Karl Marx

AFFAIRS IN FRANCE

Paris, Jan. 17, 1860

Louis Napoleon has been converted to Free-trade, and is about to inaugurate a new era of peace. He can hardly fail to be enrolled as a member of the Society of Friends, and the year 1860 will, in the annals of Europe, be recorded as the year 1 of the Millennium. This extraordinary news going the round of the London Press dates its origin from a letter of Louis Bonaparte published in the Moniteur, dated Jan. 15, 1860, and addressed to Mr. Fould, Minister of State. The first effect of the letter was to send the Funds down at Paris and to send them up at London.

Now, before all things, it seems necessary to scrutinize somewhat closely the corpus delicti—that is, the Imperial letter—upon which the whole superstructure of the new era is about to be reared. Louis Bonaparte informs Mr. Fould that

"the moment has arrived for applying ourselves to the means of giving a greater development to the different branches of national wealth."

The almost identical announcement appeared in the Moniteur of January, 1852, when the Coup d'état inaugurated the era of the Crédit Mobilier, the Crédit Foncier, and other Crédits ambulants. And this is not all. Since that eventful epoch, every yearly financial bulletin issued under the auspices of the French autocrat has laid all its stress upon and proved by an awful array of official figures the circumstance that the Empire had been as good as its word,

---

a Here and below see Le Moniteur universel, No. 15, January 15, 1860. Further on Marx calls this letter a "manifesto".—Ed.
b "Au nom du peuple français", Le Moniteur universel, No. 15, January 15, 1852.—Ed.
and that, under its fostering sway, all the branches of national industry had taken an immense development.

Thus one finds himself in a fix. Either the proclamations of the *Coup d'état* were untimely, and the financial bulletins issued after the *Coup d'état* were spurious, or the present proclamation is a mere hoax.

At all events, this much appears incontrovertible, on the own showing of the new Imperial manifesto, that the economical benefits which French society was to derive from the resurrection of Bonapartism belong not to the past, but to the future tense. Let us, then, see by what new contrivance the happy economical change is to be brought about.

In the first instance, Louis Bonaparte tells Mr. Fould, who must have been somewhat startled at the profound discovery of his master, that “our foreign commerce must be developed by the exchange of products,” a stupendous truism, indeed. Foreign commerce consisting in the exchange of national products for foreign products, it cannot be denied that, to develop French foreign commerce, the exchange of French products must be developed. The principal result which Louis Bonaparte expects from the new development of French foreign commerce he is about to start, is “to spread prosperity among the working classes,” the which, as implicitly confessed by the man of the *Coup d'État*, and as shown by recent French writers (see, for instance, the works of the late Mr. Collins*), have visibly decayed within the last ten years. Unhappily, one great fact strikes the most superficial observer. French foreign commerce has made immense strides from 1848 to 1860. Amounting in 1848 to about 875 millions francs, it has risen to more than double that sum in 1859. An increase of commerce by more than 100 per cent in the short space of ten years, is a thing almost unprecedented. The causes that have brought about that increase are to be found in California, Australia, the United States, and so forth, but certainly not in the archives of the Tuileries. It appears, then, that despite the immense increase of French foreign commerce within the last ten years—an increase to be traced to revolutions in the markets of the world quite beyond the petty control of the French police—the situation of the mass of the French nation has not improved. Consequently, there must have been at work some

agency powerful enough to frustrate the natural results of commercial progress. If the development of French foreign commerce accounts for the apparent ease with which the second Empire has been allowed to indulge its expensive vagaries, the prostration of the nation, despite its doubled exports, betrays the cost at which that Imperial ease is purchased. If the Empire could not have subsisted without that development of French foreign commerce, that commercial progress has failed with the Empire to bear its legitimate fruits.

The Austrian Emperor, having banished the deficit from his States by dint of a ukase, why should Louis Bonaparte, by dint of another ukase, not command the increase of French foreign commerce? Still he apprehends some hitch in his way.

"We must first," he says, "improve our agriculture, and free our industry from all interior impediments which place it in a position of inferiority."

That French agriculture is badly in want of improvement, is the standing topic of French economists; but how is Louis Bonaparte to do the thing? In the first place, he will grant loans to agriculture at a moderate "interest." French agriculture is notoriously the concern of more than two-thirds of the French nation. Will Louis Bonaparte impose taxes upon the remaining third, in order to grant loans "at a moderate rate" to the majority of the nation? The idea is in fact too preposterous to be insisted upon. On the other hand, it was the confessed aim of his Crédits Fonciers to direct loanable capital to the land. The only thing they have proved efficient in is not in ameliorating agriculture, but in ruining small freeholds and accelerating the concentration of landed estates. After all, we have here again the old worn-out panacea—institions of credit. Nobody will deny that the second Empire marks an epoch in the development of French credit, but that it has overshot the mark, and that, with its own credit, its credit-fostering influence has gone to the wall. The only novelty seems to be that the semi-official credit machinery having been stretched and worked to its utmost, Louis Bonaparte now dreams of converting the Government itself into a direct loan-shop. While any such attempt must be fraught with immense dangers, it would as necessarily collapse as did his grain granaries, intended to screw up the prices of corn.260 Draining, irrigating, and cleaning the ground, are all very good things in their different lines, but their only possible effect is to multiply agricultural products. They cannot raise, and they are not intended to raise, the prices of those products. Now then, even if Louis Bonaparte should find by
some miraculous methods the ways and means required for those ameliorations on a national scale, how are they to mend the depreciation of agricultural produce which the French peasant has labored under for these five years? But then, Louis Napoleon will set about a consecutive amelioration of the means of communication. The coolness with which this proposition is made, beats even Bonapartist impudence. Look only to the development of French railways since 1850. The annual expense for these “means of communication” amounted, from 1845 to ’47, to about 175,000,000 of francs; from 1848 to ’51, to about 125,000,000; from 1852 to ’54, to nearly 250,000,000 (double the expenditure of 1848-’51); from 1854a to ’56, to nearly 550,000,000; from 1857 to ’59, to about 500,000,000. In 1857, when the general crisis broke in upon the commercial world, the French Government stood aghast at the immense sums still required for the railways in progress or already conceded. It prohibited the railway companies from raising, by means of securities, debentures, &c., more than 212,500,000 francs annually, interdicted the getting up of new companies, and circumscribed within fixed limits the work to be annually undertaken. And, after all this, Louis Bonaparte speaks as if railways, canals, and so forth, were now first to be invented! A forcible reduction of the canal dues, which he hints at, is, of course, an operation involving the breach of public contracts, frightening the capital embarked in those enterprises, and certainly not calculated to allure new capital into the same channels. Lastly, to find a market for agricultural products, manufacturing industry is to be stimulated. Yet, as we have already stated, manufacturing industry has made immense strides during the second Empire, but with all that, with the unprecedented increase of exports, with the immense development of railways and other means of communication, with the exaggeration of a credit system formerly unknown in France, French agriculture languishes, and the French peasantry decays. How shall we account for the strange phenomenon? The fact that 255,000,000 of francs are added yearly to the funded debt, not to speak of the impost of blood for the army and the navy, offers a sufficient answer. The Empire itself is the great incubus whose burden grows in a greater ratio than the productive powers of the French nation.

Louis Bonaparte's prescriptions for French industry, if we deduct all that is mere phraseology, or is still looming in the

---
a Thus in the original.—Ed.
future, are simply these: Suppression of the duties on wool and cotton, and successive reductions on sugar and coffee. Now, this is all very well, but all the gullibility of English free-traders is required to call such measures free trade. Whoever is acquainted with political economy, knows full well that the abolition of duties on agricultural raw material forms a main item in the doctrine of the mercantile school of the eighteenth century. These “interior impediments” which weigh upon French production, are as nothing if compared with the octrois,\(^\text{26}\) dividing France into as many independent countries as there are towns, paralyzing the internal exchange, and barring the creation of wealth by crippling its consumption. Those octrois, however, have increased under the Imperial régime, and will continue to increase. The diminution of duties on wool and cotton is to be made up by suppressing the sinking fund, so that the last restraint upon the growth of the public debts, although merely nominal, will be done away with.

On the other hand, the woods are to be cleared, the hills to be leveled, and the moors to be drained, by applying to those purposes the 160,000,000 of francs said to form the remnant disposable from the last war loans, in three yearly installments, which will make less than 54,000,000 of francs on an annual average. Why, the embankment of the Loire alone, so pompously announced by the Imperial Cagliostro some five years ago, and then no longer thought of, would absorb the whole sum in less than three months. What then remains of the manifesto! “The inauguration of an era of peace,” as if that era had not long since been proclaimed at Bordeaux. “L’Empire c’est la paix.”\(^a\)

Written on January 17, 1860

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5862, February 7, 1860

---

\(^a\) The words quoted are taken from Napoleon III’s speech in Bordeaux on October 9, 1852, shortly before the plebiscite and the proclamation of the second Empire. They were a demagogic attempt to win the sympathy of the people.—*Ed.*
London, Jan. 27, 1860

The most interesting topics touched upon in the parliamentary address\(^a\) debates were the third Chinese war, the commercial treaty with France, and the Italian complication.\(^{262}\) The Chinese question, it ought to be understood, involves not only an international question, but also a constitutional question of vital import. The second Chinese war,\(^{263}\) undertaken on the arbitrary behest of Lord Palmerston, having led first to a vote of censure against his Cabinet, and then to a forcible dissolution of the House of Commons—the new House, although elected under his own auspices, was never called upon to cashier the sentence passed by its predecessor. To this very moment Lord Palmerston's second Chinese war stands condemned by a parliamentary verdict. But this is not all.

On the 16th of September, 1859, the account of the repulse on the Peihoo was received in England. Instead of summoning Parliament, Lord Palmerston addressed himself to Louis Bonaparte, and conversed with the autocrat on a new Anglo-French expedition against China.

“During three months,” as Lord Grey says, “the British ports and arsenals resounded with the din of preparation, and measures were taken for dispatching artillery, stores, and gun-boats to China, and for sending land forces of not less than 10,000 men, in addition to the naval forces.”\(^b\)

---

\(^a\) Victoria, “The Queen’s Speech. The Address, January 24, 1860,” *The Times*, No. 23525, January 25, 1860.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) Here and below Marx quotes Lord Grey’s speech in the House of Lords on January 24, 1860 during the parliamentary address debates. See *The Times*, No. 23525, January 25, 1860.—*Ed.*
The country having thus been fairly embarked in a new war, on
the one hand by a treaty with France, on the other by a vast
expenditure incurred without any previous communication to
Parliament, the latter, on its meeting, is coolly asked "to thank her
Majesty for having informed them of what had occurred, and the
preparations that were making for the expedition to China." In
what different style could Louis Napoleon himself have addressed
his own corps législatif, or the Emperor Alexander his senate?

In the debate on the address in the House of Commons in 1857,
Mr. Gladstone, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, with
reference to the Persian war, had indignantly exclaimed:

"I will say, without fear of contradiction, that the practice of commencing wars,
without first referring to Parliament, is utterly at variance with the established
practice of the country, dangerous to the Constitution, and absolutely requiring the
intervention of this House, in order to render the repetition of so dangerous a
proceeding utterly impossible."

Lord Palmerston has not only repeated the proceeding, "so
dangerous to the Constitution"; he has not only repeated it this
time with the concurrence of the sanctimonious Mr. Gladstone,
but as if to try the strength of ministerial irresponsibility, wielding
the rights of Parliament against the Crown, the prerogatives of the
Crown against Parliament and the privileges of both against the
people—he had the boldness to repeat the dangerous proceeding
within the same sphere of action. His one Chinese war being
censured by the Parliament, he undertakes another Chinese war in
spite of Parliament. Still, in both Houses, only one man mustered
courage enough to make a stand against this ministerial usurpa-
tion; and, curiously to say, that one man belonging not to the
popular, but to the aristocratic branch of the Legislature. The man
is Lord Grey. He proposed an amendment to the address in
answer to the Queen's speech to the purport that the expedition
ought not to have been entered upon before the sense of both
Houses of Parliament was taken.

The manner in which Lord Grey's amendment was met, both by
the spokesman of the ministerial party and the leader of her
Majesty's opposition, is highly characteristic of the political crisis
which the representative institutions of England are rapidly
approaching. Lord Grey conceded that, in a formal sense, the
Crown enjoyed the prerogative of entering upon wars, but since
Ministers were interdicted from spending one single farthing on

---

a Marx quotes Gladstone from Lord Grey's speech.—Ed.
any enterprise without the previous sanction of Parliament, it was the constitutional law and practice that the responsible representa-
tives of the Crown should never enter upon warlike expeditions before notice having been given to Parliament, and the latter been called upon to make provision for defraying the expenditure which might be thus incurred. Thus, if the council of the nation thought fit, it might check, in the beginning, any unjust or impolitic war contemplated by ministers. His Lordship quoted then some examples in order to show how strictly these rules were formerly adhered to. In 1790, when some British vessels were seized by the Spaniards on the north-west coast of America, Pitt brought down to both Houses a message from the Crown\(^a\) calling for a vote of credit to meet the probable expenses. Again in December 1826, when the daughter of Dom Pedro\(^b\) applied to England for assistance against Ferdinand VII of Spain, who intended an invasion of Portugal to the benefit of Dom Miguel, Canning brought down a similar message\(^c\) notifying to Parliament the nature of the case and the amount of expenditure likely to be incurred. In conclusion Lord Grey broadly intimated that the ministry had dared to raise taxes upon the country without the concurrence of Parliament, since the large expenditure already incurred must have been defrayed one way or other; and could not have been defrayed without encroaching upon money-grants provided for entirely different demands.

Now which sort of reply did Lord Grey elicit on the part of the Cabinet? The Duke of Newcastle, who had been foremost in protesting against the lawfulness of Palmerston's second Chinese war, answered in the first instance that "the very wholesome practice had arisen of late years of never moving an amendment to the address, unless some great party object was to be attained."\(^d\) Consequently, Lord Grey being not prompted by factious motives, and pretending not to aspire to put Ministers out in order to put himself in, what, for the life of the Duke of Newcastle, could he mean by infringing upon that "very wholesome practice of late years"? Was he crotchety enough to fancy that they were to break

---


\(^{b}\) Maria II da Gloria.—*Ed.*


\(^{d}\) Here and below Marx quotes the Duke of Newcastle's speech in the House of Lords on January 24, 1860. See *The Times*, No. 23525, January 25, 1860.—*Ed.*
lances except for great party objects? In the second instance, was it not notorious that the constitutional practice, so anxiously adhered to by Pitt and Canning, had been over and over again departed from by Lord Palmerston? Had that noble Viscount not carried on a war of his own in Portugal in 1831, in Greece in 1850, and, as the Duke of Newcastle might have added, in Persia, in Afghanistan and in many other countries? Why, if Parliament had allowed Lord Palmerston to usurp to himself the right of war and peace and taxation during the course of thirty years, why, then, should they all at once try to break from their long servile tradition? Constitutional law might be on the side of Lord Grey, but prescription was undoubtedly on the side of Lord Palmerston. Why call the noble Viscount to account at this time of the day, since never before had he been punished for similar “wholesome” innovations? In fact, the Duke of Newcastle seemed rather indulgent in not accusing Lord Grey of rebellion for his attempt at breaking through Lord Palmerston’s prescriptive privilege of doing with his own—the forces and the money of England—as he liked.

Equally original was the manner in which the Duke of Newcastle endeavored to prove the legality of the Peiho expedition. There exists an Anglo-Chinese treaty of 1843, by dint of which England enjoys all the rights conceded by the Celestials to the most favored nations. Now Russia, in her recent treaty with China, has stipulated for the right of sailing up the Peiho. Consequently, under the treaty of 1843, the English had a right to such passage. This, the Duke of Newcastle said, he might insist upon “without any great special pleading.” Might he, indeed! On the one side there is the ugly circumstance that the Russian treaty was only ratified, and, consequently, dates its actual existence only from an epoch posterior to the Peiho catastrophe. This, of course, is but a slight husteron proteron. On the other hand, it is generally known that a state of war suspends all existing treaties. If the English were at war with the Chinese at the time of the Peiho expedition, they, of course, could appeal neither to the treaty of 1843, nor to any other treaty whatever. If they were not at war, Palmerston’s Cabinet has taken upon itself to commence a new war without the sanction of Parliament? To escape the latter part of the dilemma, poor Newcastle asserts that since the Canton bombardment, for the last two years, “England had never been at peace

---

a The latter (put as) the former—a figure of speech in which what should come last is put first; inversion of the natural order.—Ed.
with China.” Consequently the Ministry had pushed on hostilities, not recommenced them, and consequently he might, without special pleading, appeal to the treaties effective only during a time of peace. And to heighten the beauty of this queer sort of dialectics, Lord Palmerston, the chief of the Cabinet, asserts at the same time, in the House of Commons, that England all this time over, “had never been at war with China.”\(^a\) They were not so now. There were, of course, Canton bombardments, Peiho catastrophes, and Anglo-French expeditions, but there was no war, since war had never been declared, and since, to this moment, the Emperor of China\(^b\) had allowed transactions at Shanghai to proceed in their usual course. The very fact of his having broken, in regard to the Chinese, through all the legitimate international forms of war, Palmerston pleads as a reason for dispensing also with the constitutional forms in regard to the British Parliament, while his spokesman in the House of Lords, Earl Granville, “with regard to China,” disdainingly declares “the consultation of Parliament by Government” to be “a purely technical point.”\(^c\) The consultation of Parliament by Government a purely technical point! What difference, then, does still remain between a British Parliament and a French Corps Législatif? In France, it is, at least, the presumed heir of a national hero\(^d\) who dares to place himself in the place of the nation, and who at the same time openly confronts all the dangers of such usurpation. But, in England, it is some subaltern spokesman, some worn-out place-hunter, some anonymous nonentity of a so-called Cabinet, that, relying on the donkey power of the parliamentary mind and the bewildering evaporations of an anonymous press, without making any noise, without incurring any danger, quietly creep their way to irresponsible power. Take on the one hand the commotions raised by a Sulla\(^e\); take on the other the fraudulent businesslike maneuvers of the manager of a joint stock bank, the secretary of a benevolent society, or the clerk of a vestry, and you will understand the difference between imperialist usurpation in France and ministerial usurpation in England! Lord Derby, fully aware of the equal interest both factions have in securing ministerial impotence and irresponsibility, could, of course, “not concur with the noble Earl

\(^{a}\) Lord Palmerston’s speech in the House of Commons on January 25, 1860, \textit{The Times}, No. 23526, January 26, 1860.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^{b}\) Hsien Fêng.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^{c}\) The Earl of Granville’s speech in the House of Lords on January 24, 1860, \textit{The Times}, No. 23525, January 25, 1860.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^{d}\) The reference is to Napoleon III and Napoleon I.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^{e}\) The reference is to Napoleon I and Napoleon II.—\textit{Ed.}
[Grey] in the strong views which he takes of the *laches* of Government." He could not quite concur in Lord Grey's complaint that "the Government ought to have called Parliament together, to have consulted them on the Chinese question," but he "certainly would not support him by his vote, should he press the amendment to a division."

Consequently, the amendment was not pressed to a division, and the whole debate, in both Houses, on the Chinese war, evaporated in grotesque compliments showered by both factions on the head of Admiral Hope for having so gloriously buried the English forces in the mud.

Written on January 27, 1860

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5868, February 14, 1860

---

Karl Marx

THE NEW TREATY BETWEEN FRANCE AND ENGLAND

London, Jan. 28, 1860

The commercial treaty with France will not be communicated to the House of Commons before the 6th of February. Still, with what was broached during the address debates—with what is insinuated by the French papers, and with what is gossiped at London and Paris, one may, Mr. Gladstone's solemn warnings notwithstanding, already venture upon some general appreciation of this "sweet changeling." It was on Monday, the 23d of January, that the treaty was duly signed at Paris, Rouher, Minister of Commerce, and Baroche, ad interim Minister of Foreign Affairs, acting as its French godfathers, while, on the part of England, the same function was performed by Lord Cowley and Mr. Cobden. That Mr. Michel Chevalier—the ex-St. Simonian—had his hand in the pie, and that general regret is felt throughout the whole realm of France that Louis Napoleon had not the tact of allowing this distinguished personage (viz.: Mr. Chevalier) to inscribe his name to the treaty by the side of his "English confrère," is a piece of news which that "distinguished personage" himself was so condescending as to send over to London and have inserted in the various free-trade organs. But, what is not known by the journals, is that Père Enfantin, the ex-high-priest of St. Simonism, was the principal actor on the French side. Is it not truly wonderful how those St. Simonians, from Père Enfantin down to Isaac Pèreire and Michel Chevalier, have been turned into the main economical pillars of the second Empire. But to return to

---

b Colleague.—Ed.
Mr. Chevalier's "English confrère," the Lancashire ex-manufacturer, who, of course, felt not a little elated at the honor of putting his own sign-manual to an international treaty. If one should consider the circumstance that reciprocity treaties, and commercial treaties generally, save the treaties with barbarians, have always been loudly denounced by the English free-traders, led by Mr. Cobden, as the worst and most pernicious form of protectionism; if it be further considered that the present treaty, even judged from the reciprocity stand-point, seems a rather ludicrous arrangement; and, lastly, if the political aims and purposes the treaty is destined to screen be duly weighed, people might feel inclined to pity Mr. Richard Cobden as the innocent victim of a Palmerstonian machination. Yet there is another side to the medal. Mr. Cobden, as is generally known, did once receive, in exchange for his Anti-Corn law\(^{272}\) success, some £60,000 sterling on the part of the grateful manufacturing interest. Mr. Cobden invested the principal in American shares, and, consequent upon the crisis of 1857, lost almost everything. The hopes he still cherished when setting out on his voyage to the United States, proved delusory. Mr. Cobden returned to England a ruined man. To appeal to a national subscription some national pretext was wanted, some transaction that might be puffed, and again exhibit Mr. Cobden in the light of the guardian angel of the United Kingdom, "securing plenty and comfort to millions of lowly households." Well, the Anglo-French treaty did the thing, and, as you will see, from the provincial papers, a new subscription to the amount of £40,000, intended to compensate the great free-trade apostle for his American losses, already goes the round very "feelingly." There is no doubt that if Disraeli, for instance, had introduced to the Commons such a treaty, Mr. Cobden at the head of the free-traders would have risen to move for a vote of non-confidence in a Cabinet attempting to carry the legislation back to the darkest fallacies of the unenlightened past.

From the following tables\(^a\) the number of protective duties levied during the year 1858 by England on French articles may be inferred:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Duty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baskets</td>
<td>£2,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter</td>
<td>7,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China and Porcelain Ware</td>
<td>1,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clocks</td>
<td>3,928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coffee ......................................................... 4,311
Eggs ................................................................ 19,934
Embroidery ..................................................... 5,572
Flowers, artificial ............................................. 20,412
Fruit .................................................................. 7,347
Lace .................................................................. 1,858
Boots, Shoes, and other Leather Manufactures ....... 8,883
Gloves ................................................................ 48,839
Musical Instruments ........................................... 4,695
Oil, chemical ..................................................... 2,369
Paper-Hangings ................................................ 6,713
Plaiting of Straw, for hats, &c ............................... 11,622
Silks .................................................................. 215,455
Brandy and other Spirits ..................................... 824,960
Sugar ................................................................ 275,702
Tea .................................................................... 14,358
Tobacco .............................................................. 52,696
Watches .............................................................. 14,940
Wine .................................................................. 164,855

Most of the duties thus levied were protective duties, as those on baskets, clocks, lace, boots, gloves, silks, etc. Others, like the duties on brandy, etc., were higher than the English excise duty on British spirits, and so far protective. Even mere duties for revenue, such as the duty on wine, might be considered by a consequent free-trader as protective duties, because it is almost impossible to levy taxes on a foreign article without protecting some similar, if not identical, article in the home market. For instance, a revenue duty on foreign wine may be considered a protective duty for native beer, etc. By dint of the treaty just concluded all British duties on French manufactures will be abolished at once, while the duties on brandy, wine, and other articles, will be assimilated to English excise duties, or to the Custom-House duty now raised on similar products (wine for instance) if introduced from British colonies. On the other hand, the French changes of tariff will not be completely carried out before October, 1861, as will be seen from the following statement, borrowed from a French Government paper:

July 1, 1860—Suppression of the import duties on cotton and wool.
July 1, 1860—Belgian tariff applied to English coal and coke.
October 1, 1860—Duty of 7 francs the 100 kilogs. substituted for the present duties on iron.
December 31, 1860—Diminution of the duties on the importation of machinery.

June 1, 1861—Removal of the prohibition on hemp threads and fabrics, and the adoption of duties not exceeding 30 per cent.

October 1, 1861—Removal of all other prohibitions, to be replaced by protective duties ad valorem for five years, and not exceeding 25 per cent afterward.

Save the reduction of the duty on English coal to the same rate now paid by Belgian coal, all the concessions apparently made by France appear of a very equivocal character. The price of a ton of pig iron No. 1 (Wales) amounts, for instance, at present, to £3 10/, but the French duty on iron will amount to nearly another £3. That the 30 per cent ad valorem duty on prohibited articles will be virtually protective is conceded by the London Economist. So far as the reductions, real or apparent, on English articles are put off to future periods, the English Government acts, in fact, the part of an insurance office for Louis Napoleon’s tenure of power for the terms specified. The true secret, however, of the commercial treaty, viz.: that “it is no commercial treaty at all,” but a simple hoax, intended to puzzle John Bull’s commercial mind, and to cloak a deep-laid political scheme, has been masterly exposed by Mr. Disraeli during the address debates. The substance of his revelation was this:

“Some years ago, the Emperor of the French made a communication similar to the letter lately addressed by him to the Minister of the Interior, in which communication he proposed the entire extinction of the prohibitive system, and the adoption of measures similar to those contained in his late manifesto. In 1856, a bill in this sense was introduced into the Corps Législatif [...], but, before being passed, was laid before the 86 Provincial Councils of France, which, with the exception of 6, all adopted the proposal with an understanding that a certain period of time should elapse before the new system should be brought into play. Consequently, the Emperor agreeing with this proposition, some public document expressed his resolution to carry this system into effect, and appointed July, 1861, as the period with which it should commence.” All, therefore, that France engages by the treaty to do in July, 1861, “was already provided by the course of law in France.”

Written on January 28, 1860
Reproduced from the newspaper


---

a Benjamin Disraeli’s speech in the House of Commons on January 24, 1860, The Times, No. 23525, January 25, 1860.—Ed.

b The Times has “the Minister of State”.—Ed.

c See this volume, p. 330.—Ed.

d The Times has “86 Councils General, the departmental Parliaments of France”.—Ed.
The Italian war of 1859, even more than the Crimean war,\(^{274}\) established the fact that the French military organization was the best in Europe. Of all European armies, excepting the French, the Austrian army certainly ranked highest; and yet, in the short campaign of 1859, though its soldiers covered themselves with glory, the army, as a whole, could not win a single battle. With all due allowance for bad generalship, want of unity of command, and for the incompetent meddling of the Emperor, still the unanimous impression of the Austrian regimental officers and of the men was, that part of their want of success was due to an organization less adapted for real war than that of their opponents. And if the Austrian army—thoroughly reorganized as it had been only a few years before—was found to be deficient, what was to be expected from other armies whose organization was of even a more ancient date?

That the French were superior in this particular, was a fact not to be wondered at. No nation with any military aptitude can carry on petty warfare for twenty-five years on so colossal a scale as that of Algeria,\(^{275}\) without thereby developing to a high pitch the capabilities of its troops. While England and Russia had waged their wars in India and the Caucasus principally with troops set apart for this service, the greater part of the French army had passed through the Algerine school. France really had made the most of this school, which had been expensive in men and money, but very effective and fruitful in valuable military experience. After this, the Crimean war, another school on a larger scale, served to enhance the confidence of the soldier by showing him that what he had learned in his campaigns against nomadic tribes
and irregulars, was quite as useful and applicable in a contest with regular troops.

That with such opportunities, a nation endowed with peculiar genius for the military profession, should have brought its warlike organization to a perfection exceeding anything attained by its neighbors—a fact proved beyond dispute at Magenta and Solferino—nevertheless excited wonder, especially in Germany. The military pedants of that country had been so secure in their presumed superiority over the volatile, unsteady, undisciplined, immoral French, that the blow stunned them. On the other hand, the younger and more intelligent portions of the Austrian and other German armies, always opposed to martinetism, now at once began to speak out. The Austrian officers, fresh from Magenta, were the first to say, what is perfectly true, that the French carry no knapsacks in battle; that they have no stocks, no stiff collars, no tight coats or trousers; they are dressed in loose trousers, and a loose great coat with collar turned down, and neck and chest quite free; their head covered with a light cap, and they carry their cartridges in their trousers pockets. Where the men of the Austrians arrive fatigued, and out of breath, the French come up fresh and singing, and ready for any physical effort. Thus reported the letters of the Austrian officers fresh from the battle-field, and Prussian, Bavarian, and other officers soon chimed in. The awful fact was there. Soldiers had actually dared to face the enemy without all the cumbersome paraphernalia which compose almost all the glorious pomp and circumstance of war, and which taken together are equivalent to a strait-jacket; and in spite of the absence of this strait-jacket they had been victorious on every field. This fact was so very serious that even the German Governments could not close their eyes to it.

Thus military reform became the watchword of the day in Germany, to the great dismay of old fogies in general. The most revolutionary theories in matters military were not only pronounced with impunity, but even taken into consideration by governments. The first point was of course that of the equipment of the soldier, which had formed the most conspicuous difference between the two armies on the battle-field, and the discussion of this project was as interminable as the varieties of taste. An immense deal of ingenuity was expended on military tailoring. Caps, helmets, shakos, hats, coats, blouses, capotes, collars, cuffs, trousers, gaiters, and boots were discussed with vivacity and loquacity as if on such things alone had depended the fate of the day at Solferino. The Austrians were the most extravagant in their
military fashions. From an almost exact copy of the French model (barring the color) they passed through all the intermediate stages, up to the blouse and slouched, wide-awake hat. Imagine the stiff, conservative, staid, Imperial Royal Austrian soldier in the coquetish dress of the French chasseur, or, still worse, in the blouse and felt hat of the revolutionary German free corps of 1848. A greater satire could not be passed on the Austrian military system than that either of these extremes should have been taken seriously into consideration. As usual, the debate has been exhausted rather than settled; military old fogyism has recovered part of the lost ground, and in Austria, at least, the alterations in the uniform will, upon the whole, be trifling; while in the other German armies scarcely any change appears probable, except that the Prussian helmet, that pet invention of the romantic Frederick William IV, seems doomed to descend to the grave even before its inventor.

Next came the great knapsack question. That the French went into battle without their knapsacks was a piece of imprudence which could be justified by nothing but their good luck, and the warmth of the season. But should it become a habitual thing with them, the first reverse in cold or rainy weather would punish them severely for it. In fact, the general adoption of this usage would imply nothing less than that in every battle the beaten army should lose not only its artillery, colors, and stores, but the whole of the individual baggage of its infantry also. In consequence, a few rainy bivouacs would completely break up the infantry, reduced as it would be to such clothing as every man might happen to be dressed in. The real question, however, would seem to be, how the individual baggage of the soldier can be reduced to a minimum, and this is a point of importance which might easily be settled in a satisfactory way, if the items composing it were considered merely as to their real utility in a campaign; but the discussion in Germany has not settled it.

Beside the clothes question and the knapsack question, the organization of the various subdivisions of the army is also a matter much disputed. How many men should make a company, how many companies a battalion, how many battalions a regiment, how many regiments a brigade, how many brigades a division, and so forth. This is another point upon which a great deal of bosh may be uttered with the most serious and important face in the world. In every army the system of elementary tactics confines to certain limits the strength and number of companies and battalions; the strength of brigades and divisions find their minimum and maximum by the strength adopted in neighboring
armies, so that in case of a conflict the disproportion between the larger tactical units may not be too great. To try to solve such questions not by the actual conditions as given by the facts of the case, but by an attempted recourse to first principles, is mere fudge, worthy perhaps of German philosophers but not suited to practical men. The increase in the number of the Austrian regiments of infantry of the line from 63 to 80, with a reduced number of battalions, will no more insure them “better luck next time” than the widening of their trousers and the turning down of their collars.

But while man-millinery and abstruse speculations on the normal strength and composition of a brigade occupy attention, the great defects and evils of the German military system are unheeded. What, indeed, are we to think of officers who most furiously discuss the cut of a pair of pantaloons, or of a collar, and who submit quietly to have in the German federal army some twenty different calibers of field artillery, and an almost incalculable variety of calibers for small-arms? The introduction of rifled muskets, which offered such a splendid occasion for equalizing the calibers all over Germany, has not only been shamefully neglected, but has made matters worse. It is worth while to look for a moment at this confusion of calibers. Austria, Bavaria, Württemberg, Baden, and Hesse-Darmstadt, have one caliber—0.53 of an inch. With that practical good sense which the South Germans have shown in many instances, they have carried this most important reform, which establishes unity of caliber for five corps of the federal army. Prussia has two calibers; one the so-called Zündnadelgewehr, or needle-gun, about 0.60 of an inch, and the old smooth-bore musket, lately rifled on Minié’s principle, about 0.68. The latter, however, is to be superseded by the former as soon as possible. The Ninth Army Corps has three different rifled and two or three different smooth-bore calibers; the Tenth has at least ten, and the reserved division has as many calibers almost as battalions. Now imagine this motley army in an active campaign. How is it possible that the ammunition belonging to each contingent can always be at hand when wanted, and if not, that contingent is helpless and useless? Excepting Austria, the South Germans and Prussia, no contingent can, from this circumstance alone, be of any real use in a lengthened contest. The same is true of the artillery. Instead of fixing at once upon one common caliber at least corresponding to the old six-pounder, which would
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\( ^a \) See Frederick Engels’ *The History of the Rifle*, present edition, Vol. 18.—*Ed.*
thus in time become the universal caliber of rifled field guns, the Prussians, the Austrians, the Bavarians are now casting rifled ordnance quite independently of each other, which will only serve to increase the diversity of calibers already existing. An army in which such fundamental defects exist might do better than spend its time in quarreling about collars and inexpressibles, and the normal strength of brigades and battalions.

There can be no military progress in Germany so long as the idea is cherished in high quarters that armies are made for parade and not for battle. Crushed for a while by Austerlitz, Wagram, and Jena,\textsuperscript{278} and by the popular enthusiasm of 1813-15, this pedantry soon raised its head again, reigned supreme until 1848, and, in Prussia, at least, seems to have attained its culminating point during the last ten years. Had Prussia been involved in the Italian war, Pélissier could scarcely have helped inflicting another Jena upon her army, and the fortresses on the Rhine alone would have saved her. Such is the condition to which an army has been reduced which, in respect of its men, stands second to none in the world. In any future conflict between the French and the Germans, we may reasonably expect to see reproduced the features of Magenta and Solferino.

Written in late January and early February 1860

First published in the \textit{New-York Daily Tribune}, No. 5873, February 20, 1860 as a leading article

Reproduced from the newspaper
Karl Marx

THE ENGLISH BUDGET

London, Feb. 11, 1860

The last was a great night, in the Parliamentary sense of the word. Mr. Gladstone, in an immense speech, simultaneously divulged the mysteries of his budget and of the commercial treaty, linking both carefully together, and propping the frailty of the one by the boldness of the other. As to the treaty, now laid with all its details before the world, you will find the sketch I gave you many weeks ago to have been quite correct, and, in fact, I have nothing to add to the general criticism I ventured upon at the time. Consequently, I propose considering Mr. Gladstone’s budget as a simple operation of English finance, a treatment of the subject more called for since the impending Parliamentary debates are sure to enlighten us, by the by, on the diplomatic undercurrent of Mr. Gladstone’s facts and figures.

Now, whatever inconsistencies may be traced in the details of the budget; whatever political objections may be raised against the prudence of answering a deficit of more than 14 per cent on the total revenue, and a vast increase of expenditure, by one full sweep of many existing duties, part of which did hardly weigh upon the mass of the people; nevertheless, common fairness obliges me to say that Mr. Gladstone’s budget is a great and bold stroke of financial ingenuity, and that the British Free-Trade doctrines once accepted—apart from some glaring incongruities necessitated by the treaty with France, as well as by the tenderness every British Chancellor of the Exchequer will always bring to
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a Marx analyses the Budget for 1860-61, introduced by Gladstone, Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his speech in the House of Commons on February 10, 1860 (The Times, No. 23540, February 11, 1860).— Ed.

b See this volume, pp. 341-44.— Ed.
bear upon the rent-rolls of the 50,000 paramount landlords—it is a fair budget. The position of Mr. Gladstone was fraught with difficulties created by himself. He was the man, who in 1853, in his so-called standard budget prospectively extending over a space of seven years, had pledged himself to definitely do away with the income tax in 1860-61.\(^a\) He again, in a supplementary budget,\(^b\) called into life by the Russian war, had promised to abolish, at no distant date, the war duty on tea and sugar. The same man, now that his promissory bills have fallen due, comes forward with a scheme in which the latter duty is maintained, while the income tax is enhanced from 9d. to 10d. in the pound; that is to say, by 11 1-9 per cent. But, you will remember that, in my strictures on his budget of 1853, I tried to prove that, if the financial legislature of free-trade meant anything, it meant indirect taxation being displaced by direct taxation.\(^{279}\) I dwelt at the time on the incompatibility of Mr. Gladstone's pledge of going on with the removal of custom and excise duties, with his simultaneous pledge of altogether expunging the income tax from the tax-gatherer's list. The income tax, only that it is partially, unjustly, and even stupidly laid on, is the best item in English financial law. That Mr. Gladstone, instead of seriously taxing landed property, maintains a war duty upon such first necessities as tea and sugar, is a cowardice due much more to the aristocratic structure of Parliament than to any narrowness of mind on his part. If he had dared lay his hands on the rent-rolls, the Cabinet, whose prospects of life are precarious enough, would have gone to the wall in no time. It is an old proverb that the belly has no ears, but it is no less true that rent-rolls have no conscience.

Before giving a succinct statement of the alterations contemplated by Mr Gladstone, I shall first call the attention of the reader to some incidental remarks dropped in the course of his speech. First, then, the Chancellor of the Exchequer admitted that the common opinion of free-trade being incarnated in the English financial system was mere slang. Secondly, he admitted that England had no commerce worth speaking of with France, while France, on the contrary, had a very extensive and expanding trade with England. Thirdly, he could not help confessing that Palmerstonian policy, embarking upon “friendly expeditions” behind the
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\(^a\) Gladstone's speeches in the House of Commons on April 18, 1853, *The Times*, No. 21406, April 19, 1853 and February 10, 1860, *The Times*, No. 23540, February 11, 1860.—Ed.

\(^b\) Gladstone's speech in the House of Commons on May 8, 1854, *The Times*, No. 21736, May 9, 1854.—Ed.
back of Parliament, had turned the scale, and paralyzed the increase accruing to the Exchequer from the extension of British commerce and industry. Lastly, although gilding the bitter pill with a sweet envelope, and presenting it in as handy a shape as French apothecaries are used to present you the most abominable pharmacutical stuff, he could not but own that the same dear ally, to whom Great Britain is just about sacrificing nearly two millions of income, is the mainspring of British military and naval expenditure being swollen, for the year 1860-61, to the stupendous amount of 30 millions. Eighteen millions, it should be recorded, was the maximum of war expenditure, which the Iron Duke,² twenty-four years since, entreated English rationalism to swallow.

After these preliminary remarks I come to the changes proposed by Mr. Gladstone. They are divided into two categories, the one resulting from the treaty with France, the other embracing subsidiary changes which Mr. Gladstone was compelled to introduce in order to free his budget from the reproach of being a concession extorted from a foreign despotical power, and imparting to it the more acceptable color of being a general reform of the existing tariff.

The changes introduced by the commercial treaty with France are these: There will at once be a clean sweep, absolutely and entirely, of manufactured goods off the British tariff, with the exception, for a limited period, of three articles only, viz.: cork, gloves, and another trifling article. The brandy duty will be reduced from 15s. a gallon to the level of the colonial duty of 8s. The duty on all foreign wines will be immediately diminished from nearly 5s. 10d. per gallon to 3s. a gallon. England engages further to reduce the duty from April 1, 1861, to a scale proportioned to the quantity of spirit contained in the wine. All duties upon foreign articles which are also produced in England, and there subject to an excise duty, will be reduced to the standard of the home excise. Such is the pith of the first set of changes to be introduced.

The alterations which, independently of the treaty with France, are to give the present budget the character of a general reformation of British financial legislature are these:

There are to be abolished immediately and entirely the duties on butter, tallow, cheese, oranges, and lemons, eggs, nutmegs, pepper, licorice, and various other articles, of which the total duty is about £382,000 a year. Reductions are to take place in the
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² The Duke of Wellington.—Ed.
present duty raised on timber from 7/ and 7/6 to the colonial rate of 1/ and 1/6. On currants, from 15/9 to 7/; on raisins and figs, from 10/ to 7/; on hops, from 45/ to 15/. Lastly, the excise upon paper is to be abolished.

The account of the financial year 1860[-61] stands thus:

**EXPENDITURE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funded and Unfunded Debt</td>
<td>£26,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Fund Charges</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army and Militia</td>
<td>15,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy and Packet Service</td>
<td>13,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous and Civil Service</td>
<td>7,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Department</td>
<td>4,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£70,100,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INCOME.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customs</td>
<td>£22,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excise</td>
<td>19,170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamps</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Taxes</td>
<td>3,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Office</td>
<td>3,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Lands</td>
<td>280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£60,700,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, on comparing expenditure with income, it will be found that a deficit to the amount of nearly £10,000,000 sterling is avowed, for which Mr. Gladstone, as already said, thinks to make up by the increase of the Income Tax from 9/ to 10/ and by the maintenance of the war duties on tea and sugar. The minor alterations, by which he proposes getting a penny here, and another penny there, it is not necessary to dwell upon in this general survey of the British Budget for 1860-61.

Written on February 11, 1860

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5878, February 25, 1860
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* Gladstone has these figures in his speech: "I propose to reduce the duty on timber from 7s. 6d. and 15s. to the colonial rate of 1s. and 2s."—Ed.

* The Times, No. 23540, February 11, 1860.—Ed.
Frederick Engels

ON RIFLED CANNON

I

[New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5914, April 7, 1860]

The first attempts at increasing the range and precision of ordnance by rifling the bore, and thereby giving the shot a rotation vertical to the line of propulsion, date from the 17th century. There is a small rifled gun at Munich, manufactured in Nuremberg in 1694; it has eight grooves and a bore of about two inches diameter. During the whole of the 18th century, experiments were made, both in Germany and in England, with rifled cannon, some of them breech-loading. Though the calibers were small, the results obtained were very satisfactory; the English two-pounders in 1776, at a range of 1,300 yards, gave a lateral deflection of two feet only—a degree of precision which no other gun at the time was capable of approaching. In the same year, these rifled cannon were for the first time used for projecting oblong shot.

These experiments, however, remained for a long while without any practical results. The current of military opinion at that time altogether went against rifled arms. The rifle itself was then a very clumsy instrument, its loading was a slow and tedious operation, requiring considerable skill. It was a weapon unfit for general warfare at a period when rapid firing, whether of deployed lines, of heads of columns, or of skirmishers, was one of the chief desiderata in battle. Napoleon would have no rifles in his army; in England and Germany, a few battalions only were equipped with them; in America and Switzerland alone, the rifle remained the national weapon.

The Algerian war was the occasion to bring the rifle again into credit, and to cause improvements in its construction which were but the beginning of that colossal revolution in the whole system
of firearms which is even now far from its conclusion. The smooth-bore muskets of the French were no match for the long *espingardas* of the Arabs; their greater length and better material, which admitted of a heavier charge, enabled the Kabyles and Bedouins to fire on the French at distances where the regulation musket was utterly powerless. The Duke of Orleans, having seen and admired the Prussian and Austrian chasseurs, organized the French chasseurs on their model, who soon, for armament, equipment, and tactics, became the first troops of their class in the world. The rifle with which they were armed was far superior to the old rifle, and it soon underwent further changes, resulting, finally, in the general introduction of rifled muskets in the whole of the infantry of Europe.

The range of infantry fire having thus been increased from 300 to 800, and even 1,000 yards, the question arose whether field artillery, which hitherto had commanded all distances from 300 up to 1,500 yards, would still be able to hold its own against the new small-arms. The fact was, that the greatest efficacy of common field guns lay just within that range which was now disputed to it by the rifle; canister was scarcely effective beyond 600 or 700 yards; round shot gave no very satisfactory results, with the six or nine-pounder, beyond 1,000 yards; and shrapnel (spherical case-shot), to be very formidable, required a coolness and a correct estimation of distances which are not always to be found on the field of battle, when the enemy is advancing; while the shell-practice of the old howitzers against troops was anything but satisfactory. The armies which had the nine-pounder gun for their smallest caliber, such as the English, were still the best off; the French eight-pounder, and, still more, the German six-pounder, became almost useless. To obviate this, the French introduced, about the beginning of the Crimean war, Louis Napoleon's so-called invention, the light twelve-pounder, *canon obusier*, from which solid shot, with a charge of one-fourth instead of one-third its weight, as well as shell, was to be fired. This gun was a mere plagiarism upon the English light twelve-pounder, which had already been again abandoned by the English; the system of firing shells from long guns had been long in practice in Germany; so that there was nothing at all new in this pretended improvement. Still, the arming of the whole French artillery with 12-pounders, even of a diminished range, would have given it a decided
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superiority over the old 6 and 8-pounders; and to counteract this, the Prussian Government, in 1859, resolved upon giving heavy 12-pounders to all its foot batteries. This was the last move in the cause of the smooth-bore gun; it showed that the whole subject was exhausted, and the defenders of the smooth-bore driven ad absurdum. There could, indeed, not be anything more absurd than to arm the whole artillery of an army with those lumbering, stick-in-the-mud Prussian 12-pounders, and that at a time when mobility and rapidity of maneuvering is the greatest desideratum of all. The French light 12-pounder having a relative superiority only to other artillery, and none at all as regarded the new small-arms, and the Prussian heavy 12-pounder being a palpable absurdity, there remained nothing but either to drop field artillery altogether, or to adopt rifled cannon.

In the mean time, experiments with rifled cannon had continually been carried on in various countries. In Germany, the Bavarian Lieut.-Col. Reichenbach experimented with a small rifled gun and cylindro-conoidal shot, as early as 1816. The results were very satisfactory as to range and precision, but the difficulties of loading and extraneous obstacles prevented the subject from being followed up. In 1846, the Piedmontese Major Cavalli constructed a breech-loading rifled gun which attracted considerable attention. His first gun was a thirty-pounder, charged with a cylindro-conoidal hollow shot weighing 64 pounds, and 5 pounds powder; at 14 3/4 degrees elevation he obtained a range (of first gauge) of 3,050 metres or 3,400 yards. His experiments (continued up to the latest period, partly in Sweden, partly in Piedmont) had the important result of leading to the discovery of the regular lateral deflection of all shot fired from rifled ordnance, which is caused by the pitch of the grooves, and which is always in the direction to which the grooves turn; this once being ascertained, its correction by what is called a lateral or horizontal tangent-scale, was also invented by Cavalli. The results of his experiments were highly satisfactory. At Turin, in 1854, his thirty-pounder, with 8-pound charges, 64-pound shot, gave the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Lateral irregular deflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10°</td>
<td>2,806 m</td>
<td>2.81 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15°</td>
<td>3,785 m</td>
<td>3.21 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20°</td>
<td>4,511 m</td>
<td>3.72 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25°</td>
<td>5,103 m</td>
<td>4.77 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

giving a range, at 25 degrees, of above three miles, with a lateral deflection from the line of aim (as corrected by the horizontal
tangent-scale) of less than 16 feet! The largest French field howitzer, at a range of 2,400 metres, equal to 2,650 yards, gave lateral deflections averaging 47 metres, or 155 feet; ten times as large as those of the rifled gun at twice the range.

Another system of rifled ordnance which created attention, a little after Cavalli's first experiments, was that of the Swedish Baron Wahrendorff. His gun was also breech-loading, and his shot cylindro-conoidal. The difference, however, in the shot was this: while Cavalli's shot was of hard metal, and had wings to fit in the grooves, Wahrendorff's shot was covered with a thin layer of lead, and slightly larger in diameter than the bore of the rifled portion of the gun. After being introduced into the chamber, which was large enough to receive it, the shot was propelled by the explosion into the rifled bore, and the lead being pressed into the grooves effectually, did away with all windage, and prevented the escape of any portion of the gases formed by the explosion. The results obtained with these guns in Sweden and elsewhere were quite satisfactory, and if Cavalli's guns were introduced into the armament of Genoa, those of Wahrendorff figure in the casemates of Waxholm in Sweden, Portsmouth in England, and in some Prussian fortresses. Thus, the introduction of rifled ordnance into practical use had begun, although only for fortresses. There remained only the one step to introduce them into field artillery, and this has been done in France and is now being done in all European artilleries. The various systems on which the rifling of field ordnance is now, or may be, profitably carried on, will form the subject of a second paper.

II

[New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5926, April 21, 1860]

The French were, as we said in our preceding paper, the first to introduce rifled cannon into practical warfare. For five or six years past, two officers, Col. Tamisier and Lieut.-Col. (now Col.) Treuille de Beaulieu, had experimentalized on the subject by order of the Government, and the results arrived at were found satisfactory enough to warrant their being made the base of a reorganization of the French artillery immediately before the outbreak of the late Italian war. Without entering upon the history of the experiments, we will at once pass to a description of the system now adopted in the French artillery.
In accordance with that desire for unity so characteristic of the French, they adopted one caliber only for field artillery (the old French four-pounder bore of 85\(\frac{1}{2}\) millimetres, or nearly 3\(\frac{1}{2}\) inches), and one for siege artillery (the old 12-pounder of 120 millimetres, or 4\(\frac{3}{4}\) inches). All other guns, except mortars, are to be done away with. The material selected is generally the common gun-metal, but also cast-steel, in some cases. The guns are muzzle-loading, as the French experiments with breech-loaders gave no satisfaction. There are six grooves in each gun, 5 millimetres deep and 16mm. broad, of a rounded form; the pitch of the rifling appears to be but low, but there are no details known respecting it. The windage on the body of the shot is about \(\frac{1}{2}\) to 1 mm.; that on the *aillettes* or warts which enter the grooves rather less than 1 mm. The shot is cylindro-ogival, and hollow, weighing about 12 pounds when filled; it has six *aillettes*, one for every groove, three standing near the point, and three near the base; they are very short—about 15 mm. long. The fuse-hole passes downward from the point, and is closed by a fuse or by a piston, with a percussion-cap for shot filled with powder, and by an iron screw, when the shot is not to explode; in this latter case it is filled with a mixture of sawdust and sand, so as to give it the same weight as when filled with powder. The length of bore of the gun is 1,385 mm., or 16 times its diameter; the weight of the brass gun is but 237 kilogrammes (518 pounds). To regulate the line of aim by the deviation (lateral deflection) of the shot in the direction of the pitch of the rifling—a deviation common to all projectiles launched from rifled barrels—the right trunnion carries what is called a horizontal tangent-scale. The gun, as well as its carriage, is reported to be of very elegant workmanship, and, from its small size and neatness, to look more like a model than a real engine of war.

Armed with this gun, the French artillery entered upon the Italian campaign, where it indeed astonished the Austrians by its great range, but certainly not by its accuracy of fire. The guns very often, indeed generally, overshot the mark, and were more dangerous to reserves than to first lines—in other words, where they hit better than the common guns, they hit people at whom they were not aimed at all. This is certainly a very questionable advantage, as in nine cases out of ten it implies that the objects at which the guns were aimed were *not* hit. The Austrian artillery, with as clumsy a material as any in Europe, made a very decent appearance when opposed to them, and came up to close quarters (that is, 500 or 600 yards) with these formidable opponents,
unlimbering under their most effective fire. There is no doubt that, great as the superiority of the new French guns is over their old smooth-bored ones, they did not perform anything like what was expected from them. Their extreme practicable range was 4,000 metres (4,400 yards), and undoubtedly it was but an impudent Bonapartist exaggeration when it was said that they could easily hit a single horseman at 3,300 yards.

The reasons for these unsatisfactory performances, in actual war, are very simple. The construction of these guns is utterly imperfect, and if the French adhere to it, in two or three years their artillery will possess the worst materiel in Europe. The first principle in rifled arms is that there must be no windage; otherwise the shot, loosely rolling about in the barrel and grooves, will not rotate round its own longitudinal axis, but rotate, in a spiral line of flight, round an imaginary line, the direction of which is determined by the accidental position of the shot when leaving the muzzle, and the spiral rounds will increase in diameter with the distance. Now, the French guns have considerable windage, and cannot do without it so long as the explosion of the charge is relied upon to light the fuse of the shell. This, then, is one circumstance which explains the want of accuracy. The second is the irregularity of the propelling force created by the greater or less escape of gas through windage during the explosion of the charge. The third is the greater elevation, with the same charge, necessitated through this windage; it stands to reason that where no gas at all can escape between shot and bore, the same charge propels further than where part of the gas escapes. Now, the French guns appear to require not only a very great charge for rifled guns (one-fifth of the weight of the shot), but also a pretty high elevation. The greater range obtained by rifled bores over smooth ones, even with smaller charges, is chiefly obtained by the absence of windage, and the certainty of having the whole explosive force of the charge applied to the expulsion of the shot. By admitting windage, the French sacrifice part of the propelling force, and have to replace it by increased charges to a limited degree, and by greater elevation beyond that. Now, there is nothing so contrary to accuracy at any distances as great elevation. So long as the line of flight of the shot does not, at its highest point, much exceed the hight of the object aimed at, so long a mistake in estimating the distance is of little importance; but at long range, the shot takes a very high flight, and comes down at an angle on an average twice as great as that under which it began its flight (this, of course, is confined to elevations up to about 15
degrees). Thus, the higher the elevation the more the line in which the shot strikes the ground approaches the vertical; and an error in estimating the distance of not more than ten or twenty yards may preclude the possibility of hitting at all. At ranges beyond even 400 or 500 yards, such errors are unavoidable, and the consequence is the astonishing difference between the capital shooting on the practice-ground, with measured distances, and the execrable practice on the battle-field, where the distances are unknown, the objects moving, and the moments for reflection very short. Thus, with the new rifles, the chance of hitting beyond three hundred yards on the battle-field is very small, while under three hundred yards, from the low flight of the ball, it is very great; in consequence of which, the charge with the bayonet becomes the most effective means of dislodging an enemy, as soon as the attacking body has come up to that distance. Suppose one army to carry rifles which at 400 yards give no higher trajectory than the rifles of their opponents give at 300 yards, the former will have the advantage of beginning an effective fire at 100 yards greater distance, and as but three or four minutes are required to charge through 400 yards, this advantage is not a mean one in the decisive moment of a battle. It is similar with cannon. Sir Howard Douglas, ten years ago, declared that gun far the best which gives the greatest range with the least elevation. With rifled cannon the importance of this point is still greater, as the chance of error in estimating distance increases with the longer range, and as the ricochets of any other than spherical shot cannot be relied upon. This is one of the disadvantages of rifled guns; they must hit with the first impact, if they are to hit at all, while round-shot, if it falls short, will rebound and continue its flight in very nearly its original direction. Here, then, a low trajectory is of the very highest importance, as every degree more of elevation reduces the chance of hitting with the first impact in an increasing ratio, and therefore the high line of flight produced by the French guns is one of their most serious defects.

But the whole of the deficiencies of these guns are crowned and enhanced by one defect, which suffices to stamp the whole system. They are produced by the machinery and on the principles formerly serving for the manufacture of the old smooth-bored guns. With the very great windage of these old guns, and the varying weights and diameters of the shot, mathematical precision
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\(^a\) Howard Douglas, *A Treatise on Naval Gunnery. Dedicated by Special Permission to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty*, London, 1851.—Ed.
in the manufacture was but a secondary consideration. The manufacture of firearms, up to a very few years ago, was the most backward branch of modern industry. There was far too much hand labor and far too little machinery. For the old smooth-bore arms this might be allowable; but when arms were to be manufactured which were expected to have great precision at long distances, this system became intolerable. To insure the certainty that every musket should shoot perfectly alike at 600, 800, 1,000 yards, and every cannon at 2,000, 4,000, 6,000 yards, it became necessary that every part of every operation should be performed by the most perfect and self-acting machinery, so as to turn out one weapon the mathematical counterpart of the other. Deviations from mathematical precision, inappreciable under the old system, now became defects rendering the whole weapon useless. The French have not improved their old machinery to any noticeable extent, and hence the irregularities in their firing. How can guns be made to give the same range at the same elevation, all other circumstances being alike, when none of them is identical with the other in every particular? But irregularities in manufacture which at 800 yards produce differences of a yard, at 4,000 will produce differences of a hundred yards in range. How, then, can such guns be expected to be true at long ranges?

To recapitulate: the French rifled guns are bad, because they must have windage; because they require, comparatively, great elevations, and because their workmanship is not at all up to the requirements of rifled long-range guns. They must soon be superseded by different constructions, or they will reduce the French artillery practice to the worst in Europe.

We have purposely examined these guns a little in detail, as they gave us, thereby, an opportunity of explaining the chief principles of rifled ordnance. In a concluding article we shall consider the two systems proposed, which in England are now contesting for superiority—systems both of which are founded upon loading by the breech, absence of windage, and perfect workmanship—the Armstrong system and that of Whitworth.

III


We now come to the description of the two kinds of breech-loading rifled cannon which at the present moment contend for superiority in England, and which, both invented by
civilians, certainly surpass in efficiency anything hitherto produced by professional artillerists—the Armstrong gun and the Whitworth gun.

Sir William Armstrong's gun had the advantage of priority, and of being praised by the whole press and official world of England. It is, undoubtedly, a highly effective machine of war, and far superior to the French rifled gun; but whether it can beat Whitworth's gun may well be doubted.

Sir Wm. Armstrong constructs his gun by wrapping, round a tube of cast steel, two layers of wrought-iron tubes in a spiral form, the upper layer laid on in the opposite direction to the lower one, in the same way as gun-barrels are made from layers of wire. This system gives a very strong and tough material, though a very expensive one. The bore is rifled with numerous narrow grooves, one close to the other, and having one turn in the length of the gun. The oblong—cylindro-ogival—shot is of cast iron, but covered with a mantle of lead, which gives it a diameter somewhat larger than the bore; this shot, along with the charge, is introduced by the breech into a chamber wide enough to receive it; the explosion propels the shot into the narrow bore, where the soft lead is pressed into the grooves, and thus does away with all windage while giving the projectile the spiral rotation indicated by the pitch of the grooves. This mode of pressing the shot into the grooves, and the coating of soft material required for it, are the characteristic features of Armstrong's system; and if the reader will refer to the principles of rifled ordnance, as developed in our preceding articles, he will agree that, in principle, Armstrong is decidedly in the right. The shot being larger in diameter than the bore, the gun is necessarily breech-loading, which, to us, also seems a necessary feature in all rifled ordnance. The breech-loading apparatus itself, however, has nothing whatever to do with the principle of any particular system of rifling, but may be transferred from one to the other; we leave it, therefore, entirely out of our consideration.

The range and precision attained with this new gun are something wonderful. The shot was thrown to some 8,500 yards, or nearly five miles, and the certainty with which the target was hit at 2,000 or 3,000 yards much exceeded what the old, smooth-bore guns could show at one-third of these distances. Still, with all the puffing of the English press, the scientifically interesting details of
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a See The Times, Nos. 23524, 23526, 23545, 23547 and 23585, January 24 and 26, February 17 and 20, and April 4, 1860.—Ed.
all these experiments were studiously kept secret. It was never stated with what elevation and charge these ranges were obtained; the weight of the shot and that of the gun itself, the exact lateral and longitudinal deviations, &c., were never particularized. Now, at last, when the Whitworth gun has made its appearance, we learn some details of one set of experiments at least. Mr. Sidney Herbert, Secretary of War, has stated in Parliament that a 12-pounder gun of 8 cwt., with 1 lb. 8 oz. of powder, gave a range of 2,460 yards, at 7 degrees elevation, with an extreme lateral deviation of three, and an extreme longitudinal deviation of 65 yards. At eight degrees elevation, the range was 2,797 yards; at nine, above 3,000 yards; the deviations remaining nearly the same. Now, an elevation of seven to nine degrees is a thing unknown in the practice of smooth-bore field artillery. The official tables, for instance, do not go beyond four degrees elevation, at which the 12-pounder and 9-pounder give a range of 1,400 yards. Any higher elevation in field guns would be useless, from giving too high a line of flight, and thereby immensely reducing the chance of hitting the mark. But we have some experiments (quoted in Sir Howard Douglas's *Naval Gunnery*) with heavy ship guns of smooth bore at higher elevations. The English long 32-pounder at Deal, in 1839, gave ranges, at 7 degrees, of 2,231 to 2,318; at 9 degrees, from 2,498 to 2,682 yards. The French 36-pounder, in 1846 and '47, gave ranges, at 7 degrees, of 2,270; at 9 degrees, of 2,636 yards. This shows that, at equal elevations, the ranges of rifled guns are not so very superior to those of smooth-bore cannon.

The Whitworth gun, in almost every respect, is the opposite of the Armstrong gun. Its bore is not circular, but hexagonal; the pitch of its rifling is very near twice as high as that of the Armstrong gun; the shot is of a very hard material, without any coating of lead; and, if it is breech-loading, it is not necessarily so, but merely as a matter of convenience and of fashion. This gun is of a recently-patented material, called "homogeneous iron," of great strength, elasticity, and toughness; the shot is a mathematically exact fit to the bore, and cannot, therefore, be introduced without the bore being lubricated. This is done by a composition of wax and grease being inserted between charge and shot, which at the same time tends to decrease whatever windage there may be
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*a In his speech in the House of Commons on February 17, 1860 (see *The Times*, No. 23546, February 18, 1860.— Ed.*


*c ibid., p. 585.—Ed.*
left. The material of the gun is so tough that it will easily stand 3,000 rounds without any damage to the bore.

The Whitworth gun was brought before the public in February last, when a series of experiments were made with it at Southport, on the Lancashire coast. There were three guns—a 3-pounder, 12-pounder, and 80-pounder; from the long reports we select the 12-pounder as an illustration. This gun was 7 feet 9 inches long, and weighed 8 cwt. The common 12-pounder, for round shot, is 6 feet 6 inches long, and weighs 18 cwt. The ranges obtained with Whitworth's gun were as follows: At 2 degrees elevation (where the old 12-pounder gives 1,000 yards), with a charge of $1^{3/4}$ lb., the range varied from 1,208 to 1,281 yards. At 5 degrees (where the old 32-pounder gives 1,940 yards), it ranged from 2,298 to 2,342 yards. At 10 degrees (range of old 32-pounder, 2,800 yards), it averaged 4,000 yards. For higher elevations a 3-pounder gun was used, with 8 oz. charge; with 20 degrees, it ranged from 6,300 to 6,800, with 33 and 35 degrees, 9,400 to 9,700 yards. The old 56-pounder, of smooth bore, gives, at 20 degrees, a range of 4,381 yards, at 32 degrees, of 5,680 yards. The precision obtained by the Whitworth gun was very satisfactory, and at least as good as that of the Armstrong gun in lateral deflection; as to longitudinal variations, the experiments do not admit of a satisfactory conclusion.

IV

[New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5950, May 19, 1860]

The Whitworth gun is constructed upon the principle of reducing windage to the utmost minimum, by a mathematical fit of the shot to the bore, and doing away with what little may remain by the effect of the lubricating composition. In this respect it is inferior to Armstrong's gun, which has no windage at all; and this we consider its principal defect. The polygonal bore, however, would be impossible without this defect, and at all events it deserves to be acknowledged that with such an originally defective system, such great results have been obtained. Whitworth has undoubtedly brought to its highest perfection the system which
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\[a\] See "Experiments with Mr. Whitworth's Breech-Loading Cannon", The Times, No. 23547, February 20, 1860.—Ed.

\[b\] This section was discovered to have been by Engels after the publication of the German and the Russian editions of the Collected Works, and appears here for the first time since its publication in the newspaper.—Ed.
gives hard, unyielding shot and allows windage. His gun is immensely superior to the rough empiricism of the French rifled ordnance. But while Armstrong's gun, and other guns depending on soft-coated shot to be forced into the grooves by pressure, may be perfected \textit{ad infinitum}, Whitworth's gun will have no such future; it has already attained the highest perfection compatible with its fundamental principles.

To recapitulate:

We find that at the \textit{practicable elevation} of field-artillery, the best rifled guns known give a range but \textit{very little} superior to the old smooth-bored gun. There is, however, some advantage, and this remains an item in their favor. But the great \textit{advantages} of rifled ordnance for field-artillery are these:

1. The same weight of shot can be projected by a gun having a much smaller bore, and with a much smaller charge than with the old smooth-bored gun, which was only fit for spherical shot. Consequently, the weight of the gun is considerably reduced. The old 12-pounder had a bore of about 4\ 1/2 inches, and weighed 18 cwt.; its charge was four pounds of powder. The new 12-pounder has a bore of about 3\ 1/2 inches, or nearly that of the old 9-pounder; its weight, 8 cwt.; charge, from 1\ 1/2 to 1\ 3/4 pounds. The French new 12-pounders, with the old 4-pounder's bore, are still lighter. This is an immense advantage. It gives to the field-gun a mobility hitherto unknown, and renders it almost as fit to go over any ground as infantry. More than four horses to a gun will henceforth be useless.

2. At the distances hitherto practicable for field-artillery, it gives a far greater chance of hitting; it lowers the trajectory, and reduces to a minimum both lateral and longitudinal deflections. At an exchange of round shot and shells with percussion fuses, a rifled battery will always beat a smooth-bored one of equal weight of shot.

As to heavy ordnance, it will be all-powerful against stone walls, especially by shell-practice with percussion fuses. This has already been proved by experiment, both in France and Germany. It will give ships and siege batteries a chance of bombarding towns at distances from 4,000 to 9,000 yards. In every other respect it will not alter materially the hitherto existing relations of besiegers and besieged, and of ships against batteries on shore.

On the other hand, the \textit{disadvantages} of rifled ordnance are:

1. The common case-shot becomes either impossible or ineffective from the irregular line of flight imparted to the balls by the spiral rotation.
2. Firing with shell with time-fuses (and shrapnel shot with ditto) becomes almost impracticable, as the absence or reduction of windage prevents the flame of the explosion from communicating with the fuse which necessarily must be at the point of the oblong shot.

In spite of these drawbacks, rifled ordnance has now become a matter of necessity for every army. The question now is only, how these drawbacks can be obviated. That they will be so there can be no doubt. But it is certain that the same rules obtain in rifled ordnance which regulate the construction and use of rifled small arms. The exaggerated ideas of five-mile ranges in the one are as ridiculous as the notion of hitting a man with the new rifles at 800 or 1,000 yards; and still the advantages given by rifled bores in either case, are so great that it is imperative upon every army which may ever be called upon to fight with civilized foes, to do away with all smooth-bored barrels, both in small arms and artillery.

Written in March and May 1860
First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, Nos. 5914 (as a leading article), 5926, 5938 and 5950, April 7 and 21, May 5 and 19, 1860; parts I and II reprinted in the New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune, Nos. 1556 and 1558, April 24 and May 1, 1860

Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune
Karl Marx
PUBLIC FEELING IN BERLIN

Berlin, April 10, 1860

If an intelligent foreigner who had visited Berlin but two months ago and then left it were now to return to the "metropolis of intelligence," the thorough change in the physiognomy, tone and temper "meiner lieben Berliner" (of my beloved Berliners)\(^a\) could not fail to strike his mental eye. Still, some months ago small talk obtained in all the ranks of the metropolitan society. People congratulated each other, in subdued accents, on the nightmare of a decennial reaction having at last ceased to crush their brains—that the worst was over. This silly theme was sounded to all keys, and the unavoidable afterthought that the change had been brought about not by any vigorous and healthy effort on the part of the Prussian subjects, but rather by the sickly affection of the Prussian King's head; that the change was therefore the work of nature, not the deed of man. This uncomfortable afterthought falsified even the first joys of the new era\(^b\) triumphantly announced by the dully-deadly pens of the Berlin daily press. Such was the pusillanimity prevailing that, not to frighten the Prince Regent\(^b\) out of his new-fangled liberalism, all the candidates in the general election to the Second Chamber were put to this simple test: Did they profess confidence in the Hohenzollern Cabinet\(^c\) installed by the Prince Regent? Were their names in no way obnoxious to the mild liberalism of the new Government? Instead of men to take up the grievances of the country, there were wanted bottle-holders with ready-cut votes for the Cabinet. That the new Cabinet actually did not touch the bureaucratic and police shackles forged by its predecessors, while its very profes-
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\(^{a}\) An allusion to Frederick William IV's address to the Berlin population on March 19, 1848 (see the Allgemeine Preussische Zeitung, No. 80, March 20, 1848).—\textit{Ed.}

\(^{b}\) William, Prince of Prussia.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^{c}\) The Cabinet headed by Karl Anton Hohenzollern.—\textit{Ed.}
sions of faith were characterized by weak duplicity, shy reserve, and equivocal reticence—these facts were hoodwinked; and it was furthermore proclaimed a patriotic duty to hoodwink them. All the opposition papers, whether styling themselves Constitutional or Democratic, turned downright Ministerial.

After the peace of Villafranca, when Herr von Schleinitz, the Prussian Minister of Foreign Affairs, published a sort of Blue Book on the Italian war—when his dispatches, true patterns of weak-minded verbosity, showed him up the worthy successor of the man who, in the last century, had concluded the peace of Basle, and, in this century, had prepared the catastrophe of Jena—when we saw him humbly receiving lessons of constitutionalism on the part of Little Johnny, the British Jack-of-all-Trades, crouching in the dust before Prince Gorchakoff, exchanging billets-doux with the Man of December, superciliously frowning upon his Austrian colleague, to be finally kicked by all his correspondents—even then the Prussian press and our Berlin Liberals worked themselves into real fits of enthusiasm with respect to the superhuman wisdom evinced by the Prussian Government, which, not content with doing nothing itself, had contrived to preclude Germany from all action.

Soon after there took place at Breslau a meeting between the Russian Czar and Gorchakoff on the one side, and the Prince Regent with his Ministerial satellites on the other. A new deed of enfeoffment of Prussia to her Muscovite neighbor was duly signed—the first, but necessary result, this, of the peace of Villafranca. Even in 1844 such an event would have aroused a storm of opposition throughout the country. Now it was extolled as an earnest of far-seeing statecraft. The nihilism of the Prince Regent's foreign policy coupled with the continuance of the old reactionary system of mingled feudalism and bureaucracy, which was forsaken in name only, seemed to our friends, the Berlin Liberals, and the Prussian press of all colors, save the special organs of the old Camarilla, sufficient reasons to claim the Imperial crown of little Germany (that is to say, Germany minus German Austria) for the representative of the Prussian dynasty. It is difficult to find in the records of history a similar piece of judicial blindness, but we remember that after the battle of
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a Karl August Hardenberg.—Ed.
b John Russell.—Ed.
c Napoleon III.—Ed.
d Johann Bernhard Rechberg.—Ed.
e Wroclaw.—Ed.
Austerlitz,\textsuperscript{284} Prussia also crowed for some days on her own dunghill, \textit{quasi re bene gesta}.\textsuperscript{a}

After the termination of the Italian war, it was a spectacle as pitiful as it was disgusting to hear the Prussian press, with the Berlin papers at its head, instead of venturing upon the faintest criticism of the stupid diplomacy of her\textsuperscript{b} native rulers; instead of boldly challenging the "liberal" Ministry to bridge at last, in internal affairs, the broad chasm between the nominal and the real; instead of denouncing the silent but obstinate encroachments on civil liberty dared upon by the host of Manteuffel's officials, still snugly ensconced in their old strongholds; instead of all that, to hear them sing panegyrics on the splendor of renovated Prussia; to see them dart their pointless shafts at humbled Austria; to see them stretch their unnerved hands at the German Imperial crown, and, to the utter astonishment of all Europe, demean themselves like maniacs in a fool's paradise. Altogether, it seemed as if the great international drama now enacted on the European stage, did only concern our Berlin friends as spectators who, from the gallery or pit, have to applaud or hoot, but not to act.

All this has been changed now as by a magician's wand. Berlin is at this moment, with the exception perhaps of Palermo and Vienna, the most revolutionary town in Europe. The fermentation pervades all ranks, and seems more intense than in the days of March, 1848. How has this phenomenon been brought about, and so suddenly, too? By a combination of events at the top of which range Louis Bonaparte's last exploits on the one hand, and the new army reforms\textsuperscript{c} proposed by the liberal Government on the other. Then, of course, the state of confidence and of willful self-delusion could not last forever. The incidents, furthermore, by which the Ministry has been forced to dismiss Stieber,\textsuperscript{285} the Police Director, the low criminal, who, together with his master, the late Hinckeldey, had swayed supreme power in Prussia ever since 1852; and last, not least, the publication of Humboldt's correspondence with Varnhagen von Ense\textsuperscript{d} have done the rest. The fool's paradise has vanished before the breath from beyond the grave.

Written on April 10, 1860

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the \textit{New-York Daily Tribune}, No. 5992, April 28, 1860

\textsuperscript{a} As if everything were well.— Ed.

\textsuperscript{b} i.e. Prussia's.— Ed.

\textsuperscript{c} See this volume, pp. 345-49.— Ed.

\textsuperscript{d} \textit{Briefe von Alexander von Humboldt an Varnhagen von Ense aus den Jahren 1827 bis 1858}, Leipzig, 1860. Humboldt's letters contain sharp criticism of the Prussian Government.— Ed.
Throughout the history of the human race no land and no people have suffered so terribly from slavery, from foreign conquests and oppressions, and none have struggled so irrepressibly for emancipation as Sicily and the Sicilians. Almost from the time when Polyphemus promenaded around Etna, or when Ceres taught the Siculi the culture of grain, to our day, Sicily has been the theater of uninterrupted invasions and wars, and of unflinching resistance. The Sicilians are a mixture of almost all southern and northern races; first, of the aboriginal Sicanians, with Phoenicians, Carthaginians, Greeks, and slaves from all regions under heaven, imported into the island by traffic or war; and then of Arabs, Normans, and Italians. The Sicilians, in all these transformations and modifications, have battled, and still battle, for their freedom.

More than thirty centuries ago the aborigines of Sicily resisted as best they could the superior weapons and military skill of Carthaginian and Greek invaders. They were made tributary, but never wholly subdued by the one or the other. For a long time Sicily was the battle-field of Greeks and Carthaginians; her people were ruined and partly enslaved; her cities, inhabited by Carthaginians and Greeks, were the central points whence oppression and slavery radiated through the interior of the island. These early Sicilians, however, never missed an opportunity to strike for liberty, or at least to take as much revenge as possible on their Carthaginian masters and on Syracuse. The Romans finally subdued Carthaginians and Syracusans, selling into slavery as many of them as possible. On one occasion 30,000 inhabitants of Panormus, the modern Palermo, were thus sold. The Romans
worked Sicily with numberless gangs of slaves, in order to feed with Sicilian wheat the poor proletarians of the Eternal City. For this purpose, they not only enslaved the inhabitants of the island, but imported slaves from all their other dominions. The terrible cruelties of Roman Proconsuls, Praetors, Praefects, are known to every one who is in any degree familiar with the history of Rome, or with the oratory of Cicero. Nowhere else, perhaps, did Roman cruelty hold such saturnalia. The poor freemen and yeomen, if unable to pay the crushing tribute exacted of them, were pitilessly sold into bondage, themselves or their children, by the tax-gatherers.

But both under the Syracusan Dionysius and under the Roman rule, the most terrible slave insurrections took place in Sicily, in which the native people and the imported slaves often made common cause. During the breaking up of the Roman Empire, Sicily was visited by various invaders. Then the Moors got hold of it for a time; but the Sicilians, and above all the genuine people of the interior, resisted always, more or less successfully, and step by step maintained or conquered various small franchises. The dawn had scarcely begun to spread over the medieval darkness, when the Sicilians stood forth, already armed, not only with various municipal liberties, but with rudiments of a constitutional government, such as at that time existed nowhere else. Earlier than any other European nation, the Sicilians regulated by vote the income of their Governments and Sovereigns. Thus the Sicilian soil has ever proved deadly to oppressors and invaders, and the Sicilian Vespers stand immortal in history. When the House of Aragon brought the Sicilians into dependence on Spain, they knew how to preserve their political immunities more or less intact; and this they did alike under the Hapsburgs and the Bourbons. When the French Revolution and Napoleon expelled the tyrannical reigning family from Naples, the Sicilians—incited and seduced by English promises and guaranties—received the fugitives, and in their struggles against Napoleon sustained them both with their blood and their money. Every one knows the subsequent treachery of the Bourbons, and the subterfuges or impudent denials by which England has tried and still tries to varnish her own faithless abandonment of the Sicilians and of their liberties to the tender mercies of the Bourbons.

At the present day, political, administrative, and fiscal oppression crushes all classes of the people; and these grievances therefore stand in the foreground. But nearly the whole soil is still in the hands of comparatively few large landowners or barons.
The medieval tenures of land are still preserved in Sicily, except that the tiller is not a serf; he ceased to be such about the eleventh century, when he became a free tenant. The conditions of his tenure are, however, generally so oppressive, that the immense majority of agriculturists work exclusively for the advantage of the tax-gatherer and of the baron, producing scarcely anything beyond the taxes and rents, and themselves remaining either wretchedly, or, at least, comparatively poor. Producing the celebrated Sicilian wheat and excellent fruits, they themselves live poorly on beans the whole year through.

Sicily now bleeds again, and England looks calmly on at these new saturnalia of the infamous Bourbon, and his not less infamous minions, lay or clerical, Jesuits or Guardsmen. The fussy declaimers of the British Parliament rend the air with their empty talk about Savoy and the dangers of Switzerland, but have not a word to say of the massacres in the Sicilian cities. No voice raises the cry of indignation throughout Europe. No ruler and no Parliament proclaims outlawry against the bloodthirsty idiot of Naples. Louis Napoleon, alone, for this or that purpose—of course not for any love of liberty, but for the aggrandizement of his family or of French influence—may perhaps stop the butcher in his work of destruction. England will howl about perfidy, will spout fire and flames against Napoleonic treachery and ambition; but the Neapolitans and the Sicilians must eventually be gainers, even under a Murat or any other new ruler. Any change must be for the better.

Written in late April and early May 1860

Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune
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*a* Francis II.—*Ed.*
Karl Marx

PREPARATIONS FOR NAPOLEON'S COMING WAR ON THE RHINE

I

Berlin, May 1, 1860

The notion that Louis Bonaparte is about to put the German question on the tapis prevails here among all classes of society. In to-day's National-Zeitung, a correspondent even affirms that he knows, from sources most authentic, that Badinguet (as Louis Bonaparte is familiarly styled at Paris) has definitely resolved upon a Rhenish campaign, and that Lord John Russell had just been informed of this scheme when, some weeks ago, he rose from his seat to frighten the House of Commons by fierce invectives against the Emperor of the French, and the sudden announcement that England was now going in search for new alliances. The tone and temper of French semi-official prints are far from allaying these apprehensions. Read, for instance, the following extract from Bullier's Correspondence, a Paris publication from which most of the provincial journalists in France derive their inspiration:

"A friend of mine, who is addicted to prophetic pleasantries, said to me the other day: 'You'll see the Emperor go to the Rhine to offer his alliance to the King of Prussia, coupled with a slight rectification of frontiers.' I replied by a quotation from the pamphlet Napoleon III et l'Italie: It is better to settle a Territorial modification in a friendly way than to have to do it the day after a victory."

Not long after the treaty of commerce with England was concluded, the French Government threw out a hint to the Prussian Ambassador at Paris that an application for a similar treaty between France and the Zollverein would be favorably received, but the Prussian Government answering that the
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a Frederick William IV.—Ed.
b La Guéronnière, L'empereur Napoléon III et l'Italie, Paris, 1859, pp. 63-64.—Ed.
c See this volume, pp. 341-44.—Ed.
d A. Pourtalès.—Ed.
Zollverein was not at all desirous to make such a treaty, surprise and displeasure were expressed in terms far from courteous. Moreover, the Prussian Government was, at the time, fully informed of the negotiations which the agents of Louis Bonaparte had recently opened with the Bavarian Court, in order to induce the latter to cede to France the fortress of Landau, which, it was said, having been left to France by the treaty of 1814, had been unjustly taken from her by the treaty of 1815. The popular rumors of an impending rupture with France are, consequently, strengthened by official suspicion.

Prussia's position at present bears, in some respects, a strong likeness to that of Austria after the conclusion of the Oriental war. Austria seemed then to have got off best of all the Powers. She flattered herself that she had humbled Russia, her dangerous neighbor, without incurring any trouble beyond the mobilization of her forces. Having played the armed mediator while the Western Powers had to bear the brunt of war, she might, after the proclamation of peace, fancy she had broken, by the arms of the Western Alliance, the ascendancy Russia had won over her since the Hungarian events of 1849, and there were indeed at that time many compliments bestowed upon the clever diplomatic tactics of the Vienna Cabinet. In point of fact, however, the ambiguous attitude maintained by Austria during the Oriental war, left her without allies, and enabled Louis Bonaparte to localize the Italian war. Prussia, in her turn, maintained her resources intact during the Italian war. She shouldered her arms, but had not used them, and contented herself with spilling, instead of blood, the patient ink of her political wiseacres. After the peace of Villafranca, Prussia seemed to have weakened the rival House of Hapsburg through the instrumentality of French victories, and opened to herself the road to paramount power in Germany. Still, the very pretexts on which the treaty of Villafranca was proclaimed ought to have rent the delusions she labored under. While Louis Bonaparte declared that Prussia's armaments and threats of an eventual intervention had blunted the sword of France, Austria declared that her own power of resistance had split upon the equivocal neutrality of Prussia. During the whole war, Prussia had displayed pretensions ludicrously contradicted by her acts. Before Austria and the minor German States she appealed to her duties as a European Power; before England and Russia she appealed to her obligations as the paramount German Power; and, resting her claims on these double pretensions, she demanded from France to be acknowledged as the armed mediator of Europe. To her claims
as the German Power, *par excellence*, she acted up by allowing Russia to intimidate, in a circular of unprecedented insolence, the minor German courts, and by timidly listening, in the person of Herr von Schleinitz, to Lord John Russell's flippant lectures on the "constitutional" law of nations.

