 267, 378, 382, 383, 385, 394, 525-28
Freiligrath, Ferdinand (1810-1876)—
German romantic and later revolutionary poet; member of the Communist League; one of the editors of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung (1848-49).—353

Fries, Peter (born c. 1822)—German lawyer, democrat; took part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; member of the Palatinate revolutionary Provisional Government; emigrated to Switzerland.—372

Frundsberg, Georg von (1473-1528)—
commander of German mercenaries; took part in suppressing the peasant uprising in Swabia and the archbishopric of Salzburg in 1525-26.—468, 476

Füster, Anton (1808-1881)—Austrian theologian, professor of Vienna University; deputy to the Imperial Diet (1848), democrat; emigrated to London and later to the USA.—597, 600

G

Gagern, Heinrich Wilhelm August, Baron von (1799-1880)—German moderate liberal politician; deputy to and President of the Frankfurt National Assembly (Right Centre), Imperial Prime Minister (December 1848-March 1849); a leader of the Gotha party after May 1849.—511, 526

Geier (Geyer), Florian (c. 1490-1525)
—Duke of Saxony (1500-39), one of the organisers of the suppression of the peasant uprising in Thuringia in 1525.—425

Gerber, Erasmus (d. 1525)—leader of the insurgent Alsatian peasants (1525).—474

Gerber, Theus (died c. 1541)—leader of a troop of Stuttgarters, which joined the Württemberg insurgent Gay Christian Troop in 1525.—457, 460

Ghillany, Friedrich Wilhelm (1807-1876)
—German historian and theologian.—242

Gibbs—a London alderman, acting Lord Mayor of London in May 1850.—352

Girardin, Émile de (1806-1881)—French journalist and politician, editor of La Presse; often changed his political views; opposed the Guizot Government in 1847; a republican during the 1848-49 revolution; deputy to the Legislative Assembly (1850-51); later Bonapartist.—137, 326-31, 333-37, 487, 518

Gnam—German democrat, took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; emigrated to England, and in 1852 to the USA.—612, 613.

Goegg, Amand (1820-1897)—German journalist, democrat; member of the
Baden Provisional Government (1849) and of the First International, joined
the German Social-Democrats in the
1870s.—182, 220

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von (1749-
1832)—German poet.—241, 242, 246

Görgey, Arthur (1818-1916)—military
leader of the 1848-49 revolution in
Hungary, a commander and, from
April to June 1849, commander-in-
chief of the Hungarian army; voiced
the conservative sentiments of the
nobility; advocated agreement with
the Habsburgs and later capitulation;
War Minister (from May 1849).—184

Götz—see Berlichingen, Götz von

Götz, Christian (1783-1849)—Austrian
general, took part in suppressing the
Italian national liberation movement
and in the war against revolutionary
Hungary in 1848-49.—547

Goudchaux, Michel (1797-1862)—French
banker, republican, Minister of Fi-
nance in the Provisional Government
in 1848.—73

Gourgaud, Caspar, baron (1783-1852)
—French general and monarchist
politician, deputy to the Legislative
Assembly during the Second Re-
public.—109

Graill, E. de—French Legitimist politi-
cian; lost the by-election to the Legis-
avative Assembly in the department of
Gard on January 13, 1850.—22

Grandin, Victor (1797-1849)—French
manufacturer and conservative politi-
cian, member of the Chamber of De-
puties (1839-48); deputy to the
Constituent and Legislative Assem-
bles during the Second Republic.
—48

Grandménil—French journalist, democ-
rat; member of secret revolutionary
societies during the July monarchy;
one of the founders and publishers of
the newspaper La Réforme.—313

Granier de Cassagnac, Bernard Adolphe
(1806-1880) — French journalist,
lacked principles in politics; prior to
the 1848 revolution, Orleanist, later
Bonapartist.—39, 138, 519

Gray, Simon (18th-19th cent.)—English
economist.—588

Grebel, Konrad (1489-1526)—head of
an Anabaptist sect in Zürich, follower
of Münzer; agitated for a revolution in
South Germany.—426

Greiner, Theodor Ludwig—German law-
yer, democrat; member of the Palati-
nate Provisional Government in 1849;
emigrated to Switzerland and subse-
quently to the USA.—200-02, 372

Greisel, Florian—German priest, took
part in the 1525 Peasant War in
Swabia.—458

Grey, Sir George (1799-1882)—British
Whig statesman, Home Secretary
(1846-52, 1855-58 and 1861-66) and
State Secretary for the Colonies (1854-
55).—3, 274, 297, 383-84

Grün, Karl Theodor Ferdinand (pen-
name Ernst von der Haidé) (1817-
1887)—German writer, “true social-
ist” in the mid-1840s; deputy to the
Prussian National Assembly (Left
wing).—345

Gudin, Charles Gabriel César (1798-
1874)—adjutant of Louis Philippe;
from 1846 Marshal of France; was
dismissed from his post in 1847 for
swindling.—358

Gugel-Bastian (d. 1514)—leader of the
peasant conspiracy in the Margraviate
of Baden in 1514.—438

Guinard, Auguste Joseph (1799-1874)
—French democrat, deputy to the
Constituent Assembly (1848-49);
took part in the Mountain party ac-
tions on June 13, 1849.—129

Guizot, François Pierre Guillaume (1787-
1874)—French historian and conser-
vative statesman; from 1840 up
to the February revolution of 1848 vir-
tually directed France’s foreign and
domestic policy.—19, 36, 48, 51,
52, 69, 76, 83, 90, 109, 113, 251-56,
301

Gutzkow, Karl Ferdinand (1811-1878)
—German writer, member of the
Young Germany group; editor of
the journal Telegraph für Deutschland
(1838-43).—242

Gütlaff, Karl Friedrich August (1803-
1851)—German missionary in Chi-
na.—266
Habern, Wilhelm von—Palatinate mar-
shal, commander-in-chief under Ludwig,
Elector of the Palatinate; took part in suppressing the 1525 peasant
uprising in the Palatinate.—456, 466
Hadrian (Publius Aelius Hadrianus) (76-
138)—Roman Emperor (117-38).—
591
Hafiz, Shams ud-din Mohammed (c. 1300-
c. 1389)—Persian poet, Tajik by
birth.—244
Hain, August—German emigrant re-
siding in London; member of the
Communist League, supported Marx
during its split.—483
Hanover, House of—British royal house
(1714-1901).—252
Hansemann, David Justus (1790-1864)
—German capitalist, a leader of the
Rhenish liberal bourgeoisie; Prussian
Finance Minister (March-Septem-
ber 1848).—156
Harlow, John (mid-19th cent.)—British
economist of the Birmingham school
known as the “little shilling men”; wrote
with Wright under the pseudo-
nym of Gemini.—588
Harney, George Julian (1817-1897)—
prominent figure in the English
labour movement; a member of the
Chartist Left wing; editor of the
newspaper Northern Star and the jour-
nal Democratic Review; friend of
Marx and Engels.—5, 484, 514, 615
Hassenpflug, Hans Daniel Ludwig Fried-
rich (1794-1862)—German statesman,
advocate of absolutism, Minister of
Justice and the Interior of Hesse-
Cassel (1832-37), head of the Hesse-
Cassel Ministry (1850-55).—527
Haupt, Hermann Wilhelm (born c. 1831)
—German business clerk; member
of the Communist League; turned
traitor during the Cologne communist
trial and was released by the police
during investigation.—483
Häusner, Karl—German engineer, com-
manded the Rhenish Hessian corps of
the Baden-Palatinate insurgent army
in 1849.—196
Haussez, Charles Lemercier de Longpré,
baron d’ (1778-1854)—French conserva-
tive politician; Minister for the Navy
(1829-30).—129
Hautpoul, Alphonse Henri, marquis d’
(1789-1865)—French general, Legiti-
mist, later Bonapartist; War Minister
(1849-50).—22, 26, 32, 113, 123, 128,
137, 143, 144, 261, 518, 523, 524
Haynau, Julius Jakob, Baron von (1786-
1853)—Austrian Master of Ordnance;
took part in suppressing the 1848-49
revolution in Italy; commanded the
Austrian troops in Hungary (1849-
50); initiated violent repressions
against the Hungarian revolutionaries.—110, 511, 624
Hecker, Friedrich Karl Franz (1811-
1881)—German democrat, a leader of
the Baden republican uprising in
April 1848; emigrated to the USA.—
149, 198, 232. 238
Hecker, Karl—one of the leaders of the
Elberfeld uprising in 1849.—164
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1770-
1831)—German philosopher.—248,
267, 302, 422, 488-89, 530
Heine, Heinrich (1797-1856)—German
revolutionary poet.—182-83, 536
Heintzmann, Alexis (born c. 1812)—Prus-
sian lawyer, liberal; member of the
Committee of Public Safety during the
Elberfeld uprising in May 1849; emig-
rated to London.—164
Heinzen, Karl (1809-1880)—German
journalist, radical; took part in the
Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849;
emigrated to Switzerland, later to
England and in the autumn of 1850 to
the USA.—3, 4, 183
Helfenstein, Ludwig, Count von (c. 1480-
1525)—Austrian Viceregent in
Weinsberg (Württemberg); was
treachery and cruel towards the peas-
ant; executed by the in-
surgents.—453-54, 462
Helvétius, Claude Adrien (1715-1771)—
French philosopher, atheist, Enlight-
ener.—99
Henneberg, Johann, Count von—Abbot of
Fulda (1521-41).—472, 479
Henry IV (1553-1610)—King of France
(1589-1610).—253
Henry V—see Chambord, Henri Charles
Ferdinand Marie Dieudonné d'Artois, duc de Bordeaux, comte de Henry VIII (1491-1547)—King of England (1509-47).—254 Herwegh, Georg Friedrich (1817-1875)—German democratic poet, a leader of the German Democratic Society in Paris.—112 Heydt, August, Baron von der (1801-1874)—Prussian conservative statesman, Elberfeld banker; from December 1848 to 1862, Minister of Trade, Industry and Public Works; deputy to the Second Chamber (1848).—603 Hillmann, Hugo (1823-1898)—German democrat, took part in the 1848-49 revolution; emigrated to London; later became member of the Lassallean General Association of German Workers; joined the Social-Democratic Workers’ Party in 1869.—612 Hipler, Wendel (c. 1465-1526)—German nobleman who sided with the insurgents during the peasant uprising in Franconia in 1525; principal author of the “Heilbronn programme”.—452-54, 461-63 Hirschfeld, Karl Ulrich Friedrich Wilhelm Moritz von (1791-1859)—Prussian general, commanded a corps which took part in suppressing the Baden-Palatinate uprising (1849).—208 Höchster, Ernst Hermann (born c. 1811)—Elberfeld lawyer, democrat, Chairman of the Elberfeld Committee of Public Safety in May 1849.—164, 175 Hodde, Lucien de la (Delahodde) (1808-1865)—French writer, member of secret revolutionary societies during the Restoration and the July Monarchy, police agent.—311-16, 320, 323 Hohenlohe, Albrecht and Leopold, Counts von—petty Franconian rulers.—452, 453 Hohenzollerns—dynasty of Brandenburg electors (1415-1701), Prussian kings (1701-1918) and German emperors (1871-1918).—171, 209, 347, 464 Homer—semi-legendary Greek epic poet, author of the Iliad and the Odyssey.—195, 258 Horace (Quintus Horatius Flaccus) (65-8 B.C.)—Roman poet.—105 Hosszu, Anton—a leader of the peasant uprising in Hungary in 1514.—439 Hubmaier, Balthasar (c. 1480-1528)—Waldshut priest, follower of Müntzer, one of the inspirers of the peasant and urban uprising in the Black Forest.—426, 446 Hudson, George (1800-1871)—British capitalist, known as the “railway king”.—358 Hugo, Victor Marie (1802-1885)—French writer; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic.—33, 112, 136, 138, 517 Hühnerbein (Hünerbein), Friedrich Wilhelm (born c. 1817)—German tailor, member of the Communist League and of the Committee of Public Safety during the Elberfeld uprising in May 1849.—602 Huss or Hus, John or Jan (c. 1369-1415)—Bohemian religious reformer and ideologist of the national movement; professor of Prague University from 1398, and rector of the same from October 1402 to April 1403; burnt at the stake as a heretic.—413 Hutten, Frowin von—cousin of Ulrich von Hutten, courtier of the Elector of Mainz; took part in suppressing the peasant uprising (1525).—466 Hutten, Ulrich von (1488-1523)—German poet, advocate of Reformation, ideologist of and participant in the knights’ uprising in 1522-23.—417, 442-45, 466

J

Jacoby, Johann (1805-1877)—German physician, petty-bourgeois journalist, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly; joined Social-Democrats in 1872.—9 Jakob—a leader of the peasant uprising of “shepherds” (1251) in France; born in Hungary.—413 Jansen, Johann Joseph (1825-1849)—German democrat, member of the Communist League; a leader of the
Cologne Workers' Association (1848), supporter of Gottschalk; shot for his participation in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849.—346

Jansen, Karl (born c. 1830)—German democrat, schoolteacher; took part in the Elberfeld uprising in May 1849; brother of Johann Joseph Jansen. —603

Jaup, Heinrich Karl (1781-1860)—German lawyer, liberal; head of the Hesse-Darmstadt Government (1848-50); President of the Pacifist Congress in Frankfurt am Main in August 1850.—511

Jean Paul (pseudonym of Johann Paul Friedrich Richter) (1763-1825)—German satirical writer. —302

Jellachich (Jellačić), Josef, Count (1801-1859)—Austrian general, Ban of Croatia; took part in suppressing the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary and Austria.—596

Joachim of Floris (c. 1132-1202)—Italian abbot, mystic, preached a "second coming of Christ"; his teaching was condemned by the Catholic Church as heretical.—420

