Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

[PUBLIC STATEMENT
TO THE EDITORS OF THE ENGLISH PRESS]  

Sir,—The undersigned call your attention to the attitude of the Prussian Press, including even the most reactionary papers, such as the Neue Preussische Zeitung, during the pending trial of the Communists at Cologne, and to the honourable discretion they observe, at a moment where scarcely a third part of the witnesses have been examined, when none of the produced documents have been verified, and not a word has fallen yet from the defence. While those papers, at the worst, represent the Cologne prisoners and the undersigned, their London friends, in accordance with the public accuser, as "dangerous conspirators who alone are responsible for the whole history of Europe of the latter four years, and for all the revolutionary commotions of 1848 and 1849"—there are in London two public organs, The Times and The Daily News which really have not hesitated to represent the Cologne prisoners and the undersigned as a "gang of sturdy beggars," swindlers, etc. The undersigned address to the English public the same demand which the defensors of the accused have addressed to the public in Germany—to suspend their judgment, and to wait for the end of the trials. Were they to give further explanations at the present time, the Prussian government might obtain the means of baffling a revelation of police-tricks, perjury, forgery of documents, falsification of dates, thefts, etc., unprecedented even in the records of Prussian political justice. When that revelation shall have been made in the course of the present proceedings, public opinion in England will know how to qualify the anonymous

---

\[a\] The reference is to an item by the Berlin correspondent of The Times written on October 9, 1852 and published in The Times, No. 21245, October 13, 1852. —Ed.
scribes of *The Times* and *Daily News*, who constitute themselves the advocates and mouthpieces of the most infamous and subaltern government spies.

We are, Sir, yours fraternally,

*F. Engels*
*F. Freiligrath*
*K. Marx*
*W. Wolff*

London, October 28th


Reproduced from *The People's Paper* and checked with the other newspapers
TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING ADVERTISER

Sir,—I beg to offer you my best thanks for the generous protection you have afforded to the cause of my friends, the prisoners at Cologne.\(^a\) While the defence will bring to light the series of unscrupulous acts committed by the agents of the Prussian police, even during the progress of this trial, I wish to inform you of the last trick that has been had recourse to, in order to prove a criminal correspondence between myself and the Cologne prisoners. According to the report of the Kölnische Zeitung, of October 29, Mr. Stieber, the councillor of police, has produced another of his documents—a ridiculous letter, purporting to be in my handwriting, in which I am made to recommend one of my pretended agents “to push under the doors of acknowledged democrats, at Crefeld, 50 copies of the Red Catechism,\(^b\) and to choose for the execution of commission the midnight-hour of June 5, 1852.”\(^c\)

For the sake of my accused friends, I hereby declare,—

1. That the letter in question is not written by myself.
2. That I learned its existence only from the Kölnische Zeitung of 29th inst.
3. That I never saw the so-called Red Catechism.
4. That I never caused any copies of the “Red” to be circulated, in whatever manner.

\(^a\) The reference is to the statement in defence of the Cologne prisoners published by The Morning Advertiser (see this volume, pp. 378-79).—Ed.
\(^b\) Moses Hess, Rother Kathechismus für das deutsche Volk.—Ed.
\(^c\) Quoted from the minutes of the Cologne trial published in the Kölnische Zeitung from October 5 to November 13, 1852, under the title Assisen-Procedur gegen D. Herrn. Becker und Genossen. Anklage wegen hochverräterischen Complottes.—Ed.
This declaration, made also before the magistrat in Marlborough Street, and consequently as valid as an oath, I have sent by post to Cologne. By your inserting it in the columns of your paper, you will the more oblige me, as that would be the most effective means of preventing the Prussian police from intercepting the document.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Dr. Charles Marx

London, October 30, 1852—
28, Dean Street, Soho

Published in The Morning Advertiser, November 2, and The People's Paper, No. 27, November 6, 1852

Reproduced from The Morning Advertiser and checked with The People's Paper
TO THE EDITOR OF THE N. Y. TRIBUNE

Sir: My letter of 28th of September last, containing revelations as to the movements of Kossuth and Mazzini,¹ has, I perceive, elicited considerable animadversion, and given the Democratic press occasion for a vast amount of superfluous declamation, abuse and bluster.

I have ascertained that Kossuth has no part in this clamor. If he had himself ventured a denial of my assertions, I should have returned to the subject, and given incontestable evidence for the facts adduced.

However, my letter was not intended as an attack on Kossuth, but rather as a warning. In politics a man may ally himself, for a given object, with the devil himself—only he must be sure that he is cheating the devil, instead of the devil cheating him.

As to the gentleman who has taken upon himself authoritatively to refute me, I beg to remind him of an old proverb: Amicus incommodus ab inimico non differt.²

To the gentlemen of the Democratic press, and especially of the German Democratic press, who, as usual, have yelled the loudest, I say they are all bigoted Crypto-Royalists. These gentlemen cannot do without kings, gods and popes. Scarcely got out of the leading strings of their old rulers, they manufacture new ones for themselves, and grow indignant at those “infidels and rebels” who

¹ See this volume, pp. 354-56.—Ed.
² An awkward friend does not differ from an enemy.—Ed.
render themselves obnoxious by publishing unpleasant truths, revealing compromising facts and thus committing lese-majesty and sacrilege against the newly-elevated Democratic gods and kings.

London, November 16, 1852

Your private correspondent

Published in the New-York Daily Tribune.
No. 3627, December 1, 1852
TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING ADVERTISER

Sir,—The undersigned discharge a duty to themselves and towards their now condemned friends at Cologne, by laying before the English public a statement of facts connected with the recent monster trial in that city, which have not been made sufficiently known by the London press.

Eighteen months have been wasted on the mere getting up of the evidence for this trial. During the whole of that time our friends have been kept in solitary confinement, deprived of all means of occupation and even of books; those who became ill were refused proper medical treatment, or if they obtained it, the condition in which they were placed prevented them from benefiting thereby. Even after the “act of accusation” had been communicated to them, they were prohibited, in direct violation of the law, from conferring with their lawyers. And what were the pretexts for this protracted cruel imprisonment? After the lapse of the first nine months the “Chamber of Accusation” declared that there were no grounds on which a charge could be maintained, and that, therefore, the instruction had to be recommended. It was recommended. Three months later, at the opening of the assizes, the public accuser\(^a\) pleaded that the mass of the evidence

\(^a\) Otto Saedt.—Ed.
had grown into a larger bulk than he had as yet been able to digest. And after three further months the trial was again adjourned, on the ground of the illness of one of the chief Government witnesses.

The real cause of all this delay was the fear of the Prussian Government to confront the meagre substance of the facts with the pompously announced "unheard-of revelations." At last, the Government succeeded in selecting a jury, such as the Rhenish provinces had never yet beheld, composed of six reactionary nobles, four members of the haute finance, and two members of the bureaucracy.

Now, what was the evidence laid before this jury? Merely the absurd proclamations and correspondence of a set of ignorant phantasts, importance-seeking conspirators, the tools and associates at once of one Cherval, an avowed agent of the police. The greater part of those papers were formerly in the possession of a certain Oswald Dietz in London. During the Great Exhibition, the Prussian police, while Dietz was absent from his home, had his drawers broken open, and thus obtained the desired documents by a common theft. These papers, in the first instance, furnished the means of discovering the so-called Franco-German plot at Paris. Now, the proceedings at Cologne proved, that those conspirators, and Cherval, their Paris agent, were the very political opponents of the defendants and their undersigned London friends. But the public accuser pleaded, that a mere personal quarrel had prevented the latter from taking part in the plot of Cherval and his associates. By such an argumentation it was intended to prove the moral complicity of the Cologne defendants in the Paris plot; and while the accused of Cologne were thus made responsible for the acts of their very enemies, the professed friends of Cherval and his associates were produced by the Government in court, not at the bar like the defendants—nay, in the witness-box, to depose against them. This, however, appeared too bad. Public opinion forced the Government to look out for less equivocal evidence. The whole of the police machinery was set to work under the direction of one Stieber, the principal Government witness at Cologne, royal councillor of police, and chief of the Berlin criminal police. In the sitting of October 23rd, Stieber announced, that an extraordinary courier from London had delivered to him most important documents, proving, undeniably, the complicity of the accused in an alleged conspiracy with the undersigned.

"Amongst other documents, the courier had brought him the original
minute-book of the sittings of the secret society, presided over by Dr. Marx, and with whom the defendants had been in correspondence.\[a\]

Stieber, however, entangled himself in discordant statements as to the date on which his courier was to have reached him. Dr. Schneider, the leading counsel for the defence, charged him directly with perjury, upon which Stieber ventured no other reply than to fall back upon his dignity of the representative of the Crown, entrusted with a most important mission from the very highest authority of the State. As to the minute-book, Stieber declared twice on oath, that it was the "genuine minute-book of the London Communist Society," but later on, closely pressed by the defence, he admitted that it might be a mere book of notes, taken by one of his spies. At length, from his own evidence, the book was proved to be a deliberate forgery, and its origin traced back to three of Stieber's London agents, Greif, Fleury, and Hirsch. The latter has since admitted that he composed the book under the guidance of Fleury and Greif. So decisive was the evidence at Cologne on this point, that even the public accuser declared Stieber's important documents a "most unfortunate book," a mere forgery. The same personage refused to take notice of a letter forming part of the Government evidence, in which the handwriting of Dr. Marx had been imitated; that document, too, having turned out a gross and palpable forgery. In the same manner every other document brought forward in order to prove, not the revolutionary tendencies, but the actual participation of the accused in some distant plot, turned out a forgery of the police. So great were the Government's fears of an exposure, that it not only caused the post to retain all documents addressed to the counsel for the defence, but the latter to be intimidated by Stieber, with a threatened prosecution for his "criminal correspondence" with the undersigned.

If now, in spite of the absence of all convincing proof, a verdict has, nevertheless, been obtained,\[257\] that result has only become possible, at the hands even of such a jury, by the retroactive application of the new criminal code, under which The Times and the Peace Society\[258\] themselves might at any time be tried on the formidable charge of high treason. Moreover, the trial at Cologne had assumed, by its duration, and by the extraordinary means

\[a\] Here and elsewhere the quotations are taken from the minutes of the Cologne trial published in the Kölnische Zeitung from October 5 to November 13, 1852, under the title Assisen-Procedur gegen D. Herrn. Becker und Genossen. Anklage wegen hochverrätherischen Complottes.—Ed.
employed on the part of the prosecution, such vast dimensions, that an acquittal would have equalled a condemnation of the Government; and a conviction prevailed generally in the Rhenish provinces, that the immediate consequence of an acquittal would be the suppression of the entire institution of the jury.

We are, Sir, your most obedient servants,

F. Engels
F. Freiligrath
K. Marx
W. Wolff

London, November 20, 1852

Published in *The Morning Advertiser*, No. 19168, November 29, 1852
Reproduced from the newspaper
You will have ere this received by the European papers numerous reports of the Communist Monster Trial at Cologne, Prussia, and of its result. But as none of the reports is anything like a faithful statement of the facts, and as these facts throw a glaring light upon the political means by which the Continent of Europe is kept in bondage, I consider it necessary to revert to this trial.

The Communist or Proletarian party, as well as other parties, had lost, by suppression of the rights of association and meeting, the means of giving to itself a legal organization on the Continent. Its leaders, besides, had been exiled from their countries. But no political party can exist without an organization; and that organization which both the Liberal bourgeois and the Democratic shopkeeping class were enabled more or less to supply by the social station, advantages, and long-established, everyday intercourse of their members, the proletarian class, without such social station and pecuniary means, was necessarily compelled to seek in secret association. Hence, both in France and Germany, sprang up those numerous secret societies which have, ever since 1849, one after another been discovered by the police and prosecuted as conspiracies; but if many of them were really conspiracies, formed with the actual intention of upsetting the Government for the time being—and he is a coward that under certain circumstances would not conspire, just as he is a fool who, under other circumstances, would do so—there were some other societies which were formed with a wider and more elevated purpose, which knew, that the upsetting of an existing Government was but a passing stage in the great impending struggle, and which intended to keep together and to prepare the party, whose nucleus they formed, for the last,
decisive combat which must one day or another crush forever in Europe the domination, not of mere "tyrants," "despots" and "usurpers," but of a power far superior, and far more formidable than theirs; that of capital over labor.

The organization of the advanced Communist party in Germany was of this kind. In accordance with the principles of its "Manifesto" (published in 1848) and with those explained in the series of articles on *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany,* published in *The New-York Daily Tribune,* this party never imagined itself capable of producing, at any time and at its pleasure, that revolution which was to carry its ideas into practice. It studied the causes that had produced the revolutionary movements of 1848, and the causes that made them fail. Recognizing the social antagonism of classes at the bottom of all political struggles, it applied itself to the study of the conditions under which one class of society can and must be called on to represent the whole of the interests of a nation, and thus politically to rule over it. History showed to the Communist party, how, after the landed aristocracy of the Middle Ages, the monied power of the first capitalists arose and seized the reins of Government; how the social influence and political rule of this financial section of capitalists was superseded by the rising strength, since the introduction of steam, of the manufacturing capitalists, and how at the present moment two more classes claim their turn of domination, the petty trading class, and the industrial working class. The practical revolutionary experience of 1848-49 confirmed the reasonings of theory, which led to the conclusion that the democracy of the petty traders must first have its turn, before the Communist working class could hope to permanently establish itself in power and destroy that system of wages-slavery which keeps it under the yoke of the bourgeoisie. Thus the secret organization of the Communists could not have the direct purpose of upsetting the present governments of Germany. Being formed to upset not these, but the insurrectionary government, which is sooner or later to follow them, its members might, and certainly would, individually lend an active hand to a revolutionary movement against the present status quo in its time; but the preparation of such a movement, otherwise than by secret spreading of Communist opinions by the masses, could not be an object of the Association. So well was this foundation of the society understood by the majority of its members, that when the place-hunting ambition of some tried to turn it into a

---

*See this volume, pp. 3–96.— Ed.*

*The Communist League.— Ed.*
conspiracy for making an *ex tempore* revolution, they were speedily turned out.

Now, according to no law upon the face of the earth, could such an association be called a plot, a conspiracy for purposes of high treason. If it was a conspiracy, it was one against, not the existing Government, but its probable successors. And the Prussian Government was aware of it. That was the cause why the eleven defendants were kept in solitary confinement during eighteen months, spent, on the part of the authorities, in the strangest judicial feats. Imagine, that after eight months' detention, the prisoners were remanded for some months more, "there being no evidence of any crime against them!" And when at last they were brought before a jury, there was not a single overt act of a treasonable nature proved against them. And yet they were convicted, and you will speedily see how.

One of the emissaries of the society\(^a\) was arrested in May, 1851, and from documents found upon him, other arrests followed. A Prussian police officer, a certain *Stieber*, was immediately ordered to trace the ramifications, in London, of the pretended plot. He succeeded in obtaining some papers connected with the above-mentioned seceders from the society, who had, after being turned out, formed an actual conspiracy in Paris and London. These papers were obtained by a double crime. A man named Reuter was bribed to break open the writing desk of the secretary of the society,\(^b\) and steal the papers therefrom. But that was nothing yet. This theft led to the discovery and conviction of the so-called Franco-German plot, in Paris,\(^c\) but it gave no clue as to the great Communist Association. The Paris plot, we may as well here observe, was under the direction of a few ambitious imbeciles and political *chevaliers d'industrie*\(^c\) in London, and of a formerly convicted forger, then acting as a police spy in Paris\(^d\); their dupes made up, by rapid declamations and blood-thirsty rantings, for the utter insignificance of their political existence.

The Prussian police, then, had to look out for fresh discoveries. They established a regular office of secret police at the Prussian Embassy in London. A police agent, Greif by name, held his odious vocation under the title of an *attaché* to the Embassy—a step which would suffice to put all Prussian Embassies out of the pale of international law, and which even the Austrians have not yet dared

---

\(a\) Peter Nothjung.—*Ed.*  
\(b\) Oswald Dietz.—*Ed.*  
\(c\) Adventurers, swindlers.—*Ed.*  
\(d\) Julien Cherval.—*Ed.*
to take. Under him worked a certain Fleury, a merchant in the City of London, a man of some fortune and rather respectably connected, one of those low creatures who do the basest actions from an innate inclination to infamy. Another agent was a commercial clerk named Hirsch, who, however, had already been denounced as a spy on his arrival. He introduced himself into the society of some German Communist refugees in London, and they, in order to obtain proofs of his real character, admitted him for a short time. The proofs of his connection with the police were very soon obtained, and Mr. Hirsch, from that time, absented himself. Although, however, he thus resigned all opportunities of gaining the information he was paid to procure, he was not inactive. From his retreat in Kensington, where he never met one of the Communists in question, he manufactured every week pretended reports of pretended sittings of a pretended Central Committee of that very conspiracy which the Prussian police could not get hold of. The contents of these reports were of the most absurd nature; not a Christian name was correct, not a name correctly spelt, not a single individual made to speak as he would be likely to speak. His master, Fleury, assisted him in this forgery, and it is not yet proved that "Attache" Greif can wash his hands of these infamous proceedings. The Prussian Government, incredible to say, took these silly fabrications for gospel truth, and you may imagine what a confusion such depositions created in the evidence to be brought before the jury. When the trial came on, Mr. Stieber, the already mentioned police officer, got into the witness-box, swore to all these absurdities, and, with no little self-complacency, maintained that he had a secret agent in the very closest intimacy with those parties in London who were considered the prime movers in this awful conspiracy. This secret agent was very secret indeed, for he had hid his face for eight months in Kensington, for fear he might actually see one of the parties whose most secret thoughts, words and doings he pretended to report week after week.

Messrs. Hirsch and Fleury, however, had another invention in store. They worked up the whole of the reports they had made into an "original Minute Book" of the sittings of the secret supreme committee, whose existence was maintained by the Prussian police; and Mr. Stieber, finding that this book wondrously agreed with the reports already received from the same parties, at once laid it before the jury, declaring upon his oath that after serious examination and according to his fullest conviction that book was genuine. It was then that most of the absurdities reported by Hirsch were made public. You may imagine the surprise of the pretended members of that secret committee when they found things stated of them which they
never knew before. Some who were baptized William, were here christened Louis or Charles; others, at the time they were at the other end of England, were made to have pronounced speeches in London; others were reported to have read letters they never had received; they were made to have met regularly on a Thursday, when they used to have a convivial reunion, once a week, on Wednesdays; a working man, who could hardly write, figured as one of the takers of minutes and signed as such; and they all of them were made to speak in a language which, if it may be that of Prussian police stations, was certainly not that of a reunion in which literary men, favorably known in their country, formed the majority. And, to crown the whole, a receipt was forged for a sum of money, pretended to have been paid by the fabricators to the pretended secretary of the fictitious Central Committee for this book; but the existence of this pretended secretary rested merely upon a hoax that some malicious Communist had played upon the unfortunate Hirsch.

This clumsy fabrication was too scandalous an affair not to produce the contrary of its intended effect. Although the London friends of the defendants were deprived of all means to bring the facts of the case before the jury—although the letters they sent to the counsel for the defense were suppressed by the post—although the documents and affidavits they succeeded in getting into the hands of these legal gentlemen were not admitted in evidence, yet the general indignation was such that even the public accusers, a nay, even Mr. Stieber—whose oath had been given as a guarantee for the authenticity of that book—were compelled to recognize it as a forgery.

This forgery, however, was not the only thing of the kind of which the police was guilty. Two or three more cases of the sort came out during the trial. The documents stolen by Reuter were interpolated by the police so as to disfigure their meaning. A paper, containing some rabid nonsense, was written in a handwriting imitating that of Dr. Marx, and for a time it was pretended that it had been written by him, until at last the prosecution was obliged to acknowledge the forgery. But for every police infamy that was proved as such, there were five or six fresh ones brought forward, which could not, at the moment, be unveiled, the defense being taken by surprise, the proofs having to be got from London, and every correspondence of the counsel for the defense with the London Communist refugees being in open court treated as complicity in the alleged plot!

---

a Otto Saedt and August Seckendorf.— Ed.
That Greif and Fleury are what they are here represented to be has been stated by Mr. Stieber himself, in his evidence; as to Hirsch, he has before a London magistrate confessed that he forged the “Minute Book” by order and with the assistance of Fleury, and then made his escape from this country in order to evade a criminal prosecution.

The Government could stand few such branding disclosures as came to light during the trial. It had a jury such as the Rhenish Province had not yet seen. Six nobles, of the purest reactionist water, four Lords of Finance, two Government officials. These were not the men to look closely into the confused mass of evidence heaped before them during six weeks, when they heard it continually dinned into their ears that the defendants were the chiefs of a dreadful Communist conspiracy, got up in order to subvert everything sacred—property, family, religion, order, government and law! And yet, had not the Government, at the same time, brought it to the knowledge of the privileged classes, that an acquittal in this trial would be the signal for the suppression of the jury; and that it would be taken as a direct political demonstration—as a proof of the middle-class liberal opposition being ready to unite even with the most extreme revolutionists—the verdict would have been an acquittal. As it was, the retroactive application of the new Prussian code enabled the Government to have seven prisoners convicted, while four merely were acquitted, and those convicted were sentenced to imprisonment varying from three to six years,262 as you have, doubtless, already stated at the time the news reached you.

Written about November 29, 1852
Signed: Karl Marx

Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune
Karl Marx

REVELATIONS
CONCERNING THE COMMUNIST TRIAL
IN COLOGNE
Written from the end of October to the beginning of December 1852

First published anonymously as a separate pamphlet: *Enthüllungen über den Kommunisten-Prozess zu Köln*, Basel, 1853
Enthüllungen

über den

Kommunisten-Prozess

zu Köln.

Basel,
Buchdruckerei von Chr. Krüsi.
1853.

Title-page of the first edition of Marx's work
Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne
PRELIMINARIES

On May 10, 1851 Notjung was arrested in Leipzig and Bürgers, Röser, Daniels, Becker and the others were arrested shortly after. The arrested men appeared before the Court of Assizes in Cologne on October 4, 1852 on a charge of “treasonable conspiracy” against the Prussian state. Thus the preliminary detention (in solitary confinement) had lasted a year and a half.

When Notjung and Bürgers were arrested the police discovered copies of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party,* a “Rules of the Communist League” (a communist propaganda society), two Addresses of the Central Authority of this League as well as a number of addresses and other publications. A week after Notjung’s arrest had become public knowledge there were house-searches and arrests in Cologne. So if there had still been something to discover it would certainly have disappeared by then. And in fact the haul yielded only a few irrelevant letters. A year and a half later when the accused finally appeared before the jury, the *bona fide* material in the possession of the prosecution had not been augmented by a single document. Nevertheless as we are assured by the Public Prosecutor’s office (represented by von Seckendorf and Saeedt) all government departments of the Prussian state had undertaken the most strenuous and many-sided activity. What then had they been doing? *Nous verrons!*

The unusually long period of pre-trial detention was explained in the most ingenious way. At first it was claimed that the Saxon government refused to extradite Bürgers and Notjung to Prussia.

---

\[a\] See present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 477-519.— *Ed.*

The court in Cologne appealed in vain to the ministry in Berlin, which appealed in vain to the authorities in Saxony. The Saxon authorities however relented. Bürgers and Nothjung were handed over. By October 1851 enough progress had been made at last for the files to be presented to the indictment board of the Cologne Court of Appeal. The board ruled that “there was no factual evidence of an indictable offence and ... the investigation must therefore start again from the beginning”. Meanwhile the zeal of the courts had been kindled by a recently approved disciplinary law which enabled the Prussian government to dismiss any official of the judiciary who incurred its displeasure. Accordingly the case was dismissed on this occasion because there was no evidence of an indictable offence. At the following quarterly session of the assizes it had to be postponed because there was too much evidence. The mass of documents was said to be so huge that the prosecutor was unable to digest it. Gradually he did digest it, the bill of indictment was presented to the prisoners and the action was due to be heard on July 28. But in the meantime the great driving wheel of the government's case, Chief of Police Schulz, fell ill. The accused had to sit in gaol for another three months awaiting an improvement in Schulz's health. Fortunately Schulz died, the public became impatient and the government had to ring up the curtain.

Throughout this whole period the police authorities in Cologne, the police headquarters in Berlin and the Ministries of Justice and of the Interior had continually intervened in the investigations, just as Stieber, their worthy representative, was to intervene later on as witness in the public court proceedings in Cologne. The government succeeded in assembling a jury that is quite unprecedented in the annals of the Rhine Province. In addition to members of the upper bourgeoisie (Herstadt, Leiden, Joest), there were city patricians (von Bianca, vom Rath), country squires (Häbling von Lanzenuer, Freiherr von Fürstenberg, etc.), two Prussian government officials, one of them a royal chamberlain (von Münch-Bellinghausen) and finally a Prussian professor (Kräusler). Thus in this jury every one of the ruling classes in Germany was represented and only these classes were represented.

With this jury the Prussian government, it seems, could stop beating about the bush and make the case into a political trial pure and simple. The documents seized from Nothjung, Bürgers and the others and admitted by them to be genuine did not indeed prove the existence of a plot; in fact they did not prove the existence of any action provided for in the Code pénal. But they showed conclusively the hostility of the accused to the existing government and the
existing social order. However what the intelligence of the legislators had failed to achieve might well be made good by the conscience of the jury. Was it not a stratagem of the accused that they should have conducted their hostile activities directed against the existing social order in such a way that they did not violate any article of the Code? Does a disease cease to be infectious because it is not listed in the Police Medical Register? If the Prussian government had restricted itself to using the material actually available to prove the harmfulness of the accused and if the jury had confined itself to rendering them harmless by its verdict of guilty, who could censure either government or jury? Who indeed but the foolish dreamer who imagines that a Prussian government and the ruling classes in Prussia are strong enough to give even their opponents a free rein as long as they confine themselves to discussion and propaganda.

However the Prussian government had deprived itself of the opportunity of using this broad highway of political trials. Owing to the unusual delay in bringing the case before the court, the Ministry's direct intervention in the proceedings, the mysterious hints about unheard-of horrors, the rodomontade about a conspiracy ensnaring the whole of Europe and, finally, the signally brutal treatment of the prisoners, the trial was swollen into a *procès monstre*, the eyes of the European press were upon it and the curiosity and suspicions of the public were fully aroused. The Prussian government had put itself in a position in which for decency's sake the prosecution was simply obliged to produce evidence and the jury to demand it. The jury itself had to face another jury, the jury of public opinion.

To rectify its first blunder, the government was forced into a second one. The police, who had acted as examining magistrates during the preliminary investigation, had to appear as witnesses during the trial. By the side of the ordinary Public Prosecutor the government had to put an extraordinary one, beside the Public Prosecutor's office the police, beside a Saedt and Seckendorf a Stieber together with his Wermuth, his griffin Greif and his little Goldheim.\(^a\) It was inevitable that yet another government department should intervene in court and, by virtue of the miraculous powers of the police, should continuously supply the facts whose shadows the legal prosecution had pursued in vain. The court was so thoroughly aware of the position that with the most laudable

\(^a\) A play on the names of the three police agents: the word *Wermuth* means vermouth, wormwood and also bitterness; *Greif*—griffin, and *Goldheimchen* (diminutive of *Goldheim*)—golden cricket.—*Ed.*
resignation the President, the judge and the prosecutor abandoned their functions to Stieber the Police Superintendent and the witness and continually disappeared behind him. Before we proceed to elucidate these revelations made by the police, revelations which form the basis of the "indictable offence" that the indictment board was unable to discover, one more preliminary observation remains to be made.

It became evident from the papers seized from the accused, as well as from their own statements, that a German communist society had existed with a central authority originally based in London. On September 15, 1850, the Central Authority split. The majority—referred to in the indictment\(^a\) as the "Marx party"—moved the seat of the Central Authority to Cologne. The minority, which was later expelled from the League by the group in Cologne, established itself as an independent central authority in London and founded a separate league\(^265\) in London and on the continent. The indictment refers to this minority and its supporters as the "Willich-Schapper party".

Saedt-Seckendorf claim that the split in the London Central Authority had its origin solely in personal disagreements. Long before Saedt-Seckendorf the "chivalrous Willich" had spread the most vicious rumours among the London émigrés about the causes of the split and had found in Herr Arnold Ruge, that fifth wheel on the state coach of European Central Democracy,\(^266\) and in others of the same sort, people who were willing to act as channels leading to the German and American press. The democrats realised that they could gain an easy victory over the Communists by making the "chivalrous Willich" the impromptu representative of the Communists. The "chivalrous Willich" for his part realised that the "Marx party" could not reveal the causes of the split without betraying the existence of a secret society in Germany and in particular exposing the Central Authority in Cologne to the paternal attention of the Prussian police. This situation no longer obtains and so we may cite a few passages from the minutes of the last session of the London Central Authority, dated September 15, 1850.\(^b\)

In support of his motion calling for separation, Marx said inter alia the following which is given here verbatim:

"The point of view of the minority is dogmatic instead of critical, idealistic instead of materialistic. They regard not the real conditions

---

\(^a\) "Königlicher Rheinischer Appellationsgerichtshof zu Köln. Anklageschrift gegen 1) Peter Gerhard Roeser, 2) Johann Heinrich Georg Bürgers, 3) Peter Nothjung u.a."—Ed.

See present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 625-29.—Ed.
but a *mere effort of will* as the driving force of the revolution. Whereas we say to the workers: ‘You will have to go through 15, 20, 50 years of civil wars and national struggles not only to bring about a change in society but also to change yourselves, and prepare yourselves for the exercise of political power’, you say on the contrary: ‘Either we seize power at once, or else we might as well just take to our beds.’ Whereas we are at pains to show the German workers in particular how rudimentary the development of the German proletariat is, you appeal to the patriotic feelings and the class prejudice of the German artisans, flattering them in the grossest way possible, and this is a more popular method, of course. Just as the word ‘*people*’ has been given an aura of sanctity by the democrats, so you have done the same for the word ‘*proletariat*’. Like the democrats you substitute the catchword of revolution for revolutionary development,” etc., etc.

Herr Schapper’s verbatim reply was as follows:

“I have voiced 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.” (Schapper even promised to lose his own head in a year, i.e. on September 15, 1851.) “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,” etc., etc.

It is obvious that it was not for personal reasons that the Central Authority was divided. But it would be just as wrong to speak of a difference of principle. The Schapper-Willich party have never laid claim to the dignity of having their own ideas. Their own contribution is the peculiar misunderstanding of other people’s ideas which they set up as dogmas and, reducing these to a phrase, they imagine to have made them their own. It would be no less incorrect to agree with the prosecution in describing the Willich-Schapper party as the “party of action”, unless by action one understands indolence concealed behind beerhouse bluster, simulated conspiracies and meaningless pseudo-alliances.

II

THE DIETZ ARCHIVE

The document found in the possession of the accused, the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, which had been printed before the February revolution and had been available from booksellers for
some years, could neither in its form nor in its aims be the programme of a "plot". The confiscated Addresses of the Central Authority were concerned exclusively with the relations of the Communists to the future democratic government and therefore not to the government of Frederick William IV. Lastly, the "Rules" were indeed the rules of a secret propaganda society, but the Code pénal prescribes no penalties for secret societies. The ultimate aim of this propaganda is said to be the destruction of existing society; but the Prussian state has already perished once and could perish ten times more and indeed for good and all without the existing social order being even the slightest bit harmed. The Communists can help accelerate the dissolution of bourgeois society and yet leave the dissolution of the Prussian state in the hands of bourgeois society. If a man whose immediate aim was the overthrow of the Prussian state were to preach the destruction of the social order as a means to this end he would be like that deranged engineer who wished to blow up the whole planet in order to remove a rubbish-heap.

But if the final goal of the League is the overthrowing of the social order, the method by which this is to be achieved is necessarily that of political revolution and this entails the overthrow of the Prussian state, just as an earthquake entails the overthrow of a chicken-house. The accused, however, proceed in fact from the outrageous assumption that the present Prussian government would collapse without their having to lift a finger. They accordingly did not found a league to overturn the present government of Prussia, and were not guilty of any "treasonable conspiracy".

Has anyone ever accused the early Christians of aiming at the overthrow of some obscure Roman prefect? The Prussian political philosophers from Leibniz to Hegel have laboured to dethrone God, and if I dethrone God I also dethrone the king who reigns by the grace of God. But has anyone ever prosecuted them for lèse-majesté against the house of Hohenzollern?

From whatever angle one looked at it, when the corpus delicti was subjected to public scrutiny it vanished like a ghost. The complaint of the indictment board a that there was "no indictable offence" remained valid and the "Marx party" was spiteful enough to refrain from providing one single iota for the indictment during the whole year and a half of the preliminary investigation.

Such an embarrassing situation had to be remedied. The Willich-Schapper party, in conjunction with the police, remedied it.

\* A pun in the original: Klage des Anklagesenats (Klage means complaint, accusation, indictment; Anklagesenat, indictment board).—Ed.
Let us see how Herr Stieber, the midwife of this party, introduces it into the trial in Cologne. (See Stieber's testimony in the sitting of October 18, 1852.)

While Stieber was in London in the spring of 1851, allegedly to protect the visitors to the Great Exhibition from pilferers and thieves, the Berlin police headquarters sent him a copy of the papers found in Nothjung's home.

"In particular," Stieber swore, "my attention was directed to the conspirators' archive which according to papers found in Nothjung's home were in the possession of a certain Oswald Dietz in London and which would undoubtedly contain the whole correspondence of the League's members."

The conspirators' archive? The whole correspondence of the League's members? But Dietz was the secretary of the Willich-Schapper Central Authority. If the archive of a conspiracy was in his possession it was the archive of the Willich-Schapper conspiracy. If Dietz had correspondence belonging to the League it could only be the correspondence of the separate league that was hostile to the accused in Cologne. But even more became clear from the scrutiny of the documents found in Nothjung's home, namely that nothing in them points to the fact of Oswald Dietz being the keeper of an archive. Moreover, how should Nothjung, who was in Leipzig, know what was not even known to the "Marx party" in London?

Stieber could not say outright: Now note this, Gentlemen of the Jury! I have made amazing discoveries in London. Unfortunately they refer to a conspiracy with which the accused in Cologne have nothing to do and which it is not the task of the Cologne jury to judge, but which provided a pretext for keeping the accused in solitary confinement for one and a half years. Stieber could not say this. The intervention of Nothjung was indispensable to create even the semblance of a connection between the revelations and documents from London and the trial in Cologne.

Stieber then swore on oath that a man offered to buy the archive for cash from Oswald Dietz. The plain fact is that a certain Reuter, a Prussian police spy who has never belonged to a communist society, lived in the same house as Dietz and, during the latter's absence,

---

a The testimony of witnesses such as Stieber and other evidence produced during the Cologne trial is quoted by Marx from the minutes of the trial published in the Kölnische Zeitung between October 5 and November 13, 1852, under the heading "Assisen-Procedur gegen D. Herrn. Becker und Genossen. Anklage wegen hochverrätherischen Complottes".—Ed.

b Poking fun at Stieber, Marx forms the words "Stiebern" and "Diebern" evidently derived from Stieber—which literally means retriever—and Dieb—thief.—Ed.
broke into his desk and stole his papers. That Herr Stieber paid him for the theft is quite credible, but this would hardly have protected Stieber from a journey to Van Diemen's Land if the manoeuvre had become public knowledge while he was in London.

On August 5, 1851, Stieber, who was in Berlin, received from London the Dietz archive, "in a bulky parcel wrapped in stout oil-cloth", which turned out to be a heap of documents consisting of "60 separate items". To this Stieber could swear, and at the same time he swore that the parcel he received on August 5, 1851 contained also letters from the leading district in Berlin dated August 20, 1851. If someone were to assert that Stieber was perjuring himself when he claimed that he received on August 5, 1851 letters dated August 20, 1851, Stieber would justly retort that a royal Prussian counsellor, like the Evangelist Matthew, has the right to perform chronological miracles.

*En passant.* From the list of documents stolen from the Willich-Schapper party and from the dates of these documents it follows that although the party had been warned by Reuter's burglary, it still constantly found ways and means of having its documents stolen and allowing them to fall into the hands of the Prussian police.

When Stieber found himself in possession of the treasure wrapped in stout oil-cloth he was beside himself with joy. "The whole network," he swore, "lay revealed before my eyes." And what did the treasure-trove contain about the "Marx party" and the accused in Cologne? According to Stieber's own testimony, nothing at all except for

"the original of a declaration by several members of the Central Authority, who obviously formed the nucleus of the 'Marx party'; it was dated London, September 17, 1850, and concerned their resignation from the communist society consequent on the well-known breach of September 15, 1850".

Stieber says so himself but even in this simple statement he is unable simply to confine himself to the facts. He is compelled to raise them to a higher plane in order to make them truly worthy of the police. For the original declaration contained nothing more than a statement of three lines to the effect that the majority-members of the former Central Authority and their friends were resigning from the *public Workers' Society of Great Windmill Street*; but they did not resign from a "communist society".

Stieber could have spared his correspondents the oil-cloth and his authorities the postal dues. He had only to *rummage* through

---


b Here Marx plays on the name *Stieber* and the verb *durchstiebern*, which means rummage, scan, search.—*Ed.*
the various German papers of September 1850 and he would have found in black and white the declaration of the “nucleus of the Marx party” announcing their resignation from the Refugee Committee and also from the Workers’ Society of Great Windmill Street.

The immediate product of Stieber’s researches was then the amazing discovery that the “nucleus of the Marx party” had resigned from the public Society of Great Windmill Street on September 17, 1850. “The whole network of the Cologne plot lay revealed before his eyes.” But the public couldn’t believe their eyes.

III

THE CHERVAL PLOT

Stieber, however, was able to make the most of his stolen treasure-trove. The papers that had come into his possession on August 5, 1851, led to the discovery of the so-called “Franco-German plot in Paris”. They contained six reports sent from Paris by Adolph Majer, an emissary of Willich-Schapper, as well as five reports from the leading district in Paris to the Willich-Schapper Central Authority. (Stieber’s testimony in the sitting of October 18.) Stieber then went on a diplomatic pleasure trip to Paris and there he made the personal acquaintance of the great Carlier who in the recent notorious affair of the Gold Bullion Lottery had just delivered proof that though a great enemy of the Communists, he was an even greater friend of other people’s private property.

“Accordingly I went to Paris in September 1851. Carlier, the Prefect of Police there at the time, was most eager and ready to lend me his support.... With the aid of French police agents the threads laid bare in the London letters were speedily and surely traced; we were able to track down the addresses of the various leaders of the conspiracy and to keep all their movements, and especially all their meetings and correspondence, under observation. Some very sinister things came to light.... I was compelled to yield to Prefect Carlier’s demands and measures were taken during the night of September 4, 1851.” (Stieber’s testimony of October 18.)

Stieber left Berlin in September. Let us assume it was September 1. At best he could have arrived in Paris on the evening of the

---

[a] In the German the last sentence has a dual meaning, either “The public, however, couldn’t believe his [i.e. Stieber’s] eyes” or “The public, however, couldn’t believe their eyes”. — Ed.

[b] See this volume, pp. 156-57. — Ed.
2nd. On the night of the 4th measures were taken. Thirty-six hours remain then for the conference with Carlier and for the necessary steps to be taken. In these thirty-six hours not only were the addresses of the various leaders “tracked down”; but all their movements, all their meetings and all their correspondence were “kept under observation”, that is of course after their “addresses had been tracked down”. Stieber’s arrival not only inspires the “French police agents” with a miraculous “speed and sureness”, it also makes the conspiratorial leaders “eager and ready” to perpetrate so many movements, meetings and so much correspondence within twenty-four hours that already the following evening measures can be taken against them.

But it is not enough that on September 3 the addresses of the individual leaders should have been traced and all their movements, meetings and correspondence put under observation:

“French police agents,” Stieber swears, “found an opportunity to be present at the meetings of the conspirators and to hear their decisions about the plan of campaign for the next revolution.”

No sooner have the police agents observed the meetings than the observation gives them an opportunity to be present, and no sooner have they been present at one meeting than it becomes several meetings, and no sooner has it become several meetings than decisions are adopted about the plan of campaign during the next revolution—and all this on the same day. On that very same day when Stieber first meets Carlier, Carlier’s police discover the addresses of the various leaders, the various leaders meet Carlier’s police, invite them to their meetings that very day, hold a whole series of meetings on the same day for their benefit and cannot part from them without hastily adopting decisions on the plan of campaign for the next revolution.

However eager and ready Carlier might be—and no one will doubt his readiness to uncover a communist plot three months before the coup d’état—Stieber ascribes more to him than he could achieve. Stieber asks miracles of the police; he does not merely ask for them, he believes them; he does not merely believe them, he swears to them on oath.\(^a\)

“At the beginning of this venture, i.e. the taking of measures, first of all a French police inspector and I personally arrested the dangerous Cherval, the ringleader of the French Communists. He resisted vigorously and a stubborn struggle ensued.”

\(^a\) A pun: Marx has *er beschwört sie*, which can mean “he swears to them on oath” or “he invokes, or entreats, them”.—*Ed.*
Thus Stieber’s testimony of October 18.

“Cherval made an attempt on my life in Paris, in my own home where he had broken in during the night. In the course of the ensuing struggle my wife, who came to my aid, was wounded.”

Thus Stieber’s further testimony of October 27.

On the night of the 4th, Stieber intervenes at Cherval’s dwelling and it comes to fisticuffs in which Cherval resists. On the night of the 3rd, Cherval intervenes at Stieber’s dwelling and it comes to fisticuffs in which Stieber resists. But it was precisely on the 3rd that a veritable entente cordiale obtained between conspirators and police agents as a result of which so many great deeds were performed in one day. It is now alleged that not only the conspirators were found out by Stieber on the 3rd, but Stieber too was found out on the 3rd by the conspirators. While Carlier’s agents discovered the addresses of the conspirators, the conspirators discovered Stieber’s address. While he played the role of an “observer” towards them, they pursued an active role towards him. While he was dreaming about their plot against the government, they were engaged in an assault on his person.

Stieber’s testimony of October 18 continues:

“In the course of the struggle” (this is Stieber on the attack) “I observed that Cherval was endeavouring to put a piece of paper into his mouth and swallow it. Only with great difficulty was it possible to retrieve one half of the paper, the other half being already devoured.”

So the paper was situated in Cherval’s mouth, between his teeth in fact, for only one half was retrieved, the other half having already been devoured. Stieber and his henchman, a police inspector or whoever, could only retrieve the other half by placing their hands in the jaws of the “dangerous Cherval”. Against such an onslaught biting was the most obvious method of defence that Cherval could adopt, and the Paris papers actually reported that Cherval had bitten Frau Stieber; in that scene however Stieber was assisted not by his wife but by the police inspector. On the other hand, Stieber declares that when Cherval assaulted him in his own home, it was Frau Stieber who had been wounded while coming to his aid. If one compares Stieber’s statements with the reports of the Paris papers it would appear that on the night of the 3rd Cherval bit Frau Stieber in an attempt to save the papers that Herr Stieber tore from between his teeth on the night of the 4th. Stieber will retort that Paris is a city of miracles and that long before him La Rochefoucauld had said that in France everything is possible.272
Putting the belief in miracles to one side for a moment it seems that the first miracles arose because Stieber compressed into one day, September 3, a whole series of events that were in reality spread over a long period of time, while the latter miracles arose when he claimed of different events that happened in one place and on one evening that they occurred in two places on two eyenings. Let us confront his tale from *A Thousand and One Nights* with the actual facts. But first one very strange fact, though by no means a miracle. Stieber tore from Cherval one half of the paper that had been swallowed. What was in the retrieved half? The whole that Stieber wanted.

"This paper," he swears, "contained a vital instruction for Gipperich, the emissary in Strasbourg, together with his complete address."

Now for the facts of the matter.

We know from Stieber that he received the Dietz archive in a stout oil-cloth wrapping on August 5, 1851. On August 8 or 9, 1851, a certain Schmidt arrived in Paris. Schmidt, it seems, is the name inevitably assumed by Prussian police agents travelling incognito. In 1845-46 Stieber travelled through the Silesian Mountains under the name of Schmidt. Fleury, his London agent, went as Schmidt to Paris in 1851. Here he searched for the various leaders of the Willich-Schapper conspiracy and lit upon Cherval. He pretended that he had fled from Cologne rescuing the League's cash-box with 500 talers. He produced credentials from Dresden and various other places and spoke about reorganising the League, uniting the different parties, as the schisms were caused solely by personal disagreements (the police preached unity and union even then), and promised to use the 500 talers to inject fresh life into the League. Schmidt gradually made the acquaintance of various leaders of the Willich-Schapper communities in Paris. He not only learned their addresses, but visited them, watched their post, observed their movements, found his way into their meetings and, as an agent provocateur, egged them on. Cherval in particular became more boastful than ever as Schmidt lavished more and more admiration on him, hailing him as the League's great unknown, as the "Great Chief" who was only unaware of his own importance, a fate that had befallen many a great man. One evening when Schmidt went with Cherval to a meeting of the League, the latter read out his famous letter to

---

a Here Marx plays on the words *verwunderlich*—strange, surprising, amazing, and *Wunder*—wonder, miracle.—*Ed.*
Gipperich before sending it off. In this way Schmidt learned of Gipperich's existence. "As soon as Gipperich returns to Strasbourg," Schmidt observed, "we can give him an order for the 500 talers lying in Strasbourg. Here is the address of the man who is holding the money. Give me in exchange Gipperich's address to send it as a credential to the man to whom Gipperich will present himself." In this way Schmidt obtained Gipperich's address. On the same evening a quarter of an hour after Cherval posted the letter to Gipperich, a message was sent by electric telegraph and Gipperich was arrested, his house was searched and the famous letter was intercepted. Gipperich was arrested before Cherval.

Some little while after this Schmidt informed Cherval that a man called Stieber who was a member of the Prussian police had arrived in Paris. He had not only learned his address but had also heard from a waiter in a café opposite that Stieber had conferred about having him (Schmidt) arrested. Cherval was the man who could give this wretched Prussian policeman a lesson he would not easily forget. "We'll throw him in the Seine" was Cherval's answer. They agreed to gain entry into Stieber's house the next day under some pretext or other in order to confirm that he was there and to make a mental note of his personal appearance. The next evening our heroes really set out on their expedition. As they approached their goal Schmidt expressed the opinion that it would be better if Cherval were to enter the house while he patrolled in front of it. "Just ask the porter for Stieber," he went on, "and when Stieber lets you in tell him that you want to speak to Herr Sperling and ask him whether he has brought the expected bill of exchange from Cologne. Oh, and one thing more. Your white hat is too conspicuous, it is too democratic. There, take my black one." They exchanged hats, Schmidt prepared to stand guard, Cherval pulled the bell-rope and found himself in Stieber's house. The porter doubted whether Stieber was at home and Cherval was about to withdraw when a woman's voice called from upstairs: "Yes, Stieber is at home." Cherval followed the voice and the trail led to an individual wearing green spectacles who identified himself as Stieber. Cherval then produced the formula agreed on about Sperling and the bill of exchange. "That won't do," Stieber interrupted him quickly. "You come into my house, ask for me, are shown up, then you try to withdraw, etc. I find that is extremely suspicious." Cherval answered brusquely. Stieber pulled the bell, several men appeared immediately, they surrounded Cherval, Stieber reached for his coat pocket from where a letter was visible. It did not in fact contain Cherval's instructions to
Gipperich, but it was a letter from Gipperich to Cherval. Cherval tried to eat the letter, Stieber attempted to take it from his mouth, Cherval hit out and bit and lashed out. Husband Stieber tried to save one half, wife Stieber the other half and an injury was all the reward she had for her zeal. The noise of the scene brought all the other tenants from their apartments. Meanwhile one of Stieber's types had thrown a gold watch downstairs and while Cherval was shouting: "Spy!" Stieber and Co. screamed: "Stop thief!" The porter recovered the gold watch and the cry of "Stop thief!" became general. Cherval was arrested and on his way out he was met at the door not by his friend Schmidt but by four or five soldiers.

When confronted with the facts, all the miracles invoked by Stieber disappear. His agent Fleury had been at work for over three weeks, he not only laid bare the threads of the plot, he also helped to weave them. Stieber had only to arrive from Berlin and he could exclaim: Veni, vidi, vici! He could present Carlier with a ready-made plot and Carlier needed only to be "willing" to intervene. There was no need for Frau Stieber to be bitten by Cherval on the 3rd because Herr Stieber put his hand into Cherval's mouth on the 4th. There was no need for Gipperich's address and the appropriate instructions to be salvaged whole from the jaws of the "dangerous Cherval", like Jonah from the whale's belly, after they have been half eaten. The only miracle that remains is the miraculous faith of the jurymen to whom Stieber dares to serve up seriously such fairy tales. Genuine representatives of the obtuse thinking of loyal subjects!

"In prison, after I had shown Cherval to his great astonishment," Stieber swears (in the sitting of October 18), "all his original reports which he had sent to London, he realised that I knew all and made a frank confession to me."

The papers that Stieber showed Cherval at first were by no means his original reports to London. Only afterwards were these together with other documents from the Dietz archive sent to Stieber from Berlin. He first showed Cherval a circular signed by Oswald Dietz that Cherval had just received and a few of the most recent letters from Willich. How did Stieber get possession of these? While Cherval was occupied biting and fighting Herr and Frau Stieber the valiant Schmidt-Fleury hurried to Mme Cherval,

---

*a* A pun: beschworen can mean both "invoked" and "sworn to".—Ed.

*b* "I came, I saw, I conquered" thus, according to Plutarch, Caesar announced his victory at Zela, on August 2, 47 B.C. over Pharnaces II, King of Bosporus.—Ed.

*c* Jonah 2:10.—Ed.
an Englishwoman (Fleury being a German businessman in London naturally speaks English) and told her that her husband had been arrested, that the danger was great, that she should hand over his papers so that he might be compromised no further, and that Cherval had instructed him to give them to a third person. As proof that he came as a genuine emissary he showed her the white hat he had taken from Cherval because it looked too democratic. Thus Fleury obtained the letters from Mme Cherval and Stieber obtained them from Fleury.

At any rate he now had a more favourable base from which to operate than previously in London. He could simply steal the Dietz archive, but he could concoct Cherval's evidence. Accordingly (in the sitting on October 18) he makes his Cherval expatiate about "contacts in Germany" as follows:

"He had lived in the Rhineland for a considerable time and more particularly he had been in Cologne in 1848. There he made the acquaintance of Marx and the latter admitted him to the League, which he then zealously propagated in Paris on the basis of elements already existing there."

In 1846 Cherval was nominated and admitted to the League in London by Schapper at a time when Marx was in Brussels and was himself not yet a member of the League.274 So Cherval could not be admitted to the same League by Marx in Cologne in 1848.

On the outbreak of the March revolution Cherval went to Rhenish Prussia for a few weeks but from there returned to London where he remained without interruption from the end of spring 1848 until the summer of 1850. He cannot therefore at the same time "have zealously propagated the League in Paris" unless Stieber, who performs chronological miracles, also finds spatial miracles within his powers and can even confer the quality of ubiquity on third persons.

Only after his expulsion from Paris did Marx come to know Cherval superficially along with a hundred other workers when he joined the Workers' Society in Great Windmill Street in London in September 1849. So he cannot have met him in Cologne in 1848.

At first Cherval told Stieber the truth on all these points. Stieber tried to compel him to make false statements. Did he succeed? We have only Stieber's testimony that he did, and that is a shortcoming. Stieber's prime concern was, of course, to establish a fictitious connection between Cherval and Marx so as to establish an artificial connection between the accused in Cologne and the Paris plot.
Whenever Stieber is required to go into details about the connections and correspondence of Cherval and his colleagues with Germany, he takes good care not even to mention Cologne and instead speaks complacently and at length of Heck in Brunswick, Laube in Berlin, Reininger in Mainz, Tietz in Hamburg, etc., etc., in short of the Willich-Schapper party. This party, says Stieber, had "the League's archive in its hands".—Through a misunderstanding it changed from their hands to his. In the archive he found not one single line written by Cherval to anyone in London, let alone to Marx in person, before September 15, 1850, before the split of the London Central Authority.

With the help of Schmidt-Fleury he swindled Frau Cherval out of her husband's papers. But again, he could not find a single line written by Marx to Cherval. To remedy this awkward state of affairs he makes Cherval write in his statement that

"he had fallen out with Marx because the latter had demanded that correspondence should still be sent to him even though the Central Authority was now situated in Cologne."

If Stieber found no Marx-Cherval correspondence before September 15, 1850, this must be due to the fact that Cherval ceased all correspondence with Marx after September 15, 1850. Pends-toi, Figaro, tu n'aurais pas inventé cela!*

The documents against the accused that had been laboriously brought together by the Prussian government and, in part, by Stieber himself during the year and a half that the investigation lasted refuted every suggestion of a connection between the accused and the Paris community or the Franco-German plot.

The Address from the London Central Authority of June 1850 proved that the Paris community was dissolved even before the split in the Central Authority. Six letters from the Dietz archive showed that after the Central Authority was transferred to Cologne the Paris communities were set up afresh by A. Majer, an emissary of the Willich-Schapper party. The letters of the leading district in Paris that were found in the archive proved that it was decidedly hostile towards the Cologne Central Authority. Finally, the French bill of indictment proved that all the acts Cherval and his associates were accused of did not occur until the year 1851. In

---

* Hang yourself, Figaro, that's a thing you wouldn't have invented (Beaumarchais, La folle journée, ou le mariage de Figaro, Act V, Scene 8—paraphrased).—Ed.

* A resumé of it was published in Le Moniteur universel, No. 58, February 27, 1852.—Ed.
the sitting of November 8 Saedt, despite the Stieberian revelations, found himself therefore reduced to the bare supposition that it was surely not impossible that the Marx party had at some time somehow been involved in some plot or other in Paris but that nothing was known of this plot or the time when it took place other than the fact that Saedt, acting on official instructions, deemed it possible. How dull-witted the German press must be to go on inventing stories of Saedt’s incisive intelligence!

*De longue main* the Prussian police had sought to persuade the public that Marx and, through Marx, the accused in Cologne were involved in the Franco-German plot. During the Cherval trial Beckmann, the police spy, sent the following notice from Paris to the *Kölnische Zeitung* on February 25, 1852:

“Several of the accused have fled, among them a certain A. Majer, who is described as an agent of Marx and Co.”

Whereupon the *Kölnische Zeitung* printed a statement by Marx that “A. Majer is one of the most intimate friends of Herr Schapper and the former Prussian lieutenant Willich, and that he is a complete stranger to Marx”. Then, in his testimony of October 18, 1852, Stieber himself admitted:

“The members of the Central Authority expelled by the Marx party in London on September 15, 1850, sent A. Majer to France, etc.”

and he even divulged the contents of the correspondence between A. Majer and Willich-Schapper.

In September 1851 during the police campaign against aliens in Paris a member of the “Marx party”, Konrad Schramm, was arrested, together with 50 or 60 other people sitting in a café, and was detained for almost two months on the charge of being implicated in the plot instigated by the Irishman Cherval. On October 16 while still in the depot of the Prefecture of Police he received a visit from a German who addressed him as follows:

“I am a Prussian official. You are aware that all over Germany and especially in Cologne there have been many arrests following the discovery of a communist society. The mere mention of a person’s name in a letter is enough to bring about his arrest. The government is somewhat embarrassed by the large number of prisoners of whom it is uncertain whether or not they are really implicated. We know that you had no part in the complot franco-allemand but on the other hand you are very closely acquainted with Marx and Engels and are doubtless very well informed about all the details of the German communist connections. We would be greatly indebted to you if you could help us in this respect and give us more detailed information as to

---

a For a long time.— Ed.

b See this volume, p. 223.— Ed.
who is guilty and who innocent. In this way you could bring about the release of a large number of people. If you wish we can draw up an official document about your statement. You will have nothing to fear from such a statement,” etc., etc.

Schramm naturally showed this gentle Prussian official the door, protested to the French Ministry about such visits and was expelled from France at the end of October.

That Schramm was a member of the “Marx party” was known to the Prussian police from the official resignation found in the Dietz archive. That the “Marx party” had no connection with the Cherval plot, they themselves admitted to Schramm. If it was possible to establish a connection between the “Marx party” and the Cherval plot this could not be done in Cologne but only in Paris where a member of that party sat in gaol at the same time as Cherval. But the Prussian government feared nothing more than a confrontation of Cherval and Schramm, which was bound to nullify in advance the successful outcome they expected from the Paris trial with regard to the accused in Cologne. By his acquittal of Schramm the French examining magistrate ruled that the trial in Cologne was in no way connected with the Paris plot.

Stieber then made a last attempt:

“With reference to the above-mentioned leader of the French Communists, Cherval, we endeavoured, for a long time in vain, to discover Cherval’s true identity. It finally became clear from a remark made in confidence to a police agent by Marx that he had escaped from gaol in Aachen in 1845, where he was serving a sentence for forgery of bills, that he was then granted admittance to the League by Marx during the troubles of 1848 and that he went as an emissary from there to Paris.”

Just as Marx was unable to inform Stieber’s spiritus familiaris,[a] the police agent, that he had admitted Cherval into the League in Cologne in 1848, for Schapper had admitted him into the League in London as early as 1846, or that he had induced him to live in London and at the same time to hawk propaganda around in Paris, so too, he was unable to inform Stieber’s alter ego, the police agent as such, that Cherval served a sentence in Aachen in 1845 and that he had forged bills, facts that he learnt only from Stieber’s testimony. Only a Stieber can allow himself such a hysteron proteron.[b] Antiquity has bequeathed to us its dying warrior[275]; the Prussian state will leave us its swearing Stieber.

Thus for a long, long time they had vainly endeavoured to

---

[a] Familiar spirit—a supernatural being which serves an individual.—Ed.
[b] Inversion of the natural order, figure of speech in which what should come last (hysteron) is put first (proteron).—Ed.
discover Cherval's true identity. On the evening of September 2 Stieber arrived in Paris. On the evening of the 4th Cherval was arrested, on the evening of the 5th he was taken from his cell to a dimly lit room. Stieber was there but in addition there was also a French police official present, an Alsatian who spoke broken German but understood it perfectly, had a policeman's memory and was not favourably impressed by the arrogantly servile Police Superintendent from Berlin. In the presence of this French official the following conversation took place:

Stieber in German: "Now look here, Herr Cherval, we know what's at the bottom of this business with the French name and the Irish passport. We know who you are, you are a Rhenish Prussian. Your name is K. and it is entirely in your own hands to escape the consequences by making a full confession," etc., etc.

Cherval denied this.

Stieber: "Certain people who forged bills and escaped from Prussian gaols were extradited to Prussia by the French authorities. So I would again urge you to think carefully; the penalty is twelve years solitary confinement."

The French police official: "We must give the man time to think it over in his cell."

Cherval was led back to his cell.

Naturally enough Stieber could not afford to blurt out the truth, he could not admit publicly that he was trying to force false admissions from Cherval by conjuring up the spectre of extradition and twelve years solitary imprisonment.

And even now Stieber had still not been able to discover Cherval's true identity. He still referred to him in front of the jury as Cherval and not as K. And that was not all. He did not know where Cherval really was. In the sitting of October 23 he had him still locked up in Paris. When in the sitting on October 27 Schneider II, counsel for the defence, pressed him to say "whether the afore-mentioned Cherval was at present in London?" Stieber answered that "he could not give any precise information on this point; and could only inform them of the rumour that Cherval had escaped in Paris."

The Prussian government suffered its customary fate of being duped. The French government had allowed it to pull the chestnuts of the Franco-German plot out of the fire but not to eat them. Cherval had managed to gain the sympathy of the French government and a few days after the Paris Assizes it let him and Gipperich flee to London. The Prussian government had hoped that in Cherval it would have a tool for the trial in Cologne, whereas in fact it only provided the French government with yet another agent.

One day before Cherval's pretended flight he received a visit
from a Prussian faquin* dressed in a black tail-coat and cuffs, with a bristling black moustache, and sparse grey hair cut short, in a word, a very pretty fellow who, he was told later, was Police Lieutenant Greif and who indeed afterwards introduced himself as Greif. Greif had obtained access to him by means of an entrance ticket he had obtained (having by-passed the prefect of police) directly from the Minister of Police. The Minister of Police thought it great fun to deceive the dear Prussians.

Greif: “I am a Prussian official. I have been sent here to negotiate with you. You will never get out of here without our aid. I have a proposal to make to you. We need you as a witness in Cologne. If you submit a request to the French government to hand you over to Prussia they have agreed to grant permission. After you have fulfilled your obligations and the case is over we shall release you on your word of honour.”

Cherval: “I’ll get out without your help.”

Greif (emphatically): “That is impossible!”

Greif also had Gipperich brought to him and proposed that he should spend five days in Hanover as a communist emissary. Likewise without success. The next day Cherval and Gipperich escaped. The French authorities smirked, the telegraph brought the bad news to Berlin and as late as October 23 Stieber swore in court that Cherval was locked up in Paris, and as late as October 27 he could not give any information and had merely heard the rumour that Cherval had escaped “in Paris”. Meanwhile, Police Lieutenant Greif had visited Cherval in London three times during the Cologne proceedings in order to discover, among other things, Nette’s address in Paris in the belief that he could be bribed to testify against the defendants in Cologne. This plan misfired.

Stieber had his reasons for casting a veil of obscurity over his relations with Cherval. K. therefore remained Cherval, the Prussian remained Irish and Stieber does not know to this day where Cherval is and what is “his true identity”. *

* Even in the Black Book Stieber still does not know who Cherval really is. It is written there, Part II, p. 38, under No. 111, Cherval: see Crämer; and under No. 116 Crämer: “as stated in No. 111, he has been very active in the Communist League under the name of Cherval. In the League he is also known as Frank. Under the name of Cherval he was sentenced to 8 years imprisonment by the Paris Assizes in February 1853” (this should read 1852) “but he soon escaped and fled to London.” So ignorant is Stieber in Part II where he provides an alphabetical, numbered list of suspects with their particulars. He has already forgotten that in Part I, p. 81 he has let slip the admission: “Cherval is the son of a Rhenish official called Joseph Krämer who” (who? the father or the son?) “abused his craft of lithography to forge bills, and was arrested for this but escaped from prison in Cologne” (false, it was Aachen!) “in 1844 and fled

---

* Scoundrel.— Ed.
In Cherval's correspondence with Gipperich the trifolium Seckendorf-Saetd-Stieber had at last found what it was looking for: Schinderhannes\(^a\), Karlo Moor Whom I took as model sure.\(^b\)

In order that Cherval's letter to Gipperich might be deeply engraved upon the lethargic cerebral matter of the 300 top tax-payers whom the jury represented, it received the honour of being read aloud three times. Behind this harmless gipsy pathos no experienced person could fail to see the figure of the buffoon who tries to appear terrifying both to himself and others.

Cherval & Co., moreover, shared the general expectation of the democrats that the second [Sunday] of May 1852\(^278\) would work miracles and so they decided to join the revolution on that day. Schmidt-Fleury had helped to bestow upon this fixed idea the form of a plan and so the activities of Cherval and Co. now came within the legal definition of a plot. Thus through them proof was provided that the plot that had not been perpetrated by the accused in Cologne against the Prussian government had at any rate been perpetrated by the Cherval party against France.

With the help of Schmidt-Fleury the Prussian government had sought to fabricate the semblance of a connection between the plot in Paris and the accused in Cologne, a connection to the reality of which Stieber then swore on oath. This trinity of Stieber, Greif, Fleury played the chief role in the Cherval plot. We shall see them at work again.

Let us then sum up:

A is a republican, B also calls himself a republican. A and B are enemies. B is commissioned by the police to construct an infernal machine. Whereupon A is dragged before the courts. If B rather than A has built the machine this is due to the enmity between A and B. In order to find proof of A's guilt B is called as a witness against him. This was the comedy of the Cherval plot.

It will be readily understood that as far as the general public was concerned the logic of this was a flop. Stieber's "factual" revelations dissolved amidst malodorous vapours; the complaint of the indictment board that "there was no factual evidence of an indictable offence" was as valid as ever. New police miracles had become necessary.

to England and later to Paris."—Compare this with Stieber's evidence before the jury quoted above. The plain fact is that the police are absolutely incapable of telling the truth. [Note by Engels to the edition of 1885.]

\(^a\) Jack the Skinner, a name given to Johann Bückler, a German robber.—Ed.

\(^b\) Heinrich Heine, "Ich kam von meiner Herrin Haus" (Buch der Lieder).—Ed.
During the sitting on October 23, the Presiding Judge announced: “Police Superintendent Stieber has indicated to me that he has to make important new depositions” and for that purpose he called this witness back into the box. Up jumped Stieber and the performance began.

Hitherto Stieber had described the activities of the Willich-Schapper party, or more briefly, the Cherval party, activities that took place both before and after the arrest of the accused in Cologne. He said nothing about the accused themselves either before or after their arrest. The Cherval plot took place after their arrest and Stieber now declared:

“In my earlier testimony I described the development of the Communist League and the activities of its members only up to the time when the men now accused were arrested.”

Thus he admitted that the Cherval plot had nothing to do with “the development of the Communist League and the activities of its members”. He confessed to the nullity of his previous testimony. Indeed, he was so complacent about his statements on October 18 that he regarded it as quite superfluous to continue to identify Cherval with the “Marx party”.

“Firstly,” he said, “the Willich group still exists and of its members hitherto only Cherval in Paris has been seized, etc.”

Aha! So the ringleader Cherval is a leader of the Willich group.

But now Stieber wished to make some most important announcements, not merely the very latest announcements that is, but the most important ones. The very latest and most important ones! These most important announcements would lose some of their significance if the insignificance of his earlier announcements were not emphasised. Up to now, Stieber declared, I have not really said anything, but now the time has come. Pay attention! Hitherto I have talked about the Cherval party, which is hostile to the accused, and strictly speaking, none of that has been in place here. But now I shall discuss the “Marx party”, and this trial is concerned exclusively with the Marx party. But Stieber could not put the matter as plainly as this. So he says:

“Up to now I have described the Communist League before the arrest of the accused; I shall now describe the League after their arrest.”
With characteristic virtuosity he manages to convert even mere rhetorical phrases into perjury.

After the arrest of the accused in Cologne Marx formed a new central authority.

"This emerges from the statement of a police agent whom the late Chief of Police Schulz had managed to smuggle unrecognised into the London League and into the immediate proximity of Marx."

The new central authority kept a minute-book and this, the "original minute-book", was now in Stieber's possession. Horrifying machinations in the Rhine provinces, in Cologne and even in the courtroom itself, all this is proved by the original minute-book. It contains proof that the accused had maintained an uninterrupted correspondence with Marx through the very walls of the prison. In a word, if the Dietz archive was the Old Testament, the original minute-book is the New Testament. The Old Testament was wrapped in stout oil-cloth, but the New Testament is bound in a sinister red morocco leather. Now the red morocco is indeed a demonstratio ad oculos, but people today are even more sceptical than in Thomas' time; they do not even believe what they see with their own eyes. Who still believes in Testaments, let them be Old or New, now that the religion of the Mormons has been invented? But Stieber, who is not wholly unsympathetic to Mormonism, has foreseen even this.

"It might be objected," Stieber the Mormon observed, "that these are nothing but the tales of contemptible police agents but," Stieber swore, "I have complete proofs of the veracity and reliability of their reports."

Just listen to that! Proofs of their veracity and proofs of their reliability! and complete proofs at that. Complete proofs! And what are these proofs?

Stieber had long known

"that a secret correspondence existed between Marx and the accused men in the gaol, but had been unable to track it down. Then on the previous Sunday a special courier from London arrived bringing me the news that we had finally managed to discover the secret address from which the correspondence had been conducted. It was the address of D.Kothes, a businessman in the Old Market here. The same courier brought me the original minute-book used by the London Central Authority which had been procured from a member of the League for money."

Stieber then communicated with Chief of Police Geiger and the postal authorities.

---

a Visual proof.—Ed.
b This sentence is omitted in the 1853 Basle edition; it occurs in the 1853 Boston edition and in the 1875 and 1885 editions.—Ed.
“The necessary precautionary measures were taken and after no more than two days the evening post from London brought with it a letter addressed to Kothes. On the instructions of the Chief Public Prosecutor the letter was detained and opened and in it was found a seven-page-long briefing for Schneider II, the Counsel for the Defence, in Marx's own handwriting. It indicated the method of defence that Counsel should adopt.... On the reverse side of the letter there was a large Latin B. The letter was copied and an easily detachable piece of the original was retained together with the original envelope. The letter was then put into a new envelope, sealed and given to a police officer from another town with the order that he should go to Kothes, and introduce himself as an emissary from Marx,” etc.

Stieber then narrated the rest of the disgusting farce enacted by the police, about how the police officer from another town had pretended to be an emissary from Marx, etc. Kothes was arrested on October 18 and after 24 hours he declared that the B on the inside of the letter stood for Bermbach. On October 19 Bermbach was arrested and his house searched. On October 21 Kothes and Bermbach were released.

Stieber gave this evidence on Saturday, October 23. “The previous Sunday”, that is Sunday, October 17, was allegedly the day the special courier arrived with Kothes' address and the original minute-book and two days after the courier, the letter arrived for Kothes, that is on October 19. But Kothes had already been arrested on October 18 because of the letter the police officer from another town had brought him on October 17. The letter to Kothes, therefore, arrived two days before the courier with Kothes' address, that is Kothes was arrested on October 18 for a letter that he did not receive until October 19. A chronological miracle?

Later, having been worried by Counsel, Stieber declared that the courier with Kothes' address and the original minute-book arrived on October 10. Why on October 10? Because October 10 happened to be likewise a Sunday and on October 23 it too would be a “previous” Sunday and in this way the original statement about the previous Sunday could be sustained and to this extent the perjury could be concealed. In that event, however, the letter did not arrive two days but a whole week after the courier. The perjury now fell on the letter rather than on the courier. Stieber's oath is like Luther's peasant. If you help him to mount the horse from one side he falls down on the other.³

And finally during the sitting of November 3 Police Lieutenant Goldheim of Berlin declared that Police Lieutenant Greif of London had delivered the minute-book to Stieber on October 11,
that is to say on a Monday, in his presence and that of Chief of Police Wermuth. Goldheim's statement therefore makes Stieber guilty of perjury twice over.

As the original envelope with the London postmark shows, Marx posted the letter to Kothes on Thursday, October 14. So the letter should have arrived on Friday evening, October 15. For a courier to deliver Kothes' address and the original minute-book two days before the letter arrived, he must have come on Wednesday, October 13. He could not arrive on October 17th, nor on the 10th nor on the 11th.

Greif, in his role of courier, did indeed bring Stieber his original minute-book from London. Stieber was as well aware as his crony Greif of the real significance of this book. He hesitated therefore to produce it in court for this time it was not a matter of statements taken behind prison bars in Mazas. Then came the letter from Marx. It was a godsend for Stieber. Kothes is a mere address, for the contents of the letter were not intended for Kothes but for the Latin B on the back of the enclosed sealed letter. Kothes is therefore nothing but an address. Let us suppose he is a secret address. Let us suppose further he is the secret address through which Marx communicates with the accused in Cologne. Let us suppose lastly that our London agents had sent by the same courier at the same time both the original minute-book and this secret address but that the letter arrived two days after the courier, the address and the minute-book. In this way we kill two birds with one stone. Firstly we have proof of the secret correspondence with Marx and secondly we prove that the original minute-book is authentic. The authenticity of the minute-book is shown by the correctness of the address, the correctness of the address is shown by the letter. The veracity and reliability of our agents is shown by the address and the letter, the authenticity of the minute-book is shown by the veracity and reliability of our agents. Quod erat demonstrandum. Then comes the merry comedy with the police official from another town and then come the mysterious arrests. Public, jurymen and even the accused, all stand thunderstruck.

But why did not Stieber let his special courier arrive on October 13, which would have been quite easy for him? Because in that case he would not have been special, because, as we have seen, chronology was not his strong point and the common calendar is beneath the dignity of a Prussian police superintendent. Moreover, he kept the original envelope; so who would be able to unravel the affair?
But giving his evidence, Stieber compromised himself from the outset by the omission of one fact. If his agents knew of Kothes’ address they would also know to whom the mysterious B referred on the reverse of the inside letter. Stieber was so little initiated into the mysteries of the Latin B that on October 17 he had Becker searched in gaol in the hope of finding the letter from Marx on him. He only learnt from Kothes’ statement that the B stood for Bermbach.

But how did Marx’s letter fall into the hands of the Prussian government? Very simply. The Prussian government regularly opens the letters entrusted to its postal service and during the trial in Cologne it did this with particular assiduity. In Aachen and Frankfurt am Main they could tell some pretty stories about it. It was a pure chance whether a letter would slip through or not.

When the story about the original courier collapsed, the one about the original minute-book had to share its fate. Naturally, Stieber did not yet suspect this in the sitting on October 23 when he triumphantly revealed the contents of the New Testament, that is the red book. The immediate effect of his statement was the re-arrest of Bermbach, who was present at the trial as a witness.

Why was Bermbach re-arrested?

Because of the papers found on him? No, for after his house had been searched he was released again. He was arrested 24 hours after Kothes. Therefore if he had had incriminating documents they would certainly have disappeared by then. Why then was witness Bermbach arrested, when the witnesses Hentze, Hätzel, Steingens, who had been shown to be accomplices or members of the league, still sat unmolested on the witness bench?

Bermbach had received a letter from Marx which contained a mere criticism of the indictment and nothing else besides. This Stieber admitted since the letter was there for the jury to see. But he couched the admission in his hyperbolic policeman’s manner thus: “Marx himself exercises an uninterrupted influence on the present case from London.” And the jury might well ask themselves, as Guizot asked his voters: *Est-ce que vous vous sentez corrompu?* What then was the reason for Bermbach’s arrest? From the beginning of the inquiry the Prussian Government as a matter of principle strove consistently to deprive the accused of all means of defence. In direct contradiction to the law, defence counsel, as they announced in open court, were refused access to the accused even after presentation of the bill of indictment. On

---

*a* Do you feel you are corrupted? — *Ed.*
his own testimony Stieber had been in possession of the Dietz archive ever since August 5, 1851. But the Dietz archive was not appended to the indictment. Not until October 18, 1852, was it produced in the middle of a public hearing—and only so much of it was produced as Stieber thought politic. The jury, the accused and the public were all to be caught off their guard and taken by surprise; defence counsel were to stand by helplessly in the face of the surprise prepared by the police.

And even more so after the presentation of the original minute-book! The Prussian Government trembled at the thought of revelations. Bermbach however had received material for the defence from Marx and it could be foreseen that he would receive information about the minute-book. His arrest denoted the proclamation of a new crime, that of corresponding with Marx, and the punishment for this crime was imprisonment. That was intended to deter every Prussian citizen from permitting his address to be used. À bon entendeur demi mot.a Bermbach was locked up so that evidence for the defence might be locked out. And Bermbach remained in gaol for five weeks. For if they had released him immediately after the case was concluded the Prussian courts would have publicly proclaimed their docile subservience to the Prussian police. So Bermbach remained in gaol, ad majorem gloriaamb of the Prussian judiciary.

Stieber swore on oath that

“after the arrest of the accused in Cologne, Marx joined together the ruins of his party in London and formed a new central authority with about eighteen people,” etc.

The ruins had never come apart for they were so joined together that they had formed a private societyc ever since September 1850. But at a word from Stieber they promptly vanished only to be revived by another command from Stieber after the arrest of the accused in Cologne and this time they appear in the form of a new central authority.

On Monday, October 25, the Kölnische Zeitung arrived in London with an account of Stieber’s testimony of October 23.

The “Marx party” had neither formed a new central authority nor kept minutes of its meetings. They guessed at once who had

---

a A word is enough to the wise.—Ed.
b Paraphrase of a saying by Gregory I: Ad majorem Dei gloriam: for the greater glory of God, which later became the motto of the Society of Jesus.—Ed.
c Marx uses the English word.—Ed.
been the chief manufacturer of the New Testament—*Wilhelm Hirsch from Hamburg*.

Early in December 1851 Hirsch appeared at the "Marx society" saying he was a communist refugee. Simultaneously, letters arrived from Hamburg denouncing him as a spy. But it was decided to allow him to remain in the society for the time being and watch him with a view to procuring proof of his innocence or guilt. At the meeting on January 15, 1852, a letter from Cologne was read aloud in which a friend of Marx referred to another postponement of the trial and to the difficulty experienced even by relatives in gaining access to the accused. On this occasion mention was made of Frau Dr. Daniels. People were struck by the fact that Hirsch was not seen again after this meeting either in anyone's "immediate proximity" or at a distance. On February 2, 1852, Marx was notified from Cologne that Frau Dr. Daniels' house had been searched as the result of a police denunciation which claimed that a letter from Frau Daniels to Marx had been read out in the communist society in London and that Marx had been instructed to write back to her telling her that he was busy reorganising the League in Germany, etc. This denunciation literally fills the first page of the original minute-book.

Marx replied by return of post that as Frau Daniels had never written to him he could not possibly have read out a letter from her; the whole denunciation had been invented by a certain Hirsch, a dissolute young man who had no objection to supplying the Prussian police with as many lies as they had a mind to pay for in cash.

Since January 15 Hirsch had disappeared from the meetings; he was now formally expelled from the society. At the same time it was resolved to change the time and place of the meetings. Hitherto, meetings had taken place on Thursdays on premises belonging to J.W.Masters, Market House, in Farringdon Street, City. From now on it was agreed that the society would meet on Wednesdays in the Rose and Crown Tavern, Crown Street, Soho. Hirsch, whom "Chief of Police Schulz had managed to smuggle unrecognised into the immediate proximity of Marx”, despite his "proximity" was unaware even eight months later of the place and day of the meetings. Both before and after February he persisted in manufacturing his "original minute-book" on a Thursday and dating the meetings on Thursdays. If the *Kölnische Zeitung* is consulted the following can be found: Minutes of January 15

---

a Bermbach — *Ed.*
Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne

(Thursday), likewise January 29 (Thursday), and March 4 (Thursday), and May 13 (Thursday), and May 20 (Thursday), and July 22 (Thursday), and July 29 (Thursday), and September 23 (Thursday), and September 30 (Thursday).

The landlord of the Rose and Crown Tavern made a declaration before the magistrate in Marlborough Street to the effect that "Dr. Marx's circle" had met in his tavern every Wednesday since February 1852. Liebknecht and Rings, whom Hirsch had named as the secretaries for his original minute-book, had their signatures witnessed by the same magistrate. And finally, the minutes Hirsch had kept in Stechan's Workers' Society were obtained so that his handwriting might be compared with that in the original minute-book.

In this way the spurious nature of the original minute-book was demonstrated without it being necessary to embark upon a criticism of the contents which their own contradictions caused to disintegrate.

The real difficulty was how to send these documents to Counsel. The Prussian Post was merely an outpost, situated between the Prussian frontier and Cologne, and designed to frustrate the passage of munitions to the defence.

It was necessary to use roundabout ways and so the first documents, despatched on October 25, arrived in Cologne only on October 30.

Counsel were at first forced to make do with the very meagre resources that lay at hand in Cologne. The first blow against Stieber came from a direction he had not foreseen. Frau Dr. Daniels' father Müller, a King's Counsel and a man in high repute as a legal expert and well known for his conservative views, declared in the Kölnische Zeitung on October 26 that his daughter had never corresponded with Marx and that Stieber's original book was a piece of "mystification". The letter Marx had sent to Cologne on February 3, 1852, in which Hirsch was alluded to as a spy and a manufacturer of false police notices, was found by chance and put at the disposal of the defence. In the "Marx party's" notice of resignation from the Great Windmill Street Society which was included in the Dietz archive, a genuine specimen of W. Liebknecht's handwriting was discovered. Lastly, Schneider II, Counsel for the Defence, obtained some genuine letters by Liebknecht from Birnbaum, the secretary of the Council for Poor-Relief in Cologne, and genuine letters by Rings from a private secretary called Schmitz. At the offices of the court

---

Counsel compared the minute-book with Liebknecht’s handwriting in the notice of resignation and also with letters by Rings and Liebknecht.

Stieber, who was already alarmed by the declaration of Müller, King’s Counsel, now heard of these ominous handwriting investigations. To forestall the imminent blow he again leaped up in court during the sitting on October 27, and declared that

“the fact that Liebknecht’s signature in the minute-book differed greatly from a signature that already was in the dossier had seemed very suspicious to him. He had therefore made further inquiries and had learnt that the signatory in the minute-book in question was H. Liebknecht whereas the name in the dossier was preceded by the initial W.”

When Counsel, Schneider II, asked him: “Who informed you that an H. Liebknecht also exists?”, Stieber refused to answer. Schneider II then asked for further information about Rings and Ulmer who appear together with Liebknecht as secretaries in the minute-book. Stieber smelt a new trap. He ignored the question three times, and tried to conceal his embarrassment and to regain his composure by recounting three times and for no reason how the minute-book had come into his possession. At last he stammered: The names Rings and Ulmer are probably not real names at all but only “League names”. Stieber explained the frequent mention in the minute-book of Frau Dr. Daniels as a correspondent of Marx by surmising that perhaps the young notary Bermbach was really meant, when the book said Frau Dr. Daniels. Counsel, von Hontheim, questioned him about Hirsch.

“He did not know this man Hirsch either,” Stieber swore. “Contrary to rumour however it is obvious that he is not a Prussian agent if only because the Prussian police are on the lookout for him.”

At a signal from Stieber Goldheim buzzed into view and said that “in October 1851 he was sent to Hamburg in order to apprehend Hirsch”.

We shall see how the very same Goldheim was sent to London on the following day to apprehend the very same Hirsch. So the very same Stieber who claimed that he had bought the Dietz archive and the original minute-book from refugees for cash, that same Stieber now asserts that Hirsch cannot be a Prussian agent because he is a refugee! You have only to be a refugee and Stieber will guarantee your absolute venality or absolute incorruptibility, just as it suits his book. And is not Fleury likewise a political refugee, the same Fleury

---

a The Basle edition of 1853 had (sic) after these words.—*Ed.*
whom Stieber denounced as a police agent in the sitting on November 3?

When the defences of his original minute-book had been breached on every side, Stieber summed up the situation on October 27 with a classical display of impudence, stating that

"his belief in the authenticity of the minute-book is firmer than ever".

At the sitting of October 29 an expert compared the letters of Liebknecht and Rings, which had been submitted by Birnbaum and Schmitz, with the minute-book and declared the signatures in the latter to be false.

The Chief Public Prosecutor, Seckendorf, said in his speech:

"The information contained in the minute-book coincides with facts derived from other sources. But the prosecution is quite unable to prove the book's authenticity."

The book is authentic, but its authenticity cannot be proved. The New Testament! Seckendorf continued:

"But the defence has itself shown that at least the book contains much that is true, for example it gives us information about the activities of Rings, who is mentioned there, activities about which no one knew anything before."

If no one knew anything about Rings' activities before, the minute-book does not provide any information about it either. Therefore the statements about Rings' activities could not confirm the truth of the minute-book's contents and as regards its form they demonstrated that the signature of a member of the "Marx party" was in truth false, and had been forged. They proved then, according to Seckendorf, that "at least the book contains much that is true"—i.e. a true forgery. The Chief Public Prosecutors (Saedt-Seckendorf) and the postal authorities had together with Stieber opened the letter to Kothes. Therefore they knew the date of its arrival. Therefore they knew that Stieber committed perjury when he caused the courier to arrive at first on October 17 and, later, on the 10th, and the letter first on October 19 and then on the 12th. They were his accomplices.

At the sitting on October 27 Stieber tried in vain to preserve a calm appearance. He feared that any day the incriminating documents might arrive from London. Stieber felt ill at ease and the Prussian state, incarnate in him, felt ill at ease too. The public exposure had reached a dangerous stage. So Police Lieutenant Goldheim was sent to London on October 28 to save the fatherland. What did Goldheim do in London? Aided by Greif and Fleury, he attempted to persuade Hirsch to go to Cologne and, under the name of H. Liebknecht, to swear to the authenticity of the minute-book. Hirsch was offered a
real state pension, but Hirsch’s policeman’s instincts were as good as Goldheim’s. Hirsch knew that he was neither Public Prosecutor nor Police Lieutenant, nor Police Superintendent, and therefore had not the privilege of committing perjury with impunity. His instincts told him that he would be dropped as soon as things began to go wrong. Hirsch did not want to become a goat, and least of all a scapegoat. Hirsch flatly refused. But the Christian-Germanic government of Prussia won lasting fame for having attempted to bribe a man to bear false witness in the course of criminal proceedings in which the heads of its own citizens were at stake.

Goldheim thus returned to Cologne without having achieved his object.

In the sitting on November 3, when the prosecutor had concluded his address and before Counsel for the defence could commence his, Stieber, caught between the two, leaped once again into the breach swearing that

“he had now ordered further research into the minute-book. He had sent Police Lieutenant Goldheim from Cologne to London to pursue the inquiry there. Goldheim left on October 28 and returned on November 2. Here is Goldheim.”

At a signal from his master Goldheim buzzed into view and swore that

“on arriving in London he went first to Police Lieutenant Greif who took him to police agent Fleury in the borough of Kensington for it was Fleury from whom Greif had obtained the book. Fleury admitted as much to him, the witness Goldheim, and asserted that he had really received the book from a member of the Marx party called H. Liebknecht. Fleury definitely recognised the receipt H. Liebknecht had given him for the money he had received for the book. Goldheim was not able to catch hold of Liebknecht himself in London because he was, according to Fleury, afraid to appear in public. During his stay in London witness became convinced that, a few errors apart, the content of the book was entirely genuine. Reliable agents who had been present at Marx’s meetings had confirmed this to him. The book itself however was not the original minute-book but only a notebook on the proceedings at Marx’s meetings. There are only two possible explanations for the admittedly still rather obscure origin of the book. Either, as the agent insists, it really emanates from Liebknecht, who has refused to give a specimen of his handwriting in order that there should be no proof of his treachery; or the agent Fleury obtained the notes for the book from Dronke and Imandt, two other émigré friends of Marx, and put them in the form of an original minute-book in order to increase the value of his commodity. Police Lieutenant Greif has officially stated that Dronke and Imandt frequently condoled with Fleury,... The witness Goldheim asserts his stay in London has convinced him that everything that had been said previously about secret meetings in Marx’s home, about the contacts between London and Cologne and about the secret correspondence, etc., was true in every particular. As evidence of how well informed the Prussian agents in London were even today, he would inform the Court that a completely secret meeting took

\[a\] Marx plays on the name Hirsch, which means "stag". — Ed.
place in Marx's house on October 27 to discuss what steps should be taken to
counteract the minute-book and above all the activities of Police Superintendent
Stieber, who was a thorn in the side of the London Party. The relevant decisions and
documents were sent in complete secrecy to the lawyer, Schneider II. In particular,
among the papers sent to Schneider II was a private letter that Stieber himself wrote to
Marx in Cologne in 1848 and that Marx had hitherto kept very secret in the hope that
it might be used to compromise the witness Stieber."

Witness Stieber leaped up and declared that he had written to Marx
about an infamous slander, and had threatened to sue him, etc.

"No one but Marx and he could know this and this was indeed the strongest proof
of the accuracy of the information from London."

So according to Goldheim the original minute-book is "entirely
genuine", apart from the false parts. What convinced him of its
authenticity is in particular the circumstance that the original
minute-book is no original minute-book but only a "notebook". And
Stieber? Stieber was by no means thunderstruck; on the contrary a
great weight had been lifted from his mind. At the very last
moment, when the sound of the prosecutor's last words had hardly
faded away and before the first word of the defence had been
uttered, Stieber managed with the aid of his Goldheim quickly to
transform the original minute-book into a notebook. When two
policemen accuse each other of lying, does that not prove that they
are both addicted to telling the truth? Through Goldheim Stieber
was able to cover his retreat.

Goldheim testified that "on arriving in London he went first to
Police Lieutenant Greif, who took him to police agent Fleury in the
borough of Kensington". Now who would not swear on oath that
poor Goldheim and Police Lieutenant Greif must have worn
themselves out walking or driving to Fleury's house in the remote
borough of Kensington? But Police Lieutenant Greif lives in the
same house as police agent Fleury, in fact he lives on the top floor of
Fleury's house, so that in reality it was not Greif who took Goldheim
to Fleury, but Fleury who took Goldheim to Greif.

"Police agent Fleury in the borough of Kensington!" What
precision! Can you still doubt the truthfulness of a Prussian
government that denounces its own spies, gives their name and
address and every detail, body and soul? If the minute-book is
false you can still rely on "police agent Fleury in Kensington".
Yes, indeed. On private secretary Pierre in the 13th arrondissement.
If you wish to specify a person you must give his Christian name

\[^a\] A pun in the original: "fällt nicht aus den Wolken"—is not thunderstruck, and
"ein Stein fällt ihm vom Herzen"—a weight is taken off his mind.—**Ed.**
as well as his surname. Not Fleury but Charles Fleury. And you must also name the profession that he practises in public, and not his clandestine activities. So it is Charles Fleury, a businessman, not Fleury, the police agent. And when you state his address you do not merely name a London borough, a town in itself, but you give the borough, the street and the number of the house. So it is not police agent Fleury in Kensington but Charles Fleury, a businessman, 17 Victoria Road, Kensington.