Her claims as a European Power she made good by hushing up the warlike impulses of the minor German princes, and by an attempt to turn the military defeats of Austria into as many titles for usurping the place formerly held by her rival in the councils of the German Confederation. When at last forced, by the progress of the French arms, to assume something like a warlike attitude, she met with the cold resistance of the minor German States, which hardly thought it worth while to dissimulate their distrust as to the ultimate intentions of the Prussian Court. The peace of Villafranca found Prussia completely insulated, not only in Europe, but in Germany, while the subsequent annexation of Savoy, by greatly contracting the exposed front of France, greatly improved her chances of a victorious campaign on the Rhine.

Under these circumstances, the line of policy which Prussia now affected to follow, both in her internal and external relations, appears alike faulty. Despite all the vainglorious declamations of the Prussian newspapers and Representative Chambers, nothing has been altered in her internal affairs, save the phraseology of her officials. The propositions on army reform, while not at all strengthening her military force for the impending emergency, aim at a permanent enlargement of the standing army, already too large; the overburdening of the financial resources, already overstrained, and the annihilation of the only democratic institution of the country—the Landwehr. All the reactionary laws on the press, the right of association, the municipal administration, the relations of landlords and peasants, the bureaucratic tutelage, the ubiquity of the police, have been carefully maintained. Even the infamous statutes relating to marriages contracted between nobles and the common stock of mankind, have not been rescinded. The very idea of restoring the Constitution, overthrown by a *coup d'état*, is hooted at as a wild dream.

I will give you one single instance of the civil liberty now enjoyed by a Prussian subject. A native of Rhenish Prussia had,

---


*b* See this volume, pp. 345-49.— *Ed.*

during the worst period of the reaction, been condemned by a packed jury, because of what was then called a political crime, to seven years imprisonment in a Prussian fortress. The period of his punishment, not abridged by the liberal ministry, having come to an end, he repaired to Cologne, there to be driven out by order of the police. He then set out for his native town, but, strange to say, was informed by the authorities that, having absented himself for seven years from the place, he had lost his citizenship, and must look for another abode. He retorted that his absence had not been a voluntary one, but all in vain. From Berlin, where he then resorted, he was again ejected on the plea that he had no means of existence to show, except his personal resources of labor and knowledge; all his property having been consumed during his imprisonment. He at last betook himself to Breslau, where an old acquaintance of his employed him as one of his agents, but being one morning summoned to the police, he was told that his permission of residence could be prolonged only for a few weeks, if, in the mean while, he should not have procured citizenship in Breslau. On his appliance to the Breslau municipal authority, many petty difficulties were thrown in his way, which, being removed by the interference of zealous friends, his petition for citizenship was at last granted, but, together with the grant, he received a big bill, parading an array of fees, all to be paid by any happy mortal on his entrance into the ranks of Breslau citizens. If his friends had not possessed the means by clubbing, to raise the sum required, this Prussian subject would, like the Wandering Jew, have found no place in his glorious fatherland where to rest his head.

II

Berlin, May 2, 1860

After the conclusion of the peace of Villafranca, the Prussian Government, which for months had flattered itself with the idle hope of being acknowledged as the armed mediator of Europe, and of rearing, upon the ruins of the Hapsburg Empire, the edifice of Hohenzollern greatness, seemed to have awakened to a sense of the immense dangers looming in the future. Their policy, at once irresolute, vacillating, and perfidious, had left them without allies, and even von Schleinitz, whose long-winded dispatches had become a standing joke with the diplomatic world, could hardly conceal from himself the truth that, so soon as the
internal state of France should again drive the Man of December beyond the French frontiers, Prussia was to be the predestined object of another localized war.

Had not Louis Napoleon, in a moment of apparent openheartedness, dropped some words to the effect that he knew what Germany stood in need of—unity, that he was the man to impart it; and that the Rhenish Provinces would be not too high a price for the purchase of so precious a commodity. Quite true to the tradition of Prussia's past, the first idea of the Prince Regent and his satellites was to throw themselves upon the mercy of Russia. Had not Frederick William I acquired Pomerania by a treaty of division concluded with Peter the Great against Charles XII of Sweden? Had not Frederick II carried the day in the Seven Years' War, and annexed Silesia by the withdrawal of Russia from her Austrian ally? Had not the several divisions of Poland, planned between the Court of Berlin and the Court of Petersburg, swelled out the diminutive dimensions of the Prussian monarchy? Had not, at the Congress of Vienna, the unbounded servility of Frederick William III, who stood by Alexander I, when, in 1814, England, Austria, and France showed some indication to opposition and resistance, been rewarded by the annexation of Saxony and the Rhenish Provinces to Prussia? Prussia, in one word, had in its encroachments upon Germany, always enjoyed the patronage and the support of Russia, on the express condition, of course, of helping that latter Power to subject the countries bordering on the fatherland, and of playing the part of its humble vassal on the European stage. In October, 1859, the Prince Regent and Alexander II, surrounded by diplomatists, generals and courtiers, met each other at Breslau, there to conclude a treaty, the articles of which have, till now, remained an unfathomable secret, not for Louis Bonaparte or Lord Palmerston, but for Prussian subjects, whose liberal representatives have proved themselves, of course, much too polite to interpellate Herr von Schleinitz, the Foreign Minister, on such a delicate question. This much, however, is sure, that the Bonapartist press took no fright at the Breslau conference; that ever since then the relations between Russia and France have grown more ostentatiously intimate; that that conference did not prevent Louis Bonaparte, either from seizing upon Savoy, or threatening Switzerland, and throwing out hints upon some unavoidable "rectification of the Rhenish frontiers," and, finally, that Prussia herself, despite the comfortable prospect

\[\text{Ed.}\]
of again being allowed to form Russia's vanguard, has, in these latter times, eagerly seized upon the bait of an English alliance, only thrown out at London to amuse the British House of Commons for a week or two.

However, Lord John Russell's indiscreet betrayal in the shape of a Blue Book, of Herr von Schleinitz's coquetry with the Tuileries during the last Italian war, gave the death-blow to the Anglo-Prussian alliance, which the Prussian Government considered for a moment as a scheme really entertained, but which was known at London to be nothing beyond a phrase hiding a Parliamentary trick. After all, despite the conference with Alexander II, at Breslau, and Lord John Russell's "search for new alliances," Prussia now, as after the treaty of Villafranca, finds herself completely insulated and singly exposed to the French theory of the natural frontiers.

Can it be believed that under such trying circumstances the only expedient which the Prussian Government has hit upon is to renew its scheme of a little Germany with a Hohenzollern at its head, and, by the most insolent provocations, not only to drive Austria into the hostile camp, but to estrange the whole of Southern Germany? Yet, incredible as it may appear, and the more incredible since this line of policy is fervently recommended by the Bonapartist press, such is the case. The nearer the danger draws, the more anxious appears Prussia to display her hunger for a new division of Germany. By the way, it is likely enough that, after the blow dealt to Austria, Germany stands in need of a similar blow being dealt to Prussia, in order to get rid of "both the houses," but at all events nobody will suspect the Prince Regent and Herr von Schleinitz of acting upon such pessimist principles. Ever since the treaty of Villafranca the leanings of the Regent's policy have been betrayed in little press skirmishes and small occasional debates on the Italian question, but, on the 20th of April, in the Prussian Lower House, on [the] occasion of the debates on the Kurhessian question, the cat was let out of the bag.

I have before explained this Kurhessian question to your readers, and shall therefore now limit myself to explaining in a
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*a Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Italy from the Signing of Preliminaries of Villafranca to the Postponement of the Congress, London, 1860.—*Ed.

*b Cf. "a plague o'both your houses", Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet, Act III, Scene 1.—*Ed.

*c See the Königlich privilegirte Berlinische Zeitung, No. 93, April 20, 1860.—*Ed.

*d Karl Marx, "Trouble in Germany", present edition, Vol. 16.—*Ed.
few words the main points upon which the debates turned. The Kurhessian Constitution of 1831 having been destroyed by the Arch-Elector\(^a\) in 1849-50, under Austrian auspices, Prussia for a moment affected a desire to draw the sword on behalf of the protesting representative Chamber, but in November, 1850, on the meeting between Prince Schwarzenberg and Baron Manteuffel at Olmütz, when Prussia altogether surrendered to Austria, acknowledged the restoration of the old German Diet,\(^b\) betrayed Schleswig-Holstein, and recanted all her pretensions to supremacy, she also yielded her knight-errantry on behalf of the Kurhessian Constitution of 1831.

In 1852, the Arch-Elector octroyed a new constitution which was guaranteed by the German Diet, despite the protest of the Kurhessian people. After the Italian war, the question, on the secret instigation of Prussia, was again mooted. The Kurhessian Chambers again declared for the validity of the Constitution of 1831, and fresh petitions for its reestablishment went up to the Diet at Frankfort. Prussia then asserted the Constitution of 1831 to be alone valid, but, as she cautiously added, it ought to be adapted to the monarchical principles of the Diet. Austria, on the other hand, insisted that the Constitution of 1852 was legal, but ought to be amended in a liberal sense. Thus the dispute was a verbal one, a mere quibble, the gist of which was a trial of the respective power wielded by the Hohenzollern and the Hapsburg over the German Confederation. A vast majority of the Diet decided at last for the validity of the Constitution of 1852; viz., on the Austrian side, and against Prussia. The motives which swayed the votes of the minor German States were transparent. Austria they knew to be too much involved in foreign difficulties, and too unpopular, to attempt anything beyond the conservation of the general status quo in Germany, while they suspected Prussia of ambitious schemes of innovation. By not acknowledging the competency of the vote of the Diet of 1851, they would have put in jeopardy the competency of all the other resolutions of the Diet since 1848. Last, not least, they did not like the Prussian strategy of dictating to the minor German Princes and encroaching upon their sovereignty, by affecting to take up the grievances of the Kurhessian people against the Arch-Elector. Consequently the motion of Prussia was lost.

Now, on the 20th of April, when this matter came to be debated at Berlin in the House of Deputies, Herr von Schleinitz, in the

\(^a\) Friedrich Wilhelm I.—\textit{Ed.}\n
\(^b\)
name of the Prussian Government, explicitly declared that Prussia would not think herself bound by the vote of the German Diet; that, in 1850, when the Prussian Constitution was fabricated, there existed no German Diet, that body having been swept away by the earthquake of 1848, whence it followed that all resolutions of the German Diet which should run counter to the plans of the Prussian Government were void of legal force; and, lastly, that, in fact, the German Diet belonged to the dead, although the German Confederation, of course, continued to exist. Now, is it possible to imagine any step more foolish on the part of the Prussian Government? The Austrian Government declared the old Constitution of the German Empire to be defunct, after Napoleon I had really put the extinguisher upon it. The Hapsburg then proclaimed only a fact. The Hohenzollern, on the contrary, now proclaims the nullity of the Federal Constitution of Germany at a moment when Germany is threatened with a foreign war, as if to afford the Man of December legal pretexts for entering into separate alliances with the minor German States, which, till now, were precluded from such a course of action by the laws of the Diet. If Prussia had proclaimed the right of the Revolution of 1848, the nullity of all the counter-revolutionary acts committed by herself and the Diet since that time, and the restoration of the institutions and laws of the Revolutionary epoch, she would have commanded the sympathies of all Germany, Austrian Germany included.

As it is, she has only divided the German Princes without uniting the German people. She has, in fact, opened the door by which to let in the Zouaves.

Written on May 3-4, 1860

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5950, May 19, 1860

---

Karl Marx

[GARIBALDI IN SICILY.—]

AFFAIRS IN PRUSSIA

Berlin, May 28, 1860

The prevailing topic of conversation here, as everywhere all over Europe, is, of course, Garibaldi’s adventures in Sicily. Now, you are aware that never before has the telegraph been put to such impudent work as in the present instance, both on the part of Naples and Genoa or Turin. Locusts have never poured upon Europe in such multitude as do now the electric canards. It seems, therefore, worth while to state, in a few words, the views here entertained of Sicilian affairs in the most competent military circles. In the first instance, the insurrection, as is generally known, was kept up for a whole month before the arrival of Garibaldi; but, of paramount importance as this fact is, it may be overvalued, as shown by the Paris Constitutionnel. The military forces Naples disposed of in Sicily before Gen. Lanza was sent over with fresh troops could hardly amount to 20,000 men, the far greater part of whom had to be concentrated in the fortresses of Palermo and Messina, so that the flying corps left available for the pursuit of the insurgents might boast of several successful encounters, disperse the enemy on certain points, and harass him in different directions, but must prove altogether insufficient to thoroughly stifle the insurrection. At the present moment, there seem to be about 30,000 Neapolitan troops gathered at Palermo, two-thirds of them holding the fortress, while one-third encamp beyond its precincts. Fifteen thousand Neapolitans are said to hold Messina. Now Garibaldi had, according to the latest news, not pushed beyond Monreale. It is true that this place is situated on hills which command Palermo from the land side, but to improve the opportunities offered by this position, Garibaldi as yet lacks the principal requisite—siege artillery. The immediate chances of
Garibaldi, whose army musters about 12,000 men, will consequently depend upon two main circumstances—the rapid spread of the insurrection throughout the island, and the attitude of the Neapolitan soldiers at Palermo. If the latter waver, and get into quarrels with the foreign mercenaries intermingled with them, Lanza's means of defense may break up in his own hands. If the insurrection develops much vital power, Garibaldi's army will be swelled to more formidable dimensions. If Garibaldi should get into Palermo, he will sweep everything before him save Messina, where the difficult task will again begin. You remember that, in 1848-49, the Neapolitans had lost everything save Messina, serving as a tête-de-pont between Sicily and Naples; but Messina then sufficed to regain the whole island. The fall of Palermo, and the military hold by the patriots of the whole island, except Messina, would, however, this time prove more decisive than in 1848-49, because of the altered political conjunctures. If Garibaldi masters Palermo, he will be officially supported by the "King of Italy." If he fails, his invasion will be disavowed as a private adventure.

There is something of ironical pathos in the words addressed to Victor Emmanuel by Garibaldi, who tells the King that he will conquer for him a new province, which he hopes the King will not again bargain away, like Nice, Garibaldi's birthplace.\(^a\)

Among the topics of Prussian politics, the first place in the public mind is naturally occupied by the Prince of Prussia's private letter to the Prince Consort of England,\(^b\) of which the Prince de La Tour d'Auvergne, Louis Bonaparte's Ambassador at the Court of Berlin, had not only the impudence to present a copy to Herr von Schleinitz, the Prussian Foreign Minister, but went the length of asking explanations on some of its passages reflecting on the character and plans of the great Paris saltimbanque.\(^b\) This incident reminds one of a similar accident that happened shortly before the ratification of the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi, 1833.\(^b\) The Grand Vizier having at that time communicated a copy of the secret treaty, drawn up by Count Orloff, to the British Embassy at Constantinople, was much bewildered when a day later, to his not agreeable surprise, Count Orloff returned him the identical copy, with the spiteful advice, to find better confidants for the future. At Berlin everybody feels sure that the Prince Regent's letter, having been transmitted by post via Ostend, not via Calais, was
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\(^a\) Giuseppe Garibaldi's address to Victor Emmanuel, Allgemeine Zeitung, No. 143, May 22, 1860.—Ed.

\(^b\) Quack.—Ed.
tampered with at the English Post-Office, where a numerous personnel is notoriously employed in prying into suspected letters—a practice carried to such a degree that at the time of the Coalition-Cabinet, the Earl of Aberdeen confessed that he dared not confide to the post his own letters addressed to his metropolitan friends. Lord Palmerston, having thus got a copy of the Prince Regent's letter, is supposed, out of spite against Prince Albert and in the interest of the Anglo-French-Russian alliance, to have placed a copy of that letter into the hands of the French Ambassador\(^a\) at London. At all events the course of the intended and much talked-of Anglo-Prussian alliance runs anything but smooth.

Some months ago, when Lord John Russell one fine morning discovered that England must go in search of new alliances,\(^b\) and when that intimation was received with much childish enthusiasm in the official circles of Berlin, out came all at once, in the form of an English Parliamentary paper, a dispatch addressed by Lord Bloomfield\(^c\) to the Foreign Office at Downing street, narrating a private conversation he had held during the last Italian war with Herr von Schleinitz, and sadly compromising the good faith of Prussian foreign policy. Lord John at the time pleaded guilty of a most strange indiscretion, but the first blow to the new alliance was dealt. The second blow has been given by the miscarriage of the Prince Regent's letter.

You will have seen that in his speech from the throne the Prince\(^d\) speaks very emphatically of the maintenance of treaty rights and the united front Germany is ready to show against any encroachment upon the independence and integrity of the common fatherland. The unpleasant impression produced upon the Paris stock exchange by the apparent menace has been allayed through the Russian journal *Le Nord*,\(^e\) which, in a tone of ironically condescending bonnehomme,\(^f\) divests the Prince's speech of all serious meaning, calls to mind similar phrases uttered by him
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\(^a\) Jean Gilbert Persigny.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) John Russell's speech in the House of Commons on March 26, 1860, *The Times*, No. 23578, March 27, 1860.—*Ed.*

\(^c\) For Lord Bloomfield's dispatch to Lord John Russell see “Nouvelles de l'Angleterre. Berlin, 14 janvier, 1860”, *L'Indépendance belge*, No. 73, March 13, 1860.—*Ed.*

\(^d\) The Prince of Prussia's speech from the throne at the closing of the Prussian Diet on May 23, 1860, *Königlich privilegirte Berlinische Zeitung*, No. 120, May 24, 1860.—*Ed.*

\(^e\) “Résumé politique”, *Le Nord*, No. 148, May 27, 1860.—*Ed.*

\(^f\) Good nature.—*Ed.*
during the Italian war, and, in conclusion, characterizes the whole passage as a mere compliment paid to popular feeling. As to the rest of the Prince’s speech, it is, in fact, but a summary of legislative failures. The only important projects debated by the Chambers—the projected laws on marriage, municipal administration, and reform of the land tax, from which the nobility in the greater part of the monarchy still remain exempt, have all proved abortive. The Prince, moreover, complains of his pet measures relating to the army reform not having yet received legislative sanction.

Though the Government has proved unable, even with the present Chamber of Representatives—whose large majority consists of Ministerialists—to carry its proposed army reform, it has at last got an extra vote of nine millions and a half of dollars, to be laid out in military expenditures; while simultaneously, as I am informed by letters from the provinces, the intended changes in the army organization are quietly but practically introduced, so as to leave to the Chambers, when reassembling, no other alternative than that of sanctioning what will then have become a fait accompli. The gist of the intended army reform is pointed out in the Baltische Monatsschrift, a Russian-German monthly, published at Riga, and printed under the sanction of the Russian Governor-General of Livonia, Estonia, and Courland.

“The Prussian army reform,” says that paper, “which was introduced immediately after the peace of Villafranca, can hardly serve any other purpose than that of emancipating the Government from the direct appeal to the whole people—[an appeal] which, with the old military system, became unavoidable, whenever the Government thought it necessary to support its policy by warlike demonstrations. Under the present political combinations of Europe, a State like Prussia, still striving for its full acknowledgment as one of the great Powers, can neither suspend its whole pacific life on every occasion that seems to necessitate the employment of its military forces, nor can it in every case guarantee to the nation when once called to arms the ensuing of actual war. There lies hidden in the Landwehr system a certain democratical antagonism against the monarchic principle. The mobilizations of 1850 and 1859, following each other within a relatively short interval, and leading both times to no warlike action, but only to demobilization, seem to have impaired with the great part of the Prussian people the authority of the State, even in foreign affairs. From the very circumstances accompanying both mobilizations, the conclusion seemed to have been drawn by the popular mind that the Government was bound to obtain the consent of public opinion in every instance of a general armament. Even the official declarations made by Prussia in regard to the attitude she observed during the Italian conflict contain the confession of the mobilization of the Landwehr having encountered unexpected difficulties.”

---

a The Baltische Monatsschrift, 1859, Bd. I, Heft I, S. 47-48.—Ed.
Hence the Russian-German paper concludes that Prussia ought to get rid of the Landwehr system, in its present form, but, at the same time, intimates with an ironical sneer that "such an alteration of one of the most popular institutions, just at a moment when Prussia affects to stand on liberalism," is a very delicate operation. I may here remark that this Baltische Monatsschrift, published under Czarist auspices at Riga, forms to some degree the counterpart of the Strassburger Correspondent, published under Bonapartist auspices at Strassburg. Both skirmish on the German frontiers, the one from the east, the other from the west. The writers of the one may be considered as literary Cossacks, the writers of the other as literary Zouaves. Both affect great tenderness for Germany, and abound in wise counsels to the land whose vernacular they still condescend to use. Both try to prepare the fatherland for great changes impending, and both smell of the entente cordiale just now linking the Caesarism of Paris to the Czarism of Petersburg; but here the likeness ends. The Strassburg paper, although perfumed with that peculiar scent of false melodramatic dignity characteristic of the Bohemian literature of the Second French Empire, is still written in the homely style that belongs to Southern Germany. It affects common sense, and certainly does not pretend to any literary distinction. The Riga monthly, on the contrary, struts with a didactic stateliness and a metaphysical profoundness savoring of the traditions of the Königsberg University. After all, I consider the ebullitions of patriotic rage with which the German press assails both the Monatsschrift and the Correspondent, but mainly the latter, as silly exhibitions of childish incompetency.

Written on May 28, 1860

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5972, June 14, 1860

---

See Marx's letter to Engels of April 24, 1860, present edition, Vol. 41.—Ed.
After a variety of the most contradictory information, we receive, at last, something like trustworthy news of the details of Garibaldi's wonderful march from Marsala to Palermo. It is, indeed, one of the most astonishing military feats of the century, and it would be almost unaccountable were it not for the prestige preceding the march of a triumphant revolutionary general. The success of Garibaldi proves that the Royalist troops of Naples still hold in terror the man who has borne high the flag of Italian revolution in the face of French, Neapolitan, and Austrian battalions, and that the people of Sicily have not lost their faith in him, or in the national cause.

On the 6th of May, two steamers leave the coast of Genoa with about 1,400 armed men, organized in seven companies, each of them, evidently, destined to become the nucleus of a battalion to be recruited among the insurgents. On the 8th, they land at Talamone on the Tuscan coast, and persuade the commander of the fort there, by some sort of argument or other, to furnish them with coal, ammunition, and four field pieces. On the 10th, they enter the harbor of Marsala, at the extreme western end of Sicily, and disembark with all their material, in spite of the arrival of two Neapolitan men-of-war, who are powerless, at the right moment, to prevent them; the story about British interference in favor of the invaders has proved false, and is now abandoned even by the Neapolitans themselves. On the 12th, the small band had marched to Salemi, 18 miles distant in the interior, and on the road toward Palermo. Here the chief men of the revolutionary party appear to have met Garibaldi, to have consulted with him, and collected insurrectionary reenforcements amounting to some 4,000 men;
while these were being organized, the insurrection, repressed but not quelled a few weeks before, was kindled afresh all over the mountains of Western Sicily, and, as was proved on the 16th, not without effect. On the 15th, Garibaldi, with his 1,400 organized volunteers and 4,000 armed peasantry, advances northward across the hills upon Calatafimi, where the country road from Marsala joins the high road from Trapani to Marsala. The defiles leading to Calatafimi, across a spur of the lofty Monte Cerrara, called the Monte di Pianto Romano, were defended by three battalions of Royal troops, with cavalry and artillery, under Gen. Landi. Garibaldi at once attacked this position, which was at first obstinately defended; but although in this attack Garibaldi could not have employed against the 3,000 or 3,500 Neapolitans more than his volunteers and a very small portion of the Sicilian insurgents, the Royalists were successively driven out of five strong positions, with the loss of one mountain-gun and numerous killed and wounded. The loss of the Garibaldians is stated by themselves at 18 killed and 128 wounded. The Neapolitans profess to have conquered one of Garibaldi's flags in this engagement, but, as they found a flag left behind on board one of the abandoned steamers at Marsala, they are quite capable of having exhibited this same flag at Naples as a proof of their pretended victory. Their defeat at Calatafimi, however, did not compel them to abandon that town the same evening. They left it on the following morning only, and after that they appear not to have offered any further resistance to Garibaldi until they reached Palermo. They did reach it, but in a terrible state of dissolution and disorder. The certainty of having succumbed to mere " filibusters and armed rabble" reproduced in their minds all at once the terrible image of that Garibaldi, who, while defending Rome against the French, could yet find time to march to Velletri and send to the right-about the advanced guard of the whole Neapolitan army, and who had since conquered, on the slopes of the Alps, warriors of a far superior mettle to any that Naples produces.\textsuperscript{308} The hurried retreat, without a show even of further resistance, must have still increased their despondency and the tendency to desertion which already existed in their ranks; and when all at once they found themselves surrounded and harassed by that insurrection which had been prepared at the meeting at Salemi, their cohesion was utterly lost; of Landi's brigade nothing but a disorderly and dispirited mob, greatly reduced in numbers, reentered Palermo in small successive bands.

Garibaldi entered Calatafimi on the day that Landi had left it—on the 16th; marched on the 17th to Alcamo (10 miles); on
the 18th to Partinico (10 miles), and beyond that place toward Palermo. On the 19th, incessant torrents of rain prevented the troops from moving.

In the mean time, Garibaldi had ascertained that the Neapolitans were throwing up entrenchments around Palermo, and strengthening the old, decayed ramparts of the town on the side facing the Partinico road. They were still at least 22,000 strong, and thus far superior to any forces that he could bring against them. But they were dispirited; their discipline was loosened; many of them began to think of passing over to the insurgents; while their generals were known, both to their own soldiers and to their enemy, to be imbeciles. The only trustworthy troops among them were the two foreign battalions. As matters stood, Garibaldi could not have ventured upon a direct front attack upon the town, while the Neapolitans could not undertake anything decisive against him, even if their troops were fit for it, as they must always leave a strong garrison in the town and never move too far away from it. With a General of the common stamp in the place of Garibaldi, this state of things would have led to a series of desultory and undecisive engagements, in which he might have trained a portion of his levies to warfare, but in which also the Royal troops would very soon have recovered a good deal of their lost confidence and discipline, for they could not help being successful in some of them. But such a kind of warfare would neither suit an insurrection nor a Garibaldi. A bold offensive was the only system of tactics permitted to a revolution; a striking success, such as the deliverance of Palermo, became a necessity as soon as the insurgents had arrived in sight of the city.

But how was this to be done? Here it was that Garibaldi brilliantly proved himself a General, fit not for petty partisan warfare only, but also for more important operations.

On the 20th and succeeding days, Garibaldi attacked the Neapolitan outposts and positions in the neighborhood of Monreale and Parco, on the roads leading to Palermo from Trapani and Corleone, thus making the enemy believe that his attack would take place chiefly against the south-western face of the town, and that here his main forces were concentrated. By a skillful combination of attacks and feigned retreats, he induced the Neapolitan General to send more and more troops out of the town in this direction, until, on the 24th, some 10,000 Neapolitans appeared outside the town, toward Parco. This was what Garibaldi intended. He at once engaged them with part of his forces, slowly
Garibaldi retreated before them so as to draw them further and further away from the town, and when he had got them as far as Piana, a across the main range of hills, which run across Sicily, and here divide the Conca d'Oro (the golden shell, the Valley of Palermo) from the Valley of Corleone, he at once threw the main body of his troops across another part of the same ridge, into the Valley of Misilmeri, which opens out to the sea, close to Palermo. On the 25th he took up his headquarters at Misilmeri, eight miles from the capital. What he further did with the 10,000 men entangled on a single line of bad road in the mountains, we are not informed, but we may be sure that he kept them well occupied with some fresh apparent victories, so as to make sure they would not come back too soon to Palermo. Having thus reduced the defenders of the town by nearly one-half, and transferred his line of attack from the Trapani road to the Catania road, he could proceed to the grand attack. Whether the insurrection in the town preceded Garibaldi's assault, or whether it was produced by his knocking at the gates, the conflicting dispatches leave unsettled; but certain it is, that on the morning of the 27th, all Palermo rose in arms and Garibaldi thundered at the Porta Termini, on the south-east face of the town, where no Neapolitan expected him. The remainder is known—the gradual clearing of the town, with the exception of the batteries, the citadel, and the Royal palace, from the troops; the subsequent bombardment, the armistice, the capitulation. Authentic details of all these proceedings are still wanting; but the main facts are pretty certain.

In the mean time, we must declare that Garibaldi's maneuvers preparatory to the attack on Palermo at once stamp him as a General of a very high order. Hitherto we knew him as a very skillful and very lucky guerrilla-chief only; even in the siege of Rome his mode of defending the town by constant sallies gave him scarcely an opportunity of rising above that level. But here we have him on fair strategic ground, and he comes from the trial a proven master of his art. His manner of enticing the Neapolitan commander into the blunder of sending one-half of his troops out of reach, his sudden flank-march and reappearance before Palermo, on the side where he was least expected, and his energetic attack while the garrison was weakened, are operations far more imprinted with the stamp of military genius than anything that occurred during the Italian war of 1859. The
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a Piana dei Greci.—Ed.
Sicilian insurrection has found a first-rate military chief; let us hope that the politician Garibaldi, who will soon have to appear on the stage, may keep unsullied the glory of the General.

Written about June 7, 1860

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5979, June 22, 1860 as a leading article; reprinted in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 1573, June 22, 1860
Karl Marx

THE EMPEROR NAPOLEON III AND PRUSSIA

Berlin, June 12, 1860

The following are extracts from Mr. About's newest pamphlet, which will be published in Paris in the course of a few days:

"Let Germany know that the friendship of France has its value. [...] Did not our soldiers rush to the Black Sea to rescue the Ottoman Empire from destruction? [...] Has not the emancipation of the Moldo-Wallachians [...] been effected solely by our influence, without bloodshed? Italy [...] has entered the paths of independence and unity under our auspices—our armies paved the way along which it now marches onward, led by Piedmont; and if Heaven shall permit this great work to be accomplished, and that a nation of 26,000,000 of souls shall be organized at our gates, France will not take umbrage, [...] for she feels that order cannot be established in Europe so long as there are oppressed nationalities and kings who are insupportable to their subjects."

"Never was that noble nation" (Germany) "so great as from 1813 to 1815, for never was it so united. When a Frenchman speaks with admiration of the campaigns which were so terrible to France, his testimony is worthy of attention. The sentiment of German honor and independence, surging up against conquest, worked miracles. Germany has but one passion—one heart. It raised itself up as one man, and the defeat of our incomparable armies showed what united Germany could do."

"Well, let Germany be again united. France ardently desires it, for she loves the Germanic nation with disinterested affection. Were we devoted by that brutal ambition attributed to us by certain Princes, we should not impel Germany to unity. [...] Let Germany be united and form so compact a body as to render invasion impossible. France sees without fear an Italy of 26 millions of souls rising on her southern frontier; she would not fear to see one of 32 millions of Germans on her eastern confines."

"The Germans begin to see [...] the folly of keeping up 37 different Governments," and are resolved to become united.

Prussia will be their nucleus, because Prussia represents freedom of trade and thought, whereas Austria represents prohibition, despotism and all the horrors
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a Edmond About, La Prusse en 1860, Paris, 1860.—Ed.
engendered by its Concordat. Therefore will they rally round Prussia. But Prussia must choose between the right divine and the rights of the people. “While some Princes are clinging to a false legitimacy, really legitimate empires are being founded on the basis of universal suffrage. The King of Naples affirms that his subjects belong to him, and they oppose an armed repudiation of these pretensions. The Emperor of the French and the King of Sardinia declare with modern philosophy that peoples belong to themselves alone, and two great nations with all but unanimity select them for their chiefs. Will the Prince of Prussia declare for the right divine [...] or the rights of the people? [...] It is the more necessary [...] that he should make this declaration, as in 1849, [...] a National Assembly, the issue of universal suffrage, brought a legitimate crown to the King in his palace. What did he? He declared for the right divine against the popular right; he would not accept the crown unless offered to him by Princes, and the Prussian clodhoppers applauded saying: ‘[...] We would not have a throne on which Democracy has spat.’ [...] Saxony and Baden had dismissed their Sovereigns. Two Prussian armies marched in the name of divine right and invaded Saxony and Baden. The Saxon King was replaced on his throne, as was also the Duke of Baden, and after all had thus been adjusted, and the Baden Democratic Army had sought shelter in Switzerland, the Prussians shot in cold blood 26 German patriots.

“A Prussian Democrat lately wrote to the people in Württemberg, ‘Why don’t you join us?’ They replied, ‘If we were Prussians we should all be exiled, with the poet Uhland at our head.’

“Nothing is more strange nor more true than this assertion. Since 1848 all the princes of Europe, including even the Pope, have granted amnesties. The Prussian amnesty has not yet appeared. If the Regent wishes to deserve well of his country, “let him summon back the exiles [...] and become the testamentary executor of the Parliament of 1849, as the Napoleons are testamentary executors of the French Revolution!

“Let us here correct certain erroneous notions which exist in Germany. They suppose, on the strength of certain feudal journals, that the French Empire is in a state of slavery—that the Imperial rule has gagged thought, suppressed the national representation, and tossed our liberties to the dogs.

“The Prussians believe themselves to be more free and happy than we are, under their liberal and parliamentary Government. It is true that the Emperor of the French works out the grandeur and prosperity of France with a dictatorial power: but it is essentially democratic, “as it was confided to him by the people.”

But is not feudalism rampant in Prussia?

“The French army is devoted to the Emperor, but it does not belong to him but to the nation. Does the Prussian army belong to the King or to the nation? To the
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[a] Francis II.—Ed.
[b] Napoleon III.—Ed.
[c] Victor Emmanuel II.—Ed.
[d] William.—Ed.
[e] Frederick William IV.—Ed.
[f] Frederick Augustus II.—Ed.
[g] Leopold.—Ed.
[h] Edmond About has “la nation française”—Ed.
[i] This sentence reads as follows in the French original: “Il est vrai que l’empereur Napoléon travaille à la grandeur et à la prospérité de la France avec un pouvoir très-étendu. Mais ce pouvoir, c’est la nation qui le lui a confié.”—Ed.
King,' said the other day the Prime Minister Hohenzollern, 'the Deputies of
the nation have nothing to do with the affairs of the army.'

"It is true that with us the liberty of the press is subjected to severe restrictions,
but the right to print and publish is not confiscated; it is only postponed. The
nation consents to remain silent around a Prince who does great things, as the
friends of a philosopher or a great writer keep silent in his cabinet. As for the
right, it remains intact, and Frenchmen [...] will have the right to reclaim it, in
good time and place, should the Emperor forget (!) to restore it to them. The
writers of Berlin are more free, perhaps," despite their taxes, and caution-money,
etc., "but who shall guarantee to them the duration of their privilege? [...] The
hand which gave may take away. The difference between us and them is that we
lend our liberties to the Emperor, whereas they borrow theirs from the Regent.

"The Germans fancy that we have allowed ourselves to be despoiled of our
Parliamentary régime. True. Our Parliament has changed since 1848. It is no
longer a coterie representing 400,000 or 500,000 persons: it is the whole nation
which sends its Deputies to the Corps Législatif. This Assembly, chosen, like the
Emperor himself, by universal suffrage, no longer enjoys the ridiculous privilege (!)
of interrupting the march of public affairs, of replacing action by speeches, union
by coalition, the public interest by private vanity, the serious progress of a great
people by the flattering of some petty oratorical ambition—but it enjoys the
inestimable right of voting all the taxes and all the laws of the Empire." "Have we
any reason to be jealous of the Prussian Constitution? Is the principle of Ministerial
responsibility applied in Prussia? Not yet. Have the Chambers the recognized right
to refuse to vote the taxes? No. And what are the Prussian Chambers? That which
corresponds with our Corps Législatif, or (!) the House of Commons. Is united by a
mechanism rather ingenious than democratic." [...] A District is given, which pays
300,000 francs direct taxation. The tax-payers are separated into three squads, the
15 or 20 large proprietors who pay 100,000 francs, are the first class of electors;
the second class consists of 200 or 300 who pay another 100,000 francs, and the
third, of the 2,000 or 3,000 who pay the remainder. Each of these classes elect [...] six Electors, and these eighteen Electors elect a Deputy. Therefore the middling
classes can never be represented, and "this is why M. de Vincke, who sat on the
Conservative side in the Frankfort Parliament, is now, without having changed his
opinions, the most advanced democrat of the Prussian Chambers. Can liberal
Germany do much with such a Chamber?" And even when it evinces some desire
for progress, is it not cramped and pushed back by the Upper House?—"an
Assembly consisting of nobles who have seats by right or by birth, and members
selected by the King from candidates presented to him by the nobility, the
Universities and large towns—on one side the right of birth, on the other the
Sovereign's choice. It is recruited from no other sources, therefore it is opposed to
all liberal measures." It lately "rejected the principle of civil marriages by a large
majority. It nearly raised an insurrection against the Minister who proposed that the
nobles should be compelled to pay taxes like the other classes of the citizens.

"This Constitution is not perfect. They will do well to modify it if Germany
should resolve to throw itself into the arms of Prussia.

"It is very desirable that Prussia should show a little more fairness toward the
Governments which are based on universal suffrage. We do not reproach the Court
of Berlin for the violence of the German press, nor do we expect the Prince Regent
to gag his subjects even when they insult us; but we must be permitted to remark
that if the Siècle and Opinion nationale express themselves in offensive terms

a Count von Roon.—Ed.
against a Sovereign who is not the enemy of France, the *Moniteur*, or at least the semi-official journals hasten to repair the injury by administering a severe reprimand.

"It would also be extremely desirable that the political men of Prussia should abstain from fulminating in the Prussian Parliament attacks openly directed against France. When M. de Vincke talks in the Prussian Chamber of Deputies of reconquering from us Alsace and Lorraine, the French nation is not sufficiently excited by this frivolity to take up arms; but it takes pleasure in declaring that such imperunities are never committed in France."

"Since the accession of Napoleon III, and especially since the annexation of Nice and Savoy, German writers and perhaps even German Princes have somewhat loudly manifested an unjust mistrust of French policy. They persist in attributing to us the project of annexing the Rhenish Provinces, and encroaching on the soil of Germany. This groundless alarm is so loudly expressed and so obstinately persevered in that it might inspire us with bad thoughts were we less equitable. It is certain that if you accost in the street the most gentle and inoffensive man, and you say to him: Sir, you mean to slap my face, you may swear that you have no such intention, but I know that you intend to slap my face. You need not swear to the contrary, for I won't believe you on your oath, for I know that you do mean to slap my face. But I am stronger than you. I am not afraid of you. I will crush you like a fly, and I defy you to slap my face. Would not the gentlest and most inoffensive man find good reason to do what was demanded of him, and would he not inflict the slap on the face of his provoker?"

"But, no provocations will cause France to depart from the line which she has traced for herself. [...] We have too much justice to think of conquering the territory of a foreign nationality. Would to Heaven that the German Confederation was animated by the same ideas! It would not have taken the Duchy of Posen, not attacked the north of Schleswig, nor declared Trieste to be a German town. As for us, we do not fear to affirm that Lorraine and Alsace are French, because they themselves have proved it against Germans. We keep what belongs to us. We demand nothing more! We believe that all the natural frontiers, all the rivers of Europe, are not worth half so much for the defense of our territory as a regiment of Zouaves or Chasseurs-à-pied with fixed bayonets.

"May we be permitted to add one piece of advice to these friendly counsels? It will prove how deeply we are interested in German unity and the future of Prussia."

"Much as the name of Prussia, its Constitution, the person of its august Regent excite the sympathies of Germany, still more so, perhaps, does its bureaucracy inspire feelings of abhorrence, not only in Germany but among honest men of all countries. On the 12th of May, 1860, a ray of light fell on the maneuvers of the Prussian police, and revealed the most singular admixture of clumsiness and immorality, zeal, and impudence, incendiary provocation and splashing Machiavel-lism.

"Here are the facts as they have been narrated to the Prussian Parliament by an honorable deputy of the Grand Duchy of Posen, Mr. Niegolewski. Three Prussian bureaucrats, M. de Puttkamer, President of the Province of Posen, M. de Baerensprung, President of the Police, and Mr. Post, Secretary-Interpreter, were in search of some means whereby they might make manifest their zeal and entitle themselves to the gratitude of the Government. M. de Puttkamer is a great personage, something more than a Prefect, something less than a Minister, M. de Baerensprung is a man of note and importance. Post is a poor devil of no note.
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"The first thinks, the second dictates, the third writes. These three worthies, by dint of digging into their bureaucratic brains, conceive the grand idea of getting up an insurrection in Posen, that they may have the honor and glory of putting it down. The part of a provocative agent, against which even Vidocq recoiled, inspired them with no disgust. They disguise themselves as Poles discontented with Prussian rule. They establish in their bureaus a false democratic committee, and put themselves in communication with the Central Committee residing in London. 'Send us,' they write, 'send us emissaries, proclamations, arms.' On the other hand, they send money to London, the money of the Budget, the thalers wrung from unfortunate tax-payers. Here are taxes well employed. The treasurer of the enterprise was M. Stolzenberg, the Secretary of Police. The letters were to be addressed to Madame Ruch, wife of a counselor in the Supreme Tribunal.

"The London Committee did not take the bait very readily. It hesitated, was mistrustful. It seemed to scent the treason. But the bureaucratic trio implored with such humility for some letters and circulars; it spoke with such admiration of General Mazzini; with so much emotion of the prose of Félix Pyat, the very bread of life, that some revolutionary men in London, including even Mazzini himself, entered into correspondence with them. This perfidious game was played for three years, and would have been played on till now, had it not been suddenly stopped by a thunderbolt from M. Niegoleswcki."

"The eloquent orator of Posen laid on the table the original text of 24 letters, written by Mr. Post, dictated by M. Baerensprung and inspired by Mr. Puttkammer. The first is dated August 19, 1858; the last April, 1860. No one, not even the Minister of the Interior, M. de Schwerin, ventured to contest the authenticity of these documents. We have had them translated by a sworn interpreter. They prove that the Prussian police excited the Committee in London to send incendiary proclamations to the Grand Duchy of Posen; that it paid the expenses for printing them in London, and caused them to be distributed to suspected persons, that they might afterward be seized and the police might then manifest their zeal to the detriment of some of the King of Prussia's subjects; that Puttkammer, Baerensprung, and their accomplices, by means of entreaties and promises, induced the Committee in London to dispatch to them an emissary named Rewitt, who was furnished by them" (the Police) "with a passport; that they allowed him to circulate freely, that he might compromise as many people as possible; that they then arrested him, and had him condemned to two years' imprisonment". After this fine exploit, M. de Baerensprung, the savior of order, which he had disturbed, [...] set up as a candidate for Parliament, and was rejected. "But he still carried on his correspondence with Mazzini, and the Committee in London, swearing to them that Rewitt had been betrayed by the Polish nobility (letter of July 5, 1859), and that numbers of the nobility were in the police. (Letter of July 19, 1859.)"

"These functionaries, in their letters, held up the nobility and clergy, including Prince Czartoryski, to the execration of the London Committee. They talk about seizing the estates of the nobles, and parceling them out among the people. [...] On the 27th March, 1859, they see that the Emperor of the French is about to make a generous effort in favor of Italian independence. They write to the London Committee to forestall it. They beg Mazzini to stir up the country before the arrival of the French army. [...] They beg him to hoist the red flag before Napoleon shall be able to mix himself up in Italian affairs. [...] On the 21st of May, they thank the
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Committee in London for sending them [...] the ‘receipt for making Orsini’s shells.’ It needs no ghost to tell us for what purpose they obtained this receipt. We know that these gentlemen belonged to the police, therefore they could not be conspirators; their intentions must have been pure. They doubtless intended to warn the Emperor against danger, and this was their reason for putting a postscript to their letter: ‘How long will the French democrats delay making another attempt against Napoleon?’ [...] After Villafranca, you might have supposed that every German would have been pleased that Venice was preserved to Austria; but they wrote to Mazzini: ‘The revolution will break out in Italy, Hungary, Germany, Prussia, and perhaps in France, and even in Poland. The eyes of the world are opened to the treachery of Napoleon, and all oppressed nations are glad to get rid of him.’ And, further on, these Prussian police agents write: ‘What is going on in France? Will no second Orsini come forth? Do the Republicans mean to do nothing to overthrow the tyrant?’ (Aug. 20, 1859.)

“We do not wish to fix too high the responsibility for these imprudences. The police has been more clumsy than culpable, for it has not had the tact to conceal its most secret papers from the gaze of honest men. But the Prussian Government should lead its police out of these tortuous paths; it is always wrong to counsel crime, even as a means for trying of what stuff men are made.

“Every one knows that if Orsini had succeeded in his criminal attempt he would have assassinated the future liberator of Italy, and have done more harm than good to his country. We may also add that if these Prussian police, without any evil intent, and simply out of a stupid zeal, had got up another Orsini, they would have deprived Prussia of a useful ally, who is still ready to render her good service, provided that she will help herself.”

Compiled on June 12, 1860 Reproduced from the newspaper


---
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Berlin, June 13, 1860

This evening the Prince Regent\textsuperscript{a} will leave for Baden-Baden, where a sort of conference between Louis Napoleon and a council of crowned German heads is to take place on the 16th and 17th inst.\textsuperscript{306} The Prince Regent's suite will be formed by Gen. von Manteuffel, the chief of the Military Cabinet; Gen. von Alvensleben, Lieut.-Col. von Schimmelmann, von Loë, \textit{chef d'escadron}, Count von Pückler, the Court Marshal, Privy Councilor von Illaire, Mr. Borkmann, the Regent's Secretary, and Prince von Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, the chief of the Cabinet and a member of the Royal family. You will remember that on the occasion of the private letter addressed by the Prince Regent to the Prince Consort of England, intercepted at London and thence communicated to Louis Bonaparte,\textsuperscript{b} the latter insisted upon a personal interview with the Prince Regent as the best means of clearing away the misunderstanding that seemed to have sprung up between France and Prussia. Shortly afterward, on the Prince Regent's visit to Saarbrücken and Trier, towns situated on the confines of France, Louis Napoleon again intimated his wish to improve this opportunity for meeting the Prince. This proposal was, however, declined. Meanwhile, the rumor having got abroad of the Prince Regent's intention to stay for a month at Baden-Baden, Max, the King of Bavaria,\textsuperscript{c} took it into his head to propose to the Regent a sort of conference at the watering-place with the Princes of Southern Germany, who wanted to come to a friendly understand-

\textsuperscript{a} William, Prince of Prussia.—\textit{Ed.}
\textsuperscript{b} See this volume, pp. 382.—\textit{Ed.}
\textsuperscript{c} Maximilian II.—\textit{Ed.}
ing with Prussia, and by this very meeting to show a united front against France. The Prince Regent, jumping at once into this scheme, which was also embraced by the Grand Duke of Baden, the King of Württemberg, and the Grand Duke of Hessen-Darmstadt, a fine morning the French Ambassador at Berlin officially notified Herr von Schleinitz, the Prussian Foreign Minister, that his august master, in order to dispel the distrust, whose innocent object France appeared to be, thought a friendly interview at Baden-Baden, with the actual chief of the Prussian State, a great benefit to both Germany and France. On the Prussian Minister's reply that unjust suspicions, not likely to be dispelled by such an interview, hovered also over Prussia, and that besides a confidential conference of German Princes at Baden-Baden had already been convened, the French Ambassador, on further information from Paris, rejoined that Louis Napoleon would delight in finding together the greatest possible number of German Princes, and that, moreover, he had some important communication to personally impart, which would allow of no further delay. At this point the Hohenzollern power of resistance gave way. A Vienna dispatch conveyed at once to Berlin the expression of Austria's displeasure at the intended rendezvous, but the other German Courts were more or less soothed by a circular note of the Prussian Foreign Minister. Consequent upon this circular note, the King of Hanover unexpectedly arrived at Berlin this morning, and declared spontaneously his willingness of accompanying to Baden-Baden the Prince Regent, who then, by a telegraphic dispatch, summoned also the King of Saxony to the conference. It need hardly be said, that the Dukes of Coburg-Gotha and Nassau will follow in the track.

Thus, a meeting of German Princes, originally purporting to mean a demonstration against France, has turned into a sort of levee, held by Louis Bonaparte, on German soil, and crowded by the Kings, Grand Dukes, and other little potentates of the German Confederation. On the part of the Prince Regent it looks like
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contrition for the sin of having uttered his suspicions as to the French usurper's aggressive schemes, and on the part of the smaller princely fry as a precaution taken for not being sold by their huger *confrère*\(^a\) to their common enemy. The lead in the humiliation of the crowned heads before the Quasimodo of the French Revolution was notoriously taken by Queen Victoria and the King of Sardinia.\(^{307}\) The Czar's personal interview at Stuttgart with the Man of December, in 1857,\(^{308}\) could surprise nobody beyond the coffee-house politicians, duped by the ostentatious coquetry of the Petersburg Court with the tenets of legitimacy. After the battle of Solferino, the Hapsburg's Villafranca meeting with his victor was a matter of business, not of courtesy. The Prince Regent, together with the minor stars clustering around him, has neither to plead an alliance, like Victoria and Victor Emmanuel, nor a conspiracy, like Alexander II, nor a defeat, like Francis Joseph; but, leaving the motives aside, he may plead the general precedent put by his betters. At all events, he has seriously impaired his factitious popularity by the acceptance of Louis Bonaparte's overture, and the more so since the latter, only a few weeks ago, had the impudence of intimating, through a dispatch of his Foreign Minister, M. de Thouvenel, to the Grand Dukes of Hessen-Darmstadt and Baden, that, for the future, they ought to sign their letters to the French Emperor with the words: "*Votre frère et serviteur.*"\(^b\) Such was, indeed, the formula Napoleon I had invented for the German Princes, forming part of the Rhenish Confederation, of which he was the protector, and to which belonged Baden and Hessen-Darmstadt, together with Württemberg, Bavaria, and other German principalities.\(^{309}\) In order to prevent Louis Bonaparte from introducing M. de Thouvenel into the presence of the highly-offended monarchs of Baden and Hessen-Darmstadt, the Prince Regent and his crowned associates have unanimously forborne to be accompanied by their respective Foreign Ministers; but, then, do these gentlemen really fancy that the affront was offered to them by the servant, instead of the servant's master?

As to the "important communication" which the Dutch savior of society is about to impart to the crowned heads of Germany, there is every reason to believe that, imitating Metternich's operations on the successive Congresses of Vienna, Aix-la-Chapelle,\(^c\) Troppau,
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Laibach and Verona,310 Louis Napoleon will try his utmost to convince the Prince Regent of the existence of a vast conspiracy among the revolutionists, straining every nerve to bring about a collision between France and Prussia, in order to enthrone the Red Republic in Paris and a Central Republic in Germany. All the Bonapartist organs in Switzerland, Belgium, and Germany, swarm, since a fortnight, with paragraphs full of similar dark insinuations; and a confidential Bonapartist agent at Geneva—a well-known German naturalist—a—has already triumphantly announced that the anti-Bonapartists’ eruptions of the German press would very soon be stopped by the competent authorities.

While the Prince Regent and his German *dii minorum gentium* are thus to be convinced of the necessity to gather round the general savior of society, the Prussian people is to be belabored in the opposite sense by M. About’s new pamphlet, “The Emperor Napoleon III and Prussia.” Although this pamphlet has as yet been retained, some stray copies of it have already found their way to Berlin, and by another letter I have sent you the most remarkable passages from this newest Tuileries manifesto. The Prussian people must choose, says the oracle from the Seine, between the feudalism of Austria and the democratic principle of the French Empire. It is only by the latter that, resolving of course to give its mighty neighbor some material guaranties, the German people can hope to realize the unity so much coveted by it. Having traced the shortcomings of the present Prussian Government in a very superficial manner, the author of the pamphlet sets out on informing the Prussians of the true nature of the “democratic principle” so characteristic of the second French Empire, and which consists, to say it shortly, in the election of its chief by what is called in modern Gaul, “general suffrage.” It is true, and M. About does hardly dare deny it, that every sort of liberty has been sequestrated in France to the profit of the Dutch adventurer, but then, this sequestration was based on general suffrage. It is in this way, with the aid of France, and on the same democratic basis, that a Teutonic Empire under the auspices of a Hohenzollern ought to be reared in Germany. The operation is a very simple one. Prussia has only to cede part of her “legitimate” possessions
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to France and to simultaneously encroach, under the form of an appeal to general suffrage, on the possessions of the minor princes, and she will at once be transformed from a feudal into a democratic state. It must be owned that this new “democratic principle” discovered by Louis Bonaparte and his sycophants is no innovation, but, on the contrary, has for about two centuries been flourishing in holy Russia. The Romanoff family was seated on the throne by general suffrage. Hence democracy reigns from the Niemen to the Amoor. Perhaps it might be retorted by the prophets of the new “democratic principle” that the Romanoffs were freely elected; that no coup d'état preceded the appeal to the people; and that, on their accession to the throne, a general state of siege failed to keep the electoral urns within the proper limits of the democratic principle. At all events, since Louis Bonaparte cannot afford to become a “legitimate” prince, the next best thing he can do is to convert his brother sovereigns of Italy and Germany into “democratic” princes, after the pattern of the Lesser Empire. The Roman Emperors, of course, were no truly “democratic” sovereigns, because modern progress requires the principle of hereditary monarchy to be engrained upon the principle of “general suffrage,” so that, when a fellow by hook or crook has once succeeded in usurping a throne, and coloring his usurpation by the farce of general election, his dynasty must forever be supposed to remain the living incarnation of the people's general will. (Rousseau's volonté générale.)

In another letter I propose surveying the state of the Schleswig-Holstein complications, which impart to the Baden-Baden Conference its actual importance. For the present, I shall only mention that on the 10th of June an interview took place at the castle of Kronburg between the King of Sweden and the King of Denmark. A fortnight before this rendezvous the Swedish Foreign Minister had sent to the Danish Foreign Minister a note to the purport that it was very desirable that the King of Denmark’s suite should contain no persons the encounter with whom might prove embarrassing for his Swedish Majesty. In other words, the King of Denmark was called upon to clear his company

---

a Marx refers to Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *Contrat social ou principes du droit politique*, London, 1782, v. 5, p. 254.—Ed.
b Charles XV and Frederick VII.—Ed.
c Kristoffer Rutger Ludvig Mandeström.—Ed.
d Carl Christian Hall.—Ed.
from the presence of his wife, the Countess Daner, *ci-devant* Mademoiselle Ramussen. Accordingly, the King of Denmark thought fit to leave his girl behind him.

Written on June 13, 1860

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5986, June 30, 1860

---

*a Formerly.— Ed.*
The great review of volunteers which took place in London a few weeks ago has attracted attention to the citizen soldiers of Great Britain. The volunteers must not be confounded with the militia, which is a separate arm of her Majesty's service. On the 1st of April, the militia numbered, according to Government statistics, 50,000. Of these, 23,735 were embodied, England contributing 13,580, Ireland 7,471, and Scotland 2,684. The militia represents the lower classes; the volunteers the middle class. The assertion of the London *Times* that in the ranks of the troops reviewed on the 22d "all classes were represented" is merely a way of giving things a popular coloring. It is not quite three months since a deputation of respectable mechanics waited on the authorities for the purpose of being supplied with arms, to "defend their country," in case of invasion. Their application was refused. The only working men admitted into the volunteer corps are those whose outfit and expenses their employers provide, and whose services are understood to be permanently at the command of those employers.

The total strength of the British volunteer force, notwithstanding the larger figures of many recent statistical tables, is short of 90,000. It is true that Col. Macmurdo declared, at a dinner given some time since to the St. George's Rifle Corps, that there were 124,000 registered for voluntary service; but when pushed for particulars he included half the militia in his estimate. The newspapers count every regiment at the nominal strength of 800 or 1,000 men, when in reality few ever mustered on parade more

---

*a The Times, Nos. 23655 and 23658, June 25 and 28, 1860.—Ed.*
than 500 or 600. Mr. Sidney Herbert, whose position at the Horse Guards entitles him to be an authority on the subject, stated in Parliament a day or two before the great turnout in London, that “on paper, the force has maintained considerable numbers, who, however, cannot be accounted for, and never answer at roll-call.”

The speech in which this passage occurs appears in the same number of *The Times* that chronicles “the magnificent success” of the national volunteer review. Even the Hyde Park parade itself furnishes a striking illustration of the exaggerated manner in which the London Press speak of such matters. *The Times* of the 20th anticipated that “no less than 35,000 men would appear before her Majesty.”

Tom Taylor, writing to *The Manchester Guardian* from London on the 21st, says that there were over 46,000 in the Metropolis. Yet the whole number of soldiers who passed before the Queen, according to Col. Macmurdo, who would hardly underestimate them, was 18,300. Certainly, this is not a very extraordinary army to be over-jubilant about. In October, 1803, nearly 13,000 native Londoners were inspected in the garb of volunteers; and, by way of comparing British military valor of those days with that of the present time, we subjoin a brief statement of the volunteer force, registered in Jan., 1804:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total of effective rank and file</th>
<th>341,687</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field-officers</td>
<td>1,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captains</td>
<td>4,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subalterns</td>
<td>9,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-officers</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeants</td>
<td>14,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drummers</td>
<td>6,733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand total .................................. 379,943

Even the 124,000, to which England hopes to raise her present voluntary army, would not figure creditably beside this table. One man in every ten of the present able-bodied of Great Britain's male population would amount to 500,000 men. It does not appear from these facts that Englishmen are becoming more

---


*b* “London, Friday, June 22, 1860”, *The Times*, No. 23653, June 22, 1860. The figure in *The Times* is 30,000.—*Ed.*
desirous to take up arms in defense of their native land than they ever were before, the statements of London journals to the contrary notwithstanding. According to the careful statistics of a writer in *The Army and Navy Gazette*, we find the total militia and volunteer force of England to be, of militia 50,160, and of volunteers 88,400, making 138,560 in all. Of these, the writer of *The Gazette* states that at least 20,000 would, from various causes, prove unavailable in case of need, so that 118,560 men constitute the grand total of England's militia and volunteers.

Written between June 25 and 28, 1860

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5994, July 11, 1860 as a leading article; reprinted in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 1579, July 13, 1860

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*
The Board of Trade Returns\(^a\) for the five months ending May 31, 1860, which have just been issued at London, show but a trifling change in the movement of British exports, if compared with the exports during the first five months of 1859.

From £52,337,268, to which they had amounted in 1859, they rose to £52,783,535 in 1860\(^b\)—this small surplus being altogether due to an increase in the month of May last.

The first feature that strikes us on comparing the respective exports during the first five months of 1860 and 1859, is a considerable decline in the British export trade to the British East Indies, as will be seen from the following statement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal British Articles Exported to the East Indies</th>
<th>Quantities</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1859.</td>
<td>1860.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer and ale, barrels ..................................</td>
<td>168,355</td>
<td>166,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottons, yards ...........................................</td>
<td>396,022,733</td>
<td>311,163,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton yarn, lbs .........................................</td>
<td>17,411,542</td>
<td>15,044,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron (bar, bolt, rod), tuns ..................................</td>
<td>16,851</td>
<td>12,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron (cast), tuns .........................................</td>
<td>12,138</td>
<td>4,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron (wrought), tuns ......................................</td>
<td>11,823</td>
<td>10,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheets and rails(^c) ...................................</td>
<td>31,582</td>
<td>79,117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) For the analysis of the British commerce Marx makes use of the table “Exports of the Principal and other Articles of British and Irish Produce and Manufactures in the Five Months ended 31st May, 1860, compared with the corresponding Months of the Year 1859”, \textit{The Economist}, No. 879, June 30, 1860, pp. 36-38.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^b\) ibid., p. 38.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^c\) \textit{The Economist} has “nails” here and in the table on p. 409.—\textit{Ed.}
From the above table it appears that the aggregate decrease in the main exports to the East Indies amounts to about one million sterling; that it is heaviest in the leading articles (cotton and cotton yarns); and that the only exception consists of commodities immediately connected with railway building. It ought, moreover, to be kept in view that the commercial news received by the last Overland Mail is highly unfavorable, and points to an overcharged market; so that, consequently, the value of the exports as declared in England, and as estimated on a range of prices far beyond the average, will by no means be realized in India. Now, there can be no doubt that the Indian trade has been overdone. The artificial demand raised by the Government during the Indian rebellion 311; the stimulus given to commercial activity by the subsiding of the revolutionary disturbances, and the contraction of most of the other markets of the world, consequent upon the general crisis of 1857-58—all these circumstances concurred to swell the bulk of the Indian trade beyond its natural capacities. Still, according to all past experience, the newfangled prosperity market might have borne the bombardment by cotton goods for some years longer, but for the sage interference of the British Government. Mr. Wilson, it seems, was expressly dispatched to Calcutta for the purpose of convulsing the Anglo-Indian trade, by the joint operation of clumsy fiscal measures in the interior, and of burdensome customs duties levied on imports from abroad. Has ever, in the whole history of commerce, such a spectacle been witnessed as that of the United Kingdom allowing its most important colonial market to be crippled by the spontaneous acts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earthen ware and porcelain</th>
<th>Quantities</th>
<th>1859</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>1859</th>
<th>1860</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£34,530</td>
<td>£24,039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberdashery and millinery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83,832</td>
<td>42,126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather—saddlery and harness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,780</td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery—steam engines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73,087</td>
<td>100,846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kinds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>165,899</td>
<td>196,928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin plates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,127</td>
<td>6,441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total ........................................................................... £7,405,806 £6,525,089
Decrease ........................................................................... £876,717
of its own Government, at the very same time that it cringes before the French Emperor, and bears with his political encroachments, on the pretext of a factitious alleviation in the French customs duties?

The exports to the Australian market, although they show some decline in cottons, exhibit, on the whole, an increase both in quantity and value. However, to arrive at a just appreciation of the present state of the markets in the Australian Colonies, we ought to turn from the Board-of-Trade returns to the last commercial intelligence received. Advices from Adelaide to the 26th of April complain of a continuance of excessive shipments from England, and a general prevalence of speculation, swindling and overtrading. An extensive weeding out, it was said, of insolvent firms had become necessary. In Sydney, New South Wales, several failures had already taken place, including nine houses with an aggregate of liabilities of £400,000, of which amount three-fourths was expected to be ultimately deficient, the loss falling on the banks and English creditors. From a list just received of Australian insolvencies during the last 17 years, it appears that the number in 1858 was three times as great as in 1857, and in 1859 there was a further increase of 50 per cent; and this year, up to the middle of April, the rate had experienced a fresh advance of about 7 per cent. The total liabilities of failed firms from 1822 to 1859 were £5,981,026; and the assets, stated in schedules, amounted to £3,735,613; but of the latter amount, not 50 per cent was ever realized.

The considerable decline that has taken place in the value, and in most cases, also, in the quantity of the British goods exported to the United States, will be illustrated by the following extract:

**PRINCIPAL ARTICLES EXPORTED TO THE UNITED STATES IN THE FIVE MONTHS ENDING MAY 31.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantities</th>
<th>1859</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1859</th>
<th>1860</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coals, tuns</td>
<td>68,020</td>
<td>106,925</td>
<td>£67,785</td>
<td>£66,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton, yards</td>
<td>88,441,112</td>
<td>84,208,598</td>
<td>1,562,918</td>
<td>1,491,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linens, yards</td>
<td>25,476,444</td>
<td>20,974,699</td>
<td>776,780</td>
<td>643,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig Iron, tuns</td>
<td>37,510</td>
<td>21,497</td>
<td>106,476</td>
<td>62,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar, bolt, rod, tuns</td>
<td>48,063</td>
<td>37,824</td>
<td>394,426</td>
<td>293,294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
a Napoleon III.— *Ed.*
b The *New-York Daily Tribune* has a misprint here, "May 1" instead of "May 31".— *Ed.*
France was, of course, the country to make up for the contraction of the markets of the East Indies, the Australian Colonies, and the United States. However, on a closer examination, the English export trade to France will be found to have lost nothing of its traditionally diminutive dimensions. As to cottons and twist, Mr. Milner Gibson, the President of the Board of Trade, seems to have been ashamed of the sorry figure he cut, and, consequently, thought fit to altogether expunge them from the returns. Ditto with linens and linen yarns, and silk manufactures. The value of the exports during the respective epochs of 1859 and 1860 shows a falling off for the current year in thrown silk from £130,260 to £88,441, in silk twist and yarn from £50,520 to £29,643, in machinery from £98,551 to £64,107, and in coals from £253,008 to £206,317, while some increase has taken place in the export of iron, copper, wool, woolens, and worsted yarns.

The import of French wine has increased, but in no greater proportion than that of all other descriptions of wine. In conclusion, we may remark that the symptoms of contraction in the principal markets, if taken together with the very distressing harvest prospects, the heavy calls upon the money market by the English and other Governments, and the unsettled political state of Europe, seem to forebode anything but a prosperous season for the Autumn of 1860.

Written in late June and early July 1860

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5998, July 16, 1860 as a leading article

---

a The figure in the New-York Daily Tribune is 199,859, which is a misprint. — Ed.

b The Economist, No. 879, June 30, 1860, pp. 37, 38, 36. — Ed.
London, July 10, 1860

The reports of the Inspectors of Factories,\textsuperscript{a} which have just been issued, comprise three reports only; the district lately vacated by Mr. Leonard Horner having been annexed partly to Sir John Kincaid's district (Scotland), and partly to Mr. Redgrave's district, now comprising 3,075 factories and printworks; while Mr. Robert Baker's district (Ireland, and some parts of England) remains within its old boundaries. The following is a general abstract, showing the total number of accidents reported to the three Inspectors during the six months ended the 30th April, 1860:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{lrrrrrrr}
\multicolumn{1}{l}{\textit{Nature of Injury}} & \multicolumn{1}{c}{\textit{Ad'ts.}} & \multicolumn{1}{c}{\textit{Y'g per.}} & \multicolumn{1}{c}{\textit{Child.}} & \multicolumn{1}{c}{\textit{Total.}} \\
\hline
Causing death & 14 & 3 & 7 & 2 & 2 & 23 & 7 \\
Amputat'n of right hand or arm & 5 & 6 & 3 & 1 & 1 & - & 9 \\
Amputat'n of left hand or arm & 4 & 1 & 7 & 3 & 1 & - & 12 \\
Amputat'n of part of right hand & 23 & 24 & 29 & 22 & 15 & 7 & 67 \\
Amputat'n of part of left hand & 16 & 17 & 21 & 18 & 8 & 7 & 45 \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{a} In writing this article Marx made use of the \textit{Reports of the Inspectors of Factories to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, for the Half Year ending 30th April 1860}, London, 1860.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} ibid., p. 4.—\textit{Ed.}
The State of British Manufacturing Industry

Nature of Injury

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amp. of any part of leg or foot</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fract. of limbs and bones of trunk</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fracture of hand or foot</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries to head and face</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac'tns, contus'ns, and other injur's not enum. above</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Surgery ..........</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACCIDENTS NOT ARISING FROM MACHINERY.

| Total ................... | 83     | 30       | 59     | 26     | 21     | 10      | 163    | 66     | 229    |

The reports are unanimous in bearing witness to the extraordinary activity of trade during the half year. Such was the demand for work that in some branches of industry the supply of labor was insufficient. This difficulty was less prevalent in the woolen manufactures, where improved machinery allowed the manufacturers to dispense with manual labor, than in cotton and worsted factories, where much machinery has been standing for want of hands, particularly of the younger. Some vicious methods have been adopted in past times to meet this transitory deficiency of labor. In the infancy of the factory system, when manufacturers were in want of labor, it was obtained directly by application to the overseers of some distant parish, who forwarded a certain number of apprentices, children of tender age, who were bound to the manufacturers for a term of years. The children being once apprenticed, the Poor-Law officers congratulated their respective parishes on their deliverance from idle mouths, while the manufacturer proceeded to make the best of his bargain by keeping them at the most economical rate, and by screwing from them all the labor of which they were capable. Hence the first of the series of Factory acts passed in 1802, 42 Geo. III, Cap. 73, has for its title, "An Act for the Preservation of the Health and Morals of Apprentices and Others Employed in Cotton and Other Mills, and Cotton and Other Factories," and was merely intended to mitigate the evils of the apprenticeship system. But as improvements were made in machinery, a different kind of labor was
wanted, when trade became brisk and the population of the neighborhood failed to supply the mills with their full complement of hands. These manufacturers sent to Ireland, and brought over Irish families; but Ireland has ceased to be the market from which a supply of labor can be procured on English demand, and manufacturers have now to look to the Southern and Western counties of England and Wales for families which can be tempted by the present rate of wages in the Northern counties to commence a new career of industry. Agents have been sent throughout the country, to set forth the advantages offered to families by removing to the manufacturing districts, and they are empowered to make arrangements for the emigration to the North. Many families are said to have been forwarded by these agents. Still, the importation into a manufacturing town of a man with his wife and family has this peculiar disadvantage, that while the younger members of the family, who can soon be taught, and whose services become valuable in a comparatively short period, are most in request, there is no ready demand for the labor of the man and his wife, unskilled in factory labor. This has induced some manufacturers to return, in some measure, to the old apprenticeship system, and to enter into engagements for specific periods, with boards of guardians, for the labor of destitute pauper children. In these cases, the manufacturer lodges, clothes and feeds the children, but pays them no regular wages. With the return of this system, complaints of its abuse seem also to have revived. However, this kind of labor, it should be remembered, would only be sought after when none other could be procured, for it is a high-priced labor. The ordinary wages of a boy of 13 would be about 4 shillings per week; but to lodge, to clothe, to feed and to provide medical attendance and proper superintendence for 50 or 100 of these boys, and to set aside some remuneration for them, could not be accomplished for 4 shillings a head per week.\(^a\)

A comparison of the rate of wages paid to factory operatives in 1839 and that paid in 1859 proves the highly interesting fact that the rate of wages has risen, at least nominally, in factories where the hours of work were restricted to 60 per week, while, with a few exceptions, a real reduction has been suffered in the printing, bleaching, and dyeing works in which the labor of children, young

\(^a\) These facts and the following are taken from the “Report of A. Redgrave, Esq., Inspector of Factories, for the Half Year ending the 30th April 1860”, *Reports of the Inspectors of Factories.*, pp. 26-27.—*Ed.*
persons, and women is unrestricted, and where they are at times employed fourteen and fifteen hours per day. The following statements have reference to the cotton trade in Manchester and its neighborhood:

**WEEKLY WAGES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours of work per week</th>
<th>1839</th>
<th>1859</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steam-engine tender</td>
<td>24sh.</td>
<td>30sh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse boys</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse men</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carding department—Scutchers (young women and girls)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skippers (young men)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlookers</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card minders (boys from 14 to 18)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing-frame tenders (young women)</td>
<td>6 6d</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinning department—Spinners on self-acting mules</td>
<td>16 to 18</td>
<td>20 to 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piecers (women and young men)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlookers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubling department—Doublers (women)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doffers (girls)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlookers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobbers (young men)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the reeling, gassing, and power-loom departments, there has also been a slight increase of wages. The anticipations of those who warned the factory operatives that they would seriously suffer by the diminution of their hours of work, have thus been completely disappointed. Compare, on the other hand, the movement of wages in those branches where the hours of daily labor are legally unrestricted:

**CALICO-PRINTING, DYEING, BLEACHING,**
**SIXTY HOURS PER WEEK.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly Wages.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1839.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color-mixer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine-printer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

a op. cit., p. 31.—Ed.
b op. cit., p. 32.—Ed.
[Continued]

Weekly Wages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1839.</th>
<th>1859.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block-cutter</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block-printer</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washer and laborer</td>
<td>16 and 15</td>
<td>16 and 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUSTIAN-DYEING, SIXTY-ONE HOURS PER WEEK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1839.</th>
<th>1859.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dressers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleachers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finishers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By far the most interesting portion of the Reports of Mr. Alexander Redgrave and Sir John Kincaid relates to the development and extension of cooperative societies for the erection and working of mills in Lancashire, and also to some degree in Yorkshire. These cooperative societies, which have multiplied since the passing of the Limited Liability Act, are generally composed of operatives. Each society has a capital of £10,000 and upward, divided into shares of £5 and £10, with power to borrow in certain proportions to the capital subscribed, the money borrowed being made up of small loans by operatives and persons of the like class. In Bury, for instance, upward of £300,000 will be required to put the cooperative mills there built and building into working order. In cotton-spinning mills the spinners and persons employed are frequently shareholders in the same mill, working for wages and receiving interest upon their shares. In cotton-weaving sheds, the partners frequently hire and work looms. This is attractive to operatives, because no great capital is required to start them in their undertaking. They purchase the yarn ready for the loom, weave the cloth, and the factory operation is completed; or else they receive the yarn from some manufacturer who trades with them, and return to him the woven fabric. But this cooperative system is not confined to the spinning and weaving of cotton. It has extended to the trade on a variety of articles of consumption, such as flour, groceries, draperies, etc.

The following report, drawn up by Mr. Patrick, one of Sir John Kincaid's sub-inspectors, contains some valuable information in regard to the progress of this new system of mill-ownership, which, I am afraid, will be put to a severe test by the next industrial crisis.
"There has been a cooperative company in existence at Rochdale, under the style of the ‘New Bacup and Wardle Commercial Company,’ for about twelve years. They are incorporated under the Joint Stock Companies Act, and unlimited. They commenced operations at Clough House Mill, Wardle, near Rochdale, with power to raise a capital of £100,000, in shares of £12 10s., £20,000 of which was paid up. They then increased to £30,000, and about five years ago built a large factory, Far Holme Mill, near Stackstead, of 100-horse power steam, in addition to Clough House Mill; and the half year ending October last they paid a dividend at the rate of 44 per cent on the paid-up capital (Mr. Patrick reports on the 11th June, that the New Bacup and Wardle Commercial Company, ‘Far Holme Mill, Bacup,’ have just declared another dividend of 48 per cent on the paid-up capital), and they have now increased their capital to the sum of £60,000, and have largely increased their Far Holme Mill, near Stackstead, in this neighborhood, requiring two more engines of 40-horse power each, which they are about to put down. The large majority of shareholders are operatives who work in the factory, but receive wages as workmen, and have no more to do with the management than to give their vote to the annual election of the Committee of Management. I have been through the Far Holme Mill this morning, and can report that, so far as the Factory Act is concerned, it is as well conducted as any in my division. I think, though I did not ask them the question, that they have borrowed money at 5 per cent interest.

"There has been another in existence in the neighborhood of Bacup about six years, trading under the firm of the ‘Rossendale Industrial Association.’

"They built a factory; but, I am told, were not thriving, in consequence of the want of sufficient funds. This, also, was on the cooperative system. The firm has now been changed to ‘The Rossendale Industrial Company,’ and are incorporated under the Limited Liabilities Act, with power to raise a capital of £200,000. £40,000 has been taken in shares of £10 each, and they have borrowed about £4,000. This £4,000 has been borrowed from small capitalists, in sums from £150 down to £10, without any mortgages being given. When this cooperative company first started, every shareholder was an operative. In addition to the Wear Mill, that referred to as having been built by the Rossendale Industrial Association, they have now bought of Messrs. R. Mum Bros., Irwell Mills, in Bacup, and are working the two.

"The prosperity and success of the New Bacup and Wardle Commercial Company seem to have given rise to the new companies that are now formed in my immediate vicinity, and preparing large factories to carry on their business. One is the ‘New-Church Cotton Spinning and Weaving Company,’ under the Limited Liabilities Act, with power to raise £100,000 in £10 shares, £40,000 of which is already paid, and the Company has borrowed £5,000 on mortgage at five per cent. This Company has already started, having taken an unoccupied factory of 40-horse power, Vale Mill, New-Church, and they are building the ‘Victoria Works,’ which will require an engine of 100-horse power. They calculate upon employing 450 people when complete, which they think will be in February next.

"Another is ‘The Ravenstall Cotton Manufacturing Company,’ also limited, with a nominal capital of £50,000, in £5 shares, with power to borrow to the extent of £10,000. About £20,000 is already paid up, and they are erecting at Hareholme a factory requiring an engine of 70-horse power. I am told that in both of these companies nine-tenths of the shareholders are of the operative class.

"There is another cooperative company which has sprung up within the last six months. ‘The Old Clough Cotton Company,’ which purchased from Messrs. R. & J. Mum, two old mills, called Irwell Springs, and are on the same principle as the
others, but not having been able to go there to-day I am not able to give all particulars about it. The power, however, has been returned as 13-horse and the number of hands employed 76, and I believe all the shareholders to be of the operative class.

"There are several who take part of a factory, one or two rooms, as the case may be, and in some instances even part of a room, but then these are masters of that part, although they work with and as their own workmen, hire and pay wages as any other manufacturer, without the workpeople employed having interest in the business. There were many more of these at Bacup than there are now. Some have given it up, while others have succeeded and either built mills for themselves or rent large premises. There are more of this sort at Rochdale than any other place in my division."a

II

[New-York Daily Tribune, No. 6032, August 24, 1860]

London, July 14, 1860

After the résumé given in my last letterb of the Factory Reports of Sir John Kincaid and Mr. Redgrave, it still remains for me to take notice of the report of Mr. Robert Baker,c Inspector of Factories for Ireland and part of Cheshire, Lancashire, Gloucestershire, Yorkshire, Staffordshire, Leicestershire, Herefordshire, Shropshire, Worcestershire, and Warwickshire. The total number of accidents in Mr. Baker's district amounted to 601, of which 9 per cent only occurred to children, while 33 per cent happened to persons above 18 years of age.d A closer analysis of these accidents will prove, firstly, that the ratio of accidents to population is greatest in those branches of industry where the machinery employed is not subject to legal control, and, secondly, that in the textile fabrics, where the same sort of machinery is employed, the bulk of accidents falls upon the largest mills. In regard to the employment of 198,565 operatives, belonging to the district of Mr. Baker, the latter gives, for the last half year, the following statement:e:

a "Report of Sir John Kincaid, Inspector of Factories, for the Half Year ending the 30th April 1860", Reports of the Inspectors of Factories..., pp. 11-12.—Ed.
b See this volume, pp. 410-16.—Ed.
d op. cit., pp. 52, 53.—Ed.
e loc. cit., p. 53.—Ed.
In all these textile fabrics, the machinery is protected—that is to say, provided with such contrivances for the security of the operatives that use it as are prescribed by the protective clauses of the Factory Act. If we now turn, for example, to Nottingham, where a large number of persons, and especially of children, are employed among machinery which is *not* protected by the law, we shall find that there were entered on the books of the General Hospital, in 1859, 1,500; and on those of the Dispensary, 794 accidents; making a total of 2,294 among a population estimated to not exceed 62,583. This gives the number of accidents within the borough of Nottingham as 1 to every 27, a proportion compared with which the accidents in the protected textile fabrics appear almost insignificant. Again, in Birmingham, which is full of employments of every kind, both with and without connection with power, where there are only two small textile factories, and where, generally, there is no compulsory protection to the machinery among which the young workers are engaged, the proportion of accidents to population was as 1 to 34. The great advantages derived from the protective clauses of the Factory Act, and from the more general enforcement of these clauses, is also shown by a comparison of all the accidents reported to all the Inspectors for the half years ending the 31st of October, 1845, and the 30th of April, 1846, with the half years ending with October and April, 1858 and 1859. In the latter period, the gross diminution of accidents was equal to 29 per cent, although there had taken place an increase of workers of 20 per cent, at the lowest estimate.

Now, as to the distribution of accidents between larger and smaller mills, I think the following facts, stated by Mr. Baker, to be decisive: During the last half year, out of the 758 cotton factories of his district, employing 107,000 persons, all the accidents which occurred happened in 167 factories, employing about 40,000 persons; so that in 591 factories, employing 67,000 persons, there were no accidents at all.\(^a\) In like manner, out of 387

\(^a\) op. cit., pp. 54-55.—*Ed.*
smaller mills all the accidents happened in 28 mills; out of 153 flax mills all the accidents happened in 45 mills, and out of 774 silk factories all the accidents happened in 14 mills, so that in a large proportion of each branch of trade there were no accidents whatever by machinery, and in every branch the bulk of the accidents happened in the largest mills. The latter phenomenon Mr. Baker tries to account for by the two causes, that in the largest mills the transition state from old, unprotected, to new machinery is, comparatively, most protracted and gradual; and, secondly, that in these larger concerns the rapidity with which the hands are collected together grows in the same ratio as the moral control exercised over such establishments diminishes.

"These two causes," says Mr. Baker, "operate most distinctly in the production of accidents. In the former, the remains of the old machinery which has never been protected, and wherein gathering parts of wheels still remain, are even more destructive from that very circumstance, since, in the safety of the new, the danger of the remaining old is forgotten, while, in the latter, the perpetual scramble for every minute of time, where work is going on by an unvarying power, which is indicated at, perhaps, a thousand horses, necessarily leads to danger. In such mills, moments are the elements of profit—the attention of everybody's every instant is demanded. It is here, where, to borrow one of Liebig's sentiments, there may be seen a perpetual struggle between life and inorganic forces; where the mental energies must direct, and the animal energies must move and be kept equivalent to the revolutions of the spindles. They must not lag, notwithstanding the strain upon them either by excessive excitement or heat; nor be suspended for an instant by any counter-attention to the various movements around, for in every lagging there is loss. Thus it is that fingers are laid upon wheels supposed to be secure, either from their position, or from the slowness of their motion when the attention is wrongly directed elsewhere. Thus, workmen, in hastening to produce a certain amount of pounds weight of yarn within a given time, forget to look under their machines for their little 'piecers.' Thus many accidents arrive from what is called self-carelessness."  

