

**KARL
MARX
FREDERICK
ENGELS**

**Collected
Works**



**Volume 17
Marx and Engels
1859 -1860**

Contents

| | |
|---------------|----|
| Preface | XI |
|---------------|----|

KARL MARX AND FREDERICK ENGELS

WORKS

October 1859-December 1860

| | |
|--|----|
| K. Marx. Letter to the Editor of the <i>Allgemeine Zeitung</i> | 3 |
| K. Marx. Statement to the Editors of <i>Die Reform</i> , the <i>Volks-Zeitung</i> and the <i>Allgemeine Zeitung</i> | 4 |
| K. Marx. Declaration | 8 |
| K. Marx. Prosecution of the Augsburg Gazette | 10 |
| K. Marx. To the Editors of the <i>Volks-Zeitung</i> . Declaration | 12 |
| K. Marx. To the Editor of the <i>Daily Telegraph</i> | 14 |
| K. Marx. To the Editors of the Augsburg <i>Allgemeine Zeitung</i> | 16 |
| K. Marx. To the Editors of <i>Die Reform</i> | 18 |
| K. Marx. Declaration | 19 |
| K. Marx. Herr Vogt | 21 |
| Preface | 25 |
| I. The Brimstone Gang | 28 |
| II. The Bristlers | 38 |
| III. Police Matters | 48 |
| 1. Confession | 48 |
| 2. The Revolutionary Congress in Murten | 50 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 3. Cherval | 55 |
| 4. The Communist Trial in Cologne | 64 |
| 5. Joint Festival of the German Workers' Educational Associations in Lausanne (June 26 and 27, 1859) | 68 |
| 6. Miscellany | 72 |
| IV. Techow's Letter | 75 |
| V. Imperial Regent and Count Palatine | 100 |
| VI. Vogt and the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> | 102 |
| VII. The Augsburg Campaign | 111 |
| VIII. Dâ-Dâ Vogt and His Studies | 133 |
| IX. Agency | 184 |
| X. Patrons and Accomplices | 214 |
| XI. A Lawsuit | 259 |
| XII. Appendices | 296 |
| 1. Schily's Expulsion from Switzerland | 296 |
| 2. The Revolutionary Congress in Murten | 303 |
| 3. Cherval | 304 |
| 4. The Communist Trial in Cologne | 305 |
| 5. Slanders | 312 |
| 6. The War between Frogs and Mice | 313 |
| 7. Palmerston-Polemic | 315 |
| 8. Statement by Herr A. Scherzer | 316 |
| 9. Blind's Article in <i>The Free Press</i> of May 27, 1859 | 317 |
| 10. Herr Orges' Letters | 317 |
| 11. Circular against K. Blind | 318 |
| 12. Vögele's Affidavit | 319 |
| 13. Wiehe's Affidavit | 319 |
| 14. From the Trial Papers | 320 |
| 15. Dentu Pamphlets | 324 |
| 16. Postscript | 327 |
| a) K. Vogt and <i>La Cimentaire</i> | 327 |
| b) Kossuth | 327 |
| c) Edmond About's <i>La Prusse en 1860</i> | 328 |
| <i>K. Marx.</i> Affairs in France | 330 |
| <i>K. Marx.</i> English Politics | 335 |
| <i>K. Marx.</i> The New Treaty between France and England | 341 |
| <i>F. Engels.</i> Military Reform in Germany | 345 |
| <i>K. Marx.</i> The English Budget | 350 |
| <i>F. Engels.</i> On Rifled Cannon | 354 |
| I. | 354 |
| II. | 357 |
| III. | 361 |
| IV. | 364 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>K. Marx.</i> Public Feeling in Berlin | 367 |
| <i>K. Marx.</i> Sicily and the Sicilians | 370 |
| <i>K. Marx.</i> Preparations for Napoleon's Coming War on the Rhine | 373 |
| I. | 373 |
| II. | 376 |
| <i>K. Marx.</i> Garibaldi in Sicily.—Affairs in Prussia | 381 |
| <i>F. Engels.</i> Garibaldi in Sicily | 386 |
| <i>K. Marx.</i> The Emperor Napoleon III and Prussia | 391 |
| <i>K. Marx.</i> Interesting from Prussia | 397 |
| <i>F. Engels.</i> The British Volunteer Force | 403 |
| <i>K. Marx.</i> British Commerce | 406 |
| <i>K. Marx.</i> The State of British Manufacturing Industry | 410 |
| I. | 410 |
| II. | 416 |
| <i>K. Marx.</i> Interesting from Sicily.—Garibaldi's Quarrel with La Farina.—A Letter from Garibaldi | 421 |
| <i>F. Engels.</i> British Defenses | 425 |
| <i>K. Marx.</i> Events in Syria.—Session of the British Parliament.—The State of British Commerce | 429 |
| <i>F. Engels.</i> Could the French Sack London? | 434 |
| <i>K. Marx.</i> The Russo-French Alliance | 439 |
| <i>K. Marx.</i> The Paper Tax.—The Emperor's Letter | 444 |
| <i>F. Engels.</i> Garibaldi's Movements | 449 |
| <i>K. Marx.</i> The New Sardinian Loan.—The Impending French and Indian Loans | 453 |
| <i>F. Engels.</i> The Sick Man of Austria | 457 |
| <i>K. Marx.</i> The Crops in Europe | 461 |
| <i>K. Marx.</i> Corn Prices.—European Finances and War Preparations.—The Oriental Question | 465 |
| <i>F. Engels.</i> Garibaldi's Progress | 471 |
| <i>F. Engels.</i> Garibaldi in Calabria | 476 |
| <i>K. Marx.</i> British Commerce | 479 |
| <i>K. Marx.</i> Russia Using Austria.—The Meeting at Warsaw | 484 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>K. Marx</i> . Affairs in Prussia.—Prussia, France and Italy | 488 |
| <i>F. Engels</i> . Preparations for War in Prussia | 493 |
| <i>K. Marx</i> . Great Britain—A Money Stringency | 497 |
| <i>F. Engels</i> . Austria—Progress of the Revolution | 499 |

FROM THE PREPARATORY MATERIALS

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>K. Marx</i> . Extracts from Imre Szabó's Work <i>The State Policy of Modern Europe, from the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century to the Present Time</i> . In Two Volumes, London, 1857 | 505 |
|---|-----|

NOTES AND INDEXES

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>Notes</i> | 531 |
| <i>Name Index</i> | 593 |
| <i>Index of Quoted and Mentioned Literature</i> | 638 |
| <i>Index of Periodicals</i> | 663 |
| <i>Subject Index</i> | 671 |

ILLUSTRATIONS

| | |
|--|---------|
| Title-page of the first edition of <i>Herr Vogt</i> by Karl Marx | 23 |
| Garibaldi's Expedition to Southern Italy (1860), Garibaldi's Advance in Sicily and His Landing on the Calabrian Coast (May-August 1860) (map) | 470-471 |
| First page of Marx's manuscript with extracts from Imre Szabó's work <i>The State Policy of Modern Europe, from the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century to the Present Time</i> | 507 |

Translated by
RODNEY LIVINGSTONE

Preface

Volume 17 of the *Collected Works* of Marx and Engels comprises works written between October 1859 and December 1860. The first half of the volume is devoted to Marx's long polemic *Herr Vogt* and the letters and statements connected with the so-called Vogt Case that he sent to the editors of various newspapers. The second half consists of articles written by Marx and Engels for the American progressive newspaper *New-York Daily Tribune* between January and December 1860. All these works are linked in subject-matter with those published in volumes 16, 18 and 19 of the present edition.

As Marx and Engels had foreseen, the first world economic crisis of 1857-58 was followed by a fresh upswing of the democratic, proletarian and national liberation movements. An ever widening struggle was being waged over the tasks the bourgeois revolutions of 1848-49 had left unsolved, one of which was the now urgent necessity for the unification of Germany, and also of Italy. In this period the international situation, as the Italian war of 1859 (France and Piedmont against Austria) had shown, was charged with the danger of armed conflict.

In the complex conditions of the time the activity of the masses, particularly that of the proletariat, grew rapidly, and Marx and Engels devoted themselves to preparing the working class for the forthcoming battles. Besides elaborating revolutionary theory and crucial questions of the tactics of proletarian struggle, they concentrated more and more of their practical activity on rallying the revolutionary forces and setting up an independent political party of the working class. Their task now was not only to preserve the cadres of experienced proletarian revolutionaries, but also to

establish closer ties with the broad masses, to give the movement its own newspaper (the attempts to turn the London German émigré paper *Das Volk* into such an organ are described in Volume 16) and to win more supporters.

Increasingly Marx and Engels devoted their journalistic writings on home and foreign policy to substantiating the position of the emerging party of the proletariat. Defending its political and moral authority, Marx vigorously rebuffed the ideological enemies of the working class, who were trying to slander and discredit the active members of the Communist League. A rebuttal of these slanderous fabrications was particularly necessary at this crucial moment in the development of the working-class movement, when the proletarians of many countries had begun to awaken to political activity and showed a tendency to set up their own political organisations and establish international connections, when new forces were entering the working-class movement and there was thus a real opportunity for creating a mass proletarian party. Its nucleus was to be, as Marx and Engels envisaged, a united and well-tested group of proletarian revolutionaries. "The moment is approaching," Marx wrote to Lassalle in September 1860, "when our 'small' and yet, in a certain sense, powerful party' (insofar as the other parties do not know what they want or do not want what they know) must draft a plan of its campaign" (see present edition, Vol. 41).

Marx's long polemical work—*Herr Vogt*—reflects the struggle waged by Marx and Engels against attempts by the ideologists and agents of the bourgeoisie to denigrate the proletarian party. Their exposure had become an important task and in the circumstances of the time was not only a means of self-defence, but also a form of active upholding and propagation of communist principles.

In his letter to Freiligrath of February 29, 1860 Marx wrote that he and his associates were being attacked with utter ruthlessness by the bourgeois circles of many countries, by the whole official world "who in order to ruin us are not just occasionally infringing the penal code but have ranged widely over its length and breadth..." (see present edition, Vol. 41). One of the spokesmen of this "official world" was the German scientist and politician Karl Vogt, who had formerly sided with the petty-bourgeois democrats. In December 1859 Vogt published a pamphlet entitled *Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung*, which was full of slanderous statements about Marx and his associates.

In this pamphlet Vogt deliberately falsified facts and invented charges against Marx and his associates, distorting the true picture

of the activities of the Communist League. Armed with police forgeries used in the Cologne communist trial in 1852, Vogt even went so far as to accuse Marx and his associates of mercenary, if not criminal aims. In principle there was nothing new in these insinuations. They were merely a rehash of the fabricated charges brought against members of the Communist League by Prussian police agents. The same lies had often been used by groups of petty-bourgeois émigrés hostile to the proletarian revolutionaries. "...At all times and in all places," Marx wrote, "the sycophants of the ruling class have always resorted to these despicable slanders to denigrate the literary and political champions of the oppressed classes" (see this volume, p. 69). However, Vogt's slanderous fabrications were on this occasion immediately taken up by the bourgeois press of Germany, England, Switzerland and other European countries and also found their way into the émigré press in the United States. The dissemination of anti-communist inventions assumed a massive scale. "Naturally the jubilation of the bourgeois press knows no bounds," Marx wrote to Engels on January 31, 1860 about the reaction of the bourgeois press to the publication of the Vogt pamphlet (see present edition, Vol. 41).

Marx rightly saw this as an attempt by the bourgeoisie to discredit the proletarian revolutionaries, to strike a blow at the emerging party of the proletariat and undermine its positions morally and politically in the eyes of the public. "His [Vogt's] attack on me...", Marx wrote to Engels on February 3, 1860, "is intended as a *grand coup* by vulgar bourgeois democracy ... against the whole party. It must therefore be answered by a *grand coup*. The *defensive* is not for us" (see present edition, Vol. 41). Marx's exposé *Herr Vogt* was the answer to this anti-communist campaign. The unmasking of Vogt was particularly important for Germany, where the proletarian revolutionaries were faced with the task of building up their influence among the masses in the struggle for the country's democratic unification.

Marx pursued a dual aim in his writings against Vogt. He exposed him both as an individual spreading slander and as "an individual who stands for a whole trend" (this volume, p. 26) of ideologists whom the bourgeoisie was using to discredit proletarian revolutionaries and disorganise the working-class movement. Marx was not merely answering the attacks on himself personally, was not only defending the proletarian revolutionaries' past activities, he was also fighting for the future of the proletarian party. The exposure of Vogt was "of decisive importance for the *historical*

vindication of the party and for its future position in Germany”, Marx wrote to Freiligrath on February 23, 1860 (see present edition, Vol. 41). The importance Marx attached to defending the party, which was still only in the process of formation, from slander by its enemies is shown by the fact that he put aside his work on *Capital* for nearly a year in order to write the pamphlet.

Herr Vogt is a complex, highly satirical work. The wealth of information it contains, the importance of the problems raised, the vast quantity of thoroughly researched and skilfully presented material, make it one of the finest examples of Marx’s polemical writings and one of the most important of his historical works. He succeeded in creating a broad canvas portraying the period, the prevailing political systems, the home and foreign policies of the ruling classes, the bourgeois court, the police and the venal press. At the same time, he levelled revealing criticism at the anti-proletarian trends of bourgeois liberalism and bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democracy.

In dealing with the formation and development of the international communist movement, Marx refuted Vogt’s allegations that the Communist League was a narrow conspiratorial organisation pursuing aims that were not revolutionary at all. In Chapter IV of the work (“Techow’s Letter”) he gave a brief but succinct description of the emergence and activities of this first international communist organisation of the proletariat. In this and other chapters (Chapter III, “Police Matters”, and Chapter VI, “Vogt and the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*”) he portrayed the historical setting in which the League operated, its connections with working-class circles and its role in the propagation of communist ideas, and also the struggle waged by the proletarian trend against sectarian elements. Discussing the reasons for the split in the Communist League, Marx pointed out the harm done by the adventurist and conspiratorial tactics of the Willich-Schapper sectarian group, their incompatibility with the true aims of the proletarian party, and particularly stressed the demoralising and disorganising consequences of the voluntarist and conspiratorial trends for the working-class movement.

Herr Vogt is the first work in Marxist literature to pinpoint the basic elements of the initial phase in the process of combining scientific communism with the working-class movement. It pioneers the idea of the continuity of the various stages of this process, the various steps in the struggle for a proletarian party. Along with Marx’s *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne* and *The Knight of the Noble Consciousness*, and Marx and

Engels' *The Great Men of the Exile* (see present edition, Vols. 11, 12), *Herr Vogt* marks the beginning of the Marxist historiography of the communist movement.

The portrait of the main character in the pamphlet is generalised. Marx used Vogt as an example to show that the anti-revolutionary, anti-proletarian prejudices of the unstable elements among the bourgeois intellectuals brought them into the camp of reaction and allowed the ruling classes, particularly those of such a corrupt state as Bonapartist France, to exploit them for counter-revolutionary purposes. Marx exposed Vogt as a petty politician and ridiculed him as one of the cowardly leaders of the leftist petty-bourgeois group in the Frankfurt National Assembly and a member of the imperial regency, set up by the rump of the Frankfurt Parliament at the closing stage of the 1848-49 revolution. Marx showed that Vogt's whole political activity was in fact counter-revolutionary. According to the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, he was "the 'faithful warner' against revolution" (this volume, p. 55). This exposure of Vogt had a great impact because he had been widely regarded as a democratic and even radical politician.

Marx considered Vogt mainly as a political figure, but some of his sharply satirical observations illuminated the nature of Vogt's philosophical views as a spokesman of German vulgar materialism.

The pamphlet's focal point is the exposure of Vogt as a paid agent of Napoleon III (Chapter VIII, "Dâ-Dâ Vogt and His Studies"; IX, "Agency"; and X, "Patrons and Accomplices"), as "one of the countless mouthpieces through whom the grotesque ventriloquist in the Tuileries spoke in foreign tongues" (this volume, p. 159). As Marx proved, Vogt performed the function of moulding European public opinion in the Bonapartist spirit and recruiting members of the liberal and democratic opposition to Bonapartism by admitting them to the "French feeding-trough". Vogt's *Studien zur gegenwärtigen Lage Europas* (Studies on the Present Situation in Europe), published a month before the outbreak of the Italian war, left Marx "in no doubt about his connection with Bonapartist propaganda" (this volume, p. 116) since it was a rehash of the official propaganda hand-outs of the Second Empire and was designed to assist the latter in its foreign-policy adventures. Subsequently, in 1870, after the fall of the Second Empire, when details of the expenditure of secret funds in 1859 were released, Vogt's name was found to be on the list of recipients. This was incontrovertible documentary proof of the charges Marx had brought against him ten years before.

Marx exposed not only Vogt but also his "patrons and

accomplices”, the whole circle of paid agents, hack writers and journalists, and unprincipled politicians acting in the interests of the Second Empire. The pages describing the typical ways in which the bourgeois press serves the ruling circles ideologically in their struggle against the revolutionary working-class movement, and purveys bourgeois influence among proletarians and democrats are brilliant political satire. Marx lashed out at the venality of the Bonapartist press, whose scribes “one and all take their inspiration from one and the same illustrious—*money-box*” (this volume, p. 211), and had some equally hard things to say about the bourgeois press of Germany and England. He treated the action of the then liberal *Daily Telegraph*, which had reprinted Vogt’s slander and refused to publish Marx’s denial, as a striking example of how the press and journalism as a whole in bourgeois society become a field for private money-making, spreading lies and misinformation, derogatory rumours and scandalous gossip to satisfy the tastes of the philistine. Marx compares the newspaper to a “great central paper *cloaca*” receiving all the “social refuse” (this volume, p. 243).

The social and national demagoguery of Bonapartism, Louis Bonaparte’s “leftist” gestures in social and national policy, designed to present the police state of the Second Empire as a champion of the workers’ interests and a defender of oppressed nations, were particularly dangerous, Marx wrote. He drew attention to the attempts of the Bonapartist Vogt to persuade the Swiss artisans that Napoleon III was a “workers’ dictator” (this volume, p. 191) deeply concerned for the welfare of the working people and their protection from exploitation by the bourgeoisie. Marx demonstrated the demoralising effect on the working class of this brand of social demagoguery, which was later to spread in other countries in the form of “police socialism”. Taking Vogt’s role as an accessory to the Bonapartist monarchy as an example, Marx pointed to the danger of the democratic and proletarian movements being penetrated by all kinds of hostile agents, and to the need for their timely identification and exposure.

Marx’s revelations of Vogt’s connections with Bonapartist circles grew into a general unmasking of the Bonapartist regime. Marx and Engels regarded the Second Empire as one of the bastions of reaction in Europe and the fight against Bonapartism as one of the international proletariat’s key tasks. In *Herr Vogt* (Chapters VIII, IX and X) Marx developed and deepened the analysis of Bonapartism that he had made in his *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (see present edition, Vol. 11) and quotes from this work.

Dealing with Vogt's and other mercenary writers' efforts to embellish the foreign policy of the Second Empire, Marx showed the reactionary aims and methods of this policy, revealing the demagogic essence of the Bonapartist "principle of nationality", and the false concept of "natural frontiers", which were used to cover up the plans of the ruling circles to exploit the national movements in order to establish French hegemony and redraw the map of Europe in favour of the Bonapartist camarilla. Marx noted that the Bonapartist clique was trying to consolidate the dictatorial regime in France by means of "local wars" and combat the revolutionary-democratic struggle in Italy and other countries by armed force. He showed that the rulers of the Second Empire were enemies of all national liberation movements and hypocritically masked their true position by a pretence of sympathy for the Poles, Hungarians, Italians and other oppressed nations. In Marx's view the tendency of some of the national leaders to succumb to Bonapartist demagoguery, their readiness to make a deal with Bonapartism, presented a grave danger to the revolutionary development of these movements. Marx revealed the true nature of the policies pursued by the ruling circles of England, and also of Tsarist Russia, who were giving Napoleon III diplomatic support and thus contributing to the outbreak of the Italian war.

In *Herr Vogt* Marx analysed various aspects of international relations from the eighteenth century up to the 1850s and highlighted the key points of contradiction and conflict between the European powers. His interest in these problems is also documented by the excerpts, published here in the section "From the Preparatory Materials", from the book by the Hungarian historian and participant in the 1848-49 revolution Imre Szabó, *The State Policy of Modern Europe, from the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century to the Present Time*, which was a source used for several passages of *Herr Vogt*.

The writings of Marx and Engels against Bonapartism were closely linked with their struggle for the unification of Germany, and also of Italy, by revolutionary-democratic means. They saw Bonapartist France as one of the main obstacles to German and Italian unity (see present edition, Vol. 16). In *Herr Vogt* Marx exposed Vogt's pro-Bonaparte stance on this issue as well.

Marx's pamphlet against Vogt and his associates was also a kind of answer to Lassalle, whose view on the ways and means of unifying Germany, and also Italy, was expounded in his pamphlet *Der italienische Krieg und die Aufgabe Preussens* (The Italian War and the Tasks of Prussia). Lassalle justified the policy of Napoleon

III in Italy and supported the dynastic way of uniting Germany under Prussian auspices that was being canvassed by the Prussophile bourgeoisie. "Lassalle's pamphlet is an enormous blunder," Marx wrote to Engels on May 18, 1859, and in a letter of November 26 of the same year he declared even more emphatically that Lassalle "in point of fact was piping the same tune as Vogt" (see present edition, Vol. 40). Not for nothing did Lassalle try to dissuade Marx from openly opposing this Bonapartist agent. In *Herr Vogt* Marx indirectly, without naming Lassalle, was actually criticising the ideas of Lassalle's pamphlet along with the views expressed by other vulgar democrats who shared Vogt's opinion. In contrast to the nationalistic ideas of Lassalle, who did not believe in the revolutionary-democratic forces of Italy and Germany, in contrast to his attempts to justify the policy of Bonapartism and the Prussian ruling circles, Marx proposed a plan for the revolutionary-democratic unification of each of the two countries from below, through the revolutionary action of the masses. "Lassalle deviated towards a national-liberal labour policy, whereas Marx encouraged and developed an independent, consistently democratic policy hostile to national-liberal cowardice" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 141).

The pamphlet *Herr Vogt*, and Engels' pamphlet *Savooy, Nice and the Rhine* written a short time before (see present edition, Vol. 16), were the first works in which the founders of Marxism actually opposed in print the tactics advocated by Lassalle.

An important problem raised by Marx in *Herr Vogt* was that of how to fight the influence of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology on the proletariat, an ideology emanating from circles that Marx classified as vulgar democrats (see his letters to Engels, January 28 and February 3, 1860, present edition, Vol. 41). In his Preface to the pamphlet, referring to German bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democracy, he wrote that one of the reasons that had prompted him to come out publicly against Vogt was the opportunity this offered of exposing the whole trend to which Vogt belonged. This was important as a means of securing the independence of the emerging proletarian party's ideological and tactical principles. The German petty-bourgeois democrats had evolved to the right since the revolution of 1848-49 and were steadily deteriorating into an appendage of bourgeois liberalism. Some of them, like Vogt, had taken up pro-Bonapartist positions. Marx and Engels had criticised the leaders of the petty bourgeoisie in their work *The Great Men of the Exile* (see present edition, Vol. 11). In Chapters IV and XII of *Herr Vogt* ("Techow's Letter" and

“Appendices”) Marx returns to this subject and ridicules the narrowness and political instability of the vulgar democrats, their contempt for the true interests of the toiling masses, and the petty quarrels between the various groups.

Brilliant both in its content and form, *Herr Vogt* is outstanding among the best examples of political satire and journalism and leaves one in no doubt as to Marx’s extensive knowledge of literature. Its sparkling aphorisms and literary references add to the acerbity of its style. “This is, of course, the best polemical work you have ever written,” was Engels’ comment in a letter to Marx of December 19, 1860 (see present edition, Vol. 41), as soon as he had read the pamphlet. Franz Mehring, who thought highly of the pamphlet’s artistic merits, although he did not fully appreciate its significance in upholding the principles of the proletarian party, wrote that it would afford great pleasure to the literary connoisseur.

Marx’s pamphlet is written in a spirit of militant partisanship. It has retained its scientific and political significance both as a source for studying the history of the international working-class movement and the struggle waged by Marx and Engels to create a proletarian party, and as an example of their opposition to Bonapartism and other reactionary forces. It remains a model of the impassioned defence of the interests of the working class and is a classic rebuttal of the opponents of communism.

The second half of the volume consists of articles by Marx and Engels on crucial problems of the social and political development of Europe in 1860. With the revolutionary movement again on the upswing their writings were of especial significance as a way of working out and popularising the tactical principles that should be adopted by the working-class and democratic movement. In 1860 the *New-York Daily Tribune* was the only newspaper for which Marx and Engels wrote on political subjects (the articles on military questions that Engels contributed in 1860 to *The New American Cyclopaedia*, *The Volunteer Journal, for Lancashire and Cheshire*, and the *Allgemeine Militär-Zeitung*, are published in Volume 18 of the present edition, as part of the cycle of works on this subject written by Marx and Engels in those years). Though he did not share Marx’s beliefs, the editor of the paper realised the importance of his articles (see this volume, p. 323-24).

The journalistic activities of Marx and Engels in this period show that they were continuing their studies of the economic contours and dynamics of the social and political development of various

countries, and the crucial points of international contradictions and conflicts. As always they took a particular interest in the unfolding of revolutionary events.

One of the main themes in the journalism of Marx and Engels in 1860 was the events in Italy. Their articles continue the cycle of their works on this subject written during the Italian war (see present edition, Vol. 16). The war resulted neither in the unification of Italy nor in its complete liberation from Austrian domination. Austria kept its grip on Venice. In return for the cession of Lombardy to Piedmont France had been given Savoy and Nice. With its national and social problems still unsolved, Italy remained one of the main centres of revolutionary ferment in Europe. In April 1860 the popular uprising in Palermo (Sicily) against the regime of the Neapolitan Bourbons launched a new stage in the struggle for the country's unification that took the form of a bourgeois-democratic revolution. Marx responded to these events with the article "Sicily and the Sicilians", drawing a graphic picture of the hardships suffered by the people of the island, where all land was owned by a few large landowners, where the medieval system of land tenure was still intact, and the tenant farmers led an impoverished existence under a crushing burden of taxes and exorbitant rent. Marx taunted Europe's official circles for their indifference over the brutal reprisals that the Neapolitan authorities had taken against the insurgents. But, as Marx noted, the people's spirit was not broken. The Sicilians "have battled, and still battle, for their freedom" (this volume, p. 370).

Garibaldi's landing with his famous "thousand" volunteers helped to unite the scattered guerrilla bands and develop the revolutionary war in Sicily. Marx and Engels followed with great sympathy the actions of Garibaldi, around whom all Italy's patriotic forces had rallied. "If the insurrection develops much vital power, Garibaldi's army will be swelled to more formidable dimensions," wrote Marx in his article "Garibaldi in Sicily.—Affairs in Prussia" (this volume, p. 382). A high evaluation of the actions of Garibaldi's insurrectionist forces is to be found in the articles "Garibaldi in Sicily", "Garibaldi's Movements", "Garibaldi's Progress" and "Garibaldi in Calabria", which Engels wrote at Marx's request. Engels spoke of Garibaldi as "the man who has borne high the flag of Italian revolution in the face of French, Neapolitan, and Austrian battalions" (this volume, p. 386). And in another place he said, "The Sicilian insurrection has found a first-rate military chief" (pp. 389-90). After Garibaldi's landing in Calabria Engels wrote that he had "shown himself to be not only a

brave leader and clever strategist, but also a scientific general" (this volume, p. 476).

Marx and Engels held that the broad scope of the popular movement in Italy offered the opportunity of achieving the unification of Italy in a democratic way. They assessed Garibaldi's successes as evidence of the superiority of Italy's revolutionary-democratic forces over the aristocratic and bourgeois monarchist camp that had assembled round Piedmont. Marx and Engels also considered Garibaldi's victories in the light of their positive international repercussions, and the revolutionary response that they had evoked among the masses in the European countries. The operations of Garibaldi's revolutionary army not only disrupted the plans of the Italian liberal-monarchist circles and the Savoyan dynasty; they also struck at the hopes nurtured by France's Bonapartist rulers of bringing Italy under its control. In the article "Interesting from Sicily.—Garibaldi's Quarrel with La Farina.—A Letter from Garibaldi", Marx joyfully reported the expulsion of Piedmont's agent La Farina from a Sicily liberated by Garibaldi's forces. Marx believed that if the movement retained "its pure popular character", and Garibaldi prevented Piedmont's ruling circles from intervening, it might lead to "rescuing Italy, not only from its old tyrants and divisions, but also from the clutches of the new French protectorate" (this volume, p. 422).

At the same time Marx and Engels were quite sober in assessing the complexity of the situation and the development of events. The liberal-monarchist circles of Piedmont were preparing, in the event of Garibaldi's campaign proving successful, to snatch the fruits of his victory and bring about the unification of Italy by dynastic means. Despite the hopes cherished by Marx and Engels, this was what happened, in the shape of the creation of the Italian monarchy headed by Victor Emmanuel II, the King of Piedmont.

A number of articles published in this volume are devoted to Germany, and more specifically to Prussia, one of the leading states of the German Confederation. In considering the principal task confronting Germany—the country's national unification—Marx and Engels developed ideas that they had already voiced in their articles of the Italian war period. The need for the unification of Germany sprang from the country's whole internal development and answered the demands of economic and social progress. In upholding the revolutionary-democratic way of solving this problem, Marx and Engels believed that only a movement involving the whole people could paralyse the opposi-

tion of the Prussian and Austrian counter-revolutionary elements. The elimination of the relics of the feudal-absolutist system, they concluded, would create favourable conditions for developing the productive forces, for social progress and rallying and organising the proletariat. "To withstand encroachments from without," Marx wrote, "or realise unity and liberty at home, she [Germany] must clear her own house of its dynastic landlords" (this volume, p. 487). Marx exposed the Prussian ruling circles' schemes for uniting the country under their aegis without any changes in its internal system by introducing and employing Prussian police and bureaucratic practices throughout the country. Opposing these plans for the Prussianisation of Germany, Marx wrote that "after the blow dealt to Austria [in the Italian war, 1859], Germany stands in need of a similar blow being dealt to Prussia, in order to get rid of 'both the houses'" (this volume, p. 378). In the article "Public Feeling in Berlin" and in other articles Marx dealt with the internal situation in Prussia. He ridiculed the sham liberalism of the Prince Regent (the future king William), the first years of whose reign—from 1858—had been proclaimed by the liberals as the beginning of a "new era", and regarded the government's manoeuvres as only a nominal rejection of "the old reactionary system of mingled feudalism and bureaucratism". In reality, he pointed out, the Prussian ruling circles had no intention of removing "the bureaucratic and police shackles" (this volume, p. 367, 368).

The articles published in this volume throw light on the beginnings of the constitutional conflict in Prussia between the liberal majority of the lower Chamber and the government, a conflict over the government plan for reorganising the army. The Bill was rejected by the Chamber, although it sanctioned the allocations "for putting the army into a state fit to encounter the dangers apprehended from without". The government launched the reform without the consent of the Provincial Diet. Marx and Engels saw the far-reaching consequences of this policy of the Prussian ruling circles, who were intent on militarising the country and creating an army "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" (this volume, pp. 495, 496).

Marx and Engels denounced the conciliatory tactics of the German liberal bourgeoisie and also the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democrats. They pointed to the timidity and inconsistency of their opposition to the government, their readiness to make concessions, and their actual orientation towards the unification of Germany round monarchical Prussia. In his article

“Preparations for War in Prussia” Engels pointed out ironically that the only retort from these “mock representatives” of the people to the government’s military reform launched without the sanction of the Provincial Diet would be “some low grumbling, pickled with fervent assertions of dynastic loyalty, and unbounded confidence in the Cabinet” (this volume, p. 495).

Some of the articles included in this volume fill in the details of the picture of the Second Empire presented in *Herr Vogt*. They focus on the counter-revolutionary essence of the Bonapartist regime, the internal situation in France, and the mainsprings of the adventurist foreign policy pursued by its rulers. In his articles “Affairs in France”, “Events in Syria.—Session of the British Parliament.—The State of British Commerce”, and others, Marx showed that behind the growth of foreign trade and the spread of the railways, there were signs of the rapid economic collapse of the Second Empire—the fifty per cent increase in the national debt, the threat of financial bankruptcy, the decline of agriculture and the ruination of the peasantry. “The Empire itself,” he wrote, “is the great incubus whose burden grows in a greater ratio than the productive powers of the French nation” (this volume, p. 333). The instability of the Bonapartist regime was becoming increasingly apparent and “the rebellious spirit of Gaul is rekindling from its cinders”. The rulers of the Second Empire, as always, saw the way out of the crisis in foreign-policy adventures. This was what gave rise to the plan for “some fresh and thrilling crusade, to plunge his Empire again into the Lethe of war-hallucinations”. This was the purpose of Napoleon III’s colonial expedition to Syria (this volume, pp. 431, 430).

Marx exposed the annexationist plans of the Bonapartist circles with regard to the left bank of the Rhine, and also the demagoguery of their promises to assist in furthering the unification of the North German states around Prussia in return for the cession of the Rhineland to France (see “Preparations for Napoleon’s Coming War on the Rhine”, “The Emperor Napoleon III and Prussia”, “Interesting from Prussia”, and others).

Economic problems and also the internal development of Britain, Austria and Russia, and the situation in the colonial world, figure among the themes of the journalistic writings included in this volume, and the ideas expressed on these questions in previous years are developed in many of them.

In some of his articles Marx analysed the state of the British economy and against this background considered the general economic condition of the bourgeois world. In two surveys entitled

“British Commerce” Marx noted that one of the peculiar features of the capitalist economy was the involvement of distant regions of the globe in world trade and the interdependence of the economic processes going on in the world. These problems are also treated in Marx’s articles on the Anglo-French trade agreement of 1860.

In his reviews on “The State of British Manufacturing Industry” Marx used official data—the reports of the factory inspectors—to analyse the mechanism of the industrial system and the various forms of the exploitation of the working class. Specifically, he pointed out that child labour was being widely used in British factories although Britain was at the time an advanced industrial country. In breach of laws already passed to restrict the use of child labour, the so-called apprentice system had been revived. Agreements were being made between manufacturers and boards of guardians for the employment of destitute children who had no other means of subsistence. In some industries (at the calico-printing, dyeing and bleaching factories), Marx observed, the working day of women and children of tender age was virtually unlimited and they toiled 14-15 hours a day while their real wages tended to decrease. The industrial accident rate was appalling and safety regulations were applied at by no means all factories (this volume, pp. 416-18).

Marx and Engels were by this time paying more and more attention to the situation in Russia. They attached tremendous importance to the Russian peasant movement for the abolition of serfdom and regarded this movement as a massive reserve for the European revolution (see Marx’s letter to Engels of January 11, 1860, present edition, Vol. 41). In his article “Russia Using Austria.—The Meeting at Warsaw” Marx delves into the position of the various classes of Russian society on the eve of the imminent abolition of serfdom and stresses the likelihood of a deal between the Tsarist Government and the nobility in the interests of the big landowners and at the expense of the broad masses of the peasantry. He wrote that “an understanding ... has been arrived at between the existing powers at the cost of the oppressed class” (this volume, p. 486).

The above-mentioned article by Marx, Engels’ articles “The Sick Man of Austria”, “Austria—Progress of the Revolution”, and others examine the process of the decay of the Austrian Empire, torn by internal contradictions and intensification of the national liberation struggle of the peoples within its borders. Marx associates the final disintegration of the Austrian Empire with the German revolution, which, he believed, would have “one

of its centers at Vienna and the other at Berlin" (this volume, p. 487).

A number of works by Engels on military subjects have been included in the volume. Engels continued his profound study of the problems of military theory, specifically analysing the character of revolutionary wars, the influence of the advance of military technology on tactics and on the methods of warfare, and studying the history of the making and perfection of various weapons. In his articles on the Italian events Engels analysed the campaigns of Garibaldi's volunteers in Sicily and Calabria from the military point of view. In a series of articles "On Rifled Cannon" Engels considered the development of artillery. His articles "Military Reform in Germany", "British Defenses" and "Could the French Sack London?" deal with military problems in connection with international relations and the mounting military conflicts. The article "The British Volunteer Force" discusses the class composition of volunteer troops.