But “Police Lieutenant Greif”, that at any rate is frankly spoken! But when Police Lieutenant Greif attaches himself to the embassy in London and the Lieutenant turns into an attaché that of course is an attachment of no concern to the courts. The heart’s desire is the voice of fate.

So Police Lieutenant Goldheim asserts that police agent Fleury asserted that he had the book from a man who really asserted that he was H. Liebknecht and who had even given a receipt to Fleury. The only drawback is that Goldheim was unable “to catch hold of” the said H. Liebknecht in London. So Goldheim could have stayed quietly in Cologne for Police Superintendent Stieber’s assertion does not look any healthier for the fact that it appears as an assertion of Police Lieutenant Goldheim’s, which had been asserted by Police Lieutenant Greif, for whom in his turn police agent Fleury had done the favour of agreeing to assert his assertion.

Goldheim’s London experiences were hardly encouraging but, undeterred and with the aid of his considerable faculty for convincing himself (which in his case must do duty for the faculty of reasoning), he convinced himself “completely” that “everything” that Stieber had affirmed on oath concerning the “Marx party”, about its contacts in Cologne, etc., was “all true in every particular”. And now that Goldheim, his junior official, has issued him with a testimonium paupertatis, surely Police Superintendent Stieber is fully covered now? Stieber’s method of swearing has at least one achievement to its credit: he has turned the whole Prussian hierarchy upside down. You don’t believe the Police Superintendent? Very well. He has compromised himself. But surely you will believe the Police Lieutenant? You don’t believe him either? Better still. Then you have no other choice than to believe at least the police agent alias mouchardus vulgaris. Such is the heretical conceptual confusion that our swearing Stieber has created.

---

a Schiller, Die Piccolomini, Act III, Scene 8—Ed.
b Certificate of poverty.—Ed.
c An ordinary spy.—Ed.
Goldheim proved that in London he had established the non-existence of the original minute-book, and as for the existence of H. Liebknecht that he was unable “to catch hold” of it in London, and it was precisely this that convinced him that “all” Stieber’s statements about the “Marx party” “were true in every particular”. In addition to these negative proofs, which in Seckendorf’s view contained “much that was true”, he had in the end to produce the positive proof of “how well informed the Prussian agents in London were even today”. As evidence of this he mentions that on October 27 there had been a “completely secret meeting in Marx’s house”. In this completely secret meeting steps were discussed to counteract the minute-book and Police Superintendent Stieber, that “thorn in their side”. The relevant orders and decisions were “sent in complete secrecy to the lawyer, Schneider II”.

Although the Prussian agents were present at these meetings the route taken by these letters remained so “completely secret” that all the efforts of the postal authorities to intercept them were in vain. Listen to the cricket chirping sadly from among the ageing and venerable ruins: “The relevant letters and documents were sent in complete secrecy to the lawyer, Schneider II.” Completely secret for Goldheim’s secret agents.

The imaginary decisions about the minute-book cannot have been made at the completely secret meeting in Marx’s house on October 27 for already on October 25 Marx had sent the chief reports about the spurious nature of the minute-book not indeed to Schneider II, but to Herr von Hontheim.

It was not merely the bad conscience of the police that gave them the idea that documents had been sent to Cologne. On October 29 Goldheim arrived in London. On October 30 Goldheim found a statement signed by Engels, Freiligrath, Marx and Wolff in *The Morning Advertiser, The Spectator, The Examiner, The Leader* and *The People’s Paper* in which the attention of the English public was drawn to the revelations that the defence would make of forgery, perjury, the falsification of documents, in short of all the infamies perpetrated by the Prussian police. The sending of the documents was veiled in such “complete secrecy” that the “Marx party” openly informed the English public about this,

---

\[a\] A pun on the name *Goldheim* and the word *Heimchen* (cricket). — *Ed.*

\[b\] See this volume, pp. 378-79. — *Ed.*

\[c\] Marx and Engels use the English words “forgery, perjury, falsification of documents”. — *Ed.*
though not until October 30 by which time Goldheim had arrived in London and the documents in Cologne.

However, on October 27 documents were also sent to Cologne. How did the omniscient Prussian police learn of this?
The Prussian police did not pursue their activities with quite such "complete secrecy" as the "Marx party". On the contrary, for weeks they had openly posted two of their spies in front of Marx's house and from the street they watched him *du soir jusqu'au matin* and *du matin jusqu'au soir* and dogged his every step. Now the absolutely secret documents, containing the genuine specimens of Liebknecht's and Rings' handwriting together with the statement of the landlord of the Crown Tavern concerning the days of the society's meetings, these absolutely secret documents Marx had officially witnessed in the absolutely public police court in Marlborough Street in the presence of reporters from the English daily press on October 27. His Prussian guardian angels followed him from his house to Marlborough Street and from Marlborough Street back to his house and from his house to the post office. They did not in fact disappear until Marx had gone in absolute secrecy to the local magistrate in order to obtain a warrant for the arrest of his two "followers".

Moreover, yet another way lay open to the Prussian government. For Marx sent the documents that were dated October 27 and had been witnessed on October 27 directly to Cologne through the post in order to ensure that the talons of the Prussian eagle would not seize the *duplicates* that had been sent in *absolute secrecy*. Both postal authorities and the police in Cologne knew then that documents dated October 27 had been forwarded by Marx and there was no need for Goldheim to make the journey to London in order to unravel the mystery.

Goldheim felt that after all he ought "in particular" to reveal something "particular" that the "absolutely secret meeting on October 27" had resolved to send to Schneider II, he therefore *mentioned* the letter written by Stieber to Marx. Unfortunately Marx had sent this letter not on October 27 but on October 25 and it was sent not to Schneider II but to Herr von Hontheim. But how did the police know that Marx still had Stieber's letter in his possession and that he intended to send it to the defence? Let us however permit Stieber to leap up once more.

---

* From evening till morning and from morning till evening (Beaumarchais, *La folle journée, ou le mariage de Figaro*, Act I, Scene 1).— Ed.
Stieber hoped to forestall Schneider II and thus prevent him from reading aloud in court what was for him a very "unpleasant letter". Stieber calculated: If Goldheim says that Schneider II has my letter and that he has it thanks to his "criminal contact with Marx", then Schneider II will suppress the letter so as to prove that Goldheim's agents were misinformed and that he himself does not maintain any criminal contact with Marx. So Stieber leaped up, gave a false account of the content of the letter and concluded with the astonishing declaration that "no one but himself and Marx could know this and this was indeed the strongest proof of the reliability of the information from London".

Stieber has a strange method of keeping secret facts that he finds unpalatable. If he remains silent, the whole world must keep silence. Hence "no one can know" apart from him and a certain elderly lady that he once lived near Weimar as an homme entretenu. But if Stieber had every reason to make sure that no one but Marx should know of the letter, Marx had every reason to let everyone apart from Stieber know about it. We now know the strongest proof of the information from London. What does Stieber's weakest proof look like?

But once again Stieber knowingly commits perjury when he says "no one but myself and Marx could know this". He knew that it was not Marx but another editor of the Rheinische Zeitung who had answered his letter. So there had been at least "one man other than Marx and himself". In order that even more people may learn of it we print the letter here:

"No. 177 of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung contains a news item from your correspondent in Frankfurt am Main dated December 21 in which a base lie is reported to the effect that being a police spy I went to Frankfurt to try, while pretending to hold democratic views, to discover the murderers of Prince Lichnowski and General Auerswald. I was in fact in Frankfurt on the 21st but stayed only one day and as you can see from the accompanying certificate I was engaged in purely private business on behalf of a lady from here, Frau von Schwezler. I have long since returned to Berlin and resumed my work as defence counsel. I would refer you moreover to the official correction in this matter that has already appeared in No. 338 of the Frankfurter Oberpostamts-Zeitung of December 21 and in No. 248 of the Berlin National-Zeitung. I believe that I may expect from your respect for the truth that you will print the enclosed correction in your paper without delay and that you will also give me the name of your slanderous informant in accordance with your legal obligations, for I cannot possibly permit such a libel to go unpunished, otherwise I shall regretfully be compelled to proceed against your editorial board.

---

a Kept man.— Ed.

b Stieber's letter was given in a footnote in the Basle and Boston editions of 1853 but in the 1875 and 1883 editions it was included in the main text.— Ed.
"I believe that in recent times democracy is indebted to no one more than myself. It was I who rescued hundreds of democrats who had been charged from the nets of the criminal courts. It was I who even while a state of siege was proclaimed here persistently and fearlessly challenged the authorities (and do so to this very day), while all the cowardly and contemptible fellows (the so-called democrats) had long since fled the field. When democratic organs treat me in this fashion it is scarcely an encouragement to me to make further efforts.

"The real joke, however, in the present case lies in the clumsiness of the organs of democracy. The rumour that I went to Frankfurt as a police agent was spread first by that notorious organ of reaction, the Neue Preussische Zeitung, in order to undermine my activities as defence counsel that gave that paper such offence. The other Berlin papers have long since corrected this report. But the democratic papers are so inept that they parrot this stupid lie. If I had wished to go to Frankfurt as a spy it would certainly not be announced beforehand in every newspaper. And how could Prussia send a police official to Frankfurt which has enough competent officials of its own? Stupidity has always been the failing of the democrats and their opponents' cunning has always brought them to victory.

"It is likewise a contemptible lie to say that years ago I was a police spy in Silesia. At that time I was openly employed as a police officer and as such I did my duty. Contemptible lies have been circulated about me. If anyone can prove that I insinuated my way into his favour let him come forth and do so. Anyone can make assertions and tell lies. I think of you as an honest, decent man and so I expect from you a satisfactory answer by return of post. The democratic papers are generally in disrepute here because of the many lies they publish. I hope that you are a man of a different stamp.

"Berlin, December 26, 1848
Respectfully yours,

Stieber, Doctor at Law, etc.,
Berlin, Ritterstrasse 65."

How then did Stieber know that on October 27 Marx had sent this letter to Schneider II? But it was not sent on October 27 but on October 25, and it was not sent to Schneider II but to von Hontheim. Stieber therefore knew only that the letter still existed and he suspected that Marx would put it in the hands of some defence counsel or other. Whence this suspicion? When the Kölnische Zeitung brought Stieber's testimony on October 18 about Cherval, etc., to London, Marx sent a statement dated October 21 to the Kölnische Zeitung, the Berlin National-Zeitung and the Frankfurter Journal and at the end of this statement Stieber was threatened with his still existing letter. In order to keep this letter "completely secret" Marx himself announced it in the newspapers. He failed, because of the cowardice of the daily press in Germany, but the Prussian post was now informed and with the Prussian post, its—Stieber.

What then was the message Goldheim chirruped back from London?
That Hirsch has not committed perjury, that H. Liebknecht has no “tangible” existence, that the original minute-book is no original minute-book and that the all-knowing London agents know all that the “Marx party” has published in the London press. To save the honour of the Prussian agents Goldheim placed in their mouths the few titbits of information that Stieber discovered in letters he had opened or purloined.

In the sitting on November 4 after Schneider II had annihilated Stieber and his minute-book and shown him to be guilty of forgery and perjury, Stieber leaped into the breach for the last time and gave vent to his moral indignation. They even dare, he cried out, his soul mortally wounded, they even dare to accuse Herr Wermuth, Chief of Police Wermuth, of perjury! Stieber thereby returned to the orthodox hierarchy, to the rising scale. Earlier he had moved on the heterodox, descending scale. If he, a police superintendent, could not be trusted, well then surely his police lieutenant could be; and if not the police lieutenant, then surely his police agent; and if not agent Fleury, then surely subagent Hirsch. But now it is in reverse. He, the police superintendent, can perhaps commit perjury, but Wermuth, a Chief of Police? Unbelievable! In his rage he praised Wermuth with mounting bitterness, he served Wermuth up to the public neat, Wermuth as a human being, Wermuth as a lawyer, Wermuth as paterfamilias, Wermuth as a Chief of Police, Wermuth for ever.

Even now, during the public hearing, Stieber did not stop trying to isolate the accused and to erect a barrier between the defence and the defence materials. He accused Schneider II of “criminal contact” with Marx. In attacking him Schneider was impugning the highest authorities of Prussia. Even Göbel, the Presiding Judge of the court, even a Göbel felt overwhelmed by Stieber’s onslaught. He could not overlook it and even though in a timorous and servile way he did lash Stieber with a few rebukes. But Stieber was in the right for all that. It was not merely he as a person that stood exposed to public view: it was the prosecution, the courts, the postal authorities, the government, the police headquarters in Berlin, it was the ministries and the Prussian embassy in London, in short it was the whole Prussian state that stood in the pillory with him, original minute-book in hand.

---

\(^{a}\) In the original a pun on Stieber: aufstiebern (aufstöbern)—to ferret out, to trace, to discover.—Ed.

\(^{b}\) A pun on Wermuth (wormwood, vermouth, bitterness) and Bitterkeit (bitterness).—Ed.

\(^{c}\) Marx uses the English phrase “for ever”.—Ed.
Herr Stieber is herewith granted permission to print the answer the Neue Rheinische Zeitung returned to his letter.

Let us now return once more to London with Goldheim.

Just as Stieber is still ignorant of Cherval's whereabouts and true identity so too, according to Goldheim's testimony (in the sitting on November 3), the origin of the minute-book is an enigma that is still not fully resolved. To resolve it Goldheim put forward two hypotheses.

"There are only two possible explanations," he said, "for the still rather obscure origin of the book. Either, as the agent insists, it really emanates from Liebknecht, who has refused to give a specimen of his handwriting in order that there should be no proof of his treachery."

W. Liebknecht is well known as a member of the "Marx party". But it is no less well known that the signature in the minute-book does not belong to W. Liebknecht. In the sitting on October 27 Stieber therefore swore that the signature was not that of W. Liebknecht but of another Liebknecht, an H. Liebknecht. He had learnt of the existence of this double without being able however to disclose the source of his discovery. Goldheim swore: "Fleury asserted that he had really received the book from a member of the 'Marx party' called H. Liebknecht." Goldheim swore further: "I was not able to catch hold of the said H. Liebknecht in London." Up to now, therefore, what signs of life has the H. Liebknecht that Stieber has discovered given to the world in general and to Police Lieutenant Goldheim in particular? No sign of life other than his handwriting in the original minute-book; but now Goldheim declares: "Liebknecht has refused to give a specimen of his handwriting."

Up to the present H. Liebknecht existed only as a signature. Now nothing remains of H. Liebknecht at all, not even a signature, not even the dot on the i. How Goldheim could possibly know that H. Liebknecht's handwriting differs from the handwriting in the minute-book, when the handwriting in the minute-book is his only proof of H. Liebknecht's existence, that is Goldheim's secret. If Stieber has his miracles, why should not Goldheim have his miracles too?

Goldheim forgot that his superior, Stieber, had sworn to H. Liebknecht's existence before him, and that he too had just sworn to it. In the same breath in which he swears to H. Liebknecht he recollects that H. Liebknecht is nothing but a makeshift, invented by Stieber, a necessary fib and necessity knows no law. He remembers that there is but one genuine Liebknecht, W. Liebknecht, but that if
W. Liebknecht is genuine then the signature in the minute-book is a forgery. He cannot confess that Fleury's subagent Hirsch had manufactured the false signature along with the false minute-book. Accordingly he invents the hypothesis: "Liebknecht has refused to give a specimen signature." Let us likewise construct a hypothesis. Goldheim once forged banknotes. He is brought before the courts; it is proved that the signature on the banknote is not that of the bank director. Don't take offence, gentlemen, Goldheim will say, don't take offence. The banknote is genuine. It comes from the bank director himself. If his name appears signed by someone other than him what does that matter? "He merely refused to give a specimen of his handwriting."

Or, Goldheim continues, if the hypothesis with Liebknecht turns out to be false: "Or the agent Fleury obtained the notes for the book from Dronke and Imandt, two other émigré friends of Marx, and then put them in the form of an original minute-book in order to increase the value of his commodity. Police Lieutenant Greif has officially stated that Dronke and Imandt frequently consorted with Fleury."

Or? How so, or? If a book like the original minute-book is signed by three people, Liebknecht, Rings and Ulmer, no one will deduce that "it emanates either from Liebknecht"—or from Dronke and Imandt, but: It emanates either from Liebknecht or from Rings and from Ulmer. Should our unfortunate Goldheim, now that he has climbed to the dizzy heights of a disjunction—either—or—should he now repeat: "Rings and Ulmer have refused to give specimens of their handwriting"? Even Goldheim realises the need for new tactics.

If the original minute-book does not emanate from Liebknecht, as the agent Fleury claimed, then it must have been manufactured by Fleury himself, but the notes for it were provided by Dronke and Imandt of whom Police Lieutenant Greif has officially stated that they frequently consorted with Fleury.

"To increase the value of his commodity," says Goldheim, Fleury put the notes in the form of an original minute-book. He not only commits a fraud, he also forges signatures and all this to "increase the value of his commodity". So scrupulous a man as this Prussian agent, who for profit manufactures forged minutes and forged signatures, is obviously incapable of manufacturing forged notes. Such is Goldheim's inference.

Dronke and Imandt did not come to London until April 1852, after they had been expelled by the Swiss authorities. However, one-third of the original minute-book consists of entries for the
months of January, February and March 1852. Fleury therefore manufactured one-third of the original minute-book without Dronke and Imandt although Goldheim had sworn that the minute-book was written either by Liebknecht—or else by Fleury, following, however, the notes of Dronke and Imandt. Goldheim swore to it, and Goldheim it is true is no Brutus a but he is Goldheim.

But the possibility still remains that Dronke and Imandt furnished Fleury with notes from April onwards for, Goldheim swore: "Police Lieutenant Greif has officially stated that Dronke and Imandt frequently consorted with Fleury."

Let us examine this association.

As we have noted above Fleury was known in London not as a Prussian police agent but as a businessman in the City, and indeed as a democratic businessman. Born in Altenburg he had come to London as a political refugee, had later married an English woman from a wealthy and respected family and apparently enjoyed a quiet life with his wife and his father-in-law, an old Quaker industrialist. On October 8 or 9 Imandt began to "consort frequently" with Fleury, in the capacity, that is, of tutor. But according to the improved version of Stieber's evidence the original minute-book arrived in Cologne on October 10—according to Goldheim's final statement on the 11th. By the time that Imandt, whom he had never set eyes on till then, had given him his first French lesson, Fleury had not only had the original minute-book bound in red morocco leather, he had already entrusted it to the special courier who brought it to Cologne. So heavily did Fleury rely on Imandt's notes when writing the original minute-book. As for Dronke, Fleury only saw him once and by chance with Imandt, and this was on October 30 by which time the original minute-book had long since dissolved into its original nothingness.

Thus the Christian-Germanic government is not content with breaking into desks, stealing papers, obtaining false testimony by underhand means, creating false plots, forging false documents, swearing false oaths, and attempting to suborn witnesses—all this to bring about the condemnation of the Cologne defendants. The government attempts also to cast suspicion on the London friends of the accused so as to conceal the activities of their Hirsch now

---

a Cf. Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, Act III, Scene 2, "Brutus is an honourable man".—Ed.
that Stieber has sworn that he does not know him and Goldheim has sworn that he is no spy.

On Friday, November 5, the Kölnische Zeitung arrived in London with the report of the court sitting on November 3 and Goldheim's evidence. Inquiries about Greif were made at once and the very same day it was learnt that he lived in Fleury's house. At the same time Dronke and Imandt paid Fleury a visit taking with them a copy of the Kölnische Zeitung. They gave him Goldheim's testimony to read. He went pale, tried to regain his composure, pretended to be utterly astonished and declared himself perfectly willing to make a statement against Goldheim before an English magistrate. But he said he must consult his solicitor first. They agreed to meet the following afternoon, Saturday, November 6. Fleury promised to have his statement officially witnessed and said he would bring it to the meeting. Of course, he did not appear. Imandt and Dronke then went to his house on Saturday evening and found there the following note addressed to Imandt:

"With the solicitor's help everything has been arranged; further steps can be taken as soon as the person in question has been found. The solicitor sent the relevant documents off today. Business commitments have made it imperative for me to go to the City. If you would like to visit me tomorrow I shall be at home the whole afternoon until 5 o'clock. Fl."

On the other side of the note there was the following postscript:

"I have just arrived home but had to go out again with Herr Werner and my wife—I can prove this to you tomorrow. Leave me a note saying when you would like to come."

Imandt left the following reply:

"I am extremely surprised not to find you at home now, especially as you did not come to meet us this afternoon as arranged. I must confess that in the circumstances my opinion of you is already fixed. If you wish me to revise it you will visit me by tomorrow morning at the latest for I cannot guarantee that your activities as a Prussian police spy might not find their way into the English newspapers. Imandt."

Fleury did not appear on Sunday morning either, so in the evening Dronke and Imandt went to his house once again in order to obtain his statement by making it appear as if their confidence in him had only at first been shaken. Finally, after all sorts of procrastinations and doubts the statement was formulated. Fleury hesitated most when it was pointed out to him that he must sign with his Christian name as well as his surname. The statement went literally as follows:
“To the editors of the Kölnische Zeitung

The undersigned declares that he has known Herr Imandt for about a month during which time the latter gave him tuition in the French language and that he met Herr Dronke for the first time on Saturday, October 30 of this year.

He declares further that neither of them gave him any information in connection with the minute-book mentioned in the Cologne trial.

That he does not know of any person by the name of Liebknecht nor has he ever been in contact with anyone of that name.


Charles Fleury”

Dronke and Imandt were, of course, quite sure that Fleury would instruct the Kölnische Zeitung not to print any statement signed by him. Accordingly they sent his statement not to the Kölnische Zeitung but to Schneider II, the lawyer, who however received it when the case was too far advanced for him to make use of it.

Fleury is not indeed the Fleur de Marie of the police prostitutes, but he is a flower* and he will bear blossom, albeit only fleurs-de-lys.*

But the story of the minute-book is not yet finished.

On Saturday, November 6, W. Hirsch of Hamburg made an affidavit before the magistrate at Bow Street, London, to the effect that under the direction of Greif and Fleury he himself had fabricated the original minute-book that figured in the Cologne communist trial.

Thus, it had at first been the original minute-book of the “Marx party”—after that it was the notebook of the police spy Fleury—and lastly it became the manufacture of the Prussian police, a simple police manufacture, a police manufacture sans phrase.

On the same day that Hirsch revealed the secret of the original minute-book to the English magistrate at Bow Street another representative of the Prussian state was busy packing at Fleury’s house in Kensington, and this time the things he was packing in stout oil-cloth were neither stolen nor forged nor even documents at all, but his own personal belongings. And this bird was none other than Greif that whom we remember from Paris, the special courier to Cologne, the chief of the Prussian police agents in London, the official director of mystifications, the Police Lieutenant attached to the Prussian Embassy. Greif had received instructions from the

* Fleurs-de-lys [lilies] is the French colloquial name of the letters T. F. (travaux forcés, forced labour), the brand-mark of criminals. The accuracy of Marx’s judgment is demonstrated in the Postscript (VIII, 1). [Note by Engels to the edition of 1885.]

a A pun: Fleur de Marie—the heroine in Eugène Sue’s novel Les mystères de Paris, fleur—a flower.—Ed.

b The word “Greif” means griffin.—Ed.
Prussian government to leave London at once. There was no time to be wasted.

Just as at the end of spectacular operas the rising amphitheatrical set in the background that had previously been obscured by curtains now suddenly flares up in a blaze of Bengal light dazzling all eyes, so too at the end of this Prussian police tragicomedy the hidden amphitheatrical workshop was revealed in which the original minute-book was forged. On the lowest level could be seen the wretched spy Hirsch working at piece rates; a little higher up was the respectfully situated spy and agent provocateur, the City businessman Fleury; higher still the diplomatic Police Lieutenant Greif and highest of all the Prussian Embassy itself to which he was attached. For 6-8 months Hirsch had laboured week by week to forge the original minute-book in Fleury's study and under his watchful eyes. But one floor above Fleury dwelt the Prussian Police Lieutenant Greif, who supervised and inspired him. However, Greif himself regularly spent a part of his day in the Prussian Embassy, where he in his turn was supervised and inspired. Thus the Prussian Embassy was the real hothouse where the original minute-book grew and flowered. Hence Greif had to disappear. He disappeared on November 6, 1852.

The authenticity of the original minute-book could not be sustained any longer, not even as a notebook. The Public Prosecutor, Saedt, buried it in the address he gave in reply to the concluding speeches by Counsel for the Defence.

The trial had now reached the point at which the Indictment Board of the Court of Appeal had begun when it ordered a new investigation because "there was no factual evidence of an indictable offence".

V

THE LETTER ACCOMPANYING THE RED CATECHISM

In his evidence during the sitting on October 27 Police Inspector Junkermann of Crefeld said that

"he confiscated a parcel containing copies of the Red Catechism; it was addressed to the waiter in an inn in Crefeld and bore a Düsseldorf post mark. It contained also an accompanying letter which was unsigned. It has not been possible to identify the sender." "As the prosecution has pointed out, the accompanying letter appeared to be written in Marx's hand."

---

a The Basle edition of 1853 included this sentence: "The scandal that awaited him in London rebounded upon the Prussian Embassy." — Ed.

b [M. Hess,] Rother Kathedismus für das deutsche Volk. — Ed.
In the sitting on October 28 the expert (???) Renard discovered that the letter was in fact in Marx's handwriting. This accompanying letter said:

"Citizen! As we have complete confidence in you, we herewith present you with 50 copies of the Red. Your task is to push them under the doors of citizens—preferably workers—who are known to sympathise with the Revolution, on Saturday, June 5, at eleven o'clock at night. We are definitely counting on your civic virtues and accordingly expect you to carry out this instruction. The Revolution is closer than many people think. Long live the Revolution!

"Berlin, May 1852

With Fraternal Greetings.

The Revolutionary Committee"

Witness Junkermann declared further that "the parcels in question had been sent to the witness Chianella".

Chief Commissioner of Police Hinckeldey of Berlin was the Supreme Commander in charge of operations against the accused in Cologne during the preliminary investigations. The laurels won by Maupas prevented him from sleeping.

The actors in the proceedings include two Chiefs of Police, one alive and one dead, one superintendent (only one, but that one a Stieber), two police lieutenants one of whom was constantly en route from London to Cologne, the other constantly journeying from Cologne to London, myriads of police agents and subagents, named, anonymous, heteronymous, pseudonymous, with tails and without. Lastly an Inspector of Police.

No sooner had the Kölnische Zeitung arrived in London with the evidence heard on October 27 and 28 than Marx went to the magistrate in Marlborough Street, where he copied out from the newspaper the text of the accompanying letter and had the copy witnessed, and at the same time the following affidavit:

1. That he had not written the letter in question;
2. that he had only learnt of its existence from the Kölnische Zeitung;
3. that he had never seen the so-called Red Catechism;
4. that he had never helped in any way at all to distribute it.

It may be pointed out in passing that if such a declaration made before a magistrate is found to be false, then it counts as perjury in England with all the consequences attendant thereupon.

The above document was sent to Schneider II but it appeared simultaneously in the London Morning Advertiser as the conviction had gained ground during the trial that as regards the observance of

---

a See this volume, pp. 380-81.—Ed.
the secrecy of correspondence the Prussian post seems to have the strange notion that letters entrusted to its care must be kept secret from the addressee. The prosecution objected to the submission of the document, even for purposes of comparison. For the prosecution was aware that a single glance from the original accompanying letter to the officially attested copy by Marx would reveal the deception, the deliberate imitation of his handwriting could not remain hidden even from such a sharpsighted jury as this. Therefore, in order to defend the morality of the Prussian state, the prosecution denounced any attempt at comparison.

Schneider II observed

"that Chianella, the addressee who had freely given information to the police about the supposed identity of the sender and who had even offered to act as a spy, had not in the remotest degree thought of Marx in this connection."

No one who has ever read a single line by Marx could possibly attribute to him the authorship of this melodramatic accompanying letter. The midnight dream hour in summer on June 5, and the officiously graphic procedure of pushing the Red under the doors of the revolutionary philistines—that could perhaps point to Kinkel’s turn of mind, just as the references to “civic virtues” and the way in which they are “definitely counting on” this military “instruction being carried out” seem to reflect the imagination of a Willich. But why should Kinkel-Willich write their prescriptions for revolution in Marx’s hand?

If it is permissible to form a hypothesis about the “as yet somewhat obscure origins” of this accompanying letter written in an imitated hand: the police found the 50 Reds in Crefeld as well as the convenient, high sounding accompanying letter. In Cologne or in Berlin qu’importe? they had the text copied in Marx’s handwriting. For what purpose? “So as to increase the value of their commodity.”

However, even the Chief Public Prosecutor did not dare to revert to the accompanying letter in his catilinarian speech. He let it drop. Hence it did not assist in ascertaining the still missing “indictable offence”.

VI

THE WILLICH-SCHAPPER GROUP

With the defeat of the revolution of 1848-49 the party of the proletariat on the Continent lost use of the press, freedom of speech and the right to associate, i.e. the legal instruments of party

---

a Cf. Shakespeare, A Midsummer Night’s Dream.—Ed.
b Marcus Tullius Cicero, Orationes in Luctum Catilinam.—Ed.
organisation, which it had enjoyed for once during that short interval. The social status of the classes they represented enabled both the bourgeois-liberal and the petty-bourgeois democratic parties to remain united in one form or another and to assert their common interests more or less effectively despite the reaction. After 1849 just as before 1848, only one path was open to the proletarian party—that of secret association. Consequently after 1849 a whole series of clandestine proletarian societies sprang up on the Continent, were discovered by the police, condemned by the courts, broken up by the gaols and continually resuscitated by the force of circumstances.

Some of these secret societies aimed directly at the overthrow of the existing state. This was fully justified in France where the proletariat had been defeated by the bourgeoisie and hence attacking the existing government and attacking the bourgeoisie were one and the same thing: Other secret societies aimed at organising the proletariat into a party, without concerning themselves with the existing governments. This was necessary in countries like Germany where both bourgeoisie and proletariat had succumbed to their semi-feudal governments and where in consequence a victorious assault on the existing governments, instead of breaking the power of the bourgeoisie or in any case of the so-called middle classes, would at first help them to gain power. There is no doubt that here too the members of the proletarian party would take part once again in a revolution against the status quo, but it was no part of their task to prepare this revolution, to agitate, conspire or to plot for it. They could leave this preparation to circumstances in general and to the classes directly involved. They had to leave it to them if they were not to abandon the position of their own party and the historic tasks that follow of themselves from the conditions governing the existence of the proletariat. For them the contemporary governments were but ephemeral phenomena, the status quo a brief stopping place and the task of toiling away at it could be left to the petty narrow-minded democrats.

The "Communist League", therefore, was no conspiratorial society, but a society which secretly strove to create an organised proletarian party because the German proletariat is publicly debarred, igni et aqua, from writing, speaking and meeting. Such a society can only be said to conspire against the status quo in the sense that steam and electricity conspire against it.

---

\[\text{Igni et aqua interdictus (deprived of fire and water)—the formula of banishment in ancient Rome.—Ed.}\]
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It is self-evident that a secret society of this kind which aims at forming not the government party of the future but the opposition party of the future could have but few attractions for individuals who on the one hand concealed their personal insignificance by strutting around in the theatrical cloak of the conspirator, and on the other wished to satisfy their narrow-minded ambition on the day of the next revolution, and who wished above all to seem important at the moment, to snatch their share of the proceeds of demagogy and to find a welcome among the quacks and charlatans of democracy.

Thus a group broke off from the Communist League, or if you like it was broken off, a group that demanded, if not real conspiracies, at any rate the appearance of conspiracies, and accordingly called for a direct alliance with the democratic heroes of the hour: this was the Willich-Schapper group. It was typical of them that Willich was, together with Kinkel, one of the entrepreneurs in the business of the German-American revolutionary loan.\footnote{See this volume, p. 325.—Ed.}

Such in short is the relation of this party to the majority of the Communist League, to which the Cologne defendants belonged. Bürgers and Röser defined it succinctly and exhaustively in the proceedings of the Cologne Assizes.

Let us pause before finally bringing our narrative to a close in order to take a glance at the behaviour of the Willich-Schapper group during the Cologne trial.

As was pointed out above, the data contained in the documents purloined from the group by Stieber make it plain that their documents contrived to find their way to the police even after Reuter's theft. To this day the group has failed to give an explanation of this phenomenon.

Schapper knew the facts about Cherval's past better than anyone. He knew that Cherval had entered the League on his nomination in 1846 and not on that of Marx in 1848, etc. By his silence he gives confirmation to Stieber's lies.

The group knew that Haacke, who was their member, had written the threatening letter to the witness, Haupt; but it allows the suspicion to remain on the heads of the party of the accused.

\textit{Moses Hess}, a member of the group and the author of the \textit{Red Catechism}\footnote{See this volume, p. 325.—Ed.}—that unfortunate parody of the \textit{Manifesto of the Communist Party}—Moses Hess, who not only writes but also distributes his own works, knew exactly to whom he had delivered parcels of his \textit{Red}. He knew that Marx had not deprived him of his profusion of \textit{Reds} to the extent of even a single copy. But Moses
calmly let suspicion fall on the accused, as if it were their party that had hawked his Red, together with its melodramatic accompanying letter, in the Rhine Province.

That the group made common cause with the Prussian police is apparent not only in their silence but also in their utterances: whenever they entered the trial it was not in the dock with the accused, but as "witnesses for the Crown".

*Hentze*, Willich's friend and benefactor, who admitted that he knew about the activities of the League, spent a few weeks in London with Willich and then journeyed to Cologne where he falsely testified that Becker (against whom there was far less evidence than against himself) had been a member of the League in 1848.

*Hättzel*, as the Dietz archive reveals, was a member of the group and received financial support from it. He had already been put on trial in Berlin for his association with the League and now he appeared as a witness for the prosecution. His testimony was false for he invented a wholly fictitious connection between the Rules of the League and the exceptional arming of the Berlin proletariat during the revolution.

*Steingens*, whose own letters proved (in the sitting on October 18) that he was the group's chief agent in Brussels, appeared in Cologne not as a defendant, but as a witness.

Not long before the court action in Cologne Willich and Kinkel sent a journeyman tailor as emissary to Germany. Kinkel is not indeed a member of the group but Willich was co-director of the German-American revolutionary loan.

Kinkel was at that time already threatened by the danger, which was later to become a reality, of seeing himself and Willich removed by the London guarantors from control of the loan moneys and seeing the money itself drift back to America despite the indignant protests of Willich and himself. Kinkel was just then in need of the pseudo-mission to Germany and a pseudo-correspondence with Germany, partly in order to demonstrate that an area still existed there for his revolutionary activities and the American dollars, and partly to provide a pretext for the enormous costs of the correspondence, postal expenses, etc., that he and Willich managed to charge to the account (see Count O. Reichenbach's lithographed circular). Kinkel knew he had no contacts either with the bourgeois liberals or with the petty-bourgeois democrats in Germany. As he could not afford to be particular he used an emissary of the group as the emissary of the German-American Revolutionary League.285

---

a August Gebert.— Ed.
This emissary's sole function was to promote antagonism among the workers towards the party of the accused in Cologne. It must be admitted that the moment was well chosen and it offered a new pretext in the nick of time to reopen the investigation. The Prussian police had been fully apprised of the emissary's identity, of the day of his departure and of his route. Who thus apprised them? We shall see. Their spies were present at the secret meetings he held in Magdeburg and they reported on the debates. The friends of the Cologne accused in Germany and in London trembled.

We have already narrated how on November 6 Hirsch went before the magistrate at Bow Street and admitted to having forged the original minute-book under the guidance of Greif and Fleury. It was Willich who induced him to take this step, and it was Willich and Schärttner the innkeeper who accompanied him to the magistrate. Three copies were made of Hirsch's confession and these were sent through the post to various addresses in Cologne.

It was of supreme importance to arrest Hirsch as soon as he left the court. With the aid of the officially witnessed statement in his possession it would have been possible for the case lost in Cologne to be won in London. If not for the accused, at any rate against the government. However, Willich did everything in his power to make such a step impossible. He observed the strictest silence not only towards the "Marx party", which was directly involved, but also towards his own people and even towards Schapper. Schärttner alone was taken into his confidence. Schärttner declared that he and Willich had accompanied Hirsch to the ship, for according to Willich's scheme Hirsch was to give evidence against himself in Cologne.

Willich informed Hirsch of the route by which the documents had been sent, Hirsch informed the Prussian Embassy, and the Prussian Embassy informed the post. The documents did not arrive at their destination; they disappeared. Some time after this, Hirsch, who had also vanished, re-appeared in London and declared at a public meeting of democrats that Willich was his accomplice.

Although it had been on a motion from Willich that Hirsch had been expelled as a spy from the Great Windmill Street Society in 1851, Willich admitted, when questioned, that he had resumed relations with Hirsch at the beginning of August 1852. For Hirsch had revealed to him that Fleury was a Prussian spy and had apprised him of all of Fleury's incoming and outgoing correspondence. He, Willich, made use of this to keep himself informed of the activities of the Prussian police.

It was notorious that Willich had been on terms of intimate
friendship with Fleury for about a year, and he had received assistance from him. But if Willich knew since August 1852 that he was a Prussian spy and if he was likewise familiar with his activities how was it possible that he should have remained ignorant of the original minute-book?

That he did not intervene until the Prussian government itself disclosed that Fleury was a spy?

That he intervened in a way which at best caused the removal of his ally Hirsch from England and of the officially witnessed proofs of Fleury’s guilt from the hands of the “Marx party”?

That he continued to receive assistance from Fleury, who boasts that he has in his possession Willich’s receipt for £15 sterling?

That Fleury continued to be actively engaged in the German-American revolutionary loan?

That he informed Fleury of the meeting place of his own secret society so that Prussian agents in the next room could make records of the debates?

That he revealed to Fleury the route of the above-mentioned emissary, the journeyman tailor, and that he even received money from Fleury towards the costs of this mission?

That, lastly, he told Fleury that he had instructed Hentze, who lived with him, how he should testify against Becker at the trial in Cologne?* It must be admitted—que tout cela n’est pas bien clair.a

VII

JUDGMENT.288

As the police mysteries were gradually explained, public opinion declared itself increasingly in favour of the defendants. When it became apparent that the original minute-book was a fraud an acquittal was generally expected. The Kölnische Zeitung felt induced to defer to public opinion and to dissociate itself from the

* As to relations between Willich and Becker:

“Willich writes me the funniest letters; I do not reply, but this does not prevent him from describing his latest plans for a revolution. He has appointed me to revolutionise the Cologne garrison!!! The other day we laughed till the tears came. His idiocy will spell disaster for countless people yet; for a single letter would suffice to guarantee the salaries of a hundred Demagogue judges for three years. As soon as I have completed the revolution in Cologne he would have no objection to assuming the leadership for all subsequent operations. Very kind of him!” (From a letter by Becker to Marx, January 27, 1851.) [Note by Marx.287]

a All that is not exactly clear (Beaumarchais, La folle journée, ou le mariage de Figaro, Act V, Scene 16).—Ed.
government. Little items favourable to the defendants and casting suspicion on Stieber suddenly found their way into columns that had earlier contained nothing but police insinuations. Even the Prussian government threw in the sponge. Its correspondents in The Times and The Morning Chronicle suddenly began to prepare public opinion abroad for an unfavourable outcome. Monstrous and destructive as the teachings of the defendants were, horrifying as were the documents found in their possession, conclusive evidence of a conspiracy was nevertheless wanting and a conviction was therefore unlikely. So low-spirited and discouraged did the Berlin correspondent of The Times write, who obsequiously echoed the fears that were circulating in the upper circles of the city on the Spree. All the more extravagant then was the rejoicing of the Byzantine court and its eunuchs when the electric telegraph flashed its message of the jury’s verdict of “Guilty” from Cologne to Berlin.

With the unmasking of the minute-book the case had advanced to a new stage. The jury was no longer free merely to find the defendants guilty or not guilty; they must either find the defendants guilty—or the government. To acquit the accused would mean condemning the government.

Replying to the summing-up for the defence, Public Prosecutor Saedt abandoned the original minute-book. He was unwilling to make use of a document on which such a slur had been cast, he himself thought that it was “unauthentic”, it was an “unfortunate” book, it had resulted in much time being wasted, it added nothing factual to the case, Stieber’s praiseworthy zeal had led in this instance to his being deceived, etc.

But the prosecution itself had maintained in its indictment that there was “much that was true” in the book. Far from declaring it spurious the prosecution had regretted only that it could not prove it to be authentic. But if the original minute-book was not authentic though Stieber had sworn to its authenticity, Cherval’s statement in Paris was invalidated despite Stieber’s sworn testimony, and to this statement Saedt had returned in his summing-up; indeed all the material evidence accumulated by the most strenuous efforts of all the authorities of the Prussian state for 1½ years was invalidated at one stroke. The court sitting set down for July 28 was postponed for three months. Why? Because Chief of Police Schulz had been taken ill. And who was Schulz? The original discoverer of the original

---

a The reference is to the item: “Prussia (From Our Own Correspondent)”, Berlin, November 7, which was published in The Times, No. 21270, November 11, 1852.—Ed.

b A pun: instead of aufgestöbert (accumulated), Marx uses aufgestiebert—an allusion to Stieber.—Ed.
minute-book. Let us go back even further. In January and February 1852, Frau Dr. Daniels’ house had been searched. On what grounds? On the grounds discovered in the first few pages of the original minute-book that Fleury had sent to Schulz, that Schulz had sent to the police authorities in Cologne, that the police authorities in Cologne had sent to the examining magistrate, that led the examining magistrate to the house of Frau Dr. Daniels.

In October 1851, despite the Cherval conspiracy, the Indictment Board was still unable to discover the missing indictable offence and on instructions from the Ministry it therefore ordered a new investigation. Who was in charge of this investigation? Chief of Police Schulz. It was therefore Schulz’s task to discover the offence. What did Schulz discover? The original minute-book. The only new material he provided was limited to the loose leaves of the minute-book which on Stieber’s orders were later completed and bound. Twelve months’ solitary confinement for the accused simply to give the original minute-book the time necessary to be born and to grow. “Bagatelles!” Saedt exclaims and finds evidence of the guilt of the accused in the mere fact that it took them and their counsel eight days to clean out an Augean stable that all the authorities of the Prussian state had needed $1\frac{1}{2}$ years to fill while the accused had to remain $1\frac{1}{2}$ years in gaol. The original minute-book was no mere single item of evidence; it was the focal point where all the threads spun by the various Prussian governmental authorities met—embassy and police, ministry and magistracy, prosecution and postal authorities, London, Berlin and Cologne. The original minute-book meant so much to the case that it was invented in order that a case might be made out. Couriers, telegrams, the intercepting of letters, arrests, perjuries to support the original minute-book, forgeries to bring it into existence, attempted bribery to authenticate it. When the mystery of the original minute-book was revealed the mystery of the whole monster trial was revealed with it.

The miracles performed by the police were originally necessary to conceal the completely political nature of the trial. “The revelations you are about to witness, Gentlemen of the Jury,” said Saedt when opening for the prosecution, “will prove to you that this trial is not a political trial.” But now he emphasises its political character so that the police revelations should be forgotten. After the $1\frac{1}{2}$-year preliminary investigation the jury needed objective evidence in order to justify itself before public opinion. After the five-week-long police comedy they needed “politics pure and simple” to extricate themselves from the sheer mess. Saedt therefore did not only confine himself to the material that had led the Indictment Board to
the conclusion that "there was no factual evidence of an indictable offence". He went even further. He attempted to prove that the law against conspiracy does not require any indictable action, but is simply a law with a political purpose, and the category of conspiracy is therefore merely a pretext for burning political heretics in a legal way. The success of his attempt promised to be all the greater because of the decision to apply the new Prussian Penal Code that had been promulgated after the accused had been arrested. On the pretext that this code contained extenuating provisions the servile court was able to permit its retroactive application.

But if it was simply a political trial why a preliminary investigation lasting 1½ years? For political reasons.

As it is therefore a question of politics are we to engage in a fundamental discussion of politics with a Saedt-Stieber-Seckendorf, with a Göbel, with a Prussian government, with the 300 most highly taxed people in the district of Cologne, with the Royal Chamberlain von Münch-Bellinghausen and with the Freiherr von Fürstenberg? *Pas si bête.*

Saedt admits (in the sitting on November 8) that

"when some few months ago, the Chief Public Prosecutor commissioned him to join him in representing the prosecution in this affair, and when, as a result, he began to read through the files he first hit upon the idea of making a somewhat more thorough study of communism and socialism. He felt impelled to impart the results of his studies to the jury, especially since he thought he might proceed on the assumption that many of them like himself may have not greatly concerned themselves with the subject hitherto."

So Saedt bought the well-known compendium by Stein. *b*  
And what he has learnt today,  
he'll teach to others tomorrow. *c*

But the prosecution was afflicted by a singular misfortune. It sought objective evidence for a case against Marx and found objective evidence for the case Cherval. It went in search of the communism propagated by the defendants and found the communism they combated. Various sorts of communism can indeed be found in Stein's compendium, but not the sort Saedt was seeking. Stein had not yet recorded German, critical communism. It is true that Saedt has in his possession a copy of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* that the defendants recognise as the manifesto of their party. This *Manifesto* contains a chapter devoted to a criticism of the whole previous literature of socialism and communism, i.e. of

---

*a* We are not that stupid.—*Ed.*  
*b* L. Stein, *Der Socialismus und Communismus des heutigen Frankreichs.*—*Ed.*  
*c* Schiller, "Die Sonntagskinder" (paraphrased).—*Ed.*
the whole of the wisdom recorded in Stein. From this chapter the distinction between the kind of communism propounded by the defendants and all previous kinds must become apparent; that is to say the specific content and the specific political tendency of the theory against which Saedt seeks to act. But no Stein will help him over this stumbling-block. Here understanding was essential, if only in order to prosecute. How did Saedt manage when Stein left him in the lurch? He claimed:

"The Manifesto consists of three sections. The first section contains a historical account of the social status of the various citizens (!) from the communist point of view" (very fine). "...The second section expounds the communist point of view vis-à-vis the proletariat.... Lastly, the final section treats of the position of the Communists in different countries...." (!) (Sitting of November 6.)

Now in fact the Manifesto consists of four sections, not of three, but what the eye does not see the heart does not grieve over. Saedt claims therefore that there are three sections and not four. The section which for him does not exist is that same accursed section with the critique of communism as recorded by Stein, that is to say the section that contains the specific brand of communism advocated by the defendants. Poor Saedt! First he cannot find an indictable offence, and now he cannot find indictable political views.

But "grey, dear friend, is every theory".

"In recent times," as Saedt observed, "competent and incompetent people have been concerned with the so-called social question and its solution."

Saedt at any rate belongs to the competent, for three months ago the Chief Public Prosecutor, Seckendorf, officially authorised him to study socialism and communism. The Saedts of all times and all places have from time immemorial unanimously declared that Galileo was "incompetent" to explore the movements of the heavenly bodies, but that the inquisitor who accused him of heresy was "competent" to do so. E pur si muove.*

* Saedt was not only "competent". He was moreover—as a reward for his performance in this trial—appointed Chief Public Prosecutor for the Rhine Province and remained in this post until he was pensioned, and afterwards, provided with the holy sacraments, he passed on. [Note by Engels to the edition of 1885.]

---

a A pun on the name Stein and the phrase Stein des Anstosses (stumbling-block).—Ed.
b Marx uses the English words "very fine".—Ed.
c Goethe, Faust, Erster Teil, "Studierzimmer".—Ed.
d A pun on berufen—competent, authorised, appointed, called upon, and unberufen—incompetent, unauthorised, etc.—Ed.
e But it does move.—Ed.
The defendants, who represented the revolutionary proletariat, stood defenceless before the ruling classes who were represented by the jury; the defendants therefore were condemned because they stood before this jury. What could, for a moment, move the bourgeois conscience of the jury, just as it had deeply disturbed public opinion, was the unmasking of the intrigues of the government, the corruption of the Prussian government that had been laid bare before their eyes. But, the members of the jury reasoned, if the Prussian government could risk using such infamous and at the same time such foolhardy methods against the accused, if it could, as it were, stake its European reputation, then the accused must be damnably dangerous, however small their party, and their theories in any case must be a real power. The government has violated every law in the penal code in order to protect us from these monstrous criminals. Let us for our part sacrifice our little point d'honneur to save the government's honour. Let us be thankful and let us condemn.

With their verdict of Guilty the Rhenish nobility and the Rhenish bourgeoisie joined in the cry uttered by the French bourgeoisie after December 2: "Property can be saved only by theft, religion only by perjury, the family only by bastardy, order only by disorder!"

In France the whole political edifice has prostituted itself. And yet no institution prostituted itself so deeply as French courts of law and French juries. Let us surpass the French judges and jurymen, the judge and jury exclaimed in Cologne. In the Cherval case immediately after the coup d'état the Paris jury acquitted Nette though there was more evidence against him than against any one of the accused [in Cologne]. Let us surpass the jury of the coup d'état of December 2. Let us, in condemning Röser, Bürgers, etc., also condemn Nette retrospectively.

Thus the superstitious faith in the jury, still rampant in Rhenish Prussia, was broken. People realised that the jury was a court-martial of the privileged classes; it was created to bridge the gaps in the law with the broad bourgeois conscience.

Jena! That is the final outcome of a government that requires such methods in order to survive and of a society that needs such a government for its protection. The word that should stand at the end of the communist trial in Cologne is ... Jena!
My predictions on the eventful results of the renewed party struggle in Parliament have been realized. At the opening of the session the opposition commanded a negative majority against ministers; but the several conflicting fractions which composed that majority have, since then, mutually paralyzed each other. The House of Commons, on the 26th of November, when it adopted, instead of the “radical” free trade resolution of Mr. Villiers, the equivocal amendment of Lord Palmerston, offered the spectacle of universal and mutual cheating, of the general dissolution and dislocation of all the old parliamentary parties.

The resolution of Mr. Villiers, which designed the act of 1846 as “wise and just,” was drawn up without the knowledge of Cobden and Bright, the free traders par excellence. The Whigs had resolved to act for the interests of the free traders, without conceding to them either the initiative or any share in the Government, after the presumed victory. Russell, the original author of the words “wise and just,” so offensive to the ministry, gave his consent to the Graham amendment; the Peelites, joined by the Ministerialists, tendered a proposition which recognizes the expediency of free trade for the future, and denies it in the past, leaving the Tories at liberty to compensate for the losses sustained by the act of Sir Robert Peel; the same Peelites rejected the amendment of Disraeli, and reassuming their own proposition, prepared to support the original free trade resolution; the Whigs, on the very eve of triumph, routed by the appearance of

---

a See this volume, pp. 369-77.—Ed.
b On November 4, 1852.—Ed.
Palmerston, who took up the amendment of Graham, and thus, with the assistance of the Peelites, secured the victory to the Ministerialists; finally, the victory itself, won by a protectionist ministry, consisted in the recognition of free trade, and was opposed by none but the fifty-three most decided adherents of their own party. Such an imbroglio of false positions, party intrigues, Parliamentary maneuvers, mutual treasons, &c., is the résumé of the debate on the 26th, in which the policy of free trade was officially acknowledged, but interpreted by Protectionists, represented by Protectionists, and to be carried out by Protectionists.

In a former letter, written before the commencement of the session, I indicated already that Disraeli, after dropping himself, in his electioneering speeches, the restoration of the Corn Laws, intended to compensate the landlords in the shape of a tax reform, which would enable the farmers to continue to pay their old Protectionist rents. By taking off the farmer's shoulders part of the present weight of taxation, and imposing it on the backs of the mass of the people, Disraeli flatters himself to have discovered a panacea for the suffering landlords far more available than the old precarious system of protection which speculated directly on the stomachs of the multitude. To speculate on their pockets—such is the ingenious plan of Mr. Disraeli, now revealed in his budget, which, on the 3d inst., he laid before the House of Commons, and the fate of which will probably be decided in this night's debate.

It is customary with German Governments and German philanthropists to talk of "measures for the elevation of the laboring classes." (Massregeln zur Hebung der arbeitenden Klassen.) Now, Mr. Disraeli's budget might not improperly be called a series of "measures for the elevation of the idle classes." However, as in the case of our German Governments and philanthropists, such measures have regularly turned out mere shams, so also the plan at present contemplated by the English Chancellor of the Exchequer for the benefit of the idle classes is a plain humbug, intended to induce the farmers the more readily to pay their actual high rents, by holding out to them an apparent reduction of their burdens, a delusion which he can only practise upon them by some evident real defraudation of the town population.

Disraeli had, for a long time, mysteriously announced his

---

a See this volume, p. 364.—Ed.
Karl Marx

budget; he had promised the world with no less than an eighth miracle. His budget was to

"put a term to the strife of interests; to end the internecine war between classes;" to
"give satisfaction to all, without damaging any of them;" to "melt the different
interests in one flourishing community;" to "create for the first time a harmony
between our commercial and financial systems, by the establishment of new
principles," looming in the future.¹

Let us now examine his revelations which no longer loom in the
future, but have already since a week been communicated to the
English Parliament and the world at large. As it behaves such
revelations of mysteries, Disraeli introduced them with the fitting
ceremonial and important-looking behavior. Peel, in his financial
statement of 1842, had spoken for two hours; Disraeli takes no
less than full five hours.² One hour he dilated in showing that the
"suffering" interests do not suffer; another one in what he did not
mean to do for them, on which occasion he contradicted Walpole's,
Packington's, Malmesbury's and his own former declarations; and
the remainder of the five hours in the exposé of the budget, and
sundry episodes on the condition of Ireland, the defense of the
country, prospective reforms in the Administration, and other
entertaining topics.

The principal features of the budget are as follows:

1. The Shipping Interest. A portion of the light dues is relaxed,
amounting to about £100,000 per annum. This is a relief of less
than sixpence per tun per annum, and cannot reach the shipping
interest before the middle of the ensuing year. The charge for
passing tolls is entirely to cease. Some of the powers of the
Admiralty, which have given offense to the merchant navy, shall
be done away with, viz.: the officers of the navy, if they enlist
seamen of foreign stations, are not to require immediate payment
of their wages—they are to furnish gratuitous assistance to vessels
in distress—and in harbor they are not to drive peaceable craft
out of the most eligible anchorage. Finally, a Committee of the

¹ Quoted from the following documents: Disraeli's address to the electors of the
County of Buckingham, March 1, 1852, published in The Times, No. 21052, March 2,
1852, under the title "The New Chancellor of the Exchequer and His Constituences";
Disraeli's speech at a dinner arranged by the electors of the County of Buckingham,
March 12, 1852 (The Times, No. 21062, March 13, 1852); Disraeli's speech in the
House of Commons, November 11, 1852 (The Times, No. 21271, November 12,
1852).—Ed.

² Disraeli's speech in the House of Commons on December 3, 1852, published in
The Times, No. 21290, December 4, 1852, under the title "The Financial
Statement".—Ed.
House of Commons is to be appointed on the subject of pilotage and ballasting. So much for the shipping interest. Lest the free traders should boast of any positive concession made to them by these provisions, the remnant of the timber duties remains as it was.

2. Colonial Interest. Leave is granted to refine sugar in bond, so that henceforth duty will be payable upon the quantity of saleable refined sugar produced, instead of upon the raw produce itself. Besides this, the Chinese immigration to the West Indies is to be encouraged to supply the planters with a sufficient number of cheap labor. The differential duties on sugar shall not be abolished.

3. Malt-Tax and Hop-Duties. The malt-tax is to be reduced by one-half, which, according to Mr. Disraeli's statement, would engender a loss of revenue amounting to £2,500,000. The hop-duties are likewise to be reduced to one-half, which would create another loss of about £300,000. These reductions are to take place on and from the 10th of October, 1853. Instead of the existing prohibition of foreign malt, and the actual duty on foreign hop, foreign hop and malt will be admitted at a duty corresponding to the excise-duty charged there.

4. Tea. The present duty shall be reduced from 2s.2½ d. to 1s. per lb. upon all qualities, but this reduction shall be effected gradually within six years, so that in 1853 there will be a reduction of 4½ d. and every following year of 2d. till the expiration of 1858. The reduction for the year 1853 would thereby amount to £400,000.

5. Property-and Income-Tax. This tax, which has only been voted until August 5, 1853, is to be renewed for three years, the amount remaining the same, but the distribution to be altered. There shall be a distinction between the charges on realized property and those on industrial income. Real properties and the funds continue to be charged at 7 pence the pound; while on industrial incomes (farmers, trades, professions, and salaries) an abatement on the charge from 3 per cent. upon 2 per cent. is projected. The latter are henceforth only to pay 5½d. in the pound. On the other hand the standard of exemption shall be lowered from £150 to £100 per annum, and upon property and funds to £50 a year. To prevent all losses to farmers by this projected change, they are to be charged at the rate of one-third of the rent, in place of one-half at present, so that the alteration will exempt all farmers renting less than £300 a year. As a boon to the Church, all parsons with an income of £100 a year shall
remain exempt from the tax. Finally, the income-tax is for the first
time to be extended to Ireland, not by any means, to the
landlords, but only as far as regards funds and salaries.

6. House-Tax.—This is to be extended to all occupiers of houses
rented at £10 per annum, instead, as formerly, only to those
occupiers of houses valued at £20 per annum. Besides, the rate of
the house-tax shall be doubled, i.e., from sixpence in the pound
on shops, and ninepence in the pound on dwelling-houses, to one
shilling and one shilling sixpence respectively.

The résumé of this budget would be—

On one side: Extension of the income-tax in England to such
classes of the town population as have hitherto been exempted
from it, and introduction of the same into Ireland for fund-
holders and public functionaries; extension of the house-tax to
such classes of the town population as were hitherto exempted
from it, and doubling of the rate of the tax. On the other side:
Diminution of the agricultural malt-tax and hop-duty by
£2,800,000; relief of the shipping interest by £100,000; reduction
of the tea-duities by £400,000.

The town population is to receive an increase of taxation in the
shape of a new income-tax, an extension of the house-tax, and a
double rate of the same, in order to relieve the rural population of
a tax-amount of £2,800,000. The small shopkeeper, the better-
paid mechanic and the commercial clerk would thus find them-
selves contributors to the house-tax, and become for the first time
subject to the income-tax. The land accordingly would have to pay
sevenpence in the pound, while dwelling-houses would pay two
shillings one penny. The reduction in the tea-duities does not
affect this proportion, its amount being comparatively very small
with regard to the increased direct taxation, and its advantages
being alike accessible to the country and to the towns.

The exemption of Irish landlords from all income-tax, of
English farmers and clergymen from the extended income-
tax, is manifestly a favor bestowed on the country at the cost
of the towns. But who is the gainer by the reduction of the
malt-tax—the landlord, the farmer, or the consumer? A reduction
of taxes is a reduction of the risks of production. According to the
laws of political economy, a reduction in the costs of production
would involve a reduction of prices, and consequently benefit
neither the landlord nor the farmer, but only the consumer.

There are, however, two circumstances to be considered in this
case. In the first place, the soil on which first-rate barley can be
grown is monopoly land in England, and restricted to Notting-
hamshire, Norfolk, etc., while the foreign supply of malt is limited by the nature of the commodity itself, neither barley nor malt being able to support long sea-voyages. Secondly, the large English brewers virtually possess a monopoly, chiefly supported by the present license system, so that even the abolition of the Corn Laws has effected no fall in the prices of porter and ale.

Thus, then, the gain on the reduction of the malt-tax would neither be in favor of the farmer nor the consumer, but only become divided between the landlords and the great brewers.—And as the odious interference of the excise with agriculture is to be maintained, the collecting of half the sum of the former taxes would continue to absorb the same amount of administrative costs as that of the whole did before. At present, the costs of collecting £14,400,000 of excise duties amount to £5 6s per cent. After the reduction of the tax by three millions, the rate would amount from £6 to £6 4s. Briefly, there would be so much less profit, and so much mischievous expense more.

The budget of Disraeli thus resumes itself into a compensation to landlords; "a compensation with a revenge."

But this budget has yet another no less interesting feature.

If you want to carry your commercial system of free trade, you have first of all to change your financial system. "You have to return from indirect taxation to direct taxation," says Disraeli, and Disraeli is right.

Direct taxation, as the most simple, is also the most ancient and first mode of taxation, contemporaneously with a state of society based on landed property. The towns afterward introduced the system of indirect taxation, but in the course of time, with the modern division of labor, the system of Great Industry, and the direct dependence of the home trade upon the foreign trade and the market of the world, the system of indirect taxation comes into a twofold conflict with the social wants. On the frontiers it becomes identical with protective duties, and disturbs or prevents the free intercourse with other countries. In the interior it is identical with fiscal interference in production—unsettles the relative value of commodities, and disturbs free competition and exchange. From both these reasons its abolition becomes a necessity. The system of direct taxation must be returned to. But direct taxation admits of no delusions, and every class perceives exactly what share it has in the contribution towards the public expenses. Nothing is therefore less popular in England than direct taxation, income-tax, property-tax, house-tax, etc. Now the question is, how the industrial classes of England, forced by free trade to adopt the system of direct taxation
will be able to introduce it without either incurring popular indignation or increasing their own burdens.

Only by three ways.

*By attacking the public debt*; but that would be a violation of public credit, confiscation, a revolutionary measure.

*By chiefly taxing the rent of land*; but that also would be an attack upon property, confiscation, a revolutionary measure.

*By re-vindicating the Church estates*; but that again is a further attack upon property, confiscation, revolutionary measure.

"By no means," says Cobden; "let us reduce the public expenses and we shall be able to reduce also our present taxation!"

This is Utopian. Firstly the international relations of England with the Continent require a perpetual increase of the national expenses; secondly, a victory of the industrial class, represented by Cobden, would have the same consequences, for the war between capital and labor would become only the more intense and the means of repression require to be increased—in other words, the budget admits of no reduction. Let me resume.

Free Trade drives towards the system of direct taxation; the system of direct taxation involves revolutionary measures against the Church, Landlords and Fund-holders; these revolutionary measures necessitate an alliance with the working classes; and this alliance deprives the English *bourgeoisie* of the principal results it expected from Free Trade, viz.: the illimited domination of capital over labor.

Written about December 10, 1852


Signed: Karl Marx

Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune
Karl Marx

A REPLY TO KOSSUTH'S "SECRETARY"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE N.-Y. TRIBUNE

London, Tuesday, December 14, 1852

Sir: It is some time since I sent you an explanation* on my late correspondence respecting the movements of Kossuth and Mazzini, which caused such a noisy outburst from the American press. This explanation—in which I stated, among other things, that Kossuth himself was a perfect stranger to the different articles called forth by my correspondence, and that my intention had been rather to give a warning, &c., than to make an attack on the parties alluded to—was all I considered necessary to say on the subject, until I received the latest American newspapers containing a sort of official refutation of my remarks from the pen of a pretended Secretary of Mr. Kossuth. With regard to this "document," I have to inform you that Kossuth, on being referred to, has assured me:

1. That, at the present time, he keeps no Secretary at all.
2. That the said "refutation" had not been written by his authorization.
3. That he had not even known of it before he received my communication.

After this "authorized" declaration I shall recur no more to the subject, leaving to the uncalled-for advocates to console themselves for their ill-applied zeal.

Your Private Correspondent

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 3656, January 4, 1853

Reproduced from the newspaper

---

* See this volume, pp. 382-83.—Ed.
\[b\] See this volume, pp. 354-56.—Ed.
I hasten to inform you of the result of last night's debate, which is the defeat of the Ministry.

This general defeat of the Ministers was preceded by the disgraceful result of the single combat of their most audacious champion, Achilles-Beresford, the Secretary of War. The Committee on the Derby Elections have made their report. That report confirms all the different facts already denounced in the petition of the Liberals, and concludes that the evidence proves that a wholesale system of bribery was carried on during the elections at Derby. The Committee, however, have forborne to follow up the evidence, and instead of directly involving Mr. Beresford in a charge of attempted bribery, they contented themselves with a severe stricture on his "reckless indifference and disregard of consequences." It remains to be seen if Parliament will accede to the views of this honest Committee and allow Mr. Beresford to retain his seat. Should that be the case, it would itself grant its ratification to the memorable words of Mr. Secretary Beresford, that "the people of England are the vilest rabble he ever saw in the world." Be this as it may be, his seat as a Minister Mr. Beresford cannot retain.

After this short digression I return to my original subject.

The members of the House of Commons having debated during four consecutive nights and the greater part of the fifth, the question whether the question should be taken upon the whole budget, or on the whole resolution, on principles or on facts, upon
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a The debate in the House of Commons on December 16, 1852.—Ed.
this or that point, the conclusion at which they arrived at last, was that the House had, at present, only to meddle with the increase of the house-tax, the extension of the area of direct taxation.

The House rejected this first proposition of Mr. Disraeli's budget, as follows:

Ayes ................................................. 286 Noes .............................................. 305

Majority against Ministers, 19. The House then adjourned till Monday next. The pressure of time forbids me to speak on the debate as extensively as I could wish. I shall, therefore, confine myself to discussing merely the most memorable passages of Mr. Disraeli's last speech, by far the most important of all.

Sir Charles Wood, the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Sir James Graham, had directed their chief attacks against his proposed appropriation of the Public Works Loan Fund (£400,000 per annum) to balance the effects of the reduction in the shipping dues. Sir James Graham, especially, had contended most strenuously for the beneficial working of that Fund. What does Mr. Disraeli answer? a

"I will show the Committee what flagrant misappropriation there has been of the funds of this country, and how immense an amount of money has been squandered away, virtually without the cognizance and control of Parliament, and entirely by the machinery of this Public Works Loan Fund."

And then follows a detailed description of the scandalous financial management of the Whig administration with regard to these funds. Disraeli then proceeds to explain the principles of his budget:

"There was a very important question to settle, before we could decide even as to the first step we should take, and that was the question how far we should prevail upon the country to fix upon that sum of direct taxation which was necessary for any Ministry that attempted to enter into a career of financial Reform. [Hear!] I have been accused by the member for Halifax (Sir Charles Wood) of making a proposition which recklessly increases the direct taxation of the country. [Hear! hear!] I have been accused by the member for Carlisle (Sir J. Graham) of pushing direct taxation to rash extremes. In the first place, the proposition I made on the part of the Government, instead of recklessly increasing the amount of direct taxation, would not, if it passed, occasion so great an amount of direct taxation as prevailed under the superintendence of the finances by the right honorable gentleman, the member for Halifax, when he enjoyed not only the income- and property-tax, but the window-tax, which, in the last year of its existence, brought him nearly two millions of pounds sterling. [Cheers.] The right honorable gentleman who says, you must not recklessly increase the amount of direct taxation, reduced the amount which he received in his last year from the

a Disraeli's speech in the House of Commons on December 16, 1852 is quoted from The Times, No. 21301, December 17, 1852.—Ed.
window-tax, and was content with the modest sum of seven hundred thousand pounds sterling by way of commutation for the window-tax. I cannot forget that the right honorable gentleman who recklessly charges me with increasing the amount of direct taxation proposed first a complete commutation which would have made his house-tax larger than the one I had proposed. [Loud cheers.] But is this all? Is this all that has been done by the right honorable gentleman who charges me with increasing recklessly the direct taxation of the country? Why, there is the Minister who with a property-tax you have now producing its full amount, with the window-tax that brought nearly two millions, came down to the House of Commons one day and proposed to a startled assembly to double nearly the property- and income-tax. [Great cheering.] I look on this conduct as indicating recklessness of consequences.... We hear of the duplication of the house-tax—an innocent amount; but if the right honorable gentleman had carried the duplication of the property- and income-tax, I think he might fairly have been charged with recklessly increasing the direct taxation of the country. [Loud cheers.] Talk of recklessness! Why, what in the history of finances is equal to the recklessness with which the right honorable gentleman acted? [Loud cheers.] And what was the ground on which he made this monstrous and enormous proposition; a proposition which only the safety of the State would have justified him in making? When he was beaten, baffled, humiliated, he came forward to say that he had sufficient revenue without resorting to that proposition. [Great and continued cheering.] The future historian will not be believed to be telling the truth when he says that the Minister came down to nearly double the income-tax, and the next day came down to say that the ways and means were ample." [Renewed cheering.]

Having thus retaliated upon Sir Charles Wood, he continues:

"We had to assert that there is a difference between property and income, a difference between precarious and certain income. We had next to vindicate a principle which we believed, and do believe, is a just one, and which, if not now, must ultimately be recognized and adopted—namely, that the basis of direct taxation should be enlarged. [Ministerial cheers]... If it be sought to establish as a permanent feature of our social system that there shall be created classes who are to exercise political power by means of throwing an undue weight of direct taxation upon the wealthier portion of the community, and an undue weight of indirect taxation on the working classes, I cannot imagine a circumstance more fatal to this country, or one more pregnant with disastrous consequences. [Cheers.] But of this I feel convinced, that those who will first experience the disastrous consequences will be the privileged class."

Turning round upon the free traders Disraeli says:

"The great opponents of colonial imposts here we find them all arrayed in favor of high taxation for the producer, and here we find them, with taunts to us, using all the fallacies which we at least have had the courage honorably to give up. [Tremendous cheering.] Tell me protection is dead! Tell me, there is no Protectionist party! Why, 'tis rampant and 'tis there. [Pointing to the Opposition benches.] They have taken up our principles with our benches, and I believe they will be quite as unsuccessful." [Cheers.] In conclusion, Disraeli replies to the benevolent suggestion of Sir Charles Wood to withdraw his budget, in the following words:

"I have been told to withdraw my budget. I was told that Mr. Pitt withdrew his budget, and that more recently other persons" (the Whigs and especially Sir Ch.
Wood) "had done so too. [Laughter.] Now, I do not aspire to the fame of Mr. Pitt, but I will not submit to the degradation of others. [Loud cheers.] No, Sir; I have seen the consequence of a government not being able to pass their measures—consequences not honorable to the government, not advantageous to the country, and not, in my opinion, conducive to the reputation of this House, which is most dear to me. [Loud cheers.] I remember a budget which was withdrawn, and re-withdrawn, and withdrawn again [laughter] in 1848. What was the consequence of the government existing upon sufferance? What was the consequence to the finances of this country? Why, that ignoble transaction respecting the commutation of the window and house duty, which now I am obliged to attempt to readjust. [Cheers.] The grievance is deeper than mere questions of party consideration.... Yes, I know what I have to face. I have to face a coalition. [Cheers.] This combination may be successful. A coalition has before this been successful. But coalitions, although successful, have always found this, that their triumph has been very brief. This I know, that England has not loved coalitions. [Cheers.] I appeal from the coalition to that public opinion which governs this country; to that public opinion whose wise and irresistible influence can control even the decrees of parliament, and without whose support the most august and ancient institutions are but the baseless fabric of a vision. [The Right Honorable gentleman resumed his seat amid deafening and prolonged cheering."

What now is the opinion of the daily press respecting the results of this ministerial defeat!

The Morning Chronicle (Peelite) and The Morning Advertiser (Radical) regard the retreat of the Ministry as a certainty. The Times is likewise of opinion that Ministers will retreat, doubting, however, the possibility of the Opposition of making as easily a new Administration as they have unmade the old one. The Daily News (Manchester School) assumes the possibility of a reconstitution of the fallen Ministry in combination with Lord Palmerston. The Morning Post (Palmerston) considers this recomposition as a matter of course. Lastly, The Morning Herald (Derby-Disraeli) declares that if Ministers tender their resignation to-day, the Queen\(^a\) will be obliged to send for them again on the next day.

One thing is certain: Ministers have been defeated on the ground of a Free Trade resolution, the extension of direct taxation. At all events, they have this satisfaction, that, if they resisted successfully the first Parliamentary attack by denying their own principles, the Opposition have beaten them in the second battle only by the negation of theirs.

Thus, what I formerly said with regard to the position of the Parliamentary parties,\(^b\) has been confirmed entirely in this debate. The coalesced Opposition possesses, compared with the compact-

\(^{a}\) Victoria.— Ed.

\(^{b}\) See this volume, pp. 369-72.— Ed.
ness of 286 Tories, only a majority of 19 votes. Let them form a new Government, and it will fall on the first opportunity. Should the Opposition Government dissolve the House of Commons, the new elections will return, under the old conditions, the same result, viz., another House of Commons, in which the different parties will again paralyse themselves, when the old game has to be recommenced, and England's politics are plunged once more in a cercle vicieux.

I, therefore, insist on the old dilemma: either Continuation of the Tory Government, or Parliamentary Reform.

Written on December 17, 1852

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 3659, January 6 (evening edition) and January 7 (morning edition), 1853

Signed: Karl Marx

Reproduced from the newspaper
Karl Marx

A SUPERANNUATED ADMINISTRATION.—
PROSPECTS OF THE COALITION MINISTRY, &c.

London, Tuesday, January 11, 1853

"We have now arrived at the commencement of the political millennium in which party spirit is to fly from the earth, and genius, experience, industry and patriotism are to be the sole qualifications for office. We have got a Ministry which seems to command the approval and support of men of every class of opinion. Its principles command universal assent and support."

Such are the words with which The Times, in their first excitement and enthusiasm, have ushered in the Aberdeen Administration.¹ From their tenor one would imagine that England is henceforth to be blessed with the spectacle of a Ministry composed entirely of new, young, and promising characters, and the world will certainly be not a little puzzled when it shall have learned that the new era in the history of Great Britain is to be inaugurated by all but used-up decrepit octogenarians. Aberdeen, an octogenarian; Lansdowne, with a foot already in the grave; Palmerston, Russell, fast approaching a similar state; Graham, the bureaucrat, who served under almost every Administration since the close of the last century; other members of the Cabinet—twice dead of age and exhaustion and only resuscitated into an artificial existence; on the whole a half score of centenarians, such is the stock of which, by a simple sum of addition, the new millennium appears to have been made up by the writer in The Times.

In this millennium then we are promised the total disappearance of party warfare, nay even of parties themselves. What is the meaning of The Times? Because certain portions of the Aristocracy

¹ The reference is to the leading article in The Times, No. 21316, January 4, 1853.— Ed.
have hitherto enjoyed the privilege of assuming the appearance of national or parliamentary parties, and have now come to the conclusion that the farce cannot be continued for the future, because, on the ground of that conviction and in virtue of the hard experiences lately undergone, these aristocratic côteries mean now to give up their little quibbles and to combine into one compact mass for the preservation of their common privileges—is the existence of all parties to cease from this hour? Or is not the very fact of such a "coalition" the most explicit indication that the time has arrived when the actually grown-up and yet partially unrepresented fundamental classes of modern society, the industrial bourgeoisie and the working class, are about to vindicate to themselves the position of the only political parties in the nation?

The Tories, under the Administration of Lord Derby, have once for ever denegated their old Protectionist doctrine and professed themselves Free Traders. The Earl of Derby, on announcing the resignation of his Cabinet, said:

"I, My Lords, remember, and probably your Lordships will remember, that the noble Earl (Aberdeen) has, upon more than one occasion, declared in this house that, the question of Free Trade excepted, he knew of none upon which there was any difference between himself and the present Government."\(^a\)

Lord Aberdeen, in confirming this statement, goes still further in his remarks: "He was ready to unite with the noble Earl (Derby) in resisting the encroachments of Democracy, but he was at a loss to see where this Democracy existed." On both sides it is granted that there is no longer any difference between Peelites and Tories. But this is not all. With regard to the foreign policy, the Earl of Aberdeen observes:

"For thirty years, though there have been differences in execution, the principle of the foreign policy of the country has never varied."\(^b\)

Accordingly, the whole struggle between Aberdeen and Palmerston, from 1830 till 1850, when the former insisted on the alliance with the Northern Powers, and the latter on the "entente cordiale" with France, when the one was against and the other for Louis Philippe, the one against and the other in favor of

\(^{a}\) Speech in the House of Lords on December 20, 1852, *The Times*, No. 21304, December 21, 1852.—*Ed.*

\(^{b}\) Here and in what follows the quotations are from Aberdeen's speech in the House of Lords on December 27, 1852, as published in *The Times*, No. 21310, December 28, 1852.—*Ed.*
intervention; all their quarrels and disputes, even their late common indignation at Lord Malmesbury's "disgraceful" conduct of the foreign affairs—all this is confessed to have been mere humbug. And yet, is there anything in the political relations of England that has undergone a more radical change than her foreign policy? Up to 1830—alliance with the Northern Powers; since 1830—union with France (quadruple alliance); since 1848—complete isolation of England from the whole Continent.

Lord Derby having first assured us that there exists no difference between Tories and Peelites, the Earl of Aberdeen further assures us that there is also no difference between Peelites and Whigs, Conservatives and Liberals. In his opinion:

"The country is tired of distinctions without meaning, and which have no real effect on the conduct or principles of public men. No Government is possible except a Conservative Government, and it is equally true that none is possible except a Liberal Government."

"These terms have no very definite meaning. The country is sick of these distinctions without meaning."

The three factions of the Aristocracy, Tories, Peelites and Whigs, consequently agree, that they possess no real marks of distinction. But there is still another subject on which they agree. Disraeli had declared that it was his intention to carry out the principle of Free Trade. Lord Aberdeen says:

"The great object of the Queen's present ministers, and the great characteristic of their Government would be the maintenance and prudent extension of Free Trade. That was the mission with which they were peculiarly entrusted."

In a word, the entire Aristocracy agree, that the Government has to be conducted for the benefit, and according to the interests of the middle-class, but they are determined that the bourgeoisie are not to be themselves the governors of this affair; and for this object all that the old Oligarchy possess of talent, influence and authority are combined, in a last effort, into one Administration, which has for its task [to keep] the bourgeoisie, as long as possible, from the direct enjoyment of governing the nation. The coàlized Aristocracy of England intend, with regard to the bourgeoisie, to act on the same principle upon which Napoleon I professed to act in reference to the people: "Tout pour le peuple, rien par le peuple."³

³ "Everything for the people, nothing through the people."—Ed.
"There must, however," as Ernest Jones observes in *The People's Paper*, "be some disguise to the evident object of excluding the middle-class, and this, they (the Ministers) hope, is afforded by an admixture in subordinate and uninfluential places of aristocratic Liberals, like Sir William Molesworth, Bernal Osborne, &c. But let them not imagine that this dandified Mayfair liberalism will satisfy the stern men of the Manchester School. They mean business, and nothing less. They mean pounds, shillings, pence—place, office, and the gigantic revenues of the largest empire of the world, placed with all its resources subservient to the disposal of their one class-interest."a

Indeed, a glance at *The Daily News, The Advertiser*, and more particularly *The Manchester Times*,b that direct organ of Mr. Bright, is sufficient to convince any one, that the men of the Manchester School, in provisionally promising their support to the Coalition Government, intend only to observe the same policy on which the Peelites and Whigs had acted in reference to the late Derby Cabinet; *i.e.* to give ministers a fair trial. What the meaning of a "fair trial" may be, Mr. Disraeli has recently had occasion to learn.

The defeat of the Tory Cabinet having been decided by the Irish Brigade,294 the new Coalition Government, of course, considered it necessary to take steps for securing the Parliamentary support of that party. Mr. Sadleir, the broker of the brigade, was soon seduced by a Lordship of Treasury. Mr. Keogh had the offer of the Irish Solicitor-Generalship, while Mr. Monsell was made Clerk of Ordnance.

"And by these three purchases," says *The Morning Herald*, "the brigade is supposed to be gained."

However, there is ample reason for doubting the effectuality of these three purchases in securing the adhesion of the entire brigade, and in *The Irish Freeman's Journal*c we actually read:

"This is the critical moment for Tenant Right and Religious Liberty. The success or failure of these questions depend not now on Ministers, but on the Irish members. Nineteen votes have overthrown the Derby Administration. Ten men, by walking from one side to the other, would have altered the event. In this state of parties the Irish members are omnipotent."

At the conclusion of my last letter I had stated it as my opinion, that there was no other alternative but that of a Tory Government

---

b The reference is to the *Examiner and Times.*—*Ed.*
c Of December 18, 1852.—*Ed.*
or a Parliamentary Reform. It will interest your readers to become acquainted with Lord Aberdeen's views on the same subject. He says:

"The improvement of the condition of the people could not exclude (sic!) the amendment of the representative system; for unquestionably, the events of the last election had not been such as to render any man enamoured of it."

And at the elections consequent on their acceptance of office, Lord Aberdeen's colleagues declared unanimously, that reforms in the representative system were called for; but in every instance they gave their audiences to understand, that such reforms must be "moderate or rational reforms, and made not rashly, but deliberately and with caution." Consequently the more rotten the present representative system turns out and is acknowledged to be, the more desirable is it that it should be altered neither rashly nor radically.

On the occasion of the late re-elections of Ministers there has been made a first trial of a new invention for public men to preserve their character under all circumstances, whether out or in. The invention consists in a hitherto unpracticed application of the "open question." Osborne and Villiers had pledged themselves on former occasions upon the ballot. They now declare the ballot an open question. Molesworth had pledged himself to Colonial Reform—open question. Keogh, Sadleir, etc., were pledged on Tenant Right—open question. In a word, all the points which they had always treated as settled, in their quality of members, have become questionable to them as Ministers.

In conclusion I have to mention another curiosity, resulting from the coalition of Peelites, Whigs, Radicals and Irishmen. Each of their respective notabilities has been turned out of that department for which alone they were supposed to possess some talent or qualification, and they have been appointed to places wondrously ill-suitting them. Palmerston, the renowned Minister of Foreign Affairs, is appointed to the Home Department, from which Russell has been removed, although grown old in that office, to take the direction of Foreign Affairs. Gladstone, the Escobar of Puseyiteism, is nominated Chancellor of the Exchequer. Molesworth, who possessed a certain reputation for his having copied or adopted Mr. Wakefield's absurd colonization system, is appointed Commissioner of Public Works. Sir Charles Wood, who as a Minister of Finance, enjoyed the privilege of being upset either with a deficit or a surplus in the treasury, is

---

a See this volume, p. 500.—Ed.
entrusted with the Presidentship of the Board of Control of Indian Affairs. Monsell, who hardly knows how to distinguish a rifle from a musket, is made Clerk of Ordnance. The only personage who has found his proper place, is Sir James Graham, the same who, in the capacity of First Lord of the Admiralty, has already on a former occasion, gained much credit for having first introduced the rotten worm into the British Navy.

Written on January 11, 1853


Signed: Karl Marx
Karl Marx

POLITICAL PROSPECTS.—COMMERCIAL PROSPERITY.—
CASE OF STARVATION

London, Friday, January 14, 1853

Lord John Russell, in receiving the diplomatic badge, at the Foreign Office, told them that he held the seals of that Department ad interim only, and that in no great length of time the Foreign Office would be transferred to the Earl of Clarendon. The fact is, that Russell has always been a perfect foreigner in the Foreign Department, in which he never made himself conspicuous, except by an insipid compilation on the history, I believe, of the treaties concluded since the time of the peace of Nymwegen, a book which, to confess the truth, is at least as entertaining as the “tragedy” with which the same Russell once surprised the world. Lord John will, in all probability, be entrusted with the leadership of the House of Commons, with a seat in the Cabinet, where his entire activity is likely to be absorbed in framing the new Reform Bill. Parliamentary Reform is Russell’s traditional field of action, since, by his measures in 1831, he proved such a masterly hand in dividing the rotten boroughs between Tories and Whigs.

My predictions on the probable inefficiency of the three Irish purchases made by the Ministry for securing the enlistment of the whole “Brigade” in the cause of the Coalition Government, have already been fulfilled to the very letter. The attitude of The Freeman’s Journal and The Tablet—the tenor of the letters and declarations of Messrs. Lucas, Moore, and Duffy—lastly, the resolution adopted against Messrs. Sadleir and Keogh, at the last

---

[a] John Russell, Memoirs of the Affairs of Europe from the “Peace of Utrecht”.—Ed.
[b] John Russell, Don Carlos; or, Persecution.—Ed.
[c] See this volume, p. 474.—Ed.
meeting of the Tenant-Right Association, sufficiently indicate that the Aberdeen Administration will only dispose of a very small fraction of the Irish troops.

It is known that Lord Aberdeen, the Chief of the Cabinet, will take his seat in the House of Lords. Now, Mr. Bright, in a speech recently delivered at a banquet at Manchester to your new Ambassador, Mr. Ingersoll, has seized an opportunity to explain how the total suppression of the House of Lords is the *conditio sine qua non* for the “advancement” of the industrial middle-class. This first official declaration of the Manchester school since the formation of the Coalition Ministry will do something toward enabling Lord Aberdeen in discovering where that Democracy, so much redoubted by Lord Derby, exists.

Thus the party warfare declared to have been abolished for ever, by a sanguine writer in *The Times*, has already burst forth, notwithstanding that the era of the “Millennium” had opened with the adjournment of Parliament until the 10th of February.

The continuation and increase of the commercial and industrial prosperity has been loudly and unanimously proclaimed at the beginning of the New-Year, and confirmed by the publication of the revenue accounts down to the 5th inst., by the returns of the Board of Trade for the month, and the 11 months ending Dec. 5, 1852, by the reports of the Inspectors of Factories, and lastly by the annual trade circulars issued at the commencement of every New-Year, and giving a general survey of all the commercial transactions of the past year.

The Revenue Returns show a total increase on the year of £978,926, and on the quarter of £702,776. There is an increase in every item on the year with the exception of Customs. The total sum placed into the Exchequer amounted to £50,468,193.

The *Excise*, which is supposed to indicate the well-being of the people, amounted to £13,093,170 in the year ending Jan. 5, 1852. In the year ending Jan. 5, 1853, it amounted to 13,356,981.

---

*a* The speech was delivered on January 7, 1853. See *The Times*, No. 21321, January 10, 1853.—*Ed.*

*b* This refers to *The Revenue. An Abstract of the Net Produce of the Revenue of Great Britain in the Years and Quarters ended 5th Jan., 1852, and 5th of Jan., 1853*, as well as to *Exports of British and Irish Produce and Manufactures from the United Kingdom. An Account of the Exports of the Principal Articles of British and Irish Produce and Manufactures in the eleven months ended December 5, 1852*; the data cited below from these documents and from the factory inspectors’ reports and trade bulletins are taken from *The Economist*, Nos. 489 and 490, January 8 and 15, 1853.—*Ed.*
The *Stamps*, which indicate the increase of commercial activity,
as in 1851-'52, yielded ......................... 5,933,549
Amounted in the years 1852-'53, to ....... 6,287,261.

The *Property-Tax*, which indicates the increase of wealth of the
upper classes,
amounting in 1851-'52, to ......................... 5,304,923
Yielded in the year 1852-'53 ..................... 5,509,637.

The Board of Trade Returns for the month and eleven months
ending Dec. 5, 1852, show:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1852</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1850</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of exports for the month ending Dec. 5</td>
<td>£6,102,694</td>
<td>£5,138,216</td>
<td>£5,362,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the eleven months ending Dec. 5</td>
<td>65,349,798</td>
<td>63,314,272</td>
<td>60,400,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequently, there is an increase of nearly £1,000,000 on the
month, and upward of £2,000,000 on the eleven months. Yet, in
the absence of all value to the imports, we know not how far it is
met or surpassed by the increased value of the latter.

Passing to the reports of the Inspectors of Factories, Mr.
Horner, Inspector for the Lancashire District, in his report on the
half year ending Oct. 31, 1852, which has just been published,
writes as follows:

"In my district, very little change has taken place in the last year as regards
woollen, worsted and silk factories, and flax mills remain as they were on the 1st of
November, 1851. But the increase in cotton mills has been very large. After
deducting those which are at present unoccupied (and many of them will, in all
probability, be soon again at work, especially those from which the machinery has
not been removed), there have been set to work in the last two years 129 new mills,
with an aggregate of 4,023 horse power; and there have been 53 instances of
additions to existing mills, with an aggregate of 2,090 horse power, so that there
has been an increase of 6,113 horse power, which must have given employment to
probably not fewer than 24,000 additional hands in the cotton trade. Nor is this all;
for many new mills are at present being built. In the limited area which includes
the towns of Ashton, Staleybridge, Oldham and Lees, there are eleven, which it is
estimated will have an aggregate power of 620 horses. The machine-makers are
said to be overwhelmed with orders; and a very intelligent and observing
mill-owner told me lately that many of the buildings now going up would in all
probability not be at work before 1854, from the impossibility to get machinery to
them. But the above returns and those that will be given by my colleagues on the
present occasion, however they may indicate a great increase, still they by no means
give the whole; for there is a large and very fertile source of increase of
productions of which it would be very difficult to obtain any account. I allude to
the modern improvements in steam-engines, by which old engines and even new engines are made to do an amount of work far beyond their nominal horse power, and to an extent formerly believed to be impossible."