During the last half year, all the textile manufactures, that of silk excepted, were highly prosperous in Ireland as well as the English districts of Mr. Baker. The only check which seemed to keep the different branches of industry within bounds, was the increasing scarcity of raw material. In the cotton trade, the erection of new mills, the formation of new systems of extension, and the demand for hands had, at no former time, been exceeded. Nothing was more remarkable than the new movements in search of raw material. Thus, in imitation of the Cotton Supply Association of Lancashire, a Flax Supply Association had been founded at Belfast. While "for the five years ending with 1853, the average importation of flax, with the flax crop of Ireland  

---

\[a\] op. cit., p. 56.—Ed.
added, had amounted to 113,409 tuns per annum, it was, for the last five years, ending with 1858, only 101,672 tuns, showing a diminution of 12,000 tuns per annum, with an increased annual value of exports of £1,000,000."a The price of wool, already above the average, during the period over which the last Factory Reports extend, has since then been continually rising. The rapid extension of the woolen manufactories, and the increased demand for mutton both in Great Britain and in the Colonies, may be considered as the permanent causes of this rise in the wool prices. As an accidental cause menacing to shorten the usual supply of wool, must be considered the peculiar character of the season; many sheep having died during the Winter from bad or improper food, and many lambs having perished during the Spring from cold, want of food, and by a disease that proved fatal in a few hours.\textsuperscript{b}

The only trade that was seriously checked during the last six months, consequent upon the conclusion of the Anglo-French Commercial Treaty,\textsuperscript{c} and the fears entertained concerning the effects of foreign competition, is the silk trade. The pressure thus exercised has been gradual, so that at the moment I write this letter more than 13,000 weavers are out of employment in Coventry alone, every loom being stopped. This crisis is the more to be regretted, since, as I remarked in a letter on the Factory Reports of 1859, there had been springing up at Coventry a number of cottage silk factories, in which the workmen employed their own families, with now and then a little hired labor. These factories had, since the commencement of 1860, been considerably increased in number. They are, in fact, a recurrence to the former domestic manufacturers, only with the addition of steam-power, but wholly different to the new cooperative system of Lancashire and Yorkshire. With them the householder is the master, the weaver the renter of power, sometimes the employer of other labor, as well as that of his own family. He has either bought his two looms out and out, or upon credit, and is paying for them so much a week; or he has hired them, probably from his landlord, who is a builder and speculator. He, besides, hires the power wanted. There is said to be as much difference now between the work thus done upon the weaver's loom and that done upon the

\textsuperscript{a} op. cit., p. 57. Robert Baker cites the figures given by the President of the Chamber of Commerce in his speech of December 1859.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} op. cit., p. 58.\textemdash\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{c} See this volume, pp. 341-44.\textemdash\textit{Ed.}
master's, as there is almost between the French ribbon and the English one. Still it is apprehended, and Mr. Robert Baker, in his report, seems to share this apprehension, that this domestic labor, combined with the employment of mechanical power, will be unable to stand commercial shocks. It is probable that the English manufacturer, to cope with his French rival, will be compelled to recur to the employment of capital on a large scale, which must break up the cottage silk factories competing at his own door.

Written on July 10 and 14, 1860

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, Nos. 6016 and 6032, August 6 and 24, 1860

Reproduced from the newspaper
According to a telegram received to-day from Palermo, Col. Medici's impending attack on Milazzo had decided the King of Naples to give orders for the complete evacuation of Sicily by the Neapolitan army, and their withdrawal to his continental dominions. Although this telegram stands in need of confirmation, it seems beyond dispute that Garibaldi's cause is working on, despite the disease his troops suffer from, and the diplomatic intrigues his Government is pestered with.

Garibaldi's open breach with the Cavour party, viz.: the expulsion from Sicily of La Farina, the notorious marplot, and of Signors Griscelli and Totti, Corsicans by birth, and Bonapartist police agents by profession, has given rise to very contradictory comments on the part of the European press. A private letter of Garibaldi's to a London friend, which has been communicated to me with the permission to state its principal contents in the Tribune, will leave no doubt as to the real bearing of the case. Garibaldi's letter is of a date anterior to his decree of the 7th inst., by which the three aforesaid plotters were summarily removed from the island, but it fully explains the points at issue between the General and the Minister—between the popular Dictator and the dynastic Grand Vizier; in one word, between Garibaldi and Cavour. The latter, in secret understanding with Louis Bonaparte, whom Garibaldi stigmatizes as "cet homme faux" (that false man), and with whom he foresees "the necessity of measuring his sword some fine morning"—Cavour, then, had determined upon

---

a Francis II.—Ed.
b "Affaires des deux Siciles", Le Constitutionnel, No. 198, July 16, 1860.—Ed.
annexing, piece-meal, such slices of Italian territory as Garibaldi's sword might cut out, or as popular risings might sever from their old allegiance. This process of piece-meal annexation to Piedmont was to be accompanied by a simultaneous process of "compensation" for the second Empire. As Savoy and Nice had to be paid for Lombardy and the Duchies, so Sardinia and Genoa were to pay for Sicily; every new act of separate annexation calling for a new separate diplomatic transaction with the protector of Piedmont. A second dismemberment to the benefit of France, quite apart from the outrage on the integrity and independence of Italy which it involved, would at once have put an extinguisher on the patriotic movements at Naples and Rome. The conviction spreading that to coalesce under Piedmontese auspices, Italy must grow less and less, would have enabled Bonaparte\(^a\) to maintain at Naples and Rome separate governments, independent in name, but for all practical purposes, French vassalages. Hence Garibaldi thought it his principal task to cut off all pretext for French diplomatic interference, but, as he understood, this could only be done by preserving to the movement its pure popular character, and divesting it of all appearance of connection with mere schemes of dynastic aggrandizement. Sicily, Naples, and Rome once liberated, the moment would have come for merging them into the kingdom of Victor Emmanuel, if the latter would take upon himself to keep them, and defend them, not only from Austria, the enemy in front, but also from France, the enemy in the rear. Relying, perhaps, somewhat too much on the good will of the English Government, and the necessities of Louis Bonaparte's situation, Garibaldi presumes that so long as he does not annex to Piedmont any territory, and exclusively relies for the liberation of Italy upon Italian arms, Louis Bonaparte will not dare to interfere in open violation of the pretexts upon which he commenced the Italian crusade. However that may be, this much is sure—that Garibaldi's plan, whether successful or not, is the only one that, under present circumstances, holds out any chance of rescuing Italy, not only from its old tyrants and divisions, but also from the clutches of the new French protectorate. And to baffle this plan was the special errand upon which Cavour had dispatched La Farina to Sicily, supported by the two Corsican brothers.

La Farina is a native of Sicily, where, in 1848, he distinguished himself among the Revolutionists by his hatred against the

\(^a\) Napoleon III.— Ed.
Republican party and his intrigues with the Piedmontese doctrinaires rather than by real energy or memorable exploits. After the failure of the Sicilian revolution and during his stay at Turin, he published a voluminous history of Italy, in which he did his best to exalt the Savoy dynasty, and to slander Mazzini. With soul and body bound to Cavour, he imbued the "National Association for Italian unity" with a Bonapartist spirit; and having become its chairman, handled it as an instrument not for furthering but for impeding all attempts at independent national action. It was quite in keeping with these antecedents that, when the first rumor got afloat of Garibaldi's intended expedition to Sicily, La Farina ridiculed and reviled the very idea of such an expedition. When, nevertheless, immediate steps were taken in preparation of the bold adventure, La Farina put in movement all the resources of the "National Association" with a view to obstruct it. When his opposition had failed in discouraging the general and his men, and when at last the expedition sailed, La Farina, with cynical sneers, indulged in forebodings of the most sinister kind, making himself bold to predict the immediate and total failure of the enterprise. So soon, however, as Garibaldi had taken Palermo and provided himself Dictator, La Farina rushed to join him, being provided with a commission from Victor Emmanuel, or rather from Cavour, which gave him power to assume the command of the island in the name of the King, directly after the annexation had been voted. Being, as he himself admits, despite his ill-omened antecedents, at first most courteously received by Garibaldi, he at once began to assume the airs of the master, to intrigue against the Ministry of Crispi, conspire with the French police agents, rally around himself the aristocratic liberals eager to close the revolution by a vote of separate annexation, and propose, instead of the necessary steps for the expulsion of the Neapolitans from Sicily, plans for the expulsion from the public administration of the Mazzinians, and other men not to be relied on by his master, Cavour.

Crispi, with the undermining of whose Ministry La Farina opened his intrigues, had for a long time been an exile in London, where he was counted among Mazzini's friends, and made the deliverance of Sicily the all-absorbing subject of his exertions. In the Spring of 1859 he went under a Wallachian name and character to Sicily at great personal risk, visited every great town

a Giuseppe La Farina, Storia d'Italia dal 1815 al 1850, Vols. I-VI, Torino, 1851-1852.—Ed.
there, and planned an insurrection for the month of October. The
events of the Autumn delayed the insurrection, first till
November, and then till the present year. In the mean time Crispi
applied to Garibaldi, who, while refusing to excite an insurrection,
gave the promise to aid it after it had once broken out and so far
consolidated itself as to prove what were the real feelings of the
Sicilians. During the expedition Crispi, with his wife, the only
woman of the expedition, accompanied Garibaldi and fought in
every action, his wife superintending the attendance on the sick
and wounded. It was this man whom Signor La Farina wanted
first to throw overboard, with the secret hope, of course, of
flinging the Dictator after him. Garibaldi, out of consideration for
Victor Emmanuel, and under the high pressure of the aristocratic
liberals, consented, although under protest, to form a new
Ministry and dismiss Crispi, whom he, however, retained as a
personal counselor and friend. But Garibaldi had hardly made this
sacrifice when he became aware that the dismissal of the Crispi
Ministry had only been insisted upon in order to quarter upon
him a Cabinet which, in all but name, was not his, but La Farina’s
or Cavour’s Cabinet, and which, encouraged by the presence of La
Farina, and relying upon Cavour’s protection, would in a very
short time counteract his whole plan of liberation, and turn all
their influence throughout the country against the Nizzardist
intruder, as Garibaldi was already nicknamed. It was then that he
saved his own cause, not less than that of Sicily and Italy, by the
expulsion of La Farina with the two Corsican brothers, the
acceptance of the resignation of La Farina’s ministerial nominees,
and the appointment of a patriotic Ministry, among whom we may
name Signor Mario.

Written on July 23, 1860
First published in the New-York Daily
Tribune, No. 6018, August 8, 1860
Frederick Engels

BRITISH DEFENSES

The plan for the National Defenses of England, just laid before Parliament,\(^a\) proposes to confine all the outlay to the fortification of the dockyards, together with some minor works, barely sufficient to protect the larger harbors of the country from insult by small hostile squadrons, and with the erection of strong and extensive forts at Dover and Portland, for the purpose of securing sheltered anchorage to fleets and detached vessels. The whole of the money is to be spent on the circumference of the country, on the coast-line accessible to an enemy's fleet; and as it is impossible to defend the whole length of coast, a few important points, especially the naval arsenals and dockyards, are selected. The interior of the country is to be left entirely to its own resources.

Now, when England once confesses that her wooden walls no longer protect her, and that she must have recourse to fortification as a means of national defense, it stands to reason that she should first shelter from attack her naval arsenals—the cradles of her fleet. That Portsmouth, Plymouth, Pembroke, Sheerness, and Woolwich (or whatever place may be selected in its stead), should be made so strong as to be able to beat off any attack by sea, and to hold out for a reasonable time against a regular siege by land, nobody will doubt. But it is perfectly ridiculous to call the providing for this danger a system of national defense. In fact, in order to elevate the scheme to this dignity, it appears to have been necessary to make it far more complicated and expensive than was required for the mere protection of the dockyards.

A country like France or Spain, which is exposed to invasion on its land frontier as much as to naval attacks and descents on its

---

\(^a\) See Report of the Commissioners appointed to consider the Defences of the United Kingdom; together with the Minutes of Evidence and Appendix; also Correspondence relative to a Site for an internal Arsenal. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty, London, 1860; on the debates see The Times, No. 23680, July 24, 1860.—Ed.
coast, is obliged to make its naval depots fortresses of the first rank. Toulon, Carthagenä, Genoa, even Cherbourg, may be subjected to the combined attack which destroyed the arsenals and dockyards of Sevastopol.\textsuperscript{315} They ought, therefore, to have a very strong land-front with detached forts to keep the dockyards out of range of a bombardment. But this does not apply to England. Supposing even that a naval defeat had for a moment placed in doubt England’s maritime supremacy; even then an invading army, landed on British soil, could never depend upon the liberty of its communications, and must, therefore, act rapidly and decisively. This invading army would not be in a state to undertake a regular siege; and if it was, nobody in his senses would expect the invader to go and settle down quietly before Portsmouth and to waste his resources in a lengthened siege, instead of marching straight upon London, and at once provoking a decision on the main issue while his moral and material ascendancy is at its height. If it comes to that, that troops and material can be safely landed in England sufficient to attack London, and at the same time to besiege Portsmouth, then England is at the brink of ruin, and no land-forts around Portsmouth can save her. As with Portsmouth, so with the other naval arsenals. Let the sea-fronts be made as strong as they can; but on the land-fronts, everything is superfluous which goes beyond keeping off the enemy far enough to protect the dockyard from bombardment, and securing it against a fortnight’s regular siege. But if we are to judge from the estimates, and from some plans respecting the proposed defenses of Portsmouth, which have got into the London Times, there is to be a great waste of brick and mortar, of ditch and parapet, of money and, in case of war, of men too. The engineering staff appear positively to revel in this luxury of planning fortifications which, to them, has so long been a forbidden joy. England is menaced with a vegetation of forts and batteries springing up as rapidly as mushrooms, and as rank as the creepers of a tropical forest. The Government seem to insist upon it that there must be something to show for the money; but that will be the principal use of all these splendid structures.

So long as the dockyards are not safe against a \textit{coup de main},\footnote{Sudden attack.——\textit{Ed.}} so long invasions might be undertaken, with the sole aim of destroying one of them, and then retiring. Thus they serve, so to say, as safety-valves for London. But as soon as they are secured against an attack by main force, and even against a regular attack, for fourteen days—and this is evidently necessary—there is no
other object left for an invasion except London. All minor ends are secured; local invasions are no longer to any purpose; an invasion must go in for the chance of annihilating England or suffer annihilation in its turn. Thus, the very fact of the fortification of the dockyards weakens London. It compels the invading power to concentrate all its strength on the attempt at once upon London. London, we are told by Lord Palmerston, must be defended in the field. Suppose this to be so: the stronger the army, the safer London will be. But where is that strong army to come from, if Portsmouth, Plymouth, Chatham, and Sheerness, and, perhaps, Pembroke, are converted into first-rate fortresses of the size of Cherbourg, Genoa, Coblentz, or Cologne, requiring garrisons of from 15,000 to 20,000 men to defend them? Thus, the stronger you make the dockyards, the weaker you render London and the country. And this is what you call national defenses.

In any case, one lost battle would decide the fate of London; and, considering the immense commercial centralization of the country, and the dead lock to which the occupation of London would bring all the industrial and commercial machinery of England, there can be no doubt that one battle would decide the fate of the whole kingdom. And thus, while twelve millions are proposed to be spent on the security of the dockyards, the very heart of the country is to remain unprotected, and is left to hinge on the result of one battle!

There is no good in mincing the matter. Let the dockyards, by all means, be fortified in a rational manner, which could be done for less than half the money now proposed to be squandered upon them; but if you want national defenses, set at once about fortifying London. It is no use saying, as Palmerston does, that this is impossible. It is the same talk that was heard when Paris was to be fortified. The surface inclosed in the continuous rampart round Paris is not much less than that occupied by London; the line of forts encircling Paris has an extent of 27 miles, and a circle round London six miles from Charing Cross would give a periphery of 37 miles. This circle might very well represent the average distance of the forts from the center; and ten miles more will not render the line too long, if a proper system of radial and circular railway communication facilitates the rapid movements of the reserves. Of course, London cannot be defended in the off-hand way, proposed in the Cornhill Magazine, where six large forts are to do all; the number of forts must be twenty at least; but, on the other hand, London need not be fortified in the pedantic style of Paris, for it will never have to stand a siege. To
defend it against a *coup de main*, against the resources which an invading army can bring against it within a fortnight after landing, is all that is required. The continuous inclosure may be dispensed with; the villages and groups of houses on the outskirts may be made to serve in its stead quite effectually, if the plan of defense be properly prepared beforehand.

With London thus fortified, and the dockyards strengthened on the sea fronts and protected on the land fronts against a forcible, irregular attack, and even a slight siege, England might defy any invasion, and the whole might be done for something like fifteen millions sterling. The dockyards would not absorb, in all, more than 70,000 regulars and 15,000 volunteers; while the whole rest of the line, the militia, and the volunteers—say 80,000 line and militia, and 100,000 volunteers—would defend the intrenched camp around London, or accept battle in front of it; and while the whole country north of London would remain at full liberty to organize fresh bodies of volunteers and depots for the line and militia. The enemy would in all cases be compelled to act; he could not, even if he would, then escape the attraction of the great intrenched camp of London, and he would have only the choice either to attack it and be beaten, or to wait, and thereby increase every day the difficulties of his position.

Instead of this, the Government plan of national defenses would bring matters to this pass, that if the forces of England consisted of 90,000 line and militia and 115,000 volunteers, the garrisons would, at least, absorb 25,000 regulars and 35,000 volunteers, leaving for the field in which to defend London, 65,000 regulars and 80,000 volunteers, while 35,000 men who might be very badly wanted on the day of battle, would be sitting quietly and unmenaced behind stone walls which nobody had thought of attacking. But not only would this army be weakened by 35,000 men, it would be deprived of a fortified position out of which it could not be driven except by a regular siege; it would have to expose its 80,000 badly officered and inexperienced volunteers to a fight in the open field, and it would thus fight in circumstances very much less favorable than the army placed as above described.

Written about July 24, 1860

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6020, August 10, 1860 as a leading article; reprinted in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 1588, August 14, 1860

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*
Karl Marx

[EVENTS IN SYRIA.—
SESSION OF THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT.—
THE STATE OF BRITISH COMMERCE]

London, July 28, 1860

The Blue Book on the Syrian disturbances\(a\) having only just been issued, and Lord Stratford de Redcliffe having announced for Tuesday next his interpellation respecting the Syrian affairs,\(b\)\(316\) I delay entering on this momentous subject, and would only warn your readers to not be carried away by the sentimental declamations of the Decembrist press, the feelings of horror at the atrocious outrages of wild tribes, and the natural sympathy felt for the sufferers. But there are a few points which ought steadily to be fixed upon. In the first instance, the Russian Empire, consequent upon the internal collisions that have arisen out of the serf emancipation movement and the dilapidated state of finances, finds itself in a fix out of which the present Government knows not how to get itself safe by a war on a grand scale. War appears to them the only means of shifting off the impending revolution so confidently predicted in Prince Dolgoroukow's *La vérité sur la Russie*. Consequently, it is about three months since Prince Gorchakoff tried to reopen the Oriental question by issuing his circular\(c\) on the grievances of the Christians in Turkey, but his appeal, reechoed only by a solitary voice from the Tuileries, fell flat on the ears of Europe.

---

\(a\) *Papers, 1858-1860, respecting past or apprehended Disturbances in Syria*, in four parts, London, 1860.— *Ed.*

\(b\) Lord Stratford de Redcliffe's interpellation of August 3, 1860, *The Times*, No. 23690, August 4, 1860.— *Ed.*

Even from that time Russian and French agents were bestirring themselves to bring about a politico-religious row—the former on the Dalmatian, the latter on the Syrian coast—both movements supporting each other, since the troubles in Montenegro and the Herzegovina compelled the Porte to withdraw almost the whole Turkish army stationed in Syria, so as to leave the arena open to the high-pitched antagonism of the barbarous clans of the Lebanon. The Emperor of the French found himself placed in the same necessity as the orthodox Czar, of looking out for some fresh and thrilling crusade, to plunge his Empire again into the Lethe of war-hallucinations. The Italian movement, slipping out of his leading-strings, and taking a course contrary to the direction he wanted to impart to it, had, as was delicately hinted in the Constitutionnel, become a bore in the opinion of Paris. His attempts at wheedling the Prince Regent of Prussia into a violent "consolidation of Germany," to be paid by a "moral compensation" for France in the shape of the Rhenish Provinces, turned out a signal failure, and even cast some ridicule on the entrepreneur of the emancipation-of-nationalities dodge. The conflict Louis Napoleon found himself involved in with the Pope damaged the prop on which his sway over the peasantry rests—the Catholic clergy of France.

The Imperial exchequer was reduced for some time to, and continues in a state of, exhaustion, which it was vainly tried to cure by throwing out the hint of the expediency of an emprunt de la paix (a peace-loan). This was too much even for Decembrist France. To eke out one loan contracted on the pretext of war by a subsequent loan contracted on the pretext of peace, was a presumption abhorrent even to the Paris stock-jobbers. Some faint voice in the emasculated Paris press dared to insinuate that the blessings of the second Empire were as great as expensive, the nation having bought them by an increase to the amount of fifty per cent of the public debt. The project of a peace loan of 500,000,000f. was consequently dropped, a retreat that only encouraged Mr. Favre to descant in the Corps Législatif on the impending "financial crash," and to tear to pieces the flowery gauze which the Imperial Budgetmonger had thrown over the State chest. The strictures in the Corps Législatif among the "chiens savants" (the learned dogs) of the mock representation, hazarded

---

a Alexander II.—Ed.
b See Ernest Dréolle's article "Paris, 10 juillet", Le Constitutionnel, No. 193, July 11, 1860.—Ed.
c William.—Ed.
Events in Syria

by Mr. Favre and Mr. Olivier, on the characteristic features of the Decembrist régime, as well as the furious onslaught on the intrigues of the “old parties,” with which the official, the semi-official, and officious press of Paris teems, coincided in bearing witness to the stern fact, that the rebellious spirit of Gaul is rekindling from its cinders, and that the continuance of the usurper’s rule again depends on the enactment of a grand war-spectacle, as it did two years after the coup d’état, and again two years after the conclusion of the Crimean episode. It is evident that the Autocrat of France and the Autocrat of Russia, laboring both under the same urgent necessity of sounding the war-trumpet, act in common concert. While Bonapartist semi-official pamphlets offered to the Prince Regent of Prussia, “German Union,” backed by a “moral compensation” for France, the Emperor Alexander, as has just been publicly stated, without a denial on the part of the Berlin governmental press, in the publications of the German “National Association,” openly proposed to his uncle the annexation to Prussia of the whole of Northern Germany up to the main, on the condition of a cession to France of the Rhenish Provinces, and of connivance at the progress of Russia on the Danube. It is this fact simultaneously thrown out by both the Autocrats that has brought about the rendezvous at Teplitz between the Emperor of Austria and the Prince Regent. The conspirators of Petersburg and Paris had, however, in case their temptations of Prussia should fail, kept in reserve the thrilling incident of the Syrian massacres, to be followed by a French intervention which, as it would not do to enter through the main gate, would open the back door of a general European war. In respect to England I will only add, that, in 1841, Lord Palmerston furnished the Druses with the arms they kept ever since, and that, in 1846, by a convention with the Czar Nicholas, he abolished, in point of fact, the Turkish sway that curbed the wild tribes of the Lebanon, and stipulated for them a quasi-independence which, in the run of time, and under the

---

a Émile Olivier’s speech in the Corps Législatif on June 26, 1860, Le Moniteur universel, No. 180, June 28, 1860.—Ed.
b Napoleon III and Alexander II.—Ed.
c Marx is referring to the following pamphlets published by Dentu in Paris in 1859 and 1860: La vraie question, France-Italie-Autriche; Napoléon III et la question roumaine; La foi des traités, les puissances signataires et l’empereur Napoléon III; Edmond About, La Prusse en 1860 (concerning the last-named pamphlet, see this volume, pp. 391-96 and 400-01.).—Ed.
d William.—Ed.
proper management of foreign plotters, could only beget a harvest of blood.

You are aware that the present Parliamentary session stands unrivalled by a startling succession of Government failures. Apart from Mr. Gladstone's abortion of protective duties, not one single important measure has been carried. But while the Government were withdrawing bill after bill, they had contrived to smuggle through the second reading a little resolution, consisting of one single little clause, which, if carried, would have brought about the greatest constitutional change witnessed in England ever since 1689. That resolution simply proposed the abolition of the local English army in India, its absorption into the British army, and consequently the transfer of its supreme command from the Governor-General at Calcutta to the London Horse Guards, alias the Duke of Cambridge. Quite apart from the other serious consequences such a change must be fraught with, it would put part of the army out of the control of Parliament, and, on the grandest scale, add to the Royal patronage. It seems that some members of the Indian Council, who unanimously objected to the Government project, but, by virtue of the Indian Act of 1858, can occupy no seats in the House of Commons, whispered their protests into the ears of some M.P.s, and so it came that when the Government already considered their dodge to be safe, a sudden Parliamentary émeute, led by Mr. Horsman, broke through their intrigue in the very nick of time. It is a truly ludicrous spectacle, this perplexity of a Cabinet unexpectedly found out, and the bewilderment of a House of Commons fretting at the snares laid to its own profound ignorance.

The declared value of the exports for last month shows the progress of the downward movement of British commerce. I have singled out in a previous letter [that], compared with the exports of June, 1859, there is a falling off of nearly a million and a half sterling for June, 1860.

The returns for the month of June in the last three years are as follows:

---

b Riot.—Ed.
d See this volume, pp. 406-09.—Ed.
e For these and the following data see the article "The Board of Trade Returns", *The Economist*, No. 883, July 28, 1860.—Ed.
For the half year ending with the 30th June, the declared value of the exports is less by a million than in the same six months of last year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>£10,241,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>£10,665,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>£9,236,454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The falling off of the last month is distributed over the cotton, cotton yarn, linen, hardware, and cutlery, iron and worsted trade. Even in the exports of manufactured woolen goods, the trade in which has hitherto shown a steadily increasing prosperity, this month excepted, "woolen and worsted yarn" shows a decline. The export of cotton goods for the six months to British India has declined from £6,094,430, in the first half of 1859, to £4,738,440 in the first half of 1860, or by [about] £1,360,000 worth of goods.\(^a\)

With regard to the imports the most striking feature is the huge bulk of the cotton arrivals. In June, 1860, 2,102,048 cwts. have been received, as against 1,655,306 cwts. in the June of last year, and 1,339,108 cwts. in June, 1858.\(^b\) The increase for the six months is no less than three millions of hundredweights; so that the half year receipts are greater by more than 60 per cent. The cotton imported in the month of May, 1860, is worth more by £1,800,000 than the import in 1859. No less than six millions and a half sterling have been spent in raw cotton in the first five months of 1860, beyond what was so spent in the same period of the previous year.

If the rapid decrease in the export of cotton goods and yarns be compared with the still more decided increase in the cotton imports, it will be understood that some cotton crisis is approaching, the more so since the new arrivals of the raw material fall upon unusually replete cotton stores.

Written on July 28, 1860
Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6021, August 11, 1860

---

\(^a\) op. cit.—Ed.
\(^b\) op. cit.—Ed.
Frederick Engels

COULD THE FRENCH SACK LONDON?

The report of the British National Defense Commission, which was recently published in London, states that if the Emperor of the French were disposed to send a hostile army to England, it would be impossible for "all the available vessels of the Royal Navy" to prevent it from landing at some point of the 2,147 miles of coast line of England and Wales, not to speak of that of Ireland. It having been also conceded, at various times before and since the publication of the famous de Joinville pamphlet, that a landing of 100,000 or more Frenchmen could be effected in the British Islands, under skillful management, the only important point to be considered is, what power of resistance Great Britain has at her command to meet such an invasion.

In compliance with an order of the House of Commons, the strength of the British land forces was reported in May last. It was as follows: Total regimental establishments, 144,148; effectives of all ranks on the 1st of May, 133,962; embodied militia, 19,333. When this statement was made public, an almost universal cry from all parts of the three Kingdoms was raised, as to the manner in which the $75,000,000 appropriated for the army estimates were spent, since an analysis of the 144,148 men, given as the available material of the line, "revealed the startling fact that scarcely 30,000 infantry could be mustered for offensive or defensive purposes, at a given place."

---

a Report of the Commissioners appointed to consider the Defences of the United Kingdom, London, 1860. See this volume, pp. 425-28.—Ed.

b François Ferdinand de Joinville's De l'État des forces navales de la France, Francfort s/M., 1844.—Ed.
Mr. Sidney Herbert and his associates of the Horse Guards, immediately held a consultation, and the London *Times* endeavored to quiet the anxiety of the people. It said:

"We took occasion to examine the figures by which these allegations were supported, and explained in some detail the actual position of affairs."

It tried to

"show that if by the term 'troops' it was intended to describe only infantry of the line, the state of the case had been pretty accurately given, but that in reality the force at home comprised strong divisions of other arms of the service, so that its aggregate strength was by no means so small as might have been imagined."

The result of this nervousness on the part of the public, and of the consultation at the Horse Guards, was a completely new table of statistics, putting down the military forces of Great Britain, at home, at 323,259; or 179,111 men more than the statement submitted two months previously. The discrepancy is not difficult of explanation. The first was issued with the intention to show the number of men that could, under favorable circumstances, and on receiving reasonable notice, be made available for immediate duty; the last to supply the sum total of every man and boy entered on the military pay-roll, and consequently receiving a share of the $75,000,000, beside including 227,179 volunteers and militia, of whom fully 200,000 have no existence as soldiers. Then there are 33,302 men accounted for, as belonging to "depots." Lest we may be charged with prejudice in describing what these "depots" are, we will cite the London *Times* as authority:

"The troops in the depots really belong, not to the home, but the foreign establishments. They are portions of the battalions serving abroad, and there is nothing strange in their being comparatively ineffective for duty at home."

In short they are merely an ineffective body, composed of recruits not over three months in the service, who are shipped off quarterly, or oftener, when enlisted, to the regiments abroad, and old invalids who have been left at home as useless,

"so that, what with those who are exhausted and those who are untaught, the corps itself is never in the condition of a regular battalion."

So much for the depots. Now as to the volunteers and militia. It is only necessary to repeat that at least 200,000 exist at present, only on paper. Mr. Maguire recently proved in Parliament that nearly every regiment of militia had from 200 to 300 men more

---

*a* "London, Saturday, June 23, 1860". *The Times*, No. 23654, June 23, 1860.—*Ed.*

*b* ibid.—*Ed.*

*c* "London, Monday, June 4, 1860". *The Times*, No. 23637, June 4, 1860.—*Ed.*
on the books of the Horse Guards than could ever be got together
on parade. Mr. Sidney Herbert made a similar admission. Of the
Irish militia regiments, whose members are compelled, from
hardship and poverty, to report themselves more punctually than
their English neighbors, many now estimated at 800—the Waterford
for instance—have only 400. The estimate giving the strength of
militia and volunteers of England at 138,560 is probably as near
the mark as it is possible for an impartial statistician to make it.

The force of the regular army at home, according to the recent
report from the War-Office, is 68,778. The Household cavalry
(1,317), Royal Engineers (2,089), the Army Hospital corps of
discarded invalids, the military train, and other partially unavail-
able troops, are here included. To avoid trespassing on disputed
grounds, we will admit that the entire 68,000 are available. This,
supposing all militia and volunteers embodied, and under arms,
would give a grand total of 206,560 men. We will even add the
Irish police to the list, which will increase it to about 237,000. The
nominal strength of the regular army and embodied militia, just
now, is given at 100,000; about 16,000 in excess of the real
figures; but we will take it as it stands. Conceding that 15,000 of
the volunteers could be assembled at a given point, within three
days of the landing of the French, England would still have at her
disposal an army of 115,000. Of these, it must be borne in mind
that fully 25,000 are novices in the use of arms. Now, all the navy
yards, arsenals and Government strongholds, would require extra
garrisons, for there are never more than 8,000 marines ashore at
the naval ports. Ireland, without attaching any importance to the
influence of the "national petition," in creating a friendly
disposition to the soldiers of McMahon, will need an army. All
volunteers or militia would not suffice to keep order in the
Emerald Isle, with the prospect of a fight in view. Her Majesty's
authorities should at least detail 10,000 regulars, and 25,000
irregulars for that country, beside the police. This would make
about 55,000 in all, and would leave only 80,000 soldiers to
England and Wales, to guard arsenals, armories, and navy yards.
It is idle to suppose that less than 20,000 serviceable troops would
be sufficient for this important duty, allowing even the worn-out
or inexperienced men in the depots to be able to hold their own.
So Napoleon's 100,000 Frenchmen, Zouaves, &c., would be
opposed by 60,000 red coats, of whom little more than 45,000

---

Sidney Herbert's speech in the House of Commons on June 26, 1860, The Times,
No. 23657, June 27, 1860.—Ed.
would belong to the line. The probable result of a renounter between the two forces, thus brought face to face, hardly admits of a doubt.

It will be objected that France could not equip and dispatch across the Channel 100,000 men, without its becoming known. It may be; but England would not know where the blow would fall, and would naturally tremble for the safety of her possessions bordering the Mediterranean, and try to reenforce her garrisons there lest the threatened attack on London might be intended to cover ulterior designs on Malta and Gibraltar. She would send over to those places, in a few vessels of the Channel fleet, 20,000 or 30,000 soldiers, who would not be "volunteers," thus throwing on the latter the weight of resisting the enemy at home. Some distinguished writers assert that even the sacking of London would eventually be less injurious to England, than her banishment from Malta and Gibraltar.

But it will be argued that the mere announcement of national danger would be sufficient to arouse every Briton in the land, from the Cheviot Hills to Cornwall, to hurl the intruder into the sea. This is plausible. But experience teaches us that no matter how intense the patriotism of the masses may be, the fact that they, as a general thing, have no arms, and do not know how to use them if they had, renders their disposition in an emergency of very little value. Cane-swords and pitchforks may be weapons exceedingly dangerous to human life in the Seven Dials, a or in the Provinces, but it is not reasonable to assume that they would be irrepressible in repelling the Zouaves. It may also be seriously doubted whether the middle classes, who almost exclusively represent the volunteer force, would be so ready to answer muster, with the French on their native island, as they are when summoned to receive the congratulations of her Majesty. At all events, it is not more absurd to admit the possibility of the invading army numbering 150,000 than to suppose the volunteers can turn out 120,000; since a cordial invitation from Buckingham Palace cannot succeed in bringing, at the end of a twelve months' recruiting, more than 18,300.

Some doubts having been expressed as to the force actually reviewed at Hyde Park, we quote a paragraph from The Manchester Guardian, of the second day's parade. The "private correspondent" alluded to is Mr. Tom Taylor, an intimate and confidential friend of Col. McMurdo:

---

a A working-class district in the centre of London.—Ed.
"Our private correspondent, as our readers may recollect, has stated the number at 18,300, on the official authority of Col. McMurdo, which is a little lower than the amount given by Sir John Burgoyne's calculation. But the martial bearing of the Volunteers evidently struck Sir John more than their mere number."

In estimating the forces that could probably be concentrated to oppose invaders, we have purposely made the most liberal calculation in favor of Great Britain. Our statement of the regular army admits as efficient every man, sick and well, whose name is on the military books. The militia and volunteers have been considered as 115,000 strong, which those well informed on the matter may deem excessive. The acknowledged ability of French field officers, the excellence of French military discipline, the general superiority of French tactics; and, on the other hand, the well-established stupidity of many of the highest officers in the English army; the slovenly management of the regulars and volunteers (after five weeks' notice had been given one regiment of militia actually mustered, in May last, with 135 barefoot members); even the conceded inferiority of the ensemble of a British to a French fighting army—all these have not been considered, although they are most important elements in a discussion of the subject.

In view of these facts, it appears certain that if Napoleon landed to-morrow, at a judiciously selected port in England, with 150,000 or even 100,000 men, he could "sack London" and escape the "annihilation" which a London journal recently stated would be his inevitable fate "if he put a hostile foot on Saxon soil."

Written between July 26 and 28, 1860
First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 6021, August 11, 1860 as a leading article
Reproduced from the newspaper
The observations made in my last letter upon the secret connection between the Syrian massacres and the Russo-French alliance, have received unexpected confirmation from the other side of the Channel, in the shape of a pamphlet published at M. Dentu's on Tuesday last, entitled La Syrie et l'Alliance Russe, and ascribed to the penmanship of M. Edmond About. M. Dentu, as you are aware, is the French Government publisher, who has issued all the semi-official pamphlets which from time to time initiated Europe into the "studies" just indulged at the Tuileries. The above-mentioned pamphlet derives a peculiar interest from the circumstance that its publication followed closely on the love-letter addressed by the Man of December to Persigny, which was destined to mesmerize John Bull, and of which Lord John Russell, at the very moment he refused to lay it before the House, forwarded a copy to the London Times. The subjoined extracts contain the substance of La Syrie et l'Alliance Russe:

"As at the time of the Crusades, Christian Europe is moved by the horrible crimes of which Syria has just been the scene. Seven hundred thousand Christians are delivered up to the merciless fanaticism of two millions of Mussulmans, and the Turkish Government, by its inexplicable inaction, appears to avow itself their accomplice. Assuredly, France would have forgotten all her traditions had she not immediately claimed the honor of protecting the lives and properties of those who,
in former days, were the soldiers of Peter the Hermit and Philip Augustus.... It is, therefore, high time to think of a remedy for a situation which could not last any longer without leading to a great calamity—the total extermination of the Christian subjects of the Porte. The expedition which the Turkish Government talks so much about is totally insufficient to restore order. The Powers which have co-religionists in Syria, and which are justly alarmed for their safety, must be prepared bodily to interfere. If they tarried, it would no longer be time to protect victims; their only duty would be to avenge martyrs.

"Two nations are especially interested in defending the Cross on those distant shores—France and Russia. What would be the probable consequence of the union of their arms, and the result on the ulterior organization of Europe? This is what we are about to investigate.

"At certain periods of history we find that under the impulse of certain laws of attraction and agglomeration peoples form political combinations unknown to the past. We are 'assisting' at one of these critical moments in the life of mankind. The Syrian question is but one of the knots of a very complicated situation. The whole of Europe is in a state of expectation and anxiety, waiting for a vast solution which may settle the basis of a lasting peace both in Europe and in the East. Now that object can only be attained in so far as the organization of our continent shall be in conformity with the wishes and requirements of the present questions of nationalities struggling beneath the yoke. Hostile religious tendencies, incompatibility of tempers, languages radically opposed to each other, keep up in certain European States an undercurrent of agitation, which prevents the restoration of confidence, and hinders the progress of civilization. Peace, that ultimate term of the ambition of all Governments, can only be permanently secured when the permanent causes of disturbance we have just indicated shall have disappeared. We therefore wish to arrive at a double result.

"1. Wherever such a thing is possible, to favor the formation of a homogeneous and national State, the mission of which would be to absorb and concentrate, in a mighty unity, populations having ideas or tendencies in common.

"2. To try and carry out that principle without having recourse to arms.

"At first sight, France and Russia appear to have realized the ideal of monarchies. Though 400 leagues divide them, these two Powers have arrived by the most different roads at that unity which alone is able to create durable empires, not ephemeral circumscription, the limits of which may be changed any day by the fortune of war.... The Czars, meditating for the last 135 years over the will of Peter the Great,325 have not ceased to cast covetous glances on European Turkey....Must France continue to protest against the pretensions of the Czars to the decaying Empire of the Sultan? We think not. If Russia lent us her cooperation for the reannexation of the Rhine frontier, it appears to us that a kingdom would not be too high a price for her alliance. Thanks to such a combination, France might resume her real limits, as traced by the geographer Strabo, 18 centuries ago. [Then follows a quotation from Strabo, enumerating the advantages of Gaul as the seat of a powerful empire.] It can easily be understood that France should desire to reconstruct that divine work [I presume the frontiers of Gaul], thwarted for so many centuries by the fraud of man, and this is so much in the nature of things, that at a period when we were not thinking of territorial aggrandizement, Germany was nevertheless subject to periodical fits of uneasiness, and flung at us, as a pledge of defiance, Becker's patriotic song326.... We know that we are not alone in having plans of aggrandizement. Now, if Russia regards Constantinople in the same way as we look at the Rhine, can one not turn these analogous pretensions to some account, and force upon Europe the acceptance of a combination which would allot Turkey to
Russia, to France that Rhine frontier, which Napoleon I considered in 1814 as a *sine qua non* condition of his existence as a sovereign?

"There are only two millions of Turks in Europe, whereas there are thirteen millions of Greeks, whose spiritual head is the Czar.... The Greek insurrection,* which lasted nine years, was but the prelude of the movement which the massacres in Syria may act upon as a signal to break out. The Greek Christians are only waiting for an order from their Chief at St. Petersburg,* or their Patriarch at Constantinople, to rise against the infidels; and there are but few far-sighted politicians who do not anticipate a solution of the Eastern question in a sense favorable to Russia, and that at no distant time. It is not, therefore, surprising, that at the call of their co-religionists, and encouraged by the predictions of Stalezanew, the Russians should be prepared to cross the Pruth at the first moment.

"If we cast an eye on our frontiers, the considerations which justify our tendencies appear to be quite as important as those which actuate Russia. Let us set aside all historical recollections, and all geographical motives, take one by one the provinces inclosed by the Rhine, and examine the reasons that militate in favor of their annexation.

"First we meet with Belgium. In good faith it is difficult to question the striking analogy which has induced some historians to call the Belgians the French of the North. In fact, throughout that country the educated classes use no language but French, and the Flemish dialect is only understood by the lower classes of the population in some few localities. Moreover, Belgium is throughout attached to Catholicism, and it is to France, her sister, by origin, idiom and religion, that she is indebted for her independence. We will not recall the fact that Belgium, conquered by our armies in 1795, formed nine French departments until 1814. Nevertheless, it would appear that our yoke was not so very heavy, as in 1831, Belgium, having been unable to obtain from the Great Powers the permission of being annexed to France, offered, by a vote of the two Chambers, the Belgian Crown to the Duke de Nemours, the son of the King of the French. The refusal of the latter induced them subsequently to offer it to the Duke of Saxe Coburg, now Leopold I; but the precedent we refer to appears to us highly important, and it leads to the presumption that if Belgium were consulted she would not be less generous than Savoy, and would prove once more the attraction of the prestige which the greatness of France causes her to feel. The opposition of a few members of the upper classes would be very soon stifled by popular acclamations.

"Before falling into the sea, the Rhine divides itself into three branches, two of which run in rather northerly directions—the Yssel, which flows into the Zuyderzee, and the Waal, a confluence of the Meuse. If France had once more to trace her limits, might she not take the line of the Rhine, properly so called, instead of that of the Waal or the Yssel, so as to slice off as little as possible of Southern Holland? That is what she would assuredly do. Moreover, it is not on the side of Holland that it is indispensable to rectify our frontier by taking the line of the Rhine as a basis. Belgium, with her present frontiers, would be enough to satisfy the want of extension which of late has been so loudly claimed by public opinion. The line of the Scheldt was, moreover, the frontier conceded to France by the treaty of Lunéville in 1801."

Next follows a short passage demonstrating, by similar arguments, the necessity of annexing the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg,

---

*a* The reference is to the 1821-29 national uprising in Greece.—*Ed.*

*b* A probable reference to the Russian Tsar.—*Ed.*
"which formed under the Empire the Département des Forêts." The pamphleteer then proceeds to show the necessity for the annexation of Rhenish Prussia:

"Belgium and Luxemburg once in our power, our task is not over.... To complete our frontiers we must not take less than two-thirds of Rhenish Prussia, the whole of Rhenish Bavaria, and about one-third of the Grand Duchy of Hesse. All these territories formed, under the Empire, the departments of Roer of the Rhine, and Moselle of the Sarre, of Mont Tonnerre, and the Grand Duchy of Berg. In 1815, they were distributed among several possessors, to render their recovery by us more difficult. A remarkable fact is, that these provinces, annexed to the French Monarchy, were but a few years in direct intercourse with us, and, nevertheless, our temporary stay among them has left the most enduring marks. What sympathy is lavished on the French traveler in those parts, we willingly appeal to those who have traveled there. For the last 45 years not a single French soldier has garrisoned those towns on the banks of the Rhine, and yet it is marvelous to see the touching reception our uniform meets with there. Catholics like us—like us they are Frenchmen. Was it not at Aix-la Chapelle that our Emperor, Charlemagne, held his Court?... Contiguous to France, the Rhenish Provinces must become the political, as they are the natural dependencies of France."

The writer then returns to Russia, and after showing that the Crimean war forms no barrier to the alliance between France and Russia, as they had not then come to an understanding, gives the following piece of information concerning one of the claims of France to the gratitude of Russia:

"It must be kept in mind that France did not lend herself to the plans of England in the Baltic. We do not know whether an attack on Cronstadt would have succeeded in any case; it was not attempted, thanks, we have reason to believe, to the opposition of France."

After an excursion to the Italian campaign, the writer does not doubt that in the end Prussia will join the Franco-Russian alliance:

"But to attach the Cabinet of Berlin to our policy, it must be withdrawn from the influence of England. How can this be brought about? By so contriving that Prussia shall cease to be our neighbor on the Rhine, and by promising to support her legitimate pretensions to preponderance in Germany. The exchange of these Rhenish Provinces causes Bavaria and Prussia to take their compensations from Austria. The English alliance can only secure to Prussia the status quo—the French alliance throws open to her a boundless horizon.

"The alliance between France, Russia, and Prussia loyally concluded, as we have reason to hope it will be, the consequences that flow from it are most natural.... We have demonstrated above what 1,800 years ago Strabo had laid down as beyond question—that the Rhine was the natural frontier of Northern France. Now, Prussia is the greatest sufferer from this extension of territory. For the last 45 years she has kept the Rhine as the dragon used to keep watch over the garden of the

---

a Forestry Department.— Ed.
b Ruhr-Rhine, Moselle-Saar, Donnersberg.— Ed.
c Aachen.— Ed.
Hesperides. Let this cause of hostility between France and Prussia disappear; let the left hand of the Rhine become French once more; in exchange for her good offices, Prussia would find a compensation in Austria—that Power would be punished for her bad faith and clumsiness. Let all be organized for a durable peace.

"Let the populations be consulted, so that no violent annexation should take place. With Russia at Constantinople, France on the Rhine, Austria diminished, and Prussia preponderating in Germany, where can any cause for disturbance or revolution be found in Europe? Would England dare to contend single-handed against Russia, Prussia, and France? We cannot admit such a thing. If, however, it did happen, if Great Britain should venture to commit such an imprudence, she might receive a severe lesson. Gibraltar, Malta, the Ionian Islands are a security for her keeping quiet; those are the weak points of her armor. But though she will be reduced to a sterile agitation in her island, and be compelled to be a passive spectator of what takes place on the continent, she will barely be permitted to offer her opinion, thanks to the five or six thousand men she will send to Syria.

"The moment has arrived when our policy must be clearly defined. It is in Syria that France must pacifically conquer the frontier of the Rhine, by cementing the alliance of Russia. But we must take care not to give Russia an unlimited extension. The provinces north of the Bosphorus must suffice for her ambition. Asia Minor must remain neutral ground. Were it, indeed, possible to look at a practical subject in a poetical and practical light, we would say our choice is made; a man has just come forward who seems the incarnation of the idea we should wish to see represented in Syria—Abd-el-Kader. He is sufficiently orthodox as a Moslem to conciliate the Mussulman population; he is sufficiently civilized to distribute justice equally to all; he is attached to France by ties of gratitude; he would protect the Christians, and reduce to obedience the turbulent tribes ever ready to disturb the repose of Asia Minor. To make of Abd-el-Kader the Syrian Emir would be a noble reward for our prisoner's services."

The critical remarks on Edmond About's pamphlet were written on August 3, 1860

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 6025, August 16, 1860

Reproduced from the newspaper
Karl Marx

THE PAPER TAX.—THE EMPEROR'S LETTER

London, Aug. 7, 1860

The great faction fight of the session, which came off yesterday night, in a full House of Commons, proved a failure in the scenical sense, although it was a triumph in the ministerial sense. Mr. Gladstone's resolutions for reducing the customs duties on paper to the level of the excise duties—some slight charge being added to the customs duties to counterbalance the incidental inconveniences of the excise duty—were carried by a majority of 33. But the House of Commons had it all their own way. There was the arena, and there were the gladiators, with their retainers behind them, but there was no audience worth mentioning. Before the battle had commenced, its issue was known and its bulletin promulgated. Hence the indifference of the public. The coalized parties, forming the so-called "Great Liberal Party," notoriously sway a Parliamentary majority, so that a defeat of the Cabinet could only have proceeded from a split in the ranks of the majority. This point, however, had been settled in Lord Palmerston's official residence, whither he had summoned the liberal members of all shadows and shades. The resolution itself proceeded from the Manchester fraction of the Ministry, Lord Palmerston having only been able to retain the support of Messrs. Gladstone and Milner Gibson by pledging himself to raise Mr. Gladstone's resolution to the rank of a Cabinet question. He had betrayed them by his management of the Paper Duty Abolition bill. This time they had bound him over to a certain line of conduct. The regular Whigs were the only fraction of the majority

a Moved on August 6, 1860. See The Times, No. 23692, August 7, 1860.—Ed.
suspected of hatching treasonable designs; but the harsh voice of
their master and the menace suspended over their heads of a new
dissolution of Parliament sufficed to bring them back to the stern
behests of discipline. Thus many hours before the curtain was
drawn, all London had become acquainted with the exact result of
the party trial, and, save the habitués of the Strangers' Gallery,
 nobody cared to assist the sham-fight at St. Stephen's.\textsuperscript{328} It was
indeed a rather dull affair, enlivened only by the sweeping oratory
of Mr. Gladstone, and the highly finished pleading of Sir Hugh
Cairns.\textsuperscript{a} Mr. Gladstone tried to represent the opposition raised
against his bill as a last desperate stand made by Protection against
Free Trade. When he sat down, the cheers that drowned his
concluding words, seemed to hail him as the true chief of the
liberal party, of which Lord Palmerston is the by no means
beloved despot. Sir Hugh Cairns, on the part of the Conservatives,
proved by close argumentation, and with great analytical power,
that the reduction of the customs duty on paper to the level of
the excise duty was in no way stipulated for by the commercial treaty
with France. His antagonist, Sir Richard Bethell, the Whig
Attorney-General, had the bad taste to show ill temper at the success
of his rival, to sneer at Sir Hugh’s “forensic eloquence,”\textsuperscript{b} and thus to
draw upon his own devoted head a regular volley of Tory
interruptions.

The great faction fight of the session being over, whole flocks of
honorable members are sure to desert the House, so that Lord
Palmerston, by the sheer process of exhaustion, may now succeed
in passing any little bill he has set his heart upon—i.e. the
monstrous Indian bill for the amalgamation of the local European
army with the British army.\textsuperscript{329} If any new striking proof were
wanted of the depth of degradation Parliamentarism has reached
in England, this Indian bill and the treatment it received in the
House of Commons would afford it. Every man in the House, of
any authority on, and any experience in, Indian affairs, had
opposed the bill. The majority themselves confessed not only their
complete ignorance, but they betrayed their dark suspicions as to
the ulterior views of the framers of the bill. They could not but
confess that the bill had been smuggled into the House under
false pretenses; that the most important papers indispensable for a

\textsuperscript{a} Hugh Cairns’ speech in the House of Commons on August 6, 1860, \textit{The
Times}, No. 23692, August 7, 1860.—\textit{Ed}.

\textsuperscript{b} Richard Bethell’s speech in the House of Commons on August 6, 1860, \textit{The
Times}, No. 23692, August 7, 1860.—\textit{Ed}.
just appreciation of the case had been fraudulently withheld; that the Indian Minister\textsuperscript{a} had introduced the bill despite the unanimous dissent of the Indian Council, a dissent which, by an open infraction of the new constitution bestowed upon India in 1858,\textsuperscript{330} he had omitted to lay on the table of the House; and lastly, that the Cabinet had not even attempted at showing any reason for driving, toward the end of the session, and after the withdrawal of every measure of import, with such indecent haste, a bill through the House which, in point of fact, radically changed the British Constitution by an immense addition of patronage to the crown, and by the creation of an army that, in every practical respect, would become independent of the vote of supplies. Still, this bill may now be carried, the chiefs of both factions having, as it appears, come to a secret understanding with the Court.

Louis Napoleon's letter to his beloved Persigny continues to form the chief topic of conversation here and on the other side of the Channel. It seems that, in the first instance, the protest of the Porte against the Syrian expedition, as originally planned between France and Russia,\textsuperscript{331} met with a strong support on the part of Austria and Prussia, while Lord Palmerston, having just singled out, during the fortification debates, Louis Napoleon as the great object of British suspicion, could not but throw his weight into the balance of Turkey and the German Powers. It appears, moreover, that the Man of December got somewhat frightened, not only at the dictatorial tone assumed by Russia, but still more at the sneers circulated in the saloons of the "anciens partis"\textsuperscript{b} and the low murmurs audible in the Faubourgs in regard to the "alliance Cosaque."\textsuperscript{c}

To make the latter palatable to Paris, a far greater complication of things must have been arrived at. Under these distressing circumstances, and in an evidently uneasy state of mind, Louis Napoleon penned his letter, several passages of which are highly perfumed with the scent of the ludicrous.

An Englishman may indulge in a downright laugh at the phrase addressed by Louis Napoleon to Lord Palmerston: "Let us understand one another in good faith like honest men as we are, and not like thieves who desire to cheat each other"; but the exquisitely bad taste blended with the power of ridicule of the original French "entendons nous loyalement comme d'honnêtes gens, que nous sommes, et

\textsuperscript{a} Sir Charles Wood.—\textit{Ed.}
\textsuperscript{b} Old parties.—\textit{Ed.}
\textsuperscript{c} Cossack alliance.—\textit{Ed.}
non comme Des Larrons qui veulent se duper mutuellement," a can only be appreciated by a French ear. No Frenchman can read that passage without being reminded of a similar sentence occurring in the famous play of "Robert Macaire." 332

I subjoin some data for a comparison between French and English state expenditure. According to the provisional or prospective budget, the total revenue of France for the year 1860 is estimated at 1,825 millions of francs, or £73,000,000 sterling, derived from the following sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Direct Taxes, land, house, personal patentes</td>
<td>£18,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Enregistrement (stamps and domaines)</td>
<td>14,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Woods, forests, and fisheries</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Customs and tax on salt</td>
<td>9,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Contributions indirectes (excise, etc.)</td>
<td>19,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Post-Office</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>7,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The English revenue for 1859 (the financial accounts for 1860 have not yet been issued) was as follows, in both cases round numbers only being given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Taxes (including income tax)</td>
<td>£10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Stamps</td>
<td>8,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Crown Lands</td>
<td>420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Customs</td>
<td>24,380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Excise</td>
<td>18,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Post-Office</td>
<td>3,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparative public expenditure of the two countries was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest on the debt</td>
<td>£22,400,000</td>
<td>£28,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army and Navy</td>
<td>18,600,000</td>
<td>22,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil List of the Crown</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of collecting the Revenue</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expenses</td>
<td>23,000,000</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>£73,000,000</td>
<td>£65,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


b The tables are taken from the article "Taxation in France", *The Economist*, No. 884, August 4, 1860, p. 840.— Ed.

c The *New-York Daily Tribune* gives 18,000,000—a misprint.— Ed.
From the last tabular statement it will be seen that the interest on the public debt is in Bonapartist France rapidly mounting to the British level; that Continental centralization keeps the Army and Navy at a cheaper cost than insular oligarchy; that one Louis Napoleon wants for his private expenses twice and a half more money than a British sovereign; and finally, that in a bureaucratic country, like France, the cost of collecting the revenue grows at a rate disproportionate to the amount of the revenue itself.

Written on August 7, 1860
First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6030, August 22, 1860
Frederick Engels

GARIBALDI’S MOVEMENTS

London, August 8, 1860

The crisis in Southern Italy is at hand. If we are to trust the French and Sardinian papers, 1,500 Garibaldians have landed on the coast of Calabria and Garibaldi is hourly expected. But even if this news be premature, there can be no doubt that Garibaldi will have transferred the seat of war to the Italian mainland before the middle of August.

To understand the movements of the Neapolitans, it must be kept in mind that there are two opposing undercurrents at work in their army: the moderate Liberal party, officially in power, and represented by the Ministry, and the Absolutist camarilla, to which most of the chiefs of the army are attached. The orders of the Ministry are counteracted by the secret orders of the Court and by the intrigues of the generals. Hence conflicting movements and conflicting reports. To-day we hear that all royal troops are to leave Sicily, to-morrow we find them preparing a fresh base of operations at Milazzo. This state of things is inherent to all half-and-half revolutions; the year 1848 furnishes examples of it all over Europe.

While the Ministry offered to evacuate the island, Bosco, who seems to be the only resolute man among the parcel of old women bearing Neapolitan generals’ epaulettes, quietly attempted to turn the north-eastern corner of the island into a stronghold from which the reconquest of the island might be attempted, and for this purpose marched to Milazzo with a picked force of the best men to be had in Messina. Here he fell in with Medici’s brigade of

---

a See “Affaires des deux Siciles”, Le Constitutionnel, No. 220, August 7, 1860.—Ed.
Garibaldians. He did not, however, venture any serious attack on them, until Garibaldi himself had been sent for and brought some reenforcements. Here the insurgent chief, in his turn, attacked the royals, and, after an obstinate fight of above twelve hours' duration, defeated them completely. The forces engaged on either side were about equal, but the position held by the Neapolitans was very strong. However, neither positions nor men could withstand the dash of the insurgents, who drove the Neapolitans right through the town into the citadel. Here nothing remained to them but to capitulate, and Garibaldi allowed them to embark, but without arms. After this victory, he marched at once to Messina, where the Neapolitan general consented to give up the outer forts of the town on condition of not being molested in the citadel. This citadel being unable to hold more than a few thousand men, will never be a serious obstacle to any offensive operations of Garibaldi, and he therefore did quite right in sparing the town of a bombardment, which would inevitably have followed any attack. As it is this series of capitulations at Palermo, Milazzo, and Messina, must do more to destroy the confidence of the royal troops in themselves and in their chiefs, than twice as many victories. It has become a matter of course that the Neapolitans always capitulate before Garibaldi.

From this moment it became possible for the Sicilian Dictator to think of landing on the continent. His steam navy does not as yet appear to be sufficiently large to warrant him in attempting a landing further north, somewhere within six or eight marches from Naples, say in the Bay of Policastro. He, therefore, seems to have decided on crossing the Straits where they are narrowest, that is, on the extreme north-eastern point of the island, north of Messina. On this point he is said to have concentrated about 1,000 vessels, very likely most of them fishing and coasting felucas, such as are common on those coasts, and if the landing of the 1,500 men under Sacchi be confirmed, they will form his advanced guard. The point is not the most favorable for a march on Naples, as it is the part of the mainland furthest away from the Capital; but if his steam navy cannot transport something like 10,000 men at once, he cannot select any other, and then he has at least this advantage, that the Calabrians will at once join him. If, however, he can cram some ten thousand men on board his steamers, and can rely on the neutrality of the Royal navy (which appears resolved not to fight against Italians), then he may still land a few men in Calabria as a feint, and himself go with the main body to the Bay of Policastro, or even to that of Salerno.
The force at present at the disposal of Garibaldi consists of five brigades of regular infantry, of four battalions each; of ten battalions of Cacciatori dell' Etna; of two battalions of Cacciatori delle Alpi, the élite of his army; of one foreign (now Italian) battalion under Col. Dunne, an Englishman; of one battalion of engineers; one regiment and a squadron of cavalry; and four battalions of field artillery; in all 34 battalions, four squadrons, and 32 guns, equal to some 25,000 men in all, of whom, rather more than one-half are North Italians, the rest Italians. The whole, nearly, of this force might be used for the invasion of Naples, as the new formations now being organized will soon suffice to observe the citadel of Messina, and protect Palermo and the other towns from insult. Still, this force looks very small when compared with what the Neapolitan Government disposes of on paper.

The Neapolitan army consists of three regiments of the guard, fifteen ditto of the line, four foreign regiments, each of two battalions, or together 44 battalions; of 13 battalions of chasseurs; of nine regiments of cavalry, and two of artillery—in all 57 battalions, and 45 squadrons, on the peace-foothing. Inclusive of the 9,000 gens d'armes, who also are organized on a perfectly military footing, this army, on the peace-foothing, counts 90,000 men. But, during the last two years, it has been raised to the full war complement; third battalions of regiments have been organized, the depot squadrons have been put to active service, the garrison troops have been completed; and this army now consists, on paper, of above 150,000 men.

But what an army is this! Externally fine to look at for a martinet, there is no life, no spirit, no patriotism, no fidelity in it. It has no national military traditions. When Neapolitans fought as such, they were always defeated. Only in the wake of Napoleon were they ever associated with victory. It is not a National army. It is a purely Royal army. It was raised and organized for the express and exclusive purpose of keeping down the people. And even for that it appears unfit; there are plenty of anti-royalist elements in it, and they now break forth everywhere. The sergeants and corporals, especially, are Liberals almost to a man. Whole regiments shout "Viva Garibaldi!" No army ever underwent such disgrace as this one did from Calatafimi to Palermo; and if the foreign troops and some Neapolitans fought well at

---

a Etna riflemen.—Ed.
b Alpine riflemen.—Ed.
Milazzo, it is not to be forgotten that these picked men form but a small minority of the army.

Thus it is almost certain that, if Garibaldi lands with a force sufficient to obtain a few successes on the continent, no concentration of Neapolitan masses will be able to oppose him with any chance of success; and we may next expect to hear that he is continuing his triumphal career, with 15,000 men against tenfold odds, from the Scilla to Naples.

Written about August 7, 1860


Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune
Karl Marx

[THE NEW SARDINIAN LOAN.—THE IMPENDING FRENCH AND INDIAN LOANS]

London, Aug. 14, 1860

The new Sardinian loan of £6,000,000 has been closed, and three times the sum required is said to have been subscribed. Thus it appears that the bonds of the new Italian Kingdom are rising in the market at the very time that Austria is struggling in vain with a debt whose magnitude ought to be measured not by the resources of the country, but by the weakness of its Government, and while Russia, mighty Russia, having been driven from the European loan market, was forced to recur again to its own paper-money machinery. Still, even in regard to Sardinia, the new loan reminds us of the ugly fact that in modern times almost the first act in a people's struggle for freedom or independence seems, by some monstrous fatality, to consist in contracting a new servitude. Is every public debt not a mortgage saddled upon the industry of a whole people, and a curtailment of its freedom? Does it not give rise to a new set of invisible tyrants, known under the name of public creditors? However that may be, if the French, in less than a decade, have almost doubled their public debt in order to remain slaves, the Italians must be allowed to incur the same liabilities in order to become freemen.

Piedmont proper, exclusive of the provinces newly added,333 was in 1847 taxed to the amount of £3,813,452, while this year it will have to pay £6,829,000. It has been stated by English papers, The Economist, for instance, that the commerce of Piedmont, consequent upon the liberal changes introduced into its tariff, had also greatly increased, and in illustration of this progress we are treated to the following figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Imports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>£12,497,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>19,123,040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marx took all the data from The Economist, No. 885, August 11, 1860, pp. 867-68.—Ed.
In 1854 the exports were £8,595,280
In 1857 they increased to 14,050,040

Now, I beg to remark that this increase is more apparent than real. The leading articles of Sardinian export consist of silk, silk manufactures, twine, spirits, and oil; but it is generally known that during the first three quarters of 1857 the prices of all those articles had assumed a most bloated aspect, and would, consequently, greatly swell the sum total of the Sardinian commercial returns. The official statistics of the Kingdom give, moreover, the values only, not the quantities of the articles exported and imported, so that the figures for the year 1857 may be altogether exceptional. No public accounts for the years 1858-60 having as yet been issued, it remains to be seen whether or not the commercial crisis in 1858 and the Italian war in 1859 have checked the industrial progress of the country. The following tabular statements, showing the official estimates of the revenue and expenditure for the current year (1860) of Sardinia proper, afford evidence that part of the new loan will be employed to cover the deficit, while another part of it is wanted for new preparations for war:

**Sardinian Revenue for 1860.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customs</td>
<td>£2,411,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land-tax, house-tax, stamps, etc</td>
<td>2,940,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroads and telegraphs</td>
<td>699,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Office</td>
<td>242,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees received at Foreign Office</td>
<td>12,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees received at Home Office</td>
<td>21,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profits on some branches of Public Instruction</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mint</td>
<td>6,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>193,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary resources</td>
<td>301,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£6,829,828</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sardinian Expenditure for 1860.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance Department</td>
<td>£4,331,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Justice</td>
<td>243,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>70,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Instruction</td>
<td>117,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of the Interior</td>
<td>407,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>854,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The New-York Daily Tribune* has 19,050,040 instead of 14,050,040.—*Ed.*
The New Sardinian Loan

Military expenditure .................................................. £2,229,464
Marine expenditure .................................................... 310,360
Extraordinary expenses .............................................. 1,453,268

Total ................................................................. £10,017,588

Comparing the expenditure amounting to £10,017,588 to the revenue of £6,829,828, we find a deficit of £3,187,760. On the other hand the newly acquired provinces are estimated to yield an annual revenue of £3,435,552, and to cost an annual expenditure of £1,855,984, so that they would leave a clear surplus of £1,600,000. According to this calculation, the deficit of the whole kingdom of Sardinia, including the newly acquired provinces, would be reduced to £1,608,282. It is only just that Lombardy and the Duchies should pay part of the expenses Piedmont has incurred in the Italian war; but, in the run of time, it might prove a highly dangerous experiment to charge taxes upon the new provinces, almost twice as large as their cost of administration requires, with a single view to relieving the exchequer of the old provinces.

People conversant with the undercurrents of the Paris money market continue to give out that another French loan is looming in a not remote future. The only thing wanted is a specious opportunity for raising the wind. The emprunt de la paix, as you know, has proved a failure. Partant pour la Syrie has till now been rehearsed on too small a scale to justify a fresh appeal to the enthusiasm of the grande nation. It is, therefore, presumed that, should nothing new turn up, and the prices of corn go on increasing, a loan will be raised on the pretext of providing against the possible disasters of dearth. In connection with French finances it may be remarked as a curious fact, that Mr. Jules Favre, who dared to predict in the midst of the Corps Législatif the impending crash of the Imperial Exchequer, has been elected Bâtonnier of the Paris Bar. The French advocates, as you are aware, have from the times of the old monarchy saved some tatters of their ancient feudal constitution. They still form a sort of corporate body, called the Barreau, the yearly elected chief of

---

a This figure is cited by The Economist, p. 867. The exact figure is £1,579,568. Hence the figure £1,608,282 in the next sentence.—Ed.
b The peace loan—a loan whose purpose was to increase military contingents. The question was debated in the Corps Législatif (see Le Moniteur universel, No. 117, April 27, 1859).—Ed.
c Jules Favre's speech in the Corps Législatif on July 13, 1860, Le Moniteur universel, No. 195, July 15, 1860.—Ed.
which, viz., the *Bâtonnier*, represents the order in its relations with the tribunals and the Government, at the same time that he watches over its internal discipline. Under the restoration, and under the following regime of the citizen King, the election of the Paris *Bâtonnier* was always considered a great political act, involving a demonstration for or against the Ministry of the day. Mr. Jules Favre's election must, I believe, be considered the first anti-Bonapartist demonstration ventured upon by the Paris Bar, and consequently deserves to be chronicled among the events of the day.

In yesterday's sitting of the House of Commons, before a House hardly large enough to make up a quorum, Sir Charles Wood, that true pattern of the genuine Whig place-hunter, carried a resolution empowering him to contract a new loan of Three Millions Sterling on behalf of the Indian Treasury. According to his statement, the Indian deficit was in 1858-59 (the financial year always beginning with and ending in April) £14,187,000, in 1859-60 £9,981,000, and is estimated for 1860-61 at £7,400,000. Part of that deficit he promised to cover from the yield of Mr. Wilson's newly-introduced taxes—a very questionable prospect, after all—while the other part was to be provided for by the new loan of three millions. The public debt, which in 1856-57, the year before the Rebellion, amounted to £59,442,000, had now increased to £97,851,000. At a still more rapid rate the interest on the debt had grown. From £2,525,000 in 1856-57 it had risen to £4,461,000 in 1859-60. Although the revenue had been forcibly expanded by the imposition of new taxes, still it could not keep pace with the expenditure which, even according to Mr. Charles Wood's own statement, was increasing in every direction, save that of Public Works. To make up for an outlay of three millions on fortified barracks, there has been put during the present, and will be put during the following year, "almost a perfect stop to public works and public buildings of a civic character." This "perfect stop" Sir Charles seemed to consider one of the beauties of the system. Instead of 40,000, as in 1856-57, there are now kept 80,000 European soldiers in India; and, instead of a native army of hardly 200,000, one of above 300,000 men.

Written on August 14, 1860

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6035, August 28, 1860

*a* Louis Philippe.—*Ed.*

*b* Sir Charles Wood's resolution of August 13, 1860, *The Times*, No. 23698, August 14, 1860.—*Ed.*
The Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria seems permitted to live only that he may prove the truth of the old Latin maxim, that he whom the gods mean to destroy they first make mad. From the beginning of the year 1859 he has done nothing but deliberately trample under foot every chance that was offered to him to save himself and the Austrian Empire. The sudden attack on Piedmont with a portion only of his forces—the superseding of Marshal Hess in the command of the army by the Emperor and his clique—the irresolution which led to the battle of Solferino—the sudden conclusion of peace at the very moment when the French had arrived before his strongest positions—the obstinate refusal of all concessions in the internal organization of the Empire until it was too late, form an unequaled series of foolish blunders to be committed by one individual in so short a time.

But, as luck would have it, Francis Joseph had still another chance. The barefaced double-dealing of Louis Napoleon rendered necessary that alliance between Prussia and Austria which the preceding humiliations of Austria, her daily increasing difficulties at home and abroad, had first rendered possible. The interviews of Baden and Teplitz sealed that alliance. Prussia, for the first time acting as the representative of the rest of Germany, promised her assistance in case Austria was attacked, not only by Italy, but by France also; while Austria promised to make concessions to public opinion, and change her internal policy. Here was indeed a hope for Francis Joseph. A fight with Italy single-handed he might not fear, even in case of troubles in Hungary, for his new policy was to be the best guaranty of security in that quarter. With a separate Constitution based upon
the one abolished in 1849, Hungary would have been satisfied; a liberal Constitution for the whole of the Empire would have fulfilled the present wishes of the German nucleus of the monarchy, and counteracted in a great measure the separate tendencies of the Slavonic provinces. The finances once under popular control, public credit would have recovered itself, and the same Austria, now weak, poor, prostrate, exhausted, and a prey to internal divisions, would have soon regained strength under the protection of the 700,000 bayonets which Germany held ready to defend her. To insure all this, but two things were required of Austria: to follow up a genuine liberal policy at home, sincerely and without reserve, and to remain on the defensive in Venice, abandoning the remainder of Italy to its fate.

But neither the one nor the other, it appears, can or will Francis Joseph do. He can neither throw overboard his power as an absolute monarch, which is every day being dissolved more and more into vapor, nor can he forget that position of protector of the petty Italian tyrants, which he has already lost. Insincere, weak, and obstinate at the same time, he seems to fly from his internal difficulties to an aggressive war abroad, and rather than cement his Empire by the sacrifice of a power which is slipping from his hands, he appears to have thrown himself once more into the arms of his personal cronies, and to be preparing a descent into Italy which may end in the breaking up of the Austrian monarchy.

There may or there may not be a note or other communication sent from Vienna to Turin, on the subject of Garibaldi's landing in Calabria; but it is quite probable that Francis Joseph has made up his mind to consider this landing a case for his intervention in favor of the King of Naples. Whether this be true, we shall soon see. But what can be the cause of this sudden revulsion of Austrian policy? Has the recent fraternization with Prussia and Bavaria turned the head of Francis Joseph? It is not likely; for, after all, that fraternization of Teplitz was a humiliation for him, and a triumph for Prussia only. Does Francis Joseph intend to collect under his standard the armies of the Pope and of the King of Naples before Garibaldi has shattered them to atoms and incorporated their Italian elements with his own followers? That would be a very insufficient motive. In any campaign whatever, these troops will want for nothing, while, in the position in which
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a Francis II.—Ed.
b Pius IX.—Ed.
Austria will place herself by such a foolish aggression, she will want for everything. There can be no other cause for it than the state of internal Austrian politics. And here we have not to seek long. The Council of the Empire, reenforced by some of the most conservative and aristocratic elements of the different Provinces, and intrusted, in time of peace, with the control of the finances of the country, is about to discuss the question of popular representation and constitutions for the Empire and the single provinces composing it. The motions made to this effect by the Hungarian members have an overwhelming majority in the Committee, and will be passed in the same triumphant manner in the Council, in the face of the Government. In one word, the second Austrian Revolution seems to have set in. The Council of the Empire—a weak counterfeit of the French Notables—exactly as they did, declares itself incompetent, and calls for the States General. The Government, in the same financial difficulties as that of Louis XVI, and weaker still by the diverging tendencies of the various nationalities composing the Empire, is not in a position to resist. Concessions wrested from the Government are sure to be followed by fees and demands. The States General soon formed themselves into the National Assembly. Francis Joseph feels the ground tremble under his feet, and to escape from the impending earthquake will perhaps fly into a war.

If Francis Joseph acts up to his menace, commencing a crusade for legitimacy in Naples and the Papal States, what will be the end of it? There is not a Power or State in Europe which has the slightest interest in the maintenance of the Bourbons, and if Francis Joseph interferes in their behalf, he will have to bear the consequences. Louis Napoleon is sure to cross the Alps in defense of non-intervention; and Austria, with the public opinion of all Europe dead against her, with ruined finances, insurrection in Hungary, and a brave but far outnumbered army, will be fearfully beaten. Perhaps she will receive her death-blow. As to Germany coming to her aid, it is perfectly out of the question. The Germans will most decidedly decline to fight either for the King of Naples or for the Pope. They will take care to have the territory of the Confederation respected (which both French and Italians will be but too glad to submit to), and if Hungary rises, they will look on quite as coolly. Nay, the German provinces of the Empire will, very likely, support the demands of the Hungarians, as they did in 1848, and demand a Constitution for themselves. The Austrian press, restricted as it is by the Government, still shows unmistakable signs of the existence, even in Austria, of a widespread
sympathy with Garibaldi. The current of opinion has changed from the channel it followed last year; Venice is now considered a very bad kind of property, and the struggle of the Italians for independence, since it is carried on without French assistance, is looked on in a favorable light by the Viennese public. Francis Joseph will find it exceedingly difficult to make even his own German subjects take up the cause of the Bourbon of Naples, of the Pope, of the petty Dukes of Emilia. A people which is just entering on a revolution against absolutism, is not likely to stick up for the dynastic interests of its ruler. The Viennese have proved this before, and it is possible enough that the passage of the Po by the Austrian troops may become the signal for the use of more violent means by the movement party in Vienna as well as in Hungary.

Written on August 16, 1860


Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune
The more the season advances the gloomier become the harvest prospects and the fainter grow the hopes still founded on a possible return of fine weather. The character of the past Summer was altogether exceptional, not only throughout the United Kingdom, but over the whole of Northern Europe, Northern France, Belgium, and the Rhenish Provinces included. In regard to this country the season has been justly described in these words:

"After the cold, backward Spring, June proved so extremely wet that in many districts turnips could not be sown, mangel-wurzel hoed, nor any of the usual operations of the period performed. Then, after about ten days of fine weather, the season became so unsettled that two days together without rain have been rather a surprise. But, in addition to the excess of moisture, the present, we may say the past Summer, has been remarkable for the absence of sunshine and the very low temperature which have prevailed even when there has been no rain."\(^a\)

The average fall of rain for the year being about 20 inches, and the fall of rain during the months of May and June having reached the figure of 11.17, it appears that these two months have given over half a year's supply of water. During the last week, at the commencement of which a favorable change seemed impending, the weather proved more unsettled and boisterous than ever, real deluges of rain being, on the 16th and 18th inst., accompanied by thunder-storms and the tempests of the south-west wind. Consequently the wheat prices at Mark Lane\(^b\) advanced yesterday about two shillings the quarter over the rates of last Monday's market.

\(^a\) "The Wet Summer", *The Economist*, No. 886, August 18, 1860, p. 899.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) August 13; see *The Times*, Nos. 23698 and 23704, August 14 and August 21, 1860.—*Ed.*
Hay-making has been already seriously interfered with and belated by the incessant wind, rain, and cold. The grass having been laid and constantly saturated with water, it is feared that much of its nutritive substance has been washed away, so that a great part of it will not do for fodder, but must be used for litter, and will thus prove a very serious loss, greatly increasing the consumption of Spring corn. Much of it is still to be gathered, and much is irretrievably lost.

"There can be little doubt," says The Gardeners’ Chronicle of Saturday last, "that the wheat crop generally is considerably injured. Of 140 reports received from as many correspondents in England and Scotland, no fewer than 91 declare the crop to be below the average, and if the chief wheat-growing districts be selected, it will be found that the proportion of unfavorable returns is quite as large. Thus, five out of six reports from Lincolnshire, three out of five from Norfolk and Suffolk, and all from the counties of Oxford, Gloucestershire, Wilts, Hants, and Kent, are unfavorable."

A great deal of the wheat crop has rotted at the root before the grain was mature, and in many districts it has been blighted and mildewed. While wheat is thus attacked by the disease, and in many districts to a large extent, the potato disease, which commenced in 1845, continued with great virulence for the four subsequent years, and gradually abated since 1850, has reappeared in an aggravated form, not only in Ireland, but in many districts of England and the Northern Continent.

The Freeman’s Journal thus resumes the general harvest prospects of Ireland:

"The oat crop is generally looked upon as all but lost. Except in a few inconsiderable districts, it has not yet ripened; but remains perfectly green, and beaten to the ground by the violence of the weather. Wheat promises to share in the calamity which generally threatens the grain crops. Little of it has been yet cut, and this crop, the condition of which inspired the most sanguine expectations only a few weeks since, is now causing farmers the deepest concern. [...] With regard to the potato crop, the general opinion is, that if the present weather continues for another month, it must be inevitably lost."\(^a\)

According to the Wexford Independent,

"the potato disease is progressing, and in some places fully one-third of the produce is found affected, irrespective alike of size and description, and in proportion to the time of planting."

This much appears, therefore, certain: The general harvest will be much belated beyond its usual term, and the existing stores

\(^a\) Quotations from The Freeman’s Journal were given in the article “The Harvest” in The Times, No. 23703, August 20, 1860.— Ed.
consequently be run short. The partial failure of hay, coupled with the potato disease, will press to an unwonted extent upon the cereals; and the yield of all sorts of corn, especially wheat, will fall far below the average. Till now, the imports from abroad, instead of showing an excess over the imports during the years 1858 and 1859, exhibit, on the contrary, a marked comparative decline. On the other hand, corn prices, although, on an average, they rule now 26 per cent higher than at the same period of last year, have as yet been kept down by the news of the plentiful harvests in America and Southern Russia, by the hope of a favorable turn in the weather, and by the extreme caution the late collapse in the leather trade had imposed upon all monetary transactions. The conclusion to which I am led by a comparison of the present prices with those of similar seasons since 1815, is, that the average price of wheat, which may be taken now to amount to 58@59/ the quarter, will have to rise, in England at least, to 65@70/. The effect of such a rise in the price of breadstuffs will be considerably aggravated by its coincidence with a progressive decline in the export trade of the country. From £63,003,159, which sum they realized during the six months ending June 30, 1859, the British exports have sunk to £62,019,989 during the corresponding period of 1860, and, as I have shown in a former letter, the contraction was mainly due to a decline in the sale of cotton goods and yarns, consequent upon the markets of Asia and Australia having been glutted. While the exports are thus falling off, the imports have considerably risen, if compared with the corresponding period of 1859. We find, in fact, the imports for the five months ending May 31, 1859, £44,968,863; 1860, £57,097,638.

This excess of imports over exports must necessarily aggravate the drain of bullion and the consequent unsettled state of the money market which characterizes all periods of failing harvests, and extraordinary purchases of foreign corn. If, in England, the effect of the imminent monetary pressure is not likely to stretch far beyond the sphere of political economy, it is quite another thing on the Continent, where serious political disturbances are almost unavoidable whenever a monetary crisis coincides with a failing harvest and a great increase of taxation. Already the most serious apprehensions are entertained at Paris, where the magistrate is just busied with buying up whole lots of old houses, in

---

a The figures quoted here and at the end of the paragraph were given in The Economist, No. 886, August 18, 1860, p. 895.—Ed.
b See this volume, pp. 406-08.—Ed.
order to have them pulled down, and thus cut out work for the "ouvriers." The Paris prices of best wheat range at this moment as high, if not somewhat higher than the London prices, namely at 60/6 to 61/. The last dodges by which Louis Bonaparte tried to divert the public mind, viz.: the Syrian expedition, the advancement of Spain to a "great power," the transactions with Prussia, and the attempts at interference with Garibaldi's progress, having all turned out dead failures, he must needs meet the dangers of a bad season, a monetary pressure and a stinted exchequer at the very moment when his political "prestige" is evidently at a considerable discount. If any proof for the latter assertion were wanted, is there not his letter to "Mon cher Persigny?"b"399

Written on August 21, 1860


Reproduced from the New-York Daily Tribune
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a "Workmen".— Ed.
b "My dear Persigny."— Ed.
Karl Marx

[CORN PRICES.—EUROPEAN FINANCES AND WAR PREPARATIONS.—THE ORIENTAL QUESTION]

London, Aug. 25, 1860

The state of the weather having not improved during this week, a rise of 6 shillings per sack took place in the value of town-made flour, at Mark Lane yesterday, and orders for the purchase of nearly 1,000,000 quarters of produce were at once forwarded to foreign ports. Importers share now pretty generally the opinion I advanced in a late letter as to the inevitable further rise in the quotations of the grain market. The recent measures taken by France in regard to the corn trade bring that country into direct competition with the British corn merchant. You are aware that there exists in France a sliding scale, regulating the import and export duties on grain, and that this sliding scale varies for the eight different circles which the whole country is divided into with respect to the corn trade. Now, by a decree published in the Moniteur of the 23d inst., this sliding scale has been altogether suspended. The decree enacts that grain and flour imported by land or by sea, in French or foreign vessels, shall, wherever they may come from, only pay, up to the 30th of September, 1861, the minimum of duties fixed by the law of the 15th of April, 1832; also, that vessels laden with grain and flour shall be exempt from tunnage dues; and finally, that vessels so laden leaving any foreign port at any date previous to the said 30th of September, 1861, shall only pay the said minimum, and shall be free from tunnage
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a See this volume, p. 461.—Ed.
b Le Moniteur universel, No. 235.—Ed.
c "Loi relative à l'importation et à l'exportation des céréales [le 15 avril 1832]", Le Moniteur universel, No. 109, April 18, 1832.—Ed.
dues. The minimum referred to, is 25 cents the hectolitre (about 2 3/4 bushels). Consequently, while France in the years 1858 and 1859 sent more wheat—2,014,923 quarters—and more flour—4,326,435 cwt. to England than any other country, it will now seriously compete with England in the purchase of grain in the foreign markets—the provisional suspension of the French sliding scale affording the wanted facilities for such competition.