* * *

The volume comprises 45 works by Marx and Engels, including Marx's *Herr Vogt*, 35 articles written for the *New-York Daily Tribune* (some of them were reprinted in its special issues, the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune* and the *New-York Weekly Tribune*) and 9 letters and statements that Marx sent to the editors of various newspapers. There are 8 works that appear in English for the first time—*Herr Vogt* and 7 letters and statements sent by Marx to the newspapers. The other works originally written in English had not been reprinted since their publication in 1860. One of Marx's statements (written in English) was never published in his lifetime.

In the section "From the Preparatory Materials" there appear for the first time in English the passages that Marx copied from Szabó's book *The State Policy of Modern Europe, from the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century to the Present Time*.

In preparing the present volume for the press the sources used by Marx were checked and the necessary corrections made. In quoting the works of other authors Marx sometimes ran paragraphs together, omitted authors' italics and introduced his own. He also abridged some passages and gave only a general summing up of their content. The present volume retains Marx's form of quotation. The most substantial changes are indicated in footnotes

and passages left out of quotations are indicated by omission marks in square brackets. For the convenience of the readers some additional paragraphing has been introduced; obvious misprints have been silently corrected.

In studying the historical material quoted in Marx's and Engels' articles, it must be borne in mind that they made use of newspaper information which in a number of cases proved to be inaccurate.

In cases where an article has no title, the editors have provided one which is given in square brackets.

The volume was compiled and the text prepared by Tatyana Yeremeyeva, who also wrote the preface and notes. Chapter XII of the pamphlet *Herr Vogt* and the section "From the Preparatory Materials" were prepared by Marina Vaninskaya, who also compiled the name index and the indexes of quoted and mentioned literature and of periodicals. The subject index was compiled by Marlen Arzumanov. The editor of the volume was Lev Churbanov (Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU).

The publishers express their gratitude to the editors of Marx/Engels, *Gesamtausgabe*—MEGA, Bd. 18, erste Abteilung (Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC, Socialist Unity Party of Germany), for the loan of materials used in preparing the volume.

The translations were made by Rodney Livingstone and edited by Nicholas Jacobs (Lawrence & Wishart), Salo Ryazanskaya, Yelena Chistyakova, Victor Schnittke (Progress Publishers) and Vladimir Mosolov, scientific editor (Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU).

The volume was prepared for the press by the editor Lyudgarda Zubrilova and the assistant editor Natalya Belskaya (Progress Publishers).

KARL MARX
and
FREDERICK ENGELS
WORKS

October 1859-December 1860

Karl Marx

[LETTER TO THE EDITOR
OF THE *ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG*]¹

October 19, 1859, 9 Grafton Terrace,
Maitland Park,
Haverstock Hill, London^a

Sir,

As long as I had a hand in the German press I attacked the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and the *Allgemeine Zeitung* attacked me. However, this does not of course prevent me from assisting the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, as far as it lies in my power, in a case in which it has in my view fulfilled the *primary* duty of the press: that of the denunciation of humbug.^b The enclosed document would be a *legal* document here in London.^c I do not know whether it is the same in *Augsburg*. I have procured the said document because Blind refused to stand by the statement which he had made to me and others, which I passed on to Liebknecht, and which allowed the latter no doubts about the denunciation contained in the anonymous pamphlet.^d

Yours very sincerely,

Dr. K. Marx^e

Published in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*,
No. 300, October 27, 1859

Printed according to the news-
paper

Published in English for the first
time

^a The *Allgemeine Zeitung* of October 27, 1859, in which this letter was published, gives the address inaccurately: "I. Grafton Terrace, Quai, Haydparck, Haverstock Hill, London." In the issue of November 21, which carried Marx's "Declaration" (see this volume, pp. 8-9), the address is given correctly.—*Ed.*

^b Marx uses the English word.—*Ed.*

^c This refers to the statement by the compositor Vögele to the effect that the pamphlet *Zur Warnung* was written in Blind's hand (see this volume, pp. 123-25.)—*Ed.*

^d See this volume, pp. 122-24.—*Ed.*

^e "Editor of the former *Rheinische Zeitung*" (footnote added by the editors of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*).—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

[STATEMENT TO THE EDITORS OF *DIE REFORM*,
THE *VOLKS-ZEITUNG* AND THE *ALLGEMEINE*
ZEITUNG]²

London, November 7, 1859

I see from a copy of *Der Freischütz*, No. 132, which a friend has sent me from Hamburg, that Eduard Meyen has felt obliged to place his unequivocally decisive weight into the scales of the Vogt affair.^a The horse-power, or should I say, the donkey-power^b of his logic is concentrated in the great thesis: that because he was a friend of Blind, and because Blind failed to send him a copy of the anonymous pamphlet, the original document I had sent to the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* must of necessity be a falsehood. In his sly little way he takes good care, of course, not to say this directly; he says it indirectly.

Incidentally, I wish that Herr Eduard Meyen would provide evidence to prove that my time is valueless enough to be squandered in attacks on the German vulgar democrats.

At the end of 1850 I broke off all relations with the German emigration in London, which really did collapse once I had pulled from under it the one thing that had held it together: its antagonism towards me. The process of dissolution was hastened, above all, by the industry of such agents as Meyen who, for example, publicly agitated against the Ruge faction on behalf of the Kinkel faction. In the nine years that have meanwhile elapsed, I have been a constant contributor to the *New-York Tribune*, a paper with 200,000 subscribers and hence a reading public roughly approximate to that of *Der Freischütz*. Have I ever even so much as mentioned the name of a single one of the German

^a This refers to the item marked **, "Der Process Carl Vogt's gegen die Augsburger Allg. Ztg.", *Der Freischütz*, No. 132, November 3, 1859.—*Ed.*

^b Marx uses the English expressions "horse-power" and "donkey-power".—*Ed.*

vulgar democrats, or spent even so much as a single word on any of the despicable attacks that these men of honour have heaped upon my head in the German and especially the German-American press over the past five years?

During this time I did indeed attack, although I did not slander, "great democrats" of the sort that were dutifully admired by Herr Eduard Meyen. Such as the great democrat Lord Palmerston.^a My offence was all the more unforgivable because my "slanders" were reprinted not merely by English papers of the most diverse political tendencies—from the Chartist *People's Paper* to *The Free Press* of Mr. Urquhart—but also as a pamphlet at least 15,000 copies of which were produced in London, Sheffield and Glasgow without any prompting by me. During that same period, moreover, I denounced the great democrat Louis Bonaparte, first in a work in German (*Der achtzehnte Brumaire des Louis Bonaparte*),^b which was confiscated at all the German frontiers, but which circulated in considerable numbers in the United States and which appeared in extract in the then London organ of Chartism.³ I have continued this "slander" of the "great democrat" Bonaparte in the *Tribune* to this day in the form of analyses of his financial system, his diplomacy, his warfare and his *idées napoléoniennes*.⁴ Louis Bonaparte has sent the *New-York Times* a public statement in gratitude^c for its opposition to these "slanders". Seven years ago I even denounced the "great democrat" Stieber in the *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial*,^d which was pulped at the frontier of Baden and Switzerland. Herr Meyen will surely give me credit for that. Such slander is democratic nowadays since it takes place "with the permission of the high authorities". But my frequent errors in timing are revealed not only by the organ of Herr Eduard Meyen, but also by that of Herr Joseph Dumont in Cologne.^e When in 1848 and 1849 I took the liberty of coming out for the cause of the Hungarian, Italian and Polish nationalities in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, who raged and foamed at the mouth more than the organ of Herr Joseph Dumont in Cologne? But at that time, of course, no Louis Napoleon Bonaparte had given his "liberal" blessing to the cause of these nationalities. That the

^a The reference is to Marx's pamphlet *Lord Palmerston* (see present edition, Vol. 12).—*Ed.*

^b *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (see present edition, Vol. 11).—*Ed.*

^c Instead of *Dankschreiben* (message of gratitude) *Die Reform* has *Denkschreiben* (memorandum), presumably a misprint.—*Ed.*

^d See present edition, Vol. 11.—*Ed.*

^e *Kölnische Zeitung*.—*Ed.*

former editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* have remained true to their opinions is known even to the erstwhile Herr Joseph Dumont, now Giuseppe Delmonte, from Frederick Engels' pamphlet *Po and Rhine*,^a which appeared at the start of the war. But as for Eduard Meyen's democracy "in its narrower sense", I have ignored it for nine years and have only on two occasions, quite recently, broken my silence. The first time was to attack Kossuth and the second was in criticism of Herr Gottfried Kinkel. I did in fact make a number of marginal comments of a purely grammatical nature on Kinkel's aesthetic effusions in the *Hermann*, and I published them in *Das Volk*. This was the only thing which I did write for *Das Volk*, apart from an article on the Peace of Villafranca under the title "Quid pro quo".^b But in the eyes of Eduard Meyen, a "good democrat" is doubtless just as justified in violating the "despotic" rules of syntax as in deserting from the republican camp to that of the royalists.^c

I now find myself at the end of this epistle in the opposite difficulty to Hegel's at the beginning of his *Logic*.^d He wanted to advance from Being to Nothing, whereas I wish to move from Nothing to Being, namely from Eduard Meyen to a real case, the case of Vogt. To make it brief I ask Karl Blind the following questions:

1. Did Blind impart to me information about Vogt on May 9 on the platform of the Urquhart meeting, information whose substance tallies precisely with that contained in the pamphlet *Zur Warnung*?

2. Did Blind publish an anonymous article in the London *Free Press* of May 27, bearing the title "The Grand Duke Constantine to be King of Hungary",^e an article which, apart from the omission of the name of Vogt, repeats the substance of the pamphlet *Zur Warnung*?

3. Did Blind cause the above-mentioned pamphlet to be printed at his expense in London in the print-shop of Herr F. Hollinger, Litchfield Street, Soho?^f

^a See present edition, Vol. 16.—*Ed.*

^b The reference is to Marx's articles "Kossuth and Louis Napoleon", "Gatherings from the Press" and "Quid pro quo" (see present edition, Vol. 16).—*Ed.*

^c An allusion to Gottfried Kinkel's speech before the court martial in Rastatt on August 4, 1849.—*Ed.*

^d G. W. F. Hegel, *Die Wissenschaft der Logik*, Band I, Abteilung 2, Berlin, 1833.—*Ed.*

^e See this volume, pp. 122-23.—*Ed.*

^f See this volume, pp. 116, 122, 123-24.—*Ed.*

Despite all the efforts of Meyen's democracy to misrepresent matters, and despite even that Great Unknown, the "outstanding lawyer" of Herr Joseph Dumont, everything still turns on the question: Who arranged for the pamphlet *Zur Warnung* to be printed? The only reason why the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* is being sued is the fact that this pamphlet was reprinted there. The only accusations of which Vogt feels compelled to clear his name in the eyes of the world are those contained in this pamphlet. The publisher of the pamphlet has, as Robert Peel would have said, three courses open to himself.^a Either he has knowingly lied. I do not believe this of Karl Blind. Or else he subsequently became convinced that the information which justified his printing the pamphlet was false. In that case he is under an even greater obligation to supply an explanation. Or, finally, he holds the proof in his hand, but wishes for private reasons of his own to hush the whole business up and endures with magnanimous resignation the rotten eggs that are hurled not at himself, but at me. But must not all private considerations lapse in such a vital matter as the need to throw light on the relations between the German Imperial Regent *in partibus*^b and the Emperor of the French *de facto*?

Karl Marx

Published in the supplement to *Die Reform*, No. 139, November 19, 1859

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

^a This phrase is in English in the original.—*Ed.*

^b *In partibus infidelium*—literally: in parts inhabited by infidels. The words are added to the title of Roman Catholic bishops holding purely nominal dioceses in non-Christian countries. Here the expression means "only in word".—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

DECLARATION⁵

Vogt, who knows the people he has to deal with, executed a very cunning manoeuvre when he shifted the source of the denunciation of himself from the so-called democratic camp into the socialist one. But I for my part have no interest in aiding and abetting this quid pro quo, and can therefore not permit Blind's declaration^a in No. 313 of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* to go unanswered.

1. On May 9, on the platform of the Urquhart meeting, Blind communicated to me all the accusations against Vogt contained in the pamphlet *Zur Warnung*. He gave the same details to others, to Freiligrath, for instance. Given the complete identity of both style and substance between his verbal statement and the printed pamphlet, he was naturally regarded as its author *de prime abord*.^b

2. In the London *Free Press* of May 27, an anonymous article of Blind's appeared with the title "The Grand Duke Constantine to be King of Hungary",^c which in all essentials anticipated the pamphlet *Zur Warnung*. In that article Blind declared that he knew of liberals in Germany and democrats in London who had been offered "large bribes"^d on behalf of Bonapartist propaganda. While Vogt's lawsuit was pending, I received a visit from Mr. D. Collet, the responsible editor of *The Free Press*, who asked me at *Blind's request* to make *no use* of my knowledge concerning the

^a See this volume, pp. 125-26.—*Ed.*

^b From the very outset.—*Ed.*

^c See this volume, pp. 122-23.—*Ed.*

^d Marx uses the English expression.—*Ed.*

authorship of the article in question. I replied to Mr. Collet—who found it quite appropriate—that I would not commit myself to anything but that my discretion in the matter would rather depend on Blind’s conduct.

3. Fidelio Hollinger’s declaration is simply ridiculous.^a Fidelio Hollinger is aware that he has formally infringed English law by publishing the pamphlet *without declaring the place of publication*. He himself therefore issues a testimonial stating that he did not commit the peccadillo in question. It so happened that the reprint in *Das Volk*^b was made from the type still standing in Hollinger’s print-shop. Thus even without the need to call witnesses, a simple comparison of the pamphlet and the reprint of it in *Das Volk* would be sufficient to prove to a court that the former “came from F. Hollinger’s print-shop”. The transfer of the trial from Augsburg to London would, in general, resolve the entire Blind-Vogt *mystère*.

Karl Marx

November 15, 1859
9 Grafton Terrace, Maitland Park,
Haverstock Hill, London

Published in the supplement to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 325, November 21, 1859

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

^a See Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung*, Genf, 1859, Dokumente, S. 38, and also this volume, p. 126.—*Ed.*

^b *Das Volk*, No. 7, June 18, 1859. See also this volume, p. 119.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

PROSECUTION OF THE AUGSBURG GAZETTE⁶

TO THE EDITOR OF *THE FREE PRESS*

9 Grafton Terrace, Maitland Park,
Haverstock Hill,
London, 4th February, 1860

Sir,

You will remember that *The Free Press* of May 27th, 1859, published an article headed: "*The Grand Duke Constantine to be King of Hungary.*" In that article *Mr. Vogt*, of Geneva, although not named, was pointed at, in a manner intelligible to the German refugees, as a Bonapartist agent, who, on the outset of the Italian war, had offered "*large bribes*" to Liberals in Germany, and German Democrats in London. The writer gave vent to his intense delight at the indignant repulse those attempts at bribery had met with. *Mr. Charles Blind* I assert to be the author of that notice. You can correct me if I am in error. Some time later, there circulated in London an anonymous *German* pamphlet, entitled *Zur Warnung* (a warning), which, in point of fact, may be considered a reproduction of the article of *The Free Press*, only that it gave fuller details and *Vogt's* name. Having been reprinted in a German London paper, entitled *Das Volk*^a (The People); thence the anonymous pamphlet found its way to the columns of the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*^b (The Augsburg Gazette), which, consequently, was sued by *Mr. Vogt* for libel. Meanwhile I had obtained from *Mr. Vögele*, a compositor then employed by *Mr. Hollinger*, the publisher of *Das Volk*, a written declaration^c to the effect, that the pamphlet was printed in *Hollinger's* office, and drawn up by *Mr. Charles Blind*. This declaration, as I told you at the time, was sent over to the *Augsburg Gazette*. The Augsburg

^a *Das Volk*, No. 7, June 18, 1859.—*Ed.*

^b "K. Vogt und die deutsche Emigration in London", *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 173 (supplement), June 22, 1859.—*Ed.*

^c See this volume, pp. 3, 123-25.—*Ed.*

tribunal having declined to decide the case, *Mr. Blind* at last came out in the *Augsburg Gazette*.^a Not content with a point-blank denial of his authorship of the anonymous pamphlet, he, in terms most positive, *declared the pamphlet not to have issued from Hollinger's printing office*. In proof of this latter statement, he laid before the public a declaration^b signed by Hollinger himself, and one *Wiehe*, a compositor, who, as he said, had for eleven months been continuously employed by Hollinger. To this joint declaration of *Blind*, *Hollinger* and *Wiehe* I replied in the *Augsburg Gazette*^c; but *Blind*, in his turn, repeated his denial, and again referred to the testimony of *Hollinger* and *Wiehe*.^d *Vogt*, who, from the beginning, and for purposes of his own, had designed *me* as the secret author of the pamphlet, then published a *brochure*^e full of the most infamous calumnies against myself.

Now, before taking any further step, I want to show up the fellows who evidently have played into the hands of *Vogt*. I, therefore, publicly declare that the statement of *Blind*, *Wiehe* and *Hollinger*, according to which the anonymous pamphlet was *not* printed in *Hollinger's* office, 3, Litchfield Street, Soho, is a *deliberate lie*. First, *Mr. Vögele*, one of the compositors, formerly employed by *Hollinger*, will declare upon oath that the said pamphlet *was* printed in *Hollinger's* office, was written in the hand-writing of *Mr. Blind*, and partly composed by *Hollinger* himself. Secondly, it can be judicially proved that the pamphlet and the article in *Das Volk*, have been taken off the same types. Thirdly, it will be shown that *Wiehe* was *not* employed by *Hollinger* for eleven consecutive months, and, especially, was *not* employed by him at the time of the pamphlet's publication. Lastly, witnesses may be summoned in whose presence *Wiehe* himself confessed having been persuaded by *Hollinger* to sign the *wilfully false declaration in the Augsburg Gazette*. Consequently, I again declare the above said *Charles Blind* to be a *deliberate liar*.

If I am wrong, he may easily confound me by appealing to an English Court of Law.

Karl Marx

Published as a pamphlet on February 4,
1860

Reproduced from the pamphlet

^a This refers to *Karl Blind's* declaration dated "London, November 3" in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 313, November 9, 1859.—*Ed.*

^b *ibid.* See also this volume, p. 126.—*Ed.*

^c See this volume, pp. 8-9.—*Ed.*

^d The *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 345, December 11, 1859.—*Ed.*

^e *Carl Vogt, Mein Prozess....—Ed.*

Karl Marx
 TO THE EDITORS OF THE *VOLKS-ZEITUNG*

DECLARATION⁷

I hereby make it known that I have taken steps preparatory to instituting legal proceedings for libel against the Berlin *National-Zeitung* in connection with the leading articles in Nos. 37 and 41^a regarding Vogt's pamphlet *Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung*. I reserve the right to answer Vogt in writing at a later date since this requires putting a number of questions to people not at present in Europe.

For the moment then I shall say only this:

1. To judge by the anthology in the *National-Zeitung*—strangely the book itself has up to now been unobtainable in London either from booksellers or the acquaintances to whom Herr Vogt had earlier sent his so-called *Studien*^b—Vogt's concoction is merely the elaboration of a sketch that he published nine months ago in his private *Moniteur*, the Biel *Handels-Courier*.^c At the time I had his lampoon published in London without comment. Such a simple procedure was sufficient here, where the situations and personalities are well known, to provide a judgment on the Herr Professor.

2. The *pretext* which led Herr Vogt to launch his campaign against me, like the pretext for the Italian campaign, was an "idea". I was alleged to be the author of the anonymous pamphlet *Zur Warnung*. From the enclosed circular^d in English, which I have had published here, you will see that I have taken steps to compel

^a "Karl Vogt und die Allgemeine Zeitung" and "Wie man radikale Flugblätter macht", *National-Zeitung*, Nos. 37 and 41, January 22 and 25, 1860.—*Ed.*

^b Carl Vogt, *Studien zur gegenwärtigen Lage Europas*, Genf und Bern, 1859.—*Ed.*

^c An allusion to Vogt's article "Zur Warnung" in the *Schweizer Handels-Courier*, No. 150 (special supplement), June 2, 1859.—*Ed.*

^d See this volume, pp. 10-11.—*Ed.*

Herr Blind and consorts either to concede the falseness of that pretext by their silence, or to be convicted of it by an English court.

Karl Marx

February 6, 1860
9 Grafton Terrace, Maitland Park,
Haverstock Hill, London

Published in the *Volks-Zeitung*, No. 35, February 10, 1860; in the supplement to the *Kölnische Zeitung*, No. 41, February 10, 1860; in *Die Reform*, No. 18, February 11, 1860; in the supplement to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 48, February 17, 1860 (with alterations)^a and in other German papers

Printed according to the *Volks-Zeitung* checked with the manuscript

Published in English for the first time

^a The manuscript of this declaration in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* written in Jenny Marx's hand and a covering note in Marx's handwriting have been preserved.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *DAILY TELEGRAPH*⁸

In your to-day's impression you publish, under the title: "*The Journalistic Auxiliaries of Austria*", a letter full of libellous and scandalous imputations against my person. That letter, purporting to be written at Frankfort on the Main, but probably indited at Berlin, is, in point of fact, but a clumsy amplification of two articles contained in the Berlin *National-Zeitung* d.d. January 22 and January 25,^a which paper will have to give account of its^b calumnies before a Prussian Court of Law. The *false pretext*, upon which Vogt launched his libel against me,^c is the assertion that I am the author of the anonymous *German* pamphlet: *Zur Warnung* (a warning), first circulated at London, and afterwards reprinted in the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*.^d From the inclosed print^e you will see that I have provoked my adversaries to bring this point to a judicial issue before an English Court of Law.

In conclusion, if you do not prefer being sued for libel, I request you to make in your next number an *amende honorable*^f for the recklessness with which you dare vilifying a man of whose

^a See this volume, p. 12.—*Ed.*

^b Marx has "his".—*Ed.*

^c Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess*...—*Ed.*

^d "K. Vogt und die deutsche Emigration in London", *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 173 (supplement), June 22, 1859.—*Ed.*

^e See this volume, pp. 12-13.—*Ed.*

^f Apology.—*Ed.*

personal character, political past, literary productions, and social standing, you cannot but confess to be utterly ignorant.

Your obedient servant,

Dr. Karl Marx

February 6, 1860
9 Grafton Terrace, Maitland Park,
Haverstock Hill, London

First published in Russian in: K. Marx
and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XXV, Moscow,
1934

Printed according to the rough
copy of the English original

Karl Marx
TO THE EDITORS
OF THE AUGSBURG *ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG*

February 21, 1860
6 Thorncliffe Grove,
Oxford Road, Manchester

Personal

In one of the two letters dated October 16, 1859 which I have received from the editors of the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*, it says literally:

“You may rest assured of our *particular gratitude* whenever the occasion should present itself for us, highly esteemed Sir, to express to you our *thanks*.”

That I neither desired nor expected either “thanks” or “particular gratitude” from the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* is made perfectly plain in my reply of October 19.^a What I did expect, however, in this *particular matter*, was at least the common fairness^b which no English paper, regardless of its shade of opinion, ever ventures to refuse.

The “particular gratitude” and the “thanks” are actually expressed in the following manner:

1. My first declaration^c was *not* printed at all. There appeared instead Blind’s impertinent statement^d together with two false pieces of evidence obtained by conspiracy.^e *Die Reform* in Hamburg published my declaration without delay.

2. In the case of my reply to Blind I had to resort to *douce violence*^f to secure its insertion.^g And even then it did not appear,

^a See this volume, p. 3.—*Ed.*

^b Marx uses the English phrase.—*Ed.*

^c See this volume, pp. 4-7.—*Ed.*

^d The *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 313, November 9, 1859.—*Ed.*

^e Marx uses the English word.—*Ed.*

^f Gentle pressure.—*Ed.*

^g See this volume, pp. 8-9.—*Ed.*

as I had demanded in all fairness, in the same place as Blind's attack, namely in the main portion of the paper.

3. The Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* then printed a second declaration by Blind^a in which he had the effrontery to speak of barefaced lies and to appeal yet again to the criminally liable testimony of Wiehe and Hollinger. The paper then declared the correspondence closed and so denied me the right to reply.

4. On February 6 I sent my final declaration together with the English circular^b to the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*. The highly esteemed editorial board pushed it to one side and instead published Blind's declaration^c *which had only come into being as the consequence of my circular*. They naturally took good care not to publish the *billet doux* this great diplomat had enclosed. They also published Biscamp's declaration,^d dated three days later than mine (viz., London, February 9). Finally, having convinced themselves of the fact that my declaration had long since been printed by the *Kölnische Zeitung*, the *Volks-Zeitung*, etc., they resolve on publication,^e but—they also take upon themselves the endearing liberty of *censoring* me and making arbitrary alterations. In Cologne in 1842-43 I suffered from the twofold Royal Prussian censorship,⁹ but never imagined that in the year 1860 I would in addition fall victim to the censorship of Herr Dr. Kolb & Co.

I consider that more specific characterisation of these methods is utterly pointless.

K. Marx

First published in Russian in: K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XXV, Moscow, 1934

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

^a The *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 345 (supplement), December 11, 1859.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 10-13.—*Ed.*

^c Karl Blind, "Gegen Karl Vogt", *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 44 (supplement), February 13, 1860.—*Ed.*

^d Elard Biscamp, "Erklärung", *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 46 (supplement), February 15, 1860.—*Ed.*

^e See this volume, pp. 12-13.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

[TO THE EDITORS OF *DIE REFORM*]¹⁰

For Information

With regard to the effusions of Herr *Eduard Meyen* in *Der Freischütz*, Nos. 17 to 21,^a I would say only this:

The libel action I am conducting against the Berlin *National-Zeitung* will achieve all that is necessary to provide a *legal* clarification of Vogt's pamphlet.^b His associate Eduard Meyen cannot lay claim to a like honour. The only thing I can do for Eduard Meyen is to assign to him a niche appropriate to his dimensions in the pamphlet which is due to appear after the conclusion of the court proceedings.

Karl Marx

Manchester, February 28, 1860

Published in *Die Reform*, No. 29, March 7, 1860

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

^a The reference is to Eduard Meyen's article "Carl Vogts Kampf gegen die Augsburg's Allgem. Zeitung und die Marxianer", *Der Freischütz*, Nos. 17-21, February 9, 11, 14, 16 and 18, 1860.—*Ed.*

^b Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess*....—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

DECLARATION¹¹

At the beginning of February 1860 the editorial board of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* were kind enough to publish a declaration by myself which began with these words:

“I hereby make it known that I have taken steps preparatory to instituting legal proceedings for libel against the Berlin *National-Zeitung* in connection with the leading articles in Nos. 37 and 41 regarding Vogt’s pamphlet *Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung*. I reserve the right to answer Vogt in writing at a later date.”^a

In the course of February 1860 I brought a libel suit in Berlin against F. Zabel, the responsible editor of the *National-Zeitung*. My lawyer, Legal Counsellor Weber, resolved at first on an *official investigation*. With a ruling of April 18, 1860 the Public Prosecutor refused to “take action” against F. Zabel, on the grounds that there was no *public interest* involved. On April 26, 1860 his refusal was confirmed by the Chief Public Prosecutor.

My lawyer then began *civil proceedings*. The Royal *Municipal Court* in a ruling of June 8, 1860 *prohibited* me from proceeding with my *lawsuit* on the grounds that the genuinely defamatory “utterances and statements” of F. Zabel’s were *merely quotations* from other persons, and that the “intention to insult” was not present. The Royal *Court of Appeal* for its part declared in a ruling of July 11, 1860 that the alleged use of quotation did not affect the culpability of the articles, but that the defamatory passages contained in them did *not* refer to my “person”. Furthermore, “in the present case” the intention to insult “could not be assumed”.

^a See this volume, p. 12.—*Ed.*

Thus the Royal Court of Appeal confirmed the negative ruling of the Municipal Court. In a ruling of October 5, 1860, which I received on October 23 of this year, the Royal *Supreme Tribunal* found that "in the present case" no "legal error" on the part of the Royal Court of Appeal "could be discerned". The *prohibition on suing F. Zabel* was thus sustained and my claim did not reach the stage of being accorded a *public hearing*.

My *reply to Vogt* will appear in a few days.

Karl Marx

London, November 24, 1860

Published in the supplement to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 336, December 1, 1860

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

Karl Marx
HERR VOGT ¹²

Written between February and November
1860

Published as a book in London in 1860

Signed: *Karl Marx*

Printed according to the book

Published in English for the first
time

Herr Vogt.

Son

Karl Marx.



London,

A. Petzsch & Co, deutsche Buchhandlung.

78, FENCHURCH STREET, E.C.

—
1860.

Title-page of the first edition of *Herr Vogt* by Karl Marx



PREFACE

Under the date “*London*, February 6, 1860”, I published a declaration^a in the Berlin *Volks-Zeitung*, the Hamburg *Reform* and a number of other German papers, which began with these words:

“I hereby make it known that I have taken steps preparatory to instituting legal proceedings for libel against the Berlin *National-Zeitung* in connection with the leading articles in Nos. 37 and 41 regarding *Vogt’s* pamphlet, *Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung*. I reserve the right to answer *Vogt* in writing at a later date.”

The present publication will make it clear why I chose to answer *Karl Vogt* in writing, while challenging the *National-Zeitung* through the courts.

During February 1860 I went ahead with the libel action against the *National-Zeitung*.^b On October 23 of this year, after the case had gone through four preliminary stages, I received a ruling from the Royal Prussian Supreme Tribunal definitively refusing me permission to put my case and so dismissing my action before it could be heard in open court. Had the latter come to pass, as I had a right to expect, I would have been spared the necessity of writing the first third of the present pamphlet. A straightforward reproduction of the verbatim report of the court proceedings would have been quite sufficient and I would have been spared the hateful task of having to answer accusations directed at my

^a See this volume, pp. 12-13.—*Ed.*

^b See Marx’s letters to Legal Counsellor Weber dated February 13, 21 and 24, 1860 (present edition, Vol. 41), and this volume, pp. 19-20.—*Ed.*

own person and therefore of having to speak about myself. I have always taken such pains to avoid this that Vogt could well expect his cock-and-bull stories to have some success. However, *sunt certi denique fines*.^a Vogt's concoction, summarised by the *National-Zeitung* in its own fashion, accused me of a series of dishonourable actions which require a literary refutation now that the road to a *public* rebuttal in the courts has been definitively barred. But even apart from this consideration, which left me no alternative, I had other reasons, since in any case I had to deal with Vogt's tall stories about me and my party comrades, for examining them in greater detail. On the one hand, there was the almost unanimous jubilation with which the so-called liberal German press greeted his alleged revelations. On the other hand, the analysis of his concoction presented me with the opportunity to dissect an individual who stands for a whole trend.

My reply to Vogt has forced me in a number of places to expose a *partie honteuse*^b in the history of the emigration. In doing so I am only making use of the right to "self-defence". Moreover, except for a few persons, the emigration can be reproached with nothing worse than indulging illusions that were more or less justified by the circumstances of the period, or perpetrating follies which arose necessarily from the extraordinary situation in which it unexpectedly found itself. I am speaking here, of course, only of the early years of the emigration. A comparative history, say from 1849 to 1859, of governments and of bourgeois society on the one hand and the emigration on the other, would constitute the most outstanding apologia of the latter that could possibly be written.

I know in advance that the same astute men who shook their heads sagely at the importance of Vogt's "revelations", when his concoction first appeared, will now be unable to comprehend why I am wasting my time refuting his childish allegations; while the "liberal" pen-pushers who gloatingly took up Vogt's commonplaces and worthless lies and hastened to hawk them around the German, Swiss, French and American press will now find my mode of dealing with themselves and their hero outrageously offensive. But never mind!^c

The political and legal aspects of the present work require no prefatory comment. I would only make one point to avoid possible

^a There are certain limits after all (Horace, *Satires*, Book I, Satire 1).— *Ed.*

^b A disgraceful affair.— *Ed.*

^c Marx uses the English phrase.— *Ed.*

misunderstandings: men who even before 1848 agreed that the independence of Poland, Hungary and Italy has to be upheld not only as the *right* of the nations concerned, but also in the *interests* of Germany and Europe, came to advance wholly opposed ideas about the tactics to be adopted by Germany *vis-à-vis* Louis Bonaparte in connection with the Italian war of 1859.¹³ This clash of opinions sprang from conflicting assessments of the *facts of the underlying situation* which it will be the prerogative of a later age to resolve. For my part, I am concerned here only with the opinions of *Vogt* and his clique. Even the views he *claimed* to uphold, and in the *fantasy* of an uncritical rabble did uphold, actually fall outside the scope of my criticism. I deal only with the views he *really* upheld.

In conclusion I wish to express my sincere gratitude for the ready assistance I have received while writing this pamphlet, not only from long-standing friends in the party, but also from many members of the emigration in Switzerland, France and England with whom I had earlier not been at all close and some of whom I still do not personally know.

London, November 17, 1860

Karl Marx

I

THE BRIMSTONE GANG¹⁴

Clarín: Malas pastillas gasta;
hase untado
 Con unguento de azufre.
 (Calderón)^a

The “*well-rounded character*”,^b as the barrister *Hermann* so delicately described his spherical client, the hereditary Vogt of Noughtborough,¹⁵ to the District Court in Augsburg, the “*well-rounded character*” begins his enormous travesty of history^c as follows:

“Among the refugees of 1849 the term **Brimstone Gang**, or else the no less characteristic name of the **Bristlers**,^d referred to a number of people who after being scattered throughout Switzerland, France and England gradually congregated in London, and there they revered Herr *Marx* as their visible leader. The political principle of these fellows was the dictatorship of the proletariat, etc.” (*Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung* by Karl Vogt, Geneva, December 1859, p. 136).

The “*Magnum Opus*”¹⁶ into which this momentous piece of information had found its way appeared in December 1859. Eight months earlier, however, in May 1859, our “*well-rounded character*” had published an article in the Biel *Handels-Courier* which must be regarded as an *outline* of the more extensive travesty of history. Let us consider the *original text*:

“Ever since the failure of the revolution of 1849,” so brags our *Commis voyageur* from Biel, “a clique of refugees has gradually congregated in London, whose

^a He’s free with empty phrases: ... he has smeared himself with sulphur ointment (*El Mágico prodigioso*, Act 2).—*Ed.*

^b Here and below Marx puns on the phrase *abgerundete Natur* which can mean both “a well-rounded character” (in the physical sense) and “an intellectually mature character”. In his speech of October 24, 1859 the barrister *Hermann* used the phrase in the latter sense (see Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess* ..., S. 17).—*Ed.*

^c Cf. Johann Fischart, *Affentheurliche, Naupengeheurliche Geschichtklitterung*.—*Ed.*

^d See this volume, pp. 38-40.—*Ed.*

members were in those days (!) known among *the Swiss emigration* as the ‘*Bristlers*’ or the ‘*Brimstone Gang*’. Their leader is *Marx*, the former editor of the *Rheinische Zeitung* in Cologne—their slogan, ‘Social Republic, Workers’ Dictatorship’—their business, establishing contacts and hatching plots.”^a (Reprinted in the “Magnum Opus”, Section 3, Documents, No. 7, pp. 31, 32.)

In the course of eight months the clique of refugees known as the “Brimstone Gang” “among the Swiss emigration” has been transformed for the benefit of a larger public into a mass “scattered throughout Switzerland, France and England” and known as the “*Brimstone Gang*” “among the refugees” in general. It is the old story of the men in buckram of Kendal green, told so merrily by Karl Vogt’s prototype, the immortal Sir John Falstaff,^b whose zoological reincarnation has forfeited nothing as to *substance*. The original text of our *Commis voyageur* from Biel makes it quite obvious that both the “*Brimstone Gang*” and the “*Bristlers*” were local *Swiss* flora. Let us try and trace their natural history.

In February 1860, having learnt from friends that a refugee association by the name of “Brimstone Gang” had indeed flourished in Geneva in the years 1849-50 and that Herr *S. L. Borkheim*, a well-situated merchant in the City of London, could provide more exact information about the origins, growth and decline of that ingenious association, I wrote to that gentleman, who was not known to me at the time, and after a personal meeting I received from him the following sketch which I print without making any alterations.

“London, February 12, 1860
18 Union Grove, Wandsworth Road

“Dear Sir,

“Although, until three days ago, we had not met personally, despite having lived for nine years in the same country, and for the most part in the same town, you have rightly presumed that I, as a fellow-exile, would not refuse you the information you require.