John (Johann) (the Steadfast) (1468-1532)—Duke of Saxony; from 1525 Elector of Saxony; one of the persecutors of Münzer; organised the suppression of the peasant uprising in Thuringia (1525).—424

John (Johann) (1782-1859)—Archduke of Austria; Imperial Regent of Germany (June 1848 to December 1849).—7, 10

Joinville, François Ferdinand Philippe Louis Marie, Prince de (1818-1900)—duke of Orleans, son of Louis Philippe; emigrated to England after the February revolution of 1848.—16, 36

Jones, Ernest Charles (1819-1869)—leading figure in the English labour movement, proletarian poet and journalist, a leader of the Left Chartists, friend of Marx and Engels. —514

Joss, Fritz from Untergrombach (died c. 1525)—organiser of secret peasant alliances and conspiracies in South Germany (1513).—433-35, 440

Jung, Rudolph—merchant, witness at the trial of the participants in the Elberfeld uprising of May 1849.—603
drawing; a leader of the May 1849 uprising in Elberfeld; emigrated to Switzerland, then to the USA.—372
Kossuth, Lajos (1802-1894)—leader of the Hungarian national liberation movement; headed bourgeois-democratic elements during the 1848-49 revolution; head of the Hungarian revolutionary Government; after the defeat of the revolution emigrated first to Turkey and then to England and America.—183, 200, 205, 206, 214, 552
Krug, Wilhelm Traugott (1770-1842)—German philosopher.—242
Kübeck, Karl Friedrich, Baron von Kübau (1780-1855)—Austrian statesman, Finance Minister after the March 1848 revolution.—10
Kunowski—Prussian major, War Ministry official; extreme monarchist. —379, 383
Kunze, August—German journalist. —242
Kurz—Swiss officer. —236

L

Lacrosse, Bertrand Théobald Joseph, baron de (1796-1865)—French politician, Orleanist; Minister of Public Works during the Second Republic; from 1850 Bonapartist.—104
La Fayette, (Lafayette), Marie Joseph Paul Ives Roch Gilbert Motier, marquis de (1757-1834)—prominent figure in the French Revolution, one of the leaders of the moderate constitutionalists (Feuillants); participated in the July revolution of 1830.—543
Laffitte, Jacques (1767-1844)—French banker and liberal politician, headed the government in the early period of the July monarchy (1830-31).—48
Lagarde, Barthélemy (1795-1887)—French politician, deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; adherent of the Mountain party.—122
La Hitte, Jean Ernest Ducos, vicomte de (1789-1878)—French general, Bonapartist, Minister of Foreign Affairs (1849-51).—129
Lamartine, Alphonse Marie Louis de (1790-1869)—French poet, historian and politician; one of the leaders of the moderate republicans in the 1840s; Minister of Foreign Affairs and virtual head of the Provisional Government in 1848.—53, 58, 65, 68, 303, 359, 362, 515, 530, 537
Lamartinière, Félix de (born c. 1808)—publisher of the Bonapartist newspaper Le Pouvoir.—39, 140, 520-21
Lamourette, Antoine Adrien (1742-1794)—French statesman, deputy to the Legislative Assembly (1792); executed as a counter-revolutionary in 1794. —139, 519
Lamparter, Gregor (1463-1523)—adviser to Duke Ulrich of Württemberg.—437
La Rochejacquelein, Henri Auguste Georges Du Vergier, Marquis de (1805-1867)—French politician, one of the leaders of the Legitimist party; deputy to the Constituent Assembly (1848), senator during the Second Empire.—54
Laurentius—see Mészáros, Laurentius
Law, John (1671-1729)—Scottish economist and financier, Director-General of Finance in France (1719-20). —491
Leclerc, Alexandre—Paris businessman, supported the party of Order and took part in suppressing the workers' uprising in June 1848.—32, 135, 516
Ledru-Rollin, Alexandre Auguste (1807-1874)—French writer and politician, a leader of the petty-bourgeois democrats, editor of La Réforme; Minister of the Interior in the Provisional Government in 1848, deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies (leader of the Mountain party); fled to England following the events of June 13, 1849.—53, 61, 64, 65, 71, 73, 81, 88, 91-93, 98, 99, 101-03, 106, 117, 129, 136, 323, 359, 364, 516, 528, 537, 541
Lehmann, Albert—German worker resident in London, leading figure in the League of the Just and in the London German Workers' Educational Society; member of the sectarian group of
Willich and Schapper in the Communist League.—625, 629, 633

_Lemoinne, John Marguerite Émile_ (1815-1892)—French journalist, correspondent of the _Journal des Débats_ and later its editor-in-chief.—138, 519

_Leo, Heinrich_ (1799-1878)—German historian and writer, extreme monarchist, ideologist of Prussian junkerdom.—523

_Leoni, Josef_—German refugee in London.—612-13

_Leopold Karl Friedrich_ (1790-1852)—Grand Duke of Baden (1830-52).—162, 175, 179, 180, 181, 184, 215

_Lerminier, Jean Louis Eugène_ (1803-1857)—French conservative lawyer and writer, professor of comparative law at the Collège de France (1831-39); resigned as a result of a campaign of protest by the students.—90

_Le Sage, Alain René_ (1668-1747)—French writer.—315

_Leo, Heinrich_ (1799-1878)—German historian and writer, extreme monarchist, ideologist of Prussian junkerdom.—523

_Leoni, Josef_—German refugee in London.—612-13

_Leopold Karl Friedrich_ (1790-1852)—Grand Duke of Baden (1830-52).—162, 175, 179, 180, 181, 184, 215

_Lerminier, Jean Louis Eugène_ (1803-1857)—French conservative lawyer and writer, professor of comparative law at the Collège de France (1831-39); resigned as a result of a campaign of protest by the students.—90

_Le Sage, Alain René_ (1668-1747)—French writer.—315

_Löwenstein, Ludwig and Friedrich, Counts von_—petty Franconian rulers.—453

_Lucas_—member of the Workers' Association in Mülheim (Rhineland) in 1849; refugee in London.—613

_Ludwig V_ (1478-1544)—Elector of the Palatinate (1508-44); took part in suppressing the knights' uprising of 1522-23; one of the organisers of reprisals against insurgent peasants in Franconia in 1525.—437, 444, 454, 455, 460, 462, 464, 465, 466

_Lüning, Otto_ (1818-1868)—German physician and writer, a "true socialist" in the mid-forties, editor of the _Neue Deutsche Zeitung_, later became a national-liberal.—387-88

_Luther, Martin_ (1483-1546)—prominent figure of the Reformation, founder of Protestantism (Lutheranism) in Germany, ideologist of the German burghers.—411, 416-21, 423-27, 429, 441-42, 446

_M_ 

_Malthus, Thomas Robert_ (1766-1834)—English clergyman and economist, advocated a misanthropic theory of population.—83

_Manstein, Johann_—German soldier who took part in storming the arsenal in
Prüm; executed in October 1849.—171

Mantel, Johann (c. 1468-1530)—German theologian, preacher at Stuttgart, follower of Münzer.—426

Manteuffel, Otto Theodor, Baron von (1805-1882)—Prussian conservative statesman, Minister of the Interior (November 1848-November 1850), Prime Minister (1850-58).—158, 182, 212

Manteuffel, Rudolph von—captain in the Baden-Palatinate insurgent army (1849); relative of Otto Theodor Manteuffel.—212

Marat, Jean Paul (1743-1793)—a Jacobin leader during the French Revolution.—540

Marche—French worker who in 1848 demanded from the Provisional Government the introduction of the right to work.—55

Marie de Saint-Georges, Alexandre Pierre Thomas Amable (1795-1870)—French lawyer and politician, moderate republican; Minister of Public Works in the Provisional Government in 1848; later Minister of Justice in the Cavaignac Government.—63, 359, 366, 537

Marrast, Armand (1801-1852)—French writer and politician, a leader of moderate republicans, editor of Le National; member of the Provisional Government and Mayor of Paris (1848), President of the Constituent Assembly (1848-49).—23, 53, 65, 72, 77, 78, 91, 98, 99, 263, 315, 319, 359, 515, 537


Mathieu de la Drôme, Philippe Antoine (1808-1865)—French democrat; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic, sympathised with the Mountain party.—90

Matthäus Lang (c. 1468-1540)—Archbishop of Salzburg (from 1519); inspired the persecution of adherents of the Reformation, and reprisals against the insurgent peasants and townsman in 1525.—475-77

Mäurer, Friedrich Wilhelm German (1811-1885)—German writer, democrat, member of the League of Outlaws, later of the League of the Just.—242

Maximilian I (1459-1519)—Holy Roman Emperor (1493-1519).—433, 437, 439, 448

Maximilian II (1811-1864)—King of Bavaria (1848-64).—8, 151

Mayerhofer, Rudolph—Deputy Minister of War in the Baden Provisional Government (1849), obstructed radical military action.—176, 180

Mazzini, Giuseppe (1805-1872)—a leader of the national liberation and democratic movement in Italy; head of the Provisional Government of the Roman Republic (1849); an organiser of the Central Committee of European Democracy in London (1850).—513-14, 528, 532, 541

McCulloch, John Ramsay (1789-1864)—Scottish economist who vulgarised David Ricardo’s theories.—584

Meininghaus, Heinrich—inkeeper, witness at the trial of the participants in the May 1849 Elberfeld uprising. —602

Meissner, Alfred (1822-1885)—German democratic writer; in the mid-forties a “true socialist”, subsequently a liberal.—242

Melanchthon, Philipp (1497-1560)—German theologian, closest associate of Luther, whom he assisted in adapting Lutheranism to the interests of princes; took a hostile attitude towards Münzer’s revolutionary ideas. —424

Menzingen, Stephan von (d. 1525)—German knight; headed the insurrection of Rothenburg petty burghers and plebeians in March 1525.—452, 465

Mersy—commander of the 3rd Division in the Baden-Palatinate insurgent army; emigrated to the USA, fought on the side of the Northerners in the American Civil War.—226, 227, 229, 230, 232
Mészáros, Laurentius (d. 1514)—priest of Szeged, a leader of the peasant insurrection in Hungary in 1514.—438, 439

Mettternich-Winneburg, Clemens Wenzel Lothar, Prince von (1773-1859)—Austrian statesman and diplomat, Minister of Foreign Affairs (1809-21), Chancellor (1821-48); an organiser of the Holy Alliance.—10, 624

Metsler, Georg—a leader of the peasant uprising in Odenwald (1525), and commander of the Gay Bright Troop; belonged to the moderate party. —452-54, 461, 463

Mieroslawski, Ludwik (1814-1878)—prominent figure in the Polish national liberation movement; took part in the insurrection of 1830-31, in the preparations for the uprising of 1846 and in the 1848-49 revolution; later, a leader of the moderate wing of Polish democratic emigrants; sympathised with Bonapartism.—152, 179, 184, 195, 196, 206, 212, 218, 219, 222-23, 226, 230, 231

Mirbach, Otto von (born c. 1800)—retired Prussian artillery officer, democrat, commandant of Elberfeld during the May 1849 uprising.—602, 604

Mniejski, Theophil (1809-1849)—Polish revolutionary, commanded a regiment in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; executed in Rastatt in 1849.—219

Mohammed (Muhammad, Mahomet) (c. 570-632)—founder of Islam.—244

Molé, Louis Mathieu, comte (1781-1855)—French statesman, Orleanist, Prime Minister (1836-37, 1837-39); deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic.—109

Molière (real name Jean Baptiste Poquelin) (1622-1673)—French dramatist.—139, 519

Moll, Joseph (1813-1849)—German watchmaker prominent in the German and international working-class movement; a leader of the League of the Just, member of the Central Authority of the Communist League; President of the Cologne Workers' Association (from July to September 1848), member of the Rhenish District Committee of Democrats; killed in battle during the Baden-Palatinate uprising in 1849.—200, 201, 225-29, 278

Münzer, Thomas (c. 1490-1525)—leader of the urban plebeians and poor
peasants during the Reformation and the Peasant War in Germany, advocated egalitarian utopian communism.—404-05, 413, 415, 418-27, 432, 442, 446, 448, 450, 461, 469-73, 475-76

Neuhaus—physician from Thuringia; commanded a detachment of the Baden-Palatinate revolutionary army in 1849.—229

Neumayer, Maximilian Georg Joseph (1789-1866)—French general, supported the party of Order.—144, 524-25

Ney, Napoléon Henri Edgard (1812-1882)—French general, Bonapartist, adjutant of President Louis Bonaparte, deputy to the Legislative Assembly of 1850-51.—112

Nicholas I (1796-1855)—Emperor of Russia (1825-55).—8, 258, 259, 262, 511, 528, 547, 556-57, 624

Noack, Ludwig (1819-1885)—German theologian and philosopher.—242

Nostradamus (Michel de Notre-Dame) (1503-1566)—French physician and astrologer, mystic.—245

Nothjung, Peter (1821-1866)—German tailor, member of the Cologne Workers’ Association and of the Communist League, one of the accused at the Cologne communist trial (1852).—376, 602

Oastler, Richard (1789-1861)—English politician, Tory philanthropist.—291, 293, 298

Oberrmüller—German journalist, participant in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849.—204, 212, 233

Oborski, Ludwik (1787-1873)—Polish colonel, participant in the Polish insurrection of 1830-31; emigrant resident in London, member of the Fraternal Democrats society; commanded a division in the Baden-Palatinate insurgent army (1849).—226, 227, 231

O’Connor, Feargus Edward (1794-1855)—a leader of the Left wing in the Chartist movement, editor of the newspaper The Northern Star; reformist after 1848.—377, 514-15