The two main markets of export which both England and France find themselves limited to are the United States and Southern Russia. In regard to the latter country, the news as to the state of the harvest is of the most contradictory character. On the one hand, it is asserted that the harvest is most plentiful; on the other, that heavy rains and high floods having damaged the crops in all parts of the Empire, the roads and corn-fields of the southern provinces had been greatly devastated by locusts, a scourge which made its first appearance in Bessarabia, and whose depredations it was vainly attempted to circumscribe within a limited area by an army of 20,000 men drawing a cordon around them. The ultimate extent of the disaster cannot, of course, be estimated, but at all events it must tend to accelerate the upward movement of food prices. Some London papers fancy that the drain of bullion inseparable from large and sudden corn imports may be counterbalanced in its usual effect upon the money market by the gold supplies from Australia. No notion could be more preposterous. We witnessed, during the crisis of 1857, a lower ebb of the bullion reserves than in any similar epoch before the discovery of Australia and California. On former occasions I have shown by incontrovertible facts and figures that the extraordinary gold imports into England since 1851 have been more than counterbalanced by extraordinary gold exports. There is, moreover, the fact that the bullion reserves in the Bank of England have, since 1857, not only not exceeded the average amount, but were continually falling off. While they amounted in August, 1858, to £17,654,506, they had declined to £16,877,255 in August, 1859, and to £15,680,840 in August, 1860. As the gold drain has not yet set in, this phenomenon may be accounted for by the circumstance that the prospect of a failing harvest is only beginning to operate, while, till now, the rate of interest has

---


continued to be higher at London than at the other principal exchanges of the Continent, viz.: Amsterdam, Frankfort, Hamburg, and Paris.

Continental Europe exhibits at this moment a very curious spectacle. France is known to labor under heavy financial difficulties, but she is creating armaments on a scale as gigantic, with an energy as untiring, as if she owned Aladdin's lamp. Austria totters on the very brink of bankruptcy, but, somehow or other, the money is found for feeding an immense army, and crowding the fortresses of the Quadrilateral with rifle cannon. And Russia, where all the monetary operations of the Government have failed, and the national bankruptcy is talked of as a probable event—where the army grumbles in consequence of arrears not paid, and even the loyalty of the Imperial Guard is put to a severe test, their pay having been withheld for the last five months—Russia, nevertheless, is pouring her troops down to the Black Sea, and holds 200 ships ready at Nicolaieff, in order to embark them for Turkey. The inability of the Russian Government to cope with the slave question, the money question, and the reviving Polish question, seems to have decided it to try war as a last resource of national soporification. The complaints arising from all parts of the Empire, and all ranks of Russian society, are consequently, by Government order, drowned in the fanatical cry of revenge for the poor, down-trodden Christians of Turkey. Day by day the Russian press teems with illustrations and demonstrations as to the necessity of an intervention in Turkey. The following extract from the Invalid may be considered a fair sample.

"The Oriental question has reached a stage which is certain to keep it before the Powers for a long time to come, and, as it now engrosses the attention of all Europe, it would ill become us to leave it undiscussed in our columns. Those only who are indifferent to the interests of humanity can allow this topic to pass by unnoticed. We, however, are obliged not only to relate the details of Oriental occurrences, but also to allude to the eventualities of the future, especially as it behooves us to show the public what measures must be taken in order to do away with such an unnatural state of things, forming, as it does, the disgrace of our century and civilization.

"Considering what acts of barbarism the Turks are allowed to commit, we are, in deference to truth and justice, compelled to acknowledge that Europe must be held accountable for the origin and consequences of Mussulman fanaticism. We will not hesitate to speak out frankly. What were the motives that prompted Europe to engage in an unjust war against Russia in 1853-4? Europe herself put forward two
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a Mantua, Peschiera, Verona and Legnago (on this see Engels, "Po and Rhine", present edition, Vol. 16).—Ed.
b Russky Invalid.—Ed.
objects as the grounds of the Crimean campaign: One was, to thwart the power and ambition of Russia; the other to prevent the oppression of Christians by the Turks. Europe, consequently, acknowledged the existence of such oppression, but in order to remove it, declared her determination to maintain the integrity of Turkey as a necessary condition of the balance of power. The war being at an end, diplomacy began to busy itself with the means for the attainment of this double object. The first step was to receive Turkey into the family of European Powers, and to protect her against the overweening interference of any one of their number. This being easy enough of accomplishment, one of the two objects was consequently secured. But how is it with the other? Have any guarantees been given for the protection of Christians against murder and every description of ill usage? Alas! Europe in this respect put her faith in words, papers, and documents, without any solid security being accorded for their fulfillment. As early as the 8th of August, 1854, when the cessation of hostilities was contemplated, the Porte was called upon to grant an equal share of religious rights to its Christian and Mussulman subjects. The same demand was raised by the St. Petersburg Cabinet in the memorials of the 28th December, 1854; and finally, the preliminary conditions of peace drawn up at Vienna on the 1st of February, 1856, and afterward embodied in the minutes of the first sitting of the Paris Congress, were made to include the following words: 'The rights of the rayahs will be protected, without prejudice, however, to the independence and sovereign dignity of the Sultan. Austria, France, Great Britain, and the Porte, are of accord respecting the maintenance of the Turkish Christians in the enjoyment of their political and religious rights; and they will request the consent of Russia to this proposition in the instrument of peace.'

"The same object occupied the Congress in various other sittings, as may be seen from the minutes of the 28th of February, and of the 24th and 25th of March. In all this, it was desirous of attaining two objects mutually destructive of each other—to preserve the sovereign rights of the Sultan, and to place those of his Christian subjects under the guardianship of Europe. The Congress altogether forgot that the same rights of the Christians, which it was so desirous of establishing, had been conceded over and over again by the Porte in its previous treaties with Europe—treaties which, moreover, had already abolished the sovereign power of that monarch, who, as Europe now said, ought to be assisted in its maintenance. To establish a little harmony between these two contradictory points, the Sultan, while induced to issue the celebrated Hatti-Humayouni, was acknowledged to have acted from his own free will and sovereign inclination. So he had to promise that he would respect and increase the rights of his Christian subjects, and this promise was received into the treaty of peace, by way of guaranty for its fulfillment as one of its constituent parts. On these conditions, the Congress, in the 9th clause of the treaty, resigned all further interference with the internal affairs of Turkey.

"But has the Congress really obtained any guaranty for the carrying out of the Hatti-Humayouni? Have any effective obligations been entered into by the Sultan?"
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a The words "as the grounds of the Crimean campaign" do not occur in the Russky Invalid.—Ed.

b The Russky Invalid has here "and the famous Four Points drawn up".—Ed.

c The Russky Invalid reads "the Porte was called upon to preserve the religious rights of all the Christians".—Ed.

d The Russky Invalid has "The same demand was raised in the memorials of the 28th December, 1854, submitted to the St. Petersburg Cabinet."—Ed.
Of this, nothing was provided. For, although the wisdom of the Hatti-Humayouni is much extolled in the treaty, that document, as all Europe predicted, has remained a dead letter. But, worse than this—Europe, in virtue of the new treaty, is deprived of all right of legal interference, a even though the Hatti-Humayouni may never have been executed, and notwithstanding the perpetration of the most horrible atrocities only four years after its issue. [...] Quite recently, Russia warned all the Cabinets of Europe that the fanaticism of the Turks b had diminished neither in zeal nor fierceness; that new outbreaks were soon to be expected, although, indeed, there had never been any interval of relaxation. But even then Europe was satisfied with the promises of the Porte, and indulged herself in the hope that the guilty parties would be punished, and law and order speedily restored. It needed the wholesale slaughter at the hands of these savages to effect a change in her opinions. Then at length Europe resolved to interfere, c though not without such delay and circumlocution as would justify the belief that she intended to let the guilty ones escape. Everything was made to depend on the letter of the treaty of the 30th March, 1856; and, just as in the case of Italy last year, the sufferings of a people weighed nothing against the text of a diplomatic document. d

"But our opinion on all this is very different. The treaty of Europe with Turkey, in our eyes, guarantees the principles of humanity, religion, and civilization. If Turkey violates these principles, she alone brings upon herself the interference of Europe." e

"Until the year 1856, the Powers of Europe, in virtue of several treaties concluded with the Porte, owned a legal right of remonstrance respecting the position of the Christian rayahs. To-day, however, it may be questioned whether or not this right has been abrogated by the treaty of the 30th March, 1856. Has Europe resigned the privileges of protecting its co-religionists? It has if it ever reckoned upon the execution of the Hatti-Humayouni, of the 18th February; if it ever believed that reforms promised are one and the same with reforms carried out; if it ever hoped that the customs, passions, and laws of the Mussulmans f are capable of a change. But, of course, Europe never was, never could be, of that opinion. Carried away by the belief that the integrity of the Ottoman Empire is a sine qua non for the balance of power, she allowed the Sultan to enter into her family of States. But this was only accorded on the condition that Turkey, dissevering herself from Mussulman traditions, should become European in her institutions; that a sword should no longer be the only law-giver between believers and unbelievers; that the Christians should no longer be the slaves of their masters and the property of the royal rayahs cease to form the common plundering-ground of Mussulmans. This, indeed, was the leading idea of Europe in 1856. With all its wrath against Russia, the natural consequence of a sanguinary and unjust war, it did not release the Porte from its previous obligations; but, on the contrary, demanded a progressive improvement in the situation of the Christians. To secure the attainment of this object was the only purpose of the common protectorate of Europe over the Porte and for this price alone Europe guaranteed the integrity of the Sultan's dominions. Without this, neither the war nor the peace would have been justifiable. Without this, Turkey would never have been received into the family of
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a The *Russky Invalid* has "mediation" instead of "legal interference". — *Ed.*
b The *Russky Invalid* has "Mussulmans". — *Ed.*
c The *Russky Invalid* has "mediate". — *Ed.*
d The *Russky Invalid* has "against the letter of the Vienna treaties". — *Ed.*
e The *Russky Invalid* has "the mediation and its consequences". — *Ed.*
f The *Russky Invalid* has "laws of the Koran". — *Ed.*
Powers, nor protected in the integrity of her possessions. The two conditions are so intimately connected that they cannot be separated; every one can see that, who wishes to see at all.

"The form of the condition, it is true, might have been less effective than it is; if the letter of the treaty ruled supreme. Europe, in virtue of the 9th clause, has formally resigned her right of interference\(^a\) in the internal affairs of Turkey; but even in this clause mention is made of the Hatti-Humayoun of the 18th February, in accordance with which the Christians are to be placed on an equal footing of right with the Mussulmans. It is but in harmony with the laws of sound logic to infer, that if the Hatti-Humayoun has been disregarded, the 9th clause falls to the ground.

"In vain Turkey now affects to quell the latest outbreak\(^b\) in Syria. That outbreak was unavoidable, considering that the situation of the Christians has not been ameliorated, but on the contrary, rendered worse than before. In vain England strives to prevent the interference\(^a\) of Europe; it is just possible she has her own policy, and is swayed by political and commercial motives, the justice and importance of which we do not care to consider; but she cannot base her objections on the 9th clause of the Paris Treaty. [...] In vain Europe seeks to conceal the fact of her interference, under the plea that it has been undertaken in consequence of a wish of the Sultan. We say that all this is in vain; and although Ilion did not believe in the prophecies of Cassandra, we have at least the satisfaction of knowing that Ilion was destroyed."

Written on August 25, 1860

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6046, September 10, 1860
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\(^a\) The *Russky Invalid* has "mediation".— *Ed.*

\(^b\) The *Russky Invalid* has "In vain Turkey now vigorously opposes mediation".— *Ed.*
As events develop themselves they begin to give us an insight into the plan which Garibaldi had prepared for the liberation of Southern Italy, and the more we see of it the more we admire the vastness of its proportions. Such a plan could not have been conceived, or its execution attempted in any country but Italy, where the National party is so perfectly organized, and so completely under the control of the one man who has drawn his sword with brilliant success for the cause of Italian unity and independence.

The plan was not confined to the liberation of the Kingdom of Naples only; the Papal States were to be attacked simultaneously, so as to find occupation for Lamoricière's army and the French at Rome,341 as well as for Bombalino'sa troops. About the 15th of August, 6,000 volunteers transferred gradually from Genoa to the Gulf of Oranges (Golfo degli Aranci), on the north-east coast of the Island of Sardinia, were to cross over to the Papal coast, while at the same time the insurrection in the various Provinces of the Neapolitan Continent was to break out, and Garibaldi was to cross the Straits of Messina into Calabria. Some reported expressions of Garibaldi's as to the cowardice of the Neapolitans, and the intelligence received by the last steamer that he had entered Naples, and been triumphantly received there, render it probable that an insurrection in the streets of that city, which the flight of the King rendered unnecessary, was a part of the plan.

The landing in the Papal States, as is already known, was prevented partly by Victor Emmanuel's representations, partly and

a Francis II.—Ed.
principally by Garibaldi’s convincing himself that these men were not in a fit state to undertake an independent campaign. He accordingly took them to Sicily, left part at Palermo, sent the remainder round the island in two steamers to Taormina, where we shall find them again presently. In the mean time the Neapolitan movements in the provincial towns took place as agreed upon, and in a manner which showed both how well the revolutionary party was organized, and how much the country was ripe for an outbreak. On the 17th of August, the insurrection broke out at Foggia, in Apulia. The dragoons, forcing the garrison of the town, joined the people. General Flores, commanding the district, sent two companies of the 13th Regiment who, on arrival, did likewise. Then did Gen. Flores come himself, accompanied by his staff; but he could do nothing and had to leave again. This proceeding clearly shows that Flores himself did not wish to offer serious resistance to the revolutionary party. Had he been in earnest he would have sent two battalions instead of two companies, and when he came himself, would have come at the head of as strong a force as he could muster, instead of coming with a few adjutants and orderlies. In fact, the circumstance alone that the insurgents allowed him to leave the town again is sufficient to show that there was at least some tacit understanding.

Another movement broke out in the Province of Basilicata. Here the insurgents collected their forces at Carletto Perticara, a village on the River Lagni (this must be the place called Corleto by the telegrams).

From this mountainous and remote district they marched to Potenza, the chief town of the Province, where they arrived, 6,000 strong, on the 17th. The only resistance they found, was offered by about 400 gendarmes, who, after a short engagement, were dispersed, and afterward came in one by one to surrender. A provincial government was formed in the name of Garibaldi, and a predictator installed. It is reported that the Royal Intendant (governor of the Province) accepts this office—another sign how hopeless the cause of the Bourbons is considered to be even by their own organs. Four companies of the Sixth Regiment of the line were sent from Salerno to put down this insurrection, but when they came to Auletta, about 23 miles from Potenza, they refused to march further, and cried Viva Garibaldi. These are the only movements of which any details have reached us. But we are further informed that other places have joined the insurrection;
for instance, Avellino, a town not 30 miles from Naples; Campobasso, in the Province of Molise (on the Adriatic), and Celenza in Apulia, for this must be the place called Cilenta in the telegrams; it is situated about half-way between Campobasso and Foggia; and now Naples itself is added to the number.

While thus the Neapolitan provincial towns at least carried out their apportioned share of the work, Garibaldi was not idle. Scarcely returned from his trip to Sardinia, he made his final arrangements for crossing over to the continent. His army now consisted of three divisions, commanded by Türr, Cosenz, and Medici. The two latter, concentrated about Messina and the Faro, were marched toward the northern coast of Sicily, between Milazzo and Faro, as if they were intended to embark there and land on the Calabrian coast, north of the Straits, somewhere about Palmi or Nicotera. Of Türr’s division, the brigade Éber was encamped near Messina, the brigade Bixio had been sent to the interior, to Bronte, to repress some disorders. Both were at once ordered to Taormina, where, on the evening of the 18th of August, the brigade Bixio, along with the men brought from Sardinia, embarked on the two steamers, the Torino and Franklin, and some on transports taken in tow.

About ten days previous Major Missori, with 300 men, had crossed the Straits and safely passed through the Neapolitans to the high and broken ground of Aspromonte. Here he was joined by other small bodies, thrown across the Straits from time to time, and by Calabrian insurgents, so that by this time he commanded a body of about 2,000 men. The Neapolitans had sent about 1,800 men after his little band when landed, but these 1,800 heroes managed so as never to come up with the Garibaldians.

On the 19th, at daybreak, Garibaldi’s expedition (for he was on board himself) landed between Melito and Cape Spartivento, on the extreme southern end of Calabria.

They found no resistance. The Neapolitans had been so completely deceived by the movements threatening a landing north of the Straits, that the country south of them was completely neglected by them. Thus 9,000 men were thrown across, beside the 2,000 got together by Missori.

Having been joined by these, Garibaldi at once marched on Reggio, which was occupied by four companies of the line and four of chasseurs. This garrison must, however, have received

---

a Faro di Messina.— Ed.
b Reggio di Calabria.— Ed.
some reenforcements, as some very severe fighting is reported to have taken place in or before Reggio on the 21st.\textsuperscript{a} After the storming of some outworks of Garibaldi, the artillery in the fort of Reggio refused to fire any longer, and Gen. Viale capitulated.\textsuperscript{b} In this engagement Col. Deflotte (the Republican member for Paris in the French Legislative Assembly of 1851) was killed.

The Neapolitan flotilla in the Straits distinguished itself by doing nothing. After Garibaldi had landed, a naval commander telegraphed to Reggio that it was impossible for the ships to offer any resistance, as he had with him eight large men-of-war and seven transports! No more did this flotilla oppose the passage by the division of Gen. Cosenz, which must have taken place on the 20th or 21st, at the narrowest place of the Straits, between Scilla and Villa San Giovanni, on the very spot where both the ships and troops of the Neapolitans were most concentrated. Cosenz's landing was marked by a signal success. The two brigades Melendez and Briganti (the Neapolitans say battalions instead of brigades), and the fort of Pizzo (not Pezzo, as some telegrams say; this place is situated far to the north, beyond Monteleone), surrendered to him, as it appears, without a blow. This is said to have taken place on the 21st, on which day also Villa San Giovanni was occupied after a short engagement.\textsuperscript{c}

Thus in three days Garibaldi had made himself master of the whole coast of the Straits, including some of the fortified points; the few forts still occupied by Neapolitans were now useless to them.

The two following days appear to have been occupied by the passage of the remainder of the troops and of the materiel—at least we do not hear of any further engagements until the 24th, when a severe contest is reported to have taken place at a place called in the telegrams Piale, which we do not find on the maps. It may be the name of some mountain torrent, the ravine formed by which might have served as a defensive position to the Neapolitans. This engagement is said to have been undecided. After some time the Garibaldians offered an armistice, which the Neapolitan commander referred to his General-in-Chief at Monteleone. But before an answer could arrive, the Neapolitan soldiers appear to have come to the conclusion that they had done quite enough for their King, and dispersed, leaving the batteries unoccupied.

\textsuperscript{a} Le Constitutionnel, No. 240, August 27, 1860.—Ed.
\textsuperscript{b} Le Constitutionnel, No. 241, August 28, 1860.—Ed.
\textsuperscript{c} ibid.—Ed.
The main body of the Neapolitans, under Bosco, appears during all this time to have quietly remained at Monteleone, some thirty miles from the Straits. They do not seem to have been very eager to fight the invaders, so Gen. Bosco went over to Naples to fetch six battalions of Chasseurs, which are, next to the Guards and foreign troops, the most reliable portions of the army. Whether these six battalions were themselves infected by the spirit of dejection and demoralization reigning in the Neapolitan army remains to be seen. Certain it is, that neither they nor any other troops have been able to prevent Garibaldi from marching victoriously, and probably unchecked, to Naples, to find that the Royal family had fled, and the gates of the city open to his triumphant entrance.

Written about September 1, 1860

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6056, September 21, 1860

as a leading article

Reproduced from the newspaper
We are now in possession of detailed information respecting the conquest of Lower Calabria by Garibaldi, and the entire dispersion of the Neapolitan corps charged with its defense. In this part of his triumphal career, Garibaldi has shown himself to be not only a brave leader and clever strategist, but also a scientific general. The attack, by main force, of a chain of coast-forts is an undertaking which requires not only military talent, but also military science; and it is gratifying to find that our hero, who never passed a military examination in his life, and can scarcely be said ever to have belonged to a regular army, was as much at home on this kind of battle-field as on any other.

The toe of the Italian boot is formed by the mountain chain of Aspromonte, which ends in the peak of Montalto, about 4,300 feet high. From this peak, the waters flow toward the coast in a number of deep ravines, extending from Montalto as from a center, like the radii of a semicircle, the periphery of which is formed by the coast. These ravines, with the beds of their respective mountain torrents dried up in this season, are called fiumare, and form as many positions for a retreating army. They may indeed be turned by the Montalto, especially as there are bridle-paths and footpaths running along the crest of each spur and of the main chain of Aspromonte itself; but the complete absence of water on the high land would make it rather a difficult maneuver to do so in Summer with a large force. The spurs of the hill run down to the coast, where they descend toward the sea in steep and irregularly broken rocks. The forts guarding the straits between Reggio and Scilla are constructed partly on the beach, but more generally on low, projecting rocks close to the shore. The consequence is that they are all of them commanded and looked into by the more elevated rocks close to the rest, and although the
commanding points may be inaccessible to artillery, and mostly out of the range of old Brown Bess, so as to be considered of no consequence when the forts were erected, their importance has become decisive since the introduction of the modern rifle; they are mostly within its range, and thus they now do command the forts in reality. Under these circumstances, a forcible attack on these forts, despising the rules of regular sieges, was perfectly justified. What Garibaldi had to do was, evidently, to send a column along the high road which skirts the shore under the fire of the forts, for a feigned front attack on the Neapolitan troops; and to take another column over the hills as high up the fiuamare as might be rendered necessary by the nature of the ground, or by the extent of front offered by any Neapolitan defensive position, thus turning both troops and fort, and having the advantage of the commanding position in every engagement.

Accordingly, on the 21st August, Garibaldi sent Bixio, with part of his troops, along the coast toward Reggio, whilst he himself, with a small detachment and the troops of Missori, which had rejoined him, went by the higher ground. The Neapolitans, eight companies, or about 1,200 men, occupied a fiuamare just outside Reggio. Bixio, being the first to attack, sent one column to the extreme left on the sandy beach, while he himself advanced on the road. The Neapolitans very soon gave way; but their left wing, in the hills, held out against the few men of Garibaldi's advanced guard until Missori's men came up and drove them in. Then they retreated to the fort, which is situated in the middle of the town, and to a small battery on the beach. The latter was taken by a very gallant rush of three of Bixio's companies, who went in through an embrasure. The large fort was cannonaded by Bixio, who found two Neapolitan heavy guns, with ammunition, in this battery; but this would not have compelled it to surrender, had not Garibaldi's sharpshooters taken up the commanding heights, from which they could see and pick off the gunners in the batteries. This told; the artillerymen forsook the platforms, and ran into the casemates: the fort surrendered, the men partly joining Garibaldi, but mostly going home. While this was going on at Reggio, the attention of the Neapolitan steamers being engaged by this fight, by the destruction of the stranded steamer Torino, and by a sham embarcation of Medici's men in Messina, Cosenz succeeded in getting 1,500 men, in 60 boats, out of the Faro Lagore, and landing them on the north-west coast, between Scilla and Bagnara.

a Bagnara Calabria.—Ed.
On the 23d, a small engagement took place near Salice, a little beyond Reggio; fifty Garibaldians, English and French, commanded by Col. De Flotte, defeated four times their number of Neapolitans. De Flotte fell on this occasion. On the same day, Gen. Briganti, who commanded a brigade in Lower Calabria under Viale, had an interview with Garibaldi as to the conditions of his passing over into the Italian camp; this interview, however, had no other result but to show that the Neapolitans were completely demoralized. From this moment, there was no longer any question as to victory, but only as to surrender. Briganti and Melendez, the chief of the second movable brigade of Lower Calabria, had taken up a position close to the coast, between Villa San Giovanni and Scilla, extending their left toward the hills near Fiumara-di-Muro. Their united forces might be computed at some 3,600 men.

Garibaldi, placing himself in communication with Cosenz, who had landed in the rear of this body, drew a complete net round them and then quietly awaited their surrender, which took place on the 24th, toward evening. He kept their arms, and permitted the men to go home if they liked, which most of them did. The fort of Punta-di-Pezzo surrendered also, and the posts of the Alla Fiumare, Torre del Cavallo, and Scilla followed the example, discouraged as much by the rifle-shots from the commanding heights as by the general defection of the other forts and the troops in the field. Thus not only was the perfect command of both sides of the straits secured, but the whole of Lower Calabria conquered, and the troops sent to its defense taken prisoners and dismissed to their homes in less than five days.

This series of defeats broke every capability of further resistance in the Neapolitan army. The officers of the remaining battalions of Viale, at Monteleone, came to the conclusion to defend their position for an hour, to save appearances, and then to lay down their arms. The insurrection in the other provinces made rapid progress; whole regiments refused to march against the insurgents, and desertions took place in bodies, even among the troops guarding Naples. And thus the road to Naples was finally opened to the hero of Italy.

Written about September 6, 1860

Reproduced from the newspaper First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 6058, September 24, 1860 as a leading article

a Saliche Calabria.—Ed.
London, Sept. 8, 1860

The Tribune was the first paper which called attention to the serious decline of the British export trade to the East Indies, a decline most conspicuous in the great staple articles, viz.: cotton goods and cotton yarns. The reaction hence arising has begun to be felt in Lancashire and Yorkshire, at the very moment when the home market is contracting in consequence of a harvest which is full five weeks later than that of last year, and, despite the improving prospects since Thursday, the 30th of August, will, at all events, fall below an average yield. The British Chambers of Commerce have, consequently, taken the alarm, and assailed the central government with protests against the New Indian Customs’ Act, by which the duty upon the staple imports from Great Britain was increased from 5 to 10 per cent.; that is to say, at a rate of 100 per cent. The English press, which, till then, had cautiously abstained from touching this point, has thus at last been compelled to break through its reserve. The London Economist treats us to the “Trade of India”, and “The Cause of its Depression.” Apart from the circumstance of The Economist being considered the first English authority in matters of this kind, its articles on India derive peculiar interest from their connexion with the writing-desk of Mr. Wilson, the present Indian Chancellor of the Exchequer. The first part of the article, an attempt at disengaging the late Indian customs legislation from all responsibility for the present contraction of the Indian market, is best answered by the necessity

---

a See this volume, pp. 406-08.—Ed.
to which the Governor-General at Calcutta has been put, of convening, at Calcutta, a committee, to consist of representatives of the Revenue Boards of Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras, and their respective Chambers of Commerce, and to be charged with the task of revising and readjusting the tariff lately introduced. That tariff, as I stated when first introducing this subject to your readers, did not create the Indian commercial crisis, whose outbreak it, however, accelerated by its sudden introduction at a time when the Indian commerce was already bloated to a size beyond its natural capacity. The glut of British commodities in the Indian market and of Indian commodities in the English market is avowed by The Economist.

"We believe," he says, "it will be admitted on all hands that the enormous profits made in the Indian trade during a portion of last year, led to a sudden and large increase of supplies to the market, more than was required for any consumption, as far as this country was concerned, and to a very extensive speculative trade by the native capitalists for the supply of the markets in the interior from the seaports. For example, the exports of cotton piece goods to British India amounted [...] in 1859 to the value of £12,043,000 against £9,299,000 in 1858 and £5,714,000 in 1857; and of yarns the exports were in 1859 £2,546,000 against £1,969,000 in 1858, and £1,147,000 in 1857. For a long time goods were taken off as rapidly as they arrived, and as long as prices continued to rise, there was no lack of speculative Mahajuns to make purchases and to consign to the markets of the interior; and there is no doubt, from the best information we can obtain, that large stocks of goods accumulated at all the markets in the North-West. Upon this point the testimony of Mirzapur, Allahabad, Lucknow, Agra, Delhi, Amritsar and Lahore is uniform."c

The Economist then proceeds to detail some circumstances which contributed to consolidate in a certain sense the glut in the Indian markets. The main cause—the continuance of large supplies from England—he does not even allude to. In the first instance, then, the Autumn crops of 1859 throughout northern India, consequent upon the drouth generally prevailing, fell much below an average, and were affected both as to quality and quantity. Hence a high range of the prices of provisions through the Winter and Spring, which, later on in the season, was still more enhanced by famine prospects. Furthermore, with scarcity and high prices, there was raging the disease.

"Throughout the whole of the North-West, the cholera prevailed to so alarming an extent among the densely-peopled cities, that the ordinary business of life was in many cases suspended, and the population fled as from an invading enemy."

---

a See this volume, pp. 406-08.—Ed.

b Usurers.—Ed.

c The Economist, No. 889, September 8, 1860, p. 978; Marx's italics.—Ed.
But, worst of all,

"Upper India was threatened, for a month or six weeks before the departure of the last mail, with a misfortune most appalling. The rains, upon which alone the Autumn crops depend, usually fall by the middle or at latest the end of June. This year, up to the middle of July, not a drop of rain had fallen. From the north-west frontier down to Lower Bengal, from the Khyber pass to Benares, including the great Doabs of the Sutlej, the Jumna, and the Ganges, all was one arid, hard, and immovable surface of parched earth. It was only in the few exceptional places which were moistened by the rivers passing through them, or by the tributaries of the great irrigation works, the Jumna and Ganges canals, that any cultivation was possible. The prospect of a famine equal to that of 1837 and 1838 created on all hands the greatest apprehension. Prices rose still more. Cattle were dying in numbers or being drawn to the hills in place of tilling the soil, and the people are described as being on the borders of starvation."\(^a\)

The worst apprehensions, however, have been set to rest, according to the telegraphic accounts received and published at Calcutta during the eight days previous to the departure of the last mail, which left on the 27th of July. Rains had at last fallen copiously, and in proper time to avert a famine, if not to secure a good crop.

The details given by *The Economist* go far to prove that for the next future there exists not the least prospect of a revival in the Indian trade, which had already fallen off about £2,000,000 for the first half year of 1860 as compared with the first half year of 1859. The Australian markets exhibit also all the symptoms of contraction consequent upon over-trade. The trade with France, which was all at once to assume immense proportions by virtue of the Commercial Treaty,\(^b\) has on the contrary declined by more than £1,000,000, as will be seen by the following statement\(^c\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1859</th>
<th>1860</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imports from France</td>
<td>£9,615,065</td>
<td>£8,523,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports to France</td>
<td>2,358,912</td>
<td>2,324,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>£11,973,977</td>
<td>£10,848,648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The heavy decline in the British import trade from France may be accounted for by the high prices of provisions in France during this year, while in 1859 corn and meal had formed a principal item in the French exports to England. Great stress is laid on the increased rate at which the United States, in return for the present

---

\(^a\) loc. cit.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) See this volume, pp. 341-44.—*Ed.*

\(^c\) *The Economist*, No. 888, September 1, 1860, p. 953.—*Ed.*
large exports of provisions to the United Kingdom, are presumed to become consumers of English manufactures. But though there will always be some proportion between the exports and the imports of a country, the above conclusion seems somewhat rash, if we are to judge from the movements of the Anglo-American trade in the first half years of 1859 and 1860. There we shall find:

1859. 1860.
British Export to the United States... £11,625,920 £9,366,647
British Imports from United States... 17,301,790 25,618,472

so that during the same epoch, in which the British imports from the United States increased by more than 8,000,000, the British exports to the United States decreased by more than 2,000,000. The only branches of international British trade which have enlarged are the Anglo-Turkish trade, the Anglo-Chinese trade, and the Anglo-German trade. Now Turkey is just being convulsed by Russian and French interference. China is convulsed by the English themselves, and Germany, while suffering in many parts from a deficient harvest, stands on the eve of grave political convulsions at home, and serious collisions abroad. As to the Anglo-Chinese trade, I still remark that some part of its increase is certainly due to the war demand; that part of the increased exports to China were only so many goods abstracted from the Indian market, and thrown, by way of experiment, on the Chinese market, and, lastly, that the import from China continues to be of much more importance than the export to China, as will be seen from the following figures:

Six months ending June 30.

1859. 1860.
Imports from China, including £5,070,691 £5,526,054
Hong Kong ..............................
Exports to China, exclusive of £1,001,709 1,622,525
Hong Kong ..............................
Exports to Hong Kong ................. 976,703 1,236,262

Total ................................... £7,049,103 £8,384,841

Meanwhile, unexpected failures in most branches of business continue to feed a general feeling of distrust. The subjoined

a loc. cit.—Ed.
summary of the till-now-ascertained liabilities and assets of the late failures in the leather trade will show that the assets, on an average, but amount to 5s. 6d. in the pound, leaving to the holders of the bills of the fallen firms a loss of £1,471,589.

**LIABILITIES.**

*Firms.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In bankruptcy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>£1,530,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winding up or compromised</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>499,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulars not published</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>..........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td><strong>£2,030,797</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASSETS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Deficit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In bankruptcy</td>
<td>£342,652 4s. 6d.</td>
<td>£1,188,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winding up or compromised</td>
<td>216,556 8s. 8d.</td>
<td>283,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulars not published</td>
<td>..........</td>
<td>..........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>£559,208 5s. 6d.</td>
<td>£1,471,589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written on September 8, 1860

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6063, September 29, 1860

---

* The Economist, No. 889, September 8, 1860, p. 992.—*Ed.
Karl Marx

RUSSIA USING AUSTRIA.—THE MEETING AT WARSAW

Berlin, 17th September, 1860

Of all the countries in Europe, Germany presents, at this moment, the most curious, the most intricate, and the most lamentable spectacle. The real state of German affairs will be best understood from a simple juxtaposition of two facts, the recent meeting of the German National Association at Coburg, and the impending meeting of the principal German princes at Warsaw. While the former aspires to the unification of the fatherland, by abandoning German Austria and confiding in Prussia, the Regent of Prussia himself rests his prospects of resistance against French aggression upon the restoration of the Holy Alliance under Russian auspices. Russian foreign policy, as is well known, does not care one straw for principles, in the common meaning of the term. It is neither legitimist nor revolutionary, but improves all opportunities of territorial aggrandizement with the same facility, whether they be obtained by siding with insurgent peoples or with struggling princes. In regard to Germany, it has become the invariable policy of Russia to shift sides. She first combines with France, in order to break the resistance of Austria to her Oriental schemes, and then sides with Germany in order to enfeeble France and draw a bill upon German gratitude, to be discounted on the Vistula or the Danube. In the progress of a European complication, she will always prefer a coalition with the German princes to an alliance with the French upstarts, for the simple reason that her real force consists in her diplomatic superiority, and not in her material power. A war with Germany, her immediate neighbor, springing from an alliance with France, would reveal the real

—a William, Prince of Prussia.—Ed.
impotency of the Northern Colossus; while in a war with France, Russia must, from her geographical position, always form the reserve, forcing Germany to do the real work, and keeping in store for herself the fruits of the victory. Coalesced empires resemble in this point the different corps of an army. The vanguard and the center have to bear the decisive shock, but the reserve decides the battle and carries the day. German dreamers may flatter themselves with the delusive hope that Russia, while laboring under the high pressure of an internal social struggle, in the emancipation movement, will for once give the lie to Karamzin, the Russian historian's maxim that Russian foreign policy never changes.

It has been presumed that an immense empire, distracted by a struggle of classes, and distressed by a financial crisis, would be but too glad to let Europe alone; but then the real nature of the Russian internal movement has been misunderstood. Whatever may have been his real intentions, it is no more possible for a benevolent Czar\textsuperscript{a} to conciliate the abolition of serfdom with the continuance of his own autocracy than it proved for a benevolent Pope,\textsuperscript{b} in 1848, to reconcile Italian unity with the vital conditions of the Papacy. Simple as the phrase of Russian serf emancipation sounds, it implies meanings the most different and aspirations the most contradictory. The vail that, in the beginning of the movement, was thrown, by a kind of general enthusiasm, over the conflicting tendencies, must necessarily be torn asunder, so soon as steps are taken to proceed from the verbal to the real. Serf emancipation, in the sense of the Czar, amounted to the destruction of the last checks still restraining the Imperial autocracy. On the one hand the relative independence of the nobles, resting upon their uncontrolled sway over the majority of the Russian people, would have been removed; on the other hand, the self-administration of the rural serf communities, based on their common property in the enslaved soil, would have been broken up by the Government scheme which aimed at the abolition of the "communist" principle. Such was serf emancipation as understood by the Central Government. The nobles, in their turn—that is to say, that influential portion of the Russian aristocracy which despaired of maintaining the old state of things—had made up their minds to grant the emancipation of the serfs on two conditions: monetary indemnity, converting the

\textsuperscript{a} Alexander II.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} Pius IX.—\textit{Ed.}
peasants from their serfs into their mortgagees, so that, so far as material interests go, nothing would have been changed, for two or three generations at least, save the form of servitude—its patriarchal form being supplanted by its civilized form. Beside this indemnity to be paid by the serfs, they wanted another indemnity to be paid by the State. For the local power over their serfs, which they declared themselves ready to surrender, they wanted to make up by political power to be wrested from the Central Government, investing them in substance with a constitutional share in the general management of the empire.

Lastly, the serfs themselves preferred the simplest formula of the emancipation question. What they understood by it was the old state of things, minus their old landlords. In this mutual strife, where the Government, despite menaces and cajoling, split upon the opposition of the nobles and the peasants—the aristocracy upon the opposition of the Government and of their human chattels, the peasantry upon the combined opposition of their central lord and their local lords—an understanding, as is usual in such transactions, has been arrived at between the existing powers at the cost of the oppressed class. The Government and the aristocracy have agreed together to shelve the emancipation question for the present, and to again try their hands at foreign adventures. Hence the secret understanding with Louis Bonaparte in 1859, and the official congress at Warsaw with the German princes in 1860. The Italian war had sufficiently broken the self-reliance of Austria to transform her from an obstacle into a tool of the Russian schemes of foreign policy, and Prussia, which had made a fool of herself by combining, during the continuance of the war, the airs of ambitious perfidy with an utter nullity of action, cannot, threatened as she is by France on her Rhenish frontiers, but follow in the wake of Austria. It was one of the great delusions of the Gotha party to fancy that the blows Austria was likely to receive on the part of France would dissolve her into her constituent parts, so that Austrian Germany, disconnected from its ties with Italy, Poland, and Hungary, might easily enter into the formation of one great German empire. A long historical experience has shown us that every war which Austria may have to wage with France or Russia would not free Germany from her weight, but only make her subservient to the schemes of France or Russia. To break her up into her constituent parts by one great blow, would be bad policy on the part of those Powers, if they were possessed of the force to strike the blow; but to enfeeble Austria, in order to turn its remaining influence to their own
account, was and must always be the main object of their
diplomatic and military operations. Nothing but a German
revolution, with one of its centers at Vienna and the other at
Berlin, could shatter to pieces the Hapsburg empire, without
endangering the integrity of Germany, and without subjecting its
non-German dominions to French or Russian control.

The impending Warsaw Congress would immensely strengthen
Louis Bonaparte's position in France, if the prospect of a conflict
in Italy between the truly national party and the French party did
not spoil his opportunity. As it is, one must hope that the Warsaw
Congress will at last open the eyes of Germany, and teach her that
either to withstand encroachments from without or realize unity
and liberty at home, she must clear her own house of its dynastic
landlords.

Written on September 17, 1860

First published in the *New-York Daily
Tribune*, No. 6072, October 10, 1860
The Prince Regent\textsuperscript{a} who, as I have already told your readers, since his accession to supreme power, is a sullen and dogged Legitimist at the core of his heart, despite the gaudy insignia of liberalism he has been decked out with by the official oracles of the Prussian fool's paradise, has just caught an occasion of publicly giving vent to his long compressed feelings. It is a strange fact, but nevertheless it is a fact, that the Prince Regent of Prussia has for the nonce shut out the Garibaldians from the fortress of Messina, and saved that important military stronghold for his beloved brother, King Bombalino\textsuperscript{b} of Naples. The Prussian Ambassador at Naples, Count of Perponcher, a personage as notorious for his staunch Legitimism as Baron of Canitz, the Prussian Ambassador at Rome, had, like most of his colleagues, followed King Bombalino to Gaeta, where the Prussian war corvette \textit{Loreley} was placed for the protection of German subjects. Now on the 15th of September, the citadel of Messina was on the point of capitulating. The officers had declared for Victor Emmanuel, and sent a deputation to Gaeta in order to tell the King that the place was no longer tenable. On the following day that deputation was shipped back to Messina by the war corvette \textit{Loreley}, with a Prussian Commissary on board, who, on the arrival of the vessel, proceeded immediately to the citadel, where he had a long conversation with the Neapolitan commander. Beside his personal eloquence, the Prussian agent exhibited a bundle of dispatches on the part of the King, encouraging the General to resistance, and strongly inveigh-

\footnote{\textsuperscript{a} William, Prince of Prussia.—\textit{Ed.}}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{b} Francis II.—\textit{Ed.}}
ing against every proposition of giving up, even under the most favorable conditions, the forts still sufficiently provisioned for several months. During the stay of the Prussian Commissary, cries of "Evviva il Re!" were heard ringing from the citadel, and when he left, the transactions entered into, with a view to stipulate the terms of the capitulation, were at once broken off. On the arrival of this news, Count Cavour hastened to lodge a complaint at Berlin because of "the abuse of the Prussian flag," and the violation of the promise to preserve perfect neutrality in the revolutionary war of Italy. Despite the justness of the complaint, Count Cavour of all men was the man least fitted to prefer it. Herr von Schleinitz, whose dispatches had, during the war of 1859, obtained some notoriety for their soft-sawder style, their seesaw reasonings, and the incomparable art of drawing out the thread of their verbosity finer than the staple of their argument—Herr von Schleinitz eagerly improved the opportunity to insinuate himself with the Prince Regent, and to change for once his humble sotto voce for the shrill tones of haughtiness. He administered a peremptory rebuke to Count Cavour, who was plainly told that Sicily had not yet become a Sardinian province, that the treaty obligations were daily violated by the Court of Turin, and that if Cavour wanted to protest against foreign intervention in Italy, he had better lodge his protest at the Tuileries.

The withdrawal of the French Ambassador from Turin is here considered a transparent dodge, since it is perfectly known that immediately after the meeting at Chambéry between Louis Bonaparte and Messrs. Farini and Cialdini, the latter was intrusted with the command of the Piedmontese invasion of the Papal States. That invasion was planned at Chambéry with a view to taking the game out of the hands of Garibaldi and replacing it into the hands of Cavour, the French Emperor's most pliant servant. The revolutionary war in Southern Italy is known to be considered at the Tuileries not as a fortuitous avalanche of a ball once set rolling, but as the deliberate act of the independent Italian party who, ever since Louis Napoleon's ingress of the via sacra, had proclaimed the rising of the South as the only means of taking off the nightmare of French protection. In point of fact, Mazzini in his proclamation to the Italian people, dated May 16, 1859, stated plainly:

---

a "Long Live the King!"—Ed.
b Undertone.—Ed.
“With due reserve the people of the North may rally round the banners of Victor Emmanuel, wherever the Austrian is encamped or neighboring; the insurrection of the South must take a different and more independent course. Rising, rising united, installing a Provisional Government, arming, selecting a strategical point where it may keep its ground and attract the volunteers of the North. Naples and Sicily may still save the cause of Italy, and constitute its power, represented by a national camp. Thanks to that camp and the Northern volunteers, Italy, at the end of the war, whatever be the intentions of its initiators, may still become the supreme arbiter of its own destinies.... Such a popular manifestation would exclude every new division of Italy, every importation of new dynasties, every peace of the Adige or the Mincio, every abandonment of every part of the Italian soil. And the name of Rome is inseparable from the name of Italy. There, in the sacred city, stands the palladium of our national unity. It is the duty of Rome not to swell the Sardinian army by a mob of volunteers, but to prove to Imperial France that the prop of the Papal despotism at Rome will never be acknowledged the sword-bearer of Italian independence.... If Rome forgets its duties, we must act for the Romans. Rome represents the unity of the fatherland. Sicily, Naples, and the volunteers of the North must constitute its army.”

Such were the words of Mazzini in May, 1859, reechoed by Garibaldi when, at the head of the popular army created in Sicily and Naples, he promised to proclaim the Unity of Italy from the top of the Quirinal.  

You will remember how Cavour, from the beginning, did everything in his power to beset Garibaldi’s expedition with difficulties; how, after the first success won by the popular hero, he sent La Farina, in company with two Bonapartist agents, over to Palermo, in order to deprive the conqueror of his dictatorship; how, later on, every military move of Garibaldi was met, on the part of Cavour, first by diplomatic and at last by military countermoves. After the fall of Palermo and the progress to Messina, Garibaldi’s popularity towered so high among the people and the army of Paris, that Louis Napoleon considered it prudent to try the wheeling method. When Gen. Türr, at that time disabled from active service, had repaired to Paris, he became quite overwhelmed with Imperial flatteries. He was not only an honored guest at the Palais Royal, but was even admitted to the Tuileries, initiated into the Emperor’s unbounded enthusiasm for his “annexed” subject, the Nizzard hero, and laden with tokens of good will, such as rifled cannon, and so forth. At the same time Türr’s mind was impressed with the Emperor’s

---

a Giuseppe Mazzini, “La Guerra”, Pensiero ed Azione, No. 17, May 2-16, 1859; Giuseppe Garibaldi’s address to the people of Palermo on September 10, 1860, L’Indépendance belge, No. 261, September 17, 1860; see also The Times, No. 23728, September 18, 1860.—Ed.
b See this volume, pp. 421-24.—Ed.
conviction that Garibaldi, after he had made sure of Naples and the Neapolitan Navy, could do nothing better than to try, in unison with the Hungarian refugees, a landing at Fiume, there to plant the banner of a Hungarian revolution. But Louis Napoleon proceeded from altogether false premises when he supposed that Türr was the man, or even fancied himself to be the man, to exercise the least control over Garibaldi's course of action. Türr, whom I know personally, is a brave soldier and an intelligent officer, but beyond the sphere of military activity he is a mere zero, below the average of common mortals, lacking not only training of mind and a cultivated intellect, but that natural shrewdness and instinct which may stand in place of education, learning, and experience. He is, in one word, an easy-going jolly good fellow, gifted with an extraordinary degree of credulity, but certainly not the man to politically control anybody, not to speak of Garibaldi, who, with a fire of soul, still owns his grain of that subtle Italian genius you may trace in Dante no less than in Machiavelli. Türr, then, having proved a miscalculation, such at least he is spoken of in the entourage of the Tuileries. Kossuth was tried and dispatched to Garibaldi to bring him round to the views of the Emperor, and to bring him off his true scent, which points to Rome. Garibaldi used Kossuth as a means of stirring the revolutionary enthusiasm, and had him consequently feasted with popular ovations, but knew wisely how to distinguish between his name, representing a popular cause, and his mission, hiding a Bonapartist snare. Kossuth returned to Paris quite chopfallen; but, to give an earnest of his fidelity to the Imperialist interests, has now, as reported by the Opinion nationale, the Plon-Plon Moniteur, addressed a letter to Garibaldi, wherein he calls upon the latter to conciliate himself with Cavour, to abstain from every attempt at Rome, in order to not estrange France, the true hope of the oppressed nationalities, and even to let Hungary alone, the latter country being not yet ripe for an insurrection.

I need not tell you that here, at Berlin, the shares of ministerial liberalism have experienced a heavy fall, consequent upon the impending Warsaw Congress; where, not only the rulers by the grace of God are to shake hands, but their respective Ministers of Foreign Affairs: Prince Gorchakoff, Count Rechberg, and our own Herr von Schleinitz, are to meet in the snug corner of a gilded antechamber, there to give an orthodox turn to the coming history of mankind.

The transactions of Prussia with Austria, as to a new commercial treaty between the Zollverein and Austria, such as foreshadowed
by the treaty of February 19, 1853, may now be considered to be broken off, since the Prussian Cabinet has positively declared that any assimilation, or even approximation of tariffs was out of the question.

Written on September 27, 1860

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6076, October 15, 1860
Frederick Engels

PREPARATIONS FOR WAR IN PRUSSIA

Berlin, Oct. 23, 1860

The anger and the dread felt by our Liberals at the Prince Regent’s\(^a\) participation in the Warsaw Congress, find, as is usual with the grievances of genuine Prussian Liberals, their vent in bitter aspersions of Austria and its new-fangled Constitution.\(^{351}\) In the first place, Francis Joseph will never be forgiven, for having bereft these gentlemen of their greatest consolation, and the standing topic of their verbose self-righteousness, viz., the contrast between “constitutional” Prussia and “absolutist” Austria. The Austrian patent, of course, is open, not only to cavils, but to serious misgivings of every kind. The circumstances under which and the hands by which the gift is bestowed, stamp it with the character of a shift, rather than a sincere concession. Once before, on the 4th of March, 1849, Francis Joseph promulgated the outlines of a constitution, only to cancel them the following year, after the fortune of war had declared on his side.\(^{352}\) But, then, there exists no instance on the records of history of princes having ever curtailed their own privileges, and yielded to popular claims, except under a heavy pressure from without, and there exists no instance of their having kept faith whenever they could dare to break their oaths and their pledges with impunity. The old Hungarian Constitution\(^{353}\) has not been restored in its integrity, since the two most important rights of voting the ways and means, and the levies of troops, are transferred from the Diet at Pesth to the Central Imperial Council at Vienna, which latter being intended to form the States General of the whole empire, finds itself invested with attributes likely to become permanent sources

---

\(^a\) William, Prince of Prussia.— *Ed.*
of strife between itself and the different national or provincial Diets. The Constitutions of the German and Slavonic provinces being limited to the most general and vague outlines, may be made nothing or everything of. The greatest fault found with the patent on the part of the Magyars is the separation of Croatia and Servia and Transylvania from Hungary, and the grant to those provinces of different independent Diets; but if the events of 1848-49 be recalled to mind, it may be justly doubted whether the Croats, Slavonians, Serbs, and Wallachians will be inclined to share in this Magyar grievance, and back it by their support. The Vienna statesmen, in this instance, seem rather to have played a clever trick upon the principle of nationality, and turned it to their own account.

But, as for the general Diet of the whole empire, under the name of the Imperial Council, seated at Vienna and composed of the respective delegates appointed by the different Diets of Galicia, Hungary, Transylvania, Croatia, Servia, Venetia, and the German provinces, being placed beyond the pale of allegiance to the Diet of the German Confederation, will it not cut asunder the relations that have hitherto obtained between German Austria and the German Confederation? This is the great theme now harped upon by official Prussian Liberalism, which will never stand in want of arguments for its pet idea, the exclusion of Austrian Germany from the German Confederation. But all this reasoning proceeds from a false premise in clinging to the letter of Francis Joseph's patent. While the latter must be considered, on the part of the Austrian dynasty, as a clever device, it affords to the various peoples crushed under Hapsburg sway a precious handle for working out their own destinies and reopening the era of revolutions. For the present, the Austrian Constitution will have done much good in humbling the Pharisean pride of the Prussian mock Liberals, and stripping the Hohenzollern dynasty of the only advantage it could boast over its rival, that of carrying on the old concern of the bureaucrat and the soldier under the more respectable form of constitutionalism.

To give you an insight into the real state of this much-vaunted, "regenerated" Prussia, it will be necessary to recur to the changes that have lately taken place in the organization of the Prussian army. You will remember that the Prussian Chamber of Deputies, while lacking on the one side the courage to affront public opinion by an open sanction of the Government proposals for the reorganization of the army, and lacking on the other side the courage to make a decided stand against the martinet leanings of
the Prince Regent, hit upon the usual expedient of weakness—a middle course, neither fish nor flesh. It refused to pass the Government plan for the reorganization of the army, but voted $9,500,000 for putting the army into a state fit to encounter the dangers apprehended from without. In other words, the Prussian Deputies voted the ways and means wanted by the Government for carrying out its plan, but voted them on false pretexts. Hardly had the Prussian Parliament been adjourned when the Ministry, openly breaking through the conditions on which the grant was obtained, began, without further ado, to introduce the changes in the organization of the army willed by the Prince Regent and rejected by the so-called representatives. During the recess of the Parliament, the standing army has been doubled, being raised from 40 regiments to 72 regiments of the line and 9 regiments of the guard. The permanent annual expenses for the military budget have thus, by the supreme will of the Prince Regent, and in open violation, not only of the will of the people, but of the vote of its mock representatives, been raised by 100 per cent. But do not fancy the Prince of Hohenzollern or any of his colleagues risks the fate of Strafford. There will be some low grumbling, pickled with fervent assertions of dynastic loyalty, and unbounded confidence in the Cabinet, and this will be all. Now, considering that even the old army organization, founded as it was upon a merely agricultural population, had become an intolerable drawback upon the resources and the productive activity of a people which in the course of time had engaged in manufactures, it will be easily understood how the army, now doubled in numbers, must grind down the best energies of the masses, and drain the springs of national wealth. The Prussian army may now boast of being the largest in Europe in proportion to population and national resources.

You know that a Hohenzollern ruler, when speaking of himself, or when spoken of by his cabinet and his officials, goes by the name of Kriegsherr, that is to say, "Lord of War." Now this, of course, does not mean that Prussian kings and regents lord it over the chances of war. Their great anxiety to keep peace, and their known propensity for being thrashed in the open field show better. By that title of "Lord of War," so dearly cherished by Hohenzollern rulers, it is rather understood that the true prop of their kingly power must be sought for, not in the people, but in a

---

a On this sitting of the Prussian Diet (February 10, 1860) see the Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen, Bd. 1, Berlin, 1860, S. 95-106.—Ed.
portion of the people, separated from the mass, opposed to it, distinguished by certain badges, trained to passive obedience, drilled into a mere instrument of the dynasty which owns it as its property and uses it according to its caprice. A Prussian king would, therefore, rather abdicate than allow his army to swear obedience to the Constitution. Hence a Hohenzollern ruler, being the king of his people only as far as he is the "Lord of War," in other words, the proprietor of the army, must, before all things, dote on it, fondle it, flatter it, and feed it with always increasing morsels of the national wealth. This great aim has been obtained by the new military organization. The number of officers has been doubled, and the rapid promotion to higher grades in the French, Austrian, and Russian armies, which the Prussian officers had cast longingly anxious eyes upon, has been secured to them without exposing their lives and limbs to the least hazard. Hence there is just now prevailing, not among the common soldiers, but among the officers of the Prussian army, a vast amount of enthusiasm for the Prince Regent and his "liberal" Ministers. At the same time the aristocratic fox-hunters, grumbling at the liberal phrases of the new régime, have been quite conciliated by the new occasion afforded them for fastening their younger sons on the purse of the country. There is one drawback to all this, even from the dynastic standpoint. Prussia has now concentrated all its available forces into one standing army. That army once beaten, there will be no reserve to fall back upon.

Written on October 23, 1860

Reproduced from the newspaper
London, Nov. 10, 1860

An event long ago predicted has set in, a drain of bullion, and, consequent upon it, a rise in the rate of discount. Yesterday the Bank of England raised the rate of discount from 4 to $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. In the corresponding month of 1859 the bank rate did not exceed 3 per cent, despite the then enormous shipments of silver to the East, amounting to £13,234,305. The obvious object of the Bank was to put a check on the drain of bullion from its vaults, which, amounting to £16,255,951 on the 26th of September last, is now reduced to £13,897,085, not including £43,000 taken from the Bank yesterday. The drain, beginning on Sept. 26, has been constantly on the increase until it has reached this week almost £300,000. The large imports of corn were, of course, sure to lead, sooner or later, to an emigration of the precious metals, but the payments of the corn bills being not yet due, the present drain cannot be accounted for in this manner, and, moreover, it takes place concurrently with a rate of discount higher in London than in Paris, Amsterdam, Brussels and Hamburg, while simultaneously the gold export leaves no profit as an exchange operation.

Whither, then, does the gold go? To the vaults of the Bank of France. The present discount rate of the Bank of France is only 3 per cent, although that concern has lost about £4,000,000 since the end of August, while its discounts for August and September have increased by about £3,000,000. Any vulgar bank would, under such circumstances, have raised its rate of discount, but Louis Bonaparte, afraid to cause a visible disturbance of the

---

a Marx based his analysis on the article “The Rise in the Bank Rate of Discount”, The Economist of November 10, 1860, pp. 1232 and 1242.— Ed.
money market, orders the Bank to purchase gold at a loss, and will force it to continue proceeding with this certainly not mercantile operation. On the other hand, the Bank of England proves that it is unable to check the present drain by the rise in the rate of interest. Yesterday, for instance, no bullion was taken from the Issue Department of the Bank, but a considerable quantity in sovereigns was drawn from the Banking Department. It is one of the necessary consequences of Sir Robert Peel's blessed bank acts of 1844 and 1845 that the mercantile public are constantly misled as to the real amount of the precious metals exported, since the Banking Department furnishes no public returns of the sovereigns withdrawn from its chest.

The rise in the official discount rate of the Bank of England, especially if continuing, will, of course, impose upon the Bank of France the necessity of following in the same direction, and thus prevent Louis Bonaparte from any longer commanding the Bank Directors to buy gold at a loss, in order to hide a visible derangement of the money market. Still, the English drain of bullion will not be stopped by that eventuality, since, in proper time, the corn bills must fall due and be paid for in cash.

Written on November 10, 1860

First published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 6111, November 24, 1860
The revolution in Austria gets along at a racing pace. Only two months ago, Francis Joseph acknowledged by his diploma of the 20th October, that his empire was in a state of revolution, and tried to remedy it by bribing Hungary by a promise that her ancient Constitution, in some curtailed shape or other, was to be restored. The diploma, although a concession to the revolutionary movement, was in its conception one of those master-strokes of treacherous policy which form such a prominent part in Austrian diplomacy. Hungary was to be bought by concessions apparently very great, and made to appear still greater by being placed side by side with the scanty allowance allotted to the German and Slavonic provinces, as well as with the mockery of an Imperial Parliament which the diploma proposed to establish. But in the details of the work the cloven foot of treachery was apparent enough to turn the contemplated master-stroke into a piece of egregious folly and a pledge given to the revolutionary movement of the helpless weakness of the Government. Not only was the voting of supplies and soldiers to be taken from the Hungarian Diet and to be transferred to the Central Parliament and partly even to the Emperor alone—as if a Government just compelled to eat all the political leek it had grown during the last ten years, was still strong enough to withhold such rights from its very conquerors—but the scanty and vague nature of the rights conferred on the other portions of the empire and on the central representation at once proved, by contrast, the insincerity of the whole affair. And when the provincial constitutions for Styria, Carinthia, Salzburg, and Tyrol were published—constitutions
giving the lion's share of representation to the nobility and clergy, and maintaining the old distinction of estates—when the old Ministry remained in office, there could be no longer any doubt as to what was intended. Hungary was to be soothed, and then to be made the cat's-paw to help absolutist Austria out of her troubles; and absolutist Austria once strong again, Hungary knew well enough from experience what her fate would be. The very fact of the unlimited and indiscriminate establishment of the Hungarian language as the only official language in Hungary, was intended for nothing else but to excite the Slavonians, Roumans, and Germans of Hungary against the Magyar race. The Hungarian old Conservatives (vulgo, Aristocrats), who had concluded this bargain with the Emperor, lost all standing at home by it; they had attempted to barter away the two most essential rights of the Diet. In fact, the Imperial diploma deceived nobody. While in the German provinces public opinion at once compelled the old municipal councils (appointed by the Emperor after the Revolution) to give way before new men, who are now being chosen by popular election, the Hungarians began to reestablish their old county officers and county assemblies which, before 1849, formed all the local authorities in the country. In either case, it is a good sign that the opposition party at once secured local and communal power, instead of merely clamoring for an ephemeral change of Ministry and neglecting to secure the important positions left open to it in more modest spheres of action. In Hungary, the forms of the ancient local administration, as reorganized in 1848, at once placed all the civil power in the hands of the people, and left to the Vienna Government no other alternative but to cede or to have recourse at once to military force. Here, then, the movement naturally went on most rapidly. The demand for the full restoration of the Constitution, as amended in 1848, and including all the laws agreed upon in that year between the Diet and the King, arose from one end of the land to the other. Not satisfied with that, the immediate repeal of the tobacco monopoly (introduced illegally since 1848), and of all other laws imposed without the consent of the Diet, was asked for. The levying of taxes was openly declared illegal, until the Diet should have voted them; not one-third of the taxes due were paid; the young men called out to serve in the army were called upon to resist enrolment, or to abscond; and Imperial eagles were pulled down, and, worst of all, in this transition state the Government had no means to resist this agitation. Wherever the county assemblies were convoked they pronounced themselves unanimously in this sense;
and the Conference of Hungarian notables assembled at Gran,\(^a\) under the Presidency of the Primate of Hungary,\(^b\) in order to propose to the Government a basis for the election of a Diet, without deliberation almost, and unanimously, declared the democratic electoral law of 1848 to be still in force.

That was more than the old Conservatives had expected when they made the compromise with the Emperor. They were completely "débordés."\(^c\) The revolutionary waves threatened to drown them. The Government itself saw that something must be done. But what could the Cabinet of Vienna do?

The attempt at bribing Hungary was on the eve of signally failing. What, if the Cabinet now tried to bribe the Germans? They never enjoyed such rights as the Hungarians, perhaps less would satisfy them. The Austrian monarchy, to exist, must use the various nationalities among its subjects in turns against each other. The Slavonians could be used in the utmost extremity only; they were too much connected with Russia by Panslavist agitation; be it then for the Germans. Count Goluchowski, the hated Polish aristocrat (a renegade from the Polish cause to that of Austrian service), was sacrificed, and Chevalier von Schmerling was made Minister of the Interior. He had been Minister of the German ephemeral empire in 1848, and afterward of Austria; this post he quitted when the Constitution of 1849 was definitively abolished. He passed for a Constitutionalist. But there was, again, so much hesitation and indecision before he was definitively called in, that the effect was again lost. People asked what good was Schmerling if all the other Ministers remained? There was a cooling down of all hopes, even before he was definitively appointed; and instead of a frank concession, his nomination only appeared as another proof of weakness. But while in the German Provinces the opposition was satisfied with securing local power, and receiving every move of the Government with undisguised distrust, and dissatisfaction, in Hungary the movement went on. Before even Schmerling had been nominated, the old Conservative Hungarians called into office, Szécsen and Vay at their head, acknowledged the impossibility of retaining their positions; and the Ministry of the Emperor had to undergo the humiliation of inviting two Hungarian Ministers of 1848, colleagues up to Autumn of that year of Batthyány, who was shot, of Kossuth and Szemere—of

---

\(^a\) Estergom.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) János Scitovszky.—*Ed.*

\(^c\) Overwhelmed.—*Ed.*
inviting Messrs. Déak and Eötvös, to enter the Ministry of the man
who had trodden down Hungary with Russian assistance. They are
not appointed yet; the system of hesitation and vacillation, of
haggling and haggling about trifles, is in its full glory yet, but if
they accept, they are sure to be ultimately appointed.

Thus Francis Joseph is being driven from one concession to
another, and if it should come to pass that in January the two
Diets should meet, one at Pesth for Hungary, and her annexes,
and the other at Vienna for the remaining provinces of the
empire, fresh concessions will be wrung from him. But instead of
reconciling his subjects, every fresh concession will exasperate
them more by the undisguised insincerity with which it is given.
And what with the reminiscences of the past—with the maneuvers
of the Hungarian emigration in the pay of Louis Napoleon; with
the fact that a liberal Austria is impossible, because Austria’s
foreign policy must always be reactionary, and, therefore, at once
create collisions between the Crown and the Parliament, and with
Louis Napoleon speculating upon this fact—it is probable enough
that 1861 may see the Austrian empire dissolve into its component
parts.

Written on December 24, 1860 Reproduced from the newspaper
First published in the New-York Daily
Tribune, No. 6152, January 12, 1861
FROM THE PREPARATORY MATERIALS
Karl Marx

[EXTRACTS FROM IMRE SZABÓ'S WORK THE STATE POLICY OF MODERN EUROPE, FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY TO THE PRESENT TIME. IN TWO VOLUMES, LONDON, 1857]359

[Volume I]

1) 1520-1559. Francis I and Charles V

(1523. Dissolution of the Union of Calmar360; Gustavus Vasa elected king of Sweden.)

1520. Charles (V) crowned emperor at Aix-la-Chapellea (master of Burgundy, Spain, Sicily, Naples and Navarre and Austria (since Maximilian I's death in 1519)).

Milan, claimed by Louis XII by the right of his grandmother, of the family of Visconti, conquered by Francis I in 1515 from the Sforzas; now claimed by Charles as a fief of the Empire. Francis also revived the claims of France to Naples and Burgundy. Thus commenced a 14 years' war, apparently for the sake of Milan. Henry VIII in the Austrian alliance. French (after defeat of Bicocco) forced by a Spanish army to abandon the Duchy of Milan. Rome, Venice, Florence and Genoa enter the Austrian alliance. Francis I without an ally; Charles Bourbon (the Constable) goes over to Charles.

Second French campaign (in Italy) under General Bonnivet. The French routed. Charles Bourbon enters the Provence. English prepare to invade Picardy. Francis drives the invaders out of the French territory, reconquers the Duchy of Milan (after the battle of Marignano).

1525. Francis beaten before Pavia, carried away prisoner to Madrid. Coalition against Charles—the small states of Italy, new pope (Clement VII), Henry VIII, Louise of Savoy (the regent of France, Francis' mother). 1526. Francis accepts Madrid peace to get free.

League between Francis, Pope, Venice, Milan, Florence, Henry VIII361.

Bourbon with the Imperialists drives Sforza from Milan, sacks Rome. Francis and Henry VIII declare war to Charles.


Charles checked by the Lutheran princes of Germany and the arms of Soliman. Ottomans occupy almost the whole of Hungary, of which Ferdinand, the brother of Charles, endeavoured to possess himself. Soliman advances to the walls of Vienna.

---

a Aachen.— Ed.
b Bicocca.— Ed.
c Francesco II.— Ed.
1529. Treaty of Cambray (traité des dames). Francis again renounces his claims to Milan, Naples, and Flanders. As to Burgundy, one chief point of the quarrel, only temporary arrangement: the marriage of Francis with Eleonora of Portugal, Charles' sister, being again stipulated.

Charles turns upon the Lutherans. The princes now [have] two lines of policy, with regard to home and foreign affairs: Pope even seeks the alliance of the infidels.

1530. Diet of Augsburg. Condemnatory decree against innovation. Protestants form the league of Schmalkalden, seek the aid of France and England. Francis enters upon the proposal; concludes also alliance with John Zapolya, of Hungary, the rival of Ferdinand of Austria, and sends Rincon to Constantinople, to secure the Sultan's assistance. Francis marries his son to Catherine of Medici, the pontiff's niece, while Henry VIII severs England from the see of Rome.


1535. Francis, after 6 years of peace, recommences war (third war), reappears in Italy: successful; dictates at Milan and Savoy. Charles returns victor from Algiers, drives the French from Italy, penetrates into the Provence where [he is] finally repulsed.


1544. Peace of Crespy: Francis renounces his claims to Naples and Artois; bind[s] himself not to meddle with Navarre. (Henry VIII had again turned on the part of Charles.)

1547. † Francis I; his son Henry II. Charles turns upon the league of Schmalkalden.

1547. Victory of the Imperialists through Maurice of Saxony of Mühlberg, dissolving the league. Charles proclaims the Interim. Maurice, having secured the co-operation of Henry II, surprises the Emperor in Tyrol (Charles forced 1552 to conclude the peace of Passau with the Protestants) same year in which the French poured into the Duchy of Lorraine, there to seize Metz, Toul and Verdun. Charles driven back from Metz and 1556 withdraws from the public scene, divides his dominions between his brother, Ferdinand of Austria, and his son Philip II. War in Italy and the Netherlands continues between Henry II and Philip II.

1559. Treaty of Château Cambresis. Each party was bound to restore all the conquests made since 1551. France abandoning more than 180 strong places besides Savoy. Marriage of Elizabeth, daughter of Henry II, to Philip II. Henry II †.

This (the reign of Charles V) the period of Habsburg supremacy proper. France is the first to attack it, but supported by Lutherans in Germany, Soliman, Hungary (Zapolya) and the Pope (Clément), also by the jealousy of the small Italian states.

II) 1559-1618. The Netherlands and Philip II


---

*a* Janos Zápolya.— *Ed.

*b* Henry II.— *Ed.

*c* Hadher Barbarossa.— *Ed.

*d* Cateau-Cambrésis.— *Ed.*
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1579. Union of Utrecht.

Elizabeth in England. 1562 (after treaty of Elizabeth with Protestants in France) treaty with Charles IX (of France). In this treaty comprehended Ferdinand (Emperor) and Philip II.

1572. Massacre of St. Bartholomew.

Till 1585 the Netherlands left to themselves. 1585. Alliance treaty of Elizabeth with the Netherlands.

1589. Henry III, the last of the Valois, murdered. Henry of Navarre (Henry IV).

1593. Alliance at the Hague between Elizabeth and Henry IV; Netherlands included in it.

1598. Peace of Vervins between Henry IV and Philip II (mutual restitution of the conquests since 1559). This peace proclaimed the \textit{wan}e of Spanish preponderance (in the same year Edict of Nantes). Philip II \textdagger. Philip III. (1588. Destruction of the Armada.) Death of Elizabeth. James I.

1609. Treaty between Henry and Spain for the cessation of hostilities with the United Provinces (form of a truce of 12 years; in fact, an acknowledgment of the independence of the Low Countries). (The Spanish branch of the Habsburgs still maintained its sway over Italy and had acquired Portugal in 1581).

Henry IV's plan for the remodelling of Europe (abasement of Austria). \textsuperscript{368} Provisions: \textit{Italy: Pope secular Prince (Rome, Naples, Apulia, Calabria under him; Venice (Republic; united with Florence, Modena, a few other small states); Duke of Savoy (to become king of Lombardy).}

\textit{Bohemia} (elective kingdom; to be annexed to it Moravia, Silesia, Lusatia\textsuperscript{a}). \textit{Hungary} (annexed to it the arch-duchy of Austria, Styria, Carinthia). \textit{Poland} also to be aggrandized. \textit{Switzerland} (to be added to it Tyrol, Alsace, and other territories). \textit{Netherlands} (to be republic).

\textit{The House of Austria} to be reduced to Spain and a few islands off the coast of the Mediterranean. 

\textdagger Henry IV 1610.

(This period [witnesses the] downfall of the older branch of the Habsburgs.)

III) 1618-1648. (Thirty Years War)

1617. Treaty between Gustav Adolphus and Michael Feodorowich (first Romanoff). Sweden confirmed in the possession of Carelia, Kexholm\textsuperscript{b} and Ingria.\textsuperscript{c} Muscovite excluded from the Gulf of Finland and the Baltic. Adolphus rendered himself master (against Poland) of Livonia and Polish Prussia. End of the 16th century extinction of the Jagellon dynasty.

Hungary and Bohemia now under the Habsburgs: the former aided, and, at the same time, dogged by Turkey in its attempts to throw off the Habsburgs.

Under Ferdinand I, Maximilian, Rudolph II (filling the XVI\textsuperscript{th} century) Austria takes no part in the wars between Spain and France; appeases the Sultans with tributes and vies for Hungary.

1606. Hungary pacified by the \textit{treaty of Vienna} (Rudolph II). Transylvania's (This period [witnesses the] downfall of the older branch of the Habsburgs.)

\textsuperscript{a} Region in the middle reaches of the Elbe, Spree and Neisse rivers, inhabited by the West Slavonic tribe of Lusatians.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} Prizorsk.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{c} The Izhora land subject to Novgorod.—\textit{Ed.}
independence acknowledged. Turkey checked by Abbas, Shah of Persia; arrested her progress to Europe.

Accession of Ferdinand II (archduke of Styria).

1618 commencement of the troubles in Bohemia. Bohemians offer the crown to Frederick V (elector of the Palatinate); his ally Bethlen a (prince of Transylvania).

28 Aug. 1619. Ferdinand II elected emperor of Germany, concludes alliance with Maximilian of Bavaria, Spain, Pope, b and Mary de Medicis (in the minority of Louis XIII, married to Anne, daughter of Philip III). (Duke of Angoulême 1620 concludes for France treaty with Ferdinand II at Ulm.) Philip III. Philip IV. Protestants in Germany [find an] ally in Christian IV of Denmark; Wallenstein's army. Beginning of the war. Prince of Wales married with Henrietta of France. c

1624. Richelieu's entrance into office.

1625. Richelieu makes war on Spain by occupying the Valtelina. Charles I (in England).

1626. Bethlen forced to make peace with Ferdinand II. Denmark (participating in the war from 1625) forced to make a separate peace with Ferdinand II (1629).

1629. Ferdinand II's decree of Restitution. La Rochelle surrenders to Richelieu.

1629. Richelieu mediates peace between Sweden and Poland. Gustavus Adolphus (with the promise of subsidies of France) lands an army in Pomerania.


(1629, after the death of Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua, Charles, Duke of Nevers, and Ferdinand of Guastalla pretenders to it. Former supported by France, latter by Austria. French army forces the pass of Susa, confirms Nevers.)

1632. Battle of Lützen. Gustav Adolphus+

1634. Defeat of the Swedes at Nördlingen. Direct participation of France in the war of Germany. France takes possession of Alsace, after its fortified places were given up to the French by their Swedish allies. New league with the Netherlands set on foot by Richelieu. Elector of Saxe goes over to the Emperor: peace of Prague. 

War simultaneously recommenced in Spain, Italy, the Netherlands, on the Rhine and the Danube. Richelieu invades Spain. (1635) Marshals Châtillon and Brézé entered the Netherlands; Créqui, in unison with the Duke of Savoy, in Italy; Guébriant and Turenne cooperate with the Swedes on the Rhine, another body penetrates into Spain.

Austria and Spain on the one side; France, Sweden, and the Netherlands on the other the principals.

1637. Ferdinand II+ Ferdinand III Emperor.

1640. Fresh war in Hungary about to commence by George Rakoczy, Prince of Transylvania, in alliance with France and Sweden; the latter (France) ditto with the Catalonians, where a rise [takes place]. Revolution in Portugal; expulsion of the Spaniards. Emperor assured by a truce with the Turks, then masters of the half of Hungary. Victories of the French army in Italy, Spain, Flanders, on the Rhine.

---

a Gábor Bethlen.— Ed.
b Paul V.— Ed.
c Henrietta Maria.— Ed.
d Vincenzo II Gonzaga.— Ed.
e Johann Georg I.— Ed.
f Victor Amadeus I.— Ed.
g György I Rákóczy.— Ed.
4 December 1642. Richelieu †. 1643. Louis XIII †. Mazarin (Anne’s of Spain Regency).376

1645. Assembling of the Plenipotentiaries at Münster (chiefly there treated the affairs of Sweden and the Protestants), and Osnabruck* (the affairs of France principally).377 (155 negotiators.) (Savoy ally of France.) Circular of the French ambassador: “the interests of France identical with German liberty”. Victories by French and Swedes.

“The Hollanders no more feared their hereditary enemies, the Spaniards, but the French, their ancient allies, now the object of their distrust” (Bougeantb). “They (the Hollanders) insensibly came to the conviction that security consisted in having the Spaniards as a barrier against France” (l.c.). Preliminary agreement between the Spanish and Dutch ambassadors.

1648. Victories of the Swedes. Ratification of peace between Spain and Holland.378

October 1648. Peace. (Spain excluded from it.)

France obtained: Upper and Lower Alsace, Brisac, right of keeping a garrison in Philipburg, the three bishoprics of Metz, Toul and Verdun. Sweden received Higher Pomerania, Stettin, Gortz, etc., port of Wismar; bishoprics of Verden and Bremen, with vote in the German diet. Brandenburg, Mecklenburg, Hanover, Hesse, etc., compensated chiefly by ecclesiastical property. (Pignerol,d formerly belonging to Savoy, [turned over] to France.) In Italy Austria confirmed in Milan and Tuscany. Acknowledged independence of Holland and Switzerland (de facto since 1315).

With reference to religion all settled on the basis of the peace of Passau and Augsburg (1552 and 1556). Emperor grants general amnesty to the empire, except his own provinces.

(Bohemia forgotten.)379

Weakening of the younger house of Austria.

IV) 1648-1660. Gallo-Spanish War.

Peace of the Pyrenees

Cromwell.

1654. War in Flanders between Mazarin and Spain.
1654. Peace between England and Holland.380
1657. † Ferdinand III. 1658 Leopold Emperor. Cromwell †.
1657. Coalition against Sweden of Denmark, Poland, Muscovy, Austria. (Charles Gustavus king of Sweden.) His only ally: Prince Rakoczy of Transylvania.
1659. Conferences between Mazarin and Don Louis de Haro, on the island of Pheasants (in the river of Bidasoa). Marriage between Louis XIV and Maria

---

*a Osnaburg.— Ed.
b Guillaume Hyacinthe Bougeant, Histoire du traité de Westphalie, ou des négociations qui se firent à Münster et à Osnabrüg, pour établir la paix entre toutes les puissances de l’Europe, Paris, 1751.— Ed.
c Breisach.— Ed.
d Pinerolo.— Ed.
Theresa, daughter of Philip IV (entire renunciation on the part of the Infanta). Treaty of the Pyrenees.\textsuperscript{381} France gets in the Low Countries the county of Arras, several places in Flanders, Hainault and the Duchy of Luxemburg. On the Pyrenees Roussillon and Conflans,\textsuperscript{3} Duke of Lorraine bound to allow a military passage to France.

March 1661 Mazarrón.\textsuperscript{†}

1654. Queen Christina resigns in favour of Charles X (son of the sister of Gustav Adolphus).\textsuperscript{b} He is allied with the elector of Brandenburg,\textsuperscript{c} invades Poland. Then league of Denmark with Muscovy, Holland against him. 1660 he compels the Danes to peace, gets Scania,\textsuperscript{d} Oeland,\textsuperscript{e} several places on the island of Rügen, exemption from the Sound Duties.\textsuperscript{382} 1660 Charles X \textsuperscript{†}; his son, Charles XI, succeeds. Renews treaty with Denmark, makes peace of Oliva\textsuperscript{383} with Poland, which cedes to him Livonia, Estonia, and Oesel. 1661 peace with Muscovy on the status quo ante bellum.

"Thus did Sweden confirm its preponderance in the north, at the very moment when France became all-powerful in the south and west of Europe."

V) 1660-1697. Wars of Louis XIV. Peace of Ryswick

Restoration in England.

Dunkirk sold to Louis XIV by Charles II. War between England and Holland. England by De Ruyter and Tromp forced to peace of Breda (1667). (Louis XIV acted in this war with Holland.) Louis XIV assists Portugal against Spain.

1665. Philip IV of Spain (Louis XIV’s father-in-law)\textsuperscript{†}. Carlos II (scarcely 4 years old, his son). (Philip IV’s 2nd daughter\textsuperscript{f} consort of the Emperor Leopold.) Louis XIV lays claim by the “right of devolution”\textsuperscript{384} to the Spanish Netherlands.

1667. Louis XIV (Turenne) conquers greatest part of the Spanish Netherlands.

1668 (winter) subdues Franche-Comté.

January 23, 1668. Triple Alliance between England, Holland and Sweden. France was to relinquish its conquests in the Spanish Netherlands or Franche-Comté.

May 1668. Louis XIV at Aix-la-Chapelle peace with Spain (retains his conquests in the Netherlands, relinquishes Franche-Comté).


1672. French invasion of Holland.

1673. Charles forced to abandon the French alliance. Coalition of Spain, the Emperor,\textsuperscript{g} Brandenburg, Holland, Denmark against France. Sweden her only ally. Theatre of war from Holland transferred to the Spanish Netherlands and the German frontiers.

1675. Negotiations commence at Nimeguen,\textsuperscript{h} where:

10 August 1678. Separate treaty between Louis XIV and Holland. September 1678 Spain made peace. Abandons Franche-Comté for the restitution of some

\textsuperscript{a} Albertville.— Ed.
\textsuperscript{b} Catherine.— Ed.
\textsuperscript{c} Frederick William.— Ed.
\textsuperscript{d} Malmöhus.— Ed.
\textsuperscript{e} Halland.— Ed.
\textsuperscript{f} Margarita Theresa.— Ed.
\textsuperscript{g} Leopold 1.— Ed.
\textsuperscript{h} Nijmegen.— Ed.
places in the Spanish Netherlands. Finally Leopold makes peace; Louis stipulates with Denmark, Brunswick, Brandenburg for the restitution to Sweden of the conquests made upon her during the war. Louis XIV triumphs at the coast of Sicily over the united fleets of Holland and Spain. But the peace of Nimeguen did not settle Louis' right over a few towns in Alsace.

1681. Chamber of Reunion in Metz. Emperor tries to make war; but war with Hungary and Turkey; 1684 makes peace with Louis XIV at Ratisbonne.

1686. League between Holland, Austria, Savoy, Brandenburg.


1689. Declaration of war against France by Holland, England, Spain, and Austria. (Separate treaty between Holland, England and the Emperor in May 1689.) (Emperor or his heirs shall be assisted in taking the eventual succession of the Spanish Monarchy. His son, Joseph, king of Hungary, shall be elected Emp. of Germany.) (France to be reduced to the terms of the treaties of Westphalia and the Pyrenees.)

August 1696. Separate peace at Turin between Louis XIV and Victor Amadeus of Savoy. Pigneron given up to Savoy.


VI) 1697-1715. War of the Spanish Succession.

Peace of Utrecht

October 11, 1698. Partition treaty (of Spain) at the Hague between Louis XIV and William III. (Two Sicilies, Tuscany, Guipuscoa allotted to the Dauphin. Milan to archduke Charles, 2nd son of the emperor. Spain and its other possessions to the Elector of Bavaria and his heirs.)

February 1698. † the Elector of Bavaria.