“Very well then, here is what I know about the ‘*Brimstone Gang*’.

“In 1849, soon after we rebels had been forced out of Baden,¹⁷ a number of young men who as students, soldiers or businessmen had been on friendly terms in Germany before 1848, or who had become so during the revolution, gathered together in *Geneva* either of their own free will or else because they had been directed there by the Swiss authorities.

“The refugees were not in a very rosy mood. The so-called political leaders blamed each other for the failure; the military leaders criticised each other’s

^a Karl Vogt, “Zur Warnung”, dated May 23, published in the *Schweizer Handels-Courier*, No. 150 (special supplement), June 2, 1859. Sometimes Marx ironically refers to this newspaper as the Biel *Commis voyageur*.—*Ed.*

^b Shakespeare, *Henry IV*, Part I, Act II, Scene 4.—*Ed.*

retrograde attacking movements, flanking manoeuvres and offensive withdrawals; people began to call each other names such as bourgeois republicans, socialists and communists; there was a flood of pamphlets, which did nothing to restore peace; spies were thought to be everywhere and, in addition to all this, the clothes of the majority gradually turned to rags and the signs of hunger could be seen on many faces. In the midst of this misery the young people referred to above held together in friendship. They were:

“*Eduard Rosenblum*, born in Odessa of German parents; he had studied medicine in Leipzig, Berlin and Paris.

“*Max Cohnheim* from Fraustadt; he had been an office-boy, and on the outbreak of the revolution, he was doing a year as a volunteer in the artillery guards.

“*Korn*, a chemist and pharmacist from Berlin.

“*Becker*, an engineer from the Rhineland.

“And *myself*, who, after matriculating from the Werder school in Berlin in 1844, had studied in Breslau,^a Greifswald and Berlin and was serving as a gunner in my home town of Glogau when the 1848 revolution began.

“I think none of us was more than 24 years old. We lived close together, for a time indeed in the Grand Pré, all in the same house. Finding ourselves in a small country that presented so little opportunity for earning a living, our chief occupation was to keep ourselves from being too much depressed and demoralised by the general misery of refugee life and political dejection. The climate and the surrounding country were glorious—we did not belie our Brandenburg origins and accents and found the place ‘luv’ly’ [fanden die *Jegend jottvoll*]^b. What belonged to one of us, the others had too, and if none of us had anything we could always find good-natured innkeepers and other friendly souls who took pleasure in lending us money on the strength of our young, vivacious faces. We really must have looked an honest set of madcaps! I must make specific thankful mention here of Bertin, the owner of the Café de l’Europe who was truly *indefatigable* in supplying us on tick, and not only us but also many other German and French refugees. In 1856, after six years’ absence, I visited Geneva on my way back from the Crimea in order, with the piety of a well-intentioned tourist, to repay my debts. Our good old fat Bertin was amazed and assured me that I was the first person to give him this pleasure, but that he did not regret the 10,000-20,000 francs still owing to him from the refugees who were by now long since scattered to the four corners of the globe. Never mentioning the money they owed him, he asked with special affection about the fate of those I had been closest to. Unfortunately there was little I could tell him.

“I return from this digression to the year 1849.

“In those days we drank merrily and sang joyfully. I remember seeing refugees of every political shade and colour at our table, including Frenchmen and Italians. Convivial evenings spent in such *dulci jubilo*¹⁸ seemed to everyone like veritable oases amidst the otherwise barren wastes of refugee life. Even those of our friends who sat on the Grand Council of Geneva, or were later to do so, would occasionally join our revels for the sake of a little relaxation.

“*Liebknecht*, who is now here and whom I have only seen three or four times in last nine years, having met him each time by chance in the street, was a frequent member of the company. Students, doctors, former friends from school and university, touring on holiday, would often drink their way through many

^a The Polish name is Wrocław.—*Ed.*

^b Berlin dialect.—*Ed.*

glasses of beer and many a bottle of that good, cheap Mâcon. Sometimes we would spend days and even weeks on the Lake of Geneva without once going on shore; we sang old love-songs and, guitar in hand, paid court beneath the windows of the villas on both the Savoy and Swiss sides.

"I shall not conceal the fact that our wild behaviour occasionally brought us into collision with the police. On such occasions that dear man, the late *Albert Galeer*, who was a by no means insignificant opponent of Fazy's among the Genevan citizenry, would read us a sermon, though in the kindest manner possible. 'You are wild lads,' he would say, 'but it is true that to have such a sense of humour amid the miseries of exile shows that you are no weaklings, either in mind or body—a certain flexibility is indispensable.' The good-natured man found it hard to rebuke us more severely than that. He was a Grand Councillor of the Canton of Geneva.

"To the best of my knowledge only one duel took place at the time, and that was fought with pistols by a Herr R...n and myself. But the quarrel was not political. My second was a Genevan in the artillery who spoke nothing but French, and *Oskar Galeer* acted as adjudicator. He was the Grand Councillor's brother, a young man who unfortunately later died prematurely of a nervous disease while still a student in Munich. A second duel, also unpolitical in origin, was to have taken place between Rosenblum and a refugee lieutenant von F...g from Baden, who returned home soon after and, I believe, rejoined the resuscitated Baden army. On the morning fixed for the battle the quarrel was settled amicably before a blow was struck thanks to the intervention of Herr Engels¹⁹—presumably the same man who is now said to be in Manchester and whom I have not seen again since those days. This Herr Engels was *passing* through Geneva and we drank many bottles of wine in his entertaining company. The acquaintance with him was very welcome to us, if I recollect rightly, especially because we could allow his purse to take charge of the proceedings.

"We were associated neither with the so-called blue or red²⁰ republicans, nor with the socialist or communist party leaders. We reserved the right to form our own opinions freely and independently (I will not say always correctly) about the political activities of Imperial Regents, members of the Frankfurt Parliament²¹ and other speech-making bodies, about generals of the revolution no less than the corporals and Dalai Lamas of communism. For this reason as well as for other reasons which diverted us we even founded a weekly paper entitled

RUMMELTIPUFF

*Organ of Rapsallionocracy**

"The paper only survived two issues. Later, when I was arrested in France prior to being deported to this country, the French police confiscated my papers and diaries and I can no longer remember clearly whether it was official ban or lack of funds that brought about the paper's demise.

"To the 'philistines'—and they were to be found in the ranks of the so-called bourgeois republicans as well as among the so-called communist workers^a—we were known as the '*Brimstone Gang*'. I sometimes imagine that we must have given

* "If my memory serves me right, this epithet had been applied to all the liberal parties in the Parliament of one of the German petty principalities, or in the Frankfurt Parliament. We wished to immortalise it." (*Borkheim*).

^a This presumably refers to the advocates of utopian workers' communism.—*Ed.*

the name to ourselves. At any rate it was only attached to us in its cosy German sense. I am on the friendliest terms with fellow-exiles, who are friends of Herr Vogt, and with others who were, and probably still are, friends of yours. But I rejoice to say that I have never found the members of what I have called the 'Brimstone Gang' referred to by anyone in a disrespectful tone in connection with either political or private matters.

"This 'Brimstone Gang' is the only one known to me. It existed in Geneva from 1849 to 1850. The few members who constituted this dangerous band were compelled, with the exception of Korn, to leave Switzerland in the middle of 1850, as they belonged to the category of undesirable aliens. Our departure meant the end of the 'Brimstone Gang'. I know nothing of other 'Brimstone Gangs', or whether other groups went by the name anywhere else, nor what goals they might have been pursuing.

"Korn remained, I believe, in Switzerland and is said to have settled down as a pharmacist. Cohnheim and Rosenblum went to Holstein before the battle of Idstedt²² in which, I believe, both took part. Later, in 1851, they sailed to America. Rosenblum returned to England at the end of the same year and left again in 1852 for Australia and I have heard nothing more of him since 1855. Cohnheim is said to have been for some time now editor of the *New-Yorker Humorist*. Becker likewise emigrated to America in 1850. Unfortunately I have no definite subsequent news of him.

"I myself stayed in Paris and Strasbourg during the winter of 1850-51 and, as I mentioned earlier, in February 1851 the French police sent me to England by brute force—for three months I was dragged from one prison to the other, 25 in all, and for the most part in heavy iron chains while *en route*. I now live here where, having devoted the first year to learning the language, I am engaged in business. My interest in the course of political events in my native land is as persistent and lively as ever, but I have held aloof from all the activities of the political cliques among the refugees. I am doing tolerably well or, as the English would say: Very well, sir, thank you.—You have only yourself to blame if I have made you wade through this long and at all events not very important story.

"I remain, Sir, your humble servant,

Sigismund L. Borkheim"

Thus far Herr Borkheim's letter. In anticipation of its historical significance the "Brimstone Gang" took the precaution of carving its own civic register into the Book of History. For the first issue of the *Rummeltipuff* is adorned by woodcut portraits of its founders.

The prodigies of the "Brimstone Gang" had taken part in Struve's republican putsch of September 1848. They then sat in Bruchsal Gaol until May 1849²³ and finally fought as combatants in the campaign for the Imperial Constitution, and as a result were pushed across the Swiss frontier. At some point in 1850 two of their matadors, Cohnheim and Rosenblum, arrived in London where they "congregated" around Herr *Gustav Struve*. I did not have the honour of a personal acquaintance with them. But they established contact with me politically by attempting to form a

counter-committee²⁴ under Struve's leadership in opposition to the London Refugee Committee²⁵ which was directed at the time by Engels, Willich, myself and others. Their manifesto, hostile to us, appeared in the Berlin *Abend-Post* and elsewhere over the signatures of Struve, Rosenblum, Cohnheim, Bobzin, Grunich and Oswald.

In the heyday of the Holy Alliance the *Charcoal Gang* (or Carbonari²⁶) was a mine richly productive of police activities and aristocratic fantasies. Was it the intention of our Imperial Gorgellantua^a to exploit the "Brimstone Gang" in the same way as the Charcoal Gang had been exploited for the benefit of ye olde Teutonic burghers? If there were a *Saltpeper Gang*, it would round off the policemen's Trinity. Possibly, also, *Karl Vogt* is averse to brimstone because he cannot take the smell of gunpowder. Or is it that, like other patients, he cannot endure a medicine specific to his disease? It is well known that the magic Dr. *Rademacher* classifies diseases according to their antidotes.²⁷ The category of sulphur diseases would include what Hermann, the barrister in the District Court in Augsburg, referred to as his client's "*well-rounded character*",^b what Rademacher calls a "drum-like distension of the peritoneum", and what the even greater Dr. Fischart describes as "the great vaulted belly from France".^c Thus all Falstaffian natures suffered from the sulphur disease in more than one sense. Or can it be that *Vogt's* zoological conscience has reminded him that sulphur is fatal to scab-mites, and that it is therefore utterly repugnant to scab-mites that have several times changed skin? For, as recent research has shown, only the mite that has shed its skin is capable of procreation and has therefore achieved self-awareness. What a charming contrast: *sulphur* on the one hand, the *self-aware scab-mite* on the other! But in any case, Vogt was obliged to prove to his "Emperor"^d and to the liberal Teutonic burghers that all disasters "since the failure of the revolution of 1849" stem from the *Brimstone Gang* in Geneva, rather than from the *December Gang* in Paris.²⁸ To punish me for my many outrages, committed over a period of years, against the head and members of the "Gang of December 10", Vogt

^a An allusion to Vogt. Gorgellantua or Gurgelgrosslinger=Gargantua. Gorgellantua occurs in Johann Fischart's adaptation of Rabelais' *Gargantua et Pantagruel*.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, p. 28.—*Ed.*

^c Johann Fischart, *Affentheurliche, Naupengeheurliche Geschichtklitterung...*, S. 130.—*Ed.*

^d Napoleon III.—*Ed.*

appointed me the leader of the Brimstone Gang which he has so reviled and which I had not heard of before the appearance of his "Magnum Opus". To render comprehensible the just indignation of this "agreeable companion"^a I may cite here some of the passages referring to the "December Gang" from my book *Der achtzehnte Brumaire des Louis Bonaparte*, New York, 1852. (Cf. loc. cit., pp. 31, 32 and 61, 62.^b)

"This gang²⁹ dates from the year 1849. On the pretext of founding a benevolent society, the lumpenproletariat of Paris had been organised into secret sections, each section being led by Bonapartist agents, with a Bonapartist general^c at the head of the whole. Alongside decayed aristocratic *roués* with dubious means of subsistence and of dubious origin, alongside ruined and adventurous offshoots of the bourgeoisie, were vagabonds, discharged soldiers, discharged jailbirds, escaped galley slaves, rogues, mountebanks, *lazzaroni*,³⁰ pickpockets, tricksters, gamblers, *maquereaus*,^d brothel-keepers, porters, casual labourers, organ-grinders, rag-pickers, knife-grinders, tinkers, beggars—in short, the whole indefinite, disintegrated mass, thrown hither and thither, which the French term *la bohème*; from this kindred element Bonaparte formed the core of the Gang of December 10. A 'benevolent society'—in so far as, like Bonaparte, all its members felt the need of benefiting themselves at the expense of the labouring nation.

"This Bonaparte, who constitutes himself chief of the lumpenproletariat, who here alone rediscovers in mass form the interests which he personally pursues, who recognises in this scum, offal, refuse of all classes the only class upon which he can base himself unconditionally, is the real Bonaparte, the Bonaparte *sans phrase*, unmistakable even when, later on, having become all-powerful, he pays his debt to a number of his former fellow-conspirators by decreeing their transportation to Cayenne along with the revolutionaries. An old crafty *roué*, he conceives the historical life of the nations and their performances of state [*Haupt- und Staatsaktionen*] as comedy in the most vulgar sense, as a masquerade where the grand costumes, words and postures merely serve to

^a Marx applies to Vogt the expression *angenehmer Gesellschafter* which the latter used in reference to Jérôme Napoleon (see Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess...*, Dokumente, S. 24).—*Ed.*

^b *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 148-49, 150, 195-97). In the extracts quoted here Marx leaves out a number of passages and slightly alters others.—*Ed.*

^c Jean Pierre Piat.—*Ed.*

^d Pimps.—*Ed.*

mask the pettiest knavery. Thus on his expedition to Strasbourg, where a trained Swiss vulture had played the part of the Napoleonic eagle. For his irruption into Boulogne he puts some London lackeys into French uniforms. They represent the army.³¹ In his Gang of December 10, he assembles 10,000 rogues who are to play the part of the people, as Nick Bottom that of the lion^a....

“What the national *ateliers* were for the socialist workers, what the *Gardes mobiles*³² were for the bourgeois republicans, the Gang of December 10, the party fighting force characteristic of Bonaparte, was for him. On his journeys the detachments of this gang packing the railways had to improvise a public for him, stage public enthusiasm, roar *vive l'Empereur*, insult and beat up republicans, of course under the protection of the police. On his return journeys to Paris they had to form the advance guard, forestall counter-demonstrations or disperse them. The Gang of December 10 belonged to him, it was *his* work, his very own idea. Whatever else he appropriates is put into his hands by the force of circumstances; whatever else he does, the circumstances do for him or he is content to copy from the deeds of others. But *he* with official phrases about order, religion, family and property in public, before the citizens, and with the secret society of the Schufferles and Spiegelbergs, the society of disorder, prostitution and theft, behind him—that is Bonaparte himself as original author, and the history of the Gang of December 10 is his own history....

“Bonaparte would like to appear as the patriarchal benefactor of all classes. But he cannot give to one class without taking from another. Just as at the time of the Fronde it was said of the Duke of Guise that he was the most *obligeant* man in France because he had turned all his estates into his partisans' obligations to him, so Bonaparte would fain be the most *obligeant* man in France and turn all the property, all the labour of France into a personal obligation to himself. He would like to *steal* the whole of France in order to be able to *make a present* of her to France, or, rather, in order to be able to *buy France anew* with French money, for as the chief of the Gang of December 10 he must needs buy what ought to belong to him. And all the state institutions, the Senate, the Council of State, the legislative body, the courts, the Legion of Honour, the soldiers' medals, the wash-houses, the public works,

^a The reference is to Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act I, Scene 2.—*Ed.*

the railways, the *état-major*^a of the National Guard excluding privates, and the confiscated estates of the House of Orleans—all become parts of the institution of purchase. Every place in the army and in the government machine becomes a means of purchase.

“But the most important feature of this process, whereby France is taken in order to be given back, is the percentages that find their way into the pockets of the head and the members of the Gang of December 10 during the transaction. The witticism with which Countess L.,^b the mistress of M. de Morny, characterised the confiscation of the Orleans estates: ‘*C’est le premier vol* de l’aigle*,’^c is applicable to every flight of this *eagle*, which is more like a *raven*. He himself and his adherents call out to one another daily like that Italian Carthusian admonishing the miser who, with boastful display, counted up the goods on which he could yet live for years to come: ‘*Tu fai conto sopra i beni, bisogna prima far il conto sopra gli anni.*’** Lest they make a mistake in the years, they count the minutes.

“A gang of shady characters push their way forward to the court, into the ministries, to the head of the administration and the army, a crowd of the best of whom it must be said that no one knows whence he comes, a noisy, disreputable, rapacious *bohème* that crawls into braided coats with the same grotesque dignity as the high dignitaries of Soulouque. One can visualise clearly this upper stratum of the Gang of December 10, if one reflects that Véron-Crevel*** is its preacher of morals and Granier de Cassagnac its thinker. When Guizot, at the time of his ministry, utilised this Granier on a hole-and-corner newspaper against the dynastic opposition, he used to boast of him with the quip: ‘*C’est le roi des drôles*,’ ‘he is the king of the buffoons.’^d One would do wrong to recall the Regency³⁴ or Louis XV in connection with

* *Vol* means flight and theft. [Note by Marx to *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*.]

** “Thou countest thy goods, thou shouldst first count thy years.” [Note by Marx to *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*.]

*** In his novel *Cousine Bette*, Balzac delineates the thoroughly dissolute Parisian philistine in Crevel, a character based on Dr. Véron, owner of the *Constitutionnel*. [Note by Marx to *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*.]

^a General Staff.—*Ed.*

^b Lehon.—*Ed.*

^c “It is the first flight (theft) of the eagle.”³³—*Ed.*

^d Quoted in the article by Emile Dupont. “Chronique de l’intérieur”, *La Voix du Proscrit*, No. 8, December 15, 1850, p. 118.—*Ed.*

Louis Bonaparte's court and clique. For 'often already, France has experienced a government of mistresses; but never before a government of *hommes entretenus*.'...*^a

"Driven by the contradictory demands of his situation and being at the same time, like a conjurer, under the necessity of keeping the public gaze fixed on himself, as Napoleon's substitute, by springing constant surprises, that is to say, under the necessity of executing a coup d'état *en miniature* every day, Bonaparte throws the entire bourgeois economy into confusion, violates everything that seemed inviolable to the Revolution of 1848, makes some tolerant of revolution, others desirous of revolution, and produces actual anarchy in the name of order, while at the same time stripping its halo from the entire state machine, profanes it and makes it at once loathsome and ridiculous. The cult of the Holy Coat of Trier³⁵ he duplicates in Paris with the cult of the Napoleonic imperial mantle. But when the imperial mantle finally falls on the shoulders of Louis Bonaparte, the bronze statue of Napoleon will crash from the top of the Vendôme Column."³⁶

* The words quoted are those of Madame Girardin. [Note by Marx to *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*.]

^a *Hommes entretenus*: kept men.—Ed.

II

THE BRISTLERS

“But, sirrah, there’s no room for faith, truth, nor honesty in this bosom of thine; it is all filled up with guts and midriff.”

(Shakespeare)^a

“*Bristlers*” or “*Brimstone Gang*” is what it says in the original Biel gospel (“Magnum Opus”, Documents, p. 31). “*Brimstone Gang*” or else “*Bristlers*” is what we find in the “Magnum Opus” (p. 136).^b

According to both versions the “Brimstone Gang” and the “Bristlers” are one and the same gang. The “Brimstone Gang” was, as we have seen, dead and buried by the middle of 1850. Therefore the “Bristlers” too? Our “well-rounded character” is the civilising agent attached to the December Gang, and civilisation, according to Fourier, is distinguished from barbarism by the fact that in it lies simple are replaced by lies composite.^c

Our “composite” Imperial Falstaff informs us (“Magnum Opus”, p. 198) that a certain *Abt* is the “lowest of the low”. What admirable self-effacement: Vogt puts himself in the positive, but his *Abt* in the superlative, appointing him, as it were, his Field Marshal Ney. When Vogt’s original gospel appeared in the Biel *Commis voyageur*,^d I requested the editors of *Das Volk*³⁷ to reprint the original rigmarole without further comment. Despite this they followed the reprint with this note:

“The above rigmarole stems from the pen of a dissolute creature called *Abt*, who, eight years ago in Geneva, was unanimously found guilty of a variety of

^a Henry IV, Part I, Act III, Scene 3. Marx quotes in English.—*Ed.*

^b Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess...*, S. 31, 136.—*Ed.*

^c Charles Fourier, *Théorie de l'unité universelle. Oeuvres complètes*, Vol. 2, Paris, 1843, pp. 78-79, and Vol. 5, Paris, 1841, pp. 213-14.—*Ed.*

^d Marx means Karl Vogt’s article “Zur Warnung” in the *Schweizer Handels-Courier*, No. 150 (special supplement), June 2, 1859 (see this volume, p. 29).—*Ed.*

dishonourable actions by a court of honour of German refugees" (*Das Volk*, No. 6, June 11, 1859).

The editors of *Das Volk* took Abt for the author of Vogt's original rigmarole; they forgot that Switzerland had two Richmonds in the field,³⁸ a Vogt, as well as an Abt.

In the spring of 1851, then, the "lowest of the low" invented the "Bristlers", whom Vogt pilfered from his Field Marshal in the autumn of 1859. The sweet habit of plagiarism acquired in making books on natural history instinctively clings to him in those dealing with his police activities. For a time the President of the Workers' Association in Geneva had been a brushmaker [*Bürstenmacher*] called *Sauernheimer*. Abt bisected *Sauernheimer's* profession and name, took the beginning of the former and the end of the latter and from the two halves thus obtained he ingeniously formed the whole: "*Bürstenheimer*" [Bristler]. This title he originally bestowed on *Sauernheimer*, as well as on his closest friends: *Kamm* from Bonn, a brushmaker by trade, and also **Ranickel**, a bookbinder's apprentice from Bingen. He appointed *Sauernheimer* general and *Ranickel* adjutant of the Bristlers, while *Kamm* became a Bristler *sans phrase*. Later, when two refugees belonging to the Workers' Association in Geneva, *Imandt* (who is at present professor at the college in Dundee) and *Schily* (a lawyer, formerly of Trier, now in Paris), brought about Abt's expulsion at the hands of a court of honour of the Association, Abt published an abusive pamphlet³⁹ in which he elevated the whole Workers' Association in Geneva to the rank of "Bristlers". It is clear, then, that there were Bristlers in general and Bristlers in particular. "Bristlers" in general included the Genevan Workers' Association, the same association which Vogt tricked into giving him a *testimonium paupertatis* which was published in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*^a at a time when he had been driven into a corner, the same association on which he fawned during the celebrations in memory of Schiller and Robert Blum (1859). "Bristlers" in particular were, as I have mentioned, *Sauernheimer*, who is totally unknown to me and who has never been to London; *Kamm* who, having been turned out of Geneva, went to the United States via London, where he looked up Kinkel and not me; and finally *Ranickel*, or **the Ranickel**,^b who remained as the adjutant of the

^a This refers to the declaration of the German Workers' Educational Association in West Switzerland printed in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 235, August 23, 1859.—*Ed.*

^b The name suggests *Ranunkel*=*ranunculus* and also, by metathesis, *Karnickel*=(1) rabbit and (2) a fool or Simple Simon. Marx puns below on *Ran-Igel*=*hedgehog*.—*Ed.*

Bristlers in Geneva where he “congregated” around our “well-rounded character”. And indeed, in his own person he represents the proletariat in Vogt’s eyes. As I shall have more to say about *the Ranickel* later on, here are a few preliminary facts about the beast. *Ranickel* took part in Hecker’s ill-starred campaign and after its defeat he joined the detachment of refugees under Willich in Besançon.⁴⁰ Still under Willich he went through the campaign for the Imperial Constitution after which he fled with him to Switzerland. Willich was in his eyes the communist Mohammed who would bring about the millennium with fire and sword. A vain, long-winded, foppish melodramatic actor, *the Ranickel* was more tyrannical than the tyrant. In Geneva he raged in a red fury against the “parliamentarians” in general and, like a second Tell, against the “Land-Vogt” in particular, whom he threatened to “strangle”. But when he was introduced to Vogt by Wallot, a refugee from the thirties and a boyhood friend of Vogt’s, *Ranickel*’s thirst for blood dissolved in the milk of human kindness.^a “*That fellow was the Vogt’s,*” as Schiller says.^b

The adjutant of the Bristlers became the adjutant of General Vogt, who has only failed to achieve military renown because Plon-Plon thought the Neapolitan captain *Ulloa* (another general by courtesy^c) bad enough for the task his “*corps de touristes*” had to perform in the Italian campaign, and so held his Parolles in reserve for the great adventure with “the lost drum” that will unfold on the Rhine.⁴¹ In 1859 Vogt promoted his *Ranickel* from the proletariat to the middle classes, obtained a business for him (*objets d’art*, bookbinding and stationery) and in addition procured for him the custom of the Geneva Government. The adjutant of the Bristlers now became Vogt’s “maid of all work”,^d his Cicisbeo, intimate friend, Leporello, confidant, correspondent, gossip-bearer and scandal-monger, but above all, after the Fall of our Fat Jack,^e he acted as his spy and as recruiting officer for Bonaparte among the workers. A Swiss paper recently reported the discovery of a third species of hedgehog, viz., the Ran or Rhine hedgehog [*Ran- oder Rhein-Igel*] which combines the qualities of both the canine and porcine varieties in itself and which has been found in

^a Marx uses the English phrase “the milk of human kindness” which comes from *Macbeth*, Act I, Scene 5.—*Ed.*

^b *Wilhelm Tell*, Act I, Scene 4.—*Ed.*

^c Marx uses the English phrase. For more about *Ulloa* see Engels’ letter written to Marx approximately July 23, 1860, present edition, Vol. 41.—*Ed.*

^d Marx uses the English phrase.—*Ed.*

^e Sir John Falstaff was addressed as Jack by his drinking mates.—*Ed.*

a hole on the River Arve, the country-seat of Humboldt-Vogt. Was this *Ran-Igel* aimed at our *Ranickel*?

N.B. The only refugee in Geneva with whom I had any contact was *Dr. Ernst Dronke*, a former co-editor of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*⁴² and at present a businessman in Liverpool. He was opposed to the activities of the "Bristlers".

The following letters from *Imandt* and *Schily* I would only preface with the remark that, on the outbreak of the revolution, *Imandt* left university in order to take part as a volunteer in the war in Schleswig-Holstein. In 1849 *Schily* and *Imandt* led the storming of the arsenal in Prüm⁴³ and from there they forced a passage to the Palatinate with their troops and the weapons they had seized. There they joined the ranks of the army of the Imperial Constitution. Having been expelled from Switzerland in the early summer of 1852 they made their way to London.

"Dundee, February 5, 1860

"Dear Marx,

"I am at a loss to understand how Vogt can attempt to connect you with affairs in Geneva. It was common knowledge among the refugees there that of all of us *only Dronke* was in communication with you. The *Brimstone Gang* was before my time and the only name I can recall in connection with it is *Borkheim*.

"The *Bristlers* were the Genevan Workers' Association. The name originated with *Abt*. At the time the Association served as nursery for *Willich's* secret league of which I was chairman. When, at my instigation, *Abt* was found by the Workers' Association, to which many refugees belonged, to be a scoundrel and unworthy to associate with refugees and workers, he published a lampoon shortly afterwards in which he accused *Schily* and myself of the absurdest crimes. Whereupon we revived the whole affair in a different place and before a completely different audience. He rejected our demand that he should come forward with proofs to back up his libellous allegations, and without its being necessary for *Schily* or myself to say a word in our own defence, *Dentzel* proposed a motion that *Abt* be declared an infamous slanderer. The motion was approved unanimously for a second time, on this occasion by a meeting of refugees consisting almost entirely of parliamentarians. I am sorry that my tale is so very meagre, but it is the first time in eight years that I have had cause to think back to all *that trash*. I would not like to be condemned to write about it and *I shall be most astonished if you can bring yourself to immerse your hand in such a brew*.

"Adieu,

Your *Imandt*"

A well-known Russian writer^a who had been on very friendly terms with Herr Vogt during his stay in Geneva, wrote to me very much along the lines of the concluding words of the above letter:

^a Nikolai Ivanovich Sazonov.—*Ed.*

“Paris, 10 Mai 1860

“Mon cher Marx!

“J’ai appris avec la plus vive indignation les calomnies qui ont été répandues sur votre compte et dont j’ai eu connaissance par un article de la *Revue contemporaine*, signé Édouard Simon.^a Ce qui m’a particulièrement étonné c’est que Vogt, que je ne croyais ni bête, ni méchant, ait pu tomber dans l’abaissement moral que sa brochure révèle. Je n’avais besoin d’aucun témoignage pour être assuré, que vous étiez incapable de basses et sales intrigues, et il m’a été d’autant plus pénible de lire ces diffamations que dans le moment même où on les imprimait, vous donniez au monde savant la première partie du beau travail^b qui doit renouveler la science économique et la fonder sur des nouvelles et plus solides bases... Mon cher Marx, ne vous occupez plus de toutes ces misères; tous les hommes sérieux, tous les hommes consciencieux sont pour vous, mais ils attendent de vous autre chose que des polémiques stériles; ils voudraient pouvoir étudier le plus tôt possible la continuation de votre belle œuvre.—Votre succès est immense parmi les hommes pensants et s’il vous peut être agréable d’apprendre le retentissement que vos doctrines trouvent en Russie, je vous dirai qu’au commencement de cette année le professeur—^c a fait à Moscou un cours public d’économie politique dont la première leçon n’a pas été autre chose que la paraphrase de votre récente publication.⁴⁴ Je vous adresse un numéro de *La Gazette du Nord*, où vous verrez combien votre nom est estimé dans mon pays. Adieu, mon cher Marx, conservez-vous en bonne santé et travaillez comme par le passé, à éclairer le monde, sans vous préoccuper des petites bêtises et des petites lâchetés. Croyez à l’amitié de votre dévoué...”^d

^a “Un tableau de moeurs politiques en Allemagne. Le procès de M. Vogt avec la gazette d’Augsbourg”, *Revue contemporaine*, February 15, 1860. For Marx’s analysis of this article see this volume, pp. 93-94, 112-13.—*Ed.*

^b The reference is to Marx’s work *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (see present edition, Vol. 30).—*Ed.*

^c Ivan Kondratyevich Babst.—*Ed.*

^d “My dear Marx, I have learnt with the greatest indignation of the slanders that have been circulated about you and of which I was apprised by an article in the *Revue contemporaine* signed by Édouard Simon. What has astonished me most of all is that Vogt whom I thought to be neither stupid nor malicious should have morally sunk so low as his pamphlet reveals. I need no evidence to persuade me that you are incapable of base and sordid intrigues and it was all the more painful to read these slanders when, at the very moment they were being printed, you were presenting to the learned world the first part of the admirable work which will give new life to the science of economics and provide it with new and more solid foundations.... My dear Marx, you must ignore all this wretched pettiness; all serious men, all scrupulous men are on your side, but they expect something other than sterile polemics from you; they would like to study the continuation of your admirable work as soon as possible.—Among thinking men your success is enormous, and if it gives you pleasure to hear of the echo your works have found in Russia, I can tell you that at the beginning of this year Professor—gave a course of public lectures on political economy in Moscow, the first hour of which was nothing but a paraphrase of your recent publication. I am sending you an issue of *La Gazette du Nord* from which you will be able to see how high your reputation stands in my

Szemere, the former Hungarian Minister, also wrote to me in similar vein:

“Vaut-il la peine que *vous* vous occupiez de toutes ces bavardises?”^a

I have briefly indicated in the Preface my reasons for immersing my hand in Vogt's brew (to use Imandt's forceful expression) despite these and similar attempts at dissuasion.

To return to our *Bristlers*. The following letter from *Schily* is printed here verbatim, not even omitting the parts that do not refer to “*nos moutons*”. I have however shortened the description of the Brimstone Gang since it would merely repeat what we already know from Borkheim's account, and certain other passages have been saved for *later* as I must to some extent treat “my agreeable subject” artistically and not blurt all my secrets out at once.

“Paris, February 8, 1860
46 Rue Lafayette

“Dear Marx,

“It was very agreeable to have a direct sign of life from you in the shape of your letter of January 31^b and you will find me all the more ready to give you the information you require about these episodes in Geneva as I intended to write to you about them *proprio motu*.^c The first thing that struck me, and not only me but also all my Geneva acquaintances here with whom I had occasion to discuss the matter, was that Vogt, as you write, lumps you together with people who are quite unknown to you. And so, in the interests of the truth, I had taken upon myself the task of conveying to you the relevant information about the ‘Bristlers’, the ‘Brimstone Gang’, etc. So you can see that both your questions: ‘(1) Who were the Bristlers and what were their activities? and (2) What was the Brimstone Gang, who belonged to it, what did they do?’ came at a very opportune moment. I must begin by pointing out, however, that you are guilty of an error in chronology, for priority belongs by rights to the *Brimstone Gang*. If it was Vogt's wish ‘to have a bit of fun’ and terrify the German philistines by conjuring up the devil or even by calling down fire and brimstone on their heads, he should have found rather more diabolical figures for his models than those harmless and jolly ale-house geniuses to whom we, the senior members of the Geneva emigration, used to refer jokingly and without any unfriendly ulterior motive as the Brimstone Gang, a title which they too accepted in good part. They were the merry sons of the Muses who had taken their *examina* and done their *exercitia practica* in the various South German putsches, finishing up in the campaign for the Imperial Constitution. After the failure they were gathering strength in Geneva in the company of their examiners and instructors in revolution for the time when business would be resumed.... It is country. Adieu, my dear Marx, keep in good health and labour as in the past for the enlightenment of the world without concerning yourself with petty stupidities and petty acts of cowardly malice. I remain your devoted friend...”—*Ed.*

^a “Is it really worth *your* while to bother your head with all this tittle-tattle?” (From *Szemere's* letter of February 5, 1860.)—*Ed.*

^b Marx's letter to *Schily* dated January 31 is not available.—*Ed.*

^c Of my own accord.—*Ed.*

obvious that anyone who either was never in Geneva or arrived there after the dissolution of the Gang could not have belonged to it. It was a purely local and ephemeral flora (a brimstone flora would be the right name for this corrosive substance), though probably because of the *Rummeltipuff* with its whiffs of revolution, it proved to have too strong a scent for Federal Swiss nerves. For Druey blew and the flower was scattered to the winds. It was not until a considerable period had elapsed that *Abt* came to Geneva, followed a few years later by *Cherval*, and while both of them smelled, 'each in his own way', it was not, as Vogt alleges, in that forgotten bouquet which had long since wilted and been torn apart.

"The activities of the Gang may be more or less summed up in the words: *toiling in the vineyard of the Lord*.^a In addition they edited the *Rummeltipuff* with its motto: 'Dwell in the land and thrive on *red wine*!'^b In it they exercised their wit and humour on everything under the sun: they denounced false prophets, flayed the parliamentarians (*inde irae*^c), and spared neither themselves nor us, their audience, but caricatured everyone whether friend or foe with an admirable conscientiousness and impartiality.

"I do not need to tell you that they had no connection with you and never wore your *Bundschuh*.^d Nor can I conceal from you the fact that that footwear would have been little to their taste. These soldiers of the revolution were for the time being lounging around in the slippers of the armistice until the revolution itself would reanimate them and re-equip them with its own buskin (the seven-league boots of resolute progress).^e And anyone who had been so bold as to disturb their siesta with Marxist political economy, workers' dictatorship, etc., would have been given a very cool reception indeed. For Heaven knows, the work *they* did required nothing further than a Master of Ceremonies and their economic researches were confined almost entirely to the 'jug' and its *reddish* contents. One of their members, Backfisch, an honest farrier from the Odenwald, once expressed the opinion that 'the right to work was all very well, but the duty to work was one he would prefer to be spared....'