Orleans, House of—French royal dynasty (1830-48).—81, 95, 111-12

Orleans, Duchess of—see Orléans, Hélène Louise Elisabeth
Orléans, Duke of—see Louis Philippe I
Orléans, Hélène Louise Elisabeth, Duchesse d’ (1814-1858)—Princess of Mecklenburg, widow of Ferdinand, Louis Philippe’s elder son.—36, 111
Oswald, Eugen (1826-1912)—German journalist, democrat, took part in the revolutionary movement in Baden (1848-49); emigrated to England after the defeat of the revolution.—219
Oudinot, Nicolas Charles Victor (1791-1863)—French general, Orleanist, in 1849 commanded troops dispatched against the Roman Republic.—93, 94, 101, 102, 549
Ovid (Publius Ovidius Naso) (43 B.C.-c. 17 A.D.)—Roman poet.—541
Pache, Jean Nicolas (1746-1823) —prominent figure in the French Revolution, Jacobin, War Minister (October 1792-January 1793), Mayor of Paris (February 1793-May 1794).—545, 563
Pagnerre, Laurent Antoine (1805-1854) —French publisher, republican; deputy to the Constituent Assembly in 1848.—91
Palmerston, Henry John Temple, 3rd Viscount (1784-1865)—British statesman, Foreign Secretary (1830-34, 1835-41, 1846-51), Home Secretary (1852-55) and Prime Minister (1855-58 and 1859-65); Tory at the beginning of his career, from 1830 onwards, Whig. —511, 513
Paris, Count of—see Louis Philippe Albert
Parmentier—French manufacturer and financier.—117
Peskevich, Ivan Fyodorovich (1782-1856)—Russian general-field marshal; commander-in-chief of the army sent to suppress the Polish insurrection in the summer of 1831, and of the army that took part in suppressing the Hungarian revolution in 1849.—547, 556
Passy, Hippolyte Philibert (1793-1880) —French economist and politician, Orleanist, several times member of the government during the July mon-
Plato (c. 427-c. 347 B.C.)—Greek philosopher.—78

Pradié, Pierre (1816-1892)—French lawyer, republican; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; wrote pamphlets defending the Republic against Louis Napoleon.—263

Praslin, Charles Hugues Théobald, duc de Choiseul (1805-1847)—French aristocrat; his trial in 1847 for murdering his wife had political repercussions.—358

Prassler, Kaspar—leader of insurgent detachments of peasants and miners in the bishopric of Salzburg (1525).—475

Pregizer, Kaspar—cutler in Schorndorf (Württemberg), one of the organisers of the Poor Konrad society; took part in the uprising of peasants and townsmen in Württemberg in 1514.—436

Prince of Prussia—see William I

Proudhon, Pierre Joseph (1809-1865)—French writer, economist and sociologist, a founder of anarchism; deputy to the Constituent Assembly in 1848. —134, 387, 486-87, 508, 541, 585, 588

Pulszky, Ferenc (1814-1897)—Hungarian politician, writer and archaeologist, a Pole by birth; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; emigrated, contributed to the New-York Daily Tribune in the 1850s; in 1867 returned to Hungary after amnesty and became deputy to the Diet (1867-76 and 1884-97).—240

R

Rabmann, Franz (d. 1525)—popular preacher, follower of Münzer, took part in the uprisings of the Black Forest and Klettgau peasants and plebeians (1525).—426

Radetzky (Radetzki), Josef, Count of Radetz (1766-1858)—Austrian field marshal, commanded the Austrian forces in Northern Italy from 1831; suppressed the Italian national liberation movement in 1848 and 1849.—10, 547, 548

Radowitz, Joseph Maria von (1797-1853)—Prussian general, conservative statesman; a Right-wing leader in the Frankfurt National Assembly in 1848 and 1849.—10

Rakow, Heinrich—German officer, took part in the struggle for the liberation of Schleswig-Holstein (1848) and in the Baden-Palatinate uprising (1849); commanded the Kaiserslautern Battalion of the Baden insurgent army. —207

Ramorino, Gerolamo (1792-1849)—Italian general, took part in the Polish insurrection of 1830-31; commanded the Piedmontese army in 1849; his tactics led to the victory of the Austrian counter-revolutionary forces.—548

Raphael Sanzio (1483-1520)—Italian painter of the Renaissance.—311

Raquilliet, Felix (1778-1863)—staff general in the Polish insurgent army (1830-31); emigrated to France; took part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; for a time was acting commander-in-chief of the Palatinate armed forces.—195

Raspail, François Vincent (1794-1878)—French naturalist, journalist and socialist close to the revolutionar y proletariat; took part in the revolutions of 1830 and 1848; deputy to the Constituent Assembly.—53, 54, 64, 65, 75, 81, 88, 359

Rateau, Jean Pierre Lamotte (1800-1887)—French lawyer; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic, Bonapartist.—86, 90

Raumer, Friedrich Ludwig Georg von (1781-1873)—German historian; Imperial Ambassador to Paris (1848); deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Right Centre).—242

Rausch, Friedrich Wilhelm (born c. 1820)—Barmen printer, participant in the Elberfeld uprising (May 1849).—603

Ravez, Auguste Marie Simon (1770-1849)—French statesman, royalist, deputy to the Chambre introuvable (1815-September 1816); President of the Chamber of Deputies (1819-28):
deputy to the Legislative Assembly during the Second Republic.—122
Reichardt, Joseph Martin (1803-1872) —German lawyer, democrat; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly, member of the Palatinate revolutionary Provisional Government (1849).—195
Rembrandt van Rijn (1606-1669) —Dutch painter.—311
Reventlow, Friedrich, Count von (1797-1874) —German conservative politician, member of the Schleswig-Holstein Provisional Government (1848).—527
Ricardo, David (1772-1823) —English economist.—334, 530
Richard von Greifenklau (1467-1531) —Elector and archbishop of Trier (1511-31), bitter opponent of the Reformation; took part in suppressing the knights' uprising in 1522-23 and the peasant uprising in 1525.—444, 466
Rintoul, Robert Stephen (1787-1858) —English journalist, editor-in-chief of The Spectator (1828-58).—380, 381, 384
Riotte, Karl Nikolaus (born c. 1816) —German lawyer, democrat, member of the Committee of Public Safety during the Elberfeld uprising (May 1849).—164
Roberts, William Prowting (1806-1871) —English lawyer connected with the Chartist and trade union movements.—534
Robespierre, Maximilien François Marie Isidore de (1758-1794) —prominent figure in the French Revolution, leader of the Jacobins, head of the revolutionary government (1793-94).—22, 77, 165, 540, 611
Robinson, W. R. —Governor of the Bank of England (1847).—493
Rohrbach, Jäcklein (c. 1498-1525) —one of the chiefs of the peasant uprising in Franconia (1525); known for his irreconcilability towards the nobility.—453-57, 460, 461
Ruge, Arnold (1802-1880) —German radical journalist and philosopher, Young Hegelian; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848; a leader of German petty-bourgeois refugees in England in the 1850s; became a national-liberal after 1866.—182, 183, 486-87, 528, 532, 535-36
Rühel (Rühl), Johannes —German lawyer, counsellor in Saxony, relative and follower of Martin Luther.—419
Russell, Lord John Russell, 1st Earl (1792-1878) —British statesman, Whig leader, Prime Minister (1846-52 and 1865-66), Foreign Secretary (1852-53 and 1859-65).—510
Ryschka, Martin —Hungarian refugee in London.—240
S
Sachs, Hans (1494-1576) —German artisan, poet and composer of the Reformation, founder of the Meistersinger school in Nuremberg.—246
Sadler, Michael Thomas (1780-1835) —English economist and politician, philanthropist, sympathised with the Tory party.—291, 298
Saint-Just, Antoine Louis Léon de Richebourg de (1767-1794) —prominent figure in the French Revolution, a Jacobin leader.—545
Saint-Simon, Claude Henri de Rouvroy, comte de (1760-1825)—French utopian socialist.—110, 306
Saphir, Moritz Gottlieb (1795-1858)—Austrian humoristic poet.—242
Sauer, Heinrich—a witness at the trial of the participants in the Elberfeld uprising of May 1849.—603
Schappeler, Christoph (1472-1551)—participating in the Peasants' War of 1525, a leader of the Allgäu Troop.—468
Schmidt, Jörg (known as Knopf von Leubas) (born c. 1480-1525)—Upper Swabian peasant; participant in the Peasant War of 1525, a leader of the Allgäu Troop.—434
Schön, Ulrich (d. 1525)—participant in the Peasant War of 1525; a leader of the Leipheim Troop.—450, 458
Schönhals, Karl von (1788-1857)—Austrian general and military writer, took an active part in suppressing the revolution in Italy (1848-49).—10, 268
Schramm, Jean Paul Adam, comte de (1789-1884)—French general and politician; Minister of War (1850).—144, 524
Schramm, Konrad (c. 1822-1858)—German proletarian revolutionary, member of the Communist League, refugee in London from 1849; manager of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Politisch-ökonomische Revue, friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—6, 483, 606, 625, 629
Schramm, Rudolf (1813-1882)—German democratic journalist; deputy to the
Prussian National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848; emigrant in England; follower of Bismarck in the 1860s. —349, 350, 612

Schubert & Co.—Hamburg bookselling firm from 1826.—5

Schurz, Karl (1829-1906) —German democrat, participant in the Baden-Palatinate uprising (1849); emigrated to Switzerland; subsequently US statesman.—372

Sébastiani, Horace François Bastien, comte (1772-1851) —French marshal, diplomat, Orleanist; Minister of Foreign Affairs (1830-32), Ambassador to London (1835-40).—69

Sefeloge, Maximilian (Max) (1820-1859) —former Prussian soldier, took part in an attempt to assassinate Frederick William IV; died in a lunatic asylum.—378, 382, 383, 386

Ségur d’Aguesseau, Raymond Joseph Paul, comte de (1803-1889) —French lawyer and politician; sympathised with all the ruling parties one after the other; represented the party of Order in the Legislative Assembly.—129

Seiler, Anton —German soldier, took part in storming the arsenal in Prüm; executed in October 1849.—171

Seiler, Sebastian (c. 1810-c. 1890) —German journalist, member of the Brussels Communist Correspondence Committee in 1846, member of the Communist League, participant in the revolution of 1848-49 in Germany.—483

Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper, 3rd Earl of (1671-1713) —English moral philosopher, politician. Whig.—253

Shakespeare, William (1564-1616) —English dramatist and poet.—206, 230

Sickingen, Franz von (1481-1523) —German knight who joined the Reformation, leader of the knights’ uprising in 1522-23.—417, 442, 444-45, 481

Sigel, Franz (1824-1902) —Baden officer, democrat, one of the military leaders of the Baden-Palatinate uprising in 1849; emigrated to Switzerland and later to England; lived in the United States from 1852, in the American Civil War fought for the North—erners.—174, 179, 226, 230-37, 372

Simon, Levi —small tradesman, witness at the trial of participants in the Elberfeld uprising of May 1849.—603

Simon, Ludwig (1810-1872) —German lawyer, democrat; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848-49; emigrated to Switzerland in 1849.—247, 248, 249, 250, 486-87

Singerhans (Singer, Hans) —a leader of the Poor Konrad society and of the peasant uprising in Württemberg and in the mountain regions of Swabia (1514).—436

Sismondi, Jean Charles Léonard Simon de (1773-1842) —Swiss economist, representative of economic romanticism. —584

Smith, Adam (1723-1790) —Scottish economist.—531, 584-85

Sobrier, Marie Joseph (c. 1825-1854) —French democrat, member of secret revolutionary societies during the July monarchy; founded in March 1848 the newspaper La Commune de Paris, organ of the Paris prefecture. —313

Solomon —King of Israel and Judah (c. 974-c. 937 B.C.).—244

Soulouque, Faustin (c. 1782-1867) —President of the Republic of Haiti; proclaimed himself emperor under the name of Faustin I in 1849.—26, 83, 123, 127

Spalatin, George (original name Georg Burckhardt) (1484-1545) —German clergyman, humanist, friend and associate of Martin Luther.—417

Spät, Dietrich (d. 1536) —German nobleman, leader of a detachment in the punitive expedition of Truchsess. —457, 459, 463

Starke, Carl —German sergeant, witness at the trial of the participants in the Elberfeld uprising of May 1849.—603

Steiniger, August —non-commissioned officer, witness at the trial of participants in the Elberfeld uprising of May 1849.—603
Sternberg—see Ungern-Sternberg, Alexander, Baron von

Sterne, Laurence (1713-1768)—English novelist.—83

Stirner, Max (real name Johann Caspar Schmidt) (1806-1856)—German philosopher, Young Hegelian, an idealist of individualism and anarchism.—334, 487, 589

Stoffel von Freiburg—an organiser of the Bundschuh peasant conspiracy in Upper Rhineland and the Black Forest in 1513.—437

Stolberg, Bodo, Count von (1467-1538)—German state councilor, abbot of the Magdeburg and Halberstadt monasteries, adviser to Cardinal Albrecht.—420

Stolberg, Friedrich Leopold, Count zu (1750-1819)—German poet.—245

Storch, Niklas (c. 1500-c. 1536)—Zwickau weaver, head of local Anabaptist sect; under Münzer’s influence preached popular insurrection against clerical and lay feudal lords.—420

Strasser, Friedrich.—Austrian painter, participant in the 1848 revolution in Austria, lieutenant-colonel of the Baden-Palatinate insurgent army in 1849.—209

Strauss, David Friedrich (1808-1874)—German philosopher and writer, Young Hegelian.—302

Strotha, Karl Adolf von (1786-1870)—Prussian general, conservative, Minister of War (November 1848-February 1850).—268

Struve, Gustav von (1805-1870)—German journalist, democrat; a leader of the Baden republican uprisings of 1848 and the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; a leader of the German petty-bourgeois emigrants in England; fought in the American Civil War on the side of the Northerners.—149, 175, 177, 180, 183, 198, 221, 222, 223, 233, 234, 235, 350, 352, 373, 612, 617, 619