March 11, 1700. Second Partition Scheme between William and Louis.
(Dauphin to receive, besides the dominions in the 1st treaty, Lorraine, for which Milan to the Duke of Lorraine. All the other dominions of the Spanish crown to the Archduke Charles.)

1699. Peace of Carlowitz between the Porte, Austria, Venice, and Poland.

1700. League between Czar Peter, Poland and Denmark against Sweden, defeat of the Russians at Narva by Charles XII.


---

a Regensburg.—Ed.
b Marx took this from the chronological table at the end of Szabó's book, p. 384.—Ed.
c Louis.—Ed.
d Joseph Ferdinand.—Ed.
e Philip of Anjou (Philip V).—Ed.
f Ferdinando Carlo, Gonzaga di.—Ed.
February 1701. Louis XIV marches troops into the Spanish Netherlands which he forces the Dutch garrisons to evacuate; letter patent by which he acknowledges the right of Philip to succeed to the throne of France.  

September 1701. Second Great Alliance.  

James II †. Louis XIV acknowledges the Pretender.  

William †. Partial war between Austria and France in Italy.  

1702. Queen Anne renews the alliance. May. War against France declared by England, Holland, Emperor. (Portugal, Hanover, Prussia accede) (also) several of the smaller German states. (Bavaria, Brunswick, Cologne, Duke of Savoy for Louis XIV.)  

1704. Gibraltar captured by the English.  

1706. victory of Ramillies (Marlborough). Civil war in Hungary.  

1707. Charles XII in Saxony.  

(Hungary in war against Austria since 1703.)  

1709. Battle of Pultava. Charles XII to Turkey.  

1710. Declarations of war by the Porte to Russia.  

1711. Peace of the Pruth between Turkey and Russia. Preliminaries of Peace between England and France.  

April 1711. † Emperor Joseph. The Archduke Charles, his son, heir to all his dominions.  

In the preliminaries (between England and France):  

Dunkirk demolished; Gibraltar and Port Mahon, Newfoundland and Hudson Bay for England.  

January 12, 1712. General Congress opened at Utrecht. (Philip renounces his claims to France.) (Duke of Berry and Duke of Orleans renounce their claims to Spain.)  

April 1713. Peace of Utrecht concluded between England, France, Spain and Holland. France ceded to England, besides the above, her possessions in the island of St. Christopher, Nova Scotia, Port Royal. In the name of Spain Louis ceded Upper Guelder to Prussia, acknowledged the king-title of Frederick I, and his sovereignty over Neufchatel. Savoy received Sicily and the right of succession [to the] throne, in default of the issue of Philip V. Frontier between France and Savoy the summits of the Alps. Holland obtains a commercial treaty and the exchange of a few places. April 11, 1713. Commercial treaty between France and England.  

1711. Hungary pacified by the treaty of Szatmar. Czar Peter promised to assist him with 30,000 men, if allowed to keep Livonia as a fief of the German empire. Short campaign, France on the Rhine superior to Austria.  

Sept. 7, 1714. Peace of Baden between France and Austria. France acknowledges the right of the Emperor to Naples, Milan, Tuscany, Spanish Netherlands; restores Brisac and Fribourg. Electors of Bavaria and Cologne to be restored to their states.  

1715. New league against Sweden joined by George I and Prussia.  

Philip V not yet acknowledged by Austria. Not until 1715 treaty between Holland and Austria, which concedes Holland a few places in the Spanish Netherlands, in addition to the right of garrisoning several other places.  

1 September 1715. Louis XIV †.
VII) 1715-1721

George I [and] Duke of Orleans united in league against Spain. (Alberoni.)

1699. Peace of Carlowitz. Peter gets Azov; abandonment of all Hungary to Austria save the Banat; Morea rendered back to Venice; Podolia and Ukraine to Poland.

Under the treaty between England (Hanover), Prussia, Poland (Saxony) and Denmark, the Czar received the Baltic provinces; Prussia Stettin and dependencies, August of Saxony rex Poloniae Courland, Hanover Bremen-Verden, Denmark the island of Rügen with a part of Swedish Pomerania. 1719. Aaland conferences opened on April 24.391 Agreed in Aaland isles that: Czar assists Charles XII to recover from Prussia Stettin and the part of Pomerania occupied by Prussian troops. Czar assists Sweden with 20,000 men for carrying on the war in Germany, and assists Charles to acquire Norway as indemnity for the Baltic provinces ceded to Russia. Czar assists Charles to gain back Bremen and Verden from George I, etc.

(also Restoration of Stuarts).


(Treaty of Stockholm, November 1, 1719.)

Treaty of Nystadt (in Finland), August 30, 1721. (Sweden cedes Livonia, Esthonia, Ingrina, part of Carelia, district of Wiborg, islands Oesel, Dago, Moen, and the other islands off the coasts of the said provinces. Czar restores Finland except a part, to be determined at the regulation of the frontiers.) 392

(Under the peace of Stockholm Schleswig fell to Denmark. Peter marries his daughter Anne to Duke of Holstein, b takes up his "rights". Originally, he in alliance with Denmark against this Duke.)

"Transformation of the north of Europe, based on the dismemberment of Sweden."

VIII) 1715-1740. General Embroilment of Europe

War between Spain and Austria in Italy. Austria supported by England. War of England and France against Spain.

Alberoni sent into exile.

January 1720. Spain accedes to the Quadruple Alliance. 393 Sicily made over to the Emperor. c Savoy receives Sardinia in exchange for it. Parma, Placentia, d Tuscany promised, on the death of the last Medici, e to Don Carlos, son of Philip V by his second wife, Elizabeth of Parma.

---

a Marx put this paragraph after the words "1719. Aaland conferences opened on April 24". The editors have transferred it to maintain the chronological order.— Ed.
b Charles I.— Ed.
c Charles VI.— Ed.
d Piacenza.— Ed.
e Cosimo III.— Ed.
1724. Congress of Cambray (England, France, Spain, and Austria).
1725. Secret treaties between Spain and Austria. Counter-treaty of Hanover. 394
1728. (Opened 14 June) Congress of Soissons.
1729. Peace of Seville between Spain, England and France.
1731. Treaty of Vienna between Austria, England and Holland. Death of king Augustus.

September 1733. Stanislaus Leszinsky proclaimed king of Poland. Russia (ruled by Anne since 1730) with Austria (Karl VI) are for the son a of the deceased king, who promised the emperor the guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction, 395 and to the Czarina not to reclaim Courland, formerly a fief of Poland. War about the crown of Poland. France attacks Austria.

Marshal Berwick operates on the Rhine. Another French army, under Villars, crosses the Alps, and, joined by Charles Emanuel of Sardinia, drove the Austrians from Milan. Shortly afterwards Don Carlos (of Spain) (son of Elizabeth) penetrated into Naples and Sicily, where he was proclaimed king, dispersing (with the aid of the population, exasperated at the tyranny of the Austrian rule) the whole imperial army; and there was soon nothing left in Italy in Austrian hands, save the fortress of Mantua. Only 1,500 French troops sent to Danzig.

1735. Peace of Vienna (October) between France and Austria. (August III of Saxony shall be king of Poland. Stanislaus, with the kingly title, receives the Duchies of Lorraine and Bar, to revert after his death to France. Don Carlos retains Naples, Sicily, and the Austrian coast of Tuscany.) The Duke of Lorraine receives in exchange for his hereditary dominions the possession of Tuscany. Sardinia shall receive Novara, Tortona, and a few other places in the Milanese. Parma and Piacenza to be given to the Emperor. All the other conquests made by the allied armies to be restored. Guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction by France, Spain, the maritime powers and Russia. (Marie Therese, the Emperor’s daughter, marries Francis of Lorraine. b)

1736. Russo-Austrian war against the Porte. Russians invade the Crimea. Munich takes Perekop, lays waste the southern part of the peninsula.

1737. Munich takes Oczakow. Gen. Lascy (Russ) again penetrates into the Crimea. Congress of Niemirov. Russia demanded: 1) the abolition of all former treaties; 2) cession of the Crimea, the Kuban, and the other Tartar provinces; 3) independence of the Danubian provinces, under the protectorate of Russia; 4) Czar to be acknowledged (his title as Emperor); 5) free navigation in the Euxine, c the Bosphorus, the Hellespont, and the Mediterranean.

Austria asked large territories beyond the Danube, including Belgrade, Widdin, several portions of Moldavia and Wallachia.

1739. Peace of Belgrade: Everything restituted to the Porte except Azov. Further: The Porte remained in the possession of Belgrade, Orsova, and the disputed parts of Wallachia and Bosnia. (Never had Hungary had a better opportunity for recovering her independence. Rakoczy, ex-prince of Transylvania, in Turkey together with anti-Austrian Hungarian chiefs.)

War in India d between Spain and England. English declaration of war against Spain. e

---

a Augustus III.— Ed.
b Francis Stephen (Francis I).— Ed.
c The Black Sea.— Ed.
d Szabó has “in the Indies”. This refers to the West Indies.— Ed.
e Marx took this sentence from the chronological table at the end of Szabó’s book, p. 386.— Ed.
1740. † Frederick William I, of Prussia; † Emperor Charles VI; † Anna of Russia.

1713-1740. Barren unison of France with England. Pitiable state of Sweden, divided into Hat (French) and Bonnet (Russian) parties, the latter of which soon gained the ascendency.

IX) 1740-1763. Austrian Succession War. 
Seven Years War

1740. Invasion of Silesia by Frederick II.

1741. Treaty of Nymphenburg, based on the partition of Austria (between France, Elector of Bavaria,a Spain, August III (of Saxony and Poland), and Prussia). Habsburg saved by Hungarian enthusiasm, and the treacherous policy and half measure of Cardinal Fleury. 1741 (spring). Fred. II marches into Moravia. Sardinia, subsequently gained over to the other side, prepares for the invasion of Milan.

1742. England declares for Austria. June 11 peace at Breslau between Frederick and Austria (he gets Lower Silesia). War between France and Austria goes on in Germany and Italy. Frankfurt (1742) Charles VII (Bavaria) crowned Emperor.

To prevent Russia from rendering aid to Maria Theresa, French bring about a Russo-Swedish war; soon ended to Russia's profit. 1743 peace of Abo; Sweden to cede different places in Finland; to designate, at the behest of the Czarinab, the Duke of Holstein Gottorpc successor to the Swedish crown.

1743. Peace of Abo; Sweden to cede different places in Finland; to designate, at the behest of the Czarina, the Duke of Holstein Gottorp, successor to the Swedish crown.

1745. Treaty of Warsaw between England, Saxony and Austria against Frederick.

(1743. Treaty of Worms between Austria, England and Sardinia.) Frederick again enters the French alliance.

(1744. Spring. France and England declare war against each other.)

1745 (December). Peace of Dresden between Frederick and Austria: renewal of the treaty of Breslau, by which Frederick retained Silesia, promising his vote to Francis of Lorraine, consort of Maria Theresa. Emperor Charles Albert of Bavaria had died, his son ed had made peace with Maria Theresa. (This the second separate Austro-Prussian peace.)

This peace enabled Maria Theresa to send large reinforcements to Italy where Milan, Parma and Piacenza had fallen into the hands of the Gallo-Spanish armies; scale turned.


---

a Charles VII (Charles Albert).—Ed.
b Elizabeth (Petrovna).—Ed.
c Adolphus Frederic.—Ed.
d Marx put this after the words “1745 (December). Peace of Dresden between Frederick and Austria”. The editors have transferred it in accordance with Marx’s marginal notes.—Ed.
e Maximilian III Josef.—Ed.
f Maurice von Saxe.—Ed.
1748. October. Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle which Maria Theresia could not but accept. Restitution of conquests by France and England. France gave up for Cape Breton the places in the Netherlands, and restored to England Madras; dispute about the frontiers in Canada left for subsequent decision. Parma, Piacenza, Gustalla\(^a\) given to Don Philip and his male heirs. Sardinia remains in status quo, Assiento treaty for England prolonged for 4 years, guarantee of the English succession, expulsion of the Stuarts from France. Guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction, confirmation of Lower Silesia to Frederick II. Germs of the new war the pending differences between France and England.


1754. War recommences between France and England in America; dispute about the boundaries of Nova Scotia, or Acadia, ceded to England in the Utrecht treaty\(^b\): building of French forts along the Ohio, occupation by the French of the neutral islands of the Antilles, Tobago, St. Vincent, St. Lucia.

January 1756. Anglo-Prussian treaty of Westminster. Against it Gallo-Austrian defensive alliance of Versailles (May 1756). At the same time negotiations between Austria, Saxony, and (Elizabeth) Russia. June 1756. Capture of Fort Mahon by the French. Frederick defeats the Saxons at Pirna (surrender of 18,000 men) (autumn 1756).

1757 (winter). Austria, France, Russia, Sweden, and several “circles” of Germany collect force of 400,000 men against Frederick. Spring 1757 Fred. beats the Austrians at Prague; beaten by Daun at Collin,\(^b\) forced to retreat to Saxony. Defeat of the Hanovero-Hessian troops by Richelieu,\(^b\) (Convention at Closter Seven, by which Duke of Cumberland bound to disband the Han. Hess. troops.) Frederick persuades Richelieu to inaction, while he falls upon Soubise and the Germans under Prince Hildburghausen. November 5 his victory at Rosbach, while Richelieu remained inactive in his quarters at Halberstadt. Then to Silesia. Victory at Lissa.\(^c\)

1758. Accession of Pitt (Lord Chatham) to the head of affairs.

December 1758. Second Gallo-Austrian treaty at Versailles. Louis XV engages to subsidise the Swedes, to maintain 100,000 army (French) in Germany, and to maintain also the Saxon army—Silesia and Glatz to be restituted to the empress,\(^d\) the Rhenish provinces to be conquered from Prussia, to be ceded to Austria, the revenues, however, during the time of war, to be given to France. France forgot her maritime war,\(^d\) to fight the battles of Austria.

1759. Defeat of Prussians at Hochkirchen.

1759-60. English victorious in the East Indies, in America (capture of Quebec by Wolfe, hence, the conquest of Canada) and in the West Indies. Choiseul in Austria's interest.


January 1762. † Elizabeth of Russia. Peter III emperor. The propositions made to the Czar by Lord Bute, through the Russian minister, Prince Golitsin, to reduce Prussia to peace on any conditions, declined.

(Fred. II informed of these despatches by Peter III.)

Bute's secret negotiations with Austria for the dismemberment of Prussia met with no better success.

\(^a\) Gustalla.—Ed.
\(^b\) Kolin.—Ed.
\(^c\) Maria Theresa.—Ed.
February 1763. Peace between England, France, Spain at Paris. England received Nova Scotia, Canada, Cape Breton, while France a share in the fisheries of Newfoundland. Mississippi declared the boundary between Louisiana and the British settlements. France yielded to England, in the West Indies, Grenada and the neutral islands of St. Vincent, Domingo, Tobago. In Africa the English restored Gorea, retained Senegal; Menorca restored to England. France recovered her small possessions in the East Indies, but engaged to maintain no troops in Bengal. Spain gave up to England Florida, confirms her right to cut logwood in the bay of Honduras, but Spain replaced in Cuba and Havana. Portugal in the status quo ante bellum.

Peace at Hubertusburg between Fred. and Austria (nothing else than a confirmation of the peace at Breslau and Dresden). (Fred. engages to give his vote for Archduke Joseph, son of Maria Theresa, at the pending election of the king of the Roumans.) No territorial change in Europe after the 7 years' war.

If Frederick raised Prussia to the rank formerly occupied by Sweden (since the peace of Westphalia), he is prudent enough to profit by, but too weak to arrest, the progress of Muscovite ambition. Fred. II had no great political plan. Silesia his whole and single idea.

The distinctive character of this period the decline of France. In the first war the alliances of France with Frederick, twice thrown overboard by him, failed to wrest the German sceptre from dilapidated Austria. In the second war, France, allied with that same Austria, Saxony, Sweden and Russia, failed even to dispossess Frederick of Silesia.

X) 1763-1774. Partition of Poland.

Peace of Kainardji

Augustus III, Saxon king of Poland, † June 1762. Catherine usurps throne of Russia. Catherine and Frederick declare for Poniatowski. Defensive alliance between them, contains secret clause not to permit any changes in the anomalous constitution of Poland.

1764. Russian troops march into Poland. September enthrone Poniatowski. Russian minister at Warsaw real president of the assemblies of Poland. Catherine declares for the dissidents (Greeks and Protestants), also supported by England and Sweden, as the guarantees of the peace of Oliva.

Diet of 1767. Prince Repnin, the Russian ambassador, assumes the part of a dictator. Polish Confederacy of Bar (in Podolia). War with the Russians; the remnant of the Bar confederates driven into the dominions of the Porte, excited by France to mingle in the Russo-Polish war. At the end of 1768 or the beginning of 1769 the Sultan throws the Russian Ambassador in the 7 towers.

1770. Russo-Turkish war.

(Corsica sold to France by Genoa.)

---

a Dominica.—Ed.
b See this volume, p. 517.—Ed.
c Nikolai Vasilyevich Repnin.—Ed.
d Mustafa III.—Ed.
e Alexei Mikhailovich Obreskov.—Ed.
f Marx took this from the chronological table at the end of Szabó's book, p. 386.—Ed.
g Marx put this after the words "1772. Partition of Poland". The editors have transferred it in accordance with the way the material is presented in Szabó's book.—Ed.
1772. Partition of Poland. By the partition Prussia obtained West Prussia (600,000 souls; master of the Vistula, the inlets and outlets of Polish commerce); Catherine: Lithuania and the country between the rivers Dvina and Dnieper (1,800,000 souls); Austria: Lodomeria, Galicia, and other parts surrounding Hungary (3,000,000 souls).

July 1774. (Peace of Kainardji.) (Independence of the Crimea.) Azov, Kinburn, Kertch, Yenikale for Russia, etc. The right of Russia to make verbal applications at Constantinople, in behalf of Moldavia and Wallachia.

Austria obtains the Bukovina part of Moldavia (Austria, the ally of Turkey).

XI) 1774-1783. American War of Independence.  
*Peace of Paris*

1763. Rigorous regulations (British) to prevent smuggling; stamp duty.  
1773. Boston demonstration (ship-cargoes with tea thrown into the sea). 
December 1776. (Franklin arrives in France.)  
6 February 1778. Treaty between France and the revolted Colonies.  
April 1778. French fleet under Count d’Estaing with a considerable land force sets sail for America. 
Joseph (of Austria) attempts to annex Lower Bavaria (after the death of the Elector Maximilian Joseph) to Austria. 

Potato war.  
He tries also to open by force of arms the free navigation of the Scheldt.

1779. Spain joins with France in the war against England.  
1780. Russia proclaims the Armed Neutrality.  
May 1784. Peace between England and Holland.

XII) 1783-1790. Final annexation of the Crimea to the Russian Empire

Austria in alliance with Russia, ready to share in the spoil.  
1790. Prusso-Turkish Alliance. ... Congress of Reichenbach (entire conciliation of Prussia and Austria). ... Peace of Werila (on the basis of the status quo) between Sweden and Russia. ... Discontent of the Hungarians and Belgians. ... Peace of Szistova between Austria and Turkey. ... Peace of Jassy (between Russia and Turkey).

Austria, since the days of Charles V, was never able either to conquer, or to recover, a single province.

[Volume II]

Ia) 1790-1796

1792 (April 20). French declaration of war against Austria.

---


b Marx took this item from the chronological table at the end of Szabó’s book, p. 386.— *Ed.*

c Item taken by Marx from Szabó’s chronological table (ibid., p. 387). — *Ed.*
1792 (July 25, Coblenz). Brunswick's proclamation.
1793, 21 January. Louis Capet executed.
1793, 25 March. Convention of Pitt with Russia, followed by treaties of alliance and subsidies with Sardinia, Spain, the Bourbon Princes of Italy, Prussia, Austria, Portugal, and several petty states of Germany

(against France).

1st Coalition. (While sending his troops into the heart of France, the Prussian king\(^a\) plotted with Catherine a second partition of Poland.)

July 1793. Second partition of Poland. Prussia: Danzig and Thorn.

(The new constitution of Poland had been proclaimed May 3, 1791.) (Throne hereditary.) (Russian campaign in Poland 1792.) (Convention between Prussia and Russia of St. Petersburg, January 23, 1793. Prussians enter Poland. Russia got nearly the half of Lithuania (the Palatinate of Podolia, Polotsk and Minsk, the half of Novogrodek,\(^b\) Brest, Volhynia) (3 millions of inhabitants).\(^c\)

Catherine vehemently inveigled against France, keeping her forces at home. April 1794. (Subsidiary agreement between Prussia and England.)


3 January 1795. Separate Declaration of Petersburg between Austria and Russia (relating to the division). October 24, 1795. Prussia signs with Austria the convention of Petersburg. Cracow for Austria. Russia obtained the remainder of Poland and Lithuania as far as the Niemen, and the confines of Brest and Novogrodek, greater part of Samogitia, all of Courland and Semigalia. In little Poland that part of the territory of Chelm situated on the right bank of the Bug, and the remainder of Volhynia. (1,200,000.)

Austria [obtains], besides principal part of Cracow, Palatinate of Sandomir and Lublin, part of the district of Chelm, Palatinate of Brest, Podolactia\(^d\) and Masovia (on the left bank of the Bug) (about 1 million of souls).

Prussia part of Masovia and Podolactia on the right bank of the Bug, in Lithuania part of the Palatinate of Troki and Samogitia and small district in little Poland, part of the Palatinate of Cracow (about 1 million).

---

\(^a\) Frederick William II.—Ed.
\(^b\) Novogrudok.—Ed.
\(^c\) This paragraph is not based on Szabó's book, but on some other source.—Ed.
\(^d\) Podlachia.—Ed.
Russia hitherto the greatest gainer by the French war. The first in impressing upon England, Austria, Prussia the dangers of the revolutionary principles, Catherine pursued her separate interests, without furnishing a single Cossack or a single rouble for the “common cause”. Her few vessels sent to the assistance of England had the appearance of mockery.

5 April 1795. Basel Peace of France with Prussia. Definite and secret treaty in August. Prussia ceded her possessions on the left bank of the Rhine, to be indemnified by the secularisation of several German bishoprics. Spain follows. (France holds only Spanish part of St. Domingo. Tuscany [made] peace with France earlier on. Two powers of the Baltic neutral. England now only with Sardinia and Austria. Belgium incorporated into France. Parts of Holland ceded to France.

IIa) 1796-1801 (peace of Luneville)

April 1796. (3 consecutive battles—Bonaparte—decide the fate of Sardinia.) (France obtained Savoy, Nice and the right to occupy several fortresses.) Bonaparte in Lombardy. The colonies of the Batavian republic had fallen into the hands of Great Britain.

Catherine † 17 November 1796. 18 April 1797. Peace preliminaries at Leoben signed by Austria.

Cisalpine Republic (Modena, Ferrara, Romagna, Mantua). Ligurian republic (Genoa, etc.)

17 October 1797. Peace of Campoformio. (Austria renounces the Netherlands, consents to the acquisition of the left bank of the Rhine by France. Receives Venice and the Dalmatian part of the Venetian territory. Albania and the Venetian or Ionian islands become French.)

(May 19, 1798. Bonaparte leaves Toulon for Egypt.) (Malta Bonaparte conquers in June 1798.)


(9 October 1799. Bonaparte lands in France.)


March 23, 1801. Paul †. Alexander I.

9 February 1801. Peace of Luneville. (Rhine recognised by Austria as the boundary of France. Division of Venetian territory. Cession of Belgium to France.) (Cisalpine, Ligurian, Helvetian, Batavian republics recognised.)

---

a Marx took this from the chronological table at the end of Szabó's book.— Ed.
b Friedrich Karl Joseph, Baron of Erthal.— Ed.
c Frederick I.— Ed.
IIIa) 1801-1805

January 1802. Bonaparte president of the Italian republic.
27 March 1802. Peace of Amiens (France, England, Spain, Holland). (England retains Trinidad and Ceylon.) (Malta to be evacuated by the English, independent.) (France promises to evacuate Naples, Papal states; England all the ports and islands in the Mediterranean and Adriatic. Republic of the Ionian islands, integrity of Turkey guaranteed.)
May 18, 1803. England declares war to France.
May 18, 1804. Bonaparte Emperor. 2 December 1804 crowned by Pope.a

IVa) 1805-1807. 3d Coalition. Peace of Tilsit

Petersburg the pivot of new combinations against France.
11 April 1805. Coalition Treaty between England and Russia. (Sweden already bound to England by a treaty of December 1804, by which Stralsund was made the dépôt of the English.)

Declar. Petersburg of August 9, exchanged between Austria with England and Russia.
17 October 1805. Capitulation of Ulm. 2 December Austerlitz.
26 December 1805. Separate Peace of Pressburg (Austria and Bonaparte). (Napoleon recognised as king of Italy. Austria loses her Venetian part. Cedes Tyrol to Bavaria; other parts to Baden and Württemberg. Bavaria and Württemberg kingdoms, Baden Grand Duchy.)
January 23, 1806. Pitt †. Fox negotiates with France. Russia thwarts the peace negotiations. September 13, 1806. Fox †.

July 12, 1806 (Paris. Confederation of the Rhine, 16 German princes.)
6 August 1806. Austria resigns the title of German Emperor. (Empire at an end.)

October 14, 1806. Battle of Jena and Auerstädt.
June 14, 1807. Battle of Friedland.
July 7, 1807. Peace of Tilsit. (Warsaw and part of West Prussia given to August III (Saxony) and raised into a kingdom; East Prussia to the Czar. Secret articles: Moldavia and Wallachia to Russia, Morea and Candia to France, Continental System. Deposition of Bourbons in Spain.)

Va) 1807-1814. (Peace of Paris)

October 1808. Congress of Erfurt. Conquests of Russia in Sweden (Finland) and Turkey (Danubian Principalities).

(At the same time the Russians engaged in backstage dealings with Prussia and Austria against France.)

---

a Pius VII.—Ed.
b Marx has "Russia", probably a slip of the pen.—Ed.
c Crete.—Ed.
d The original is illegible here.—Ed.
March 1809. Austrian Manifesto calls the Tyroleans to arms. Archduke John into Italy, Ferdinand marched upon Warsaw, Charles into Bavaria.

12 May 1809. Napoleon enters Vienna. 5, 6 July Wagram. 10 Oct. Peace at Schönbrunn. (Austria cedes Carinthia, part of Tyrol, the territory of Trieste, part of Croatia, Hungarian Adriatic Coast with Fiume. King of Saxony received West Galicia; Russia another part of Austrian Poland, for her tardy and reluctant manoeuvres during the campaign, as the ally of France.) (Austria had received secret assurances of the neutrality of the Czar.)

September 1809. Peace of Russia with Sweden. (It obtained Finland and the Aaland isles.)

December 1810. Ukase issued by Russia against the principles of the Continental System.

By the end of 1811, the whole of the plots between the northern courts and the court of St. James ripe for execution. Pozzo di Borgo and Prince Lubersinski channels between Petersburg and London. Bernadotte already looked upon as a sure card. Prussia and Russia already favoured with arms and ammunition by England. General rising in Italy prepared by Pozzo.

1812. Peace of Bucharest under English mediation; acquisition by Russia of Bessarabia and part of Moldavia.

1813, February. Prusso-Russian treaty of Kalisch.

1814, April 12. Abdication of Napoleon.


VIa) May 1814 to November 1815

1 November 1814. Opening of the Congress of Vienna.
9 January 1815. Secret treaty between Austria, France, and England.
1 March 1815. Bonaparte lands in France.
June 18, 1815. Waterloo. (September 26, 1815. Holy Alliance.)

End of June 1815. Congress of Vienna ends. ("Kingdom of Poland" to Russia; part of the Duchy of Warsaw (Posen) to Prussia. Gallicia to Austria. Prussia received half of Saxony, part of Swedish Pomerania, several provinces of Westphalia, and on the left bank of the Rhine. Belgium and Luxemburg to Holland. Austria obtains (in exchange for Belgium) besides its former possessions the whole of Venice, Mantua, etc. (Modena, Tuscany and Parma for other members of the Habsburg family.) Naples restored to Ferdinand. Genoa to Piedmont. Denmark must give up Norway to Sweden. Austria gets president of the Frankfort diet. Switzerland: Valois, Neufchatel, Geneva added to it. Several settlements in the Indies, the Cape of Good Hope, Malta, the Ionian islands, Heligoland—spoils from France, Holland, Venice, the Knights of St. John and Denmark to England.)

26 September 1815. Holy Alliance.
20 November 1815. Second Paris Treaty. France obliged to give up several frontier fortresses on the side of the Rhine, Netherlands, Alps.

---

a Frederick Augustus I.—Ed.

b Marx took this sentence from the chronological table at the end of Szabó's book, p. 388.—Ed.

c Presumably this refers to Holland (see Szabó, The State Policy..., Vol. I, p. 92).—Ed.

d Ferdinand I.—Ed.

e Valais.—Ed.
VIIa) 1815-1825

October 1817. Festival of the German students at Wartburg. Burschenschaft.\(^{417}\) Abolition of the constitution (of 1812) of Sicily. Ditto of Cortes in Spain.\(^{418}\)

September 1818. Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle. Evacuation of France. The war in Portugal. War between Spain and her American colonies. Periodical meetings proposed by Metternich, to keep down the revolutionary spirit. November 15 protocol signed with relation to those meetings. Castlereagh had signed it. France also taken into the Holy Alliance; [Castlereagh] departs on command of his ministry. (Metternich, Hardenberg, Nesselrode the triumvirate.)

1819. Congress at Carlsbad under Austro-Prussian auspices; afterwards transferred to Vienna. Remodelled the German constitution. Police-Commission at Maynz.\(^{419}\) Carbonari (formed in 1809 around the throne of Emperor Francis)\(^{420}\).\(^{420}\) Pope\(^{b}\) thunders against Carbonarism and Freemasons.

January 1820. Ferdinand of Spain\(^{c}\) forced to restore the constitution of the Cortes, ditto Ferdinand king of Naples (6 July). (General William Pepe, leader of the Carbonari.)

August 1820. Proclamation issued in Lombard-Venetia by Emp. Francis I against Carbonarism.

October 1820. Congress at Troppau. Armed interference against Naples proposed by Metternich. (Dissent of Castlereagh) (who, however, “will leave Austria unembarrassed in her cause”); the congress transferred to Laybach (1821).


28 January 1823. Crown speech of Louis XVIII. Announces the intervention in Spain. Alexander I distinctly announced his resolve to aid France if attacked by England. (Metternich began to equivocate.)

Counter-revolution in Portugal. (1822 House of Braganza had granted constitution similar to that of Spain.\(^{421}\) (King John VI.) (Made counter-revolution with the aid of his son, Don Miquel and the Count Amarazda.\(^{e}\)) Canning forbids Spanish Intervention; acknowledges the independence of the American Colonies.)

December 2, 1823. Message to the American Congress of James Monroe, the President. 1825. Mexico acknowledged by Canning.

September 1824. Louis XVIII †. Charles X.

1 October 1825. Alexander I (“The White Angel” of Madame de Krüdener) †. Nicolaus.

VIIIa) 1825-1834

Mohamed II (Reformer). (Mutiny of the Janissaries, discontent of the Ulemas.\(^{422}\) defection of several Pashas.) (“Hetäria”.) (First established in Moscow.\(^{423}\) (Alexander’s Ionian minister,\(^{424}\) Capo d’Istria, chief instrument in the Greek

---

\(^{a}\) Francis I.— Ed.
\(^{b}\) Pius VII.— Ed.
\(^{c}\) Ferdinand VII.— Ed.
\(^{d}\) Johann Maria Philipp Frimont.— Ed.
\(^{e}\) Dom Miguel and Count of Amarante.— Ed.
\(^{f}\) See this volume, p. 138.— Ed.
movement.) (Ali Pasha, of Janina, gives in 1821 signal to the general rising of the Greeks.) (Alexander Ypsilanti in Wallachia first rising. Simultaneous risings in the Peloponnesus, the Archipelago, etc. Destruction of the Janissaries.)

February 1825. Ibrahim Pasha (son of Mehemet Ali) lands in Morea.

Quarrel of Turkey with Russia, before Alexander’s death.

4 April 1826. Anglo-Russian Protocol (of Petersburg) on Greece.

Treaty of Ackerman October 1826 (between Russia and Turkey). (Stipulations with regard to the Principalities and Servia.)

March 1826. King John VI of Portugal (His eldest son Don Pedro gives Portugal to his daughter Maria.) Metternich intrigues with and for the Sultan.

6th July 1827. Treaty (on Greece) signed in London by France, England, and Russia (mediation upon the belligerents).

October 20, 1827. Navarino Disaster. (Canning meanwhile.)

Spring 1828. Russian army crosses the Pruth. Occupies the Principalities. Pozzo, bosom friend of La Ferronnays, French Minister, privy to every secret communication proceeding from Vienna.


Settlement of the Greek affairs.

October 1831. Finis Poloniae.

20 January 1831. Declaration of Belgian independence.


7 May 1832. Otto of Bavaria King of Greece.

(On Metternich’s initiative reactionary measures in Germany.

IXa) 1834-1846


Ferdinand of Spain (Sir Charles Napier destroys the Miquelites squadrons at Cape St. Vincent.)

April 1834. Quadruple Alliance (England, France, Spain, Portugal).

Treaty of July 15, 1840.

6 November 1846. Cracow incorporated into Austria.

XIa) 1846-1850

Pope Pius IX. Swiss Confederation wages war [against the Sonderbund].

Revolution of February 1848.

a Moldavia and Wallachia.—Ed.

b Mahmood II.—Ed.

c Marx took this item from the chronological table at the end of Szabó’s book, p. 389.—Ed.

d See this volume, p. 148.—Ed.

e Marx omitted Chapter X (“Theories of International Law”) of Szabó’s book.—Ed.
November 1846. Pope issues order for the convocation of a “Consulta di Stato”.

Pressburg diet of 1847.

9 August 1848. Charles Albert (Sardinia) forced to buy the armistice at Solasco (lasts until mid-March 1849).


May 1848. Frankfort Assembly.


14 April 1849. Independence of Hungary proclaimed.


August 22, 1849. Venice surrenders.

1848, July. Entry of the Russians into the Principalities.

Duke of Genoa becomes king of Sicily.


March 15. The Russians expelled from Transylvania.

March 23. Defeat of the Sardinians at Novara.

April 14. Dethronisation (Hungary) of the Habsburgs.


April 1849. Treaty of Balta Liman.

April 22. French embark for Civita Vecchia.

June. Russians enter Hungary.

June 30. Rome surrenders to the French.

August 13. Surrender of the chief Hungarian corps to the Russians.

August 22. Surrender of Venice.

XIIa) 1850-1853

1850, January. Greece blockaded by the English.

May 24. Three Kings' Treaty (Prussia, Saxony, Hanover). b

October. Warsaw conferences.

December. Austro-Russian conferences at Dresden.

1851, December 2. Coup d'Etat.

1851, Russians withdraw from the principalities.

1852, December 2. French Empire proclaimed.


1852, May. Danish succession treaty.

XIIIa) 1853-56 c

Compiled in June 1860.


Printed according to the manuscript in English and German.

Published in English for the first time.

---

a Ferdinando Maria Alberto.— Ed.

b Frederick William IV, Frederick Augustus II and Ernest Augustus.— Ed.

c Here the manuscript breaks off.— Ed.
NOTES
AND
INDEXES
NOTES

1 This letter is the first document bearing on the Vogt case (see Note 12). In the spring of 1859 Karl Vogt had published his pamphlet Studien zur gegenwärtige Lage Europas (Genf und Bern, 1859) in which he put forward a Bonapartist conception of foreign policy. In June 1859, an anonymous pamphlet, Zur Warnung (A Warning), appeared in London. It was published in the London newspaper Das Volk, No. 7, June 18, 1859 under the heading Warnung zur gefälligen Verbreitung (A Warning. With a Request for Circulation—in Herr Vogt and his letters Marx refers to it as Zur Warnung) in the column “Reichsverraatherei”, and it exposed Vogt's Bonapartist intrigues and his attempts to bribe some journalists to present a Bonapartist picture of developments. As Marx shows, the pamphlet was written by Karl Blind. Wilhelm Liebknecht sent a proof sheet of Zur Warnung to the Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung (see this volume, p. 114) which published it in its No. 173 on June 22, 1859 in the article “Karl Vogt und die deutsche Emigration in London” (“Karl Vogt and the German Emigrés in London”). This induced Vogt to bring an action against the Allgemeine Zeitung.

Blind denied authorship of Zur Warnung thus making it impossible for the Allgemeine Zeitung to refute Vogt's complaint. This caused Marx to send its editors a statement by the compositor Vögele confirming Blind's authorship (see this volume, pp. 117-19).

The present letter by Marx was published by the Allgemeine Zeitung, No. 300, October 27, 1859 under the editorial heading “Prozess Vogt gegen die Redaktion der Allgemeinen Zeitung” (“Vogt's Action against the Editors of the Allgemeine Zeitung”) in the column “Neuste Posten” alongside the relevant statements by E. Biscamp, A. Vögele and W. Liebknecht. p. 3

2 The Volks-Zeitung and the Allgemeine Zeitung did not publish this statement. The Reform carried it in the Supplement to its No. 139 on November 19, 1859 under the editorial heading “Zum Prozesse von Carl Vogt contra die Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung” (“Concerning Carl Vogt's Lawsuit against the Allgemeine Zeitung”). The statement was prefaced with the following editorial note: “In view of the great interest Carl Vogt's lawsuit against the Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung has evoked everywhere, we would not deny Herr K. Marx acceptance of the following letter which casts a new light on the grave and
utterly unproved accusations made by Karl Blind against the former member of the Frankfurt Parliament.”

3 Excerpts from The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte first appeared in English in the Chartist People's Paper in “A Review of the Literature on the Coup d'état” written by Johann Georg Eccarius, a Communist League member, and published in instalments from October to December 1852 (see this edition, Vol. 11). The last part of the “Review” (The People's Paper, Nos. 32 and 33, December 11 and 18) contained passages from the first chapter of The Eighteenth Brumaire.

4 Here and below Marx refers to the book Des idées napoléoniennes written by Louis Bonaparte in England and published in Paris and Brussels in 1839.

5 Apart from the Allgemeine Zeitung, No. 325, November 21, 1859 (Supplement), this “Declaration” was published in Karl Vogt's Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung, Genf, 1859 (Dokumente, Nr. 12).

6 This declaration, published as a leaflet in London in February 1860, was repeatedly referred to by Marx as a circular because he had sent it, together with the “Declaration” of February 6, 1860 (see this volume, pp. 12-13), to a number of German newspapers. Marx translated the closing part of the circular into German and included it in the main body of his Herr Vogt (see this volume, pp. 127-28). He also included this section, in English, in the Appendix (11) to this work.

7 Besides the newspapers listed under Marx's text this “Declaration” was published in the Berlin Publicist (see Marx's letter to Engels of February 13, 1860, present edition, Vol. 41). Marx also sent copies of the “Declaration” to the National-Zeitung and the Frankfurter Journal (see his letter to Engels of February 7, 1860) but these papers did not publish it.

Die Reform printed the “Declaration” with the editorial note: “The pamphlet is headed 'Prosecution of the Augsburg Gazette' and is available for inspection at the editorial office.”

The opening part of the “Declaration” was included by Marx in the Preface to Herr Vogt (see this volume, p. 25).

8 This letter was not published. A copy of it, written in Marx's hand, is extant. (See Marx's letters to Engels of February 9 and 14, 1860 and to Legal Counsellor Weber of February 24, 1860, present edition, Vol. 41.)

9 This refers to the strict twofold censorship imposed by the Prussian Government on the Rheinische Zeitung, which was edited by Marx.

10 As can be seen from an entry in Marx's notebook for 1860 this declaration was also sent to the Hamburg Freischütz which, however, did not publish it.

11 Marx sent this “Declaration” to the Volks-Zeitung and Die Reform.

12 Marx's exposé Herr Vogt was written in reply to Vogt's pamphlet Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung, Genf, 1859, which heaped slander on Marx and his associates in the Communist League. Vogt wrote his pamphlet after the
Allgemeine Zeitung had reprinted the pamphlet Zur Warnung, which exposed Vogt's Bonapartist intrigues (see Note 1). Vogt had brought an action against the newspaper. His complaint was dismissed, and in December 1859 he published his pamphlet. The bourgeois press gave his slanderous accusations the broadest publicity. On January 31, 1860 Marx wrote to Engels: “The jubilation of the bourgeois press is, of course, unbounded” (see present edition, Vol. 41). The Berlin National-Zeitung gave a résumé of Vogt’s pamphlet in two leading articles (Nos. 37 and 41, January 22 and 25, 1860). A number of European periodicals, notably the Hamburg Freischütz (Nos. 17-21, April 1860), the Breslauer Zeitung, the London Daily Telegraph (February 5, 1860) and the Paris Revue contemporaine (XIII, February 15, 1860), also gave it extensive coverage.

In the interests of the proletarian party, then in process of formation, Marx decided to answer Vogt through the press. He did so in his exposé Herr Vogt. He also intended to bring an action for libel against the National-Zeitung. In late January 1860 he began gathering the material for his book against Vogt and his action against the National-Zeitung. With this aim in view he wrote dozens of letters to people with whom he was connected in his political and revolutionary activity and received from them material exposing Vogt. Letters arrived from J. Ph. Becker, G. Lommel (as Marx wrote to Engels on November 13, 1860, Lommel’s letter provided the basis for Chapter IX, “Agency”, of Herr Vogt), S. Borkheim and others. C. A. Dana, C. D. Collet, L. L. Jottrand, J. Lelewel, B. Szemere, M. Perczel, N. I. Sazonov and others sent letters bearing witness to Marx’s faultless political record. Marx was also supported by Ernest Jones, which led to the resumption of their old friendship. In mid-February 1860 Marx began sending evidence against Friedrich Zabel, editor of the National-Zeitung, to Legal Counsellor Weber, who instituted legal proceedings against Zabel. However, between April and October 1860 Marx’s complaint was dismissed at every level of the Prussian judiciary.

While supplying evidence for his action, Marx continued to work on his exposé of Vogt. His preparatory materials for it, contained above all in his notebooks for 1858-60, and the numerous direct and indirect references to various sources in the book itself, testify to the vastness of the factual material Marx had gone through. He studied the political and diplomatic history of the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and made copious notes on foreign policy from books and periodicals of different orientations, from Bonapartist pamphlets brought out by the Denut publishers, from Hansard’s Parliamentary Debates, from Blue Books and from other sources.

In September Marx by and large concluded his work on Herr Vogt. However, following the dismissal of his charge against Zabel, he wrote one more chapter, “A Lawsuit”, in which he criticised the Prussian judiciary. In a letter to Engels dated October 2, 1860 Marx gave a summary of Herr Vogt which, with some alterations, he later incorporated in the book as its table of contents. In the letter, Section 5 of Chapter III was entitled “Central Festival of Workers in Lausanne”; in the book its title is “Central Festival of the German Workers’ Educational Associations in Lausanne (June 26 and 27, 1859)”; Chapter VIII bears the title “Vogt’s Studies” in the letter, and “Dâ-Dâ Vogt and His Studies” in the book. The latter change accentuates the similarity of views of the Bonapartist Vogt and the contemporary Arab journalist Dâ-Dâ, who translated Bonapartist pamphlets into Arabic on the instructions of the Algerian authorities.
Marx considered several titles for his book. Originally he intended to call it *Ex-Imperial Vogt* or *Dâ-Dâ Vogt* (see his letter to Engels of September 25, 1860). Both versions met with the objections of Engels, and it was at his suggestion that the book was entitled *Herr Vogt* (see Marx's letters to Engels of October 2 and November 13, 1860 and Engels' letters to Marx of October 1 and 5, 1860 in Vol. 41 of the present edition). Originally every chapter had a résumé at the end, but Marx omitted them because the book, as he wrote in his letter to Engels of December 6, 1860, had "grown without my noticing it".

Publication of *Herr Vogt* involved serious difficulties, both financial ones and those connected with the revelations contained in this scathing polemic (see, for instance, Marx's letters to Engels of September 15 and 25 and to Lassalle of September 15, 1860). The book was sent to the printers in September 1860 (Marx to Lassalle, September 15, 1860) and appeared on December 1, 1860. The publisher was A. Petsch (London) and the printer R. Hirschfeld. In his letter to Marx of December 5, 1860 Engels deplored the numerous misprints and spelling mistakes, and also the absence of résumés at the end of chapters. Such résumés, he wrote, would have been "extremely effective" and, at the same time, "brought out the artistry of the whole arrangement which is truly admirable".

Marx took steps to ensure the wide circulation of the book as a means of exposing Vogt and other Bonapartist agents among journalists. Advertisements of its publication were sent to more than 40 newspapers, mostly German ones, in Germany, Switzerland and America, and also to a number of British papers (Marx to Engels, December 12, 1860 and January 22, 1861). But only a few newspapers published them: the *Genfer Grenzpost*, No. 12, December 22, 1860, the Hamburg *Reform* (supplements to Nos. 150 and 152, December 15 and 19, 1860) and *Freischütz*, the Berlin *Publicist* and *Neue Preussische Zeitung*, and the *Kölnische Zeitung* (Marx to Engels, December 26, 1860 and January 8 and 22, 1861, Engels to Marx, January 7, 1861). Most papers ignored the book. In his letter to Engels of January 22, 1861 Marx wrote with bitterness: "The scoundrels ... want to consign it to oblivion." The censorship and the police authorities, in particular those of the Bonapartist Second Empire, reacted guardedly. A report from Paris in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of April 19, 1861 said: "By way of warning to booksellers *Herr Vogt* by Karl Marx was placed on the list of proscribed books, thus frustrating the appearance of a muchabridged French version which is now printing" (Marx to Engels, May 16, 1861).

The book was duly appreciated by Marx's friends and acquaintances. On receiving it Engels wrote to Marx: "That thing is grand. Especially the chapters 'Studies' and 'Agency'; cela est écrasant." Two days later he wrote: "The more I read of the book, the better it pleases me." And still later: "It's certainly the best piece of polemical writing you have ever done" (Engels to Marx, December 3, 5 and 19, 1860). W. Wolff's comment was: "It is a masterpiece from beginning to end." Contemporaries greatly appreciated Marx's closely reasoned arguments. For instance, P. Imandt wrote in January 1861 that it had banished whatever doubts he still had about Vogt's treachery in 1849. Lassalle, who originally objected to the very idea of writing a polemic against Vogt, was forced to admit that there were solid grounds for accusing Vogt of association with Bonapartist circles. This was also granted by people whose views widely differed from Marx's. For instance, L. Bucher, as Marx wrote to Engels on December 19, 1860, admitted the validity of Marx's arguments and that the
book had destroyed "any prejudice he might have had against Marx's agitational activities".

A number of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois journalists attempted to refute Marx's exposé of Vogt as a Bonapartist agent. This was the purpose of Eduard Meyen's libellous article "Die neue Dunciad Karl Vogt's durch K. Marx" ("The New Dunciad of Karl Vogt by Karl Marx") in Der Freischütz, Nos. 155 and 156, December 27 and 29, 1860 and No. 1, January 1, 1861 (Marx to Engels, January 3, 1861). Marx was also attacked by Bettziech (pen name of the German petty-bourgeois democrat H. Beta) in the Magazin für die Literatur des Auslandes, No. 2, January 9, 1861. Complimentary notices on the book were published in the Kölnischer Anzeiger (Marx to Engels, January 18, 1861).

No second edition of Herr Vogt appeared during the lifetime of Marx and Engels. Only a few short excerpts were reprinted. Thus a passage from Chapter X ("Patrons and Accomplices") appeared in the Breslauer Zeitung, No. 115, March 9, 1861 under the heading "Zur Charakteristik Kossuth's" ("Concerning Kossuth") and in the Leipzig Demokratisches Wochenblatt, Nos. 16-18, April 18 and 25 and May 2, 1868 under the heading "Der enthüllte Kossuth" ("Kossuth Exposed"). Appendix 4 ("The Communist Trial in Cologne") from Chapter XII was reprinted in the Leipzig Volksstaat, organ of the Social-Democratic Party, Nos. 7 and 8, January 20 and 22, 1875 under the heading "Enthüllungen über den Kölner Kommunistenprozess" ("Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne"). The same section was reproduced in the Nachtrag (Appendix) to the authorised (second) edition of Marx's Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne (Leipzig, 1875). Under the heading "Nachtrag aus der Leipziger Auflage von 1875" ("Appendix from the Leipzig Edition of 1875") Engels also included it, with a small addendum, in the third edition of the Revelations, which he published in 1885.


13 This refers to the war between the Kingdom of Sardinia (Piedmont) and France, on the one hand, and Austria, on the other (April 29 to July 8, 1859). It was launched by Napoleon III, who, under the banner of the "liberation of Italy", strove for aggrandizement and sought to strengthen the Bonapartist regime in France with the help of a successful military campaign. The Piedmont ruling circles hoped that French support would enable them to unite Italy, without the participation of the masses, under the aegis of the Savoy dynasty ruling in Piedmont. The war caused an upsurge of the national liberation movement in Italy. The Austrian army suffered a series of defeats. However, Napoleon III, frightened by the scale of the national liberation movement in Italy, abruptly ceased hostilities. On July 11, the French and Austrian emperors concluded a separate preliminary peace in Villafranca (see Note 126).

In this passage Marx alludes to his differences with Ferdinand Lassalle on the ways of unifying Italy and Germany. In his pamphlet Der italienische Krieg und die Aufgabe Preußens. Eine Stimme aus der Demokratie (The Italian War and the Task of Prussia. The Voice of a Democrat) published in Berlin in 1859, Lassalle
advocated the dynastic unification of Germany under the aegis of Prussia (see the preface to this volume, pp. XVII-XVIII).

14 The Brimstone Gang (Schwefelbande)—the name of a students' association at Jena University in the 1770s whose members were notorious for their brawls; subsequently the expression “Brimstone Gang” became widespread.

15 Marx often puns on the name of Karl Vogt. Vogt or Landvogt was the name of provincial governors and other administrators in the German Empire in the Middle Ages. The “hereditary Vogt of Noughtborough (Nichilburg)” is an allusion to a character in Johann Fischart's satirical novel Affentheurliehe, Naupengeheurliche Geschichtklitterung: von Thaten und Rahten der vor kurzen langen und je weilen vollenwoelbeschreyten Helden und Herrn: Grandgoschier, Gorgellantua und Pantagruel. Königen imn Utopien, Iedewelt und Nienenreich, Soldan der Neuen Kanarrien und Oudyssen Inseln: auch Grossfürsten im Nibel Nebelland, Erbvoegt auff Nichilburg, und Niderherren zu Nullibingen, Nullenstein und Niergendheym Etwan von M. Franz Rabelais Französisch entworffen. Achte Ausgabe, 1617. Fischart's work, a German adaptation of François Rabelais' novels Gargantua and Pantagruel, was published in 1757. Below Marx frequently uses phrases from it.

16 By “Magnum Opus” Marx means, here and below, Vogt's book Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung, as distinct from Vogt's other, shorter writings on the same subject.

17 This refers to the closing stage of the campaign in support of the Imperial Constitution which was adopted by the Frankfurt National Assembly on March 28, 1849. Most German states refused to recognise the Constitution. The people were its sole defender. Led by petty-bourgeois democrats, they launched an armed struggle in its support in the spring of 1849. The most violent uprisings occurred in the Bavarian Palatinate and Baden. However, in July the joint Prussian, Bavarian and Württemberg troops crushed the resistance of the Palatinate and Baden insurgent army and forced the remaining units to withdraw into Switzerland. The Baden and Palatinate events marked the end of the German revolution of 1848-49. Engels described them in The Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution and Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany (see present edition, Vols. 10 and 11).

18 In dulci jubilo (in sweet merriment)—the opening words of a fourteenth-century Christmas carol. Later the phrase occurred in various student songs.

19 Engels took part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising and on July 12, 1849, after its defeat, crossed over into Switzerland together with the detachment of August Willich, whose adjutant he was. He first settled in Vevey, but later moved to Lausanne. In September he met with members of the Communist League in Berne and Geneva. In early October, after obtaining a permit to leave Switzerland (see present edition Vol. 10, p. 595) he left for London where Marx wanted him to take part in the publication of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Politisch-ökonomische Revue and in reorganising the Communist League (Marx to Engels, end of July, August 17 and 23, 1849, present edition, Vol. 38).
20 The blue republicans—bourgeois republicans; red republicans—democrats and socialists of various trends. p. 31

21 The Frankfurt Parliament or the German National Assembly, opened in Frankfurt am Main on May 18, 1848. It was convened to unify the country and draw up a Constitution. The liberal deputies, who were in the majority, turned the Assembly into a mere debating club. At the decisive moments of the revolution, the liberal majority condoned the counter-revolutionary forces. In spring 1849, the liberals left the Assembly after the Prussian and other governments had rejected the Imperial Constitution that it had drawn up. What remained of the Assembly (the Rump) moved to Stuttgart and was dispersed by the Württemberg forces on June 18.

The Regency of the Empire was formed in Stuttgart on June 6, 1849 by what remained of the Frankfurt National Assembly. The Regency consisted of five deputies representing the Left faction (moderate democrats), including Karl Vogt. Their attempts to ensure by parliamentary means the implementation of the Constitution drawn up by the Frankfurt Assembly and rejected by the German princes ended in total failure. p. 31

22 The battle of Idstedt (June 24-25, 1850) was the closing episode of the war waged by the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein against Denmark. Under the impact of the March 1848 revolution in Germany a national liberation uprising had flared up in the two duchies, which were subject to the King of Denmark but populated mainly by Germans. The uprising became part of the struggle for the unification of Germany. The ruling circles of Prussia, which was at war with Denmark over Schleswig and Holstein, feared a popular outbreak and an intensification of the revolution. They therefore sought an agreement with the Danish monarchy to the detriment of overall German interests, which also had a negative effect on the operations of the Prussian army. The war lasted intermittently until July 1850. The Schleswig-Holstein army was defeated at Idstedt. As a result, the two duchies remained part of the Kingdom of Denmark. p. 32

23 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 in Bruchsal by decision of a court-martial. They were released during another uprising in Baden in May 1849. p. 32

24 This refers to attempts by Struve and other German democrats to form a refugee Democratic Association and a Central Bureau of the United German Emigration. The activities of the petty-bourgeois democrats were to a considerable extent directed against the Social-Democratic Refugee Committee, then led by Marx and Engels (see Note 25), and aimed at bringing the proletarian sections under their influence. A critical assessment of these activities is given in the “Address of the Central Authority to the League, June 1850”, written by Marx and Engels (see present edition, Vol. 10, p. 371) and in Engels' letter to Joseph Weydemeyer of April 22, 1850 (see present edition, Vol. 38). p. 33

25 The London German Refugee Committee was set up on September 18, 1849 on Marx's initiative under the auspices of the German Workers' Educational
Society. Besides Marx and other members of the Communist League, it included a number of petty-bourgeois democrats. At a meeting of the Society on November 18, the Committee was transformed into the *Social-Democratic Refugee Committee*, the aim being to dissociate the proletarian section of the London refugees from the petty-bourgeois elements (the report on the meeting was dated December 3, 1849). The new Committee included only members of the Communist League: Karl Marx (who was elected chairman), Heinrich Bauer, August Willich, Karl Pfänder and Frederick Engels. Besides providing material assistance for the refugees, predominantly those belonging to the proletarian wing, the Committee played an important part in restoring ties between members of the Communist League, in uniting the supporters of Marx and Engels in London and in reorganising the Communist League. In mid-September 1850, following the split in the Communist League, when most members of the Educational Society, to which the Committee was accountable, came under the influence of the Willich-Schapper sectarian group, Marx and Engels, together with their followers, withdrew from the Educational Society and the Committee (for details see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 483 and 632).

26 *Carbonari*—members of secret political societies in Italy and France in the first half of the nineteenth century. In Italy they fought for national independence, unification of the country and liberal constitutional reforms. In France their movement was primarily directed against the rule of the restored Bourbon dynasty (1815-30).


28 By the *December Gang* Marx means the secret Society of December 10 founded in 1849 and so called to commemorate the election of Louis Bonaparte, the Society’s patron, to the Presidency of the French Republic on December 10, 1848. Marx describes the December 10 Society further in the text. The Society played an active part in the Bonapartist coup d’état of December 2, 1851 which established the counter-revolutionary regime of the Second Empire (1852-70) headed by Napoleon III.

29 In the passage from *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* quoted here Marx consistently substitutes the word “gang” (*Bande*) for “society” (*Gesellschaft*).

30 *Lazzaroni*—a contemptuous name for decased proletarians, primarily in the Kingdom of Naples. These people were repeatedly used by reactionary governments against liberal and democratic movements.

31 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. Louis Bonaparte was sentenced to life imprisonment, but escaped to England in 1846.

32 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 province 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 Gardes mobiles (Mobile Guards), set up by a decree of the Provisional Government on February 25, 1848 with the secret aim of fighting the revolutionary masses, were used to crush the June uprising of the Paris workers. Later they were disbanded on the insistence of Bonapartist circles, who feared that in the event of a conflict between Louis Bonaparte and the republicans, the Gardes mobiles would side with the latter.

33 This witticism by Countess Lehon and the caustic remark by Madame de Girardin on the Bonapartist regime, both of 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 and 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 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, Émile de Girardin was expelled" (see present edition, Vol. 39).

34 This refers to the Regency of Philippe of Orleans in France from 1715 to 1723 during the minority of Louis XV.

35 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.
The Vendôme Column was erected in Paris between 1806 and 1810 as a 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.

Das Volk—a German-language weekly published in London from May 7 to August 20, 1859—was founded as the official organ of the German Workers' Educational Society in London. The first issue appeared under the editorship of the German journalist Elard Biscamp, a petty-bourgeois democrat. Beginning with issue No. 2 Marx took an active part in its publication: he gave advice to the editors, edited articles himself and organised material support. In issue No. 6 of June 11, the Editorial Board officially named Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, Ferdinand Freiligrath, Wilhelm Wolff and Heinrich Heise as its contributors (see present edition, Vol. 16, p. 624). Marx's first article in the paper—"Spree and Mincio"—was printed on June 25 (see present edition, Vol. 16). Under Marx's influence Das Volk began to turn into a militant revolutionary working-class newspaper. In the beginning of July, Marx became its virtual editor and manager.

Das Volk carried Marx's preface to his work A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, six of his articles, including the unfinished series Quid pro Quo, seven articles by Engels and his review of Marx's Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, and reviews of the Hermann, the newspaper of the German petty-bourgeois democrats, by Marx and Biscamp (they appeared in the column "Gatherings from the Press"). Furthermore, many articles and political reviews written by different authors were edited by Marx. In all, sixteen issues appeared. Das Volk ceased publication for lack of money.

Articles published in Das Volk reflected the elaboration by Marx and Engels of questions of revolutionary theory and the tactics of proletarian struggle, covered the class battles of the proletariat and implacably combated petty-bourgeois ideology. From a position of proletarian internationalism the newspaper analysed the course of the Austro-Italo-French war of 1859 and the issues involved in the unification of Germany and Italy, exposed the foreign policy of Britain, Prussia, France, Russia and other reactionary states and waged a consistent struggle against Bonapartism and its overt and covert supporters.

TwoRichmonds in the field is an expression used to denote a second, unexpected adversary. It originates from Shakespeare's Richard III (Act V, Scene 4).

This presumably refers to Abt's pamphlet Carl Vogt und Carl Marx oder die Bürstenheimer, Leipzig, Heidelberg. A notice in No. 27 (July 5, 1861) of the Stimmen der Zeit. Wochenschrift für Politik und Literatur, a weekly published by Adolph Kolatschek, said that the pamphlet would be published in the supplement to No. 39, and contained the following editorial note: "The work in question reached the editor as early as January of this year. The delay in publication is by no means due to any fault on the part of the author."

It is possible that friends had forwarded the manuscript of the pamphlet to Marx.
In April 1848 a republican uprising took place in Baden. Led by the petty-bourgeois democrats Friedrich Hecker and Gustav Struve, it started with republican detachments invading Baden from Switzerland. The uprising was poorly organised and was crushed by the end of April.

Later some participants in the Baden uprising joined the unit formed by August Willich from German émigré workers and artisans in Besançon, France, in November 1848. Its members received allowances from the French Government, payment of which was, however, discontinued at the beginning of 1849. Later the unit was incorporated in Willich's volunteer detachment which took part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising in May-June 1849. p. 40

The great adventure with "the lost drum" is Marx's ironic way of referring to the manoeuvres of Napoleon III and the Bonapartist circles in France aimed at capturing the left bank of the Rhine. Vogt supported these manoeuvres in the press. Marx compares them to a comic episode in Shakespeare's *All's Well That Ends Well* (Act III, Scenes 5 and 6, Act IV, Scenes 1 and 3). By Parolles Vogt is meant. p. 40

The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Organ der Democra tie* appeared in Cologne daily from June 1, 1848 to May 19, 1849. The editorial board included Karl Marx (Editor-in-Chief), Heinrich Bürgers, Ernst Dronke, Ferdinand Freiligrath, Georg Weerth, Wilhelm Wolff, Ferdinand Wolff and Frederick Engels.

The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was founded by Marx as a militant periodical intended to exert a direct influence on the masses, educate and unite them politically and ideologically and pave the way for the creation of a mass party of the German proletariat. As a rule, Marx and Engels wrote the editorials, formulating the paper's stand on the key questions of the revolution.

The consistent revolutionary tendency of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, its active internationalism and its attacks on the government, aroused the displeasure of the bourgeois shareholders and led to the persecution of its editors by the authorities and a smear campaign in the feudal monarchist and liberal bourgeois press. It was particularly the paper's articles in defence of the June 1848 uprising of the Paris proletariat that frightened away the shareholders. Persecution of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* editors by the judicial authorities and the police became particularly severe after the counter-revolutionary coup in Prussia in November-December 1848.

In May 1849, under the conditions of the general counter-revolutionary offensive, the Prussian Government expelled Marx from Prussia on the pretext that he was not a Prussian citizen. Marx's expulsion and new repressive measures against other editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* resulted in the paper ceasing publication. The last issue, No. 301, printed in red ink, appeared on May 19, 1849. In their farewell address "To the Workers of Cologne", the editors wrote that "their last word everywhere and always will be *emancipation of the working class*". p. 41

The arsenal in Prüm was stormed by democrats and workers from Trier and neighbouring townships on May 17 and 18, 1849. Their aim was to seize the arms and extend the uprising in defence of the Imperial Constitution to the left bank of the Rhine. The insurgents succeeded in capturing the arsenal, but government troops soon arrived on the scene and the movement was suppressed. p. 41

Sazonov obviously had in mind Professor I. K. Babst, who had given a series of lectures in political economy in Moscow. An account of the first lecture was
published in the *Moskovskiye vedomosti*, No. 19, January 24, 1860. In Sazonov's opinion, this lecture reflected some of the ideas contained in the Preface of Marx’s *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy.*

45 The *Bundschuh* was a secret revolutionary peasant union active in Germany on the eve of the Peasant War of 1525. Schily uses the name to designate the Communist League, led by Marx and Engels.

46 An allusion to the *Club of Resolute Progress*. Founded in Karlsruhe on June 5, 1848, it represented the more radical wing of the petty-bourgeois democratic republicans (Struve, Tzschirner, Heinzen and others) discontented with the conciliatory policy of the Brentano government and the increasing strength of the Rightist elements within it. The Club suggested that Brentano should extend the revolution beyond Baden and the Palatinate and introduce radicals into the government. Brentano refused, so the Club tried, on June 6, to force the government’s hand by threatening an armed demonstration. The government, however, supported by the civic militia and other armed units, proved the stronger party in the conflict. The Club of Resolute Progress was disbanded.

47 *Cercle social*—an organisation established by democratic intellectuals in Paris in the first years of the French Revolution. Its chief spokesmen, Claude Fauchet and Nicolas Bonneville, demanded the egalitarian division of the land, restrictions on large fortunes and employment for all able-bodied citizens.

48 Here Marx has “auch eine schöne Gegend”, i.e. “a beautiful landscape too”. The phrase originated from a story about a woman who, trying to console the mother of a soldier killed at the Battle of Leipzig (1813), said: “But it was a beautiful landscape.”

49 The *Grüti Association (Grütliverein)* was a Swiss petty-bourgeois reformist organisation founded in 1838 as an educational society for artisans and workers. The name *Grütliverein* was to emphasise the Swiss national character of the association. Legend has it that in 1307 representatives of three Swiss cantons met in Grüti meadow and formed an alliance to fight against the arbitrary rule of the Austrian governors (Vogts). Hence Marx’s ironic reference to Karl Vogt.

50 *Badinguet* was the nickname of Napoleon III. He was called so because in 1846 he escaped from prison disguised in the clothes of the stonemason Badinguet. *Marianne* was the name of a secret republican society in France founded in 1850. Its aim was to fight against the Bonapartist regime of the Second Empire.

51 The *Communist League* was 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 refugee workers and artisans that was set up in Paris 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. Although 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 tactics of immediately unleashing a revolution without taking into account the actual situation and the practical possibilities. The discord led to a split within the League in September 1850. Because of police persecutions and arrests of League members in May 1851, the activities of the League as an organisation practically ceased in Germany. On November 17, 1852, on a motion by Marx, the League's London District announced the dissolution of the League (see Marx's letter to Engels of November 19, 1852). On February 24, 1860 Marx sent this letter to Legal Counsellor Weber (see present edition, Vol. 41).

The Communist League played an outstanding role as the first proletarian party guided by the principles of scientific communism, as a school of proletarian revolutionaries and as the historical forerunner of the International Working Men's Association. (On the Communist League see this volume, pp. 78-82.)

52 See Marx's *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne* (present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 445-49). This work was published as a pamphlet in Basle, Switzerland, in January 1853 (the edition used by Vogt). In the USA it was first published in instalments in the democratic Boston *Neu-England-Zeitung* and at the end of April 1853 it was printed in pamphlet form by the same newspaper. In *Herr Vogt* Marx quotes the *Revelations* from the Boston pamphlet. p. 49

53 The *Palais Royal* in Paris was the residence of Jérôme Bonaparte (the youngest brother of Napoleon I) and his son, Prince Joseph (nicknamed Plon-Plon).

p. 49

54 The *German-American Revolutionary Loan* was a loan that Gottfried Kinkel and other petty-bourgeois émigré leaders tried to raise in 1851 and 1852 among German refugees and Americans of German origin with a view to immediately inciting a revolution in Germany. To win support for the loan, Kinkel toured the USA in September 1851. The project proved a total failure. In a number of their works Marx and Engels ridiculed the loan as an adventurist and harmful attempt artificially to engineer a revolution during a lull in the revolutionary movement.

p. 50

55 At the *battle of Murten* (June 22, 1476), fought in the course of the Burgundian Wars, the troops of Duke Charles the Bold of Burgundy were defeated by the Swiss.

p. 50

56 In *St. Paul's Church*, Frankfurt am Main, the Frankfurt National Assembly met in 1848 and 1849.

p. 51

57 The *Grand Cophta* was the name of the omnipotent and omniscient Egyptian priest who headed the nonexistent Masonic "Egyptian Lodge" which the famous eighteenth-century impostor "Count" Cagliostro (Giuseppe Balsamo) claimed to have founded.

p. 53

58 The *Federal Council*—the Government of the Swiss Confederation.

p. 54

59 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 the 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 the group's local communities in Paris, to fabricate the case of the so-called Franco-German plot. Cherval was both an agent of the Prussian envoy in Paris and a French spy. In February 1852 the accused were sentenced on a charge of plotting a coup d'état. With the connivance of the French and Prussian police Cherval was allowed to escape from prison. The attempts of the Prussian police to incriminate the Communist League led by Marx and Engels failed. Konrad Schramm, a League member, arrested in Paris in September 1851, was soon released owing to lack of evidence. Nevertheless, the Prussian Police Superintendent Stieber, one of the organisers of the Cologne Communist trial in 1852, repeated the false police accusations. Marx exposed Stieber's perjury in his Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne (see the chapter "The Cherval Plot", present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 407-19).

On his arrival in London in May 1852 Cherval was admitted to the German Workers' Educational Society led by Schapper but was soon expelled because of his role of provocateur in the so-called Franco-German plot.

---

60 The Cologne trial (October 4-November 12, 1852) was organised and stage-managed by the Prussian Government. The defendants were members of the Communist League arrested in the spring of 1851 on charges of "treasonable plotting". The forged documents and false evidence presented by the police authorities were not only designed to secure the conviction of the defendants but also to compromise their London comrades and the proletarian organisation as a whole. Seven of the defendants were sentenced to imprisonment in a fortress for terms ranging from three to six years. The dishonest tactics resorted to by the Prussian police state in fighting the international working-class movement were exposed by Engels in his article "The Late Trial in Cologne" and, in greater detail, by Marx in his pamphlet Revelations: Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne (see present edition, Vol. 11).

61 The German Workers' Educational Society in London was founded in February 1840 by Karl Schapper, Joseph Moll and other members of the League of the Just (an organisation of German craftsmen and workers, and also of emigrant workers of other nationalities). After the reorganisation of the League of the Just in the summer of 1847 and the founding of the Communist League, the latter's local communities played the leading role in the Society. During various periods of its activity, the Society had branches in working-class districts in London. In 1847 and 1849-50, Marx and Engels took an active part in the Society's work, but on September 17, 1850, Marx, Engels and a number of their followers withdrew because the Willich-Schapper sectarian and adventurer faction had temporarily increased its influence in the Society, causing a split in the Communist League (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 483, 632). In the late 1850s, Marx and Engels resumed their work in the Educational Society, which was active up to 1918, when it was closed down by the British Government.

62 Karl Vogt was one of the five members of the Imperial Regency (see Note 21).
63 An allusion to the denunciatory prophecies of Zacharias, one of the twelve minor prophets of the Old Testament.  

64 The Hambach Festival was a political demonstration held by members of the liberal and radical bourgeoisie at the castle of Hambach (in the Bavarian Palatinate) on May 27, 1832 to urge the unification of Germany, constitutional reforms and the transformation of Germany into a federal republic.  

65 The German socialist Eichhoff was Berlin correspondent of the weekly Hermann. In September and October 1859 he anonymously published in it a series of articles headed “Stieber” in which he exposed the part played by Wilhelm Stieber, chief of the Prussian political police, in organising the government-inspired trial of members of the Communist League in Cologne in 1852. Stieber sued Eichhoff for libel. In May 1860 a Berlin court sentenced Eichhoff to 14 months imprisonment (see Marx’s letters to Engels of January 31, 1860 and to Freiligrath of February 29, 1860, present edition, Vol. 41).  

66 The Ladendorf trial—the trial of Ladendorf, Gercke, Falkenthal, Levy and several other persons arrested in 1853 on the basis of a denunciation by police agent Hentze, a former member of the Communist League. The trial was held in Berlin in 1854. On trumped-up charges of plotting, the defendants were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment (from three to five years). The League of the Dead was a secret conspiratorial organisation in Bremen in the 1840s and early 1850s. It was uncovered by the police in 1852.  

67 Here Marx paraphrases two expressions: “Tranquillity is the first duty of the citizen”, a dictum coined by the Prussian minister Schulenburg-Kehnert in his address to the population of Berlin of October 17, 1806, following the defeat at Jena (Le Moniteur universel, No. 304, October 31, 1806, “Prusse”, Berlin, du 18 octobre), and “In hoc signo vinces” (“By this sign thou shalt conquer”). Legend has it that on the eve of a battle against his rival Maxentius in 312, the Roman Emperor Constantine (274-337) saw in the sky the sign of the Cross and over it the words “In hoc signo vinces”. The Church associates this legend with Constantine’s “conversion” from the persecution of Christianity to its protection.  

68 At the battle of Zorndorf, fought in the course of the Seven Years’ War on August 14 (25), 1758, the Prussian army, commanded by Frederick II, clashed with the Russian forces. Both sides suffered heavy losses. The outcome of the battle was inconclusive.  

69 Kobes I was the nickname of Jacob Venedey, who was born in Cologne. In the Cologne dialect, Kobes stands for Jacob. Venedey owed the nickname to Heinrich Heine, who in a satirical poem headed “Kobes I” ridiculed him as a model philistine.  

70 An ironic allusion to the book Kraft und Stoff (Energy and Matter) (1855) by the German physiologist Ludwig Büchner, a vulgar materialist like Vogt.  

71 This refers to the Second Democratic Congress of representatives of democratic and workers’ organisations from various German towns which was held in Berlin from October 26 to 30, 1848.
A reference to the *Revolutionary Centralisation*, a secret organisation founded at the beginning of 1850 by German refugees in Switzerland, mostly petty-bourgeois democrats. Its Central Committee, based in Zurich, was headed by S. E. Tzschirner, a leader of the Dresden uprising in May 1849. Prominent members were P. Fries, T. L. Greiner, F. Sigel, G. A. Techow and J. Ph. Becker, all participants in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising. Members of the Communist League, K. L. J. d'Estier, K. Bruhn and W. Wolff, also belonged to this organisation. In July and August 1850 the leaders of the Revolutionary Centralisation approached the Central Authority of the Communist League with a proposal to amalgamate. On behalf of the League's Central Authority Marx and Engels rejected the proposal as detrimental to the class independence of the proletarian party. By the end of 1850, the Revolutionary Centralisation had disintegrated as a result of the mass expulsion of German refugees from Switzerland.

Beust's letter to Schily of May 1, 1860 was a postscript to Emmermann's letter to Schily part of which Marx quotes immediately above. Marx commented on Emmermann's and Beust's letters (particularly on the latter, which contained derogatory statements about Marx) in his letter to Engels of May 7, 1860 (see present edition, Vol. 41).

The German Workers' Educational Society in Brussels (Deutscher Arbeiterverein) was founded by Marx and Engels at the end of August 1847 to provide a political education for German workers living in Belgium and spread the ideas of communism among them. With Marx, Engels and their associates at its head, the Society became the legal centre rallying German revolutionary proletarians in Belgium and maintaining direct contact with Flemish and Walloon workers' clubs. Its most active members belonged to the Brussels community of the Communist League. The Society played an important part in founding the Brussels Democratic Association. Its activities ceased after the February 1848 revolution in France when the Belgian police arrested and deported its members.

The reference here is to the Willich-Schapper group, which Marx and Engels called the *Sonderbund*—perhaps an allusion to the separatist union of 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 (see Note 51) 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, the Cologne Central Authority expelled them from the League at the proposal of the League's London District and gave notification of this in its Address of December 1, 1850 (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 625-30 and 633). By their activities the Willich-Schapper group helped the Prussian police uncover the League's illegal communities in Germany and fabricate a case in Cologne in 1852 against prominent members of the League (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 445-52).

The *German Confederation* (*der Deutsche Bund*) was an ephemeral union of German states formed by decision of the Congress of Vienna in June 1815 and originally comprising 35 absolutist feudal states and 4 free cities. The
Confederation aggravated the political and economic fragmentation of Germany and impeded its development.

After the defeat of the 1848-49 revolution, a struggle for hegemony in Germany developed between Prussia and Austria. The latter sought to restore the German Confederation, which had virtually fallen apart during the revolution. Prussia hoped to achieve supremacy by forming a union of German states under its own aegis. In the autumn of 1850 the Austro-Prussian rivalry was intensified by the clash of interests over the Electorate of Hesse-Cassel, where a constitutional conflict had developed between the local Chamber and the Elector as a result of which the Chamber was disbanded and martial law introduced. In this situation Austria and Prussia vied for the right to carry out punitive operations against the Hesse constitutional movement. In early November 1850 Prussian and Austrian troops clashed on the territory of Hesse-Cassel. However, under pressure from Nicholas I, Prussia was forced to yield to Austria and temporarily desist from its plans for establishing hegemony in Germany (see Note 143).

77 The Federal Diet (Bundestag)—the central body of the German Confederation. It consisted of representatives of the member states and held its sessions in Frankfurt am Main. Having no actual power, it nevertheless served as an instrument of monarchist feudal reaction.

78 The German military association “Self-Help” (Deutscher republikanischer Wehrbund “Hilf Dir”) was set up at the initiative of J. Ph. Becker in Gross-Hünningen in October 1848. It was to unite Germans living abroad, particularly political refugees and artisans in Switzerland and France. The Association’s Central Committee was in Biel, Berne Canton. Becker was the political leader, A. Willich the military. A German column was formed in Besançon with branches in Nancy, Vesul, Lyons and other towns. The idea of rallying all German unions in Switzerland failed to materialise.

79 H. L. Miskowsky was burnt to death during a fire in a wooden barracks in Whitechapel in 1854 (see Marx’s letter to Engels of May 6, 1854, present edition, Vol. 39).

80 The meeting in question was held in late August 1850.

81 In Marx’s exposé The Knight of the Noble Consciousness, in which this letter is quoted in full, it is dated November 22 (see present edition, Vol. 12, pp. 504-05). The original of the letter is not extant.

82 An allusion to Batrachomyomachia (The Battle of the Frogs and the Mice), an anonymous Greek poem which parodies Homer’s Iliad.

Marx and Engels give a detailed description of A. Ruge’s Agitation Union and G. Kinkel’s Émigré Club (Marx calls it Émigré Society here) and also of the relations between the two émigré petty-bourgeois organisations in their exposé The Great Men of the Exile (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 310-25).

83 This idea was formulated in the “Review, May to October 1850” in a section which Engels later included in Chapter IV of The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850, 1895 edition (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 509-10 and 134-35). Marx expressed the same idea even earlier in his article “The Revolutionary Movement” (present edition, Vol. 8, p. 214).
“A storm in a teacup” is an expression used by Montesquieu about a series of riots in the republic of San Marino.  

84 Marx quotes from his speech at the trial of the Rhenish District Committee of Democrats (see present edition, Vol. 8, p. 336). The minutes of the trial were published in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Nos. 226 and 231-33, February 19, 25, 27 and 28, 1849 and as a separate pamphlet under the heading Zwei politische Prozesse. Verhandelt vor den Februar-Assisen in Köln, Köln, 1849. Verlag der Expedition der Neuen Rheinischen Zeitung. The pamphlet also included a report on the trial of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung of February 7, 1849.  

85 The Comité de salut public (Committee of Public Safety) was established by the Convention on April 6, 1793; during the Jacobin dictatorship (June 2, 1793-July 27, 1794) it was the leading body of the revolutionary government in France.  

86 Ernst Dronke was sent to Switzerland as an emissary of the Communist League in July 1850 after Marx and Engels had learnt about the activity of the Revolutionary Centralisation from a letter by Wilhelm Wolff of May 9, 1850. Dronke wrote about his work in Switzerland and Germany in his letters to the League’s Central Authority of July 3, 1850 and to Engels of July 3 and 18, 1850.  

87 This quotation is from the article “Gottfried Kinkel” by Marx and Engels (see present edition, Vol. 10, p. 345). The article castigated the unworthy conduct of the petty-bourgeois democrat Kinkel before the court-martial in Rastatt which tried him for his part in the campaign for the Imperial Constitution. Speaking in court in his own defence on August 4, 1849 Kinkel denied his involvement in the revolutionary movement and eulogised the Hohenzollern dynasty. Marx and Engels gave a satirical portrayal of Kinkel in their exposé The Great Men of the Exile (see present edition, Vol. 11).  

88 Marx probably means the American Revolutionary Union for Europe (Amerikanischer Revolutionsbund für Europa), a German-American émigré organisation set up in Philadelphia in the summer of 1852 and consisting mostly of former members of the Agitation Union.  

89 Marx means the polemic between Gustav Adolf Roesler and Franz Heinrich Zitz, former deputies to the Frankfurt National Assembly, who attacked each other between July and September 1850 in the German-American newspapers Deutsche Schnellpost für Europäische Zustände, öffentliches und sociales Leben Deutschlands (New York) and New-Yorker Democrat.  

90 This probably refers to the manuscript “Drei Jahre in Paris” ("Three Years in Paris"), a description of the German emigration in 1849 to 1851 by the petty-bourgeois refugee Leopold Hähner. Marx was familiar with it (see his letter to Adolph Cluss of September 3, 1852, present edition, Vol. 39).  

91 Marx is referring to Vogt’s pamphlet Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung as the Louisiade (from the German word Laus, i.e. louse) by analogy with the Lousiad, a satirical epic by the English poet Peter Pindar (pen name of John Wolcot).
Lusiads (Os Lusiadas) is an epic by Luis de Camoens (c. 1524-1580), the great poet of the Portuguese Renaissance.

Marx ridicules Vogt's ephemeral power as Imperial Regent (see Note 21) by comparing his status to Sancho Panza's imaginary governorship of the island of Barataria (barato means "cheap" in Spanish) in Cervantes' Don Quixote.

Here and elsewhere, speaking of the Frankfurt National Assembly, Marx used the Assembly's verbatim reports, which were later published in book form under the heading Stenographischer Bericht über die Verhandlungen der deutschen constituirenden Nationalversammlung zu Frankfurt am Main, Frankfurt am Main, 1848-1849.

On August 26, 1848 Denmark and Prussia concluded an armistice in Malmö which nullified the revolutionary and democratic gains of the peoples of Schleswig and Holstein and virtually sanctioned the continuance of Danish rule there. On September 16, 1848 the Frankfurt National Assembly ratified the armistice. This decision caused an outburst of indignation in Germany's democratic circles. On September 17, 1848 a mass meeting held in the Pfingstweide meadow in the northeast suburb of Frankfurt am Main adopted a resolution demanding that the deputies who had voted for ratification should be declared traitors and urging the Left deputies to walk out of the Assembly (Stenographischer Bericht..., Bd. 3, S. 2184). While some extreme Left deputies complied with these demands, Karl Vogt came out against them. On September 18 the popular movement in Frankfurt against the ratification of the Malmö armistice developed into an uprising which was brutally suppressed by government troops.

On October 9, 1848 the Frankfurt National Assembly adopted a "Law for the Protection of the Constituent National Assembly and of the Officials of the Central Authority" ("Gesetz betreffend den Schutz der Konstituierenden Reichsversammlung und der Beamten der Zentralgewalt", Stenographischer Bericht..., Bd. 4, S. 2528-29). Under this law, insulting a deputy of the Assembly or a representative of the central authority (an Imperial Regent, a minister or any other official) was punishable by imprisonment. This was one of the repressive measures against the people introduced after the September uprising in Frankfurt.