"Let us then replace the sacrilegiously abused tombstone of the Brimstone Gang. To prevent any further desecration of their grave a Hafiz should be employed to sing the *requiescat in pace*.^d But, failing that, may they herewith accept this obituary *pro viatico et epitaphio*^e: "They knew the smell of powder.' Whereas their sacrilegious historiographer has merely managed to smell out brimstone.

"The *Bristlers* first emerged at a time when the Brimstone Gang only lived on verbally in legend, in the records of Genevan philistines and the hearts of Genevan beauties. The brushmakers and bookbinders, Sauernheimer, Kamm, Ranickel, etc., came into conflict with *Abt*. When *Imandt*, myself and others resolutely took their side we too became the targets of his hostility. *Abt* was then summoned to appear before a general assembly of refugees and members of the Workers' Association, combined to form a *cour des pairs*^f or a *haute cour de justice*.^g *Abt* did in fact appear

^a Matthew 20:4.—*Ed.*

^b A pun on Psalm 37:3. Proverbial (in German): "Dwell in the land and verily thou shalt be fed" (lit. "feed thyself honestly" in Luther's version). Schily replaced *redlich* (honestly) with *rötlich*, literally "reddish".—*Ed.*

^c Hence the outcry (Juvenal, *Satires*, Book I, Satire 1).—*Ed.*

^d Rest in peace. Psalms 4:9.—*Ed.*

^e For their extreme unction and epitaph.—*Ed.*

^f Court of peers.—*Ed.*

^g High court.—*Ed.*

and not only failed to provide proof of the accusations he had hurled at various people, but even declared quite openly that he had made them up quite arbitrarily, as reprisals for just as arbitrary accusations that his enemies had levelled at him: '*Tit for tat, reprisals make the world go round!*'—was his view of the matter. Having made a valiant plea for his system of tit for tat, thoroughly convincing the noble peers of the great practical advantages to be derived from it, and after proofs of the accusations against him had been brought, he was declared to have confessed his malicious slanders, was found guilty of the other misdeeds imputed to him and was formally outlawed. In revenge he christened the noble peers, originally only the above-named guild-members, the '*Bürstenheimers*' [Bristlers], which, as you see, is a happy combination of the trade and name of the first-named. You should revere him, therefore, as the progenitor of the family of Bürstenheim, without however your being in a position to claim to be one of or related to the clan, whether the term is applied to the guild or the peerage. For you ought to know that those of them that did busy themselves with 'organising the revolution' did so not as your supporters but as your opponents. They revered Willich as God the Father or as their Pope and anathematised you as the Antichrist or antipope, so that Dronke, who was regarded as your only supporter and *legatus a latere*^a in the diocese of Geneva, was excluded from all councils of the Church except the oenological ones, where he was *primus inter pares*. But the Bristlers, like the Brimstone Gang, were the merest Ephemeridae, and Druey had only to give one mighty puff and they scattered in all directions.

"The fact that a pupil of Agassiz^b should have got involved in these fossils of the Geneva emigration and have unearthed such fantastic tales as those served up in his pamphlet is the more astonishing since as regards the species of Bristleriana he actually possesses a perfect specimen in his own zoological cabinet in the shape of a mastodon of the order of ruminants: **Ranickel**, the very prototype of the Bristler. So the rumination seems to have been imperfectly performed, or else not properly studied by the above-mentioned pupil....

"There you have all you asked for *et au delà*.^c But now I too should like to ask you something, namely your opinion about the wisdom of introducing an inheritance tax *pro patria, vulgo*: for the state. It would form the state's principal source of income, eliminate the taxes which at present burden the poorer classes and of course would only apply in cases of sizeable estates.... Besides this inheritance tax I am interested in two German institutions: 'the consolidation of landed property' and 'mortgage insurance', institutions which I wish were better appreciated in this country. At the present time they are not at all understood, for the French in general, with but few exceptions, when they gaze across the Rhine see nothing but nebulosities and sauerkraut. An exception was provided recently by *L'Univers*^d which, after lamenting immoderately about the fragmentation of landed property, added quite correctly: 'Il serait désirable qu'on appliquât immédiatement les remèdes énergiques, dont une partie de l'Allemagne s'est servie avec avantage: le remaniement obligatoire des propriétés partout où les $\frac{7}{10}$ des propriétaires d'une commune réclament cette mesure. La nouvelle répartition facilitera le

^a Cardinal, emissary. Dronke was sent to Switzerland as an emissary of the Communist League in the summer of 1850.—*Ed.*

^b Vogt had been an assistant to the Swiss naturalist Agassiz.—*Ed.*

^c And more besides.—*Ed.*

^d The full title of the newspaper is *L'Univers religieux, philosophique, politique, scientifique et littéraire*.—*Ed.*

drainage, l'irrigation, la culture rationnelle et la voirie des propriétés.'^a On top of this comes *Le Siècle* which is in general somewhat myopic, but which is completely blind when it comes to consider German affairs, thanks to a chauvinism which it displays as proudly as Diogenes showed off his threadbare cloak—it serves up this stuff, disguised as patriotism, daily to its subscribers. This chauvinist, then, having fired off the obligatory salvo at *L'Univers*, its *bête noire*, went on to say: 'Propriétaires ruraux, suivez ce conseil! Empressez-vous de réclamer le remaniement obligatoire des propriétés; *dépouillez les petits au profit des grands*. O fortunatos nimium agricolos—trop heureux habitants des campagnes—sua si bona—s'ils connaissent l'avantage à remanier obligatoirement la propriété.'^b As if the large landowners could out-vote the smallholders where *each man* had a vote.

"For the rest I let God's water flow freely over His land, give unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's,^c and even 'the Devil's share',^d and remain your old affectionate friend,

Schily'

It follows from the foregoing that as there existed a "Brimstone Gang" in Geneva in 1849-50, and an association called the "Bristlers" in 1851-52, two societies connected neither with each other nor with myself, the revelations of our parliamentary clown about the existence of the "*Brimstone Gang or Bristlers*" are flesh of his flesh, a *lie* to the fourth power, "like the father that begets it: gross as a mountain, open, palpable".^e Just imagine a historian shameless enough to report: At the time of the first French Revolution there was a group of people known by the name of the "*Cercle social*"⁴⁷ **or else** by the no less characteristic title of "*Jacobins*".

As regards the life and deeds of the "*Brimstone Gang or Bristlers*" that he concocted, our merry joker was careful to keep the costs of their production down to a minimum. I shall give but a single instance of this:

"One of the chief occupations of the Brimstone Gang," the well-rounded one informs his astounded audience of philistines, "was to compromise people at home in Germany in such a way that they were forced to pay money and no longer resist the attempts to blackmail them" (a fine how-do-you-do⁴⁸; "they were forced to no longer

^a "It would be desirable that energetic remedies be introduced immediately, such as those that have proved so successful in part of Germany: the compulsory reorganisation of land holdings wherever it is demanded by $\frac{7}{10}$ of the owners in the community. The new distribution of land would facilitate drainage, irrigation, the rational exploitation of the land and the planning of roads."—*Ed.*

^b "Rural landowners, follow this advice! Hasten to demand the compulsory reorganisation of land holdings; *rob the small owners to enrich the large ones*. O fortunatos nimium agricolos—too happy country-dwellers—sua si bona—if they only knew the advantages of the compulsory reorganisation of land holdings." (The Latin expression quoted here is a paraphrase from Virgil's poem *Georgics*.)—*Ed.*

^c Matthew 22: 21.—*Ed.*

^d Shakespeare, *Henry IV*, Part I, Act I, Scene 2.—*Ed.*

^e *ibid.*, Act II, Scene 4.—*Ed.*

resist the attempts to blackmail them”), “in exchange for which the gang should preserve the secret of their having been compromised. Not just *one* letter, but *hundreds* were written to Germany by these men” (namely Vogt’s homunculi) “and all of them contained the naked threat that the person in question would be denounced for complicity in this or that act of revolution unless a certain sum of money had been received at a specified address by a given date” (“Magnum Opus”, p. 139).

Why did Vogt fail to print even “*one*” of these letters? Because the “Brimstone Gang” wrote “*hundreds*” of them. If threatening letters were as plentiful as blackberries^a Vogt would swear that we should have no threatening letter. If he were summoned to appear tomorrow before a court of honour of the Grütli Association⁴⁹ to give an account of the “hundreds” of “threatening letters”, he would instead of producing a single letter pull a bottle of wine from his jerkin, smack his lips, cock a snook and with a great belly-laugh worthy of Silenus, he would exclaim like his Abt: “Tit for tat, reprisals make the world go round.”

^a Adaptation of Falstaff’s “if reasons were as plentiful as blackberries” (Shakespeare, *Henry IV*, Part I, Act II, Scene 4).—*Ed.*

III

POLICE MATTERS

“Welch’ Neues Unerhörtes hat der Vogt
Sich ausgesonnen!”

(Schiller)^a

“I say quite bluntly,” says Vogt, striking the gravest pose of which such a buffoon is capable, “I say quite bluntly: Everyone who engages in political machinations with Marx and his associates will sooner or later fall into the hands of the police. For these machinations are no sooner under way than they are made known and betrayed to the secret police and hatched out by them as soon as the time appears to be ripe” (these machinations are eggs, it would seem, and the police are the broody hens that hatch them out). “The instigators, Marx & Co., are of course sitting in London out of reach” (while the police are sitting on the eggs). “I would not be at a loss to provide proofs of this assertion” (“Magnum Opus”, pp. 166, 167).^b

Vogt is not “at a loss” [*verlegen*], Falstaff was never “at a loss” either. As “mendacious” [*verlogen*] as you please, but “at a loss”? Come, your “proofs” [*Belege*], Jack, your “proofs”.^c

1. CONFESSION

“Marx himself says on p. 77 of his pamphlet *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne*,^d published in 1853: ‘After 1849 just as before 1848, only one path was open to the proletarian party—that of *secret association*. Consequently after 1849 a whole series of clandestine proletarian societies sprang up on the Continent, were *discovered by the police*, condemned by the courts, broken up by the gaols and *continually resuscitated* by the force of circumstances.’ Marx,” Vogt declares, “here euphemistically describes himself as ‘circumstance’” (“Magnum Opus”, p. 167).

Marx says, then, that “the police have discovered a whole series of secret societies since 1849” that were restored to life by the

^a “What new, unheard-of plan has Vogt invented now?” (*Wilhelm Tell*, Act I, Scene 3.)—*Ed.*

^b Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess...* The italics are Marx’s.—*Ed.*

^c Shakespeare, *Henry IV*, Part I, Act II, Scene 4.—*Ed.*

^d See present edition, Vol. 11, p. 446.—*Ed.*

force of circumstances. Vogt says it was *Marx* and not the “circumstances” that “resuscitated the secret societies”. Thus Vogt has furnished proof that whenever Badinguet’s police discovered Marianne,⁵⁰ Marx in collusion with Pietri set it up again.

“*Marx himself says.*” I shall now quote what Marx himself says in its proper context:

“With the defeat of the revolution of 1848-49 the party of the proletariat on the Continent lost use of the *press, freedom of speech and the right to associate*, i.e. the *legal instruments* of party organisation, which it had enjoyed for once during that short interval. The social status of the classes they represented enabled both the bourgeois-liberal and the petty-bourgeois democratic parties to remain united in one form or another and to assert their common interests more or less effectively despite the reaction. After 1849 just as before 1848, only *one* path was open to the *proletarian party*—that of *secret association*. Consequently after 1849 a whole series of clandestine proletarian societies sprang up on the Continent, were discovered by the police, condemned by the courts, broken up by the gaols and continually resuscitated by the force of circumstances. Some of these secret societies aimed directly at the overthrow of the existing state. This was fully justified in *France*.... Other secret societies aimed at organising the proletariat into a party, without concerning themselves with the existing governments. This was necessary in countries like *Germany*.... There is no doubt that here too the members of the proletarian party would take part once again in a revolution against the *status quo*, but it was no part of **their** task to prepare this revolution, to agitate, conspire or to plot for it.... The Communist League,⁵¹ therefore, was no conspiratorial society...” (*Revelations, etc.*,⁵² Boston edition, pp. 62, 63).^a

But our merciless Land-Vogt regards even “propaganda” as a crime, except of course for the propaganda organised by Pietri and Laity. Our Land-Vogt will even condone “agitation, conspiracy and plotting”, but only when its central office is in the Palais Royal⁵³ with Hearty Harry, Heliogabalus Plon-Plon. But “propaganda” among proletarians! Fie!

After the above-quoted passage, so significantly mutilated by our Examining Magistrate Vogt, I continue in the *Revelations* as follows:

^a See present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 445-46. Marx introduces additional italics and also bold type in quoting.—*Ed.*

“It is self-evident that a secret society of this kind” (like the *Communist League*) “[...] could have had but few attractions for individuals who on the one hand concealed their personal insignificance by strutting around in the theatrical cloak of the conspirator, and on the other wished to satisfy their narrow-minded ambition on the day of the next revolution, and who wished above all to seem important at the moment, to snatch their share of the proceeds of demagoguery and to find a welcome among the quacks and charlatans of democracy. Thus a group broke off from the *Communist League*, or if you like it was broken off, a group that demanded, if not real conspiracies, at any rate the *appearance* of conspiracies, and accordingly called for a direct alliance with the democratic heroes of the hour; this was the Willich-Schapper group. It was typical of them that Willich was, together with *Kinkel*, one of the *entrepreneurs* in the business of the German-American Revolutionary Loan”⁵⁴ (pp. 63, 64).^a

And how does Vogt translate this passage into his “euphemistic” police mumbo-jumbo? Listen:

“As long as *both* (parties) “cooperated, they worked, as *Marx himself says*, to create secret societies and to **compromise societies and individuals on the Continent**” (p. 171).

Our fat rascal forgets only to quote the page in the *Revelations* where Marx “*of course says this himself*”.

“Egli è bugiardo e padre di menzogna.”^b

2. THE REVOLUTIONARY CONGRESS IN MURTEN

“Charles the Bold”, our “bold Charles”, *vulgo* Karl Vogt, now delivers his account of the defeat of Murten.⁵⁵

“Large numbers of workers and refugees were cajoled and bullied”—namely by *Liebknecht*—“until finally [...] it was agreed that there should be a *revolutionary congress* in Murten. The delegates of the branch societies were to assemble there *in secret* in order to confer about the *final organisation of the League* and the *exact moment for the armed uprising*. All preparations were made in *absolute secrecy*, the summonses were conveyed *only* by *Liebknecht*’s trusted friends and correspondents. The delegates converged on Murten from *all sides, on foot, by boat and by carriage*, and were immediately welcomed by gendarmes, who knew in advance about the *whats, the whys and the hows*. The whole company that had been arrested *in this manner* was detained for a while in the Augustinian monastery in Fribourg and then transported to England and America. Herr *Liebknecht* was treated with quite *exceptional* consideration” (“Magnum Opus”, p. 168).

^a See present edition, Vol. 11, p. 449.—*Ed.*

^b “‘Twas said he was a liar and the father of lies” (Dante, *The Divine Comedy*, Inferno, Canto XXIII).—*Ed.*

“Herr Liebknecht” had taken part in Struve’s putsch in September 1848, then was kept in Baden gaols until the middle of May 1849, was freed as a result of the military insurrection in Baden, served as a common soldier in the Baden People’s Artillery, was incarcerated once more as a rebel in the casemates in Rastatt by Vogt’s friend Brentano; having been freed again during the campaign for the Imperial Constitution he joined the division commanded by Johann Philipp Becker and finally crossed the French border with Struve, Cohnheim, Korn and Rosenblum from where they made their way to Switzerland.

At the time I knew even less about “Herr Liebknecht” and his Swiss “revolutionary congresses” than about the drinking-meetings with mine host Benz in Kessler Street in Berne where the assembled parliamentarians regaled each other with the speeches they had made in St. Paul’s Church,⁵⁶ counted and distributed future posts of the Empire among themselves, and helped to while away the hard night of exile by listening to the lies, farces, ribaldry and rodomontades of Charles the Bold who, not without a touch of humour, awarded himself the letters patent of “*Imperial Wine Bibber*” in honour of an old German lay.

The “lay” begins with these words:

“Swaz ich trinken’s hân gesêhen,
 daz ist gar von kinden geschêhen:
 ich hân einen swêlch gesêhen,
 dem wil ich meisterschêfte jêhen.
 “Den dûhten becher gar entwiht,
 êr wolde nâpf noch kophe niht.
 êr tranc ûz grôzen kânnen.
 êr ist vor allen mannen
 ein vorlauf allen swêlhen
 “von ûren und von êlhen
 wart solcher slûnd nie niht getân.”^a

^a “The drink and drinking I have seen
 Are fit alone for callow youth,
 But one great tippler has there been
 Fit to wear the crown in truth.
 “Normal cups he had forsworn,
 Pots and jugs he’d laugh to scorn,
 He would guzzle tankards tall,
 The staunchest drinkers he would balk,
 He was the greatest of them all.
 “Neither bison nor the elk
 Could quaff their drink in such a gulp.”

(From the thirteenth-century comic poem “Weinschwelg”. Marx quotes in Middle High German.)—*Ed.*

But to return to the “revolutionary congress” in Murten. “Revolutionary congress”! “*Final* organisation of the League”! “Moment for the armed uprising”! “*Absolutely secret* preparations”! “*Very secret* meeting converging from all sides on foot, by boat and by carriage”! “Charles the Bold” evidently did not study my analysis of Stieber’s methods in the *Revelations* without profit.

The facts of the matter are simply these: Liebknecht was—early in 1850—the President of the Geneva Workers’ Association. He proposed a union of all the hitherto unconnected German workers’ associations in Switzerland. The proposal was accepted. Whereupon it was decided to send a circular to twenty-four different workers’ associations, inviting them to Murten to discuss the problems of the intended organisation and of establishing a joint newspaper. The debates in the Geneva Workers’ Association, the circular, the discussions of the latter in the other twenty-four workers’ associations—all this was done *in public* and the congress at Murten was likewise arranged *in full view of the public*. Had the Swiss authorities desired to ban it they could have done so four weeks before it was due to be held. But the liberal Herr *Druvey*, who was on the look-out for a victim he could devour and thus placate the sabre-rattling Holy Alliance, preferred to have his police stage a *coup de théâtre*. Liebknecht, who as President of the Workers’ Association had signed the document proclaiming the congress, was accorded the honour of being regarded as one of the chief ringleaders. He was separated from the other delegates, was granted free lodging in the uppermost turret of the tower in Fribourg, from where he enjoyed a fine view of the surrounding country, and he even had the privilege of walking for an hour each day upon the battlements. The only special feature of the way he was treated was the fact of solitary confinement. His repeated request to be allowed to join the other prisoners was repeatedly rejected. Vogt, however, knows full well that the police do not put their “*moutons*”^a in solitary confinement, but place them as “agreeable companions” among the mass.

Two months later Liebknecht, together with a certain Gebert, was transported by the Fribourg Chief of Police to Besançon, where both he and his companion received a compulsory French passport to London, with the warning that if they deviated from the prescribed route they would be deported to Algiers. As a result of this unexpected journey Liebknecht lost most of the

^a Spies.—*Ed.*

personal effects he had in Geneva. Apart from this, however, Messrs. Castella, Schaller and the other members of the then Fribourg Government are to be commended for their humane treatment of Liebknecht and the other prisoners of Murten. These gentlemen were mindful of the fact that they themselves had been captive or on the run but a few years before and they openly expressed the disgust they felt at being obliged to execute the orders of the Grand Cophta Druely.⁵⁷ The captive refugees were not given the *kind* of treatment that the refugee "parliamentarians" had expected. A certain Herr H., an associate of the parliamentarians who is still in Switzerland, felt it incumbent on himself to publish a pamphlet in which he denounced the prisoners in general and Liebknecht in particular for upholding "revolutionary" ideas that exceeded the limits of parliamentary reason. And it seems that "Charles the Bold" is still inconsolable about the "quite exceptional consideration" accorded to Lieb-knecht.

Plagiarism is a general characteristic of all the concoctions of our "bold hero", and this one is no exception. For the Swiss liberals invariably "liberalised" their acts of expulsion by accusing their victims of spying. After *Fazy* had expelled *Siruve* he denounced him publicly as a "Russian spy". Likewise *Druely*, who accused *Boichot* of being a French *mouchard*. *Tourte* slandered *Schily* in a similar manner after he had suddenly had him arrested in the street in Geneva and sent to the *tour des prisons* in Berne. "*Le commissaire maire fédéral Monsieur Kern exige votre expulsion*"^a was the reply of the high and mighty *Tourte* when *Schily* asked the reason for the brutal treatment meted out to him. *Schily*: "*Alors mettez-moi en présence de Monsieur Kern.*"^b *Tourte*: "*Non, nous ne voulons pas que M. le commissaire fédéral fasse la police à Genève.*"^c The logic of this reply was altogether worthy of the letter this same *Tourte*, who was then Swiss Ambassador in Turin, wrote to the President of the Confederation^d informing him that Cavour was working with might and main to prevent the cession of Savoy and Nice at a time when this cession was already a *fait accompli*. But it is possible that certain diplomatic railway

^a "The Federal Commissioner, Mayor Kern, demands your expulsion."—*Ed.*

^b "Very well, then, take me to M. Kern."—*Ed.*

^c "No, no, we won't have the Federal Commissioner playing policeman in Geneva."—*Ed.*

^d See *Correspondence Respecting the Proposed Annexation of Savoy and Nice to France...*, No. 34, p. 34, Hudson to Russell, received February 16, 1860.—*Ed.*

connections were responsible for the failure of Tourte's normal discernment at the time. Scarcely was Schily locked up in the severest solitary confinement in Berne when Tourte began to "liberalise" his police brutality by whispering in the ears of German refugees (Dr. Fink, for example) that "Schily had secretly been in contact with Kern and had sent him information about refugees in Geneva, etc." The Geneva paper *Indépendant* itself included among the notorious sins of the Geneva Government of the day "the systematic calumny of the refugees, which has been raised to the level of a principle of state". (See Appendix I.)

At the very first representations of the German police, Swiss liberalism violated the right of asylum by driving out the so-called "leaders"—and this right of asylum had just been granted on condition that the remnant of the revolutionary army would refrain from fighting a last battle on Baden soil. But later, after the "leaders", it was the turn of the "misguided led". Thousands of Baden soldiers were given passports for home on false pretences and when they arrived there they were immediately welcomed by gendarmes, who knew in advance about "the whats, the whys and the hows". Then came the threats of the Holy Alliance and with them the police farce in *Murten*. But even the "liberal" Federal Council⁵⁸ did not venture to go as far as the "bold Charles". Nothing at all about "revolutionary congress", "final organisation of the League", "exact moment for the armed uprising". The investigation which for propriety's sake had to be started, vanished into thin air.

"Threats of war" from abroad and "political-propagandistic tendencies", that was all the "embarrassed" Federal Council could stutter by way of excuse in its official report. (See Appendix 2.) The grand police actions of "Swiss liberalism" did not cease with the "revolutionary congress in Murten". On January 25, 1851 my friend Wilhelm Wolff ("Parliamentary Wolf" as he was known among the "Parliamentary Sheep") wrote to me from Zurich:

"The recent measures taken by the Federal Council have reduced the number of refugees from 11,000 to 500, and the Council will not rest until the remnant has been harried out of the country too, leaving only those who possess either a considerable fortune or powerful connections."

The refugees who had fought for the revolution stood in the most natural opposition to the heroes of St. Paul's Church who had talked it into the grave. The latter did not scruple to deliver their opponents into the hands of the Swiss police.

Vogt's loyal follower, the *Ranickel* monstrosity, himself wrote to *Schily* after the latter's arrival in London:

"Try to keep a few columns open in one of the Belgian newspapers for explanations, and do not fail to make the life of those *rascally German dogs* (the parliamentarians) in America miserable for having **sold themselves to that goitrous diplomat** (*Druey*)."

It is now apparent what "Charles the Bold" meant when he said:

"I was labouring *with all my strength* to set limits to all these revolutionary antics and to provide the refugees with *shelter*, either on the Continent or *overseas*."^a

The following description was to be found, long ago, in No. 257 of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* dated

"Heidelberg, March 23, 1849: Our friend *Vogt*, 'champion' of the Left, imperial jester of the moment, imperial Barrot of the future, the 'faithful warner' against revolution—he has joined forces with—some like-minded people? By no means! But with a few reactionaries of the deepest dye ... and for what purpose? In order to convey or to *deport* to America all those 'characters' living in Strasbourg, Besançon and elsewhere on the German frontier.... What Cavaignac's iron rule imposes as a punishment these gentlemen would like to mete out in the name of Christian charity.... Amnesty is dead, long live *deportation*! And of course this was accompanied by the *pia fraus*^b that the refugees had themselves expressed the desire to emigrate, etc. But now the *Seblätter* receives word from Strasbourg that these intentions to deport them have unleashed an angry storm of protest among *all* the refugees, etc. [...] In fact they all hope to return to Germany soon, even at the risk (as Herr Vogt touchingly remarks) of having to join some 'mad escapade.'^c

But enough of "Charles the Bold's" revolutionary congress in Murten.

3. CHERVAL

"The virtue of this jest will be the incomprehensible lies that this same fat rogue will tell us."^d

In my *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne* an entire chapter is devoted to the *Cherval plot*.⁵⁴ In it I show that Stieber with Cherval (a pseudonym for Crämer) as his instrument, and Carlier, Greif and Fleury as midwives, brought the so-called

^a Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess*.... S. 165.—*Ed.*

^b Pious deception.—*Ed.*

^c Marx quotes the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* from his notebook. There are some alterations in the use of italics as compared with the original.—*Ed.*

^d Shakespeare, *Henry IV*, Part I, Act I, Scene 2. Marx quotes in English and gives the German translation.—*Ed.*

Franco-German September plot in Paris into the world,* with the intention of providing the prosecution with just that “*factual evidence of an indictable offence*” against the Cologne prisoners the lack of which the “Indictment Board of Cologne” had criticised.

So decisive were the proofs I delivered to the defence during the Cologne trial,⁶⁰ so convincing the demonstration of a total lack of connection between Cherval, on the one hand, and the accused at Cologne and myself, on the other, that Stieber, who had sworn by Cherval on October 18 (1852), forswore him again on October 23, 1852 (*Revelations*, p. 29^a). Driven into a corner he abandoned the attempt to link Cherval and his plot with us. Stieber was Stieber, but even Stieber was a far cry from Vogt.

I think it is quite unnecessary for me to repeat here the information I gave in the *Revelations* about the so-called September plot. At the beginning of May 1852 Cherval returned to London, from where he had moved to Paris on business in the early summer of 1850. The Paris police let him escape from them a few months after he was sentenced in February 1852. In London he was greeted at first as a political martyr and welcomed into the German Workers' Educational Society, from which my friends and I had resigned as early as *mid-September 1850*.⁶¹ But this delusion was short-lived. The truth about his deeds of heroism in Paris soon became known and during that same month, May 1852, he was publicly expelled from the Society for his infamous conduct. The accused in Cologne, who had been imprisoned early in May 1851, were still in detention awaiting trial. I realised from a notice sent from Paris by the spy *Beckmann* to his paper, the *Kölnische Zeitung*, that the Prussian police were attempting retrospectively to forge a link between Cherval, his plot and the accused in Cologne. I accordingly kept on the look-out for reports about Cherval. It so happened that in July 1852 the latter offered his services as an Orleanist agent to M. de R.,^b a former Minister during Louis Philippe's reign and a well-known eclectic philosopher. The connections which M. de R. retained in the Paris Prefecture of Police enabled him to obtain extracts from their dossier on

* I did not learn until after the *Revelations* were in print that de la Hodde (under the name Duprez) as well as the Prussian police agents *Beckmann* (then correspondent of the “*Kölnische Zeitung*”) and *Sommer* were also involved.

^a See present edition, Vol. 11, p. 420.—*Ed.*

^b Charles François Marie de Rémusat (see Marx's letter to Engels, July 13, 1852, present edition, Vol. 39).—*Ed.*

Cherval. In the French police report Cherval was referred to as *Cherval nommé Frank, dont le véritable nom est Crämer*.^a For a long time he had worked as an agent for Prince Hatzfeldt, the Prussian Ambassador in Paris; he was the betrayer of the *complot franco-allemand* and was now simultaneously a spy for the French, etc. In the course of the Cologne trial I gave these reports to one of the counsel for the defence, Herr *Schneider II*, and empowered him to name my source if need arose. When Stieber said under oath during the session of October 18 that the Irishman Cherval, who on Stieber's own testimony had served a gaol sentence in Aachen in 1845 for forging bills of exchange, was at that moment still under arrest in Paris, I informed Schneider II by return of post that, under the pseudonym of Cherval, the Rhenish Prussian Crämer was "still" in London, was in daily communication with Greif, the Prussian lieutenant of police, and that, as he was a condemned Prussian criminal, the English would extradite him as soon as they received an application from the Prussian Government. To have brought him to Cologne as a witness would have overthrown the entire Stieber system.

Under pressure from Schneider II Stieber finally remembered on October 23 having heard that Cherval had fled from Paris, but he swore high and low that he had no knowledge of the present whereabouts of the Irishman or of his alliance with the Prussian police. In fact at that time Cherval was attached to Greif in London by a fixed weekly salary. The debates about the "Cherval mystery" at the Cologne Assizes, that had been provoked by my reports, drove Cherval from London. I heard that he had gone on a police mission to Jersey. I had long lost sight of him when by chance I came across a report from the Geneva correspondent of the *Republik der Arbeiter*,^b which appears in New York, stating that Cherval had turned up in Geneva in March 1853 under the name of *Nugent*, and that he had vanished from there once more in the summer of 1854. He visited Vogt in Geneva, then, a few weeks after my *Revelations* with the compromising statements about him had been published in Basle by Schabelitz.

Let us now return to the Falstaffian travesty of history.

According to Vogt, Cherval arrived in Geneva *immediately* after his fictitious escape from Paris and before that he was allegedly "sent" by the secret Communist League from London to Paris "a

^a Cherval, called Frank, whose real name is Crämer.—*Ed.*

^b "Korrespondenzen. Genf, den 16. April 1854", *Republik der Arbeiter*, No. 22, May 27, 1854.—*Ed.*

few months” prior to the discovery of the September plot (loc. cit., p. 172). Hence while the interval between May 1852 and March 1853 thus disappears altogether, the interval between June 1850 and September 1851 shrinks to “a few months”. What wouldn’t Stieber have given for a Vogt who could have testified on oath before the Assizes at Cologne that the “secret Communist League in London” had sent Cherval to Paris in June 1850, and what wouldn’t I have given to see Vogt sweating on the witness stand next to his Stieber! What a fine company they make: the swearing Stieber with his bird, the Greif [griffin], his Wermuth [vermouth], his Goldheimchen [golden cricket] and his *Bettelvogt* [beadle]. Vogt’s Cherval brought with him to Geneva “*recommendations to all friends of Marx & Co., from whom Mr. Nugent soon became inseparable*” (p. 173). He “took up his quarters with the family of a correspondent of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*” and gained access to Vogt probably as the result of my recommendations (in the *Revelations*). Vogt employed him as a lithographer (loc. cit., pp. 173[-74]) and entered with him so to speak into a “scientific intercourse” as he had done earlier with Archduke John and was to do later with Plon-Plon. One day, while he was working in the “office” of the Imperial Regent,⁶² “Nugent” was recognised by an “acquaintance” as Cherval and accused of being an “*agent provocateur*”. In fact Nugent was not only working for Vogt in Geneva but was also busily engaged in “founding a clandestine society”.

“Cherval-Nugent presided, *kept the minutes and corresponded with London*” (loc. cit., p. 175). He had “*taken a few not very discerning but otherwise worthy workers into his confidence*” (ibid.), however “among the members *there was also an associate of the Marx clique known to everyone as a suspect minion of the German police*” (loc. cit.).

“All the friends” of Marx, from whom Cherval-Nugent “became inseparable”, are now suddenly transformed into “*one associate*”, and this *one* associate promptly dissolves again into “*the associates of Marx who had remained behind in Geneva*” (p. 176), with whom Nugent later “continues to correspond from Paris” and whom he magnetically “attracts to himself” in Paris (loc. cit.).

Yet another instance, then, of his favourite “transformation” of the buckram “cloth” of Kendal green!

What Cherval-Nugent purposed with his society was the

“mass production of forged banknotes and treasury bills which when put into circulation were expected to undermine the credit of the despots and ruin their finances” (loc. cit., p. 175).

Cherval, it seems, was trying to emulate the celebrated Pitt who, as is well known, set up a factory not far from London during the war against the Jacobins to produce false French assignats.

"Various stone and copper plates had *already* been engraved for this purpose by Nugent himself; the gullible members of the secret league had *already* been selected to go to France, Switzerland and Germany with packets of these"—stone and copper plates?—no—"these counterfeit banknotes" (the banknotes were, of course, put into packets before they were printed) (p. 175),

but Cicero-Vogt was *already* standing behind Cherval-Catiline with his sword drawn. A peculiar characteristic of all Falstaffs is that as well as big bellies they also have big mouths. Just look at our Gurgelgrosslinger who has already set limits to "revolutionary antics" in Switzerland and arranged for whole shiploads of refugees to find a *livelihood overseas*, look how he postures, how melodramatically he acts, how he magnifies Stieber's Paris skirmish with Cherval (see *Revelations*^a)! Here he lay, and thus he bore his point!^b

"The plan of the whole *conspiracy*" (loc. cit., p. 176) "*had been monstrously conceived*." "All the workers' associations were to have Cherval's project laid at their door." There had *already* been "some confidential inquiries from foreign embassies", they were *already* on the point of "compromising Switzerland, especially the Canton of Geneva".

But the Land-Vogt was vigilant. He carried out his first rescue of Switzerland, an experiment he later repeated several times with steadily increasing success.

"I cannot deny," the weighty man exclaims, "I cannot deny that I contributed **a substantial part** in frustrating these *devilish plans*; I cannot deny that I made use of the police of the Geneva Republic for this purpose; I regret to this day" (disconsolate Cicero) "that the zeal of some deluded enthusiasts served to warn the wily ringleader and enabled him to evade arrest" [p. 177].

But at all events, Cicero-Vogt had "frustrated" the Catiline conspiracy, rescued Switzerland, and "contributed" **his substantial part** (wherever he carries that). According to him Cherval reappeared in Paris a few weeks later and there "he made no attempt to hide himself, but showed himself *in public* like other citizens" (loc. cit., p. 176). And we all know how *public* is the *life* of the citizens of Paris in the counterfeit Empire.

^a See present edition, Vol. 11.—*Ed.*

^b Falstaff's words (slightly paraphrased) from Shakespeare's *Henry IV*, Part I, Act II, Scene 4.—*Ed.*

While Cherval thus gads about in Paris “in public”, poor^a Vogt always has to hide in the Palais Royal under Plon-Plon’s table when he visits Paris!

I rather regret that after Vogt’s powerful Zachariad⁶³ I must now give the following letter from *Johann Philipp Becker*. A veteran of the German emigration, active as a revolutionary from the Hambach Festival⁶⁴ to the campaign for the Imperial Constitution, in which he fought as commander of the 5th Army Division (the Berlin *Militär-Wochenschrift*, a voice that is by no means partial, testified to his military achievement), Johann Philipp Becker is too well known to require any recommendation from me. I need only say, therefore, that his letter was written to R.,^b a German businessman in London with whom I am on friendly terms, that I do not know Becker personally and that he has never been connected with me politically. Finally, I should note that I have omitted the opening section of his letter which deals with business matters as well as most of the passages referring to the “Brimstone Gang” and the “Bristlers” since we are already familiar with the material they contain. (The original of the letter is in Berlin along with other documents connected with my suit.)

“Paris, March 20, 1860

“...I recently saw Vogt’s pamphlet against Marx.^c I found its contents very distressing, all the more so since, as I was living in Geneva at the time, I am perfectly familiar with the history of the so-called Brimstone Gang and the notorious Cherval. It is evident that the events have been totally distorted and with an utter disregard for justice have been falsely connected with the political activities of the economist Marx. I do not know Herr Marx personally, nor have I ever had any association with him whatever, but I have known Herr Vogt and his family for upwards of twenty years and am bound to him by much closer bonds of affection. I must bitterly deplore and unreservedly repudiate the frivolous and unscrupulous manner in which Vogt has entered the lists on this occasion. It is unworthy of a man to include distorted and even imaginary facts as weapons in his armoury. It is really very painful to see that Vogt unthinkingly, and apparently suicidally, destroys his congenial field of activity, compromises his position and stains his own reputation; and this would be the case even if he could be wholly acquitted of the charge of being in the pay of Napoleon. On the other hand, how gladly would I have seen him use every honest means to clear his name of such grave accusations. As it is, his behaviour hitherto in this unedifying business impels me to give you a description of the so-called Brimstone Gang and the worthy Herr Cherval so that you may judge for yourself the extent to which Marx may be held responsible for their existence and their activities.