Stuarts—royal dynasty in Scotland (1371-1714) and England (1603-49 and 1660-1714).—254

Sue, Eugène Marie Joseph (1804-1857)—French writer, author of sentimental social novels.—31, 32, 38, 124, 135-37, 516, 517, 518

Sulz, Rudolf, Count von—judge of the Imperial Court in Rottweil; an organiser of reprisals against insurgents in South Germany during the Peasant War of 1525.—467

Suvorov, Alexander Vasilyevich, Count Suvorov-Rymniksky, Prince Italisky (1729-1800)—Russian general.—548

Száleresi, Ambros—Pest citizen, joined the peasant uprising in Hungary in 1514, betrayed the insurgents and went over to the nobility.—438

Sznyde, Franz (1790-1850)—participant in the Polish insurrection of 1830-31, general of the Baden-Palatinate insurgent army in 1849.—195, 196, 199, 200, 205, 209, 218, 219, 221

Stolle, Karl Adolf von (1786-1870)—Prussian general, conservative, Minister of War (November 1848-February 1850).—268

Techow, Gustav Adolf (1813-1893)—Prussian officer, democrat, chief of the general staff of the Palatinate insurgent army; emigrated to Switzerland and in 1852 to Australia.—195-96, 220, 221

Teleki, István (d. 1514)—royal chancellor, later Hungarian treasurer, killed by insurgents during the peasant uprising of 1514.—439

Teste, Jean Baptiste (1780-1852)—French lawyer and statesman, Orleanist, Minister of Trade, Justice and Public Works during the July monarchy, tried for bribery and malpractices.—117, 358

Thiers, Louis Adolphe (1797-1877)—French historian and statesman, Prime Minister (1836, 1840); deputy to the Constituent Assembly (1848) and to the Legislative Assembly (1848-51); head of the Orleanist
monarchist party after 1848, hangman of the Paris Commune; President of the Republic (1871-73).—22, 36, 109, 114, 124, 136, 139, 255, 517, 519

Thomé—colonel in the Baden army; commanded a division in the Baden-Palatinate insurgent army (1849); advocated capitulation towards the end of the campaign.—226

Thumb von Neuburg, Konrad (1465-1525)—counsellor of Duke Ulrich of Württemberg.—437

Thunfeld, Kunz von—German knight, participant in the peasant conspiracy of Hans Böheim in Niklashausen (bishopric of Würzburg) in 1476.—430

Thunfeld, Michael von—son of Kunz von Thunfeld, with whom he took part in the peasant conspiracy of Hans Böheim in Niklashausen in 1476.—430

Thurn und Taxis, Maximilian Karl von (1802-1871)—German prince, enjoyed the hereditary privilege of organising postal service in several German states; owner of the Frankfurter Oberpostamts-Zeitung.—10, 11

Tichen, G.—see Tiehsen, Eduard

Tiehsen (Thiessen, Tichen), Eduard—citizen of Stettin who sent money to the Committee of Support for German refugees in 1849.—598

Tiphaine, Jean Laurent (born c. 1805)—French democrat, member of secret revolutionary societies during the July monarchy, supported the newspaper La Réforme.—513

Tooke, Thomas (1774-1858)—English economist, adherent of the classical school in political economy.—496, 584

Toussaint-Louverture (L'Ouverture, dit Toussaint), François Dominique (1743-1803)—leader of the revolutionary movement of Haitian Negroes against Spanish and English domination during the French Revolution.—83

Toussenel, Alphonse (1803-1885)—French politician and journalist, disciple of Fourier in 1839, editor-in-chief of La Paix, a founder of La Démocratie pacifique, member of the Luxembourg Commission in 1848.—51

Trélat, Ulysse (1795-1879)—French politician, moderate republican; deputy to the Constituent Assembly in 1848, Minister of Public Works in May-June 1848.—66, 368

Trestaillons (Trestaillon), Jacques Dupont, dit—French Legitimist.—22

Trociński, Feliks—participant in the Polish insurrection of 1830-31, subsequently emigrated; commanded the Polish detachment in the Baden-Palatinate insurgent army (1849).—209

Truchsess von Waldburg, Georg (1488-1531)—commander of the armed forces of the Swabian League, chief organiser of the suppression of the peasant and urban plebeian uprising in 1525.—447-50, 457-60, 462-65, 467-68, 472

Turenne, Henri de La Tour d'Auvergne, vicomte de (1611-1675)—French general.—556

Turgot, Anne Robert Jacques, baron de l'Aulne (1727-1781)—French statesman and economist, physiocrat; Director-General of Finance (1774-76).—302

Tyler, Wat (or Walter) (d. 1381)—leader of the peasant revolt of 1381 in England.—414

Tzschirner, Samuel Ersmann (c. 1812-1870)—German lawyer, democrat, extreme Left leader in the Saxonian Diet, an organiser of the May 1849 uprising in Dresden, participant in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849.—201-02

U

Ulrich (1487-1550)—Duke of Württemberg (from 1498), banished in 1519; sought to utilise the peasant movement of 1525 to restore his power; regained the Württemberg throne in 1534.—436-37, 448-50

Ungern-Sternberg, Alexander, Baron von (1806-1868)—German writer who idealised medieval aristocracy.—242

Uttenhoven, von (d. 1849)—Prussian officer, killed during the Elberfeld uprising in May 1849.—160
Vasco da Gama (1469-1524)—Portuguese navigator, discovered the sea route to India round the Cape of Good Hope (1497-98).—401

Vassal—police officer in Paris (second half of the 1840s).—324

Vauban, Sébastien Le Prestre de (1633-1707)—French marshal and military engineer, criticised France's taxation system.—119

Venedey, Jakob (1805-1871)—German radical journalist and politician; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848; a liberal after the 1848-49 revolution.—258, 511

Véron, Louis Désiré (1798-1867)—French journalist and politician, Orleanist until 1848, when he became a Bonapartist; owner and publisher of Le Constitutionnel (1844-52).—39

Vespasian (Titus Flavius Vespasianus) (9-79)—Roman Emperor (69-79).—591

Vidal, François (1814-1872)—French economist, petty-bourgeois socialist, secretary of the Luxembourg Commission (1848), deputy to the Legislative Assembly (1850-51).—27, 31, 128, 129, 135, 344, 516

Vidil, Jules—French officer, member of the committee of the French society of Blanquist emigrants in London; associated with the sectarian group of Willich and Schapper.—484, 615

Vidocq, François Eugène (1775-1857)—French secret police agent, presumed author of Memoirs; his name was used to denote a cunning sleuth and rogue.—319

Virgil (Publius Vergilius Maro) (70-19 B.C.)—Roman poet.—111

Vivien, Alexandre François Auguste (1799-1854)—French lawyer and politician, Orleanist, Minister of Justice (1840); Minister of Public Works in the Cavaignac Government (1848).—78

Vogt, Karl (1817-1895)—German naturalist, vulgar materialist, petty-bourgeois democrat; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848-49; one of the five imperial regents (June 1849); emigrated in 1849; later received subsidies from Napoleon III; slandered Marx and Engels.—258, 486-87

Voltaire, François Marie Arouet (1694-1778)—French philosopher, writer and historian of the Enlightenment. —22, 83, 111, 312, 331

Voss, Johann Heinrich (1751-1826)—German poet and translator.—195

W

Waldau, Max (real name Richard Georg Spiller von Hauenschild) (1825-1855)—German writer.—242

Waldeck, Benedikt Franz Leo (1802-1870)—German lawyer and radical politician; Vice-President of the Prussian National Assembly and a leader of its Left wing in 1848; later a leader of the Progressist Party.—9, 258, 345

Walpole, Sir Robert, 1st Earl of Orford (1676-1745)—British Prime Minister (1721-42), Whig, the first to form cabinets independent of the king and relying on the majority in Parliament; widely resorted to bribery.—252

Washington, George (1732-1799)—American statesman, commander-in-chief during the war of the North American colonies for their independence (1775-83); first President of the United States (1789-97).—26

Weerth, Georg (1822-1856)—German poet and writer, member of the Communist League; a founder of proletarian poetry in Germany; an editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung in 1848-49; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—353

Wehe, Hans Jakob (d. 1525)—Leipheim clergyman, follower of Münzer; a leader of the Leipheim peasant troop in 1525.—426, 450, 453, 458

Weigand von Redwitz—Bishop of Bamberg (1522-56), an organiser of the suppression of the peasant insurrection in Franconia (1525).—452, 465

Weiss, Guido—German physician, participant in the Baden-Palatinate up-
William III (1650-1702)—Prince of Orange, Stadtholder of the Netherlands (1672-1702), King of England (1689-1702).—252, 253
Willich, August (1810-1878)—Prussian officer; resigned from the army on account of his political convictions, member of the Communist League, participant in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849, a leader of the sectarian group which split away from the Communist League in 1850.—170, 186, 196-98, 202-06, 209-15, 218-22, 224-31, 233, 234-36, 346, 350-51, 378, 379, 381, 384, 390, 533, 534, 537, 601, 610, 615, 618-19, 620, 625, 629
Windischgrätz, Alfred Candidus Ferdinand, Prince (1787-1862)—Austrian field marshal; commanded the troops which crushed the uprisings in Prague and Vienna in 1848; led the Austrian army against the Hungarian revolution in 1848-49.—547
Winkelried, Arnold von (d. 1386)—semilegendarious hero of the Swiss war of liberation against the Habsburgs; legend has it that he secured the victory over the Austrian Duke Leopold in the battle at Sempach at the price of his life.—532
Wiseman, Nicholas Patrick Stephen (1802-1865)—English Catholic clergyman, appointed Archbishop of Westminster and Cardinal in 1850.—512-13
Wohlmeiner, Johann Gottfried (born c. 1826)—architect, born in Cologne, participant in the Elberfeld uprising (May 1849).—603-04
Wolff, Ferdinand (1812-1895)—German journalist, member of the Communist League, an editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung; emigrated from Germany after the defeat of the revolution; took the side of Marx when the Communist League split in 1850.—81, 86, 353, 483
Wolff, Wilhelm (Lupus) (1809-1864)—German teacher, proletarian revolutionary, leading figure in the Communist League, an editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung in 1848 and
1849; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—41, 353, 373
Wrangel, Friedrich Heinrich Ernst, Count von (1784-1877)—Prussian general; took part in the counter-revolutionary coup d'état in Berlin and in dispersing the Prussian National Assembly in November 1848.—596
Wright, Thomas Barber (mid-19th cent.)—English economist of the Birmingham school known as the “little shilling men”. He and his fellow-thinker Harlow wrote under the pseudonym of Gemini.—588
Wycliffe (Wyclif), John (c. 1324-1384) —English religious reformer, champion of the interests of the townspeople and the knights; fought for an English Church independent of Rome.—413-14

Z

Zápolya, Janos (Johann) (1487-1540)—Transylvanian voivode, suppressed the 1514 peasant uprising in Hungary; King of Hungary (1526-40).—439, 440
Zell, Friedrich Josef (1814-1881)—Trier lawyer, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left Centre).—158
Zimmermann, Wilhelm (1807-1878)—German historian, democrat, took part in the 1848-49 revolution, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing).—417-19, 423, 424, 425, 426, 447, 450
Zinn, Christian—German democrat, Kaiserslautern journalist, captain in the Palatinate insurgent army (1849).—206, 230
Zitz, Franz Heinrich (1803-1877)—German lawyer, democrat; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848, took part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising in 1849; emigrated to the USA.—149, 196, 198, 201, 224-25
Zychlinski—participant in the May uprising in Dresden and the Baden-Palatinate uprising in 1849.—215, 217, 229

INDEX OF LITERARY AND MYTHOLOGICAL NAMES

Amphitryon (Gr. Myth.)—King of Tiryns. His name is used to mean a generous host.—76
Antaeus (Gr. Myth.)—a giant of Libya, invincible in wrestling so long as he touched his mother the earth; Hercules held him off the ground and throttled him.—104
Atta Troll—a bear, title figure in a satirical poem by Heine; image of the philistine dabbler in politics, primitive in his arguments, intolerant of jokes and wit.—182-83, 536

Bacchus—see Dionysus
Bartholomew, Saint—one of Christ’s twelve apostles.—77, 130
Bitch, Harvey—main character in James Fenimore Cooper’s novel The Spy, a patriot whose sense of civic duty makes him become a spy.—312-14

Christ, Jesus (Bib.)—421, 422, 426

Damocles—according to a Greek legend, a courtier of the Syracusan tyrant Dionysius (4th cent. B.C.).—123
Daniel—prophet of the Old Testament.—421
David—according to biblical legend, slew the Philistine giant Goliath; later King of Judah.—80
Dionysus (Bacchus) (Gr. and Rom. Myth.)—god of wine and fertility.—188
Don Quixote—title character in Miguel Cervantes’ novel.—174, 512
Eckart—according to medieval German legends, a devoted servant and trustworthy guardian. —241

Elijah—prophet of the Old Testament. —421

Ezekiel—prophet of the Old Testament. —421

Falstaff, Sir John—a character in Shakespeare's tragedy King Henry IV and his comedy The Merry Wives of Windsor; a sly fat braggart and jester.—206

Gil Bias—title character in Alain René Le Sage's novel Histoire de Gil Blas de Santillane. —315

Gordius—according to legend a tiller of the land who became king of Phrygia and tied an intricate knot. An oracle declared that he who should untie it should be master of Asia; Alexander the Great, unable to untie the knot, cut it with his sword. —143, 523

Jacques le bonhomme (Jack the Simpleton)—ironical name given to the French peasant. —61

Janus—an ancient Roman deity represented with a double-faced head. —101

Joseph (Bib.)—son of Jacob, sold by his brothers as a slave in Egypt where he became the Pharaoh's favourite because of his wisdom and beauty. —111