The Central March Association, thus named after the March 1848 revolution in Germany, was founded in Frankfurt am Main at the end of November 1848 by Left-wing deputies to the Frankfurt National Assembly and had branches in various towns in Germany. Fröbel, Simon, 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 counter-revolutionaries, for which Marx and Engels sharply criticised them (e.g., in the article "Ein Aktenstück des Märzvereins", Neue Rheinische Zeitung, No. 181, December 29, 1848).

See Engels' works "Elberfeld" and The Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution (present edition, Vols. 9 and 10).

In November and early December 1848 a coup d'état took place in Prussia
which led to the establishment of the arch-reactionary Brandenburg-Manteuffel Ministry and the dissolution of the National Assembly.  

99 See Note 70.

100 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.

"...the Frankfurt Assembly, which was 'in the process of dissolution'"—Marx ironically quotes the statement in which the liberals in question announced their withdrawal from the Assembly (Stenographischer Bericht..., Bd. 9, S. 6746).

101 The proclamation "The German National Assembly to the German Nation" ("Die deutsche Nationalversammlung an das deutsche Volk") drawn up by the poet J. L. Uhland on behalf of the moderate democrats was dictated by the latter's desire for a political rapprochement with the liberal bourgeoisie. It offered no concrete programme of action and boiled down to an impotent appeal to the German nation to press for the introduction of the Imperial Constitution.

The other proclamation, stemming from the Committee of Thirty, contained an equally ineffectual call to the armies of those German states which refused to recognise the National Assembly, to swear allegiance to the Imperial Constitution.

The Committee of Thirty was set up by the Frankfurt National Assembly on April 11, 1849 to devise steps conducive to the implementation of the Imperial Constitution in view of the ambiguous stand of Frederick William IV, King of Prussia, on the Assembly's offer of the Imperial Crown. Originally Frederick William IV made his acceptance contingent on the attitude of the other German princes, but on April 28, 1849 he rejected the Imperial Constitution and the Imperial Crown.

102 In early May 1849 Middle Franconia (part of Bavaria) was swept by a wave of protests against the rejection of the Imperial Constitution by the Bavarian Government. The movement culminated in a mass rally in Nuremberg on May 13 attended by 50,000 people. In his address Karl Vogt, under cover of pseudo-revolutionary phrases, urged the people to abstain from resolute action.

"Waiters" (Heuler)—the name the republican democrats in Germany applied to the moderate constitutionalists in 1848 and 1849. The latter, in turn, called their opponents "agitators" (Wühler).

103 An ironic reference to Louis Bonaparte, who was brought up in the Swiss canton of Thurgau. In 1832 he became a citizen of that canton and in 1833 an honorary citizen of the Swiss Republic.

104 The Great Exhibition in London, from May to October 1851, was the first world trade and industrial exhibition.

105 This refers to Heinrich Heine's political articles for the Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung from Paris in the 1830s and 1840s and to the essays published in the same newspaper by the German Orientalist Jakob Philipp Fallmerayer in the early 1840s. Heine published most of the articles in question in book form
under the titles *Französische Zustände* (1832) and *Lutetia* (1854). Fallmerayer’s essays appeared in a two-volume edition under the title *Fragmente aus dem Orient* in 1845.

106 "Bas Empire" (Lower Empire) is the name sometimes given to the Byzantine Empire and also to the late Roman Empire in historical literature. It came to be applied to any state in decline or disintegration.

107 At the beginning of April 1859 Vogt sent Freiligrath and others his political “Programme” calling on the states of the German Confederation to maintain neutrality in the war France and Piedmont were preparing against Austria. Vogt urged political leaders to support his “Programme” in the press. (See Vogt, *Mein Prozess...*, Dokumente, S. 33.)

108 In this footnote Marx outlines the history of the publication of his exposé *Lord Palmerston* (see present edition, Vol. 12). It was conceived as a series of articles for the *New-York Daily Tribune*, but not all of the articles were published there. Between October 1853 and January 1854 four instalments appeared as anonymous leading articles, externally unconnected and under different titles.

Simultaneously, between October 22 and December 24, 1853, the Chartist *People’s Paper* published eight articles under the common title *Lord Palmerston* with the editorial note: “Written for the *New-York Tribune* by Dr. Marx, and communicated by him to us.”

The pamphlet against Palmerston was widely circulated. On November 26, 1853 the *Glasgow Sentinel* reprinted from the *Tribune* the third article of the series under the title “Lord Palmerston and Russia”. In December of the same year the London publisher Tucker put out this article in pamphlet form. In early February 1854 a second edition of the pamphlet appeared with Marx’s participation, now under the heading *Palmerston and Poland*. Somewhat later Tucker published another pamphlet, *Palmerston and the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi* (the heading on the title page was: *Palmerston, What Has He Done?*), which reproduced, with a number of alterations, the text of the fourth and fifth articles in the series.

Between December 1855 and February 1856 all eight articles were reprinted in *The Free Press*, organ of the London Urquhartists, and, as a separate edition, in No. 5 of *The Free Press Serials*. At about the same time individual articles of the series appeared in the Urquhartist *Sheffield Free Press* and later in a number of other newspapers.

109 The *Foreign Affairs Committees* were public organisations set up by the Urquhartists in a number of English cities between the 1840s and 1860s, mainly with the aim of opposing Palmerston’s policy.

110 This refers to Marx’s unfinished introduction to a work he proposed to write on the history of British and Russian diplomacy in the eighteenth century. The introduction was first published under the title *Revelations of the Diplomatic History of the 18th Century* in the *Sheffield Free Press* and the London *Free Press* between June 1856 and April 1857. In 1899 Eleanor Aveling, Marx’s daughter, published it in London in book form under the heading *Secret Diplomatic History of the Eighteenth Century*.

111 The *Manchester School*—a trend in economic thought reflecting the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie. It advocated Free Trade and non-interference by the state in economic affairs. In the 1840s and 1850s the Free Traders were an
independent political group; later they constituted the Left wing of the Liberal Party.

112 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 the book tells of the migration of the Israelite tribes to America which, it claims, took place in antiquity.

113 This refers to La question romaine, a pamphlet by E. About published in Brussels in 1859. A supplement to the Schweizer Handels-Courier, No. 150, June 2, 1859 published an article “Die römische Frage (von E. About. Fortsetzung). Pius IX”.

114 These words are not from Müllner but from Franz Grillparzer’s play Die Ahnfrau (Act III).

115 On June 7, 1859 the Allgemeine Zeitung (No. 158) carried an article under the editorial heading “Venedey über die Stellung Deutschlands und Preussens zur italienischen Frage” (“Venedey on the Position of Germany and Prussia on the Italian Question”) including a letter by Venedey to a friend of his in Prussia which was originally published in the Zeitung für Norddeutschland. Among other things, the letter exposed Vogt’s ties with Prince Joseph Napoleon.

116 Marx ironically calls Vogt a “diminisher of the Empire” (Mindrer des Reichs) by contrast to “Augmenter of the Empire” (Mehrer des Reichs), a title given to German emperors in the Middle Ages. See also p. 166 of this volume.

The “Little Germany” press—the press favouring a “Little Germany”, i.e. the unification of Germany under Prussia’s supremacy without Austria.

117 A copy of the letters by Liebknecht and Blind (of September 8, 1860) is contained in Marx’s notebook for 1860. The originals have not been found. The italics are presumably Marx’s.

118 Eisele and Beisele were a pair of ridiculously stupid characters in the humorous weekly Fliegende Blätter started in 1844. They were also the heroes of Johann Wilhelm Christern’s anonymously published story Doktor Eisele's und Baron von Beisele's Landtagsreise im April 1847.

119 Sine studio means here “without favour”. It is part of the phrase “sine ira et studio” (“without anger and prejudice”) with which Tacitus declared his intention to write an unbiased history (Annales, Liber primus, I). Marx’s use of the phrase with reference to Vogt’s Studien is clearly ironic.

120 This refers to the series of pro-Bonapartist pamphlets put out by the Dentu publishing house in Paris in 1859 and 1860.

121 Théâtre de la Porte Saint-Martin—a theatre company in Paris that catered to low tastes during the Second Empire.

122 The Seven Years’ War (1756-63)—a European war in which England and Prussia fought against the coalition of Austria, France, Russia, Saxony and Sweden. In 1756-57, the Prussian troops of Frederick II won a number of victories over the Austrian and French armies; however, the success of the Russian forces in Prussia (1757-60) put Frederick II in a critical position,
nullifying the results of his victories. The war ended with France having to cede some of her colonies (including Canada and almost all of her possessions in the East Indies) to Britain, while Prussia, Austria and Saxony had to recognise the pre-war frontiers.

123 The Treaty of Basle was concluded separately by the French Republic and Prussia, a member of the European Coalition, on April 5, 1795. Prussia was forced to sign it in view of the successes of the French army and the growing differences between the coalition members, above all between Prussia and Austria. Its conclusion marked the beginning of the coalition’s disintegration. On July 22, 1795 Spain also signed a separate peace treaty with France in Basle.
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124 The treaty was designed to prevent the seizure by Prussia of the King of Saxony’s possessions and the annexation by Russia of all the lands of the former Duchy of Warsaw.
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125 The agreement, concluded in October 1821 during King George IV’s visit to Hanover, was directed against Russia’s policy on the Greek question.
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126 On July 8, 1859 the emperors of France and Austria held a separate meeting—without the King of Piedmont, France’s ally in the war against Austria (see Note 13)—in Villafranca, at which they reached an agreement on an armistice. The meeting was held on the initiative of Napoleon III, who feared that the protracted war might give a fresh impulse to the revolutionary and national liberation movement in Italy and other European states. On July 11 France and Austria signed a preliminary peace treaty under which Austria was to cede to France its rights to Lombardy and France was to transfer this territory to Piedmont. Venetia was to remain under Austrian supremacy (despite the terms of the Plombières agreement, see Note 159) and the princes of the Central Italian states were to be restored to their thrones. A confederation of Italian states was to be formed under the honorary chairmanship of the Pope.
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127 This refers to the peace treaty concluded by the Habsburgs and representatives of the Hungarian nobility at Szatmar, Hungary, in April 1711, following the defeat of the national liberation movement in Hungary. Under the peace treaty, Hungary became part of the Habsburg Empire. During the liberation war in Hungary British diplomacy sought to secure an early termination of the hostilities and preserve the integrity of the Habsburg Empire, Britain’s ally in the War of the Spanish Succession.

p. 136

128 The reference is to the London Convention of July 15, 1840 between Britain, Russia, Austria and Piedmont on supporting the Turkish Sultan against the Egyptian ruler Mehemet Ali. France, which supported Mehemet Ali, did not participate. The threat of an anti-French coalition made France withdraw her support for the Egyptian ruler.
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Under a treaty concluded in 1816 by Britain and the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies (the Kingdom of Naples) the latter undertook not to grant commercial privileges to third countries prejudicial to Britain's interests. In 1838 the King of Naples granted a French company the monopoly right to mine sulphur in Sicily, which evoked a sharp protest from Britain. To make the King of Naples rescind his decision the British Government in 1840 ordered its navy in the Mediterranean to open hostilities. Naples was forced to comply with Britain's demands.

In 1797 the British Government issued a special Bank Restriction Act making banknotes legal tender and suspending the payment of gold for them. To all intents and purposes convertibility was not reintroduced until 1821. The return to convertibility was made possible by a law passed in 1819.

In August 1858 Russia and Piedmont concluded an agreement granting the Russian Steamship and Trading Company the temporary right to use the eastern part of the Villafranca harbour, near Nice, for mooring, refuelling and repairing its ships.

In 1853 Prussia bought from the Duchy of Oldenburg a strip of the shore in the Jade Bay to set up a naval base there. It was built between 1855 and 1869 and named Wilhelmshaven.

This refers to the repercussions of the uprising in the free city of Cracow (the Cracow Republic), which, by decision of the Congress of Vienna, had been placed under the joint control of Austria, Prussia and Russia. On February 22, 1846 the insurgents seized power in Cracow, established a National Government and issued a manifesto abolishing feudal services. The uprising was suppressed at the beginning of March. In November 1846 Austria, Prussia and Russia signed a treaty incorporating Cracow into the Austrian Empire.

This refers to the decree of November 20 (8), 1847, signed by Nicholas I, allowing serfs to buy themselves off, together with their land, when their landlords' estates were put under distraint. (For details see Marx's article "The Emancipation Question", present edition, Vol. 16.)

To strengthen its influence in the Balkans, Russia supported the national liberation movement of the Balkan peoples against Turkish domination. Together with France, which likewise sought to consolidate its influence in the area, Russia backed the striving of Moldavia and Wallachia to unite and form a Romanian state. With French and Russian support Colonel Alexandru Cuza was elected hospodar (ruler) of Moldavia in January 1859 and of Wallachia in early February 1859. A united Romanian state was set up in 1862.

The memorandum was printed in the Preussisches Wochenblatt zur Besprechung politischer Tagesfragen, Nos. 23, 24 and 25 of June 9, 16 and 23, 1855. The source of its origin was not indicated. On July 13, 1859 it was reprinted in The Free Press under the heading "Memoir on Russia, for the Instruction of the Present Emperor. Drawn up by the Cabinet in 1837". Marx used the document in one of his reports for the New-York Daily Tribune (see present edition, Vol. 16). The memorandum attracted his attention in connection with the aggravation of the struggle over the question of German and Italian unification and the fight against Bonapartism. In a letter to Engels of July 19, 1859 Marx wrote that he intended to sum up Russia's role in this tragicomedy and at the
same time expose Bonaparte's intrigues. After familiarising themselves with this
document Marx and Engels expressed doubts about the authenticity of certain
passages (see Engels' letter to Marx of June 18, 1859 and Marx's letter to

Bismarck in his reminiscences (Gedanken und Erinnerungen von Otto Fürst von
Bismarck, Stuttgart, 1898, Bd. 1, S. 111-12) says that the memorandum was a
falsification.
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136 The Congress of Nemirov—the peace talks held by Russia, Austria and Turkey
in the Ukrainian town of Nemirov between August and November 1737. The
congress was convened on Turkey's initiative during the Russo-Turkish war of
1735-39, which Austria entered, on the side of Russia, in 1737. The peace
terms put forward by Russia called, among other things, for granting Moldavia
and Wallachia the status of independent principalities under Russian
protection. Turkey declared most of the terms unacceptable and resumed hostili-
ties.

The Congress of Focșani was held at the Romanian town of Focșani in July
and August 1772 with a view to ending the Russo-Turkish war started by
Turkey in 1768. The Russian delegation proposed, in particular, that Wallachia
and Moldavia should be granted independence under the joint protection of the
European powers. Turkey rejected Russia's proposals. No agreement was
reached and the hostilities were resumed.

p. 142

137 The Peace of Bucharest, concluded on May 28 (16), 1812, put an end to the
Russo-Turkish war of 1806-12. Under its terms, Russia got Bessarabia and
certain areas in Transcaucasia. Turkey was to grant internal autonomy to
Serbia and confirm its earlier agreements with Russia extending a measure of
autonomy to Moldavia and Wallachia.

p. 142

138 Règlement organique (1831-32)—constitutional acts laying down the socio-
political system of the Danubian Principalities (Wallachia and Moldavia) after
the Russo-Turkish war of 1828-29. The Règlement, based on a draft framed by
P. D. Kiselev, head of the Russian administration, was adopted by an assembly
of boyars and clergymen. Legislative power in each of the Principalities was
vested in an assembly elected by the big landowners. Executive power was
wielded by the hospodars, rulers elected for life by representatives of the
landowners, the clergy and the towns. The Règlement envisaged a number of
bourgeois reforms: abolition of internal customs duties, introduction of free
trade, and the right of peasants to move from one owner to another. However,
in view of the preservation of serfdom and concentration of political power in
the hands of the big landowners and boyars, the progressive forces in the
Principalities regarded the Règlement as a symbol of feudal stagnation. It was
repealed during the 1848 revolution.

p. 142

139 The Hetairia (full name: Philike Hetairia) was a Greek secret organisation
founded in Odessa in 1814. It moved its headquarters to Constantinople in
1818 and soon won a nation-wide following. In 1821 the Hetairia prepared a
national liberation uprising in Greece, after the beginning of which it was
disbanded.

p. 143

140 At its congress in Verona (October to December 1822) the Holy Alliance
decided to launch an armed intervention against revolutionary Spain. In 1823
French troops invaded Spain and restored the absolute power of Ferdinand
VII. They stayed in the country until 1828.

p. 143
At Navarino (a port in Greece) on October 20, 1827 the Turko-Egyptian navy clashed with the British, French and Russian squadrons sent into Greek waters for armed mediation in the war between Turkey and the Greek insurgents. The battle was fought after the Turkish command had refused to end the massacre of the Greek population. The forces of the three European powers, commanded by the British Vice-Admiral Edward Codrington, routed the Turko-Egyptian fleet. This facilitated the national liberation struggle of the Greeks and Russia's success in its war against Turkey in 1828 and 1829.

Young Italy (Giovine Italia) was a secret organisation of Italian revolutionaries (1831-48) founded by Mazzini. It fought for national independence and a united Italian republic.

In October 1850 Emperor Nicholas I of Russia, Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria and Count Frederick William von Brandenburg, the head of the Prussian Government, met in Warsaw. The conference was held on the initiative of Nicholas I in connection with the sharpening struggle between Austria and Prussia for supremacy in Germany. The Russian Tsar, acting as arbiter, used his influence to make Prussia abandon its attempts to form a political confederation of German states under Prussia's aegis. The dispute was settled when the heads of the Austrian and Prussian governments signed an agreement in Olmütz (Olomouc) on November 29, 1850 under which Prussia renounced its claims to supremacy in Germany and yielded on the issues of Schleswig-Holstein and Hesse-Cassel. As a result of the agreement an Austrian army corps was sent to Holstein.

Pozzo di Borgo, Russia's Ambassador to Paris, sent the dispatch in question to Count Nesselrode, the Russian Chancellor, on October 16 (4), 1825 in reply to the latter's circular letter of August 18 (6), 1825. The circular, drawn up at the instructions of Alexander I, asked the Russian Ambassadors abroad for their opinion about the Western Powers' policy vis-à-vis Russia in connection with the Eastern question. Pozzo di Borgo suggested in his dispatch that Russia should resort to armed force in dealing with Turkey. The dispatch was published in Recueil des documents pour la plupart secrets et inédits et d'autres pièces historiques utiles à consulter dans la crise actuelle (juillet 1853), Paris. Marx used the second (1854) edition of the book.

Finis Poloniae!—a phrase attributed—without sufficient grounds—to Tadeusz Kościusko, the leader of the national liberation movement in Poland in 1794. He is supposed to have uttered it after the defeat of the insurgent army at the battle of Maciejowice (October 10, 1794) when he was taken prisoner.

Marx is referring to the map of Slav lands compiled by the Czech Slavonic scholar Pavel Josef Šafařík for his book Slovanský národopis (Slavonic Ethnography) published in 1842.

The Lay of Ludwig (Das Ludwigslied) was written in the Frankish dialect by an anonymous poet in the late ninth century. It is a panegyric of the West Frankish King Louis III, celebrating his victory over the Normans at Sancourt in 881 (Hausschatz der Volkspoesie, Leipzig, 1846).
On June 11, 1849 Ledru-Rollin, the leader of the petty-bourgeois democrats, tabled a motion in the Legislative Assembly calling for the impeachment of President Louis Bonaparte and the government for violating the Constitution by sending French troops to crush the Roman Republic and restore the temporal power of the Pope. After it had been voted down by the conservative majority of the Assembly the petty-bourgeois democrats tried to organise a mass protest demonstration on June 13, which was dispersed by government troops. The leaders of the Montagne, the petty-bourgeois faction in the Assembly, were stripped of their powers as deputies and persecuted. Some of them were forced to emigrate. The June 13 events revealed the Montagne leaders' indecision and inability to head the revolutionary movement of the masses (see Marx's The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850, present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 101-07).

Napoléon le Petit (Napoleon the Little)—the nickname given to Louis Bonaparte by Victor Hugo in a speech he made to the French Legislative Assembly in 1851. It gained wide currency after the publication in 1852 of Hugo's Napoléon le Petit.

Here Marx uses the words “ein Ende mit Schrecken”, apparently an allusion to the dictum “Lieber ein Ende mit Schrecken als ein Schrecken ohne Ende” (“A dreadful end is better than dread without end”). It is attributed to Ferdinand Schill, commander of volunteer units that fought against Napoleon's troops in 1806-07. Schill is believed to have uttered these words in a speech he made in the market-place of Arneburg on the Elbe on May 12, 1809 when he urged Prussia to fight France.

In the early 1850s the French Government drew up a plan for the import of African Negroes, including inhabitants of Portugal's African colonies, for work on plantations in France's West Indian colonies. The implementation of the plan was tantamount to a revival of the slave trade and led to a conflict between France and Portugal.

This refers to the abortive attempt by the Italian revolutionaries Orsini and Pieri to assassinate Napoleon III on January 14, 1858. Marx refers to it in several of his articles, e.g. “The War Prospect in France” and “Quid pro Quo” (see present edition, Vol. 16).

By the Lois de sûreté publique (laws on social security) Marx means the Loi des suspects (law on suspects) adopted by the Corps Lésgislatif on February 19, 1858. It granted the government and the Emperor the unlimited right to deport persons suspected of hostility towards the regime of the Second Empire to various places in France and Algeria and even to banish them from French territory.

By the decree of January 27, 1858 the territory of the Second Empire was divided into five General Captainies headed by marshals. This was done on the pattern of Spain, where the captain generals (commanders of military districts) wielded full power.

The decree on the regency and the establishment of the Privy Council was issued on February 1, 1858, soon after Orsini's attempt on the life of Napoleon III. Pélissier was a member of the Council, which was to become the Regency Council if the Emperor's son, a minor, acceded to the throne.
Napoleon III was the son of Napoleon I's brother Louis Bonaparte, King of Holland from 1806 to 1810. By calling Napoleon III the "nephew of the battle of Austerlitz" Marx alludes to the fact that the coup d'état of December 2, 1851 was timed to coincide with the anniversary of the battle of Austerlitz (December 2, 1805) at which Napoleon I defeated the allied Russian and Austrian forces.

At the end of 1858 the French journalist Montalembert was put on trial for writing an article condemning the regime of the Second Empire ("Un débat sur l'Inde au parlement anglais", Le Correspondant, nouvelle série, V. IX, octobre 1858). He was pardoned by Napoleon III but rejected the pardon and demanded his acquittal. Marx ironically draws a parallel between this trial and that of John Hampden, a prominent figure in the English seventeenth-century revolution, who in 1636 refused to pay "ship money", a royal tax not authorised by the House of Commons. The Hampden trial increased the opposition to absolutism in England.

In his pamphlet De la Justice poursuivie par l'Eglise (Brussels, 1858) Proudhon compares the Bonaparte and Orléans dynasties and gives preference to the principles of government proclaimed by the latter, but makes reservations concerning the need for certain democratic reforms. Marx ironically compares these reservations with the Acte additionel, the constitutional regulations introduced by Napoleon I in France in 1815 upon his return from Elba.

This refers to the abortive republican uprising of troops in Chalon-sur-Saône on March 6, 1858 (see Marx's article "Portents of the Day", present edition, Vol. 15).

On January 20, 1858 Count Walewski, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, sent a Note to the British Government expressing dissatisfaction with Britain's granting asylum to political refugees. In this connection Palmerston tabled the Conspiracy to Murder Bill in the House of Commons on February 8. During its second reading Milner Gibson proposed an amendment censuring the Palmerston Government for not giving an appropriate reply to the Note. The amendment, adopted by the majority of the House, amounted to a vote of no-confidence in the Government and forced it to resign.

On July 21, 1858, at Plombières, Napoleon III and Prime Minister Cavour of the Kingdom of Sardinia (Piedmont) reached a secret agreement envisaging Franco-Sardinian military co-operation against Austria, the abolition of Austrian rule in Lombardy and Venetia and their union with Piedmont, the establishment of a North Italian state to be ruled by the Savoy dynasty, and the cession by Piedmont of Savoy and Nice to France. The agreement was formalised by a Franco-Sardinian treaty concluded in Turin in January 1859. During the Plombières meeting the question of a Franco-Sardinian war against Austria was decided. It started in April 1859.

In the autumn of 1858, Palmerston, then head of the Whig opposition to the Derby-Disraeli Tory Cabinet, was invited by Napoleon III to Compiègne to clarify his position on the impending Franco-Austrian war. At the meeting Palmerston did not object to the Austrians being driven out of Italy, but in his speech at the opening of Parliament on February 3, 1859 he condemned France's action.
On October 10, 1850 Louis Bonaparte, then President of the French Republic, held a general review of troops on the plain of Satory (near Versailles). During the review Bonaparte, who was preparing a coup d'état, treated the soldiers and officers to sausages in order to win their support.

At the Congress of Paris on March 30, 1856 France, Britain, Austria, Sardinia, Prussia and Turkey, on the one hand, and Russia, on the other, signed a peace treaty that concluded the Crimean War (1853-56). Russia, defeated in the war, was forced to cede the estuary of the Danube and part of South Bessarabia, renounce its protection of the Danubian Principalities, and agree to the neutralisation of the Black Sea, which involved the closure of the Straits to foreign warships and a ban on the maintenance by Russia and Turkey of naval arsenals and navies in the Black Sea. In exchange for Sevastopol and the other Crimean towns seized by the Allies, Russia was to return Kars to Turkey. France refused to support Britain's demand for the severance of the Caucasus from Russia and Austria's demand for the incorporation of Bessarabia into Turkey. The Congress marked the beginning of a Franco-Russian rapprochement.

The Thirty Years' War (1618-48)—a European war in which the Pope, the Spanish and Austrian Habsburgs and the Catholic German princes, rallied under the banner of Catholicism, fought the Protestant countries: Bohemia, Denmark, Sweden, the Republic of the Netherlands and a number of Protestant German states. The rulers of Catholic France—rivals of the Habsburgs—supported the Protestant camp. Germany was the principal battle area and the main object of plunder and territorial claims. The Treaty of Westphalia (1648) sealed the political dismemberment of Germany.

During the Irish uprising of 1798 the town of Kilkenny was occupied by Hessian mercenaries serving in the British army, who used to amuse themselves by watching fights between cats with their tails tied together. One day, a soldier, seeing an officer approaching, cut off the cats' tails with his sword and the cats ran away. The officer was told that the cats had eaten each other and only their tails remained.

The Treaty of Campoformio, signed on October 17, 1797, concluded the victorious war of the French Republic against Austria, a member of the first anti-French coalition. Under the treaty, France got Belgium, the Ionian Islands and part of Albania. Austria was to help France annex the left bank of the Rhine, and relinquished its former possessions in Northern Italy. Together with part of the abolished Venetian Republic, these constituted the Cisalpine Republic, a new state under French protection. A big portion of the Venetian Republic, including Venice, and also Istria and Dalmatia, were given to Austria in exchange for concessions made to France on the Rhine frontier.

The Council of States—one of the two houses of Switzerland's Federal Assembly (Parliament). The other house is called the National Council.

Vallée des Dappes—a mountain valley on the border of the Swiss Canton of Vaud and France. The Congress of Vienna (1814-15) ruled it to be Swiss territory; however France later refused to recognise this decision. Because of its strategic importance the Vallée des Dappes remained a bone of contention.
between the two states until Switzerland ceded part of it to France in exchange for territorial compensation in 1862.

In the autumn of 1856 a conflict developed between Prussia and Switzerland over the events in Neuchâtel (in German: Neuenburg). From 1707 to 1806 the principality of Neuchâtel was a dwarf state under Prussian rule. In 1815, by decision of the Vienna Congress, it was incorporated into the Swiss Confederation as its 21st canton, at the same time remaining a vassal of Prussia. In February 1848 a bourgeois revolution in Neuchâtel put an end to Prussian rule and a republic was proclaimed. In 1852 Britain, France and Russia signed a protocol in London which re-affirmed the Prussian King's rights to Neuchâtel. The Prussio-Swiss conflict flared up with fresh violence in September 1856 when the Swiss authorities arrested the participants in an abortive monarchist putsch in Neuchâtel who had the support of the Prussian King. The Swiss Government demanded that Prussia should renounce all its claims to the canton. The conflict was settled in the spring of 1857 thanks to the diplomatic intervention of other powers, notably France. The Prussian King had to waive his claim to Neuchâtel, while the Swiss Government released the arrested royalists.

The Sonderbund—a separatist union of the seven economically backward Catholic cantons of Switzerland formed in 1843 to resist progressive bourgeois reforms and to defend the privileges of the Church and the Jesuits. The decree of the Swiss Diet of July 1847 dissolving the Sonderbund was used by the latter as a pretext for starting hostilities against the other cantons early in November. On November 23, 1847 the Sonderbund army was defeated by the federal forces. Attempts by Austria and Prussia to interfere in Swiss affairs in support of the Sonderbund failed. Louis Philippe's Government virtually sided with these powers in protecting the Sonderbund.

In this Note, directed to a number of states, the Federal Council declared that in the event of war in Italy, Switzerland would defend its neutrality and territorial integrity and would, in keeping with the resolutions of the Congress of Vienna, occupy the neutralised area of Savoy (Northern Savoy).

The Congress had proclaimed the “perpetual neutrality” of Switzerland and, in its Final Act, adopted on June 9, 1815, declared Chablais and Faucigny, the provinces of Northern Savoy, a neutralised territory and authorised Switzerland, in the event of war or the threat of war between the neighbouring states, to occupy these provinces, at the same time enjoining the Kingdom of Sardinia to withdraw its troops from there.

Marx quotes from Klage (Lament), an anonymous twelfth-century German poem. It is a kind of supplement to the Nibelungenlied (or Der Nibelunge Not). Marx probably used the 1826 edition by Karl Lachmann Der Nibelungen Not mit der Klage. He quotes from an entry in his notebook of 1860.

Iwein, oder der Ritter mit dem Löwen (Ywain, or the Knight of the Lion) is a narrative poem by the medieval German poet Hartmann von Aue. Its central idea is the sacrifice of happiness for the sake of honour. The poem is an adaptation of the novel Yvain ou le Chevalier au Lion by the French twelfth-century writer Chrétien de Troyes. Marx presumably used the edition, Hartmann von Aue, Iwein, Eine Erzählung (Mit Anmerkungen von G. F. Benecke und K. Lachmann), Berlin, 1843.
171 *Die Kaiserchronik*—a German epic of the twelfth century telling in semi-legendary form the history of the Roman and German emperors from Caesar to 1147. The extant version is attributed to the twelfth-century German poet Konrad. Marx probably used the edition prepared by Heinrich Kurz, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, Leipzig, 1857. p. 185

172 Prince Napoleon commanded a division in the Crimea in 1854. Lacking military talent and unpopular with the army, he feigned ill health to stay away from directing military operations and later returned to Paris without official permission. p. 189

173 An allusion to Napoleon III’s rumoured illegitimacy. Officially he was the son of King Louis Bonaparte of Holland, a brother of Napoleon I. p. 190

174 See Note 70. p. 190

175 See Note 165. p. 192

176 See Note 159. p. 192

177 *Corybants*—attendants of the goddess Cybele who were supposed to accompany her with wild dances and music; also priests of Cybele who acted as Corybants with orgiastic processions and rites. p. 194

178 The *Crédit Mobilier* (*Société général du Crédit Mobilier*) was a French joint-stock bank founded in 1852 by the Péreire brothers. Closely connected with and protected by the Government of Napoleon III, it engaged in large-scale speculation. The bank was involved, in particular, in the railway-building business. It went bankrupt in 1867 and was liquidated in 1871. p. 198

179 *Helvetia*—a Swiss student association which in 1859-60 opposed Napoleon III’s plans for the annexation of Savoy to France. p. 201

180 See Note 45. p. 204

181 The *Fusionists* advocated fusion of the Legitimists (the supporters of the elder branch of the French Bourbon dynasty) and the Orleanists (the adherents of the younger branch). *Collège de France*—one of France’s oldest higher educational establishments (founded 1530 in Paris).

*L’Institut de France*—France’s highest scientific and art centre. It comprises a number of leading academies, including the Académie Française. p. 207

182 This refers to the committee of the party of Order, which sat in the *rue de Poitiers*. The party of Order formed in 1848 was a coalition of monarchist groups: the Legitimists (supporters of the Bourbon dynasty), the Orleanists (supporters of the Orleans dynasty) and the Bonapartists. It was the party of the conservative big bourgeoisie. From 1849 until the coup d’état of December 2, 1851 it held sway in the Legislative Assembly of the Second Republic. p. 208

183 An allusion to the shrine of the three Magi in Cologne Cathedral (cf. Heinrich Heine, *Deutschland, ein Wintermärchen*, Chapter VII). p. 210

184 Marx is referring to Vogt’s speech in the Frankfurt National Assembly on April 24, 1849 (*Stenographischer Bericht über die Verhandlungen der deutschen constituiren-
den Nationalversammlung zu Frankfurt am Main). An excerpt from Vogt's speech was published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 283, April 27, 1849 and is contained in Marx's notebook. p. 211

185 *Mouse Tower*—a tower built on a rock in the middle of the Rhine below the town of Bingen. Hemmed in by rocks, this section of the river is called the Binger Loch (Bingen Hole). According to one version, the name of the tower is associated with Archbishop Hatto II of Mayence. Legend has it that he ordered a number of starving people to be burnt in a barn. When their screams were heard, he jokingly told the bystanders that these were the cries of the mice who had caused the food shortage. This earned him the disfavour of mice, to avoid which he had a tower built for him on a rock in the Binger Loch. However the mice found him out there and devoured him. p. 212

186 An allusion to Vogt's participation in the Genevan joint-stock company La Cimenterie (see this volume, p. 327). p. 212

187 An allusion to the prolonged resistance that the garrison of Komárom fortress, commanded by General Klapka, offered to the besieging Austrian army and the Russian troops sent by Tsar Nicholas I. The fortress held out until the end of September 1849. The defence of Komárom was the closing act of the Hungarian revolution of 1848-49. p. 214

188 This refers to the rising in Milan on February 6, 1853 organised by the followers of the Italian revolutionary Mazzini and supported by Hungarian revolutionary refugees. The aim of the insurgents, mostly Italian patriotic workers, was to overthrow Austrian rule in Italy. However, the leaders' conspiratorial tactics and failure to take into account the actual situation led to the rapid defeat of the insurgents. Marx analysed the rising in a number of articles (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 508-09, 513-16 and 535-37). p. 217

189 Speaking of manifestos issued by Kossuth and Mazzini, Marx based himself on the article “Data by Which to Judge of Kossuth” (*The Free Press*, No. 5, May 27, 1855), which mentioned a manifesto issued by Kossuth in 1855 and added: “The names associated in this with Kossuth were Ledru-Rollin and Mazzini.”

The *Central Committee of European Democracy*, set up in London in June 1850 on Mazzini's initiative, was an organisation of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois refugees from different countries. Kossuth played an important part in it, as well as Mazzini, Ledru-Rollin and Ruge. The Committee's Inaugural Manifesto, “Aux peuples!”, of July 22, 1850 (*Le Proscrit*, No. 2, August 6, 1850) was criticized by Marx and Engels in their international review for May to October 1850 published in the autumn of that year in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Politisch-ökonomische Revue* (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 529-32). Extremely heterogeneous in composition and ideological principles, the Committee virtually disintegrated in March 1852 because of the strained relations between the Italian and French democratic refugees. p. 218

190 Kossuth's lectures of 1858 and a number of his articles were published in Brussels in 1859 under the title: Kossuth L., *L'Europe, l'Autriche et la Hongrie*.

The *Concordats* are agreements between the Pope and the governments of individual countries on the status and privileges of the Catholic Church in these countries. Under the Concordat of 1855 concluded by the Holy See and Vienna, the Catholic Church in Austria was to enjoy autonomy, the right of
direct communication with Rome and the right to own property. It was to act as supreme spiritual censor and wield a vast influence on the schools.

p. 221

191 The facts Marx presents here and further on (p. 222) concerning Kossuth's meeting with Napoleon III and financial dealings with the Bonapartists were related to him by Szemere (see Marx's letter to Engels of September 28, 1859). He also used them in his article "Kossuth and Louis Napoleon", published in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 5748, September 24, 1859 (see present edition, Vol. 16). The article caused considerable repercussions among Hungarian refugees in the United States. "Hungarians in New York, Chicago, New Orleans, etc., have held meetings at which they resolved to send Kossuth a letter challenging him to justify himself with respect to my article in the New-York Tribune," Marx wrote to Engels on November 19, 1859 (present edition, Vol. 40).

A version of this article, headlined "Particulars of Kossuth's Transactions with Louis Napoleon" was published in The Free Press, No. 10, September 28, 1859. On October 8, 1859 Marx wrote to Szemere that "the Free Press report was reprinted in English, Scottish and Irish provincial newspapers". A German version of the article appeared in the supplement to the Allgemeine Zeitung, No. 276, October 3, 1859. On October 10 Marx informed Engels that it had also been reprinted by the Weser-Zeitung.

p. 221

192 This refers to Emperor Francis Joseph's diploma of October 20, 1860 (das Kaiserliche Diplom vom 20. Oktober 1860) which granted a measure of autonomy to the non-German parts of the Austrian Empire. It was a half-measure designed to placate the advocates of federalism, particularly the Hungarians. (Engels analysed it in his article "Austria—Progress of the Revolution", see this volume, pp. 499-500.) However the October diploma was rescinded a few months later by the Patent of February 26, 1861, which reintroduced the centralist system in the Austrian Empire.

p. 225

193 In usum Delphini—literally: "for the use of the Dauphin", in a figurative sense: "with omissions", "bowdlerised". The phrase gained currency after 1668 when the works of ancient classics were published for the son of Louis XIV, the heir to the French throne (the Dauphin), expurgated of all "objectionable" passages.

p. 225

194 On August 13, 1849, at Világos, the Hungarian army commanded by Görgey surrendered to the Tsarist troops sent to help the Habsburgs suppress the revolution in Hungary. Although the Hungarian army possessed considerable resources and was able to continue the struggle, Görgey treasonably capitulated to meet the wishes of the conservative nobility who were opposed to a spread of the revolution.

p. 226

195 The ultramontane party in Switzerland was formed in the 1840s on the initiative of the reactionary Catholic circles in connection with the intensified opposition of the economically backward cantons to the liberal-democratic reforms carried out by the bourgeoisie. This opposition led to the establishment of the Sonderbund (see Note 168) and a civil war in Switzerland.

p. 228

196 This refers to one of the charitable educational institutions run by the Herrnhut communities. The first of these communities was set up in Herrnhut, Saxony, in 1722 by followers of a religious fraternity originally known as the Moravian
Brethren. There were a number of Herrnhut communities in Germany, America and South Africa. p. 231

197 “Laissez aller et laissez faire” was the formula of the advocates of free trade and non-intervention of the state in economic relations. p. 231

198 This refers to the street riots in Geneva in October 1846 caused by differences between bourgeois radicals and Rightists over the attitude to be adopted towards the Sonderbund and democratic reforms in the administration of the canton of Geneva. p. 231

199 See Note 168. p. 231

200 In January 1849 Mazzini and J. Ph. Becker advanced a plan for establishing a volunteer German-Helvetic republican legion to support the revolutionary movement in Sicily. The Swiss Federal Council banned propaganda of the plan in the Swiss press as prejudicial to Switzerland’s neutrality. Becker’s attempts to organise the shipment to Italy of the 2,500 volunteers assembled in Marseilles failed because of a ban imposed by the French authorities, who were preparing an intervention against the Roman Republic. p. 232

201 See Note 178. p. 234

   Schilda—the name of a town whose inhabitants, portrayed in Die Schildbürger, a German popular satirical book of the late 16th century, have come to be regarded as epitomes of philistine narrow-mindedness and obtuseness. p. 236

203 The original has “denkende Leser” (“thinking readers”) here. This ironic reference to the readers of the National-Zeitung seems to be an allusion to the title of K. Rotteck’s well-known book Allgemeine Geschichte vom Anfang der historischen Kenntniss bis auf unsere Zeiten; für denkende Geschichtsfreunde (Universal History from the Beginnings of Historical Knowledge to Modern Times; for Thinking Friends of History), Freiburg und Konstanz, 1813-1818. p. 236

204 These lines (Marx quotes in English and gives the German translation in a footnote) are from Alexander Pope’s The Dunciad. An Heroic Poem, Book I, written between 1728 and 1743. Pope gives a satirical portrayal of his literary adversaries, relegating them to the realm of Dulness. p. 237

205 The Neue Oder-Zeitung was a German bourgeoisie-democratic daily published under this title in Breslau (Wroclaw) from 1849 to 1855. It started publication in March 1849 following a split in the editorial board of the oppositional Catholic Allgemeine Oder-Zeitung, which appeared from 1846. The Neue Oder-Zeitung was the most radical newspaper in Germany in the 1850s, and the object of government persecution. Its editorial board was headed by the bourgeois democrats Temme, Stein and Elsner. The last named became Editor-in-Chief in September 1855. In 1855 Marx contributed to the Neue Oder-Zeitung as its London correspondent. In view of the almost complete absence of a working-class press in the years of reaction Marx and Engels
considered it essential to use the bourgeois-democratic press in the struggle against the reactionary forces.

206 See present edition, Vol. 8, pp. 390-91 ("Stein"). The italics in this passage were partly changed by Marx.

Agreement Assembly (Vereinbarer-Versammlung) was Marx's and Engels' ironic way of referring to the Prussian National Assembly, which was guided by the "theory of agreement". Convened in Berlin in May 1848, it was to draw up a Constitution not on the basis of sovereign and constituent rights but "by agreement with the Crown" (the principle formulated by the Camphausen-Hansemann Government and adopted by the majority of the Assembly). The Crown used the theory of agreement to camouflage its preparations for a counter-revolutionary coup d'etat. On December 5, 1848 the Prussian National Assembly was disbanded.

The imposed Constitution was made public on the same day. It introduced a two-chamber parliament in Prussia. By the imposition of age and property qualifications the First Chamber was made a privileged chamber of the gentry. Under the electoral law of December 6, 1848, the right to vote in the two-stage elections to the Second Chamber was granted only to "independent Prussians". The two Chambers first met on February 26, 1849. However, the Brandenburg-Manteuffel 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 ruling circles of Prussia, in a still more anti-democratic spirit.

207 The Corn Laws were repealed in June 1846. They imposed high import duties on agricultural produce in the interests of the landowners, in order to maintain high prices on the home market. The repeal of the Corn Laws marked a victory for the industrial bourgeoisie, who opposed them under the slogan of free trade.

208 The First Democratic Congress, held in Frankfurt am Main from June 14 to June 17, 1848 and attended by delegates of 89 democratic and workers' organisations from different German cities, decided to unite all democratic associations and set up district committees and a Central Committee of German Democrats. The latter had its headquarters in Berlin.

209 See Note 203.

210 Septembrists was the name given to the Jacobins by their enemies who slanderously accused them of wanton brutality in September 1792, during the French Revolution.

211 Levites—Hebrew priests in the service of the Temple of Jerusalem for whose benefit tithes were collected (see Numbers 3:39).

212 The friend in question was Ferdinand Lassalle (see Marx's letters to him of February 23 and March 3, 1860). In reply to Marx's request Lassalle answered that no one in Berlin knew of any Daily Telegraph correspondent (Lassalle's

The acquaintance mentioned further in the text was presumably Eduard Fischel. An entry in Marx’s notebook for 1860 mentions the dispatch of a letter to him (it has not been found). Marx learned the name of the Daily Telegraph correspondent from Fischel’s letter of May 30, 1860.

213 Magistrat in German means municipal or city council.

214 The Echternach procession (or leaping procession) has been held annually in the Luxemburg town of Echternach at Whitsun since the Middle Ages in gratitude for the termination of an epidemic of St. Vitus’s dance (chorea) which raged in the town in 1374. The participants in the procession perform complicated forward and backward movements.

215 An allusion to the speculative activities of the Crédit Mobilier bank founded by the Péreire Brothers (see Note 178).

216 Marx calls Vincke a knight of the joyful countenance by analogy with the Knight of the Doleful Countenance (Don Quixote).

Chevalier sans peur et sans reproche (knight without fear or reproach)—appellation of the medieval knight Pierre du Terrail seigneur de Bayard. It is used with reference to other people too, both in its literal sense and ironically.

217 The conservative deputies of the Frankfurt National Assembly arranged a banquet in honour of the Regent of the Empire, Archduke John, who arrived in Frankfurt am Main on July 11, 1848. Vincke was present too. The reference is to his speech at the sitting of July 15, 1848 (Deutsche Reichstags-Zeitung, No. 49, July 16, 1848).

The couplet quoted lower in the text is from an eighteenth-century student song.

218 The Corpus juris civilis, compiled in the sixth century under the Emperor Justinian, was a code of law regulating property relations in Rome’s slave-owning society. It was applied in part in Germany from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century.

219 An allusion to Benda’s challenging Vincke to a duel for his provocative anti-Jewish remarks which Benda took as a personal insult. Vincke refused to fight. The Neue Rheinische Zeitung wrote about the incident in its issue No. 184, January 1, 1849.

The United Diet, convened by Frederick William IV in Berlin in April 1847, was an assembly of Prussia’s eight provincial diets and, like these, was based on the principle of social estates. Its terms of reference were limited to the endorsement of new taxes and loans, a deliberative vote in the discussions of draft laws and the right to petition the king. The first United Diet was dissolved because of its refusal to approve a new loan.

220 Here and below Marx used the reports on the session of the Frankfurt National Assembly published in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung.
An account of Vincke's speech appeared in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 126, October 26, 1848.

221 This refers to the counter-revolutionary stand of the German and Austrian bourgeoisie during the Vienna uprising in October 1848. It was manifest, in particular, in the actions of the majority of the Frankfurt National Assembly and the central authority which, posing as mediator, virtually sabotaged aid to revolutionary Vienna. Vincke actively supported this attitude (*Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 126, October 26, 1848).

222 The Fata Morgana of *Little Germany*—a plan for the unification of Germany from above under Prussia's aegis and excluding Austria. Supported by the majority of the bourgeoisie, it reflected the struggle between Austria and Prussia for supremacy in Germany after unification.

223 Here Marx summarises Vincke's speeches in the Prussian United Diet on December 29, 1848 and January 3, 1849 (*Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, Nos. 184 and 185, January 1 and 3, 1849).

224 *Daimios*—powerful feudal barons in medieval Japan.

225 The *Ministry of Action* (Ministerium der That) was the name given during the 1848-49 revolution to Prussia's Auerswald-Hansemann government (June-September 1848) (see Engels' article "The Fall of the Government of Action", present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 417-19).

226 These words were spoken by Count von Brandenburg, the Prussian Prime Minister, at a sitting of the Lower Chamber of the Prussian Diet on April 20, 1849 in connection with the proposal to adopt the Imperial Constitution (*Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 280, April 24, 1849).

227 See Note 193.

228 This refers to the *Democratic Association* founded in Brussels in the autumn of 1847. It consisted of proletarian revolutionaries, mainly German revolutionary refugees, and radical bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democrats. Marx and Engels took an active part in setting up the Association. On November 15, 1847 Marx was elected its Vice-President (the President was Luden Jottrand, a Belgian democrat), and under his influence the Association became a leading centre of the international democratic movement. During the February 1848 revolution in France, the proletarian wing of the Association pressed for the armament of Belgian workers and an intensification of the struggle for a democratic republic. However after Marx's expulsion from Brussels in early March 1848 and the suppression of the revolutionary elements by the Belgian authorities, the Association's activities assumed a narrower, purely local character and virtually ceased in 1849.

229 The *Labour Parliament* met in Manchester from March 6 to 18, 1854. It had been called in connection with the rise of the strike movement in Britain in 1853 on the initiative of a group of Chartists headed by Ernest Jones. As early as the end of 1853 (Marx mistakenly gives this as the date of the Labour Parliament's meeting) this group proposed setting up a broad working-class
organisation called The Mass Movement which was to bring together the trade unions and the unorganised workers with a view to co-ordinating strikes in different parts of the country. The organisation was to be headed by a periodically convened Labour Parliament consisting of delegates elected by meetings of unorganised workers and the trade unions affiliated with The Mass Movement. The Labour Parliament adopted the programme of The Mass Movement and formed a five-member executive committee. Marx, elected an honorary delegate to the Parliament, sent a letter which was read out on March 16 (see present edition, Vol. 13, pp. 57-58). In it he put forward the task of establishing an independent mass working-class party in Britain.

However, the attempt to set up The Mass Movement failed because most trade union leaders rejected political struggle and refused to support the idea of forming a united mass working-class organisation. The decline of the strike movement in the summer of 1854 was a contributing factor. The Labour Parliament did not meet after March 1854.

270 Marx intended to write a pamphlet entitled On Prussian Justice (see his letters to Engels of October 25, 1860 and to Lassalle of October 2, 1860, present edition, Vol. 41). The plan did not materialise.

271 Code civil (Code Napoléon)—French Civil Code published in 1804. It was introduced by Napoleon in the conquered regions of West and Southwest Germany and remained in force in the Rhine Province after its incorporation into Prussia in 1815.

272 The Patriots was a republican society of German refugees in London in the 1850s and 60s. Its members included Blind, Freiligrath and Hollinger.

The National Association (Deutscher National-Verein) was a party of the German liberal bourgeoisie which advocated the unification of Germany (without Austria) in a strong centralised state under the aegis of the Prussian monarchy. Its inaugural congress was held in Frankfurt in September 1859.

The open letter of the Patriots to the National Association was published in a number of German newspapers in November 1859. It contained a vaguely formulated plan for the dynastic unification of Germany under Prussia's aegis.

273 Quirites—the citizens of Ancient Rome in their civil capacity.

274 Schily's letter to Marx is not dated. Presumably it was written at the end of June 1860. It deals with the fate of German refugees, participants in the revolution of 1848-49, who were not members of the Frankfurt National Assembly.

275 The Grand Councils in Switzerland were the legislatures of the city cantons set up under the Constitution of 1803.

The National Council—one of the two chambers of the Swiss Federal Assembly formed under the Constitution of 1848 (the other chamber was the Council of States).

The Federal Council was the supreme federal executive body, formed under the 1848 Constitution. Its chairman was the president of the republic.

The Council of States—see Note 165.
236 See Note 17.  

237 Vae victis! (woe to the vanquished!). Defeated by the Gauls at Allia in 390 the Romans had to pay a ransom of a thousand pounds of gold. When the Romans complained that the weights used by the victors were too heavy, the Gauls' king Brennus exclaimed "Vae victis!" and threw his big sword on the scales too. (Titus Livius, V, 48).  

238 Marx's assumption that Vogt, as the Berne correspondent of the Frankfurter Journal, was the author of the articles in question has not been proved.  

239 A reference to the Biblical "fleshpots" of Egypt. During the Jews' exodus from Egypt, the fainthearts among them, depressed by the hardships of the march and by hunger, recalled with longing the days of captivity when they at least had enough to eat.  

240 The protest in question was quoted in Schily's letter to Marx (written after March 6, 1860).  

241 See Note 75.  

242 See Note 59.  

243 See Note 66.  

244 This refers to the book Die Kommunisten-Verschwörungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, Berlin, Erster Theil 1853, Zweiter Theil 1854, compiled by the police officers Wermuth and Stieber. The appendices to the first volume, a "history" of the working-class movement written for the information of the police, contained some documents of the Communist League. The second volume was a blacklist of persons associated with the working-class and democratic movement, complete with biographical data.  

245 See Note 87.  

246 On May 15, 1848 workers led by Blanqui and Barbès staged a revolutionary uprising against the anti-labour and anti-democratic policy of the bourgeois Constituent Assembly, which met on May 4. Participants in the popular demonstration forced their way into its premises and demanded the formation of a Ministry of Labour and a number of other measures. An attempt was made to set up a revolutionary government. However, National Guards from the bourgeois districts and units of the regular army helped restore the Assembly to power. The leaders of the movement were arrested and put on trial.  

248 The Order of St. Gregory the Great was founded by Pope Gregory XVI in 1831.

249 The meeting of the Russian and Austrian emperors and the Prince Regent of Prussia took place in Warsaw. The attempted rapprochement between Austria, Prussia and Russia was motivated by a desire to prevent the unification of Italy and counteract the foreign policy of Napoleon III, who supported Victor Emmanuel II of Sardinia.

250 Maronites—members of the Maronite Christian Church, chiefly in Lebanon. The reference here is to the clashes between Maronite peasants and townspeople, on the one hand, and their feudal lords belonging to the Druse Moslem sect, on the other. Externally a religious conflict between Christians and Moslems, it was essentially a class conflict. See also Note 316.

251 An allusion to Louis Bonaparte's financial claims on the National Assembly at the time of his Presidency (1848-52).

252 The memorandum was sent to Marx by Bertalan Szemere. The covering letter has not been found. It was presumably written in February 1860. The memorandum is an account of a conversation Kossuth had with the British MP Sandford on May 30, 1854. Szemere learned of this conversation from a letter he had received from Richard Cobden, leader of the British Free Traders.

253 In July 1848 the Austrian Government asked Hungary to provide troops for the suppression of the liberation struggle in Italy. Kossuth readily supported this request and urged the State Assembly to grant it. After winning a victory at Custozza on July 25 Austria consolidated its positions in Italy and threw all its forces against the liberation struggle in Hungary.

254 According to verified data, the right to raise tithes was first relinquished by Dorocy Zsigmond, the representative of the bishopric of Pecs, who made a statement to this effect in the Lower Chamber. The representatives of other bishoprics followed his example.

255 On June 16 and 17, 1860, at Baden-Baden, Napoleon III met the Prince Regent William of Prussia, and the princes of other German states. Hoping to realise his ambition of annexing the German lands on the left bank of the Rhine, he sought a deal with Prussia at the expense of the small German states. The meeting ended in failure for Napoleon and helped Prussia secure a key role in Germany's foreign policy.

256 This article was written by Marx for the *New-York Daily Tribune* to which he contributed from August 1851 to March 1862. On Marx's request many of the articles were written by Engels (see notes 273, 302, 314). By agreement with the *New-York Daily Tribune* editors Marx wrote on some of his articles dealing with different European countries “Paris”, “Berlin” or “Vienna” respectively. (See Marx's letters to Engels of November 10, 1858, December 16, 1858 and January 13 and 15, 1859 and also Marx's letter to F. Lassalle of March 28, 1859; present edition, Vol. 40).
The articles which Marx and Engels contributed to the *New-York Daily Tribune* mainly dealt with the most important questions of foreign and home policy, the working-class movement, the economic development of the major European countries, colonial expansion and the national liberation movement in the oppressed and dependent countries. They immediately attracted attention by their profundity, political insight and literary merit. Many of Marx's and Engels' contributions were reprinted in special issues of the *New-York Daily Tribune*—the *New-York Weekly Tribune* and *Semi-Weekly Tribune*—and some of them also in the Chartist *People's Paper*. Other papers, in particular the *New-York Times*, quoted passages from Marx's and Engels' articles.

On many occasions the *New-York Daily Tribune* editors treated these articles quite arbitrarily; they printed them unsigned, as editorials, made insertions and introduced new passages which sometimes ran contrary to what Marx and Engels wanted to say. Marx repeatedly protested against those practices. From the autumn of 1857, when the financial position of the *New-York Daily Tribune* deteriorated due to the economic crisis that gripped the USA, Marx had to reduce the number of his contributions to the paper, and during the American Civil War he stopped sending them altogether, mainly because the *Tribune* had come under the sway of people advocating a compromise with the slave-owning states.

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.

On many occasions the *New-York Daily Tribune* editors treated these articles quite arbitrarily; they printed them unsigned, as editorials, made insertions and introduced new passages which sometimes ran contrary to what Marx and Engels wanted to say. Marx repeatedly protested against those practices. From the autumn of 1857, when the financial position of the *New-York Daily Tribune* deteriorated due to the economic crisis that gripped the USA, Marx had to reduce the number of his contributions to the paper, and during the American Civil War he stopped sending them altogether, mainly because the *Tribune* had come under the sway of people advocating a compromise with the slave-owning states.

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 reference is to *Société générale du Crédit Mobilier*—see Note 178.

Crédit Foncier, a French joint-stock bank, set up in 1852, granted short- and long-term loans on the security of immovable property. Between 1854 and 1859 it granted loans totalling 2,000 million francs to the government of Napoleon III.

By referring to the banks of Napoleonic France as *Crédits ambulants* (travelling credits) Marx emphasised their instability.

Rich gold deposits were discovered in California in 1848 and Australia in 1851. Apart from their great importance for the commercial and industrial development of Europe and America, these discoveries whipped up stock-exchange speculation in the capitalist countries.

The Tuileries—the royal palace in Paris, residence of Napoleon III.


Droit d'octroi—a right, originating from feudal times, of cities to levy tolls on imported consumer goods. It was repealed in 1791 during the French Revolution, but later reintroduced on some foodstuffs (salt, wine, fish, etc.). These tolls varied from town to town.

A reference to the preparations for an Opium War against China conducted by the British and French governments in early 1860. The war was unleashed in the
summer of the same year with the aim of imposing onerous new terms upon China.

The Anglo-French commercial treaty, signed on January 23, 1860, signified a triumph for the advocates of free trade in both countries and served the interests of the British industrial bourgeoisie (for details see this volume, pp. 341-44).

Marx is referring to the movement for the national unification of Italy, which gained momentum during and after the Austro-Italo-French War of 1859 (see Note 13) and was opposed by a number of European countries. In the spring and summer of 1859 popular insurrections flared up in Tuscany, Modena, Parma and Romagna. The members of the ruling dynasties there fled from their duchies to seek the protection of the Austrian army. The national assemblies set up as the result of the insurrections declared that the population of the duchies wished to be incorporated in Piedmont. This question was finally settled in March 1860 by a plebiscite.

263 This refers to the second Opium War, waged by Britain and France against China in 1856-60.

264 The object of the Anglo-Persian War of 1856-57 was to establish British influence in Persia, pave the way for further colonial expansion in the Middle East and Central Asia and prevent the Shah of Persia from establishing his power over the independent principality of Herat. When Persian troops occupied Herat in October 1856 Britain used this as a pretext to open hostilities. The war took an unfavourable turn for Persia. However, the national liberation uprising that flared up in India in 1857 and continued up to 1859 compelled Britain to conclude a peace treaty with Persia in all haste. Under the terms of the treaty signed in Paris in March 1857, Persia repudiated its claims to Herat, which, in 1863, was incorporated into the possessions of the Afghan Emir.

265 Britain interfered in the civil war in Portugal (1828-34) waged by the liberal nobility, bourgeoisie and intelligentsia, which were supported by the anti-feudal section of the peasantry and fought for the preservation of the constitutional monarchy and against the feudal aristocracy, which sought to restore absolute monarchy and was backed up by the clergy and reaction-influenced peasants in some districts of Spain. The absolutists were led by Dom Miguel, a pretender to the Portuguese throne. In an attempt to consolidate their influence in the Iberian Peninsula and weaken the positions of Austria, which supported the absolutists, the British and French governments sent a fleet to the Portuguese coast (in 1831) to blockade the Tagus and Douro rivers, thus facilitating the victory of the constitutionalists.

The Anglo-Greek conflict referred to occurred in June 1850. When the British Government presented Greece with an ultimatum and sent ships to blockade Piraeus, using as a pretext the burning (in Athens in 1847) of the house of a Portuguese merchant, Pacifico, who was a British subject. The real object of this move, however, was to make Greece surrender several strategically important islands in the Aegean Sea.

The war against Afghanistan was instigated by the British Government in 1838. British troops invaded Afghanistan, but British rule was short-lived. In November 1841 a popular insurrection broke out and the occupying troops
were defeated. In 1842 Britain made another attempt to conquer Afghanistan, but this also ended in total failure.

266 The Anglo-Chinese Treaty, signed on October 8, 1843, supplemented the Treaty of Nanking (1842), which was concluded after the Anglo-Chinese War of 1840-42 (known as the first Opium War) and was the first of a series of unequal treaties imposed by the Western powers on China and reducing it to the status of a semi-colony.

Under the supplementary treaty of 1843 the British secured further concessions from China, including the right to have special settlements for foreign citizens in the open ports, the right of extraterritoriality and most-favoured-nation treatment.

267 A reference to the Tientsin Russo-Chinese Treaty signed on June 13 (1), 1858. It stipulated among other things that Russian envoys going to Peking could sail up the Peiho River via Daga.

268 The seizure of a British ship carrying contraband opium by the Chinese authorities in October 1856, followed by the savage bombardment of Canton by the British Navy, served as a pretext for the second Opium War.

269 A reference to the struggle for power in Ancient Rome waged by the Roman general Lucius Cornelius Sulla supported by the nobility and army veterans. It resulted in the establishment of Sulla’s dictatorship in 82 B.C. Here, Marx has in mind Napoleon III.

270 See Note 262.

271 Marx is referring to the Anglo-French Commercial Treaty of 1860, a source of intricate political intrigues in the relations between the two countries. He compares this treaty with the “sweet changeling” (Puck) of Oberon, king of the fairies, and his wife Titania (Shakespeare, A Midsummer Night’s Dream, Act II, Scene 1), Puck being the cause of Oberon’s wicked tricks.

272 See Note 207.

273 The subject of this and several other articles was suggested to Engels by Marx who wrote in his letter of November 3, 1859: “Couldn’t you do me an article on the recent changes in the Prussian army?” (see present edition, Vol. 40). The Prussian military reform is also described in the article “Preparations for War in Prussia” (see this volume, pp. 493-96) and in Engels’ “The War Question in Prussia and the German Workers’ Party” (present edition, Vol. 20).

274 See Note 13.

The Crimean War (1853-56), or the Eastern war, was waged by Russia against the allied forces of Britain, France and Turkey for supremacy in the Middle East and ended with the signing of the Paris Peace Treaty (1856). The war is described by Marx and Engels in the articles included in volumes 13-15 of the present edition.

275 A reference to the colonial war in Algeria, launched by the French Government in 1830. The Algerian people put up a stubborn resistance to the French colonialists; it took them 40 years to turn Algeria into a French colony.
These battles took place during the Austro-Italo-French War between the Kingdom of Sardinia (Piedmont) and France on the one hand, and Austria on the other (see Note 13). In the battle at *Magenta* (June 4, 1859) the Austrian army was defeated by the French (see Engels’ articles “A Chapter of History” and “The Austrian Defeat”, present edition, Vol. 16). At *Solferino* (June 24, 1859) the Austrians were again defeated by the French and Piedmontese forces (see Engels’ articles “The Battle at Solferino” and “Historical Justice”, present edition, Vol. 16).

---

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.

At the battle of *Jena* on October 14, 1806, the Prussian troops were defeated by Napoleon’s army. This resulted in Prussia’s capitulation.

At the battle of *Wagram* on July 5-6, 1809, Napoleon defeated the Austrian army commanded by Archduke Charles.

This refers to Marx’s articles dealing with the budget proposed by Gladstone: among them are “Feargus O’Connor.—Ministerial Defeats.—The Budget”, “L.S.D., or Class Budgets, and Who’s Relieved by Them”, “Riot at Constantinople.—German Table Moving.—The Budget”, “Soap for the People, a Sop for The Times.—The Coalition Budget” (see present edition, Vol. 12).

A reference to the “liberal course” proclaimed by Prince William of Prussia (King of Prussia from 1861) in October 1858, when he took up the regency. In the bourgeois press this course was described as a “new era”. Actually he did not carry out any of the reforms expected by the bourgeoisie; but in 1860 a previously prepared military reform was effected which abolished the remnants of democratism still surviving in the Prussian army after the national liberation war against Napoleon I in 1813-15. This reform stipulated that henceforth the Landwehr would be used only for garrison duties, and it considerably increased the strength of the army in peacetime.

A reference to the diplomatic documents of the Austro-Italo-French War of 1859, published by the Prussian Government in the *Neue Preussische Zeitung*, Nos. 170, 171, 173 and 174 (July 24, 26, 28 and 29, 1859) and in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 211 (July 30, 1859). For details see Marx’s article “Quid pro Quo” in Volume 16 of the present edition.

The meeting between Alexander II and William, Prince Regent of Prussia, took place in October 1859 in Breslau (Wroclaw). Although no political objects of the meeting were officially mentioned either in Prussia or in Russia, the press of both countries stressed its great political importance for consolidating the alliance of the two sovereigns.
285 See notes 65 and 59.  

286 *Siculi*—one of the ancient tribes in Sicily. 

287 A reference to a popular rising in Sicily against the French Anjou dynasty, which conquered Southern Italy and Sicily in 1267. On the evening of March 31, 1282, the population of Palermo took the chimes for vespers as a signal to massacre several thousand French knights and soldiers. As a result, the whole of Sicily was freed from French domination and came under the King of Aragon. 

288 Popular unrest in Sicily against Francis II of Naples and his hirelings began in the autumn of 1859. The uprising that broke out in October was suppressed, but in the spring of 1860 disturbances broke out again. The Palermo uprising in May 1860 was again crushed by the royal forces. Peasant guerrilla units were operating all over the island, however, and they joined Garibaldi after he landed in Sicily with his “Thousand” volunteers. 

289 *Bullier's Correspondance*, a Paris news agency founded in the 1850s and later amalgamated with *Havas.* 

290 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. 

291 A reference to the Paris peace treaties of 1814 and 1815 signed by France and the main participants of the sixth and seventh anti-French coalitions (Russia, Britain, Austria and Prussia) that defeated Napoleon. Under the terms of the first treaty, signed on May 30, 1814, France lost all the territories won by her in the 1792-1814 wars, with the exception of several border fortresses and Western Savoy. Under the provisions of the second Paris treaty the territory of France was limited by the 1790 borders and she was deprived of strategically important points on her Eastern frontier, including the fortress of Landau. 

292 See Note 280. 

293 A reference to the treaty of alliance and mutual guarantees between Russia and Prussia (*Traité d'alliance et de garantie mutuelle conclu à St. Petersbourg entre la Russie et la Prusse*) concluded in June 1714 during the Northern War between Russia and Sweden (1700-21) when Russia sought to win Prussia over to her side by promising to divide Swedish possessions in Germany. Under the treaty Prussia was guaranteed the possession of Eastern Pomerania with the town of Stettin (Szczecin). 

294 On the *Seven Years' War* (1756-63) see Note 122. 

The death of Empress Elisabeth on January 5, 1762 (December 25, 1761) led to a sudden change in Russia's foreign policy. Her successor, Peter III, concluded a peace treaty with Prussia thereby giving the latter an opportunity to sign, in 1763, the Hubertusburg peace treaty with Austria and Saxony and retain the possession of Silesia.
The three partitions of Poland (by Austria, Prussia and Russia) took place at the end of the eighteenth century (1772, 1793, 1795).

Russia gained Lithuanian, Byelorussian and Ukrainian territories; Polish land, including Pomorze, Great Poland, and part of Mazovia with Warsaw, went over to Prussia; and Austria received the Western Ukraine and part of Smaller Poland. As a result of the third partition Poland ceased to exist as a state.

The Congress of Vienna was held by European monarchs and their ministers in 1814-15. They established the borders and status of the 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. By decision of the Congress of Vienna, territories along the right and left banks of the Rhine, as well as Northern Saxony, were incorporated into Prussia, notwithstanding the opposition of Britain, Austria and France.

See Note 283.

A reference to the claims of Napoleon III to the left bank of the Rhine, which the French ruling circles had considered France's "natural frontier" in the east ever since the seventeenth century. For details see Engels' articles "Po and Rhine" and "Savoy, Nice and the Rhine" (present edition Vol. 16).

The Olmütz agreement—see Note 143.
The Federal Diet—see Note 77.

In the letter which William, Prince Regent of Prussia, sent to Albert, Prince Consort of England in February 1860, he expressed his readiness to accept Britain's proposal concerning the alliance between Britain, Austria and Prussia, into which he hoped to draw Russia as well. This proposal was called forth by the increasingly aggressive tendencies of the government of Napoleon III with regard to the German lands on the left bank of the Rhine and by France's annexation of Savoy and Nice.

In the spring of 1833 Russian troops were landed at Unkia-Skelessi, near the Bosporus, to render assistance to the Turkish Sultan against the army of the insurgent Egyptian ruler Mehemet Ali. In May 1833 the Porte, with the mediation of Britain and France, signed a peace treaty with Mehemet Ali, ceding him Syria and Palestine. However, Russian diplomats took advantage of the strained situation and the presence of Russian troops in Turkey and prevailed upon the Porte to sign, on July 8, 1833, the Unkia-Skelessi Treaty for a defensive alliance with Russia. On the insistence of Russia a secret clause was included in the treaty prohibiting all foreign warships, except those of Russia, to pass through the Dardanelles. This circumstance greatly aggravated the relations between Russia and the West-European countries and, during a new Turko-Egyptian crisis (1839-41), the tsarist government had to comply with their demand that in peacetime the straits should be closed to the warships of all foreign states without exception.

The subject of this article was suggested by Marx who wrote to Engels on June
2, 1860 asking him to write a small article about “the Garibaldi’s affair” (see present edition, Vol. 41).

303 A reference to the defence of the Roman Republic which was virtually directed by Garibaldi from April to July 1849. In April 1849, President Louis Bonaparte and the French Government sent an expeditionary corps to Italy under General Oudinot to intervene against the Roman Republic proclaimed on February 9, 1849, and to restore the secular power of the Pope. On April 30, 1849, the French troops were driven back from Rome. The main blow was dealt by Garibaldi’s volunteer corps. Oudinot violated the terms of the armistice signed by the French, however, and on June 3 started a new offensive against the Roman Republic, which had just completed a military campaign against Neapolitan troops in the south and was engaged in rebuffing the Austrians in the north. After a month of heroic defence, Rome was captured by the interventionists and the Roman Republic ceased to exist.

304 This item and the next one ("Interesting from Prussia") were directed against the Bonapartist agents among the European democrats and exposed the chauvinist nature of About’s pamphlet (see this volume, pp. 400-01, as well as Marx’s letters to Engels of June 16, 1860 and December 26, 1860, and Marx’s letter to J. Ph. Becker of June 23, 1860, present edition, Vol. 41), the publication of which was connected with the forthcoming meeting between Napoleon III and William, Prince Regent of Prussia (see Note 255). Marx used quotations from About’s pamphlet to unmask the activity of the Prussian police agents among European democrats. In Herr Vogt Marx revealed the connection between About’s ideas and Vogt’s activity as a secret agent in the pay of Napoleon III (see this volume, pp. 183, 328-29). At Marx’s suggestion, Sigismund Borkheim, one of the German democrats, wrote a pamphlet entitled Napoleon III und Preussen. Antwort eines deutschen Flüchtlings auf "Preussen in 1860" von Edmond About, London, 1860.

Marx must have used the proofs of About’s pamphlet supplied to him by Borkheim, since in both his articles and in the Notebook for 1860 containing passages from About’s pamphlet he gives its original title Napoleon III et la Prusse (see also this volume, pp. 328-29).

The extracts given by Marx in this article were checked against About’s pamphlet. Marx’s text is set in large type. While quoting from the pamphlet, Marx often changed punctuation and paragraphs; sometimes, instead of direct quotations, he gave a précis of the text in which case the editors of this volume have omitted quotation marks; omissions in quotations are indicated by omission marks in square brackets.

305 See Note 190.

306 See Note 255.

307 The governments of Britain and the Kingdom of Sardinia flirted with Napoleon III in an effort to secure an exclusive alliance with France.

308 Alexander II and Napoleon III met in Stuttgart on September 25, 1857. Their meeting testified to the emerging rapprochement between France and Russia after the Crimean War.

309 The Rhenish Confederation (Rheinbund) of the states of Western and Southern Germany was founded in 1806 under the protectorate of Napoleon. These
states officially broke with the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation, which ceased to exist shortly afterwards. When Napoleon lost the military campaign of 1813 the confederation fell apart. p. 399

Speaking of the *Dutch savior of society* Marx has in mind Napoleon III, who was a son of Louis Bonaparte (brother of Napoleon I), King of Holland in 1806-10. On the Congress of Vienna, see Note 296.

The Congresses of 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) took place in Aix-la-Chapelle (1818), in Troppau (Opava) and Laibach (Ljubljana) (1820-21), and in Verona (1822). The Laibach Congress proclaimed the principle of interference by the Holy Alliance members in the internal affairs of other countries with the aim of maintaining monarchies there; and adopted a decision on sending the Austrian army to Italy to suppress the revolutionary and national liberation movement in that country. The Verona Congress sanctioned French armed intervention against Spain. p. 400

In 1857-59 India was the scene of a big popular uprising against the British. It flared up in the spring of 1857 among the Sepoy units of the Bengal army and spread to large areas in Northern and Central India. Its main strength was in the peasants and the poor urban artisans. Directed by local feudal lords it was put down owing to the country's disunity, religious and caste differences and also because of the military and technical superiority of the British. p. 407

The letter which Garibaldi sent in the summer of 1860 to Mr. Green, an English acquaintance of Marx, shows that Garibaldi wanted the struggle waged by the Italian people for the national unification of the country and its liberation from foreign rule to be independent of Napoleon III's policy. Marx is referring to this in his letters to Engels of July 9 and to Lassalle of September 15, 1860 (see present edition, Vol. 41). p. 421

A reference to the *Società Nazionale Italiana*, a political organisation of a liberal monarchist trend founded in 1856 in Turin and other towns by G. Pallavicino, an Italian political figure, and La Farina, an agent in the pay of Cavour. Its aim was to popularise the ideas of Italy's unification under the aegis of the Savoy dynasty and to enlist the country's national forces for this cause. Garibaldi was an active member of this association and represented its revolutionary wing, but the decisive role in the organisation was played by Cavour's accomplices. p. 423

The subject of this and several other articles was suggested by Marx who wrote to Engels on June 25: "I would be grateful if by Friday or Saturday you could write an article for the *Tribune* either on the defences of England, or on Garibaldi, or on the Indian trade" (see present edition, Vol. 41). On July 25 Marx informed Engels that he had received his article "British Defences" and promised to send him the *Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Consider the Defences of the United Kingdom; together with the Minutes of Evidence and Appendix*, London, 1860. Concerning British defences Engels wrote one more article (end of July 1860) entitled "Could the French Sack London?" (this volume, pp. 434-38).
The article "Garibaldi's Movements" was written by Engels on August 8 (this volume, pp. 449-52).

As is evident from Engels' letter of July 26, 1860 (see present edition, Vol. 41) an article on Indian commerce was not written. Marx devoted a few lines to this question in his article "British Commerce" (this volume, pp. 406-09).

During the Crimean War of 1853-56 Sevastopol was besieged by the British, French, Turkish and Sardinian troops. In the course of the fighting, Sevastopol was badly damaged.

In 1859 Northern Lebanon was the scene of an anti-feudal rebellion started by the Maronite peasants (see Note 250); disturbances spread to the centre of Lebanon and in the spring of 1860 fierce clashes took place between Druses and Maronites. This was largely due to British and French policy. Britain gave support to the Druse feudalists, whereas the Maronite feudal lords and the clergy were backed by France. British and French emissaries incited enmity between rival Druse and Maronite feudal groups and fanned religious strife between Moslems and Christians. The Turkish authorities also played a provocative part. Napoleon III used the massacre of May-June 1860 as a pretext for sending an expeditionary corps to Lebanon. The agreement between Britain, Austria, Russia, France, Prussia and Turkey provided for setting up an international commission and specified the term during which the French troops were to stay in Lebanon. Under pressure from Britain and Austria, the French forces were withdrawn from that country in 1861.

The conflict was caused by La Guéronnière's pamphlet *Le Pape et le Congrès*, which appeared in France at the close of December 1859 and was inspired by Napoleon III. The clericals saw in it an attempt on the part of the emperor to restrict the secular power of Pius IX. The higher Catholic clergy of France started a campaign against Napoleon III after Pius IX strongly denounced the pamphlet in an Encyclical early in 1860.

A reference to the monarchist parties of Legitimists and Orleanists that formed in the early half of the nineteenth century. The Legitimist Party stood for the big landowners and the restoration of the Bourbons. The Orleanist Party, that ruled during the July monarchy, represented the interests of big financial and industrial capital and supported the restoration of the Orleans, that is, the younger branch of the Bourbons.

See Note 232.

Francis Joseph of Austria, and William, Prince Regent of Prussia, met on July 26, 1860 in Teplitz (Teplice). The Austrian emperor sought Prussia's support in case of a war with France and Sardinia.

In the early 1840s, under pressure from France and Britain, Turkey had to reorganise the administration of Lebanon, which was divided into two sectors. The northern sector, with a Maronite population, was administered by a governor from among the Maronite feudal lords connected with France, while the southern sector, populated by Maronites and Druse Moslems, was ruled by
a governor from among the Druse feudal lords connected with Britain. While remaining within the framework of the Turkish Empire, Lebanon received a certain degree of autonomy in the sphere of judiciary, finance, etc. Seeking to increase their political influence in Lebanon and win the Lebanese market, the European powers fanned religious strife between Maronites and Druses.

322 A reference to the revolution of 1688-89, after which constitutional monarchy was consolidated in England on the basis of a compromise between the landed aristocracy and the bourgeoisie. The 1689 Bill of Rights and other acts limited the rights of the king still further and extended the rights of Parliament.

323 Under the Act for the Better Government of India, adopted by the British Parliament on August 2, 1858, India passed under the control of the British crown and the East India Company was liquidated. The Act also provided for the formation of the Indian Council as an advisory body of the Board of Control for India. The Governor-General of India became known as the Viceroy, though he remained virtually functionary of the Secretary of State for India in London.

324 In a letter to Persigny, the French Ambassador in London, written on July 25, 1860, and published in French papers (Le Constitutionnel, “Paris le 1er août”, No. 215, August 2, 1860), Napoleon III denied a hostile attitude to Britain and sought to dispel suspicion and distrust, prevalent in Britain at the time, of his foreign policy (see this volume, p. 446).

325 The will of Peter the Great—a spurious document circulated by enemies of Russia. The idea of the existence of the “will” was advanced in the West as early as 1797. In 1812 Ch. L. Lesur described the contents of this pseudo-will in his book Des progrès de la puissance russe, depuis son origine jusqu’au commencement du XIXe siècle, and in 1836 it was reproduced as a document in T. F. Gaillardet’s book Mémoires du Chevalier d’Eon. In Marx’s and Engels’ lifetime many people in Western Europe regarded this document as authentic.

326 A reference to the Rhine-song (“Der deutsche Rhein”)—a poem by Niclaus Becker which was widely used by nationalists in their own interests. It was written in 1840 and set to music by several composers.

327 The Liberal Party was formed in Britain in the late 1850s and early 1860s. It united in its ranks the Whigs, the Manchester men (representatives of the industrial bourgeoisie) and the Peelites (moderate Tories). In the British two-party system the Liberal Party’s counterpart was the emerging party of Conservatives (former Tories).

328 At St. Stephen’s Chapel (in Westminster Palace) the British House of Commons held its sessions from the sixteenth century to the nineteenth.

329 A reference to a Bill passed in August 1860. Under the Act for the Reorganisation of the Indian Army, the European contingent of the Indian Army, formerly at the disposal of the East India Company, became part of the British royal armed forces, and the number of British soldiers in the Indian army increased sharply. Adopted after the suppression of the Indian uprising
of 1857-59 (see Note 311) the Act was one of the measures the British Government resorted to in an effort to consolidate British rule in India.

350 See Note 323.

351 See Note 316.

352 Robert Macaire—a social comedy staged by the famous French actor Frédéric Lemaître in collaboration with the playwrights Antier and Saint-Amand. Marx is referring to Macaire’s words “Foi d’honnête homme ... pas de bêtises!” (Acte II. III tableau, scène VIII). The character of Robert Macaire, portraying a clever swindler, was a biting satire on the domination of the financial aristocracy under the July monarchy. Marx alluded to this character on several occasions. See, for example, The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850 (present edition, Vol. 10, p. 50).

353 A reference to Lombardy, which France ceded to Piedmont under the Villafranca Peace Treaty (see Note 126), as well as to Romagna and the duchies of Parma, Modena and Tuscany, which were incorporated into Piedmont following the plebiscite of March 1860.

354 Partant pour la Syrie (Departing for Syria)—the opening words of a song sung at the festivities arranged by Napoleon III at the time of the Second Empire. Marx is alluding to the Syrian expedition.

355 See notes 255 and 320.

356 The assemblee des notables—a consultative body irregularly convened by French kings from the fourteenth century to the eighteenth. It consisted of representatives of the higher clergy and court nobility, and also of mayors of the cities. In 1787, on the eve of the French Revolution, it voted down the government’s tax bill and met for the last time in 1788 to discuss the composition of, and elections to, the States General.

The States General—a body representing the social estates in medieval France. It consisted of clergymen, nobles and burghers. Convened in May 1789, after a 175-year interval, at a time when the bourgeois revolution was maturing in France, the States General were on June 17 transformed by the decision of the deputies of the third estate into the National Assembly, which on July 9 proclaimed itself the Constituent Assembly and became the supreme organ of revolutionary France.

357 Mark Lane—the grain stock exchange in London.

358 In 1860 France put forth a project which acknowledged Spain as a great power. Owing to Britain’s opposition, the project did not materialise.

359 See Note 324.

360 Marx is quoting from “The Oriental Question”, an article published in the Russky Invalid, Nos. 164 and 165 on July 31 and August 2, 1860, making some changes in the text of the journal. Apparently, he was using a version of this
article printed in the European press. The most important divergences are indicated in the footnotes. p. 467

341 After the defeat of the Roman Republic in 1849 the French interventionist troops did not leave Rome until 1870. p. 471

342 "Brown Bess"—the name used by British soldiers in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries for a flint-lock musket with a brown walnut stock. p. 477

343 See notes 232 and 249. p. 484

344 On March 3 (February 19), 1859, Russia and France concluded in Paris a secret agreement under which Russia undertook to adopt a “political and military stand which most easily proves its favourable neutrality towards France” (Article 1) and to make no objection to the Kingdom of Sardinia being enlarged in the event of a war between France and Sardinia on the one hand and Austria on the other. France undertook to raise the question of revising those articles of the Paris Peace Treaty of 1856 which restricted Russia’s rights in the Black Sea area and robbed her of a part of Bessarabia. p. 486

345 On June 26, 1849, the liberal deputies of the Frankfurt National Assembly, who had walked out after the Prussian King’s refusal to accept the Imperial Crown, met in Gotha for a three-day conference which resulted in the formation of the Gotha party. It expressed the interests of the pro-Prussian German bourgeoisie and supported the policy of Prussian ruling circles aimed at uniting Germany under the hegemony of Hohenzollern Prussia. p. 486

346 See Note 281. p. 489

347 Via sacra (sacred road)—in Ancient Rome victorious troops marched in triumph along this highway. The expression “via sacra” is also used to describe a victorious campaign.