“A word, then, about the rise and fall of the Brimstone Gang, for scarcely

^a Marx uses the English word.—*Ed.*

^b Georg Friedrich Rheinländer.—*Ed.*

^c Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess...*—*Ed.*

anyone is in a better position than I am to give you this information. During my stay in Geneva at that time I had an opportunity to observe the activities of the emigrants not only thanks to my position; but in addition, as an older man and always mindful of the general cause, I had a particular interest in closely following their every move so as to be able whenever possible to forestall and prevent the occasional foolish ventures which were so forgivable in people whom misfortune had so harassed and even reduced to despair. My 30 years' experience had taught me only too well how richly every emigration is endowed with illusions."

(What follows has been largely anticipated in the letters of Borkheim and Schily.)^a

"...This company, essentially a company of idlers, was referred to jestingly and mockingly as the Brimstone Gang. It was a club which consisted, as it were, of a motley crowd brought together by chance; it had neither president nor programme, neither statute nor dogma. There is no question of its having been a secret society, or of its having had any political or other goal to pursue systematically; they merely wanted to show off and that with an openness and frankness that knew no bounds. Nor did they have any connection with Marx, who for his part could certainly have known nothing of their existence and whose socio-political views moreover diverged widely from theirs. And in addition these fellows evinced a strong urge to be independent that verged on self-conceit and it is extremely unlikely that they would have been willing to subordinate themselves to any authority either in theory or in practice. They would have laughed Vogt's paternalistic admonitions out of court, no less than they would have ridiculed Marx's policy instructions. I was in a position to obtain very precise information about everything that went on in those circles since my eldest son^b used to meet the Big White Chiefs every day.... In all, the whole farce of this gang, devoid of any ties,^c scarcely outlasted the winter of 1849-50; the force of circumstances scattered our heroes to the winds.

"Who would have thought that after ten years' slumber the long-forgotten Brimstone Gang would be set alight once more by Professor Vogt in order to ward off imagined aggressors by spreading a foul stench which was then transmitted by obliging journalists with great enthusiasm acting as it were as electromagnetic-sympathetic conductors. Even Herr von Vincke, that liberal *par excellence*, mentioned the Brimstone Gang in connection with the Italian question and used it as an illustration in the modest Prussian Chamber. And the otherwise blameless citizens of Breslau in their *sancta simplicitas* have in honour of the Brimstone Gang prepared a carnival jest and fumigated the whole city with sulphur fires as the symbol of their loyalty.

"Poor innocent Brimstone Gang! After your blessed end you had willy-nilly to turn into a veritable volcano, to become the boggy that frightens timid subjects into a wholesome respect for the police, to vulcanise all the fat-heads of the world and blacken every overheated brain down to its roots—just as Vogt, in my opinion, has burnt his fingers for ever.

"Now then, *as for Crämer, vulgo Cherval*. This socio-political and common scoundrel came to Geneva in 1853, pretending to be an Englishman by the name

^a See this volume, pp. 29-32, 43-46.—*Ed.*

^b Gottfried Becker.—*Ed.*

^c A pun in the original: *bandlose Bande*. *Bandlose* means "without ties", *Bande* means "band", "gang".—*Ed.*

of Nugent. This was in fact the surname of the woman who accompanied him, ostensibly as his wife, and who really was English. He spoke both French and English fluently and for a long time carefully avoided speaking German for he seemed to be doing everything in his power to pass for a native Englishman. Being competent in both lithography and chromolithography, he boasted of having introduced this latter art into Geneva. In society he was very adept, he knew how to make his presence felt and to show himself to advantage. He soon obtained a sufficient amount of work, drawing objects from nature and antiquity for professors of the Academy. At first he lived a retired life and later, when he did seek company it was exclusively in the circle of French and Italian refugees. At that time I founded an *office de renseignements*^a and a daily paper *Le Messager du Léman* and I had an assistant called *Stecher*,^b a refugee from Baden who had formerly been headmaster in a secondary school. He was a talented draughtsman and strove to improve his standing by studying chromolithography. He found a teacher in the Englishman Nugent. Stecher was now full of stories about this skilful, kindly and generous Englishman and about the pleasant and graceful Englishwoman. Stecher also taught singing in the Workers' Educational Association and he occasionally brought his teacher Nugent with him. It was there that I first had the pleasure of meeting him and that he condescended to speak German; he spoke it so fluently and with such a command of the Lower Rhenish dialect that I said to him: 'But you can't possibly be an Englishman!' He persisted in his assertion, however, explaining that his parents had placed him in a school in Bonn when he was very young and that he had remained there until his eighteenth year, during which time he had got used to the local dialect. Stecher, who remained enchanted by the 'nice' man almost to the last, helped to make the belief that he was an Englishman more credible. But this incident made me rather distrustful of the would-be son of Albion and I urged caution on my fellow-members in the Association. Some time later I met the Englishman in the company of some French refugees and approached just as he was boasting of his heroism during the Paris uprisings. This was the first occasion on which I learned that he was also interested in politics. This made him all the more suspect so I made fun of the 'leonine bravery' he claimed to have displayed, to give him the chance to exhibit it against me in the presence of the Frenchmen. But as he answered my biting mockery by cringing like a cur I judged him contemptible from that moment on.

"From then on he avoided me whenever he could. In the meantime, with Stecher's aid, he organised evening dances in the bosom of the German Workers' Association, enlisting additional musical talent free of charge in the shape of an Italian, a Swiss and a Frenchman. At these balls I again met the Englishman, this time as a veritable *maître de plaisir*^c and completely in his element; uproarious merriment and pleasing the ladies suited him much better than his leonine bravery. However, he was not politically active in the Workers' Association, where he did nothing but hop, skip and jump, drink and sing. In the meantime however I heard from Fritz, a goldsmith from Württemberg, that our 'intrepid revolutionary Englishman' had founded a League consisting of him (Fritz), another German, a few Italians and Frenchmen, making seven members in all. I implored Fritz to have nothing to do with this political tightrope-walker, at any rate as far as serious matters were concerned, and begged him both to resign from the League at once and induce his associates to do likewise. Some time later my bookseller sent me a

^a Information bureau.—*Ed.*

^b See Appendix 3 (p. 304 of this volume).—*Ed.*

^c Master of ceremonies.—*Ed.*

pamphlet by *Marx* dealing with the communist trial in Cologne^a and in this Cherval was unmasked as Crämer and sharply attacked as a scoundrel and a traitor. At once I began to suspect that Nugent might be Cherval, above all because, according to the pamphlet, he came from the Rhineland and this corresponded to his accent. Also he was alleged to be living with an Englishwoman, which was the case here too. I at once told Stecher, Fritz and others of my suspicions and circulated the pamphlet to this end. Mistrust of Nugent spread quickly; *Marx's pamphlet had its effect*. Soon Fritz came to me explaining that he had resigned from the 'League' and that the others would follow his example. He also revealed to me the League's secret aim. The 'Englishman' intended to destroy the credit of the nations by manufacturing government securities and using the profits that would be gained in this manner to start a European revolution, etc. At about this time a French refugee called Laya, who had formerly been a lawyer in Paris, was giving lectures on socialism. Nugent attended them and Laya, who had defended him at his trial in Paris, identified him as Cherval, and told him so. Nugent implored Laya not to betray him. I learned of it from a French emigrant friendly with Laya and I spread the news at once. Nugent had the effrontery to appear once again in the Workers' Association whereupon he was exposed as the German Crämer and the Frenchman Cherval and was expelled. Ranickel from Bingen is said to have been his most violent assailant on this occasion. To crown it all the Genevan police began to show an interest in him because of the League, but the manufacturer of government securities had disappeared without a trace.

"In Paris he engaged in decorating porcelain and since I was in the same line of trade I met him in the course of business. But I found him the same irresponsible and incorrigible windbag as before.

"But how Vogt could have dared to connect the Genevan activities of this rogue with those of *Marx* and to describe him as one of his confederates or tools is utterly beyond my comprehension, especially as this was supposed to have been at the very time that he was the object of such a violent attack by *Marx* in the pamphlet referred to above. *It was after all Marx who unmasked him and who drove him from Geneva where, according to Vogt, he was actively engaged on Marx's behalf.*

"When I reflect how it was possible for a scientist like Vogt thus to go astray my mind reels. Is it not lamentable to find the praiseworthy reputation brought about by a happy coincidence of events so recklessly destroyed in such a wasteful and sterile fashion! Would it be surprising if after witnessing such deeds the whole world were to receive Vogt's scientific researches with scepticism, suspecting all the while that he might have arrived at his scientific conclusions with the same recklessness and the same lack of scruple, basing them on erroneous notions rather than on positive facts, painstakingly studied?

"If to become a statesman and a scientist nothing but ambition were required even Crämer might become both. *Unfortunately, with his Brimstone Gang and his Cherval, Vogt has degenerated into a sort of Cherval himself. And indeed there are intrinsic similarities between the two, brought about by their hankering for material comfort, for the safety of their own persons, for the joys of conviviality and for frivolous trifling with serious matters....* In anticipation of friendly news from you I send you my warmest greetings.

"Yours,

J. Ph. Becker

^a *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne* (see present edition, Vol. 11).—Ed.

"P. S. Glancing once more at Vogt's pamphlet I observe to my further surprise that the 'Bristlers' too have been duly honoured. So I am adding a few words to outline their story...."

"Furthermore, I also saw in the pamphlet that he claims that Nugent-Cherval-Crämer *came to Geneva on a mission for Marx*.^a I must add therefore that he did not drop the pretence of being an Englishman up to the very last moment in Geneva and that he *never gave the slightest indication that he had ever had any contact whatever with any German emigrant*, which would in any case have scarcely been reconcilable with his wish to preserve his incognito. Even here and now, when the matter must have lost its former significance for him, he is reluctant to admit his German origin and steadfastly denies all earlier acquaintance with Germans.

"Hitherto I still believed that Vogt had light-mindedly allowed himself to be mystified by others, but now his actions increasingly seem to be motivated by malicious perfidy. I am less sorry for him than before and my sympathy is reserved now for his worthy and good old father^b who will suffer many a bitter moment because of this business.

"I will not only permit you, I actually request you to make known this information among your circle of acquaintances in the interest of truth and of the good cause.

"With warm greetings,

Yours,

J. Philipp B." (See Appendix 3.)

4. THE COMMUNIST TRIAL IN COLOGNE

From the "office" of the Regent of the Empire in Geneva to the Royal Prussian Court of Assizes in Cologne.

"In the Cologne trial *Marx* played an outstanding part." Undoubtedly.

"In Cologne *his confederates* were on trial."^c Granted.

The Cologne accused were held in detention for 1½ years pending the trial.

The Prussian police and the Embassy, Hinckeldey with his entire clan, postal and municipal authorities, the Ministries of the Interior and of Justice—all made the most strenuous efforts during these 1½ years to give birth to a *corpus delicti*.

Here then, in his research into my "activities", Vogt has at his disposal, as it were, the assistance of the Prussian state and he even had authentic material contained in my *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne*, Basle, 1853, a copy of which he discovered in the Geneva Workers' Association and which he borrowed and "studied". This time, then, young Karl really will

^a Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess...*, S. 176.—*Ed.*

^b Philipp Friedrich Wilhelm Vogt.—*Ed.*

^c Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess...*, S. 169-70.—*Ed.*

settle my hash. But no! For once Vogt is “at a loss”, he just sets off a few of his home-made smoke-bombs and stink-bombs* before beating a hasty retreat, stammering:

“*The Cologne trial is of no particular significance for us*”^a (“Magnum Opus”, p. 172).

In the *Revelations* I was compelled to attack Herr August Willich among other people. Willich commenced his defence in the *New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung* of October 28, 1853** by describing my work as “*a masterly critique of the savage procedures adopted by the central police of the German Confederation*”^b. Jacob Schabelitz fils, the publisher of the pamphlet, wrote to me from Basle on December 11, 1852 after receiving the manuscript:

“Your exposure of the perfidy of the police is unsurpassable. You have erected a permanent monument to the present regime in Prussia.”^c

He added that his judgment was shared by experts, chief among these “experts” being a man who is at present a Genevan friend of Herr Karl Vogt.

Seven years after the publication of the *Revelations* Herr Eichhoff of Berlin, whom I do not know at all, made the following statement in court (it is well known that Eichhoff was on trial,⁶⁵ accused of having slandered Stieber):

“He had made a detailed study of the Cologne communist trial and not only adhered to his original opinion that Stieber had committed perjury but had to extend it to assert that everything Stieber said during the trial was false.... The verdict passed on the accused in Cologne was due entirely to Stieber’s testimony.... Stieber’s whole testimony was perjury from start to finish” (first supplement to the Berlin *Vossische Zeitung*, May 9, 1860).^d

* “*Smoke-bombs or stink-bombs* are used chiefly in mine warfare. One works with an ordinary flare-charge which must however contain rather more *sulphur* than usual and as much feathers, horn, hair and other rubbish as the charge will take. This is put in a container and the shell fired with a fuse” (F. C. Plümicke, *Handbuch für die Königlich Preussischen Artillerie-Offiziere*, Erster Teil, Berlin, 1820).

** I replied with a pamphlet called *The Knight of the Noble Consciousness*, New York, 1853. [See present edition, Vol. 12.]

^a Italics by Marx.—Ed.

^b This refers to August Willich’s slanderous article “Doctor Karl Marx und seine Enthüllungen”, published in the *Belletristisches Journal und New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung*, October 28 and November 4, 1853.—Ed.

^c See present edition, Vol. 39. Marx gives a summary rather than the exact words of the quoted passage.—Ed.

^d Karl Wilhelm Eichhoff [Erklärung vor dem Criminalgericht 8.-15. Mai 1860], *Königlich privilegierte Berlinische Zeitung von Staats- und gelehrten Sachen*, No. 108 (supplement), May 9, 1860.—Ed.

Vogt himself admits:

"He" (Marx) "did *everything in his power* to provide the defence with the materials and instructions necessary for the conduct of their case...."

It is a known fact that "false documents, manufactured by the agents themselves", i. e. Stieber, Fleury, etc., "were presented to the court" (in Cologne) "as 'evidence' and that in general an abyss of perfidy was *exposed* among this police rabble that makes one shudder to contemplate" ("Magnum Opus", pp. 169, 170).

If Vogt can show his hatred of the coup d'état by making propaganda for Bonapartism, why should not I reveal "my collusion" with the secret police by *exposing* their abysmal perfidy? If the police had genuine proofs, why manufacture false ones?

But, lectures Professor Vogt,

"nevertheless the blow *only* fell on the members of the Marxian League in Cologne, only on the Marx party".

Indeed, Polonius! Had not the blow fallen on another party earlier on in Paris; did it not also strike another party later on in Berlin (the Ladendorf trial), and yet another in Bremen (League of the Dead),⁶⁶ etc., etc.?

As to the *verdict* passed on the Cologne accused I shall quote a relevant passage from my *Revelations*:

"The miracles performed by the police were originally necessary to conceal the completely *political nature* of the trial. 'The revelations you are about to witness, Gentlemen of the Jury,' said Saedt when opening for the prosecution, 'will prove to you that this trial is not a political trial.' But now" (at the conclusion of the case) "he emphasises its political character so that the police revelations should be forgotten. After the 1½-year preliminary investigation the jury needed objective evidence in order to justify itself before public opinion.

"After the five-week-long police comedy they needed 'politics *pure and simple*' to extricate themselves from the sheer mess. Saedt therefore did not only confine himself to the material that had led the Indictment Board to the conclusion that 'there was no factual evidence of an indictable offence'. He went even further. He attempted to prove that the law against conspiracy does not require any indictable action, but is simply a law with a political purpose, and the category of conspiracy is therefore merely a pretext for burning political heretics in a legal way. The success of his attempt promised to be all the greater because of the decision to apply the new [Prussian] Penal Code that had been promulgated after the accused had been arrested. On the pretext that this code contained extenuating provisions the servile court was able to

permit its retroactive application. But if it was simply a political trial why a preliminary investigation lasting 1½ years? For political reasons" (loc. cit., pp. 71, 72).

"With the unmasking of the minute-book" forged and planted by the Prussian police themselves "the case had advanced to a new stage. The jury was no longer free merely to find the defendants guilty or not guilty; they must either find the defendants guilty—or the government.

"*To acquit the accused would mean condemning the government*" (loc. cit., p. 70).^a

That the Prussian Government of the day put a similar construction on the situation is plain from a communication that Hinckeldey sent to the Prussian Embassy in London while the Cologne trial was still in progress. In this he said that "*the whole existence of the political police depended on the outcome of the trial*". He accordingly asked for a person who could appear in court in the guise of the witness H.^b (who had disappeared), for which performance he would receive 1,000 talers reward. This person had actually been found when Hinckeldey's next letter arrived:

"The State Prosecutor hopes that *thanks to the happy constitution of the jury* it will be possible to get a verdict of guilty even without further extraordinary measures, and he" (Hinckeldey) "therefore asks you not to trouble yourselves further." (See Appendix 4.)

It was in fact the *happy constitution of the jury in Cologne* which inaugurated the Hinckeldey-Stieber regime in Prussia. "A blow will be struck in Berlin if the Cologne accused are condemned" was the view of the police rabble attached to the Prussian Embassy in London, as early as October 1852, even though the police mine (the Ladendorf conspiracy) did not explode in Berlin until the end of March 1853. (See Appendix 4.)

The liberal outcry that follows an age of reaction is all the louder the greater the cowardice displayed by liberals in putting up with the reaction for years on end without protest. Thus at the time of the Cologne trial, all my efforts to expose Stieber's system of deception in the liberal Prussian press were unavailing. The motto of the press, printed on its banner in block letters, ran: Reliability is the first duty of the citizen, and in this sign shalt thou—live.⁶⁷

^a See *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne* (present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 454-55, 453). Except for the words "pure and simple", the italics were introduced by Marx in *Herr Vogt.—Ed.*

^b Hermann Wilhelm Haupt.—*Ed.*

5. JOINT FESTIVAL OF THE GERMAN WORKERS'
EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS IN LAUSANNE
(JUNE 26 AND 27, 1859)

Our hero takes to his heels and with undiminished pleasure he retreats to—Arcadia. We meet him again in a “secluded corner of Switzerland”, in Lausanne, at a “Joint Festival” of a number of German workers’ educational associations which took place towards the end of June. Here Karl Vogt saved Switzerland for the second time. While Catiline was sitting in London, our Cicero with the gay-coloured jacket thundered in Lausanne:

“Jam, jam intelligis me acrius vigilare ad salutem, quam te ad perniciem reipublicae.”^a

By happy chance there exists an authentic report on the above-mentioned “Joint Festival” and on the deed of valour performed during it by our “well-rounded character”. Written by Herr G. Lommel with the collaboration of Vogt, it is entitled *Das Centralfest der Deutschen Arbeiterbildungsvereine in der Westschweiz (Lausanne 1859)*, Geneva, 1859, Markus Vaney, rue de la Croix d’or. Let us compare the authentic report with the “Magnum Opus”, which appeared five months later. The report contains Cicero-Vogt’s speech “*delivered by himself*” and in it he begins by explaining the mystery of his presence at this gathering. He appears among the workers, he harangues them, because

“grave accusations have latterly been made against him, accusations which, if they were true, were bound utterly to destroy the confidence placed in him and completely undermine all his political activities”. “I have come,” he goes on, “I have specifically come here to protest publicly against the” (above-mentioned) “malicious underhand dealings” (*Report*, pp. 6-7).

He has been accused of Bonapartist intrigues, he has to rescue his political activities and as is his wont he defends his skin with his tongue. After indulging in empty talk for an hour and a half, he recollects Demosthenes’ admonition that “action, action and once again action is the soul of eloquence”.^b

But what is action? In America there is a small animal called a *skunk* which has only *one* method of defending itself at moments of extreme danger: its offensive smell. When attacked it releases a substance from certain parts of its body which, if it touches your clothes, will ensure that they have to be burnt and, if it touches

^a “You will already be aware that I attend with greater zeal to the salvation of the state than you to its destruction” (Cicero, *Speeches against Catiline*, I, 4).—*Ed.*

^b Demosthenes, *The Olynthiac*, Second Speech, Chapter Four.—*Ed.*

your skin, will banish you for a period from all human society. The smell is so horribly offensive that when hunters see that their dogs have accidentally started a skunk they will hurriedly take to their heels in greater panic than if they had found that a wolf or a tiger was pursuing them. For powder and lead is an adequate defence against wolves and tigers, but no antidote has been found to the *a posteriori* of a skunk.

That is what action is, says our orator, a naturalised citizen of the "Kingdom of Animals",^a and bespatters his supposed persecutors with the following skunk-like effluent:

"But I would like to warn you of one thing above all else, and that is of the machinations of a small group of depraved men whose aims and efforts are all directed towards seducing the worker away from his job, implicating him in conspiracies and communist intrigues, and finally, after living from the sweat of his brow, driving him cold-bloodedly" (i. e. after he has finished sweating) "to his destruction. Now *once again* this small group is using every possible method" (just keep it as general as possible!) "to ensnare the workers' associations in its toils. Whatever they may say" (about Vogt's Bonapartist intrigues) "you may rest assured that their true aim is to exploit the worker for their own selfish ends and finally to abandon him to his fate" (*Report*, p. 18. See Appendix).

The shameless impertinence with which this "skunk" accuses me and my friends of "*living from the sweat of the workers' brow*", when we have always sacrificed our private interests in order to defend those of the working class, and have done this *gratis*, is not even original. The *mouchards* of the December Gang hurled similar slanders at Louis Blanc, Blanqui, Raspail, etc. And not only that, for at all times and in all places the sycophants of the ruling class have always resorted to these despicable slanders to denigrate the literary and political champions of the oppressed classes. (See Appendix 5.)

After this action our "well-rounded character" is incidentally no longer able to keep a straight face. The buffoon goes on to compare his "persecutors" who are walking about freely, with the "Russians *taken prisoner* at Zorndorf".^{b 68} And he compares himself with—who would have guessed it!—*Frederick the Great*. Falstaff-Vogt remembers that Frederick the Great ran away from the first battle at which he was present. How much greater then is *he* who ran away without even waiting for the battle.*

* Kobes 169 relates in *Jacob Venedey's* pamphlet *Pro domo und pro patria gegen Karl Vogt*, Hanover, 1860: "He was a witness to the fact that the Imperial Regent,

^a An allusion to the title of Karl Vogt's book, *Untersuchungen über Thierstaaten*, in which the author treats his subject as a vulgar materialist.—*Ed.*

^b Georg Lommel, op. cit., S. 19.—*Ed.*

Thus far the adventures of the Joint Festival at Lausanne according to the authentic report. And “now just look” (as Fischart puts it) “at our clammy-handed, parasitically stout, slovenly cook and pot holder”^a and see what a fine police *purée à la Eulenspiegel* he serves up five months later for the benefit of the German philistines.

“They wanted at *all costs to create complications in Switzerland*; some sort of blow was to be aimed ... at the policy of neutrality. *I was informed* that the Joint Festival of the Workers’ Educational Associations was to be used to induce the workers to follow a route which they had firmly rejected. It was hoped that the lovely Festival would provide an opportunity for forming a *secret committee* to enter into communication with like-minded people in Germany and take God knows what *steps*” (Vogt does not know, *even though he was informed*). “There were all sorts of dark rumours and mysterious talk about the active intervention of the workers in German political affairs. *I at once resolved to oppose these intrigues* and to exhort the workers anew to turn a deaf ear to *all proposals of this sort*. At the conclusion of the speech referred to above I gave a solemn warning, etc.” (“Magnum Opus”, pp. 180 [-81]).

Cicero-Vogt has already forgotten that at the start of his speech he let slip what had brought him to the Joint Festival—not the neutrality of Switzerland but the need to save his own skin. His speech does not contain a single word about the intended plot against Switzerland, the conspiratorial intentions at the Joint Festival, the secret committee, the active intervention of the workers in German politics or proposals of “*this*” or any other “*sort*”. Not a word about all these Stieberiads. His final warning was nothing but the warning of the honest Sikes in the Old Bailey who warned the jurymen not to listen to the “infamous” detectives who had caught him stealing.

“The events which immediately followed,” Falstaff-Vogt declares (“Magnum Opus”, p. 181), “confirmed my *forebodings*.”

Karl Vogt, was not present when we and the four other Imperial Regents forced the Government of Württemberg to bring the Parliament to an honourable end with sword and bayonet. It is an amusing story. The other four Imperial Regents had already entered the carriage to go to the Assembly Room, as agreed, and there together with the Rump Parliament [...] to put on a bold front” (it is well known that the Rump Parliament had no head). [Venedey says here: *die Brust bieten*: (literally, to present the breast). The phrase is an adaptation of the German idiomatic expression, *die Stirn bieten* (to present the forehead) which means “to put on a bold front”. Marx puns on Venedey’s substitution of *Brust* (breast) for *Stirn* (forehead) to stress that the Rump Parliament had no head.] “Karl Vogt slammed the carriage-door shut and called to the coachman: ‘You go on ahead, the carriage is full up. I shall follow on!’ But Karl Vogt only appeared [...] after all possible danger was over” (loc. cit., pp. 23, 24).

^a Johann Fischart, *Affentheurliche. Naupengeheurliche Geschichtklitterung...*, S. 73.—Ed.

What does he mean, *forebodings!* But Falstaff has already forgotten that a few lines before he did not have “forebodings”, but that he had been “informed”, *informed* of the plans of the conspirators, and *informed in detail!* And what, you vengeful angel,^a were the *events* which immediately followed?

“An article in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* imputed tendencies to the Festival and to the life of the workers which these” (i. e. the Festival and the life) “did not in the least have in mind.” (Just as Vogt had imputed tendencies to the Murten Congress and the workers’ organisations in general.) “This article and a *reprint* of it in the *Frankfurter Journal* led to a confidential inquiry from the Ambassador of a South German state in which the Festival was given the importance”—“*imputed*” to it by the article in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and the reprint in the *Frankfurter Journal*?—by no means!—“which it **ought to have had** if the *intentions of the Brimstone Gang had not been frustrated.*”^b

Ought to have had! Yes indeed!

Although the most superficial comparison of the “Magnum Opus” and the authentic report on the Joint Festival is enough to clear up the mystery of Cicero-Vogt’s second rescue of Switzerland, I nevertheless wished to ascertain whether there was any factual basis, however slender, that might have given him the “matter” which provided him with his “energy”.⁷⁰ I wrote, therefore, to the editor of the authentic report, Herr G. Lommel in Geneva.^c Herr Lommel must have been on friendly terms with Vogt since he not only collaborated with him on the report on the Joint Festival in Lausanne but also, in a subsequent pamphlet about the Schiller and Robert Blum memorial celebrations in Geneva,^d he covered up the fiasco that Vogt had brought upon himself there. In his reply of April 13, 1860, Herr Lommel, who is personally unknown to me, wrote:

“Vogt’s story that he had frustrated a dangerous conspiracy in Lausanne is *the sheerest fairy-tale or lie*; he only went to Lausanne because it was an opportunity to make a speech which he could afterwards print. In the speech, which lasted 1½ hours, he defended himself against allegations that he was in the pay of Bonaparte. I still have the manuscript in safe keeping.”

^a An allusion to Goethe’s *Faust*, Erster Teil, Marthens Garten. But instead of Goethe’s *du ahnungsvoller* (foreboding) *Engel* Marx has *du ahnungsvoller* (vengeful) *Engel*.—*Ed.*

^b Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess...*, S. 181, 182. In the last sentence the italics are Vogt’s. He is referring to the article in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 215 (supplement), August 3, 1859.—*Ed.*

^c Marx to Lommel, April 9, 1860 (present edition, Vol. 41).—*Ed.*

^d Georg Lommel, *Das Centralfest der Deutschen Arbeiterbildungsvereine in der Westschweiz*, Genf, 1859.—*Ed.*

A Frenchman living in Geneva, when asked about the same Vogtian conspiracy, replied bluntly:

“Il faut connaître cet individu” (namely Vogt), “surtout **le faiseur, l'homme important, toujours hors de la nature et de la vérité.**”^a

Vogt himself declares on p. 99 of his so-called *Studien*^b that he “had never laid claim to *prophetic gifts*”. But we know from the Old Testament that the ass could see what the prophet had missed.^c And so we can understand how Vogt managed to *see* the conspiracy which in November 1859 he had forebodings of having “frustrated” in June 1859.

6. MISCELLANY

“If my memory does not deceive me,” our Parliamentary Clown writes, “the circular” (i. e. an alleged address to the proletarians dated London 1850) “was indeed written by a follower of Marx’s known as Parliamentary Wolf, and it was allowed to fall into the hands of the Hanover police. Here too we find *this same channel turning up* in the history of the circular ‘of the patriots to the men of Gotha’” (“Magnum Opus”, p. 144).

A channel turns up! A prolapsus ani,^d perhaps, you zoological jester?

As to “Parliamentary Wolf”—and we shall see later on why, like a bad dream, Parliamentary Wolf weighs so heavily on the memory of our Parliamentary Clown—he published the following statement in the Berlin *Volks-Zeitung*, the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and the Hamburg *Reform*:

“*Statement.* Manchester, February 6, 1860: I see from the letter of a friend that the *National-Zeitung* (No. 41 of this year) has brought the following passage to the attention of the public in a leading article based on Vogt’s pamphlet:

“In 1850 another *circular* was dispatched from London to *the proletarians* in Germany, written, as Vogt believes he remembers, by Parliamentary Wolf, alias Casemate Wolf. The circular was allowed simultaneously to fall into the hands of the Hanover police.’ I have seen neither the relevant issue of the *National-Zeitung* nor the Vogt pamphlet and would like therefore to direct my answer solely to the passage just cited:

“1. In 1850 I was living not in London but *in Zurich*, and I did not move to London until the summer of 1851.

“2. I have never in the whole of my life written a circular addressed either to ‘proletarians’ or to anyone else.

^a “One must know this fellow who is above all a **charlatan**, a *self-important*, unnatural, untruthful man.”—*Ed.*

^b Carl Vogt, *Studien zur gegenwärtigen Lage Europas*, Genf und Bern, 1859, S. 99. Marx’s italics.—*Ed.*

^c Numbers 22: 21-33.—*Ed.*

^d Prolapse of the rectum.—*Ed.*

"3. As to the insinuation about the Hanover police *I hereby return this shamelessly invented accusation to its author with contempt*. If the remainder of Vogt's pamphlet is as full of impudent lies as the part that refers to me it is a worthy fellow to the fabrications of *Chenu, de la Hodde & Co.*

W. Wolff" ^a

There you are: just as *Cuvier* could construct the whole skeleton of an animal from a single bone, *Wolff* has correctly constructed Vogt's whole fabrication from a single fragmentary quotation. *Karl Vogt* can indeed stand beside *Chenu* and *de la Hodde* as *primus inter pares*.

The last "proof" adduced by Vogt, who is still "by no means at a loss", to demonstrate my *entente cordiale* with the secret police in general and "my relations with the *Kreuz-Zeitung* party in particular", consists in the argument that my wife is the sister of the retired Prussian Minister Herr von Westphalen ("Magnum Opus", p. 194). Now how to parry the cowardly stratagem of our fat Falstaff? Perhaps the Clown will forgive my wife the cognate Prussian Minister ^b when he learns of the agnate Scotsman ^c who was beheaded in the market-place in Edinburgh as a rebel in the war of liberation against James II. It is well known that it is only by accident that Vogt still carries his own head around. For at the Robert Blum celebrations of the German Workers' Educational Association in Geneva (November 13, 1859) he reported

"how the Left of the Frankfurt Parliament was for a long time undecided who to send to Vienna, Blum or him. Finally, the matter was decided by lot, by drawing a piece of straw, which fell upon Blum, or rather against him" (*Die Schillerfeier zu Genf usw.*, Geneva, 1859, pp. 28, 29).

On October 13 Robert Blum set out from Frankfurt for Vienna. On October 23 or 24 a deputation of the extreme Left in Frankfurt arrived in Cologne on the way to the Democratic Congress in Berlin.⁷¹ I met these gentlemen, among whom were several Members of Parliament who had close bonds with the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. These parliamentarians, of whom one was summarily shot during the campaign for the Imperial Constitution, a second died in exile, while the third still lives, whispered all sorts of strange and sinister stories in my ear about Vogt's intrigues in connection with Robert^c Blum's mission to Vienna.

^a Wilhelm Wolff, "Erklärung", *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 44 (supplement), February 13, 1860. Also published in the Hamburg *Reform* on February 11, 1860 and in the Berlin *Volks-Zeitung* on February 24, 1860.—*Ed.*

^b Ferdinand von Westphalen.—*Ed.*

^c Archibald Campbell Argyll.—*Ed.*

However,

Bid me not speak, bid me be silent,
To keep the secret I am bound.^a

The Robert Blum celebrations of November 1859 in Geneva to which we have already referred treated our “well-rounded character” most unkindly. On entering the premises, waddling like an obsequious Silenus at the heels of his patron, James Fazy, a worker was heard to say: There’s Harry with Falstaff after him. When he told a delightful anecdote designed to present himself as the *alter ego* of Robert Blum, it was only with difficulty that some infuriated workers were prevented from storming the podium. And when, finally, forgetting how he had frustrated the revolution in June, he himself “called yet again for the barricades”^b (*Schillerfeier*, p. 29) a mocking echo repeated: “Barricades—shmarricades!” Abroad, however, people know so well just what value they are to place on Vogt’s revolutionary mouthings that the “confidential inquiry from a South German Ambassador”,^c usually unavoidable, was unforthcoming on this occasion and *no* article appeared in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*.

Vogt’s entire Stieberiad from the “Brimstone Gang” to the “retired Minister” reveals the sort of Mastersinger of whom Dante says:

Ed egli avea fatto del cul trombeta.*

* And he made a trumpet of his rear. (*Kannegiesser*) [Dante, *The Divine Comedy*, Inferno, Canto XXI. *Kannegiesser* is the name of the German translator.]

^a Mignon’s song in Goethe’s novel *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*, Fünftes Buch, Kapitel 16.—*Ed.*

^b The closing line of the poem about Robert Blum which Vogt quoted concluding his speech at the Blum celebrations (see Georg Lommel, *Die Schiller-Feier in Genf. Nebst einem Nachtrag enthaltend die diesjährige Todtenfeier für Robert Blum*, Genf, 1859, S. 29).—*Ed.*

^c Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess...*, S. 181-82.—*Ed.*

IV

TECHOW'S LETTER

What else does our “*well-rounded character*” pull out of that

“tristo sacco
Che merda fa di quel, che si trangugia.”

(Dante)*

A letter from Techow dated London, August 26, 1850:

“I cannot characterise these activities better” (i.e. of the “Brimstone Gang”) “than by imparting to you the contents of a letter from a man whom all who have ever known him will acknowledge as a man of honour, a letter which I may permit myself to publish because it”^a (the man of honour or the letter?) “was expressly intended *for communication*” (to whom?) “and the considerations” (whose?) “which earlier militated against *publication* no longer obtain” (“Magnum Opus”, p. 141).

Techow arrived in London from Switzerland at the end of August 1850. His letter is addressed to *Schimmelpfennig*, formerly a lieutenant in the Prussian army, who lived in Berne at the time. *Schimmelpfennig* was supposed to “communicate the letter to our friends”, i.e. the members of the *Centralisation*,⁷² a secret society now extinct for nearly a decade, set up by German refugees in Switzerland with a rather mixed membership and a strong leavening of parliamentarians. *Techow* was a member of the society, but *Vogt* and his friends were not. How then did *Vogt* come into possession of *Techow*’s letter and who authorised him to publish it?

* “The sordid sack

That turns to dung the food it swallows.” [*The Divine Comedy*, Inferno, Canto XXVIII.]