Josiah—a king of Judah in the Old Testament. —421

Leporello—a character from Mozart's opera Don Giovanni. Don Giovanni's servant. —531

Luke, Saint—alleged author of one of the Gospels. —421

Macaire, Robert—typical villain a character created by the French actor Lemaître and immortalised in Honoré Daumier's caricatures. —50, 358

Mary—figure in the New Testament, the mother of Christ. —428, 429, 433

Meister, Wilhelm—main character in Goethe's novel Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre. —246

Menelaus (Gr. Myth.)—King of Sparta; took part in the Trojan War. —195

Midas (Gr. Myth.)—a King of Phrygia who turned to gold everything he touched; insulted by him, Apollo changed his ears into ass's ears. —83

Moloch—the Sun-God in Carthage and Phoenicia, whose worship was accompanied by human sacrifices. —243

Moses—Hebrew legislator in the Old Testament. —117, 421

Nemesis (Gr. Myth.)—goddess of retributive justice. —100

Orlando (or Roland) Furioso—title character in Lodovico Ariosto's epic poem. —62, 86

Orpheus (Gr. Myth.)—Thracian poet and musician able to charm stones and tame wild beasts with his lyre. —99

Pangloss, Doctor—a character from Candide, a philosophical story by Voltaire. —331

Pecksniff—a character from Charles Dickens' novel Martin Chuzzlewit, a bigot and hypocrite. —302

Pentephri (Potiphar) (Bib.)—an official of the Egyptian Pharaoh. He bought Joseph, whom his wife tried to seduce, from Ismail merchants. —111

Peter—one of Christ's twelve apostles. —302

Pistol—a character in Shakespeare's tragedies King Henry IV and King Henry V and in his comedy The Merry Wives of Windsor, a vain boaster and liar. —206, 230

Rhadamanthus (Gr. Myth.)—son of Zeus and Europa, brother of Minos, King of
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— and revolution—56, 67, 178, 390, 412, 529-30
— classes and class struggle during transition period from capitalism to socialism—127, 553, 614
See also Chartism; Revolution, proletarian, socialist; Working-class movement
Clergy—102, 118, 272, 274, 404-05, 407, 479
— place of in social hierarchy of feudal society—118, 272, 274, 404, 409, 451, 478, 480
— as representative of ideology of feudalism—155, 272, 402-05, 412-14, 415
— lesser—405, 441
— in bourgeois society—118, 274
— and lay education—22-23, 262, 404, 412
See also Church; Papacy
Communism (social formation), communist transformation of society
— prospects of proletarian revolution and building communism—70, 116-17
— material prerequisites for communist transformation of society—56-57, 266, 299, 429, 500
— international character of communist transformation of society—56, 70, 116-17, 281, 553
— transition period from capitalism to communism (socialism)—127, 275, 281, 298-99, 300, 331, 553, 614
— abolition of private ownership of means of production—78, 281, 331, 422, 553
— production—268, 501-02, 553-54
— labour—299, 553, 554
— social relations, social system—127, 281, 298, 387, 422
— elimination of class distinctions, classless society—127, 281, 297, 331, 385, 420, 484, 551-52
— communist transformation of society and the state—57-58, 281-87, 302, 333, 422, 486
— social consciousness—127, 387
See also Dictatorship of the proletariat; Revolution, proletarian, socialist
Communism, scientific—127, 277, 387
Communism, utopian, of Münzer—409, 413, 414, 422, 423, 432, 461
Communist League
— fundamental principles, documents—127, 277, 281-86, 387, 626, 627
— tactical principles—280-86, 374-77, 469-70
— organisational principles, Rules—277, 372, 374-76, 626, 627, 654-37
— during 1848-49 revolution—224-26, 277-78, 371
— struggle against Willich-Schapper sectarian group—483, 484, 535-36, 625-29, 633
— and workers' educational societies—376, 483, 535-36
— and petty-bourgeois democracy—3-4, 277-86, 345-47, 372-74
— its communities—277-78, 371, 374, 375, 376-77, 626, 633

Communist party—see Party, proletarian Community
— village or peasant—409, 451, 478, 480
— urban—406-07
— and the state—177, 280, 285
— disintegration of under capitalism—285
— in Ireland—569
— in Scotland—567-69
— in Switzerland—177, 286

Consciousness—69-70, 127, 244, 275, 387, 487

Conspiracy—314-21, 322
See also Blanquism, Blanquists

See also Democracy, bourgeois; Parliament; State

— between productive forces and production relations—135, 510
— class—58, 238, 255, 281, 288, 298, 306, 335, 415, 470, 486, 554
— between labour and capital—300
— contradictory theories, views—79, 514-15, 577-78
— elimination of social contradictions as a result of communist transformation of society—281, 298, 300, 553-54

Corn Laws, repeal of—34, 52, 264, 273, 274, 275, 293, 296, 307, 340, 502, 510-12, 515

Courée—120, 403-04, 409, 451

Counter-revolution—70, 89, 101, 107-08, 110, 132, 151, 239, 279

Courts, judiciary system—274, 409
— feudal—404, 409, 412, 447, 448, 451
— in bourgeois society—74, 79, 156, 258, 274-75, 317, 577
— military—347, 568, 569

Craftsmen, handicrafts—293, 400, 408, 429, 466, 485, 584

Credit—49, 59, 60-62, 74, 363, 364, 365, 503
See also Banks, bankers; Bank of England; Bank of France

Crusades—439

Cult of heroes, of genius—245, 246, 302, 306-08

Cult of nature—244-45

D

Danish-Prussian war of 1848-50—393-94, 507, 511, 526-27

Day labourers—407, 408
See also Farm-labourers

Democracy (political and state system)—280, 442-43, 580

Democracy, bourgeois
— as form of dictatorship of bourgeoisie—280, 282-83
— illusory character of bourgeois-democratic order—78-79, 567-79
— as political trend—285, 577-78

Democracy, petty-bourgeois (movement)—81-82, 98-104, 163-64, 169, 190, 225, 279-87, 372, 373

Demography—see Population

Denmark—392-94
See also Schleswig-Holstein question

Despotism, military; dictatorship, military—8, 10, 11, 25, 76, 107, 124, 154-55
See also Bonapartism

Development—68, 97, 288, 299, 306, 413, 553
— social—156, 297-99, 553
— and class struggle—69, 288
Dictatorship, bourgeois—67, 77, 122, 123, 125, 131, 577-78

Dictatorship of the proletariat
— historical necessity and tasks of—69, 237, 275-76, 281, 293, 298, 300, 387
— as the state in transition period from capitalism to socialism—127, 614
— state centralisation of industry—281, 300
— role and significance of proletarian party—634
— and abolition of classes—127, 281, 387
— and peasantry—122, 284-85
— use of the term “dictatorship of the proletariat”—69, 122, 127, 387, 614
See also Communism (social formation); Party, proletarian; Revolution, proletarian, socialist; Working class

Dictatorship, revolutionary-democratic—122, 283, 286
See also Jacobin dictatorship, Jacobins

Division of labour—120, 316, 404, 591

E

Economic crises—135, 234, 264-65, 275, 294, 299, 490, 500, 509, 584, 586, 589
— in industry and other branches of economy—52, 58-60, 263-64, 296-97, 338, 340, 341, 492-93, 495, 497-98, 585, 587
— forecasting of—263-65, 275, 296-97, 340, 501
— periodical character of (industrial cycles)—134, 275, 294, 296-97, 299, 497, 501
— prosperity as phase of cycle—134, 135, 263-64, 272, 296, 297, 299, 490-91, 497, 499, 500, 502, 503, 507-10
— depression—134, 339, 490, 509
— and condition of working people—134, 275, 275-76, 296, 297, 509
— crisis of 1846-47—52-53, 263-64, 491-97
Economic laws—295-96, 305-08, 502
Education—307, 404, 412
Electoral system (in bourgeois state)—294, 577
Emancipation—549-50, 553-54
Emancipation of working class—57, 276, 298, 360, 363, 553
— as workers’ own task—275
— and petty bourgeoisie, peasantry—27-28
— and struggle for national independence in Europe—369
See also Revolution, proletarian, socialist

Emigration—378-79, 385-86, 392, 533, 596-97, 598
— bourgeois-democratic, petty-bourgeois—372-74, 528-32
— proletarian—378, 386, 485, 597-601, 608-10, 617-19
— Hungarian—240, 376, 385
— Italian—385

— population—298
— Irish immigration—309
— Wars of the Roses—443
— in 16th century, Reformation—254
— in 17th century—252, 273-74
— coup d’état of 1688 (Glorious Revolution)—252-54
— in 18th century—253, 291-92
— industrial revolution—254, 292-94
— in first half of 19th century (before 1848)—292, 491-92, 500
— in 1848—58, 263, 338-39, 496
— industry—253, 254, 263, 272-73, 288, 291, 293, 297, 335, 339, 492, 498-501
— finances—252
— transport—273, 295, 491, 492, 494, 496-97, 498
— towns—443, 503
— landownershi, agriculture—254, 335, 443, 493, 502-03
— trade—134, 264, 295, 296, 340, 349
— classes, class struggle—255, 273, 274-75, 412
— social and political system—251-56, 272-73, 274-75, 292, 293, 295-96, 379, 382, 511-12, 572
— Parliament—252-53, 255, 510
— legislation—34, 63, 264, 272-300, 310
— electoral system—255, 292-95, 298, 310, 340
— ruling classes’ political parties—125, 292, 340, 510, 512
— bourgeois-democratic movements in England—116, 251, 264, 273, 291-92, 293-97, 298, 511-12, 612
— revolutionary movements and prospects of revolution—255, 264, 299
— science, literature—302, 513-14
— religion, church—254, 414, 512-13
— colonial policy—265, 266, 295, 491, 505-07, 512-13
— foreign policy—56, 76, 252, 259-60, 379, 382
— and Austria and other European states—76, 252, 260, 340, 394, 511, 514
— and USA—501-02
— and Central Europe—394
See also Aristocracy, English; Army, English; Bourgeoisie, English; Chartism; Corn Laws; Labour movement in England; Petty bourgeoisie, English; Tories; Whigs; Working class in England

English bourgeois revolution of 17th century—252-55, 429

English philosophy—252


Equality
— as demand of masses in Middle Ages—413-15, 422, 428-29, 438-39, 471
— as demand of bourgeoisie—567
— bourgeois—589
— as understood by utopian socialists and utopian communists—422-23
— as interpreted by Christian religion—413-15, 471

Estates, social—118-19, 431, 444, 586, 588-89, 591
— in feudal society and under preservation of feudal survivals—151, 402-05, 409-12, 431, 437, 441
— burghers—149
— nobility—406, 442, 443-44
— knights—403, 479
— clergy—402-05, 413, 479
— princes—480
— peasantry—461
— judiciary—404
— assembly of estates, representation of estates—402, 431, 527
— tiers état (third estate)—76
— and bourgeois revolution—101

Europe—237, 358-59, 360, 363, 393, 394, 482, 554
— prospects of revolution during reaction (after 1848-49)—16, 70, 116-17, 134, 252, 279, 340, 369, 377
See also Revolution of 1848-49 in Europe

Exploitation—272
— pre-capitalist forms—272, 292
— usurious—57, 122, 361
— capitalist—57, 121-22, 272, 288-89, 293, 295-96, 361
— of labour-power by capital—271-72, 273-74, 276-93
— of female and child labour—288, 291
— of peasants—57, 121-22
— of petty bourgeoisie—57
— attempts at justification of by ideologists of propertied classes—272
See also Child labour; Female labour; Ten Hours’ Bill; Wage labour; Women’s question; Working day
Family and marriage—106, 118, 130, 567
Farm labourers—375
See also Agriculture; Agricultural workers; Day labourers
Female labour—245, 274, 288-91
Feudalism
— agriculture as key branch of production—401
— division of labour, handicrafts, trade—265, 266, 400, 401, 403, 404, 408, 429, 465
— taxation—330-31
— feudal hierarchy, feudal privileges—402-03, 407, 419, 443
— military system, feudatory system—402-03, 404, 405-52
— legal system, lawyers—403-04, 406, 409-10, 412
— classes, class struggle—402-10, 412-13, 415, 428, 481
— feudal lords, nobility, aristocracy, knights—403, 404, 443
— bourgeoisie—406-07
— origin of proletariat—408, 409, 422, 461
— vagrancy and laws of 13th-16th centuries—407-08, 433, 478
— science, education, invention—400, 412
— ideology, world outlook—404
— religion, church, clergy—403-06, 412, 414, 512-13
— origin of capitalist relations, decay and collapse of feudalism—120, 155, 284-85, 407, 408, 414, 419, 461, 471
— survivals of feudalism—173-74, 280, 307, 550, 551
See also Burghers; Estates, social; Guilds; Middle Ages; Peasantry; Plebeians, plebs; Serfdom; Society, feudal; Town, medieval; Village
Flagellants—414
Foreign trade—259, 265, 268, 401, 504-05
See also Trade, commerce; World market
Fragmentation of land, parcellation—120, 121, 155, 254, 262, 335, 336, 503, 514, 551
— small-plot peasants—550, 551, 552
France—18-19, 54-55, 120, 544, 553, 554, 555, 563
— formation of French nation, national character—133, 329, 410, 507, 508, 561
— economy—50, 52, 59-60, 115, 116-17, 118-22, 125, 132-34, 254-55, 329, 492, 507-09
— taxation—17-18, 117-19, 121-23, 133, 262, 327-29, 509
— social and political system—443
— state apparatus—115-16
— classes, class relations—116-17, 412
— in Middle Ages (up to 17th century)—130, 328, 402, 413, 443
— in 17th-18th centuries—118-19, 252, 253, 254
— French Revolution of 18th century—see French revolution of 1789-94
— during Thermidorian reaction and Directory—22-23, 122
— during Consulate and First Empire—52, 118-19, 155, 329
— during Restoration (1815-30)—22-23, 61, 95, 114-15, 118-19, 122, 124, 128-29, 263, 316
— July revolution of 1830—54, 55, 68-69, 294, 316, 578
— economic development in 1830-48—49, 50, 52-53, 56-57, 59, 60, 357-58, 492, 496-97, 508
— internal policy of July monarchy—50-53, 320-21
— Chamber of Deputies—48-50
— bourgeois liberals (dynastic opposition)—48, 53, 116
— bourgeois republicans (National party)—53, 72, 76, 95, 316
— petty-bourgeois democrats (Réforme party)—53, 316, 320, 322
— republicans, their insurrections in 1830s—48, 315-17, 320
— political crisis of 1846-47—51-53, 321-22
— foreign policy of July monarchy—51-52
— and other European states—51, 52, 155, 156, 252, 546-47
See also Bourgeoisie, French; June insurrection of Paris proletariat in 1848; Petty bourgeoisie, French; Revolution of 1848 in France. Second Republic; Socialism, socialists in France; Uprisings of Lyons weavers in 1831 and 1834; Working class in France; Working-class movement in France.