348 Quirinal—one of the seven hills on which Rome is situated. p. 490

349 See notes 233 and 259. p. 490

350 This refers to the commercial treaty between Prussia and Austria, concluded in Berlin on February 19, 1853. It eliminated many of the customs barriers that
obstructed the development of trade between the two countries. (See Marx, "Kossuth and Mazzini.—Intrigues of the Prussian Government.—Austro-Prussian Commercial Treaty.—The Times and the Refugees", present edition, Vol. 11.)

Concerning the Zollverein see Note 290.

See Note 192.

An allusion to the Constitution of the Austrian monarchy (Gesamtmonarchie) introduced by Francis Joseph on March 4, 1849 (Reichsverfassung für das Kaisertum Oesterreich. Olmütz, 4 März 1849. In: Wiener Zeitung, No. 57, March 8, 1849). 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). The Constitution of March 4 was a step towards restoring absolutism in Austria. Nevertheless the Constitution limited the Emperor's power and it was abrogated by the imperial patent of December 31, 1851. (Concerning the Constitution of March 4, 1849, see F. Engels' articles "The War in Italy and Hungary", "From the Theatre of War,—Windischgrätz's Comments on the Imposed Constitution", present edition, Vol. 9, pp. 148, 261-64, and "Letters from Germany", Vol. 10, p. 11.)

The reference is to Hungary's unwritten constitution which was the oldest in Europe and based on ancient traditions and legislative acts of the Kingdom. The independence of the Diet was guaranteed in the interests of the Hungarian nobility, as also was the Diet's right to decide the most important state questions, including financial credits and army recruitment.

Lord Strafford, Charles I's favourite and an ardent champion of absolutism, was accused of high treason and executed in 1641 by demand of Parliament supported by the people of London and the suburbs.

An Act to Regulate the Issue of Banknotes, and for Giving to the Governor and Company of the Bank of England Certain Privileges for a Limited Period was introduced by Robert Peel on July 19, 1844. It envisaged the division of the Bank of England into two completely independent departments, each with its own cash account—the Banking Department, dealing exclusively with credit operations and the Issue Department, issuing banknotes.

The Act limited the number of banknotes in circulation and guaranteed them with definite gold and silver reserves which could not be used for the credit operations of the Banking Department. Further issues of banknotes were allowed only in the event of a corresponding increase in the precious metal reserves.


See Note 192.

The county assemblies, based on the estate principle, were a form of self-government in Hungary. In 1848, as a result of the revolutionary changes in the country, representatives of the entire population without any estate distinctions were allowed to sit in these assemblies. After the defeat of the 1848-49 revolution the county assemblies were disbanded, and the comitatus as an administrative unit was abolished. p. 500

This is Marx's synopsis of Imre Szabó's two-volume study, The State Policy of Modern Europe, from the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century to the Present Time, which was published anonymously in London in May-June 1857. Szabó's work, written in English, is a summary of inter-state relations in Europe from the Italian wars of the early 16th century to the Paris Congress of 1856. It reflects the influence of David Urquhart's views. Marx compiled his synopsis in the first half of June 1860 in connection with his work on Herr Vogt. He needed this historical investigation to expose the counter-revolutionary nature of Napoleon III's policy. In taking notes he concentrated on the events and fully ignored Szabó's interpretation of them. Some notes refer to events not mentioned in Szabó's work and are probably based on other sources. In the present edition these insertions and Marx's conclusions are set in large type. The names of persons and geographical names are reproduced in Marx's transcription, with their present spelling given in footnotes. Obvious mistakes have been silently corrected.

Marx drew on these notes above all in the chapter "Dâ-Dâ Vogt and His Studies" (see this volume, pp. 133-83). p. 505

The Union of Calmar (1397-1523) included Denmark, Norway (with Iceland) and Sweden (with Finland) under the sovereignty of the Danish kings. Sweden virtually broke away in 1449. The attempt of the Danish King Christian II to bring it back into the union by staging a bloodbath in Stockholm led to a final rupture and the restoration of Swedish statehood (1523). p. 505

This refers to the League of Cognac formed on May 22, 1526. p. 505

Traité des dames—an ironic designation of the Peace of Cambray (August 1529), which was concluded with the active co-operation of Louise of Savoy (Francis I's mother) and Margaret (Charles V's aunt). p. 506

This refers to the rejection by Charles V and the Augsburg Imperial Diet in 1530 of the Confession of Augsburg, which laid down the principles of Lutheranism and established the ritual aspect. p. 506

The League of Schmalkalden (February 27, 1531), named after the town in Thuringia where it was formed, was a union of Protestant princes and a number of Imperial towns for the protection of the Reformation against the
Catholic princes headed by Emperor Charles V. From 1546 to 1548 the League and the Emperor were engaged in a war which ended in the latter's victory and the disintegration of the League. p. 506

365 In 1534 Henry VIII broke off relations with the Pope and was proclaimed Head of the Anglican Church by Parliament (Act of Supremacy). p. 506

366 The Augsburg Interim was a treaty between the German Catholics and Protestants adopted by the Imperial Diet in Augsburg after the Protestants' defeat in the Schmalkalden War. A compromise that satisfied neither party, it was superseded by the Religious Peace of Augsburg (1555). p. 506

367 The Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis (1559) put an end to the Italian Wars (1494-1559). It consisted of two treaties: one between France and England and another between France and Spain. France renounced all claims to possessions in Italy. The Savoy Duchy, captured by Francis I in 1536, was restored and given part of Piedmont. p. 506

368 Marx is obviously referring to an international treaty proposed in Mémoires des sages et royales économies d'Estat, domestiques, politiques et militaires de Henry le Grand, a book by Sully, Counsellor to Henry IV, published in 1638. Drawn up by Sully (even though he attributes it to Henry IV) at the height of the Thirty Years' War, it was anti-Habsburg in character and advocated the expulsion of the Turks and Tatars from Europe and the establishment of a conglomerate of Christian states under the nominal supremacy of the Pope, but actually led by France. The plan was patently unrealistic. p. 509

369 From 1604 to 1606 Hungary, Hungarian-ruled Slovakia and Transylvania were the scene of an anti-Habsburg liberation movement led by the Hungarian feudal lord Istvan Bocskai. The anti-feudal demands of the peasants taking part in the movement made its leaders accept a compromise with the Habsburgs. The treaty signed by Bocskai and Rudolph II in Vienna in 1606 restored Transylvania's independence, granted religious freedom to the Protestants and replaced a number of the Emperor's counsellors by members of the Hungarian nobility. p. 510

370 The Thirty Years' War (see Note 162) was sparked off by an anti-Habsburg uprising in Bohemia which lasted from 1618 to 1620. The Bohemians were supported by Gábor Bethlen, leader of a similar uprising in Hungary. The insurgents suffered a decisive defeat at Bílá Hora on November 8, 1620. p. 510

371 The anti-Habsburg movement in Hungary led by Gábor Bethlen (1619-26) was one aspect of the Thirty Years' War and ended in the signing of the Pozsony (Bratislava) Peace on December 20, 1626. p. 510

372 The Edict of Restitution (1629) provided for the restoration of secularised church land to the German Catholic princes. It was the result of the successes achieved by the Habsburg-Catholic camp in the early stage of the Thirty Years' War. The Edict was officially revoked by the Peace Treaty of Westphalia (October 24, 1648). p. 510

373 The Truce of Altmark was concluded by Poland and Sweden with French
mediation for six years on September 26, 1629. It enabled Sweden to open
hostilities against the Habsburgs.

374 This refers to the war of the Mantuan Succession (1628-31), which formed
the third stage of the Thirty Years' War.

375 The Peace of Prague was concluded by the German Protestant princes with the
Emperor on May 30, 1635.

376 Anne of Austria, consort of Louis XIII of France, was the daughter of Philip III
of Spain and tried to pursue a pro-Spanish policy at the time of her regency
(1643-61), during the minority of her son Louis XIV. France's virtual ruler at
that time was Mazarin.

377 The Peace of Westphalia, signed in Münster on October 24, 1648, consisted of
two interlinked peace treaties: the Osnabrück Treaty (between the Holy Roman
Emperor and his allies, on the one hand, and Sweden and its allies, on the
other) and the Münster Treaty (between the Emperor and France with its
allies). Peace negotiations had been under way from 1645. The Peace of
Westphalia virtually sealed Germany's political fragmentation (see also Note
162).

378 This refers to Spain's separate treaty with Holland (one of the series of
Westphalian treaties).

379 Bohemia formed part of the Habsburg Empire (1526-1918).

Speaking of the amnesty Marx means the promises Britain, France, Sweden,
Denmark and other states made to Bohemia during the Thirty Years' War when
it fought on the side of the anti-Habsburg coalition. Under the Peace of
Westphalia, the Bohemian lands, the scene of military operations throughout
the Thirty Years' War, remained under Habsburg rule.

380 This refers to the Westminster Peace Treaty of April 14, 1654, which
concluded the first Anglo-Dutch war (1652-54). It was waged for mastery of the
seas and ended in defeat for Holland. The latter was forced to reconcile itself
to the English Navigation Act of 1651, which was directed against the Dutch
carrying trade.

381 After the Peace of Westphalia (1648) France continued its war against Spain. It
was concluded by the Treaty of the Pyrenees, signed on Fezán Island on
Bidasoa River on November 7, 1659. As a result, hegemony in Western Europe
passed from Spain to France.

382 This refers to the terms of the Peace of Roeskilde concluded on February 26,
1658, which ended the Danish-Swedish War of 1657-58.

Sound duties—the money toll exacted from 1425 onwards by Denmark from
foreign ships passing through the Sound.

383 The Peace of Oliva, signed on May 3, 1660, by Sweden, on the one hand, and
Poland, Emperor Leopold I and Elector Frederick-William of Brandenburg, on
the other, was one of the series of treaties that ended the Northern War
(1655-60).
384 The *jus devolutionis* was a legal principle in some of the Netherland provinces under which, in the event of a second marriage of the father, his land passed to his children by the first marriage. It served as a basis for Louis XIV, married to Maria Theresa, daughter of Philip IV of Spain by his first marriage, to launch a war for the Spanish Netherlands (the War of Devolution, 1667-68) against Charles II, King of Spain, son of Philip IV of second marriage. Philip IV died in 1668.

385 This refers to the Peace of Nijmegen, concluded by France and Sweden with Emperor Leopold I on February 5, 1679. It confirmed the terms of the Peace of Westphalia and was one of the Nijmegen treaties of 1678-79 which ended the war of 1672-78 waged by a coalition of states headed by France against a coalition under the Netherlands.

386 The *Chambres de réunion* were set up by Louis XIV at the municipal council of Breisach and the Parliaments of Metz and Besançon in 1679-80 to provide legal justification for France's claims to territories in Alsace, Western Lorraine and some other areas.

387 The Peace of Ryswick (or Rijswijk) concluded the 1688-97 war between France and the Augsburg League (the Netherlands, England, Spain, the German Empire, Savoy, Sweden, and a number of German and Italian principalities). It confirmed, with certain alterations, the pre-war frontiers of the states involved. France was forced to recognise William of Orange as King of Great Britain and Ireland and thus reconcile itself to the coup d'état of 1688-89.

388 The Grand Alliance—the anti-French coalition formed on September 7, 1701 in The Hague by Emperor Leopold I, Britain and the Netherlands on the eve of the War of the Spanish Succession. Prussia, Denmark, Portugal and several other states joined the alliance later. By calling it the second Grand Alliance, Szabó treats the anti-French coalition of 1688 as the first.

389 What is meant here is the beginning of the War of the Spanish Succession, in which the first action was the dispatch in 1701 of Imperial troops under Eugene of Savoy to Italy to prevent the capture of the Duchy of Milan by the French. War was officially declared on Louis XIV in 1702.

390 This refers to the anti-Habsburg liberation movement in Hungary (1703-11) led by Ferenc II Rákóczy. An active part in it, particularly in the early period, was played by the peasants, who put forward anti-feudal demands. The movement ended in the signing of the Treaty of Szatmar (1711) (see Note 127) and the surrender of the insurgent army. Hungary was incorporated into the Habsburg Empire. Rákóczy regarded the Szatmar treaty as a betrayal and refused to recognise it.

391 The *Aaland Congress* (1718-19)—preliminary peace talks between representatives of Russia and Sweden during the Great Northern War (1700-21). The parties failed to reach agreement.

392 The *Great Northern War* (1700-21) was concluded by a series of peace treaties: the *Treaty of Stockholm* (November 9, 1719) between Sweden and Britain (Hanover); the *Treaty of Stockholm* (January 21, 1720) between Sweden and
Prussia; the treaty between Sweden and Denmark (July 3, 1720) and the Treaty of Nystadt (September 10/August 30, 1721) between Russia and Sweden. Marx gives the wrong date, November 1, when referring to the Treaty of Stockholm between Sweden and Britain.

Quadruple Alliance (1718)—the alliance formed by France and Britain and later joined by Austria (the Netherlands was expected to join too) to uphold the terms of the Peace of Utrecht in the face of Spain's attempts to recover its possessions in Italy turned over to Austria under the Utrecht peace agreements. The conflict took the form of a war by France and Britain against Spain which ended in Spain's defeat and accession (1720) to the Quadruple Alliance.

This refers to the Hanoverian Alliance formed by France, Britain and Prussia on September 3, 1725 and joined by the Netherlands in 1726 and Denmark and Sweden in 1727. It was directed against Spain and Austria.

The Pragmatic Sanction was a law on succession to the throne issued by Charles VI of Habsburg in 1713. It decreed the indivisibility of the Habsburgs' hereditary lands and envisaged the possibility of the Crown of the Austrian Empire passing to Maria Theresa, Charles VI's daughter.

This refers to the treaties (including the Peace of Utrecht and the Peace of Rastatt) concluded between 1713 and 1715 by France and Spain with the members of the anti-French coalition (Britain, the Netherlands, Portugal, Prussia, Savoy and the Austrian Habsburgs) to end the long War of the Spanish Succession. Their major provision was the retention of the Spanish throne by Philip Bourbon, grandson of Louis XIV, but the King of France was forced to renounce his plans for merging the French and Spanish monarchies. A number of French and Spanish colonies in the West Indies and North America, and also Gibraltar and the port of Mahón on Minorca Island were turned over to Britain. It also secured the asiento, a monopoly right to import African slaves into the Spanish dominions in America.

A mistake in Szabó's book: the Hanovero-Hessian troops were beaten by a French army under Marshal L. Ch. d'Estrées. Marshal L. F. Richelieu assumed command of this army in 1758.

This refers to the Battle of Leiten (Lutynia) in Silesia on December 5, 1757 at which Frederick II defeated the Austrians and secured the capture of Silesia by Prussia.

An allusion to the fact that one of the main causes of the Seven Years' War (see Note 122) was Anglo-French rivalry over colonies.

The Hubertusburg Peace, signed by Austria and Saxony with Prussia on February 15, 1763, was made possible by Peter III, who not only stopped all hostilities against Prussia but pledged himself to Frederick II to use whatever influence Russia could exert on Austria to end the Seven Years' War (1756-63). Under the Hubertusburg Peace, Prussia recovered all the territories it had lost during the war.
This refers to the benefits Sweden gained under the Peace of Westphalia, which gave it control of the main harbours on the Baltic and the North Sea (see also Note 162).

An allusion to the *liberum veto*, the right of every member of the Diet to veto its decisions; introduced in 1652, it aggravated feudal anarchy in Poland.

*Stamp duty*—the duty imposed in North America on commercial and judicial documents and periodicals. It was introduced by the Stamp Act, endorsed by the British Parliament on March 22, 1765.

*Potato War*—ironic name given to the War of the Bavarian Succession (1778-79), waged by Prussia and Saxony against Austria.

The Armed Neutrality, a policy directed against Britain, was based on five principles of international law put forward in 1778 in connection with problems of navigation in the Sound. The Armed Neutrality was also acceded to by Denmark, Sweden and Prussia.

In June and July 1790 representatives of Austria, Prussia, Poland, Britain and the Netherlands conferred in the Silesian town of Reichenbach. Worried by Russia's successes in the Russo-Turkish War (1787-91), they obliged Austria to make peace with Turkey (see Note 408).

The *Peace of Värälä*, signed on August 14, 1790, ended the Russo-Swedish War of 1788-90. Russia recognised the new Swedish Constitution, which curtailed the rights of the Riksdag, strengthened the King's authority and confirmed the privileges of the nobility. The peace treaty recognised Russia's right to the territories it has obtained under the Nystadt and Abo treaties (see this volume, pp. 515, 517).

On August 4, 1791 Austria and Turkey signed a *peace treaty at Sistova*, Bulgaria, terminating the Austro-Turkish War of 1788-90 on the basis of the *status quo ante bellum*. Austria obtained Stara Orsova, but without the right to erect fortifications there.

The *Treaty of Jassy*, signed on December 29, 1791 (January 9, 1792), ended the Russo-Turkish War of 1787-91. It confirmed the annexation of the Crimea to Russia and laid down the Russo-Turkish frontier along the Dniester.

In his synopsis of Volume II of Szabó's book, Marx adds the letter "a" to the numbers of chapters: Ia, Ila, etc.

Under the separate *Treaty of Basle* (July 22, 1795) concluded by France and Spain, the former obtained the Spanish (eastern) part of Haiti. The western part of the island, called Santo Domingo from 1697 to 1803, was owned by France under the Ryswick peace treaty of 1697 (see Note 387). In the nineteenth century the whole of Haiti was sometimes referred to as Santo Domingo.

This refers to the treaty between France and the Batavian Republic, which was formed on the territory of the Dutch Kingdom following the entry of French republican troops into the country and a rising of the local population.
(January-March 1795) against the reactionary regime of Stadtholder William V. Signed in May 1795, the treaty provided for the transfer of part of the republic's territory to France. In 1806 Napoleon I transformed the Batavian Republic into the Kingdom of Holland.

413 See Note 164.

414 This refers to the negotiations to settle the territorial disputes involving the Holy Roman Empire held by representatives of France, Austria, Prussia and a number of other German states in Rastatt from December 9, 1797. In March 1798 the Imperial delegation approved the transfer of the left bank of the Rhine to France (this seems to be the event Marx had in mind in recording the date in question), and on April 23, 1799 the congress closed because of the outbreak of hostilities between the second coalition and France.

415 The Parthenopaean Republic was proclaimed on the territory of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies on January 22, 1799 by Neapolitan republicans backed by the troops of the French Directory. It only survived until June 23, 1799 when the power of the Bourbons (Ferdinand IV) was restored with British help.

416 This refers to the Federal Diet, an assembly of representatives of the German states which formed the German Confederation (see Note 76) at the Congress of Vienna on June 8, 1815.

417 The Wartburg Festival was held on the initiative of Jena University students on October 18, 1817 to commemorate the tercentenary of the Reformation and the fourth anniversary of the Battle of Leipzig. The Festival was a demonstration of the students' opposition to the Metternich regime.

The Burschenschaften were German student organisations formed during the liberation struggle against Napoleon. They advocated the unification of Germany and combined progressive ideas with extreme nationalism. Szabó mistakenly associates the rise of these organisations with the Wartburg Festival.

418 Marx refers to the Constitution adopted by the Cortes in Cadiz on March 18, 1812, in the course of the Spanish revolution of 1808-14. It envisaged a series of bourgeois-democratic reforms and was repealed by Ferdinand VII on May 4, 1814. Reintroduced by Riego during the Spanish revolution of 1820-23, it was again repealed on October 1, 1823 by Ferdinand VII, who had earlier sworn allegiance to it. It was again introduced on August 12, 1836 and remained in force until June 18, 1837.

419 This refers to the Central Commission of Investigation set up at Mainz on August 31, 1819 at a conference of ministers of Austria, Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony and other member states of the German Confederation to combat the liberal and revolutionary opposition in Germany.

420 At an early stage of their activity in the nineteenth century the Carbonari headed the anti-French movement in the Kingdom of Naples (against Murat) and helped Ferdinand I and his son Francis I recover the crown of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. The source used by Marx mistakenly calls Francis an emperor.
I.e., the Constitution of Cadiz (see Note 418). p. 525

The Ulema were Moslem doctors of divine law and theology who controlled the judiciary and the religious institutions and schools in Moslem countries. They enjoyed high prestige in the political life of the Ottoman Empire. p. 525

Hetairia—see Note 139. p. 525

An allusion to the fact that before entering the Russian diplomatic service in 1809 G. Capo d’Istria held a number of posts in the Republic of the Seven United Islands set up on the Ionian Islands under the Russo-Turkish convention of 1800. p. 525

See Note 301. p. 526

This refers to the Convention on the Iberian Peninsula signed by the four powers in London on April 22, 1834 (see Note 265). p. 526

See Note 128. p. 526

See Note 168. p. 526

At the beginning of his pontificate (1846), Pope Pius IX announced a programme of moderate liberal-bourgeois reforms (establishment of a commission on the administrative reorganisation of the Papal States, limited political amnesty and other measures). p. 527

From here on Marx’s notes follow not the text of Volume II of Szabó’s book but the chronological table appended to it (State Policy..., Vol. II, pp. 389-91). p. 527
NAME INDEX

A

Abbas I (1571-1629)—Shah of Persia (1587-1629).—510
Abd-el-Kader (c. 1808-1883)—Emir of Algeria; a leader of the Arabs in the 1832-47 national liberation war in Algeria and Morocco against the French; prisoner of war in France (1847-52); set free and granted a pension by the French Government; later lived in Damascus.—443
Abdul Mejid (1823-1861)—Sultan of Turkey (1839-61).—468
Abel, Karl (b. 1837)—German philologist and journalist, Berlin correspondent of The Daily Telegraph.—246-50
Aberdeen, George Hamilton Gordon, Earl of (1784-1860)—British Tory statesman; leader of the Peelites from 1850; Foreign Secretary (1828-30, 1841-46); Prime Minister of the Coalition Government (1852-55).—383
Abt—German journalist, petty-bourgeois democrat; emigrated to Geneva in the early 1850s; expelled from the local German Workers’ Association for slander.—38, 39, 41, 44, 47
Adolf (1817-1905)—Duke of Nassau (1839-66), Grand Duke of Luxembourg (1890-1905).—398
Adolphus Frederick (1710-1771)—King of Sweden (1751-71) from the Holstein-Gottorp House.—517
Aeschylus (525-456 B.C.)—Greek dramatist.—299
Agassiz, Louis Jean Rodolphe (1807-1873)—Swiss-born American naturalist, opponent of Darwinism.—45
Alberoni, Giulio (1664-1752)—Spanish statesman, cardinal; First Minister of King Philip V (from 1717 to 1719).—224, 515
Albert, Prince Consort of Queen Victoria of Great Britain (1819-1861).—382, 383, 397
Alberts—secretary of Prussian Embassy in London in the 1850s.—305
Alexander I (1777-1825)—Emperor of Russia (1801-25).—138, 140, 142, 143, 147, 153, 377, 485, 522, 524, 25, 526
Alexander II (1818-1881)—Emperor of Russia (1855-81).—138-42, 144-47, 150, 153, 154, 165, 166, 171, 336, 368, 377, 399, 430, 431, 485
Alexander of Macedon (Alexander the Great) (356-323 B.C.)—general and statesman.—190
Ali (Ali Pasha) (1741-1822)—actual ruler of the Albanian and Greek lands belonging to Turkey (1788-1822).—526
Altenhöfer, August Joseph (1804-1876)—German journalist, an editor of the
Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung.—112
Alvensleben, Gustav von (1803-1881)—Prussian general, confidant of the Prince Regent of Prussia who became King William I in 1861.—216, 397
Amarente—see Chaves, Manoel de Silveira
Angoulême, Charles de Valois, Duke of (1573-1650)—Charles IX's natural son; served in the army of Louis XIII.—510
Anne (1601-1666)—Consort of Louis XIII of France from 1615; Regent (1643-61) for her son Louis XIV; daughter of Philip III of Spain.—510, 511
Anne (1665-1714)—Queen of Great Britain and Ireland (1702-14).—514
Anne (Anna) (1693-1740)—Empress of Russia (1730-40).—142, 516, 517
Anne (Anna Petrovna) (1708-1728)—daughter of Peter I of Russia; married Charles I, the Duke of Holstein-Gottorp, in 1725, mother of Peter III.—515
Anson, George, Baron (1697-1762)—British admiral, First Lord of the Admiralty (1751-56, 1757-62); took part in the war of the Austrian Succession (1740-48); carried out reforms in the British navy.—517

Apollonius of Rhodes (Rhodius) (3rd cent. B.C.)—Greek poet and grammarian, author of the epic Argonautica.—199
Aragon, House of (11th-15th cent.).—371
Argyll, Archibald Campbell, Earl of (1629-1685)—Scottish aristocrat; headed the rebellion against James II in May and June 1685; executed after the defeat of the rebellion.—73
Armstrong, William George, Baron Armstrong of Cragside from 1887 (1810-1900)—English inventor and industrialist; noted for his invention of a special type of rifled cannon.—361-65
Arndt, Ernst Moritz (1769-1860)—German writer, historian and philologist; took part in the struggle against Napoleonic rule; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Right Centre) in 1848-49.—134
Arnim, Harry, Count von (1824-1881)—German conservative diplomat, Bismarck's opponent, envoy (1871) and Ambassador (1872-74) to Paris; arrested for appropriating diplomatic documents (1874) and expelled from the country.—307
Arnim-Boitzenburg, Adolf Heinrich, Count von (1803-1868)—Prussian statesman; Minister of the Interior (1842-45) and Prime Minister (March 19-29, 1848); deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Right wing) in 1849.—252
Assermann, Ferenc (1821-1893)—Hungarian army officer, took part in the revolution of 1848-49 in Hungary.—225-26
August (us) II (the Strong) (1670-1733)—King of Poland (1697-1706, 1709-33) and Elector of Saxony as Frederick Augustus I (1694-1733).—515, 516
August (us) III (1696-1763)—King of Poland (1734-63) and Elector of Saxony (from 1733) as Frederick Augustus II; son of Augustus II.—516, 517, 519

B

Babst, Ivan Kondratyevich (1824-1881)—Russian economist, historian and writer; professor of political economy at the universities of Kazan (from 1851) and Moscow (from 1857); gave public lectures on political economy in the early 1860s.—42
Badel, Marguerite (Rigolboche) (born c. 1842)—French dancer.—326
Badinguet—see Napoleon III
Baerensprung, von—chief of the Prussian police in Posen in the late 1850s.—394, 395
Baker, Robert—British official, factory inspector in the 1850s and 1860s.—410, 416-18, 419, 420
Balzac, Honoré de (1799-1850)—French novelist.—36, 266
Bamberger, Ludwig (1823-1899)—German democratic journalist; took
part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; emigrated to France in the 1850s; later a National-Liberal and deputy to the Imperial Diet.—249

Bangya, János (Johann) (1817-1868)—Hungarian journalist and army officer; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; after the defeat of the revolution, Kossuth's emissary abroad and at the same time a secret police agent; later served in the Turkish army under the name of Mehemed Bey and was a Turkish agent during the war in the Caucasus (1855-58).—219-21

Baraguay d'Hilliers, Louis (1764-1812)—French general; fought in the wars of the French Republic against the coalition of European states and took part in Napoleon I's campaigns.—162-63

Baroche, Pierre Jules (1802-1870)—French lawyer and politician; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; procurator-general of the Court of Appeal (1849); Bonapartist; member of several cabinets before and after the coup d'état of December 2, 1851.—194, 341

Barreux (Jacques Vallée, Sieur des) (1602-1673)—French poet.—91

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 he headed the monarchist coalition Ministry.—55, 105

Barthélemy, Emmanuel (c. 1820-1855)—French worker, Blanquist, member of secret revolutionary societies during the July monarchy and participant in the June 1848 uprising in Paris; a leader of the French society of Blanquist emigrants in London; executed in 1855 on a criminal charge.—83, 84

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).—105, 302

Batthyány, Kázmér, Count of (1807-1854)—Hungarian statesman, liberal aristocrat; Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Hungarian revolutionary Government of Szemere (1849); emigrated first to Turkey and then to France after the suppression of the revolution.—216

Batthyány, Lajos (Ludwig, Louis), Count of (1806-1849)—Hungarian statesman, liberal aristocrat; Prime Minister (March-September 1848); pursued a policy of compromise with the Austrian monarchy; shot after the suppression of the revolution.—216, 501

Bauer, Edgar (1820-1886)—German writer, Young Hegelian; lived abroad in the 1850s and early 1860s; editor of the London newspaper Die Neue Zeit (1858-59).—117

Bayard, Pierre Terrail, seigneur de (c. 1475-1524)—French military hero, glorified by his contemporaries as the knight sans peur et sans reproche (without fear and without reproach).—250, 251, 253-58

Bazancourt, César Lécat, baron de (1810-1865)—French military writer, Bonapartist.—163

Beauharnais, Eugène de (1781-1824)—French general, stepson of Napoleon I; fought in the wars of Napoleonic France; Viceroy of Italy (1805-14).—144

Becher, August—member of the Baden Provisional Government, one of the five Imperial Regents; emigrated in 1849 after the defeat of the Baden-Palatinate uprising.—210

Becker, Gottfried (1827-1865)—German journalist; took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; emigrated to America (1853); fought in the American Civil War; son of Johann Philipp Becker.—61

Becker, Johann Philipp (1809-1886)—German revolutionary; took part in the German and Swiss democratic movement in the 1830s and 1840s
and in the 1848-49 revolution; commanded the Baden people's militia during the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; prominent figure in the First International in the 1860s, delegate to all its congresses; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—51, 60, 61, 62, 63, 77, 82, 228, 230-33, 235, 250, 262, 267, 299, 304, 310, 327

**Becker, Max Joseph** (d. 1896)—German engineer, democrat; took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; after its defeat emigrated first to Switzerland and then to the USA.—30, 32

**Becker, Nicolaus** (1809-1845)—German poet, author of the song "Der deutsche Rhein".—440

**Beckmann**—Prussian police spy in Paris in the early 1850s, Paris correspondent of the *Kölnerische Zeitung*—56, 307

**Belle-Isle, Charles Louis Auguste Fouquet, duc de** (1684-1761)—French military leader and diplomat, Marshal of France (from 1741), War Minister from 1750 (with intervals); fought in the war of the Austrian Succession (1740-48).—517

**Benda, Robert von** (1816-1899)—German liberal politician, member of the Prussian Chamber of Deputies from 1859; member of the Imperial Diet from 1867; a National-Liberal.—251

**Bernadotte, Jean Baptiste Jules** (c. 1763-1844)—Marshal of France; was adopted by Charles XIII of Sweden (1810) and became heir to the Swedish throne; fought in the war against Napoleon I (1813); King of Sweden and Norway as Charles XIV John (1818-44).—524

**Bernis, François Joachim Pierre de** (1715-1794)—French statesman, diplomat and writer; cardinal from 1758; Foreign Minister (1757-58).—518

**Berry, Charles Ferdinand** (1686-1714)—grandson of Louis XIV; married (1710) Marie Louise, daughter of Philippe of Orleans.—514

**Berryer, Pierre Antoine** (1790-1868)—French lawyer and politician, deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic, Legitimist.—157

**Berwick, James Fitzjames, Duke of** (1670-1734)—Marshal of France, natural son of James II of Great Britain; fought in the wars of the Spanish (1701-14) and the Polish (1733-35) Succession.—516

**Bethell, Richard, 1st Lord Westbury** (1800-1873)—British lawyer and liberal statesman; Attorney General (1856-59, 1860-61) and Lord Chancellor (1861-65).—445

**Bethlen, Gábor** (1580-1629)—leader of the anti-Habsburg movement in the Kingdom of Hungary (1619-26), Prince of Transylvania (1613-29) and King of Hungary (1620-21).—510

**Beust, Friedrich von** (1817-1899)—former Prussian army officer; committee member of the Cologne Workers’ Association (1848); an editor of the *Neue Kölnerische Zeitung* (September 1848-February 1849); took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; emigrated to Switzerland; professor of pedagogy.—76

**Biedermann, Friedrich Karl** (1812-1901)—German historian and writer, liberal; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Centre) in 1848; later a National-Liberal.—302

**Biscamp, Elard**—German democratic journalist; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; emigrated after the defeat of the revolution; member of the editorial board of *Das Volk*, organ of the German refugees in London published with Marx’s collaboration.—17, 117-18, 127, 240, 261, 263, 265, 273, 275, 277, 286, 289, 296-301

**Bixio, Girolamo (Nino)** (1821-1875)—Italian democrat; took part in the 1848-49 national liberation war, the defence of the Roman Republic (April-July 1849) and Garibaldi’s revolutionary campaign in Southern Italy (1860); became general of the Italian army in 1862; commanded
the detachment of Garibaldians that captured Rome (1870).—473, 477

**Blanc, Jean Joseph Louis** (1811-1882)—French petty-bourgeois socialist, historian; member of the Provisional Government and President of the Luxembourg Commission (1848); pursued a policy of conciliation with the bourgeoisie; emigrated to England (August 1848) and became a leader of the petty-bourgeois refugees in London.—69, 265

**Blanchenay, Louis** (1800-1881)—Swiss politician, deputy to the National Council (1848-60); customs director (1861-73).—198

**Blanqui, Louis Auguste** (1805-1881)—French revolutionary, utopian communist; organised several secret societies and plots; adhered to the extreme Left of the democratic and proletarian movement during the 1848 revolution.—69

**Blind, Karl** (1826-1907)—German democratic journalist; took part in the Baden revolutionary movement in 1848-49; a leader of the German petty-bourgeois refugees in London in the 1850s; National-Liberal in the 1860s.—3, 4, 7-11, 13, 16, 17, 116-18, 119, 122-32, 186, 240, 263, 267, 273, 275-78, 283-86, 289, 315-19

**Blondin** (pseudonym of Jean François Gravelet) (1824-1897)—famous French tightrope walker.—225

**Bloomfield, John Arthur Douglas, Baron Bloomfield of Oakhampton and Redwood** (1802-1879)—British diplomat, envoy to Berlin (1851-60) and Ambassador to Vienna (1860-71).—383

**Blum, Robert** (1807-1848)—German democratic journalist; leader of the Left in the Frankfurt National Assembly; took part in the defence of Vienna in October 1848; court-martialled and executed after the fall of the city.—39, 71, 73, 74, 192, 243

**Bluntschli, Johann Caspar** (1808-1881)—Swiss lawyer and politician.—79

**Bobzin, Friedrich Heinrich Karl** (b. 1826)—German artisan, member of the German Workers' Association in Brussels (1847); took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; together with Gustav Struve headed the democratic Association of German Emigrants in London.—33

**Boiardo (Bojardo), Matteo Maria** (c. 1441-1494)—Italian poet of the Renaissance, author of L'Orlando innamorato.—313

**Boichot, Jean Baptiste** (1820-1889)—French republican; deputy to the Legislative Assembly (1849); took part in the demonstration of June 13, 1849; later an émigré and one of the leaders of the French emigrant society in London; returned to Paris (1854) where he was again persecuted by the police and imprisoned; amnestied in 1859.—53

**Bolivar y Ponte, Simon** (1783-1830)—South American politician, one of the chief leaders of the South American Spanish colonies in their war of independence; President of the Republic of Colombia (1819-30).—219, 328

**Bonaparte**—imperial dynasty in France (1804-14, 1815 and 1852-70).—175, 188, 194

**Bonaparte, Jérôme Napoléon Joseph Charles Paul** (1784-1860)—youngest brother of Napoleon I; King of Westphalia (1807-13), Marshal of France from 1850.—170

**Bonaparte, Louis** (1778-1846)—brother of Napoleon I; King of Holland (1806-10); father of Napoleon III.—189-90

**Bonaparte, Louis**—see Napoleon III

**Bonaparte, Prince Napoléon Joseph Charles Paul (Plon-Plon)** (1822-1891)—son of Jérôme Bonaparte, cousin of Napoleon III; adopted the name of Jérôme after the death of his elder brother (1847); deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; commanded a division in the Crimea (1854) and a corps in the Austro-Italo-French war (1859); went by the name of Plon-Plon and the Red Prince.—40, 49, 58, 60, 116, 123,
148, 170, 187-90, 193, 197-99, 205, 206, 211-12, 221, 222, 225, 258, 316

Bonerius (Boner), Ulrich (1324-1349)—German poet and preaching monk; author of a collection of fables, Der Edel Stein, based on Latin sources.—193

Boniface, Louis (b. 1796)—French journalist, Bonapartist.—186, 211

Bónis, Samuel (1810-1879)—Hungarian lawyer and politician; took part in the 1848-49 revolution; supported Kossuth.—328

Bonnivet, Guillaume Gouffier, seigneur de (1488-1525)—French admiral; commanded the French troops (1523-25) during the Italian war; killed in the battle of Pavia.—505

Borchardt, Louis—German physician, one of Engels’ acquaintances in Manchester.—119

Borkheim, Sigismund Ludwig (1825-1885)—German democratic journalist; took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; emigrated after its defeat; London merchant from 1851; was on friendly terms with Marx and Engels.—29, 30, 31, 32, 41, 42, 61, 329

Borkmann—private secretary of William, Prince Regent of Prussia.—397

Bosco—Neapolitan general; fought against Garibaldi’s revolutionary detachments in South Italy (1860).—475

Bougeant, Guillaume Hyacinthe (1690-1743)—French historian and man of letters, Jesuit; his best known works are on the history of the Thirty Years’ War (1618-48) and the Peace of Westphalia.—511

Bourbon, Charles, duc de (1490-1527)—commander-in-chief of the French army under Francis I; later went over to the side of Charles V; defeated the French troops in the battle of Pavia (1525).—505

Bourbons—royal dynasty in France (1589-1792, 1814-15, 1815-30), Spain (1700-1808, 1814-68, 1874-1931 and since 1975), and some of the Italian states.—371, 459, 460, 472, 518, 521, 523

Brandenburg, Friedrich Wilhelm, Count of (1792-1850)—Prussian general and statesman; headed the counter-revolutionary Ministry (November 1848-November 1850).—255

Brass, August (1818-1876)—German journalist; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; emigrated to Switzerland after its defeat; editor-in-chief of the Neue Schweizer Zeitung (1859-60).—187, 188

Braun, Karl Johann von Braunthal (Jean Charles) (1802-1866)—German novelist.—242

Brentano, Lorenz Peter (1813-1891)—Baden democrat, lawyer, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848; headed the Baden Provisional Government (1849); after the defeat of the Baden-Palatinate uprising emigrated to Switzerland and later to the USA.—51, 254

Brézé, Urbain de Maillé, marquis de (1597-1650)—French military leader and diplomat; fought in the Thirty Years’ War (1618-48); Marshal of France from 1632.—510

Briganti (d. 1860)—Neapolitan general; fought against Garibaldi’s revolutionary detachments in South Italy and was killed by the insurgent Neapolitan soldiers (1860).—474, 478

Brillat-Savarin, Anthelme (1755-1826)—French lawyer and writer.—197

Brunnow, Filipp Ivanovich (1797-1875)—Russian diplomat; took part in the Troppau, Laibach and Verona Congresses of the Holy Alliance; envoy (1840-54, 1858-60) and Ambassador (1860-74) to London.—146

Brunswick, Karl Wilhelm Ferdinand, Duke of (1735-1806)—commander-in-chief of the Austro-Prussian army fighting against revolutionary France (1792).—521

Buchu, Lothar (1817-1892)—Prussian official and journalist; deputy to the Prussian National Assembly (Left Centre) in 1848; refugee in London
and correspondent of the Berlin National-Zeitung; subsequently a Nation-
al-Liberal.—88, 115

Büchner, Ludwig (1824-1899)—German physiologist and vulgar mate-
rialist philosopher.—72, 106, 190

Bullier—French journalist. Bonapartist.—186

Bunsen, Christian Karl Josias, Baron von (1791-1860)—Prus-
ussian diplomat, writer and theologian; Ambassador to London (1842-54).—310

Bürgers, Heinrich (1820-1878)—German journalist, contribu-
tor to the Rheinische Zeitung (1842-43); member of the Cologne community of the Communist League (1848); one of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung editors; subsequently a liberal.—262

Burgoyne, Sir John Fox, Baronet (1782-1871)—British military engineer, general, field marshal from 1868; military adviser and chief of the engineers in the Crimea (1854-55).—438

Buss, Franz Joseph von (1803-1878)—German lawyer and politician; opposed Prussia’s hegemony.—107

Bute, John Stuart, Earl of (1713-1792)—British Tory statesman, Prime Minis-
ter (1762-63).—135, 518

Butenev, Appollinary Petrovich (1787-1866)—Russian diplomat, Ambas-
sador to Turkey (1830-40); envoy to Rome (1843-56) and to Turkey
(1856-58).—144, 219-20

Butler, Samuel (1612-1680)—English satirical poet, author of the poem Hudibras.—190

Byron, George Gordon Noel, Lord (1788-1824)—English poet.—78, 243

C

Cabet, Étienne (1788-1856)—French writer, utopian communist, author of
Voyage en Icarie.—88, 89

Cagliostro, Alessandro, Count (Giuseppe Balsamo) (1743-1795)—Italian im-
postor.—334

Cairns, Hugh McCalmont (1819-1885)—British lawyer and statesman, Tory
and later (from the 1860s) a Conservative; Lord Justice of Appeal (from
1858), Lord Chancellor (1868, 1874-80), M.P.—445

Calderón de la Barca, Pedro (1600-1681)—Spanish dramatist and poet.
—28, 251

Cambacérès, Jean Jacques Régis, duc de (1753-1824)—French lawyer and statesman; President of the Convention (1794-95), then consul; counselor of Napoleon I, one of the compilers of the Code civil.—197

Cambridge, George William Frederick Charles, Duke of (1819-1904)—British general, commander-in-chief of the British army (1856-95).—432

Cammarano, Salvatore (1801-1852)—Italian dramatist, author of several opera libretti.—77

Camoens (Camões), Luis Vaz de (c. 1524-1580)—Portuguese poet, author of the epic poem Os Lusiadas.—99, 190

Canning, Charles John (1812-1862)—British statesman, Tory and subsequently Peelite; Postmaster General (1853-55), Governor-General of India (1856-62).—480

Canning, George (1770-1827)—British Tory statesman and diplomat, For-
gien Secretary (1807-09, 1822-27), Prime Minister (1827).—337, 525-26

Capo d’Istria, Giovanni Antonio (Joannes), Count (1776-1831)—Greek statesman and diplomat; was in the Russian service (1809-22), Second Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in Russia (1815-22); President of Greece (1827-31).—143, 525-26

Carlet, Pierre Charles Joseph (1799-1858)—Prefect of the Paris police
(1849-51), Bonapartist.—55

Castella—Swiss radical politician, member of the government of the Frei-
burg (Fribourg) Canton (1847-56).—53

Caslerough, Robert Stewart, Marquis of Londonderry. Viscount (1769-1822)—British Tory statesman, brutally suppressed the uprising in Ireland (1798); Chief Secretary for Ireland
(1799-1801), Secretary for War and for the Colonies (1805-06, 1807-09), Foreign Secretary (1812-22).—135, 525

**Catherine** (1584-1638)—mother of Charles X (Gustavus) of Sweden, sister of Gustavus II (Adolphus) of Sweden.—512

**Catherine II** (1729-1796)—Empress of Russia (1762-96).—138, 142, 519-22

**Catherine de Médicis** (1519-1589)—Queen of Henry II of France.—506

**Catiline** (Lucius Sergius Catilina) (c. 108-62 B.C.)—Roman politician and conspirator against the aristocratic republic.—59, 68, 180

**Cato, Marcus Porcius** ("the Elder") (234-149 B.C.)—Roman statesman and writer, upheld aristocratic privileges.—244

**Cavaignac, Louis Eugène** (1802-1857)—French general and politician, moderate republican, took part in the conquest of Algeria; War Minister of France from May 1848, directed the suppression of the June uprising; head of the executive (June-December 1848).—55, 154

**Cavalli, Giovanni** (1808-1879)—Italian army officer, general from 1860, military inventor.—356-57

**Cavour, Camillo Benso, conte di** (1810-1861)—Italian statesman, Prime Minister of Piedmont (1852-59, 1860-61); pursued a policy of uniting Italy under the supremacy of the Savoy dynasty relying on the support of Napoleon III; headed the first Government of united Italy in 1861.—53, 180, 181, 195, 421, 423, 424, 489-91

**Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de** (1547-1616)—Spanish writer.—190

**Charles I** (1600-1649)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1625-49); executed during the Revolution.—510

**Charles I** (Charles Frederick) (1700-1739)—Duke of Holstein-Gottorp. —515

**Charles I Gonzaga** (1580-1637)—Duke of Nevers and Mantua (1627-37).—510

**Charles II** (1630-1685)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1660-85).—512

**Charles II** (1661-1700)—King of Spain (1665-1700).—512

**Charles III** (1716-1788)—King of Spain (1759-88), King of Naples as Charles VII and of Sicily as Charles IV (1735-59).—516

**Charles V** (1500-1558)—Holy Roman Emperor (1519-56) and King of Spain as Charles I (1516-56), Prince of the Netherlands (1516-55) and King of Sicily (1516-56).—505-06, 520

**Charles VI** (1685-1740)—Holy Roman Emperor (1711-40); son of Leopold I.—514-17

**Charles VII** (Charles Albert) (1697-1745)—Holy Roman Emperor (1742-45); Elector of Bavaria (1726-45).—517

**Charles IX** (1550-1574)—King of France (1560-74).—509

**Charles X** (1757-1836)—King of France (1824-30).—146, 525

**Charles X** (Gustavus) (1622-1660)—King of Sweden (1654-60).—512

**Charles XI** (1655-1697)—King of Sweden (1660-97).—512

**Charles XII** (1682-1718)—King of Sweden (1697-1718).—377, 513-15

**Charles XV** (1826-1872)—King of Sweden and Norway (1859-72).—401

**Charles Albert** (1798-1849)—King of Piedmont (1831-49).—527

**Charles ("the Bold")** (1433-1477)—Duke of Burgundy (1467-77).—50-52, 53-55, 109

**Charles, Duke of Nevers**—see Charles I Gonzaga

**Charles Emmanuele III** (1701-1773)—King of Piedmont, Duke of Savoy (1730-73).—516

**Charles Emmanuele IV** (1751-1819)—King of Piedmont, Duke of Savoy (1796-1802).—522

**Charles the Great** (Charlemagne) (742-814)—Frankish King from 768 and Emperor of Rome (800-814).—151, 442
Charles (Karl Ludwig)—(1771-1847)—Archduke of Austria; general and writer on military science; fought in the wars against Napoleonic France (1792-1809).—524

Chateaubriand, François René, vicomte de (1768-1848)—French writer, statesman and diplomat; supported the policy of the Holy Alliance; Foreign Minister (1822-24).—143

Châtillon—see Coligny, Gaspard de

Chaves, Manoel de Silveira, Pinto de Fonseca, marquis de, Count of Amarante (1784-1830)—Portuguese general and politician, supporter of the absolute monarchy, a leader of the revolt that sparked off the Miguelist wars (1823-34).—525

Chelsea, Viscount—British diplomat, secretary at the British Embassy in Paris (1859).—160

Chenu, Adolphe (born c. 1817)—member of secret revolutionary societies in France during the July monarchy, agent-provocateur of the secret police.—73

Cherval, Julien (real name Joseph Cramer)—Prussian police spy who had gained entry into the Communist League and led one of the Paris communities belonging to the sectarian Willich-Schapper group; accused of complicity in the so-called Franco-German plot in Paris in February 1852; escaped from prison with the connivance of the police; agent-provocateur in Switzerland under the name of Nugent (1853-54).—44, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 118, 180, 261, 262, 266-67, 276, 278-80, 283, 285, 304-05, 308-09, 311

Chevalier, Michel (1806-1879)—French engineer, economist and writer, follower of Saint-Simon; championed Napoleon III’s economic policy; contributed to the Journal des Débats.—341-42

Choiseul, Étienne François, duc de, comte de Stainville (1719-1785)—French statesman and military leader; Foreign Minister (1758-70), and at the same time War and Naval Minister (1761-66).—518

Christern, Johann Wilhelm—author of the anonymously published satirical pamphlet Doctor Eisele’s und Baron von Beiselse’s Landtagsreise im April 1847.—131, 274

Christian IV (1577-1648)—King of Denmark and Norway (1588-1648).—510

Christina (1626-1689)—Queen of Sweden (1632-44).—512

Cialdini, Enrico, Duke of Gaeta (1811-1892)—Italian general; commanded a brigade of the Sardinian corps in the Crimea (1855).—489

 Cicero (Marcus Tullius Cicero) (106-43 B.C.)—Roman statesman, orator and philosopher.—68, 70-71, 297, 371

Cincinnatus (Lucius Quinctius Cincinnatus) (c. 519-c. 438 B.C.)—Roman politician, patrician; a model of simplicity and valour.—257

Clairville, Louis François (Nicolaie, dit) (1811-1879)—French dramatist and journalist.—324

Claudius, Matthias (pseudonyms Asmus or der Wandsbecker Bote) (1740-1815)—German poet and writer, published Der Wandsbecker Bote in 1771-75.—242

Clement VII (Giulio de Medici) (1478-1534)—Pope (1523-34).—491, 506

Clossmann, A. von (d. 1871)—German army officer, petty-bourgeois democrat; took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; later emigrated to Switzerland.—188

Clothilde of Savoy (1843-1911)—Princess of Savoy, daughter of Victor Emmanuel II of Sardinia, wife of Prince Napoleon (Plon-Plon) from 1859.—212

Cluss, Adolph (1825-1905)—German engineer, member of the Communist League; secretary of the Workers’ Educational Association in Mainz (1848); emigrated to the USA (1848) where, in the 1850s, he was active in the German-American workers’ organisations; one of the first propagators of scientific communism in America.—309

Cobden, Richard (1804-1865)—English
manufacturer and politician, a leader of the Free Traders and founder of the Anti-Corn Law League, M.P.—341-42

Cohnheim, Max—German democrat; took part in the Baden revolutionary movement in 1848-49; emigrated after the revolution.—30, 32, 33

Coligny, Gaspard de (called Maréchal de Châtillon) (1584-1646)—Marshall of France; fought in the Thirty Years' War.—510

Colins, Jean Guillaume César Alexandre Hippolyte, baron de (1783-1859)—French petty-bourgeois economist of Belgian descent.—331

Collet, Collet Dobson—English radical journalist and public figure; editor of *The Free Press*, organ of Urquhart's followers (1859-65).—8, 9, 124

Constantine (Konstantin Nikolayevich) (1827-1892)—Russian Grand Duke, second son of Nicholas I, admiral general; head of the Naval Department (1853-81) and commander-in-chief of the Navy (1855-81); took part in preparing and carrying out the Peasant Reform of 1861; Viceroy of Poland (1862-63).—6, 8, 10, 116, 123, 151, 317

Cosenz, Enrico (1820-1898)—Italian general; took part in the national liberation movement in Italy; commanded a division during Garibaldi's revolutionary campaign in South Italy (1860); Chief of the General Staff (1882-93).—471, 474

Cosimo III Medici (1642-1723)—ruler of Florence (1670-1723).—515

Cowley, Henry Wellesley, Earl of (1804-1884)—British diplomat; Ambassador to Paris (1852-67).—134, 158, 160, 172, 189, 192, 193, 194, 196, 341

Crämer—see Cherval, Julien

Crawshay, G.—English journalist, supporter of David Urquhart; editor of *The Free Press* (1856-60).—218

Créquy, Charles de Blanchefort, marquis de, prince de Poix, duc de Lesdiguières (1578-1638)—Marshall of France; fought in the Thirty Years' War (1618-48); Ambassador to Rome (1633) and to Venice (1636).—510

Crispi, Francesco (1818-1901)—Italian statesman, republican; took part in the 1848-49 Italian revolution and in Garibaldi's revolutionary campaign in South Italy (1860); began to champion the constitutional monarchy after the final unification of Italy (the late 1860s).—421, 423

Crispi, Rosalie (née Montmasson)—wife of Francesco Crispi; together with her husband, took part in Garibaldi's revolutionary campaign in South Italy (1860).—421

Cromwell, Oliver (1599-1658)—leader of the English revolution; Lord Protector of England, Scotland and Ireland.—496

Cumberland—see William Augustus

Cuvier, Georges Léopold Chrétien Frédéric Dagobert, baron de (1769-1852)—French naturalist, author of works on comparative anatomy, paleontology and the classification of animals.—73

Cuza (Cusa), Alexander (1820-1873)—Romanian politician; as Alexander Johann I, Hospodar (1859-66) of the Danubian principalities, Moldavia and Wallachia, which formed a united Romanian state in 1862; was removed from power as a result of a reactionary plot (1866) and emigrated.—141-42, 161-62, 164

Cyphes, William (1831-1882)—English journalist, politician and public figure, Urquhartist; contributor to the *Sheffield Free Press* and secretary of the Sheffield Foreign Committee (1856).—315

Czartoryski, Adam Jerzy, Prince (1770-1861)—Polish magnate; Foreign Minister of Russia (1804-06); head of the Polish Provisional Government during the 1830-31 insurrection; later leader of the Polish monarchist émigrés in Paris.—395

D

Dâ-Dâ Rochaid (Dahdah)—Arabian writer; translated Bonapartist pamphlets into his native tongue on the instruc-
tions of the Algerian authorities (1850s).—182, 183, 184, 187, 206, 324, 328

**Dana, Charles Anderson** (1819-1897)—American journalist, one of the *New-York Daily Tribune* editors (1840s-1860s); later editor of the *Sun*.—265, 323-24

**Dante Alighieri** (1265-1321)—Italian poet.—50, 74, 75, 100, 209, 279

**Daun, Leopold Joseph Maria, Count von** (1705-1766)—Austrian general; fought in the Seven Years' War (1756-63).—518

**Déak, Ferenc** (1803-1876)—Hungarian statesman, representative of the liberal Hungarian aristocracy; advocated compromise with the Austrian monarchy; Minister of Justice in the Batthyány Government (March-September 1848); member of the Chamber of Deputies from 1860.—502

**Delahodde**—see Hodde, Lucien de la

**Delarageaz, Louis Henri** (1807-1891)—Swiss radical politician, supporter of Fourier, editor of the *Nouvelliste Vaudois*.—198

**Demosthenes** (c. 384-322 B.C.)—Athenian orator and statesman.—68

**Dentu, Édouard Henry Justin** (1830-1884)—one of the owners of Dentu Publishers in France; Bonapartist.—134, 135, 137, 139, 140, 153, 161-62, 165, 172, 174, 180, 183, 324, 325, 327, 328, 431

**Dentzel, Bernhard Gottlieb** (1773-1838)—German politician, member of the Baden Chamber; emigrated to Switzerland.—41, 299

**Derby, Edward Geoffrey Smith Stanley, Earl of** (1799-1869)—British statesman, Tory leader; Prime Minister (1852, 1858-59, 1866-68).—158, 177, 223, 339

**Dickens, Charles John Hufham** (1812-1870)—English novelist.—70, 174

**Dieffenbach, Ernst** (1811-1855)—German naturalist, professor of geology in Giessen (1850).—212

**Dietz, Oswald** (c. 1824-1864)—German architect; took part in the 1848-49 revolution; refugee in London; member of the Central Authority of the Communist League; belonged to the sectarian Willich-Schapper group after the split in the League in 1850; subsequently fought in the American Civil War on the side of the Union.—307

**Dietzel, Gustav** (1827-1864)—German scientist, lawyer.—210

**Diogenes of Sinope** (c. 412-c. 323 B.C.)—Greek Cynic philosopher.—46

**Dionysius (the Elder)** (c. 432-c. 367 B.C.)—tyrant of Syracuse (406-367).—371

**Disraeli, Benjamin, Earl of Beaconsfield** (1804-1881)—British statesman and writer, a Tory leader; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852, 1858-59, 1866-68), Prime Minister (1868, 1874-80).—245, 342, 344

**Dolgorukov (Dolgoruki, Dolgoroukow), Pyotr Vladimir Ovich, Prince** (1816-1868)—Russian historian and writer, liberal; emigrated in 1859; published a number of opposition newspapers and journals (1860s); contributed to Herzen's *Kolokol*.—141, 429

**Don Carlos**—see Charles III

**Donizetti, Gaetano** (1797-1848)—Italian composer.—77

**Douglas, Sir Howard** (1776-1861)—British general and military writer.—360, 363

**Dréolle, Ernest** (1829-1887)—French journalist and politician, Bonapartist.—430

**Dronke, Ernst** (1822-1891)—German writer; at first a "true socialist", later a member of the Communist League and an editor of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*; emigrated to England after the 1848-49 revolution; supported Marx and Engels.—41, 45

**Druey, Henri** (1799-1855)—Swiss radical statesman; member of the Federal Council (1848-54); head of the Department of Justice and Police (1848); President of the Swiss Confederation (1850).—44, 45, 52, 53, 54, 296, 297, 299-301
Ducommun, Elie (1833-1906)—Swiss radical statesman and journalist, editor of the Revue de Genève from 1855.—200

Dufauve, Jules Armand Stanislas (1798-1881)—French lawyer and politician, Orleanist; deputy to the Constituent Assembly (1848); Minister of the Interior in the Cavaignac Government (October-December 1848); inspired the suppression of the Paris Commune.—157

Dulon, Rudolph (1807-1870)—German pastor; emigrated to the USA in 1853.—87

Dumont (Du Mont), Joseph (1811-1861)—German journalist, moderate liberal; publisher of the Kölnische Zeitung from 1831; changed his name to Del Monte (Delmonte).—5, 6, 242

Dunne—British army officer; took part in Garibaldi’s revolutionary campaign in South Italy (1860).—451

Duns Scotus, John (c. 1265-1308)—Scottish scholastic theologian.—251, 255

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 a Bonapartist.—228

Dupont, Émile (b. 1821)—French public figure, member of the co-operative society in Valenciennes; editor of a number of journals, including La voix du proscrit; author of articles on the position of the miners.—36

Dušek, František (1797-1873)—Hungarian statesman of Bohemian descent; Minister of Finance in the Szemere Government during the 1848-49 revolution.—223

Éber, Nánor (1825-1885)—Hungarian journalist; took part in the 1848-49 revolutionary movement and in Garibaldi’s revolutionary campaign in South Italy (1860).—473

Eichhoff, Karl Wilhelm (1833-1895)—German socialist journalist; in the late 1850s exposed Stieber as a police spy in the press and was brought to trial for this; refugee in London (1861-66); member of the First International from 1868, and one of its first historians; member of the German Social-Democratic Workers’ Party from 1869.—65

Eisenmann, Johann Gottfried (1795-1867)—German physician and writer; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Centre, later Left wing) in 1848-49.—103

Eleanor of Austria (1498-1558)—sister of Charles V, the Holy Roman Emperor; wife of Manuel I of Portugal and from 1530, of Francis I of France.—506

Eleonora of Portugal—see Eleanor of Austria

Elizabeth I (1533-1603)—Queen of England (1558-1603).—506, 509

Elizabeth of Parma—see Farnese, Elizabeth

Elizabeth of Valois (1545-1568)—daughter of Henry II of France; wife of Philip II of Spain from 1559.—506

Elizabeth (Elizaveta Petrovna) (1709-1761)—Empress of Russia (1741-61).—517, 518

Elsner, Karl Friedrich Moritz (1809-1894)—Silesian radical journalist; deputy to the Prussian National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848; an editor of the Neue Oder Zeitung in the 1850s.—263

Emmermann, Karl—chief forester from the Rhine Province; commanded an infantry unit of the Baden-Palatinate insurgent army in 1849; emigrated to Switzerland.—76, 77

Enfantin, Barthélemy Prosper (1796-1864)—French utopian socialist, a disciple of Saint-Simon; held leading posts in a number of capitalist enterprises from the mid-1840s.—341

Engels, Frederick (1820-1895).—6, 33, 40, 79, 81, 84-86, 88-90, 96-97, 101,
Engländer, Sigmund (1828-1902)—Austrian journalist; emigrated to England in 1848; secret police agent.—277

Éötvös, József, Baron (1813-1871)—Hungarian writer and statesman, representative of the liberal aristocracy; Minister of Religious Worship and Public Education in the Batthyány Government (March-September 1848).—502

Ephialtes—Greek, native of Melos; showed the Persian troops a passage through the mountains (480 B.C.), thus enabling them to attack the troops of the Spartan King Leonidas from the rear.—204

Ermani—German publisher and bookseller in London.—129, 319

Ernst Augustus (1771-1851)—King of Hanover (1837-51).—398, 527

Ernst II (1818-1895)—Duke of Saxony, Coburg and Gotha (1844-93).—398

Erthal, Friedrich Karl Joseph, Baron of (1719-1802)—Elector and Bishop of Mayence (1774).—522

Estaing, Jean Baptiste Charles Henri Hector, comte d' (1729-1794)—French admiral; commanded the French squadron (1778) in the American War of Independence (1775-83).—520

D'Ester, Karl Ludwig Johann (1811-1859)—German physician; socialist and democrat; member of the Cologne community of the Communist League; deputy to the Prussian National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848; member of the Central Committee of German Democrats from October 1848; prominent figure in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; emigrated to Switzerland.—101, 237

F

Fallmerayer, Jakob Philipp (1790-1861)—German historian and traveller.—114

Farini, Luigi Carlo (1812-1866)—Italian historian and statesman; championed the unification of Italy under the Savoy dynasty; Minister of Public Education (1851-52); ruler of Modena (1859); Sardinian Minister of the Interior (1860); head of the Italian Government (1862-63).—489

Farnese, Elizabeth (1692-1766)—Queen of Spain and Princess of Parma; wife of Philip V of Spain.—515

Faucher, Julius (Jules) (1820-1878)—German writer, Young Hegelian; advocate of free trade; refugee in England from 1850 till 1861, when he returned to Germany; contributor to the Morning Star.—117-19


Ferdinand, Prince of Guastalla—see Ferrante II

Ferdinand I (1503-1564)—Holy Roman Emperor (1556-64); brother of Charles V.—506-09

Ferdinand I (1751-1825)—King of the Two Sicilies (1816-25); King of Naples as Ferdinand IV (1759-1825, with intervals); King of Sicily as Ferdinand III (1759-1825).—524, 525

Ferdinand II (1578-1637)—Holy Roman Emperor (1619-37).—458, 510

Ferdinand III (1608-1657)—Holy Roman Emperor (1637-57); Archduke of Austria.—510, 511

Ferdinand VII (1784-1833)—King of Spain (1808, 1814-33).—143, 337, 525, 526
Ferdinand (Charles Joseph) of Este (1781-1850)—Archduke of Austria; commanded troops in Bavaria and Poland during the wars against Napoleonic France.—524
Ferdinand Philippe Louis Charles Henri, duc d'Orléans (1810-1842)—eldest son of Louis Philippe of France; took part in the conquest of Algeria (1835-40).—355
Ferdinando Carlo, Gonzaga di (1652-1708)—Duke of Mantua (1665-1707), the last of the Gonzaga family.—513
Ferdinando Maria Alberto (1822-1855)—Duke of Genoa, brother of Victor Emmanuel II of Sardinia; fought in the war against Austria (1848-49); elected King of Sicily (1848) but refused to accept the crown.—527
Ferrante II (1563-1630)—Prince of Guastalla (1621-30) from the Gonzaga family; claimed the Duchy of Mantua (1629) after the death of Vincenzo II Gonzaga.—510
Fialin—see Persigny, Jean Gilbert
Fink—German refugee in Geneva.—54
Fischel, Eduard (1826-1863)—German writer, progressist; assessor of the Berlin Municipal Court from 1858; editor of the Berlin Urquhartist journal Das Neue Portfolio (1859-60); sharply criticised the foreign policy pursued by Palmerston and Napoleon III.—246
Fleury, André Hercule de (1653-1743)—French cardinal and statesman; became First Minister of Louis XV in 1726.—517
Fleury, Charles (real name Carl Friedrich August Krause) (b. 1824)—London merchant, Prussian spy and police agent.—55, 66, 305, 306-12
Flocon, Ferdinand (1800-1866)—French democratic politician and journalist, an editor of La Réforme; member of the Provisional Government (1848).—263, 322
Flores—Neapolitan general; com-
(1853-56) and the war in the Caucasus (1877).—221
Frank (Franck), Gustav—Austrian petty-bourgeois democrat; refugee in London in the 1850s.—88
Franklin, Benjamin (1706-1790)—American physicist, economist and politician; took part in the American War of Independence.—520
Frederick I (1657-1713)—King of Prussia (1701-13); Elector of Brandenburg as Frederick III from 1688.—514
Frederick I (1754-1816)—Duke of Württemberg; King of Württemberg (1805-16).—522
Frederick II ("The Great") (1712-1786)—King of Prussia (1740-1786).—69, 135, 517-19
Frederick V (1596-1632)—Elector of the Palatine (1610-23).—510
Frederick VII (1808-1863)—King of Denmark (1848-63).—402
Frederick Augustus I ("the Just") (1750-1827)—Elector of Saxony as Frederick Augustus III (1763-1806); King of Saxony (1806-27).—524
Frederick Augustus II (1797-1854)—King of Saxony (1836-54).—392, 527
Frederick William (1620-1688)—Elector of Brandenburg (1640-88).—254, 512
Frederick William I (1688-1740)—King of Prussia (1713-1740).—377, 379, 517
Frederick William III (1770-1840)—King of Prussia (1797-1840).—377
Frederick William IV (1795-1861)—King of Prussia (1840-61).—257, 347, 367, 373, 496
Fregoso, Cesare (d. 1541)—French diplomat from an ancient Genoese family; assassinated by order of Charles V.—506
Freiligrath, Ferdinand (1810-1876)—German romantic and later revolutionary poet, member of the Communist League; an editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung (1848-49).—8, 115
Frey-Hérosé (Frei-Herose), Friedrich (1801-1873)—Swiss military leader and politician, liberal, member of the Federal Council (1848); deputy to the National Council and later President of the Confederation (1854, 1860).—176, 194, 198
Friedrich Wilhelm Ludwig (1826-1907)—Grand Duke of Baden (1856-1907).—398
Friedrich Wilhelm I (1802-1875)—Elector of Hesse (1847-75).—379
Frimont, Johann Maria Philipp, Count of Palota, Prince of Antrodocco (1759-1831)—Austrian general; commanded the Austrian expeditionary corps that suppressed the 1820-21 Neapolitan revolution.—525
Fröbel, Jürgen (1805-1893)—German radical writer and publisher of progressive literature; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848; emigrated to America in 1849; returned to Germany in 1857.—116, 130

G
Gagern, Heinrich Wilhelm August, Baron von (1799-1880)—German politician, moderate liberal; deputy to and President of the Frankfurt National Assembly (Right Centre); Prime Minister (December 1848-March 1849); a leader of the Gotha Party after May 1849.—100, 109, 154
Galeer, Albert Frédéric Jean (1816-1851)—Swiss teacher and man of letters, democrat; took part in the war against the Sonderbund (1847) and in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; member of the Grand Council of Geneva; at first supported Fazy and later headed the opposition.—31, 231-33
Galeer, Oskar—student, brother of the above.—31
Garibaldi, Giuseppe (1807-1882)—Italian revolutionary, democrat; organised the defence of the Roman Republic (April-June 1849); headed the Italian people's struggle for national independence and the unification of the country (the 1850s-60s).—224, 381, 382, 386-91, 421-
Name Index

Gebert, August—Mecklenburg joiner; member of the Communist League in Switzerland and later in London; after the split in 1850 belonged to the sectarian Willich-Schapper group. 
—52

George I (1660-1727)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1714-27), Elector of Hanover (1698-1714).—515

George III (1738-1820)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1760-1820).—11

George V (1819-1878)—King of Hanover (1851-66).—398

Gerlach, Ernst Ludwig von (1795-1877)—Prussian lawyer, reactionary politician, one of the founders of the Neue Preussische Zeitung. 
—247

Gibson, Thomas Milner (1806-1884)—British politician and statesman, Free Trader, President of the Board of Trade (1859-65, 1865-66).—409, 444

Gipperich, Joseph—German tailor; member of a Paris community of the Communist League supporting the sectarian Willich-Schapper group after the split in the League in 1850; became a secret agent of the Prussian police; one of the accused at the trial of the so-called Franco-German plot in Paris in February 1852; escaped from prison with, the aid of the police; emigrated to England in 1852.—308

Girardin, Delphine de (1804-1855)—French author; wife of Émile de Girardin. 
—37

Girardin, Émile de (1806-1881)—French journalist and politician; editor of La Presse (the 1830s-60s, with intervals); moderate republican, later Bonapartist. —207

Giusti, Giuseppe (1809-1850)—Italian satirical poet. —203

Gladstone, William Ewart (1809-1898)—British statesman, Tory and later Peelite, leader of the Liberal Party in the latter half of the century; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852-55, 1859-66), Prime Minister (1868-74, 1880-85, 1886, 1892-94).—336, 341, 350, 351, 353, 444

Gneisenau, August Wilhelm Anton Neithardt von (1760-1831)—Prussian field marshal-general; one of the organizers of the liberation struggle against Napoleonic rule. —146

Goegg, Amand (1820-1897)—German journalist, democrat; member of the Baden Provisional Government (1849); emigrated after the revolution; member of the First International; joined the German Social-Democrats in the 1870s. —98-99, 313

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von (1749-1832)—German poet. —71, 74, 91, 185, 251

Goldheim—Prussian police officer; a secret agent of the Prussian police in London in the early 1850s. —58, 310-12

Golitsin, Alexander Mikhailovich, Prince (1718-1783)—Russian diplomat, Ambassador to London (1755-62), Vice-Chancellor (1762-75).—135, 518

Goluchowski, Agenor, Count (1812-1875)—Polish aristocrat, Austrian conservative statesman; Viceroy of Galicia (1849-59, 1866-67, 1871-75); Austrian Minister of the Interior (1859-60).—501

Gorchakov (Gorchakow), Alexander Mikhailovich, Prince (1788-1883)—Russian statesman and diplomat, Ambassador to Vienna (1854-56), Foreign Minister (1856-82), State Chancellor (1867-82).—368, 375, 429, 491

Görgey (Görsei), Arthur (1818-1916)—military leader of the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; commander-in-chief of the Hungarian army (April-June 1849); voiced the conservative sentiments of the nobility; advocated agreement with the Habsburgs and, later, capitulation; War Minister from May 1849.—148, 214, 215, 226-27

Gottfried von Strassburg (late 12th-early 13th cent.).—German poet, author of Tristan und Isolde. —156

Götze—Prussian lawyer; Vice-President
of the Prussian High Court in the 1850s.—270

Grabbe, Pavel Khristoforovich, Count (1789-1875)—Russian military leader and statesman; took part in suppressing the Polish insurrection of 1830-31 and in the Tsarist troops' intervention against revolutionary Hungary in 1849.—227

Grandguillot, Alcide Pierre (1829-1891)—French journalist, Bonapartist; editor-in-chief of Le Constitutionnel from 1859; editor-in-chief of Le Pays (1863-65).—176, 186, 324, 325

Granier de Cassagnac, Bernard Adolphe (1806-1880)—French journalist, Orleanist before the 1848 revolution, later Bonapartist; deputy to the Corps Législatif (1852-70); contributed to Le Constitutionnel.—36, 186, 211

Granville, George Leveson-Gower, Earl of (1815-1891)—British statesman, Whig and later Liberal, Foreign Secretary (1851-52, 1870-74, 1880-85), President of the Council (1852-54, 1855-58, 1859-65), Secretary of State for the Colonies (1868-70, 1886).—339

Grégoire (Georgi Petrovich Postnikov) (1784-1860)—Russian theologian, Metropolitan of St. Petersburg and Novgorod from 1855.—441

Gregory XVI (Bartolomeo Alberto, otherwise Mauro Cappellari) (1765-1846)—Pope (1831-46).—144

Greif—Prussian police officer; one of the chiefs of the Prussian secret service in London in the early 1850s.—55, 57, 305, 306-10

Greiner, Theodor Ludwig—German lawyer, petty-bourgeois democrat; member of the Palatinate revolutionary Provisional Government (1849); emigrated first to Switzerland and then to the USA after the defeat of the revolution.—100-01, 110

Grey, Sir Henry George, Earl of from 1845 (1802-1894)—British statesman, Whig; Secretary at War (1835-39), Colonial Secretary (1846-52).—194, 335-40

Griscelli, Jacques François—Corsican-born Bonapartist police agent.—421, 422, 424, 490

Grün, Karl (1817-1887)—German writer, member of the Prussian National Assembly during the 1848-49 revolution.—199

Grunich—German democrat; refugee in London in the early 1850s.—33

Guébriant, Jean Baptiste Budes, comte de (1602-1643)—Marshal of France; fought in the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648).—510

Guise, Duke of—see Henry II of Lorraine

Guizot, François Pierre Guillaume (1787-1874)—French historian and statesman; virtually directed France's foreign and domestic policy from 1840 to the February 1848 revolution; expressed the interests of the financial bourgeoisie.—36, 79, 263

Gumptert, Eduard (d. 1893)—German physician resident in Manchester, a friend of Marx and Engels.—119

Gustav(us) I (Gustavus Vasa) (1496-1560)—King of Sweden (1523-60).—505

Gustav(us) II (Adolphus) (1594-1632)—King of Sweden (1611-32).—509, 510, 511

Guthschmidt—Prussian judicial official.—283, 290, 291

Guyon, Richard Debaufre (1803-1856)—British army officer, general of the Hungarian revolutionary army; served in the Turkish army under the name of Khourschid Pasha after the defeat of the Hungarian revolution; commanded Turkish troops in the Caucasus (1853).—214

H

Habsburgs (or Hapsburgs)—dynasty of emperors of the Holy Roman Empire (1273-1806, intermittently), of Austria (from 1804) and of Austria-Hungary (1867-1918).—108, 149, 254, 274, 371, 374, 376, 379-80, 487, 494, 506, 509, 512, 517, 524, 527

Hackländer, Friedrich Wilhelm von (1816-1877)—German writer.—183
Hadher Barbarossa (Khair-ed-Deen) (c. 1483-1546)—ruler of Algeria (1519-46).—506
Hafiz Shams ud-din Mohammed (c. 1300-c. 1389)—Persian poet of Tajik descent.—44
Hafner, Leopold (born c. 1820)—Austrian journalist, petty-bourgeois democrat; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; emigrated to France.—87, 88, 99, 188
Hagen, Karl (1810-1868)—German historian and politician; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (1848-49); professor in Berne from 1855.—100, 108
Hall, Carl Christian (1812-1888)—Danish politician; Foreign Minister.—401
Hampden, John (1595-1643)—prominent figure in the English revolution, a leader of the parliamentary opposition to the absolutist regime.—157
Hardenberg, Karl August von (1750-1822)—Prussian statesman and diplomat, Foreign Minister (1804-06, 1807), Chancellor of State (1810-22); champion of moderate reforms; supported the policy of the Holy Alliance after 1815.—368, 525
Harney, George Julian (1817-1897)—prominent figure in the English labour movement, a leader of the Left-wing Chartists, editor of The Northern Star and of the Democratic Review; was on friendly terms with Marx and Engels.—86
Haro—see Mendes de Haro
Harris, Edward Alfred John (1808-1888)—British army officer and diplomat, chargé d'affaires in Berne (1858-67).—176, 177, 179, 192-97
Hartmann von Aue (c. 1170-c. 1210)—German poet.—184
Hartmann, Moritz (1821-1872)—Austrian writer; a “true socialist” in the mid-1840s; member of the Frankfurt National Assembly (extreme Left) during the 1848-49 revolution.—184
Hatzfeldt zu Trachenberg-Schönstein, Max-
imilian Friedrich Karl Franz, Count of (1813-1859)—Prussian diplomat, envoy to Paris from 1849; took part in the Paris Peace Congress in 1856.—57
Haug, Ernst—Austrian army officer, democrat; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Italy; emigrated to England after the revolution.—87
Haupt, Hermann Wilhelm (born c. 1833)—German shop assistant, member of the Communist League; turned informer during the Cologne Communist trial, was released by the police during investigation and fled to Brazil.—67, 309
Havas, August (1814-1889)—one of the proprietors of Agence Havas, son of Charles Havas.—277
Havas, Charles (1785-1858)—French journalist, founder of the French information agency Agence Havas.—277
Hawke, Edward Hawke, Baron (1705-1781)—British admiral; fought in the war of the Austrian Succession (1740-48) and in the Seven Years' War (1756-63); M. P., First Lord of the Admiralty (1765-71).—517
Haxthausen, August Franz Maria, Baron von (1792-1866)—Prussian official and economist.—146
Haynau, Julius Jakob, Baron von (1786-1853)—Austrian field marshal; brutally suppressed the 1848-49 revolutionary movement in Italy and Hungary.—228
Hecker, Friedrich Karl Franz (1811-1881)—German democrat, a leader of the Baden republican uprising in April 1848; after its defeat, emigrated to Switzerland and later to the USA where he fought in the Civil War on the side of the Union.—40, 254
Heckscher, Martin—German physician resident in Manchester, Engels' doctor; helped Das Volk with money.—119
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1770-1831)—German philosopher.—6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role, Description</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heiden, Loghin Petrovich (Lodewijk Sigismund Vincent Gustaaf), Count of (1772-1850)</td>
<td>admiral of the Russian fleet; commanded a squadron in the battle of Navarino (1827); commander-in-chief of the Russian fleet in the Mediterranean during the Russo-Turkish war of 1828-29</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heine, Heinrich (1797-1856)</td>
<td>German revolutionary poet</td>
<td>69, 109, 114, 181, 235, 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinezen, Karl Peter (1809-1880)</td>
<td>German journalist, radical; took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; contributed to the Leipziger Allgemeine Zeitung; emigrated to Switzerland, later to England and, in the autumn of 1850, to the USA.</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herzen, Alexander Ivanovich (1812-1870)</td>
<td>Russian revolutionary democrat, materialist philosopher and writer; emigrated in 1847.</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hess, Heinrich Hermann Josef, Baron von (1788-1870)</td>
<td>Austrian general, later field marshal; took part in suppressing the 1848-49 revolution in Italy; commanded the Austrian army in the Austro-Italian-French war of 1859 after the defeat at Magenta (June-July 1859).</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hildburghausen, Josef Maria Friedrich Wilhelm, Prince von Sachsen (1702-1787)</td>
<td>German field marshal.</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillgärtner, Georg</td>
<td>German journalist and lawyer, petty-bourgeois democrat; sentenced to death for his participation in the 1848-49 revolution; emigrated to the USA.</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckeldey, Karl Ludwig Friedrich von (1805-1856)</td>
<td>Prussian government official, Chief Commissioner of Berlin police from 1848; Chief of the police department in the Ministry of the Interior from 1853.</td>
<td>64, 67, 87, 309, 369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirsch, Wilhelm</td>
<td>commercial clerk from Hamburg; Prussian police agent in London in the early 1850s.</td>
<td>219, 305-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodde, Lucien de la (Delahodde, pseudonym Duprez) (1808-1865)</td>
<td>French writer, participant in secret revolutionary societies during the Restoration and July monarchy, police agent.</td>
<td>56, 73, 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffmann</td>
<td>French journalist, Bonapartist.</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, Karl Anton, Prince von (1811-1885)</td>
<td>Prussian general, Prime Minister (1858-62).</td>
<td>237, 247, 367, 393, 397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hohenzollerns</td>
<td>dynasty of Brandenburg electors (1415-1701), Prussian kings (1701-1918) and German emperors</td>
<td>363, 404, 435, 436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1871-1918).—191, 254, 274, 367, 376, 378, 379, 494-96
Hollinger, Fidelio—owner of a print-shop in London which printed Das Volk.—6-11, 17, 119, 122-26, 128-31, 241, 275, 283, 319-20
Holstein-Gottorp—see Charles I (Charles Frederick)
Hope, Sir James (1808-1881)—British admiral; commanded British expeditionary troops in China (1859-60).—340
Horace (Quintus Horatius Flaccus) (65-8 B. C.)—Roman poet.—26, 136, 214, 247
Hörfel, Gustav—Austrian petty-bourgeois democrat; emigrated to Paris in 1850 and became an agent of the French police.—87, 88, 89
Horner, Leonard (1785-1864)—English geologist and public figure; factory inspector (1833-59), upheld the workers' interests.—410
Horsman, Edward (1807-1876)—British politician, Liberal M. P., Chief Secretary for Ireland (1855-57).—158, 432
Hsien Feng (c. 1831-1861)—Emperor of China (1851-61).—339
Hudson, Sir James (1810-1885)—British diplomat, envoy to Tourin (1851-63).—53, 195-96
Hugo, Victor Marie (1802-1885)—French writer, republican; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies (1848-51); emigrated to Jersey after the coup d'état of December 2, 1851, deported by the local authorities at the end of 1855.—156, 162-63, 189-90, 327
Humboldt, Alexander, Baron von (1769-1859)—German naturalist, traveller and statesman.—41, 167, 177, 183, 369
Huntel—chief of the Bremen police.—305

I
Ibrahim Pasha (1789-1848)—Egyptian general and statesman, commander-in-chief of the Egyptian army (1816-41); took part in the struggle against the Greek national liberation uprising (1824-27) and in the wars waged by Egypt against Turkey (1831-33, 1839-41); co-ruler with his father, Mohammed Ali, from 1844; actual ruler of Egypt from 1847; appointed Pasha of Egypt in 1848.—526
Imandi, Peter—German teacher, democrat; took part in the 1848-49 revolution; emigrated first to Switzerland and, in 1852, to London; member of the Communist League; supporter of Marx and Engels.—39, 43, 44, 296, 301
Imbert, Jacques (1793-1851)—French journalist, democrat and socialist; took part in the 1834 uprising of the Lyons weavers; refugee in Belgium in the 1840s; Vice-President of the Brussels Democratic Association.—264
Ivan III (1440-1505)—Grand Duke of Muscovy (1462-1505).—189