^a The German *er* used here can refer either to the man of honour or the letter.—*Ed.*

Techow himself wrote to me on the subject from Australia on April 17, 1860:

"At any rate, *I have never had occasion to give Herr Karl Vogt any authorisation in connection with this matter.*"

Of the "friends" of Techow to whom the letter was to be communicated only two are still living in Switzerland. Both may speak for themselves:

E^a to Schily, April 29, 1860, Upper Engadine, Grisons Canton:

"When Vogt's pamphlet *Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung* appeared, containing a letter from Techow to his friends in Switzerland dated August 26, 1850,^b we, the friends of Techow still living in Switzerland, resolved to write to Vogt to express our disapproval of his *unauthorised* publication of the letter. Techow's letter had been addressed to Schimmelpfennig in Berne and the intention was to distribute copies of it among friends.... I am glad that we were not mistaken in our belief that none of Techow's friends, none of those who had a right to see the letter of August 26, had used it after the manner of the man who has by accident come into possession of it. On January 22 a letter was dispatched to Vogt protesting against the *unauthorised* publication of Techow's letter, forbidding *any further misuse* of it and demanding the return of the letter. On January 27 Vogt replied: "Techow's letter was intended to be shown to his friends; the friend who had it in his possession had handed it over with the express wish that it should be published ... and he would only return the letter to the man from whom *he* had received it."

B^c to Schily, Zurich, May 1, 1860⁷³:

"The letter to Vogt was written by me after I had discussed the matter with E.... R.^d was not among the 'friends' for whom Techow's letter was intended. From the contents of the letter, however, it was *perfectly clear to Vogt* that it had been addressed to me among others, but he took good care not to ask me for permission to publish it."

The solution to the riddle is contained in a passage from *Schily's* letter quoted earlier^e and which I have saved up for this moment. He writes:

"I must say something here about **Ranickel** because it is *through him that Techow's letter must have fallen into Vogt's hands*, a point in your letter which I had almost overlooked. This letter was written by Techow to friends he had lived with in Zurich: Schimmelpfennig, B. and E. As their friend and Techow's, I was also able to read it later on. When I was brutally and summarily expelled from Switzerland (without any previous order of expulsion having been made I was simply arrested in the street in Geneva and immediately transported from there), I was not permitted to go back to my lodgings to arrange my affairs. From the prison in Berne I wrote to a reliable man in Geneva, a master shoemaker called

^a Karl Emmermann.—*Ed.*

^b See Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess...*, S. 142-61.—*Ed.*

^c Friedrich von Beust.—*Ed.*

^d Ranickel.—*Ed.*

^e See this volume, pp. 43-46.—*Ed.*

Thum, asking him to find one or other of my friends who might be still in Geneva (for I did not know whether the same fate had not befallen any of them), who could pack up my belongings and send the most valuable of them to me in Berne, putting the remainder *into safe keeping* for the time being. I wanted that person to sort out my papers taking particular care to ensure that nothing should be forwarded to me which could not survive the transit through France. Thum did as I asked him and Techow's letter remained behind. My belongings included a number of papers relating to a rebellion of the parliamentarians against the Geneva local committee for the distribution of money for the refugees (the committee consisted of three Geneva citizens, among them Thum, and two refugees, Becker and myself). *Ranickel* was familiar with these as he had taken the side of the committee against the parliamentarians. For this reason I had asked Thum as the treasurer and archivist of the committee to take out those papers with *Ranickel's* help. It may now be the case that, having a legitimate reason for being present while my papers were being sorted, *Ranickel* somehow got his hands on Techow's letter. Perhaps it was given him by one of the sorters. I do not by any means dispute the *transfer of the letter into his possession*, as distinct from the transfer of *property rights* from me to him. On the contrary, I claim the latter quite explicitly. *I soon wrote to Ranickel from London asking him to send me the letter. However, he did not do so* and his *culpa manifesta*^a dates from that time. At the beginning it was probably only *levis*^b but it then mounted, depending on the extent of his complicity in the unauthorised publication of the letter, to *magna* or *maxima culpa*^c or even to *dolus*.^d I do not doubt for a single moment that his publication of the letter was *unauthorised* and that none of the addressees had given their permission, but I shall nevertheless write to E. for confirmation of this. Nor can it be doubted that *Ranickel* assisted in the publication, given his notorious intimacy with Vogt. And even though I do not wish in the least to criticise that intimacy, I cannot refrain from pointing out the contrast with their earlier relationship. For *Ranickel* had not only been one of the greatest enemies of the parliamentarians in general; he had also uttered the most blood-curdling threats in regard to the Imperial Regent in particular. 'I'll strangle the fellow,' he would shout, 'even if I have to go to Berne to do it', and we had to forcibly restrain him from carrying out his regicidal intention. But now that the scales seem to have fallen from his eyes, and Saul has turned into Paul,^e I am very curious to see how he will worm his way out of another obligation: that of becoming the *avenger of Europe*. I have fought a hard struggle, he would say in the days when he was hesitating between Europe and America, but now it is at an end. I shall remain and—*avenge myself!!* Let Byzantium tremble."^f

Thus far *Schily's* letter.

Ranickel, then, unearthed^g Techow's letter among the papers left behind by *Schily*. Notwithstanding *Schily's* request for it from

^a Manifest guilt.—*Ed.*

^b Slight.—*Ed.*

^c Great or maximum guilt.—*Ed.*

^d Evil intent.—*Ed.*

^e The Acts of the Apostles 9:15-17.—*Ed.*

^f "Trema, Bisanzio!"—quoted from Gaetano Donizetti's opera *Belisario*, Act II, Scene 3 (libretto by Salvatore Cammarano).—*Ed.*

^g Marx uses the verb *aufstiebern*—an adaptation of the verb *aufstöbern* (ferret out, unearth)—formed by analogy with *Stieber*, the name of a German police agent.—*Ed.*

London, he retained it. The letter *misappropriated* in this way was handed by “friend” *Ranickel* to “friend” Vogt, and “friend” Vogt, with his characteristic delicacy of conscience, declared himself authorised to publish the letter since Vogt and *Ranickel* are “friends”. Anyone, therefore, who writes a letter to be “communicated” to “friends”, necessarily writes for the benefit of “friends” *Vogt* and *Ranickel*—*arcades ambo*.^a

I must apologise if this peculiar sort of jurisprudence leads me back to long-past and half-forgotten events. But *Ranickel* has started it and I must follow.

The “*Communist League*” was founded in Paris in 1836, originally under another name.^b The organisation that gradually evolved was as follows: a certain number of members formed a “community”, the different communities in the same town constituted a “district” [*Kreis*] and a varying number of districts were joined together into “leading districts” [*leitende Kreise*]. At the head of the whole stood the “Central Authority” which was elected at a congress consisting of deputies from all the districts, but which had the right to add to its own numbers and, in emergencies, to nominate its successor on a provisional basis. The Central Authority was based first in Paris, and then, from 1840 to the beginning of 1848, in London. The chairmen of the communities and districts and the Central Authority itself were elected. This democratic constitution, utterly unsuitable for conspiratorial secret societies, was not incompatible, to say the least, with the tasks facing a propaganda association. The activities of the “League” consisted first of all in founding public German workers’ educational associations, and the majority of the associations of this sort, which still exist in Switzerland, England, Belgium and the United States, were founded either directly by the “League” or else by people who had at one time belonged to it. The constitution of these workers’ associations is accordingly the same everywhere. One day per week was devoted to discussion, another to social activities (singing, recitations, etc.). Libraries were set up everywhere, and where possible classes in elementary education were started for the instruction of the workers. The “League” standing behind the public educational associations, and guiding them, found them both the most convenient forum for

^a Literally “Arcadians both”, i.e. each deserves the other—an expression used by Virgil in *Bucolics* (Eclogues), 7, 4, and later by Byron, who wrote: “‘Arcades ambo’ id est—blackguards both” (*Don Juan*, IV, 93).—*Ed.*

^b The League of the Just.—*Ed.*

public propaganda and also a reservoir whose most useful members could replenish and swell its own ranks. In view of the itinerant life of German artisans it was only on rare occasions that the Central Authority had to send special emissaries.

As far as the secret doctrine of the "League" is concerned, it underwent all the transformations of French and English socialism and communism, as well as their German versions (e. g. Weitling's fantasies). After 1839, as is made clear in the Bluntschli report,^a the religious question came to play the most important role alongside the social problem. The various phases undergone by German philosophy from 1839 to 1846 were followed with the most lively interest in these workers' societies. The secret form of the society goes back to its Paris origins. The chief purpose of the League—propaganda among workers in Germany—dictated the retention of this form in later years. During my first stay in Paris^b I established personal contact with the leaders of the "League" living there as well as with the leaders of the majority of the secret French workers' associations, without however becoming a member of any of them. In Brussels, where Guizot's expulsion order had sent me, I, together with Engels, W. Wolff and others, founded the German Workers' Educational Society,⁷⁴ which is still in existence. At the same time we published a series of pamphlets,^c partly printed, partly lithographed, in which we mercilessly criticised the hotchpotch of Franco-English socialism or communism and German philosophy, which formed the secret doctrine of the "League" at that time. In its place we proposed the scientific study of the economic structure of bourgeois society as the only tenable theoretical foundation. Furthermore, we argued in popular form that it was not a matter of putting some utopian system into effect, but of conscious participation in the historical process revolutionising society before our very eyes. In consequence of these activities the London Central Authority entered into correspondence with us and at the end of 1846 they sent one of their members, a watchmaker called *Joseph Moll*, who later fell as a soldier of the revolution on the field of battle in Baden,^d to Brussels to invite us to join the "League". Moll allayed

^a Johann Caspar Bluntschli, *Die Kommunisten in der Schweiz nach den bei Weitling vorgefundenen Papieren...*, Zürich, 1843.—*Ed.*

^b From late October 1843 to February 3, 1845.—*Ed.*

^c The only one extant is *Circular Against Kriege* (see present edition, Vol. 6).—*Ed.*

^d See Frederick Engels, *The Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution* (present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 225-26).—*Ed.*

our doubts and objections by revealing that the Central Authority intended to convoke a Congress of the League in London where the critical views we had expressed would be laid down in an open manifesto as the doctrine of the League. He argued, however, that if backward and refractory elements were to be overcome, our participation in person was indispensable, but that this could only be arranged if we became members of the "League". Accordingly, we joined it. The Congress, at which members from Switzerland, France, Belgium, Germany and England were represented, took place,^a and after heated debate over several weeks it adopted the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*^b written by Engels and myself, which appeared in print at the beginning of 1848 and was later translated into English, French, Danish and Italian. On the outbreak of the February revolution the London Central Authority entrusted me with the leadership of the "League". During the revolutionary period in Germany, its activities died down of themselves, since more effective avenues existed now for the realisation of its ends. When, in the late summer of 1849, I arrived in London after being expelled from France for a second time, I found that the Central Authority had been reconstructed from the ruins and that the links with the reconstituted districts of the League in Germany had been re-established. *Willich* arrived in London a few months later and was admitted to the Central Authority at my suggestion. He had been recommended to me by *Engels*, who acted as his adjutant in the campaign for the Imperial Constitution. To round off the history of the League I would only remark that there was a split in the Central Authority on September 15, 1850.^c Its majority, including Engels and myself, transferred the seat of the Central Authority to *Cologne*, which had long been the "leading district" for Central and Southern Germany and which, after London, was the most important centre of intellectual activity.

We resigned from the London *Workers' Educational Society* at the same time. The minority on the Central Authority, however, including *Willich* and *Schapper*, set up a separate League⁷⁵ which maintained relations with the *Workers' Educational Society* and also resumed contact with Switzerland and France, which had been interrupted since 1848. On November 12, 1852 the accused in the Cologne communist trial were condemned. A few days later, at my

^a The Second Congress of the Communist League was held in London between November 29 and December 8, 1847.—*Ed.*

^b See present edition, Vol. 6.—*Ed.*

^c See present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 625-30.—*Ed.*

suggestion, the League was declared dissolved.^a I included a document, relating to the dissolution, dated November 1852, in the dossier on my action against the *National-Zeitung*. The reason given there for the dissolution of the League is that with the arrests in Germany, i.e. from as early as the spring of 1851, *all* contact with the Continent had in any case ceased to exist and that moreover circumstances were no longer favourable for a propaganda society of this sort. A few months later, at the beginning of 1853, the Willich-Schapper separate League also died a natural death.

The issues of principle which underlay the split mentioned above are set out in my *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial*,^b which contains an extract from the minutes of the meeting of the Central Authority of September 15, 1850. The immediate practical cause of the split was *Willich's* efforts to involve the "League" in the revolutionary escapades of the German democratic emigration. The disagreement was exacerbated by wholly opposed interpretations of the political situation. I shall cite only *one* example. Willich had conceived the idea that the quarrel between Prussia and Austria on the question of the Electorate of Hesse and the German Confederation⁷⁶ would lead to serious conflicts and create an opportunity for the practical intervention of the revolutionary party. On November 10, 1850, shortly after the split in the "League", he published a proclamation along these lines entitled *Aux démocrates de toutes les nations*^c over the signatures of the Central Authority of the "separate League" as well as those of French, Hungarian and Polish refugees. Engels and I, on the other hand, as can be seen in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Revue* (double issue, May to October 1850, Hamburg, pp. 174, 175), maintained on the contrary that "*None of this noise will lead to anything.... Without a drop of blood having been shed, the parties to the dispute*", i.e. Austria and Prussia, "*will come together on the benches of the Federal Diet*"⁷⁷ in Frankfurt "*without there being the slightest diminution in their petty mutual jealousies, or in their dissensions with their subjects, or in their irritation at Russian supremacy*".^d

^a See Marx's letter to Engels dated November 19, 1852 (present edition, Vol. 39). A copy of the letter is to be found in Marx's notebook for 1860.—*Ed.*

^b See present edition, Vol. 11.—*Ed.*

^c *Le Constitutionnel*, November 18, 1850. The text of this proclamation is quoted by Marx in his letter to Engels dated December 2, 1850 (see present edition, Vol. 38).—*Ed.*

^d See "Review, May to October [1850]" (present edition, Vol. 10, p. 528). The italics were introduced by Marx in *Herr Vogt*.—*Ed.*

Now it may be judged from the following document whether Willich's individuality (whose worth incidentally we do not intend to dispute) and the then (1850) still fresh memories of his experiences in Besançon enabled him "impartially" to consider conflicts which contradictory views had rendered inevitable and had constantly renewed:

"The German Brigade in Nancy
to
Citizen Joh. Philipp Becker in Biel,
President of the German military
association 'Self-Help'⁷⁸

"Citizen,

"We are writing to inform you, as the elected representative of all German republican refugees, that in Nancy a brigade of German refugees has been formed which bears the name: 'German Brigade in Nancy.'

"The refugees who make up the present Brigade are composed partly of former members of the Vesle Brigade and partly of units of the Besançon Brigade. Factors of a purely democratic nature are responsible for the removal of the latter from Besançon.

"The fact is that in everything that he did, Willich very rarely consulted the Brigade. Hence the principles governing the Besançon Brigade were not generally discussed and decided by all members, but were decreed *a priori* by Willich and put into effect without the approval of the Brigade.

"Furthermore, Willich also provided evidence of his despotic nature *a posteriori* in the form of a number of orders worthy of a Jellachich or a Windischgrätz, but not a republican.

"Willich ordered a man called Schön, who wished to resign from the Brigade, to take off his new shoes which had been purchased from the savings of the Brigade, disregarding the fact that Schön too had contributed his share to these savings, which consisted chiefly of the daily 10 sous per capita which the French paid by way of subsidy.... Schön wanted to take his shoes with him, but Willich forced him to leave them behind.

"Several valuable members of the Brigade were for trivial offences such as absence from roll-call, drill, lateness (in the evening), petty quarrels, etc., ordered by Willich, who *did not consult* the Brigade, to leave Besançon. They could go to Africa, he remarked, for they had no right to remain in France, and if they did not go to Africa he would see to it that they were extradited to Germany. He claimed that the French Government had given him authority to do this, but upon subsequent inquiry the Prefecture in Besançon declared this to be untrue. Almost every day at roll-call, Willich announced: Whoever does not like it here can go, if he wishes, the sooner the better; he can go to Africa, etc. On one occasion he also uttered the general threat that anyone who refused to obey his orders could either go to Africa or he, Willich, would have him extradited to Germany. This led to our making the above-mentioned inquiry at the Prefecture. As a result of these daily threats many people were fed up with life in Besançon where, as they said, one was constantly provoked into chucking up the whole paltry business. If we wish to be slaves, they said, we can go to Russia and we need not have started the fight in Germany in the first place. In short, they declared that they could no longer endure it in Besançon at any price without coming into serious conflict with Willich. They therefore left Besançon, but as at that time there was no other brigade which they could join, and as they could not live on the 10 sous on their

own, they had no other choice but to sign on for Africa, and this they did. In this way Willich reduced thirty worthy citizens to despair and he is to blame for their loss to the national cause.

"Furthermore, Willich was unwise enough always to praise his old colleagues at roll-call while denigrating the new ones, and this led to constant friction. On one occasion Willich even declared at roll-call that the Prussians were far superior to the South Germans in head, heart and body, or as he put it, in physical, moral and intellectual abilities. The South Germans, in contrast, were easy-going, or rather, stupid was what he wanted to say, but he did not quite dare. In this way Willich managed to infuriate the South Germans, who were in a great majority. We have left the worst to the end:

"Two weeks ago the 7th Company allowed a man called Baroggio whom Willich had arbitrarily expelled from the barracks to spend an extra night in their room. Despite Willich's refusal to permit this they kept him in their room and defended it against Willich's supporters, fanatical tailors. Willich then ordered ropes to be brought and the rebels to be bound. The ropes really were brought, but although Willich had the will to have his order carried through, he did not have the power.... It is for these reasons that they have left the Brigade.

"We have not written this letter in order to accuse Willich. For Willich's character and intentions are good, and many of us respect him. But we did not like the manner in which he attempts to achieve his ends nor all the means he uses. Willich means well. But he believes to be wisdom itself and the *ultima ratio* and thinks that everyone who opposes him, even on petty issues, is either a fool or a traitor. In short, Willich acknowledges no opinion other than his own. He is a spiritual aristocrat and despot; when he has resolved on a thing, he does not easily shrink from using the means necessary to put it into practice. But enough: we know Willich now. We know his strengths and his weaknesses; this is why we are no longer in Besançon. Incidentally, when we left Besançon we all declared that we were leaving Willich, but that we did not wish to resign from the German military association 'Self-Help'.

"This applies to the members of the Vesle Brigade also....

"Assuring you of our enduring respect, we conclude with fraternal greetings from the Brigade in Nancy.

"Approved in general assembly, November 13, 1848.

"Nancy, November 14, 1848

"In the name and on the instructions of the Brigade,
B..., Secretary"

Let us now return to *Techow's* letter. As with other reptiles, its poison is in the tail, namely in the postscript of September 3 (1850). It refers to a duel between Herr *Willich* and my friend, *Konrad Schramm*, who died a premature death. In the duel, which took place in Antwerp in the beginning of September 1850, *Techow* and *Barthélemy*, a Frenchman, acted as *Willich's* seconds. *Techow* wrote to Schimmelpfennig "for communication to our friends":

"They" (i. e. Marx and his followers) "have let their champion *Schramm* loose against *Willich* who had attacked him" (*Techow* means: whom he had attacked) "with invective of the most vulgar sort and finally challenged him to a duel." ("Magnum Opus", pp. 156, 157.)

My refutation of this stupid piece of gossip was published seven years ago in the pamphlet, cited earlier, *The Knight of the Noble Conscientiousness*, New York, 1853.

At the time Schramm was still alive. Like Willich he was living in the United States.

Willich's second, Barthélemy, had not yet been hanged; Schramm's second, the worthy Polish officer Miskowsky, had not yet been burnt to death,⁷⁹ and Herr Techow could not yet have forgotten the letter he had written for "communication to our friends".

In the above-mentioned pamphlet there is a letter from my friend *Frederick Engels*, dated *Manchester, November 23, 1853*, at the end of which he writes:

*"In the meeting of the Central Authority, when it came to a challenge to a duel between Schramm and Willich,⁸⁰ I" (Engels) "am supposed" (according to Willich) "to have committed the crime of having 'left the room' together with Schramm shortly before the scene took place, and, therefore, of having prepared the whole scene in advance. Previously" (according to Willich) "it was Marx who was alleged to have 'egged on' Schramm, now for a change I am supposed to have done so. A duel between a Prussian lieutenant, an old hand at pistol shooting, and a *commerçant*, who perhaps had never had a pistol in his hand, was truly a remarkable means to 'get rid' of the lieutenant. Yet friend Willich maintained everywhere, orally and in writing, that we had wanted to get him shot.... Simply, Schramm was furious at Willich's shameless behaviour, and to the great astonishment of us all he challenged him to a duel. A few minutes before, Schramm himself had no inkling that it would come to this. Never was an action more spontaneous.... Schramm departed" (from the room) "only after being personally addressed by Marx, who wanted to avoid any further scandal.*

Fr. Engels" (The Knight, etc., p. 7.)^a

How far I was from foreseeing that *Techow* would allow himself to become a vehicle for this stupid piece of gossip can be seen from the following passage of the same pamphlet:

"Originally, as Techow himself told Engels and me after his return to London, Willich was firmly convinced that through Schramm I aimed at his removal from this world, and he put this idea in writing everywhere. On closer reflection, however, he found it impossible that a diabolical tactician like myself could hit on the

^a See present edition, Vol. 12, pp. 492, 493. The italics were introduced by Marx in *Herr Vogt*.—Ed.

idea of getting rid of him by means of a duel with Schramm" (loc. cit., p. 9).^a

The gossip that Techow imparted to Herr Schimmelpfennig for "communication to our friends" was hearsay which he simply repeated. *Karl Schapper*, who took Willich's side when later the split in the League occurred and who witnessed the challenge, has written this letter to me about it:

"5 Percy Street, Bedford Square,
September 27, 1860

"Dear Marx,

"Concerning the row between Schramm and Willich:

"It broke out during a meeting of the Central Authority as the result of a fierce argument between the two which arose *by chance* in the course of the discussion. I can still remember very well that you did *everything* possible to restore calm and to settle the affair and that you appeared to be as much taken by surprise by this sudden explosion as I myself and everyone else present.

"Salute,

Your *Karl Schapper*"

Finally, it is worth mentioning that a few weeks *after* the duel, in a letter dated *December 31, 1850*, Schramm himself accused me of *being partial to Willich*. The disapproval which Engels and I had openly expressed, both before the duel and after it, had momentarily annoyed him. His letter and other papers of his and Miskowsky's concerning the duel, which have come into my hands, are available for perusal by his relatives. They should not be exposed to the gaze of the public.

When Konrad Schramm next visited me in London in mid-July 1857 after his return from the United States, his impetuous, tall, youthful frame had already collapsed under the impact of galloping consumption, which however had merely heightened the effect of his strikingly handsome features. With the sense of humour peculiar to him and which never left him for a moment, the first thing he showed me, laughing as he did so, was the notice of his death which an indiscreet friend had already published in a German paper in New York on the basis of a rumour.^b On medical advice Schramm went to St. Hélier in Jersey, where Engels and I saw him for the last time. Schramm died on January 16, 1858. At his burial, which was attended by the entire liberal population of St. Hélier and the whole of the emigration resident

^a *ibid.*, p. 496. The italics were introduced by Marx in *Herr Vogt.—Ed.*

^b See Marx's letter to Engels dated April 9, 1857 (present edition, Vol. 40). The paper referred to is *Neue Zeit.—Ed.*

there, the funeral oration was given by one of the best English popular orators, *G. Julian Harney*, who was known earlier as one of the Chartist leaders and who had been friendly with Schramm during his stay in London. Schramm's ardent, fiery and enterprising nature, which could never be curbed by mundane concerns, was combined with critical understanding, original intelligence, ironic humour and naive geniality. He was the Percy Hotspur of our party.

To return to Herr *Techow's* letter. A few days after his arrival in London, he had a long meeting with us late one evening^a in a tavern where Engels, Schramm and myself acted as hosts. He describes the meeting in his letter of August 26, 1850 to Schimmelpfennig, "for communication to our friends".^b I had never met him before and only saw him once or twice afterwards, and then only briefly. Nevertheless, he at once made a penetrating analysis of me and my friends, closely examining our minds, hearts and entrails, and hastened to send a letter containing a psychological description behind our backs to Switzerland, carefully advising his "friends" that it should be secretly reproduced and distributed.

Techow is much concerned with the state of my "heart". I will generously refrain from following him into this territory. "*Ne parlons pas morale*";^c as the Parisian grisette says when her friend starts to talk politics.

Let us dwell a while on the recipient of the letter of August 26, the former Prussian lieutenant *Schimmelpfennig*. I do not know the gentleman personally and have never seen him. I shall quote from two letters to convey his character. The first, which I give only in extract, was addressed to me by my friend *W. Steffen*, a former Prussian lieutenant and teacher in the Divisional School. It is dated *Chester, November 23, 1853*⁸¹ and he writes:

"Willich once sent an adjutant called *Schimmelpfennig* over" (to Cologne). "He paid me the compliment of summoning me to him and he was firmly convinced that he could assess the whole situation right from the start better than anyone who was involved in it from day to day. He therefore formed a very low opinion of me when I told him that the officers of the Prussian army would be far from considering themselves fortunate to be able to fight under his banner and Willich's and that they were certainly not inclined to proclaim Willich's republic at once. He became even angrier when no one showed himself foolish enough to offer to duplicate the proclamation which he had brought with him in readiness and which exhorted the officers to declare themselves in favour of what he called democracy.

^a On August 21, 1850.—*Ed.*

^b See Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess...*, S. 142-61.—*Ed.*

^c "Don't let's talk morality."—*Ed.*

"In a fury, he departed from what he described to me as 'a *Cologne enslaved by Marx*'. He arranged for the duplication of his nonsense elsewhere and dispatched it to a large number of officers with the result that the chaste mystery of his cunning plan to convert Prussian officers to the republican cause was prostituted by the 'Spectator' of the *Kreuz-Zeitung*."

At the time of this adventure, Steffen, who only came to England in 1853, was completely unknown to me. Even more revealing is *Schimmelpfennig's* self-characterisation in the following letter to the same *Hörfel* who was later exposed as a French police agent. He was the heart and soul of the Revolutionary Committee founded in Paris at the end of 1850 by Schimmelpfennig, Schurz, Häfner and other friends of *Kinkel* in those days and he was on terms of intimacy with those two matadors Schurz and Schimmelpfennig.

Schimmelpfennig to Hörfel (in Paris, 1851):

"Here" (in London) "the following events have taken place.... We have written to all our friends with any influence" (in America) "asking them to prepare the way for the loan" (the Kinkel Loan) "first of all by talking for some time about the power of conspiracy, both personally and in the press, and by emphasising that people worth their salt will never leave the field of battle—neither the Germans, the French nor the Italians." (History does not have no date?^a) "... Our work is now off to a good start. If you drop people who are too obstinate, they will soon think better of it and come to accept the conditions imposed. Since the work is now firm and secure, I shall tomorrow establish contact with Ruge and Haug.... My own social position, like yours, is very oppressive. It is vital that our affairs should get moving soon." (Namely the business of Kinkel's Revolutionary Loan.)

"Your *Schimmelpfennig*"

This letter of *Schimmelpfennig's* is to be found in the *Enthüllungen* which *A. Ruge* published in the *Herold des Westens*, Louisville, September 11, 1853. *Schimmelpfennig*, who was already living in the United States when they appeared, never impugned the authenticity of the letter. *Ruge's Enthüllungen* are reprinted from a document entitled "*Aus den Akten des Berliner Polizeipräsidiums*". It consists of marginal notes by *Hinckeldey* and of papers which were either found by the French police in the possession of *Schimmelpfennig* and *Hörfel* in Paris, or were unearthed at *Pastor Dulon's* in Bremen, or, lastly, were entrusted to the German-American press during the Frogs-and-Mice War between *Ruge's* Agitation Union and *Kinkel's* Émigré Society,⁸² by the feuding brothers themselves. Typical is the irony with which

^a Marx ridicules *Schimmelpfennig's* ungrammatical sentence by alluding to an equally ungrammatical statement made by Prince Lichnowski, a reactionary deputy of the Frankfurt National Assembly, who said at one of the sessions: "Für das historische Recht gibt es kein Datum nicht" ("With regard to historical right there does not exist no date") (cf. present edition, Vol. 7, p. 369).—Ed.

Hinckeldey remarks that Schimmelpfennig abruptly cut short his journey through Prussia as missionary on behalf of Kinkel's Revolutionary Loan because "he *imagined* that he was being pursued by the police"! The same *Enthüllungen* contain a letter from Karl Schurz, "the representative of the Paris Committee" (i.e. that of Hörfel, Häfner, Schimmelpfennig, etc.) "in London", in which we find:

"It was decided yesterday that of the members of the emigration here Bucher, Dr. Frank, Redz from Vienna and *Techow*, who will soon be here, should be asked to join the discussions. N.B. *Techow* should not be informed of this decision for the time being, either verbally or in writing, before his arrival." (*Karl Schurz* to his "dear men" in Paris, London, April 16, 1851.)

It was to one of these "dear men", Herr *Schimmelpfennig*, that *Techow* addresses his letter of August 26, 1850 for "communication to our friends". He begins by informing the "dear man" of theories which I had been trying to keep a strict secret, but which he at once detected at our single encounter by means of the proverb "*in vino veritas*".

"I," Herr *Techow* recounts to Herr *Schimmelpfennig*, "for communication to our friends", "I ... declared finally that I had *always imagined* them" (i.e. Marx, Engels, etc.) "*to be above all the nonsense about a communist paradisiacal barn à la Cabot*, etc." ("*Magnum Opus*", p. 150.)^a

Imagined! So *Techow* did not even *know* the elementary facts about our views, but was nevertheless magnanimous and condescending enough to *imagine* that they were not exactly "nonsense".

Leaving scientific works to one side, even if he had read the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, which he later calls my "Proletarian Catechism",^b he would have found in it a detailed chapter with the title "Socialist and Communist Literature", and at the end of this chapter a section entitled "Critical-Utopian Socialism and Communism", in which it says:

"The Socialist and Communist systems properly so called, those of Saint-Simon, Fourier, Owen and others, spring into existence in the early undeveloped period, described above, of the struggle between proletariat and bourgeoisie.... The founders of these systems saw, indeed, the class antagonisms, as well as the action of the decomposing elements in the prevailing form of society. But the proletariat offered to them the spectacle of a class without any historical initiative or any independent political movement. Since the development of class antagonism keeps even pace with the

^a Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess...*, S. 150. Marx's italics and bold type.—*Ed.*

^b *ibid.*, S. 152.—*Ed.*

development of industry, the economic situation, as they find it, does not as yet offer to them the material conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat. They therefore search after a social science, after social laws, *that are to create these conditions*. Social action is to yield to their personal inventive action, *historically* created conditions of emancipation to *fantastic* ones, and the gradual class organisation of the proletariat to an *organisation of society specially contrived by these inventors*. Future history resolves itself, in their eyes, into the *propaganda and the practical* carrying out of their social plans.... The significance of Critical-Utopian Socialism and Communism bears an inverse relation to historical development.... Therefore, although the originators of these systems were, in many respects, revolutionary, their disciples have, in every case, formed mere reactionary sects [...] and [...] still *dream* of experimental realisation of their social Utopias, of founding isolated 'phalanstères', of establishing 'Home Colonies', of *setting up a 'Little Icaria'*—duodecimo editions of the New Jerusalem...*" (*Manifesto of the Communist Party*, 1848, pp. 21, 22).^a

In the concluding words *Cabet's Icaria*, or "paradisiacal barn", to use Techow's expression, is explicitly referred to as a "duodecimo edition of the New Jerusalem".

Techow's self-confessed total ignorance of the ideas that Engels and I had published in print years before our encounter with him is the factor that completely accounts for his misunderstanding. A few quotations will serve adequately to characterise *him*:

"He" (Marx) "laughs at the fools who blindly repeat his Proletarian Catechism after him, just as he laughs at communists like Willich and at the bourgeoisie. The only men he respects are *aristocrats*, those who are pure aristocrats, and are conscious of being so. *To oust them from power* he requires a force which he can find only in the proletariat. *This is why his system is tailored to fit that force*" ("Magnum Opus", p. 152).

* *Phalanstères* were Socialist colonies on the plan of Charles Fourier; *Icaria* was the name given by Cabet to his Utopia and, later on, to his American Communist colony. [*Note by Engels to the English edition of 1888.*]

"Home Colonies" were what Owen called his Communist model societies. *Phalanstères* was the name of the public palaces planned by Fourier. *Icaria* was the name given to the Utopian land of fancy, whose Communist institutions Cabet portrayed. [*Note by Engels to the German edition of 1890.*]

^a Here and below Marx quotes from the first German edition of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, published in London in 1848 (see present edition, Vol. 6. pp. 514-15, 516). The italics were introduced by Marx in *Herr Vogt.—Ed.*

Techow thus “imagines” that I have written a “Proletarian Catechism”. He means the *Manifesto* which criticises and, if he likes, “ridicules” socialist and critical utopianism of every kind. Only, this “ridiculing” was not such a simple matter as Techow “imagines”, but required a fair amount of work, as he could see from my book against Proudhon, *Misère de la philosophie* (1847).^a Techow further “imagines” that I have “tailored” a “system”, whereas, on the contrary, even in the *Manifesto* which was intended directly for workers, I rejected systems of every kind and in their place I insisted on “a critical insight into the conditions, the line of march and the ultimate general results of the real movement of society”.^b Such an “insight” cannot be blindly repeated, nor can it be “tailored” like a cartridge pouch. Of rare naivety is the view of the relations between aristocracy, bourgeoisie and proletariat, as Techow “imagines” them and *imputes* them to me.

I “respect” the aristocracy, “laugh” at the bourgeoisie, and I “tailor a system” to fit the proletariat, using them to “oust the aristocracy from power”. In the first section of the *Manifesto*, entitled “Bourgeois and Proletarians” (see *Manifesto*, p. 11),^c it is argued in detail that the economic and, hence too, in one form or another, the political *sway of the bourgeoisie* is the essential precondition both of the existence of the modern proletariat and of the creation of the “material conditions for its emancipation”. “The development of the modern proletariat” (see *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Revue*, January 1850, p. 15) “is, in general, conditioned by the development of the industrial bourgeoisie. Only *under its rule* does the proletariat gain that extensive national existence which can raise its revolution to a national one, and does it itself create the modern means of production, which become just so many means of its revolutionary emancipation. Only *its rule* tears up the material roots of feudal society and levels the ground *on which alone a proletarian revolution is possible*.”^d I declared accordingly in the same “Review” that any revolution in which England did not take part was no more than a “storm in a teacup”.^e Engels had already advanced the same opinion in 1845 in *The Condition of the Working-Class in England*.^e Hence in countries where an aristocracy

^a See present edition, Vol. 6.—*Ed.*

^b *ibid.*, p. 497.—*Ed.*

^c *ibid.*, pp. 495-96.—*Ed.*

^d Karl Marx, *The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850* (see present edition, Vol. 10, p. 56). The italics were introduced by Marx in *Herr Vogt*.—*Ed.*

^e See present edition, Vol. 4.—*Ed.*

in the Continental sense of the term—and this is what Techow meant by “aristocracy”—has still to be “ousted from power”, the very first prerequisite of a proletarian revolution is in my opinion missing, namely the existence of an *industrial proletariat* on a national scale.

Techow could have found my view of the attitude to the bourgeois movement adopted by the German workers in particular expressed very clearly in the *Manifesto*.

“In Germany they [the Communists] fight with the bourgeoisie whenever it acts in a revolutionary way, against the absolute monarchy, the feudal landowners and philistinism [*Kleinbürgerei*]. But they never cease, for a single instant, to instil into the working class the clearest possible recognition of the hostile antagonism between bourgeoisie and proletariat, etc.” (*Manifesto*, p. 23.)^a

When I stood before a bourgeois jury in Cologne charged with “rebellion”, I argued along the same lines: “Modern bourgeois society still has *classes*, but no longer *social estates*. Its development lies in the struggle between these classes, but the latter stand united against the estates and their monarchy by the grace of God.” (“*Zwei politische Prozesse, verhandelt vor den Februar-Assisen zu Köln 1849*”, p. 59.)⁸⁴

What else did the liberal bourgeoisie do in its appeals to the proletariat between 1688 and 1848 but “tailor systems and phrases” in order to use the *proletariat's* strength to oust the aristocracy from power? So Herr Techow discovers that the core of the matter^b hidden in my secret theory is *bourgeois liberalism of the crudest sort! Tant de bruit pour une omelette!*^c Since, on the other hand, Techow knew perfectly well that “Marx” was no bourgeois liberal, he was left finally with no choice but “to go away with the impression that *his* personal supremacy was the goal of all his actions”. “All my actions”, what a temperate description of my single interview with Herr Techow!