Mr. Horner then quotes a letter from the eminent civil-engineer, Mr. Nasmyth, of Birmingham, describing the gain of power by working the engines at greater speed, and by adapting to them the high pressure double cylinders of Woolf, the result of which is, that at least fifty per cent. more work is done by the identical engines still in use than was done before the improvement.

It appears from a summary of the reports of all the Inspectors, that in the year ending Oct. 31, 1852, the total number of new factories occupied was 229, with a steam power of 4,771 horses and a water-power of 586 horses, and the addition to existing factories amounted to 69, with a steam power of 1,532 horses, and a water-power of 28 horses, making a grand total of 6,917 horse power.

Passing next to the annual trade circulars, we find them all breathing the same enthusiastic style in which The Times predicted the political millennium, and having, at any rate, this advantage, that they are based on facts and not on mere expectations, as far as they refer to the past year.

The agricultural interest has no cause for complaint. On the opening of the year the weekly average price of wheat was 37/2; at the close of the year it has reached 45/11. The rise in the prices of grain has been accompanied by a rise in the price of cattle, meat, butter and cheese.

In August, 1851, an unprecedented fall in the prices of produce was known to have taken place, chiefly in the prices of sugar and coffee, and it did not cease with that year, for the panic in Mincing Lane* did not reach its height till the first month of the past year. The annual circulars indicate now a considerable advance in the prices of most articles of foreign production, especially of colonial produce, sugar, coffee, etc.

As to the movement in raw materials it will be seen from the following:

"The state of the wool trade" is described in Messrs. Hughes & Ronald's circular,

"as having been throughout the past year in the highest degree satisfactory.... The home demand for wool has been unusually large.... The export of woollen and worsted goods has been on a very extensive scale, even exceeding the year 1851,

* The centre of wholesale trade in colonial goods in London.—Ed.
the highest rate ever before attained.... Prices have been steadily looking up, but it is only during the last month, that any decided advance has taken place, and at present they may be quoted, on the average, about 15 to 20 per cent. above the corresponding period last year."

"The wood trade," say Messrs. Churchill & Sim, "has largely partaken in the commercial prosperity of the country during 1852.... The importation into London exceeded 1,200 cargoes during 1852—closely parallel to 1851. Both years were 50 per cent. in advance of those preceding, which average about 800 cargoes. While the quantity of hewn timber stands at the average of several years; the use of deals, battens, etc.; or the sawn wood, has taken an immense start during 1852, when 6,800,000 pieces replaced the previous average of 4,900,000 pieces."

With regard to leather, Messrs. Powell & Co. say:

"The year just concluded has doubtless been a favorable one for leather manufacturers in almost every department. Raw goods, at the commencement of the year, were at low rates, and circumstances have taken place which have given leather an increased value in a greater degree than for several past years."

The iron trade is particularly flourishing, the price of iron having risen from £5 per tun to £10 10/ per tun; and more recently to £12 per tun, with the probability of a rise to £15, and more furnaces continually coming into operation.

Of the shipping, Messrs. Offor & Gamman say:

"The year just closed has been of remarkable activity to British shipping, chiefly caused by the stimulus given to business by the gold discovery in Australia.... There has taken place a general rise in freights."

The same movement has taken place in the shipbuilding department. In reference to this branch, the circular of Messrs. Tonge, Currie & Co., of Liverpool, contains the following:

"On no occasion have we been able to report so favorably for the year past of the sale of ships at this port—both of the amount of tonnage sold, and the prices that have been obtained; prices of colonial ships having advanced fully 17 per cent., with a continuing tendency upward, while stocks have been reduced to 48 sail against 76 in 1852, and 82 in 1851, without any immediate supplies being expected.... The number of vessels that have come into Liverpool within the year and sold, is 120; equal to 50,000 tons. The number of ships launched, and in course of construction, in our port this year, is 39, computed at 15,000 tons, against 23, computed at 9,200 in 1851. The number of steamers built, and in the course of construction here, amounts to 13, equal to 4,050 tons.... As regards iron-built sailing vessels, the most remarkable feature of our trade is the very increasing favor they are growing into, and which are now occupying the builders both here, in the Clyde, New-Castle and elsewhere, to an unprecedented extent."

As regards railways, Messrs. Woods & Stubbs write:

"The returns caused the most sanguine expectations, and far outstrip all previous calculations. The returns for last week show an increased mileage over 1851 of 348 miles, 5½ per cent., and an increased traffic of £41,426, or 14 per cent."
Lastly, Messrs. Du Fay & Co.'s Circular (Manchester) records the transactions with India and China for the month of December, 1852, as extensive, and the abundance of money alluded to as having favored undertakings to distant markets, and as having enabled those interested in them to make up for losses sustained in the early part of the year on goods and produce.

"Various new land, and mining, and other schemes attract speculators and capitalists just now."

The prosperity of the manufacturing districts in general, and particularly of the cotton districts, has been shown from the reports of the Inspectors of Factories. In reference to the cotton manufacture, Messrs. John Wrigley & Son, of Liverpool, have the following:

"Viewed as a test of the general prosperity of the country, the progress of the cotton-trade, during the year now closed, affords results the most gratifying.... It has presented many striking features, but none more prominent and noteworthy than the extreme facility with which so unprecedentedly large a crop as upward of 3,000,000 of bales, the produce of the United States of America, has been disposed of.... Preparations are [in the] making in many districts for an extension of manufacturing powers, and we may expect a larger aggregate quantity of cotton to be worked up during the approaching year than any previous one."

Most other branches of industry are in the same position.

"We refer," say Messrs. McNair, Greenhow & Irving (of Manchester), "to Glasgow as connected with its cotton and iron manufacture; to Huddersfield, Leeds, Halifax, Bradford, Nottingham, Leicester, Sheffield, Birmingham, Wolverhampton, etc., as connected with their various productions—all seem in a high state of prosperity."

The only exceptions to the general prosperity are the silk-trade and the wool-combers in Yorkshire; and the general aspect of trade may be resumed in the words of a Manchester circular:

"Our apprehensions are those of over-speculation, rather than of inactivity and want of means."

In the midst of this universal prosperity, a step recently taken by the Bank of England has raised a general consternation among the commercial world. On the 22d of April, 1852, the Bank of England had lowered the rate of discount to 2 per cent. On the morning of January 6, 1853, notice was given that the discount would be raised from 2 to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., an increase in the charges of 25 per cent. Attempts have been made to explain this increase by the large liabilities contracted lately by some extensive railway contractors, whose bills are known to be afloat in heavy amounts.
In other quarters it was believed, as for instance by *The London Sun*, a that the Bank of England intended, in their turn, to take advantage of the existing prosperity by increasing discounts. On the whole, the act has been reprobated as "uncalled for." In order to appreciate it in its true light, I subjoin the following statements from *The Economist*:\(^a\)

### BANK OF ENGLAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Bullion</th>
<th>Securities</th>
<th>Minimum rate of Discount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 22</td>
<td>£19,587,670</td>
<td>£23,782,000</td>
<td>Reduced to 2 per cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 24</td>
<td>22,065,349</td>
<td>24,013,728</td>
<td>2 per cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 18</td>
<td>21,165,224</td>
<td>26,765,724</td>
<td>2 per cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 24</td>
<td>20,794,190</td>
<td>27,545,640</td>
<td>2 per cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan’y 1</td>
<td>20,527,662</td>
<td>29,284,447</td>
<td>2 per cent., but raised to 2(\frac{1}{2}) per cent. Jan’y 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is, accordingly, a million of gold more in the Bank than in April, 1852, when the rate of interest was reduced to 2 per cent., but the difference is very marked between the two periods; for it has changed in regard to the movements of gold from a flowing to an ebbing tide. The afflux is peculiarly powerful, from its overbearing all the imports from America and Australia of the last month. Besides, securities were five and a half millions less in April than at present. Consequently, in April, 1852, the supply of loanable capital was larger than the demand, while now the reverse is the case.

The emigration of bullion was accompanied by a marked decline in the foreign exchanges, a circumstance which must be accounted for, partly by the considerable advance in the prices of most articles of import, partly by the large speculations in imports. To this must be added the influence of the unfavorable autumn and winter on farmers, the consequent doubts and fears respecting the next harvest, and, as a result of the latter, immense operations in foreign grains and farinas. Lastly, English capitalists have very largely engaged in the formation of railway and other companies in France, Italy, Spain, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Germany and

---

\(^a\) The reference is to the item "Money and Commercial News" in *The Sun* for January 6, 1853.— *Ed.*

\(^b\) "The Bank Rate of Interest", *The Economist*, No. 489, January 8, 1853.— *Ed.*
Belgium, and partake very much in the general swindle now going on at the Paris Bourse. Paper on London is therefore more abundant in all markets of Europe than at any former period, in consequence of which there has been a continued fall in the rate of Exchanges. On July 24th the Exchange on Paris was 25f. 30c. for the pound sterling; on the 1st of January it had fallen to 25 francs. Some transactions have even been made below 25 francs.

In so far as the demand for capital has increased in proportion to the supply, the late measure adopted by the Bank of England, appears to be perfectly justified. In so far as it was intended to put a check upon speculation and upon the emigration of capital, I venture to predict, that it will be thoroughly ineffectual.

Your readers having accompanied us to such a length, through all the testimonials of the growing prosperity of England, I request them to stop a moment and to follow a poor needle-maker, Henry Morgan, who started out from London, on his journey to Birmingham, in search of work. Lest I should be charged with exaggerating the case, I give the literal account of *The Northampton Journal*.

"Death from Destitution.—Cosgrove.—About nine o'clock on the morning of Monday, two laboring men, while seeking shelter from the rain in a lone barn, occupied by Mr. T. Slade, in the parish of Cosgrove, were attracted by groans, which were found to come from a poor man, lying in a heap-hole, in a state of extreme exhaustion. They spoke to him, kindly offering him some of their breakfast, but without receiving any answer; and upon touching him, found his body almost cold. Having fetched Mr. Slade, who was near by, this gentleman, after some time had elapsed, sent him, by a boy, in a cart, with a bed and covering of straw, to the Yardley-Gobion union-house about a mile distant, where he arrived just before one o'clock, but expired a quarter of an hour afterward. The famished, filthy, and ill-clad condition of the poor creature presented a most frightful spectacle. It appears that this unhappy being, on the evening of Thursday, the 2d, obtained a vagrant's order for a night's lodging at the Yardley-house, from the relieving officer at Stoney-Stratford, and, having then walked to Yardley, a distance of three miles and upward, was accordingly admitted; he had food given him, which he eat heartily, and begged to be allowed to remain the next day and night, which was granted, and upon leaving on Saturday morning early, after his breakfast (most likely his last meal in this world), took the road back to Stratford. It is probable that, being weak and footsore, for he had a bad place on one heel, he was soon glad to seek the first friendly shelter he could find, which was an open shed, forming part of some outfarming-buildings, a quarter of a mile from the turnpike-road. Here he was found lying in the straw on Monday, the 6th, at noon, and, it not being wished that a stranger should remain on the premises, he was desired to go away. He asked leave to stay a little longer, and went off about four o'clock, once more to seek at nightfall the nearest place of rest and shelter, which was this lone barn, with its thatch partly off, with its door left open, and in the

---

*a Northampton Mercury, December 18, 1852.— Ed.*
coldest possible situation, into the heap-hole of which he crept, there to lie without food for seven days more, till discovered, as has been described above, on the morning of the 13th. This ill-fated man had given his name as Henry Morgan, a needle-maker, and appeared between thirty and forty years of age, and in person, a good-framed man."

It is hardly possible to conceive a more horrible case. A stalwart, strong-framed man, in the prime of life—his long pilgrimage of martyrdom from London to Stoney-Stratford—his wretched appeals for help to the "civilization" around him—his seven days fast—his brutal abandonment by his fellow men—his seeking shelter and being driven from resting-place to resting-place—the crowning inhumanity of the person named Slade and the patient, miserable death of the worn-out man—are a picture perfectly astonishing to contemplate.

No doubt he invaded the rights of property, when he sought shelter in the shed and in the lone barn!!

Relate this starvation case in midst of prosperity, to a fat London City man, and he will answer you with the words of The London Economist of Jan. 8th:

"Delightful is it thus to see, under Free Trade, all classes flourishing; their energies are called forth by hope of reward; all improve their productions, and all and each are benefited."

Written on January 14, 1853


Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune
The re-elections consequent upon the new ministerial arrangements are finished. Ministers have suffered a defeat, Mr. Sadleir, one of the Lords of the Treasury, and hitherto considered the chief of the "Irish Brigade," having been beaten by Mr. Alexander, who was elected by a majority of six votes. Mr. Alexander owes his election to a coalition of the Orangemen and the Catholics. On the other hand, Ministers were victorious at Oxford University, where the poll lasted fifteen days and the struggle was extremely animated. Gladstone carried the day by a majority of 124 against Dudley Perceval, the candidate of the High Church Party. To amateurs of Hudibrasian logic we can recommend the leaders of the two contending journals in this struggle, The Morning Chronicle and The Morning Herald.

Yesterday, after a long debate, the Directors of the Bank of England again raised the minimum rate of discount from 2\(\frac{1}{2}\) to 3 per cent. This circumstance had an immediate effect upon the Paris Bourse, where all sorts of securities had to submit to another decline.—But if the Bank of England should succeed in checking speculation at Paris, there will remain open another outlet for the drain of bullion: the imports of corn. The last harvest both in England and on the Continent is estimated at one-third below the average. Besides, there exists some doubt as to the quantity of food available for consumption until next harvest, in consequence of the delay in sowing the seed caused by the wet state of the soil. Therefore, large imports of grain are arranged for, and will continue to keep the course of exchange unfavorable for England. The gold ships from Australia cannot keep pace with the sudden augmentation of grain imports.

In one of my late letters I mentioned the speculation going on in

---

*See Samuel Butler, *Hudibras, a Poem written in the Time of the Civil Wars.*—Ed.
iron. The first raising of the rate of discount, by the Bank, from 2 to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., had already had its effect upon this branch of trade. Scotch pigs, for the last fortnight selling at 78 shillings, on the nineteenth of this month dropped down to 61 shillings. The Railway Share market, too, will probably be depressed since the raising of the rate of interest, by forced sales of shares hitherto deposited as securities for loans, and the commencement of these operations has already taken place. My opinion, however, is that the drain of bullion is not caused by exportation of gold alone, but that the brisk home trade, especially in the manufacturing districts, has a full share in it.

During the present momentary slackness in political affairs, the address of the Stafford House Assembly of Ladies to their sisters in America upon the subject of Negro slavery, and the “Affectionate and Christian address of many thousands of the women of the United States of America to their sisters, the women of England,” upon white slavery, have proved a godsend to the press. Not one of the British papers was ever struck by the circumstance that the Stafford House Assembly took place at the palace and under the presidency of the Duchess of Sutherland, and yet the names of Stafford and Sutherland should have been sufficient to class the philanthropy of the British aristocracy—a philanthropy which chooses its objects as far distant from home as possible, and rather on that than on this side of the ocean.

The history of the wealth of the Sutherland family is the history of the ruin and of the expropriation of the Scotch-Gaelic population from its native soil. As far back as the tenth century, the Danes had landed in Scotland, conquered the plains of Caithness, and driven back the aborigines into the mountains. Mor-Fear Chattaibh, as he was called in Gaelic, or the “Great Man of Sutherland,” had always found his companions in arms ready to defend him at the risk of their lives against all his enemies, Danes or Scots, foreigners or natives. After the revolution which drove the Stuarts from Britain, private feuds among the petty chieftains of Scotland became less and less frequent, and the British Kings, in order to keep up at least a semblance of dominion in those remote districts, encouraged the levying of family regiments among the chieftains, a system by which

---

[a] See this volume, p. 479.— Ed.
[c] In the New-York Daily Tribune here and in what follows is “Mheoir-Thair-Chattaibh”.— Ed.
these lairds were enabled to combine modern military establishments with the ancient clan system in such a manner as to support one by the other.

Now, in order to distinctly appreciate the usurpation subsequently carried out, we must first properly understand what the clan meant. The clan belonged to a form of social existence which, in the scale of historical development, stands a full degree below the feudal state; viz., the patriarchal state of society. “Klaen” in Gaelic, means children. Every one of the usages and traditions of the Scottish Gaels reposes upon the supposition that the members of the clan belong to one and the same family. The “great man,” the chieftain of the clan, is on the one hand quite as arbitrary, on the other quite as confined in his power, by consanguinity, etc., as every father of a family. To the clan, to the family, belonged the district where it had established itself, exactly as, in Russia, the land occupied by a community of peasants belongs, not to the individual peasants, but to the community. Thus the district was the common property of the family. There could be no more question, under this system, of private property, in the modern sense of the word, than there could be of comparing the social existence of the members of the clan to that of individuals living in the midst of our modern society. The division and subdivision of the land corresponded to the military functions of the single members of the clan. According to their military abilities, the chieftain entrusted to them the several allotments, cancelled or enlarged according to his pleasure the tenures of the individual officers, and these officers again distributed to their vassals and under-vassals every separate plot of land. But the district at large always remained the property of the clan, and, however the claims of individuals might vary, the tenure remained the same; nor were the contributions for the common defense, or the tribute for the laird, who at once was leader in battle and chief magistrate in peace, ever increased. Upon the whole, every plot of land was cultivated by the same family, from generation to generation, under fixed imposts. These imposts were insignificant, more a tribute by which the supremacy of the “great man” and of his officers was acknowledged than a rent of land in the modern sense, or a source of revenue. The officers directly subordinate to the “great man” were called “Taksmen,” and the district entrusted to their care, “Tak.” Under them were placed inferior officers, at the head of every hamlet, and under these stood the peasantry.

Thus you see, the clan is nothing but a family organized in a military manner, quite as little defined by laws, just as closely hemmed in by traditions, as any family. But the land is the property of
SUTHERLAND AND SLAVERY;

THE DUCHESS AT HOME.

By Dr. Charles Marx.

How can thou say to thy servant, water, let me take the mote out of thine eye, and percuss not the beam in thine own eye? (The ancient hyperbole of "Chorub and State")—a system of oppression is carried on in the name of religion and conscience, showing how the Sutherland family got their wealth. The Duchess of Sutherland had been allotted to the "Countess-Duchess" mother-in-law in the present Duchess. How the present Duchess, under the influence of the Countess-Duchess, the reader may have occasion to see when we have done with the latter.

How the wealth of the Sutherland family is the history of the ruin and of the oppression is carried on in this system of oppression, showing how the Sutherland family got their wealth. The Duchess of Sutherland had been allotted to the "Countess-Duchess" mother-in-law in the present Duchess. How the present Duchess, under the influence of the Countess-Duchess, the reader may have occasion to see when we have done with the latter.

History of the Sutherland family is the history of the ruin and of the oppression is carried on in the name of religion and conscience, showing how the Sutherland family got their wealth. The Duchess of Sutherland had been allotted to the "Countess-Duchess" mother-in-law in the present Duchess. How the present Duchess, under the influence of the Countess-Duchess, the reader may have occasion to see when we have done with the latter.

How the wealth of the Sutherland family is the history of the ruin and of the oppression is carried on in the name of religion and conscience, showing how the Sutherland family got their wealth. The Duchess of Sutherland had been allotted to the "Countess-Duchess" mother-in-law in the present Duchess. How the present Duchess, under the influence of the Countess-Duchess, the reader may have occasion to see when we have done with the latter.

How the wealth of the Sutherland family is the history of the ruin and of the oppression is carried on in the name of religion and conscience, showing how the Sutherland family got their wealth. The Duchess of Sutherland had been allotted to the "Countess-Duchess" mother-in-law in the present Duchess. How the present Duchess, under the influence of the Countess-Duchess, the reader may have occasion to see when we have done with the latter.

How the wealth of the Sutherland family is the history of the ruin and of the oppression is carried on in the name of religion and conscience, showing how the Sutherland family got their wealth. The Duchess of Sutherland had been allotted to the "Countess-Duchess" mother-in-law in the present Duchess. How the present Duchess, under the influence of the Countess-Duchess, the reader may have occasion to see when we have done with the latter.

The first usurpation took place after the expulsion of the Stuarts, by the establishment of the family. That from that moment, by the principal source of revenue of the Great Men, the Mhoir-Phate-Chattelers, in the conquest of the Landholders, the large proprietors were enabled to squeeze as much money as possible out of their offices, and they applied the same system in inferior. The ancient tribute was transformed into fixed money contracts. In one respect three of her generosity she elected at the expelled native about 6,000 acres, two acres per family. These 6,000 acres had been lying woe until then, and brought no revenue to the proprietors. The Countess was generous enough to sell the acres at 5d. on an average, to the clan-men who for centuries past had shot their blood for her family. The whole of their unappropriated class land was divided into twenty-nine large sheep farms, each of them inhabited by one single family, mostly English farm labourers; and in 1811, the 13,000 Gius had already been superseded by 121,000 sheep.

A portion of the deforestation has been thrown on the sea-shore, and attempted to live by fishing. They became neighbours, and, as an English people, lived half on land and half on water, and after all did not half live upon both. Much, in his "Ethel Seamen," observes with regard to the suppression of the Gaels from Sutherland—on an example, which, by the bye, was imitated by the other "great men of Scotland:"

"The large extent of salmonid domains is not a circumstance peculiar to Britain. In the whole empire of Charlemagne, in the whole ancient, entire space was bounded by the sea-shore, who had them cultivated for their own account by the conducted, and sometimes by their own companions in arms. During the ninth and tenth centuries the Counts of Maine, Anjou, Poitou, for the Counts of these provinces rather three large principalities, Scotland who in many respects resembles Scotland, was at that time divided among a small number of Benefactors. If the Counts of Kyburg, of Lantzeburg, of Heist, of Graymures had been protected by British laws, they would have been in the same position in the Earls of Sutherland, and more than one of them might have disappeared from the Alp in order to make room for wolves of sheep. Not the most despicable monarch in Germany would be allowed to attempt anything of the sort." Mr. Lock, in his defence of the Countess of Sutherland, (1760) repeats to the above as follows:

"Why should there be made an exception to the rule adopted in every other case, just for this particular one? Why should the absolute authority of the landlord be sanctioned to the public interest and to motives which concern the public only? And why then should the shareholding in the Southern States of North America sacrifice their sovereign interest to the philanthropic graces of their Grace, the Duchess of Sutherland? The British aristocracy, who have everywhere ascended man by bullock and sheep, will, in a future not very distant, be superseded in turn by those useful animals.

The process of clearing estates, which, in Scotland, we have just now described, was carried out in England in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. Thomas Carlyle already complained of it in the sixteenth century. It was performed in Scotland in the beginning of the nineteenth century, and in Ireland it is now in full progress. The noble Viscount Palmerston, two years ago cleared of the land in Ireland, exactly in the manner described above.

If any property it ever was true that it was robbery, it is literally true of the property of the British aristocracy. Robbery of the Church property, robbery of commons, fraudulent transformation, accompanied by murder, of feudal and public domain into private property—these are the titles of British Aristocrates to their possessions. And what services in this latter process were rendered by a servile class of lawyers they saw from an English lawyer of the last century. The example, who, in his "History of Feudal Property," says, might prove that any law or deed conveying property was interpreted by the lawyer, in England, where the middle ages in wealth, in favour of the noble class in Scotland, where the nobility enriched themselves, in favour of the nobility—in either case it was interposed as a sensible motive to the people.

The above Turkish reform by the Countess of Sutherland was justifiable, at least, from a Malthean point of view. Other Scottish noblemen went further. Having superseded human beings by sheep, they superseded sheep by game, and by pasture grounds by forests. At the head of these was the Duke of Atholl. "After the conquest, the Norman Kings interfered large portions of the soil of England, in much the same way as the landlords have interfered with the Highlands." (See Somer's Letters on the Highlands, 1848.)

As for the great number of the human beings expelled to make room for the game of the Duke of Atholl, and the sheep of the Counts of Sutherland, land where they did fly to, where did they find a home?

In the United States of North America.

The enemy of British Wagon Slavery has a right to conditions by the Government of British North America, a Duchess of Atholl, a Dutchess of Atholl, a Manchester Cotton-herd—never!"—Kara Marx.
the family, in the midst of which differences of rank, in spite of consanguinity, do prevail as well as in all the ancient Asiatic family communities.

The first usurpation took place, after the expulsion of the Stuarts, by the establishment of the family regiments. From that moment, pay became the principal source of revenue of the “Great Man,” the Mor-Fear-Chattaibh. Entangled in the dissipation of the Court of London, he tried to squeeze as much money as possible out of his officers, and they applied the same system to their inferiors. The ancient tribute was transformed into fixed money contracts. In one respect these contracts constituted a progress, by fixing the traditional imposts; in another respect they were a usurpation, inasmuch as the “great man” now took the position of landlord toward the “taksmen” who again took toward the peasantry that of farmers. And as the “great man” now required money no less than the “taksmen,” a production not only for direct consumption but for export and exchange also became necessary; the system of national production had to be changed, the hands superseded by this change had to be got rid of. Population, therefore, decreased. But that it as yet was kept up in a certain manner, and that man, in the 18th century, was not yet openly sacrificed to net revenue, we see from a passage in Steuart, a Scotch political economist, whose work was published ten years before Adam Smith’s where he says (Vol. 1, chap. 16):

“The rent of these lands is very trifling compared to their extent, but compared to the number of mouths which a farm maintains, it will perhaps be found that a plot of land in the highlands of Scotland feeds ten times more people than a farm of the same extent in the richest provinces.”

That even in the beginning of the 19th century the rental imposts were very small is shown by the work of Mr. Loch (1820), the steward of the Countess of Sutherland, who directed the improvements on her estates. He gives for instance the rental of the Kintraddawell estate for 1811, from which it appears that up to then, every family was obliged to pay a yearly impost of a few shillings in money, a few fowls, and some days’ work, at the highest.

It was only after 1811 that the ultimate and real usurpation was enacted, the forcible transformation of clan property into the private property, in the modern sense, of the chief. The person who stood at the head of this economical revolution was a female Mehemet Ali.

---

a James Steuart, *An Inquiry into the Principles of Political Economy.*—Ed.
b James Loch, *An Account of the Improvements on the Estates of the Marquess of Stafford, in the Counties of Stafford and Salop, and on the Estate of Sutherland.*—Ed.
who had well digested her Malthus—the Countess of Sutherland, alias Marchioness of Stafford.

Let us first state that the ancestors of the Marchioness of Stafford were the “great men” of the most northern part of Scotland, of very near three-quarters of Sutherlandshire. This county is more extensive than many French Départements or small German Principalities. When the Countess of Sutherland inherited these estates, which she afterward brought to her husband, the Marquis of Stafford, afterward Duke of Sutherland, the population of them was already reduced to 15,000. My lady Countess resolved upon a radical economical reform, and determined upon transforming the whole tract of country into sheep-walks. From 1814 to 1820, these 15,000 inhabitants, about 3,000 families, were systematically expelled and exterminated. All their villages were demolished and burned down, and all their fields converted into pasturage. British soldiers were commanded for this execution, and came to blows with the natives. An old woman refusing to quit her hut was burned in the flames of it. Thus my lady Countess appropriated to herself seven hundred and ninety-four thousand acres of land, which from time immemorial had belonged to the clan. In the exuberance of her generosity she allotted to the expelled natives about 6,000 acres—2 acres per family. These 6,000 acres had been lying waste until then, and brought no revenue to the proprietors. The Countess was generous enough to sell the acre at 2s. 6d., on an average, to the clan-men who for centuries past had shed their blood for her family. The whole of the unrightfully appropriated clan-land she divided into 29 large sheep farms, each of them inhabited by one single family, mostly English farm-laborers; and in 1821 the 15,000 Gaels had already been superseded by 131,000 sheep.

A portion of the aborigines had been thrown upon the seashore, and attempted to live by fishing. They became amphibious, and, as an English author says, lived half on land and half on water, and after all did not half live upon both.

Sismondi, in his Études Sociales, observes with regard to this expropriation of the Gaels from Sutherlandshire—an example, which, by the by, was imitated by the other “great men” of Scotland:

“The large extent of seignorial domains is not a circumstance peculiar to Britain. In the whole Empire of Charlemagne, in the whole Occident, entire provinces were usurped by the warlike chiefs, who had them cultivated for their own account by the vanquished, and sometimes by their own companions in arms. During the 9th and 10th centuries the Counties of Maine, Anjou, Poitou were for the Counts of these provinces rather three large estates than principalities. Switzerland, which in so many respects resembles Scotland, was at that time divided among a small number of
Seigneurs. If the Counts of Kyburg, of Lenzburg, of Habsburg, of Gruyères had been protected by British laws, they would have been in the same position as the Earls of Sutherland; some of them would perhaps have had the same taste for improvement as the Marchioness of Stafford, and more than one republic might have disappeared from the Alps in order to make room for flocks of sheep. Not the most despotic monarch in Germany would be allowed to attempt anything of the sort."a

Mr. Loch, in his defense of the Countess of Sutherland (1820), replies to the above as follows:

"Why should there be made an exception to the rule adopted in every other case, just for this particular case? Why should the absolute authority of the landlord over his land be sacrificed to the public interest and to motives which concern the public only?"

And why, then, should the slave-holders in the Southern States of North America sacrifice their private interest to the philanthropic grimaces of her Grace, the Duchess of Sutherland?

The British aristocracy, who have everywhere superseded man by bullocks and sheep, will, in a future not very distant, be superseded, in turn, by these useful animals.

The process of clearing estates which, in Scotland, we have just now described, was carried out in England in the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries. Thomas Morus already complains of it in the beginning of the 16th century. b It was performed in Scotland in the beginning of the 19th, and in Ireland it is now in full progress. The noble Viscount Palmerston, too, some years ago cleared of men his property in Ireland, exactly in the manner described above.

If of any property it ever was true that it was robbery,c it is literally true of the property of the British aristocracy. Robbery of Church property, robbery of commons, fraudulent transformation accompanied by murder, of feudal and patriarchal property into private property—these are the titles of British aristocrats to their possessions. And what services in this latter process were performed by a servile class of lawyers, you may see from an English lawyer of the last century, Dalrymple, who, in his "History of Feudal Property", very naively proves that every law or deed concerning property was interpreted by the lawyers, in England, when the middle class rose in wealth, in favor of the middle class—in Scotland, where the nobility enriched themselves, in favor of the nobility—in either case it was interpreted in a sense hostile to the people.

The above Turkish reform by the Countess of Sutherland was

a J.-C.-L. Simonde de Sismondi, Études sur l'économie politique.—Ed.
b Th. Morus, Utopia, Book 1.—Ed.
c An allusion to the description of property as robbery in Proudhon's book Qu'est-ce que la propriété?—Ed.
justifiable, at least, from a Malthusian point of view. Other Scottish noblemen went further. Having superseded human beings by sheep, they superseded sheep by game, and the pasture grounds by forests. At the head of these was the Duke of Atholl.

"After the conquest, the Norman Kings afforested large portions of the soil of England, in much the same way as the landlords here are now doing with the Highlands." (R. Somers, Letters from the Highlands, 1848.)

As for a large number of the human beings expelled to make room for the game of the Duke of Atholl, and the sheep of the Countess of Sutherland, where did they fly to, where did they find a home?

In the United States of North America.

The enemy of British Wages-Slavery has a right to condemn Negro-Slavery; a Duchess of Sutherland, a Duke of Atholl, a Manchester Cotton Lord—never!

Written on January 21, 1853

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 3687, February 8 (evening edition) and February 9 (morning edition), 1853; reprinted in the Semi-Weekly Tribune, No. 805, February 11, and in The People's Paper (without the first four paragraphs), No. 45, March 12, 1853

Signed: Karl Marx
London, Friday, January 28, 1853

The Times of Jan. 25 contains the following observations under the head of "Amateur Hanging":

"It has often been remarked that in this country a public execution is generally followed closely by instances of death by hanging, either suicidal or accidental, in consequence of the powerful effect which the execution of a noted criminal produces upon a morbid and unmatured mind."

Of the several cases which are alleged by The Times in illustration of this remark, one is that of a lunatic at Sheffield, who, after talking with other lunatics respecting the execution of Barbour, put an end to his existence by hanging himself. Another case is that of a boy of 14 years, who also hung himself.

The doctrine to which the enumeration of these facts was intended to give its support, is one which no reasonable man would be likely to guess, it being no less than a direct apotheosis of the hangman, while capital punishment is extolled as the ultima ratio of society. This is done in a leading article of the "leading journal."

The Morning Advertiser, in some very bitter but just strictures on the hanging predilections and bloody logic of The Times, has the following interesting data on 43 days of the year 1849:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executions of:</th>
<th>Murders and Suicides:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millan ..........</td>
<td>March 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulley ..........</td>
<td>March 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Sandles</td>
<td>March 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. G. Newton</td>
<td>March 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. G. Gleeson—4</td>
<td>at Liverpool ..........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murders</td>
<td>March 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a The data are taken from the leading article in The Morning Advertiser, January 26, 1853.—Ed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>March 27</td>
<td>Murder and suicide at Leicester</td>
<td>April 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>March 31</td>
<td>Poisoning at Bath</td>
<td>April 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Bailey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>April 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landick</td>
<td>April 9</td>
<td>J. Ward murders his mother</td>
<td>April 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Thomas</td>
<td>April 13</td>
<td>Yardley</td>
<td>April 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doxey, parricide</td>
<td>April 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Bailey kills his two children and himself</td>
<td>April 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Griffiths</td>
<td>April 18</td>
<td>Charles Overton</td>
<td>April 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Rush</td>
<td>April 21</td>
<td>Daniel Holmsden</td>
<td>May 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table, as *The Times* concedes, shows not only suicides, but also murders of the most atrocious kind, following closely upon the execution of criminals. It is astonishing that the article in question does not even produce a single argument or pretext for indulging in the savage theory therein propounded; and it would be very difficult, if not altogether impossible, to establish any principle upon which the justice or expediency of capital punishment could be founded, in a society glorying in its civilization. Punishment in general has been defended as a means either of ameliorating or of intimidating. Now what right have you to punish me for the amelioration or intimidation of others? And besides, there is history—there is such a thing as statistics—which prove with the most complete evidence that since Cain the world has neither been intimidated nor ameliorated by punishment. Quite the contrary. From the point of view of abstract right, there is only one theory of punishment which recognizes human dignity in the abstract, and that is the theory of Kant, especially in the more rigid formula given to it by Hegel. Hegel says:

"Punishment is the right of the criminal. It is an act of his own will. The violation of right has been proclaimed by the criminal as his own right. His crime is the negation of right. Punishment is the negation of this negation, and consequently an affirmation of right, solicited and forced upon the criminal by himself."\(^a\)

There is no doubt something specious in this formula, inasmuch as Hegel, instead of looking upon the criminal as the mere object, the slave of justice, elevates him to the position of a free and self-determined being. Looking, however, more closely into the matter, we discover that German idealism here, as in most other instances, has but given a transcendental sanction to the rules of existing society. Is it not a delusion to substitute for the individual with his real motives, with multifarious social circumstances pressing

---
upon him, the abstraction of "free-will"—one among the many qualities of man for man himself! This theory, considering punishment as the result of the criminal's own will, is only a metaphysical expression for the old "jus talionis": *eye against eye, tooth against tooth, blood against blood. Plainly speaking, and dispensing with all paraphrases, punishment is nothing but a means of society to defend itself against the infraction of its vital conditions, whatever may be their character. Now, what a state of society is that, which knows of no better instrument for its own defense than the hangman, and which proclaims through the "leading journal of the world" its own brutality as eternal law?

Mr. A. Quételet, in his excellent and learned work, l'Homme et ses Facultés, says:

"There is a budget which we pay with frightful regularity—it is that of prisons, dungeons and scaffolds.... We might even predict how many individuals will stain their hands with the blood of their fellow men, how many will be forgers, how many will deal in poison, pretty nearly the same way as we may foretell the annual births and deaths."

And Mr. Quételet, in a calculation of the probabilities of crime published in 1829, actually predicted with astonishing certainty, not only the amount but all the different kinds of crimes committed in France in 1830. That it is not so much the particular political institutions of a country as the fundamental conditions of modern bourgeois society in general, which produce an average amount of crime in a given national fraction of society, may be seen from the following table, communicated by Quételet, for the years 1822-24. We find in a number of one hundred condemned criminals in America and France:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Philadelphia</th>
<th>France</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under twenty-one years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty-one to thirty</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirty to forty</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above forty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, if crimes observed on a great scale thus show, in their amount and their classification, the regularity of physical phenomena—if as Mr. Quételet remarks, "it would be difficult to decide in respect to which of the two" (the physical world and the social system) "the acting causes produce their effect with the utmost regularity"—is there not a necessity for deeply reflecting upon an alteration of the system that breeds these crimes, instead of

---

* "The right of retaliation by inflicting punishment of the same kind".—*Ed.
glorifying the hangman who executes a lot of criminals to make room only for the supply of new ones? One of the topics of the day is the publication of a pamphlet by Mr. Richard Cobden—"1793 and 1853, in Three Letters" (140 pages). The first part of this pamphlet, treating of the time of, and previous to, the revolution of 1793, has the merit of attacking openly and vigorously the old English prejudices respecting that epoch. Mr. Cobden shows that England was the aggressive party in the revolutionary war. But here he has no claim to originality, as he does but repeat, and in a much less brilliant manner, the statements once given by the greatest pamphleteer England has ever possessed, viz.: the late William Cobbett The other part of the pamphlet, although written from an economical point of view, is of a rather romantic character. Mr. Cobden labors to prove that the idea of Louis Napoleon's having any intention of invading England is a mere absurdity; that the noise about the defenseless state of the country has no material foundation, and is propagated only by persons interested in augmenting the public expenditure. By what arguments does he prove that Louis Napoleon has no hostile intentions toward England? Louis Napoleon, he contends, has no rational ground for quarreling with England. And how does he prove that a foreign invasion of this country is impossible? For 800 years, says Mr. Cobden, England has not been invaded. And what are his arguments to show that the cry about the defenseless state is a mere interested humbug? The highest military authorities have declared that they feel quite safe! Louis Napoleon has never met, even in the Legislative Assembly, with a more credulous believer in his faith and peaceable intentions, than he finds now, rather unexpectedly, in Mr. Richard Cobden. The Morning Herald (in yesterday's number), a the habitual defender of Louis Napoleon, publishes a letter addressed to Mr. Cobden, and alleged to have been written under the immediate inspiration of Bonaparte himself, in which the prince-hero of Satory assures us that he will only come over to England, if the Queen, threatened by rising Democracy, should want some 200,000 of his décembrailards or bullies. But this Democracy, according to The Herald, is nobody else than Messrs. Cobden & Co.

---

a Of January 27, 1853.— Ed.
b i.e. Louis Bonaparte. For the review of the troops in Satory see this volume, p. 151.— Ed.
c Victoria.— Ed.
d Décembrailards (décembre+ braillards)—literally “December bullies”. An allusion to the members of the Bonapartist Society of December 10.— Ed.
We must confess that, having perused the pamphlet in question, we begin to feel an apprehension of something like an invasion of Great Britain. Mr. Cobden is no very happy prophet. After the repeal of the Corn Laws he made a trip to the Continent, visiting even Russia, and after his return stated that all things were right, that the times of violence had passed, that the nations deeply and eagerly involved in commercial and industrial pursuits, would now develop themselves in a quiet business-like manner, without political storms, without outbreaks and disturbances. His prophecy had scarcely reached the Continent, when the Revolution of 1848 burst forth over all Europe, and gave a somewhat ironical echo to Mr. Cobden's meek predictions. He talked peace, where there was no peace.

It would be a great mistake to suppose that the peace doctrine of the Manchester School has a deep philosophical bearing. It only means, that the feudal method of warfare shall be supplanted by the commercial one—cannons by capital. The Peace Society yesterday held a meeting at Manchester, where it was almost unanimously declared, that Louis Napoleon could not be supposed as intending anything against the safety of England, if the press would but discontinue its odious censures on his Government, and become mute! Now, with this statement, it appears very singular, that increased army and navy estimates have been voted in the House of Commons without opposition, none of the M. P.'s present at the Peace Conference having had anything to say against the proposed addition to the military force.

During the political calm, produced by the adjournment of Parliament, there are two principal topics which occupy the press, viz.: The coming Reform Bill, and the last Discount Regulations of the Bank of England.

The Times of the 24th inst. informs the public that a new Reform Bill is on the stocks. What kind of a Reform Bill it will be, you may infer from Sir Charles Wood's election-speech at Halifax, in which he declared against the principle of equal electoral districts; from Sir James Graham's at Carlisle, where he rejected the ballot; and from the confidentially circulated statement, that even the small Reform pills prescribed in Feb. 1852 by Johnny Russell, are considered as far too strong and dangerous. But there is something which looks yet more suspicious. The mouthpiece of the Coalition Ministry, The Economist, in the number of Jan. 22, states, not only:

"That the reform of our representative system stands not very early on the list of topics of pressing or immediate importance," but also, that "we want the raw materials..."
for legislative action. The extension, adjustment, purification, protection and re-distribution of the Franchise, are branches of the question, each of which demands profound reflection, and much inquiry.... It is not that several of our statesmen may not have a good deal of useful information on all or some of these points, but it is picked up, not worked out, it is miscellaneous, partial, and incomplete.... The obvious mode of remedying this, is by issuing a Commission of Inquiry, charged to investigate all points of fact directly or remotely connected with the subject.”

Thus the Methusalem Ministry will again begin their political studies, coram publico. The colleagues of Peel, the colleagues of Melbourne, the subaltern of Canning, the lieutenant of the elder Grey, men who served under Lord Liverpool, others who sat in the cabinet of Lord Grenville, all neophytes of half-a-century back, are unable, from want of experience, to propose to Parliament any decisive measure on Electoral Reform. Thus, the old proverb, that experience comes with age, appears to be refuted. “This coyness in a coalition of veteran partisans is something too comical to be easily described,” exclaims The Daily News, asking: “Where is your Reform Bill?”

b The Morning Advertiser replies:

“We should be inclined to the opinion that there will be no Reform Bill at all during the present session. There may be some attempt at legislating for the prevention and punishment of bribery at elections, and with regard to some other matters of minor importance; an effort may be made to remedy evils connected with the parliamentary representations of the country, but such legislation will not be deserving the name of a new Reform Bill.”

c With regard to the late Discount Regulations of the Bank of England, the panic at first called forth by them, has now subsided, and businessmen alike with theorists, have assured themselves that the present prosperity will not be seriously interrupted or checked. But read the following extract from The Economist:

“This year, upon an immense extent of our wheat-land, there is no plant at all. On a very large proportion of our heavy soils, much of the land which should have been in wheat, remains unsown, and some of that which has been sown, is in no better plight, for the seed has either perished, or the plant has come up so thinly, or has been so destroyed by slugs, that the prospects of the occupiers are not better than those of the unsown lands. It has now become nearly impossible to plant all the wheat-land.”

d Now the crisis, temporarily protracted by the opening of the Californian and Australian markets and mines, will unquestionably become due, in the event of a bad harvest. The Discount Regulations
of the Bank are only the first forebodings. In 1847 the Bank of England altered its rate of discount 13 times. In 1853 there will be a full score of such measures. In conclusion, I wish to ask the English Economists, how it happens that modern Political Economy commenced its warfare against the mercantile system by demonstrating that the influx and efflux of gold in a country are indifferent, that products are only exchanged against products, and that gold is a product like all others, while the very same Economy, now at the end of its career, is most anxiously watching the efflux and influx of gold? “The real object to be accomplished by the operations of the Bank,” says The Economist, “is to prevent an exportation of capital.”

Now, would The Economist prevent an exportation of capital in the shape of cotton, iron, woollen yarns and stuffs? And is gold not a product like all other products? Or has The Economist turned, in his old days, a Mercantilist? And after having set free the importation of foreign capital, does he aim at checking the exportation of British capital? After having freed himself from the civilized system of protection, will he recur to the Turkish one?

I am just concluding my letter, as I am informed, that a report is prevalent in political circles, that Mr. Gladstone is at variance with several of the leading members of the Aberdeen Ministry, on the subject of the Income Tax, and that the result of the misunderstanding will probably be the resignation of the Right Hon. gentleman. In that case, Sir Francis Baring, formerly Chancellor of the Exchequer under Lord Melbourne, will probably become his successor.

Written on January 28, 1853


Signed: Karl Marx

---

a “The Bank of England and the Rate of Discount”, The Economist, No. 491, January 22, 1853.—Ed.
The Daily News states that the establishment of a defensive coast-militia is under the serious consideration of the Government.

The Bank accounts show a further decrease of bullion to the amount of £362,084. There have been shipped, during the last fortnight, about £1,000,000 partly for the continent and partly in coin, for Australia. As the bullion in the Bank of France continues to also decrease, in spite of the large importation of gold from England, there has apparently sprung up a system of private hoarding, which strongly indicates the general distrust in the stability of Napoleonic government.

At present there is manifested a general demand for higher wages, on the part of working-men, especially shipwrights, colliers, factory-operatives and mechanics. This demand is owing to the prevailing prosperity and cannot be considered as a very particular event. A fact which deserves more notice, is a regular strike amongst agricultural laborers, a thing which has never taken place before. The laborers of South Wilts have struck for an advance of 2 shillings, their weekly wages amounting now only to 7s.

According to the quarterly returns of the registrar-general, emigration from Great Britain was going on through the past year, at the rate of 1,000 a-day, the increase of population being somewhat slower. Simultaneously there was a large increase of marriages.

The deaths of Viscount Melbourne and the Earl of Tyrconnel, with that of the Earl of Oxford, make no less than three peerages, that have become extinct within the last fortnight. If there be any class exempt from the Malthusian law of procreation in a geometrical progression, it is that of the hereditary aristocracy. Take, for instance, the peers and baronets of Great Britain. Few, if any, of the Norman nobility exist at this time and not much more of the original baronet families of King James I. The great majority of the House of Lords were created in 1760. The order of baronets commenced in 1611,
under James I. There are at present only thirteen surviving out of the number of baronet families then created, and of those created in 1625 there remain but 39. The extraordinary decrease of the Venetian nobility affords another instance of the prevalence of the same law, notwithstanding that all the sons were ennobled by birth. Amelot counted in his time 2,500 nobles at Venice, possessing the right of voting in the council. At the commencement of the 18th century there remained only 1,500, in spite of a later addition of several families. From 1583-1654, the sovereign council of Berne admitted into the hereditary patricia 487 families, of which 399 became extinct within the space of two centuries while in 1783 there survived only 108. To recur to remoter periods of history, Tacitus informs us that the Emperor Claudius created a new stock of patricians, "exhaustis etiam quas dictator Caesar lege Cassia et princeps Augustus lege Saenia sublegere." It is evident from these facts, that nature does not like hereditary aristocracy, and it may safely be asserted but that for a continual infusion of new blood, and an artificial system of propping up, the English House of Lords would ere this have died its natural death. Modern physiology has ascertained the fact, that fertility decreases among the higher animals, inversely with the development of the nervous system, especially with the growing bulk of the brain. But no one will venture to affirm that the extinction of the English aristocracy has anything to do with an exuberance of brain.

It appears that the "millennium" is already considered as broken down by the same parties who predicted and originated it, even before the House of Commons has taken place. The Times, in its number of Feb. 4, says:

"While Manchester has been fulminating her indignation against the Government of Lord Aberdeen, ... Irish Popery and Socialism (?) are bestowing their questionable praises on Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli."

As to the Irish Socialism alluded to in The Times, this term applies, of course, to the Tenant-Right agitation. On a future occasion I intend to show that the theories of all modern English bourgeois economists are in perfect accordance with the principle of Tenant-Right. How little the tenor of The Times article just quoted is shared in by other newspapers, may be seen from the following contained in The Morning Advertiser:

---

a Amelot de la Houssaye, Histoire du gouvernement de Venise.—Ed.

b "For even those had died out who had been added by the dictator Caesar under the law of Cassius and by the princeps Augustus under the law of Saenius", Publius Cornelius Tacitus, Annales, XI, 25.— Ed.
"We should despise the Irishmen, could we believe them capable of deserting the principle of Tenant-Right."a

The wrath of the Aberdeen organ is explained by the fact of the Millenarian Ministry being completely disappointed. Messrs. Sadleir and Keogh were the acknowledged leaders of the Brigade—the one in the Cabinet, the other in the field. Mr. Sadleir directed and managed, while Mr. Keogh made the speeches. It was supposed that the purchase of these two would bring over the whole lot. But the members of the Brigade were sent to Parliament pledged to stand in opposition to, and to remain independent of every Government that would not establish perfect religious equality, and realize the principle of Sharman Crawford’s bill on the rights of the Irish tenants.308 The Times, therefore, is indignant at these men being unwilling to break their faith. The immediate cause of the outbreak of this angry feeling was given by a meeting and banquet at Kells, County of Meath. The circular invited those to whom it was addressed, to express their indignation at “the recent desertion from the Irish Parliamentary party,” and a resolution was passed in that sense.

This failure in the calculations of the Ministry with regard to the Brigade could have been anticipated; but a transformation is now going on in the character and position of Irish parties, of the deep bearing of which neither they nor the English press appear yet to be aware. The bishops and the mass of the clergy approve of the course taken by the Catholic members, who have joined the Administration. At Carlow, the clergy afforded their entire support to Mr. Sadleir, who would not have been defeated but for the efforts of the Tenant-Leaguers. In what light this schism is viewed by the true Catholic party, may be seen from an article in the French Univers, the European organ of Jesuitism. It says:

“The only reproach which can, with good foundation, be objected to Messrs. Keogh and Sadleir, is, that they suffered themselves to be thrown into connection with two Associations (the Tenant-League and the Religious Equality Association) which have no other object than to make patent the anarchy which consumes Ireland.”

In its indignation, the Univers betrays its secret:

“We deeply regret to see the two Associations put themselves in open opposition to the bishops and clergy, in a country where the prelates and dignitaries of the Church have hitherto been the safest guides of popular and national organization.”

We may infer that, should the Tenant-Leaguers happen to be in France, the Univers would cause them to be transported to Cayenne.

a Quoted from the leading article in The Morning Advertiser, February 5, 1853.— Ed.
The Repeal agitation was a mere political movement, and therefore, it was possible for the Catholic clergy to make use of it, for extorting concessions from the English Government while the people were nothing but the tools of the priests. The Tenant-Right agitation is a deep-rooted social movement which, in its course, will produce a downright scission between the Church and the Irish Revolutionary party, and thus emancipate the people from that mental thralldom which has frustrated all their exertions, sacrifices, and struggles for centuries past.

I pass now to the “Reunion” of the leading reformers of the County of Lancaster and its representatives, which was held at Manchester on the 3d inst. Mr. George Wilson was in the chair. He spoke only of the iniquitous representation of the commercial and industrial compared with the agricultural districts, upon which he expressed himself in the following terms:

“In the five Counties of Buckingham, Dorset, Wilts, Northampton, and Salop, 63 members were returned by 52,921 voters, while only the same number were returned by Lancashire and Yorkshire, with 89,669 county and 84,612 borough voters, making a total of 174,281. So that, if they returned members in proportion to voters alone, those five counties could only claim 19; while, if Lancashire took their proportion, it would be entitled to 207. There were twelve large cities or boroughs (taking London as a double borough) returning 24 members, with 192,000 voters, and a population of 3,268,218, and 383,000 inhabited houses. On the other side, 24 members were returned by Andover, Buckingham, Chippenham, Cockermouth, Totnes, Harwich, Honiton, Thetford, Lymington, Marlborough, Great Marlborough and Richmond; but they had only 3,569 voters, 67,434 inhabitants, and 1,373 inhabited houses.... The most timid reformer and most moderate man would hardly object to the disfranchisement of those boroughs which had a population less than 5,000, and to handing over the 20 members to those large constituencies.”

Mr. Milner Gibson, M.P., took up the subject of National Education, and the Taxes on Knowledge. With regard to the Reform Bill, the only passage in his speech deserving notice, is his declaration on the point of equal electoral districts:

“It may be, if you please, a great class-question.”

Mr. Brotherton, another M.P., said:

“No Reform Bill would be satisfactory, at this time, which did not propose to equalize the distribution of the representation.”

But by far the most memorable speech was that of Mr. Bright, M.P., the real man among the “Manchester men.” He said:

---

a Speeches at a meeting of Parliamentary Reform supporters at Manchester on February 3, 1853 are quoted from the account of the meeting published in The Times, No. 21344, February 5, 1853, under the title “Social Soirée of Reformers at Manchester.”—Ed.
"The Government is a coalition Government, composed of Whigs and Peelites.... There is no great cause for any throwing up of caps, as if we had in the Government men of new principles and of a new policy, who are about to take a great start, and who would not require to be urged on by all those who are favorable to Reform in every part of the country. [Hear.]"

In reference to Parliamentary Reform he said:

"If Louis Napoleon had started with a Representation like ours, in France; if he had given all the Members to the rural districts, where the Bonaparte family are so popular, and had not allowed Members to be returned from Paris, and Lyons, and Marseilles, all the Press of England would have denounced the sham Representation which he was establishing in that country. [Hear! hear!]... We have one-eighth of the population of England here in Lancashire; we have one-tenth of its rateable property, and we have one-tenth of the whole number of houses.... We begin to know where we are now. [Loud cheers]... There is another little difficulty, which is the difficulty of the ballot. [Hear! hear!] I read Lord John Russell's speech at his election, and really these London electors were in capital humor or they would not have allowed such an argument to pass without saying something against it. 'He was against secrecy everywhere'; and when I read the paragraph, I said to myself 'Very well; if I had been one of your supporters, I should have recommended you to take a reporter from The Times office to the next Cabinet-meeting with you.'" [Hear! laughter.] Now we come to Sir James Graham's argument: 'He did not think secret voting could be made compulsory.' Why can it not be made compulsory? Open voting is made compulsory, and secret voting could be made compulsory. It is compulsory, at any rate, in the State of Massachusetts, if not in the other States of North America; and Sir James Graham knows perfectly well that there was no force in what he was saying to 2,000 or 3,000 of the people of Carlisle, on a rainy day, when, I suppose, people did not weigh matters under their umbrellas very carefully.

"We must not forget," concluded Mr. Bright, "that everything the country has gained since the Revolution of 1688—and especially everything of late years—has been gained in a main contest of the industrial and commercial classes against the aristocratic and privileged classes of this country. We must carry on the same conflict; there are great things yet to be done. [Hear! hear! and cheers.]"

The resolution unanimously agreed to was:

"That this meeting requests the Liberal Members connected with the County of Lancaster to consider themselves a committee for the purpose of aiding in any proceedings with reference to Parliamentary Reform, with a view to secure such additional representation for this County, as its population, industry, wealth and intelligence require."

The Manchester School have repeated at this meeting their battle cry: the industrial Bourgeoisie against the Aristocracy; but, on the other hand, they have also betrayed the secret of their policy, viz.: the exclusion of the people from the representation of the country, and the strict maintenance of their particular class-interest. All that was said with regard to the ballot, national education, taxes on knowledge, &c., is nothing but rhetorical flourishes; the only serious object being the equalization of Electoral Districts—at least the only one upon which a resolution was passed and a pledge taken by the
members. Why this? With equal electoral districts the town interest would become the commander of the country interest—the bourgeoisie would become master of the House of Commons. If it were given to the Manchester men to obtain equal electoral districts, without a necessity of making serious concessions to the Chartists, the latter would find instead of two enemies, mutually trying to outbid each other in their appeals to them, one compact army of foes, who would concentrate all their forces to resist the people's demands. There would be, for a while, the unrestricted rule of capital, not only industrially but also politically.

A bad omen for the coalition Ministry may be found in the eulogiums bestowed at Kells and at Manchester on the fallen Administration. Mr. Lucas, M.P., said at Kells:

"There were no greater enemies to Tenant Right than the Marquis of Lansdowne, Lord Palmerston, Sidney Herbert, &c. &c. Had they not had the Whig Ministry and the Grahamites nibbling at the Tenant question? They had on the other hand the Tory officials; and he would leave it to the conscience of any man, who read the propositions that emanated from the various parties, to say whether the treatment of the subject on the side of the Derby Government was not a thousand times more honest than that of the Whigs."

At the Manchester Reunion, Milner Gibson said:

"Although the Budget of the late Ministry, as a whole, was bad, still there were good indications of future policy in that budget.—[Hear! hear!] At least the late Chancellor of the Exchequer has broken the ice. I mean with regard to the Tea Duties. I have heard from good authority that it was the intention of the late Government to repeal the Advertisement Duty."

Mr. Bright went still further in his eulogium:

"The late Government did a bold thing with regard to the Income Tax. For the country gentlemen of England, themselves the owners of a vast portion of the fixed landed property of the country, for them to come forward and support a proposition which made a distinction in the rate charged on fixed property, and that on income derived from trade and other precarious sources, was a step that we ought not to lose sight of, and that we, in this district, are bound to applaud. But there was another point to which Mr. Disraeli referred, and for which I must say I feel grateful to him. In the speech introducing his budget, and in the speech in which he contended for three hours with that mass of power opposed to him, on the night of his final defeat, he referred to the tax on successions, which is what we understand by the legacy and probate duties, and he admitted that it required to be adjusted. [Loud cheers.]"

Written on February 8, 1853


Signed: Karl Marx

---

a Disraeli.—Ed.
Karl Marx

THE ITALIAN INSURRECTION.—BRITISH POLITICS

London, Friday, February 11, 1853

The political torpor which, under the protection of nature's dullest fog, has for so long a time prevailed here, has been suddenly interrupted by the arrival of revolutionary news from Italy. Intelligence has been received by electric telegraph, that an insurrection took place at Milan on the 6th; that proclamations had been posted up, one by Mazzini, the other by Kossuth, exhorting the Hungarians in the Austrian army to join the revolutionists; that the insurrection had been at first suppressed, but had afterwards recommenced; that the Austrians stationed in the arsenal had been massacred, &c.; that the gates of Milan were shut up. The French Government papers, it is true, communicate two further dispatches, dated Berne the 9th, and Turin 8th, which report the definitive suppression of the outbreak on the 7th. But the non-arrival of any direct information at the English Foreign Office for two days, is regarded as a favorable symptom by the friends of Italy.

Rumors are current in Paris, that great excitement prevailed at Pisa, Lucca and in other towns.

At Turin the ministry met in haste, in consequence of a communication from the Austrian Consul, in order to deliberate on the aspect of affairs in Lombardy. The day, on which the first information reached London, was the 9th of February, which day, curiously enough, is also the anniversary of the proclamation of the Roman Republic in 1849, of the decapitation of Charles I in 1649, and of the deposition of James II in 1689.

---

a G Mazzini, A. Saffi, “Italian National Committee” (February 1853), The Times, No. 21350, February 12, 1853.—Ed.
b L. Kossuth, “In the Name of the Hungarian Nation.—To the Soldiers Quartered in Italy” (February 1853), The Times, No. 21348, February 10, 1853.—Ed.
As regards the chances of the present insurrection at Milan, there can be little hope of success, unless some of the Austrian regiments pass over to the revolutionary camp. Private letters from Turin, which I expect will shortly reach me, will probably enable me to furnish you a detailed account of the whole affair.

Several statements as to the character of the amnesty lately granted by Louis Napoleon, have been published on behalf of the French refugees. Victor Frondes (a former officer) declares in the Nation, a Brussels paper, that he was surprised to see his name in the list of the amnestied, he having already amnestied himself, five months ago, by making his escape from Algiers.

The Moniteur announced at first, that 3,000 exiles were to be amnestied, and that only about 1,200 citizens would remain under the ban of proscription. A few days later the same authority stated, that 4,312 persons had been pardoned, so that Louis Napoleon actually forgave 100 persons more than he had previously condemned. Paris and the Department of the Seine alone numbered about 4,000 exiles. Of these only 226 are included in the amnesty. The Department of the Hérault counted 2,611 exiles; 299 are amnestied. The Nièvre furnished 1,478 victims among whom there were 1,100 fathers of families averaging three children each; 180 have been amnestied. In the Department of the Var 687 out of 2,181 have been released. Among the 1,200 republicans transported to Cayenne, only a few have been pardoned, and precisely such as have escaped already from that penal settlement. The number of persons transported to Algeria and now released, is large, but still in no proportion to the immense mass of people that have been carried over to Africa, which is said to amount to 12,000. The refugees now living in England, Belgium, Switzerland and Spain, with very rare exceptions, are entirely excluded from the decree. On the other hand, the amnesty lists actually contain a large number of persons who have never quitted France, or who have long since been permitted to re-enter it; nay, more, there are names which figure in the list several times. But the most monstrous fact is, that the list is swelled with the names of a large number of persons well known to have been slaughtered during the sanguinary “battues” of December.

The new Parliamentary session commenced yesterday. As a worthy introduction to the future performances of the Millenarian Ministry, the following scene was produced in the House of Lords:

---
a Of January 31, 1853.— *Ed.*
b “Décret accordant la grâce à 4312 condamnés politiques, le 2 février 1853”, *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 35, February 4, 1853.— *Ed.*
The Earl of Derby asked the Earl of Aberdeen what measures the Government proposed to submit to the consideration of Parliament; upon which the latter replied that he had already, on a former occasion, explained his principles, a repetition of which would be inconvenient; and that any further statement, before the communication to be made in the House of Commons, would be premature. And now ensued a most curious dialogue, in which the Earl of Derby spoke, and the Earl of Aberdeen only bowed significantly:

*The Earl of Derby*—"He would ask the noble Lord what measures he intended to submit to their Lordships in the course of the Session?"

After a few seconds' pause, no noble Lord having risen—

*The Earl of Derby*—"Does silence mean no measures?" [A laugh.]

*The Earl of Aberdeen*—[Muttering some inaudible words.]

*The Earl of Derby*—"May I be permitted to ask what measures will be introduced in this House?"

No answer.

The question of adjournment being put by the Lord Chancellor, their Lordships adjourned.

Passing from the House of Lords to "Her Majesty's liege Commons," we shall observe that the Earl of Aberdeen has expounded the programme of the Ministry much more strikingly by his silence than Lord John Russell by his long and grave speech last night. The short *resumé* of the latter was: "No Measures, but Men"; adjournment of all questions of Parliamentary importance for one year; and strict payment of the salaries of her Majesty's Ministers during that time. Lord John Russell stated the intention of the Government in nearly these words:

"With regard to the number of men to be voted for the Army, the Navy, and Ordnance, there will be no increase beyond the number voted before the Christmas holidays. With regard to the amounts in the various estimates, there will be found a considerable increase upon the estimates of last year.... A bill will be brought in to enable the Legislature of Canada to dispose of the Clergy Reserves in Canada.... The President of the Board of Trade will move for the introduction of a Pilotage bill.... The disabilities of her Majesty's Jewish subjects will be removed.... Propositions will be made on the subject of Education. I am not prepared to say that I am about to introduce, on the part of her Majesty's Government, a very large plan on that subject. It will include educational measures for the poorer classes, and propositions with respect to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.... Transportation to Australia will cease.... There will be made a proposal with respect to the system of secondary punishments.... Immediately after the Easter recess, or as soon as possible after that period, the Chancellor of the Exchequer will propose the financial statement for the

---

*a* Information about the debate in the House of Lords and Russell's speech in the House of Commons on February 10, 1853 are given according to the account of them in *The Times*, No. 21349, February 11, 1853.—*Ed.*

*b* Cranworth.—*Ed.*

*c* Cardwell.—*Ed.*

*d* Gladstone.—*Ed.*
year.... The Lord Chancellor will state in a few days what are the measures he proposes to bring in for the improvement of the law.... It is the intention of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, in a few days, to move the appointment of a select Committee with regard to the law of Landlord and Tenant in Ireland.... Ministers would endeavor to effect a renewal of the Income Tax for the present year, without any observation or discussion whatever.”

In reference to Parliamentary Reform, Lord John Russell declares that it may perhaps be taken into consideration in the next session. Accordingly, no Reform Bill at present. Nay more, Johnny was at great pains to disclaim the idea of ever having promised to give a more liberal measure of representative reform than his bill of last session. He was even indignant that words to that effect should have been ascribed to him. He never said nor meant anything of the kind. Nor does he promise that his intended bill of next session will be as comprehensive as that of 1852. With respect to bribery and corruption, he said:

“I think it better to defer giving an opinion as to whether any further measures may be necessary to check bribery and corruption. I will only say that the subject is one of the highest importance.”

It is impossible to describe the cool amazement with which this speech of Finality-John was received by the House of Commons. It would be difficult to state, which was greater, the perplexity of his friends, or the hilarity of his foes. All seemed to regard his speech as a complete refutation of Lucretius’s doctrine, that “Nil de nihilo fit.” Lord John at least made something out of nothing; a dry, long and very tedious speech.

There were two subjects upon which Ministers were supposed to mean to stand or fall—a new assessment of the Income Tax and a new Reform Bill. Now, as to the Income Tax it is proposed to continue it for a year in its present form. As to a Reform Bill, even of Whig dimensions, it is declared that Ministers intend to introduce it only on the condition that they remain in office for a whole year. It is altogether the programme of the late Russell Administration, minus the Reform Bill. Even the financial statement is postponed till after the Easter recess, so that Ministers may be able, in any event, to touch their quarterly pay.

The particular reform propositions are nearly all of them borrowed from Mr. Disraeli’s programme. Thus for instance, the law amendment, the abolition of transportation to Australia, the Pilotage bill, the Committee on the Tenant-Right question, etc. The

---

a John Young.— Ed.
b “Nothing comes out of nothing” (Lucretius Carus, De rerum natura. V).— Ed.
only points belonging properly to the present Ministry, are the proposed educational reform which Lord John assures us will be of no larger size than himself, and the removal of Baronet Lionel Rothschild’s disabilities. It may be questioned, whether the English people will be very contented with this extension of the suffrage to a Jewish usurer, who was notoriously one of the accomplices of the Bonapartist coup d’état.

This impudence of a Ministry, composed of two parties that were completely beaten at the late general elections, it would be difficult to explain, were it not for the circumstance that any new Reform Bill would necessitate a dissolution of the present House of Commons, the majority of which stick to their dearly-bought seats, gained by narrow majorities.

Nothing is more delightful than the manner in which The Times attempts to comfort its readers:

“Next session is not quite so uncertain an epoch as to-morrow; for to-morrow depends not only on the will, but even on the life of the procrastinator, while, if the world endures, next session will certainly arrive. Then put off to next session—the whole Parliamentary reform—give the Ministry a rest for one year!”

I, for my part, am of opinion, that it is highly beneficial to the people, that no Reform Bill is to be octroyed by Ministers, in the present dull state of the public mind, and “under the cold shadow of an aristocratic Coalition Cabinet.” It must not be forgotten that Lord Aberdeen was a member of the Tory Cabinet, which, in 1830, refused to agree to any measure of reform. National reforms must be won by National agitation, and not by the grace of my Lord Aberdeen.

In conclusion let me mention that, at a special meeting of the General Committee of the National Association for the Protection of British Industry and Capital, held in the South-Sea House, on Monday last, under the Presidency of the Duke of Richmond, this Society wisely resolved to dissolve itself.

Written on February 11, 1853

Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune


Signed: Karl Marx

— Quoted from the leading article in The Times, No. 21349, February 11, 1853.
— Ed.
The electric telegraph brings the following news from Stuhlweissenburg\(^a\):

"On the 18th inst., at 1 o'clock, the Emperor of Austria, Francis Joseph, was walking on the ramparts of Vienna, when a Hungarian journeyman tailor named János Libényi, formerly a hussar from Vienna, rushed upon him in a moment and struck him with a poniard. The blow was warded off by an aid-de-camp, the Count O'Donnell. Francis Joseph was wounded below the occiput. The Hungarian, 21 years of age, was struck down by a blow of the aid-de-camp's sword and was arrested immediately."

According to other accounts, the weapon employed was a musket.

A very extensive conspiracy for the overthrow of the Austrian rule has just been discovered in Hungary.

The *Wiener Zeitung*\(^b\) publishes several sentences passed by courts martial on thirty-nine individuals, accused principally of conspiracy with Kossuth and Ruszak, from Hamburg.

Immediately after the revolutionary outbreak in Milan had been crushed, Radetzky gave orders to intercept all communication with Piedmont and Switzerland. You will ere this have received the scanty information that has been allowed to find its way from Italy to England. I call your attention to one characteristic feature in the Milan affair.

Lieutenant-Marshal Count Strassoldo, in his first decree of the 7th inst., although imposing the severest state of siege upon Milan, plainly admits that the bulk of the population took no part whatever in the late insurrection. Radetzky, in his subsequent proclamation of

---

\(^a\) The Hungarian name is Székesfehérvár.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) Issue No. 35 of February 10, 1853.—*Ed.*
the 9th inst., dated from Verona, subverts the statement of his inferior, and takes advantage of the rebellion to obtain money under false pretenses. He subjects all persons not notoriously belonging to the Austrian party to fines of unlimited extent, for the benefit of the garrison. In his proclamation of the 11th inst. he declares “that the generality of the inhabitants, with a few praiseworthy exceptions, are unwilling to submit to the Imperial rule,” and he instructs all judicial authorities, i.e. the courts martial, to sequestrate the property of all the accomplices, explaining this term in the following manner:

“Che tale complicità consista semplicemente nella omissione della denuncia a cui ognuno è tenuto.”

He might as well have confiscated all Milan at once under the pretense that, the insurrection having broken out on the 6th, its inhabitants failed to denounce it on the 5th. Whoever will not become a spy and informer for the Hapsburg shall be liable to become the lawful prey of the Croat. In a word, Radetzky proclaims a new system of wholesale plunder.

The Milan insurrection is significant as a symptom of the approaching revolutionary crisis on the whole European continent. As the heroic act of some few proletarians—the sons of Mammon were dancing, and singing, and feasting amid the blood and tears of their debased and crucified nation—proletarians who, armed only with knives, marched to attack the citadel of a garrison and surrounding army of forty thousand of the finest troops in Europe, it is admirable. But as the finale of Mazzini’s eternal conspiracy, of his bombastic proclamations and his arrogant capucinades against the French people, it is a very poor result. Let us hope that henceforth there will be an end of révolutions improvisées, as the French call them. Has one ever heard of great improvisators being also great poets? They are the same in politics as in poetry. Revolutions are never made to order. After the terrible experience of ’48 and ’49, it needs something more than paper summonses from distant leaders to evoke national revolutions. Kossuth has seized the opportunity for publicly disavowing the insurrection in general, and the proclamation published in his name in particular. It looks, however, rather suspicious that he claims for himself a post-factum superiority to his friend Mazzini as a politician. The Leader remarks on this subject:
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\[a\] “And that complicity consists in the simple failure to denounce, to which everybody is obliged.” — Ed.

\[b\] See this volume, p. 508. — Ed.
"We deem it necessary to caution our readers that the matter in question lies exclusively between Mr. Kossuth and Mr. Mazzini, the latter of whom is absent from England."^a

Della Rocco, a friend of Mazzini, says in a letter addressed to *The Daily News*, with regard to Mr. Kossuth's and Mr. Agostini's disavowals:

"There are persons who will suspect that they were waiting the definitive news of the success or the failure of the insurrection, as ready to share the honor of the former as to repel the responsibility of the latter."^b

B. Szemere, Ex-Minister of Hungary, protests in a letter addressed to the editor of *The Morning Chronicle*, "against the illegitimate usurpation of the name of Hungary by Kossuth." He says:

"Let those who are desirous of forming a judgment of him as a statesman, read attentively the history of the last Hungarian Revolution, or of learning his skill as a conspirator, cast a retrospective glance on the unhappy Hamburg expedition of last year."^315

That the revolution is victorious even in its failures, one may see from the terrors the Milan échauffourééc has thrown in the very heart of continental potentates. Look only at the following letter published in the official *Frankfurter Oberpostamts-Zeitung*d:

"Berlin, Feb. 13.—The events at Milan have produced a deep impression here. The news reached the Kingéc by telegraph on the 9th, just as the court was in the middle of a ball. The King immediately declared that the movement was connected with a deep conspiracy, which had its ramifications everywhere, and that it showed the necessity for the close union of Prussia and Austria in presence of these revolutionary movements.... A high functionary exclaimed: 'We may thus have to defend the Prussian crown on the banks of the Po.'"

So great was the alarm created in the first moment, that about twenty inhabitants of Berlin were arrested without any other cause than the "deep impression." The *Neue Preussische Zeitung*, the ultra Royalist paper, was confiscated for publishing the document purporting to be from Kossuth. On the 13th the Minister of Westphalia presented to the first chamber a hasty bill for empowering the Government to seize all papers or pamphlets published outside the frontiers of Prussia. Arrests and domiciliar
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^a "Kossuth and the Milan Revolt", *The Leader*, February 19, 1853.—*Ed.*
^b Della Rocco, "Mazzini's Proclamation", *The Daily News*, February 21, 1853.—*Ed.*
^c Affrays.—*Ed.*
^d *Frankfurter Postzeitung*.—*Ed.*
^e Frederick William IV.—*Ed.*
visits are the order of the day at Vienna. Negotiations immediately took place between Russia, Prussia and Austria, for a joint remonstrance to be addressed to the British Government on the subject of political refugees. So weak, so powerless are the so-called “powers.” They feel the thrones of Europe vibrate to their foundations at the first forebodings of the revolutionary earthquake. In the midst of their armies, their gallows and their dungeons, they are trembling at what they call “the subversive attempts of a few paid miscreants.”

“Quiet is restored.” It is. The ominous and dreadful quiet that intervenes between the first burst of the tempest and its returning roar.

From the agitated scenes of the Continent I pass to quiet England. It would seem as if the spirit of little Finality-John had obtained the whole of the official sphere for its dominion; as though the nation throughout had become as paralytic as the men who now govern it. Even The Times exclaims with despair:

“It may be the calm before a storm; it may be the smoke before the fire.... For the present it is dullness.”

Business has been resumed in Parliament, but till now the three times repeated bowing of Lord Aberdeen has been the most dramatic, and the only conspicuous act of the Coalition Ministry. The impression Lord John’s programme has made on his enemies has been best described by the professions of his friends:

“Lord John Russell,” says The Times, “has made a speech with rather less spirit than an ordinary auctioneer would put into his preliminary remarks before a sale of old furniture, damaged goods, or shop fittings.... Lord John Russell creates mighty little enthusiasm.”

You know that the new Reform Bill has been postponed under the presence of more urgent practical reforms calling upon the more immediate attention of legislators. Now an instance has already been given of what nature these reforms must turn out to be, while the instrument of reforming, viz., Parliament, remains itself unreformed.

On Feb. 14, Lord Cranworth laid his programme of legal reform before the House of Lords. By far the greater part of his prolix,
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a This quotation and one that follows are from the leading article in The Times, No. 21350, February 12, 1853.—Ed.
b See this volume, p. 510.—Ed.
tedious, and indecisive speech consisted in the enumeration of the many things he was expected, but not at all prepared to do. He excused himself with being only seven weeks on the woolsack, but, as The Times observes, "Lord Cranworth has been 63 years in this world, and 37 at the Bar." In the true spirit of Whiggery, he infers from the comparatively great results obtained by the small legal reforms hitherto made, that it would be an infraction of the laws of modesty to go on reforming in the same strain. In the true spirit of Aristocracy, he abstains from dealing with Ecclesiastical Law, as "It would interfere too much with vested interests." Interests vested in what? In public nuisances. The only measures of any importance prepared by Lord Cranworth are the following two: Firstly, a "Bill to facilitate the transfer of land," the principal features of which are, that it renders the transfer of land only more difficult, by increasing the expenses thereon, and augmenting the technical obstructions, without shortening the length, or diminishing the complexity of conveyances. Second, a proposition to form a commission for digesting the statute law, the whole merit of which will be restricted to the compilation of an index for the 40 quarto volumes of statutes at large. Lord Cranworth certainly may defend his measures against the most inveterate opponents to law-reform with the same excuse which was offered by the poor girl to her Confessor, namely: that, though it was true that she had had a child, it was but a very little one.

Up to this day the only interesting debate in the House of Commons was that in which Mr. Disraeli, on the 18th inst., interpellated the Ministers on the relations of the country with France. Disraeli began with Poitiers and Azincourt, and ended with the hustings at Carlisle, and the Cloth-Hall at Halifax, his object being to denounce Sir James Graham and Sir Charles Wood for irreverent remarks made on the character of Napoleon III. Disraeli could not have rendered the utter decay of the old Tory party more evident, than by his throwing himself up as the apologist of the Bonapartes, the hereditary enemies of the very political class whose chief he himself is. He could not have opened his opposition career in a more inappropriate manner, than by this justification of the actual regime in France. The weakness of this part of his speech may be seen from a short analysis of it.

Attempting to explain the causes of the uneasiness felt by the
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a Quoted from the leading article in The Times, No. 21352, February 15, 1853.

b Graham was deputy from Carlisle and Wood from Halifax.—Ed.
public on the state of England's present relations with France, he was compelled to admit that the principal motive was just derived from the large armaments, which were commenced under his own administration. Nevertheless he endeavored to prove, that the increasing and completing of the defenses of Great Britain had their only reason in the great changes occasioned by the modern application of science to the art of war. Competent authorities, he says, had ere this recognized the necessity of such measures. In 1840, under the Ministry of M. Thiers, there had been made some efforts by the Government of Sir Robert Peel, at least to commence a new system with regard to the public defenses. But in vain. Again, at the outbreak of the Continental revolutions in 1848, an opportunity had been offered to the Government of the day to lead popular opinion in the direction which it desired, as far as the defense of the country was concerned. But again without result. The question of national defenses had not become ripe before he and his colleagues were placed at the head of the Government. The measures adopted by them were as follows:

I. A Militia was established.
II. The Artillery was placed in an efficient state.
III. Measures were introduced which will completely fortify the arsenals of the country, and some important strong posts upon the coast.
IV. A proposition was made by which will be added to the Navy 5,000 sailors and 1,500 marines.
V. Arrangements were made for the establishment of the ancient force in the form of a Channel Fleet of 15 or 20 sail of the line with an adequate number of frigates and smaller ships.

Now, from all these statements, it is evident that Disraeli established exactly the contrary of what he wanted to prove. The Government was unable to effect an increase of armaments, when the Syrian and Tahitian questions menaced the entente cordiale with Louis Philippe$^{319}$; it was equally unable to do so when Revolution spread all over the Continent and seemed to threaten British interests at their very root. Why, then, has it become possible to do so now, and why was it done by Mr. Disraeli's Government? Exactly because Napoleon III has raised more fears for the security of England than have existed at any time since 1815. And further, as Mr. Cobden justly observed:

"The proposed increase in the naval force was not an increase of steam machinery, but one of men, and the transition from the use of sailing vessels to that of steamers did not imply the necessity of a larger number of sailors, but quite the contrary."$^{3}$
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$^{3}$ Richard Cobden, Speech in the House of Commons on February 18, 1853, The Times, No. 21356, February 19, 1853.—Ed.
Disraeli said:  

"Another cause for the belief in an impending rupture with France is the existence in France of a military government. But when armies are anxious for conquests it is because their position at home is uneasy; and France is now governed by the army, not in consequence of the military ambition of the troops, but in consequence of the disquietude of the citizens."

Mr. Disraeli seems entirely to overlook that the question is just, how long the army will feel easy at home, and how long the entire Nation will bow, out of deference to the egotistical disquietude of a small class of citizens, to the actual terrors of a military despotism, which after all is but the instrument of exclusive class interests.

The third cause alleged by Mr. Disraeli was:

"The considerable prejudice in this country against the present ruler of France.... It is understood that in acceding to power he has terminated what we esteem a Parliamentary Constitution, and that he has abrogated the liberty of the press."

There is, however, but little which Mr. Disraeli knew of to oppose to that prejudice. He said "it was extremely difficult to form an opinion on French politics."

It is simply common sense which tells the English people, although less deeply initiated into the mysteries of French politics than Mr. Disraeli, that the reckless adventurer, being neither controlled by a Parliament nor a press, is the very man to make a piratical descent upon England, after his own exchequer has become exhausted by extravagance and dissipation.

Mr. Disraeli then records some instances, in which the cordial understanding between Bonaparte and the late Administration had greatly contributed toward the maintenance of peace, as in the case of an impending conflict between France and Switzerland, in the opening of the South America rivers, in the case of Prussia and Neuchâtel, in pressing upon the United States the Tripartite renunciation of Cuba, in the common action in the Levant with regard to the Tanzimat in Egypt, in the revision of the Greek Succession Treaty, in the cordial co-operation with regard to the Regency of Tunis, &c. Now this reminds me of a certain member of the French party of order, who made a speech at the end of November, 1851, on the cordial understanding between Bonaparte and the majority of the Assembly which had enabled the latter so easily to dispose of the Suffrage, the Association, and the
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a Here and below Disraeli's speech in the House of Commons on February 18, 1853 is quoted from The Times, No. 21356, February 19, 1853. His opponents' statements are also quoted from the same newspaper.—Ed.
Press questions. Two days later the coup d'état had been carried out.

Weak and inconsistent as was this part of Disraeli's speech, his attacks on the Coalition Ministry formed a brilliant conclusion:

"There is one other reason," he concluded, "why I am bound to pursue this inquiry at the present moment, and I find that reason in the present state of parties in this House. It is a peculiar state of things. We have at this moment a Conservative Ministry, and we have a Conservative Opposition. [Cheers.] Where the great Liberal party is, I pretend not to know. [Cheers.] Where are the Whigs, with their great traditions? ... There is no one to answer. [Renewed cheering.] Where, I ask, are the youthful energies of Radicalism? Its buoyant expectations—its expanded hopes? Awakened, I fear, from the dreams of that ardent inexperience which attend sometimes the career of youth, it finds itself at the same moment used and discarded. [Cheers.] Used without compunction, and not discarded with too much decency. [Cheers.] Where are the Radicals? Is there a man in the House who declares himself to be a Radical? [Hear, hear!] No, not one. He would be afraid of being caught and turned into a Conservative Minister. [Roars of laughter.] Well, how has this curious state of things been brought about? Where is the machinery by which it has been effected, this portentous political calamity? I believe I must go to that inexhaustible magazine of political devices, the First Lord of the Admiralty (Graham), to explain the present state of affairs. The House may recollect that some two years ago the First Lord of the Admiralty afforded us, as is his wont, one of those political creeds in which his speeches abound. He said: 'I take my stand on progress.' Well, Sir, I thought at the time that progress was an odd thing to take one's stand upon. [Much laughter and cheering.] I thought at the time that this was a piece of oratorical slip-slop. But I apologize for the momentary suspicion. I find that it was a system perfectly matured, and now brought into action. For we have now a Ministry of progress, and every one stands still. [Cheers.] We never hear the word 'reform' now; it is no longer a Ministry of reform; it is a Ministry of progress, every member of which resolves to do nothing. All difficult questions are suspended. All questions which cannot be agreed upon are open questions."

The opponents of Disraeli had but little to say in reply to him, with the exception of that very "inexhaustible magazine of political devices," Sir James Graham, who, at least, preserved his dignity in not wholly retracting the offensive words against Louis Napoleon, of which he had been accused.

Lord John Russell charged Mr. Disraeli with making a party question of the country's foreign policy, and assured the Opposition:

"That after the contentions and struggles of last year the country would gladly see a short time at least of peaceable progress, without any of these great convulsive struggles of parties."

The result of the debate is, that the whole of the navy estimates will be voted by the House, but to the comfort of Louis Napoleon, not from a warlike but only a scientific view of the matter. Suaviter in
modo, fortiter in re. On Thursday morning last, the Queen's Advocate, appearing before Sir J. Dodson, in the Prerogative Court, requested, on behalf of the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, that the original will and codicil of Napoleon Bonaparte should be delivered up by the Register to the French Government; which desire was complied with. Should Louis Bonaparte proceed to open and endeavor to execute this testament, it might prove the modern box of Pandora.

Written on February 22, 1853

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 3710, March 7 (evening edition) and March 8 (morning edition), 1853

Signed: Karl Marx

---

a Literally: suavely in manner, strongly in matter; gently but firmly—an expression from the treatise Industriae ad curandos animae morbos by Claudio Acquaviva, General of the Society of Jesus.—Ed.
The Parliamentary debates of the week offer but little of interest. On the 22nd inst., Mr. Spooner moved, in the House of Commons, the repeal of the money grants for the Catholic College at Maynooth, and Mr. Scholefield proposed the amendment “to repeal all enactments now in force whereby the revenue of the State is charged in aid of any ecclesiastical or religious purpose whatsoever.” Mr. Spooner’s motion was lost by 162 to 192 votes. Mr. Scholefield’s amendment will not come under discussion before Wednesday next; it is, however, not improbable that the amendment will be withdrawn altogether. The only remarkable passage in the Maynooth debate is an observation that fell from Mr. Duffy (Irish Brigade):

“He did not think it wholly impossible that the President of the United States, or the new Emperor of the French, might be glad to renew the relations between those countries and the Irish Priesthood.”

In the session of last night Lord John Russell brought before the House of Commons his motion for the “removal of some disabilities of Her Majesty’s Jewish subjects.” The motion was carried by a majority of 29. Thus the question is again settled in the House of Commons, but there is no doubt that it will be once more unsettled in the House of Lords.

The exclusion of Jews from the House of Commons, after the spirit of usury has so long presided in the British Parliament, is

---

a Frank Pierce.—Ed.
b Napoleon III.—Ed.
unquestionably an absurd anomaly, the more so as they have already become eligible to all the civil offices of the community. But it remains no less characteristic for the man and for his times, that instead of a Reform Bill which was promised to remove the disabilities of the mass of the English people, a bill is brought in by Finality-John for the exclusive removal of the disabilities of Baron Lionel de Rothschild. How utterly insignificant an interest is taken in this affair by the public at large, may be inferred from the fact that from not a single place in Great Britain a petition in favor of the admission of Jews has been forwarded to Parliament. The whole secret of this miserable reform farce was betrayed by the speech of the present Sir Robert Peel.¹

"After all, the House were only considering the noble Lord's private affairs. [Loud cheers.] The noble Lord represented London with a Jew [cheers], and had made the pledge to bring forward annually a motion in favor of the Jews. [Hear!] No doubt Baron Rothschild was a very wealthy man, but this did not entitle him to any consideration, especially considering how his wealth had been amassed. [Loud cries of "hear, hear", and "Oh! Oh!" from the Ministerial benches.] Only yesterday he had read in the papers that the House of Rothschild had consented to grant a loan to Greece, on considerable guaranties, at 9%. [Hear!] No wonder, at this rate, that the house of Rothschild were wealthy. [Hear!] The President of the Board of Control had been talking of gagging the Press. Why, no one had done so much to depress freedom in Europe as the house of Rothschild [Hear, hear!] by the loans with which they assisted the despotic powers. But even supposing the Baron to be as worthy a man as he was certainly rich, it was to have been expected that the noble Lord who represented in that House a government consisting of the leaders of all the political factions who had opposed the late Administration, would have proposed some measure of more importance than the present."

The proceedings on election-petitions have commenced. The elections for Canterbury and Lancaster have been declared null and void, under circumstances which proved the habitual venality on the part of a certain class of electors, but it is pretty sure that the majority of cases will be adjusted by way of compromise.

"The privileged classes," says The Daily News,⁵ "who have successfully contrived to baffle the intentions of the Reform Bill and to recover their ascendancy in the existing representation are naturally alarmed at the idea of full and complete exposure."

On the 21st inst., Lord John Russell resigned the seals on the Foreign Office, and Lord Clarendon was sworn in as his successor. Lord John is the first Member of the House of Commons admitted to
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¹ Delivered in the House of Commons on February 24, 1853. The account of speech in The Times, No. 21361, February 25, 1853.—Ed.
² Charles Wood.—Ed.
³ February 23, 1853 (leading article).—Ed.
a seat in the Cabinet without any official appointment. He is now only a favorite adviser, without a place—and without salary. Notice, however, has already been given by Mr. Kelly of a proposition to remedy the latter inconvenience of poor Johnny's situation. The Secretaryship of Foreign Affairs is at the present juncture the more important, as the Germanic Diet has bestirred itself to ask the removal of all political refugees from Great Britain, as the Austrians propose to pack us all up and transport us to some barren island in the South Pacific.

Allusion has been made, in a former letter, to the probability of the Irish Tenant-Right agitation becoming, in time, an anti-clerical movement, notwithstanding the views and intentions of its actual leaders. I alleged the fact, that the higher Clergy was already beginning to take a hostile attitude with regard to the League. Another force has since stepped into the field which presses the movement in the same direction. The landlords of the north of Ireland endeavor to persuade their tenantry that the Tenant League and the Catholic Defense Association are identical, and they labor to get up an opposition to the former under the pretense of resisting the progress of Popery.