J
Jacoby, Abraham (1830-1919)—German physician, member of the Communist League, one of the accused at the Cologne Communist trial (1852); subsequently emigrated to the USA.—301, 313
Jagiellonowie (Jagelion) (1386-1572)—dynasty of Polish kings (1386-1572) and of grand dukes of Lithuania (1377-1572).—509
Jahn, Friedrich Ludwig (1778-1852)—German writer, organised the sports movement (Turn- und Sportbewegung) in Germany; prominent in the German people's liberation struggle against Napoleon's rule; nationalist.—134
James I Stuart (1566-1625)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1603-25).—509
James II (1633-1701)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1685-88).—73, 514
James Stuart, so-called James III (1688-1766)—son of James II; pretender to the British throne.—514
Jekelfalussy—Hungarian clergyman; Bishop of Zips (1848-49).—328

Jellachich (Jellačić), Josef, Count (1801-1859)—Austrian general, Ban of Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia; took part in suppressing the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary and Austria.—82

John George (Johann Georg) I (1585-1656)—Elector of Saxe (1611-56.)—510

John (Johann) (1782-1859)—Archduke of Austria, field marshal; fought in the wars against Napoleonic France; commanded one of the Austrian armies (1809); Imperial Regent of Germany (June 1848-December 1849).—58, 107-09, 253-54, 524

John (Johann) Nepomuk Maria Joseph (1801-1873)—King of Saxony (1854-73).—398

John VI (1769-1826)—King of Portugal (1816-26) and Emperor of Brazil (1807-25).—525, 526

Joinville, François Ferdinand Philippe Louis Marie, duc d'Orléans, prince de (1818-1900)—son of Louis Philippe; took part in the conquest of Algeria (the 1840s); emigrated to England after the victory of the February 1848 revolution; fought in the American Civil War on the side of the Union (1861-62).—434

Jones, Ernest Charles (1819-1869)—prominent figure in the English labour movement, proletarian poet and journalist, leader of the Left-wing Chartists, editor of Notes to the People and The People's Paper, friend of Marx and Engels.—116, 264-65, 322

Joseph I (1678-1711)—King of Hungary (1687-1711), Holy Roman Emperor (1705-11).—322, 520

Joseph II (1741-1790)—co-regent of his mother Maria Theresa (1765-80), Holy Roman Emperor (1765-90).—149, 519, 520

Joseph Ferdinand (1692-1699)—heir to the throne of the Electorate of Bavaria and proposed heir to the Spanish throne.—513

Jottrand, Lucien Léopold (1804-1877)—Belgian lawyer and writer, democrat; President of the Brussels Democratic Association (1847).—264, 321-22

Jourdan, Louis (1810-1881)—French journalist, Saint-Simonist and later Bonapartist; editor of the newspaper Le Siècle.—186, 206, 211

Jung, Georg Gottlob (1814-1886)—German writer, Young Hegelian, one of the responsible publishers of the Rheinische Zeitung, democrat; deputy to the Prussian National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848.—255

Juvenal (Decimus Junius Juvenalis) (c. 60-140)—Roman satirical poet.—44, 273

K

Kaliningos—Patriarch of Constantinople.—441

Kamm, Friedrich (d. 1867)—German artisan, petty-bourgeois democrat; took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; emigrated to Switzerland after its defeat; member of the German Workers' Association in Geneva; emigrated to the USA (1852).—39, 44, 298

Kamitz und Dallwitz, Karl, Baron von (b. 1812)—Prussian diplomat, envoy to Rome (1859-63).—488

Kannegesser, Karl Friedrich Ludwig (1781-1861)—German poet and translator.—74, 100

Karamzin, Nikolai Mikhailovich (1766-1826)—Russian poet and writer.—141, 485

Karl Wilhelm Ferdinand (1735-1806)—Duke of Brunswick (1780-1806); commander-in-chief of the Austro-Prussian army fighting against revolutionary France (1792).—521

Károlyi, Countess (née Zichy, Karolina), (1818-1903)—a relative of Lajos Batthyány; lived in Italy and Switzerland after the suppression of the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; gave financial help to Hungarian refugees.—189
Katakazi, Gavriil Antonovich (1794-1867)—Russian diplomat of Greek descent; minister in Athens (1833-43), senator.—145

Kaunitz, Wenzel Anton, Prince von (1711-1794)—Austrian statesman and diplomat, supporter of enlightened absolutism, rabid opponent of the French Revolution; Chancellor of State (1753-92).—135, 518

Kern, Johann Conrad (1815-1882)—German poet and journalist, democrat; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; emigrated to Switzerland after its defeat, and to Argentina in 1857.—30, 32, 51

Kosiúszko, Thaddeus (Andrzej Bonawentura) (1746-1817)—prominent figure in the Polish national liberation movement, leader of the 1794 uprising; took part in the struggle for the independence of the North American colonies (1776-83).—521

Kossuth, Lajos (1802-1894)—leader of the Hungarian national liberation movement; head of the revolutionary government (1848-49); after the defeat of the revolution emigrated first to Turkey and then to England and the USA.—149, 165, 189, 214-25, 314, 328

Krause, Carl Friedrich August—see Fleury, Charles

Krause, Friedrich August (d. 1834)—Dresden shoemaker, then steward of Countess Schönberg’s estate, executed for killing her; father of Charles Fleury.—311

Krüdener, Barbara Juliane, Baroness von (1764-1824)—Russian author, preacher of Pietism; the idea of
creating the Holy Alliance was erroneously ascribed to her in the nineteenth century.—138, 525

Krudener, Pavel Alexeyevich (d. 1858)—Russian envoy to Washington and Berne (1837-58).—299

Kubesch.—Austrian police counsellor in London.—305

L

Ladendorf, August—German democrat, sentenced to five years' imprisonment in 1854 on a trumped-up charge of conspiracy.—66, 67, 311

La Farina, Giuseppe (1815-1863)—Italian liberal politician, historian and writer; a leader of the revolutionary movement in Sicily (1848-49); Cavour's emissary in Sicily in 1860 (up to July); adviser to the viceroy of Sicily (October 1860-January 1861).—421, 422-23, 424, 490

La Fayette, Marie Joseph Paul Yves Roch Gilbert du Motier, marquis de (1757-1834)—general, prominent figure in the French Revolution, a leader of the moderate constitutionalists (Feuillants); took part in the July 1830 revolution.—93

La Ferronnays, Auguste Pierre Marie Ferron, comte de (1777-1842)—French politician and diplomat, Ambassador to St. Petersburg (1819-27), participant in the Holy Alliance Congresses, Foreign Minister (1828-29).—526

La Guérinonnère, Louis Étienne Arthur Dubreuil Héliot, vicomte de (1816-1875)—French writer and politician; Bonapartist (the 1850s), chief censor.—113, 138, 182, 186, 207-11, 212, 373

Lasty, Armand François Ruperch (1812-1889)—French army officer and politician; took part in Louis Bonaparte's Strasbourg putsch (1836); senator from 1857.—49, 200

Lamartine, Alphonse Marie Louis de (1790-1869)—French poet, historian and politician; a leader of the moderate republicans in the 1840s; Foreign Minister and virtual head of the Provisional Government in 1848.—207

Lamoricière, Christophe Léon Louis Juchault de (1806-1865)—French general and moderate republican politician; took part in the conquest of Algeria in the 1830s-40s and in the suppression of the June 1848 uprising in Paris, War Minister in the Cavaignac Government (June-December 1848); expelled from France after the coup d'état of December 2, 1851; returned home in 1857.—471-73

Landi—Neapolitan general, fought against Garibaldi's revolutionary detachments in South Italy (1860).—387

Langenschwarz, Maximilian (born c. 1806) —German poet-improviser, tried to found the theory of improvisation.—224

Lanza, Ferdinando—Neapolitan general; fought against Garibaldi's revolutionary detachments in South Italy (1860).—381, 382

Lapinski, Theophil (Łapiński, Teofil) (1827-1886)—Polish colonel; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; served in the Turkish army under the name of Tevfik Bey; fought against Russia in Circassia (1857-58).—148, 214-15, 219, 225-27

Las Cases, Emmanuel Augustin Dieudonné Marie Joseph, comte de (1756-1842)—French historian, accompanied Napoleon to St. Helena (1815-16); published Mémorial de Sainte-Hélène (1822-23).—143

Lascy, Pyotr Petrovich, Count (1678-1751)—Russian field marshal-general of Irish descent; fought in the Northern War (1700-21), the war of Polish Succession (1733-35) and the Russo-Turkish war of 1735-39.—516

Lassalle, Ferdinand (1825-1864)—German lawyer and writer, petty-bourgeois socialist; took part in the democratic movement in the Rhine Province (1848-49); founder of the General Association of German Workers (1863); one of the
originators of the opportunist trend among the German Social-Democrats.—27, 246, 249, 309

La Tour d'Auvergne-Lauraguais, Henri Godefroi Bernard Alphonse, prince de (1823-1871)—French diplomat, Ambassador to Berlin (1859-62), Rome (1862-63) and London (1863-69).—382, 398

Laya, Léon (1811-1872)—French dramatist.—62-63

Ledru-Rollin, Alexandre Auguste (1807-1874)—French writer and politician, a leader of the petty-bourgeois democrats, editor of La Réforme; Minister of the Interior in the Provisional Government (1848), deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies (leader of the Montagnards); emigrated to England after the demonstration of June 13, 1849.—155

Lehon, Countess—lived in Paris in the 1830s-50s and was connected with the Orleans dynasty.—36

Lelewel, Joachim (1786-1861)—Polish historian and revolutionary; took part in the 1830-31 insurrection in Poland; a leader of the democratic wing of Polish refugees (1847-48); member of the Committee of the Brussels Democratic Association.—264, 322

Leonidas (c. 508-480 B.C.)—King of Sparta (c. 488-480 B.C.), hero of the battle of Thermopylae during the Greco-Persian war.—204

Leopold (1790-1852)—Grand Duke of Baden (1830-52).—392

Leopold I (1640-1705)—Holy Roman Emperor (1658-1705).—512-14

Leopold I (1790-1865)—King of Belgium (1831-65).—441

Leotard, Jules (1830-1870)—French circus artist.—326

Leszczynski—see Stanislaus I

Leuchtenberg, Maximilien Eugène Joseph Napoléon, duc de (1817-1852)—son of Eugène Beauharnais; married Nicholas I’s daughter (1839).—144-45

Lévy, A.—182

Levy, Joseph Moses (1812-1888)—English journalist, one of the founders and publisher of The Daily Telegraph.—130, 243-48, 249-50, 257

Lichnowski, Felix Maria, Prince von (1814-1848)—Prussian army officer, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Right wing); killed during the Frankfurt uprising in September 1848.—87, 102, 251, 252

Liebig, Justus, Baron von (1803-1873)—German chemist.—243

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.—30, 50, 52-53, 112-14, 117, 119, 122, 124-25, 127, 132, 240, 247, 261, 263, 273, 275, 284-86, 288, 317-20

Limayrac, Paulin (1817-1868)—French journalist, contributed to many big French newspapers; editor-in-chief of Le Constitutionnel (1861-68); Bonapartist.—324

Lippe, Leopold, Count zur (1815-1889)—Prussian lawyer and statesman; Public Prosecutor in Berlin (1860), Minister of Justice (1862-67).—269

Loë, Heinrich Friedrich Walther De- genhardt, Baron von (1828-1908)—Prussian army officer, aide-de-camp of the Prince Regent; retained this post when the Prince Regent became King William I.—397

Loening—German publisher.—121, 185

Lommel, Georg—German petty-bourgeois democrat, took part in the Baden uprising in April 1848; emigrated to Switzerland after its defeat.—68-71, 74, 185, 191-92, 198, 201

Longinus, Cassius (c. 213-273)—Greek neo-Platonic philosopher.—120

Louis (1661-1711)—Dauphin of Louis XIV.—513

Louis XII (1462-1515)—King of France (1498-1515).—505
MacMahon, Marie Edme Patrice Maurice, comte de, duc de Magenta (1808-1893)—French general, later Marshal of France, senator, Bonapartist; fought in the wars of the Second Empire.—496

McMurdo, Sir William Montagu Scott (1819-1894)—British army officer, later general; served in India in the 1840s-50s; Inspector-General of the Volunteers (1860-65).—403, 404, 437

Maguire, John Francis (1815-1872)—Irish liberal politician, M.P.—437

Mahmood II (1785-1839)—Sultan of Turkey (1808-1839).—143, 525, 526

Mahomet—see Mohammed

Maistre, Xavier de (1763-1852)—French general and writer; emigrated to Russia during the French Revolution.—247

Malmesbury, James Howard Harris, Earl of (1807-1889)—British statesman, Tory, later Conservative; Foreign Secretary (1852, 1858-59), Lord Privy Seal (1866-68, 1874-76).—134, 177-79, 181, 193

Mandeström, Kristoffer Rutger Ludvig (1806-1873)—Swedish statesman, Foreign Minister (1858-68).—401

Manilius Brutus—Roman lawyer.—293

Manteuffel, Edwin Hans Karl, Baron von (1809-1885)—Prussian general; chief of the Military Cabinet from 1857; adjutant-general of William I from 1861.—397

Manteuffel, Otto Theodor, Baron von (1805-1882)—Prussian statesman; Minister of the Interior (November 1848-November 1850), Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs (1850-58).—237-38, 256-57, 266, 369, 379

Margarita Theresa (d. 1673)—daughter of Philip IV of Spain; first wife of the Holy Roman Emperor Leopold I.—512

Maria II (da Gloria) (1819-1853)—Queen of Portugal (1826-28, 1834-53).—337, 526

Maria Theresa (1638-1683)—Queen of Louis XIV of France from 1660;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Role and Notable Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maria Theres (Marie Thérèse)</td>
<td>(1717-1780)</td>
<td>Archduchess of Austria (1740-80); Holy Roman Empress (1745-80), daughter of Philip IV of Spain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie de Medicis</td>
<td>(1573-1642)</td>
<td>Wife of Henry IV of France.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario, Alberto</td>
<td>(1825-1883)</td>
<td>Italian politician and writer; took part in Garibaldi's revolutionary campaign in South Italy (1860).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazarin, Jules</td>
<td>(1602-1661)</td>
<td>French cardinal and statesman; Prime Minister, virtual ruler of France (1643-1661).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazzini, Giuseppe</td>
<td>(1805-1872)</td>
<td>Italian revolutionary, democrat; head of the Provisional Government of the Roman Republic (1849); sought for support among the Bonapartists (the early 1850s); subsequently opposed Bonapartism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medici del Vacello, Giacomo</td>
<td>(1817-1882)</td>
<td>Italian general; fought in the national liberation war of 1848-49 and defended the Roman Republic in April-July 1849; took part in Garibaldi's revolutionary campaign in South Italy (1860).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maupe, Charlemagne Émile de</td>
<td>(1818-1888)</td>
<td>French lawyer, Bonapartist; Prefect of the Paris police (1851); an organiser of the coup d'état of December 2, 1851; Minister of Police (1852-53).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Saxe, von</td>
<td>(1521-1553)</td>
<td>Elector of Saxony from 1547; Duke from 1541; commander-in-chief of the Imperial troops in the Smalkald war (1546-48).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Saxe, comte de</td>
<td>(1696-1750)</td>
<td>Marshal of France; fought in the war of the Austrian Succession (1741-48); writer on military science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer, Karl</td>
<td>(1819-1889)</td>
<td>German petty-bourgeois democrat; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (1848-49); emigrated to Switzerland after the defeat of the revolution; editor of the Stuttgart newspaper Beobachter in the 1860s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medici del Vacello, Giacomo</td>
<td>(1817-1882)</td>
<td>Italian general; fought in the national liberation war of 1848-49 and defended the Roman Republic in April-July 1849; took part in Garibaldi's revolutionary campaign in South Italy (1860).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mélusé, —</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neapolitan general; fought against Garibaldi's revolutionary detachments in South Italy (1860).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinet, François Aimé</td>
<td>(1768-1852)</td>
<td>Belgian general; took part in the democratic movement and the 1830 revolution in Belgium; Honorary President of the Brussels Democratic Association; one of the accused at the Risquons Tout trial.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1661)—Spanish statesman and diplomat; First Minister of Spain from 1643.—511
Meszlenyi, Zsuzsánna (née Kossuth) (1806-1856)—sister of Lajos Kossuth; inspector of hospitals during the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary.—222
Metternich-Winneburg, Clemens Wenzel Lothar, Prince von (1773-1859)—Austrian statesman and diplomat; Foreign Minister (1809-21) and Chancellor (1821-48); one of the founders of the Holy Alliance.—135, 148, 399, 525-26
Meyen, Eduard (1812-1870)—German writer, Young Hegelian; emigrated to England after the defeat of the 1848-49 revolution.—4-7, 18, 97, 239-42, 308
Miguel Maria Evaristo (Dom Miguel) (1802-1866)—King of Portugal (1828-34).—143, 337, 525, 526
Mikhail Fyodorovich (1596-1645)—first tsar (1613-45) of the Russian Romanov dynasty (1613-1917).—509
Minié, Claude Etienne (1804-1879)—French colonel, inventor of a new type of rifle adopted by the French army in 1852.—348
Miskowsky, Henryk Ludvic (d. 1854)—Polish army officer; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; emigrated first to Turkey and then to London after the defeat of the revolution.—84-85
Missori, Giuseppe (1829-1911)—Italian army officer; took part in the national liberation movement in Italy; fought in Garibaldi’s revolutionary detachments in the 1860s.—473, 477
Müller, Georg—German refugee in London in 1860, Chairman of the German Workers’ Educational Society.—264
Mühlau, Joseph (1813-1849)—German watchmaker; prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement; a leader of the League of the Just; member of the Central Authority of the Communist League; President of the Cologne Workers’ Association and member of the Rhenish District Committee of Democrats (July-September 1848); killed in battle during the Baden-Palatinate uprising in 1849.—79
Montalembert, Charles Forbes René de Tryon, comte de (1810-1870)—French politician and writer; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies (1848-51); Orleanist, leader of the Catholic party; supported Louis Bonaparte during the coup d’état of December 2, 1851, but soon afterwards joined the opposition.—157
Morny, Charles Auguste Louis Joseph, duc de (1811-1865)—French politician, Bonapartist, half-brother of Napoleon III; 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); President of the Corps Législatif (1854-56, 1857-65).—36, 159
Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus (1756-1791)—Austrian composer.—40
Mucius Scaevola—Roman lawyer.—293
Müller, Georg—German refugee in London in 1860, Chairman of the German Workers’ Educational Society.—264
Mühlau, Amannus Gottfried Adolf (1774-1829)—German poet and literary critic.—120
Münich (Munich), Khristofor Antonovich, Count (1683-1767)—Russian military leader and statesman, field marshal-general, engineer; commanded Russian troops in the Crimea and in
Bessarabia during the Russo-Turkish war of 1735-39.—516

Mural, Napoléon Lucien Charles, prince (1803-1878)—French politician of the Second Republic and Second Empire; cousin of Napoleon III; envoy to Turin (1849-50); pretender to the Neapoltan throne (1851).—372

Mustafa III (1717-1774)—Sultan of Turkey (1757-74).—519

N

Napier, Sir Charles (1786-1860)—British admiral; fought in the wars against Portugal (1810, 1823-34) and Syria (1840); commanded the British fleet in the Baltic (1854); M.P.—135, 526

Napoléon, Jérôme, prince—see Bonaparte, Jérôme Napoleon Joseph Charles Paul

Napoleon I Bonaparte (1769-1821)—Emperor of the French (1804-14, 1815).—34, 37, 93, 97, 135, 138, 143, 148, 156-57, 159-60, 161-64, 170, 183, 190, 204, 260-61, 288, 291, 441, 522-24


Nemours, Louis Charles Philippe Raphaël d’Orléans, duc de (1814-1896)—second son of Louis Philippe; general of the French army.—441

Nesselrode, Karl Vasilyevich, Count (1780-1862)—Russian statesman and diplomat; Foreign Minister (1816-56); State Chancellor from 1845.—525

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); Colonial Secretary (1859-64).—373-39

Ney, Michel, duc d’Elchingen, prince de la Moscova (1769-1815)—Marshal of France; fought in the wars waged by the French Republic and Napoleonic France.—38

Nicholas I (1796-1855)—Emperor of Russia (1825-55).—145, 147, 227, 431, 525

Niegolewski (1819-1885)—Polish lawyer and politician; petty-bourgeois democrat; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (1848); member of the Prussian Chamber of Deputies for Posen from 1849.—394-95

Nothjung, Peter (1823-1866)—German tailor; member of the Cologne Workers’ Association and of the Communist League; one of the accused at the Cologne Communist trial (1852); sentenced to six years’ imprisonment.—237, 375

Nugent—see Cherval, Julien

O

Obreskov, Alexei Mikhailovich (1718-1787)—Russian diplomat, chargé d’affaires (1751) and resident (1752-68) in Constantinople; took part in signing the peace of Kuchuk Kainarji (1774).—519

Ochsenbein, Johann Ulrich (1811-1890)—Swiss general, statesman and politician; at first radical and later liberal; President of the Federal Diet during the Sonderbund war; head of the Federal Government (1847-48); President of the National Council and member of the Federal Council (1848-54).—231-32

Ohly, Karl Friedrich Christian Hermann (1825-1881)—German journalist, petty-bourgeois democrat; took part in the 1848-49 revolution; emigrated first to Switzerland and then to London after the defeat of the revolution; correspondent of the
Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung.—112, 261, 286
Olga (1822-1892)—Grand Duchess of Russia, second daughter of Nicholas I; Queen of Württemberg from 1864.—299
Oliphant, Laurence (1829-1888)—English traveller and journalist; correspondent of The Times in the Caucasus with Omer Pasha’s expeditionary corps (1855).—180
Olivier, Émile (1825-1913)—French politician, moderate republican; member of the Corps Législatif from 1857; became Bonapartist in the late 1860s; head of the government (January-August 1870).—431
Oppenheim, Heinrich Bernhard (1819-1880)—German democratic politician, economist and journalist; an editor of the Berlin newspaper Die Reform (1848); refugee (1849-50); subsequently a National-Liberal.—97, 249
Orges, Hermann (1821-1874)—German journalist; an editor of the Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung (1854-64).—124, 210, 263, 317
Orléans—royal dynasty in France (1830-48).—36
Orloff (Orlov), Alexei Fyodorovich, Count, Prince from 1856 (1786-1861)—Russian military leader, statesman and diplomat; signed the treaties of Adrianople (1829) and Unkias-Skelessi (1833) with Turkey; headed the Russian delegation to the Paris Congress (1856).—382
Orsini, Felice (1819-1858)—Italian democrat, republican; prominent figure in the struggle for Italy’s national liberation and unification; executed for his attempt on the life of Napoleon III.—157, 395-96
Oswald, Eugen (1826-1912)—German journalist, democrat; took part in the 1848-49 Baden revolutionary movement; emigrated to England after the defeat of the revolution.—33
Otto I (1815-1867)—King of Greece (1832-62) from the Bavarian dynasty of Wittelsbachs.—526
Oudinot, Nicolas Charles Victor (1791-1863)—French general, Orleanist; commanded troops sent against the Roman Republic (1849).—155
Owen, Robert (1771-1858)—English utopian socialist.—88-89

P

Palestrina—French police officer.—208, 211
Palmerston, Henry John Temple, Viscount (1784-1865)—British statesman; at first Tory and, from 1830, Whig; Foreign Secretary (1830-34, 1835-41, 1846-51); Home Secretary (1852-55); Prime Minister (1855-58, 1859-65).—5, 116-17, 136, 139, 143, 158-59, 173, 179, 202, 215-16, 244, 315, 339
Papinian, Aemilius Papinianus (c. 140-212)—Roman lawyer.—293
Paul I (1754-1801)—Emperor of Russia (1796-1801).—522
Paul V (Camillo Borghese) (1552-1621)—Pope (1605-21).—Pope (1605-21).—509-10
Pedro I (Dom Pedro de Alcantara) (1798-1834)—Emperor of Brazil (1822-31); son of John VI of Portugal; father of Maria II da Gloria of Portugal.—337, 526
Peel, Sir Robert, Baronet (1788-1850)—British statesman, moderate Tory; Home Secretary (1822-27, 1828-30); Prime Minister (1834-35, 1841-46).—7, 498
Peire, Vidal (12th-13th cent.)—famous Provençal troubadour.—96
Pélissier, Aimable Jean Jacques, duc de Malakoff (1794-1864)—French general, Marshal of France from September 1855; took part in the conquest of Algeria in the 1830s-50s; corps commander (early 1855) and commander-in-chief of the French army (May 1855-July 1856) in the Crimea; Ambassador to London (1858-59).—157, 349
Pepe, Guglielmo (1783-1855)—prominent figure in the Italian national liberation movement, general of the Neapolitan army; sided with the
Carbonari and commanded the army of the rebels during the 1820-21 Neapolitan revolution; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Italy.—525

Perczel, Mór (Moritz) (1811-1899)—Hungarian general; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; emigrated to Turkey after the defeat of the revolution and, in 1851, to England.—149, 224

Péreire, Isaac (1806-1880)—French banker, Bonapartist, deputy to the Corps Législatif; founded the joint-stock bank Crédit Mobilier together with his brother Emile (1852); author of works on credit.—248, 341

Perponcher-Sedlnitzki, Wilhelm, Count von (1819-1893)—Prussian diplomat; envoy to Naples in the early 1860s.—488

Perrée, Jean Baptiste Emmanuel (1761-1800)—French naval officer, rear admiral (1798); fought in Napoleon I's campaigns in Venice and Toulon (1796-98); commanded the French fleet in the Adriatic.—163

Perrier, John—Swiss radical politician, member of the Grand Council (1852, 1856-60), Fazy's supporter.—196, 199-201

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, 1860-63); Ambassador to London (1855-58, 1859-60).—174, 383, 447

Persius (Aulus Persius Flaccus) (34-62)—Roman satirist.—243, 245

Peter I ("the Great") (1672-1725)—Tsar of Russia (1682-1721), Emperor of Russia (1721-25).—117, 142, 513-16

Peter the Hermit (c. 1050-1115)—French monk and preacher; a leader of the peasant volunteer corps in the first crusade (1096-99).—440

Peter III (1728-1762)—Emperor of Russia (1761-62).—518

Petétin, Anselme (1807-1873)—French writer; at first republican and later Bonapartist; Prefect of Savoy (1860-61).—193

Pfuel, Ernst Heinrich Adolf von (1779-1866)—Prussian general; Prime Minister and War Minister (September-October 1848).—256

Philip (1720-1765)—Duke of Parma (1748-65).—518

Philip II (or Philip Augustus) (1165-1223)—King of France (1180-1223); a leader of the third crusade (1189-91).—440

Philip II (1527-1598)—King of Spain (1556-98).—506, 509

Philip III (1578-1621)—King of Spain (1598-1621).—509, 510

Philip IV (1605-1665)—King of Spain (1621-65).—510

Philip V (1683-1746)—King of Spain (1700-24, 1724-46), Duke of Anjou.—513-15, 517

Philippe of Orléans (1674-1723)—Duke of Chartres; Regent of France (1715-23) during the infancy of Louis XV.—514, 515

Philipson, Grigory Ivanovich (1809-1883)—Russian general; fought in the war in the Caucasus (1835-49).—220-21

Pial, Jean Pierre (1774-1862)—French general, Bonapartist; organised and headed the Society of December 10.—34

Pietri, Pierre Marie (1809-1864)—French politician, Bonapartist, Prefect of the Paris police (1852-58).—49

Pindar, Peter—see Wolcot, John

Pitt, William ("the Younger") (1759-1806)—British statesman, Tory; Prime Minister (1783-1801, 1804-06).—59, 135, 338, 521, 523

Pitt, William, Earl of Chatham (1708-1778)—British statesman, Whig; Foreign Secretary and Secretary of State for War (1756-61); Prime Minister (1766-68).—518

Pius VII (Gregorio Luigi Barnaba Chiaramonti) (1742-1823)—Pope (1800-23).—523, 525

Pius IX (Giovanni Maria Mastai-Ferretti) (1792-1878)—Pope (1846-78).—141,
Plautus, Titus (Titus Maccius Plautus) (c. 254-184 B.C.)—Roman dramatist.—112

Pöntkósz, F.C.—German army officer, author of Handbuch für die Königlich Prussischen Artillerie-Offiziere.—65

Pope, Alexander (1688-1744)—English poet.—237, 247, 250, 327

Post—Prussian police officer.—394-95

Pourtalès, Albert (1688-1744)—English poet.—237, 247, 250, 327

Prince of Prussia—see William I

Prince Regent—see William I

Proudhon, Pierre Joseph (1809-1865)—French writer, economist and sociologist; a founder of anarchism; fashionable tamer to the Constituent Assembly (1848).—90, 157

Pückler, Erdmann, Count von (b. 1792)—Prussian Minister of Agriculture from 1858.—397

Pulszky, Ferenc (1814-1897)—Hungarian politician, writer and archaeologist of Polish descent; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; emigrated after its defeat; contributed to the New-York Daily Tribune in the 1850s; returned to Hungary in 1867 after an amnesty; deputy to the Diet (1867-76, 1884-97).—224

Puttkammer—Oberpräsident of the Prussian province of Posen (1851-60).—395

Pyat, Félix (1810-1889)—French journalist, dramatist and politician, petty-bourgeois democrat; took part in the 1848 revolution; opposed an independent working-class movement; fought against Marx and the First International for a number of years.—395

Pythagoras (c. 571-c. 497 B.C.)—Greek philosopher and mathematician.—239, 295

R

Rademacher, Johann Gottfried (1772-1849)—German physician famous for his peculiar classification of diseases according to remedies.—33

Radetzky, Joseph, Count of Radetz (1766-1858)—Austrian field marshal; commanded the Austrian forces in North Italy from 1831; suppressed the national liberation movement in Italy (1848-49); Governor-General of the Kingdom of Lombardy and Venice (1850-56).—136

Radovitz, Joseph Maria von (1797-1853)—Prussian general and statesman; a leader of the Right wing in the Frankfurt National Assembly (1848-49).—251-53

Raisin, Pierre (1820-1870)—Swiss lawyer and politician, member of the Grand Council.—297

Rákóczi, Ferenc (1676-1735)—leader of the Hungarian national liberation movement against the Habsburgs (early 18th cent.).—225

Rákóczi, György I (1593-1648)—Prince of Transylvania; fought against the Habsburgs and the Ottoman Empire for the unification of all Hungarian lands; acted in league with Sweden during the Thirty Years' War.—510

Rákóczi, György II (1621-1660)—Prince of Transylvania (1648-60).—511

Rákóczi, József (1700-1738)—one of the last representatives of the ancient Hungarian family of Transylvanian princes; lived in Turkey from 1736; died during the military expedition to Moldavia.—516

Ranickel—German bookbinder, petty-bourgeois democrat; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; emigrated to Switzerland after its defeat.—39, 40, 41, 44, 45, 55, 63, 76, 77, 78, 118, 120, 193, 205-06, 250, 299

Raspail, François Vincent (1794-1878)—French naturalist, sociologist and writer close to the revolutionary proletariat; took part in the revolutions of 1830 and 1848; deputy to the Constituent Assembly (1869).—69
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.—210, 253

Rechberg and Rothenlöwen, Johann Bernhard, Count von (1806-1899)—Austrian statesman and diplomat; Prime Minister (1859-60); Foreign Minister (1859-64).—368, 491

Redgrave, Alexander—English inspector of factories.—410, 414, 416

Reh, Theodore—German lawyer; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (1848-49).—106-08

Reichardt, Joseph Martin (1803-1872)—German lawyer, democrat; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly; member of the Palatinate revolutionary Provisional Government (1849); emigrated to the USA after the defeat of the revolution.—255

Reichenbach, Georg von (1772-1826)—Bavarian army officer and inventor.—356

Reichenbach, Oskar, Count (b. 1815)—Silesian landowner, democrat; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (1848-49); emigrated to England (1850) and later to the USA.—315

Reinach, Arnold (c. 1820-1870)—German petty-bourgeois democrat; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; afterwards emigrated to Switzerland.—120, 299

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.—56

Repin, Nikolai Vasilevich, Prince (1734-1801)—Russian military leader and diplomat; field marshal-general from 1796; took part in the Seven Years' War (1756-63); Ambassador to Poland (1763-69); fought in the Russo-Turkish wars (1768-74, 1787-91).—519

Reshid Pasha Mustafa Mehemed (1802-1858)—Turkish statesman; repeatedly held the posts of Grand Vizier and Foreign Minister (May 1853-May 1855, with intervals).—149, 218, 382

Reuter, Max—Prussian police agent in London in the early 1850s.—307

Reuter, Paul Julius, Baron (1816-1899)—founder of the Reuter telegraph agency in London (1851); German by birth.—277, 307

Rewitt—London Refugee Committee emissary to Posen.—395

Rheinländer, Georg Friedrich—German revolutionary, member of the Paris Outlaws' League, later refugee in London.—60, 228

Richelieu, Armand Emmanuel du Plessis, duc de (1766-1822)—French statesman; emigrated to Russia on the outbreak of the French Revolution; returned to France in 1813; Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs (1815-18, 1820-21).—143

Richelieu, Armand Jean du Plessis, duc de (1696-1788)—French military leader and diplomat; Marshal of France from 1748; fought in the wars of the Spanish, Polish and Austrian Succession and in the Seven Years' War.—518

Riesser, Gabriel (1806-1863)—German lawyer and politician; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (first Right Centre and then, from September 1848, Left Centre) in 1848-49.—109

Rigolboche—see Badel, Marguerite.

Rincón, Antonio—Italian-born French diplomat, envoy to Constantinople; assassinated in Italy on Charles V's order (1530).—506

Rings, L.W.—member of the Communist League; refugee in London in the early 1850s; supporter of Marx and Engels.—309

Roesler, Gustav Adolf (1818-1855)—
German teacher and journalist; member of the Left wing in the Frankfurt National Assembly (1848-49); emigrated to the USA in 1850.—98

Rogier, Charles Latour (1800-1885)—Belgian statesman, Minister of the Interior (1848-52).—263

Romanoffs (Romanovs)—dynasty of Russian tsars and emperors (1613-1917).—401

Roon, Albrecht Theodor Emil, Count von (1803-1879)—Prussian statesman and military leader; field marshal-general from 1873; War Minister (1859-73) and Naval Minister (1861-71); reorganised the Prussian army.—252

Rosenblum, Eduard—German student; took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; emigrated after its defeat.—30-32

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; one of the accused at the Cologne Communist trial (1852); sentenced to six years' imprisonment; later sided with the Lassalleans.—309

Rotteck, Karl Wenzeslaus Rodecker von (1775-1840)—German historian and liberal politician.—236

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 a number of government posts during the Second Empire.—341

Rousseau, Jean Jacques (1712-1778)—French philosopher and writer of the Enlightenment.—232, 401

Rudolph II (1552-1612)—Holy Roman Emperor (1576-1612).—509

Ruge, Arnold (1802-1880)—German radical journalist and Young Hegelian philosopher; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848; a leader of the German petty-bourgeois refugees in Eng-
in the early 1840s and contributed to various journals and newspapers.—41-42

**Schaebitz, Jacob** (1827-1899)—Swiss publisher and bookseller; member of the Fraternal Democrats society from 1846, member of the Communist League; maintained contact with Marx and Engels in the late 1840s and the early 1850s.—57, 65

**Schaible, Karl Heinrich** (1824-1899)—German physician and writer; took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; afterwards emigrated to England.—130-32, 213, 267, 283, 285

**Schaller, Julien** (1807-1871)—Swiss statesman; head of the government of the Freiburg (Fribourg) Canton (1848-56).—53

**Schapper, Karl** (c. 1812-1870)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement, a leader of the League of the Just, member of the Central Authority of the Communist League; took part in the 1848-49 revolution; after the revolution, a leader of the sectarian group that split away from the Communist League in 1850; later a member of the General Council of the First International.—50, 80, 266, 307

**Scherzer, Andreas** (1807-1879)—German tailor; member of one of the Paris communities, which joined the Willich-Schapper sectarian group after the split in the Communist League, one of the accused in the case of the so-called Franco-German conspiracy in Paris in February 1852; subsequently emigrated to England and became a leader of the German Workers' Educational Society in London, publisher of *Die Neue Zeit* and contributor to *Das Volk*.—117, 118, 316, 317

**Schiss, Johann Ulrich** (1813-1883)—Swiss politician and diplomat, Chancellor of the Confederation (1848-81).—179, 193

**Schiller, Johann Christoph Friedrich von** (1759-1805)—German poet, dramatist, historian and philosopher.—8, 35, 39, 40, 48, 65, 71, 101, 187, 192, 258

**Schily, Victor** (1810-1875)—German lawyer, democrat; took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; emigrated to France; member of the First International.—39-46, 51, 76, 77, 101, 296-301

**Schimmelpfennig, Alexander** (1824-1865)—Prussian army officer, democrat; took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; emigrated to the USA; adhered to the Willich-Schapper sectarian group; fought in the American Civil War on the side of the Union.—75-76, 84-88, 91, 93, 97, 99

**Schleinitz, Alexander Gustav Adolf, Baron von** (1807-1885)—Prussian statesman, Foreign Minister (June 1848, 1849-50, 1858-61).—248, 368, 375, 376-79, 382, 383, 398, 489, 491

**Schlickmann**—Prussian judicial official.—294, 295

**Schlöffer, Friedrich Wilhelm** (1800-1870)—Silesian factory owner, democrat; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848.—107

**Schlööffel, Gustav Adolph** (c. 1828-1849)—German student and journalist; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany and Hungary; correspondent of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* in the Frankfurt National Assembly.—102, 105, 107

**Schmerling, Anton von** (1805-1893)—Austrian statesman, liberal; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Right Centre) in 1848-49; Minister of the Interior (July-September 1848), Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs (September 1848).—254, 501

**Schneider II, Karl**—German lawyer, democrat; President of the Cologne Democratic Society and member of the Rhenish District Committee of Democrats; defended Marx and Engels at the trial of the *Neue Rheinische
Zeitung on February 7, 1849; counsel for the defence at the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—57, 262, 267
Schrarm, Konrad (c. 1822-1858)—German proletarian revolutionary, member of the Communist League; emigrated to London in 1849; responsible editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung and Politisch-ökonomische Revue; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—83-86, 285
Schulenburg, Friedrich Wilhelm, Count von (1742-1815)—Prussian statesman, Governor of Berlin (1806).—67
Schüler, Ernst (1807-1881)—German politician and writer, democrat; emigrated to Switzerland in 1833 and became a teacher; published the newspaper Schweizer Handels-Courier from 1853; disseminated Bonapartist ideas in the 1850s and 1860s.—119
Schüler, Friedrich (1791-1873)—deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (1848); elected one of the five Imperial Regents in June 1849; emigrated after the suppression of the Baden-Palatinate uprising.—210
Schultz—Prussian judicial official.—283, 290, 291
Schurz, Karl (1829-1906)—German petty-bourgeois democrat; took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; emigrated to Switzerland; later US statesman.—87, 88, 97, 99
Schiwarck—Chief Public Prosecutor of the Prussian Court of Appeal.—19, 268-69
Schwarzenberg, Felix Ludwig Johann Friedrich, Prince zu (1800-1852)—Austrian conservative statesman and diplomat; envoy to Turin (1838-46) and to Naples (1846-48); after the suppression of the Vienna uprising in October 1848 Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs (November 1848-1852).—379
Schwerin, Maximilian Heinrich Karl, Count (1804-1872)—Prussian statesman, Minister of Religious Worship, Public Education and Medicine (March-June 1848); deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Right wing); Minister of the Interior (1859-62); National-Liberal.—238, 395
Scitovsky, János (b. 1785)—Primate of Hungary.—501
Scott, Sir Walter (1771-1832)—Scottish poet and novelist.—97
Seckendorf, August Heinrich Eduard Friedrich, Baron von (1807-1885)—Prussian legal official; member of the Second Chamber (Centre) in 1849; public prosecutor at the Cologne Communist trial (1852).—309
Seidensticker, Georg Friedrich Karl Theodor (1797-1862)—German lawyer and politician; sentenced to imprisonment for participation in the 1831 Göttingen riot; emigrated to the USA in 1845 and became a journalist there.—97
Semrau, August (1816-1893)—German journalist and poet.—238
Seneca, Lucius Annaeus (c. 4 B.C.-A.D. 65)—Roman stoic philosopher.—299
Sepher Pasha—Circassian prince; served the Turks and took part in the Russo-Turkish war (1826-28); directed the Circassians’ military operations against Russia (1855-59).—219
Sforza—see Francesco II Sforza
Shakespeare, William (1564-1616)—English dramatist and poet.—29, 35, 38, 40, 46, 47, 48, 55, 59, 116, 128, 190, 244-45, 378
Sigel, Albert (1827-1884)—Baden army officer, journalist; took part in the Baden revolutionary movement (1848-49); emigrated to the USA in 1853; fought in the American Civil War on the side of the Union.—96, 97
Sigel, Franz (1824-1902)—Baden army officer, democrat, one of the military leaders of the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; refugee in Switzerland, England and (from 1852) in the USA; fought in the American Civil War on the side of the Union.—96, 97
Simon, Édouard (1824-1897)—Berlin-born French journalist, Bonapartist spy.—42, 93-94, 112-13, 206-11, 236, 240, 245
Simon, Heinrich (1805-1860)—German liberal, counsellor-at-law in Breslau (Wroclaw); dismissed for his oppositional views in the 1840s; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (1848); elected one of the five Imperial Regents (June 1849); subsequently emigrated to Switzerland.—210

Simon, Ludwig (1810-1872)—German lawyer, democrat; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848-49; emigrated to Switzerland in 1849; lived in Paris in 1855-70.—101, 208, 329

Solyman (or Soliman) I ("the Magnificent") (c. 1496-1566) — Ottoman Sultan (1520-66).—505, 506

Sommer—Prussian police agent in Paris in the early 1850s.—56, 307

Sophia (Sophie) (1805-1872)—Archduchess of Austria, mother of Emperor Francis Joseph I.—222, 243

Soubise, Charles de Rohan, prince de (1715-1787)—Marshall of France, favourite of Louis XV, participant in the Seven Years' War (1756-63).—518

Soulouque, Faustin (c. 1782-1867) — President of the Republic of Haiti (1849-59); proclaimed himself Emperor Faustin I in 1849.—36

Stahl, Friedrich Julius (1802-1861) — German lawyer, philosopher and reactionary politician; became professor of Berlin University in 1840.—247

Stämpfli, Jakob (1820-1879)—Swiss politician and statesman, radical; deputy to the National Council for the Berne Canton (1848-54); President of the Swiss Confederation (1856, 1859, 1862).—53, 179, 192, 193, 202-03

Stanbury—owner of a printshop in London.—308

Stanislaus I (Leszczyński) (1677-1766)—King of Poland (1704-11, 1733-34).—516

Stanislaus II (Stanislaus Augustus Poniatowski) (1732-1798)—King of Poland as Stanislaus II Augustus (1764-95).—519

Stecher, H. C.—former headmaster of a secondary school in Baden; emigrated after the defeat of the revolution; engaged in lithography.—62, 63, 304

Steffen, Wilhelm—former Prussian army officer, witness for the defence at the Cologne Communist trial (1852); emigrated to England in 1853 and afterwards to the USA; closely associated with Marx and Engels in the 1850s.—86, 87

Stein, Julius (1813-1889)—Silesian teacher and journalist; deputy to the Prussian National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848; deputy to the Second Chamber (extreme Left wing) in 1849.—237, 238

Stein, Maximilian, Baron (1811-1860)—Austrian army officer; chief of staff of the revolutionary army during the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; afterwards emigrated to Turkey and assumed the name of Ferhad Pasha; fought in the Caucasus against Russia (1857-58).—220

Stenzel, Gustav Adolf—deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly for Breslau (Silesia) in 1849.—106

Sterne, Laurence (1713-1768)—British novelist.—245

Stieber, Wilhelm (1818-1882)—Prussian police officer, one of the organisers of the Cologne Communist trial (1852) and principal witness for the prosecution; collaborated with Wermuth on the book Die Kommunisten-Verschwörungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts; chief of the Prussian political police (1850-60).—52, 55-56, 57, 58, 59, 65, 66, 67, 74, 77, 288, 305, 306, 307, 309, 310-11, 312, 369

Stolzenberg—Prussian police officer.—395

Strabo (63 B.C.-A.D. c. 20)—Greek geographer and historian.—440

Stratford, Thomas Wentworth, Earl of (1593-1641) — English statesman; principal minister to Charles I from 1628; advocate of absolutism.—495

Stratford de Redcliffe, Stratford Canning, Viscount (1786-1880) — British diplomat, envoy to Constantinople.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Contribution and Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Struve, Amalie</td>
<td>(d. 1862)</td>
<td>Wife of Gustav Struve; took part in the democratic movement in Germany in 1848-49.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struve, Gustav von</td>
<td>(1805-1870)</td>
<td>German journalist, democrat; a leader of the Baden uprisings in April and September 1848, of the Baden-Palatinate uprising in 1849 and later of the German petty-bourgeois refugees in England; fought in the American Civil War on the side of the Union.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue, Eugène Marie Joseph</td>
<td>(1804-1857)</td>
<td>French writer, author of sentimental novels dealing with social problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulla (Lucius Cornelius Sulla)</td>
<td>(138-78 B.C.)</td>
<td>Roman general and statesman; consul (88 B.C.); dictator (82-79 B.C.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suworov, Alexander Arkadyevich, Count</td>
<td>(1804-1882)</td>
<td>Russian military leader and statesman; fought in the Russo-Turkish wars (1826-28, 1828-29); took part in the suppression of the 1830-31 uprising in Poland; Governor-General of the Baltic provinces (1848-61).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suworov, Alexander Vasilyevich, Count</td>
<td>(1729-1800)</td>
<td>Russian field marshal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szabó, Imre von</td>
<td>(1820-1865)</td>
<td>Hungarian army officer; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; member of the first Hungarian revolutionary government (March-September 1848) and deputy to the State Assembly in Debrecen (1849); after the defeat of the revolution, emigrated to Paris and later to London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szécesen, Antal, Count</td>
<td>(1819-1896)</td>
<td>Hungarian statesman, conservative; supported the Austrian monarchy during the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; took part in elaborating the 1860 October diploma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szemere, Bartholomäus (Bertalan)</td>
<td>(1812-1869)</td>
<td>Hungarian politician and writer; Minister of the Interior and head of the revolutionary government (1849); emigrated after the defeat of the revolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szirmai, Pál, Count</td>
<td>(1804-1883)</td>
<td>Hungarian politician; member of the Chamber of Deputies (1848); after the defeat of the revolution refugee and Lajos Kossuth's emissary in Paris; was amnestied in 1855 and returned to Hungary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacitus, Publius Cornelius</td>
<td>(c. 55-c. 120)</td>
<td>Roman historian and orator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamisier, François Laurent Alphonse</td>
<td>(1809-1880)</td>
<td>French army officer, military inventor and politician.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tausenau, Karl</td>
<td>(1808-1873)</td>
<td>Austrian politician, democrat; head of the Central Committee of the Vienna Democratic Societies during the 1848 revolution; emigrated to London in 1849.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Tom</td>
<td>(1817-1880)</td>
<td>English dramatist and journalist; contributed to several periodicals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techow, Gustav Adolf</td>
<td>(1813-1893)</td>
<td>Prussian army officer, petty-bourgeois democrat; took part in the 1848 revolutionary events in Berlin; Chief of the General Staff of the Palatinate revolutionary army; emigrated to Switzerland after the defeat of the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising and became a leader of the refugee organisation Revolutionary Centralisation; left for Australia in 1852.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**T**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Contribution and Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teleki, László (Ladislaus), Count</td>
<td>(1811-1861)</td>
<td>Hungarian politician and...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
writer; represented the Hungarian
Republic in France during the 1848-
49 revolution in Hungary; remained
in France after the defeat of the
revolution.—221

Temme, Jodocus Donatus Hubertus (1798-
1881)—German lawyer, democrat;
deputy to the Prussian National As-
ssembly (Left wing) in 1848; deputy to
the Frankfurt National Assembly in
1849.—256

Thouvenel, Édouard Antoine (1818-
1866)—French statesman and dip-
losmat, Bonapartist; envoy to Athens
(1848-50) and to Munich (1850-51);
Ambassador to Constantinople (1855-
60); Foreign Minister (1852, 1860-
62).—175, 194-96, 197, 399

Totti—Bonapartist police spy, Corsican
by birth.—421, 422, 424, 490

Tourte, Abraham Louis (1818-1863)—
Swiss statesman and diplomat, envoy
to Turin from 1860.—53-54, 295, 297,
298, 299

Treille de Beaulieu, Antoine Hector
Thésée, baron (1809-1886)—French
general, military inventor.—357

Trog, Johann von Ölten (1807-1867)—
Swiss lawyer; deputy to the National
Council for Solothurn Canton (1848-
57); Federal Commissar (1852-56).—
232, 297, 302

Tromp, Cornelis (1629-1691)—Dutch
admiral; fought in the second and
third Anglo-Dutch wars (1665-67,
1672-74); commander-in-chief of the
Dutch fleet from 1676.—512

Tucker—London publisher.—116

Turenne, Henri de la Tour d'Auvergne,
vicomte de (1611-1675)—French gen-
eral, Marshal of France from 1643;
commander-in-chief of the French
army in Germany during the Thirty
Years' War (1618-48); fought in the
wars of the Fronde and in the
Devolution War (1667-68); author of
memoirs.—510, 512

Türr, István (Achmed Kiamil Bey)
(1825-1908)—Hungarian army offi-
cer; took part in the 1848-49 rev-
olution in Italy and Germany; emi-
grated to Turkey; fought in the Cri-
mean war on the side of the Allies;
joined Garibaldi's revolutionary cam-
paign in South Italy (1860); general
of the Italian army from 1861.—219,
473, 490, 491

Tschirmer, Samuel Erdmann (c. 1812-
1870)—German lawyer; leader of the
extreme Left in the Saxon Diet dur-
ing the 1848-49 revolution; one of
the leaders of the May 1849 uprising
in Dresden; participant in the 1849
Baden-Palatinate uprising; emigrated
to Switzerland after the defeat of the
revolution and became a member of
the Central Committee of the re-

frigeue organisation Revolutionary
Centralisation; later emigrated to Eng-
land.—94

Uhland, Ludwige (1787-1862)—German
romantic poet; deputy to the Frank-
furt National Assembly (Left Centre)
in 1848-49.—106-08, 392

Ulloa, Girolamo (1810-1891)—Nea-
opolitan general; took part in the
national liberation and revolutionary
movements in Italy in 1848-49; emi-
grated to France after the defeat of
the revolution; commanded the Tus-
can army in the Austro-Italian-French
war of 1859.—40

Ulmer, Johann—member of the Com-
munist League; refugee in London in
the early 1850s; supported Marx and
Engels during the split in the Com-
munist League.—309

Ulpianus (Ulpian), Domitius (c. 170-
228)—Roman lawyer and states-
man.—293

Ulrich (1487-1550)—Duke of Würt-
temberg from 1498; expelled in 1519;
tried to use the peasant movement of
1525 to restore his power; re-es-
established himself on the Württemberg
throne in 1534.—204

Urquhart, David (1805-1877)—British
diplomat, writer and politician, Turk-
ophile; went on diplomatic mis-
sions to Turkey in the 1830s; Tory
M.P. (1847-52); opposed Palmerston's
policy; founder and editor of *The Free Press* (1855-77), which appeared under the heading Diplomatic Review from 1866.—5-6, 8, 116, 118, 148, 150, 214-18

V

Varnhagen von Ense, Karl August (1785-1858)—German novelist and literary critic of a liberal trend.—369

Varus, Publius Quintilius (d. A.D. 9)—Roman politician; ruler of Germania (6-9); killed in battle in the Teutoburger Wald during the uprising of the German tribes.—251

Vay, Miklos, Baron (1802-1894)—Hungarian statesman, conservative; government commissioner in Transylvania (1848); pursued the policy of compromise with the Austrian monarchy.—501

Vegezzi-Ruscalla, Giovenale—Italian writer of the midnineteenth century, author of the pamphlet *La nationalità di Nizza*.—198

Venedey, Jakob (1805-1871)—German radical journalist; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848-49; liberal after the 1848-49 revolution.—69, 103, 109, 120, 251

Véron, Louis Désiré (1798-1867)—French journalist and politician, Orleanist till 1848 and afterwards Bonapartist; owner and publisher of *Le Constitutionnel* (1844-52).—36

Vespasian (Titus Flavius Sabinus Vespasianus) (9-79)—Roman Emperor (69-79).—249

Viale—Neapolitan general; fought against Garibaldi's revolutionary detachments in South Italy in 1860.—474, 478

Victor Amadeus I (1587-1637)—Duke of Savoy from 1630.—510

Victor Amadeus II (1666-1732)—Duke of Savoy (1675-1730); King of Sicily (1713-18); first King of Sardinia (1720-30).—513-14

Victor Emmanuel II (1820-1878)—Duke of Savoy; King of Sardinia (1848-61); King of Italy (1861-78).—173-74, 200, 212, 382, 392, 399

Victoria (1819-1901)—Queen of Great Britain and Ireland (1837-1901).—335, 399

Vidocq, François Eugène (1775-1857)—French secret police agent; chief of the secret criminal police (La Sûreté) (1812-27); his name was used to denote any cunning sleuth and rogue.—395

Villars, Claude Louis Hector, prince de Martignes (1653-1734)—French general, Marshal of France from 1702; fought in the wars of the Spanish (1701-14) and the Polish (1733-36) Succession.—516

Vincenzo II Gonzaga (1594-1627)—the last of the Gonzaga dukes of Mantua (1626-27); cardinal from 1615.—510

Vincze, Georg Ernst Friedrich, Baron von (1811-1875)—Prussian politician; a leader of the Right wing in the Frankfurt National Assembly (1848-49); deputy to the Second Chamber (Right wing) in 1849; elected to the Chamber of Deputies of the Prussian Diet in the 1850s and 1860s; moderate liberal.—61, 102, 250-58, 393

Virgil (Publius Vergilius Maro) (70-19 B.C.)—Roman poet.—46, 78, 239, 282, 303

Visconti, Valentina (1366-1408)—Duchess, grandmother of Louis XI, came from a noble Milan family.—505

Vladimirescu, Tudor (c. 1780-1821)—leader of the 1821 Wallachian popular uprising against rich landowners and the Turkish yoke.—143

Vögele, A.—German refugee in London, compositor in Hollinger's printshop in 1859.—3, 10, 11, 119, 123-31, 267, 275, 276, 283-85, 319-20

Vogt, Adolf (b. 1823)—Swiss doctor, Karl Vogt's brother.—203

Vogt, Emil (1820-1883)—Swiss lawyer, Karl Vogt's brother.—203

Vogt, Gustav (1829-1901)—Swiss lawyer, writer and radical politician; director of the statistical bureau.
(1860-62); Karl Vogt's brother.—201, 203


Vogt, Philipp Friedrich Wilhelm (1786-1861)—German doctor; lived in Switzerland from the early 1830s; professor of medicine in the Berne Higher School from 1835; an adherent of the liberals; Karl Vogt’s father.—64, 203

W

Wahrendorff, Martin, Baron von (1789-1861)—Swedish manufacturer and military inventor.—357

Walewski, Alexandre Florian Joseph Colonna, comte (1810-1868)—French diplomat and statesman, son of Napoleon I and the Polish Countess Marie Walewska; took part in the 1830-31 Polish insurrection; emigrated to France after its defeat; French Foreign Minister (1855-60).—193

Wallenstein, Albrecht Wenzel Eusebius von, Duke of Friedland and Mecklenburg, Prince of Sagan (1583-1634)—general of the Holy Roman Empire, commander-in-chief during the Thirty Years’ War (1618-48); Bohemian by birth.—510

Walther von der Vogelweide (c. 1170-c. 1230)—German minnesinger.—108

Wanner—Swiss consul in Le Havre.—300

Warren, Sir Peter (1703-1752)—British admiral of Irish descent; fought in the war of the Austrian Succession (1740-48); M.P.—517

Warwick, Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick and Salisbury (“the Kingmaker”) (1428-1471)—English feudal lord; fought in the Wars of the Roses (1455-85).—256

Weber—Prussian lawyer, Marx’s counsel in the trial against the Berlin Nationalzeitung in 1860.—19, 25, 261, 262, 264, 268, 283, 293-95

Weerth, Georg Ludwig (1822-1856)—German poet and journalist, member of the Communist League, a founder of proletarian poetry in Germany; an editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung in 1848-49.—320

Weitling, Wilhelm Christian (1808-1871)—German tailor; one of the early leaders of the working-class movement in Germany and a theoretician of utopian egalitarian communism.—79

Wellington, Arthur Wellesley, Duke of (1769-1852)—British general and statesman, Tory; Prime Minister (1828-30), Foreign Secretary (1834-35).—352

Wermuth—police director in Hanover; an organiser of and witness for the prosecution at the Cologne Communist trial (1852); collaborated with Stieber on the book Die Kommunisten-Verschwörungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts.—58

Wesendonck, Hugo—Düsseldorf lawyer; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848-49; deputy to the Second Chamber (extreme Left wing) in 1849.—106

Westphalen, Ferdinand Otto Wilhelm Henning von (1799-1876)—Prussian statesman; Minister of the Interior (1850-58); stepbrother of Jenny Marx, Karl Marx’s wife.—73

Weydemeyer, Joseph (1818-1866)—prominent figure in the German and American working-class movement;
“true socialist” in 1846-47; adopted scientific communism under the influence of Marx and Engels and became a member of the Communist League; took part in the 1848-49 revolution; editor of the *Neue Deutsche Zeitung* (1849-50); emigrated to the USA after the defeat of the revolution.—96, 313

Whitworth, Sir Joseph, Baronet (1803-1887)—English manufacturer and military inventor.—361-65

Wiebe, Johann Friedrich—German refugee in London, compositor, worked in Hollinger's printshop in 1859.—11, 17, 126, 128-30, 275, 318-20

William I (1781-1864)—King of Württemberg (1816-64).—398

William I (1797-1888)—Prince of Prussia; Prince Regent (1858-61); King of Prussia (1861-88); Emperor of Germany (1871-88).—168, 191, 239, 314, 367, 368, 377-79, 382-84, 397-400, 430, 431, 488, 489, 493, 495, 496

William III (1650-1702)—Stadtholder of the Netherlands (1672-1702); King of Great Britain and Ireland (1689-1702).—513-14

William Augustus (1721-1765)—Duke of Cumberland, British general; son of George II; commanded the British army at the beginning of the Seven Years' War of 1756-63.—518

Willich, August (1810-1878)—Prussian army officer who left the service on political grounds; member of the Communist League; took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; one of the leaders of the sectarian group that broke away from the Communist League in 1850; emigrated to the USA in 1853; fought in the American Civil War on the side of the Union.—33, 40, 45, 50, 65, 82, 83, 84, 89, 241, 260, 266, 305, 307, 310

Wilson, James (1805-1860)—Scottish economist and politician, Free Trader; founder and editor of *The Economist*; M.P. (1847-59); Financial Secretary of the Treasury (1853-58)

Vice-President of the Board of Trade.—160

Windischgrätz, Alfred Candidus Ferdinand, Prince zu (1787-1862)—Austrian field marshal; suppressed the uprisings in Prague and Vienna in 1848; led the Austrian army against the Hungarian revolution in 1848-49.—82, 242

Winkelried, Arnold von (d. 1386)—semi-legendary hero of the Swiss war of liberation against the Habsburgs; legend has it that he sacrificed his life to secure victory over Duke Leopold III of Austria in the battle of Sempach on June 9, 1386.—198

Wittig, E. L.—German journalist, editor of the *Dresdner Zeitung*.—306, 311

Wolcot, John (pseudonym Peter Pindar) (1738-1819)—English satirical poet.—99

Wolfe, James (1727-1759)—British general; fought in Canada during the Seven Years' War of 1756-63.—518

Wolff, Bernhard (Benda) (1811-1879)—German journalist; owner of the Berlin newspaper *National-Zeitung* from 1848; founder of the first telegraph agency in Germany (1849).—276

Wolff, Wilhelm (Lupus) (1809-1864)—German teacher, proletarian revolutionary, prominent figure in the Communist League; an editor of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* and deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (1848-49); emigrated to England in 1851; associate of Marx and Engels.—54, 72, 73, 79, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 115, 119, 276, 286, 288

Wolfram von Eschenbach (c. 1170-c. 1220)—German poet, author of *Parzival*, a poem of chivalry.—213

Wood, Sir Charles, 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); Secretary of State for India (1859-66).—446, 456
INDEX OF LITERARY AND MYTHOLOGICAL NAMES

Abel (Bib.)—the second son of Adam, slain by his elder brother Cain.—247
Abigail (Bib.)—247
Aeolus (Gr. Myth.)—the god of the winds; hence Aeolian harp—stringed instrument producing musical sounds on exposure to wind.—225
Ahasuerus or The Wandering Jew—the subject of a medieval legend, condemned to wander until the Day of Judgment for having mocked Christ on the day of Crucifixion.—376
Aladdin—a character in the Arabian Nights, owner of a magic lamp.—467
Argonauts (Gr. Myth.)—heroes who sailed with Jason, on the ship Argo, to Colchis for the golden fleece, which was guarded by a dragon. The poet and musician Orpheus participated in this feat, which was described in the 3rd century B.C. by Apollonius of Rhodes in his poem Argonautica.—199-201
Bacchus (Dionysus)—the Greek and Roman god of wine and mirth.—190, 205
Beisele—see Eisele
Bottom—a character in Shakespeare’s comedy A Midsummer Night’s Dream.—35
Cain (Bib.)—the eldest son of Adam, who killed his brother Abel out of jealousy.—247

Wrangel, Friedrich Heinrich Ernst, Count von (1784-1877)—Prussian general; took part in the counter-revolutionary coup d'état in Berlin and in the dissolution of the Prussian National Assembly in November 1848.—255
Würth—German politician, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly.—109
Wyss—barrister in Berne in the 1850s.—300, 301

Y

Ypsilanti, Alexander (1792-1828)—prominent figure in the Greek national liberation movement; major-general of the Russian army, participant in the 1812 war; raised a revolt in Moldavia (1821); fled to Austria after its defeat, was arrested and kept in prison up to 1827; released as a result of Russia’s intercession.—143, 526

Z

Zabel, Friedrich (1802-1875)—German liberal journalist, editor of the Berlin National-Zeitung (1848-75).—19, 20, 236, 246-47, 259-79, 281-95, 308, 324, 327
Zachariä, Heinrich Albert (1806-1875)—German lawyer; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Right Centre) in 1848-49.—103, 108
Zápolya, Janos (Johann) (1487-1540)—Transylvanian voivode; suppressed the 1514 peasant uprising in Hungary; King of Hungary (1526-40).—506
Zerfy, Gustav (real name Hirsch) (born c. 1820)—Hungarian journalist; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; emigrated to Paris in 1852 and to London in early 1853; maintained contact with Marx in the early 1850s; later supported Kinkel.—219
Zimmermann, Ernst Wilhelm Eduard (1807-1878)—German historian, democrat; took part in the 1848-49 revolution; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing).—103, 109
Zitz, Franz Heinrich (1803-1877)—German lawyer, democrat; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848; took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; emigrated to the USA.—98
Cassandra (Gr. Myth.)—a daughter of Priam, King of Troy, endowed with the gift of prophecy.—470
Ceres (Rom. Myth.)—see Demeter
Cipriano—a character in Calderón’s play El Mágico prodigioso, an image close to Faust.—251
Clarin—a character in Calderón’s play El Mágico prodigioso.—28
Crevel—a character in Balzac’s novel La Cousine Bette, a parvenu, money-grubber and profligate.—36
Demeter (Gr. Myth.)—goddess of agriculture, fertility and marriage.—370
Don Quixote—the title character in Cervantes’ novel.—190
Dunce I and Dunce II—characters in Alexander Pope’s poem The Dunciad.—237, 275
Egeria (Rom. Myth.)—a prophetic nymph.—189, 197, 198
Eisele and Beisele—main characters in an anonymously published satirical pamphlet by J. W. Christern Doctor Eisele’s und Baron von Beisele’s Landtagsreise im April 1847.—131, 274
Faunus (Rom. Myth.)—the god of nature and fertility, worshipped by shepherds and farmers.—257
Faust—the title character of Goethe’s tragedy.—71, 251
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*Volksblatt,* 7. November 1859: [An article on Marx.]*—208-09
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Aargauer Nachrichten—a Swiss liberal daily published in Aarau from 1854 to 1918.—204

Abend-Post. Demokratische Zeitung—a German democratic newspaper published in Berlin, appeared under this title from January to July 1850.—33

Allgemeine Preussische Zeitung—an official daily newspaper of the Prussian Government published in Berlin from 1843 to 1848.—367
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The Army and Navy Gazette—an official weekly organ of the British War Office published in London from 1860 to 1921.—405

Augsburger Zeitung—see Allgemeine Zeitung

Baltimore Wecker—a German-language daily, published by the Socialist Gymnastic Association in the USA from 1851 to 1911; its founder and editor was Karl Schnaufer.—97

Baltische Monatsschrift—German-language monthly published in Riga from 1859 to 1913.—248, 384

Belletristisches Journal und New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung—a weekly founded by German petty-bourgeois émigrés in New York in 1852 and published under this title from March 18, 1853 to March 10, 1854.—65, 219, 305, 313

Berliner Militär-Wochenschrift—see Deutsche Wehrzeitung

Breslauer Zeitung—a German daily founded in Breslau (Wroclaw) in 1820; in the 1850s-1860s it took a conservative line.—236, 237

Der Bund, Eidgenössisches Zentralblatt—a Swiss radical daily, published in German in Berne from 1850.—179
Le Constitutionnel—a daily published from 1815 to 1870 in Paris; in the 1848 revolution, a mouthpiece of the monarchist bourgeoisie (the Thiers party); after the 1851 coup d'état it became a Bonapartist newspaper.—36, 81, 186, 381, 421, 430, 447, 449, 472, 474

The Cornhill Magazine—a literary monthly published in London since 1860.—427

Correspondent—see Der Deutsche Correspondent

Courrier du Dimanche—an anti-Bonapartist weekly published in Paris from 1858 to 1866.—324

Criminal-Zeitung—see Belletristisches Journal und New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung

Daily Telegraph—a newspaper founded in London in 1855 and published under this title up to 1937; in the 1850s it was liberal in approach.—14, 128, 130, 243–46, 249

Le Débat social, organe de la démocratie—a radical and democratic weekly, published in Brussels from 1844 to 1849.—321

Der Deutsche Correspondent—a German-language daily published in Baltimore from 1841 to 1918.—97

Deutsche Monatsschrift für Politik, Wissenschaft, Kunst und Leben—a monthly of the German petty-bourgeois democrats, published in Stuttgart in 1850 and in Bremen in 1851.—100, 127, 327

Deutsche Wehrzeitung Militärische Wochenschrift herausgegeben von einer Gesellschaft deutscher Offiziere und Militär Beamten—a conservative military paper published in Berlin twice weekly from 1848 to 1850.—60

Dresdner Zeitung—a daily newspaper of the German petty-bourgeois democrats, published in Dresden from 1848 to 1850.—306, 311


Eidgenössische Zeitung—a Swiss conservative daily published in Zurich from 1845 to 1860 and in Berne from 1860 to 1864.—179

L’Espérance—a Bonapartist newspaper published in Geneva from 1859 to 1862.—204–06, 211

Frankfurter Journal—a German daily published in Frankfurt am Main from the seventeenth century up to 1903; in the 1840s and 1850s followed a liberal trend.—71, 302

The Freeman’s Journal and Daily Commercial Advertiser—an Irish daily published in Dublin from 1763 to 1924; from the 1840 to 1860s, supported the demand for the repeal of the Union with England and defended the Irish tenants’ rights.—462

The Free Press. Journal of the Foreign Affairs Committees—a journal on questions of foreign policy, opposed to the Palmerston government; published by David Urquhart and his supporters in London from 1855 to 1865 (weekly till April 1858 and then monthly); renamed Diplomatic Review in 1866, it printed several
works by Marx.—5, 6, 8, 10, 116, 123, 124, 128, 150, 218, 219-20, 223, 267, 317

*Der Freischütz*—a German newspaper on literature and art, published in Hamburg from 1825 to 1878.—4, 18, 240-42

_Galignani's Messenger_*—an English-language newspaper published in Paris from 1814; at first, three times weekly and then daily; it mostly reprinted excerpts from major English, American and French papers.—173

_Gardeners' Chronicle and Agricultural Gazette_*—an agricultural weekly published in London since 1841.—462

_La Gazette du Nord_*—a weekly founded in Paris in 1859.—42

_The Glasgow Sentinel_*—a Scottish weekly newspaper, organ of the Tories, published in Glasgow from 1850 to 1877.—116, 221

_Hamburger Nachrichten_*—a German newspaper published until 1868.—99

_Handels-Courier_*—see Schweizer Handels-Courier

_Hermann. Deutsches Wochenblatt aus London_*—a German-language weekly for the petty-bourgeois refugees published in London from January 1859; from January to July 1859, it was published and edited by Gottfried Kinkel.—6, 117, 314

_Herold des Westens_*—a German-language weekly published in Louisville (USA) in 1853 and edited by Karl Heinzen.—87

_Die Hornisse_*—A German newspaper published in Cassel in 1848-50 by the petty-bourgeois democrats Heise and Kellner; Biscamp was a contributor in 1848-49.—118

_L'Indépendance belge. Journal mondial d'informations politiques et littéraires_*—a liberal daily founded in Brussels in 1831.—206, 211, 320-21, 383, 490

_L'Indépendant_*—a Swiss democratic weekly published in Geneva in 1851-52.—54, 297

_La Jeune Italie_*—a French-language paper published in Paris in 1843 by Mazzini's supporters.—144

_Journal de Constantinople_*—a Turkish newspaper published in French from 1848. Subsidised by the Turkish Government as an official organ, it was actually a vehicle for French influence; appeared 6 times a month.—220

_Journal des Débats politiques et littéraires_*—a French daily published in Paris from 1789 to 1944; after the 1851 coup d'état, an organ of the moderate Orleanist opposition.—207

_Journal de Genève_*—a Swiss conservative daily founded in 1826.—302

_Journal du tir fédéral_*—a Swiss newspaper published by the Shooting Society in French and German.—298

_Kladderadatsch_*—an illustrated satirical weekly of liberal and, later, nationalist-liberal trend, published in Berlin from 1848.—239, 290
Kölnische Zeitung—a German daily published in Cologne from 1802 to 1945; during the 1848-49 revolution and the subsequent period of political reaction, it represented the interests of the Prussian liberal bourgeoisie.—5, 17, 56, 127, 128, 242, 243, 248, 306, 311, 321

Königlich privilegirte Berlinische Zeitung von Staats- und gelehrten Sachen—a German moderate liberal newspaper published from 1785; known also as Vossische Zeitung after its owner Christian Friedrich Voss.—65, 378, 383

Kreuz-Zeitung—see Neue Preussische Zeitung

Lithographierte Correspondenz—a German-language daily published in Paris from 1845 to 1849.—186

Mainzer Zeitung—a German newspaper published from 1802; in 1848 it was edited by Ludwig Bamberger.—248

The Manchester Guardian—a daily founded in 1821; organ of the Free Traders and, from the mid-nineteenth century, of the Liberal Party.—326-27

Le Messager du Léman—a Swiss democratic daily published in Geneva in French from 1853.—62

Monatsschrift—see Deutsche Monatsschrift für Politik, Wissenschaft, Kunst und Leben

Le Moniteur universel—a daily published in Paris from 1789 to 1901; appeared under this title after 1811; from 1799 to 1868—an official government publication.—134, 154, 159-62, 183, 195, 325, 330, 431, 455, 465

Morgenblatt für gebildete Leser—a German literary daily published in Stuttgart and Tübingen from 1807 to 1865; carried a number of reports by Engels in 1840-41.—113

The Morning Chronicle—a daily published in London from 1770 to 1862; in the 1840s, organ of the Whigs; in the early 1850s, organ of the Peelites and later of the Conservatives.—211

The Morning Star—an English daily published by the Free Traders from 1856 to 1869; had a regular evening edition, The Evening Star.—117

La Nation Suisse—a radical daily published in Geneva from 1860 to 1866.—206

Le National—a French moderate republican daily published in Paris from 1830 to 1851.—231

National-Zeitung—a daily published in Berlin from 1848 to 1915; expressed liberal views in the 1850s.—12, 25, 26, 72, 81, 115, 125, 127, 128, 130, 236, 237, 246, 259, 260, 264, 265, 268, 271, 277, 282, 283, 285, 289, 291, 292, 293, 294, 302, 326, 373

Les Nationalités Messager des intérêts, nouveaux, quotidien, politique et littéraire—a French-language daily influenced by Cavour; published in 1860 in both Paris and Turin.—211

Neue Deutsche Zeitung—a democratic daily published in Darmstadt from July 1, 1848 to April 1, 1849 and in Frankfurt am Main until it was suppressed on December 14, 1850. One of its editors was Joseph Weydemeyer, a member of the Communist League.—96
Newe Hannoversche Zeitung—a German conservative monarchist daily published from 1857 to 1883.—274

Newe Oder-Zeitung—a German daily published under this title in Breslau (Wroclaw) from 1849 to 1855; in the 1850s it was the most radical of German papers and was persecuted by the Government authorities; in 1855 Marx was its London correspondent.—238, 263

Newe Preussische Zeitung—a conservative daily published in Berlin from June 1848 to 1939; mouthpiece of the Prussian junkers and Court circles; known also as the Kreuz-Zeitung, because its heading included a cross bearing the motto “Forward with God for King and Fatherland!”—73, 257

Newe Rheinische Zeitung. Organ der Demokratie—a German daily newspaper, organ of the revolutionary proletarian democrats during the German revolution of 1848-49; 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).—29, 41, 55, 73, 102, 103, 104-05, 106, 155, 236, 237, 238, 242, 250, 251, 260, 264, 272, 276, 281, 288, 291, 321

Newe Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue—a theoretical and political journal published by Marx and Engels from December 1849 to November 1850 as the organ of the Communist League after the Neue Rheinische Zeitung which they published in Cologne during the 1848-49 revolution.—81, 90-92, 96, 101, 109, 115

Newe Schweizer Zeitung—a radical weekly published in Geneva from 1859 to 1860 by the German refugee August Brass.—187, 188

Newe Zeit—a German petty-bourgeois weekly published in New York from 1855 to 1857.—85

Die Neue Zeit—the organ of the German refugees published in London between June 1858 and April 1859.—85, 117

Neue Zürcher-Zeitung—a Swiss liberal newspaper first published in 1780; in the 1850-60s, expressed Bonapartist views.—198

New-York Daily Tribune—a daily published from 1841 to 1924; spoke for the Left wing of the American Whigs until the mid-1850s and subsequently for the Republican Party, held progressive views and denounced slavery. Marx and Engels contributed to it from August 1851 to March 1862. The newspaper brought out a number of special issues including the New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune and the New-York Weekly Tribune.—4, 5, 114, 116, 153, 217, 220, 223, 265, 322-24, 407, 409, 421, 479

New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune—a special issue of the New-York Daily Tribune, appearing on Tuesdays and Fridays.—361, 464

The New-York Times—a Republican daily founded in 1851.—5

New-York Weekly Tribune—a special issue of the New-York Daily Tribune published every Saturday.—464

New Yorker Criminal-Zeitung—see Belletristisches Journal und New Yorker Criminal-Zeitung

New Yorker Humorist—a German-language comic journal published in New-York.—32

*Notes to the People*—a Chartist weekly published in London in 1851 and 1852 and edited by Ernest Jones; supported by Marx and Engels who helped to edit and publish it, and who contributed a number of articles between June 1851 and April 1852.—323

*Nouvelliste Vaudois*—a Swiss newspaper published in Lausanne from 1798 to 1804 and from 1824 to 1914.—198, 211

*L'Opinion nationale*—a daily newspaper published in Paris from 1859 to 1874.—174, 206, 211, 329

*La Patrie*—a French daily published from 1841; mouthpiece of the monarchist bourgeoisie represented by the Party of Order in 1850; after the coup d'etat of December 2, 1851, took a Bonapartist stand.—196, 208

*Le Patriote savoisien*—a French democratic daily published in Chambéry in 1851-95.—192

*Le Pays, Journal de l'Empire*—a daily founded in Paris in 1849; during the Second Empire (1852-70), was a semi-official newspaper of Napoleon III's Government.—208

*Pensiero ed Azione*—an Italian democratic fortnightly published in London (1858-59) and in Lugano and Genoa (1860) and edited by Giuseppe Mazzini.—153, 180, 221

*The People's Paper*—a Chartist weekly founded by Ernest Jones in London and published from May 1852 to 1858. Marx and Engels contributed to the newspaper and helped to edit it from October 1852 to December 1856. Apart from the articles written by Marx and Engels for *The People's Paper*, it reprinted several of their articles from the *New-York Daily Tribune.*—116

*Le Peuple de 1850*—a social-reformist monthly newspaper published intermittently in Paris from 1848 to 1850.—153

*The Players*—theatrical and musical weekly journal published in London in 1860-61.—244

*Der Postheiri*—a Swiss weekly published in Solothurn in 1845-75.—205

*Prager Zeitung*—an Austrian monarchist daily published from 1814 to 1919.—173

*Preussisches Wochenblatt*—a conservative weekly published in Berlin from 1851 to 1861.—141

*Die Preussische Zeitung*—a daily published in Berlin from 1851 to 1859; organ of the Manteuffel and later of the Hohenzollern-Auerswald Ministries.—248

*Le Propagateur du Nord et du Pas-de-Calais*—a conservative Bonapartist daily published in Lille from 1860 to 1883.—206

*Der Publicist*—a liberal newspaper published in Berlin from 1845 to 1874.—311

*Punch, or the London Charivari*—a liberal comic weekly founded in London in 1840.—239

Die Reform—a German liberal daily published in Hamburg from 1848 to 1892.—4, 5, 25, 72, 124

Republik der Arbeiter—a workers' newspaper published in New York from 1850 to 1855 by Wilhelm Weitling; voiced the views of the egalitarian communists.—57

Revue contemporaine—a fortnightly published in Paris from 1851 to 1870; during the Second Republic represented the Party of Order; after the coup d'état of December 2, 1851 took a Bonapartist stand.—42, 94, 112, 182, 206, 207, 209, 236

Revue de Genève et Journal Suisse—a radical newspaper published in Geneva from 1842; appeared under this title until 1861, when it merged with La Nation Suisse. During the Second Empire in France it adopted a Bonapartist stand.—188, 189, 192, 193, 197, 200-03, 206, 233

Revue des deux Mondes—a literary and political fortnightly, published in Paris from 1829.—206, 207

Revue européenne—a Bonapartist monthly published in Paris from 1859 to 1861; in 1862 merged with the journal Revue contemporaine.—207

Rheinische Volks-Halle—a German Catholic conservative daily published in Cologne in 1848-49.—243

Rheinische Zeitung für Politik, Handel und Gewerbe—a German daily founded by the Rhenish bourgeois opposition and published in Cologne from January 1, 1842 to March 31, 1843. In April 1842 Marx became its contributor and in October of the same year—one of the editors.—3, 111

Rummeltpuff—a weekly published in Geneva in the end of 1849 by the German democratic refugees.—31, 32, 44

Russky Invalid («РУССКИЙ ИНВАЛИД»)—a military newspaper published in St. Petersburg from 1813 to 1917. Initially the revenue from it was intended as relief to war victims; from 1862 it was an official newspaper of the War Ministry.—467-70

Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art—a conservative weekly published in London from 1855 to 1938.—200, 244

Schlesische Zeitung—a German daily published in Breslau (Wrocław) from 1742 to 1945, organ of the constitutional-monarchist circles before and during the revolution of 1848-49; was conservative in the 1860s.—238

Schweizer Handels-Courier—a Swiss daily published in Biel (canton of Berne); appeared under this title from 1853 to 1909; expressed Bonapartist views. In the 1850s-1860s, its editors were closely connected with Karl Vogt.—12, 28, 29, 38, 118, 121, 131, 192, 197, 198, 203, 265

Schweizerische National-Zeitung—a Swiss bourgeois daily published in Basle in 1842.—302

Seeblätter—a German weekly published in Konstanz (Baden) from 1837 to 1849.—55
The Sheffield Free Press—an English newspaper published in Sheffield from 1851 to 1857 by David Urquhart and his supporters.—117

Le Siècle—a daily published in Paris from 1836 to 1939; in the 1850s a moderate republican newspaper.—186, 206

Stimmen der Zeit—a German petty-bourgeois monthly and later weekly published in 1858-62 by Adolph Kolatschek. It appeared first in Gotha and then in Weimar, Leipzig, Heidelberg and Vienna simultaneously.—127, 327

Strassburger Korrespondent für West- und Mitteleuropa—a German Bonapartist newspaper published in Strasbourg up to 1860.—385

The Tablet—a Catholic conservative weekly published in London since 1840.—144, 145


Tribune—see New-York Daily Tribune

L'Univers religieux, philosophique, politique, scientifique et littéraire—a clerical newspaper founded in Paris in 1833; supported Bonaparte's policy in the 1850s.—45

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; the continuation of the monthly Le Proscrit.—36

Das Volk—a German-language weekly published in London from May 7 to August 20, 1859; it was founded as the official organ of the German Workers' Educational Society in London; Marx took part in its publication beginning with issue No. 2, and in early July he virtually became its editor and manager.—6, 9-11, 38, 117-19, 127, 129, 179, 180, 241, 265, 275, 276, 277, 318, 319-20

Volks-Zeitung—a democratic daily published in Berlin since 1853.—4, 25, 72, 124, 238

Volksblatt—a popular newspaper published in Trier.—209

Vossische Zeitung—see Königlich privilegirte Berlinische Zeitung von Staats- und gelehrten Sachen

Weekly Mail—a Tory periodical published in London from 1858 to 1860.—245
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