Franconia—426, 452, 468, 471, 472, 473, 475

Fraternal Democrats—637

Freedom, its illusory nature in bourgeois society—333, 530, 567-70, 572, 577-78, 591
— right of assembly and association—90-91, 569, 577-78
— use of bourgeois-democratic freedoms by working class and masses—79, 275-76, 298


See also Corn Laws; Manchester school

Freemasons—306

French revolution of 1789-94—68-69, 253-54, 285, 327-29, 412, 549-50
— abolition of feudal landownership and feudal obligations—61, 120, 439-40
— and bourgeoisie—68-69, 549-50
— role of masses—555
— and peasantry—21-22, 61, 364, 549-50
— and embryonic proletariat—554
— revolutionary wars—542, 543, 544-47, 549-50, 555, 556, 560-61
— Convention—94, 103, 285, 542, 544-47
— counter-revolutionary mutinies, Vendée—130-31, 543, 544, 563
— terror—22, 105
— and counter-revolutionary European powers—155-56, 242, 254-55, 479, 542

See also Girondists; Jacobin dictatorship, Jacobins

G

Genoa—265

German Confederation (1815-66)—393, 527, 557

— Federal Diet—7, 258, 525-26

Germanic tribes—244, 443

— German philosophy—248, 422, 487-89

See also Hegel, Hegelianism

German Workers' Society in Brussels—374

German Workers' Educational Society in London (1840-1918)—42, 226, 370, 374, 483, 533-36, 598-602, 610, 618, 623, 626, 630, 633

German Workers' Society in Paris (1840s and 1850s)—631

Germany—242, 243, 246, 392, 394, 395, 410, 411, 478, 480, 487-88
— in Middle Ages—399-482
— and French revolution of 1789-94 and Napoleonic wars—155, 156, 242, 412, 479
— survivals of feudalism—155, 285, 551
— oppositional movement in early 19th century—150, 157
— fragmentation of country and task of its unification—8, 258-59, 347, 395, 401-02, 411, 432, 442, 455, 461, 480-82, 528
— industry—155-56, 170, 176, 246, 400, 401, 403, 411, 479, 480, 507
— handicrafts—248, 400, 406, 485
— guilds—155, 406-07
— transport—155-56, 401
— agriculture and agricultural relations—155, 401, 479
— finance, taxation—13, 402-04, 405-06, 409, 414
— estates, classes—402
— bureaucracy—151, 152, 172, 182, 187, 188, 237, 280, 406, 409, 481
— clergy—155, 402-07, 409, 410, 415, 417, 419, 442, 478-80
— craftsmen—177, 280, 403, 407, 408, 481, 485
— intelligentsia—224
— philistinism—175, 179, 187, 188, 192, 242, 243, 246, 417
— political system—285, 419, 481
— legislation, court—7, 13, 409, 450-51
Subject Index

— bourgeois liberalism of 1840s—13, 152, 157, 159, 278, 279, 407, 415, 416, 418, 488, 489, 525, 596
— democrats, democratic movement—8, 149-50, 225, 258, 279-86, 345, 372, 408, 486-87, 536, 595, 605
— prospects and character of revolution in Germany in 1850s—8, 13, 16, 279, 302, 394, 482, 553-54
— religion and church—155, 405, 412-19, 422, 441, 478, 479
— education—404
— literature—177, 246, 302, 441, 489
— and Austria—7-8, 10
— and Denmark—393-94
— and England—340
— and Prussia—7-8, 10, 16, 526
— and Russia—259, 260
— and Switzerland—177, 268-69
See also Bourgeoisie, German; Peasants, German; Petty bourgeoisie, German; Prussia; Revolution of 1848-49 in Germany; Working class in Germany; Working-class movement in Germany

Girondists—544
Gold, discovery of in Australia and California—265, 504-05
Gotha Party (Germany, 1849) —525, 526
Government securities—49, 60
Greece—511
Guilds—155, 400, 406-08, 465-66, 550

H

Hanseatic League—400
Hegel, Hegelianism—248, 267, 302, 422, 487-89, 530
Heresy, heretics—413-16, 418-20, 423-24
See also Albigenses; Anabaptists; Flagellants; Lollards; Taborites; Waldenses
Hesse—469, 471-73
Hesse-Cassel—507, 526-28
Historiography
— as expression of ideology of ruling classes—307, 471
— idealistic background of before Marx—251, 255-56, 306, 411
— bourgeois, in 19th century—253-58, 285, 301, 310, 428, 471
— petty-bourgeois (democratic and socialist)—221, 247-50
History—126, 255, 271, 306, 311, 399, 413, 485, 489
Holy Alliance—14, 15, 16, 28, 369, 392, 394
Holy Roman Empire of the German nation (962-1806) —7, 155, 402, 405, 406, 415, 442, 481
Hungary—8, 394, 433, 438-39, 482
— national liberation war of 1848-49—97, 101, 152, 162, 190, 196, 200, 547-48
See also Peasant war in Hungary under leadership of Dózsa (1514); Revolution of 1848-49 in Hungary
Huns—244
Hussite movement—413-15, 420, 428
See also Taborites

I

Ideas—127, 387, 411, 427, 470, 489
Ideology (as an idealistic conception of reality)—411
Immigration—504
Industrial exhibition of 1851 in London—499-500
Industrial revolution—293
Industry, capitalist—288-89, 295, 404, 408, 490-91
— and social progress—238, 299, 300, 485, 500-01, 554
— and exploitation of female and child labour—288-89
— and science—245
— and trade—116-17, 264, 265, 295
— and agriculture—254-55
— and taxes—330, 331, 335
— and classes, class struggle—237-38, 299-300
— and political supremacy of bourgeoisie—293-94
— development of as a material prerequisite of communist transformation of society—266, 299-300
500-01, 554
Inquisition—109
Instruments of production—121, 273, 554
Insurance—329, 330
Ireland—292, 327, 492, 512
Italy—254, 265, 316, 394, 401, 413, 514, 547
See also Austro-Italian war of 1848-49; Revolution of 1848-49 in Italian states

J

Jacobin dictatorship, Jacobins—57-58, 81-82, 103, 156, 275, 285, 545
Jesuits—118, 124, 128
July monarchy—see France, July monarchy
July revolution in France—see France, July Revolution of 1830
June insurrection of Paris proletariat in 1848—25, 34, 57, 67-70, 71, 93, 98-100, 106, 149, 237, 356, 362, 368-69, 390
— causes of—66-70, 87, 104, 368
— heroism of working class—67
— and petty bourgeoisie, petty-bourgeois democrats—27, 57, 68, 69, 71, 74-76, 98, 106, 322-23, 366
— and peasantry—57, 69, 368
— role of National and Mobile Guards in suppression of—67-68, 76, 97
— establishment of military dictatorship of Cavaignac, bourgeois repressals against insurgents—68, 71, 108, 261-62, 368, 568, 578
— its defeat and strengthening of European counter-revolution—70, 368, 369
— and proletarian press—68-69
Jurisprudence, lawyers—272, 296, 404, 412

K

Knights—246, 402-04, 438, 442
Knights' insurrections of 1522-23 in Germany—442-45, 481

L

Labour aristocracy—295-96, 513-14
Labour movement in England—288, 292, 293, 294, 298
See also Chartism; Luddism
Labour productivity—553-56
Labour time under communism—299-300
Land, as instrument of production—120-21
Landed property—120-21, 191, 254, 264, 284, 294, 327, 335-36, 443, 461, 503, 515
Law—122, 125, 136, 156, 280, 328, 404-05, 517
— and communist transformation of society—57-58
See also Jurisprudence, lawyers; Legislation
Legislation—86, 107, 155, 274, 322, 409, 569
See also Law; Napoleonic code
Liberalism—73, 83, 159, 278-79, 407, 595
Literature—299-300, 310, 489
— folklore—149, 203
— American—312
— Ancient Greek—258
— English—206, 300
— French—135, 137, 139-39, 203
— German—242, 245-46, 301, 302, 441
— Italian—413
— Spanish—63
Loans (state)—11, 15, 49-50
Lollards—414
Lombardy—93, 514
London—265, 294, 401, 506
Luddism—292
Lutheranism—411-20, 423-27, 441-42, 446
See also Protestantism; Reformation

M

Man, individual, person—99, 148-49, 245, 305-06, 333, 469-70, 486, 523-24, 562
Manchester school—271
See also Bourgeoisie, English, Free Trade
Market—295, 505-04
See also Foreign trade; Trade, commerce; World market
Mazzinism, Mazzinists—513-14, 529, 532
Means of communication—266, 411, 504-07, 553
See also Railways
Mexico—132, 260, 507
Middle Ages—412-13
See also Feudalism
Military art, military science—154, 403, 543, 545, 550-56
See also Army
Monarchy—65-67, 114, 443
— absolute—77, 237, 248, 253, 267, 279, 412, 419, 443, 481, 512, 552
— constitutional (bourgeois)—54, 57, 65, 66-67, 70, 114, 131, 251-56, 269, 413, 443
— based on social estates—253, 443
— and religion—412
Monasteries, monks—405, 407, 413
See also Church; Clergy
Monetary system—587, 588, 589
Money as means of circulation—11-12, 584, 586, 587, 590
— metal (gold, silver)—11, 587, 590
Mortgage (in bourgeois society)—57, 120-22, 158, 502
— and working-class party programme—97, 190
See also Usurious capital
Mühlhausen—424, 469-73, 480
Mysticism—see Religion, mysticism, religious

N

Napoleonic code (Code Napoléon)—155
Napoleonic wars—260, 545, 547, 548, 550, 555, 560
Nation—51, 237, 356, 394, 406, 411, 480, 500, 561, 626
National debt—49, 60, 115, 116, 252, 286, 526
Needs—69, 255, 266, 401, 403-05, 410, 414, 442
— of bourgeoisie—255
— of proletariat—69
— and revolution—69, 266
— under communism—266
Netherlands—394, 400, 492, 499, 506
Neue Rheinische Zeitung—5, 68, 156, 171, 181, 187, 202, 351, 388, 605
See also Revolution of 1848-49 in Germany
New York—265, 506
Nineteenth century—501
Nobility—125, 155, 414, 442-43
See also Aristocracy; Feudalism; Nobility (in different countries)
Nobility, German—151, 152, 155, 172, 237, 404, 410
— in Middle Ages, knights—401-06, 409, 410, 433, 442-45, 479, 480
— in 1850s—7
— and bourgeoisie—237
— and peasantry—443-44, 445
See also Revolution of 1848-49 in Germany
Nobility, Italian—548
Nobility, Polish—443, 444

O

Officials—118-19, 409, 575-76
See also Bureaucracy

P

Pacific Ocean—265, 266, 499, 504, 505
Panama—265
Pantheism—305, 421
Papacy—92, 405, 413, 480, 513-14
Paris—24, 52-53, 316, 359, 564
Parliament (in the bourgeois state)—118, 123
See also England
Party, political—53, 97-99, 163, 263, 372, 427, 441-42, 469-70, 525, 530
— party point of view—530
Party, proletarian—279, 280, 320, 345-46, 354, 371, 394
— vanguard role of—227, 280, 416
— necessity of organising proletariat into independent political party—282
— as necessary condition for victory of proletarian revolution—634
— programme demand of socialisation of means of production—78
— tactics—280-86
Subject Index

— and masses—374-76
— and petty-bourgeois democracy—280-83, 286, 374
— party discipline—635
— propaganda, agitation—634
— party point of view—530
See also Communist League

Patriotic War of 1812 (Russia)—260, 546, 550-51

Peasantry
— in feudal society—409-10, 414, 478, 488
— and usury—57, 121, 122, 282
— in bourgeois-democratic revolution—57, 61, 80, 96, 119, 123, 150, 262, 284, 482, 515
— under capitalism—122
— sluggishness of—134, 245, 263, 509
— and bourgeoisie—69, 122, 156, 280, 284
— and working class and working-class movement; as ally of proletariat—29-30, 57, 69, 96, 122, 125, 285, 361
— and proletarian revolution and proletarian state—57, 122, 285

Peasants, French—49, 52, 54, 78, 80, 118-23, 125, 134, 263, 264, 286, 335, 509, 551
— during French revolution of 1789-94—80, 120, 155, 284, 550
— and 1848 revolution—see Revolution of 1848 in France. Second Republic

Peasants, German—13, 177, 190, 280, 409-10, 429, 478-79
— in Middle Ages—401, 402-06, 408-10, 414-19, 425, 427, 429, 431, 441, 446, 447, 459, 461-62, 465, 466, 469, 478, 479, 480-81, 482
— serf peasants and bondsmen—402-04, 409, 410, 415, 478
— liberation from serf bondage—282, 444, 446-47, 451, 461
— agricultural workers, farm-labourers—280, 375
— and nobility—403-04, 443-44, 447, 449, 454
— and bourgeoisie—280, 437, 481
— and working-class party—375-76
— peasant movements—410, 415, 428-29, 430-38, 439-40, 441