While we thus see the Irish landlords appealing to their tenants against the Catholic clergy we behold on the other hand the English Protestant clergy appealing to the working classes against the mill-lords. The industrial proletariat of England has renewed with double vigor its old campaign for the Ten Hours Bill and against the truck and shoppage system. As the demands of this kind shall be brought before the House of Commons, to which numerous petitions on the subject have already been presented, there will be an opportunity for me to dwell in a future letter on the cruel and infamous practices of the factory-despots, who are in the habit of making the press and the tribune resound with their liberal rhetorics. For the present it may suffice to recall to memory that from 1802 there has been a continual strife on the part of the English working people for legislative interference with the duration of factory labor, until in 1847 the celebrated Ten Hours Act of John Fielden was passed, whereby young persons and females were prohibited to work in any factory longer than ten hours a day. The liberal mill-lords speedily found out that under this act factories might be worked by shifts and relays. In 1849 an action of law was brought before the Court of Exchequer, and the Judge decided that to work the relay or shift-system, with two sets of children, the adults
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*See this volume, p. 505.— Ed.*
working the whole space of time during which the machinery was running, was legal. It therefore became necessary to go to Parliament again, and in 1850 the relay and shift-system was condemned there, but the Ten Hours Act was transformed into a Ten and a Half Hours Act.\footnote{"An Act to Amend the Acts Relating to Labour in Factories, 1850." — Ed.} Now, at this moment, the working classes demand a restitution \textit{in integrum} of the original Ten Hours Bill; yet, in order to make it efficient, they add the demand of a restriction of the moving power of machinery.

Such is, in short, the exoteric history of the Ten Hours Act. Its secret history was as follows: The landed aristocracy having suffered a defeat from the bourgeoisie by the passing of the Reform Bill of 1831, and being assailed in “their most sacred interests” by the cry of the manufacturers for Free Trade and the abolition of the Corn Laws, resolved to resist the middle class by espousing the cause and claims of the working-men against their masters, and especially by rallying around their demands for the limitation of factory labor. So-called philanthropic Lords were then at the head of all Ten-Hours’ meetings. Lord Ashley has even made a sort of “renommée” by his performances in this movement. The landed aristocracy, having received a deadly blow by the actual abolition of the Corn Laws in 1846, took their vengeance by forcing the Ten Hours Bill of 1847 upon Parliament. But the industrial bourgeoisie recovered by judiciary authority, what they had lost by Parliamentary legislation. In 1850, the wrath of the Landlords had gradually subsided, and they made a compromise with the Mill-lords, condemning the shift-system, but imposing, at the same time, as a penalty for the enforcement of the law, half an hour extra work \textit{per diem} on the working classes. At the present juncture, however, as they feel the approach of their final struggle with the men of the Manchester School, they are again trying to get hold of the short-time movement; but, not daring to come forward themselves, they endeavor to undermine the Cotton-lords by directing the popular force against them through the medium of the \textit{State Church Clergymen}. In what rude manner these holy men have taken the anti-industrial crusade into their hands, may be seen from the following few instances. At Crompton a Ten-Hours’ meeting was held, the Rev. Dr. Brammell \textit{[of the State Church]} in the chair. At this meeting, Rev. J. R. Stephens, Incumbent of Stalybridge, said:

"There had been ages in the world when the nations were governed by Theocracy.... That state of things is now no more.... Still the spirit of law was the same.... The laboring man should, first of all, be partaker of the fruits of the earth,"
which he was the means of producing. The factory law was so unblushingly violated that the Chief Inspector of that part of the factory district, Mr. Leonard Horner, had found himself necessitated to write to the Home Secretary, to say that he dared not, and would not send any of his Sub-Inspectors into certain districts until he had police protection. And protection against whom? Against the factory-masters! Against the magistrates of the district, against the richest men in the district, against the most influential men in the district, against the men who hold her Majesty's Commission, against the men who sat in the Petty Sessions as the Representatives of Royalty. And did the masters suffer for their violation of the law? In his own district, it was a settled custom of the male, and to a great extent of the female workers in factories, to be in bed till 9, 10 or 11 o'clock on Sunday, because they were tired out by the labor of the week. Sunday was the only day on which they could rest their wearied frames. It would generally be found that, the longer the time of work, the smaller the wages. He would rather be a slave in South Carolina, than a factory operative in England.

At the great Ten-Hours' meeting, at Burnley, Rev. E. A. Verity, Incumbent of Habbergham Eaves, told his audience among other things:

"Where was Mr. Cobden, where was Mr. Bright, where were the other members of the Manchester School, when the people of Lancashire were oppressed?... What was the end of the rich man's thinking? Why, he was scheming how he could defraud the working classes out of an hour or two. That was the scheming of what he called the Manchester School. That made them such cunning hypocrites, and such crafty rascals. As a minister of the Church of England, he protested against such work."

The motive, that has so suddenly metamorphosed the gentlemen of the Established Church, into as many knights-errant of labor's rights, and so fervent knights too, has already been pointed out. They are not only laying in a stock of popularity for the rainy days of approaching Democracy, they are not only conscious that the Established Church is essentially an aristocratic institution, which must either stand or fall with the landed Oligarchy—there is something more. The men of the Manchester School are Anti-State Church men, they are Dissenters, they are, above all, so highly enamored of the £13,000,000 annually abstracted from their pockets by the State Church in England and Wales alone, that they are resolved to bring about a separation between those profane millions and the holy orders, the better to qualify the latter for heaven. The reverend gentlemen, therefore, are struggling pro aris et focis. The men of the Manchester School, however, may infer from this diversion, that they will be unable to abstract the political power from

---

\[a\] E. A. Verity, Speech at a Ten-Hours' meeting, at Burnley, on February 18, 1853. The People's Paper, No. 42, February 19, 1853.—Ed.

\[b\] For their alters and their firesides, i.e. for all that is sacred to them (M. T. Cicero, De natura deorum, Lib. 3, Cap. 40, 94).—Ed.
the hands of the Aristocracy, unless they consent, with whatever reluctance, to give the people also their full share in it.

On the Continent, hanging, shooting and transportation is the order of the day. But the executioners are themselves tangible and hangable beings, and their deeds are recorded in the conscience of the whole civilized world. At the same time there acts in England an invisible, intangible and silent despot, condemning individuals, in extreme cases, to the most cruel of deaths, and driving in its noiseless, every day working, whole races and whole classes of men from the soil of their forefathers, like the angel with the fiery sword who drove Adam from Paradise. In the latter form the work of the unseen social despot calls itself *forced emigration*, in the former it is called *starvation*.

Some further cases of starvation have occurred in London during the present month. I remember only that of Mary Ann Sandry, aged 43 years, who died in Coal-lane, Shadwell, London. Mr. Thomas Peene, the surgeon, assisting the Coroner’s inquest, said the deceased died from starvation and exposure to the cold. The deceased was lying on a small heap of straw, without the slightest covering. The room was completely destitute of furniture, firing and food. Five young children were sitting on the bare flooring, crying from hunger and cold by the side of the mother’s dead body.

On the working of “forced emigration” in my next.

Written on February 25, 1853 Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 3716, March 15, 1853

Signed: Karl Marx

---

*Cf.* Genesis 3:24.—*Ed.*
London, Friday, March 4, 1853

From the accounts relating to trade and navigation for the years 1851 and 1852, published in Feb. last, we see that the total declared value of exports amounted to £68,531,601 in 1851, and to £71,429,548 in 1852; of the latter amount, £47,209,000 go to the export of cotton, wool, linen and silk manufactures. The quantity of imports for 1852 is below that for the year 1851. The proportion of imports entered for home consumption not having diminished, but rather increased, it follows that England has reexported, instead of the usual quantity of colonial produce, a certain amount of gold and silver.a

The Colonial Land Emigration Office gives the following return of the emigration from England, Scotland and Ireland to all parts of the world, from Jan. 1, 1847, to June 30, 1852:b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Scotch</th>
<th>Irish</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>34,685</td>
<td>8,616</td>
<td>214,969</td>
<td>258,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>58,865</td>
<td>11,505</td>
<td>177,719</td>
<td>248,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>73,613</td>
<td>17,127</td>
<td>208,758</td>
<td>299,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>57,843</td>
<td>15,154</td>
<td>207,852</td>
<td>280,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>69,557</td>
<td>18,646</td>
<td>247,763</td>
<td>335,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852 (till June)</td>
<td>40,767</td>
<td>11,562</td>
<td>143,375</td>
<td>195,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>335,330</strong></td>
<td><strong>82,610</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,200,436</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,618,376</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
a This paragraph is omitted in The People's Paper.—Ed.
b The returns are quoted from the article "Effects of Emigration on Production and Consumption" published in The Economist, No. 494, February 12, 1853 (the comments quoted below are from this article).—Ed.
“Nine-tenths”, remarks the Office, “of the emigrants from Liverpool are assumed to be Irish. About three-fourths of the emigrants from Scotland are Celts, either from the Highlands, or from Ireland through Glasgow.”

Nearly four-fifths of the whole emigration are, accordingly, to be regarded as belonging to the Celtic population of Ireland and of the Highlands and islands of Scotland. The London Economist says of this emigration:

“It is consequent on the breaking down of the system of society founded on small holdings and potato cultivation”; and adds: “The departure of the redundant part of the population of Ireland and the Highlands of Scotland is an indispensable preliminary to every kind of improvement.... The revenue of Ireland has not suffered in any degree from the famine of 1846-47, or from the emigration that has since taken place. On the contrary, her net revenue amounted in 1851 to £4,281,999, being about £184,000 greater than in 1843.”

Begin with pauperizing the inhabitants of a country, and when there is no more profit to be ground out of them, when they have grown a burden to the revenue, drive them away, and sum up your Net Revenue! Such is the doctrine laid down by Ricardo, in his celebrated work, The Principle of Political Economy. The annual profits of a capitalist amounting to £2,000, what does it matter to him whether he employs 100 men or 1,000 men? “Is not,” says Ricardo, “the real income of a nation similar?” The net real income of a nation, rents and profits, remaining the same, it is no subject of consideration whether it is derived from 10 millions of people or from 12 millions. Sismondi, in his Nouveaux Principes d’Économie Politique, answers that, according to this view of the matter, the English nation would not be interested at all in the disappearance of the whole population, the King a (at that time it was no Queen, but a King) remaining alone in the midst of the island, supposing only that automatic machinery enabled him to procure the amount of Net Revenue now produced by a population of 20 millions. Indeed, that grammatical entity “the national wealth” would in this case not be diminished.

In a former letter I have given an instance of the clearing of estates in the Highlands of Scotland. b That emigration continues to be forced upon Ireland by the same process, you may see from the following quotation from The Galway Mercury:

“The people are fast passing away from the land in the West of Ireland. The landlords of Connaught are tacitly combined to weed out all the smaller occupiers,

---

a The reference is to King George III.—Ed.
b See this volume, pp. 487-94.—Ed.
against whom a regular systematic war of extermination is being waged.... The most heart-rending cruelties are daily practiced in this province, of which the public are not at all aware."a

But it is not only the pauperized inhabitants of Green Erin and of the Highlands of Scotland that are swept away by agricultural improvements, and by the "breaking down of the antiquated system of society." It is not only the able-bodied agricultural laborers from England, Wales, and Lower Scotland whose passages are paid by the Emigration Commissioners. The wheel of "improvement" is now seizing another class, the most stationary class in England. A startling emigration movement has sprung up among the smaller English farmers, especially those holding heavy clay soils, who, with bad prospects for the coming harvest, and in want of sufficient capital to make the great improvements on their farms which would enable them to pay their old rents, have no other alternative but to cross the sea in search of a new country and of new lands. I am not speaking now of the emigration caused by the gold mania, but only of the compulsory emigration produced by landlordism, concentration of farms, application of machinery to the soil, and introduction of the modern system of agriculture on a great scale.

In the ancient states, in Greece and Rome, compulsory emigration, assuming the shape of the periodical establishment of colonies, formed a regular link in the structure of society. The whole system of those states was founded on certain limits to the numbers of the population, which could not be surpassed without endangering the condition of antique civilization itself. But why was it so? Because the application of science to material production was utterly unknown to them. To remain civilized they were forced to remain few. Otherwise they would have had to submit to the bodily drudgery which transformed the free citizen into a slave. The want of productive power made citizenship dependent on a certain proportion in numbers not to be disturbed. Forced emigration was the only remedy.

It was the same pressure of population on the powers of production that drove the barbarians from the high plains of Asia to invade the Old World. The same cause acted there, although under a different form. To remain barbarians they were forced to remain few. They were pastoral, hunting, war-waging tribes, whose manner of production required a large space for every individual, as is now the case with the Indian tribes in North America. By augmenting in numbers they curtailed each other’s field of production. Thus the

a "State of the Country", The Galway Mercury, February 5, 1853. This quotation and the paragraph directly preceding it are omitted in The People’s Paper.—Ed.
surplus population was forced to undertake those great adventurous migratory movements which laid the foundation of the peoples of ancient and modern Europe.

But with modern compulsory emigration the case stands quite opposite. Here it is not the want of productive power which creates a surplus population; it is the increase of productive power which demands a diminution of population, and drives away the surplus by famine or emigration. It is not population that presses on productive power; it is productive power that presses on population.

Now I share neither in the opinions of Ricardo, who regards “Net Revenue” as the Moloch to whom entire populations must be sacrificed, without even so much as complaint, nor in the opinion of Sismondi, who, in his hypochondriacal philanthropy, would forcibly retain the superannuated methods of agriculture and proscribe science from industry, as Plato expelled poets from his Republic.1 Society is undergoing a silent revolution, which must be submitted to, and which takes no more notice of the human existences it breaks down than an earthquake regards the houses it subverts. The classes and the races, too weak to master the new conditions of life, must give way. But can there be anything more puerile, more shortsighted, than the views of those economists who believe in all earnest that this woeful transitory state means nothing but adapting society to the acquisitive propensities of capitalists, both landlords and money lords? In Great Britain the working of that process is most transparent. The application of modern science to production clears the land of its inhabitants, but it concentrates people in manufacturing towns.

“No manufacturing workmen,” says The Economist, “have been assisted by the Emigration Commissioners, except a few Spitalfields and Paisley hand-loom weavers, and few or none have emigrated at their own expense.”

The Economist knows very well that they could not emigrate at their own expense, and that the industrial middle class would not assist them in emigrating. Now, to what does this lead? The rural population, the most stationary and conservative element of modern society, disappears, while the industrial proletariat, by the very working of modern production, finds itself gathered in mighty centers, around the great productive forces, whose history of creation has hitherto been the martyrology of the laborers. Who will prevent them from going a step further and appropriating these forces, to which they have been appropriated before? Where will be

1 Plato, Politeia. X.—Ed.
the power of resisting them? Nowhere! Then, it will be of no use to appeal to the "rights of property." The modern changes in the art of production have, according to the bourgeois economists themselves, broken down the antiquated system of society and its modes of appropriation. They have expropriated the Scotch clansman, the Irish cottier and tenant, the English yeoman, the hand-loom weaver, numberless handicrafts, whole generations of factory children and women; they will expropriate, in due time, the landlord and the cotton lord.

On the Continent heaven is fulminating, but in England the earth itself is trembling. England is the country where the real revulsion of modern society begins.\(^a\)

In my letter of the 1st inst. I told you that Mazzini would remonstrate publicly with Kossuth.\(^b\) On the 2d inst. there appeared actually in The Morning Advertiser, Morning Post and Daily News a letter from Mazzini. As Mazzini himself has now broken the ice, I may as well state that Kossuth disowned his own document under the pressure of his Paris friends.\(^b\) In the past career of Kossuth we find many such symptoms of vacillating weakness, inextricable contradictions and duplicity. He possesses all the attractive virtues, but also all the feminine faults of the "artiste" character. He is a great artist "\(\text{en paroles}\)." I recommend Mr. Szemere's lately published biographies of Louis Batthyány, Arthur Görgei and Louis Kossuth to those who, unwilling to bow to popular superstition, are anxious to form a matter-of-fact judgment.\(^c\)

As to Lombardy, you may be sure that, if Mazzini has failed to draw the Italian middle classes into the movement, Radetzky will not fail therein. At this moment he is preparing to confiscate the property of all emigrants, even those who emigrated with Austrian permission, and have been naturalized in other countries, unless they prove they are unconnected with the late rising. The Austrian papers calculate the amount of confiscable property at £12,000,000.

Upon a question put by Lord Dudley Stuart, Lord Palmerston stated in the session of the House of Commons of March 1:

"That no application for the expulsion of the political refugees had been made by the Continental Powers, or that, if made, it would meet with a firm and decided refusal. The British Government had never undertaken to provide for the internal security of other countries."

---

\(a\) The paragraph that follows is omitted in The People's Paper.—Ed.

\(b\) See this volume, p. 508.—Ed.

\(c\) B. Szemere, Graf Ludwig Batthyány, Arthur Görgei, Ludwig Kossuth. Politische Characterskizzen aus dem Ungarischen Freiheitskriege.—Ed.
That such an application, however, was intended to be made, you may see from the stockjobbing *Moniteur* and the *Journal des Débats*, which, in one of its last numbers, supposes England already bowing to the joint demands of Austria, Russia, Prussia and France. That journal adds:

“If the Swiss Confederation should refuse to allow Austria to exercise a *surveillance* over the Cantons on her frontiers she will probably violate the Swiss territory and occupy the Canton of Tessin; in which case France, to preserve a political equilibrium would force her armies into the Swiss Cantons on her frontiers.”

In substance, the *Journal des Débats* gives, with regard to Switzerland, that simple solution of the question jocosely proposed by Prince Henry of Prussia to the Empress Catherine in 1770, with regard to Poland. In the meantime the venerable body called the German Diet is gravely discussing on “the application about to be made to England,” and expends as much breath on this solemn matter as would suffice to swell the sails of the whole German fleet.

In the session of the House of Commons of the 1st inst., there occurred a very characteristic incident. The representatives of Bridgenorth and Blackburn having been declared unduly elected on the ground of bribery, Sir J. Shelley moved that the evidence taken before their respective Committees should be laid upon the table of the House, and that the writs for reelection be suspended until the 4th of April. The Right Hon. Baronet Sir J. Trollope remarked with regard to this: “That 14 Committees had already been appointed to try boroughs for corrupt practices, and that about 50 more remained to be appointed,” and he spoke of the difficulty in finding members enough in the House to constitute tribunals to judge the disputed elections, and at the same time to form Committees for the ordinary business of the House. Sifting a little deeper into its own foundation, a breaking down of the House must ensue, and the parliamentary machinery come to a deadlock.

In his recent pamphlet, as well as in his *harangues*, at the Manchester Peace Congress, and at various educational meetings, Mr. Cobden has amused himself with censuring the press. The whole press has retaliated upon him; but the most heavy blow strikes him from the hands of the “Englishman,” whose letters on Louis Napoleon elicited such a sensation at the time of the *coup d’état*, and who has since turned round upon the silken barons and cotton lords.

---

a Of March 1, 1853.—*Ed.*
b Richard Cobden, 1793 and 1853, in *Three Letters.*—*Ed.*
c Alfred Bate Richards.—*Ed.*
He concludes a letter, addressed to Mr. Cobden, with the following epigrammatic characterization of the West-Riding oracle:

"Elated and unbalanced by one single triumph, he would compass a popular autocracy. The prophet of a clique, restlessy agitating, greedy of notoriety, chafed of opposition, crotchety, illogical, utopian, stubborn of purpose, arrogant of bearing, a quarrelsome peace preacher, and acrimonious proselyte of universal brotherhood, with liberty upon his lips, but despotism in his dogmas, he is exasperated with a press that will neither be bullied nor bamboozled—would geld its influence, intelligence, and independence, and would sink a profession of accomplished gentlemen to a gang of penny-a-liners, with himself for the only Leader." 

Written on March 4, 1853


Signed: Karl Marx

Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune and checked with The People’s Paper

---

* Quoted from Richards' letter to Cobden published in The Morning Advertiser on February 24, 1853.— Ed.
London, Friday, March 18, 1853

Parliament will adjourn to-day, for the Easter recess, until April 4th.

In a former letter I reported, according to a generally accredited rumor, that Libényi's wife had been flogged by the Austrians at Pesth.\(^3\) I have since ascertained that he was never married, and likewise that the story circulated in the English press, saying that he had attempted to revenge his father, who had been ill-treated by the Austrians, is wholly unfounded. He acted exclusively under the influence of political motives, and retained to the last hour a firm and heroic demeanor.

You will, ere this, have received with the English papers the reply of Kossuth to Mazzini's declaration.\(^a\) For my part, I am of opinion that Kossuth has only made a bad case still worse. The contradictions in his first and his last declaration\(^b\) are so palpable that I need not insist on urging them here. Besides, there is a repulsive heterogeneity in the language of the two documents, the former being written in the Oriental hyperbolics of the Prophet, and the latter in the casuistic pleading-style of a lawyer.

---

\(^a\) The reference is to Mazzini's letter to a number of English newspapers published on March 2, 1853 (see this volume, p. 508.). Kossuth's reply to this letter was given in his letter to Captain Mayne Reid (date unknown), excerpts from which were published in *The Leader*, No. 154, March 5, 1853.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) The reference is to Kossuth's proclamation of February 1853 "In the Name of the Hungarian Nation.—To the Soldiers Quartered in Italy", published in *The Times*, No. 21348, February 10, 1853 (see this volume, p. 508), and to his letter to Captain Mayne Reid mentioned above.—*Ed.*
Mazzini's friends affirm now, to a man, that the Milanese insurrection was forced upon him and his associates by circumstances which it was beyond his power to control. But, on one side, it belongs to the very nature of conspiracies to be driven to a premature outbreak, either by treason or by accidents. On the other side, if you cry, during three years, action, action, action—if your entire revolutionary vocabulary be exhausted by the one word "Insurrection," you cannot expect to hold sufficient authority for dictating, at any given moment: there shall be no insurrection. Be this as it may, Austrian brutality has turned the Milanese failure into the real commencement of a national revolution. Hear, for instance, the well-informed organ of Lord Palmerston, The Morning Post, of to-day:

"The people of Naples wait for a movement which is sure to take place in the Austrian Empire. Then the whole of Italy, from the frontiers of Piedmont to Sicily, will be in revolt, and sad disasters will follow. The Italian troops will disband—the so-called Swiss soldiers, recruited from the revolution of 1848, will not save the sovereigns of Italy. An impossible republic awaits Italy. That will assuredly be the next act of the drama which began in 1848. Diplomacy has exhausted all its powers for the princes of Italy."\(^a\)

Aurelio Saffi, who countersigned Mazzini's proclamation,\(^b\) and who made a tour through Italy before the outbreak, avows, in a letter addressed to The Daily News, that "the upper classes were sunk in listless indifference or despair," and that it was the "people of Milan," the proletarians, who,

"abandoned without direction to their own instincts, preserved their faith in the destiny of their country and, in the face of the despotism of Austrian Proconsuls and the judicial assassinations of military commissions, had unanimously made ready for vengeance."\(^c\)

Now, it is a great progress of the Mazzini party to have at last convinced themselves that, even in the case of national insurrections against foreign despotism, there exists such a thing as class-distinctions, and that it is not the upper classes which must be looked to for a revolutionary movement in modern times. Perhaps they will go a step further and come to the understanding that they have to seriously occupy themselves with the material condition of the Italian country population, if they expect to find an echo to their "Dio e popolo." On a future occasion I intend to dwell on the material

---

\(^a\) "Political Excitement in Sicily", The Morning Post, March 18, 1853.—Ed.
\(^b\) See this volume, p. 508.—Ed.
\(^c\) The reference is to Saffi's letter to Italia e Popolo which was reprinted in The Daily News on March 9, 1853.—Ed.
circumstances in which by far the greater portion of the rural inhabitants of that country are placed, and which have made them till now, if not reactionary, at least indifferent to the national struggle of Italy.

Two thousand copies of a pamphlet which I published some time ago at Basle, entitled "Revelations on the Trial of the Communists at Cologne" (Enthüllungen über den Kölner Kommunisten-Prozess), have been seized at the Baden frontier and burned, on the request of the Prussian Government. According to the new Press Law imposed on the Swiss Bund by the Continental Powers, the publisher, Mr. Schabelitz, his son, and the printer a will be persecuted by the Basle Government, which has already confiscated a number of copies still in possession of the publisher. This will be the first trial of this kind in Switzerland, and the affair has become already a matter of controversy between the Radicals and the Conservative party. How anxious the Prussian Government is to conceal its infamies during the Cologne trial from publicity, you may infer from the fact that the Minister of the Exterior b has issued orders for the seizure (Fahndebriefe) of the pamphlet wherever it should appear, but does not even dare to call it by its title. In order to mislead the public, he gives as its name "A Theory of Communism," while it contains nothing but revelations of the Prussian state mysteries.

The only "progress" made in official Germany since the year 1848, is the conclusion c of the Austro-Prussian Commercial Treaty — et encore! That Treaty is surrounded with so many clausulae, retrenched behind so many exceptions, and reserves so many chief questions to the future adjustment of yet unborn commissions, while the actual diminution in the tariffs is so small, that it amounts to a mere aspiration towards a real Commercial Union of Germany, and is, practically speaking, utterly insignificant. The most striking feature of the Treaty is the victory Austria has again won over Prussia. This perfidious, this base, this cowardly, this vacillating sham-power, has bowed again before its more brutal, but more straightforward rival. Not only has Austria forced a treaty on Prussia which the latter was most unwilling to accept, but Prussia has been compelled to renew the old Zoll-Verein 333 with the old tariff, or to promise not to change, for twelve years, anything in her Commercial policy without the unanimous consent of the minor Zoll-Verein States i.e. without the permission of Austria (the South-German

---

a Jakob Schabelitz and Chr. Krüsi.— Ed.
b Otto von Manteuffel.— Ed.
c On February 19, 1853.— Ed.
States being not only politically, but also commercially, the vassals of Austria, or the antagonists of Prussia). Since the restoration of "Divine Power," Prussia has marched from degradation to degradation. Her king, a "a wise man in his times," appears to think that his people may derive a comforting compensation in the infernal despotism they are subject to from the debasement their Government has to suffer abroad.

The refugee question is not settled yet. The semi-official Oesterreichische Correspondenz contradicts the statement, that Austria had addressed at this moment a fresh note to the English Government, because "recent events having shown that Lord Palmerston has recovered his influence, the Imperial Government could not expose its dignity to a certain check." I have written you before on Palmerston's declaration in the House of Commons. b From the English papers you know the philo-Austrian declaration of Aberdeen in the House of Lords, c that the English Government would make itself the spy and Attorney-General of Austria. Palmerston's journal d now remarks on the observation of his colleague:

"Even on the modified concession which Lord Aberdeen appears inclined to make, we cannot say that we look with much confidence to success.... No one will dare to propose to a British Government to attempt its conversion into an engine of foreign policy and a political man-trap."

You see what good understanding there is in the councils of the Methusaleministry between "antiquated imbecility and liberal energy." In the whole London press there was a unanimous cry of indignation against Aberdeen and the House of Lords, with one base exception, that of The Times newspaper.

The Times, you will remember, commenced by denouncing the refugees and inviting the Foreign Powers to ask for their expulsion. Then, having ascertained that a renewal of the Alien Bill 334 would be refused with scorn to the Ministry in the House of Commons, it at once overflowed with rhetorically framed descriptions of the sacrifice it was ready to make—oh dear!—for the preservation of the right of asylum. Finally, after the amiable conversation between my Lords of the Upper House it revenged itself on its own high-sounding civism, with the following angry explosion in its leading article of March 5th:

---

a Frederick William IV.—Ed.
b See this volume, p. 532.—Ed.
c On March 4, 1853.—Ed.
d The Morning Post (the quotation that follows is from its leading article of March 10, 1853).—Ed.
“It is believed in many parts of the Continent that we delight in this country in a menagerie of refugees—fierce characters of all nations, and fit for all crimes.... Do these foreign writers who denounce the presence of their own outlawed countrymen in England suppose that the existence of a refugee in this country is an enviable fate? Let them be undeceived. *This wretched class of beings live, for the most part, in squalid poverty, eating the salt of the stranger, when they can get it, sunk, as it were, beneath the turbid waves of this vast metropolis.... Their punishment is exile in its harshest form.*

As to the last point, *The Times* is right; England is a delightful country to live out of.

In the “heaven of Mars” Dante meets with his ancestor, Cacciaguida de Elisei, who predicts to him his approaching exile from Florence in these words:

> "Tu proverai si come sa di sale
> Lo pane altrui, e com'è duro calle
> Lo scendere, e'l salir per l'altrui scale."

> "Thou shalt prove how salt the savour is
> Of others' bread, how hard the passage,
> To descend and climb by others' stairs."a

Happy Dante, another “being of that wretched class called political refugees,” whom his enemies could not threaten with the misery of a *Times*-leader! Happier “*Times*,” that escaped a “reserved seat” in his “*Inferno!*”

If the refugees eat the salt of the stranger, as *The Times* says, getting it at strange prices, too, which it forgot to say, is *The Times* itself not feeding on the strangers' flesh and blood? How many leaders and how many pounds have its anonymous Pythias not made out of French revolutions, German insurrections, Italian outbreaks and Hungarian wars, of French “fusillades,” of Austrian gallows, of confiscated heads and beheaded property? Unhappy *Times*, if there were no “fierce characters” on the Continent, if it were to grow older day by day on the coarse food of Smithfield Market, London chimney smoke, dirt, *ferocious* cabmen, the six bridges of the Thames, intermural interments, pestilent churchyards, filthy drink-water, railway accidents, crippled pint and quart bottles, and other interesting topics, which form its regular stock-in-trade, in the intervals of continental dullness. *The Times* is unchanged since the epoch when it called upon the British Government to *murder* Napoleon I.

> “Is it considered,” it said, in its number of July 27, 1815, “what effect the knowledge of his being in existence must necessarily have on the disaffected in every

---

a Dante, *La Divina comedia*, “Il Paradiso”, XVII.—Ed.
part of Europe? They will think, and think with truth, that the Allied Sovereigns are afraid to touch the life of a man who has so many adherents and admirers."

It is still the same paper which preached the crusade against the United States of America:

"No peace should be made with America, until that mischievous example of successful democratic rebellion has been done away."

In *The Times* editorial office there are no "ferocious" continental characters. Quite the contrary. There is, for example, a poor little man, a Prussian, named Otto von Wenckstern, once editor of a little German newspaper, afterward sunk in Switzerland, in squalid poverty, appealing to the pockets of Freiligrath and other refugees, and lastly finding himself at the same time in the service of the Prussian Ambassador in London—the far-famed Bunsen—and an integral member of the Printing-House-square's oracle. There are more such conciliatory continental characters in *The Times* Office, forming the connecting link between the Continental Police and the leading journal of England.

The liberty of the Press in England is exemplified by the following case: At the Bow-st. Police Office, in London, Mr. E. Truelove, of the Strand, appeared on an information laid at the instance of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, under 6th and 7th William IV, cap. 76, for having sold a newspaper, called *The Potteries Free Press*, and printed on paper not duly stamped. Four numbers of this paper had been published at Stoke-upon-Trent, the nominal proprietor being Collet Dobson Collet, Secretary of the *Society for the Abolition of Taxes on Knowledge*, who have issued it in "Conformity with the practice of the Stamp-Office, which permits records of current events, and comments thereon, to be published without a stamp in *The Athenaeum, Builder, Punch, Racing Times*, etc."; and with the avowed intention of inviting a Government prosecution, in order that a jury might determine what description of news is to be entitled to exemption from the penny stamp. Mr. Henry, the magistrate, has reserved his decision. Much, however, will not depend on the decision, for the paper in question is not issued in defiance of the Stamp Law, but merely to avail itself of a still doubtful quibble in the law.

The English papers of to-day have a telegraphic dispatch from Constantinople, of March 6th, according to which, Fuad Effendi, the

---

*a* The address of *The Times.*—*Ed.

*b* "An Act to reduce the Duties on Newspapers, and to amend the Laws relating to the Duties on Newspapers and Advertisments", 1836.—*Ed.*
Minister of Foreign Affairs, has been replaced by Rifaat Pasha. This concession has been extorted from the Porte by the Extraordinary Russian Envoy, Prince Menchikoff. The affair of the Holy Places is not settled yet between Russia, France, and the Porte, as L. Napoleon, highly irritated at the intrigues of Russia and Austria for the prevention of his coronation by the Pope, intends indemnifying himself at the expense of the Turk. In my next letter, I shall treat of this eternally-recurring Eastern question, the pons asinib of European Diplomacy.

Written on March 18, 1853

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 3733, April 4, 1853, and in the Semi-Weekly Tribune, No. 820, April 5, 1853

Signed: Karl Marx

---

a Pius IX.— Ed.
b Stumbling-block; literally: asses' bridge (5th proposition of the 1st book of Euclid which the beginners found very difficult to understand).— Ed.
FROM THE PREPARATORY MATERIALS
Frederick Engels
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P. J. PROUDHON,
IDÉE GÉNÉRALE DE LA RÉVOLUTION AU XIX-e SIÈCLE
(CHOIX D'ÉTUDES SUR LA PRATIQUE RÉVOLUTIONNAIRE ET INDUSTRIELLE),
PARIS, GARNIER FRÈRES, 1851

1) "To the bourgeoisie".
"You", bourgeois, "were always the most fearless and the most skilful revolutionaries..." Even before the invasion of the barbarians, it was you who by means of your municipal federations had laid the shroud over the Roman Empire in Gaul (p. 1). From then on until now you were at the head of the revolution. Nothing that was attempted without you or against you met with success; everything that you attempted has been achieved, everything that you will attempt will be achieved.

The historical exposition of this theme in declamatory style.—

At the present moment the old political intriguers are again in the saddle and treat you as revolutionaries (p. V). Therefore, accept the title, be revolutionary!

2) As to the subject matter. There follow seven essays to develop the following three points of view:

a) the old regime, b) the parties at the time of the revolution, c) the solution, i.e. the revolution itself (pp. 1-2).

First Essay
"REACTIONS DETERMINE REVOLUTIONS"

A revolution cannot be prevented. The opinion of Droz, who believes that the first revolution a could have been prevented by concessions and skilful behaviour, is as absurd as that of Blanqui, who believes revolutions can be conjured up (pp. 3-4).

The French monarchy from Clovis to Richelieu was revolutionary, it became reactionary in 1614 at the time of the last États généraux 338; the punishment: January

a The French Revolution.— Ed.
21, 1793. The revolution can be guided, moderated, made to advance slowly, and this system of giving way step by step is the wisest (p. 5). But it cannot be curbed. Witness the suppression of the conspiracies of 1822 and 1839, and the revolutions of 1830 and 1848. But "established interests and governmental pride" always oppose the peaceful development of the revolution (p. 8). Reaction always creates revolution. So it was in 1789 et seq., so it was in 1848. In February when the proletariat intervened in the conflict between the bourgeoisie and the Crown, it demanded only work. The Republicans promised it work and so it joined them (pp. 10-11): "Work and, by means of work, bread; that was what the working classes asked for in 1848, that was the unshakable foundation they gave to the Republic, that is the revolution." The Republic was the "act of a minority more or less ... usurpatory", "the revolutionary question of work" was something quite different. The Republic was merely the "pledge of the revolution" (p. 11).

The Provisional Government was serious in its promises of work, but it could not keep them, otherwise it would have had to "change course, to alter the economic system of society". But instead of dealing candidly with the difficulties, and turning to the journalists, it kept silent, became directly reactionary, declared itself against socialism. "the new name that the revolution was taking" (p. 13), drove the unemployed masses in Paris and Rouen into revolt, and tried to drown in blood the great idea of February and the protest action of the workers. Henceforth it was established that the Republic of 1848 and that of 1793 were two quite different things, and that socialism was the last word of the Republic of 1848.

Hence the present struggle between all the old revolutionary trends on the one side, and socialism on the other. And if at the outset one did not know what socialism was, the forces of reaction have taught us this since February; "it is by the reaction that the revolution will be determined" (p. 17).

A solemn description of reaction and repression gradually making the majority of the nation revolutionary, and the bourgeoisie itself, the "eternal friend of order", becoming suspect and therefore being punished, and consequently thrown into the arms of the revolution. This leads up to the new electoral law.\footnote{340}

Therefore, "the people having been mentally alienated", the sole remedy that remains is "force" (p. 26).

And this "force", for the crisis of 1852,\footnote{341} consists of a series of measures which is only completed by the restoration in full of the feudal ancien régime.

But that you cannot and dare not do (p. 31). Appeal to the Republicans now to become really revolutionary and give "the revolution pledges" and "plans of economic renovation" (pp. 33, 34).

\footnote{a} The day Louis XVI was executed after the Convention had sentenced him to death.—\textit{Ed.}
\footnote{b} Engels uses the English word.—\textit{Ed.}
\footnote{c} 1848.—\textit{Ed.}
Second Essay

"IS THERE SUFFICIENT REASON FOR REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY?"


"The motive for revolutions is not so much the unhappy state experienced by society at a given time as the continuation of this unhappy state which tends to nullify well-being and cause it to disappear" (p. 36). Hence it is the tendency of the society which is the cause of revolution. The people, being neither optimists nor pessimists, do not demand that society shall be perfect, but that it "should have a tendency towards well-being and virtue"; they revolt "when society has for them a tendency towards poverty and corruption" (p. 37).

What then is at present the tendency of society?

1789 merely overthrew things, but did not rebuild at all. Hence "the kind of impossibility of living to which French society has been a prey for the last sixty years".

(Therefore—the actually existing bourgeois social order is nothing positive, free competition is merely negative, consequently the true bourgeois order has yet to be found.)

The feudal organisation which was destroyed on August 4, 1789, has not been replaced by a new "national economy and equilibrium of interests". "Since birth no longer determined the position the citizen occupied, for labour alone was all" (?) "for even property depended on it ... it was evident that the problem of the revolution consisted ... in establishing everywhere ... an egalitarian or industrial regime" (p. 39).

(As if that did not exist as far as was possible!)

But that was not understood and people resorted merely to politics. The revolutionaries were led astray by "their lack of the rudiments of economics, their idea of government," and their distrust of the proletariat" (p. 40). "In the minds of all, politics again took precedence over industry, Rousseau and Montesquieu reigned to the exclusion of Quesnay and Adam Smith." (!!!) Hence the new society remains always in an embryonic condition (p. 41).

2. "The Anarchy of Economic Forces. The Tendency of Society Towards Poverty"

"I term economic forces certain principles of action such as division of labour, competition, collective force, exchange, credit, property, etc., which are to labour and wealth what class distinctions, the representative system, hereditary monarchy, centralised administration" (a fine juxtaposition!)

---
a Engels has "l'idée gouvernementale", Proudhon "le préjugé gouvernemental" (p. 40).— Ed.
"are to the state. If these forces are kept in equilibrium, subject to the laws appropriate to them, and which do not depend in any way on human arbitrariness, labour can be said to be well-organised and the well-being of all assured. If, on the other hand, they are left without guidance and without any counterpoise"

(against what??),

"labour is in a state of complete anarchy; the useful effects of the economic forces are mixed with an equal amount of harmful effects, the deficiency outweighs the benefit, and society, insofar as it is the seat, agent, or subject of production, circulation and consumption, is in a state of increasing suffering" (pp. 42-43).

Up to now only two forms of social existence are known, "the political form and the economic form, between which moreover there is an essential antipathy and contradiction".

"The anarchy of the economic forces, the struggle they wage against the system of government, which is the sole obstacle to their organisation,—such is the real, deep-seated cause of the malaise to which society in France is a prey."

(Thus Proudhon, like a true Frenchman, confuses the French bureaucratic government with the normal state of a bourgeoisie that rules both itself and the proletariat) (p. 43).

Examples: 1) "Division of labour".—The basic principle of modern industry and at the same time the chief cause of the workers' stupefaction and decreasing wages. In England, for instance, owing to division of labour and the use of machines, the workers in one workshop have been reduced to one-half, one-third or even one-sixth of the previous number, and "their wages have been seen to fall in the same proportion, from an average of three francs down to 50 or 30 centimes" (!!) (p. 46).

Apart from this remarkable information (p. 46), it is all very superficial and commonplace.

2) Competition.—"This is the very law of the market, the spice of commerce, the salt of labour."

(beautiful!)

"Competition, however, lacking legal forms (!) and superior and regulative standards, is in its turn perverted." The workers are excluded from competition, except for competition among themselves to depress wages. It has become a monopoly and has created a new aristocracy.

Very superficial.

"Recently, when the Prefect of Police"

---

\( ^a \) A pun in the original: Proudhon has "contrepoids" (counterpoise), Engels has "contre quoi" (against what).—\( Ed. \)

\( ^b \) Proudhon has "l'ordre dans une société" (p. 43).—\( Ed. \)

\( ^c \) Engels uses the English word.—\( Ed. \)
(a compliment paid to Carlier),

"in response to the general wish, authorised the sale of meat by auction, one saw what free competition can do for the well-being of the people and how illusory this guarantee is still among us" (p. 48).

O crapaud! The bourgeois measures of Carlier are socialist! Free trade, because it does not exist in France, is socialistic!

Next, credit. A monopoly of the Bank of France. According to Proudhon, this monopoly is to blame for the fact that "property has become progressively mortgaged to an amount of 12 milliard [francs], and the state to an amount of 6 milliard francs", that interest and other expenses in this connection amount to 1,200 million francs per annum

(still only $6^{2/3}$ per cent),

and that in addition 700-800 million francs have to be paid annually in discount, "advances of money, payment of arrears, shares of joint-stock companies, dividends, obligations under private deed, judicial expenses, etc.", and that as a result house rents and land rents have become unbearably high, and that of 10 milliards of annual production, 6 milliards are swallowed up through parasitism (pp. 51-52).

Further examples or quotations are intended to prove that the situation of the people is continually worsening, and their income continually decreasing, in arithmetic progression, a counterpart to that of Malthus, such as

65 centimes, 60, 55 ... 15, 10, 5, 0, -5, -10, -15 (p. 52),

so that a time comes when the worker, instead of being paid so and so many centimes for his work per day, must pay 5, 10, 15 centimes into the bargain! And what about the law of wages, and competition!!

Examples follow to prove that the situation of the people since the revolution has continually worsened.

Decrease in the consumption of wine, meat, etc. Reduction in "the height required for military service", and an increase in the number unfit for service—1830 to 1839 45$^{1/2}$ per cent; 1839 to 1848 50$^{1/2}$ per cent. Incompatibility of universal education with the present social state of affairs. Increase of crime:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Criminal Cases</th>
<th>Accused Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>34,908</td>
<td>47,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>80,891</td>
<td>101,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>95,914</td>
<td>124,159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

a Proudhon has said earlier: "la concurrence [doit] servir à garantir la sincérité du commerce" ("competition [must] serve as a guarantee of honesty in commerce"). — Ed.

b Toad, contemptible person.— Ed.

c Here and below Engels uses the English term.— Ed.
and in the police courts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Accused Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>108,390</td>
<td>159,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>152,923</td>
<td>197,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>184,922</td>
<td>239,291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. "Government Irregularities, Tendency to Tyranny and Corruption"

Prior to 1848, philanthropic concern for the workers, even on the part of the government. Since 1848 progress; people realise that only a revolution can achieve decisive results here and therefore leave matters alone.

Interest on the national debt amounted to 63 million in 1814, now it amounts to 271 million. In 1802 the budget was 589 million, in 1848 it was 1,692 million, an increase which cannot be explained by the stupidity and wickedness of the governments. Between 1830 and 1848 the total salaries of officials rose by 65 million. Ditto.

(In France there are 568,365 officials; taking this as the basis Proudhon calculates that every ninth man lives at the expense of the budget, that is to say that there are only 5,115,285 men in France, whereas over 6½ million voted in 1848!) (p. 62).

This increase in the number of officials and in the size of the military budget is proof of the growing need to enhance the repressive power, and hence of the growing danger to the state from the proletariat. This tendency of the state to maintain big landownership and capital leads directly to corruption, which is the direct consequence of all centralisation.

—Hence:

"there is sufficient reason for revolution in the nineteenth century".

This second essay contains among other things also the following gems:

1. "The system of taxation at present in force ... is conceived in such a way that the producer pays everything, the capitalist nothing. In fact, even when the latter is entered for a particular sum in the book of the tax collector, or when he pays the dues laid down by the Exchequer on articles of consumption, it is clear that his income, being derived exclusively from the prelibation of his capital and not from the exchange of his products, this income remains free from tax, since only he who produces pays" (p. 65).

This last "since" says the same as the first proposition which has to be proved, and this proposition is thus of course proved. C'est là la logique tranchante de M. Proudhon. This is expounded further:

---

a Proudhon has: "des classes laborieuses" (p. 63).—Ed.
b Such is the trenchant logic of M. Proudhon.—Ed.
“There is therefore a pact between capital and the authorities for ensuring that taxes are paid exclusively by the worker, and the secret of this pact consists simply, as I have said, in imposing taxes on products instead of on capital. By means of this dissimulation, the capitalist property-owner appears to be paying for his lands, for his house, for his chattels, for the alterations he makes, for his travels, for his consumption, like all the other citizens. Moreover, he says that his income, which without the tax would be 3,000, 6,000, 10,000 or 20,000 francs, is, thanks to the tax, not more than 2,500, 4,500, 8,000 or 15,000 francs. And on top of that he protests more indignantly than his tenants against the size of the budget. Sheer equivocator! The capitalist does not pay anything, the government shares with him, that is all.”

(It shares also with the producer when it takes part of his products from him, and the capitalist likewise, dicitur potest, shares with the producer.)

“They make common cause.”

(O Stirner!)

“What worker then would not regard himself as lucky to be written down in the public ledger for 2,000 francs of rent on the sole condition of parting with one quarter of it as amortisation?”!!! (pp. 65-66).

2) The register is drawn up “as if the purpose of the legislator was to re-establish the inalienability of real estate—as if he continually wanted to remind the bondsman freed during the night of August 4 that his position was that of a serf, that it was not his lot to own the soil, that every cultivator was of right, except through a concession from the sovereign, a tenant by emphyteusis and in mortmain!” (p. 66).

O Stirner! As if the registration did not affect big real estate just as much as small, according to which Louis Philippe himself was a bondsman.

3) The theory of free trade and explanation of protective duties.

The duties yield 160 million to the state. Suppose the customs were abolished and foreign competition were strong in the French market; “suppose then the state makes the following proposal to the French industrialists: which do you prefer for safeguarding your interests: to pay me 160 million or to receive them? Do you think the industrialists would choose the first alternative? It is precisely this that the government imposes on them. To the ordinary expenses we have to pay on products from abroad and on those we send there, the state adds 160 million which serve it as a sort of premium; that is the meaning of customs” (pp. 68-69).

If considering the lunatic French tariff, such nonsense can be excused, it is still a bit steep that M. Proudhon measures protective tariffs in general by the French scale and makes out that they are a tax on manufacturers.

---

a One can say.—*Ed.*

b Proudhon has: “the legislator of 1789” (p. 66).—*Ed.*
4) pp. 73, 74. Proudhon quotes a speech by Royer-Collard in the Chamber of Deputies; the debate of January 19-24, 1822, in which this lawyer expresses his regret at the disappearance of the independent Benches (parliaments) and other "democratic institutions", "powerful assemblages of private rights, true republics in the monarchy"; they had set limits to sovereignty everywhere, whereas at present although the government is divided up it is unrestricted in its action.

This reactionary review of the old lawyer, who cannot conceal his hatred of the administrative system, M. Proudhon mistakenly regards as social-revolutionary;

"what Royer-Collard said about the monarchy of 1814 is true, what he says of the Republic of 1848 is still more so."

What leads M. Proudhon astray is the confused statement by Royer-Collard:

"The Charter, therefore, at one and the same time has to provide the constitutional basis for government and society; no doubt society has not been forgotten or neglected, but postponed."

What Royer-Collard understands by society is evident from the fact that he says:

"It is only in establishing freedom of the press as a public right that the Charter has restored society to itself" (p. 75).

Hence "society" = the governed considered in their capability of resistance to the government.

Third Essay

"ON THE PRINCIPLE OF ASSOCIATION"

First of all, before we come to the solution, "it is advisable to estimate the value of the theories offered for public consumption, the compulsory baggage of all revolutions" (p. 79). But when we criticise their principle then we have disposed of all of them, the St. Simonists, Fourier, Owen, Cabet, Louis Blanc, etc. This principle of all systems is association.

Association is not an "equilibrium of economic forces", it is not even a "force", it is a "dogma" (p. 84). The further elaboration of the principle of association always leads to a system and the socialism based on it necessarily becomes a religion (p. 84).

Association is not an "economic force". Commerce is one, for "independently of the service performed by the material fact of transport it is by itself a direct stimulus to consumption, and consequently a cause of production, a principle of the creation of values (!) the metaphysical act of exchange, and just as much as labour, but in a different manner from labour, it produces real objects and wealth.... Moreover, the merchant enriched by speculative transactions divested of all stockjobbery (!!), deservedly enjoys the fortune he has acquired; this fortune is as legitimate as that produced by labour"
(the bourgeois forgets here that without capital one can certainly work for another capitalist, but cannot carry on commerce without capital, otherwise this apologia for the merchant is very significant). Further ...

"exchange, this purely moral operation ... is also creation" (p. 85).

The "collective force", which Proudhon flatters himself to have discovered in *Qu'est-ce que la propriété*, is also an "economic force". Likewise competition, likewise division of labour, property, etc., etc.

What Proudhon calls "economic forces" are simply the modes of production and intercourse of the bourgeoisie, insofar as they serve his purpose, insofar as in his eyes they have either only a good side or, along with the bad side, have at least a very marked good side as well. Even general forms of intercourse and production, which when once discovered are everywhere applied in all succeeding generations, with appropriate modification, are as much at the disposal of society as the use of water power, knowledge of the spherical shape of the earth and the division of the latter into degrees of latitude and longitude, etc., etc., even these general forms Proudhon knows only in their bourgeois form. Exchange, for example, as we have just seen, is from the outset merged in commerce. If the collective force appears at least to be something eternal, it is on the other hand nothing but an attempt to convert the existence of society itself into an economic force. Without society, just as without a collective force, there is no relation between men, no intercourse. Exchange, division of labour, competition, credit are manifestations of the collective force. It takes at least two to produce a relationship, and where two collaborate to do something which cannot be done by one, there exists a collective force. However, it is ridiculous first of all to describe all the forms in which members of society carry on intercourse and produce as forces, and then finally trying to foist on us the existence of society, social production and social intercourse as a distinct economic force. Moreover, the primitive, crude form of collective force which Proudhon has in mind (mass labour in the construction of obelisks, pyramids, etc., etc.) has long ago been almost entirely replaced by the use of machines and horses, division of labour, etc., and converted into quite different forms.

If, however, commerce, competition, division of labour, etc., are economic forces, there is no reason why, for instance, the factory system, banking, paper money, the parcellation of landed property, big landownership, wage labour, capital, and rent, should not also be economic forces. On each of these it is easy to declaim a dithyrambic
panegyrical as Proudhon does for the former set of forces. But there's the rub.

It is strange that Proudhon, p. 88, calls these relationships essentially non-material forces, and makes this non-materiality the basis for hymns to the effect, for example, that

the economists by their theory of industrial forces "have, without suspecting it, demonstrated the fundamental dogma of Christian theology, creation de nihilo", (ex ??a) (p. 87), and earlier [he speaks] of

the "purely moral" act of "commerce, which is also a creation" (p. 86).

Next comes the following magnificent piece of sophistry on association:

"Association is by its nature sterile, even harmful, since it impedes the freedom of the worker. The writers responsible for utopian fraternities ... have, without motives and without proofs, ascribed to the social contract [contrat de société] a virtue and an efficacy which belongs only to the collective force, to division of labour, or to exchange. ... When an industrial or commercial society has as its aim either to put into operation one of the great economic forces, or to exploit a group of resources the nature of which demands that it remains undivided, one clientele, one monopoly, the society formed for this purpose can have a successful result; but this result is not created by virtue of its principle, but is due to its means. This is so true that whenever the same result can be achieved without association, people"

(i.e. the capitalists)

"prefer not to associate" (pp. 88-89). People associate only when they must.

Association—solidarity, "joint responsibility, fusion of rights and duties in relation to third parties"—"Equality of wages, the supreme law of association."—"One can say" therefore "that association is useful to the associate who is weak or lazy, and only to him."—"Solidarity of the unskilful and the unfit" (pp. 89, 90). Every prospering association "owes its prosperity to an objective cause which is foreign to it and is in no way bound up with its essence". Association is suitable only "in special conditions" (p. 91).

Furthermore, in all workers' associations at present piece-workb has been substituted for equality of wages—there is the least possible solidarity, the greatest possible independence when forces and capitals are combined,

that is to say, the least possible association, the greatest possible means.

"Association established specially with a view to the family tie and the law of dedication, and apart from any external economic consideration and any preponderant interest, association for its own sake, in short, is purely an act of religion, a supernatural bond, devoid of positive value, a myth."

---

a Proudhon mistakenly has: "de nihilo"—"without ground", "without reason" (p. 87). Engels queries this and suggests "ex [ nihil0]"—"out of nothing".—Ed.
b Engels uses the English term.—Ed.
As far as the Paris workers’ associations are concerned, Proudhon gives the following cold-blooded classification:

“A fairly large number exist and can be expected to develop further; one knows why. Some of them are formed by the most skilled workers in their occupation; it is the monopoly of talent which helps them to succeed.... Others attract and keep their customers by cheapness; they live by competition.... In general, finally, in all these associations the workers... have to work a little more and to content themselves with a smaller reward. There is nothing in that but what is quite usual in political economy and to obtain which... there was no need of association” (pp. 96-97).

The associations of slaughtermen are not associations, “they are set up at joint expense by citizens of all estates to compete with the monopoly of the butchers. It is the application, such as it is, of a new principle, not to say” (why not?)

“of a new economic force, reciprocity, which consists in the partners guaranteeing one another, irrevocably, their products at the cost of production.”

(Of course, M. Proudhon is the first inventor of “reciprocity”, cf. Organisation du crédit et de la circulation, Garnier frères, 1848, and the Banque du peuple) (pp. 97, 98).

Next come advertisements, M. Proudhon’s witty remarks about Louis Blanc. De chacun selon sa capacité, à chacun selon ses besoins, and then:

of 36 million Frenchmen, 24 million are peasants. “These you will never organise in associations. Agricultural work has no need of joint choreography, and the soul of the peasant rejects it.”

Compare the rage of the peasants against the June insurgents, whom they believed to be communists. Moreover

of the remaining 12 million, at least half are “manufacturers, craftsmen, employees, for whom association is purposeless”; there remain 6 million who could perhaps be induced to join the associations, but the majority of whom would very soon break this yoke.

The existing workers’ associations are not to be judged by their present results, but by their “secret tendency, which is to affirm the possibility of the social republic. Whether the workers know it or not, the importance of their work does not lie at all in the petty interests of the society... later on... the associations of workers, abandoning the production of fancy goods and toys, will have to turn to the major branches of industry which are their natural sphere” (p. 107).

Finally, he invites Louis Blanc,

---

a “From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs”, L. Blanc, “Un homme et une doctrine”, Le Nouveau Monde, No. 6, December 15, 1849.— Ed.
the “cicada of the revolution”, to “contribute his abstention and his silence as his obol to the cause of the proletariat, which on one day of mistakes fell into his feeble hands” (p. 108).

The point is: association as such, in abstracto, is of course just as much dependent on circumstances as any other social relationship. Where the prerequisites are absent, no economic force is of any avail. Competition presupposes the means for it just as much as association. Division of labour can be applied inopportune just as much as association. One can carry out exchange badly, just as one can form associations badly. Viewed abstractly, every economic force is just as much a dogma as is association, it all depends on the existing conditions. And it is precisely in the investigation of existing conditions that Proudhon has contributed nothing at all; he has treated Parisian small-scale industry as the normal state of affairs, instead of seeing in the development of large-scale industry, machinery and division of labour, as it occurs in England, and the growing centralisation of capital bound up with it, a need for association which requires for its satisfaction a quite different type of amalgamation and centralisation of forces than the Parisian toy associations and the Proudhonist workers’ companies.351

Fourth Essay
"ON THE PRINCIPLE OF AUTHORITY"

First of all a dithyramb on “anarchy”, discovered by M. Proudhon.


All government has arisen from the patriarchal family. “The final stage of governmental evolution is democracy” (p. 119); the final stage of democracy is the direct government of Considérant, Rittinghausen, etc., etc. And this would logically lead directly to imperial tyranny, as in Greece and Rome (p. 121).

The “negation of government” dates from the Reformation. The principle of authority in the religious sphere supplanted by liberty of thought. Later carried over into the secular sphere as well, especially by Jurieu, who invented (?) the term social contract. The idea of contract, of “the reign of contract”, applied in practice to social life, trade, etc., and not merely to politics, would have led beyond the whole government regime. But Rousseau, “who did not understand anything about the social contract”, ruined everything.

---

Proudhon has: “Louis Blanc considered himself the bee of the revolution, but was merely its cicada” (“Il s’est cru l’abeille de la révolution, il n’en a été que la cigale”).— Ed.
The social contract must be freely discussed and accepted by every participant, otherwise it is invalid— and other moral comments of a Stirner-like character (pp. 125-27).

But Rousseau's social contract 1) does not contain even the matters which should be the subject of contract; 2) it contains neither rights nor obligations, but merely punishments (p. 128).

Detailed proof that Rousseau, proceeding from the "broadest democratic basis", a abandons one aspect of it after another as being impracticable, and that having recognised the impossibility of maintaining equality and democratic government he "deduces the necessity of the proletariat, the subordinate position of the worker, dictatorship and the Inquisition", and simply puts forward "the code of capitalist and commercial tyranny" (pp. 131-33).

A furious attack on Rousseau in the highest style of Proudhonian declamation, but nevertheless sufficiently serious for people like L. Blanc and Co.

Saint-Simon was the first to envisage the end of the governmental system, the coming of the industrial system. He deduced the negation of the state "from historical observation and the education of mankind".

Proudhon deduces it "from an analysis of economic functions, and from the theory of credit and exchange". The eighteenth century finally completed the reformation and replaced the idea of government by the idea of contract (of "liberty of thought" in the sphere of practice) (pp. 136-40).

2. "General Critique of the Idea of Authority" (p. 141)

1) "Absolute authority"

Trash. b

"Absolutism in its naive expression is repugnant to reason and liberty" (!), and similar profound matters (pp. 142-46).

2) "Laws"

Infinity of cases, hence laws pass into bad infinity (pp. 147-50).

3) "Constitutional monarchy"

"A hybrid government." It is the number, the majority, that is decisive.

Verbose exposition of all the old abuse of the historical school352 against majority, against counting heads, etc. (pp. 150-56).

---

a Engels' quotation marks.— Ed.
b Engels uses the English word.— Ed.
4) "Universal suffrage"

General platitudes about the moral justification of the February revolution.

What universal suffrage can do is shown by the two National Assemblies and the election of Louis Bonaparte.353

Universal suffrage is definitely discredited (pp. 156-62).

5) "Direct legislation"

It is at any rate consistently democratic and Robespierre and L. Blanc very wrongl (from their standpoint) oppose it.

Solemn discussion of direct government.

It is a question of ascertaining "the wish of all", as of a "collective being". But this is not possible. Hence a system of questions is necessary, questions which the representatives ask and to which the people have to answer yes or no. But that is nonsense, for no question can be formulated in such a way that all truth, fairness and justice are on one side and all unreason and injustice on the other.

There follows a mass of examples, mostly taken from Herr Rittinghausen himself. Among them is the following example of the industrial regime à la Proudhon:

Rittinghausen asks the people: "Should there be a railway from Lyons to Avignon?" and the people say yes. "This yes, however, can contain a serious mistake, in any case it is an infraction of the rights of the localities."

"There exists a navigable waterway from Châlon to Avignon which offers transport 70 per cent below all the railway rates (!). It can lower its charges (I know something about it) to 90 per cent (!!). Instead of constructing a railway which will cost 200 million and which will ruin the trade of four departments, why not utilise"

(what does this mean? is it not already utilised?)

"this waterway which would cost almost nothing? But that is not how matters are understood in the Palais législatif, where there is no freight commissioner, and since the French people, apart from those living along the Rhône and the Saône, do not know anything more than their Ministers which takes place on the two rivers, they will pronounce, as can easily be foreseen, not according to their own thought, but according to the desire of their appointees. Eighty-two departments will decree the ruin (!!!) of four others; that is how direct legislation wants it to be" (p. 169).

Thus under the industrial system railways would never have been built if tug-boat navigation existed on the Rhine. This is already promising enough.

Then on p. 173 against Ledru and the Constitution of 1793,354 and the system that the people should merely vote the laws, the general principles, but the deputies should make the decrees, i.e. the "executive part". Proof that then, with the help of the decrees, it is possible to reverse in detail that which the people have decided in general, in principle (pp. 174-76).

The final form: where the people themselves perform all governmental duties. But
then they are unable to work, and they do not have slaves. Hence the "governmental idea" results in an absurdity.

As a practical example he considers the Constitution of 1793 and Robespierre. He says that Robespierre was a "juste milieu" man of 1791 and that he hated "direct government." By greater concentration of governmental power he wanted to abolish the Constitution of 1793. This was also the desire of the majority of the Convention, but this majority did not trust him, appropriated the same idea, removed him and subsequently carried out the idea. What the men of Thermidor did was what he wanted.

Proudhon writes that Robespierre was reactionary throughout the revolution and always preached tranquillity. Conclusion: a rhetorical characterisation of Robespierre.

Fifth Essay
"SOCIAL LIQUIDATION"

Recapitulation: the solution is said to lie in reciprocit y and in the idea of contract, which is the juridical expression of reciprocit y. According to this, three things have to be done: "1) to put a definite stop to the disorganising tendency bequeathed to us by the old revolution and to proceed with the help of the new principle to the liquidation of the vested interests; 2) to organise with the help of the new principle the economic forces and give property its constitution; 3) to make the political or governmental system dissolve, merge and disappear in the economic system" (p. 196).

Assuming that the elections of 1852 turn out to be revolutionary, the following would have to be done:

I. "National Bank"

The citizens can agree on and if necessary contribute to any establishment which proves to be to the advantage of the participants—hence also to a discount bank, and in fact this can be founded without "either association or fraternity being necessary for it ... there need be nothing but a reciprocal promise of sale or exchange, in short, a simple contract" (p. 198).

The existing bank endeavours to become a "public establishment" 1) because it makes use of capital that does not belong to it, 2) because it has the privilege of issuing paper money, and any privilege is a "public property", 3) because enjoyment of the interest on foreign capital and artificial increase of the price of the circulating medium are illegitimate, "hence the bank, owing to the illegitimacy of its profits, is condemned to become a public establishment" (p. 199). Hence the decree: "The bank is declared to be not the property of the state but an establishment of public utility, and the liquidation of the company is ordered." As an "establishment of public utility having as capitalists its own clients" (!) it does not pay interest to anyone, since the public benefit requires that money shall be as cheap as possible. Once the interest accruing to the bank belongs to the public it can be so much reduced that it covers only the costs of administration, i.e. to 1/4 or 1/2 per cent (pp. 200-01). This is very different from the socialist State Bank, and from the "credit of the state", which is nothing but "the democratic and social consecration of the principle of plunder, the exploitation of the worker in the name of, on the model of and under the patronage of, the Republic" (pp. 201, 202). This, then, is what the National Assembly should decree.

^ That of 1789-94.—Ed.
2. "The National Debt"

Six milliards, interest 270 million, and 74 million annually for redemption, hence 344 million annually, and 56 million for pensions and retirement payments.

With the bank revolutionised and the rate of interest reduced, the national debt can likewise be put on a lower rate of interest. Then it is paid off in annual instalments, that is to say, from the 5 per cent paid 1/4 per cent is reckoned as interest and 4\(\frac{3}{4}\) per cent as repayment of capital (pp. 204-05).

3. "Mortgage Debts, Simple Bonds"

Interest amounts to 1,200 million annually,

hence capital of about 24 milliards.

Decree: "Interest on all debts, mortgages, simple contract debts, joint-stock shares, is fixed at the same rate"

(as above, \(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent);

"repayment claims can be met only by annual instalments; the annual instalment for all sums below 2,000 fr. will be 10 per cent, for sums above 2,000 fr. 5 per cent. A section of the offices of the National Discount Bank will become a mortgage bank, the maximum of its advances will be 500 million per annum" (p. 213).

4. "Buildings"

If the rate of interest = 0, house rent is also reduced to nil

(therefore profit and ground rent depend on the rate of interest) (p. 218).

Decree: "Every payment made in respect of rent shall be entered to the account of the property, reckoned as twenty times the rent"

(and what about repairs?).

"With every instalment of rent the tenant will acquire a proportional and joint share in the house he occupies and in the totality of all buildings let for rent and serving as dwellings for the citizens. Property thus paid for will pass by degrees into the hands of the communal administration (!), which by the fact of the payment"

(which it does not make at all!)

"takes over the mortgages and prerogatives in the name"

(and without the permission?)

"of the mass of tenants, and will guarantee"

(solidarity!!!)

"their domicile to all of them in perpetuity at the cost price of the building.—The communes will be able to negotiate separate agreements with the owners for the immediate liquidation and repayment of the leased properties. In this case, and in

\[^a\] See this volume, p. 559.—Ed.
order that the present generation shall enjoy reduced rents, the said communes will be able immediately to reduce the rent of houses for which they have concluded agreements, in such a way that amortisation be completed only in thirty years.—For repairs, fittings and upkeep of the buildings, as in the case of new constructions, the communes will negotiate with the companies of masons or associations of building workers according to the principles and rules of the new social contract. The owners, sole occupants of their own houses, will retain the property as long as they judge this advantageous to their interests” (pp. 221-22).

“5. Landed Property”

It will be revolutionised through the “mortgage bank”. “The special character of the mortgage bank, in addition to the low price and facility of its credit, lies in repayment by annual instalments” (p. 223). For example, it has funds of 2 milliards and lends annually 400 million fr. with a 5 per cent annual repayment. In this way the peasants pay off their mortgage creditors and twenty years after taking up the loan they are free from debt. “At the end of five years the capital of 2 milliards would be exhausted; but because of the annual instalments it receives and the deductions it makes from credits (!!!) the bank will find that it has in hand a sum of approximately 400 million, which it will lend out afresh. The transactions therefore will continue in this way till at the end of twenty years the landed property will have repaid 4×2 milliards, i.e. 8 milliards of mortgages, and in 30 years it will be rid of usurers” (p. 224).

A fine calculation! 1) It is not possible to imagine that “the deductions made from credits” can be anything but acts of defraudation. 2) No annual instalment is recovered by the bank in the first year; at the end of the first year it gets 5 per cent of 400 million = 20 million; at the end of the second year it gets 5 per cent of 800 million = 40 million; at the end of the third year 60 million; of the fourth year 80 million; of the fifth year 100 million; it has therefore recovered 300 million, and not approximately 400 million. But supposing it could lend out 400 million in the sixth year, then at the end of this year it would receive only 120 million and therefore be unable to give out 400 million. Supposing the bank had been provided with a capital of 4 milliards instead of 2 milliards and could therefore lend 400 million per annum for ten years before having to resort to the money paid back, even then it would be broke in the 13th year and in this year could lend only 360 million instead of 400 million. With 4,400 million, that is with an original capital enabling it to pay out during 11 years, it would have reached bottom in the 17th year and could only expend 320 million. Finally, with 4,800 million it could give loans for 12 years from the original fund and afterwards from the repayments and at the end of the 20th year have 600 million over in addition to the periodically recurring repayments of 400 million annually, which fall due at that time.

Proof:
Up to the twelfth year payments are made from the capital.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (12th-21st)</th>
<th>Annual advances per year</th>
<th>Annual repayment</th>
<th>Excess</th>
<th>Total balance per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>4,800 mill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>240 mill.</td>
<td>+(1320-400) 920</td>
<td>=1,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>+ 760</td>
<td>=1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>+ 620</td>
<td>= 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>+ 500</td>
<td>= 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>+ 400</td>
<td>= 720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>+ 320</td>
<td>= 660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>+ 260</td>
<td>= 620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>+ 220</td>
<td>= 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>+ 200</td>
<td>= 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>+ 200</td>
<td>= 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

never increasing.
That is how M. Proudhon lays the foundation for his National Mortgage Bank.
But the thing can be done even more speedily. One issues a decree stating:

"Every payment of rent for the use of a piece of real estate will make the farmer part-proprietor of it and will count as a mortgage payment by him. When the property has been entirely paid for it will be immediately taken over by the commune, which will take the place of the former owner" (why does the new owner not immediately enter into his rights?)

"and will share with the farmer the ownership and the net product. The communes will be able to negotiate separate agreements with the owners who desire it for the redemption of the rents and the immediate repayment of the properties. In that case at the request of the communes steps shall be taken to instal (??) the cultivators, and to delimit their properties, taking care that as far as possible the size of the area shall make up (??) for the quality of the land, and that the rent" (where did the annual instalments get to?)

"shall be proportional to the product. As soon as the property has been entirely paid for, all the communes of the Republic will have to reach agreement among themselves to equalise (??) the differences in the quality of the strips of land, and also the contingencies of farming. The part of the rent due to them from the plots in their particular area will be used for this compensation and general insurance. Dating from the same period the old owners who worked themselves on their properties, will retain their title, and will be treated in the same way as the new owners, will have to pay the same rent and will be granted the same rights" (what rights?)

"in such a way that no one is favoured by the chance of location and inheritance and that the conditions of cultivation are equal for all (!!!!). The land tax will be abolished"

(after a new one has been put in its place!).
"The functions of the rural police will devolve on the municipal councils" (p. 228).
Colossal nonsense.
Next he explains that

"the right to the increase in value", i.e. the right of the farmer to the improvements he makes to the soil, cannot be implemented, any more than "the right to work", however popular both of these are.

A very legal and moral point of view.

_Sixth Essay_

"ORGANISATION OF THE ECONOMIC FORCES"

Everything is done by way of contract. I make a contract about something with my neighbour—the contract expresses My will. I can equally well make a contract with all the inhabitants of my commune, and my commune with any other, with all the other communes of the country. "I could be sure that the law thus made throughout the Republic, derived from millions of different initiatives, would never be anything other than My law" (p. 236).

O Stirner!! Hence the regime of contract is something like the following:

1. "Credit"

This is already settled by the bank through the lowering of the rate of interest to \(1/2, 1/4, 1/8\) per cent, and will be completed by the withdrawal of all gold and silver from circulation.

"As for personal credit"

(i.e. not based on security),

"it is not a matter that concerns the National Bank; it should be operated in the workers' companies and the industrial and agricultural societies" (pp. 237-38).

2. "Property"a

This is conceived by all socialists either as property of the commune organised through association, where the peasant is an agricultural worker in an association, or as state property which is leased to peasants. The first form is "communistic", "utopian", "still-born"; if it should be seriously attempted "the peasant would be faced with the question of insurrection" (pp. 238-39). The second form, too, is inapplicable, "governmental", "feudal", "fiscal", etc. The reasons advanced in favour of it fall to the ground, for "the net product"

(i.e. the rent),

being the result of the unequal quality of the soil, belongs not to the state but to "the farmer who receives little; it is for this reason that in our plan for liquidation we have

---

a Proudhon deals with landed property here.—*Ed.*
stipulated that the rent should be proportionate to the type of land so as to form a fund in order to equalise the income of the farmers and to insure the products” (p. 240).

That means everything remains as it was before, the farmer pays the rent during the first 20-30 years to the old property-owner and then to the general assurance fund, which divides it among the owners of inferior land. Thus good and bad land will have exactly the same value, or rather the same lack of value, for it is inconceivable how land then can still have any capital value. In what way this differs from payment of rent to the state—especially as the communes will be at liberty to interfere in everything—is also inconceivable. And that is what Proudhon calls

“property separated from rent, liberated from its fetters and cured of its leprosy”

and believes that it has now become a pure medium of circulation (p. 242).

With the confiscation of landed property by the state, the value of the entire landed property in the country, worth 80 milliards, would be withdrawn from circulation and, as belonging to all, that is to say to no one would have to be struck from the inventory. “In any case, the collective wealth of the nation will undoubtedly neither lose nor gain; what does it matter to society whether the 80 milliards of real estate, which constitute individual fortunes, figure or do not figure in the total? But is it the same thing for the farmer in whose hands the mobilised soil once again becomes a value in circulation, money?” (p. 245).

With the system of tenure under the state, the peasant would very soon assert his right of ownership of the soil, which would be easy for him “since the peasants would always have the upper hand in France” (p. 246).

Quite correct, of course, if the lousy small-holding system, the only one that Proudhon knows, were to be retained. But then, too, in spite of Proudhon, mortgages and usury would just as quickly reappear.

“Given the facility of repayment by annual instalments, the value of a piece of real estate can be indefinitely divided, exchanged, and undergo any conceivable change, without the real estate being in the least affected. The rest is a matter of the police, and we do not have to concern ourselves with it” (pp. 246-47).

3. “Division of Labour, Collective Forces, Machinery. Companies of Workers”

“Agricultural labour is a kind of labour which least of all requires, or, better expressed, which rejects with the utmost vigour, the co-operative form; one has never seen peasants forming association for cultivating their fields; and one never will see it. The only relations of concord and solidarity which could exist between farmers, the only form of centralisation of which rural industry is capable ... is that which results from the equalisation of the net product, from mutual insurance and, above all, from the abolition of rent” (!!) (p. 247).
Last page of Engels' manuscript "Critical Review of Proudhon's Book
Idée générale de la Révolution au XIX-e siècle"
a fixed salary and an honourable employment in a workers' company to all the anxiety connected with a private enterprise” (p. 258).

(Vous les connaissez bien, M. Proudhon.)

4. “The Determination of Value, the Establishment of a Cheap Market”

“The fair price”,

the great desideratum,

consists of 1) the costs of production, 2) the salary of the merchant, or “the compensation for the advantages which the seller forgoes by parting with the article” (p. 262). In order to secure the fair price, one must ensure that the merchant will be able to sell his goods. The Provisional Government could have made commerce flourish at once if it had guaranteed 5 per cent interest to the first 10,000 industrialists to invest up to 100,000 francs each in their business

(where are these to be obtained from, even in the highest prosperity!)

One thousand million would have been invested in industry. “Ten thousand commercial and industrial establishments could not operate simultaneously without supporting one another; what one produces another consumes; work, that is the outlet.”

(The landlubber only knows of home trade and like the most shallow English Tory believes that he can make large-scale industry prosper by means of it!)

Thus the state would not have had to pay 50 million, it would not have had to pay 10 million, in order to meet this guarantee (pp. 266, 267).

Worse trash never was written not even by Proudhon himself.

Contracts therefore are made on the following basis:

“The state, on behalf of the interests which it temporarily represents, and the departments and communes on behalf of their respective inhabitants ... propose to guarantee that the entrepreneurs who offer the most advantageous conditions will receive either interest”

(after payment of interest has been abolished)

“on the capital and material invested in their enterprises, or a fixed salary, or in appropriate cases a sufficient quantity of orders. In return, the tendering parties will pledge themselves to meet all consumers' requests for the goods and services they have undertaken to supply. Apart from that, full scope is left for competition. They must state the component parts of their prices, the method of delivery, the duration of their commitments, and their means of fulfilment. The tenders submitted under seal within

---

* You know them very well, M. Proudhon.— Ed.
* Engels uses the English term.— Ed.
* Engels wrote this sentence in English.— Ed.
the periods prescribed will subsequently be opened and made public 8 days, 15 days\(^a\) ...

... before the contracts are allocated. At the expiry of each contract, new tenders will
be invited” (pp. 268, 269).

5. “Foreign Trade, Balance of Exports and Imports”

Inasmuch as the purpose of customs duties is to protect home industry, the
reduction of the rate of interest, the liquidation of the national debt and private debts,
the lowering of rents and leases, the determination of value, etc., will greatly decrease
the costs of production of all articles and therefore make it possible to lower customs
duties (p. 272).

Proudhon is in favour of abolishing customs duties as soon as the
rate of interest is reduced to \(1/2\) per cent or \(1/4\) per cent.

“If tomorrow ... the Bank of France reduced its discount rate to \(1/2\) per cent,
interest and commission included, immediately all manufacturers and merchants of
Paris and the provinces who do not have credit at the Bank would endeavour in their
negotiations to obtain bills, for it would cost only \(1/2\) per cent [to discount] these bills
received at par instead of 6, 7, 8 or 9 per cent, which money costs at the bankers”
(!!!!) “...Those abroad would also have recourse to this. French bills would cost only \(1/2\)
per cent, whereas those of other states would cost 10 or 12 times as much” (!!),
“preference would be given to the former—everybody would be interested in using
this money in their payments” (!!!) (p. 274). In order to have more French banknotes,
the foreign producers would lower the prices of their commodities and our imports
would rise. Since, however, foreign countries can neither buy French annuities with
the exported banknotes, or lend them to us again, nor take up mortgages on our land,
this import cannot harm us; “on the contrary, it is not we who would have to moderate
our purchases, it would be up to the foreign countries to be cautious about their
sales” (!!) (pp. 274-75).

Owing to the influx of these miraculous French banknotes foreign
countries would be compelled to repeat the same economic revo-
lution which Proudhon has achieved for France.

Finally, an appeal to the Republican lawyers, Crémieux, Marie,
Ledru, Michel, etc., to take up these ideas. They, the representatives
of the idea of justice, are called upon to pave the way here (pp. 275,
276).

Seventh Essay

“THE MERGING OF GOVERNMENT IN THE ECONOMIC ORGANISM”

1. “Society without authority”

Rhetoric.

---

\(^a\) Proudhon has: “8 days, 15 days, one month, three months, depending on the
importance of the contract” (p. 269).—*Ed.*
2. "Elimination of governmental functions. Cults"

Historical, religious philosophical fantasies. Result: this aspect of the voluntary system that prevails in America amounts to the abolition of the state (pp. 293-95).

3. "Justice"

No one has the right to judge another unless the latter makes him his judge and freely consents to the law that he has transgressed ...

and other such profound observations.

Under the "regime of contract", everyone has given his consent to the law, and "in accordance with the democratic principle, the judge must be elected by those who are justifiable"

(this is the case in America).

In cases of common law the parties should choose arbitrators whose judgment has executive force in all cases. Thus the state is eliminated also from the judicature (pp. 301-02).

4. "Administration, police"

Where all stand in contractual relations to all, no police is necessary, "and the citizens and communes"

(hence also the departments and therefore also the nations)

"no longer need the intervention of the state to manage their property, to construct their bridges, etc., and to carry out all acts of inspection, preservation, and policing" (p. 311).

In other words, administration is not abolished but merely decentralised.

5. "Public education, public works, agriculture, commerce, and finance"

All these Ministries will be abolished. Fathers of families elect the teachers. The teachers elect the higher educational authorities right up to the supreme "Academic Council" (p. 317). Higher, theoretical education will be linked with vocational education; so long as it is divorced from apprenticeship it is aristocratic by nature, and serves to strengthen the ruling class and the power it wields over the oppressed (pp. 318-19).

On the whole, this, too, is very narrowly conceived and bound up with the division of labour, exactly as is apprenticeship in the workers' companies.

Incidentally, "I do not see any harm in the existence of a central research department, and a department of manufactures and arts in the Republic".

---

*Engels uses the English term.*—*Ed.*
Merely, the Ministries and the French system of centralisation have to be done away with (p. 319).

There must not be any Ministry of Public Works because it would preclude the initiative of the communes and departments, and of the workers' companies.

Therefore here, too, we have the Anglo-American system with social embellishments (pp. 320-21).

The Ministry of Agriculture and Trade is sheer parasitism and corruption. The proof: its budget (pp. 322-24).

The Ministry of Finance comes to an end of itself when there are no longer any finances that have to be administered (p. 324).

6. "Foreign affairs, war, the navy"

Foreign affairs will cease to exist in view of the inevitable universal character of the revolution. The nations will become decentralised, and their various sections will carry on intercourse with their neighbours as if they belonged to the same nation. Diplomacy and war will be at an end. If Russia wants to interfere, Russia will be revolutionised. If England is not willing to give in, then England will be revolutionised and there is an end of the difficulty. The revolutionised nations have the same interests because political economy, like geometry, is the same in all countries. "There is no Russian, English, Austrian, Tartar or Hindu economics, any more than there is a Hungarian, German or American physics or geometry" (p. 328).

"Epilogue"

Pure rhetoric. In between is the following point-blank shot which, rather amusingly, overthrows the whole edifice of anarchy.

In the economic regime, "reason aided by experience reveals to man the laws of nature and society, and then it tells him: These laws are those of necessity itself, no man has made them, no one imposes them on you.... Do you promise to respect the honour, the liberty and the well-being of your brothers? Do you promise never to appropriate the products or property of another, whether by violence or fraud, usury or stock-jobbing? Do you promise never to lie or deceive, whether in matters of law or commerce, or in any of your transactions? You are free to accept or refuse. If you refuse, you belong to the society of savages; expelled from the community of the human race, you become a suspect; you have no protection. At the least insult, anyone can strike you without incurring any other charge than that of ill-treatment needlessly inflicted on a beast. If, on the other hand, you swear adherence to the pact, you belong to the society of free men. All your brothers pledge themselves with you, promise you loyalty, friendship, assistance, service, exchange. In case of infringement, on their part or yours, by negligence, passion or malice, you are responsible to one another for the harm done, as also for the disgrace and insecurity of which you will have been the cause; this responsibility, taking into account the seriousness of perjury or repetition of the offence, can go as far as to incur excommunication or death" (pp. 342-43).

There follows the wording of the oath of the new alliance, sworn

"on one's conscience, before one's brothers, and before humanity".
Finally, reflections on the present state of affairs.

The peasant has no politics, the worker ditto, but both are revolutionary. Like them, the bourgeois minds his interests, and hardly worries about the form of government. He naively calls that "being conservative and not at all revolutionary". "The merchant, the industrialist, the manufacturer, the landowner ... these people want to live and to live well; they are revolutionary to their heart's core, only they seek the revolution under a false banner." Moreover, they have been frightened by the necessity that at the beginning the revolution had to take up a position corresponding to "the special point of view of the proletariat"; "today the question has been too clearly elucidated for such a split"

(between bourgeoisie and proletariat)

"to continue any longer" (p. 347). With credit and interest at $1/4$ per cent, the bourgeoisie will become revolutionary, this does not frighten them.

Final rhetoric addressed to Cavaignac and Ledru-Rollin:

When they say that "the republic stands above universal suffrage", that means: "the revolution stands above the republic".\footnote{559}

Written in August and October 1851
Printed according to the manuscript
Translated from the German and the French
Published in English for the first time
APPENDICES
Ernest Jones

A LETTER TO THE ADVOCATES
OF THE CO-OPERATIVE PRINCIPLE,
AND TO THE MEMBERS
OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES

The co-operative principles!
The errors of the present movement.
The true basis of co-operation.

It is too much the custom to cry down the individual whose vision
is not identical with our own—he who will not advocate a principle in
the same way in which it is advocated by ourselves, is too often
denounced as an enemy instead of being recognised as a friend, who
thinks that better means may be adopted for the furtherance of the
very principle itself.

The liberty of opinion is the most sacred of all liberties, for it is the
basis of all, and claiming a right to the free expression of my views on
a subject that I hold of vital importance to the interests of the people,
I take this opportunity for offering a few remarks on the character
and results of the co-operative movement.

In accordance with the prejudice above alluded to, some may say,
indeed some have said, that I am opposed to co-operation: on the
contrary, I am its sincere though humble advocate, and, from that
very reason, feel bound to warn the people against what I conceive to
be the suicidal tendency of our associative efforts as conducted now.

At the same time I feel bound to express my full conviction that
the present leaders of the co-operative movement are honest,
sincere, and well-meaning men, who, in their zeal for the furtherance
of a good cause, have overlooked the fatal tendency of some of
the details in their plan of action.

I contend that co-operation as now developed, must result in
failure to the majority of those concerned, and that it is merely
perpetuating the evils which it professes to remove.

I will divide the remarks I have to offer, under three heads:
1st, what are the means the present co-operative movement
possesses, of defeating the system of monopoly and wages-slavery;
2nd, what would be its effects upon society if successful; 3rd, what is the only salutary basis for co-operative industry?

Before proceeding, however, to the consideration of these several points let us ask, what are the avowed objects of co-operation?

To put an end to profitmongering—to emancipate the working classes from wages-slavery, by enabling them to become their own masters; to destroy monopoly and to counteract the centralisation of wealth, by its equable and general diffusion. We now proceed to consider—

I. The means applied to effect these results.

For the above purposes the working classes are exhorted to subscribe their pence, under the conviction that, by so doing, they will soon be enabled to beat the monopolist out of the field, and become workers and shopkeepers for themselves.

They are told that the pence of the working-man are, collectively, more powerful than the sovereigns of the rich—that they can outbuy the money lords in their own markets—that they can outbuy the landlords on their own acres. The fallacy of this is proved by the fact, that out of the annual income of the empire, a by far greater portion is absorbed by the rich than by the working classes (a fact too well known to need statistics)—a fact most forcibly conveyed to us by the recollection, that during the last fifty years, while the savings of the working classes (a great portion of the same, however, belonging to the middle classes) have been £43,000,000, the rich classes have increased their capital by £2,414,827,575. It is, therefore, an error to say, that capital against capital—pence against pounds—the co-operation of the working classes can beat down the combination of the rich, if their power of so doing is argued on the ground, that they possess more money collectively.

But, it may be objected, "the facts you adduce prove the extent to which profitmongering has progressed, and still more forcibly point to the necessity for co-operation." — Agreed.—"Again," say they, "admitting that our capital is smaller than that of our masters, we do not merely intend to balance capital against capital as it stands, and there to stop, but so to employ whatever capital we possess, as to make it reproduce itself, while the effect of our success is to impoverish the great employer, and thus daily lessen the discrepancy in our relative resources."

It must, however, be recollected, that while the working classes are trying to do this with their little capital, the monied classes will be trying to do the same thing with their enormous riches; that the monied classes, further, have the advantage of being already far ahead in the race—that they wield all the national power—that they
are, to a great extent, independent of home trade—that their cannonballs open new markets, of which they will take good care to maintain exclusive possession—that they control the entire monied and commercial system, and can, therefore, expand or contract the currency, raise or depreciate the various interests, glut or restrict the market, and create panic upon panic whenever their interest is enlisted in the measure. It may be said, that they would injure themselves by resorting to some of these means for crippling working class co-operation: granted. But, remember! they can *afford to lose*—you cannot! That which would but pinch their little finger would amputate your entire arm. Thus they would counteract the expansion of your capital by reproductive means. Again—never lose sight of this: they wield all the political power as well! If they should fail in other ways, they can destroy you by new laws—they can throw legal obstacles in the way of co-operation that would prove insurmountable: in this the middle class would support them, every shopkeeper, little or large, every profitmonger, down to the smallest, would be against you—for you *profess* to put an end to profitmongering—you *profess* to supersede the shopocratic class.

It is amusing to remark, that many of those who advise a union with the middle classes are strenuous supporters of the present co-operative system; they seek the support of the middle class, and tell us to expect it—with the same breath shouting to the world, that their “co-operation” will destroy the shopkeepers! That destruction, however, proceeds but very slowly, co-operation on their plan has now been long tried—is widely developed, and they tell us it is locally successful—yet, never in the same period, has the monopolist reaped such profits, or extended his operations with such giant strides. Do we find Moses, or Hyam, waning before the tailors—Grissel, or Peto, shrinking before the builders—Clowes, or Odell, falling before the printers? Everywhere they are more successful than before!—Why! because the same briskness of trade that enables the co-operators to live, enables the monopolists, with their far greater powers, to luxuriate.

Thus much for the inequality of the contest—an inequality that might almost deter from the attempt. But that attempt may triumph, if those forces which we really *do* possess are but directed aright.

This brings me to the consideration of the co-operative plan by which you endeavour to effect the regeneration of society.

The co-operative power you have evoked can be applied to only three objects:

1. To the purchase of land;
2. To the purchase of machinery, for the purpose of manufacture;

3. To the establishment of stores, for the purposes of distribution.

1. The Land. Consider, firstly, the enormous amount you must subscribe for the purchase of land in sufficient quantity to relieve the labour market of its competitive surplus. Secondly, remember that the more an article is in demand, the more it rises in price. The more land you want, the dearer it will become, and the more unattainable it will be by your means. Thirdly, recollect that your wages have been falling for years, and that they will continue to fall; consequently, while the land is rising in price on the one hand, your means of purchase are diminishing on the other. Fourthly, two parties are required in every bargain—the purchaser and seller. If the rich class find that the poor are buying up the land, they won’t sell it to them—we have had sufficient instances of this already. They have sagacity enough not to let it pass out of their hands, even by these means. Fifthly, never lose sight of this fact: only a restricted portion of the land ever does come into the market—the laws of primogeniture, settlement, and entail lock up the remainder; a political law intervenes, that political power alone can abrogate.