Techow further confides to his Schimmelpfennig, “for communication to our friends”, that I had expressed the following monstrous opinion:

^a Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (see present edition, Vol. 6, p. 519). Marx quotes the German edition of 1848.—*Ed.*

^b Marx uses the idiomatic expression *des Pudels Kern* from Goethe's *Faust*, Erster Teil, Studierzimmer.—*Ed.*

^c Much ado about an omelette!—an exclamation which Jacques Vallée, Sieur des Barreaux, is supposed to have made when a thunderstorm occurred while he was eating an omelette on a fast-day.—*Ed.*

“In the end it is a matter of complete indifference whether this miserable Europe were to be destroyed, a thing which must happen **within a short space of time** without a social revolution, and whether afterwards America would exploit the old system at Europe’s expense.” (“Magnum Opus”, p. 148.)^a

My conversation with Techow took place at the end of August 1850. In the February 1850 issue of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Revue*, i.e. eight months *before* Techow culled this secret from my lips, I revealed the following views to the German public:

“Now we come *to America*. The most important thing to have occurred here, more important than the February revolution, is the discovery of the Californian gold-mines. Already now, after barely eighteen months, one may predict that this discovery will have much more impressive consequences than the discovery of America itself.... For the second time world trade is taking a new direction ... the Pacific Ocean will have the same role as the Atlantic has now and the Mediterranean had in antiquity and in the Middle Ages—that of the great water highway of world commerce; and the Atlantic will decline to the status of an inland sea, like the Mediterranean nowadays. The only chance the civilised nations of Europe will *then* have, not to fall into the same industrial, commercial and political dependence to which Italy, Spain and Portugal are now reduced, lies in a social revolution.” (*Revue*, No. 2, February 1850, pp. [76,] 77.)^b

But the idea that old Europe will be “destroyed *within a short space of time*” and America will accede to the throne the following morning, belongs to Herr Techow. The clarity of my own view of America’s immediate prospects at that time can be seen from another passage in the same “Review”: “*Over-speculation* will develop very soon, and even if British capital becomes involved on a large scale [...] nevertheless this time *New York* will remain the centre of the whole swindle and, as in 1836, will be the first to suffer when it collapses.” (*Revue*, double issue, May to October 1850, p. 149.)^c This prognosis for America, which I made in 1850, was fully borne out by the great trade crisis of 1857. As to “old Europe”, on the other hand, having given an account of the revival of its economy, I go on to say: “With this general prosperity, in which the productive forces of bourgeois society

^a In this passage Marx left out Vogt’s italics and introduced bold type.—*Ed.*

^b See present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 265-66. The word “*then*” in the last sentence was introduced by Marx in *Herr Vogt*.—*Ed.*

^c Here and immediately below Marx quotes, with minor alterations, from “Review, May to October [1850]” (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 506 and 510). The italics were introduced by Marx in *Herr Vogt*.—*Ed.*

develop so luxuriantly ... there can be no talk of a real revolution.... The various quarrels in which the representatives of the individual factions of the Continental party of Order now indulge and mutually compromise themselves, far from providing the occasion for revolution, are, on the contrary, possible only because the basis of the relationships is *momentarily* so secure and, what the reaction does not know, *so bourgeois*. All reactionary attempts to hold up bourgeois development will rebound off it just as certainly as *all moral indignation and all enthusiastic proclamations of the democrats*. A new revolution is possible only in consequence of a crisis" (loc. cit., p. 153).

And in fact European history has only re-entered an acute and, if one wishes, revolutionary phase since the crisis of 1857-58. In fact it was precisely during the reactionary period from 1849 to 1859 that industry and trade on the Continent, and along with them the material foundations for the political domination of the bourgeoisie, developed to an extent unheard of previously. In fact during this period "all moral indignation and all enthusiastic proclamations of the democrats" rebounded off the realities of economic conditions.

If *Techow* took the serious side of our discussions so humorously, he made up for it by the seriousness with which he responded to their humorous side. With a woebegone face he reports to his *Schimmelpfennig* "for communication to our friends":

"Furthermore, *Marx* stated: In revolutions officers are always the greatest threat; [...] from La Fayette to Napoleon, a series of traitors and treacheries. *One ought always to have dagger and poison in readiness for them.*" ("Magnum Opus", p. 153.)^a

Even *Techow* will not wish to claim that the platitude about the treasonable activities of "the military" is an original opinion of mine. My originality is supposed rather to consist in the "dagger and poison" always to be held in readiness. Did *Techow* not know even then that really revolutionary governments, such as the *Comité du salut public*,⁸⁵ kept antidotes in readiness for "the military" that were very drastic though less melodramatic? The dagger and poison really belong to the stock-in-trade of a Venetian oligarchy. If *Techow* were to scrutinise his letter once again, he would perhaps notice the irony in the "dagger and poison". *Vogt's* fellow-scoundrel, **Edouard Simon**, the notorious Bonapartist **spy**, translated the last part of *Techow's* letter in the

^a In this passage the italics are *Vogt's*.—*Ed.*

Revue contemporaine (XIII, Paris, 1860, p. 528, in his "Le procès de M. Vogt, etc.") adding his own gloss:

"Marx n'aime pas beaucoup voir des officiers dans sa bande. Les officiers sont trop dangereux dans les révolutions.

"Il faut toujours tenir prêts pour eux le poignard et le poison!

"Techow, qui est officier, se le tient pour dit; il se rembarque et retourne en Suisse."^a

According to *Edouard Simon*, poor Techow was in such a panic at the thought of the "dagger and poison" I was holding in readiness, that he immediately took to his heels, boarded ship and returned to Switzerland. The Imperial Vogt prints the passage about "dagger and poison" in bold type, to send a shiver down the spine of the German philistines. However, the same merry gentleman wrote in his so-called *Studien*:

"Today the knife and the poison of the Spaniard are shining in even greater glory—for it was the independence of the nation that was at stake" (loc. cit., p. 79).^b

Quite by the way: the Spanish and English historical sources dealing with the period 1807-14 have long since disproved the tales about poison invented by the French. But for the tub-thumping politicians, of course, they survive unscathed.

I now come, lastly, to the "tittle-tattle" in Techow's letter and shall provide a few illustrations of his historical impartiality:

"The talk centred at first on the question of competition between them and us, Switzerland and London. [...] They had to maintain the rights of the old League, which because of its own specific party policy of course could not tolerate another league operating in the same area" (the proletariat) ("Magnum Opus", p. 143).^c

The rival organisation in Switzerland to which Techow refers here and as whose representative he, as it were, approached us, was the already-mentioned "*Revolutionary Centralisation*". Its Central Committee was located in Zurich and its President was a lawyer, a former Vice-President of one of the pocket parliaments of 1848 and a member of one of the provisional governments in Germany in 1849.^d In July 1850 *Dronke* went to Zurich⁸⁶ where, as a

^a "Marx does not much care to see officers in his gang. Officers are too dangerous in revolutions.

"One ought always to have dagger and poison in readiness for them!

"Techow, who is an officer, did not need to be told twice; he re-embarked and returned to Switzerland" (Edouard Simon, "Un tableau de moeurs politiques en Allemagne. Le procès de M. Vogt avec la gazette d'Augsbourg", *Revue contemporaine*, t. 13, Paris, February 15, 1860). The italics are Simon's.—Ed.

^b Carl Vogt, *Studien zur gegenwärtigen Lage Europas*, S. 79. Marx's italics.—Ed.

^c Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess...*, S. 143.—Ed.

^d Samuel Erdmann Tzschirner.—Ed.

member of the London "League", he was given a sort of legal contract by that lawyer "for communication" to me. I quote from it verbatim:

"Considering the necessity for a union of all truly revolutionary elements, and since all members of the Revolutionary Central Committee have acknowledged the proletarian character of the next revolution, even though not all were able unreservedly to accept the programme adopted in London (the Manifesto of 1848), the Communist organisation and the Revolutionary Centralisation have agreed on the following points:

"1. Both parties agree to continue working side by side—the Revolutionary Centralisation will strive to prepare for the next revolution by attempting to unite *all* revolutionary elements, the London association will try to prepare for the rule of the proletariat by concentrating *primarily* on the organisation of *proletarian elements*;

"2. The Revolutionary Centralisation will instruct its agents and emissaries that, when forming branches in Germany, members who seem to be qualified to join the Communist organisation should have their attention drawn to the existence of an organisation devoted primarily towards the furtherance of proletarian interests;

"3. and 4. That the leadership in the 'Revolutionary Central Committee' for Switzerland will only be entrusted to *genuine supporters* of the London Manifesto, and that there should be a general exchange of information."

It is evident from this document, which is still in my possession, that there was no question of two secret societies "operating in the same area" (the proletariat), but of an alliance between two societies with *different aims* operating in *different areas*. It is equally evident that the "Revolutionary Centralisation" declared itself willing to act as a sort of branch organisation of the "Communist League", in addition to pursuing its own ends.

The proposal was rejected because it was incompatible with the principles of the "League".

"Then it was *Kinkel's* turn.... To this they replied.... They had never striven for cheap popularity, on the contrary! [...] As far as Kinkel was concerned they would not have begrudged him his cheap popularity in the least, had he kept quiet. But once he had published that Rastatt speech in the Berlin *Abend-Post*,^a peace was no longer possible. They had known perfectly well that there would be a general outcry; they had clearly foreseen that the existence of their present paper" (*Rheinische Zeitung. Revue*) "was at stake. Moreover, their fears had been realised. They had been ruined by the whole affair, they had lost all their subscribers in the Rhine Province and had to close the paper down. But it would do them no harm" (loc. cit., pp. 146-48).^b

First a factual correction. It is not true that the *Revue* was closed down at this point, since one more, double issue came out three

^a Gottfried Kinkel's speech before the court martial in Rastatt on August 4, 1849, *Abend-Post*, Nos. 78 and 79, April 5 and 6, 1850.—*Ed.*

^b Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess...*, S. 146-48.—*Ed.*

months afterwards.^a Nor had we lost *a single subscriber* in the Rhine Province, as my old friend *J. Weydemeyer*, a former Prussian lieutenant of artillery and, at that time, editor of the *Neue Deutsche Zeitung* in Frankfurt, can testify since it was he who was kind enough to collect the subscriptions for us. For the rest, Techow, who had only a hearsay acquaintance with the writings of Engels and myself, nevertheless must at least have read our critique—which he himself criticises—of Kinkel’s speech. Why then send this confidential information to his “dear men” in Switzerland? Why “reveal” to them what we had ourselves revealed to the public five months previously? We wrote in the critique referred to:

“We know in advance that we shall provoke the general wrath of the sentimental swindlers and democratic spouters by denouncing this speech of the ‘captured’ Kinkel to our party. To this we are completely indifferent. Our task is that of ruthless criticism ... and in maintaining this our position *we gladly forego cheap democratic popularity*. Our attack will by no means worsen Herr Kinkel’s position; *we denounce his amnesty* by confirming his confession that he is not the man people allege to hold him for, and by declaring that he is worthy, not only of being amnestied, but even of entering the service of the Prussian state! Moreover, his speech has been published” (*Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Revue*, April 1850, pp. 70, 71).⁸⁷

Techow asserts that we “compromised” the *petits grands hommes*^b of the revolution. However, he does not use the word “compromise” in the *police* sense of Herr Vogt. On the contrary, he means the operation by means of which we stripped off the offensive covering of those sheep who had dressed up in revolutionary wolf’s clothing, thus preserving them from the fate of the celebrated Provençal troubadour^c who was torn to pieces by the dogs because they took the wolf’s pelt seriously which he wore to go hunting.

As an instance of our offensive attacks Techow singles out the incidental gloss on General *Sigel* to be found in Engels’ account of the “campaign for the Imperial Constitution” (see *Revue*, March 1850, pp. 70-78).^d

^a The issue in question—*Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue*, No. 5-6—appeared in late November 1850.—*Ed.*

^b Little great men.—*Ed.*

^c Vidal Peire.—*Ed.*

^d See present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 174-79.—*Ed.*

Now Engels' critique, which is based on documentary evidence, should be compared with the following malicious and trite twaddle about that same General *Sigel*, published about a year after our meeting with Techow by the London "Emigration Association" run by Techow, Kinkel, Willich, Schimmelpfennig, Schurz, H. B. Oppenheim, Eduard Meyen, etc. Moreover, this was published solely because *Sigel* belonged to Ruge's "Agitation Union", instead of Kinkel's "Emigration Association".

On December 3, 1851 the *Baltimore Correspondent*,^a which was at the time a sort of *Kinkel Moniteur*, published the following description of *Sigel* beneath the title "*The Agitation Union in London*":

"Let us take another look at these worthy men who regard everyone else as an 'immature politician'. *Sigel*, the supreme commander. If anyone ever asks the muse of history how such an insipid nonentity was given the supreme command she will be even more at a loss for an explanation than in the case of that mooncalf Napoleon. The latter is at least 'his uncle's nephew'; *Sigel*, however, is only 'his brother's brother'. His brother^b became a popular officer as a result of his critical remarks about the government, remarks which had been provoked by his frequent arrests for *disorderly behaviour*. The young *Sigel* thought this *reason enough* in the early confusion prevailing at the outbreak of the revolution to proclaim himself supreme commander and Minister of War. The Baden artillery, which had often proved its worth, had plenty of older and more experienced officers who should have taken precedence over this *young Lieutenant Sigel*, and they were more than a little indignant when they had to obey a *young, insignificant* man whose *inexperience was only matched by his incompetence*. But there was Brentano, who was so mindless and treacherous as to permit anything that might ruin the revolution. It is a ridiculous fact, but a fact nevertheless, that *Sigel promoted himself to the rank of commander-in-chief* and that Brentano approved his nomination in retrospect.... It is certainly noteworthy that *Sigel* left the bravest soldiers of the republican army in the lurch at the desperate and hopeless battles in Rastatt and the Black Forest without the reinforcements he had promised while he himself drove around Zurich with the epaulettes and in the carriage of Prince von Fürstenberg and paraded as an interesting unfortunate supreme commander. This is the well-known magnitude of this mature politician who, 'understandably proud' of his earlier heroic deeds, imposed himself as supreme commander for a second time, on this occasion in the *Agitation Union*. This is the great *well-known man*,^c the 'brother of his brother'."^d

Impartiality requires us to lend an ear also to Ruge's "Agitation Union" in the person of its spokesman *Tausenau*. In an open letter addressed "To Citizen Seidensticker", London, *November 14, 1851*,

^a *Der Deutsche Correspondent* (Baltimore).—*Ed.*

^b Albert *Sigel*.—*Ed.*

^c Presumably an analogy with The Great Unknown, i.e. Sir Walter Scott, who was called so because until 1827 his novels appeared anonymously.—*Ed.*

^d This passage is also quoted in the pamphlet *The Great Men of the Exile* by Marx and Engels (see present edition, Vol. 11, p. 324).—*Ed.*

Tausenau writes with reference to the "Emigration Association" led by Kinkel, Techow, etc.:

"...They affirm their conviction that the union of all in the interest of the revolution is an urgent patriotic duty. The German Agitation Union shares this conviction, and its members have proved this by their sustained efforts to achieve unity with Kinkel and his supporters. But as soon as a basis for political co-operation seemed to be established it vanished once again, and new disappointments followed the old ones. High-handed actions in violation of previous agreements, separate interests in the guise of conciliation, the systematic 'fixing' of majorities, the emergence of unknown quantities as party leaders, attempts to impose a secret finance committee are but a few of the devious tricks and chess moves that immature politicians always resort to in exile in the belief that they are guiding the fortunes of their country, while in reality the very first glow of the revolution will dissipate all such vanities and scatter them to the winds.... We were denounced officially and in public by Kinkel's supporters; the **reactionary German press, which was barred to us**, is packed with reports favourable to Kinkel and hostile to us. Finally Kinkel made the journey to the United States in order to use his project of the so-called German Loan as a means of imposing a union on us, or rather a status of subordination and dependence which is the *goal of everyone who proposes a financial merger between two parties*. Kinkel's departure was kept so secret that we did not learn of it until we read in the American press about his arrival in New York.... All this, and other considerations of the same sort, were compelling motives to persuade serious revolutionaries who did not overestimate themselves, but who in the *knowledge of their previous achievements* could with self-confidence assert that at any rate *clearly defined sections of the people stood behind them*, to enter an association which seeks in its own way to further the interests of the revolution."^a

Further it is held against Kinkel that the funds he had collected were to be used for the benefit of "a clique", as "his entire behaviour here" (in London) "and in America makes plain", as do also "the majority of the guarantors nominated by Kinkel himself".

Tausenau concludes by saying:

"We *promise* our friends neither interest on their money nor the repayment of their patriotic donations; but we know that we shall vindicate their confidence in us through our positive achievements" (fair services?) "and scrupulous accounting and *that one day, when we come to publish their names, the gratitude of the nation will await them*" (*Baltimore Wecker* of November 29, 1851).

This was the sort of "literary activity" maintained in the columns of the German-American press for three years by the democratic heroes of the "Agitation Union" and the "Emigration Association" who were later joined by the "Revolutionary League of Two Worlds"⁸⁸ founded by Goegg. (See Appendix 6.)

The refugee row in the American press, incidentally, was inaugurated by a paper battle⁸⁹ between the parliamentarians Zitz and Roesler of Oels.

^a This passage is contained in Marx's notebook for 1860.—Ed.

One more fact by way of characterising Techow's "dear men". Schimmelpfennig, to whom Techow's letter "for communication to our friends" was addressed, had set up a so-called Revolutionary Committee in Paris at the end of 1850 (as we have already mentioned) together with Hörfel, Häfner, Goegg and others (K. Schurz joined in at a later date).

A few years ago a document written by a former member of the Committee to a political refugee here⁹⁰ was handed to me to use as I pleased. The document is still in my possession.

It says, among other things:

"Schurz and Schimmelpfennig were in effect the whole Committee. They also acquired some sort of associates but they were merely for show. These two gentlemen firmly believed at that time that they could soon put their Kinkel, whom they had virtually made their property, at the head of affairs in Germany. They particularly detested Ruge's sarcasms and the criticism and demonic activity of Marx. At a meeting of these gentlemen with their associates they gave us a really very interesting description of Marx and conveyed to us an exaggerated impression of the pandemonic dangers he represented.... Schurz-Schimmelpfennig proposed a motion to *destroy* Marx. The means they *recommended* were *insinuations and intrigues*, and **the most shameless slanders**. A vote in favour and a resolution, if one can use these words to describe their childish antics, then took place. The next step was the character sketch of Marx published in the *literary section* of the *Hamburger Anzeiger*^a at the beginning of 1851. It was written by *L. Häfner* on the basis of the above-mentioned description by Schurz and Schimmelpfennig."

In any event there is the most striking affinity between Häfner's essay and Techow's letter, although neither the one nor the other can equal *Vogt's Lousiad*. It is important not to confuse the *Lousiad* with the *Lusiads* of Camoens. The original *Lousiad* was rather a mock heroic epic by *Peter Pindar*.⁹¹

^a Leopold Häfner's article was published in the *Hamburger Nachrichten* on February 28, 1851.—*Ed.*

V

IMPERIAL REGENT AND COUNT PALATINE

Vidi un col capo sì di merda lordo,
 Che non pareva, s'era laico, o chercò,
 Quei mi sgridò: perchè se' tu sì 'ngordo
 Di riguardar più me che gli altri brutti.

(Dante)*

Vogt, repulsed by the Bristlers, experiences a powerful need to show why the “Brimstone Gang” had singled him out as the *bête noire*. For this reason *Cherval* and the “frustrated conspiracy” at the Joint Festival in Lausanne are supplemented by the adventure of the “fugitive Imperial Regent”, an adventure which had no less reality than they. *Vogt*, we must not forget, was at one time Governor of the parliamentary island of Barataria.⁹² His story goes like this:

“Early in 1850 the *Deutsche Monatschrift* of Kolatschek made its appearance. [...] Immediately after the publication of the first number, *the Brimstone Gang*, acting through one of its comrades who left for America without delay, issued a pamphlet with the title *Der flüchtige Reichsregent Vogt mit seinem Anhang und die Deutsche Monatschrift von Adolf Kolatschek*, a work which was also mentioned by the *Allgemeine Zeitung*.... The Brimstone Gang's whole system is revealed yet again in this pamphlet” (loc. cit., pp. [162-]163).^a

He goes on to explain at tedious length how, in the pamphlet referred to, an anonymous article on *Gagern* which had been written by Professor *Hagen* was “attributed” to the fugitive Imperial Regent, *Vogt*, because

* I there made out a smeared

Head—whether clerk or lay was hard to tell,

It was so thickly plastered with the merd.

“Why stand there gloating?” he began to yell,

“Why stare at me more than the other scum?” (*Kannegiesser*) [*The Divine Comedy*, *Inferno*, *Canto XVIII*. *Kannegiesser* is the name of the German translator.]

^a Here and below Marx quotes from *Vogt's Mein Prozess...*, S. 162-63. The italics are Marx's.—*Ed.*

“the Brimstone Gang knew” that Hagen “was living in Germany at the time, that he had been harassed by the Baden police and that he could not be named without exposing him to molestation of the most unpleasant sort” (p. 163).

In his letter of February 6,^a *Schily* wrote to me from Paris:

“That *Greiner* who, to the best of my knowledge, has never been to Geneva, has been linked with the Brimstone Gang, is the result of his obituary notice to the ‘fugitive Imperial Regent’ for which *d’Ester* was held responsible and outlawed in parliamentary circles until I set matters right in a letter to one of Vogt’s friends and colleagues.”^b

Greiner was a member of the Provisional Government of the Palatinate. *Greiner*’s rule was an “unrelieved horror” (see *Vogt*’s *Studien*, p. 28), that is for my friend *Engels*, whom he had arrested on a trumped-up charge in Kirchheim. *Engels* has himself given a detailed account of the whole tragicomedy in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Revue* (February 1850, pp. 53-55).^c And that is all I know about Herr *Greiner*. The fact that the fugitive Imperial Regent has managed to implicate me in his quarrel with “Count Palatine” reveals “yet again” the “whole system” by means of which our ingenious raconteur has composed the story of the life and deeds of “the Brimstone Gang”.

What endears him to me, however, is the true Falstaffian humour he displayed in causing the Count Palatine to depart for America “without delay”. The Count Palatine, having let fly his pamphlet at the “fugitive Imperial Regent” like a Parthian shot, was suddenly overwhelmed with horror. Which caused *Greiner* to flee from Switzerland to France, from France to England. Even the Channel did not seem to offer sufficient protection and so he fled headlong to a Cunard steamer^d in Liverpool where he breathlessly cried out to the Captain: “Away, across the Atlantic!” And the “stern mariner”^e replied:

“I’ll save you from the hands of the *Vogt*
But from the might of the storm another must lend his aid.”^f

^a Marx quotes from *Schily*’s letter of February 8, 1860.—*Ed.*

^b Ludwig Simon.—*Ed.*

^c See *The Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution* (present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 200-02).—*Ed.*

^d Marx uses the English word.—*Ed.*

^e Marx uses the English phrase.—*Ed.*

^f Schiller, *Wilhelm Tell*, Act I, Scene 1.—*Ed.*

VI

VOGT AND THE *NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG*

“Sin kumber was manecvalt.”^a

Vogt himself claims that his “purpose” in writing his “Magnum Opus” (p. 162) is to clarify “the *development of his personal attitude to this clique*” (Marx and Co.). Curiously enough, he only describes conflicts that he has never experienced and only experiences conflicts that he has never described. So it is necessary to confront his tall stories with a piece of real history. Anyone who leafs through the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* (June 1, 1848-May 19, 1849) will discover that in 1848 Vogt’s name does not occur, apart from a single exception,^b either in its leading articles or in its correspondence columns. It will be found only in the daily reports of the parliamentary debates and to Vogt’s immense satisfaction the Frankfurt reporter^c never failed to record conscientiously the “applause” accorded to him for “the speeches delivered by himself”. We saw that whereas the Right wing in Frankfurt had at their disposal the united forces of a harlequin like *Lichnowski* and a clown like *von Vincke*, the Left was forced to rely entirely on the sporadic outbreaks of farce from its one and only *Vogt*. We realised that he stood in need of encouragement,

“that *important fellow*,
the children’s wonder—*Signor Punchinello*”.^d

^a “His griefs were manifold”—an adapted line from *Der Edel Stein*, a collection of fables by Ulrich Bonerius.—*Ed.*

^b This refers to the article “Ein Aktenstück des Märzvereins” in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 181, December 29, 1848.—*Ed.*

^c Gustav Adolph Schlöffel.—*Ed.*

^d Marx gives these lines in English.—*Ed.*

and so let the Frankfurt reporter have his head. After the middle of September 1848 his reports underwent a change of tone.

In the debates on the Truce of Malmö, Vogt tried to stir up a rebellion with his revolutionary rantings.^a At the decisive moment he did his utmost to prevent the acceptance of the resolutions which had been passed by the popular assembly on the Pfingstweide and approved by a section of the extreme Left.⁹⁴ After the barricade fighting had been crushed, with Frankfurt openly transformed into an army camp and a state of siege proclaimed, this same Vogt declared on September 19 that he was in favour of *urgently* discussing Zachariä's resolution endorsing the measures already taken by the Imperial Ministry and expressing gratitude to the Imperial troops.^b Before *Vogt* rose to speak even *Venedey*^c had protested against the "*urgency*" of these resolutions, declaring that such a discussion at such a time was unworthy of the Assembly. But Vogt was *inferior* to Venedey. By way of punishment I inserted the word "*windbag*" into the parliamentary report^d after the word "*Vogt*", as a hint to the Frankfurt reporter.

In the following October Vogt not only neglected his duty of waving his harlequin's wooden sword above the heads of the then boisterous and fiercely reactionary majority. He did not even dare to sign the protest tabled by *Zimmermann* of Spandau^e on October 10 in the name of some 40 deputies, opposing the law for the protection of the National Assembly.⁹⁵ The law, as *Zimmermann* correctly pointed out, signalled the most shameless interference with the popular rights that had been gained in the March revolution—right of assembly, freedom of speech and of the press. Even *Eisenmann*^f handed in a similar protest. But *Vogt* was *inferior* to *Eisenmann*. When he did venture forth again at the founding of the "*Central March Association*"⁹⁶ his name finally made its appearance in an article in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*

^a Vogt's speech in the Frankfurt National Assembly on September 15, 1848, *Stenographischer Bericht über die Verhandlungen der deutschen constituirenden Nationalversammlung zu Frankfurt am Main*,⁹³ Bd. 3, S. 2091-94.—*Ed.*

^b The speeches by Vogt and Zachariä in the Frankfurt National Assembly on September 19, 1848, *ibid.*, S. 2188.—*Ed.*

^c Venedey's speech in the Frankfurt National Assembly on September 19, 1848, *ibid.*, S. 2187.—*Ed.*

^d Report on the sitting of the Frankfurt National Assembly on September 20, 1848, *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 110, September 23, 1848.—*Ed.*

^e *Zimmermann's* speech in the Frankfurt National Assembly on October 10, 1848, *Stenographischer Bericht...*, Bd. 4, S. 2531.—*Ed.*

^f *Eisenmann's* speech in the Frankfurt National Assembly, *ibid.*, pp. 2531 et seq.—*Ed.*

(December 29, 1848), in which the "March Association" was designated the "unconscious tool of the counter-revolution", its programme was critically torn to shreds and *Vogt* was represented as one half of the two-headed figure whose other half was *Vincke*. More than a decade later both "Ministers of the Future" acknowledged their affinity and chose the *partition of Germany* as the motto of their unity.

That our assessment of the "March Association" was correct was not only confirmed by its later "development". The Heidelberg "People's League", the Breslau "Democratic Association", the Jena "Democratic Association", etc., all rejected its importunate offers of love with scorn, and those members of the extreme Left who had joined it confirmed our criticism of December 29, 1848, by announcing their resignation on April 20, 1849. *Vogt*, however, in the quiet grandeur of his soul, heaped coals of fire on our heads as can be seen from the following quotation:

"*Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 243, Cologne, March 10, 1849. 'The Frankfurt so-called March Association' of the so-called 'Imperial Assembly' has had the insolence to send us the following lithographed letter:

"The March Association has decided to compile a list of *all newspapers* which have given us space in their columns and to distribute it to all associations with which we are connected in order that with the assistance of this association the newspapers indicated will be given preference in being supplied with any relevant announcements. In informing you herewith of this list, we believe it is unnecessary to draw your attention to the importance of the paid announcements of a newspaper as the chief source of income for the whole enterprise. [...] Frankfurt, end of February 1849.

The Managing Committee
of the Central March Association'

"In the enclosed list of newspapers which have given space in their columns to the March Association and to which the supporters of the March Association should give preference in supplying 'relevant announcements', one finds also the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, which, in addition, is given the honour of an asterisk. We hereby announce [...] that our newspaper has never given space in its columns to the so-called March Association.... If, therefore, the March Association in its lithographed report to those newspapers which have really given it space in their columns designates our newspaper as one of its organs, this is simply calumny against the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* and absurd boasting on the part of the March Association....

"To the dirty remark of the profit-greedy competition-goaded

patriots about the importance of the paid announcements of a newspaper as a *source of income for the whole enterprise*, we, of course, do not reply. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* has always differed from the patriots not only generally but also in that it has never regarded political movement as a territory for swindlers or a source of income."^a

Shortly after this brusque rejection of the source of income proffered by Vogt and Co. the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was tearfully held up as a model of "true German disunity" at a meeting of the Central Commercial Association.^b At the conclusion of our reply to this Jeremiad (*Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 248) Vogt is described as a "provincial academic beer-blusterer and an *unsuccessful Imperial Barrot*".^c True, at that time (March 15), he had not yet compromised himself on the question of the Emperor. But we had made our minds up once and for all about Herr Vogt and could therefore regard his future treason as a foregone conclusion, even before it was clear to Vogt himself.

From then on, incidentally, we abandoned Vogt and Co. to the attentions of the young *Schlöffel*, who was both brave and intelligent. He had arrived in Frankfurt from Hungary early in March after which he kept us informed of all the storms in the Imperial frog-pond.

Vogt, meanwhile, had sunk so low—he himself had of course done more to bring this about than the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*—that even *Bassermann* could venture to brand him an "*apostate and renegade*" in the session of April 25, 1849.^d

F. Engels, one of the editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, was forced to flee because of the part he played in the Elberfeld uprising,^{e7} and I myself was driven out of Prussia shortly afterwards, after repeated efforts to silence me through legal proceedings had failed thanks to the jury, and after the *Neue Preussische Zeitung*, the organ of the coup d'état Ministry,^{e8} had repeatedly denounced the "Chimborazo insolence" of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, compared to which the *Moniteur* of 1793

^a Karl Marx, "The March Association" (see present edition, Vol. 9, pp. 36-37).—*Ed.*

^b Marx puns on *März* (March) and *Kommerz* (commerce).—*Ed.*

^c Karl Marx, "The Frankfurt March Association and the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*" (see present edition, Vol. 9, p. 85). The italics were introduced by Marx in *Herr Vogt*.—*Ed.*

^d *Stenographischer Bericht...*, Bd. 8, S. 6303.—*Ed.*

^e The Chimborazo is a peak of the Andes. "Chimborazo insolence" means "monumental insolence".—*Ed.*

seemed rather pale” (see the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 299).^a Such “Chimborazo insolence” was highly appropriate in a Prussian fortress-town and at a time when the victorious counter-revolution sought to intimidate people by means of unashamed brutality.

On May 19, 1849 the last number of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* (the Red Number) appeared. As long as the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* existed, Vogt had endured in silence. If a parliamentarian did lodge a complaint, he did so in all modesty. For example:

“Sir, the *sharp criticism* in your newspaper is valued by me no less because it *observes all parties and all persons with equal strictness*” (see No. 219 [supplement], February 11, 1849. *Wesendonck's* complaint).^b

A week after the demise of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, Vogt, operating under the mantle of parliamentary immunity, finally thought he could seize his long-awaited opportunity to convert the “matter” he had accumulated deep in his heart into “energy”.⁹⁹ The position was that one of the editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, *Wilhelm Wolff*, had replaced a retired Silesian deputy^c in the Frankfurt Assembly, which was “in the process of dissolution” at the time.¹⁰⁰

In order to understand the following scene in the parliamentary session of May 26, 1849, it must be borne in mind that the uprising in Dresden and the local movements in the Rhine Province had already been crushed. The Empire was about to intervene in Baden and the Palatinate, the main Russian army was marching on Hungary and, finally, the Imperial Ministry had simply quashed resolutions approved by the Assembly. On the agenda were two “Proclamations to the German Nation”, the first edited by Uhland and emanating from the majority, the other stemming from the Committee of Thirty,¹⁰¹ whose members belonged to the Centre. Presiding over the Assembly was *Reh* from Darmstadt who later turned into a rabbit^d and “detached” himself from the Assembly, which was “in complete disarray”. I quote from the official stenographic report, Nos. 229, 228. Session in St. Paul's Church.^e

Wolff from Breslau: “Gentlemen, I have registered my opposition to the Proclamation to the Nation, the proclamation that was composed by the majority

^a Karl Marx, “The *Kreuz-Zeitung*” (see present edition, Vol. 9, p. 437).— *Ed.*

^b Hugo Wesendonck, “Erklärung. Düsseldorf, 8. Februar 1849”.— *Ed.*

^c Gustav Adolf Stenzel.— *Ed.*

^d Marx plays on the surname *Reh*, a homonym of *Reh* (roe deer).— *Ed.*

^e *Stenographischer Bericht...*, Bd. 9, S. 6749.— *Ed.*

and that has been read aloud here, because I think it utterly inadequate to the needs of the present time. I find it altogether too feeble. It is good enough to appear as an article in the newspapers which represent the party that has devised it, but it is not good enough for a Proclamation to the German Nation. Since a second Proclamation has now been read out I may remark in passing that I would be even more strongly opposed to it than to the first one, for reasons that I do not need to enter into here." (A voice from the Centre: "Why not?") "I am speaking solely of the majority Proclamation. It is true that it is couched in such moderate terms that even Herr Buss had little to say against it, and that is without doubt the worst recommendation for any proclamation. No, gentlemen, if you wish to have any influence on the people at all you should not address it in the manner adopted in this Proclamation. You must not speak about legality, the legal basis, etc., but of illegality just like the governments, like the *Russians*—and by *Russians* I understand the Prussians, Austrians, Bavarians and Hanoverians." (Commotion and laughter.) "All these have been subsumed under the name *Russians*." (Loud laughter.) "Yes, gentlemen, the *Russians* are represented in this Chamber too. You must tell them: 'In the same way as you adopt the legal standpoint, so do we.' This is the standpoint of force, and in parenthesis you ought to explain legality by saying that you will oppose the Russian cannon with force, with well-organised storming-parties. If any proclamation is to be issued, issue one which begins by outlawing the first traitor to the people, the Imperial Regent."^a (Interruption: "Order!"—Lively applause from the gallery.) "*All the Ministers likewise.*" (Renewed commotion.) "Oh, I shall not let myself be intimidated: *he is the first traitor to the people.*"

President: "I think that Herr Wolff has ignored and offended against every propriety. He cannot describe the *Archducal Imperial Regent* as a *traitor to the people in this House* and I must therefore call him to order. I must also request the galleries for the last time not to intervene further in the debate."

Wolff: "For my part, I accept the call to order and declare that it was my *intention* to transgress the bounds of order and to state that *he and his Ministers are traitors.*" (From all sides of the House: "Order. This is scandalous.")

President: "I must ask you to be seated."

Wolff: "Very well, *I protest.* I wanted to speak here in the *name of the people* and to say what the *people is thinking.* I protest against every proclamation framed in these terms." (Great tumult.)