See also Peasant War in Germany in 1524-25

Peasants, Swiss—127-28, 129, 221

— causes of—402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 409-10, 428, 468, 475
— peasants’ demands, Twelve Articles—446, 447, 448, 450, 451, 461, 475
— in Swabia and Franconia—426, 432, 440, 446-68, 469, 471, 472, 473, 475
— in Thuringia—408, 418, 421, 423, 425, 426, 452, 469, 471, 473, 475
— in Alpine lands of Austria—475-77
— repressive terror—419, 425, 448, 453, 460, 462, 463, 464, 465, 469, 472, 474, 476

Peasant war in Hungary under leadership of Dózsa—433, 437-40, 482

Petty bourgeoisie—150, 177, 361
— in feudal society—246
— in bourgeois society—28, 30-31, 57, 79, 126, 361
— and bourgeoisie—151
— in bourgeois-democratic revolution—119-20, 150-51, 164-66, 178, 280-87, 408
— and peasantry—150-51, 176, 280, 284
— and working class, working-class socialist movement—27, 30-31, 56, 69, 71, 96, 103, 125, 150-51, 176, 287, 361
— as proletariat's ally—30-31, 57, 69, 96, 125, 150-51, 281, 282
— and proletarian revolution—27-28, 30-31, 57
— world outlook—30-31, 126, 177, 292
See also Democracy, petty-bourgeois

Petty bourgeoisie, English—150, 151, 292, 514
Petty bourgeoisie, French—49, 51, 100, 103-07, 110, 116, 117, 120-21, 124, 135-37, 144, 150, 151, 263, 279, 316, 507, 516-17, 525
Petty bourgeoisie, German—149-50, 156, 176-79, 237, 246, 277, 279-87, 408, 410, 481, 527-28
Philanthropy—78, 272, 298, 415, 419
Philistinism—246, 429, 529
Philosophy—267, 272, 412, 413
See also English philosophy; German philosophy; Hegel, Hegelianism
Pietism, pietists—165
Plebeians, plebs (in Middle Ages)—266, 399, 405, 407-08, 414-18, 422, 426-27, 432-33, 434, 435, 441, 457, 478, 480
— as predecessors of proletariat—408, 415, 422
— plebeian asceticism—428-29
See also Asceticism; Pre-proletariat

Poland, Polish question—8, 15, 58, 196, 394, 442, 443
Political struggle—5, 150, 412, 470, 634
Poor Konrad (peasant alliance in Germany in 16th century)—431, 433, 436-38, 440
Poor Laws—294, 310
See also Workhouses
Population—401, 554-55
Portugal—254, 270
Preconditions—305-08
— of proletarian revolution—553
Pre-proletariat—408, 409, 414-15, 422, 461, 470-71
See also Plebeians, plebs

Press, the—5, 137, 518
— reactionary laws on; censorship of—14, 39-40, 107, 136-38, 517, 518-19, 568-69, 571
— freedom of—14, 57, 125, 569, 577
— bourgeois—503
— democratic—150
— proletarian—see Neue Rheinische Zeitung

Principles—577-78
Private property—137, 285, 517
— transformation of feudal property into bourgeois—56-57
— feudal—284
— abolition of as condition for emancipation of proletariat—78, 92, 130, 281, 286, 300, 331, 387, 422, 553
— and theories of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois economists—286, 330, 331, 336, 415, 422, 531-32
Production—49, 96, 115, 118, 127, 266, 273, 553, 555
— and social intercourse—96, 266, 470, 475
— and social relations, social system—96, 127, 363
— and classes—96, 127, 470
— and the state—49
— and military science—552-55
— and social consciousness—470
— spiritual production—118
— and social revolution—266, 363, 509-10
— under communism—266, 501
See also Instruments of production; Production relations; Productive forces
Production relations—59, 470, 510
— and classes, class struggle—127, 387
— and the state, political relations—127, 387
— and forms of social consciousness—127, 387
— contradictions between them and productive forces as basis of proletarian revolution—135, 510
— in bourgeois society—55-56, 59, 78, 127, 387, 510
— and proletariat, communist transformation of society—56, 59, 127, 387, 510
See also Basis and superstructure

— and classes—281, 292
— under feudalism—479
contradictions between them and production relations under capitalism — 135, 295, 299, 510
contradictions between them and production relations as basis of proletarian revolution — 135, 510
development of as material pre-condition of communist transformation of society — 266, 299, 429, 500
under communism — 266, 281, 286
Progress — 292, 297, 300, 304, 418, 461, 482, 485
Proletariat — see Working class
Property — 56, 78, 336, 422, 517
See also Private property
Protectionism — 57, 116, 252, 295-96
Protestantism — 253-55, 415-20, 441-42
See also Church; Lutheranism; Reformation
Proudhonism — 487, 508, 541, 585, 588
Prussia
— and French revolution of 1789-94 — 155, 156
— 1815-early 1848 — 277
— in 1850 — 7-9, 12-13, 14-16, 267-68, 583
— industry — 526
— railways — 15, 155
— finances, budget, taxation — 14-15, 259, 267-68, 526
— trade — 155
— agriculture and agrarian relations — 155-56
— political system and constitution — 14, 237-38, 248, 267-68, 526
— bureaucracy — 12, 208-09, 237, 488, 552
— nobility, aristocracy — 12, 583
— law, legal procedure — 9, 12-13, 157, 257
— foreign policy — 7-9, 268, 269-70, 369, 382, 527
— and Austria — 499-500, 507, 525-28, 583
— and England — 252
— and France — 16, 252, 268
— and Germany — 7-9, 10, 16, 526-27
— and Poland — 51
— and Russia — 3, 8, 528
See also Army, Prussian; Danish-Prussian war of 1848-50; Germany; Revolution of 1848-49 in Germany;

Working-class movement in Germany
Prussian-Swiss conflict over Neuchâtel — 15-16, 260, 261

Q
Quantity and quality — 592

R
Radicalism, radicals — 330
Railways — 50, 155, 338, 491, 506, 554, 558
Reform — 80, 261, 298, 330, 331, 513-16
— and revolution, permanent revolution — 285-86
Reformation — 254, 412, 413, 481, 482
See also Lutheranism; Protestantism
Reformation in Germany — 411-27, 441-46, 469-72, 475, 476, 478-83
Reformers, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois — 101, 110, 126, 310, 419, 424
Religion — 94, 98, 118, 130, 244, 272, 412-14, 417, 421-22, 512-13
— in slave-owning society — 244
— in feudal society — 411-15, 512
— in bourgeois society — 94, 98, 118, 253-54
— and science, philosophy — 412
— mysticism, religious — 413, 414-15, 420, 441
— history and significance of criticism of — 421-22
— deification of nature — 245, 246
See also Sects, religious
Rent of land — 120, 409, 443, 586, 589
Republican movement — 70, 71, 74-75, 78, 79, 107, 110, 315, 316
— parliamentary — 103, 106, 110, 113-14, 122, 123, 129-31
— federative — 177, 279, 285, 482
— and class struggle — 66-68, 69, 516
— and working class, working-class movement — 56-58, 65, 66, 69, 131, 252, 285-86, 313
— and peasantry — 82-83, 121-23
— and universal suffrage — 56, 57, 67-68
See also Democracy, bourgeois; France; Revolution of 1848 in France. Second Republic; Switzerland

Revolution, social, social-democratic (demand for)—109, 122, 579

Reserve and insurance fund—62, 134, 494-96, 508-09

Revolution—56, 135, 314, 529
— as driving force of historical progress—122
— prerequisites, causes of—135, 251, 253-54, 471, 482, 509-10
— and economic crises—135, 275, 299, 509-10
— and class struggle—127, 178, 388, 412, 492, 529-30
— and role of masses—69, 410, 418
— and the state—125, 172, 279-80, 283-86
— criticism of voluntaristic views on revolution—314, 317-19, 372-74, 470, 530-31

Revolution, bourgeois, bourgeois-democratic—254
— limitedness of—68-69, 278-79, 284-85, 286
— attitude towards old state apparatus—192-93
— bourgeoisie's inclination towards compromise—236-37, 278-79
— and problem of property—178-79
— motive forces, role of masses—69
— and working class—55-57, 66, 67, 81, 99, 225-26, 277-78, 281-86, 298, 419
— question of workers' representation in government—470
— tasks of proletarian party—277-78, 280-86
— as step towards proletarian revolution—57, 117, 238, 281, 282-83, 286, 298
— necessity of revolutionary methods of struggle to bring it to completion—283-84
— and agrarian question—61, 80, 96, 118-20, 481
— and petty bourgeoisie—69, 100, 150-51, 164-66, 178, 179, 279-86, 408, 481-82
— religious form of—252

See also Bourgeoisie; English bourgeois revolution of 17th century; French revolution of 1789-94; Revolution of 1848-49 in Europe

Revolution, permanent—117, 127, 237-38, 281-86, 298, 614
— workers' political clubs as organs of revolutionary power—282, 284

— prerequisites for—56-57, 135, 255, 275-76, 299-300, 429, 470, 509-10
— proletarian party as condition of victory—634
— necessity of workers' political and theoretical preparation for revolution—485
— transformation of proletariat into ruling class, establishment of dictatorship of proletariat—274-76, 293, 298, 300, 320-21, 387, 553-54, 634
— as highest form of proletarian class struggle with bourgeoisie—529-30
— as culmination of permanent revolution—237-38, 281, 283, 614
— simultaneous accomplishment in a number of countries—56, 69-70, 117, 286, 553-54
— peaceful and violent methods of accomplishment—487
— fundamental difference from bourgeois revolution—69, 276
— and universal suffrage—517
— abolition of private ownership of means of production—300, 387, 553
— solution of national question—70, 266, 561
— and peasantry and agricultural proletariat—57, 122, 285
— and petty bourgeoisie—27, 30-31, 57
— necessity of winning over army to proletarian revolution—551

See also Class struggle; Dictatorship of the proletariat; Party, proletarian

Revolution, social
— as bourgeois revolution—253-54
— as form of transition from capitalism to socialism—69-70, 78, 255, 266, 273, 275-76
Revolution of 1848-49 in Austria—58, 70, 151-52
Revolution of 1848-49 in Europe—132, 237, 482, 497
— democratic illusions—243-44, 531-32
— and bourgeoisie—69-70, 237
— and petty bourgeoisie—529
— and national movement—70
— role of in European events—64, 70-71, 91-92, 94, 369
— and England—263-64, 497-98, 509-10
— and Russia—70
— and possibility of European war—70-71
— counter-revolution—94, 97, 101, 110, 132; 369, 547
— causes of defeat—132, 135, 637
— results of—5, 244, 275, 503
— preconditions and causes of, revolutionary situation in 1847-48—48-53, 192
— periods in development of revolution—105-07, 109-10, 112, 129-30
— decline of revolution—47
— Provisional Government—21, 27, 53-55, 57-66, 71, 73, 106, 319-21, 360, 365
— Luxembourg Commission—55, 56, 57, 58, 63, 360
— intensification of class struggle in March and April 1848—64-65, 71, 73
— Executive Commission, its anti-working-class policy—63-64, 66, 68, 71, 72, 87, 106
— National ateliers (workshops)—63-64, 67-68, 87
— events of May 15, 1848—67, 73, 77, 88, 97, 323, 575-77
— after-effects of June insurrection, prospects of further development—41, 70, 71-74, 77-78, 122, 131, 144, 263, 279, 384-85, 362, 368, 369, 486-88, 525, 577-80
— absence of conditions for victorious proletarian revolution—56-57, 68-70, 116-17, 135
— Constitution of 1848—77-80, 84-85, 89-91, 94, 101-02, 103, 105-09, 110, 130, 136, 141-42, 522, 567-79
— preservation of old state apparatus—57, 78, 85, 116, 118
— election of Louis Bonaparte as President—79-80, 84-85, 89, 95, 96, 111-14, 123-25, 127-28, 572
— clashes of Legislative Assembly with government—82-87, 91-93, 98, 99, 111, 114, 118, 123, 127-29, 137, 139-40, 143-44, 262
— financial policy, finances, taxation—17-20, 22, 29, 58-62, 73-76, 84-85, 111-12, 114-21, 133, 329, 363-64, 365, 508
— industry—116-17, 132, 134, 137, 507, 509, 517
— agriculture and agrarian relations—20, 116, 327, 335
— trade—19, 132-34, 137, 507-09, 517
— joint-stock companies, banks—125, 132-34, 507, 508
— Stock Exchange, stock-exchange speculation—19, 114, 115, 342-44
— usury—21, 122, 509
— military legislation—25, 576
— and army—25, 30, 32, 34, 35, 58, 62, 65, 76, 77, 81, 98, 103-07, 118,
124, 127-30, 137, 139, 142-44, 343, 365, 517, 523, 551, 579, 580
— and National Guard—53, 62, 64, 65, 67, 87, 104-07, 365, 366, 576
— and Mobile Guard—62-63, 67, 76, 81, 87, 90, 365, 366
— and clergy—23, 569, 570
— and financial aristocracy—114-16, 117-18, 127, 133, 263, 342, 508, 525
— and big landowners—55, 61, 65, 79, 95, 96, 115, 125
— and middle strata, intermediate classes—64, 65, 69, 99, 108, 110, 125, 126, 366, 367, 368
— demand of right to work—55-56, 78, 360, 567-68
— alliance of workers and peasants—22
— alliance of petty bourgeoisie and proletariat—27-28, 34, 368
— lumpenproletariat—62, 365
— dynastic opposition—53, 68, 82-83, 97, 116
— Bonapartists, Society of December 10—40, 90, 96, 111, 113, 124, 139-43, 262, 520, 521, 523
— petty-bourgeois democracy, La Réforme newspaper, Mountain party—34, 35, 55, 60, 66, 70, 74-75, 84, 314, 321-22
— bloc of democrats and socialists (New Mountain)—90, 97, 98-101, 103-05, 107, 125, 126, 127, 128-29, 135-37, 138, 141-42, 279, 320-21, 343, 515-18, 522
— utopian socialist views—57, 70-71, 99, 100, 105, 122, 126-27, 128-29, 138, 263
— workers’ clubs, secret societies—83, 89-93, 99, 100, 104, 105, 110, 125, 138, 322-24, 569
— events of June 13, 1849, and their consequences—85, 94, 101-10, 127-30, 184, 238, 262, 523, 576
— elections of March 10, 1850—56, 127-31, 135-36, 324, 516
— expedition to Rome—93-94, 103, 104, 109-12, 567
— colonial subjugation of Algeria—524
— and other European powers—11-12, 15, 16, 58, 60, 103, 116-17, 189, 262, 268, 511, 547
— causes of defeat—132-35
— influence on European peoples—60, 72-73, 103, 116-17, 279
— prospects of revolution—16-17, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28-29, 32, 34
See also June insurrection of Paris proletariat in 1848