It may, however, be urged, in answer to the first objection, that the capital invested in the purchase of land would reproduce itself. I answer, reflect on how our forefathers lost the land—by unequal legislation. It was not taken from them by force of arms, but by force of laws—not by direct legal confiscation, but they were taxed out of it. The same causes will produce the same effects. If you re-purchase a portion of the land, you would re-commence precisely the same struggle fought by your ancestors of yore—you would wrestle for a time with adversity, growing poorer every year, till holding after holding was sold, and you reverted to your old condition. This can be obviated only by a re-adjustment of taxation—a measure that can be enforced by political power alone.

2. Machinery and Manufacture. The second object to which co-operation is directed, consists in the purchase of machinery for purposes of manufacture. It is argued, “we shall shut up the factories, and competing with the employer, deprive him of his workmen, who will flock to us to be partakers of the fruits of their own industry.” It is impossible for you to shut up the factories, because the great manufacturer is not dependent on home-trade—he can live on foreign markets; and in all markets, both home and foreign, he can undersell you. His capital and resources, his command of machinery, enables him to do so. Is it not an undeniable fact, that the working-men’s associations—the co-
operative tailors, printers, &c., are dearer than their monopolising rivals? And must they not remain so, if their labour is to have a fair remuneration? It is impossible to deprive the employer of workmen to such an extent as to ruin him—the labour surplus is too great; and were it even smaller, the constantly developed power of machinery, which he can always command the readiest, would more than balance the deficiency you caused.

If, then, we do not shut up the factories, we only increase the evil by still more overglutting the market. It is a market for that which is manufactured, far more than a deficiency of manufacture under which we labour. If we add to manufacture we cheapen prices; if we cheapen prices we cheapen wages (these generally sink disproportionately)—and thus add to the misery and poverty of the toiling population. “But,” you may argue, “we shall make a market—create home-trade, by rendering the working classes prosperous” You fail a leverage: the prosperity of the working classes is necessary to enable your co-operation to succeed; and, according to your own argument, the success of your co-operation is necessary to make the working classes prosperous! Do you not see you are reasoning in a circle? You are beating the air. You want some third power to ensure success. In fine, you want political power to re-construct the bases of society. Under the present system, on your present plan, all your efforts must prove vain—have proved vain—towards the production of a national result.

3. Co-operative Stores.—By these you undertake to make the working-man his own shopkeeper, and to enable him to keep in his own pocket the profits which the shopkeeper formerly extracted from his custom.

These stores must be directed towards the distribution of manufactures or of food. If the former, you must either manufacture your goods yourselves, or else buy them of the rich manufacturer. If you manufacture them yourselves, the evil consequences, alluded to in the previous paragraph, meet you at the outset. If you buy them, the manufacturer can undersell you, because the first-hand can afford to sell cheaper than the second—and recollect the wholesale dealer is every year absorbing more and more the retailing channels of trade.

We then suppose your stores to be for the retailing of provisions. Under this aspect, their power, as a national remedy, is very limited. Food is wealth—money is but its representative; to increase the real prosperity of a country, you must increase its wealth, whereas these stores do not create additional food, but merely distribute that which is created already.
But the question is here raised: "If the working-man has to pay a less exorbitant price for the articles he wants, he will have so much more of his wages left to purchase land, and otherwise emancipate himself from wages' slavery. Therefore the co-operative stores are the very means for obviating one of the objections urged: they are the very means for counteracting the threatened fall of wages, and consequent diminution of subscriptions."

This observation brings me to the second division of the subject, as in that the answer is contained; and here again I admit that co-operation on a sound basis is salutary, and may be a powerful adjunct towards both social and political emancipation. The solution of this question, however, depends not only on the means at command, but also on the way in which those means are used—and I contend:

II. That the co-operative system, as at present practised, carries within it the germs of dissolution, would inflict a renewed evil on the masses of the people, and is essentially destructive of the real principles of co-operation. Instead of abrogating profitmongering, it re-creates it. Instead of counteracting competition, it re-establishes it. Instead of preventing centralisation, it renews it—merely transferring the rôle from one set of actors to another.

1. It is to destroy profitmongering: Here I refer you to the confessions at the recent meeting of Co-operative Delegates; it was the boast contained in every reported speech, that the society to which the speaker belonged had accumulated a large capital—some as high as £2,000 and £3,000 in a very short space of time—some having started with a capital as small as £25, others having borrowed large sums (in one instance as much as £9,000) from rich capitalists, a measure not much calculated to emancipate co-operation from the thraldom of the rich.

But to revert to the accumulated capital; how was this sum accumulated? By buying and selling. By selling at cost price? Oh no! By buying for little, and selling for more—it was accumulated by profits, and profits to such an extent, that in one case, 250 members accumulated a capital of £3,000 in a very short space of time! “Down with profitmongering!”

What is this but the very same thing as that practised by the denounced shopocracy? Only that it has not yet reached so frightful a stage. They are stepping in the footsteps of the profitmongers, only they are beginning to do now what the others began some centuries ago.

2. It is to put an end to competition, but unfortunately it re-creates it. Each store or club stands as an isolated body, with individual
interests. Firstly, they have to compete with the shopkeeper—but, secondly, they are beginning to compete with each other. Two or more stores or co-operative associations are now frequently established in the same town, with no identity of interests. If they fail, there is an end of it, but if they succeed, they will spread till they touch, till rivalry turns to competition—then they will undermine each other—and be either mutually ruined, or the one will rise upon the ashes of its neighbour. I ask every candid reader—is not this already the case in several of our northern towns?

3. *It is to counteract the centralisation of wealth,* but it renews it. We proceed one step further—the fratricidal battle has been fought in the one town,—the one association has triumphed over the others, it absorbs the custom of its neighbours—the co-operative power falls out of many hands into few—*wealth centralises.* In the next town the same has been taking place—at last the two victor-associations dispute the prize with each other—they undersell each other—they cheapen labour—the same results attend on the same causes, and the working classes have been rearing up a strong, new juggernaut, to replace the worn out idol under which they bowed before.

Let us reflect, what are the great canal-companies, joint-stock companies, banking companies, railway companies, trading companies—what are they but co-operative associations in the hands of the rich? What have been their effects on the people? To centralise wealth, and to pauperise labour. Where is the essential difference between those and the present co-operative schemes? A few men club their means together. So did *they.* Whether the means are large or little, makes no difference in the working of the plan, otherwise than in the rapidity or slowness of its development. But many of our richest companies began with the smallest means. A few men start in trade, and accumulate profits. So did they. Profits grow on profits, capital accumulates on capital—always flowing into the pockets of those few men. The same with their rich prototypes. What kind of co-operation do you call this? It is the co-operation of Moses and Co., only a little less iniquitous—but, based on the same principle, who guarantees that it will not run to the same lengths? What benefit are the people to derive from this? What is it to us if you beggar the Moseses and the Rothschilds to-morrow, and create another Rothschild and Moses in their place? My idea of reform is not to ruin one man to enrich another—that is merely robbing Peter to pay Paul. As long as there are to be monied and landed monopolists in the world, it matters little to us, whether they bear the name of Lascelles or of Smith. Such is the present system of co-operation,—a system unstable in itself, and, if successful, injurious to the
community. A system that makes a few new shopkeepers and capitalists to replace the old, and increases the great curse of the working classes, the aristocracy of labour.

III. Then what is the only salutary basis for co-operative industry? A national one. All co-operation should be founded, not on isolated efforts, absorbing, if successful, vast riches to themselves, but on a national union which should distribute the national wealth. To make these associations secure and beneficial, you must make it their interest to assist each other, instead of competing with each other—you must give them unity of action, and identity of interest.

To effect this, every local association should be the branch of a national one, and all profits, beyond a certain amount, should be paid into a national fund, for the purpose of opening fresh branches, and enabling the poorest to obtain land, establish stores, and otherwise apply their labour power, not only to their own advantage, but to that of the general body.

This is the vital point: are the profits to accumulate in the hands of isolated clubs, or are they to be devoted to the elevation of the entire people? Is the wealth to gather around local centres, or is it to be diffused by a distributive agency?

This alternative embraces the fortune of the future. From the one flows profitmongering, competition, monopoly, and ruin; from the other may emanate the regeneration of society.

Again—the land that is purchased, should be purchased in trust for the entire union—those located thereon being tenants, and not exclusive proprietors, of the farms they cultivate. Freehold land-societies, companies, etc., but perpetuate the present system—they strengthen the power of landlordism. We have now 30,000 landlords—should we be better off if we had 300,000? We should be worse off—there are too many already! The land can be more easily and more rapidly nationalised, if held by merely 30,000 than if possessed by ten times that amount. And, again, the rent would increase the national fund—while the contributions of the freeholders would be but a chimerical treasure.

Such a union, based on such a plan of action, might hope for success. The present co-operative movement, I repeat, must perish as its kindred have done before it—and, if not, its success would be a new curse to the community. Why do the rich smile on it? Because they know it will prove in the long run harmless as regards them—because they know it has always failed, hitherto, to subvert their power. True the attempts often succeed in the beginning—and why? Because the new idea attracts many sympathisers—while it is too weak to draw down the opposition of the money lord. Thence the
co-operators are enabled to pick up some of the crumbs that fall from the table of the rich. But what is the £3,000 of Rochdale amid the proud treasures of its factory lords? Let the shock come among the mighty colossi of trade, and the pigmies will be crushed between them.

A national union, on the plan suggested, does not run these dangers. A national fund thus established, would, in all probability, be a large one—and place a great power in the hands of the association. Persecution would be far more difficult. Now each society stands isolated, and is attacked in detail by the combined forces of monopoly—then to touch one would be to touch all. The national centralisation of popular power and popular wealth (not its local centralisation), is the secret of success. Then restrictive political laws would be far more difficult, for they would encounter a gigantic union, instead of a disorganised body. Then the combination of the rich would be far less formidable—for, though superior in wealth, they would be far inferior in numbers. So they are now—but the numbers at present are without a connecting bond; nay, in but too many cases, essentially antagonistic.

I entreat the reader calmly and dispassionately to weigh the preceding arguments. They are written in a hostile spirit to no one at present concerned in co-operative movements—but from a sincere and earnest conviction that the opinions here expressed are founded upon truth. I have given the difficulties in the way of the co-operative movement—not with a view to discouragement—but that by seeing the dangers, we may learn how to avoid them. As it is we are falling from Scylla into Charybdis.

If, then, you would re-create society, if you would destroy profitmongering, if you would supplant competition by the genial influence of fraternity, and counteract the centralisation of wealth and all its concomitant evils,

NATIONALISE CO-OPERATION.
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Signed: Ernest Jones
Ernest Jones

CO-OPERATION.
WHAT IT IS, AND WHAT IT OUGHT TO BE

Contents:—The errors of the present movement. Illustrations: Padiham, Bradford, &c. A better spirit: Bingley, Bury.—The true plan of co-operation.—A contrast between the two.

The priest, if you inveigh against his priestcraft, says you are an enemy of christianity itself. So does the co-operator, if you inveigh against that kind of so-called co-operation, which, in reality, is profitmongering, say you are an enemy of co-operation itself. But the reverse is the case. As the true christian tries to rescue christianity from priestcraft, so does the real friend of co-operation endeavour to rescue that from the pernicious tendencies into which it is being launched.

In No. 2 of this publication it has been shown how the present erroneous system of co-operation leads, in reality, to competition, and through that to monopoly. I will not recapitulate the arguments here, to weary by repetition those readers who have already seen that article—but most earnestly do I invite for it the attention of others.

On the present occasion, I will dwell on the actual working of some of the co-operative efforts, on what they are, and then, on what, as it appears to me, they ought to be.

The plan on which co-operative attempts are now conducted, is to buy cheap in the wholesale market—and to sell dearer.

The sale takes place, in some few instances, only to the shareholders themselves—in most, however, to the general public.

Where the sale takes place to the shareholders, the profit goes partly to pay the working expenses, and the remainder of the profit is divided among the shareholders at the end of the year. What is the real meaning of this?—it means that the shareholders buy in the wholesale market, that they then are charged so much more for the retailing than they ought to be, and that, having lost the use of the money for an entire year, they receive back that out of which they
have been robbed, at the end of twelve months. Can there be greater folly than this? People deliberately charge themselves too much, and pay themselves back at the end of the year, having lost the use of their money during all the intermediate time! The excuse for this is, that they must charge more than the wholesale price, to cover the working expenses, and that they cannot know beforehand what the working charges will be. In the first place, this might be known within a very narrow margin of allowance,—but the fact is this, that they want none, or scarcely any of these working charges. If twenty people club together to form a co-operative store, and then get the articles they want retailed to them at second hand by their own agents, they might just as well send one of their number to the wholesale market, buy at first-hand, and divide the goods in the proportionate shares required, among themselves, without any working charges, or any other expenses, except the one journey (if such were required) and the one transit of the goods. For instance, if twenty families agree together to buy their groceries wholesale, in the mass,—each says how much he wants,—he lays by so much per week, and keeps it at home, or pays it into the hands of any one who may be appointed to act as banker for the rest (instead of, as now, subscribing it to a store), and at given periods one or more of this little domestic league goes into the wholesale market, buys the groceries, divided there or afterwards into such portions as each of the members has given an order for,—the individual members receive their several shares as ordered—and there the transaction is complete. This is done every day by rich families of the middle-class. Two or three club together to get their coals or potatoes, &c., wholesale; one of them buys the lot,—they get them at the wholesale price—save all the retailing charges, and then divide the articles among themselves.

This could be done by twenty or thirty, as well as by two or three. Here you have all the advantages of a co-operative store, without any of its expenses and difficulties. You require no payment of rent, taxes and rates; no feeing of officers; no fittings and counters; no advertising and placarding; no payments to lawyers; no registering, enrolling, or certifying; no profitmongering whatever, under the plea of covering working charges;—the whole thing is merely a domestic arrangement of a few families among each other—and there you have all that is required: you keep your money in your own pockets; you do not clash with the law if unenrolled, or become slaves to it if enrolled—every member has the usual legal security against the other,—for the purposes of buying wholesale and selling to the shareholders, a co-operative store is utterly unnecessary—it is
plundering yourselves—it is doing at second-hand that which you can do with a large saving of money at first-hand! Can anything be more comical, than men saying we'll buy at first-hand, but we won't take our goods home, we'll let them stop half way, we'll charge ourselves too much, we'll pay for an expensive machinery in order that we may be overcharged, and then, at the end of the year, we'll pay ourselves back a portion of what is left after payment of the working charges, that is, of the charges that are necessary for the process of enabling us to cheat ourselves!

Such is the real working of co-operative stores that profess to sell to the shareholders alone. But of such there are but few—for most profess to sell to the general public. The former are imperatively harmless, for a man may cheat himself, if he is fool enough to do so, without inflicting much injury on others.

But, if a man has a right to cheat himself, he has no right to cheat another. And this is done in the other modes of so-called co-operation, as existent at the present day.

The next order of co-operation is that in which the goods are sold not only to the shareholders, but to the public at large. In the former kind, we have seen that it is an absurd waste of time, trouble, and money, for an object that could be much better achieved without any co-operative store at all. But in the case now before us, the whole system of profitmongering, leading to competition and monopoly, is attempted over again, under the soothing name of co-operation itself.

Here the profit is taken direct from the purchaser, and no return made at all. The “co-operator” buys in the cheapest market, and he sells as dear as he can, coolly telling us that he is doing this with a view to the destruction of that horrid profitmongering of the shopocracy. The poor customer pays him the “profit”—and that he divides at the end of the year between himself and his brother co-operators. Then they boast, that they have made £2,000 net in one year! What did these £2,000 consist of? Of the difference between the wholesale price (the price at which they bought) and the retail price (the price at which they sold) over and above the working charges. Every farthing of this £2,000 is profitmongering of the most odious description, because it is done under the name of co-operation; every farthing of this £2,000 is as much direct plunder taken from the public.

Now, since during the last few months an exposure has been made of this new system of profitmongering, all the so-called “co-operators” have disclaimed violently against the charge, and have tried to slip unscathed through the imputation, by tacking some supposed “saving-clause” to their rules. For instance, the London tailors
gravely tell us that they see the full force and justice of the resolution passed by the National Convention, for nationalising the tendency of co-operation, and therefore they intend to set five per cent of their net profits aside for a national fund. *Five per cent!* Then they are to pocket *ninety-five per cent* of clear profit! Every fraction of that 95 per cent is a deliberate robbery upon their customers! For, **no man has a right to take more from society than the value of what he gives to it.** All beyond that is robbery. The London tailors, therefore, have a right to a fair remuneration for their labour, and no more. A fair remuneration for labour is, supposing that the labourer gives his full strength to society, *as much as will enable that labourer to live in comfort.*

Therefore, every farthing of those net profits after the working charges are paid (a portion of the working charges being a fair remuneration for the work performed), is an imposition and a cheat upon society.

Some societies, however, try to evade the charge of profitmongering by a more roundabout, but equally transparent, trick. I will illustrate this by the *Bradford Co-operative Store.* This store professes to divide only *half* the *profits* among its members. Let us analyse the scheme.

**Rule 1** says: The object of the Association is “to furnish its *members* with provision and clothing at *prime cost.*”

**Rule 6** says: “All goods shall be sold at *reasonable* market prices, for ready money only, and the whole *surplus profits*, after deducting working expenses, and *five per cent interest on shares*, shall be *divided half-yearly among the members* according to the amount of purchases made by each; but no member to receive interest on part shares.”

Now, in the first place, if the goods are to be sold at “prime cost,” there could be no “surplus profits.” But the “members” only get them at “prime cost,” the “surplus profits” are to come from the public.

Pretty well this! In the first place, the *members* get their goods at *prime cost.* They are not even to bear their proportion of the working charges—the poor, good-natured “public” are to pay for this.

In the second place, the members are to receive “five per cent interest on their shares.” Pretty well again!

**Rule 3** provides that members may have *as many shares* as they like (though only one vote). A snug investment that! Five per cent! Elsewhere they could get only $3/9$. Here they are to get five! Firstly, *they* get what they want at *prime cost*; secondly, they get five per cent on their investment. The poor, good-natured public are expected to pay for this too!
In the third place, "the surplus profit shall be divided half-yearly among the members, according to the amount of purchases made by each." Pretty well once more! So these lucky members are to get their goods at prime cost, to get five per cent. for their money, and besides all this, to get "surplus profits," and divide them every half-year among themselves. And the poor, good-natured public are expected to pay for all this as well!

Pretty well in the profitmongering line. This is worse than the shopkeepers. You catch us with a threefold gripe—and tell us all the while you are our benefactors.

In Rochdale and Padiham, "Co-operation" has assumed a form more injurious still to the best interests of humanity and progression. At the latter place, a "co-operative" factory has been built, by shares of £25 each payable in 5s. calls. This is a workingman's factory with a vengeance!—and here, as in almost all the co-operative attempts in England, all the profits are to be divided among the share-holders—the amount of profit to be extorted from the public, being left to the consciences of the profitmongers themselves.

Workingmen! Democrats! Can you for a moment tolerate or sanction such a system?

The least objectionable stores I know of, are those at Bingley and Bury.

So much of the true metal rings at these places, that they have not been as deeply tainted with the rust of profitmongering, as Padiham, Rochdale, Bradford, London, and most other places.

At Bingley they have raised, in two pound shares, a grocer's and draper's shop. In this, Rule 1 says—"One-half of the clear profits to be divided annually among its members, the other half to be given to the society, and never to be divided, but to go to extend its operations to other branches of business."

There is some recognition of principle in this, but, in reality, there is only a distinction without a difference. Though the members receive only half the profits direct, yet, as the other half goes to extend the business of the association, it, in reality, goes to extend their profits, or by enlarging the concern, it enlarges the "half" which they are to divide among themselves.

At Bury, if I understood them rightly, they adopt the rule, that any one of the general public, who chooses to deal at their store, and subscribe one penny weekly towards it, shall be entitled to a share of the profits proportionate to the amount of his purchase. This is a great advance on every attempt at "co-operation" that has hitherto been made.

Let us now glance at what co-operation ought to be. I believe the
principle of co-operation is but very imperfectly understood in this country. People imagine if a few individuals co-operate together to start a trading concern and make as much money as they can, that this means co-operation in the real sense of emancipated and associated labour.

Nothing of the sort! If that were so, every railway, banking, or shipping company would realise the true principles of co-operation.

By co-operation, a very inadequate word, by the way, we mean the abolition of profitmongering and wages-slavery, by the development of independent and associated labour. But this can be established only on the basis of the following principle already laid down in this article:

*No man has a right to take more from society, than the value of that which he confers upon it.*

Consequently, associated labour has no right to take more from its customers, than will pay for the prime cost of production, and enable the man to live adequately, who devotes all his time to the production or the distribution of wealth.

To meet this position, associated labour has two alternatives: to charge merely thus much additional between the prime cost and the retail price, as will cover the expenses of retailing; or to charge more, but devote every fraction of that overcharge to a national purpose, such as the purchase of land, machinery, &c., whereon to set the present wages-slave at employment in self-remunerating labour.

Considering the present circumstances by which society is surrounded, I prefer the latter, as being the best calculated to further labour's emancipation.

Let us see how this would work. A co-operative association is formed; after payment of its working charges (including labour in production or distribution), it finds itself at the end of the year with a surplus in hand; instead of dividing this surplus among the members, it employs it to purchase land or machinery, which it lets out to other bodies of workingmen, on the associative principle. The rent paid for the land or the machinery, and the surplus of each concern beyond the working charges, is *again to be applied to the further purchase of machinery and land*, on the same terms, and under the same conditions; and so on, continually extending the power, strength, and resources of association. This is co-operation. It is co-operation, because it establishes a *community of interest*—the success of each "branch" furthers the success of every other, and of the whole collectively. There can be no conflicting interests—no rivalry—no *competition*—for the greater the success of each
undertaking, the more the stability and permanency of the whole is ensured. It makes it the interest of each and of all to see co-operative associations spread and multiply. This, I repeat emphatically, this is real co-operation.

But what is the present isolated system? It is based on individual and antagonistic interests. It makes the vital interest of the "co-operator" to prevent others from co-operating—to hinder the spread of the associative principle. And it does it in this way: a co-operative trading concern is started on the present isolated plan; that is, the concern forming a "close borough,"—admitting no more within its pale—making what profits it can, and pocketing them among the same few individuals. What now becomes the interest of these individuals? To prevent another co-operative concern from being started in their immediate neighbourhood—to prevent another body of workingmen from deriving the advantages of co-operation. Because, if the original concern flourishes, it absorbs all the trade of the locality (if one don't, two or more do, it becomes merely a question of numbers—of how many customers there are in a place); if another independent concern is started, it must have a portion of that custom, or it cannot exist. Consequently it becomes a rival of the other association; it begins to compete; there not being customers enough for all, the one concern too many must try to draw away customers from those already established. To do this, it must undersell—it must buy still cheaper, and pay still cheaper for its labour, in order that it may undersell; the other concerns must do the same in self-defence; and there you have the old system of competition, with its necessary consequences, wages-slavery, plunder, ruin on the one hand, and monopoly on the other, added to that profitmongering on which the present plan, as already shown, is altogether based!

Therefore, the present plan is not true co-operation; it is essentially hostile to the spread of associated labour; instead of ending profitmongering, it renews it; instead of abolishing competition, it recreates it; instead of abrogating monopoly, it re-establishes it, and is the death-blow to the hopes of labour's emancipation.

Now, my friends, let me implore of you to weigh these remarks, and those previously given in this work, without prejudice or anger. I write with a sincere conviction of the truth, and of the paramount duty of combating a pernicious fallacy. I am not the enemy of co-operation, but its friend—its true friend—I do not oppose co-operation, but wish to rescue it from that course, in which it is digging its own grave. I trust those who have supported "co-operation" on its present plan, will not be offended by these
observations. They are made in all friendliness of spirit and sincerity of heart. I believe the advocates of the present system to be generally true, honest, and well-meaning—but may I escape the charge of presumption if I also state my belief that they are quite blind as to the nature and the consequences of what they are advocating with such zeal? Believe me! you are digging the grave of co-operation, while you think you are fashioning its cradle. Compare your plan with that which I have here proposed—and judge dispassionately.

I know self-interest would dictate that I should write in favour of the present movement, and not against it. I know this very article may injure the circulation of these “Notes”. But sooner write not at all, than be such a slave as not to dare write truth. Then, sink or swim, the truth shall be written. I launch this little article on the troubled tides of controversy, and commend it to the good sense and honest feeling of my readers.

Published in Notes to the People, Vol. 1, No. 21, September 20, 1851

Signed: Ernest Jones
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Written about October 31, 1852

Printed according to the manuscript

Published in English for the first time
There is a subject with regard to this country which we have hitherto not been able to dwell upon but which we deem worthy of our most eager attention: namely, the utterly shortsighted and ignorant views on the change in the public destinies of France since the 2nd December, taken by nearly all the authors who have written on the character and consequences of the coup d'état. A short review of the publications that have appeared from different quarters on this subject will render the truth of this statement the more evident and the more important, as all these publications pretend more or less, to be the expressions and sentiments of the parties or classes to which their authors respectively belong.

On the 2nd December, in the face of the Bonapartist coup, it was but natural that all parties opposed to it should agree in their language—and so it was. The protest of the combined royalists and the proclamation of the Montagne, as dictated by the common interests of self-defence against a common foe, differed only in this, that the latter fraction had at least the courage to take up those arms to which the former merely made a cowardly appeal. Both had the name of the constitution in their mouth, of a constitution which had been as often attacked, violated, suspended and overthrown by the royalists, as it had been ridiculously and hopelessly defended by the republicans.

But, what have they done since? The legitimists have accepted, the Orleanists denounced, the republicans execrated, the coup d'état. Has any one explained, has any one understood its secret? With the legitimists the fault lies in the socialists; with the Orleanists in the Montagne; with the republicans in the crime of Bonaparte. To such
casualties as the mistaken policy of a couple of representatives, or the frivolous ambition of an individual, the mighty changes in the condition of a people are ascribed by the political sages of the day, who still, by exempting themselves from all responsibility in past events, attempt to impose themselves on the public as the initiators of a future, when they, as well as their parties, are crushed for ever, and flung into nought long ago. What a poor argument for historical explanation! But what a rich source of pamphlets, of recriminations, and of all kinds of attacks on antagonistic personalities! We are certainly no partisans of Mr. Bonaparte; we do not mean to thank him as he did not mean to benefit us by it, for having replaced the tyranny of middle-class parliamentary rule by dictatorship of his own and of a military swell-mob; but we are glad at his success, we rejoice in his temporary triumph because it secures the triumph of our principles, the triumph of our class. His is the momentary glory, the revelry of an hour; but ours will be the final, the definitive victory. The dictatorship of Bonaparte has prepared the sovereignty of the working-classes. What are all these lamentations about the decay of French civilisation? What all these splendid comparisons with the fall of the Roman Empire in the mouth of the middle-class writers, but the elegiac confessions that the times of their glory are gone in France, never to return? What is it they understand by civilisation, but the government of landlords and capitalists with their appendage of priests and lawyers? Is it the ruin of the working-classes they deplore? Good Heavens! Let them be cheerful, their ruin depends not on the calamities of the middle class. It is just the political ruin of the latter, that prepares the advent of the working-classes, that guarantees their salvation, both political and social. How deeply those writers deplore, and almost weep over, the decline and hopeless degeneration of France, of that unhappy and blind nation which could sacrifice its public liberties (?) to the arbitrary pleasure of a tyrant! What are these liberties alleged to have been sacrificed? The Suffrage? You forget the law of the 31st of May.\(^a\) The Press?—why you had gagged, fined, confiscated, and suppressed it. Association?—there never were such things as decrees of suspension, high tribunals, dungeons, or transportations for the leaders of the clubs! No—Blanqui never was in the pontoons of Belle Isle. You never provoked—you never laid an ambush for the people! You never slaughtered them at Rouen, nor massacred them at Lyons, nor shot them in the streets of Paris! To hear you, the people, before the 2nd of December, were as free and sovereign, as they were happy and

\(^a\) This law adopted by the Legislative Assembly abolished universal suffrage.—Ed.
prosperous. You wonderful talkers and writers! Yes, decidedly; then it was madness and quite shameful on the part of the people to forsake such disinterested and loyal leaders, on the day when they proclaimed the liberties of the nation to be in danger. But, if it were otherwise—if the people really had nothing to lose—if it was only your liberties, your rule over the people, that were in danger—what do you say then? Never mind; for morality's sake the people ought to have resisted a man\(^a\) who so openly broke his faith to them. To them? Why, he never swore them obedience or faithfulness! How preposterous to suppose a "vile and immoral multitude" to stand up for morality! Who accustomed the people to broken oaths? Not Thiers—not Berryer—not Molé—innocent, pure, and honest consciences! It was Bonaparte who invented the trade never known before. The world was so young, so harmless, and so perfect, that it knew almost no crimes before this ominous day of December, which put an end to the paradise of political innocence. The apple of perjury had never been eaten; but the spectacle of a drunken and infuriated army stabbing the peaceful (why were they peaceful, if their liberties were in danger?); violating the virgin, and demolishing the property of the citizen (this last was their worst crime):—should not that have animated the people to rise up in their defence? Why? They had no property; the rich leave them very few virgins; and if the killed had been peaceful, they remained so without being killed. The people allowed Bonaparte to revenge them on their enemies, awaiting the opportunity when they might take their revenge on both. They were right. But to suffer the dictator to enforce a constitution on them which is all but a mockery of the people's dearest principle, the Suffrage!—how disgraceful to a nation to be deluded and duped by the very appearances of unbounded liberty, which is still, in fact, an outrageous slavery! In the first place, they are neither duped nor deluded, because they know this as well as any liberal English newspaper. Then, how can they suffer it? They only take their time. The Orleanists and Republicans no doubt will find it rather long, wishing to return to their country. Now, the people do not have such a desire; they are, besides, in no hurry. Trade is doing well, as yet. And did not you always say, "the people ought to be quiet, and to mind nothing but their work?" Well, they will mind their work, as long as they have any, after which they will look out for themselves. For themselves? Yes, is not that frightful? To behold a people unwilling to hazard their lives for the restoration of a prince,

\(^{a}\) Louis Bonaparte.—Ed.
or the revival of a middle-class parliament—a people who will only take up arms for murderers! Adieu! civilisation of France—the "Times" despairs of thee! No hopes in France but for the people. There is the terrible deluge, prophesied to the French people so often by every successive party in power. There it is coming, and no escape. O! sage Lord Maidstone! when will our English deluge begin?

In our next we shall commence giving a résumé of the works that have appeared on both sides of the Channel, on the subject of the French coup d'état, comprehending the "18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte," by Charles Marx; "The coup d'état of Louis Bonaparte," by Xavier Durrieu; "Napoleon the Little," by Victor Hugo; and "The Social Revolution," by Proudhon.

No. 1

[The People's Paper, No. 22, October 2, 1852]

The empire not having yet been proclaimed, and the new police farce of the infernal machine, offering little or no comment, I intend in this letter to criticise a series of works on the events of the 2nd December, enumerated in my last letter, which have as yet been not sufficiently circulated amongst the English public, and most superficially appreciated by the English press. The order in which I shall proceed differs from that in which I first placed the different works under notice; but it will be perceived how much better it suits the purposes of a gradually-progressing and yet all-exhausting criticism, to begin with that work which merely elucidates the data and facts of history, and next to take that which elevates itself to a contemplation of those same facts from the general point of view of current traditional ideas; then to dispose of that work which, although advancing a step in the revolutionary direction, still affects to consider the whole change in the destinies of France, brought about by Bonaparte, as a proof of the truth or necessity of its author's doctrinal Socialist schemes; and, finally, to conclude by reviewing that work which, as we may here at once point out, is the only one that has at once satisfied history, and the want of the present generation to understand the revolutionary movement in which it finds itself engaged.

---

a An allusion to Victor Hugo's book.—Ed.
b The reference is to Proudhon's work.—Ed.
c This refers to Marx's Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte.—Ed.
The merits of this book consist in the great probability, or rather in the simple truth, of its narrative. As all the witnesses of the 2nd December, who have stood up to denounce the crimes and treachery of Louis Bonaparte, have been charged with gross exaggeration of the facts, by the “Moniteur” and other government organs, the author of this book has rendered a great service by his depositions, which certainly nobody will accuse of tending, by rhetorical or poetical licence, to impose on the public. And if Mr. Durrieu’s talent as a writer may be doubted in England, where your penny-a-liners write such admirable articles, although he was a Paris journalist, his right of describing the horrible actions of which he was the spectator and victim at the same time, remains incontestable, and one can only applaud him for having had the courage to come before the public. Here you have a short account of the events he relates, and of the part he played in them.

He commences by a sketch of Louis Bonaparte, and of his principal accomplices in the perpetration of the coup d’état. We pass by that of the master, it being too inferior to the portrait which others, and Victor Hugo especially, have given us of that monster scoundrel; we will cast a glance only at those of his ministers.

General Magnan, the commander of the Boulevard-butcher, was accused in 1840 of having favoured Bonaparte's attempts at Strasburg, and Boulogne. Called to appear at the bar of the Peers, he denied and betrayed his then unfortunate master, with so much coolness and contemptible egoism, that even the Peers—those veterans in the traffic of apostasy—felt disgusted. In 1848 he was charged by some Democratic paper with being in the pay of the Orleanists; he went himself to the office, and begged insertion of a protest, in which he denounced the Orleanists, and swore that, as a soldier of the old Republic, under the Convention, his sympathies had ever been attached to the Republican institutions. Three years afterwards he murdered that Republic for the payment of his debts.

General St. Arnaud, the Minister of War, was a simple captain in 1835, when, for certain services rendered at the Castle of Blaye, the prison of the unfortunate Duchess of Angoulême, he was suddenly promoted to the rank of a general. His debaucheries and dissipations would have brought him in contact with the criminal law, had not his
former crimes protected him. Louis Philippe sheltered him first—Louis Napoleon has sheltered him now.

M. Persigny, the Minister of the Interior of to-day, but who lacked the courage to become it on the 2nd December, raised himself from the station of a penny-a-liner to that of Louis Bonaparte's valet and confidant—the purveyor of his master's pleasures, in which he is even supposed to take a very close part, and the agent in his low intrigues and forgeries; the fellowship of crime is the secret of his present splendour.

M. de Morny, lastly, may be considered as the type of the higher swell-mob, that gang of gamblers, swindlers, and forgers, who always escape by some enormous crimes from the claws of the lower police. He was to be imprisoned on the 3rd; he imprisoned his creditors and accusers on the 2nd December. The portraits of these four men are as true as they are familiar to every Parisian.

I am sorry that I cannot delight you with their counterfeit—the work of Mr. Granier de Cassagnac, a miserable but impudent Gascoign, who erected, almost on the smoking ruins of the December Insurrection, the statues of its murderers, elevating them to the rank of demi-gods, and idolising Bonaparte as the Saviour of society. By the way, it will amuse you to hear, that the gendarmerie and clergy of his department have received this new apostle under a triumphal arch, bearing the inscription—"To the defender of order and religion!" After this, may we not hope soon to see the downfall of the two pillars of class society?

Now to Mr. Durrieu. On the morning of the 2nd December, he hastened to the office of the "Révolution," a paper founded by Ledru-Rollin, and invested with that name, after its competitor, the real revolution, had been ruined by him in the struggle of June. As is usual at Paris in times of excitement, the so-called revolutionary notabilities, which means a handful of petty ambitions, held a meeting at the newspaper-office. Durrieu was charged to draw up a proclamation. "Constitution—treason" were its two handles, the paltry weapons which alone were left to the Democrats, after their separation from the Revolution. The proclamation was placarded; so was that issuing from the office of the "Presse." Mr. Durrieu complains that they were so little responded to. But by whom were they signed, and to whom did they appeal? Was there any one of the people's leaders—of those the people acknowledged and cherished

---

a The reference is to a pamphlet by Granier de Cassagnac, Récit populaire des événements de décembre 1851, Paris, 1852.—Ed.
b The uprising of the Paris proletariat in June 1848.—Ed.
as their champions—amongst the names of the undersigned? They were all known to be Montagnards, “liberal” writers, orators, drums and trumpets of the tribune indeed, but whose greatness sprung from the ruin of the proletarian party, whose eloquence had for condition the silence of the people’s defenders; in a word, who had always preached submission and calm, when a combat had to be fought, and who called to arms, when revolution had no interest in the battle, but Mr. Durrieu himself has the naiveté to reveal the reasons why his partisans had no influence on the masses, why their alarm-cries were distrusted, like those of the shepherd-boy in the fable.\(^{371}\) They had raised their cry too often, when no wolf was to be met; in fact, it was a thing used up. He tells us that, when the surprised Republican Representatives were removed in prison vans to Vincennes, on passing the Boulevards the people attempted to break the file of their escorte, and actually offered to release the prisoners. What did these heroes of the tribune reply? “For heaven’s sake, desist! Let us proceed to our prison, we know we are innocent!” Such frightened, cowardly innocents—do they not deserve to be laughed at by the people? These tame and timid souls—these inviolable, but also non-violating personages—these knights of the sorrowful figure, were offered to the people as their guides—nay, their commanders. No, if the people had had the choice (but they had not, nor did they want it then), they would have been right to prefer Bonaparte, although a knave, a thief, an assassin, and whatever else you may call him (for he deserves every one of these titles), even when he struck them in the face, to that band of officious mourners, who have buried Revolution to get the right of lamenting over it. Their sermons have demoralised and torpified the people, while Bonaparte’s effrontery has awakened their senses. I say this in respect of the Montagne, and the Democratic leaders as a body. I don’t mean to include in my invectives against that party every individual belonging to it (French Democracy is not to be confounded with the English. In France, it represents the small proprietors and tenants, but less their real wants than their imaginary wishes. In England, Democracy applies directly to the movement of the working class); such brave and generous men as the heroic Charles Baudin, and the author of the present work himself, regain as much estimation by their conduct as they may have lost by their narrow principles and views. But these are exceptions, and no hero or martyr ever deserves to have the people on his side, unless he battles for the direct interest of the masses, instead of for the dead letter of a class constitution, or the imaginary glory of some abstract truth. But this latter point I will settle in my next, as Mr. Hugo still
affords me still better occasion for it. As for Mr. Durrieu, let me add that, after having issued his proclamation, he took his post on the barricades, where he fought until night, and whence, after all was lost, he escaped only to be taken prisoner, to be conducted to the prison of Mazas, thence to the casemates of Bicêtre and Ivry, the horrors of which he describes with much tact; transported thence on board the “Duguesclin,” to be sent to Cayenne, and finally expelled by the Dictator from his country.

No. 2

[The People’s Paper, No. 23, October 9, 1852]

Your readers will doubtlessly absolve me for another week from recording and commenting on those well-known despicable quack-performances composing the official history of the day—all the feasts, revelries, processions, demonstrations, conspiracies, triumphs, and final choruses, which make up the “mise en scène” of the Empire in France, and through which they hope to derive the power of producing an impression upon a public to whom the piece itself offers no other novelty, than that “the machinery is by electric telegraph.” In fact, these are dull times, and men certainly want some leisure yet, before they will be able to come forth with “a new piece.” And as good actors require to be critics first, so let the people become critics of their own revolutionary past, and let those who aspire to be their leaders, prove their vocation in guiding them through their studies, and the revolutionary drama of the future will be a hit, and no failure. I proceed with my review.

II. NAPOLEON THE LITTLE, BY VICTOR HUGO.

It would be difficult exactly to describe my feelings at the moment when I sit down to criticise a work of such generally acknowledged reputation, yet of so little solid or lasting merits as this last production of the most splendid of all French writers. What I cherish in it, what I could not omit expressing, without becoming guilty of ingratitude, is the pleasure it gave me on the first reading. And that pleasure will be shared by all people who do the same, particularly those who had it in the original language. Victor Hugo stands indeed unsurpassed in the ranks of French literature of the nineteenth century. He is a true genius. To compare, as some of his countrymen, or rather, his political enemies do, to compare Victor

---

a Victor Hugo, Napoléon le petit, Londres, 1852.—Ed.
Hugo with Lamartine as a poet, with Alexandre Dumas as a dramatist, with Eugène Sue as a romance-writer, or with Odilon Barrot as an orator, would be comparing a Byron with a Wordsworth, a Shakespeare with a Bulwer, a Walter Scott with a James, or a Sheridan with an Osborne. Lamartine, that vainest of all authors, and that most hypocritical of all men, relates in his "Voyage in the Orient," a that in his youth he considered it the height of all human greatness for one man to unite in himself the poet's laurel, the orator's palm, and the politician's sceptre. He let us into the secret of his own ambition.

But how signally has that ambition failed! History will scarcely recognise him as an historian; but no doubt the Athenians would have given him the headmastership of a school of rhetoric. Ah! On your rival posterity will confer the honours that you have craved in vain. Yes! Victor Hugo's is the laurel! I cannot omit extracting the following poetic passage from his last work:—

"WILL MEN AWAKEN?"

"We are in Russia, the Neva is frozen over; houses are built on the ice, and heavy chariots roll over it. 'Tis no longer water, but rock. The people flock up and down this marble, which was once a river. A town is run up, streets are made, shops opened, people buy, sell, eat, drink, sleep, light fires on what once was water. You can do whatever you please there. Fear nothing. Laugh, dance; 'tis more solid than terra firma. Why, it sounds beneath the foot like granite. Hurrah for the winter! Hurrah for the ice! This will last till doomsday! And look up at the sky; is it day? is it night? what is it? A dull, wan light drags over the snow; why, the sun is dying!

"No, thou art not dying, O liberty! And these days, at the moment when thou art least expected, in the hour when they shall have most utterly forgotten thee, thou wilt rise dazzling! thy radiant face will suddenly be seen issuing from the earth, resplendent in the horizon! Over all that snow, over all that ice, over that hard, white plain, over that water become rock, over all that villainous winter, thou wilt cast thine arrow of gold, thine ardent and effulgent ray! Light, heat, life! and then, listen! hear you that murmuring sound! hear you that cracking noise wide-spread and so formidable! 'Tis the breaking up of the ice! 'tis the melting of the Neva! 'tis the river resuming its course! 'tis the water, living, joyous, and terrible, upraising the hideous, dead ice, and smashing it. 'T was granite, said you; see, it splinters like glass! 'tis the breaking up of the ice, I tell you; 'tis the truth returning, 'tis progress recommencing, 'tis humanity resuming its march, and uprooting, breaking to pieces, carrying off, and burying fathoms deep, and for ever, not merely the brand-new empire of Louis Bonaparte, but all the constructions and all the walls of the antique despotism. Look on these things as they are passing away; they will never return, you will never behold them again. That book, half submerged, is the old code of iniquity; that sinking stool is the throne; that other stool, standing upon it, is the scaffold!

"And for this immense engulfment, this supreme victory of life over death, what was needed? One of thy glories, O sun! one of thy ravs, O liberty!"

\[a\] A. Lamartine, *Voyage en Orient.*—Ed.

\[b\] Victor Hugo, *Napoléon le petit,* Book 1, Ch. IV.—Ed.
Yes, Victor Hugo's is the palm of eloquence! His is, also, what is more—the immortelle of the insurgent. He also fought on the barricades of December. But the sceptre of the politician: would that he never thought of aspiring to it; for that we must absolutely deny him, and withhold from his hands. His partisans might entrust him with the leadership of Democracy. Does he not behold the hopeless prostration of that party? His vanity might be flattered by the supposition of a talent which is not given to him. Does he not perceive how it endangers the glory of those talents which really are in his possession? Alas! is it then true that all human greatness—all the heroes and martyrs—all the stars and lumina—find a stone in their road, over which they will stumble! Revel, ye millions! you are rising in the scale; and that makes your great men go down. *Let them all break their necks over this stumbling stone of politics, let them be thrown into the sea, if they cannot devise the riddle of the modern Sphinx—the revolutionary solution of the war of classes. But I am forgetting Napoleon the Little. The title is well-chosen, if meant to humiliate Louis Bonaparte. Why, then, is it not carried through in the work itself? There was a Napoleon the Great; but Victor Hugo does not show us a little one. What if this is the work of one man: the dissolution of an assembly—the confiscation of the laws—the suppression of the public liberties—the imprisonment of the representatives—the slaughter of the Republicans—the transportation of thousands—the profanation of religion—the prostitution of justice—the proclamation of a new constitution—the sequestration of the national, and almost the private property—the submission of the proudest nation to his arbitrary pleasure—the restoration of a dynasty, of an Empire: if all this is the work of the one man, as you assert, Mr. Hugo, how can you call him “Little” in your work? But you do not. On the contrary, except in the title, you everywhere swell his personal dimensions to the most enormous bulk of a liar, a swindler, a perjurer, an assassin, it is true; but when you thus place him by the side of Nero, Attila, Jenghiz Khan, or King Bomba, *you cannot affirm, in the same breath, that he is the “Little.” With all your brilliant parallels you do not obtain that object. Had you shown that for instance the Assembly was already

---

*a* Probably a paraphrase of the motto of the Révolutions de Paris, a revolutionary-democratic weekly which was published in Paris from July 1789 to February 1794. The motto was: “Les grands ne nous paraissent grands que parce que nous sommes à genoux: levons-nous!” (“The great only seem great to us because we are on our knees: Let us rise up!”).—*Ed.*

*b* Ferdinand II, King of Naples.—*Ed.*
dead and decayed, when buried by Bonaparte; that the laws had ever been suspended and confiscated; that a systematic suppression of the public liberties had actually left little for the dictator to add; that your representatives were accustomed to imprisonment and transportation, by the same parties who had ever slaughtered your republicans; that religion had profaned itself on every occasion as an instrument of governmental oppression; that justice had proclaimed its prostitution in your High-Courts of May and your Courts-Martial of June. In short, that your whole middle-class rule and bourgeois society was already rotten from top to bottom, smelling of bribery and corruption as much as the soldiery who kicked it from its pedestal, were smelling of brandy and sausages—then you might have justly called him "little" whose name only, not his person, was necessary at the head of a coup d'etat effected by the last desperate exertions of the army, the priesthood, the functionaries and the mob, to save themselves from their inevitable destruction by the approaching revolution of the working-class, to which they felt themselves exposed by the weakness and incapacity of a parliamentary bourgeoisie. Then what remained for Bonaparte? To make himself the instrument of the situation. To command a situation is greatness. To obey one is littleness. There you would have reduced him to his proper dimensions. You would not have made such a noise of his oath—was he not as dependent, as "little," in breaking it, as he was in taking it? Then the title of your book would have indeed been to the purpose. Nevertheless, one admires your parallels.

"Peter the Cruel massacred, but he did not steal; Henry III assassinated, but he did not swindle; Timour Beg crushed children under horses' hoofs, much as M. Bonaparte exterminated women and old men on the Boulevard, but he did not tell lies."

No. 3

[The People's Paper, No. 24, October 16, 1852]

Having shown that the principal error of V. Hugo consists in ascribing the whole turn of events, before and after the 2nd of Dec., to the policy and conduct of an individual, L. Bonaparte, it becomes incumbent on me, further to develop the causes which necessarily led our author to such a fallacy. Reasoning from general principles—the general principles of society, laid down by the ruling classes and embodied in their very creeds, Victor Hugo judges from an erroneous point of view; he sees in the man the motive power,
instead of seeking for it in class interests, class antagonism, and class revolution, while the man is the mere temporary exponent of the change—as the weathercock betokens the direction of the wind. Victor Hugo belongs to a class who thus look on the effect as the cause—on the instrument as the hand that uses it. In that class, certainly there are those who denounce the inequalities and horrors of the present system with a violence and a declamatory force often superior to the expressions of the very revolutionary class itself. To hear them one would believe that they are more socialist than the whole of the working class. And what are they in fact? They are reactionary. I shall not call them knaves; perhaps they are unconscious of the real tendency of their doctrines and actions, although in our present age illusions are hardly possible to men, who live in contact with the actual world. But most certainly are they the dupes of the class notions, instilled into their minds as the general principles of social life. Incapable of conceiving that such gregarious phrases as “Liberty of the individual,” “Industry,” “Prosperity,” and “Humanity,” proclaimed at the outset of our modern age, are just the promises under which all the results of middle-class society were necessarily brought about, they fancy those results to be all the faults of the moral degeneration of the governments, to whose care the development of the social principles had been trusted. And such is particularly the case with Victor Hugo. In his eyes the principles of present social government are right, and the men to be blamed. That is the opinion of all moralising middle-class reformers. Whatever there is wrong and perverted, pernicious and deleterious, it is the fault of the individuals—and the classes who support those individuals? Oh, they never think of classes. Far from them the misanthropical conception of a society composed of classes and ruled by class-interests. “Mend your morals, nations, and your governments will be perfect.” Such is their motto. They always treat the people as a whole, address it as a whole, suppose them of the same creed, with one common conscience, with one universal opinion. Take that for granted, and those men would seem the greatest (would-be) benefactors of humanity, the initiators of a new era, the restorers of the paradise lost. Drive them from this ground, show the people that there is neither a community of morals, nor of conscience, nor of opinion ever possible between different classes with opposed interests, that the institutions of a class produce not only with necessity those facts over which our philanthropists lament, but also the men, whom they accuse of all the mischievous arrangements in the body politic—and from the dignity of demi-gods you reduce them to the nullity of sham-prophets. Deprive V. Hugo of these
garments, which style, eloquence and poetry have spread over his work, all that remains is a moral sermon, full of vituperations of the Lord, and of reproach to the middle class, preached to poor peasants who are not a bit wiser for it, neither how it came that they fell into the hands of the former, nor how they will ever be able to escape the grasp of the latter.

No. 4

[The People's Paper, No. 25, October 23, 1852]

[III.] THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION.
AS PROVED BY THE COUP D'ÉTAT. BY J. P. PROUDHON. *

In suppressing the greater part of my last letter, you have, no doubt, followed such considerations of policy as, under existing circumstances, I can scarcely object to. I have now arrived, in the series of my critical remarks, at the last production of an author who has acquired a considerable reputation on the continent for the "boldness" of his opinions, and is sometimes considered by English middle-class writers as the very incarnation of the revolutionary Socialism in France, but whose only real merit consists, as I shall prove, in the severe, but true judgment which he has passed on all the hollow conceptions of plain Republicanism and of formal Democracy. The sarcasm with which he has attacked and exposed both the political leaders and literary notabilities of the said parties have merited for him the surname of the "Mephisto" of the French Democracy. As it is possible that the meaning of this epithet may not be generally understood by your readers, I think it expedient to give a short explanation of it. There exists an old German legend, long familiarised to the English by Marlowe, b but universally divulged in the matchless tragedy of Goethe, c in which the vague ideal aspirations of man towards an imaginary state of perfection, are ingeniously parodied by the materialist and practical suggestions of the spirit of the world (Mephisto), with whom the hero, Faust, has concluded an indissoluble treaty of union. Faust, a philosopher, or "black artist," as the medieval legend says, full of wild dreams, conceived in seclusion and ignorance of human society, calls upon the spirit who has the control of the material world, to assist him in

---

* P. J. Proudhon, La révolution sociale démontrée par le coup d'état du 2 décembre, Paris, 1852.—Ed.

b Ch. Marlowe, The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus.—Ed.

c Goethe, Faust.—Ed.
the realisation of his visionary schemes of perfection. Mephisto then acquaints him with the realities of life. But the more Faust becomes conversant with our common world, the more he believes to approach the accomplishment of his ardent desire of perfection by an accumulation of sensual pleasures, the more also does he lose recollection of his first proud conceptions, and the more he descends from the height of moral elevation; until, after a variety of adventures and experiences, in all of which he is attended by Mephisto, the witness and merciless scorn of his weaknesses and vacillations, our "noble, aspiring, and generous" Faust, turns out to be of the same low, degenerate, and egotistical nature of which he had thought himself to be the most competent reformer, and the most opposite example. Substitute for the "noble" Faust a "noble" Democracy, and you may not improperly call Proudhon its Mephisto, in so far as he has, indeed, not only recorded and urged all the manifold deceptions and weaknesses of the French Democracy, but treated with the severest scorn its hyperbolical pretensions and its ridiculous ambition. And that part he has performed ever since the Democrats in the Provisional Government had manifested their incapacity, and the Republicans in the National Assembly enacted their reactionary formalism in the Constitution of 1848. While arguing against the former, that raised upon the shoulders of Revolution, which, if it means anything at all, has for its invariable object "the displacement of the previously commanding interests of the substitution of a government for the benefit of the oppressed classes," they left all the enemies of progress in the undisturbed possession of the strongholds of society, such as the army, the administration, the church, the courts, and the police, and thus allowed them the means of organising their counter-revolutionary crusade. Proudhon crushes the Republican party by sarcastically demonstrating how their great formula of liberty—their "pure and sublime" Democracy obtained its practical realisation only by the slaughter of almost a whole class, and through the establishment of a military dictatorship, placed in the hands of General Cavaignac. But the best of his arguments he has spared for the refutation of the dogma of Universal Suffrage, and on this ground he has given the most deadly blow to the French sham Democracy. I recollect very well the attempts once made to persuade the people of England likewise, that Universal Suffrage alone was in itself the cure of all the social iniquities under which they are suffering, and that, at a certain time, it was held almost a sacrilege or a blasphemy to talk of Social Rights, or the Labour Question. Happily they have learnt that, far from being the definitive end of political development, it is only the
first decisive step in the revolutionary direction, the piece of ground necessary for the organisation of their army, the open field in which the hitherto disguised war of classes can at last be fairly fought out, the means in a word, and not the end, of the people's emancipation. But how much are we indebted for this knowledge to the experiments which, for want of our own experience, the French nation has made on behalf of the whole world, and of which that nation itself could hardly be expected to reap the fruits, if it had not, on the denunciation of Blanqui and other revolutionary leaders, ceased at last to believe in the fatal delusion into which Democracy has led them by representing Universal Suffrage as the magic rod, that has only to be once applied, when the treasures of a new social paradise would be thrown open to the world.

It cannot be said that Proudhon was the first who discovered and exposed the insufficiency of the suffrage to effect the social enfranchisement of the people. As early as April, 1848, Blanqui, then at the head of the Paris proletarians, had the conviction that the result of the first general elections\(^a\) would be the formation of a reactionary assembly, and he urged the Provisional Government to defer the time appointed for those elections, in order to gain the means of better influencing them by the organisation of revolutionary committees, the only condition as he then pointed out, under which the suffrage would be made a weapon in the hands of the people. Thus he indicated already, in opposition to the official Democracy, that he considered Universal Suffrage as a mere instrument of class-warfare which might be turned to advantage if used in the proper way, but which he declared might as well be employed for the purposes of any particular party in power. His views were confirmed by subsequent events, and as he was decided to carry the victory of Revolution in spite of all imposed sham legal decrees, he endeavoured to break up the very National Assembly, which was the first manifestation of Universal Suffrage. The 15th of May was a failure and Blanqui went to prison,\(^373\) while Proudhon profited in safety by this lesson and restricted himself to protesting in the Press against the suffrage, as a political fiction. His peaceful remonstrance, however, did not save him from a similar fate, and he also went into prison for three years, whence he has now come forth, resuming with laudable vigour his former attacks. As it happens, that on this subject Proudhon, although still from a mere theoretical point of view, concurs in the arguments of the revolutionary party, I

\(^a\) The elections to the French Constituent Assembly, held on April 23, 1848.—Ed.
give you the whole passage on the Suffrage, contained in his last work; observing that if the argumentation itself necessarily leads to extreme conclusions, his language will be found to lack that spirit and decision which would betray in every work, however disguised and moderate the author might have been obliged to be in his phraseology, from considerations of policy, the man of a determined principle—the man of Revolution.

Proudhon excuses himself, that writing as it were under the jealous eyes of a dictator, he could not allow himself to indulge in using such strong expressions as would expose him at once as the most terrible champion of Revolution. I think, however, that he has, nevertheless, said everything in this work as determinedly as he could have intended to do under any circumstances, seeing that those passages in which he endeavours, by an occasional flattering supposition, to captivate the indulgence of Louis Napoleon's censorship, have altogether nothing to do with, and interrupt in no wise, the strain of his observations. At any rate M. Proudhon could never make me believe him to be a decided champion of Revolution, when I remember him to have always been the loudest where nobody was in the field besides himself, and no immediate measure to be proposed to the people; and to have almost disappeared or entirely plunged himself into doctrinal expositions where a real revolutionary act was to be committed.

While Blanqui was leading the Proletarians onwards, to the direct destruction of the class obstacles that stood in the way of the people's enfranchisement, Proudhon went about preaching the wonderful blessings of petty co-operation; and when the terrible defeat of June had removed, with the best and bravest part of their army, the whole claims of the working class, Proudhon started up in the middle-class Assembly, and proposed the abolition of property. But of the nature of this proposition, and of the particular Socialist doctrine which makes up the chief contents of Proudhon's literary publications, I shall treat in my next letter. Here is the above-mentioned passages on Universal Suffrage:

"It is just the republicans who, on the authority of the most suspicious traditions, have always repeated that the voice of the People is the voice of God. Then it is the voice of God that has elected Louis Napoleon! By the expression of the popular will he is your true and legitimate Sovereign. And to whom would you expect that the people should have given their votes? You have entertained them with 1789, with '92 and '93: the people have retained nothing but the legend of the Empire. In the memory of the people the Empire has wiped out the Republic. Do they remember

a The quotations that follow are taken from pp. 80-81 of Proudhon's book.—Ed.
Count Mirabeau, Robespierre, their 'Ami du Peuple,' Marat, or the Père Duchesne' (the journal of the Jacobins)? The people know only the good God and the Emperor, as they once knew but the good God and Charlemagne. It is in vain that you have preached the Rights of Man, or that you made a monarch swear to respect the Republic as above Universal Suffrage. The people only recognise the rights of force.

"And you are defeated in virtue of your own principles. You have been defeated because, relying on Rousseau and the most detestable orators of 1793, you would not acknowledge that monarchy is just the direct and inevitable product of popular spontaneity; because, after having abolished the government by the Grace of God, you have pretended to establish, by means of another fiction, a government by the Grace of the People; because, instead of making yourselves the educators of the multitude you have made yourselves its slaves. You, the same as the masses, required visible manifestations, palpable symbols, puppets in a word. Having chased a king from the throne you placed the mob in his stead, without conceiving that that was just the root from which, sooner or later, would spring up a new crown, the onion which would generate the 'lily.' [The lily is the emblem of Legitimate Monarchy in France.] Scarcely delivered of one idol you must already create a new one, resembling therein those soldiers of Titus who, after the taking of the Temple of Jerusalem, could not withhold their surprise at discovering in the Jewish sanctuary neither statues, nor oxen, nor asses, nor phalli, nor wenches. They could not conceive an invisible Jehovah. Thus you could not conceive Liberty without chamberlains.

"May these severe remarks be pardoned to an author who has performed so often the part of Cassandra. [A high priestess of the Trojans who predicted the fall of their city.] I do not accuse Democracy as little as I mean to inveigh against the vote which has renewed the mandate of Louis Napoleon. But it is time that this sect of sham-revolutionary men should at once disappear who, speculating more on the agitation than on the instruction of the people, on handstrokes more than on ideas, have made themselves the courtiers of the multitude, and become the most dangerous blockers-up of the revolution.

"Who has named the Constituent Assembly, swarming with Legitimist dynasties, nobles, generals, and prelates? Universal Suffrage. Who has made the 10th of December, 1848? a Universal Suffrage. Who has elected the Legislative Assembly? Universal Suffrage. And who has absolved Bonaparte of his coup d'état? Universal Suffrage.

"May it not be said also, that it was Universal Suffrage which commenced the reaction of the 16th of April, which eclipsed itself behind the back of Barère on the 15th of May, which remained deaf to the appeal of the 13th of June, which allowed the passing of the law of the 31st of May, b which crossed arms on the 2nd of December. c

"In thus accusing the suffrage, I repeat that I do not intend to attack the established Constitution and the principle of the present government. I have myself defended the suffrage as a constitutional right, and the law of the state; and as it once exists, I do not demand its suppression; but let it be instructed and organised. To the philosopher, however, it must be permitted to argue, for the explanation of history and the information of the future, that Universal Suffrage given to a people of so neglected an education as ours, far from being the instrument of progress, is only the stumbling-block of liberty.

---

a On this day Louis Bonaparte was elected President of the Republic.—Ed.

b The law abolishing universal suffrage.—Ed.

c The reference is to Louis Bonaparte coup d'état.—Ed.
"Poor, inconsequent democrats! You made philippic speeches against tyranny, preached the respect of every nationality, the free exercise of the people's sovereignty; you were ready to take up arms to defend against everybody all those sublime and incontestable doctrines.—And with what right, if Universal Suffrage was your rule, did you suppose that the Russian nation felt the least uncomfortable under their Czar; that the Polish, Hungarian, Lombard, and Tuscan peasants were sobbing for their emancipation; that the Lazzaroni hated their King Bomba, and the Trasteverians abhorred Monsignor Antonelli; that the Spaniards and Portuguese blushed for their Queens, Donna Maria and Isabella, when our own people, in spite of the appeal of their representatives, in spite of the written law of the Constitution, in spite of the bloodshed and the merciless proscription, from fear, ignorance, constraint or affection (you may choose), give 7,600,000 votes to the man the most detested by Democracy, whom it believed to have ruined, demolished and used up by a three-years exposure to ridicule, insults, and hatred, when the people make this man a dictator, and Emperor?"a

[No. 5]

[The People's Paper, No. 27, November 6, 1852]

While that Assembly of Bonapartist lackeys, called the Senate of France, is deliberating on the ceremonies by which the long expected Empire shall be ushered in at last, and the official world at Paris is all given up to conjectures about the manner of the coronation, the prince's marriage, the probable succession, &c., I shall take advantage of the leisure thus left to my pen, and, turning my back to those "important events" which furnish the gossiping middle-class papers with inexhaustible stuff for small talk, I continue to-day my review on Proudhon's last work. We have seen Proudhon criticising the actions and political systems of the different Republican parties in France; let us now become, in our turn, the critics of his own system. A few words only may be said before, on the career of an author who is yet so little known in England.

Proudhon is a native of Besançon, a town which is perspicuous for the number of eminent men it has sent forth, among whom the names of Victor Hugo and Béranger stand in the first rank. The son of a poor vine-grower, his means for obtaining a good education were but scanty; but thanks to the energy of his character, he had no

---

a At the end of this article the editors of The People's Paper added the following note in square brackets: "It is obvious that our correspondent does not attack Universal Suffrage, but the idea, that Universal Suffrage taken nakedly by itself, must necessarily emancipate a people. Here is another proof how necessary the details are to guard the suffrage—here is another proof how necessary is a knowledge of our social rights, to make the suffrage conducive to happiness and freedom. We trust our correspondent's strictures on a one-sided class-application of Universal Suffrage will not be misunderstood."—Ed.
sooner grown up, and secured a situation for himself as printer, than he began to make up the gaps in his knowledge by strenuously applying himself to the study of languages, of history, and of political economy. Proudhon is altogether an autodidact (self-taught), and as such he shares largely in that quality of tenaciously sticking to his first conceptions, so common to the whole of this class of people. It is curious to observe how regularly he relapses into those errors which his critics have so often exposed, and of which it would seem as if he had sometimes become conscious himself.

Napoleon, the uncle of course, has invented a term for such people which marvellously applies to M. Proudhon. He called them "ideologues"—an expression by which he meant to embrace all those speculative minds, philosophers and politicians, who standing aloof from the real movement of history, incapable or unwilling to take any active part therein, or to fill out any practical mission, still wanted to prescribe to the historical process the laws according to which it had to enact itself. Those philosophers, it must be said, deserved by no means the contempt in which they were held by Napoleon, who esteemed but two qualities in man: military genius and administrative talents. They are often superior observers of facts and admirable critics of past events; their weakness consists only in this: that they understand not to draw just conclusions such as correspond to the premises so well defined by them. In their proposed solutions they invariably substitute the arbitrary decrees of speculation to the force of circumstances, to the decisions of the combating elements, to the material power, from which in reality not only the motive force but also the direction can alone be derived. Materialists in their judgment of the past they fall back in the fathomless depths of idealism, of Utopianism, the moment they endeavour to indicate, or rather to fix the constitution of the future. And what is the cause of this error? Merely this: that our "ideologues," correct in their view of the past, by comparing the facts themselves with their representation in thought, neglect to secure for their conjectures on the future that same measure of comparison, which can exclusively guarantee the justice of human conceptions. And this comes because they either take their stand on the ground of a party or class which by its very conditions can have no future, or, what is more generally the case, because they pretend to keep themselves apart from all the actual parties, and to anticipate by speculation the solution of a problem which can only result from the co-operation or rather the conflict of those very parties. They conceive history as a mathematical problem, a sum of equations. Thus they conceive the possibility of calculating it on paper. The elements
known are put in their respective order, a line is drawn, and the result is found without difficulty. But is it thus in reality? Are there any conflicts recorded by history which have proven their decision through the decree of a philosopher, the idea of an individual? Are they all decided by their mere force of an idea? They are decided by men, their solution is given by the triumph of a political class. That is what our "ideologues," including M. Proudhon, overlook.

Let us examine the "solution" offered by Proudhon. There is undoubtedly a conflict of antagonistic interest—a war of classes—existing in all European societies, consequently also in France. That conflict will lead to some final result; the war must end in the triumph of one or the other parties. Translate this into the language of Proudhon: "There is a problem,—hanging over modern society, a problem which must find its definitive solution. That solution is the social revolution of the 19th century." Ah, a revolutionary solution you will say. Then Proudhon is our man? Stop! stop! You think Proudhon would leave the solution of his "problem" to the action of a party, do you? He keeps that for himself; his is to remain the merit of having discovered the philosopher's stone. That solution is contained in the idea of the social revolution. And what is that idea? "The elements of the problem are given by our history." Let us resume them. What is the actual situation of France? In the first place the state is composed of:

"First, an organised clergy, numbering about 50,000 priests, and as many individuals of both sexes living in the various religious establishments; having at their disposition a capital of three hundred millions of francs, exclusive of the churches, the ecclesiastical estates, forming the private property of the priests, the produce of indulgences, the proceeds of collections, &c., an organ of public morality, presumed to be indispensable, and the more powerful, as its influence is secretly and privately exercised within the precincts of domestic life.

"Second, an army of 400,000 men, disciplined, stripped of all family ties, trained in the contempt of the National Guard, entirely at the command of the Executive, and alone considered to be able to defend so as to keep down the nation.

"Third, a centralised administration, ministers of the police, of public instruction, of the state-works, the taxes, the customs, the domains, numbering upwards of 500,000 functionaries in the salary of the state; holding in its dependence, directly or indirectly, every industry, arts, extending its power over all persons and things, governing and administrating everything, and leaving no other care to the taxpayers, but to produce and pay their rates.

"Fourth, a magistracy, hierarchically organised, and influencing by its inevitable arbitration every social relation, every private interest, Court of Cassation, Court of Appeal, Civil and Commercial Tribunals, Justice of the Peace, etc., all in

---

a There follow quotations from pp. 19-22 of Proudhon's book.—Ed.
perfect understanding with the Church, the Administration, the Police and the Army."

As to the nation, it is divided into

"First, the bourgeoisie—that class which comprehends all people living on the revenues of their capital, on their rents, official privileges, places and sinecures, more than on the fruits of their industry. The modern bourgeoisie, thus classified, forms a sort of aristocracy of capital and money, analogous to the ancient aristocracy of birth, by their riches as well as by the extent of their patronage; disposing of the bank, the railways, the mines, the insurances, the great industry, the wholesale commerce, and having for the basis of their operations a public and a hypotheticary debt of 1,000 millions of pounds.

"Second, the small middle class, composed of speculators, masters, shopkeepers, cultivators and professional men, etc., living much more on their personal produce than on their capital, privileges, or property, but distinguishing themselves from the proletarians by this, that they work for their own account and on their own risks, and enjoy for themselves the profits of their industry.

"Third, the working class, or proletarians, living on their wages, and having no economical or industrial initiative, thus fully deserving the name of a mercenary or salaried mass.

"The country has a population of thirty-six millions of inhabitants. Its annual produce is valued at 9,000 millions of francs, one-fourth of which goes off for the maintenance of the State, the Church and other unproductive or parasitic functions; another fourth falls under the title of interest, rent, agio, commission, etc., to the share of the bourgeoisie; which leaves for the working class, including the small middle class, an average revenue or salary of forty-one centimes (3½ d.) per head and per diem, but which in some extreme cases falls short of fifteen centimes (1¼ d.) per day."

Here is a picture of the actual situation of France—which, for its exactitude and striking features, can scarcely be surpassed. Here Proudhon has collected all the elements that make up the groundwork, the foundation of the real social revolution. Now, what is the conclusion he draws from these premises?

---

a Here the editors of The People's Paper added the following note in square brackets: "The valuable analysis which follows here we are compelled to leave out this week."—Ed.
exchange, liberty and well-being. In this consists the operation of the century, the objects, still so little understood, of Socialism.\textsuperscript{a}

Here the "ideologue" becomes at once visible. The elements of the historical process are changed into the elements of an arithmetical sum; the classes become abstract "categories"—and the result, the conclusion is no longer dependent on the action of the principal and original elements, but on their arbitrary arrangement by the pencil of the calculator. The arithmetical means is substituted for the historical solution of the "problem" of reality. A stroke of his pencil is the touch of the new magic rod, by which Mr. Proudhon discovers at once the secret of the social revolution. The small middle class is henceforth the cardinal point of society! Decidedly every man must be made a shopkeeper! for this end. What has to be done? Why the political power must be entrusted to the shopkeepers; credit, the distribution of labour, the entire organisation of the community must be put into their hands—and they will give every man the means of placing himself in their class, the bourgeois as well as the proletarian. A nice solution that—on paper! If it could but be made accepted by the world? Let us see.

Will the bourgeois, the great mill owner, the banker, the 10,000 acres proprietor, the railway millionaire, the cotton growing slaveholder, the rich speculator, will these people accept Proudhon's theory, and modestly forswear their palace-like counting houses for the desk of a small shopkeeper? Will the proletarians, on the other hand, who have learned to appreciate the miraculous force of associated labour, in their great factories and workshops, will they renounce those immense means of production, and of their definitive emancipation, when once theirs, for the idyllic pictures of a ten acres freehold, or a £10 household? Suppose they would, Mr. Proudhon, is that the social solution of the nineteenth century? Why, man, you are behind your time; you are an anachronism. What you preach as a new theory, is an old worn-out fact—it is the solution attempted by the eighteenth century, executed in your own country. Did not 1789 give every peasant his ten acres of land?—were not your shopkeepers and burghers of the towns in possession of their £10 household?—was not liberty the great formula of 1793, the well-being of all the eternal phrases of your "Rights of man" constitutions? Whence, then, came the bourgeois and the proletarian? whence arose these extremes, but just from that middle, your small middle class, invested with the sovereign disposition of

\textsuperscript{a} P. J. Proudhon. \textit{La révolution sociale démontrée par le coup d'état du 2 décembre}, Paris, 1852.—\textit{Ed.}
the national interests? And you propose to begin the same thing again! Because you have not learned your lesson, you would make the whole nation repeat their task. Strange philosopher, still stranger initiator of the social revolution of the nineteenth century. Like causes, like effects. Liberty of the individual to dispose over his capital and his labour—and concentration of wealth in the hands of the stranger and the more cunning or clever,—"Credit shall be given equally to all," very good. But can that be done at once? What is credit? The permission to use a portion of the accumulated labour, say the capital, of another man, or the state, if you like, for productive purposes, against the payment of interest, discount, &c.

Now, is the capital accumulated, even supposing it to be in the possession of individuals, of a class, is that capital sufficiently large to put every man on a shopkeeper's or small cultivator's footing, by dividing it into equal portions? That is the question, sir, if you have any notions of credit, is it not? Then how will you proceed? You will give credit to as many as possible. Very well, they will get an advance on those that are provisionally left to look to their wages—labour for an existence. There is the proletarian. Ah, but afterwards, with the reflux of the first lent-out capital, you will afford the proletarians the same credit, and draw them from their slavery. Well, supposing that the population had not increased faster than the accumulation of capital, under your provisions, is it you that decides upon the question of extending the public credit, or is it the class into whose hands you have once, in the beginning, placed the capital? And do you think that class, once materially and economically constituted as such, would not keep the capital of the nation for itself, the more so as they are also entrusted by you with the political power? Acknowledge then, that the proletarians will get no credit; their social enfranchisement does not take place. There is one point. Now, it is obvious, that amongst the capital-holding class, cleverness, invention, ability, force, fraud, and competition, will in time mark out some palpable destructions; the one fraction will get the greater part of the capital into their hands, or the whole of the credit under their control. There is the bourgeoisie. There then you would have, after a similar lapse of time, perhaps at the beginning of the twentieth century, arrived again at the starting point of another "Social Revolution," and another Proudhon might again come forth and propose, for the third time, the same solution. The people, Mr. Proudhon, thank you for this prospect; they will even listen with pleasure to your stricture of other systems, but believe me they will never accept your own.

---

It is a very remarkable phenomenon that all the French authors, who have favoured the contemporary world with their accounts of the late coup d'état, and to whom not only the consequences but also the origin of that event might be supposed to be best known, have failed in the attempt to explain its real causes; while a German writer, who was himself but a distant observer of the progress of events in France, has given not merely the first, but the only competent version of the history of the Bonapartist Usurpation. This is a truly surprising fact. It might perhaps be thought, that the very circumstance of the author's absence from France had enabled him to take up a more impartial point of view, from which to judge of the character of the situation and the conduct of parties; but we are soon convinced, that such is not the case. No one has shown less of that objective impartiality, which is so wrongly supposed by many people to be the most important requisite in a historian. Such impartiality is simply a fiction, never to be met with in reality; and happily no—for to whom, except to the author himself, could it give satisfaction? Thus it is not his independence from party principles and party views, that has given the power to Mr. Marx of satisfactorily accounting for the causes and effects of the events he records, but rather the correctness of the method and the justice of the principles, which he has followed in his work. The secret of his success, to speak in plain terms, is his adherence to a party, that was not immediately involved in the struggle, and yet, by its conditions, its growing and indestructible power, and by its future, must finally become the supreme arbiter of all the incidental quarrels and alternative defeats and triumphs of which the official history of the latter days in France is composed. The revolutionary party of the working class disappeared from the political stage with the insurrection of June, 1848. From that time they became the mere witnesses of the historical drama in which all other parties remained engaged: Legitimists, Orleanists, Bonapartists, Republicans, and Democratic Socialists. Consequently, they were the only independent judges of all the errors, faults, "crimes", &c., committed by each of the said fractions.

Let me now briefly state the argument, why it has not been possible to the representatives of any other party, than that of the

---

* See this volume, pp. 99-197.—Ed.
revolutionary proletariat, to pronounce a sound and true judgment on the character of the last historical epoch in France. Who are the Legitimists? The representatives of the great landed property, the aristocracy of the soil. And who are the Orleanists? The representatives of commerce, the aristocracy of money. Was it for either of them to confess: Our rule has been upset by the moneyed interest in 1830—and ours by the labour interests in 1848; having succeeded by the combination of our mutual power to grasp again on the political domination, the necessity of our class position, the contingencies of the social struggle compelled us so to strengthen and centralise the resources of the executive, placing it in the hands of a single individual, that it was but the natural and inevitable result of our exertions, if this individual has afterwards deprived us of our prerogative and made himself an absolute dictator and Emperor? Both Legitimists and Orleanists comprehended that, this being the only manner in which their defeat could have been accounted for, it would be better for them to hold their tongues. This they have done. Not so the Republicans, the Democrats, as well as the Democratic Socialists. But what expedient remained to them? History, the history of the human race, its development under the different social constitutions, is no less a physical process, a series of changes, dissolutions, formations, reformations, revolutions, as the history of our globe with its constantly changing and ever returning phenomena of revolution, change of matter, seasons, &c., &c. As there is not one of the manifestations of this permanent physical change which, even if it cannot be traced by our understanding to its immediate source, does not depend on some particular cause so also is there no event, no circumstance in the affairs of the body of a nation, without its necessary preceding impulse. Nowhere do we behold any miracles, nor casualties: nay, as the elements of the social phenomena are all known to us, open to investigation, subject to experience, they are just the very thing of which a full and circumstantial account can, in every instance, be given, unless prejudice or interest blind man's observation. This was the case with the Republicans, who tried everything in order to avoid arriving at conclusions which would have no longer permitted them to advocate interests without the conditions of vitality, and to profess principles of demonstrated importance. Rather than do so, they have preferred to misrepresent reality, to understate their actual defeat, to exaggerate the individual merits of their enemy, in short, to falsify history by the substitution of accidents, casualties and enormities to the simple laws of effects and causes, the law of necessity.

From the point of view of the revolutionary proletarians, no such
deception was possible; no historical fraud could have been intended; and this being the stand, Mr. Marx has not only occupied in the present work, but which he has filled so eminently in all his critical labours: he, the representative of the revolutionary theory of the working-class movements, the literary pilot of the most advanced fraction of European Democracy, he has also shown himself the best historian of the Presidency, Dictature, and Empire of Louis Bonaparte.
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[The People's Paper, No. 33, December 18, 1852]

The first chapter of this book, which may be considered as its programme, begins with contrasting the character of the revolution of 1789 with that of 1848. The former was the work of the middle class, the latter announced itself as the revolution of the working class; the former was victorious through the energies and conscience of their objects possessed by its originators; the latter turned out a failure, through the indecision and ignorance of its leaders as well as of the masses. A social revolution was to be made. Nobody knew how. What else could be possible but that people looked back for guidance to the pages of past history? So they tried alternately a National Assembly, declared a Republic, established a Dictature, received the Convention, created another Napoleon. They had only drawn up so many caricatures of a dead epoch, the spirit of which was gone. But have these experiments been useless, or what lesson, yet indispensable towards the completion of their education, have the working classes learned by them?

The social revolution of the nineteenth century cannot draw its poetry from the past, but only from the future. It cannot begin by itself, until stripped of all superstitious veneration of the past. Former revolutions needed the recollections of history, in order to deceive themselves as to their object. The revolution of the nineteenth century must let the dead bury their dead, in order to arrive at a clear perception of its own ends and purposes. There the phrase overstepped the object, here the object far oversteps the phrase.

The Revolution of February, 1848, was a surprise of the governmental stronghold of existing society, and the people proclaimed this unhoped-for coup-de-main as a first-rate historical event by which a new epoch was to be opened. On the 2nd of

\[a\] Matthew 8:22.—Ed.
December the revolution of February is lost by the *volte* of a political cheat at cards; and society, instead of having conquered the basis for a new stage of historical development, *seems* only to have restored the state in its most obsolete form, the simple and impudent rule of sword and priest-gown.

Time, however, has not passed away without fruit. French society, during the years 1848-51, has made up—following an abridging because revolutionary method, for those studies and experiences which, in the ordinary and regular course of things, ought to have preceded the revolution of February, if that revolution was to have been something more than a mere superficial shock. Society seems now to have stepped back beyond its point of departure: but, in reality, it had first to create the revolutionary point of issue, the situation, the circumstances, and the conditions in which alone modern Revolution becomes serious.

Middle-class revolutions, like those of the eighteenth century, rapidly storm from conquest to conquest; their dramatic efforts surpass each other; men and things appear as if surrounded by a halo of radiating fire; ecstasy is the spirit of every day. But they are short-living—they soon reach their zenith: and a long apathy seizes upon society before it soberly learns to appropriate the results of the heroic intoxication of its youthful epoch. Proletarian revolutions, like that of the nineteenth century, on the contrary, continually interrupt their own course, sceptically criticise their own performances, return periodically to what they appear to have already completed, in order to do it over again; they rail at the inconsistencies, frailties, contemptibilities of their own first experiments with the merciless superiority of gained experience; they seem to prostrate their antagonist only that he may draw, Antaeus-like, new strength from the earth, and rise again the more gigantically before them; every moment they recoil before the indefinite, monstrous grandeur of their own objects, till that situation has arrived where retreat is no longer possible; and circumstances themselves impose their

"Hic Rhodus! hic salta!  
Here is Rhodus! come and dance!"

I regret that want of space, and the necessity of putting a term to my reflections on the general literature on the *coup d'état*, prevent us from dwelling at greater length on the review of Mr. Marx's particular work, which contains, besides its historical pages, such a picture on the actual condition of the different classes in France.

---

*Marx translates this line as "Here is the rose, here dance!"—*Ed.*
 chiefly of the peasantry, as I have not met with in any other place.

I have already said, that the Insurrection of June was the turning point of the tide of Revolution in 1848. Consequently that event must contain in its germs the original and last explanation of all subsequent history, including the coup d'état and the proclamation of another Empire. Let us see if our author has successfully argued this idea. I again extract his own words, touching the changed aspect of a class-struggle, after the defeat of the working class.

"After this defeat, the proletarians attempt, indeed, to step forward, every time that the movement appears to take a fresh start; but their efforts become gradually weaker, and the results more insignificant. As soon as one of the higher strata of society passes into revolutionary fermentation, they combine with it, and thus share all the defeats suffered in succession by the respective parties. But these subsequent blows become less severe the more they extend over the whole surface of society. The more prominent leaders of the working class in the assembly and in the press fall, each in its turn, the victims of the courts of law, and more and more equivocal individuals appear at their head. A portion of them throw themselves into doctrinal experiments, such as labour exchange, banks and co-operative associations, and thus engage in a new movement where they renounce the attempt to overthrow the whole world by appropriating and putting in movement its own great resources, labouring instead to effect their emancipation privately and clandestinely behind the back, so to say, of society, and within the narrow limits prescribed by their actual condition. In this they, of course, are defeated. They seem neither to recover from their own energies, their past revolutionary grandeur, nor do they appear likely to gain new energy from their alliance with other classes, until all those classes against which they fought in June, be prostrate aside of them. They, however, do not fall without the honours of the grand historical battle; not only France—all Europe trembles under the earthquake of June, while the subsequent victories over the higher classes are so cheaply bought, as to require the most impudent exaggeration on the part of the conqueror, in order to pass as anything like events, and turn out the more ignominiously the more remote the vanquished class stands from the proletariat."

"All classes and all parties had fused themselves into the one

\[\text{a}\] Marx has here "exchange banks and workers' associations". — Ed.
\[\text{b}\] Marx has here "while the ensuing defeats of the upper classes". — Ed.
\[\text{c}\] The next paragraph from Chapter I of The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte is omitted by Eccarius. — Ed.
\[\text{d}\] Marx has here "During the June days all classes and parties". — Ed.
Party of Order, in opposition to the proletariat, the party of Anarchy, of Socialism, and of Communism. They had saved society from 'the enemies of society'. They had given out the watchwords of bourgeois society: ‘Property, Family, Religion, and Order,’ to the army, and encouraged the counter-revolutionary crusade by the sacramental words: ‘In hoc signo vinces!’

“From this moment, as often as any one of the numerous parties that had ranged themselves under this sign against the insurgents of June, ventures to contest the revolutionary battle-field on the grounds of its own separate class interests it succumbs to the cry of ‘Property, Family, Religion, and Order.’ Society is saved as often as the number of its rulers is diminished by the victory of a more exclusive interest over wider and more general interests. Every demand of simple, middle-class financial reform, of ordinary liberalism—of mere Republican formalism and etiquette—of common-place Democracy, is at once branded as an ‘attack upon society’, and stigmatised as ‘Socialism’. And, finally, the high priests of the religion of order they themselves are kicked from their Pythian stools, carried away from their beds in the depth of night, thrown into prison vans, incarcerated, and exiled; their temple levelled to the ground—theyir mouths gagged—their pens broken—their laws torn to pieces—in the name of ‘Religion, of Order, of Property, and of Family.’

‘Respectable’ capitalists, themselves fanatics of order, are shot down from their balconies by a drunken soldiery—the sanctity of their families profaned—their houses bombarded for pastime, in the name of Religion, of Family, of Order, and of Property.

The lowest caste of all society in the end, forms the sacred phalanx of order; and the hero, Crapulinski,* triumphantly enters the Tuileries as the ‘saviour of society’.”

Published in The People’s Paper, Nos. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 32 and 33, September 25, October 2, 9, 16, 23, November 6, 13, December 11 and 18, 1852

* See Heine’s Romanzero, Hamburg, 1851. [Note by Eccarius. The reference is to the poem “Zwei Ritter”.

---
a “By this sign thou shalt conquer!” — Ed.
b See this volume, p. 112.— Ed.
c Marx has here “in the name of religion, of property, of the family, of order”. — Ed.
d Marx has here “Bourgeois fanatics for order”. — Ed.
e Marx has here “in the name of property, of the family, of religion and of order”. — Ed.
f Marx has here “the scum of bourgeois society”. — Ed.
[APPEAL FOR SUPPORT
OF THE MEN SENTENCED IN COLOGNE] 379

We have received the following letter together with the appended appeal. We are publishing the communication in accordance with its authors' wishes.

For the California Staats-Zeitung
Washington, January 14, 1853

TO THE GERMAN-AMERICAN PUBLIC! 380

With the monster trial in Cologne, the workers' movement in Germany has entered a new phase. It has cast off the fetters which the small compass of a fanatical sectarian movement imposed upon it and has stepped out openly into the political arena. Statesmen of the proletariat confronted the public prosecutors of the bureaucratic police state; the aristocrats and members of the bourgeoisie from the Rhineland who formed the jury set themselves up as a court martial and pronounced their verdict "guilty" on labour's opposition to their privileges. This being the situation, it is an agreeable duty for us to publicise the appended appeal, which members of our association have received from the signatories for distribution in the United States, and at the same time we offer our services to transmit to London any small sums remitted, against statement of account.

Whatever title your organisations bear, in these times when your members are enjoying many a frolicsome evening of conviviality, give heart to our active friends back home by stretching out a helping hand to those struck down in the struggle by donating the money raised at such gatherings. Contributions should be sent to the following address: Relief Fund, care of Adolf Cluss, Adams Express, Iron Building, Washington D.C.

Washington, January 10, 1853

J. Gerhardt, President
Ad. Cluss, Secretary
APPEAL

The workers’ party has a duty to alleviate the plight of those in the vanguard of the struggle who were sentenced in Cologne and in particular to take care of their families who are bereft of support. We expect that the German workers in the United States will also wish to be associated with this debt the party owes. The treasurer appointed to receive the sums intended for the prisoners and their families is: Ferdinand Freiligrath, 3 Sutton Place, Hackney, London.

London, December 7, 1852

| Johann Baer  | Ernest Jones | L. W. Rings |
| E. Dronke    | G. Lochner   | E. Rumpf    |
| J. G. Eccarius | K. Marx   | J. Ulmer    |
| J. F. Eccarius | W. Liebknecht | Ferd. Wolff |
| Fr. Engels   | F. Münks     | W. Wolff    |
| F. Freiligrath | K. Pfänder | Münks II   |
| Imandt       | W. Pieper    |            |

The German-American press is urged to copy.

Published in the California Staats-Zeitung, January 1853
Printed according to the newspaper
Published in English for the first time
Among the obligations which political parties implicitly assume towards themselves and their members is above all that of support for those who fall into the hands of the enemy while occupying outposts which they have defended with the utmost courage and tenacity.—For the proletarian or workers' party, those sentenced in Cologne in Germany fall into this category; they were not sentenced on account of the crime of which they stood accused—ridiculous revolutionary machinations—but because they had helped to organise the workers' party, and they were sentenced by judges who were members of the moneyed and feudal aristocracy, whose verdict was for that reason bound to be unjust, and to cap it all the Prussian government resorted to the basest forgeries to eliminate any possible stirrings of scrupulousness in these judges.

As workers and writers having no private resources, who had earned their daily bread by their hands and their writing, the convicted men have by their imprisonment been robbed of any means of further supporting their families, and as a result of the sufferings and deprivations to which they are subject in prison they themselves risk losing that freshness and elasticity of mind which previously gave them their pre-eminent positions in the party, unless every effort is made to alleviate their situation and relieve them of the burden of anxiety about the maintenance of their families.
A committee was immediately set up in London which elected Ferd. Freiligrath, the poet of the proletariat, to be its treasurer and includes the leader of the English Chartists, Ernest Jones, among its members. It has addressed the following appeal to the German workers in America, to which we have hastened to respond:

"The workers’ party has a duty to alleviate the plight of those in the vanguard of the struggle who were sentenced in Cologne and in particular to take care of their families who are bereft of support. We expect that the workers of the United States will also wish to be associated with this debt the party owes."

The treasurer appointed to receive the sums intended for the prisoners and their families is: Ferdinand Freiligrath, No. 3 Sutton Place, Hackney, London.


The Socialist Gymnastic Association has requested its administrative council to organise this support; the undersigned are members of the latter who have constituted a special committee and now request all Germans in New York who still have feelings for the cause of freedom and for those who espouse it back in the home country to send their contributions to them; the Gymnastic Association will in due course render a full account of their use.—We take it for granted that associations of like persuasion will gladly and enthusiastically take up this opportunity for offering support.

An appeal has already been sent out by the Executive Committee to all gymnastic societies in the United States.

In conclusion we would further mention that it has been decided the socialist gymnastic societies are to hold a general lottery on the first Monday in March, and we are convinced it will prove highly productive thanks to the generosity which the German women young and old have frequently demonstrated on similar occasions, as an expression of their sympathy for liberty and those in the vanguard of the struggle for it.

Lists for the subscription of contributions, whether they consist of
money or other gifts, bear the seal of the Socialist Gymnastic Association and are to be found at the latter’s premises, No. 38 Canal Street; at the house of Reicherzer and Hein, No. 12 North William Street; and with V. Keck, at the house of Jos. Müller, No. 24 Allen Street.

New York, January 16, 1853

The administrative council of the Socialist Gymnastic Society, in the name of the latter:

the Relief Committee:

K. Reicherzer, J. L. Schuler, B. Becker,
V. Keck, E. Reistle

Published in the New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung, January 1853

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

1 Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany was written after Charles Dana, one of the editors of the New-York Daily Tribune, had suggested to Marx, early in 1851, that he contribute to the newspaper. Being engaged in economic research, Marx asked Engels, on August 14, 1851, to write "a series of articles about Germany, from 1848 onwards". Engels agreed, and in the course of thirteen months he wrote 19 articles about the German revolution of 1848-49. He intended to write one more, concluding article, but it did not appear in the Tribune and most probably was not written at all. Engels used as the main source of reference a file of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, apart from some additional material given him by Marx, whom he constantly consulted and who read every article before mailing it.

The series of articles, Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany, was printed in the New-York Daily Tribune over the signature of Karl Marx, the paper's official correspondent. It was only in 1913, when the correspondence between Marx and Engels was published, that it became known that the articles had in fact been written by Engels. During Marx's and Engels' lifetime the work was never republished, apart from the first two articles, which were reprinted in the New-Yorker Abendzeitung, a newspaper of the German refugees in the United States, at the end of October 1851. The first separate edition of this work in English was prepared in 1896 by Marx's daughter, Eleanor Marx-Aveling; the same year a German translation appeared. In this and a number of later editions Marx was given as the author.

In the New-York Daily Tribune the articles were printed under the general heading: Germany: Revolution and Counter-Revolution, and numbered in Roman figures. In the 1896 English edition Eleanor Marx-Aveling provided subheadings which are preserved in this edition.

p. 3

2 The Tribune is short for the New-York Daily Tribune. Marx's work in this progressive newspaper continued from August 1851 to March 1862, but a large number of the articles he dispatched were written at his request by Engels. Marx began to send his own articles to New York in August 1852, the first being "The Elections in England.—Tories and Whigs" (see this volume, pp. 327-32). Initially, he wrote them in German, and his friends, most often Engels, translated them into English. But by January 1853 he had sufficiently mastered the English language to write his contributions in English. Marx's first
English-language article was "Capital Punishment.—Mr. Cobden's Pamphlet.—
Regulations of the Bank of England" (see this volume, pp. 495-501).

Marx's and Engels' articles in the *New-York Daily Tribune* dealt in the main with
major questions of foreign and home policy, the working-class movement, the
economic development of European countries, colonial expansion, the national
liberation movement in oppressed and dependent countries. The articles at once
attracted attention by the amount of information they conveyed, their acute
political assessments and brilliant literary style. The editors of the *Tribune* publicly
acknowledged their outstanding quality. Thus, in a leading article on April 7,
1853, they saw fit "to pay a tribute to the remarkable ability of the
correspondent". They went on to say: "Mr. Marx has very decided opinions of his
own, with some of which we are far from agreeing; but those who do not read his
letters neglect one of the most instructive sources of information on the great
questions of current European politics." In a letter to Mrs. Marx of July 1, 1853,
Charles Dana, one of the editors, wrote that her husband's articles were highly
thought of by the *Tribune* owners and the reading public.

Many of the articles by Marx and Engels were reprinted in the *Tribune* s special
editions, the *New-York Weekly Tribune* and the *Semi-Weekly Tribune*, and were
quoted by other American newspapers, in particular by the *New-York Times*. The
articles also reached England. Some were reprinted in the Chartist *People's Paper*,
and in his speech in the House of Commons on July 1, 1853, John Bright, the
Free-Trade leader, specially mentioned Marx's *Tribune* article on Gladstone's
budget.

The editors of the *New-York Daily Tribune* arbitrarily printed some of Marx's
and Engels' articles without the author's signature as editorial leading articles, and
occasionally made insertions and additions to the text which were sometimes
contrary to their content. Marx repeatedly protested against this. In the autumn of
1857, in view of the economic crisis in the USA, which had also affected the
newspaper's finances, Marx had to reduce the number of his contributions. His
final break with the newspaper occurred during the Civil War in the United States.
It was largely due to the fact that its editorial policies increasingly supported
compromise with the slave-owning states and to its general falling away from
progressive views.

3 Serfdom was abolished in the territories along the left bank of the Rhine annexed
to France during the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars, as were the
privileges of the nobility and the clergy, and the church estates. p. 7

4 The *Continental System*, or the *Continental Blockade*, proclaimed by Napoleon I in
1806, forbade the countries of the European Continent to trade with Great
Britain. p. 8

5 The *Protective Tariff of 1818 (Schutzzolltarif)* abolished internal duties throughout
the territory of Prussia and created the conditions for the formation of the
Customs Union (*Zollverein*).

The *Zollverein*, a union of German states, which established a common customs
frontier, was set up in 1834 under the aegis of Prussia. Brought into being by the
need to create an all-German market, the Customs Union subsequently embraced
all the German states except Austria and a few of the smaller states. p. 8

6 The reference is to the uprising of the Silesian weavers on June 4-6, 1844, the first
big class battle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in Germany, and to the
uprising of the Bohemian workers in the second half of June 1844. The workers' movement, which was accompanied by factory and machine wrecking, was brutally suppressed by government troops.

The *German Confederation (der Deutsche Bund)*—an ephemeral confederation of German states founded in 1815 by decision of the Congress of Vienna.

The *Federal Diet (Bundestag)*—the central body of the German Confederation, which consisted of representatives of the German states and held its sessions in Frankfurt am Main. Having no actual power, it nevertheless served as an instrument of monarchist feudal reaction. After the March 1848 revolution in Germany, Right-wing circles tried to revive the Diet, but in the summer of 1848 it had to cede its functions to the Imperial Regent elected by the Frankfurt National Assembly and to the Imperial Government which the Assembly set up. The Diet's powers were restored in March 1851. The formation in 1866 of the North-German Confederation under Prussia's hegemony put an end to the German Confederation and the Diet.

The *Customs Union (Steuerverein)* was formed in May 1834; it included the German states of Hanover, Brunswick, Oldenburg and Schaumburg-Lippe, which were interested in commerce with Great Britain. In 1854 this separatist union disintegrated and its participants joined the *Zollverein* (see Note 5).

The *Congress of Vienna* of European monarchs and their ministers (September 1814-June 1815) established a system of all-European treaties after the Napoleonic wars. The Congress decisions helped to restore the feudal system and a number of old dynasties in states that had been subjugated by Napoleon and to preserve the political dismemberment of Germany and Italy, sanctioned the annexation of Belgium to Holland and the partition of Poland, and planned measures to combat the revolutionary movement.

The July 1830 revolution in France was followed by a revolution in Belgium, and a revival of the revolutionary movement and uprisings in Poland, Germany and Italy.

"Young Germany" (*Junges Deutschland*)—a literary group that emerged in Germany in the 1830s and fell under the influence of Heinrich Heine and Ludwig Börne. The members of this group (Gutzkow, Wienberg, Mundt, Laube, Jung and others) engaged in both fiction-writing and journalism, through which they advocated freedom of conscience and the press, the introduction of a Constitution, the emancipation of women, and other reforms. Their political views were, however, vague and inconsistent, and many of them soon became indistinguishable from ordinary liberals.

The *Holy Alliance*—an association of European monarchs founded in September 1815, on the initiative of the Russian Tsar Alexander I and the Austrian Chancellor Metternich to suppress revolutionary movements and preserve feudal monarchies in European countries.

The *Historical School of Law*—a trend in German historiography and jurisprudence which emerged in the late eighteenth century. The representatives of this
school—Gustav Hugo, Friedrich Karl Savigny and others—sought to justify feudal institutions and the privileges of the nobility on the grounds of the inviolability of historical tradition.

For a criticism of this trend see Marx’s works: *The Philosophical Manifesto of the Historical School of Law* and *Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Law. Introduction* (present edition, Vols. 1 and 3).

**Legitimists**—supporters of the Bourbon dynasty, which represented the interests of the big hereditary landowners. By the “first generation of French Legitimists” Engels means royalist writers and politicians who were vehemently hostile to the French Revolution, being particularly outraged when, in 1792, the monarchy was overthrown. After the restoration of the Bourbons, in 1815-30, the Legitimists formed a Right-wing political party which continued to be active even after 1830, when the dynasty was overthrown a second time.

The question of introducing a Constitution in Prussia was raised by moderate reformers after the defeat of the Prussian feudal state in the war with Napoleonic France in 1806-07. As early as October 1810, under pressure from the reformers, Frederick William III promised in very vague terms (in his “Edikt über die Finanzen des Staats und die neuen Einrichtungen wegen der Abgaben”) to grant “representation both in the provinces and in the entire country”. Illusions about the King’s intention to introduce a representative system were encouraged by the Prussian ruling circles during the upsurge of patriotism connected with Prussia’s entry, in 1813, into the war of liberation waged by the European peoples against Napoleonic rule. However, practical steps were postponed until the end of the war. Article 13 of the Act setting up a German Confederation, adopted by the Congress of Vienna in June 1815, provided for the introduction in the German states of constitutions based on the estate principle. But this provision was not carried out in the majority of states, including Prussia, despite the King’s promises to set up representative institutions made by him in a number of patents and manifestos, in particular in a special decree of May 22, 1815 (“Verordnung über die zu bildende Repräsentation des Volkes”).

According to the “Verordnung wegen der künftigen Behandlung des gesammten Staatschulden-Wesens” (Decree on the future handling of all state debts) issued in Prussia on January 17, 1820, new loans and state debts had to be guaranteed by the forthcoming Prussian assembly of the estates as well as by the government.

The reference is to the *Ständische Ausschüsse*—committees of the estates of the provincial assemblies set up in Prussia in June 1842. They were elected by the provincial assemblies from among their members (on the estate principle) and formed a single advisory body—the United Committees (Vereinigte Ausschüsse), which were a sham representative assembly. The session of the United Committees mentioned by Engels below took place from October 18 to November 10, 1842.

Marx refers rather derisively to this body and to the attempts made by the ruling circles and the conservative newspapers to give it the appearance of a constitutional organ in his article “The Supplement to Nos. 335 and 336 of the Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung on the Commissions of the Estates in Prussia” (present edition, Vol. 1, pp. 292-306).

The reference is to the *Preussische Seehandlungsgesellschaft* (Prussian Maritime Trading Company)—a commercial and banking company founded in 1772 and
enjoying a number of important state privileges. It advanced big loans to the

government and in fact became its banker and broker. p. 19

On February 3 and 8, 1847, Frederick William IV issued an order setting up the

United Diet and a patent on its convocation (“Verordnung über die Bildung des

Vereinigten Landtages” and “Patent wegen Einberufung des Vereinigten

Landtages”). The session of the United Diet opened on April 11 and continued

until June 26, 1847. p. 19

In his speech from the throne at the opening of the first United Diet on April 11,

1847, Frederick William IV declared that he would never let the “natural relations

between the monarch and the people” turn into “conditioned, constitutional”

relations and a “written sheet of paper” become a substitute for “genuine sacred

loyalty” (see Der erste Vereinigte Landtag in Berlin 1847. Erster Theil). p. 20

The reference is to German or “true socialism” which was widespread in Germany

in the 1840s, mostly among petty-bourgeois intellectuals. The “true socialists”—

Karl Grün, Moses Hess, Hermann Kriege—substituted the sentimental preaching

of love and brotherhood for the ideas of socialism and denied the need for a

bourgeois-democratic revolution in Germany. Marx and Engels criticised this

trend in the following works: The German Ideology (see present edition, Vol. 5),

Circular Against Kriege, German Socialism in Verse and Prose and Manifesto of the

Communist Party (Vol. 6). p. 20

In April and May 1847, bread riots broke out in many parts of Germany (primar-

ily in Berlin) and other European countries. They were caused by the general rise

in food prices due to the crop failure in 1846, and to the effects of the economic

crisis which had gripped the whole of Europe. p. 21

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

so-called Gotha party. It expressed the interests of the pro-Prussian German

bourgeoisie and supported the policy of the Prussian ruling circles aimed at

uniting Germany under the hegemony of Hohenzollern Prussia. p. 22

German Catholicism—a religious movement which arose in a number of German

states in 1844 and affected considerable sections of the middle and petty

bourgeoisie. The “German Catholics” did not recognise the supremacy of the

Pope, rejected many dogmas and rites of the Roman Catholic Church and sought

to adapt Catholicism to the needs of the German bourgeoisie.

Free Congregationalism—a movement that took shape in 1846 among

Protestant communities which sought to free themselves from the official

Lutheran Church. It developed under the influence of the Friends of Light

(Lichtfreunde)—a religious trend that arose in 1841 and was directed against the

pietism predominant in the Lutheran Church and distinguished by extreme

mysticism and bigotry. This religious opposition expressed the German

bourgeoisie’s discontent with the reactionary system in Germany in the 1840s. The

“free congregations” broke away from the official Lutheran Church and on

March 30, 1847 received the right to conduct their own religious services.

In 1859 Free Congregationalism merged with “German Catholicism”. p. 23
The Unitarians (or Anti-Trinitarians) reject the dogma of the "Holy Trinity". The Unitarian Church first appeared in England and America in the seventeenth century, and its teachings have always emphasised the moral and ethical side of the Christian religion in contrast to its external ritualistic aspect. p. 24

Napoleon's victories in Germany in 1806 led to the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation which was founded in 962. At different periods it included German, Italian, Austrian, Hungarian and Bohemian territories, 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. In August 1806 the Austrian Emperor Francis I renounced the title of Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. p. 24

Marx, Engels and their followers advocated a single German republic before the 1848 revolution (see present edition, Vol. 6, p. 335). The same slogan was put forward as the first point in the "Demands of the Communist Party in Germany" (Vol. 7, pp. 3-7)—the political programme of the Communist League in the German revolution formulated by Marx and Engels in March 1848. p. 25

The reference is to the First Opium War (1839-42)—an aggressive war waged by Britain against China which started China's transformation into a semi-colony. One of the clauses of the Nanking Treaty imposed on China provided for the opening of five Chinese ports to foreign trade. p. 26

In February-March 1846, simultaneously with the national liberation insurrection in the free city of Cracow, which had been under the joint control of Austria, Prussia and Russia since 1815, a big peasant uprising flared up in Galicia. Taking advantage of class contradictions, the Austrian authorities provoked clashes between the insurgent Galician peasants and the Polish nobility who were trying to come to the support of Cracow. After putting down the insurgent movement of the nobility, the Austrian Government also suppressed the peasant uprising in Galicia. p. 26

The reference is to the Academic Legion, a para-military student organisation set up in March 1848 in Vienna. It also included university lecturers and other intellectuals, mostly radical democrats. The Legion played a significant part in the Austrian revolutionary movement in 1848. After the suppression of the October uprising in Vienna, it was disbanded. p. 33

The reference is to the national liberation war waged by the Italian people against Austrian domination in 1848-49. The war began in March 1848, following a victorious popular uprising in Lombardy and the Venice region, which were under Austrian rule. Under pressure from the masses, the Italian monarchist states, headed by Piedmont, also entered the war. But the treachery of the Italian ruling classes, who feared a revolutionary unification of Italy, led to the defeat of the struggle against Austria.

The first stage of the war resulted in a defeat for the Piedmontese troops at Custozza on July 25, 1848, and the conclusion of an Austro-Piedmont armistice on August 9. In view of the new revolutionary upsurge in Italy, the King of Piedmont...
had to resume fighting on March 20, 1849, but already on March 21-23 the Piedmontese army was routed at Mortara and Novara. The military rout of Piedmont and the capitulation of its ruling circles enabled the Austrians to suppress the centres of popular resistance and restore their rule in Northern Italy.

p. 34

The reference is to the resolution of the Austrian Imperial Diet abolishing feudal servitude which was passed on August 31, 1848 and which, following its approval by the Emperor, became law on September 9 ("Gesetz über die Aufhebung des Unterthänigkeitsbandes und die Entlastung des bäuerlichen Besitzes.").

p. 34

Penates—household gods of the ancient Romans.

p. 35

The session of the second United Diet, which adopted a law on elections to the Prussian National Assembly ("Wahlgesetz für die zur Vereinbarung der Preußischen Staatsverfassung zu berufende Versammlung. Vom 8. April 1848"), was held from April 2 to 10, 1848.

p. 37

In the spring of 1848, Mainz (Mayence) was the scene of bloody clashes between the civic militia and Prussian soldiers. These clashes had repercussions throughout Germany and were discussed in the Frankfurt National Assembly; the latter was content to appoint a committee which submitted its report only after the Mainz civic militia had already been disarmed by Prussian soldiers.

p. 41

This apparently refers to the statement by the Frankfurt National Assembly on May 27, 1848, which said that all clauses in the constitutions of individual German states must coincide with those of the all-German Constitution to be drawn up by the Assembly.

Archduke John of Austria was elected Regent of Germany on June 29, 1848, whereupon a provisional Imperial Government, consisting of Right-wing and moderate deputies of the Assembly, was set up under him. It possessed no real power, but nevertheless the Regent and his Ministers were officially vested with the functions of a German Central Authority.

p. 41

The reference is to the armistice concluded on August 26, 1848 in the Swedish town of Malmö between Denmark and Prussia for a term of seven months. Under the impact of the March 1848 revolution a national liberation uprising had flared up in the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, which were subject to the King of Denmark but populated mainly by Germans. The uprising was widely supported by the advocates of German unification. The ruling circles of Prussia, which was at war with Denmark over Schleswig and Holstein, fearing a popular outbreak and an intensification of the revolution, sought an agreement with the Danish monarchy to the detriment of overall German interests, which also had a negative effect on the military operations of the Prussian army. The armistice virtually preserved Danish rule in Schleswig and Holstein, provided for the replacement of the provisional authorities in Schleswig by a new government (in which placemen of the Danish monarchy were preponderant), the separation of the Schleswig and Holstein troops, and other terms unfavourable to the national
liberation movement in the duchies. The revolutionary-democratic changes that had been introduced there were virtually nullified. (The attitude of the Frankfurt National Assembly to the armistice of Malmö is described in detail by Engels in Article X of this series; see this volume, p. 53.)

In March 1849, however, the ruling circles of Prussia, hoping to raise the prestige of the Prussian monarchy by taking part in this popular war and to realise their aggressive plans, resumed hostilities, which proceeded with varying success. However, under pressure from Britain and Russia, which supported Denmark, Prussia signed a peace treaty with Denmark on July 2, 1850, temporarily relinquishing its claims to Schleswig and Holstein and withdrew its military support in the war waged by the duchies. The Schleswig-Holstein troops were defeated and ceased all resistance. As a result, the two duchies remained part of the Kingdom of Denmark.

36 On Engels' views on the historical destiny of the Slav peoples incorporated into the Austrian Empire see the Preface to this volume (pp. XV-XVI).

37 The first partition of Poland by Prussia, Austria and Tsarist Russia took place in 1772. Russia appropriated mainly the Byelorussian lands which had been earlier annexed by the Kingdom of Poland. As a result of the second and third partitions, by Russia and Prussia in 1793 and by Russia, Prussia and Austria in 1795, Poland ceased to exist as an independent state.

38 The March revolution of 1848 provided an impetus for an insurrection of the Poles in the Duchy of Posen for liberation from the Prussian yoke. Polish peasants and artisans took an active part in the insurrection together with members of the lesser nobility. The Prussian Government was forced to promise that a committee would be set up to carry out a reorganisation in Posen: creation of a Polish army, admission of Poles to administrative and other posts, recognition of Polish as an official language, etc. Similar promises were contained in the Convention of April 11, 1848, signed by the Posen Committee and the Prussian Commissioner. However, the Prussian troops broke the Convention and brutally suppressed the insurrection. The reorganisation promised to the Poles was never carried out.

39 The wars of the Hussites, named after the Czech patriot and reformer Jan Huss, who was burnt at the stake in 1415, began with a popular uprising in Prague on July 30, 1419. The revolutionary wars of the Czech people against feudal exploitation, the Catholic Church and national enslavement continued until 1437 and ended in the defeat of the Hussites.

40 The Slavonic Congress—the congress of representatives of the Slav lands forming part of the Austrian Empire met in Prague on June 2, 1848. The Right, moderate liberal wing, to which Palacký and Šafařík, the leaders of the Congress, belonged, tried to solve the national question through autonomy of the Slav lands within the framework of the Habsburg monarchy. The Left, radical wing (Sabina, Frič, Libelt and others) wanted joint revolutionary action with the democratic movement in Germany and Hungary. The radical delegates took an active part in the popular uprising in Prague on June 12-17, 1848 against the arbitrary rule of the Austrian authorities, and were subjected to cruel reprisals. On June 16 the moderate liberal delegates declared the Congress adjourned for an indefinite period.
The mass demonstration in London, called by the Chartists for April 10, 1848, was to present a petition to Parliament for the adoption of the People's Charter. The Government prohibited the demonstration, and troops and police were brought to London to prevent it. The Chartist leaders, many of whom vacillated, called off the demonstration and persuaded the masses to disperse. The failure of the demonstration was used by the Government for an attack on the workers and repressions against the Chartists.

On April 16, 1848 a peaceful procession of Paris workers marched towards the Town Hall to present a petition to the Provisional Government for "organisation of labour" and "abolition of the exploitation of man by man". The workers encountered battalions of the bourgeois national guard and were forced to retreat.

On May 15, 1848 Paris workers led by Blanqui, Barbès and others took revolutionary action against the anti-labour and anti-democratic policy of the bourgeois Constituent Assembly which had opened on May 4. The participants in the mass demonstration forced their way into the Assembly, 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.

On May 15, 1848 Ferdinand II, King of Naples, subsequently nicknamed "King Bomba" for the bombardment of Messina in September 1848, suppressed a national uprising in Naples, disbanded the National Guard, dissolved Parliament and abrogated the reforms introduced under pressure from the masses in February 1848.

Seeing that the war with Denmark over Schleswig and Holstein was waged by the whole of Germany, during the armistice talks in Malmö (see Note 35) the Prussian representatives formally based themselves on the sanction of the Central Imperial Government and the latter's draft agreement. But actually they ignored this draft and changed many of its important points. Nevertheless, the imperial Ministers, fearing that a rupture with Prussia would strengthen the democratic circles, consented to Prussia's terms, and an armistice agreement was concluded on August 26, 1848. When it was rejected by the Frankfurt Parliament on September 5, 1848, the Ministers resigned. An attempt to form a more liberal cabinet failed, and a new government was set up, of almost the same composition as the former one. On September 16 the National Assembly cancelled its earlier decision and ratified the armistice. This evoked a popular uprising on September 18, which was suppressed by Prussian and Austrian troops summoned to Frankfurt by the Imperial Government.

The temporary press regulations ("Provisorische Vorschrift über die Presse") of March 31, 1848 provided for the payment of high caution deposits by newspaper publishers, preserved censorship and made persons guilty of "misuse of the press" liable to trial at police courts and not by jury.

The Constitutional Act of the Austrian Empire ("Verfassungs-Urkunde des Oesterreichischen Kaiserstaates") of April 25, 1848 provided for the establishment of two Chambers—a Chamber of Deputies and a Senate—and the preservation of provincial representative institutions based on the estate
principle. It vested executive power and command of the armed forces in the
Emperor and granted him the right to reject laws adopted by the Chambers.

The Provisional Election Regulations to the Constitutional Act of April 25,
1848 ("Provisorische Wahlordnung zur Verfassungs-Urkunde vom 25. April
1848") adopted on May 9, 1848, deprived the majority of the population of the
right to vote. They stipulated that "workers receiving pay by the day or by
the week, servants, and persons receiving benefits from public charities cannot act as
electors". Some senators were appointed by the Emperor, others were elected by
the big landowners from among their own ranks.

The reference is to the battle at the village of Pákozd, near Székesfehérvár
(Stuhlweissenburg), on September 29, 1848, in which the Hungarian revolution-
ary troops defeated the army of the Croatian Ban Jellachich, who had invaded
Hungary on September 11 on the secret instigation of the Austrian ruling circles.
Pursuing the enemy, the Hungarians reached the Austrian frontier on October
10.

The victory of September 29, 1848 was a landmark in the national liberation
war of the Hungarian people. Beginning with the popular uprising in Pest on
March 15, 1848 the revolution in Hungary developed along an ascending line.
Already in March the country was proclaimed independent in financial and
military matters (connection with the Empire continued in the form of Hungary's
recognition of a common monarch of the Habsburg dynasty), a national
government was set up, and a number of progressive reforms carried out
(abolition of serfdom, etc.). In July the National Assembly (Seim) was convened
which adopted a decision on the formation of a national army (its soldiers were
called "Honvéd"—"defenders of the homeland"). Though at first the
Austrian ruling circles had to tolerate these changes, they were secretly pre-
paring a blow against revolutionary Hungary. They did their utmost to fan the
conflict caused by the Hungarian Government's refusal to satisfy the national
demands of the Croats, the Voivodina Serbs and other national minorities which,
according to the then existing administrative division, belonged to the Kingdom
of Hungary, and incited the Right-wing landowners and bourgeoisie in the
national movements of these peoples to start a war against the Hungarians. All this
resulted in Jellachich's invasion which, contrary to the Habsburgs' expectations,
evoked a new revolutionary upsurge in the country. On September 22, 1848 a
Defence Council headed by Lajos Kossuth was set up, to which power was
soon transferred; the moderate elements in the National Assembly and the
government apparatus were forced into the background. But advocates of
compromise with the Habsburgs continued to sabotage resolute revolutionary
actions.

The Hungarian command's delay in taking offensive action in support of the
Vienna insurgents—due mainly to the opposition of the advocates of a
compromise with the Habsburgs (including the influential General Görgey)—had
unfavourable consequences for Hungary too. Having defeated the Hungarians at
Schwechat, on the approaches to Vienna, on October 30, 1848, having captured
this town and suppressed the Vienna insurrection, Windischgrätz and Austrian
counter-revolutionary forces began to concentrate forces for a campaign against
Hungary. In December the Austrian army under Windischgrätz invaded
Hungary, captured Pest and occupied a considerable part of the country up to the
Theiss. The Hungarian National Assembly and the Defence Council were forced
to move to Debrecen. But the Hungarian revolutionary army reinforced its
ranks, mobilised all available resources and, supported by the local population and guerrillas in the enemy's rear, began a counter-offensive in early April 1849, delivered a number of crushing blows on the Austrians and drove them out of Hungary (see Engels' articles on the revolutionary war in Hungary for the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* in Vols. 8 and 9). The Austrian Emperor Francis Joseph had to ask the Russian Tsar Nicholas I for help. By the autumn of 1849 the Hungarian revolution had been suppressed by the joint forces of Habsburg Austria and Tsarist Russia.

On August 13, 1849, at Világos, the Hungarian army commanded by Görgey surrendered to the Tsarist troops sent to help the Habsburgs to suppress the revolution in Hungary.

*Lancastrian schools*—primary schools for children of non-propertied parents, in which a system of mutual instruction was employed. For lack of teachers, senior and more capable pupils helped to teach the rest of the pupils. Named after Joseph Lancaster (1778-1838), an English pedagogue, these schools were widespread in England and a number of other countries in the first half of the nineteenth century.

In the new Prussian Government, formed on November 8, 1849, Count von Brandenburg held the post of Prime Minister, and Manteuffel, the most influential member of the Cabinet, assumed the post of Minister of the Interior (in 1850 he became Prime Minister). The royal decree transferring the Prussian National Assembly from Berlin to Brandenburg ("Botschaft an die zur Vereinbarung der Verfassung berufene Versammlung") was also dated November 8 and announced to the Assembly on the following day.

In 1637 John Hampden, member of Parliament and later a prominent figure in the English revolution, refused to pay the royal tax collectors the "ship money" tax which had not been approved by the House of Commons. His refusal resulted in a trial which stimulated the growth of opposition to the Stuart monarchy.

The movement in America against the taxes and customs duties introduced by the British Government in the colonies was the prelude to the American War of Independence (1775-83). In 1766 the British Parliament was compelled to cancel the stamp-duty introduced in the preceding year, and later the Americans declared a boycott of English goods subject to indirect taxation. In 1773 an attempt forcibly to bring into America tea on which high duties were imposed, resulted in the destruction of a cargo in the port of Boston, Massachusetts. All this led to further conflicts and culminated in the rebellion of the American colonies against Britain.

The reference is to a resolution passed by the Prussian National Assembly on November 15, 1848, at a sitting held in a Berlin hotel. It declared the levying of taxes illegal until the Assembly was in a position to continue its sittings in Berlin unhindered. However, it did not call on the people to resist the collection of taxes.

The sitting of November 15 was the last one which the deputies held in Berlin. Early in December some of them, mostly Right-wing deputies, assembled in Brandenburg. But on December 5, 1848 royal decrees were issued dissolving the National Assembly and introducing a Constitution imposed by the King. This completed the Prussian counter-revolutionary coup d'etat.
On March 4, 1849 the counter-revolutionary Austrian Government promulgated a Constitution imposed by the Emperor without waiting for the end of the discussion of constitutional drafts in the Constituent Imperial Diet. Despite the promises of autonomy to the lands inhabited by non-Austrians, the imposed Constitution was conceived in an anti-democratic spirit of centralised bureaucracy and anti-democratic government (the Emperor and his Ministers were to enjoy full powers). In reply to the deputies' protests, the Imperial Diet was dissolved on March 7. The Constitution of March 4 was a step towards restoring absolutism in Austria (it was finally restored by the imperial patent of December 31, 1851, which abolished constitutional rule).

Vendée—a department in Western France; during the French Revolution of 1789-94 a centre of a royalist revolt in which the mass of the local peasantry took part. The name "Vendée" came to denote counter-revolutionary activity.

Under the Constitution imposed by Frederick William IV on December 5, 1848, a two-Chamber parliament was introduced in Prussia. By the imposition of age and property qualifications the First Chamber was made a privileged chamber of the gentry. The two Chambers met on February 26, 1849. However, the government, displeased with the position of the Left-wing deputies of the Second Chamber, though their opposition was rather moderate, dissolved it on April 27. The pretext for the dissolution was the approval by the Second Chamber of the Imperial Constitution drawn up by the Frankfurt National Assembly. Subsequently, the imposed Constitution was repeatedly revised, on the initiative of the Right-wing ruling circles of Prussia, in a still more anti-democratic spirit.

The Fundamental Rights of the German People ("Die Grundrechte des deutschen Volkes")—a document adopted by the Frankfurt National Assembly as a Declaration of Rights and published as early as December 1848 was incorporated into the text of the Imperial Constitution ("Verfassung des deutschen Reiches") as a separate, sixth, chapter. At its sitting on March 27, 1849, the National Assembly adopted the Imperial Electoral Law ("Reichsgesetz über die Wahlen der Abgeordneten zum Volkhause") along with the Constitution, which was published on March 28. Also on March 28 the Assembly elected the King of Prussia "Emperor of the Germans".

On March 21, 1848, on the initiative of Prussian bourgeois ministers who sought to bolster the King's prestige, a royal pageant was staged in Berlin accompanied by demonstrations in favour of German unification. Frederick William IV drove along the streets of Berlin wearing a black-red-and-gold armband—the symbol of united Germany—and delivered pseudo-patriotic speeches, posing as an advocate of "German freedom and unity".

The reference is to the conference of representatives of Prussia, Saxony, Hanover and Württemberg which met in Berlin on March 17, 1849 to revise the so-called Imperial Constitution drawn up by the Frankfurt National Assembly. It resulted in an agreement concluded on May 26, 1849, between the kings of Prussia, Saxony and Hanover (the "Three-King-League") based on the Prussian project for reorganising the German Confederation, which was aimed at establishing Prussia's 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.

59 At the elections to the Frankfurt National Assembly in May 1848, the Silesian district of Striegau (Strzegom) elected Wilhelm Wolff to deputise when necessary for the liberal deputy Stenzel, who obtained a majority vote. When Stenzel and a group of other liberal deputies walked out of the Assembly in May 1849, his seat went to Wolff. It was on May 26, 1849, during the Assembly’s discussion of an appeal to the German people couched in very moderate terms, that Wolff made the speech referred to, demanding that the Imperial Regent and his Ministers should be outlawed.

60 The battle at Waghäusel (Baden) between the Baden-Palatinate insurgent army and the Prussian punitive force took place on June 21, 1849.

Under the walls of Rastatt fortress the Prussian and other punitive forces defeated the Baden-Palatinate army on June 29-30. The latter had to retreat to the south and on July 11-12 crossed over into Switzerland. On July 23 the insurgent garrison of Rastatt capitulated after a severe siege.

61 The Imperial Regent and his Ministers were declared deposed and a new executive body—a Regency of five—was formed in their place at the sitting of the National Assembly on June 6, 1849, after its “rump” had moved from Frankfurt to Stuttgart. The Regency consisted of the moderate democrats Raveaux, Vogt, Simon, Schüler and Becher. Their attempts to implement the Imperial Constitution by parliamentary means ended in complete failure.

62 The last article in the series Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany did not appear in the New-York Daily Tribune. The English edition of 1896 and a number of later editions included as the last article Engels’ “The Late Trial at Cologne” (see this volume, pp. 388-93), which did not belong to this series.

63 This statement was written in connection with the arrest of Bürgers, Röser, Daniels and other members of the Communist League by the Prussian police in Cologne in May 1851, following the arrest of Nothjung, an emissary of the League, by the Saxon authorities in Leipzig, and in view of the rumours spread by the reactionary press of a communist plot, the threads of which allegedly led to Marx in London.

Marx’s statement was not published in the Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung but was printed in the Kölnische Zeitung on October 9, 1851. On October 13, Marx wrote to Engels: “You’ll have seen in the Kölnische Zeitung that I’ve made a statement refuting the Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung’s nonsense. The title-tattle was becoming altogether too wild. The ruffians’ intention, in launching the recent series of prolonged attacks on me in all the German newspapers, was, I am quite sure, to place me on the horns of a dilemma. Either I must publicly disown the conspiracy and hence our party friends, or I must publicly acknowledge them, thus committing an act of treason ‘in law’. However, these gentlemen are too clumsy to catch us out” (see present edition, Vol. 38).

64 The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte (Der achtzehnte Brumaire des Louis Bonaparte) was written by Marx from December 1851 to March 1852, immediately following the coup d’état in France engineered by the French
President, who called himself “Louis Napoleon”. In the course of his work on the book Marx constantly exchanged views with Engels concerning these events. Thus, in this book Marx developed some of the ideas contained in Engels' letter of December 3, 1851, in particular the ironical comparison of the Bonapartist coup d'état of December 2, 1851 with the coup of November 9, 1799 (the 18th Brumaire according to the republican calendar), as a result of which the Directory was overthrown and a dictatorship set up under General Napoleon Bonaparte, who was proclaimed First Consul and later, in 1804, Emperor of the French. Besides periodicals and official documents, Marx also used private letters from Paris as his sources.

*The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* was originally intended as a series of articles in the weekly *Die Revolution*, which was being prepared for publication by Joseph Weydemeyer, a friend of Marx and Engels and a member of the Communist League in the United States. But Weydemeyer managed to put out only two issues (January 1852), following which publication ceased for lack of funds. Marx's articles arrived too late for inclusion. On Marx's advice, Weydemeyer published this work in May 1852 as the first issue of the "non-periodic journal" *Die Revolution*, and provided it with a short preface. In giving it the title *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon*, Weydemeyer failed to take into account that throughout the book Marx referred to the chief initiator of the coup d'état as Louis Bonaparte, which he did deliberately (see his letter to Jenny Marx of June 11, 1852). Being in financial straits, Weydemeyer could not buy up the bulk of the impression from the print-shop, and only a small number of copies reached Europe. All attempts to publish the book in Germany or England (in an English translation) were unsuccessful.

The second edition of the book, this time under the title *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, appeared only in 1869. For this edition Marx revised the text, corrected a large number of misprints, mainly in accordance with the list appended to the 1852 edition, eliminated repetitions, abridged certain passages, and wrote a preface dated June 23, 1869, in which he described the editorial work he had done as follows: "A revision of the present work would have robbed it of its peculiar colouring. Accordingly I have confined myself to mere correction of printer's errors and to striking out allusions now no longer intelligible." This 1869 edition is the one translated here, but since the passages omitted by Marx are of great interest because they show how he revised the book and, in a number of cases (especially the abridgments in Chapter VII) because of their theoretical content, they are reproduced in this volume as footnotes.

The third edition came out in 1885 under the editorship of Engels and with his preface. The text in the main coincided with that of the 1869 edition. Passages from *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* were published in *Der Sozialdemokrat*, an illegal organ of the German Social-Democratic Party, on March 18, 1887 (No. 12) and on March 16, 1889 (No. 11). During Engels' lifetime two translations were made from the 1885 edition: a French translation (published in *Le Socialiste*, organ of the Workers' Party of France, from January to November 1891, and in a separate pamphlet that appeared in Lille the same year) and a Russian translation (appeared as a pamphlet in Geneva in 1894).

In English, excerpts from this work were first published in "A Review of the Literature on the Coup d'État" by Georg Eccarius, a Communist League member, which was printed in the Chartist *People's Paper* from September to December 1852. In the last section of this review, printed on December 18,
1852, Eccarius quoted long passages from Chapter I of *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (see this volume, pp. 617-20). In English this work was first published in full in *The People*, the weekly of the Socialist Labour Party of the United States, in September-November 1897. It was published in book form in New York in 1898.

Hegel expressed this idea in his work *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte* (its first edition came out in Berlin in 1837). In the third part of this work, at the end of Section 2, entitled “Rom vom zweiten punischen Krieg bis zum Kaiserthum”, Hegel wrote in particular that “A coup d’état is sanctioned as it were in the opinion of people if it is repeated. Thus, Napoleon was defeated twice and twice the Bourbons were driven out. Through repetition, what at the beginning seemed to be merely accidental and possible becomes real and established.” Hegel also repeatedly expressed the idea that in the process of dialectical development there is bound to be a transition from the stage of formation and efflorescence to that of disintegration and ruin (see, in particular, G. W. F. Hegel, *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts*, Th. 3, Abt. 3, §347). Developing this thought and Hegel’s idea about the recurrence of historical phenomena Marx wrote in his *Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Law. Introduction* (end of 1843-beginning of 1844): “History is thorough and goes through many phases when carrying an old form to the grave. The last phase of a world-historical form is its comedy” (see present edition, Vol. 3, p. 179). A similar interpretation of Hegel’s idea, albeit in the form of a vague hint, can be found in Marx’s article “The Deeds of the Hohenzollern Dynasty” written in 1849 (see present edition, Vol. 9, p. 421).

Montagne (the Mountain)—representatives in the Constituent and subsequently in the Legislative Assembly of a bloc of democrats and petty-bourgeois socialists grouped round the newspaper *La Réforme*. They called themselves Montagnards or the Mountain by analogy with the Montagnards in the Convention of 1792-94.

An allusion to the fact that, while in emigration in England, Louis Bonaparte volunteered for the special constabulary (a police reserve consisting of civilians) which helped the regular police disperse the Chartist demonstration on April 10, 1848.

The “Little Corporal”—a nickname of General Bonaparte (later Emperor Napoleon I) popular among the French army.

At Marengo (North Italy) Napoleon Bonaparte’s army, which had crossed the Alps at the St. Bernard Pass, defeated the army of the Austrian General Melas on June 14, 1800.

“A company of gendarmes to be sent across the Jura”—Marx refers here to the conflict between France and Switzerland in December 1851-January 1852 over Louis Bonaparte’s demand for the deportation of French republican refugees from Switzerland. The Jura—a mountain range on the French-Swiss border.

Order of St. Andrew—the highest order of the Russian Empire. Marx apparently refers to the need for Louis Bonaparte to be recognised by the Russian Tsar Nicholas I.

On December 10, 1848 Louis Bonaparte was elected President of the French Republic by a majority vote.
As the Bible has it (Exodus 16:3), during the exodus of the Jews from Egypt the faint-hearted among them, depressed by the difficulties of the journey and by hunger, began to sigh for the days spent in captivity when they at least had something to eat. The expression “to sigh for the fleshpots of Egypt” became a proverb.

Hic Rhodus, hic salta! (“Here is Rhodes, leap here!”—meaning: here is the main point, now show us what you can do!)—words addressed to a swaggerer (in a fable by Aesop, “The Boasting Traveller”) who claimed that he had made tremendous leaps in Rhodes.

Here is the rose, here dance!—a paraphrase of the preceding quotation (in Greek Rhodes, the name of an island, also means “rose”) used by Hegel in the preface to his work Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts.

In May 1852 Louis Bonaparte’s term of office as President expired. Under the French Constitution of 1848, presidential elections were to be held every four years on the second Sunday in May, and the outgoing President could not stand for re-election.

Chiliasts (from the Greek word chilias, a thousand)—preachers of a mystical religious doctrine that Christ would come to earth a second time and usher in a “millennium” of universal equality, justice and well-being. Chiliastic beliefs sprang up in the period of early Christianity and were continuously revived in the doctrines of the various medieval sects which voiced the sentiments of the peasants and the urban poor.

The dynastic parties—the Legitimists (see Note 13) and the Orleanists. The latter supported the House of Orleans, which was overthrown by the February revolution of 1848. They represented the interests of the finance aristocracy and the big bourgeoisie.

The blue republicans—bourgeois republicans; red republicans—democrats and socialists of various trends.

The heroes of Africa—Generals Cavaignac, Lamoricière and Bedeau, who took an active part in the colonial wars in Algeria.

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 views of the liberal industrial and commercial bourgeoisie and favoured a moderate electoral reform, which they regarded as a means of preventing a revolution and preserving the Orleans dynasty.

On the events of May 15, 1848 see Note 42.

The Mobile Guard was set up by a decree of the Provisional Government on February 25, 1848 with the secret aim of fighting the revolutionary masses. Its armed units consisted mainly of lumpenproletarians and were used to crush the June uprising of the Paris workers. Subsequently, it was disbanded on the insistence of the Bonapartists, who feared that in the event of a conflict between President Bonaparte and the republicans the Mobile Guard would side with the latter.

For Marx’s description of the Mobile Guard see his work The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850 (present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 62-63).
An allusion to a legend according to which the Roman Emperor Constantine (274-337) on the eve of a battle against his rival Maxentius in 312 saw in the sky the sign of the Cross and over it the words: “By this sign thou shalt conquer!” With this legend the Church links Constantine’s “conversion” from the persecution of Christianity to its protection. p. 111

The Vienna treaties—the treaties and agreements concluded at the Congress of Vienna held by European monarchs and their Ministers in 1814-15. They established the borders and status of European states after the victory over Napoleonic France and sanctioned, contrary to the national interests and will of the peoples, the reshaping of Europe's political map and the restoration of the “legitimate” dynasties overthrown as a result of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars. The Vienna treaties confirmed France's territory within the borders of 1790 and the restoration of the Bourbons in France. p. 113

On February 24, 1848 Louis Philippe abdicated in favour of his grandson, the Count of Paris. In view of the latter's minority, his mother, the Duchess of Orleans, was to assume the regency. But the King's abdication failed to halt the development of the revolution. Under pressure from the insurgent masses a Provisional Government was set up which proclaimed a republic the next day. p. 113

The Executive Commission (Commission du pouvoir exécutif)—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. Composed mostly of moderate republicans, the commission included Ledru-Rollin as a representative of the Left. p. 113

The text of the Constitution of the French Republic was originally published in Le Moniteur universel, No. 312, November 7, 1848, and the same year it appeared as a pamphlet. Marx examined this document in 1851 in a special article entitled “The Constitution of the French Republic” (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 567-80). In The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte Marx often designates articles of this Constitution as paragraphs (§§).

The constitutional Charter, adopted after the bourgeois revolution of 1830, was the fundamental law of the July monarchy. Nominally the Charter proclaimed the sovereign rights of the nation and restricted somewhat the king's power. But the bureaucratic and police apparatus remained intact, as did the severe laws against the working-class and democratic movement. p. 114

"Frère, il faut mourir!" ("Brother, one must die!")—this is how Trappists, monks of a Catholic order, greeted each other. The order was founded in 1664 and was noted for its strict rules and the ascetic life of its members. p. 116

Clichy—a debtors' prison in Paris from 1826 to 1867. p. 116

This refers to the Cavaignac Government's attitude towards the new revolutionary upsurge in Italy that began in the autumn of 1848. Though Cavaignac declared a policy of non-interference, he actually rendered diplomatic aid to the ruling circles of the Kingdom of Naples and Austria in their struggle against the Italian
national liberation movement. When Pius IX fled to the Neapolitan fortress of Gaeta after the popular uprising in Rome on November 16, which started a series of events that resulted in the proclamation of the Roman Republic on February 9, 1849, Cavaignac offered him asylum in France. Incited by the French Government, Pius IX called on all Catholic states on December 4, 1848 to intervene against the Roman revolutionaries, and Naples and Austria immediately responded to this call. By his policy Cavaignac in effect prepared for the dispatch of a French expeditionary corps against the Roman Republic undertaken later by President Louis Bonaparte.

86 In 1832 Louis Bonaparte became a Swiss citizen in the canton of Thurgau; on his joining the special constabulary in England, see Note 67.

87 An ironical allusion to Louis Bonaparte’s book Des Idées napoléoniennes, which he wrote in England and published in Paris and Brussels in 1839.

88 The French Government managed to get allocations from the Constituent Assembly for the dispatch to Italy of an expeditionary corps under General Oudinot in April 1849 on the pretext of defending Piedmont in its struggle against Austria, and of protecting the Roman Republic. The true aim of the expedition was intervention against the Roman Republic and restoration of the Pope’s temporal power. (On this subject see also Marx’s The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850, present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 91-94).

89 The reference is to the Bill introduced on November 6, 1851 by the royalists Le Flô, Baze and Panat, questors of the Legislative Assembly (deputies of the Assembly charged with economic and financial matters and safeguarding its security). It was rejected on November 17 after a heated debate, in which Thiers supported the Bill and the Bonapartist Saint-Arnaud opposed it. When the vote was taken, the Montagne supported the Bonapartists because it saw the main danger in the royalists.

90 On the events of April 16 and May 15, 1848 see Note 42.

91 The Fronde—a movement in France against the absolutist regime and its prop, the government of Cardinal Mazarin. It was active from 1648 to 1653 and involved various social sections, which in many cases pursued opposite aims, from radical peasant and plebeian elements and oppositional bourgeoisie, to high-ranking officials who sought to maintain their privileges, and aristocrats seeking lucrative posts, pensions and allowances. The defeat of the Fronde led to the strengthening of absolutism.

92 The ruling Bonapartist circles and the counter-revolutionary press, preparing the coup d’état of December 2, 1851, did everything they could to scare all timid and law-abiding citizens by the prospect of anarchy, revolutionary plots, a new Jacquerie and encroachments on property during the presidential elections scheduled for May 1852. A special role in this campaign was played by the pamphlet Le spectre rouge de 1852 (Brussels, 1851) by A. Romieu, a former prefect of police.
Ems—a health resort in Germany where a Legitimist conference was held in August 1849; it was attended by the Count de Chambord, pretender to the French throne under the name of Henry V.

Claremont—a house near London, residence of Louis Philippe after his flight from France.

Marx uses the term "Haupt- und Staatsaktionen" ("principal and spectacular actions"), which has several meanings. In the seventeenth and the first half of the eighteenth century, it denoted plays performed by German touring companies. The plays, which were rather formless, presented tragic historical events in a bombastic and at the same time coarse and farcical way.

Secondly, 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 Staatsaktionen as the main subject-matter of history.

The expeditionary corps under General Oudinot, sent to Italy by decision of President Louis Bonaparte and the French Government, was driven back from Rome by the troops of the Roman Republic on April 30, 1849. But, in violation of the terms of the armistice signed by the French, Oudinot launched a new offensive on June 3. Throughout the siege of Rome until the fall of the Republic on July 3, 1849 the city was repeatedly subjected to heavy bombardment.

Article V belongs to the introductory part of the French Constitution of 1848; the articles of the main part of the Constitution are numbered in Arabic numerals.

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 High Court. Thirty-four deputies of the Montagne (Alexandre Ledru-Rollin, Félix Pyat and Victor Considérant among them) were deprived of their mandates and put on trial (those who had emigrated were tried by default).

On June 13 the editorial offices of democratic and socialist newspapers were raided and many of these papers were banned.

The events in Paris sparked off an armed uprising of Lyons workers and artisans on June 15, 1849. The insurgents occupied the Croix-Rousse district and erected barricades there, but were overcome by troops after several hours of stubborn fighting.

An ironical allusion to the plans of Louis Napoleon, who expected to receive the French Crown from the hands of Pius IX, whose temporal power he helped restore. According to the Bible, David was anointed king by the prophet Samuel in opposition to the Hebrew king Saul (1 Samuel 16:13).

The battle of Austerlitz between the Russo-Austrian and the French armies on December 2, 1805 ended in victory for the French commanded by Napoleon I.

See Note 87.

The wine tax, abolished as of January 1, 1850 by decision of the Constituent Assembly, was re-introduced by a law of the Legislative Assembly on December 20-21, 1849.
The education law, which virtually placed the schools under the control of the clergy, was adopted by the Legislative Assembly on March 15-27, 1850. For an assessment of these laws see Karl Marx, *The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850* (present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 119-20).

The reference is to the commission of 17 Orleanists and Legitimists—deputies of 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 a historical drama by Victor Hugo, 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, appointed by the emperor, of a *Burg* (city) or district.

From March 7 to April 3, 1849 the leaders of the Paris workers' uprising of May 15, 1848 were tried at Bourges on a charge of conspiring 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.

On the events of May 15, 1848 see Note 42.

The press law passed by the Legislative Assembly in July 1850 ("Loi sur le cautionnement des journaux et le timbre des écrits périodiques et non périodiques. 16-23 juillet 1850") considerably increased the caution money which newspaper publishers had to deposit, and introduced a stamp-duty, which applied also to pamphlets. This new law was a continuation of reactionary measures which virtually led to the abolition of freedom of the press in France (see also Karl Marx, *The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850*, present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 137-38).

*Lazzaroni*—a contemptuous name for declassed proletarians, primarily in the Kingdom of Naples. These people were repeatedly used by reactionary governments against liberal and democratic movements.

The reference is to French Guiana where political prisoners were sent for penal servitude.

This refers to Louis Bonaparte's attempts during the July monarchy to stage a coup d'état by means of a military mutiny. On October 30, 1836 he succeeded, with the help of several Bonapartist officers, in inciting two artillery regiments of the Strasbourg garrison to mutiny, but they were disarmed within a few hours. Louis Bonaparte was arrested and deported to America. On August 6, 1840, taking advantage of a partial revival of Bonapartist sentiments in France, he landed in Boulogne with a handful of conspirators and attempted to raise a mutiny among the troops of the local garrison. This attempt likewise proved a failure. He was sentenced to life imprisonment, but escaped to England in 1846.

The *national ateliers* (workshops) were instituted by the Provisional Government immediately after the February revolution of 1848. By this means the Government sought to discredit Louis Blanc's ideas on "the organisation of labour" in the eyes of the workers and, at the same time, to utilise those employed in the national workshops, organised on military lines, against the revolutionary
proletariat. Revolutionary ideas, however, continued to gain ground in the national workshops. The Government took steps to reduce the number of workers employed in them, to send a large number off to public works in the provinces and finally to liquidate the workshops. This precipitated a proletarian uprising in Paris in June 1848. After its suppression, the Cavaignac Government issued a decree on July 3, disbanding the national workshops.


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 the registration 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 they consisted of officials of high birth called the “nobility of the mantle”. The parliaments ultimately became the bulwark of Right-wing opposition to absolutism and impeded the implementation of even moderate reforms, and were abolished during the French Revolution, in 1790.

Belle Isle—an island in the Bay of Biscay, a place of detention of political prisoners in 1849-57; among others, workers who took part in the Paris uprising in June 1848 were detained there.

Here Marx is drawing a parallel with a story told by the Greek writer Athenaeus (2nd-3rd cent. A.D.) in his book Deipnosophistae (Dinner-Table Philosophers). The Egyptian Pharaoh Tachos, alluding to the small stature of the Spartan King Agesilaus, who had come with his troops to the Pharaoh's help, said: “The mountain was in labour. Zeus was afraid. But the mountain has brought forth a mouse.” Agesilaus replied: “I seem to you now only a mouse, but the time will come when I will appear to you like a lion.”

In the 1850s, the Count of Chambord, the Legitimist pretender to the French throne, lived in Venice.

Claremont—see Note 93.

The reference is to tactical disagreements in the Legitimist camp during the Restoration period. Louis XVIII and Villèle favoured a more cautious introduction of reactionary measures while the Count d’Artois (King Charles X from 1824) and Polignac ignored the actual situation in France and advocated the complete restoration of the pre-revolutionary regime.

The Tuileries Palace in Paris was Louis XVIII's residence.

The Pavillon Marsan, one of the wings of the Palace, was the residence of the Count d’Artois during the Restoration.

General Magnan directed the suppression of the armed uprising of workers and artisans in Lyons on June 15, 1849 (see Note 97).

The Great Exhibition in London, from May to October 1851, was the first world trade and industrial exhibition.

On December 4, 1851 government troops commanded by Bonapartist generals suppressed a republican uprising directed against the coup d’état in Paris. The
uprising was led by a group of Left-wing deputies of the Legislative Assembly and leaders of workers' corporations and secret societies. Employing cannon, the government troops destroyed the barricades erected by the defenders of the Republi. While fighting the insurgents, drunken soldiers and officers fired at passers-by, at customers in cafés and at spectators at windows and balconies. Several bourgeois mansions were also damaged in this Bonapartist terror.

p. 179

117 This refers to the participation of peasants in the republican uprisings in France in late 1851 in protest against the Bonapartist coup d'état. These uprisings, involving mainly artisans and workers of small towns and settlements, local peasants, tradesmen and intellectuals, embraced nearly twenty departments in south-east, south-west and central France. Lacking unity and centralisation they were fairly quickly suppressed by police and troops.

p. 188

118 Here Marx compares the Bonapartist authorities' reprisals against the participants in the republican movement, including peasants, with the persecution of the so-called demagogues in Germany in the 1820s and 1830s.

Demagogues in Germany were participants in the opposition movement of intellectuals. The name became current after the Karlsbad Conference of Ministers of the German States in August 1819, which adopted a special decision against the intrigues of "demagogues".

p. 188

119 Cévennes—a mountain region in the Languedoc Province of France where an uprising of peasants, known as the uprising of “Camisards” (camisé in old French means shirt) took place between 1702 and 1705. The uprising, which began in protest against the persecution of Protestants, assumed an openly anti-feudal character.

Vendée—see Note 54.

p. 188

120 This refers to a speech by Montalembert, leader of the Legitimists, in the Legislative Assembly on May 22, 1850, in which he urged them to "wage a serious war against socialism".

p. 192

121 The Council of Constance (1414-18) was convened to strengthen the weakened position of the Catholic Church at that period. The Council condemned the teachings of John Wycliffe and Jan Huss, and put an end to the split in the Catholic Church by electing a new Pope instead of the three pretenders competing for the papacy.

p. 194

122 On the “true socialists” see Note 19.

p. 194

123 This witticism of Countess Lehon and the caustic remark of Madame de Girardin on the Bonapartist regime, which Marx quotes at the end of the paragraph, were forwarded to him, together with many other items used in The Eighteenth Brumaire, by Richard Reinhardt, a German refugee in Paris, Heinrich Heine’s secretary. In his letter to Ferdinand Lassalle of February 23, 1852 Marx quotes a letter to him from Reinhardt, in particular the following passage: “As for de Morny, the minister who resigned with Dupin, he was known as the escroc [swindler] of his mistress’ (Countess Lehon’s) husband, a circumstance which caused Émile de Girardin’s wife to say that while it was not unprecedented for governments to be in the hands of men who were governed by their wives, none
had ever been known to be in the hands of *hommes entretenus* [kept men]. Well, this
same Countess Lehon holds a salon where she is one of Bonaparte's most
c vociferous opponents and it was she who, on the occasion of the confiscation of the
Orleans' estates let fall 'C'est le premier vol de l'aigle'. [A pun: "It is the first flight of
the eagle" and "It is the first theft of the eagle".] Thanks to this remark of his
wife's, Emile de Girardin was expelled" (see present edition, Vol. 39).  p. 196

124 The reference is to the Regency of Philippe of Orléans in France from 1715 to
1723 during the minority of Louis XV.  p. 196

125 The *Holy Coat of Trier*—a relic exhibited in the Catholic Cathedral at Trier,
allegedly a garment of Christ of which he was stripped at his crucifixion.
Generations of pilgrims came to venerate it.  p. 197

126 The *Vendôme Column* was erected in Paris between 1806 and 1810 in tribute to the
military victories of Napoleon I. It was made of bronze from captured enemy guns
and crowned by a statue of Napoleon; the statue was removed during the
Restoration but re-erected in 1833. In the spring of 1871, by order of the Paris
Commune, the Vendôme Column was destroyed as a symbol of militarism.
  p. 197

127 Engels' articles on England were intended for *Die Revolution*, a New York weekly
published by Joseph Weydemeyer. Of the four articles written by Engels in
December 1851 and January 1852, only two reached Weydemeyer, the other two
having been lost on the way. But even the articles which reached Weydemeyer
were not published in *Die Revolution*, since the journal had ceased publication.
The first of these articles was published in an abridged form (without the first four
paragraphs and the last one) in the *Turn-Zeitung* (No. 15, November 15, 1852), a
newspaper published in New York of which Weydemeyer was an editor. The
second article was used by Weydemeyer in a number of his own writings for the
press.
   In the manuscript the title "England" is written by Engels over each of the two
extant articles. This title was crossed out above the second article, apparently by
Weydemeyer, and it was probably he who numbered the articles with Roman
numerals.  p. 198

128 Palmerston, Foreign Secretary in the Whig Ministry of Russell, was dismissed
because in a conversation with the French ambassador he had expressed his
approval of the Bonapartist coup d'état in France on December 2, 1851, without
consulting the other members of the Ministry. The dismissal occurred on
December 19, 1851, and in February 1852 Russell's Ministry was replaced by the
Tory Ministry of Derby.  p. 198

129 At the battle of Waterloo (June 18, 1815) Napoleon's army was defeated by
British and Prussian forces commanded by the Duke of Wellington and
Blücher.  p. 198

130 From 1850 to 1853 Britain waged one of its Kaffir wars against the Xhosan
tribe in Africa. In the first years of the war the local population defeated the
British troops several times, but under the Peace Treaty of 1853 the Xhosas
had to cede part of their lands to Britain.
In 1851 the British made an attempt to seize the Slave Coast (West Africa), for which purpose they intervened in an internecine war of the local Yoruba tribes. Despite their bombardment of the town of Lagos in December 1851, the British failed to subjugate the local population and had to content themselves with installing a henchman of theirs in power. It was not until they had "purchased" Lagos in 1861 that the British consolidated themselves on the Slave Coast and laid the foundations of their colony, Nigeria. p. 198

131 This refers to the French colonial troops who took part in the conquest of Algeria. p. 199

132 In his song Les mirmidons ou les funérailles d’Achille, Béranger allegorically portrayed the base and worthless rulers of France under the Restoration. There is a pun in the title: mirmidons (myrmidons) is the name of a legendary tribe in South Thessaly whose warriors fought in the Trojan War under Achilles’ command; it also means dwarfs and, figuratively, base, worthless people. p. 200

133 On the defeat of the Chartists on April 10, 1848 see Note 41. p. 200

134 Here and below the reference is to the Punic Wars (264-241, 218-201 and 149-146 B.C.) which were waged between the two major slave-owning states of antiquity, Rome and Carthage, for supremacy in the Western Mediterranean, for the conquest of new territories and for slaves. They ended in the defeat of Carthage. p. 201

135 During the war against the first anti-French coalition (1792-97), Napoleon’s army fighting the Austrian forces occupied the neutral Venetian Republic in May-June 1797. Under the Franco-Austrian treaty concluded in Campoformio in October 1797, part of the republic’s territory, including Venice, was given to Austria in exchange for concessions the latter made on the frontier along the Rhine; the other part went to the Cisalpine Republic formed by Napoleon out of lands he had captured in Northern Italy; the Ionian Islands and the Venetian Republic’s possessions on the Albanian coast were annexed to France. p. 201

136 The reference is to the British fleet in Portugal, stationed in Tagus estuary, which was used by the British Mediterranean fleet as an intermediate base in the nineteenth century. p. 202

137 An allusion to the camp at Boulogne established by Napoleon I in 1803-05 for the invasion of England across the Channel. Concentrated here were nearly 2,500 small transport ships and a 120,000-strong army of invasion. The defeat of the French fleet at Trafalgar by Admiral Lord Nelson and the formation in Europe of a new anti-French coalition including Russia and Austria compelled Napoleon to abandon his plan. p. 203

138 The reference is to an operation in the Schleswig-Holstein war (see Note 35), when, on April 5, 1849, a Danish squadron of ten ships attacked from the sea the Schleswig town of Eckernförde, situated on the shore of a bay, with a view to landing troops there. The ships were destroyed by cross-fire from coastal batteries. p. 204
The *Peace Society*—a pacifist organisation founded by the Quakers in London in 1816. The society was actively supported by the Free Traders, who thought that in conditions of peace free trade would enable England to make full use of her industrial superiority and thus gain economic and political supremacy.

p. 205

Here the following editorial note was added, apparently by Weydemeyer: “The letter discussing Palmerston’s dismissal has not reached us, it has probably been lost on the way from England.”

p. 205

The *People’s Charter*, which contained the demands of the Chartists, was published on May 8, 1838, in the form of a Bill to be submitted to Parliament. It consisted of six points: universal suffrage (for men of 21 years of age), annual elections to Parliament, secret ballot, equal constituencies, abolition of property qualifications for candidates to Parliament, and salaries for M.P.s. In 1839 and 1842 petitions for the Charter were rejected by Parliament.

p. 206

As a result of the Union of 1707 England and Scotland were united into a single state, the Kingdom of Great Britain. The Act of Union abolished the Scottish Parliament and Scotland was given several dozen seats in the London Parliament. But the autonomous rights of the Scottish (Presbyterian) Church were preserved.

p. 207


p. 208

This letter was written by Engels on the initiative of Marx (see his letter to Engels of January 24, 1852) and sent by the latter to the editor of *The Times*. At Marx’s request Engels prepared a similar letter for *The Daily News*. But the letters were not published because of the openly hostile attitude of these newspapers towards the Communist League leaders. In this volume the letter is published according to the draft written on the back of Engels’ letter to Marx of January 28, 1852. The signature “A Prussian” is in Marx’s hand.

p. 210

The *Grand Jury*—until 1933 a body of from 12 to 23 jurors appointed by the sheriff from among “good and loyal persons” to make a preliminary examination of cases before the accused were brought to trial.

p. 211

This series was written by Engels for *Notes to the People*, the weekly organ of the revolutionary wing of the Chartists edited by Ernest Jones. After their temporary break with George Julian Harney, who became associated with the petty-bourgeois democrats and the separatist Willich-Schapper group responsible for the split in the Communist League, Marx and Engels strengthened their ties with Jones, who remained true to the Chartist revolutionary traditions. They supported his agitation and organising work and actively helped him in publishing periodicals. In the summer of 1851, Marx published his article “The Constitution of the French Republic” (present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 567-80) in *Notes to the People* and helped Jones write a number of articles on co-operation.
(published in this journal), of which Marx was virtually a co-author (see this volume, pp. 571-89).

This series of articles by Engels was printed anonymously in three issues of *Notes to the People* under the editors' headings: "The Continental Correspondent of the 'Notes'", "Letter of Our Foreign Correspondent" and "Our Foreign Correspondent's Letter". Only the first article was provided with a title. Judging by the concluding paragraph of the third article, the published articles did not exhaust the author's plans. However, the continuation of the series did not appear in this weekly, which ceased publication on April 24, 1852. It is not known whether Engels had written the rest of the series.

The reference is to the attempts at armed resistance to the Bonapartist coup d'état in Paris and to the republican uprisings in a number of French departments (see notes 116 and 117).

Having suppressed these actions in defence of the republic, the Bonapartists staged a "plebiscite" in an atmosphere of fierce police terror, on December 20-21, 1851, thus giving the coup d'état the semblance of popular approval. On January 14, 1852 a new constitution was introduced which conferred all state power upon the President, elected for ten years; the composition and legislative functions of the Council of State, the Legislative Corps and the Senate—the supreme state institutions modelled on the corresponding bodies of Napoleon I—were placed under his direct control. This constitution in fact restored the regime of the Empire in France. On December 2, 1852 the Second Republic was abolished and the Prince-President was formally proclaimed Emperor of the French under the name of Napoleon III.

This refers to a number of press laws passed by the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies—"Décret relatif aux cautionnements des journaux et écrits périodiques du 9-12 août 1848"; "Décret relatif à la répression des crimes et délits commis par la voie de la presse du 11-12 août 1848"; "Loi sur la presse du 27-29 juillet 1849"; "Loi sur le cautionnement des journaux et le timbre des écrits périodiques et non périodiques du 16-23 juillet 1850." These laws introduced high caution deposits for the publication of newspapers, a stamp-duty on newspapers and pamphlets and severe punishment for attacks on "the principle of property and family right" and for "incitement to civil war". These laws virtually abolished freedom of the press and freedom of speech in France.

Engels called these press laws "gagging laws" by analogy with the six English acts adopted by the British Parliament in 1819, which abolished inviolability of the person and freedom of the press and assembly.

As Engels foresaw, in late 1853 and in 1854 there were signs of economic crisis in the major capitalist countries. Gluts in the market, above all in America and Australia, resulted in production cutbacks in the English textile and iron industries. Similar processes took place in France. The US industry also experienced serious difficulties. But a world economic crisis did not occur until 1857.

*Belgrave Square*—a fashionable residential district in London's West End.
In September 1851 arrests were made in France among members of local communities belonging to the Willich-Schapper group, which was responsible for the split in the Communist League in September 1850. The petty-bourgeois conspiratorial tactics of this group, ignoring realities and aiming at an immediate uprising, enabled the French and Prussian police, with the help of the agent-provocateur Cherval, who headed one of these local communities in Paris, to fabricate the case of the so-called Franco-German conspiracy. In February 1852 the accused were sentenced on a charge of plotting a coup d'état. Cherval was allowed to escape from prison. The attempts of the Prussian police to incriminate the Communist League led by Marx and Engels failed. Conrad Schramm, a League member, arrested in Paris in September 1851, was soon released for lack of evidence. Nevertheless, the Prussian Police Superintendent Stieber, one of the organisers of the Cologne Communist trial in 1852, repeated the false police accusation. His perjury was exposed by Marx (see this volume, pp. 404-38).

In September 1849 Marx was elected to the Committee of Support for German Refugees formed by the German Workers' Educational Society in London. With a view to counteract the attempts of petty-bourgeois refugee democrats to influence the proletarian refugees, the Committee was reorganised into the Social-Democratic Refugee Committee, as suggested by Marx and other Communist League leaders. Engels was among the leaders of the new Committee. In mid-September 1850 Marx and Engels withdrew from the Refugee Committee because the majority of its members were under the influence of the Willich-Schapper group.

These are Marx's introductory and concluding remarks on the "Political Programme" of General Klapka, who took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary. Marx may have received this document from Bertalan Szemere, Gustav Zerffi or some other Hungarian émigré among his acquaintances. His interest in it, judging by his letter to Engels of May 6, 1852, was aroused by the preparations for armed actions in Hungary and Italy against Austrian rule being made by the followers of Kossuth and Mazzini. Klapka was to be one of the military leaders. In conditions of the temporary triumph of reaction everywhere, Marx regarded these actions as adventurism which could only play into the hands of the counter-revolutionaries. He saw as particularly dangerous the tendency of certain Hungarian and Italian leaders to seek support for their liberation struggle from Louis Bonaparte and his entourage, who were coquetting with the national movements in an attempt to raise the prestige of the Bonapartist regime and further its foreign policy aims. Later, Marx wrote special articles for the New-York Daily Tribune warning of the danger of this tendency (see "Movements of Mazzini and Kossuth.—League with Louis Napoleon.—Palmerston", "Kossuth, Mazzini, and Louis Napoleon" and other articles in this volume). Klapka's "Programme" apparently attracted Marx's attention also because of the author's criticism, though timid and half-hearted, of Kossuth's activity and because of his attempt—in opposition to Kossuth—to propose a more democratic course, that of recognising the rights of national minorities from the outset. As can be seen from Marx's letter to Cluss, dated

Notes 655

The reference is to the confiscation of the property of the House of Orleans decreed by Louis Bonaparte on January 22, 1852.
May 10, 1852, he intended to publish his remarks on the “Programme” as an article in the *New-York Daily Tribune*. In this volume, they are published according to the copy made by Mrs. Marx.

155 *The Great Men of the Exile* (*Die grossen Männer des Exils*) is a satirical exposé of the leaders of the petty-bourgeois emigration and of the separatist Willich-Schapper group which caused a split in the Communist League in the autumn of 1850. In conditions of the offensive of reaction throughout the European Continent, Marx and Engels attached great importance to exposing these circles, whose adventurist, conspiratorial and pseudo-revolutionary activities were accompanied by internal strife and squabbles, provided opportunities for police provocations, and diverted the attention of the proletarian and democratic forces from the truly revolutionary tasks.

It was in early 1851 that Marx and Engels conceived the idea of publishing a satirical exposé of the leaders of the emigration who were only playing at revolution. As can be seen from Engels’ letters to Marx of January 25 and February 5 and from their joint declaration against Ruge of January 27, 1851 (see present edition, Vols. 10 and 38), Engels already then wanted to publish a series of articles about “continental democracy” in Harney’s Chartist weekly *Friend of the People*. However, Harney’s association with petty-bourgeois émigrés and the Willich-Schapper group, which resulted in a temporary break with him, made Engels interrupt this work and prompted him and Marx to look for other possibilities for a public criticism of the petty-bourgeois émigré groups. This is testified by Marx’s letters to the Frankfurt journalist Hermann Ebner, written in August and on December 2, 1851, containing factual material against Arnold Ruge, Gottfried Kinkel, August Willich and others which is textually close to the corresponding pages of the future exposé. It was apparently at that time too that the title of the pamphlet was conceived: in his letter to Ebner written in August 1851 Marx called the people he was unmasking “the great men of the future”. Engels, too, returned to this theme. In the autumn of 1851 he began writing a satirical article about Karl Schapper, one of those responsible for the split in the Communist League. He hoped to publish it in the USA with the help of Joseph Weydemeyer. But soon Schapper showed signs of disillusionment with sectarian tactics, as a result of which Marx and Engels presumably decided not to include him among the main characters of their pamphlet. For some time they thought it possible to publish it in Weydemeyer’s weekly *Die Revolution*, but this soon ceased publication. Nevertheless, Marx provided Weydemeyer and Cluss, another of his followers in the USA, with information about the habits and intrigues of the émigrés, which they used in their writings in the American labour and democratic press.

By the spring of 1852 the plan had crystallised. The pamphlet was written in May and June 1852, partly in London and partly at Engels’ home in Manchester, where Marx arrived at the end of May. The authors used their previous notes and also a wealth of new factual material collected with the help of their friends: articles and pamphlets by the émigré leaders themselves, the latter’s biographies compiled by their admirers, various émigré publications, documents, memoirs, the German, French and English press, including periodicals printed by German émigrés in the USA (unfortunately, some of these periodicals were not available to the compiler of this volume), and so on. Apart from Mrs. Marx, Ernst Dronke, a Communist League member, also took part in selecting the material and preparing the manuscript for the press. Early in July Marx passed on the manuscript to the Hungarian émigré Bangya,
who offered to publish it in Germany. Later, it turned out that Bangya was a police spy, who had sold the manuscript to the Prussian police. The actions of Bangya, who managed to win even Marx's confidence for a time, were unmasked by the latter in the article "Hirsch's Confessions" written in April 1853 and published in the American newspaper Bellettristisches Journal und New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung on May 5, 1853 (see present edition, Vol. 12).

*The Great Men of the Exile* was not printed during the lifetime of Marx and Engels. The preliminary copy of the manuscript (the first pages are in Dronke's hand and the remainder in Engels' with Marx's additions) was preserved by Marx and later fell into the hands of Eduard Bernstein who, far from taking steps to have it printed, omitted all passages about Marx's talks with Bangya concerning *The Great Men of the Exile* when publishing the Marx-Engels correspondence in 1913. It was not until 1924 that the MS was handed over by Bernstein to the archives of the German Social-Democratic Party, which was custodian of Marx's and Engels' papers. The pamphlet was first published in 1930 in Russian translation in Book 5 of *Marx-Engels Archives* by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU and was not printed in the original German until its inclusion in Marx/Engels, *Werke* in 1960 (Vol. 8).

In English this work was first published in 1971 in the book: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The Cologne Communist Trial*, Lawrence & Wishart, London.

In this volume editorial corrections made by Marx and Engels have been taken into account. Passages deleted by the authors in the manuscript are not reproduced, except for two which sum up, as it were, the preceding text. These are given in footnotes (see pp. 231, 273).

---

156 Marx and Engels refer here to the sentimental trend in German literature typified by Johann Martin Miller's novel *Siegwart, Eine Klostergeschichte* (1776), which was popular in the late eighteenth century.

---

157 *Rationalists*—representatives of a trend in German Protestant theology which enjoyed a considerable following in the eighteenth and the early nineteenth century. As distinct from the pietists, another trend in the Lutheran Church which was distinguished by extreme mysticism, the rationalists sought to combine theology with philosophy and prove that "divine revelation" could be explained by reason.

---

158 In E.T.A. Hoffmann's story *Meister Johannes Wacht*, the carpenter Johannes Wacht, overwhelmed by grief over the recent loss of his wife and son, finds consolation in artistic work and designs an original building.

---

159 The *Hainbund* (Grove Union)—a circle of young poets including Johann Heinrich Voss, Ludwig Heinrich Höltz, Johann Martin Miller and Johann Friedrich Hahn. It was founded in Göttingen University in 1772 and belonged to a trend which soon became known as the *Sturm und Drang* and expressed the discontent of the German burghers with the existing system in Germany. The Union's ideological inspirer was Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock. Characteristic of the *Hainbund* was lyric poetry in which protest was interwoven with sentimental praise of the philistine way of life of German burghers. The Union disintegrated in 1774.

---

160 Marx and Engels refer here to the utopian programmes for restoring guilds put forward by artisans' congresses in different towns of Germany in 1848. They nicknamed them *Winkelblechiads* after the German economist K.G. Win-
kelblech, who called for a return to the guild system. On July 15, 1848 an All-German Artisans' Congress met in Frankfurt am Main to work out a common programme. As apprentices were not admitted to the congress by the master-workmen, they convened their own congress and invited representatives of the workers from South German towns. But the programme of this congress was likewise drawn up in the spirit of the utopian ideas of Winkelblech, who took part in both congresses.

p. 249

161 The Lower Chamber of the Prussian Diet (Landtag) was convened on February 26, 1849, on the basis of the Constitution imposed by Frederick William IV on December 5, 1848 following the coup d'état in Prussia (see Note 52). Despite the fact that in many provinces the elections to it were held in conditions of a virtual state of siege, and notwithstanding the undemocratic electoral law of December 6, 1848, a strong opposition was formed in the Chamber. It was made up of the majority of Left- and Right-Centre deputies of the dissolved Berlin National Assembly. Though the Left wing took a rather moderate stand, the Lower Chamber was dissolved by the government on April 27, 1849.

p. 252

162 See Note 60.

p. 253

163 Kinkel's speech before the military tribunal in Rastatt (he was tried for his part in the campaign for the Imperial Constitution), published in the Berlin Abend-Post on April 5 and 6, 1850, was sharply criticised by Marx and Engels in their article "Gottfried Kinkel" which appeared in the fourth issue of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung: Politisch-ökonomische Revue (see present edition, Vol. 10). In this article Marx and Engels also quoted this passage from Kinkel's speech, describing it as a cowardly renunciation of his revolutionary comrades and unprincipled adaptation to the reaction. Later, this speech of Kinkel's and his speech on May 2, 1850 at the Cologne trial, where he was charged with taking part in the insurgent movement in the Rhine Province in the spring of 1849 (passages from this speech are quoted further in the text), were reproduced in Schrodtmann's book Gottfried Kinkel. Wahrheit ohne Dichtung, Vol. 2, Hamburg, 1851.

p. 254

164 According to a thirteenth-century romance, the English King Richard Lionheart, imprisoned by Duke Leopold I of Austria when returning from the third Crusade (1189-92), was freed by the French troubadour Blondel, Richard's court poet, who made his presence known by singing a song known only to the King and himself.

p. 257

165 The Crystal Palace was built of metal and glass for the first world trade and industrial exhibition in London in 1851.

p. 258

166 The article "Kinkel's Lectures", which was published in the weekly Der Kosmos in 1851, was quoted by Marx in his letter to Engels on May 28, 1851 (see present edition, Vol. 38).

p. 258

167 Under the Constitution, presidential elections were to be held in France on the second Sunday in May 1852. The petty-bourgeois democrats, and in particular the émigrés, hoped this day would bring the democratic parties to power.

p. 259
The reference is to the campaign for the Imperial Constitution which was adopted by the Frankfurt National Assembly on March 28, 1849, but rejected by the governments of the majority of German states. In May and June uprisings flared up in Saxony, Rhenish Prussia, Baden and the Palatinate in support of the Constitution, but the movement, led by petty-bourgeois democrats, was largely local and was defeated in July 1849. Engels assessed it in his works *The Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution* (present edition, Vol. 10) and *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany* (this volume, pp. 69-87).

This refers to an attempt by Gustav Struve and other German democrats to set up an émigré organisation, a *Democratic Association*. In April 1850 they distributed in England and Germany a circular announcing the formation of a single émigré leading body—the Central Bureau of the United German Emigration. But their plans for unification proved ephemeral. The efforts of the petty-bourgeois and bourgeois democrats were directed largely against the Social-Democratic Refugee Committee (see Note 153), headed at the time by Marx and Engels, and were aimed at bringing the proletarian refugees under the petty-bourgeois influence. Marx and Engels subjected these actions to criticism in the June 1850 “Address of the Central Authority to the League” (see present edition, Vol. 10, p. 373).

The *Club of Resolute Progress*, founded in Karlsruhe on June 5, 1849, was the more radical wing of the petty-bourgeois democratic republicans (Struve, Tzschirner, Heinzen and others) discontented with the capitulatory policy of the Baden Provisional Government headed by Brentano, and the growth of 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. But the government, supported by the civic militia and other armed units, proved the stronger party in the conflict. The Club of Resolute Progress was disbanded.

The four faculties usual in German universities were: theological, law, medical and philosophical.

The first of these uprisings in the Grand Duchy of Baden occurred in April 1848. Led by the petty-bourgeois democrats Friedrich Hecker and Gustav Struve, it started with republican detachments invading Baden from the Swiss border. But this poorly organised uprising was crushed by the end of April.

On September 21, 1848 German refugees led by Struve invaded Baden from Swiss territory. Supported by the local republicans, Struve proclaimed a German Republic in the frontier town of Lörrach and formed a provisional government. The insurgent detachments were soon dispersed by troops, and Struve, Blind and other leaders of the uprising were imprisoned by decision of a court-martial. They were released during the third republican uprising in Baden in May 1849, which occurred in connection with the spread of the campaign in defence of the Imperial Constitution (see Note 168).
On the demagogues see Note 118.

The Palais-Royal in Paris was the residence of Louis XIV from 1643; in 1692 it became the property of the Orleans branch of the Bourbons. In the 1830s and 1840s its grounds and galleries were places of amusement.

An allusion to the order of the French authorities of January 16, 1845, expelling from France Karl Marx, Heinrich Bürgers, Michael Bakunin and other contributors to the German-language newspaper Vorwärts!, published in Paris, for their sharp criticism of the absolutist system in Prussia and other German states and for spreading revolutionary ideas.

The Wahl-Manifest der radikalen Reformpartei für Deutschland, written by Ruge and published in Die Reform (Berlin), No. 16, April 16, 1848, proclaimed “the editing of the rationale of events” as the main task of the German National Assembly.

The reference is to the Second Democratic Congress of representatives of democratic and workers’ organisations of various German towns which was held in Berlin from October 26 to 30, 1848. It discussed the question of constitutional principles, adopted the “Declaration of the Rights of Man” and elected a new Central Committee of German democrats (d’Ester, Reichenbach, Hexamer). Several points of the “Demands of the Communist Party in Germany” written by Marx and Engels were made the basis of the practical proposals on the social question submitted by the Congress for discussion to all democratic associations. The report at the Congress was made by Beust, a delegate from the Cologne Workers’ Association. The motley composition of the Congress led to discord and differences on the main political issues. Instead of adopting resolute measures to mobilise the masses for struggle against counter-revolution, the Congress confined itself to sterile and contradictory decisions. Thus, a manifesto adopted on Ruge’s proposal on October 29 was couched in bombastic terms and contained nothing but an appeal to secure aid for revolutionary Vienna from the governments of the German states, which were manifestly hostile to it. Marx sharply criticised this document in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, in the article “Appeal of the Democratic Congress to the German People” (see present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 490-92).

The reference is to the tactics of passive resistance to the Prussian coup d’état in October-November 1848 (see this volume, pp. 66-70) adopted by the Prussian and German liberals and moderate democrats, including deputies to the Prussian National Assembly (see Note 52).

Arnold Winkelried was a semi-legendary popular hero of the Swiss war of liberation against the Austrian yoke. According to tradition, during the battle of the Swiss against the forces of Prince Leopold III of Austria at Sempach (Lucerne canton) on June 9, 1386, Winkelried opened the attack with the cry “Der Freiheit eine Gasse!” (“Path to Freedom!”) and at the cost of his own life decided the outcome of the battle in favour of the Swiss.

Sophiens Reise von Memel nach Sachsen—a moralising and sentimental novel by Johann Timotheus Hermes, popular in Germany at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries.
The March Association (thus named after the March 1848 revolution in Germany) had branches in various towns of Germany. It was founded in Frankfurt am Main at the end of November 1848 by the Left-wing deputies of the Frankfurt National Assembly. Frobel, Simon, Ruge, 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 the counter-revolutionaries, for which Marx and Engels sharply criticised them.

The French judicial system was introduced in Germany in 1811 in the regions conquered by the French. In the Rhine Province it remained in force even after the province was incorporated in Prussia in 1815, and was superseded by the Prussian system only gradually.

Quakers (or Society of Friends)—a religious sect founded in England during the seventeenth-century revolution and later widespread in North America. They rejected the Established Church with its rites and preached pacifist ideas. The “wet” Quakers, so called in opposition to the Orthodox or “dry” Quakers, were a trend which emerged in the 1820s and sought to renew the Quaker doctrines.

The European Central Committee (Central Committee of European Democracy) was set up in London in June 1850 on the initiative of Giuseppe Mazzini and united bourgeois and petty-bourgeois refugees from various countries. Extremely heterogeneous in composition and ideological principles, the Central Committee of European Democracy had actually disintegrated by March 1852 because of the strained relations between the Italian and French democratic refugees. Its Inaugural Manifesto, “Aux peuples!”, of July 3, 1850, was criticised by Marx and Engels in their international review (May to October) published in the autumn of 1850 in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 528-32).

Wasserpolachen—originally a name given to ferrymen on the Oder who were mainly natives of Upper Silesia; subsequently it became widespread in Germany as a nickname for Silesian Poles.

Bronzell (in the electorate of Hesse-Cassel or Kurhessen) was the site of an unimportant skirmish between Prussian and Austrian detachments on November 8, 1850. Prussia and Austria, contending for hegemony in Germany, claimed to have the sole right to intervene in the internal affairs of Hesse-Cassel in order to crush the growing movement for a constitution there against the Elector Frederick William I and his reactionary Ministers. Austria received diplomatic support from Nicholas I, Emperor of Russia, and Prussia had to yield and allow Austria to undertake a punitive mission in Hesse-Cassel.

This refers to the international congress of pacifists in Frankfurt am Main in August 1850 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.
A national liberation movement flared up in Greece in the spring of 1821 and after a long struggle led to the country's independence. As a result of Russia's victory in the Russo-Turkish War of 1828-29, Turkey had to recognise the independence of Greece. However, the ruling circles of the European powers who were compelled, under pressure from public opinion, to render military aid to Greece, imposed a monarchy on the newly liberated country.

This refers to the Polish national liberation uprising of November 1830-October 1831. Its participants belonged mostly to the revolutionary gentry and its leaders were mainly from aristocratic circles. It was crushed by Tsarist Russia aided by Prussia and Austria, the states which had taken part in the partition of Poland at the end of the eighteenth century.

The Hambach Festival was a political demonstration by South-German liberal and radical bourgeoisie at the castle of Hambach (in the Bavarian Palatinate) on May 27, 1832. Its participants called on all the Germans to unite against the German princes in the struggle for bourgeois freedoms and constitutional reforms. The Federal Diet and the governments of German states replied by fresh police measures against the opposition movement.

In early April 1833, in response to the police measures undertaken by the Federal Diet after the Hambach Festival, a group of conspirators, mainly students, attempted to seize Frankfurt am Main, overthrow the Diet and proclaim a republic. But the conspirators only managed to take possession of the guard-house for a short time, following which they were dispersed by troops.

The reference is to the march of revolutionary emigrants organised by Mazzini in 1834 with a view to inciting a republican uprising in Piedmont. A detachment of insurgent emigrants of various nationalities under the command of Ramorino invaded Savoy from Switzerland but was defeated by Piedmontese troops.

"Young Europe"—an international association of revolutionary political emigrants which was founded on Mazzini's initiative in Switzerland in 1834 and existed until 1836. It included "Young Italy", "Young Poland", "Young Germany" and other national organisations and aimed at establishing a republican system in European states.

"Young Germany" was a secret revolutionary organisation of German émigrés in Switzerland in the 1830s and 1840s (not to be confused with the literary group also known as "Young Germany"—see Note 11). Initially it comprised mainly petty-bourgeois intellectuals, whose object was to set up a democratic republic in Germany, but it soon came more under the influence of the workers'
associations and socialist clubs. In the mid-1830s, the Swiss Government, under pressure from Austria and Prussia, deported the German revolutionaries; the workers' associations were closed. “Young Germany” virtually ceased to exist, though several groups of its followers still remained in the cantons of Geneva and Vaud. In the 1840s “Young Germany” was revived, when, under the influence of Ludwig Feuerbach’s ideas, its members carried on mainly atheistic propaganda among the German émigrés, vigorously opposing the communist trends, especially that of Weitling, although some of the members of “Young Germany” were more and more attracted by social questions. In 1845 “Young Germany” was again crushed.

198 In June 1844 the Bandiera brothers, who were members of a conspiratorial organisation, landed on the Calabrian coast at the head of a small detachment of Italian patriots with the intention of sparking off an insurrection against the Bourbons of Naples and the Austrian rule. But the participants in the expedition were betrayed by one of their number and taken prisoner; the Bandiera brothers were shot.

199 The reference is to the supporters of the German Augustenburg dynasty, which disputed the claims of the Danish kings to Schleswig-Holstein.

200 The text of this manifesto is cited by Marx in his letter to Engels written on December 2, 1850 (see present edition, Vol. 38). Apart from the leaders of the separatist Willich-Schapper group, it was signed by French émigrés, followers of Blanqui (including Adam, Barthélémy, Fanon, Gouté, Caperon), and by several Polish and Hungarian émigrés.

201 On October 28, 1850 there was a meeting in Warsaw between the Russian Emperor Nicholas I, the Austrian Emperor Francis Joseph and the head of the Prussian Government, the Count of Brandenburg, during which Nicholas I resolutely took the side of Austria in the Austro-Prussian conflict and brought pressure to bear upon the Prussian Prime Minister, demanding that Prussia should abandon all plans to unite Germany under her hegemony.