Revolution of 1848-49 in Germany
— Germany on eve of revolution—481-82
— March revolution—58, 64, 156-57, 243-44, 248, 278, 419
— and counter-revolutionary forces (nobility, Junkers, aristocracy and bureaucracy)—151, 152, 172, 179, 187, 188, 190, 192-93, 208, 237, 278
— petty bourgeoisie—149-51, 157-61, 163-71, 172, 175-80, 183, 184, 190-92, 237, 279, 281, 408-09, 481-82
— peasantry—150, 151, 154, 159, 167, 169, 172, 173, 177, 178, 180, 184, 191, 238, 481
— working class and working-class movement—13, 150-51, 157, 160, 161, 162, 163, 165-71, 176, 184, 192, 225-26, 237, 238, 277, 278, 374, 388, 419, 481-82
— intelligentsia—172, 224, 237
— army—101, 151, 152, 159-62, 166, 167-69, 170, 172-75, 178, 180, 181, 184, 192, 206, 208, 209, 238, 605
— civic militia—160, 161, 166-69, 179, 181, 193-94, 196-97
— United Diet in Prussia (1847, 1848)—258, 268
— Prussian National Assembly—7, 12, 279, 417-18
— coup d'état in Prussia and movement for non-payment of taxes in November 1848—279
— Prussian Constitution of December 5, 1848—257
— Chambers of Prussian Diet—257, 417
— democratic movement, position of petty-bourgeois democrats—4, 147-50, 162, 163, 172, 175, 186, 190-92, 225-26, 247, 277-80, 285, 286, 388, 409, 487
— Neue Rheinische Zeitung, persecution of editorial board—156-57, 171, 181, 187, 353, 388, 605
— and Communist League—165-66, 186, 201, 225-26, 277-78, 371, 374
— Cologne Workers' Association—226
— and ways of unifying country—247
— national question—70
— Frankfurt National Assembly, Imperial Regency and Ministry—150, 157, 159, 173, 238, 247-50, 258, 259, 279, 388, 417
— Imperial Constitution—150, 151, 166, 178, 237-38, 248-49
— Dresden uprising (May 3-8, 1849)—154, 157, 162, 169, 190
— uprising in Rhine Province—154-72, 174, 178, 190-92, 196, 605
— uprising in Palatinate—155, 157, 162, 170, 172, 179-81, 184-214, 249
— and Hungary—162, 182, 184, 200, 205
— and Rhine Province—156-71
— and revolution of 1848 in France—64, 182, 184, 238
— offensive of counter-revolution and reaction—108, 110, 151, 152, 171, 236-37, 239, 279, 481-82, 597
— and Austria—248, 482
— and France—189
— and Prussia—10, 13, 101, 157, 158, 189, 248, 482
— Marx's and Engels' participation in—168, 180-83, 186-87, 192, 200-37


Revolution of 1848-49 in Hungary—58, 70, 97, 101, 108, 110, 152, 184, 197, 200, 205, 214


Rhenish Federation—547

Rhenish Hesse—155

Rhine Province—155-72, 191, 507

Russia (Russian Empire)—8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 259-62, 269, 369, 393, 394, 527-28, 550, 553, 554

See also Patriotic war of 1812; Tsarism, tsarist autocracy

Russo-Turkish war of 1787-91—548-49

Saint-Simonism—306

Savings banks—59-60

Saxony—156, 426, 469, 471-74

Schleswig-Holstein question—392-94, 526-27

Sectarianism—98

Sects, religious—413-15, 420, 426, 428-30

See also Anabaptists

Seehandlung (Preussische Seehandlungsgesellschaft)—259, 267-68

Serdom—419, 439, 443, 451

Serf peasantry—402, 403, 405-07, 409, 415, 478, 551, 578

Seven Years’ War of 1756-63—546, 550

Social-Democratic Refugee Committee (late 1840s-early 1850s)—349-52, 600-01, 608-10, 616-23, 631-32

Socialism (theories and trends)

— reactionary—488

— bourgeois (conservative)—125-26, 263, 326, 331, 337, 419, 488

— petty-bourgeois—30, 31, 125-26, 127, 128-29, 488, 531-32, 585, 588, 589, 590

— doctrinaire—67-68, 97, 98, 125-26, 127, 128-29

— sentimental—31, 537

— eclectic—126, 127

— Louis Blanc’s—63, 125-27, 128, 537, 541

— proletarian (revolutionary)—30, 127

See also Communism, scientific

Socialism, socialists in France—35, 125-27, 255, 319-20

— social-democratic party of 1840s—88, 97-98, 125-27, 129, 279, 518-19

— during revolution of 1848—57-58, 63-64, 67-69, 88, 97-98, 110, 118-19, 122, 125-27, 128-29, 133, 263, 279, 507, 518-19

Socialism, socialists in Germany—3-4, 177, 282, 416, 419-20, 488, 489, 596

Social labour under capitalism—56, 500

Société des saisons (Society of the Seasons) (Paris, 1839)—48, 312, 314, 320

Societies, secret, revolutionary, proletarian—110, 277, 311-22, 371, 633, 634

See also Anarchism, anarchists; Blanquis, Blanquists

Society—54, 55-57, 67, 71, 333, 414, 443

See also Civil society; Communism (social formation)


— and economic crises—134, 509

— classes, class struggle—57, 65, 68, 156, 254, 363, 384

— and the state—54, 76-77, 78, 118, 125, 156, 251, 254-56, 296, 330-33, 522

— and religion—92, 96, 118, 254

— prerequisites for inevitable destruction of bourgeois society and rise of new society—134, 275, 299, 363, 500


See also Stock Exchange, Bourse

State, the

— origin—72

— and classes—65, 253, 333, 486

— class essence of, instrument of domination by exploiters—50-51, 331, 486

— and society, social system—54, 65-68, 71, 91, 115-16, 125, 280, 285, 331, 422
— alienation of—422
— apparent independence of—54, 333
— state centralisation—125, 285, 399, 443, 461, 480
— state machine—61, 172, 296
— and abolition of classes, withering away of the state under communism—333, 422, 486
— critique of anarchist views on—354, 486-88
See also Monarchy; Republic, bourgeois


State, feudal—401
See also Feudalism

State, proletarian—see Communism (social formation); Dictatorship of the proletariat

Stock Exchange, Bourse—49, 60, 114, 115, 292, 342-44, 363, 504

Styria—439, 475, 476

Suffrage (in the bourgeois state)—65, 79, 151, 263, 296
— and Bonapartism—80
— and peasantry and agricultural workers—54, 65, 78, 79, 122
— significance for working class—79, 137, 275, 298, 517

Superstructure—see Basis and superstructure

Switzerland—177-78, 261, 268-70, 279, 285, 393, 413-33, 435-36, 477
— and revolution of 1848-49 in Europe—260-61, 392
— and France—52
— and Germany—15-16, 177-78, 267-70
See also Peasants, Swiss; Prussian-Swiss conflict over Neuchâtel; Sonderbund

T

Taborites—414, 415

Taiping rebellion—266-67

Taxation—49, 61, 78, 84, 116, 118, 122, 126, 262, 292, 324, 325, 327, 328-29, 331, 508

Ten Hours' Bill—271-76, 288, 297-98

Terror
— revolutionary—57-58, 109, 173, 471-72
— counter-revolutionary—22, 70, 85, 109, 122, 263, 368, 437
See also Violence

Teutonic Order—454

Theology—411-12, 420, 422

Theory and practice—77-78, 91, 127, 471

Thirty Years' War (1618-48)—478-79

Thuringia—408, 418, 421, 426, 469, 471-73, 475

Tories—255, 273, 291-93, 511, 512

Town, medieval—401, 402, 406, 407, 408, 412-14, 443, 465
See also Burghers; Craftsman, handicrafts; Guilds; Plebeians, plebs

Trade, commerce—265-66, 295, 401-02, 490, 504-06, 584-90
— world—393, 585
— money—294
— and economic crises—264, 295, 490, 584
— trade wars—252
— and revolution of 1848-49—263
— merchant navy and merchant shipping—401, 505-07

Traditions—47, 320, 399, 560

Tsarism, tsarist autocracy—259-60, 546-47

Turkey—15, 259, 268, 270

U

Ulster—9


Universal Society of Revolutionary Communists—484, 613-15

Uprising, armed—106, 154, 172, 173-74, 282-84, 413
See also June insurrection of Paris proletariat in 1848; Uprisings of Lyons weavers in 1831 and 1834

Uprisings of Lyons weavers in 1831 and 1834—48

Usurious capital—57, 98, 121-22, 191, 280, 406, 431, 509

Utopianism—126, 331, 336
V

Vagrancy—407, 409, 433-34, 478
Venice—265, 477
Village—406, 408
See also Peasantry
Violence—279
See also Terror
Voltaireanism—124, 125
Voluntarism, voluntaristic attitude towards revolution—318, 372-73, 470, 530
See also Anarchism, anarchists; Blanquism, Blanquists

W

Wage labour—56, 78, 308, 490, 502
See also Exploitation, of labour-power by capital
Wages—275, 295, 331
Waldenses—413
War, wars—56, 252
— methods of conducting wars—548-50, 553-55
— and revolution, revolutionary wars—56, 70, 117, 395, 542, 555, 556, 560
— popular, guerrilla—197, 552
— wars of conquest—268, 549
— world—70
— trade—252
— threat of war in 1850s-60s—117, 260, 268, 269, 542
See also Army
Wars of First French Republic (late 18th-early 19th centuries)—236, 542, 543, 544-46, 552, 560
Wat Tyler’s rebellion (1381)—414
Whigs—255, 293, 299, 340, 510
Women’s question—245, 274, 288-91
Worker, workers—271, 272, 273-76, 280-86, 501-02, 503
Workhouses—63, 288, 366
Working class—55-57, 69, 281, 361-62, 485, 585, 590, 591
— forming in process of development of large-scale industry—288
— industrial (factory) proletariat—56, 121, 156, 272-73, 360
— organising as class—274-75, 387
— the only consistently revolutionary class—55-57, 81, 96-97, 125, 225, 237, 277, 429, 502
— world-historic role—31, 299
— historical necessity to win political power, to become ruling class—69, 237, 274-76, 281, 293, 298, 300, 387
— conditions of emancipation—55-57, 274-75, 276, 298, 553-54
— class consciousness, its growth—176-77 238, 271, 275, 286-87, 320
— as leading class (hegemony)—126, 282-83
—and peasantry—28, 57, 58, 69, 96-97, 122, 125, 285, 361
—and petty bourgeoisie—28, 30-31, 57, 69, 71, 96-97, 103, 104, 125, 150-57, 177, 279-86, 361
—as driving force in bourgeois revolution—55-56, 57, 66, 67, 81, 225-26, 277-78, 281-86, 298, 419
— disappearance of proletariat as a result of communist transformation of society—387
See also Class struggle; Dictatorship of the proletariat; Party, proletarian; Revolution, proletarian, socialist; Worker, workers; Working-class movement
Working class in England—255-56, 274-76, 287, 298
—and handweavers—293
—and significance of struggle for universal suffrage—275, 298
—and labour aristocracy—295, 513-14
See also Chartism; Labour movement in England
—and Paris proletariat—55, 317, 319-20
See also Working-class movement in France
Working class in Germany—13, 156, 165, 168, 177, 277, 279-81, 286, 388, 410, 412, 481, 537, 553-54
—and bourgeoisie, petty bourgeoisie—177, 279-81, 286, 481
—and peasants—481
—and lumpenproletariat—165, 407, 408, 450
—an agricultural proletariat—280, 375
See also Working-class movement in Germany

Working-class movement
— immediate and ultimate aims—293-94
— necessity to combine political and economic struggle—274-76
— and revolutionary theory—127, 318-19, 415
— and proletarian party—634

See also Chartism; Class struggle; Communist League; Party, proletarian; Working class

Working-class movement in France—48, 52, 105, 312, 313, 315-18, 319-20, 321
See also June insurrection of Paris proletariat in 1848; Uprisings of Lyons weavers in 1831 and 1834

Working-class movement in Germany—13, 277, 482

Working day—272-76, 288, 297, 300

World market—56, 255, 295, 299, 361, 501-02, 585
— Britain's monopoly—56, 116, 134, 254, 255, 265, 291-95, 340, 495, 496

See also Foreign trade; Market

Württemberg—10, 11, 435-36, 438, 448, 450, 455, 456, 457
Würzburg—428, 455, 464-66, 480