202 The reference is to the former members of the Labour Commission that met at the Luxembourg Palace under the chairmanship of Louis Blanc. It was set up on February 28, 1848 by the Provisional Government under pressure from the workers, who demanded a Ministry of Labour. The Commission, on which both workers and employers were represented, acted as mediator in labour conflicts, often taking the side of the employers. The revolutionary action of Paris workers on May 15, 1848 (see Note 42) led to the end of the Luxembourg Commission, which was disbanded by the government the next day.

203 The toast which Blanqui sent to London from the Belle-Isle prison and which the organisers of the meeting of February 24, 1851 (“banquet of the equal”) deliberately concealed from its participants, was published in a number of French newspapers. In La Patrie it appeared on February 27 (“Toaste envoyé par le citoyen L.-A. Blanqui à la commission près les réfugiés de Londres pour le banquet anniversaire du 24 février. Prison de Belle-Isle-en-Mer, 10 février
1851”). In March 1851 Marx and Engels translated it into German and English and provided it with an introduction (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 537-39). The German translation was published in 30,000 copies and was circulated in Germany and Austria.

The reference is to the all-German National Assembly which met in Frankfurt am Main in 1848 and 1849.

The Pre-parliament, which met in Frankfurt am Main from March 31 to April 4, 1848, consisted of representatives from the German states, most of the delegates being constitutional monarchists. The Pre-parliament passed a resolution to convene an all-German National Assembly and produced a draft of the “Fundamental Rights and Demands of the German People”. Although this document proclaimed certain rights and liberties, including the right of all-German citizenship for the residents of any German state, it did not touch the basis of the semi-feudal absolutist system prevalent in Germany at the time.

See Note 125.

See Note 48.

See Note 95.

This refers to the events of June 6, 1849 in Karlsruhe, capital of Baden, when the radical wing of the democrats—founders of the Club of Resolute Progress—attempted to bring pressure to bear upon the Brentano Provisional Government (see Note 170).

See Note 121.

The Holy Grail—according to a medieval legend, a miraculous cup in which Joseph of Arimathea had received the blood of Christ.

The reference is to Willisen’s views as set out in his book Theorie des grossen Krieges angewendet auf den russisch-polnischen Feldzug von 1831 (Berlin, 1840) in which he based the science of war on abstract philosophical propositions instead of observable facts.

The reference is to a unit which was formed by Willich in November 1848 out of German émigré workers and artisans in Besançon (France). Its members received allowances from the French Government but at the beginning of 1849 the latter stopped paying them. Later the unit was incorporated in the Willich detachment which took part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising in May-June 1849.

The reference is to one of the best-known paintings by Wilhelm von Kaulbach, the Battle of the Huns (Hunenschlacht), which shows the ghosts of fallen warriors fighting in the air over the battlefield.

The reference is to the former members of the Imperial Regency appointed by the German National Assembly on June 6, 1849 (see Note 61).
Marx's contribution to the *New-York Daily Tribune* (see Note 2) actually begins with the article "The Elections in England.—Tories and Whigs". Up to that time he had sent to the newspaper only articles from the series *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany* written by Engels. This article and the one that follows it, "The Chartists", were written by Marx in German as a single article and sent by him on August 2, 1852 to Engels in Manchester to be translated into English. Marx's subsequent articles until the end of January 1853 were also, as a rule, translated by Engels. Later Marx mastered the English language sufficiently to be able to write his contributions in English. In making the English translations, Engels sometimes divided a long article into two parts, which were then sent by Marx to the newspaper as independent articles. In this case Engels thus divided the article which Marx had sent to him into two: "The Elections in England.—Tories and Whigs" and "The Chartists". The dates of this and many other articles given in the *New-York Daily Tribune* do not coincide with the actual dates of their writing. The editors frequently published the articles under the date given by Marx when sending the translated articles to New York, or dated them at their discretion.

In October 1852 the two articles mentioned above, together with the articles "Corruption at Elections" and "Result of the Elections" (see this volume, pp. 342-47 and 348-53), were reprinted in several issues of the Chartist *People's Paper* (which began to appear in May 1852) as a single series under the heading "General Election in Great Britain". The name of the author was followed by an acknowledgement that the articles were reprinted from the *New-York Daily Tribune*. The first article was prefaced with the following brief editorial note in square brackets: "We point our readers' attention to the following valuable papers by Dr. Marx, which have appeared in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, a paper which enjoys the largest circulation of any in the United States, and certainly is the ablest journal in the union. Dr. Marx's view of parties in England is the more valuable, as emanating from one beyond the vortex of party interest, and whose antecedents vouch for his Democracy, and his discriminating judgment." The article "The Chartists" was published in *The People's Paper* with abridgements, some details which Marx had borrowed from this paper being omitted. Later, besides reprints of Marx's and Engels' most important articles from the *New-York Daily Tribune*, *The People's Paper* published a number of articles specially written for it by Marx and Engels.

As a rule, Marx's articles from the *Tribune* were reprinted in *The People's Paper* without any changes, but sometimes they were abridged. The editors of *The People's Paper* frequently altered the parapraghing and made stylistic improvements. In the present edition some of these changes are preserved where there are misprints in the *New-York Daily Tribune*. In very important cases divergent readings from the texts of these two newspapers are given in footnotes.

The *Manchester School*—a trend in economic thinking which reflected the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie. Its supporters, known as Free Traders, advocated freedom of trade and non-interference by government in economic life. The centre of the Free Traders' agitation was Manchester, where the movement was headed by two textile manufacturers, Richard Cobden and John Bright, founders of the Anti-Corn Law League in 1838. In the 1840s and 1850s the Free Traders formed a separate political group which later formed the Left wing of the Liberal Party.
The High Church—a trend in the Anglican Church which found support chiefly among landowners. It preserved traditional rites and stressed its continuity with Catholicism. The Low Church—another trend in the Anglican Church—was supported mainly by the bourgeoisie and the lower clergy and was evangelical in tendency.

The Bill repealing the Corn Laws was passed in June 1846. The English Corn Laws imposed high import duties on agricultural products in the interests of landowners, in order to maintain high prices for them on the home market. Their repeal marked a victory for the industrial bourgeoisie who opposed them under the slogan of free trade.

Dissenters were members of Protestant sects and trends in England which to some extent rejected the dogmas and rituals of the official Anglican Church.

American Whigs were members of a political party in the USA mainly representing the interests of the industrial and financial bourgeoisie and supported by some of the plantation owners. The American Whig Party existed from 1838 to 1854, when the intensification of the struggle over slavery gave rise to splits and regroupings in the political parties of the country. In 1854 the majority of the Whigs, together with a section of the Democratic Party and the farmers’ party (Free-Soilers), formed the Republican Party, which opposed slavery. The Right Whigs joined with the Democratic Party, which defended the interests of the slave-owning planters.

An allusion to the nickname “Finality-John” which was given by the radicals to John Russell, the leader of the Whig Party in England, after his speech in 1837 in which he characterised the Parliamentary Reform of 1832 as the final point of constitutional development in England.

The reference is to the revolution of 1688 (the overthrow of the Stuart dynasty and the enthronement of William III of Orange), after which constitutional monarchy was consolidated in England on the basis of a compromise between the landed aristocracy and the bourgeoisie.

The Reform Bill of 1831 was finally passed by the British Parliament in June 1832. The reform of 1832 was directed against the political monopoly of the landed and finance aristocracy and enabled the industrial bourgeoisie to enjoy its due representation in Parliament. The proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie, the main forces in the struggle for the reform, remained disfranchised.

“The Chartists” was the first of Marx’s and Engels’ articles which were published not only in the main edition of the New-York Daily Tribune but were also reprinted in the paper’s special editions, the Semi-Weekly Tribune and the New-York Weekly Tribune. Known cases of such reprinting are given in the present edition at the end of articles.

Concerning this article see also Note 215.

Court of Chancery or Court of Equity—one of the high courts of England, which after the judicial reform of 1873 became a division of the High Court of Justice.
The jurisdiction of the court, presided over by the Lord Chancellor, covered matters concerning inheritance, contractual obligations, joint-stock companies, etc. In a number of cases the powers of this court overlapped those of other high courts. In counterbalance to the English common law accepted in other courts, the legal proceedings in the Court of Chancery were conducted on the basis of the so-called law of equity.

226 Freeholders—a category of English small landowners dating from feudal times. p. 336

227 In February 1852 Russell made a preliminary statement of his intention to introduce a franchise Bill, but it was not discussed in Parliament. For Engels' analysis of this Bill see this volume, pp. 205-09. p. 338

228 This refers to the subsidies granted by the British Parliament in 1846 for the construction of a new building for the Catholic College in Maynooth (Ireland) founded in 1795, and to allocations for its maintenance. These measures of the English ruling classes were aimed at winning over the Irish Catholic clergy to their side and thus weakening the national liberation movement in Ireland.

On the dissenters see Note 219. p. 340

229 Originally, this and the next article, “Result of the Elections”, were written by Marx in German as a single article which he sent to Manchester, about August 16, to be translated into English by Engels. Engels divided it into two; when Marx sent these articles to New York, he dated the first article August 20, 1852 and the second August 27, 1852. p. 342

230 The Thirty-Nine Articles, which enunciated the compulsory articles of faith of the Church of England, were promulgated in 1571. p. 342

231 On June 29 and 30, 1852 a fanatical crowd of English Protestants attacked the Irish population of the town of Stockport (Cheshire). They acted with the connivance of the local authorities and police, who had been inflaming Anglo-Irish national differences. The houses of the Irish Catholics, who made up nearly a third of the town’s population, were severely damaged; many Irishmen were badly wounded and one of them was killed. At the same time the police took into custody over a hundred innocent Irishmen, supposedly for participating in the disturbances. p. 344

232 According to Greek mythology, the Curetés guarded the infant Zeus (Jupiter in Roman mythology) on the Island of Crete, where he had been hidden by his mother, the Goddess Rhea, from his father, the Titan Cronos, who devoured his children because he feared that they would deprive him of his power. The Curetés drowned the cries of the newly born Zeus by beating on their shields with swords. p. 346

233 On the details about the writing and publication of this article see Note 229. p. 348

234 In accordance with the procedure adopted in the British Parliament, the House of Commons, when discussing certain important questions, declares itself the Committee of the Whole House. The functions of the Chairman of the
Committee at such sittings are fulfilled by one of the list of chairmen specially appointed by the Speaker to conduct this sitting.  

235 *Navigation Laws*—a series of acts passed in England to protect English shipping against foreign competition. The best known was that of 1651, directed mainly against the Dutch, who controlled most of the sea trade. It prohibited the importation of any goods not carried by English ships or the ships of the country where the goods were produced, and laid down that British coasting trade and commerce with the colonies were to be carried on only by English ships. The Navigation Laws were modified in the early nineteenth century and repealed in 1849 except for a reservation regarding coasting trade, which was revoked in 1854.  

236 The *Irish Brigade*—the Irish faction in the British Parliament in the 1830s-1850s. Until 1847 it was led by Daniel O'Connell, who adopted in the main the tactics of parliamentary manœuvre to secure concessions for the big Irish bourgeoisie from the British Government. Early in the 1850s, a number of deputies belonging to this faction entered into an alliance with the radical Irish Tenant-Right League and formed in the House of Commons an Independent Opposition. However, the leaders of the Irish Brigade soon came to terms with the British ruling circles and refused to support the League's demands, which led to the demoralisation and final dissolution of the Independent Opposition in 1859.  

237 The editors of the *New-York Daily Tribune* prefaced this anonymous article with the following note in square brackets: "In giving place to the following letter from a private correspondent, the Editors of *The Tribune* do not vouch for the exactness of its statements, but only for the extensive means of information possessed by the writer. We give his communication as a matter of interesting news whose correctness or incorrectness time will show."

238 The *Centralisation*, the leading executive organ of the Polish Democratic Society, was set up in 1836. The Democratic Society was an organisation of the Left wing of the Polish emigration which united representatives of the small nobility (*szlachta*) and the bourgeoisie. Its programme envisaged the abolition of feudal obligations and of inequality of social estates, the transfer of land allotments to the peasants without payment, and a number of other progressive measures. The Democratic Society took an active part in preparing the national liberation uprising in Cracow in 1846. In the summer of 1849, following the prohibition of the Polish Democratic Society by the French authorities, London became the seat of the Centralisation though the majority of its members still remained in France. The 1850s were marked by discord in the Democratic Society. In 1862, when the Central National Committee for Preparing the Uprising was formed in Poland, the Society decided to dissolve itself.  

239 Originally Marx wrote this article and "Political Consequences of the Commercial Excitement" in German as a single article, which he sent to Engels in Manchester on October 12 to be translated into English. Engels divided the text into two independent articles. When sending the translated articles to New York, Marx dated the first article October 15, 1852, and the second October 19, 1852. In this volume some figures have been verified on the basis of the sources used by the author.
The Poor Law of 1834—"An Act for the Amendment and Better Administration of the Laws Relating to the Poor in England and Wales"—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".

In 1845-47 a grievous famine blighted Ireland due to the ruin of farms and the pauperisation of the peasants. Although the potato crop, the principal diet of the Irish peasants, had been largely destroyed by blight, the English landlords continued to export grain and livestock-products from the country, condemning the poorest sections of the population to starvation. About a million people starved to death and the new wave of emigration caused by famine carried away another million. As a result large districts of Ireland were depopulated and the abandoned land was turned into pasture by the Irish and English landlords.

For the details about the writing of this article see Note 239.

The Court of Queen's Bench is one of the high courts in England; in the nineteenth century (up to 1873) it was an independent supreme court for criminal and civil cases, competent to review the decisions of lower judicial bodies.

The Court of Common Pleas, the court for trial of civil cases, was one of the high courts of England based on English Common Law (after the reform of 1873 it became a division of the High Court of Justice). Among other matters it examined appeals against decisions of lawyers who were responsible for revising the voters' lists. In accordance with English Common Law only questions of law, i.e. questions concerning the violation of legal and judicial procedure, came within the competence of a court of appeal, while questions of fact, i.e. questions concerning the factual circumstances of a case, were examined by jury.

Originally, this article and "Attempts to Form a New Opposition Party" formed a single article written in German and sent by Marx to Engels in Manchester on October 16, 1852 to be translated into English. Engels divided the material into two articles. When Marx sent them to New York he dated the first article November 2, 1852, and the second November 9, 1852.

The Cinque ports—a confederation of five maritime towns (Hastings, Sandwich, Dover, Romney and Hythe) in south-east England formed in the Middle Ages. They enjoyed privileges in sea trade and fishing but had to supply the king with warships and equipment. The Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports possessed wide administrative and judicial powers. With the formation of a standing royal fleet his office gradually became one of the major sinecures of the British monarchy.

For the details concerning the writing of this article see Note 246. In the New-York Daily Tribune it was published without a title in the section "England".
249 See Note 141.

250 This is a reference to the representatives of a radical political trend among the Free Traders who founded the National Parliamentary and Financial Reform Association in 1849. The Association campaigned for the so-called Little Charter, a reform Bill repeatedly introduced in Parliament by the bourgeois-radical leader Joseph Hume from 1849 to 1851. As distinct from the Chartist People's Charter, the Little Charter consisted of three points containing demands for household suffrage, three-yearly elections to Parliament and voting by ballot. By opposing their programme to that of the Chartists and at the same time borrowing some of their demands from them, though in a rather curtailed form, the bourgeois radicals hoped to influence the workers during the decline of the Chartist movement. But the majority of the politically active English workers did not support the Little Charter, except for the reformist elements in the Chartist movement including Feargus O'Connor's followers who had degenerated into a reformist sect. The Association ceased to exist in 1855.

251 The reference is to the Executive Committee, the leading body of the National Charter Association founded in July 1840. This Association was the first mass workers' party in the history of the working-class movement, numbering up to 50,000 members at its peak. The Executive Committee was elected at congresses and conferences of delegates. After the defeat of the Chartists in 1848 and the ensuing split in their ranks the Association lost its mass character. However, under the leadership of Ernest Jones and other revolutionary Chartists it fought in 1851-52 for the revival of Chartism on a revolutionary basis, for the adoption of the People's Charter, and for the socialist principles proclaimed by the Chartist Convention in 1851. It ceased its activities in 1858.

252 This statement, as well as other newspaper items by Marx and Engels, was written in connection with the Cologne trial of members of the Communist League arrested in the spring of 1851, which started on October 4, 1852 and continued until November 12. During the trial the Prussian police authorities who had organised it resorted to forged documents and false evidence in order not only to convict the accused but also to defame their London friends and the entire proletarian organisation. Official government and bourgeois newspapers, including in England the conservative newspaper The Times and the liberal Daily News (see, in particular, The Times, No. 21245, October 13, 1852), conducted a concerted anti-Communist campaign. In response to the police provocations and slanders, Marx and Engels sent to the counsel for the defence in Cologne material exposing the false accusations and printed refutations in newspapers.

As can be seen from Marx's letter to Engels of October 28, 1852, this statement was written mainly by Marx but it also contained material from Engels' letter to Marx of October 27, 1852. Marx sent the statement to a number of London weeklies and dailies. On December 7 he wrote to Adolf Cluss: "What particularly annoyed the Prussian Embassy was that this public denunciation of the Prussian Government was published in the most distinguished and most respectable London weeklies The Spectator and The Examiner." The statement was published simultaneously by five newspapers on October 30, 1852 (under different titles): The People's Paper ("The Cologne Trials"), The
Spectator (“The Cologne Prisoners”), The Examiner (“The Communist Trials in Prussia”), The Morning Advertiser (“The Prussian Press Contrasts with Two London Journals”), and The Leader (“The Trials of Cologne”). In the last two papers the text differs slightly from that of the first three. All these newspapers reproduced the signatures (The Spectator with a misprint: K. Alarx instead of K. Marx).

As is evident from a letter of Mrs. Marx to Adolf Cluss of October 28, 1852, the statement was also sent to the USA to be published in the New-York Daily Tribune and German workers’ papers. A German translation was printed in the Republik der Arbeiter, a newspaper published in New York by Wilhelm Weitling, No. 49, December 4, 1852.

In his letter to Adolf Cluss dated December 7, 1852, Marx informed him of the motives which prompted him to write this statement: it was the clamour raised by a number of German-American democratic newspapers over Marx’s warning concerning the danger of a tie-up between the followers of Mazzini and Kossuth and Bonapartist circles.

A draft of this declaration was drawn up by Marx shortly after the Cologne trial (the sentence was passed on November 12 and published in the German newspapers the next day). On November 16 Marx informed Engels of his intention to discuss the declaration with his London comrades, and then to send his variant to Engels for editing. The final text was sent to The Morning Advertiser on November 20 and also to some other newspapers.

This declaration was published in German in the USA by the New Yorker Criminal-Zeitung, No. 39, December 10, 1852.

Under the sentence passed by the court in Cologne on November 12, 1852, Heinrich Bürgers, Peter Nothjung and Peter Röser were each condemned to six years’ imprisonment in a fortress; Hermann Heinrich Becker, Karl Otto and Wilhelm Reiff to five years; and Friedrich Lessner to three years. Four of the accused—Roland Daniels, Johann Jacob Klein, Johann Erhard and Abraham Jacobi—were acquitted. Roland Daniels died a few years later of tuberculosis contracted during the 18 months he had been imprisoned awaiting trial. Ferdinand Freiligrath evaded arrest and trial by emigrating to London.

This article was written by Engels at Marx’s request for the New-York Daily Tribune (see Marx’s letter to Engels of October 16, 1852). Later it was included in the separate edition of the series of articles Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany (1896), prepared for publication by Eleanor Marx-Aveling, in place of the last article of the series which Engels had promised to write but which did not appear in the newspaper.

The reference is to the Communist League, the first German and international communist organisation of the proletariat formed under the leadership of Marx and Engels in London early in June 1847, as a result of the reorganisation of the League of the Just (a secret association of workers and artisans that appeared in
the 1830s and had communities in Germany, France, Switzerland and England). The programme and organisational principles of the Communist League were drawn up with the direct participation of Marx and Engels. The League’s members took an active part in the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Germany in 1848-49. Though the defeat of the revolution dealt a blow to the League, in 1849-50 it was reorganised and continued its activities. In the summer of 1850 disagreements arose in the League between the supporters of Marx and Engels and the sectarian Willich-Schapper group which tried to impose on the League its adventurist tactics of immediately unleashing a revolution without taking into account the actual situation and the practical possibilities. The discord resulted in a split within the League. Owing to police persecutions and arrests of League members in May 1851, the activities of the Communist League as an organisation practically ceased in Germany. On November 17, 1852, on a motion by Marx, the London District announced the dissolution of the League.

The Communist League played an important historical role as the first proletarian party based on the principles of scientific communism, as a school of proletarian revolutionaries, and as the historical forerunner of the International Working Men’s Association.

261 See Note 152.

262 See Note 257.

263 *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne* is a militant work in which Marx exposed the unseemly methods used by the Prussian police state against the communist movement. On October 27, 1852 Marx wrote to Engels: “My pamphlet is not intended to defend any principles but to brand the Prussian Government on the basis of an account of the facts and the course of the trial.” Marx began writing the pamphlet at the end of October 1852, when the trial of the Communists was still in progress in Cologne (see Note 252), and completed it by early December despite his material difficulties and the fact that he was very busy collecting evidence for the defence counsel in Cologne to discredit the prosecution. His main sources of information were the documents of the trial, in particular the official minutes published in the *Kölnische Zeitung* from October 5 to November 13, 1852 (*Assisen-Procedur gegen D. Herrn. Becker und Genossen. Anklage wegen hochverrätherischen Complottes*), newspaper reports, and the material collected by himself and his friends, Engels included. On December 6 a copy of the MS was sent to the publisher Schabelitz Junior, in Switzerland, and on the following day a second copy was despatched to Adolf Cluss, a member of the Communist League in the USA, to be published there. In his covering letter to Cluss Marx wrote: “You will appreciate the humour of the pamphlet when you realise that its author is practically interned through his lack of adequate covering for his posterior and feet and moreover at any moment expects to see really horrid misery overwhelming his family. The trial is to blame for this as well, because I have had to spend five weeks working for the Party against the machinations of the government instead of working for my daily bread.”

The pamphlet was published in Basle in January 1853, but in March almost the whole edition (2,000 copies) was confiscated by the police in the Baden frontier village of Weill on the way to Germany. In the USA the work was at first published in instalments (on March 6 and April 2 and 28, 1853) in the democratic Boston newspaper *New-England-Zeitung* and at the end of April 1853 it was printed as a separate pamphlet by the same publishing house. However, the Boston
edition was circulated at the time mostly among the German refugees in North America.

In 1874 this work was reprinted in 13 instalments in the 
Volksstaat 
(Leipzig), organ of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party (from October 28 to December 18, 1874), and Marx was named as its author for the first time. On January 20 and 22, 1875, the 
Volksstaat 
published, as a supplement to the 
Revelations, Marx's Appendix 4 (''The Communist Trial in Cologne'') to his pamphlet 
Herr Vogt
written in 1860, and on January 27 it published his special postscript to the 
Revelations dated January 8, 1875. The 
Revelations appeared as a book in Leipzig in 1875, reproducing the text from the 
Volksstaat.

The third edition came out in Hottingen-Zürich in 1885 under the editorship of Engels, with notes and an introductory article by Engels: ''On the History of the Communist League''. Engels included in this edition Marx's Postscript of 1875, Appendix 4 to 
Herr Vogt
and the March and June 1850 Addresses of the Central Authority to the Communist League (see present edition, Vol. 10).

The editions of the 
Revelations printed during Marx's lifetime, and the 1885 edition prepared for publication by Engels after Marx's death, differ only in minor respects, such as discrepancies in separate words, the spelling of some proper names and the use of italics. In the 1875 and 1885 editions some misprints of the first edition are corrected and certain factual and stylistic improvements made, sometimes on the basis of the Boston (1853) edition. In the present edition these improvements of the text, as well as those made in the 1885 edition as compared with the last authorised edition of 1875, are taken into account.

In English the 
Revelations were first published in 1971 in the book: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, 
The Cologne Communist Trial, Lawrence and Wishart, London.

p. 395

The 
Code pénal,
adopted in France in 1810 and introduced in the regions of West and South-West Germany conquered by the French, remained in force in the Rhine Province, along with the 
Code civil, even after its incorporation into Prussia in 1815.

p. 400

The reference here is to the Willich-Schapper group, which Marx and Engels called the Sonderbund—perhaps an allusion to the separatist union of the seven economically backward Catholic cantons of Switzerland formed in the 1840s to resist progressive bourgeois reforms. This sectarian-adventurist group split away from the Communist League after September 15, 1850, and formed an independent organisation with its own Central Authority. In view of the factionalists' refusal to abide by the decision to transfer the Central Authority to Cologne and because of their disorganising activities, on November 11, 1850 the London District proposed to the Cologne Central Authority to expel the members of the Sonderbund from the League (see present edition, Vol. 10, p. 633). The Central Authority endorsed the proposal and gave notification of this in its Address of December 1. By their activities the members of the Willich-Schapper group helped the Prussian police to discover the League's illegal communities in Germany and frame a case in Cologne in 1852 against prominent members of the League.

p. 402

See Note 186.

p. 402

See Note 115.

p. 405
268 Van Diemen's Land—the name initially given by Europeans to the island of Tasmania, which was a British penal colony up to 1853. p. 406

269 The reference is to the German Workers' Educational Society in London which was founded in February 1840 by Karl Schapper, Joseph Moll and other members of the League of the Just (an organisation of German artisans 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 League'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. p. 406

270 See Note 153. p. 407

271 See Note 152. p. 407

272 An allusion to the following episode from the period of the Fronde (see Note 91). In September 1650 the Duke de La Rochefoucauld and two of his associates travelled in the coach of their powerful adversary, Cardinal Mazarin, and when the latter jokingly noted that a week ago nobody would even have thought such a situation possible, the Duke said: “Anything can happen in France” (“Tout arrive en France”). p. 409

273 This is an expression used by the Prussian Minister of the Interior von Rochow. In his letter of January 15, 1838 to the citizens of Elbing, who had expressed their dissatisfaction at the expulsion of seven oppositional professors from the Göttingen University, Rochow wrote: “It behoves a loyal subject to exhibit due obedience to his king and sovereign... it does not behove him to apply the measure of his limited understanding to the actions of the head of the state.” p. 412

274 Marx emphasises the fact that Cherval was admitted into the League of the Just prior to its reorganisation into the Communist League in June 1847. Though Marx and Engels were not members of the League of the Just, founded in 1836, they were in touch with its leaders. They agreed to join the League and take part in its reorganisation provided it became transformed from a conspiratorial society into an association built on democratic principles, and provided it adopted the principles of scientific communism as its programme. p. 413

275 The Dying Warrior is the well-known statue The Dying Gaul (Pergamum School, 3d cent. B.C.). p. 416

276 Marx adduced fresh data exposing Cherval as a spy and an agent provocateur in his work Herr Vogt, in the appendices to it, and in the Postscript to the 1875 edition of his Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne. According to these data, Cherval, whose real name was Joseph Crämer, was an agent of the
Prussian envoy in Paris and a French spy. He escaped from prison with the connivance of the French and Prussian police. On his arrival in London in May 1852 he was admitted into the German Workers' Educational Society led by Schapper but was soon expelled from it because of his role of provocateur in the case of the so-called German-French plot.

The reference is to the book Die Communisten-Verschwörungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts (Berlin, Part One 1853, Part Two 1854) by the police officials Wermuth and Stieber. In his article “On the History of the Communist League” (1885), Engels describes it as a “crude compilation, which bristles with deliberate falsifications, fabricated by two of the most contemptible police scoundrels of our century”. The appendices to the first part, which purported to tell the history of the workers' movement for the information of police agents, reproduced some of the League's documents that had fallen into the hands of the police. The second part contained a “black list” and biographical particulars of people connected with the workers' and democratic movement.

Mormons—members of a religious sect founded in the United States in 1830 by Joseph Smith (1805-1844) who wrote the Book of Mormon (1830) on the basis of alleged divine revelations. In the name of the prophet Mormon this book tells of the migration of the Israelite tribes into America which, it claims, took place in antiquity.

Mazas—a prison in Paris. Marx refers to statements made by people imprisoned in connection with the so-called Franco-German plot.

This refers to the workers' society founded in London in January 1852 with Marx's support, its president being a Hanoverian refugee, the joiner Gottlieb Stechan. It included workers who broke away from the German Workers' Educational Society, which had come under the influence of the Willich-Schapper group. Georg Lochner, a worker close to Marx and Engels and member of the Communist League, also took an active part in organising this society. Later, many of its members, including Stechan himself, became influenced by the Willich-Schapper group and joined the earlier organisation.

Among Marx's manuscripts is preserved a draft in Marx's own hand of a reply to Stieber which contains a sharp accusation of him as a police spy (see present edition, Vol. 38). The letter refutes Stieber's attempts to dispute the revelations concerning his activities as a spy, in particular in Silesia before the revolution of 1848-49, made in a report from Frankfurt am Main which was published in issue No. 177 of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung on December 24, 1848 under the title “Dr. Stieber”. Concerning Stieber's attempts to depict himself as a more consistent democrat than representatives of the democratic trends and his attacks against the latter, Marx limited himself to this remark: “We excuse the lectures on democracy and democratic organs contained in your letter on the grounds of novelty.” At the same time the editors of the newspaper thought fit to publish, in a supplement to issue No. 182, December 30, an official correction to the passage of the above-mentioned report which said that Stieber went to Frankfurt in connection with the popular uprising in September 1848, and pointed out that he went there to arrange personal matters.
The reply to Stieber drafted by Marx was in all probability sent over the signature of another editor of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, most likely Wilhelm Wolff, who may have been well aware of Stieber's activity in Silesia. p. 435

Engels refers to the first supplement to the 1875 and 1885 editions of the *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne*, which reproduced without the title Appendix 4 ("The Communist Trial in Cologne") to Marx's pamphlet *Herr Vogl* (1860) (see present edition, Vol. 17). It said that soon after the Cologne trial Fleury was charged with forgery and sentenced to several years' penal servitude. p. 442

In the Postscript to the 1875 edition of his work Marx pointed out that the Red Catechism had been written not by Moses Hess but by a certain Levy. However, it turned out later that Marx had been right in affirning that the Red Catechism had in fact been written by Hess. This can be proved in particular by a letter of Hess to Weydemeyer of July 21, 1850, which Marx did not know about. p. 449

The reference is apparently to the *German-American Revolutionary Association*—an organisation of German emigrants in the USA founded in January 1852 by the petty-bourgeois democrats Goegg and Fickler who went to the USA to place the so-called German-American revolutionary loan. p. 450

See Note 118. p. 452

Criticism of the behaviour of the leader of the sectarian group and some of his followers during the Cologne Communist trial evoked a mordant reaction on the part of Willich. On October 28 and November 4, 1853 he published his article "Doctor Karl Marx und seine 'Enthüllungen'" (*Belletristisches Journal und New Yorker Criminal-Zeitung*, Nos. 33 and 34) violently attacking Marx and his work *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne*. Marx replied with his pamphlet *Knight of Noble Consciousness* published with the help of Adolf Cluss and Joseph Weydemeyer in New York in January 1854 (see present edition, Vol. 12). p. 452

See Note 257. p. 452

An allusion to the defeat of Prussia by Napoleonic France at Jena on October 14, 1806. The defeat led to Prussia's capitulation and revealed the instability of the social and political system of the Hohenzollern feudal monarchy. p. 457

This refers to the repeal of the Corn Laws (see Note 218). p. 458

The reference is to the demagogic attempts made by some representatives of ruling circles in the German states, above all in Prussia, to present the monarchy as the guardian of the working people's welfare (Marx exposed this idea of "social monarchy" even before the 1848-49 revolution in Germany in his article "The Communism of the Rheinischer Beobachter", see present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 220-34), and to the philanthropic measures proposed by the German liberal bourgeoisie as a means to solve the social question. Thus in 1844-45 in a number of Prussian towns, associations for the improvement of the condition of the working classes were formed on the initiative of the liberal bourgeoisie, who were alarmed by the uprising of the Silesian weavers in the
summer of 1844. They hoped to divert the attention of the German workers from the struggle for their class interests.  

292 This refers to Palmerston’s attitude to the Belgian question in connection with the revolution in Belgium in August 1830 and its separation from the Kingdom of the Netherlands in which it had been incorporated in 1815 by decision of the Vienna Congress. The northern states (Russia, Prussia and Austria) insisted on Belgium’s return under the rule of the King of the Netherlands. The ruling circles of the July monarchy in France supported the Belgians while secretly planning to incorporate Belgium in France. To counterbalance certain conservative elements in Britain, Palmerston acted in alliance with the French diplomats (the Belgian question was a pretext for a temporary Anglo-French rapprochement in the sphere of foreign policy known in history as entente cordiale), but at the same time he resolutely opposed their plans to annex Belgium to France. The efforts of Britain and France were successful: in 1831 the European powers concluded in London a treaty on the independence and neutrality of the Kingdom of Belgium, and the King of the Netherlands’ refusal to recognise this treaty and to withdraw the Netherlands garrison from Antwerp led in 1832 to Anglo-French armed intervention in the war. French troops entered Belgium and besieged Antwerp by land, and the English ships by sea, forcing the Dutch to capitulate. In 1833 the King of the Netherlands was compelled to recognise Belgium’s independence.  

293 The relations established between Great Britain and France after the July revolution of 1830 and known in history as entente cordiale were confirmed by treaty only in April 1834, when the so-called Quadruple Alliance was concluded between Great Britain, France, Spain and Portugal. But when this treaty was being concluded contradictions between Britain and France became apparent and they subsequently led to the aggravation of relations between the two countries. Formally directed against the absolutist “northern states” (Russia, Prussia and Austria), the treaty in fact allowed Britain to strengthen her position in Spain and Portugal under the pretext of rendering armed assistance to both governments in their struggle against the pretenders to the throne (Don Carlos in Spain and Dom Miguel in Portugal).  

294 See Note 236.  

295 Puseyism—a trend in the Anglican Church from the 1830s to the 1860s, named after one of its founders, Edward 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.  

296 A criticism of Wakefield’s theory of colonisation was later given by Marx in Volume I of Capital (see present edition, Vol. 31).  

297 Rotten boroughs—sparsely populated or depopulated small towns and villages in England which enjoyed the right to send representatives to Parliament since the Middle Ages. These representatives were in fact appointed by the landed aristocracy, who controlled the handful of “free voters” who nominally elected them. The “rotten boroughs” were disfranchised by the electoral reforms of 1832, 1867 and 1884.
The Tenant-Right League was founded in August 1850. One of its chief organisers was Charles Gavan Duffy, formerly a leader of the radical "Young Ireland" group. The League aimed at liquidating, by constitutional means, the semi-feudal methods of exploitation of the Irish peasantry which hampered the development of capitalism in Ireland. Despite its moderate leadership, the League reflected the interests of the Irish tenants fighting against the landlords and speculators in land. Its programme included the following demands: prohibition of arbitrary lease cancellation by landlords and compensation of the tenants for land-reclamation work in case of termination of lease, establishment of a fair rent, and recognition of tenants' right to transfer the lease by means of free sale.

During the general elections to Parliament in 1852 the League's demands were supported by the mass of Irish tenants, both Catholic and Protestant. At the re-elections in January 1853 the League campaigned against the Right-wing leaders of the Irish Brigade—Irish M.P.s who, despite their former promises to secure an agrarian reform, conducted a policy of agreement and entered the coalition government. The landlords, together with the Irish Catholic and Protestant higher clergy who feared the rise of the democratic movement in the country, opposed the League. The League had ceased its activities by the end of the 1850s.

The greater part of this article, beginning with the words "The history of the wealth of the Sutherland family" (see this volume, p. 487) to the end, was reprinted in The People's Paper on March 12, 1853, as an independent publication signed by Marx and headed "Sutherland and Slavery; or, the Duchess at Home". It had as an epigraph a paraphrase of Luke 6:42: "How canst thou say to thy sister: Sister, let me take the mote out of thine eye, and perceivest not the beam in thine own eye." After this epigraph, came a short editorial introductory note in square brackets: "Under the sanctified hypocrisy of 'Church and State' a system of oppression is carried on in this gloriously free country, that equals in kindred atrocity the slavery of the American South. We give as a fitting illustration, the following historical statement, showing how the Sutherland family got their wealth. The Duchess of Sutherland here alluded to, is the celebrated 'Countess-Duchess', mother-in-law of the present Duchess. How the present Duke improved on the lessons of the Countess-Duchess, the reader may have occasion to see when we have done with the latter." Marx's article followed.

The text in The People's Paper makes more frequent use of italics and has several insignificant omissions of words as compared with that in the New-York Daily Tribune. In the quotation from Sismondi's book The People's Paper corrected some misprints.

The material on the expropriation of the land of the Celtic population of the Scottish highlands by the Sutherland family, quoted in this article, was subsequently used by Marx in Volume I of Capital, in the chapter on the so-called primitive accumulation. In a footnote to the relevant passage Marx wrote: "When the present Duchess of Sutherland entertained Mrs. Beecher Stow, authoress of Uncle Tom's Cabin, with great magnificence in London to show her sympathy for the Negro slaves of the American republic—a sympathy that she prudently forgot, with her fellow-aristocrats, during the civil war, in which every 'noble' English heart beat for the slave-owner—I gave in the New-York Daily Tribune the facts about the Sutherland slaves. (Epitomised in part by Carey in The Slave Trade, Philadelphia, 1853, pp. 203, 204.) My article
was reprinted in a Scottish newspaper, and led to a pretty polemic between the latter and the sycophants of the Sutherlands.” p. 486

300 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 dynasty. The Order had especially strong influence in Ulster, Northern Ireland, with a mainly Protestant population. Contrary to the will of the landlords and both Catholic and Protestant higher clergy, when the Tenant-Right League (see Note 298) was active in Ireland, there were cases of rapprochement between rank-and-file Protestant Orangemen and Catholics on the basis of their common support for the League’s agrarian demands. p. 486

301 See Note 217. p. 486

302 Hudibras—the title character of a satirical poem by the English poet Samuel Butler written in 1663-78. Hudibras was distinguished for his inclination to absurd reasoning and disputes and for his ability to prove the most absurd propositions by means of syllogisms. The poem was directed against the hypocrisy and religious bigotry of the English bourgeoisie. p. 486

303 This refers to the revolution of 1688 (see Note 222). p. 487

304 This was the first article written by Marx in English (see Note 215). On January 29, 1853 he wrote to Engels: “Yesterday I risked for the first time to write an article for Dana in English.” Until then Marx wrote his articles for the New-York Daily Tribune in German; then they were translated into English, mostly by Engels, but sometimes by Wilhelm Pieper, a German political refugee, philologist and journalist. p. 495

305 This is a reference to the international Peace Congress convened by the Peace Society (see Note 139) at the end of January 1853 in Manchester. Free Traders were especially active at it. The Peace Congress adopted a number of resolutions of no practical importance, against anti-French military propaganda in England and against the growth of armaments. p. 499

306 See Note 227. p. 499

307 On the Tenant-Right League see Note 298. Marx soon carried out his intention by writing the article “The Indian Question.—The Irish Tenant Right” in June 1853 (see present edition, Vol. 12). p. 503

308 This Bill of the Irish radical Sharman Crawford, providing for compensation of tenants for land improvements when the lease was terminated, was first introduced in the House of Commons in 1835 and was rejected in 1836. Reintroduced in 1847, 1852 and 1856, it was each time rejected.
On the Irish Brigade see Note 236. p. 504

309 The reference is to the Repealers, supporters of the repeal of the Anglo-Irish Union of January 1, 1801, which abolished the autonomy of the Irish Parliament and made Ireland still more dependent on England. In the
1820s, the demand for the repeal of the Union became the most popular slogan of the Irish national liberation movement. In 1840 a Repeal Association was founded whose leader, Daniel O'Connell, stood for a compromise with the English ruling circles and practically reduced the programme of the movement to the demand for autonomy and other political concessions. In January 1847 its radical elements broke away from the Association and formed an Irish Confederation; representatives of the latter's Left revolutionary wing stood at the head of the national liberation movement and in 1848 were subjected to severe repression. Later the Repeal Association finally ceased to exist.

310 On February 9, 1849 the Constituent Assembly in Rome, elected by universal suffrage, abolished the secular power of the Pope and proclaimed a republic. The Roman Republic had to repulse attacks of the counter-revolutionary Neapolitan and Austrian troops and the French expeditionary corps sent to Italy in April 1849 by decision of President Louis Bonaparte to restore the Papal power. The republic lasted only until July 3, 1849, the main blow having been dealt to it by the French interventionists.

311 See Note 227.

312 See Note 221.

313 The reference is to the Association for the Protection of Agriculture and British Industry which originally was named the Association for the Protection of Agriculture. Founded in 1845 to fight the Free Traders it expressed the interests of the big landowners and opposed the repeal of the Corn Laws (see Note 218).

The South Sea Company, in the former premises of which the abovementioned meeting was held, was founded in England about 1712, officially to trade with South America and the islands of the Pacific Ocean. Its true aim was to speculate in state securities, which led to the bankruptcy of the Company in 1720.

314 The reference is to the Croatian border regiments stationed in the Military Border Area, a special militarily organised region of the Austrian Empire along the frontier with Turkey. They were used by the Austrian command to suppress the national liberation movements in the provinces, in Northern Italy in particular.

315 In November 1851 Kossuth sent his emissary Mihály Pataki Piringer from London to Hungary via Hamburg, where he established contact with the Hungarian émigré Ignác Ruscsák who was in touch with the Hungarian soldiers of the Austrian regiments stationed in Holstein. The soldiers spread Kossuth's appeals and manifestos. In Hamburg both Piringer and Ruscsák were arrested, and arrests among the soldiers followed. Piringer and Ruscsák were sentenced to death. Piringer was executed on February 5, 1852, but Ruscsák's death sentence was commuted to 18-year hard labour; the arrested soldiers were sentenced to hard labour (from three to eight years) or imprisonment in a fortress. The sentences were published in the Wiener Zeitung, No. 35, February 10, 1853.

316 See Note 221.

This refers to two major battles in the Hundred Years' War (1337-1453) between England and France: in 1358 at Poitiers and in 1415 at Agincourt (Agincourt) the English bowmen routed the French knights' cavalry.

The Turko-Egyptian conflict over Syria, which was occupied by the Egyptian troops in 1833, recommenced in 1839. French aid to the Egyptian Pasha Muhammed Ali aggravated Anglo-French relations in the Middle East at the time. In an effort to prevent France from spreading its influence in this important region on the approaches to its Asian colonies, Britain rendered military assistance to Turkey against Egypt and, supported by Russia, Austria and Turkey, brought diplomatic pressure to bear upon France, forcing it to refuse aid to Egypt.

In 1844 a new aggravation of Anglo-French relations occurred in connection with the expulsion in March of a British agent from Tahiti, which shortly before had been proclaimed a French protectorate. The Tahiti incident resulted from increased Anglo-French rivalry in the Pacific.

On the conflict between France and Switzerland see Note 68.

During the 1841 war with Uruguay, Argentina closed the Parana and Uruguay rivers. Demanding the opening of these rivers to their merchant ships, Britain and France brought diplomatic and military pressure to bear upon the Argentine Government and in 1845 they declared war on Argentina. As a result of a long blockade of the coast by the British and French navies, Argentina had to yield and in 1853 signed a treaty opening the above-mentioned rivers to foreign ships.

Neuchâtel, a Swiss canton, was at the same time in vassalage to Prussia. In February 1848 a bourgeois revolution in Neuchâtel put an end to Prussian rule and a republic was proclaimed there. Diplomatic interference by the European powers, including Britain and France, prevented Prussia from using force. It was not until 1857 that Prussia finally relinquished her claims to Neuchâtel.

In 1852 the British and French governments suggested to the US Government that they sign a tripartite convention renouncing any claim to Cuba, as they feared that the United States might seize this island belonging to Spain. The convention was not signed because the United States refused.

In 1851, under the pretext of spreading the Tanzimat to Egypt (Tanzimat—a reform policy carried out in Turkey from 1839 to strengthen the monarchy by a compromise with the nascent bourgeoisie), Turkey suggested that Egypt's governor should carry out a number of "reforms" which would bring Egypt back under Turkish rule. Under pressure from Britain and France, Egypt was forced to accept some of the Turkish demands.

In November 1852 a protocol was signed in London between Britain, France, Russia, Bavaria and Greece under which Adalbert of Bavaria was appointed heir to his childless elder brother King Otto of Greece instead of another prince of Bavaria who had refused to adopt the Orthodox faith.

In the 1840s and 1850s Britain and France raising obstacles to Tunisia's independence interfered in its foreign policy and helped Turkey in its claim to rule in Tunisia.

This article was published in many editions under the editorial heading: "Parliamentary Debates.—The Clergy and the Struggle for the Ten-Hour
Day.—Starvation”. The word “socialism” given in the heading by the New-York Daily Tribune should be understood ironically, in the same sense in which Marx spoke of The Times attempting to declare the Free Trade principles of the bourgeois Tenant-Right League “Irish socialism”. See his article “Defense.—Finances.—Decrease of the Aristocracy.—Politics” (this volume, p. 502). p. 522

322 See Note 228.

323 This Act was examined by Engels in his articles “The Ten Hours’ Question” and “The English Ten Hours’ Bill” (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 271-76 and 288-300). However, these articles show that Marxist political economy had not yet been fully developed, as reflected in a certain underestimation of the positive consequences of legal limitation of the working day. Marx and Engels gave an exhaustive assessment of this Act in their later works, particularly Marx’s “Inaugural Address of the International Working Men’s Association” and Capital (Vol. I, Chapter X, Sections 5-7).

324 See Note 219.

325 The text of this article was reprinted, somewhat abridged, on April 16 in The People’s Paper as two separate items: as a correspondent’s report under the general heading “The American Press and the European Movement”, containing the concluding sections of the original text, from “On the Continent heaven is fulminating” to the end, and an article entitled “Forced Emigration”. The article was published giving the name of the author, “Dr. Marx”, while the correspondent’s report was published unsigned but with the editors’ note: “From the New-York Daily Tribune”. In a number of cases the use of italics does not coincide in the two newspapers; passages omitted in The People’s Paper are indicated in footnotes in this volume. There are no other textual discrepancies.

326 The article mentioned by Marx was not published in the New-York Daily Tribune and the manuscript is not extant.

327 This refers to the plan to partition Poland proposed by Henry of Prussia when he visited St. Petersburg in 1770. Striving to preserve its influence over the whole of Poland, the tsarist government at first opposed this plan but the rapprochement between Prussia and Austria prompted Catherine II in 1772 to conclude a convention with them sharing part of the Polish territory between the three powers (first partition of Poland).

328 See Note 7.

329 See Note 305

330 The reference is to articles by an English journalist, Alfred Bate Richards, published from December 1851 to November 1852 in The Times under the pen-name “Englishman”.

331 This article was published in the New-York Daily Tribune without a heading.

332 The facts which Marx refers to were probably cited in his report of March 1, 1853, which he mentions in his article “Forced Emigration.—Kossuth and Mazzini.—
Refugee Question.—Election Bribery in England.—Mr. Cobden". This report is not extant (see Note 326).

See Note 5.

The Alien Bill, enacted by the British Parliament in 1793, was renewed in 1802, 1803, 1816, 1818 and, finally, in 1848 in connection with revolutionary events on the Continent and the Chartist demonstration on April 10. Enacted for one year, this law authorised the deportation of aliens from England at any time by decision of the government. In 1850 public opinion prevented the renewal of this Bill despite Conservative efforts, which were repeated also in the following years.

The long-standing quarrel between the Greek Orthodox Church and the Roman Church over rights to the Christian Holy Places in Palestine was resumed in 1850 on Louis Bonaparte's initiative, with a view to strengthening France's positions in the Middle East. It grew into a serious diplomatic conflict which served as a pretext for the Crimean War.

By this time Marx and Engels had prepared an article, "British Policy.—Disraeli.—Emigrants.—Mazzini in London.—Turkey", which was published on April 7, 1853 in the New-York Daily Tribune and was the first of their articles on the Eastern Question in this newspaper (see present edition, Vol. 12).

This review of Proudhon's book, Idée générale de la Révolution au XIX-e siècle (1851), containing many critical remarks, was written by Engels at the request of Marx who had decided to write a polemical work against Proudhon. In August 1851 Marx and Engels discussed Proudhon's book in many of their letters. In his letter to Engels of August 8 Marx gave a detailed account of its contents, citing large excerpts, and in mid-August he sent the book to Engels in Manchester asking him for a detailed opinion on it. Engels worked on the review in August (from about August 16 to 21) and from mid-October, and returned it to Marx at the end of October. On November 24, 1851 Marx wrote to Engels: "I have been through your critique again. It's a pity qu'il n'y a pas moyen [that there's no means] of getting it printed. Otherwise—and if my own twaddle were added to it—we could bring it out under both our names, provided this didn't upset your firm in any way" (see present edition, Vol. 38).

When Marx learned that Joseph Weydemeyer (who had emigrated to the United States in the autumn of 1851) was going to publish the weekly Die Revolution in New York beginning in January 1852, he decided to publish the critique of Proudhon in that journal. On December 19, 1851 he asked Weydemeyer to publish in his weekly an announcement of the forthcoming publication of the Neueste Offenbarungen des Sozialismus oder "Idée générale de la Révolution au XIX-e siècle, par P. J. Proudhon." Kritik von K. M. in the form of a series of articles. In January 1852 the notice was published in the first issue of Die Revolution, but the plan did not materialise. Until April 1852 Marx was engrossed in writing The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte. By that time Die Revolution had already ceased to exist as a periodical due to the editor's lack of funds.

In this volume excerpts from Proudhon's book are printed in small type, literal quotations being given in quotes while Engels' expositions of Proudhon's text in German are not. Engels' own text is in ordinary type and
the emphasised words are italicised. The French quotations and the German text are translated into English; the French words and expressions used by Engels in his own text are reproduced in the original and supplied, whenever necessary, with translations in footnotes. Editorial insertions in square brackets are made only when there are obvious omissions in the text or when it is advisable to give Proudhon's terms in French besides their English translations. In the small-type text the words in ordinary italics are ones emphasised by Proudhon, those in heavy italics by Engels.

p. 545

États généraux (States-General)—in feudal France the supreme consultative body composed of representatives of the various estates. From 1614 they did not meet until 1789, when they proclaimed themselves the National Assembly.

p. 545

Proudhon here refers to a series of trials in 1822 of members of republican societies (including carbonari) who tried to foment anti-monarchist uprisings in Belfort, La Rochelle and Saumur, and to an uprising on May 12, 1839 in Paris. The May uprising, in which revolutionary workers played the 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.

p. 546

The new electoral law which in fact abolished universal suffrage in France was adopted by the Legislative Assembly on May 31, 1850 (see this volume, p. 145, where Marx characterises this law).

p. 546

See Note 72.

p. 546

During the night of August 3, 1789 the French Constituent Assembly, under pressure from the growing peasant movement, announced the abrogation of a number of feudal obligations which had already been abolished by the insurgent peasants.

p. 547

Here and below Proudhon uses the terms le préjugé gouvernemental, le système gouvernemental and l'évolution gouvernementale to denote different aspects of the political system of government to which he counterposes the economic system, organisation of economic forces, invented and proposed by himself.

p. 547

According to a medieval tradition which even the French Revolution was unable to do away with, the sale of meat in Paris was in the hands of a butchers' corporation that maintained low prices on livestock and high prices on meat. When speaking of "the sale of meat by auction" (le vente de la viande à la criée), Proudhon had in mind a series of measures carried out by the government from 1848 to liquidate the monopoly of the butchers' corporation (authorisation of daily trade in meat by people who did not belong to the corporation, etc.).

p. 549

Proudhon further discloses the meaning of the term "parasitism": "Parasitism is finance, abusive property, the budget and all that accompanies it" (pp. 51-52).

p. 549

Royer-Collard made this speech on January 22, 1822, when an anti-press bill was being debated in the Chamber of Deputies.

p. 552

On the French parliaments see Note 109.
The reference is to the Charté octroyée granted in 1814 by Louis XVIII. It was the fundamental law of the Bourbons, introducing a regime of moderate constitutional monarchy with wide powers for the king and high electoral qualifications ensuring above all political privileges for the landed aristocracy.

Proudhon goes on explaining his idea: "...This principle which is of all importance in the so-called butchers' associations has so little in common with the essence of the association that in many of these slaughter-houses the work is done by hired workers under the guidance of the director who represents the depositors."

Engels refers to the following footnote by Proudhon on pp. 97 and 98 of the book in question: "Reciprocity is not identical with exchange; meanwhile it increasingly tends to become the law of exchange and to mix up with it. A scientific analysis of this law was first given in a pamphlet, Organisation du crédit et de la circulation (Paris, 1848, Garnier frères), and the first attempt to apply it was made by the People's Bank."

The People's Bank (La Banque du Peuple) was founded by Proudhon in 1849 to implement the reforms he suggested in the sphere of credit and circulation which he saw as a means of solving the social question and establishing class harmony. By means of these reforms Proudhon hoped to liquidate loan-interest and to organise exchange without money while preserving private property in the means of production and the wages system. According to Proudhon, this peaceful process was to transform capitalism into a system of equality under which every member of society could become a free producer and exchange equal quantities of labour with others. The short-lived People's Bank only showed how groundless were Proudhon's projects both in theory and in practice.

Engels refers here to workers' associations permissible in Proudhon's system. While stressig the need for a reform in the sphere of credit and money circulation and for the maintenance of individual property in the means of production, Proudhon also admitted the need for the transfer of a number of big factories, railways, mines, etc., to associations of workers employed in them. Accordingly, Proudhon's term compagnies ouvrières is further translated as "workers' associations."

See Note 13.

The reference is to the Constituent National Assembly which held its sessions from May 4, 1848, and to the Legislative National Assembly which replaced it on May 28, 1849. Louis Bonaparte was elected President of the French Republic by universal suffrage on May 10, 1848.

The Jacobin Constitution, adopted by the Convention on June 24, 1793, proclaimed the freedom of person, religion, legislative initiative and the press, freedom to present petitions, and the right to work, to education, and to resist oppression while leaving private property intact. The difficult situation in the republic caused by foreign intervention and counter-revolutionary revolts made the Jacobins postpone the implementation of the constitution and temporarily introduce a democratic-revolutionary dictatorship. After the counter-
revolutionary coup d'état of the ninth Thermidor (July 27-28), 1794, the
Constitution of 1793 was replaced in 1795 by a new qualification and
anti-democratic constitution.

355 The reference is to the Bank of France founded in 1800 by a shareholders'
company under Bonaparte's protection. It enjoyed a number of state privileges
while remaining the property of the company. In 1848 this bank was granted
the monopoly right to issue banknotes of small denomination; its monopoly
position was also consolidated by the fact that provincial banks were deprived
of the right to issue money.

356 In his letter to Engels on August 8, 1851, Marx wrote concerning this passage
in Proudhon's book: "Instead of interest the state pays annuities, i.e. it repays in
yearly quotas the capital it has been loaned" (see present edition, Vol. 38).

357 In accordance with the Constituent Assembly's decrees of January 15 and
February 16 and 26, 1790, a new administrative division was introduced in
France: the country was divided into 83 departments which, in their turn, were
subdivided into cantons and the latter into communes.

358 Among the socialists Proudhon names Saint-Simon, Fourier, Owen, Cabet,
Louis Blanc, and the Chartists.

359 The beginning of Chapter One of Pushkin's novel in verse Yeugeny Onegin is
reproduced on the last page of Engels' manuscript. It corresponds to the
Russian original though it is written in Latin letters. This is apparently
connected with Engels' study of the Russian language which he began in
Manchester in 1851 (see illustration between pages 564 and 565 in this volume).

360 In 1851 the Chartist weekly Notes to the People published two articles by Ernest
Jones, the editor, on co-operation: "A Letter to the Advocates of the
Co-operative Principle, and to the Members of Co-operative Societies" (No. 2,
May 10, 1851), and "Co-operation. What It Is, and What It Ought to Be" (No.
21, September 20, 1851). They were written at a time when especially close,
friendly relations had been established between Marx and Engels on the one
hand and Ernest Jones, the Left-wing Chartist leader on the other. Marx and
Engels constantly helped Jones in his fight for the revival of Chartism on a
socialist basis, in his propaganda campaign and his work as publisher and
editor of the Chartist papers, Notes to the People and, later, The People's Paper, by
publicising these periodicals in their articles and contributing to them. Marx
also helped Jones to write his articles, particularly on economics. On November
4, 1864 Marx wrote to Engels the following: "I happened to come across
several numbers of E. Jones' Notes to the People (1851, 1852) which, as far as
economic articles are concerned, had been written in the main points under my
direction and in part even with my close participation. Well! What do I find
there? That then we conducted the same polemic—only in a better way—against
the co-operative movement, since in its present narrow-minded form it claimed
to be the latest word, as ten to twelve years later Lassalle conducted in Germany
against Schulze-Delitzsch."

The publication of Jones' articles on co-operation met with a response from
Edward Vansittart Neale, a Christian socialist and prominent bourgeois
co-operator. On October 11, 1851 the weekly published (issue No. 24) Neale's
first letter and Jones' reply to it. Neale's second letter was published on November 15, 1851 (No. 29) and Jones' reply on November 22 (No. 30).

These two letters by Neale and Jones' replies to them show clearly the difference between the viewpoints of the Christian socialist and the proletarian revolutionary. The former saw the aim of the co-operative movement in distracting the workers from the class struggle and called for the collaboration of hostile classes and the reconciliation of their interests. Jones, supported by Marx, emphasised that from the viewpoint of the workers' liberation struggle peaceful co-operation had no prospect and that under capitalism workers' co-operative societies could not exist for long; they would not withstand competition on the part of big capital and would go bankrupt, or else they would turn into purely capitalist enterprises deriving profit from exploiting workers. The decisive condition, Jones said, for the workers' co-operative societies to be really of use to the working class was that the latter win political power in order to reorganise the existing system in the interest of the working people.

Of Jones' many articles on co-operation the two mentioned at the beginning of this note are included in this volume because they most vividly reflect the influence of Marx's views on Jones and show clearly that Marx in fact took part in writing them.

p. 573

See Note 226.

p. 580

The reference is to the funds of the Equitable Pioneers of Rochdale, a consumers' retail co-operative society founded by Rochdale workers in 1844. It was the embryo of the co-operative movement in England and other countries.

p. 581

This list of documents shows the efforts made by Marx and Engels to help the accused Communists in Cologne and their defence counsel to prove how unfounded were the charges fabricated against them by means of perjury, juggling with facts and forged material. The documents enumerated in the list were to provide the defence with material exposing the provocative actions of the police and judicial authorities. As addresses the list often mentions businessmen and trading houses which Marx and Engels used for safe dispatch of the documents to the defence counsels Schneider II, Esser I and Honthheim. Most of these conspiratorial addresses were supplied by Engels, making use of his commercial ties.

The calendar for July-October 1852 (in Engels' handwriting) at the end of the manuscript is not reproduced in this volume.

p. 590

In points 3 to 5 Engels lists the envelopes with commercial addresses which he sent to Marx in London on October 28 to be delivered to Honthheim, Esser I, Schneider II (see Engels' letter to Marx of October 28, 1852).

Point 6 refers to a letter from Marx which was sent via Düsseldorf to Schneider II at the address of a German merchant, an acquaintance of Freiligrath. The letter is not extant. On its contents see Marx's letter to Engels dated October 28, 1852.

p. 590

The following documents are listed:

1) Marx's letter of October 26, 1852 to the lawyer Schneider II which, in view of its importance, was sent to Cologne in four copies through different hands, including Weerth from Manchester (see Marx's letter to Engels of October 26, 1852); two other copies, besides the third spoken of in this point,
are mentioned by Engels in the list under No. 1 and No. 8; the letter has not been found.

2) A letter from Hermann Becker, one of the main accused at the trial, to Marx dated January 27, 1851 (see this volume, p. 452; it is also mentioned in point 8 of this document), and letters from Roland Daniels to Marx, written between February and May 1851, concerning his book *Mikrokosmos. Entwurf einer physiologischen Anthropologie*. The letters in question were written by Becker and Daniels prior to their arrest.

3) Cherval’s statement, printed in *The People’s Paper* after his escape to England arranged by the French police (see this volume, p. 418).

4) A letter from Stieber to Marx of December 26, 1848, quoted by Marx in his *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne* (see this volume, pp. 435-36); this letter is also mentioned in point 8. p. 590

The reference is to the documents which Marx sent to Schneider II (through Hermann Jung living in Frankfurt am Main) proving that the “original minute-book” was a forgery and that Hirsch participated in its fabrication, and exposing Stieber’s perjury (see this volume, pp. 426-35, and Marx’s letter to Engels of October 28, 1852). p. 590

This refers to the theft of the so-called Dietz archive (Dietz was secretary of the sectarian Willich-Schapper group that broke away from the Communist League) by Max Reuter, a Prussian police agent in London (see this volume, pp. 403-07). p. 591

This work was published in instalments in nine issues of the Chartist *People’s Paper*, from the end of September 1852 until the end of the year. The articles were published unsigned under the editorial heading “Our Paris Correspondence”. Their author was Georg Eccarius—a tailor from London, a close associate of Marx and an active member of the Communist League—which can be seen from Marx’s letter to Adolf Cluss written in November 1853. This letter also shows that it was Marx who helped to get Eccarius to contribute to the Chartist paper and, most probably, looked through his writings in manuscript before Eccarius sent them to Jones. Marx and Engels rated highly Eccarius’ intelligence and theoretical ability (see, for example, their opinion of Eccarius’ article “Tailoring in London or the Struggle Between Big and Small Capital” in Volume 10 of the present edition, p. 485). Marx encouraged and assisted his literary activities in every possible way. There is no doubt that Marx also helped Eccarius to write this review, especially in examining the writings of different authors on the coup d’état of December 2, 1851. It is noteworthy that in assessing Victor Hugo’s book on this subject Eccarius expresses ideas close to those which Marx himself expressed on the same subject later, in 1869, in the Preface to the second edition of *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (see present edition, Vol. 21). Eccarius’ criticism of Proudhon’s social projects in this review coincides with their assessment in the works of Marx and Engels (see, in particular, this volume, pp. 557-68).

The first, introductory, article of the series was printed in *The People’s Paper* without the general heading, “A Review of the Literature on the *Coup d’État*”, under which the ensuing articles were published. Four articles immediately following the introductory one were marked No. 1, No. 2, etc., while the remaining articles were not numbered. But the general heading and the editors’ “to be continued” given in some cases show that the series was not only
written but also published as a single work, of which the separate articles seemed to be chapters. Accordingly, in this volume the missing numbers (5-8) are added in square brackets. In the eighth and ninth articles Eccarius assesses Marx’s *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. (As distinct from the erroneous title of the first edition, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon*, he uses the right one which indicates that Marx took part in writing the “Review”.) These articles, containing the most important excerpts from Chapter I of *The Eighteenth Brumaire*, acquainted the English reader with this outstanding work for the first time. Later, in his “Statement to the Editorial Boards of the Newspapers *Reform, Volkszeitung* and *Allgemeine Zeitung*” (November 7, 1859), Marx pointed out that his work *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* “appeared in excerpts in the then London organ of the Chartists” (i.e. *The People’s Paper*) (see present edition, Vol. 17).  

369 At the end of September 1852 the French police declared that an infernal machine had been discovered in Marseilles with which the conspirators wanted to kill Louis Bonaparte, who at the time was touring the South of France. The public regarded this communication as a crude farce providing an additional pretext for proclaiming Louis Bonaparte emperor.  

370 See Note 107.  

371 The reference is to Aesop’s fable “The Shepherd Boy and the Wolf” in which the shepherd boy repeatedly raised false alarms by shouting that wolves were attacking the herd. After a number of such episodes, nobody responded to his cries for help when wolves really did attack the herd.  

372 This refers to the High Court in Bourges which passed severe sentences on the participants in the revolutionary events of May 15, 1848 (see Note 103), and to the courts-martial which dealt with the participants in the June uprising in Paris in 1848.  

373 See Note 42.  

374 See Note 42.  

375 On June 13, 1849 the Montagne organised a peaceful demonstration in Paris in protest against a violation of the Constitution—the dispatch of French troops against the Roman Republic. The demonstration was dispersed by troops.  

376 On the *lazzaroni* see Note 105. *Trasteverians*—inhabitants of a district of Rome situated on the right bank of the Tiber.  

377 In this article Eccarius sets forth the contents of Chapter I of Marx’s *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, in some places almost literally. Further he cites a long quotation in his own translation, embracing, except for one paragraph, the concluding part of this chapter (see this volume, pp. 106-12). Eccarius’ translation differs from that accepted in modern English publications and from the translation in this volume. The use of italics in the passage quoted by Eccarius does not coincide with that in the original.  

378 See Note 71.
This and the following document include an appeal to the German workers in America written by Marx in the name of a committee founded by him in London for aid to the Communists sentenced in Cologne. On December 7, 1852 Marx wrote to Adolf Cluss in Washington: “Herewith also an appeal for money for the Cologne prisoners and their families. See that it appears in various papers. It might also be a good idea for you too to form committees over there. Here it is being done as a party demonstration. You will observe that Ernest Jones actually appears as a party member. In an introductory note, signed by you both, you might specially emphasise that this is not a case of raising revolutionary funds Kinkel-fashion, etc., but rather of a definite party aim whose fulfilment is demanded by the honour of a workers' party” (see present edition, Vol. 39).

The letter accompanying the appeal was written in the name of the Washington branch of the Socialist Gymnastic Association (Sozialistischer Turnverein), an organisation of the German democratic emigrants in the USA founded at a congress of German gymnastic societies in Philadelphia on October 5, 1850. In the early stage of its activity the Association maintained contacts with the German labour movement in America. Joseph Weydemeyer and Adolf Cluss contributed to its periodical, Turnzeitung. During the American Civil War it took an active part in the struggle against the slave-owning states. In 1865 it was renamed North-American Gymnastic Association.
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Aberdeen, George Hamilton, Earl of (1784-1860)—British statesman, Tory, from 1850 leader of the Peelites, Foreign Secretary (1828-30, 1841-46) and Prime Minister of the coalition cabinet (1852-55).—471-75, 478, 501, 503-04, 510, 512, 516, 538

Abraham a Sancta Clara (real name Ulrich Megerle) (1644-1709)—Austrian Catholic preacher and popular humorous writer.—317, 319-20

Acquaviva, Claudio (1543-1615)—General of the Society of Jesus (1581-1615).—521

Aesop (6th cent. B.C.)—semi-legendary Greek author of fables.—107

Agesilaus (c. 442-c. 360 B.C.)—King of Sparta (c. 398-c. 360 B.C.), brother of Agis II.—163

Agis II—King of Sparta (c. 427-c. 400 B.C.), elder brother of Agesilaus.—163

Agostini, Cesare (1803-1855)—Italian revolutionary, follower of Mazzini; participant in the 1848-49 revolution in Italy; refugee in England; subsequently departed from Mazzini.—515

Ailly, Pierre d'(1550-1420)—French cardinal, played an important role at the Council of Constance.—194

Alexander of Macedon (Alexander the Great) (362-323 B.C.)—military leader and statesman; King of Macedon (336-323 B.C.).—151

Alexander, John—Irish politician, M.P. (1853).—486

Allais, Louis Pierre Constant (born c. 1821)—French police agent.—150, 154

Amelot de la Houssaye, Abraham Nicolas (1634-1706)—French writer, author of Histoire du gouvernement de Venise.—503

Anglas—see Boissy d'Anglas

Angoulême, Marie Thérèse Charlotte, duchesse d'(1778-1851)—daughter of Louis XVI.—596

Anneme, 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 in 1848; editor of the Neue Kölnische Zeitung; member of the Rhenish District Committee of Democrats.—252

Antoine, Gustav—French émigré in London in the early 1850s; son-in-law of Auguste Blanqui.—296

Antonelli, Giacomo (1806-1876)—Italian cardinal, adviser to Pius IX; virtually
governed the Papal states in 1850-70.—609
Arconati Visconti, Constanza, Marquise (1797-1870)—member of the Italian national liberation movement.—356
Ariosto, Lodovico (1474-1533)—Italian poet of the Renaissance, author of L’Orlando furioso.—275, 280, 302, 303, 315, 323
Arnaud St.—see Saint-Arnaud, Armand
Arnim, Bettina (Elisabeth) von (1785-1859)—German writer of the Romantic school; also known as Bettina Brentano.—241
Arsenius, Saint (c. 354-c. 450)—Roman aristocrat, retired into hermitage in the Egyptian deserts; Christian saint.—182
Ashley (Cooper, Anthony Ashley, 7th Earl of Shaftesbury) (1801-1885)—English politician, Tory philanthropist.—525
Atholl, George Augustus Frederic John Murray, Duke of (1814-1864)—big Scottish landowner.—494
Attila (d. 453)—King of the Huns (433-453).—601
Auerswald, Hans Adolf Erdmann von (1792-1848)—Prussian general, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Right wing); killed during an uprising in Frankfurt in September 1848.—435
Auerswald, Rudolf von (1795-1866)—Prussian statesman, liberal aristocrat; Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs (June-September 1848), Oberpräsident of Western Prussia (from September 1848 to 1850).—66
Augustenburgs—dynasty of Schleswig-Holstein dukes (1627-1852).—289
Augustus (Gaius Julius Caesar Octavianus) (63 B.C.-A.D. 14)—Roman Emperor (27 B.C.-A.D. 14).—503
Barbè, Armand (1809-1870)—French revolutionary, a leader of secret societies during the July monarchy; prominent figure in the 1848 revolution; deputy to the Constituent Assembly; sentenced to life imprisonment for participation in the insurrection of May 15, 1848; pardoned in 1854.—295, 608
Barbour, James (1831-1853)—criminal, executed for murder in Sheffield.—495
Baring, Sir Francis Thornhill (1796-1866)—British statesman, Whig, M.P., Chancellor of the Exchequer (1839-41), First Lord of the Admiralty (1848-52).—501
Baroche, Pierre Jules (1802-1870)—French lawyer and politician; deputy
to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; representative of the Party of Order; procurator-general of the Court of Appeal; Bonapartist; member of several cabinets prior to and after the coup d'état of December 2, 1851.—144, 154, 156, 159, 163

Barrot, Camille Hyacinthe Odilon (1791-1873)—French lawyer and politician, leader of the liberal dynastic opposition until February 1848; from December 1848 to October 1849 headed the Ministry, which relied on a monarchist coalition.—121-23, 125, 138-40, 147, 160, 162, 168, 176, 600

Barthélémy, Emmanuel (c. 1820-1855)—French worker, follower of Blanqui, 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; charged with criminal offences and executed in 1855.—295, 296

Bassermann, Friedrich Daniel (1811-1855)—German politician; represented the Baden Government in the Federal Diet during the 1848-49 revolution; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Right Centre).—69

Batthyány, Lajos, Count von (1806-1849)—Hungarian statesman, Prime Minister (March-September 1848); liberal aristocrat, pursued a policy of compromise with the Austrian monarchy; shot after the suppression of the revolution.—532

Baudin, Charles (1784-1854)—French admiral.—598

Bauer, Bruno (1809-1882)—German philosopher, Young Hegelian.—242, 265, 267, 273, 283

Baze, Jean Didier (1800-1881)—French lawyer and politician, deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; Orleanist.—167, 180

Beaumarchais, Pierre Augustin Caron de (1732-1799)—French dramatist.—414, 432, 452

Beck, Wilhelmina (d. 1851)—Austrian adventuress who passed herself for a baroness and Kossuth’s political informer, agent of the Austrian and English police.—97-98

Becker, B.—German refugee in the USA, member of the Socialist Gymnastic Association in the early 1850s.—625

Becker, Hermann Heinrich (1820-1885)—German lawyer and journalist, member of the Communist League from 1850; defendant in the Cologne Communist trial (1852), sentenced to five-year imprisonment; in later years a national-liberal.—210, 211, 399, 402, 424, 450, 452, 590

Beckerath, Hermann von (1801-1870)—German banker; moderate liberal, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Right Centre); Finance Minister in the Imperial Government (August-September 1848).—302

Beckmann—Prussian police spy in Paris in the early 1850s, Paris correspondent of the Kölnische Zeitung.—415

Bedeau, Marie Alphonse (1804-1863)—French general and politician, moderate republican; Vice-President of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic.—126, 159


Bellini, Vincenzo (1801-1835)—Italian composer.—235

Bem, Józef (1795-1850)—Polish general, prominent 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.—60, 300

_Benoist (Benoît) d’Azy, Denis, comte_ (1796-1880)—French politician, financier and industrialist; Vice-President of the Legislative Assembly (1849-51); Legitimist.—162, 166

_Béranger, Pierre Jean de_ (1780-1857)—French poet, wrote many satirical songs on political subjects; democrat.—200, 609

_Bernesford, William_ (b. 1798)—English politician, Tory, M.P., Secretary of War (March-December 1852).—337, 343, 466

_Berkeley, Francis Henry Fitzhardinge_ (1794-1870)—English liberal politician, M.P. (1837).—340

_Bermbach, Adolph_ (1821-1875)—Cologne lawyer, democrat, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly; witness for the defence in the Cologne Communist trial (1852); corresponded with Marx.—422, 424, 425, 426, 428, 590

_Bernai Osborne, Ralph_ (1808-1882)—British liberal politician, M.P., Secretary of the Admiralty (1852-58).—473, 475, 600

_Bernal, Ralph_ (d. 1854)—British politician, Whig, M.P., Chairman of Committees of the House of Commons (1830s-1850s).—350

_Bernard—French colonel, headed military commissions meting out reprisals against the participants in the June 1848 uprising in Paris; after the coup d'état on December 2, 1851 took part in organising trials of republicans.—118-19

_Berryer, Pierre Antoine_ (1790-1868)—French lawyer and politician, deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic, Legitimist.—129, 144, 160, 166, 168, 170, 173, 594

_Bettina—see Arnim, Bettina (Elisabeth) von_
bly; took part in the defence of Vienna in October 1848, court-martialled and executed after the fall of the city.—65, 73, 295

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 Gustav Struve headed the democratic Association of German Emigrants in London.—280

Bögehold, Sophie—girl friend of Gottfried Kinkel.—240, 241, 245

Boiardo (Bojardo), Matteo Maria (c. 1441-1494)—Italian poet of the Renaissance, author of L'Orlando innamorato.—274, 310, 315, 326

Boichot, Jean Baptiste (1820-1889)—French republican, deputy to the Legislative Assembly in 1849; took part in the demonstration on June 13, 1849; later an émigré.—126

Boissy d'Anglas, Jean Gabriel, comte de (1782-1864)—deputy to the Legislative Assembly, Orleanist.—171

Bonald, Louis Gabriel Ambroise, vicomte de (1754-1840)—French politician and writer, one of the ideologists of the aristocratic and monarchist reaction in the Restoration period.—16

Bonaparte—dynasty of French emperors (1804-14, 1815 and 1852-70).—186-89, 506, 517

Bonaparte, Jérôme (1784-1860)—younger brother of Napoleon I, King of Westphalia (1807-13), from 1850 marshal of France.—355

Bonaparte, Louis—see Napoleon III

Bonaparte, Pierre Napoleon (1815-1881)—cousin of Napoleon III; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic.—355

Börne, Ludwig (1786-1837)—German critic and writer.—277

Bourbons—royal dynasty in France (1589-1792, 1814-15 and 1815-30).—120, 127, 164, 165, 167, 170, 187

Bramvell—English clergyman.—525

Brentano, Clemens (1778-1842)—German poet of the Romantic school.—243

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 Baden-Palatinate uprising emigrated to Switzerland and then to the USA.—91, 103, 261, 263, 272, 275, 307, 309, 324

Bright, John (1811-1889)—English manufacturer, a leader of the Free Traders and one of the founders of the Anti-Corn Law League.—205, 350, 372, 458, 474, 505-07, 526

Broglio, Achille Charles Léonce Victor, duc de (1785-1870)—French statesman, Prime Minister (1835-36), deputy to the Legislative Assembly (1849-51); Orleanist.—144, 168

Brotherton, Joseph (1783-1857)—English politician, Free Trader, advocate of electoral reform, M.P.—505

Brüggemann, Karl Heinrich (1810-1887)—German journalist, moderate liberal; editor-in-chief of the Kölnische Zeitung (1845-55).—273

Brunswick, Duke of—see Karl Friedrich August Wilhelm

Brutus, Marcus Junius (c. 85-42 B.C.)—Roman politician, republican; an initiator of the conspiracy against Julius Caesar.—104, 440

Bucher, Lothar (1817-1892)—Prussian official, journalist; deputy to the Prussian National Assembly in 1848 (Left Centre); emigrated to London; in later years a national-liberal, adherent of Bismarck.—294, 297, 318

Bückler, Johann (c. 1780-1803)—Ger-
man robber nicknamed Schinderhannes (Hans the Flayer).—419

Buhl, Ludwig Heinrich Franz (1814-c. 1882)—German writer, Young Hegelian, author of pamphlets in the Patriot series.—306

Bulwer—see Lytton, Edward George

Bunsen, Christian Karl Josias, Baron von (1791-1860)—Prussian diplomat, writer and theologian; Ambassador to London (1842-54).—540

Bürgers, Heinrich (1820-1878)—German journalist, contributor to the Rheinische Zeitung (1842-43), member of the Cologne community of the Communist League (1848), one of the editors of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung.—210, 211, 399, 400, 402, 449, 457

Buridan, Jean (1300-1358)—French philosopher.—178, 245

Burritt, Elihu (1810-1879)—American linguist, philanthropist and pacifist, organiser of several international pacifist congresses.—283

Butler, Samuel (1612-1680)—English satirical poet, author of the poem Hudibras.—486

Byron, George Gordon Noel, Lord (1788-1824)—English romantic poet.—600

C

Cabet, Étienne (1788-1856)—French writer, utopian Communist, author of Voyage en Icarie.—295, 552

Caesar, Gaius Julius (c. 100-44 B.C.)—Roman general and statesman.—104, 262, 284, 321, 412, 503

Caligula, Gaius Caesar (A.D. 12-41)—Roman Emperor (37-41); was enthroned by the praetorian guard.—122

Cambridge, George William Frederick Charles, Duke of (1819-1904)—British general, commander-in-chief of the British army (1856-95).—340

Camphausen, Ludolf (1803-1890)—German banker, a leader of the Rhenish liberal bourgeoisie, Prime Minister of Prussia from March to June 1848.—36, 39, 45-46, 66, 260

Canning, George (1770-1827)—British statesman, Tory, Foreign Secretary (1807-09, 1822-27), Prime Minister (1827).—200, 500

Caperon, Paulin—French émigré, member of the Committee of the French society of Blanquist emigrants in London in the early 1850s.—294

Cardwell, Edward Cardwell, Viscount (1813-1886)—British statesman; a Peelite leader, later a Liberal; President of the Board of Trade (1852-55), Chief Secretary for Ireland (1859-61), Secretary for the Colonies (1864-66) and Secretary for War (1868-74).—332, 350, 510

Carlier, Pierre Charles Joseph (1799-1858)—Prefect of the Paris police (1849-51), Bonapartist.—140, 150, 156, 177, 407-09, 412, 549

Carnot, Lazare Hippolyte (1801-1888)—French writer and politician.—144

Cassius, Gaius (d. 42 B.C.)—Roman politician, people’s tribune.—503

Catherine II (1729-1796)—Russian Empress (1762-96).—533

Catiline, (Lucius Sergius Catilina) (c. 108-62 B.C.)—Roman politician, organiser of a conspiracy against the aristocratic republic.—375, 445

Cato, Marcus Porcius (Cato the Elder) (234-149 B.C.)—Roman statesman and writer, upheld aristocratic privileges; in 184 B.C. was elected censor, the strictness of his censorship became proverbial.—197, 318

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.—103
Cavaignac, Louis Eugène (1802-1857) — French general and politician, moderate republican; took part in the conquest of Algeria; Governor of Algeria after the February 1848 revolution; War Minister of France from May 1848, directed the suppression of the June uprising; head of the executive (June-December 1848).—51, 113, 118-20, 126, 161, 172, 180, 216, 570, 605

Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de (1547-1616)—Spanish writer.—17, 64, 287, 290, 315

Chambord, Henri Charles Ferdinand Marie Dieudonné d'Artois, duc de Bordeaux, comte de (1820-1883)—last representative of the elder line of the Bourbons, grandson of Charles X, pretender to the French throne under the name of Henry V.—129, 148, 166, 170

Chamisso, Adelbert von (1781-1838)—German romantic poet.—125, 235, 252

Changarnier, Nicolas Anne Théodule (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 after the coup d'état of December 2, 1851.—46, 122, 123, 125, 131, 136, 150-52, 154, 157-61, 163, 168, 171, 176, 178, 180

Charlemagne (Charles the Great) (c. 742-814)—King of the Franks (768-800) and Roman Emperor (800-14).—43, 608

Charles I (1600-1649)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1625-49), beheaded during the revolution.—508

Charras, Jean Baptiste Adolphe (1810-1865)—French military and political figure, moderate republican; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Repub-
gineer, member of the Communist League; secretary of the Workers' Educational Society in Mainz (1848); in 1848 emigrated to the United States where, in the 1850s, he was active in the German-American workers' organisations; one of the first propagators of scientific communism in America.—621

Cobbett, William (c. 1762-1835)—English politician and radical writer.—498

Cobden, Richard (1804-1865)—English manufacturer, a leader of the Free Traders and one of the founders of the Anti-Corn Law League.—205, 283, 365, 458, 464, 497, 498, 499, 518, 526, 534

Cohnheim, Max—German democrat, took part in the Baden revolutionary movement in 1848-49; emigrated after the revolution.—280

Collet, Collet Dobson—English radical writer and public figure.—540

Commissaire, Sébastien (1822-1890)—French republican, deputy to the Legislative Assembly (1849); took part in the demonstration of June 3, 1849; exiled to Corsica.—126

Confucius (550 or 551-479 B.C.)—Chinese philosopher and statesman.—274

Considérant, Victor Prosper (1808-1893)—French writer, utopian socialist; disciple and follower of Fourier.—556

Constant de Rebecque, Henri Benjamin (1767-1830)—French liberal politician and writer.—104

Cooke, George Wingrove (1814-1865)—English liberal historian and journalist.—329

Cornwall, Lewis—see Lewis, Sir George Cornwall

Cotta, Johann Georg (1796-1863)—German publisher, owner of a large publishing house in 1832-63.—248

Cousin, Victor (1792-1867)—French philosopher.—104

Craig, William Gibson (1797-1878)—English statesman, Whig, Lord of the Treasury (1846-52).—349

Cramer, Karl Gottlob (1758-1817)—German writer, author of adventure novels.—237

Cranworth, Robert Monsey Rolfe, Baron (1790-1868)—English statesman and lawyer, Whig, Lord Chancellor (1852-58, 1865-66).—510, 517

Crawford, William Sharman (1781-1861)—Irish radical, M.P.; supported the Chartists; took part in founding the Tenant-Right League.—504

Creton, Nicolas Joseph (1798-1864)—French lawyer; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic, Orleanist.—165

Cromwell, Oliver (1599-1658)—leader of the English revolution, Lord Protector of England, Scotland and Ireland from 1653.—105, 179, 180, 314

Crossley, Sir Francis (1817-1872)—English manufacturer, radical, M.P.—338, 341

D

Dalhmann, Friedrich Christoph (1785-1860)—German liberal historian and politician, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly in 1848 (Right Centre).—22

Dalhousie, James Andrew Brown Ramsay, Earl and Marquis of (1812-1860)—English statesman, Peelite, Governor-General of India (1848-56); pursued a policy of colonial conquests.—370

Dalrymple, Sir John Hamilton Macgill (1726-1810)—Scottish lawyer and historian, author of An Essay towards a General History of Feudal Property in Great Britain.—493
Damm—German democrat; in 1849 President of the Baden Constituent Assembly; later emigrated to England.—319

Daniels, Amalie (1820-1895)—wife of Roland Daniels.—426-28, 454

Daniels, Roland (1819-1855)—German physician, member of the Cologne Central Authority of the Communist League from 1850; defendant in the Cologne Communist trial (1852), acquitted by the jury; friend of Marx and Engels.—210, 211, 399, 402, 426, 427, 454, 590

Dante Alighieri (1265-1321)—Italian poet.—539

Danton, Georges Jacques (1759-1794)—leader of the Right wing of the Jacobins in the French Revolution.—86, 103, 104

Darasz, Albert (1808-1852)—prominent figure in the Polish national liberation movement, took part in the 1830-31 insurrection; a leader of the democratic organisations of Polish emigrants; member of the Central Committee of European Democracy.—103, 281

Deflotte—see Flotte, Paul Louis Francois René de

Della Rocco, Henrico Morozzo—Italian refugee, follower of Mazzini.—515

De Maistre—see Maistre, Joseph Marie, comte de

De Morny—see Morny, Charles Auguste Louis Joseph, duc de

Demosthenes (384-322 B.C.)—Greek orator and politician.—273

Derby, Edward Geoffrey Smith Stanley, Earl of (1799-1869)—English statesman, Tory leader; Prime Minister (1852, 1858-59, 1866-68).—338, 344, 349, 352, 365-67, 370-74, 469, 472-74, 478, 503, 507, 510

Desfossés, Romain Joseph (1798-1864)—French admiral, deputy to the Legislative Assembly, Minister of the Navy (November 1849-January 1851).—157

Desmoulins, Lucie Simplice Camille Be- noit (1760-1794)—French writer; played an active part in the French Revolution, Right-wing Jacobin.—104

Dickens, Charles John Huffam (1812-1870)—English writer.—257, 258

Diderot, Denis (1713-1784)—French philosopher of the Enlightenment, atheist, leader of the Encyclopaedists.—260

Dietz, Oswald (c. 1824-1864)—German architect; participated in the 1848-49 revolution; emigrated to London, member of the Central Authority of the Communist League; when the League split in 1850, joined the separatist Willich-Schapper group and became a member of its Central Committee; in later years took part in the American Civil War.—293, 385, 390, 403-05, 410, 412-14, 416, 421, 425, 427, 428, 450, 591

Disraeli, Benjamin, Earl of Beaconsfield (1804-1881)—British statesman and writer; adhered to the Young England group in the 1840s; in later years leader of the Tories; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852, 1858-59, 1866-68), Prime Minister (1868, 1874-80).—349, 364, 458-61, 463, 467-69, 473, 474, 503, 507, 511

Dobhöf-Dier, Anton, Baron von (1800-1872)—Austrian statesman, moderate liberal; Minister of Trade (May 1848) and Minister of the Interior (July-October 1848).—56

Döbler, Ludwig (1801-1864)—Austrian illusionist, presented "dissolving views".—258

Dodson, Sir John (1780-1858)—English judge.—521

Douro, Marquis of—see Wellington, Arthur Richard Wellesley, Marquis of Douro, Duke of

Dronke, Ernst (1822-1891)—German journalist; at first a "true socialist",
Eccarius, Johann Friedrich—German tailor; member of the Communist League; emigrated to London in 1851; supported Marx and Engels after the split in the League; brother of Johann Georg Eccarius.—622, 624

Eccarius, Johann Georg (1818-1889)—German tailor; prominent in the German and international working-class movement, member of the League of the Just and later of the Communist League; member of the General Council of the First International; in later years took part in the English trade union movement.—592, 622, 624

Edwards, Henry—English politician, Tory, M.P. (1847-52).—338, 341

Eichhorn, Johann Albrecht Friedrich (1779-1856)—Prussian statesman, Minister of Religious Worship, Education and Medicine (1840-48).—24

Eisenmann, Gottfried (1795-1867)—German journalist, physician; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Centre, later Left wing).—14

Engels—German Protestant pastor from Cologne.—246

Engels, Frederick (1820-1895).—1, 10, 12, 21, 22, 39, 50, 53, 62, 74, 88, 96, 206, 217, 222, 269, 378, 379, 384-87, 389, 399, 403, 433, 449, 456, 557, 566, 570, 590, 622, 624

Escobar y Mendoza, Antonio (1589-1669)—Spanish preacher, Jesuit.—475

in later years a member of the Communist League and an editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung; emigrated to England after the 1848-49 revolution; supporter of Marx and Engels.—223, 439-42, 622, 624

Droz, François Xavier Joseph (1773-1850)—French historian, philosopher and economist.—545

Duchâtel, Charles Marie Tanneguy, comte (1803-1867)—French statesman, Orleanist, Minister of Trade (1834-36), Minister of the Interior (1839, 1840-February 1848); follower of Malthus.—167, 269

Duffy, Sir Charles Gavan (1816-1903)—Irish politician and writer; a leader of the Young Ireland group and founder-member of the Tenant-Right League, M.P.; emigrated to Australia in 1855.—270, 281, 282

Dulon, Rudolph (1807-1870)—German pastor, a leader of the Friends of Light movement opposing the official church; emigrated to America in 1853.—270, 281, 282

Dumas, Alexandre Dumas père (1802-1870)—French writer.—600

Dundas, Sir David (1799-1877)—English Liberal politician, lawyer, Judge Advocate-General (1849-52).—350

Dünweg, Hugo—architect from Barmen, friend of Gottfried Kinkel.—234

Dupin, André Marie Jean Jacques (1783-1865)—French lawyer and politician, Orleanist; deputy to the Constituent Assembly (1848-49) and President of the Legislative Assembly (1849-51); subsequently Bonapartist.—132, 150, 154

Duprat, Pascal Pierre (1815-1885)—French journalist and politician, republican; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; opponent of Louis Bonaparte.—156

Durrieu, Xavier (1817-1868)—French journalist and politician, republican; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; author of a book on the coup d’état of 1851.—595, 596-99

F.

Ebner, Hermann—German journalist, secret agent of the Austrian police in the 1840s and 1850s.—590

Eccarius, Johann Friedrich—German tailor; member of the Communist League; emigrated to London in 1851; supported Marx and Engels after the split in the League; brother of Johann Georg Eccarius.—622, 624
Esser I, Johann Heinrich Theodor—
Prussian official, lawyer, clerical; in 1848 Vice-President of the Prussian National Assembly, belonged to its Centre; defence counsel in the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—590

Euclid (late 4th-early 3rd cent. B.C.)—
Greek mathematician.—541

Ewart, William (1798-1869)—English
politician, Free Trader.—340, 350

Fairbairn, Sir William (1789-1874)—
Scottish engineer, owner of a factory in Manchester.—360

Falloux, Frédéric Alfred Pierre, comte de
(1811-1886)—French politician and writer, Legitimist and clerical; in 1848 initiated the closure of the national workshops and organised the suppression of the June uprising of the Paris workers; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; Minister of Education (1849).—127, 137, 139, 168, 170

Fanon—French émigré, member of the Committee of the French society of Blanquist emigrants in London in the early 1850s.—294

Faucher, Julius (Jules) (1820-1878)—
German writer, Young Hegelian; advocate of free trade; propagated individualistic, anarchist views in the early 1850s; refugee in England in 1850-51.—305-07

Faucher, Léon (1803-1854)—French
writer and politician, Malthusian economist, Orleanist; Minister of the Interior (December 1848-May 1849, 1851), later Bonapartist.—145, 163, 168

Fazy, Jean Jacques (1794-1878)—Swiss
statesman and journalist, radical, head of government of the Geneva canton (1846-53 and 1855-61); pursued a pro-Bonapartist policy in the 1850s.—264

Ferdinand I (1793-1875)—Emperor of
Austria (1835-48).—50, 55-57, 65

Ferdinand II (1810-1859)—King of the
Two Sicilies (1830-59).—50, 601, 609

Ferenzi—Hungarian singer.—354

Feuerbach, Ludwig Andreas (1804-
1872)—German philosopher.—247,
265, 270, 273

Fickler, Joseph (1808-1865)—German
journalist, democrat, a leader of the Baden democratic movement in 1848-49, member of the Baden Provisional Government (1849); after the revolution emigrated to Switzerland; later lived in England and America.—305, 308-09, 317, 320, 321, 322, 323

Fielden, John (1784-1849)—English
manufacturer, philanthropist, proponent of factory legislation.—524

Fleury, Charles (also Schmidt, real name
Carl Friedrich August Krause) (b.

Flotte, Paul Louis François René de (De-
flotte) (1817-1860)—French naval officer, democrat and socialist, Blanquist; active in the events of May 15 and the June 1848 uprising in Paris; deputy to the Legislative Assembly (1850-51).—144

Follen, August Adolf Ludwig (1794-
1855)—German journalist and poet; took part in the war against Napoleonic France; joined the student movement in 1815.—278, 282

Fould, Achille (1800-1867)—French
banker and politician, Orleanist, subsequently Bonapartist, Finance Minister several times between 1849 and 1867.—140, 157, 159, 163, 170

Fourier, François Marie Charles (1772-
1837)—French utopian socialist.—20, 552
Fox, William Johnson (1786-1864)—English politician and journalist, Free Trader, M.P.—350

Francis I (1494-1547)—King of France (1515-47).—126

Francis I (1768-1835)—Emperor of Austria (1804-35), the last emperor of the Holy Roman Empire known as Francis II (1792-1806).—29, 31

Francis Joseph I (1830-1916)—Emperor of Austria (1848-1916).—72, 513

Franck, Gustav (d. 1860)—Austrian democrat, refugee in London in the early 1850s.—320

Frederick I ("Barbarossa" or "Red-beard") (c. 1123-1190)—German King from 1152, Holy Roman Emperor (1155-90).—311

Frederick Augustus II (1797-1854)—King of Saxony (1836-54).—85

Frederick William III (1770-1840)—King of Prussia (1797-1840).—15, 17-20

Frederick William IV (1795-1861)—King of Prussia (1840-61).—16, 17, 19-20, 24, 31, 35, 36, 67, 68, 72, 76, 80, 244, 404, 515, 538

Freiligrath, Ferdinand (1810-1876)—German revolutionary poet, member of the Communist League, an editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung in 1848-49.—248, 378, 379, 384-87, 433, 540, 622-24

Fröbel, Julius (1805-1895)—German radical writer and publisher of progressive literature; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly in 1848 (Left wing).—65

Fronde, Victor—French army officer banished to Algeria after the coup d'état of December 2, 1851; later emigrated to Belgium.—509

Frost, John (1784-1877)—English radical; joined the Chartist movement in 1838; sentenced to deportation for life to Australia for organising a miners' uprising in Wales in 1839; was pardoned in 1856 and returned to England.—340, 374

Fuad Effendi Mehemed (1815-1869)—Turkish statesman; in the 1850s and 1860s was several times Minister of Foreign Affairs and Grand Vizier.—540

Fürstenberg, Baron von—Prussian landowner, member of the jury in the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—400, 455

G

Galilei, Galileo (1564-1642)—Italian physicist and astronomer, founder of mechanics.—456

Gammage, Robert George (1815-1888)—Chartist; saddler and cobbler; author of The History of the Chartist Movement (1854).—376

Garibaldi, Giuseppe (1807-1882)—Italian revolutionary, democrat; in the 1830s and 1840s took part in the revolutionary movement of South America; chief organiser of the defence of the Roman Republic in April-June 1849; in the 1850s and 1860s headed the struggle of the Italian people for national liberation and the unification of the country.—288, 295

Gauthier (nicknamed Walther the Pauper) (d. 1096)—French knight, a leader of the detachment of French peasants in the First Crusade (1096-99).—313, 314

Gavazzi, Alessandro (1809-1889)—Italian clergyman; participant in the 1848-49 revolution in Italy; refugee in England, campaigned against the Catholic Church and the temporal power of the Pope; in later years comrade-in-arms of Garibaldi.—299

Gebert, August—Mecklenburg joiner; member of the Communist League in Switzerland and later in London; after the split in 1850 belonged
to the separatist Willich-Schapper group.—293, 450, 452

Geiger, Wilhelm Arnold—Prussian police official; in 1848 examining magistrate, then Chief of Police in Cologne.—421

George III (1738-1820)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1760-1820).—529

Gerhardt, J.—German democrat, refugee in the USA in the early 1850s.—621

Germans, St.—see Saint-Germans, Edward Granville Eliot

Gervinus, Georg Gottfried (1805-1871)—German historian, liberal; in 1848 deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Right Centre).—23

Gibson, Thomas Milner (1806-1884)—English politician and statesman, Free Trader.—350, 505, 507

Gipperich (Gibberich), Joseph—German tailor; after the split in the Communist League member of a Paris community supporting the separatist Willich-Schapper group; defendant in the trial following the so-called Franco-German plot in Paris in February 1852; later emigrated to England.—411, 412, 417, 418-19

Girardin, Delphine de (1804-1855)—French authoress; wife of Émile de Girardin.—196

Girardin, Émile de (1806-1881)—French journalist and politician, editor of La Presse; notorious for his lack of principles in politics; moderate republican during the 1848-49 revolution, deputy to the Legislative Assembly (1850-51); later Bonapartist.—156, 283

Giraud, Charles Joseph Barthélemy (1802-1881)—French lawyer, monarchist, Minister of Education (1851).—177

Gladstone, William Ewart (1809-1898)—British statesman; Tory, later Peelite; leader of the Liberal Party and head of a number of Liberal cabinets in the latter half of the nineteenth century; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852-55 and 1859-60).—332, 352, 371, 475, 486, 501, 510

Göbel—presiding judge of the Assizes in the Cologne trial of Communists.—420, 437, 455

Goegg, Amand (1820-1897)—German journalist, democrat; member of the Baden Provisional Government in 1849; emigrated after the revolution; member of the First International in later years; in the 1870s joined the German Social-Democrats.—263, 305, 308-11, 316-23

Göhringer, Carl (born c. 1808)—innkeeper from Baden; member of the Communist League; belonged to the separatist Willich-Schapper group; owner of a public house in London which was the meeting-place of German refugees.—300, 305


Goldheim—Prussian police officer, in the early 1850s a secret Prussian agent in London.—401, 422, 428-35, 436-41, 444

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).—63, 300

Gorzowski, Tadeusz—Polish refugee, member of the Polish Democratic Society.—355

Gottfried von Strassburg (end of the 12th-beginning of the 13th cent.)—German poet, author of the epic poem Die Sage von Tristan und Isolde.—234, 238

Goupil de Préfelne, Guillaume François
Charles (1727-1801)—French politician, deputy to the Constituent Assembly, constitutional monarchist.—375

Gouté—French émigré, member of the Committee of the French society of Blanquist emigrants in London in the early 1850s.—294

Gracchus Gaius Sempronius (153-121 B.C.)—people’s tribune in Ancient Rome (123-122 B.C.); campaigned for agrarian laws in the interests of the peasants; brother of Gracchus Tiberius.—104

Gracchus Tiberius Sempronius (163-133 B.C.)—people’s tribune in Ancient Rome (133 B.C.); campaigned for agrarian laws in the interests of the peasants.—104

Graham, Sir James Robert George (1792-1861)—British statesman; Whig, then follower of Peel; Home Secretary in Peel’s Cabinet (1841-46).—332, 352, 458, 459, 467, 471, 476, 499, 506, 507, 517, 520

Granier de Cassagnac, Bernard Adolphe (1806-1880)—French journalist, lacked principle in politics; prior to the 1848 revolution Orleanist, then Bonapartist; deputy to the Legislative Corps during the Second Empire.—196, 597

Greene, Thomas—English politician, Peelite, M.P. (1846-52).—350

Gregory I the Great, Saint (540-604)—Pope (590-604).—425

Greif—Prussian police officer, one of the leaders of the Prussian agency in London in the early 1850s.—386, 390-91, 393, 401, 418-19, 422, 429-33, 439, 440, 442-43, 451

Grenville, William Wyndham, Baron (1759-1834)—British statesman, Whig, Prime Minister (1806-07).—500

Grey, Charles, Earl of (1764-1845)—British statesman, a Whig leader, Prime Minister (1830-34).—338, 500

Grey, Sir George (1799-1882)—British statesman, Whig, Home Secretary (1846-52, 1855-58 and 1861-66) and Secretary for Colonial Affairs (1854-55).—350

Grimm, Jacob Ludwig Carl (1785-1863)—German philologist, author of a historical grammar of the German language, and of folklore adaptations; professor in Göttingen and then in Berlin; liberal.—277

Grimm, Wilhelm Carl (1786-1859)—German philologist, co-author of his brother, Jacob Grimm, in his main works; professor in Göttingen and then in Berlin; liberal.—277

Grunich—German democrat, refugee in London in the early 1850s.—280

Gruyères, Counts—Swiss aristocratic family.—493

Guise, Duke—see Henry II of Lorraine

Guizot, François Pierre Guillaume (1787-1874)—French historian and statesman; from 1840 up to the February revolution of 1848 virtually directed France’s foreign and domestic policy.—104, 116, 167, 168, 183, 184, 196, 424

H

Haacke, Johann Carl (born c. 1820)—German tailor; member of the Communist League; after its split belonged to the separatist Willich-Schapper group.—449

Habbeg—German democrat, refugee in London in the early 1850s.—280

Häbling von Lanzenauer—German landowner, juryman in the Communist trial in Cologne (1852).—400

Habsburgs—dynasty of emperors of the Holy Roman Empire from 1273 to 1806 (with intervals), of Austria (from 1804) and of Austria-Hungary (from 1867 to 1918).—514

Hampden, John (1595-1643)—English politician; during the 17th-century
revolution, a leader of the Parliamentary opposition to the absolutist regime.—67

Hansemann, David Justus (1790-1864)—German capitalist, a leader of the Rhenish liberal bourgeoisie, Finance Minister of Prussia (from March to September 1848).—36, 39, 45, 66, 67, 294

Harring, Harro Paul (1798-1870)—German writer, radical; emigrated in 1828, lived in various countries of Europe and America, including the USA.—284-89

Hasse, Leo—friend of Gottfried Kinkel.—244

Hatchell, John (b. 1788)—English statesman, Whig, Attorney-General for Ireland (1851-52).—350

Hätzel, Carl Joseph August (born c. 1815)—German shoemaker; tried with a group of Communist League members in Berlin in August 1850, acquitted by the jury; member of the separatist Willich-Schapper group; witness for the prosecution in the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—424, 450

Hauck, Ludwig (1799-1850)—Austrian army officer, democrat; took part in the uprising in Vienna in 1848 and in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; shot after the defeat of the revolution.—299-300

Haug, Ernst—Austrian army officer, democrat; active in the 1848-49 revolution in Italy; after the revolution emigrated to England; an editor of the weekly Der Kosmos.—281, 297-98, 300-02, 320, 321

Haupt, Hermann Wilhelm (born c. 1833)—German shop assistant, member of the Communist League; arrested with other Cologne Communists he turned King’s evidence and was released before the trial; fled to Brazil.—449

Hautpoul, Alphonse Henri, marquis d’(1789-1865)—French general, Legitimist, later Bonapartist; deputy to the Legislative Assembly (1849-51), War Minister (1849-50).—139, 144, 151-53

Haynau, Julius Jakob, Baron von (1786-1853)—Austrian general; took part in suppressing the 1848-49 revolution in Italy; commanded the Austrian troops in Hungary (1849-50); initiated violent repressions against Hungarian revolutionaries.—46

Head, Sir Francis Bond (1793-1875)—British colonial administrator, traveller and writer.—198

Heck, Ludwig (born c. 1822)—tailor from Brunswick, member of the Communist League; after the League split up in 1850, joined the separatist Willich-Schapper group.—414

Hecker, Friedrich Karl Franz (1811-1881)—German democrat, a leader of the Baden republican uprising in April 1848; after its defeat he emigrated to Switzerland and later to the USA.—262

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1770-1831)—German philosopher.—14, 103, 107, 230, 234, 239, 244, 265-68, 277, 284, 299, 404, 496

Hein—German refugee in the USA, member of the Socialist Gymnastic Association in the early 1850s.—625

Heine, Heinrich (1797-1856)—German revolutionary poet.—42, 49, 112, 265, 268, 269, 419, 620

Heinrich LXXII (1797-1853)—ruler of the tiny German principality of Reuss-Lobenstein-Ebersdorf (1822-48).—75

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.—270, 274-80, 293, 301-03, 309, 323

Henley, Joseph Warner (1793-1884)—English statesman, Tory, President of
the Board of Trade (1852 and 1858-59).—357, 367

Henry II of Lorraine (1614-1664)—one of the leaders of the Fronde.—195

Henry III (1551-1589)—King of France (1574-89).—602

Henry IV (1553-1610)—King of France (1589-1610).—282

Henry V—see Chambord, Henri Charles Ferdinand Marie Dieudonné d’Artois, duc de Bordeaux, comte de

Henry VI (1421-1471)—King of England (1422-61).—166

Henry of Prussia, Friedrich Heinrich Ludwig (1726-1802)—Prince of Prussia, military leader and diplomat; took part in the Seven Years’ War (1756-63).—533

Henry, Sir Thomas (1807-1876)—English judge. —540

Heute, A.—German officer, member of the Communist League; after the split in 1850 joined the separatist Willich-Schapper group; witness for the prosecution in the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—424, 450, 452

Herbert, Sidney, Baron of Lea (1810-1861)—British statesman, Tory, later Peelite; Secretary for the Admiralty (1841-45), Secretary at War (1845-46 and 1852-55) and War Secretary (1859-60).—352, 507

Hoffmann, Ernst Theodor Amadeus (1776-1822)—German writer. —238

Hohenzollerns— dynasty of Brandenburg electors (1415-1701), Prussian kings (1701-1918) and German emperors (1871-1918).—404

Homer—semi-legendary epic poet of ancient Greece, author of the Iliad and the Odyssey.—258

Houtheim, Richard von (d. 1857)—lawyer in Cologne, defence counsel in the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—428, 433, 434, 436, 590, 591

Horner, Leonard (1785-1864)—English geologist and public figure; factory inspector (1833-56); member of the Factories Inquiry Commission in 1833 and of the Children’s Employment Commission in 1841; took the side of the workers.—360, 479, 480, 526

Hume, Joseph (1777-1855)—English politician, a leader of the radicals, M.P.—340, 362, 372, 374-76

Hume, Victor Marie (1802-1885)—French writer; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; opposed Louis Bonaparte.—138, 234, 595-96, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602-04, 609
I

Imandt, Peter—German teacher, took part in the 1848-49 revolution; member of the Communist League; emigrated to London in 1852; supporter of Marx and Engels.—439-42, 622, 624

Ingersoll, Joseph (1786-1868)—US Congressman, ambassador to Britain (1852-53).—478

Isabella II (1830-1904)—Queen of Spain (1833-68), daughter of Ferdinand VII.—609

Itzstein, Johann Adam von (1775-1855)—a leader of the liberal opposition in the Baden Diet; in 1848-49 deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (extreme Left wing); emigrated to Switzerland after the defeat of the revolution.—278

J

Jacobi, Abraham (1830-1919)—German physician, member of the Communist League; defendant in the Cologne Communist trial (1852), acquitted by the jury; in later years emigrated to the USA.—210, 211

Jacoby, Johann (1805-1877)—German radical writer and politician, physician; in 1848 one of the leaders of the Left wing in the Prussian National Assembly; in the 1870s was close to the Social-Democratic Party.—295

James I (1566-1625)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1603-25).—502, 503

James II (1633-1701)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1685-88).—508

James, George Payne Rainsford (1799-1860)—English romantic writer. —600

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.—283

Jellachich (Jellačić), Josef, Count (1801-1859)—Austrian general, Ban of Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia (1848-59); took part in suppressing the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary and Austria.—55, 56, 57, 59, 61

Jenghiz Khan (1162-1227)—Mongolian Khan and general.—601

Joest, Karl—manufacturer in Cologne, juryman in the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—400

John (Johann Baptist Joseph Fabian Sebastian) (1782-1859)—Archduke of Austria, imperial Regent of Germany (June 1848 to December 1849).—41, 53, 84, 86, 87

Joinville. François Ferdinand Philippe Louis Marie, Prince de (1818-1900)—Duke of Orleans, son of Louis Philippe; emigrated to England after the February 1848 revolution.—167, 176

Jones, Ernest Charles (1819-1869)—prominent figure in the English working-class movement, proletarian poet and journalist, a leader of the Left wing of the Chartist movement; friend of Marx and Engels.—337-40, 343, 376, 473-74, 573, 581, 582, 589, 622, 624

Jones, William (c. 1808-1873)—English watch-maker, Chartist, an organiser of a miners' uprising in Wales in 1839; sentenced to deportation for life in Australia.—341

Jordan, Sylvester (1792-1861)—German lawyer and politician, a leader of the constitutional-democratic movement in Kurhessen in the 1830s; member of the Frankfurt National Assembly in 1848-49.—13

Joseph II (1741-1790)—Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire (1765-90).—28, 29

Jung, Georg Gottlob (1814-1886)—German writer, Young Hegelian, responsible publisher of the Rheinische Zeitung, democrat; deputy to the
Prussian National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848.—590

Jung-Stilling, Johann Heinrich (1740-1817)—German writer, Pietist.—241

Junkermann—Police inspector in Crefeld, witness for the prosecution in the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—443, 444

Jurieu, Pierre (1637-1713)—French theologian, Protestant, opponent of absolutism, predecessor of Rousseau.—556

Kagiga-wa-be-ta—leader of an Indian tribe, took part in the international pacifist congress in Frankfurt am Main in August 1850.—283

Kant, Immanuel (1724-1804)—German philosopher.—247, 496

Karl Friedrich August Wilhelm (1804-1873)—Duke of Brunswick from 1823; early in September 1830, was deposed and forced to emigrate; in the 1840s and 1850s maintained contacts with democratic refugees; published the *Deutsche Londoner Zeitung*.—264, 279, 301

Kaulbach, Wilhelm von (1805-1874)—German painter.—322

Keck, V.—German refugee in the USA, member of the Socialist Gymnastic Association in the early 1850s.—625

Kelly, Sir Fitzroy (1796-1880)—British statesman, Tory, M.P.—524

Keogh, William Nicholas (1817-1878)—Irish lawyer and politician, a leader of the Irish faction in Parliament; held high judicial posts in Ireland.—474, 475, 477, 504

King, Peter John Locke (1811-1885)—British politician, radical, M.P.—207, 340

Kinkel, Johann Gottfried (1815-1882)—German poet and journalist, took part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; sentenced to life imprisonment by a Prussian court; in 1850 escaped and emigrated to London, where he became a leader of the petty-bourgeois emigration and came out against Marx and Engels.—103, 229, 274, 284, 290-94, 297-304, 306-07, 312, 316-23, 325, 326, 445, 450

Kinkel, Johanna (née Mockel) (1810-1858)—German authoress, wife of Gottfried Kinkel.—232, 237, 240, 241, 242, 244-47, 252, 254-56, 258, 302-04

Kiss, Miklós (b. 1820)—Hungarian officer, democrat, refugee, Kossuth's agent in France and Italy.—355

Klapka, György (Georg) (1820-1892)—general of the Hungarian revolutionary army (1848-49), emigrated in 1849; maintained contact with the Bonapartist circles in the 1850s; after the amnesty in 1867 returned to Hungary.—224, 225

Klein, Johann Jacob (born c. 1817)—doctor in Cologne, member of the Communist League, defendant in the Cologne Communist trial (1852); acquitted by the jury.—210, 211, 402

Klein, Julius Leopold (1810-1876)—German dramatist and theatre critic.—306

Klopstock, Friedrich Gottlieb (1724-1803)—German poet, representative of the German Enlightenment.—229

Knap, Albert (1798-1864)—German poet, author of hymns, Pietist.—235, 252

Kock, Charles Paul de (1793-1871)—French novelist and dramatist.—269

Kortum, Karl Arnold (1745-1824)—German poet and writer, author of the satiric poem *Die Jobsiade*.—283

Kossuth, Lajos (1802-1894)—leader of the Hungarian national liberation movement, headed the bourgeois-democratic elements in the 1848-49
revolution, head of the Hungarian revolutionary government; after the defeat of the revolution emigrated first to Turkey and later to England and the USA.—224, 225, 274, 276, 295, 326, 354-55, 382, 465, 508, 513, 514, 515, 528, 532, 535

Kothes, D.—businessman in Cologne, democrat, witness for the defence in the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—421-24, 429

Kotzebue, August Friedrich Ferdinand von (1761-1819)—German writer and journalist, extreme monarchist.—239

Kräusler—Prussian professor, jurym an in the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—400

Krug, Wilhelm Traugott (1770-1842)—German philosopher.—299

Krüsi, Chr.—owner of a printshop in Basle.—537

Krummacher, Friedrich Wilhelm (1796-1868)—German preacher, Calvinist pastor, leader of the Wuppertal pietists.—243

Kyburg, Counts (13th cent.)—a family of Swiss nobles, became extinct in 1264.—493

La Hitte, Jean Ernest Ducos, vicomte de (1789-1878)—French general, Bonapartist, deputy to the Legislative Assembly (1850-51), Foreign Minister (1849-51).—144

Lamartine, Alphonse Marie Louis de (1790-1869)—French poet, historian and politician; a leader of the moderate republicans in the 1840s; Foreign Minister and effective head of the Provisional Government in 1848.—162, 251, 278, 600

Lamoricière, Christophe Léon Louis Fuchault de (1806-1865)—French general, moderate republican; took part in suppressing the June 1848 uprising; Minister of War in the Cavaignac Government (June to December 1848); deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies.—126, 180

Lanckoroński, Count—Polish refugee, agent of the Russian tsarist government.—355

Landolphe—French petty-bourgeois socialist, émigré in London; joined the separatist Willich-Schapper group after the split in the Communist League in 1850.—295

Lansdowne, Henry Petty-Fitzmaurice, Marquess of (1780-1863)—British statesman, Whig, Chancellor of the Exchequer (1806-07), President of the Privy Council (1830-41 and 1846-52), member of Cabinet without office (1852-63).—471, 507

La Rochejaquelein, Henri Auguste Georges du Vergier, marquis de (1805-1867)—French politician, a leader of the Legitimist party; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; later senator of the Second Empire.—168

Las Cases, Emmanuel Augustin Dieudonné, comte de (1766-1842)—French historian, accompanied Napoleon to St. Helena (1815-16); published Mémorial de Sainte Hélène (1822-23).—182

Latour, Theodor, Count Baillot von (1780-1848)—Austrian statesman, advocate of absolutist monarchy; Minister of War in 1848; killed by insurgents in the October 1848 uprising in Vienna.—57

Lauze, Samuel—German tailor, member of the Communist League, joined the separatist Willich-Schapper group when the League split up in 1850.—414

Ledru-Rollin, Alexandre Auguste (1807-1874)—French journalist and politician, a leader of the petty-bourgeois democrats, editor of La Réforme; in February-May 1848 Minister of the
Interior in the Provisional Government, deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies, where he headed the Montagne party; emigrated to England after the demonstration of June 13, 1849.—6, 46, 113, 126, 131, 134, 216, 272, 281, 282, 290-95, 297, 301, 311, 324, 558, 560, 597

Le Flô, Adolphe Emmanuel Charles (1804-1887)—French general, politician and diplomat, representative of the Party of Order, deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic.—123, 180

Lehon, Countess—lived in Paris in the 1830s-1850s, was connected with the Orleans.—196

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm, Baron von (1646-1716)—German philosopher and mathematician.—404

Leiden, Kosmos Damian—wine-seller from Cologne, juryman in the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—400

Lelewel, Joachim (1786-1861)—Polish historian and revolutionary; took part in the Polish insurrection of 1830-31; a leader of the democratic wing of the Polish emigration in 1847-48; member of the Committee of the Brussels Democratic Association.—355

Lenzburg, Counts—representatives of a Swiss aristocratic family which became extinct about 1172.—493

Leo, Heinrich (1799-1878)—German historian and writer, extreme monarchist, ideologist of Prussian big landowners.—282

Leopold, Karl Friedrich (1790-1852)—Grand Duke of Baden (1830-52).—85, 90

Lewald, Fanny (1811-1889)—German writer associated with the Young Germany group.—270

Lewis, Sir George Cornewall (1806-1863)—British statesman, Whig, Secretary to the Treasury (1850-52), Chancellor of the Exchequer (1855-58), Home Secretary (1859-61) and Secretary of State for War (1861-63).—350

Libényi, János (c. 1832-1853)—Hungarian journeyman tailor who made an attempt on the life of the Austrian Emperor Francis Joseph in 1853.—513, 535

Lichnowski, Felix Maria, Prince von (1814-1848)—Prussian officer, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Right wing); killed during the September 1848 uprising in Frankfurt.—435

Liebknecht, Wilhelm (1826-1900)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement; took part in the 1848-49 revolution; member of the Communist League; one of the founders and leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—427-29, 430, 432, 438, 439, 442, 622, 624

Liverpool, Robert Banks Jenkinson, Earl (1770-1828)—British statesman, a Tory leader, held several ministerial posts, Prime Minister (1812-27).—500

Loch, James (1780-1855)—Scottish economist and lawyer, manager of the Duchess of Sutherland’s estates.—491, 493

Lochner, Georg (born c. 1824)—carpenter; active member of the German working-class movement, member of the Communist League and, later, of the General Council of the First International; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—622, 624

Locke, John (1632-1704)—English philosopher.—105

Locke King—see King, Peter John Locke

Longard, Sebastian—friend of Gottfried Kinkel; subsequently lawyer in Cologne.—244

Louis XIV (1638-1715)—King of France (1643-1715).—188
Machiaevelli, Niccolò (1469-1527)—Italian politician, historian and writer.—317, 320

Magna Carta, see King John

Magnan, Bernard Pierre (1791-1865)—French general, marshal from December 1851, Bonapartist; took part in suppressing workers' uprisings in Lyons (1851 and 1849), Lille and Roubeaux (1845), and the June 1848 uprising in Paris; deputy to the Legislative Assembly (1849-51); an organiser of the coup d'état of December 2, 1851.—169, 177, 180, 596

Mahon, Philip Henry Stanhope, Viscount (1805-1875)—British politician and historian, Peelite, M.P.—350

Maistre, Joseph Marie, comte de (1753-1821)—French writer, monarchist, an ideologist of the aristocratic and clerical reaction.—16

Majer, Adolph (born c. 1819)—member of the Communist League, as emissary of the separatist Willich-Schapper group worked in France from the end of 1850 to 1851; defendant in the trial following the discovery of the so-called Franco-German plot in Paris in February 1852.—223, 293, 407, 414

Maleville, François Jean Léon de (1803-1879)—French politician, Orleanist, deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; Minister of the Interior (latter half of December 1848).—162

Malthus, Thomas Robert (1766-1834)—English clergyman and economist, author of a theory of population.—331, 492, 502, 549

Manteuffel, Otto Theodor, Baron von (1805-1882)—Prussian statesman, Minister of the Interior (November 1848-November 1850), Prime Minister (1850-58).—460, 473

Marat, Jean Paul (1743-1793)—a Jacobin leader in the French Revolution.—608

Marheineke, Philipp Konrad (1780-1846)—German Protestant theologian and historian of Christianity, Right-wing Hegelian.—230

Maria Cristina, senior (1806-1878)—wife of the Spanish King Ferdinand
VII, Regent of Spain from 1833 to 1840 (during the minority of her daughter Isabella II).—609

Marlowe, Christopher (1564-1593)—English poet and playwright.—604

Marrast, Armand (1801-1852)—French journalist and politician, a leader of moderate republicans, editor of Le National; in 1848 member of the Provisional Government and Mayor of Paris, President of the Constituent Assembly (1848-49).—6, 105, 114, 123


Masaniello, properly Tommaso Aniello (1620-1647)—Italian fisherman; leader of the popular revolt in July 1647 against the Spanish Viceroy of Naples.—179

Masterman, John (c. 1782-1862)—English banker and politician, Tory, M.P.—349

Mathy, Karl (1807-1868)—Baden journalist and politician, moderate liberal; deputy to the Frankfort National Assembly (Right Centre) in 1848-49.—309

Mauguin, François (1785-1854)—French lawyer and politician, a leader of the liberal dynastic opposition (until 1848); deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic (Right wing).—153, 155

Maupas, Charlemagne Émile de (1818-1888)—French lawyer, Bonapartist, Prefect of the Paris police (1851), an organiser of the coup d'état of December 2, 1851; Minister of Justice (1852-53).—177, 444

Maurice of Saxony (Moritz von Sachsen) (1696-1750)—French marshal of German descent; took part in the war for the Austrian succession (1741-48); author of theoretical works on war.—266

Maximilian II (1811-1864)—King of Bavaria (1848-64).—75

Mayerhofer, Rudolph—Deputy Minister of War in the Baden Provisional Government in 1849; sabotaged the introduction of radical military measures.—263

Mayne Reid—see Reid, Thomas Mayne

Mazzini, Giuseppe (1805-1872)—Italian revolutionary; bourgeois democrat, head of the Provisional Government of the Roman Republic in 1849; an organiser of the Central Committee of European Democracy in London in 1850; in the early 1850s sought support in Bonapartist circles; in later years became an anti-Bonapartist.—281-84, 286-88, 290-95, 297, 298, 300, 301, 303, 310, 321, 324, 354-56, 382, 465, 508, 514, 515, 532, 535, 536

Mehemet Ali (or Mohammed Ali) (1769-1849)—Ruler of Egypt (1805-49); carried out a number of progressive reforms.—491

Melanchthon, Philipp (1497-1560)—German theologian, closest associate of Martin Luther, together with whom he adapted Lutheranism to the princes' interests.—317

Melbourne, Frederick James Lamb, Viscount (1782-1853)—English diplomat, Whig.—502

Melbourne, William Lamb, Viscount (1779-1848)—English statesman, Whig, Prime Minister (1834 and 1835-41).—500, 501

Menchikoff (Menshikov), Alexander Sergeyevich, Prince (1787-1869)—Extraordinary Russian Envoy in Turkey in 1853; commander-in-chief of the Russian land and naval forces in the Crimea (1853-55).—541

Messenhauser, Caesar Wenzel (1811-1848)—Austrian army officer and
man of letters; commander of the National Guard and commandant of Vienna during the uprising in October 1848; shot after the city was seized by the Austrian troops.—60

Metternich-Winneburg, Clemens Wenzel Lothar, Prince von (1773-1859)—Austrian statesman and diplomat, Minister of Foreign Affairs (1809-21) and Chancellor (1821-48); an organiser of the Holy Alliance.—15, 26, 27, 29-32, 34, 35, 49, 54, 317

Meyen, Eduard (1812-1870)—German journalist, Young Hegelian; emigrated to England after the defeat of the 1848-49 revolution.—305-07, 312, 318-19, 322, 324

Mierosiawski, Ludwik (1814-1878)—prominent figure in the Polish national liberation movement; took part in the 1830-31 Polish insurrection, in the preparations for the 1846 uprising in the Polish lands and in the 1848-49 revolution; subsequently a leader of the moderate wing of Polish democratic emigrants; inclined towards Bonapartism.—91

Miller, Johann Martin (1750-1814)—German poet and writer, representative of sentimentalism in German literature, author of the novel Siegwart. Eine Klostergeschichte.—229, 232, 236, 241, 242, 255, 256

Milner, Gibson—see Gibson, Thomas

Mironneau, Honoré Gabriel Victor Riqueti, comte de (1749-1791)—leading figure in the French Revolution, advocate of constitutional monarchy.—608

Mockel—see Kinkel, Johanna

Molé, Louis Mathieu, comte (1781-1855)—French statesman, Orleanist, Prime Minister (1836-37 and 1837-39), deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic.—144, 168, 594

Molesworth, Sir William (1810-1855)—English statesman, Liberal, M.P., Commissioner of Public Works (1853) and Secretary of State for Colonies (1855).—473, 475

Molinari, G. de (1819-1912)—Belgian economist and journalist.—294

Monk (Monck), George, 1st Duke of Albemarle (1608-1670)—English general and statesman; at first monarchist, then general in Cromwell’s army; in 1660 helped to restore the Stuarts to power.—151

Monsell, William (1812-1894)—Irish liberal, a leader of the Irish faction in Parliament; clerk of Ordnance (1852-57).—474, 476

Montalembert, Charles Forbes René de Tryon, comte de (1810-1870)—French politician and journalist, deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic, Orleanist, leader of the Catholic circles; supported Louis Bonaparte during the coup d’état of December 2, 1851.—160, 168, 192

Montesquieu, Charles Louis de Secondat, Baron de la Brède et de (1689-1755)—French sociologist, economist and writer of the Enlightenment.—547

Moore, George Henry (1811-1870)—Irish politician and leader of the Tenant-Right movement, M.P.—477

More, Sir Thomas (1478-1535)—English politician, Lord Chancellor (1529-32), humanist writer, an early representative of utopian communism, author of Utopia.—493

Moreau, Jean Victor Marie (1763-1813)—French general; took part in the wars waged by the French Republic against the coalition of European states.—308

Morgan, Henry (d. 1853)—English needle-maker.—484, 485

Morny, Charles Auguste Louis Joseph, duc de (1811-1865)—French politician, Bonapartist, deputy to the Legislative Assembly (1849-51); an organiser of the coup d’état of December 2, 1851; Minister of the Interior (December
1851-January 1852): half-brother of Napoleon III.—196, 221, 597

Mosl, Johann Ludwig (1794-1877)—German army officer, representative of Oldenburg in the Federal Diet, imperial commissioner in Vienna (August-October 1848).—64

Mügge, Theodor (1806-1861)—German writer and journalist, Young Hegelian.—306

Müller, Christian—customs officer in Lörrach (Baden).—263, 298

Müller, Franz Joseph—legal counsellor in Cologne, conservative; father-in-law of Roland Daniels.—427-28

Müller, Johannes von (1752-1809)—Swiss conservative historian.—288, 289

Münch-Bellinghausen, Franz Theodor, Baron (b. 1787)—Prussian official, juryman in the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—400, 455

Münk, F.—German refugee in London in the early 1850s, member of the Communist League, associate of Marx and Engels.—622, 624

Münk II—German refugee in London in the early 1850s, member of the Communist League, associate of Marx and Engels.—622, 624

Murat, Napoleon Lucien Charles, Prince (1803-1878)—French politician, Bonapartist, deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; cousin of Napoleon III.—356

Napoleon I Bonaparte (1769-1821)—Emperor of the French (1804-14 and 1815).—7-8, 18, 24, 91, 103-05, 118, 149, 151, 179, 180, 184, 186, 188-93, 195, 197, 200-01, 211, 216, 222, 308, 310, 473, 515, 521, 539, 601, 607, 610


Nasmyth, James (1808-1890)—English engineer and inventor.—480

Nero (Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus) (37-68)—Roman Emperor (54-68).—601

Nette, Ludwig Heinrich (born c. 1819)—tailor from Hanover; member of a Paris community belonging, after the split in the Communist League in 1850, to the separatist Willich-Schapper group; defendant in the trial following the discovery of the so-called Franco-German plot in Paris in February 1852.—418, 457

Neumayer, Maximilian Georges Joseph (1789-1866) —French general, supporter of the Party of Order, commander of a division in Paris.—151

Newcastle, Henry-Pelham Fiennes Pelham Clinton, Duke of (1811-1864)—British statesman, Peelite, Secretary for War and the Colonies (1852-54), Secretary for War (1854-55) and Secretary for Colonies (1859-64).—370

Ney, Napoléon Henri Edgar (1812-1882)—French general, Bonapartist, aide-de-camp of President Louis Bonaparte, deputy to the Legislative Assembly (1850-51).—138

Nicolai, Christoph Friedrich (1733-1811)—German writer, publisher and bookseller, advocate of “enlightened absolutism”.—265, 271

Nitzsch, Karl Immanuel (1787-1868)—German Protestant theologian and preacher, professor of Bonn and Berlin Universities.—229

Nothjung, Peter (1821-1866)—tailor; member of the Cologne Workers’
Association and of the Communist League, defendant in the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—390, 399, 400, 402, 405

Novalis (pseudonym of Friedrich Leopold von Hardenberg) (1772-1801)—German romantic writer, author of the novel Heinrich von Ofterdingen.—237, 239, 240, 242, 244, 246, 249, 254

O'Connell, Daniel (1775-1847)—Irish lawyer and politician, leader of the liberal wing of the national liberation movement.—277, 353

O'Donnell, Maximilian, Count von (1812-1895)—aide-de-camp of Emperor Francis Joseph.—513

Oppenheim, Heinrich Bernhard (1819-1880)—German democratic politician, economist and journalist; an editor of the Berlin newspaper Die Reform in 1848; refugee in 1849 and 1850; later a national-liberal.—272, 290, 306, 307, 312, 320, 324


Orléans, Hélène Louise-Elisabeth, Duchesse d’ (1814-1858)—Princess of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, widow of Ferdinand, Louis Philippe’s eldest son; mother of the Count of Paris, pretender to the French throne.—113, 138

Osborne—see Bernal Osborne, Ralph

Oswald, Eugen (1826-1912)—German journalist, democrat; took part in the revolutionary movement in Baden in 1848-49; emigrated to England after the defeat of the revolution.—280

Otto, Carl Wunibald (born 1810)—German chemist; in 1848-49 member of the Cologne Workers’ Association; member of the Communist League; a defendant in the Cologne Communist trial (1852); sentenced to five years imprisonment.—210, 211, 402

Oudinot, Nicolas Charles Victor (1791-1863)—French general, Orleanist; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; in 1849 commanded the troops sent against the Roman Republic; tried to organise resistance to the coup d'état of December 2, 1851.—123, 132, 138

Owen, Robert (1771-1858)—English utopian socialist.—552

Oxford, Alfred Harley, Earl of (1809-1853)—English aristocrat.—502
Paulus, Heinrich Eberhard Gottlob (1761-1851)—German Protestant theologian, representative of the rationalist trend in Lutheranism.—299

Peel, Sir Robert (1788-1850)—British statesman, moderate Tory, Prime Minister (1841-46); repealed the Corn Laws in 1846.—200, 208, 332, 350, 365, 370, 371, 458, 460, 500, 518

Peel, Sir Robert (1822-1895)—British politician and diplomat, M.P.; son of the above.—523

Peene, Thomas—London physician.—527

Perceval, Dudley (1801-1856)—British public figure, Tory.—486

Perczel, Mor (1811-1899)—Hungarian general; took part in the Hungarian revolution of 1848-49; after the defeat of the revolution emigrated to Turkey and in 1851 to England.—57, 59, 61

Perrot, Benjamin Pierre (1791-1865)—French general; took part in suppressing the June 1848 uprising, commanded the Paris National Guard in 1849.—159

Persigny, Jean Gilbert Victor Fialin, comte (1808-1872)—French statesman, Bonapartist, deputy to the Legislative Assembly (1849-51); an organiser of the coup d'état of December 2, 1851; Minister of the Interior (1852-54 and 1860-63).—163, 176, 597

Peter the Cruel—King of Castile and Leon (1350-69).—602

Peter the Hermit (c. 1050-1115)—French monk and preacher, one of the leaders of the peasant forces in the First Crusade (1096-99).—313, 314

Peto, Samuel Morton (1809-1889)—English businessman, engaged in railway construction; M.P., Liberal; withdrew from public activity in 1866, when his firm went bankrupt.—575

Pfänder, Karl (c. 1818-1876)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement; painter; in 1845 emigrated to London; member of the Communist League and later of the General Council of the First International; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—622, 624

Pharnaces II (d. 47 B.C.)—King of Bosporus (from 63 B.C.).—412

Piat, Jean Pierre (1774-1862)—French general, Bonapartist, organiser and head of the Society of December 10.—149

Pieper, Wilhelm (born c. 1826)—German philologist and journalist, member of the Communist League; emigrated to London; in 1850-53, was close to Marx and Engels.—622, 624

Pierce, Franklin (1804-1869)—the fourteenth President of the USA.—522

Pierre—clerk from London.—431

Pitt, William (1759-1806)—British statesman, Tory; Prime Minister (1783-1801 and 1804-06).—469

Pius IX (Giovanni Maria Mastai-Ferretti) (1792-1878)—Pope (1846-78).—135, 138, 541

Platen (Platen-Hallermünde), August, Count von (1796-1835)—German poet and dramatist.—234

Plato (c. 427-c. 347 B.C.)—Greek philosopher.—531

Plutarch (c. 46-c. 125)—Greek writer and philosopher.—412

Poinsinet, Antoine Alexandre (1735-1769)—French dramatist; author of many comedies. He is mentioned in Diderot’s dialogue Le neveu de Rameau.—305

Polignac, Jules Auguste Armand Marie (1780-1847)—French statesman of the Restoration, Legitimist and clerical, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Prime Minister (1829-30).—168

Pope—see Pius IX

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 (1848).—134, 545, 547-59, 562, 564-67, 595, 604-07, 609-11, 612-13, 614

Pruitz, Robert Eduard (1816-1872)—German poet, journalist and historian of literature, associated with Young Hegelians.—268

Publicola (Valerius Publius, called Publicola) (d. 503 B.C.)—statesman of the Roman Republic.—104

Pythagoras (c. 571-497 B.C.)—Greek mathematician and philosopher.—307

Q

Quesnay, François (1694-1774)—French economist, founder of the school of Physiocrats; physician by profession.—547

Quétellet, Lambert Adolphe Jacques (1796-1874)—Belgian mathematician, statistician and astronomer.—497

R

Radetzky, Josef, Count of Radetz (1766-1858)—Austrian field marshal, commander of the Austrian troops in Northern Italy from 1831; in 1848-49 suppressed the Italian national liberation movement; in 1850-56 Governor-General of the Lombardian-Venetian Kingdom.—50, 56, 58, 513, 514, 532

Radowitz, Joseph Maria von (1797-1853)—Prussian general and statesman; a Right-wing leader in the Frankfurt National Assembly in 1848-49.—301

Ramorino, Gerolamo (1792-1849)—Italian general; in 1834 headed the march of revolutionary refugees to Savoy organised by Mazzini; commanded the Piedmontese army in the 1848-49 revolution in Italy and by his treacherous tactics contributed to the victory of the Austrian counter-revolutionary forces.—286

Rateau, Jean Pierre Lamotte (1800-1887)—French lawyer, Bonapartist, deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic.—121

Rath, von—Cologne manufacturer, juryman in the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—400

Rattier, François Edmond (1822-1890)—French republican, deputy to the Legislative Assembly (1849); took part in the demonstration of June 3, 1849; emigrated.—126

Raveaux, Franz (1810-1851)—German politician, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left Centre) in 1848-49; imperial commissioner in Switzerland, and one of the five Imperial regents in June 1849; member of the Baden Provisional Government; emigrated after the revolution.—324, 325

Regnault (Regnaud) de Saint-Jean d'Angély, Auguste Michel Étienne, comte (1794-1870)—French general, Bonapartist; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; War Minister (January 1851).—158

Reichenbach, Oskar, Count (b. 1815)—Silesian landowner, democrat, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (1848-49); in 1850 emigrated to England and later to America.—297, 312, 317, 319, 325, 450

Reicherzer, K.—German refugee in the USA, member of the Socialist Gymnastic Association in the early 1850s.—625

Reid, Thomas Mayne (1818-1883)—British novelist.—535

Reininger, Johann Georg.—German tailor; member of a Paris community belonging, after the split in the Communist League, to the separatist Willich-Schapper group; defendant in the trial following the discovery of the so-called Franco-German plot in Paris in February 1852.—414
Reistle, E.—German refugee in the USA, member of the Socialist Gymnastic Association in the early 1850s.—625

Rémusat, Charles François Marie, comte de (1797-1875)—French statesman and writer, Orleanist, Minister of the Interior (1840), deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic.—160

Renard—teacher of calligraphy in Cologne, expert at the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—444

Reuchlin, Johann (1455-1522)—German scientist, philologist and lawyer, prominent representative of humanism.—270

Reuter, Max—Prussian police agent in London in the early 1850s.—390, 392, 406, 449, 591

Ricardo, David (1772-1823)—English economist.—528, 531

Richard I (Richard Lionheart) (1157-1199)—King of England (1189-99).—257

Richard III (1452-1485)—King of England (1483-85).—165

Richards, Alfred Bate (1820-1876)—English playwright, journalist (wrote under the pen-name “Englishman”); came out against Cobden and the Manchester School.—534

Richelieu, Armand Jean du Plessis de (1585-1642)—French statesman in the period of absolutism, Cardinal.—545

Richmond, Charles Gordon-Lennox, Duke of (1791-1860)—British politician, Tory Protectionist.—512

Rifaat-Pasha, Sadik (1798-1855)—Turkish statesman and diplomat, Minister of Foreign Affairs (1853).—541

Rings, L. W.—member of the Communist League, in the early 1850s emigrated to London, supporter of Marx and Engels.—427-29, 434, 439, 622, 624

Rittinghausen, Moritz (1814-1890)—German democrat, contributor to the Neue Rheinische Zeitung; took part in the 1848-49 revolution; member of the Cologne Democratic Society and later of the German Social-Democratic Party.—556, 558

Robespierre, Maximilien François Marie Isidore de (1758-1794)—leader of the Jacobins in the French Revolution, head of the revolutionary government (1793-94).—103, 104, 295, 558, 559, 608

Robinson, Frederick John (Viscount Goderich, 1st Earl of Ripon) (1782-1859)—British statesman, Tory; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1823-27) and Prime Minister (1827-28).—362

Rochow, Gustav Adolf Rochus von (1792-1847)—Prussian Minister of the Interior (1834-42).—412

Roeper (Römer), Friedrich von (1794-1864)—Württemberg statesman, one of the leaders of the liberal opposition in the Lower Chamber until 1848; in 1848-49 Minister of Justice and Prime Minister of Württemberg, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly.—13, 309

Roesler, Gustav Adolf (1818-1855)—German teacher and journalist, member of the Left in the Frankfurt National Assembly (1848-49); emigrated to America in 1850.—94

Romain-Desfossés—see Desfossés, Romain Joseph

Ronge, Johannes (1813-1887)—German pastor, one of the initiators of the “German Catholics” movement, took part in the 1848-49 revolution, democrat; emigrated to England after the revolution was defeated.—270, 297-99, 302, 317, 320, 321

Rosenblum, Eduard—German student, participated in the Baden-Palatinate
uprising of 1849; emigrated after its defeat.—280

Röser, Peter Gerhard (1814-1865)—cigar-maker; prominent figure in the German working-class movement; Vice-President of the Cologne Workers’ Association (1848-49); member of the Communist League; defendant in the Cologne Communist trial (1852), was sentenced to six-year imprisonment; later joined the Lassalleans.—399, 402, 449, 457

Rothschild, Anselm Mayer (1773-1855)—head of the Rothschild banking house in Frankfort am Main.—19

Rothschild, Lionel Nathan, Baron (1808-1879)—head of the Rothschild banking house in London; Whig, M.P. (from 1858).—512, 523, 579

Rotteck, Karl Wenzeslaus Rodecker von (1775-1840)—German historian and politician, liberal.—13, 22, 262-64, 281-301

Rouher, Eugène (1814-1884)—French statesman, Bonapartist; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; Minister of Justice (1849-52, with intervals); held several government posts during the Second Empire.—154, 155, 157, 163

Rousseau, Jean Jacques (1712-1778)—French philosopher and writer of the Enlightenment.—547, 556-57, 608

Royer-Collard, Pierre Paul (1763-1845)—French philosopher and politician, advocate of constitutional monarchy.—104, 552

Ruge, Arnold (1802-1880)—German radical journalist and Young-Hegelian philosopher; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848; one of the leaders of the German petty-bourgeois refugees in England in the 1850s.—103, 260, 264-74, 278, 281-84, 290-94, 297-302, 304, 307, 309, 312, 316-18, 320-21, 323, 324, 402

Rumpf, E.—German tailor; member of the Communist League; emigrated to London in 1851, supporter of Marx and Engels.—622, 624

Ruscsák, Ignác—Hungarian tailor; democrat, associate of Kossuth.—513

Russell, John, 1st Earl (1792-1878)—British statesman, leader of the Whig Party, Prime Minister (1846-52 and 1865-66) and Foreign Secretary (1852-53 and 1859-65).—205, 207-08, 331, 338, 349, 370-76, 458, 471, 475, 477, 499, 506, 510-11, 516, 520, 522-23

S

Sack, Karl Heinrich (1789-1875)—German Protestant theologian, professor in Bonn, advocate of religious orthodoxy.—229

Sadleir, John (1814-1856)—Irish banker and politician, a leader of the Irish group in Parliament, Junior Lord of the Treasury in 1853.—474, 475, 477, 486, 504

Saedt, Otto Joseph Arnold (1816-1886)—Prussian legal official, Public Prosecutor in Cologne from 1848, prosecutor in the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—384, 386, 392, 399, 401, 402, 415, 419, 429, 443, 453-56

Saffi, Aurelio (1819-1890)—Italian writer and prominent figure in the national liberation movement, associate of Mazzini; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Italy; emigrated to England in 1851.—536

Saint-Arnaud, Armand Jacques Leroy de (1801-1854)—French general, from 1852 marshal, Bonapartist; War Minister (1851-54); one of the organizers of the coup d’etat of December 2, 1851.—123, 596

Saint-Arnaud, Armand Jacques Leroy de, 3rd Earl of St. Germans (1798-1877)—British statesman, Peelite, Chief Secretary for Ireland (1841-45) and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1852-55).—370
Saint-Jean d'Angély—see Regnault (Regnaud) de Saint-Jean d'Angély, Auguste Michel Étienne

Saint-Just, Antoine Louis Léon de Richebourg de (1767-1794)—a Jacobin leader in the French Revolution.—104

Saint-Priest, Emmanuel Louis Marie de Guignard, vicomte de (1789-1881)—French general and diplomat, Legitimist, deputy to the Legislative Assembly (1849-51).—166

Saint-Simon, Claude Henri de Rouvroy, comte de (1760-1825)—French Utopian socialist.—20, 557

Saint-Beuve, Pierre Henri (1819-1855)—French manufacturer and landowner, advocate of free trade; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic, representative of the Party of Order.—171

Salandrouze de Lamornais, Charles Jean (1808-1867)—French industrialist, deputy to the Constituent Assembly (1848-49); supported Louis Bonaparte during the coup d'état of December 2, 1851.—179

Salvandy, Narcisse Achille, comte de (1795-1856)—French writer and statesman, Orleanist, Minister of Education (1837-38 and 1845-48).—166

Sandy, Mary Ann (c. 1810-1853)—English working woman.—527

Saul—first King of Israel (c. 1025 B.C.).—285

Say, Jean Baptiste (1767-1832)—French economist, one of the founders of the “three production factors” theory, an apologia of capitalist exploitation.—104

Schabelitz—Swiss publisher and bookseller; father of Jacob Schabelitz.—537

Schabelitz, Jacob (1827-1899)—Swiss publisher and bookseller, member of the Fraternal Democrats society from 1846, member of the Communist League; maintained contacts with Marx and Engels in the late 1840s and the early 1850s.—537

Schapper, Karl (c. 1812-1870)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement, one of the leaders of the League of the Just, member of the Communist League Central Authority; participant in the 1848-49 revolution; after the revolution one of the leaders of the separatist group that split away from the Communist League in 1850; later a member of the General Council of the First International.—223, 293, 295, 402, 403, 404, 406, 407, 410, 413-16, 420, 445, 449, 451

Schärtner, August—cooper in Hanau, active in the 1848 revolution and the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; emigrated to London; member of the Communist League; after its split in 1850 joined the separatist Willich-Schapper group and became a member of its Central Authority.—293, 305, 451

Schiller, Johann Christoph Friedrich von (1759-1805)—German poet, dramatist, historian and philosopher.—150, 156, 239, 455

Schimmelpennig, Alexander (1824-1865)—Prussian officer, democrat, participant in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; emigrated, joined the separatist Willich-Schapper group; took part in the American Civil War on the side of the Northerners.—290, 312, 316, 317, 319

Schinderhannes—see Bückler, Johann

Schönbach, Carl Arnold (1807-1866)—German poet, friend of Gottfried Kinkel.—244

Schlössing, Marie—Berlin acquaintance of Gottfried Kinkel.—234

Schmidt—see Fleury, Charles

Schmitz, Th.—private secretary in Cologne, witness for the defence in the
Cologne Communist trial (1852).—427, 429

Schnauffer, Karl Heinrich (c. 1823-1854)—German poet and journalist, democrat; took part in the 1848-49 revolutionary movement in Baden; emigrated after the revolution.—280

Schneider II, Karl—German lawyer, democrat; in 1848, President of the Cologne Democratic Society and member of the Rhenish District Committee of Democrats; counsel for the defence in the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—386, 417, 427, 434, 435, 436, 437, 442, 445, 590, 591

Scholefield, William (1809-1867)—British radical, M.P.—522

Schramm, Jean Paul Adam, comte de (1789-1884)—French general and politician, Bonapartist, Minister of War (October 1850-January 1851).—152, 157

Schramm, Konrad (c. 1822-1858)—active figure in the German working-class movement, member of the Communist League; emigrated to London in 1849, responsible editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Politisch-ökonomische Revue; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—415, 416

Schramm, Rudolf (1813-1882)—German journalist, democrat, deputy to the Prussian National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848; emigrated to England after the revolution; opponent of Marx; supporter of Bismarck in the 1860s.—260, 261, 264, 274, 294, 297, 321, 324

Schulte, J. L.—German refugee in the USA, member of the Socialist Gymnastic Association in the early 1850s.—625

Schultz (d. 1852)—chief of police in Cologne, an organiser of the Cologne Communist trial of 1852.—400, 426, 444, 454

Schurz, Karl (1829-1906)—German democrat, active in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; emigrated to Switzerland; later US statesman.—243, 257, 290, 293, 312, 316-21, 325

Schütz, Jacob Friedrich (1813-1877)—German democrat; took part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; representative of the Baden Provisional Government in Paris; later emigrated to England.—272

Schwarzenberg, Felix, Prince zu (1800-1852)—Austrian conservative statesman and diplomat; Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs (from November 1848 to 1852).—34

Schwarzer, Ernst (1808-1860)—Austrian official and journalist, Minister of Public Works (from July to September 1848).—56

Schwezler von Lecton—widow of an official in Frankfurt am Main.—435

Scott, Sir Walter (1771-1832)—Scottish writer.—600

Seckendorf, August Heinrich Edward Friedrich, Baron von (1807-1885)—Prussian legal official, member of the Lower Chamber (Centre) in 1849; public prosecutor in the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—392, 399, 401, 402, 419, 429, 433, 455, 456

Shadwell—revising barrister for Middlesex in the early 1850s.—367

Shakespeare, William (1564-1616)—English dramatist and poet.—149, 185, 307, 600

Shelley, John Villiers (1808-1867)—British M.P., Free Trader.—533

Sheridan, Richard Brinsley (1751-1816)—English playwright and politician.—600

Sigel, Albert (1827-1884)—Baden officer, journalist; democrat; took part in the Baden revolutionary movement of 1848-49; emigrated to the
USA in 1853; took part in the American Civil War on the side of the Northerners.—321, 324

Sigel (Siegel), Franz (1824-1902)—Baden officer, democrat, one of the military leaders of the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; refugee in Switzerland, England and, from 1852, in the USA; took part in the American Civil War on the side of the Northerners.—91, 305, 308, 310, 311, 316, 317, 320, 321, 323-24

Simon, Ludwig (1810-1872)—German democrat, lawyer, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848-49; one of the five Imperial regents in June 1849; emigrated to Switzerland.—324

Sismondi, Jean Charles Léonard Sismonde de (1773-1842) —Swiss economist, representative of economic romanticism.—492, 529, 531

Smith, Adam (1723-1790) —Scottish economist.—491, 547, 579

Socrates (c. 469-399 B.C.) —Greek philosopher.—262

Somers, Robert (1822-1891) —British bourgeois journalist.—494

Somerville, Sir William Meredyth (1802-1873)—British statesman, Whig, Chief Secretary for Ireland (1847-52).—350

Soulouque, Faustin (c. 1782-1867) —President of the Republic of Haiti (1849-59); proclaimed himself Emperor of Haiti in 1849 under the name of Faustin I.—196

Spiess, Christian Heinrich (1755-1799) —German writer, author of entertaining novels.—237

Spooner, Richard (1783-1864) —British banker and politician, Tory, M.P. —522

Stadion, Franz, Count von (1806-1853) —Austrian statesman, Minister of the Interior (1848-49).—65

Stafford, George Granville Leveson-Gower, 1st Duke of Sutherland from 1833, Marquis (1758-1833)—big Scottish landowner.—492

Stahr, Adolf Wilhelm Theodor (1805-1876) —German writer, author of historical novels and works dealing with the history of art and literature.—256

Stechan, Gottlieb Ludwig (born c. 1814)—joiner from Hanover; member of the Communist League, belonged to the separatist Willich-Schapper group but in December 1851 went over to Marx and Engels; from January 1852 he headed the Workers' Society in London.—427

Stein, Lorenz von (1815-1890) —German lawyer and historian, author of works on the socialist movement, advocate of “social monarchy”.—455, 456

Steingens, Luithert (Suithert) Heinrich Hermann (born c. 1817) —German house-painter; emigrated to Brussels, member of the Communist League; after the split in the League in 1850 joined the separatist Willich-Schapper group; witness for the prosecution in the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—424, 450

Stephens, Joseph Rayner (1805-1879) —English clergyman; took an active part in the Chartist movement in Lancashire in 1837-39.—525

Stewart, Sir Huston, afterwards Denham (1712-1780) —British economist, one of the last representatives of mercantilism.—491

Stewart, Sir James, afterwards Denham (1712-1780) —British economist, one of the last representatives of mercantilism.—491

Stieber, Wilhelm (1818-1882) —Prussian police officer, an organiser of and chief witness for the prosecution in the Cologne Communist trial (1852); together with Wermuth he wrote the book Die Kommunisten-Verschwörungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts; in later years chief of the Prussian political
police.—380, 385, 386, 390, 391, 392, 400-02, 405-25, 427-38, 441, 444-45, 449, 453-55, 590, 591

Stirner, Max (real name Schmidt, Johann Caspar) (1806-1856) — German Young Hegelian philosopher, an idealist of individualism and anarchism.—270, 551, 557, 563

Strassoldo, Julius Cäsar, Count (1791-1855) — Austrian general; took part in suppressing the national liberation movement in Italy in 1848-49; in 1853 commanded a division stationed in Milan.—513

Strauss, David Friedrich (1808-1874) — German Young Hegelian philosopher and writer.—247, 265

Strodtmann, Adolf (1829-1879) — German liberal politician, Minister of the Interior of Hanover (1848-50).—13

Sue, Eugène Marie Joseph (1804-1857) — French writer, author of sentimental novels dealing with social problems.—145, 442, 600

Sutherland, Elisabeth Leveson-Gower, Marchioness Stafford, Countess, Duchess from 1833 (1765-1839) — big Scottish landowner; wife of Marquis Stafford.—491-94

Sutherland, Harriet Elisabeth Georgiana Leveson-Gower, Duchess (1806-1868) — big Scottish landowner, Whig, daughter-in-law of the above.—486, 487, 493

Szemere, Bartholomäus (Bertalan) (1812-1869) — Hungarian politician and journalist; Minister of the Interior and head of the revolutionary government (1849); fled from Hungary after the defeat of the revolution.—515, 532

T
Tacitus, Cornelius (c. 55-c. 120) — Roman historian and orator.—283, 503

Talleyrand-Périgord, Charles Maurice de (1754-1838) — French diplomat, Minister of Foreign Affairs (1797-99, 1799-1807 and 1814-15).—317

Tausenau, Karl (1808-1873) — Austrian democrat, head of the Central Committee of the Democratic Societies of Vienna during the 1848 revolution; emigrated to London in 1849.—297, 317-19, 323-24

Techow, Gustav Adolf (1813-1893) — Prussian officer, democrat, participant in the revolutionary events of 1848 in Berlin, Chief of the General Staff of the Palatinate revolutionary army; emigrated to Switzerland after the revolution and became a leader of the refugee organisation called Revolutionary Centralisation; in 1852
he went to Australia.—290, 312, 316, 317

Thiers, Louis Adolphe (1797-1877)—French historian and statesman, Prime Minister (1836, 1840), deputy to the Constituent Assembly (1848); after 1848, head of the Orleanists; organised the suppression of the Paris Commune (1871); President of the Republic (1871-73).—123, 129, 131, 134, 144, 160, 167-68, 171, 173, 180, 518

Thompson, Thomas Perronet (1783-1869)—British politician and economist, Free Trader.—350

Thorigny, Pierre François Elisabeth Leul- tion de (1798-1869)—French lawyer; in 1834 conducted the investigation into the April uprising in Lyons; Bonapartist, Minister of the Interior (1851).—177

Tietz, Friedrich Wilhelm (born c. 1823)—German tailor, member of the Communist League; joined the separatist Willich-Schapper group when the League split up in 1850.—414

Timur (Tamerlane) (1336-1405)—Central Asian soldier and conqueror, founder of a vast state in the East.—602

Titus (Titus Flavius Sabinus Vespasianus) (born c. 41-81)—Roman Emperor (79-81).—608

Toqueville, Alexis Charles Henri Maurice Clérel de (1805-1859)—French liberal historian and politician, Legitimist, advocate of constitutional monarchy, deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic, Minister of Foreign Affairs (June-October 1849).—168

Tooke, Thomas (1774-1858)—English economist, adherent of the classical school of political economy.—362

Torrington, George Byng, Viscount (1812-1884)—British statesman, Whig, M.P., Governor of Ceylon (1847-50).—340

Trollope, John (b. 1800)—British politician, M.P.—533

Tyrconnel, John Delaval Carpenter, Earl (c. 1790-1853)—English aristocrat.—502

Ulmer, Johann—member of the Communist League, refugee in London in the early 1850s, supporter of Marx and Engels.—428, 439, 622, 624

Vaisse, Claude Marius (1799-1864)—French statesman, Bonapartist, Minister of the Interior (January-April 1851).—162

Vatimesnil, Antoine François Henri Lefebvre de (1789-1860)—French statesman, Legitimist, Minister of Education (1828-30), deputy to the Legislative Assembly (1849-51).—162

Venedey, Jakob (1805-1871)—German radical journalist and politician, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848; liberal after the 1848-49 revolution.—277

Verity, E.A.—English clergyman.—526

Véron, Louis Désiré (1798-1867)—French journalist and politician, up to 1848 Orleanist, then Bonapartist; owner and publisher of Le Constitutionnel (1844-52).—196

Vetter, Antal (Doggenfeldi) (1803-1882)—Hungarian general, in 1848-49 an associate of Kossuth; emigrated after the defeat of the revolution.—354

Victoria (1819-1901)—Queen of Great Britain and Ireland (1837-1901).—469, 498, 529

Vidal, François (1814-1872)—French economist, petty-bourgeois socialist, Secretary of the Luxembourg Com-
mission in 1848, deputy to the Legislative Assembly (1850-51).—144

Vidil, Jules—French officer, socialist, member of the Committee of the French society of Blanquist emigrants in London; after the split in the Communist League in 1850 he was associated with the separatist Willich-Schapper group.—295-96

Vieyra—French colonel, Chief of Staff of the National Guard in 1851; Bonapartist, played an active part in the coup d'état of December 2, 1851.—135

Villèle, Jean Baptiste Séraphin Joseph, comte de (1773-1854)—French statesman of the Restoration, Legitimist, Prime Minister (1822-28).—168

Villiers, Charles Pelham (1802-1898)—British politician and lawyer, Free Trader, M.P.—458, 475

Visconti—see Arconati Visconti, Constanza, Marquise

Vogt, Karl (1817-1895)—German natural scientist, materialist, petty-bourgeois democrat; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848-49; one of the five Imperial regents in June 1849; emigrated in 1849; was exposed by Marx as an agent of Louis Bonaparte in his work Herr Vogt (1860).—86

Voltaire, François Marie Arouet (1694-1778)—French philosopher, writer and historian of the Enlightenment.—307

W

Wakefield, Edward Gibbon (1796-1862)—British journalist, statesman, economist, author of a theory of colonisation.—475

Waldeck, Benedikt Franz Leo (1802-1870)—German lawyer and radical politician; in 1848 Vice-President of the Prussian National Assembly and one of the leaders of its Left wing; subsequently a leader in the Progressist Party.—295

Walther the Pauper—see Gauthier

Walpole, Spencer Horatio (1806-1898)—British statesman, Tory, Home Secretary (1852, 1858-59 and 1866-67).—460

Ward, Henry George (1797-1860)—British colonial official, Whig; Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands (1849-55), Governor of Ceylon (1855-60) and Madras (1860).—340

Weiss, Johann Gottlieb Christian (1790-1853)—German actor and producer.—234

Welcker, Karl Theodor (1790-1869)—German lawyer and liberal writer; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Right Centre) in 1848-49.—13, 22, 64, 262, 281, 285

Wellington, Arthur Wellesley, 1st Duke of (1769-1852)—British general and statesman, Tory, Prime Minister (1828-30 and 1852-55) and Foreign Secretary (December 1834-April 1835).—198, 366, 368

Wellington, Arthur Richard Wellesley, Marquis of Douro, Duke of (1807-1884)—British politician, Tory; son of the above.—368

Wenckstern, Otto von (1819-1869)—German journalist, member of the Times editorial office in the early 1850s; Prussian spy in London.—540

Wermuth—chief of police in Hanover, an organiser of and witness for the prosecution in the Cologne Communist trial (1852); together with Stieber he wrote the book Die Kommunisten-Verschwörungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts.—401, 423, 437, 444

Westphalen, Ferdinand Otto Wilhelm Henning von (1799-1876) —Prussian statesman, Minister of the Interior (1850-58), stepbrother of Jenny Marx, Karl Marx's wife.—515

Wigand, Otto (1795-1870)—German publisher and bookseller, owner of a firm in Leipzig which published works by radical writers.—270, 272
William I (1781-1864)—King of Württemberg (1816-64).—85

William I (1797-1888)—Prince of Prussia, King of Prussia (1861-88) and German Emperor (1871-88).—323

William IV (1765-1837)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1830-37).—540

Williams, Zephaniah (c. 1794-1874)—Chartist, an organiser of the miners' revolt in Wales in 1839, sentenced to life deportation to Australia.—340, 374

Willich, August (1810-1878)—Prussian officer who left the service on political grounds; member of the Communist League, participant in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; one of the leaders of the separatist group that split away from the Communist League in 1850; in 1853 emigrated to the USA, took part in the American Civil War on the side of the Northerners.—223, 253, 293, 300, 301, 304, 312, 314-17, 320-23, 325, 402, 403, 404, 406, 407, 410, 412, 414-15, 420, 445, 449-52, 590

Willisen, Karl Wilhelm, Baron von (1790-1879)—Prussian general and military theoretician; royal commissioner in Posen (1848); in 1850 commanded the Schleswig-Holstein army in the war against Denmark.—313

Wilson, George (1808-1870)—British manufacturer and politician, Free Trader, President of the Anti-Corn Law League (1841-46).—505

Windischgrätz, Alfred, Prince (1787-1862)—Austrian field marshal; in 1848 commanded the troops which crushed the uprisings in Prague and Vienna; in 1848-49 led the Austrian army against the Hungarian revolution.—48, 55, 57, 59, 65, 272

Winkelblech, Karl Georg (1810-1865)—German economist, advocate of "federal socialism", which called for the restoration of the guilds.—249

Winkelried, Arnold von (d. 1386)—semilegendarious hero of the Swiss war of liberation against the Habsburgs; legend has it that he sacrificed his life to secure victory over Duke Leopold of Austria in the battle of Sempach (1386).—274, 304

Wiss, C.—German physician and journalist, Young Hegelian, emigrated to the USA in the early 1850s.—303

Wolff, Ferdinand (1812-1895)—German journalist, member of the Brussels Communist Correspondence Committee (1846-47) and the Communist League, an editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung (1848-49); emigrated after the 1848-49 revolution; associate of Marx and Engels; later withdrew from all political activity.—622, 624

Wolff, Wilhelm (Lupus) (1809-1864)—German proletarian revolutionary, teacher, prominent in the Communist League; an editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung (1848-49); friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—87, 93, 378, 379, 384-87, 433, 622, 624

Wolfram von Eschenbach (c. 1170-1220)—German poet, author of Parzival, a poem of chivalry.—234

Wood, Sir Charles, 1st Viscount Halifax (1800-1885)—British statesman, Whig, Chancellor of the Exchequer (1846-52), President of the Board of Control of Indian Affairs (1852-55), First Lord of the Admiralty (1855-58) and Secretary for India (1859-66).—337-38, 340, 467-69, 476, 499, 517, 523

Woolf, Arthur (1766-1837)—English engineer and inventor.—480

Wordsworth, William (1770-1850)—English poet.—600

Wrangel, Friedrich Heinrich Ernst, Count von (1784-1877)—Prussian general; one of the leaders of the counter-revolutionary coup d'état in Prussia and active participant in the dissolu-
INDEX OF LITERARY AND MYTHOLOGICAL NAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achilles</td>
<td>hero of Homer’s <em>Iliad</em>; in Greek mythology, one of the Greek leaders in the Trojan War.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam (Bib.)</td>
<td>—Adam’s elder son who killed his brother Abel out of envy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahriman</td>
<td>Greek name of the ancient Persian god Ahromayus, the god of darkness and evil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcina</td>
<td>a wicked enchantress in Ariosto’s poem <em>L’Orlando furioso</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelica</td>
<td>a character in Ariosto’s <em>L’Orlando furioso</em> and in Boiardo’s <em>Orlando innamorato</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antaeus (Gr. myth.)</td>
<td>—a giant, who was invincible as long as he touched the earth, his mother; was vanquished by Heracles, who tore him off from the earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astolf</td>
<td>—a character in Ariosto’s <em>L’Orlando furioso</em> and in Boiardo’s <em>Orlando innamorato</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augeas, Augeias or Augias (Gr. myth.)</td>
<td>—King of Elis, at whose order Heracles performed one of his exploits— cleaned his stables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacchus</td>
<td>sec Dionysus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom</td>
<td>—a character in Shakespeare’s comedy <em>A Midsummer Night’s Dream</em>, a dull and self-confident weaver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brava</td>
<td>—a character in Boiardo’s <em>Orlando innamorato</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brute</td>
<td>—a character in Shakespeare’s drama <em>Julius Caesar</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zabel, Friedrich (1802-1875)</td>
<td>—German liberal journalist, editor of the Berlin National-Zeitung (1848-75).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeller, Elise</td>
<td>—sister of Paul Zeller.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeller, Paul</td>
<td>—student of Bonn University in 1834, friend of Gottfried Kinkel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casserina (Gr. myth.)</td>
<td>—a daughter of Priam (King of Troy), prophetess, Agamemnon’s niece, a character in Aeschylus’ tragedy Agamemnon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charon</td>
<td>—a Greek name of the ancient Persian god Charon, the god of the underworld.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ, Jesus (Bib.)</td>
<td>—107, 232, 242, 243, 254, 255, 257, 287.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circe</td>
<td>—a sorceress in Homer’s <em>Odyssey</em> who turned Odysseus’ companions into swine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crevel</td>
<td>—a character in Balzac’s novel <em>Cousine Bette</em>, an upstart, money-grubber and libertine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damocles</td>
<td>—according to Greek legend, a courtier of the Syracusean tyrant Dionysius (4th cent. B.C.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David (Bib.)</td>
<td>—King of Israel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionysus (Bacchus)</td>
<td>(Gr. myth.)—god of wine and mirth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Quixote</td>
<td>—the title character in Cervantes’ novel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elijah (Bib.)</td>
<td>—231-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>(Bib.).—193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faust</td>
<td>—hero of a medieval German legend, the title character in Goethe’s tragedy and Marlowe’s play <em>The Tragi-cal History of Doctor Faustus</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figaro—the main character in Beaumarchais’ comedy La folle journée, ou le mariage de Figaro.—414

Fleur de Marie—heroine in Eugène Sue’s novel Les Mystères de Paris, a girl who grew up among criminals but preserved her purity and noble-mindedness; Sue gave her the name of lily, a flower which grows in dirty swamps but has snow-white petals.—442

Habakkuk (Bib.)—a prophet.—105

Hecuba (Gr. Hekabe)—wife of the Trojan King Priam, mother of Hector and Paris.—235

Hudibras—the title character in Samuel Butler’s satirical poem, a man inclined to meaningless arguments and debates and capable of proving the most absurd propositions with the help of syllogisms.—486

Israel (Bib.).—231, 232

Janus (Rom. myth.)—god represented with two faces looking in opposite directions.—309

Jehovah (Bib.).—608

Jeremiah (Bib.)—a prophet who in his Lamentations mourns the destruction of Jerusalem.—297

Jesus—see Christ, Jesus

Jobs—hero of Karl Arnold Kortum’s Die Jobsiade. Ein komisches Heldengedicht, a satirical poem popular in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.—283

John Bull—the title character in John Arbuthnot’s book The History of John Bull (18th cent.). His name is often used to personify England.—198

Jonah (Bib.).—412

Judas (Bib.)—the apostle who betrayed Christ for thirty silver coins.—303

Jupiter (Jove)—supreme god of the Romans, corresponding to the Greek god Zeus.—235

Krapulinski (Crapulinski)—one of the main characters in Heine’s poem Zwei Ritter, a spendthrift Polish nobleman (the name comes from the French word crapule meaning gluttony, hard drinking as well as base scoundrel, idler).—112, 620

Lorelei—heroine of a popular legend which was widely used by German poets; a synonym of baneful, indifferent beauty.—245

Mahadeva (Mahadō)—“great god”, the nickname of Shiva, one of the chief Indian gods.—235

Mammon—wealth or the idol of wealth among some ancient peoples.—514

Mary (Bib.).—232, 237

Matthew (Bib.)—one of the four evangelists.—106, 141, 196, 406

Mephistopheles—a character in Goethe’s tragedy Faust and Marlowe’s play The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus.—230, 604-05

Methuselah—a Biblical patriarch who is stated to have lived 969 years; his name is a synonym of longevity.—500, 538

Moor, Karl—hero of Schiller’s drama Die Räuber.—419

Moses (Bib.).—171, 449, 575

Narcissus (Gr. myth.)—a handsome youth who fell in love with his own reflection in the water; figuratively: a man absorbed in his own personal perfections.—233

Nestor (Gr. myth.)—the oldest and wisest of the Greek heroes who took part in the Trojan War.—372

Noah (Bib.).—230, 232

Odysseus—the title character in Homer’s poem.—64, 258

Ofterdingen, Heinrich von—the title character in Novalis’ unfinished novel, a romantic poet who spent his life in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schlemihl, Peter</td>
<td>a character in Chamisso's story Peter Schlemihls wundersame Geschichte who exchanged his shadow for a magic purse. — 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schufterle and Spiegelberg</td>
<td>characters in Schiller's Die Räuber, ruthless robbers and murderers. — 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scylla and Charybdis</td>
<td>two female monsters living on either side of narrow straits (Gibraltar) and bringing death to all mariners. — 581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silenus (Gr. myth.)</td>
<td>an attendant of Dionysus (god of wine and mirth). — 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>see Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stilling</td>
<td>hero of Jung-Stilling's hypocritical autobiographical novel Jugendjahre. — 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tartuffe</td>
<td>the title character in Molière's comedy. — 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thetis (Gr. myth.)</td>
<td>sea goddess, mother of Achilles. — 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>according to Biblical tradition, an apostle of Christ who refused to believe his resurrection and was called the doubting Thomas. — 421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turpin</td>
<td>a character in Boiardo's Orlando innamorato. — 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wacht, Johannes</td>
<td>hero of Hoffmann's story Meister Johannes Wacht. — 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>a character in Goethe's Faust, a pedantic, narrow-minded scholar. — 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werther</td>
<td>hero of Goethe's novel Die Leiden des jungen Werthers. — 256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*search for the "blue flower", the symbol of ideal poetry.— 237, 239, 240, 242, 244, 246, 248, 254

*Old Mother Goose* — a character in English nursery rhymes and tales. — 350

*Orlando* — hero of Ariosto's poem L'Orlando furioso and Boiardo's Orlando innamorato. — 310, 315

*Pandora* — a character in Greek mythology who, out of curiosity, opened a box which contained all human evils and let them out. — 521

*Paul* — according to Biblical tradition, a Christian apostle; before his conversion to Christianity he was called Saul. — 93, 104, 193

*Perceval* (Percival) — hero of several medieval poems; a knight who went in search for the Holy Grail; after accomplishing a number of feats he became its guardian. — 326

*Peter* — according to Biblical tradition, a Christian apostle; before his conversion to Christianity he was called Simon. — 193

*Pistol* — a character in Shakespeare's The Merry Wives of Windsor, King Henry IV (Part Two) and King Henry V; an idler, braggart and liar. — 307

*Priam* (Gr. myth.) — King of Troy. — 235

*Rodomonte* — a character in Ariosto's poem L'Orlando furioso, a boastful knight. — 274, 275, 302, 303, 323

*Sancho Panza* — a character in Cervantes' Don Quixote. — 64, 315

*Saucissard* — a character in Paul de Kock's L'amant de la lune. — 269

*Saul* — see Paul
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Manchester Times—see Examiner and Times

Mannheimer Abendzeitung—a radical daily founded in 1842 by Karl Grün, who soon afterwards became representative of “true socialism”. It existed until the end of 1848.—278, 306

Le Messager de l'Assemblée—an anti-Bonapartist daily published in Paris from February 16 to December 2, 1851.—176

Le Moniteur universel—a daily newspaper published in Paris from 1789 to 1901; official organ of the government (1799-1814, 1816-68).—123, 148, 152, 158, 159, 161, 168, 180, 509, 533, 596

The Morning Advertiser—a London daily published from 1794 to 1934; organ of the radical bourgeoisie in the 1850s.—273, 379, 380, 381, 384, 387, 433, 444, 469, 474, 495, 500, 503, 532

The Morning Chronicle—a London daily published from 1770 to 1862, organ of the Whigs; in the early 1850s, organ of the Peelites and later of the Conservatives.—297, 353, 369, 371, 453, 469, 486, 515

The Morning Herald—a London conservative daily published from 1780 to 1869.—369, 373, 374, 469, 474, 486, 498

The Morning Post—a London conservative daily published from 1772 to 1937: in the
mid-nineteenth century it was the mouthpiece of the Right wing of the Whig Party grouped around Palmerston.—370, 371, 469, 532, 536, 538

La Nation, organe quotidien démocrate socialiste—a newspaper of Belgian petty-bourgeois democrats published in Brussels from 1848 to 1856.—509

Le National—a Paris daily published from 1830 to 1851; organ of the moderate republicans in the 1840s.—112, 113, 119, 120, 145

National-Zeitung—a Berlin daily published from 1848 to 1915; in the 1850s it followed a liberal line.—103, 435, 436

Neue Preussische Zeitung—a Berlin conservative daily published from June 1848, organ of the Prussian Junkers and Court circles. It was also known as the Kreuz-Zeitung because the heading contained a cross bearing the device “Forward with God for King and Fatherland!”—272, 307, 378, 436, 515

Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Organ der Demokratie—a daily newspaper, organ of the revolutionary proletarian democrats during the German revolution of 1848-49; it was published in Cologne under Marx’s editorship from June 1, 1848 to May 19, 1849 (with an interval from September 27 to October 12, 1848).—63, 87, 93, 435, 438


New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung—a weekly founded in New York in 1852 by German petty-bourgeois refugees. From March 18, 1853 to March 10, 1854 it appeared under the title Belletristisches Journal und New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung.—625

New-Yorker Deutsche Zeitung, herausgegeben von Freunden des Fortschritts—a daily newspaper published in 1851 by Karl Heinzen, organ of the German petty-bourgeois refugees in the USA.—311, 323, 325

New-Yorker Staatszeitung—a German democratic daily founded in New York in 1834; later an organ of the US Democratic Party.—303, 311

Northampton Mercury—an English provincial newspaper.—484

Notes to the People—a Chartist weekly edited by Ernest Jones and published in London in 1851 and 1852; Marx and Engels supported the journal, took part in editing and publishing it, and printed a number of articles in it between June 1851 and April 1852.—212, 222, 581, 589

Oesterreichische Correspondenz—a semi-official lithographed organ of the Austrian Government; it appeared under this title in Vienna from 1850 to 1863.—538

La Patrie. Journal du commerce, de l’agriculture, de l’industrie, de la littérature, des sciences et des arts—a Paris daily published from 1841; in 1850 it spoke for the Party of Order (the monarchist bourgeoisie) and later took a Bonapartist stand.—137, 294, 295, 296
The People's Paper—a Chartist weekly founded by Ernest Jones in London in May 1852. From October 1852 to December 1856 Marx and Engels contributed to the newspaper and also helped to edit it.—332, 333, 341, 343, 347, 353, 366, 367, 379, 381, 433, 474, 494, 528, 532, 534, 590, 620

Le Père Duchesne—a newspaper published in Paris from 1790 to 1794 by Jacques Hébert; it expressed the views of the urban semi-proletarian masses during the French Revolution.—608

Le Peuple de 1850—a socio-reformist newspaper published in Paris; from April 1848 it appeared under the title Le Représentant du Peuple; from September 1848 to June 13, 1849, under the title Le Peuple; from October 1, 1849 to May 14, 1850, under the title La Voix du Peuple, and from June 15 to October 13, 1850, under the title Le Peuple de 1850. Its editor was Proudhon.—134

Poole and Dorsetshire Weekly Herald—an English provincial newspaper.—343

Potteries' Free Press—a newspaper published in Stoke on Trent from February to April 1853.—540

La Presse—a daily published in Paris from 1836 to 1866; in the 1840s, mouthpiece for the opposition to the July monarchy; organ of the moderate republicans in 1848-49, later a Bonapartist paper.—145, 597

Preussische Lithographische Correspondenz—a semi-official organ of the Prussian Ministry for Foreign Affairs published in Berlin.—318

Le Proscrit. Journal de la République universelle—a monthly published in Paris in 1850, organ of the Central Committee of European Democracy. Only two issues appeared. In late October 1850 it was turned into a weekly which was published under the title La Voix du Proscrit in Saint-Amand (France) till September 1851.—134, 281

Punch, or the London Charivari—a comic weekly paper of a liberal trend, founded in London in 1841.—540

Racing Times—a sports journal founded in London in 1851.—540

Die Reform. Organ der demokratischen Partei—a newspaper published by Arnold Ruge and Heinrich Bernhard Oppenheim and edited by Eduard Meyen, organ of the petty-bourgeois democrats; it appeared in Leipzig and Berlin from April 1848, and in Berlin from the summer of 1848 to the early 1850s.—271, 272

La Réforme—a daily newspaper published in Paris from 1843 to 1850, organ of the republican democrats and petty-bourgeois socialists.—132, 271

Republikanisches Regierungs-Blatt. Deutsche Republik! Wohlstand, Bildung, Freiheit für Alle!—an organ of the petty-bourgeois democrats published by Gustav Struve and Karl Blind in Lorrach during the second Baden uprising in September 1848.—263

Die Revolution—a communist journal published in New York in 1852 by Joseph Weydemeyer. On January 6 and 13 two weekly issues appeared; in May and June two “non-periodic” issues appeared.—100-01, 597

Rheinische Zeitung für Politik, Handel und Gewerbe—a daily founded on January 1, 1842, organ of the Rhenish bourgeois opposition. It was published in Cologne till March 31, 1843. From October 15, 1842 to March 17, 1843 it was edited by Marx and assumed a strongly pronounced revolutionary-democratic complexion, which led to its suppression. Engels was one of its contributors.—18
Schnellpost—see Deutsche Schnellpost für Europäische Zustände, öffentliches und soziales Leben Deutschlands

Seeblätter—a newspaper published in Konstanz (Baden) in South Germany.—309


The Spectator—a weekly published in London since 1828; originally liberal, later conservative.—353, 379, 433

Staatszeitung—see New-Yorker Staatszeitung

The Sun—a liberal daily published in London from 1798 to 1876.—483

The Tablet—a Catholic weekly published in London since 1840.—477

Tages-Chronik—a democratic newspaper published in Bremen from 1849 to 1851. It was edited by Rudolph Dulong. From January 1851 it appeared under the title Bremer Tages-Chronik. Organ der Demokratie. Arnold Ruge contributed to it in 1851.—281, 290, 293, 298, 304


Tribune—see New-York Daily Tribune

L'Univers religieux, philosophique, politique, scientifique et littéraire—a clerical newspaper founded in Paris in 1833; in the 1850s it supported Bonaparte.—504

La Voix du Proscrit—a weekly of the Central Committee of European Democracy published in Saint-Amand (France) from late October 1850 to September 1851; it was the continuation of Le Proscrit (q.v.).—283

Wecker—see Baltimore Wecker

The Weekly Dispatch—a London newspaper published under this title from 1801 to 1928; in the 1850s it was radical.—212

Westamerikanische Blätter—a German-language newspaper published in the USA.—309

Wiener Zeitung—a daily newspaper, official government organ, published in Vienna from 1780 to 1931.—56, 513

Wochenblatt der Deutschen Schnellpost—the weekly supplement to the newspaper Deutsche Schnellpost (q.v.) which was published in New York from 1843 to 1851.—303, 318

Wochenblatt der New-Yorker Deutschen Zeitung—the weekly supplement to the New-Yorker Deutsche Zeitung (q.v.) which was published in New York in 1851.—316
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