President: "Gentlemen, will you please allow me to speak for a moment. Gentlemen, the *incident* that has just taken place is, I may say, the *first* there has been *since Parliament has been in session here.*" (It was indeed the first and the *only incident* to take place in that Debating Society.) "No speaker has ever before declared that it was his intention to disrupt the *order, the very foundations* of this House." (*Schlöffel* had replied to a similar call to order, in the session of April 25: "I accept the call to order, all the more as I hope that *the time will soon come when this Assembly will be called to order in a very different way.*")^b

"Gentlemen, I deeply regret that Herr Wolff, who has only just become a member of this House, should have made his *début* in this manner" (Reh looks at the matter from a theatrical point of view). "Gentlemen, I have called him to order because he has permitted himself *greatly to affront the respect and consideration that we owe to the person of the Imperial Regent.*"

^a Archduke John.—*Ed.*

^b *Stenographischer Bericht...*, Bd. 8, S. 6751.—*Ed.*

The debate then proceeded. Hagen and Zachariä made long speeches, the one for and the other against the proclamation of the majority. Finally,

Vogt from Giessen rose from his seat: "Gentlemen, allow me a few words, I shall not weary you. It is perfectly true that this Parliament is *no longer what it was* when it assembled last year, gentlemen, and we *thank Heaven*" (our Vogt of "blind faith"^a thanks Heaven) "that *it is become so*" (*is become*, indeed!^b) "and that those who lost faith in the people and who betrayed the cause of the people at the decisive moment, have now left this Assembly! Gentlemen, I *have asked permission to speak*" (so the thanksgiving we have just heard was just humbug), "in order to defend the *crystal-clear stream*" (defence of a stream) "that flowed from the poet's soul" (Vogt is becoming soulful) "into this proclamation against the *unworthy filth* that has been thrown into it *or* hurled at it" (but the stream had already been absorbed by the proclamation), "to defend these *words*" (as with everything that Vogt touches, the stream has been changed into *words*) "against the *muck* that has been heaped up in this latest movement and which threatens to engulf and besmirch everything. Yes, gentlemen! That" (namely the muck) "is *muck and filth*" (the muck is filth!) "which is being thrown in *this way*" (in what way?) "*at everything pure that can be imagined*, and I wish to express my *deep indignation*" (Vogt in deep indignation, *quel tableau!*^c) "at the fact that *this sort of thing*" (what sort of thing?) "could have happened."^d

And his very speech is—muck.^e

Wolff had not said a single word about *Uhland's editing* of the proclamation. As the President repeatedly declared, he had been called to order, he had conjured up the whole storm, because *he* had declared that the *Imperial Regent and all his Ministers were traitors to the people* and had called on Parliament to do likewise. But for Vogt the "Archducal Imperial Regent", the "worn-out Habsburg" (*Vogt's Studien*, p. 28) and "*all his Ministers*" represent "*everything pure that can be imagined*". With Walther von der Vogelweide he sang:

"des fürsten milte üz ôsterrîche
fröit dem süezen rêgen gelîche
beidiu liute und ouch daz lant."^f

^a Vogt of "blind faith" (*der "Köhlergläubige" Vogt*)—an ironical allusion to Vogt's book *Köhlerglaube und Wissenschaft...*, Giessen, 1855.—*Ed.*

^b Marx ridicules the ungrammatical verb form used by Vogt: *geworden wird.*—*Ed.*

^c What a sight!—*Ed.*

^d *Stenographischer Bericht...*, Bd. 9, S. 6751.—*Ed.*

^e Variation on a verse from Ludwig Uhland's "Des Sängers Fluch": "Und was er spricht, ist Geissel" ("His very speech is a whiplash").—*Ed.*

^f "The Prince of Austria's generosity,
Like gentle rain, bestows felicity
Both on the people and on the land."—*Ed.*

Did Vogt already, even at that time, enjoy the “scientific relationship” with Archduke John that he later confessed to? (See Documents in the “Magnum Opus”, p. 25.)

Ten years later the same Vogt declared in the *Studien* (pp. 27[-28]):

“So much at least is certain: the National Assembly in France and its leaders at the time underestimated the abilities of Louis Napoleon just as the leaders of the Frankfurt National Assembly underestimated *those of Archduke John*, and both the old foxes *made their respective detractors pay dearly for their mistake*. We are far from wanting to equate the two men. The terrible ruthlessness, etc., etc.” (of Louis Bonaparte).—“All this makes him cut a far superior figure to the old and worn-out Habsburg.”^a

During the very same session *Wolff* challenged *Vogt* to a duel with pistols—a challenge which was transmitted by deputy Würth from Sigmaringen—and when the aforesaid *Vogt* preferred to preserve his skin intact for the Empire,* he threatened to thrash him. On leaving St. Paul’s Church, however, *Wolff* discovered Charles the Bold flanked by two ladies, and bursting into laughter he left him to his fate. Although he is a wolf, with a wolf’s heart and teeth, *Wolff* is a lamb when he sees the fair sex. His only, really quite innocuous, revenge was an article in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Revue* (April issue, 1850, p. 73) entitled “*Nachträgliches aus dem Reich*” in which he wrote about the Ex-Imperial Regent as follows:

“In these critical days the Central March people have been extremely industrious. Before withdrawing from Frankfurt they had published an address to the various March associations and to the German people: ‘Fellow-citizens! The eleventh hour has struck!’ In order to assemble a people’s army they issued a new proclamation ‘to the German nation’ from Stuttgart, and lo and behold! the hand on the Central March clock had stood still, or like the clock on Freiburg Minster, had lost the number XII. However that might be, this proclamation too began with the words: ‘Fellow-citizens! The eleventh hour has struck!’ Oh if only it had struck earlier, and had pierced your heads, at least at the time when *Karl Vogt*, the Central March hero, was pacifying the Franconian revolution¹⁰² in Nuremberg to his own satisfaction and to the satisfaction of the wailers who were fêting him**....

* In the pamphlet by Jacobus Venedey already referred to, Kobes I tells the following story: “In the same session in which Gagern embraced Gabriel Riesser after the latter’s speech on the Emperor, ... Karl Vogt embraced Zimmermann in St. Paul’s Church with mock pathos and noisy exclamations, and so I called out to him: ‘Stop these roguish pranks.’ Vogt thought it expedient to reply in provocative and abusive terms and when I challenged him personally, he had the courage, after a friend had made a number of journeys between the two of us, to withdraw his insult” (loc. cit., pp. 21, 22).

** Vogt later justified his valiant deeds in Nuremberg with the words: “He had been given no guarantees for his own personal safety.”

^a Carl Vogt, *Studien zur gegenwärtigen Lage Europas*, S. 27-28. Marx’s italics.—Ed.

The Regency set up its offices in the government building in Freiburg. The Regent *Karl Vogt*, who was also Foreign Minister and the incumbent of many other Ministries, once more took the well-being of the German people^a very much to heart. Having studied their problems in long days and nights he came up with a very timely invention, that of '*Imperial Regency passports*'. These passports were simple, beautifully lithographed and could be obtained gratis by anyone whose heart desired one. They only had the one small defect of being recognised as valid only in Vogt's Chancellery. It is possible that later on one or other of them will find its way into an Englishman's collection of curios."^b

Wolff did not follow Greiner's example. Instead of "departing at once for America" as soon as the *Revue* "had appeared", he remained for a year in Switzerland, awaiting the revenge of the Land-Vogt.

^a Wolff has: "of the German Empire".—*Ed.*

^b *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue*, IV. Heft, April 1850, S. 75, 76.—*Ed.*

VII

THE AUGSBURG CAMPAIGN

Shortly after the citizen of the Canton of Thurgau¹⁰³ had concluded his Italian war, the citizen of the Canton of Berne^a launched his Augsburg campaign.

"There" (in London) "it was *the Marx clique* that had *always* supplied the greater part of the reports" (of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*), "and *ever since 1849 its relations with the 'Allgemeine Zeitung' had been continuous*" ("Magnum Opus", p. 194).^b

Although Marx has only been living in London since the end of 1849,^c i.e. since he was expelled from France for the second time, the "Marx clique" appears to have lived in London *always*, and although the Marx clique has "*always* supplied **the greater part of the reports** of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*", "its relations" with the *Allgemeine Zeitung* have only been "*continuous* ever since 1849". At all events, Vogt's chronology is divided—and this is not to be wondered at since before 1848 the man "had not yet contemplated any political activity" (loc. cit., p. 225)—into two great periods, viz., the period "*always*" up to 1849, and the period from 1849 up to "this" year.

Between 1842 and 1843 I edited the old *Rheinische Zeitung*, which waged a life-and-death war with the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. From 1848 to 1849 the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* revived the polemic. What remains, then, of the period "*always up to 1849*"

^a i.e. Vogt. See his *Studien zur gegenwärtigen Lage Europas*, S. 6.—*Ed.*

^b Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess...*, S. 194. The words "the Marx clique" were italicised by Vogt, the rest of the italics are Marx's.—*Ed.*

^c Marx arrived in London about August 26, 1849.—*Ed.*

apart from the fact that Marx had fought against the *Allgemeine Zeitung* "always", while Vogt had been its "constant collaborator" from 1844 to 1847? (See "Magnum Opus", p. 225.)

Now for the second period of world history *à la* Vogt.

The reason why I maintained "continuous relations with the *Allgemeine Zeitung*" from London, "*continuous ever since 1849*", is that "*from 1852*" a certain *Ohly* had been chief London correspondent of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. It is true that *Ohly* had no relations whatever with me, either before or after 1852. I have never seen him in my life. Inasmuch as he played any part among the London refugees it was as a member of Kinkel's *Emigration Association*. But this has no bearing on the case, for,

"The former oracle of Altenhöfer, that old Bavarian who had learnt English, was my" (Vogt's) "*fellow-countryman, the blond Ohly, who having started out as a communist, strove to attain a loftier poetic standpoint in politics and literature. At first in Zurich, but from 1852 in London, he was the chief correspondent of the Allgemeine Zeitung until he ended his days in a madhouse.*" ("Magnum Opus", p. 195.)

Edouard Simon, the police spy, has Frenchified this Vogtiad as follows:

"En voici d'abord un qui de son point de départ communiste, avait cherché à s'élever aux plus hautes conceptions de la politique." ("Loftier poetic standpoint in politics" was beyond the genius even of an Edouard Simon.) "À en croire M. Vogt, cet adepte fut l'oracle de la Gazette d'Augsbourg jusqu'en 1852, époque où il mourut dans une maison de fous"^a (*Revue contemporaine*, Vol. XIII, Paris, 1860, p. 529).

"*Operam et oleum perdidit,*"^b Vogt may well say of his "Magnum Opus" and his *Ohly*. Whereas he makes his "fellow-countryman" the London correspondent of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* from 1852, until he "ends his days in a madhouse", Edouard Simon says that "if we may believe Vogt, *Ohly* had been the oracle of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* up to 1852 when he" (who, it will be noted, is still alive) "*died in a madhouse*". But Edouard Simon knows his Karl Vogt. Edouard knows that once one has resolved to "believe" Karl, it is quite irrelevant *what* one believes, whether it is what he says, or the opposite of what he says.

"*Herr Liebknecht,*" says Karl Vogt, "replaced him" (namely *Ohly*) "as correspondent of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*." "Only after Liebknecht had been openly proclaimed

^a "This is a man who, having started out as a communist, strove to raise himself to the loftier conceptions of politics. If we may believe Herr Vogt, this adept was the oracle of the Augsburg Gazette up to 1852 when he died in a madhouse."—*Ed.*

^b "I have wasted oil and labour", Plautus, *Poenulus*, Act I, Scene 2, where it is spoken by a whore whose efforts to repair the ravages of time have proved vain. *Oleum* is a pun on *Ohly*.—*Ed.*

a member of the *Marx party*,^a was he accepted as a correspondent by the *Allgemeine Zeitung*" (loc. cit., p. 169).

That proclamation was made during the Cologne communist trial, i.e. at the *end* of 1852.

In fact in the spring of 1851 Liebknecht became a contributor to the *Morgenblatt* where he reported on the Great Exhibition in London.¹⁰⁴ Through the mediation of the *Morgenblatt* he was made correspondent of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* in *September 1855*.

"His" (Marx's) "comrades do not write a single line of which Marx *has not been previously informed*" (loc. cit., p. 194).

The proof is simple: "He" (Marx) "has absolute control over his people" (p. 195) whereas Vogt is absolutely obedient to his Fazy and Co. We are confronted here by a peculiarity of Vogt's myth-making. The pygmy standards of Giessen or Geneva, the small-town framework and the fug of Swiss taverns are everywhere. Naively translating the leisurely provincial cliquism of Geneva to one of the great cities of the world, London, he will not allow Liebknecht to write "a single line" in the West End of which I "have not been previously informed" four miles away in Hampstead. And I perform the identical services of a La Guéronnière^b every day for a whole host of "comrades" scattered all over London and writing their reports to the four corners of the globe. A delightful profession—and a profitable one!

With the unmistakable delicacy of the artist, Vogt's mentor, Edouard Simon, who does not know London, but is at least familiar with conditions in Paris, provides the account of his uncouth "friend from the country" with the veneer of the big city:

"Marx, comme chef de la société, ne tient pas lui-même la plume, mais ses fidèles n'écrivent pas une ligne sans l'avoir consulté: *La Gazette d'Augsbourg* sera d'autant mieux servie" (loc. cit., p. 529). That is to say, "Marx as head of the society *does not write himself*, but his trusted associates do not write a single line without first consulting him. In this way the *Augsburger Zeitung* is the better served."

Does Vogt appreciate all the subtlety of this correction?

I had as much to do with Liebknecht's reports to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* from London as I had with Vogt's reports to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* from Paris. Moreover, Liebknecht's reports were praiseworthy in every respect—a critical presentation of *English* politics, which he described in exactly the same way in the

^a Vogt has: "of Marx's society".—*Ed.*

^b La Guéronnière was Chief Censor during the Second Empire in France.—*Ed.*

Allgemeine Zeitung as in his reports for the radical German-American newspapers written at the same time. Vogt himself, who has anxiously searched through whole years of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* in the hope of discovering something detrimental in Liebknecht's letters, confines his critique of their contents to stating that the symbol used by Liebknecht to indicate his authorship consisted of "two thin slanting lines" ("Magnum Opus", p. 196).

The fact that the lines were on a slant showed of course that the reports themselves were not quite straight. But even worse, they were "thin"! If only Liebknecht had chosen instead of two "thin lines", two round blobs of grease for his reports! But even if there is nothing reprehensible about his reports apart from these "two thin slanting lines", there is still the objection that they were printed at all in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. And why should they not? It is a known fact that the *Allgemeine Zeitung* allows the most widely divergent views to be expressed in its columns, at least on such neutral topics as that of English politics, and in addition it is the only German paper with a more than local significance in the eyes of the world. Liebknecht could without hesitation dispatch his London letters to the very newspaper for which *Heine* wrote his "Paris Letters" and *Fallmerayer* his "Oriental Letters".¹⁰⁵ Vogt reports that lewd persons also wrote for the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. It is well known that he himself was a contributor from 1844 to 1847.

As far as *Frederick Engels* and myself are concerned—I mention Engels because we work to a common plan and after prior agreement—it is true that in 1859 we did enter into a "relationship" of a sort with the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. That is to say during January, February and March 1859 I published a series of leading articles in the *New-York Tribune* in which *inter alia* the theory advanced by the *Allgemeine Zeitung* about a "Central European great power" and that paper's claim that it was in the *Germans' interest* to maintain Austria's rule in Italy were subjected to searching criticism. Shortly before the outbreak of war, and with my agreement, Engels published *Po and Rhine*, Berlin, 1859,^a a pamphlet directed specifically against the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. To quote Engels' own words (from his pamphlet *Savoy, Nice and the Rhine*, Berlin, 1860, p. 4) it provided scientific military proof that "Germany does not need any part of Italy for its defence and that

^a Karl Marx, "The War Prospect in Prussia", and Frederick Engels, *Po and Rhine* (see present edition, Vol. 16).—Ed.

France, if only military considerations counted, would certainly have much stronger claims to the Rhine than Germany to the Mincio".^a This polemic against the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and its theory of the necessity of Austrian despotic rule in Italy went hand in hand with a polemic directed against *Bonapartist* propaganda. For instance, I argued in detail in the *Tribune* (see e.g. February 1859) that the financial and internal political problems of the "*bas empire*"¹⁰⁶ had reached a critical point and that only a foreign war could prolong the rule of the coup d'état in France and hence the counter-revolution in Europe.^b I demonstrated that the *Bonapartist* liberation of Italy was a mere pretext to keep France in subjection, to subject Italy to the rule of the coup d'état, to shift France's "natural frontiers" to Germany, to transform Austria into a tool of Russia and to force the nations into a war waged by the legitimate counter-revolution against the illegitimate counter-revolution. All this took place before the ex-Regent of the Empire, Karl Vogt, issued his clarion call from Geneva.

Ever since Wolff's article in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Revue* (1850),^c I had completely forgotten the "well-rounded character". I was reminded of the merry fellow once more in the spring of 1859, on an evening in April, when Freiligrath gave me a letter of Vogt's to read together with an accompanying political "*Programme*".¹⁰⁷ This was no act of indiscretion since Vogt's circular was intended "for communication" to the friends not of Vogt, but of the addressee.

Asked what I found in the "Programme", I replied: "Political hot air." I could see at once that the old joker had not changed, from his request to Freiligrath to persuade Herr *Bucher* to become political correspondent for the propaganda sheet to be published in Geneva.^d Vogt's letter was dated April 1, 1859. It was well known that in the reports he sent from London to the Berlin *National-Zeitung* since January 1859, Bucher advocated views directly antithetical to those in Vogt's Programme. But all cats are grey to the man of "critical immediacy".

After this incident which I did not think of sufficient importance to mention to anyone, I received a copy of Vogt's *Studien*

^a See present edition, Vol. 16, p. 572.—*Ed.*

^b See "The Money Panic in Europe", *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5548, February 1, 1859 (present edition, Vol. 16).—*Ed.*

^c Wilhelm Wolff, "Nachträgliches aus dem Reich...", *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue*, Heft 4, April 1850.—*Ed.*

^d Presumably *Die Neue Schweiz*.—*Ed.*

zur gegenwärtigen Lage Europas, a woeful document which left me in no doubt about his connection with Bonapartist propaganda.

On the evening of May 9, 1859 I found myself on the platform at a public meeting arranged by David Urquhart because of the Italian war. Before the meeting had got under way I saw a solemn figure approaching me portentously. From the Hamlet-like expression on his countenance I realised at once that "something was rotten in the state of Denmark".^a It was the *homme d'état*, Karl Blind. After a few preliminaries he began to talk about Vogt's "intrigues" and he assured me with much shaking of the head that Vogt was in receipt of Bonapartist subsidies for his propaganda, that a South German writer, whose name he could "unfortunately" not reveal, had been offered 30,000 guilders as a bribe by Vogt—I was in some doubt as to which South German writer could possibly be worth 30,000 guilders—that there had been attempts at bribery in London, that as early as 1858 there had been a meeting between Plon-Plon, Fazy & Co. in Geneva where the Italian war had been discussed and the Grand Duke Constantine of Russia had been named as the future King of Hungary, that Vogt had also tried to enlist him (Blind) for his propaganda, and that he had *proofs* of Vogt's treasonable intrigues against his country. Blind then withdrew to his seat at the other corner of the platform next to his friend J. Fröbel; the meeting began and in a detailed report^b D. Urquhart tried to present the Italian war as the fruit of Franco-Russian intrigue.*

* Vogt naturally connects the attacks on Lord Palmerston by the Marx clique with my hostility to this self-important personage and his "friends" ("Magnum Opus", p. 212). It would appear, then, that this is a suitable place to comment briefly on my relations with D. Urquhart and his party. Urquhart's writings on Russia and against Palmerston had interested but not convinced me. In order to arrive at a firm view I undertook the laborious analysis of *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates* and the diplomatic Blue Books from 1807 to 1850. The first fruits of these studies were a series of leading articles in the *New-York Tribune* (end of 1853) in which I demonstrated Palmerston's involvement with the St. Petersburg Cabinet on the basis of his transactions with Poland, Turkey, Circassia, etc. Shortly afterwards I had these articles reprinted in *The People's Paper*, the organ of the Chartists edited by Ernest Jones, together with additional passages about Palmerston's activities.¹⁰⁸ In the meantime, *The Glasgow Sentinel* had also reprinted one of the articles ("Palmerston and Poland") which attracted the attention of Mr. D. Urquhart. After a meeting with me he persuaded Mr. Tucker in London to bring out some of

^a Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, Act I, Scene 4.—Ed.

^b David Urquhart's report was discussed in the article "Mr. Urquhart's Address on Neutrality" in *The Free Press*, No. 5, May 27, 1859.—Ed.

Towards the end of the meeting *Dr. Faucher*, foreign-news editor of *The Morning Star* (the organ of the Manchester School¹¹¹), came up to me to tell me that a new London German weekly, *Das Volk*, had just appeared. *Die Neue Zeit*, a workers' paper published by Herr A. Scherzer and edited by *Edgar Bauer*, had just folded up as the result of an intrigue by *Kinkel*, the publisher of the *Hermann*. Hearing this news, *Biscamp*, who had been a reporter for *Die Neue Zeit* up to that time, gave up his teaching post in the South of England in order to go to London and set up *Das Volk* in opposition to the *Hermann*. The German Workers' Educational Society and other London societies supported the newspaper, which like all such workers' newspapers was naturally edited and written gratis. Although as a free-trader^b he, *Faucher*, did not agree with the general policy of *Das Volk*, he was opposed to there being a monopoly in the German press in London and therefore, together with some London acquaintances, he had set up a Finance Committee in support of the paper. *Biscamp* had already written to *Liebknecht*, whom he had not yet met, with a request for literary contributions, etc. Finally, *Faucher* asked me to join in the venture.

Although *Biscamp* had been living in England since 1852, we had not yet made each other's acquaintance. The day after the *Urquhart* meeting *Liebknecht* brought him to my home. From lack of time I could not accept the invitation to write for *Das Volk* for the moment, but I promised to ask my German friends in

the articles in pamphlet form. These Palmerston pamphlets were later sold in various editions in numbers ranging from 15,000 to 20,000. Following my analysis of the Blue Book on the fall of *Kars*—it was published in the London organ of the Chartists in April 1856^a—I received a letter of thanks from the Sheffield Foreign Affairs Committee.¹⁰⁹ (See Appendix 7.) While looking through the diplomatic manuscripts in the possession of the British Museum I came across a series of English documents, going back from the end of the eighteenth century to the time of Peter the Great, which reveal the continuous secret collaboration between the Cabinets of London and St. Petersburg, and seem to indicate that this relationship arose at the time of Peter the Great. Up to now, all I have published of a detailed investigation into the subject has been an introduction with the title *Revelations of the Diplomatic History of the 18th Century*. This appeared first in the Sheffield and subsequently in the London *Free Press*,¹¹⁰ both published by *Urquhart*. The last-named has received occasional contributions from me since its foundation. My interest in Palmerston and British-Russian diplomatic relations in general arose, as one can see, without my having had the slightest suspicion that the figure of Herr *Karl Vogt* was standing behind that of Lord Palmerston.

^a "The Fall of *Kars*", *The People's Paper*, Nos. 205-08, April 5, 12, 19 and 26 (see present edition, Vol. 14).—*Ed.*

^b Marx uses the English term.—*Ed.*

England for subscriptions, financial donations and literary contributions. In the course of the conversation we came to speak of the Urquhart meeting and this led on to Vogt, whose *Studien Biscamp* had already read and correctly evaluated. I told him and Liebknecht of the contents of Vogt's "Programme" and also of Blind's revelations, adding, however, with respect to the latter, that South Germans were inclined to paint in rather exaggerated colours. To my surprise, No. 2 of *Das Volk* (May 14) printed an article with the title "Der Reichsregent als Reichsverräther" [The Imperial Regent as Imperial Traitor]^a (see "Magnum Opus", Documents, pp. 17, 18) in which Biscamp mentioned two of the facts reported by Blind—the 30,000 guilders, which, however, he reduced to 4,000, and the Bonapartist sources of Vogt's funds. For the rest his article consisted of witticisms in the manner of *Die Hornisse*, which he had edited in Cassel with Heise in 1848-49. In the meantime, as I learned long after the appearance of the "Magnum Opus" (see Appendix 8), the London Workers' Educational Society had commissioned Herr Scherzer, one of its leaders, to invite the workers' educational associations in Switzerland, Belgium and the United States to support *Das Volk* and to combat Bonapartist propaganda. Biscamp himself sent a copy of the above-mentioned article published in *Das Volk* on May 14, 1859 to Vogt, who simultaneously received Herr A. Scherzer's circular from his own Ranickel.

With his familiar "critical immediacy" Vogt at once cast me in the role of the demiurge behind these attempts to ensnare him. Without hesitation he at once published an *outline* of his later travesty of history^b in the oft-quoted "*special supplement to No. 150 of the 'Schweizer Handels-Courier'*". This original gospel which first revealed the mysteries of the Brimstone Gang, the Bristlers, Cherval, etc., beneath the date Berne, May 23, 1859 (and hence more recently than the gospel according to the Mormons¹¹²), bore the title **Zur Warnung**^c and its content corresponds to that of a piece translated from a pamphlet¹¹³ by the notorious E. About.*

* A word about the Biel *Commis voyageur*, the local *Moniteur* of the "fugitive Imperial Regent". The publisher and editor of the Biel *Handels-Courier* is a

^a This refers to the anonymous article "Der Reichsregent". One of the paragraphs in it begins with the words "Der Reichsregent als Reichsverräther!"—*Ed.*

^b See Johann Fischart, *Affentheurliche, Nautpengerliche Geschichtklitterung*....—*Ed.*

^c Carl Vogt, "Zur Warnung", *Schweizer Handels-Courier*, No. 150 (special supplement), June 2, 1859; see also *Mein Prozess*..., Dokumente, S. 31-33.—*Ed.*

Vogt's anonymous original gospel *Zur Warnung* was reprinted, as I have already remarked, in *Das Volk*^a at my request.

In the beginning of June I left London to visit Engels in Manchester, where a subscription of about £25 was collected for *Das Volk*. This contribution, whose "nature" induced the "curious" Vogt to cast his "eyes across the Channel" towards Augsburg and Vienna ("Magnum Opus", p. 212), came from Frederick Engels, Wilhelm Wolff, myself and finally three German physicians^b resident in Manchester, whose names are recorded in one of the legal documents I sent to Berlin. As to the money collected in London by the original Finance Committee, Vogt should consult Dr. Faucher.

Vogt informs us on p. 225 of the "Magnum Opus":

"But it has always been a *device* of the *reactionaries* to require the democrats to do everything *for nothing* while *they*" (that is the reactionaries, not the democrats) "*claim* the right to demand payment and to be paid."

What a *reactionary* device on the part of *Das Volk*, which is not only edited and written for nothing but *even induces* those who work on it to *pay*! If that is not proof of the connection between *Das Volk* and the reaction, then Karl Vogt is at his wit's end.

During my stay in Manchester an event of decisive importance took place in London. Liebknecht discovered in the compositor's room of Hollinger (*who printed "Das Volk"*) the proof-sheet of the anonymous pamphlet against Vogt entitled *Zur Warnung*. He read it through cursorily, immediately recognised Blind's revelations and to crown it all learnt from A. Vögele, the compositor, that *Blind* had given the manuscript, which was in his handwriting, to Hollinger for printing. The corrections on the proof-sheet were also in *Blind's* handwriting. Two days later Hollinger sent Liebknecht the proof-sheet, which he in turn sent to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. The type for the pamphlet survived and was used later for a reprint in *Das Volk*, No. 7 (June 18, 1859).^c

With the publication of the "*warning*" by the *Allgemeine Zeitung*^d

certain Ernst Schüler, a political refugee of 1838, a postmaster, wine merchant, bankrupt and at present solvent once more thanks to the fact that his newspaper, which was subsidised by British, French and Swiss advertisements during the Crimean war, now numbers 1,200 subscribers.

^a No. 6, June 11, 1859.—*Ed.*

^b Louis Borchart, Eduard Gumpert and Martin Heckscher.—*Ed.*

^c In the article "Warnung zur gefälligen Verbreitung".—*Ed.*

^d "K. Vogt und die deutsche Emigration in London", *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 173, June 22, 1859.—*Ed.*

begins the Augsburg campaign of the ex-Vogt of the Empire. He sued the *Allgemeine Zeitung* for reprinting the pamphlet.

In the "Magnum Opus" (pp. 227-28) Vogt travesties Müllner's "'Tis me, 'tis me; I am the robber Jaromir".¹¹⁴ He merely translates "to be" into "to have".

"*I have sued* because I knew all along that the shallowness, futility and baseness of the editorial board which parades as the 'representative of High German culture', would be forced into the open. *I have sued* because I knew all along that the connection of its esteemed editors and the Austrian policies they have been exalting to the heavens with the Brimstone Gang and the dregs of the revolution, could not remain hidden from the public."

And so on through another four "*I have sued's*". The suing Vogt becomes quite sublime,^a or Longinus is right when he says that there is nothing in the world that is drier than a man with dropsy.^b

"Personal considerations," the "well-rounded character" declares, "were the least of my motives when I went for the law."

In reality matters stood quite differently. No calf could show greater reluctance to go to the slaughter than Karl Vogt to go to court. While his "close" friends, the Ranickel, Reinach (formerly a peripatetic *chronique scandaleuse* about Vogt) and the garrulous Mayer from Esslingen, a member of the Rump Parliament, confirmed him in his terror of the court, he was bombarded with urgent requests from Zurich to proceed with his "suit". At the Workers' Festival in Lausanne the fur-dealer Roos told him in front of witnesses that he could no longer have any respect for him if he did not take legal proceedings. Nevertheless, Vogt resisted: He did not give a rap for the Augsburg and London Brimstone Gang and would remain silent. Suddenly, however, he spoke. Various newspapers announced the forthcoming trial and the Ranickel declared:

"*The Stuttgart people would not leave him*" (Vogt) "*any peace*. He" (Ranickel) "had not given his approval."

We may note in passing that since the "well-rounded one" found himself in a tight corner, an action against the *Allgemeine Zeitung* was undoubtedly the most promising stratagem. Vogt's self-apologia in response to an attack on him by J. Venedey, who had accused him of Bonapartist intrigues,¹¹⁵ saw the light in the

^a A pun in the original: *der geklagt habende* (who has sued) and *wird erhaben* (becomes sublime).—*Ed.*

^b Cassius Longinus, *On the Sublime*.—*Ed.*

Biel "*Handels-Courier*" of June 16, 1859,^a and hence arrived in London *after* the appearance of the anonymous pamphlet, which concluded with the threat:

"II. however, Vogt attempts to deny these accusations, a thing he will hardly dare, this revelation will be followed by No. 2."^b

Vogt had now issued a denial and revelation No. 2 did not follow. Secure on this front, mischief could only come from his dear friends, whom he knew well enough to rely on their cowardice. The more he exposed himself in public by resorting to legal action, the more surely he could bank on their discretion, for in the person of the "fugitive Imperial Regent" it was in a way the entire Rump Parliament that was standing in the pillory.

Parliamentarian *Jacob Venedey* tells tales out of school in his *Pro domo und pro patria gegen Karl Vogt*, Hanover, 1860, pp. 27-28:

"Apart from the letters produced by Vogt in his own account of his lawsuit, I have read a further letter of Vogt's which reveals, much more clearly than the letter to Dr. Loening,^c Vogt's position as the accomplice of those who were making strenuous efforts to localise the war in Italy. I have copied out a few passages from this letter for my own information, but unfortunately I cannot publish them because the man to whom the letter was addressed only showed them to me on condition that I would not publish them. *Attempts have been made from personal and party considerations to cover up Vogt's part in this affair which in my view cannot be justified either from a party point of view or in terms of a man's duty to his country. This restraint on the part of many people explains why Vogt can still have the temerity to present himself as a German party leader. It appears to me, however, that the party to which Vogt belonged has by this means become in part responsible for his activities.*"*

If then his action against the *Allgemeine Zeitung* was not risking all that much, an offensive in that direction provided General Vogt with the most favourable base of operations. It was Austria that was denigrating the Imperial Vogt through the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, and moreover, Austria in league with the communists! Thus the Imperial Vogt appeared as the interesting victim of a

* See also p. 4 of the same pamphlet where it is stated: "This practice of 'making allowances' from party considerations, the want of moral principle implied in admitting among themselves that Vogt has been playing a disgraceful game with his own country [...] and then permitting Vogt to sue people for slander when they have only asserted what all know and think and of which they know and even possess the proofs—all this I find quite nauseating, etc."

^a Carl Vogt, "Erklärung", *Schweizer Handels-Courier*, No. 162 (special supplement). Vogt's statement was dated Geneva, June 10, 1859. He also included it in his *Mein Prozess...*, Dokumente, S. 20-25.—*Ed.*

^b "Warnung zur gefälligen Verbreitung", *Das Volk*, No. 7, June 18, 1859.—*Ed.*

^c Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess...*, Dokumente, S. 36.—*Ed.*

monstrous coalition of the enemies of bourgeois liberalism. And the "Little Germany" press, which was already prejudiced in the Imperial Vogt's favour, as a diminisher of the Empire,¹¹⁶ would jubilantly bear him aloft on its shield!

In the beginning of July 1859, shortly after my return from Manchester, Blind paid me a visit in consequence of an incident of no importance in this context. He was accompanied by Fidelio Hollinger and Liebknecht. During this meeting I gave it as my opinion that Blind was the author of the pamphlet *Zur Warnung*. He protested the opposite. I repeated what he had told me on May 9^a point by point, for in fact his assertions then constituted the entire contents of the pamphlet. He admitted all that but nevertheless insisted that he was not the author of the pamphlet.

About a month later, in August 1859, Liebknecht showed me a letter he had received from the editors of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* who urgently asked him for proof of the allegations made in the pamphlet *Zur Warnung*. At his request I agreed to go with him to Blind's home in St. John's Wood, for even if Blind was not the *author*, he at any rate had known as early as the beginning of May what the pamphlet did not reveal to the world until the beginning of June, and he could, moreover, "*prove*" what he knew. Blind was not there. He had gone to a seaside resort. Liebknecht, therefore, wrote to him explaining the purpose of our visit. No answer. Liebknecht wrote to him a second time.¹¹⁷ Finally, the following statesman-like document arrived:

"Dear Herr Liebknecht,

"Your two letters, which had been wrongly addressed, arrived almost simultaneously. As you will understand I have absolutely no wish to meddle in the affairs of a newspaper with which I am quite unconnected. All the less in the given case, since, as I have already stated, I had **nothing whatever to do** with the *problem in question*. As to the remarks you cite that were made in the course of a *private conversation*, it is obvious that these were completely misinterpreted. There is evidently a misunderstanding here which I shall discuss with you in due course. I am sorry that your visit to me with Marx was in vain and

"I remain, respectfully yours,

K. Blind

"St. Leonard's, September 8"

This cool diplomatic note according to which *Blind* had "**nothing whatever to do**" with the denunciation of Vogt, reminded me of an article which had appeared anonymously in

^a See this volume, p. 116.—*Ed.*

The Free Press in London on May 27, 1859 and which went as follows^a:

✦

“*The Grand Duke Constantine to be King of Hungary*”

“A Correspondent, who encloses his card, writes as follows:—

“Sir,—Having been present at the last meeting* in the Music Hall, I heard the statement made concerning the Grand Duke Constantine. I am able to give you another fact: So far back as last summer, Prince Jérôme-Napoléon detailed to some of his confidants at Geneva a plan of attack against Austria, and prospective rearrangement of the map of Europe. I know the name of a Swiss senator to whom he broached the subject. Prince Jérôme, at that time, declared that, according to the plan made, Grand Duke Constantine was to become King of Hungary.

“I know further of *attempts* made, in the beginning of the present year, to *win over* to the Russo-Napoleonic scheme *some of the exiled German Democrats, as well as some influential Liberals in Germany. Large pecuniary advantages were held out to them as a bribe.*^b I am glad to say that these offers were rejected with indignation.” (See Appendix 9.)

This article—though it does not name Vogt but, as far as the German emigration in London was concerned, unmistakably points to him—does in effect contain the *core* of the pamphlet *Zur Warnung* that appeared later on. The author of the “*future King of Hungary*”, whom patriotic zeal drove to make an anonymous denunciation of Vogt, had of course to grasp the golden opportunity that the Augsburg trial had thrown into his lap, the opportunity to reveal the treachery in a court of law in full view of the whole of Europe. And who was the author of the “*future King of Hungary*”? *Citizen Karl Blind*. The form and content of the article had already made that obvious to me in May and this was now *officially confirmed* by Mr. Collet, the editor of *The Free Press*, after I had explained to him the importance of the dispute that was pending and after I had shown him Blind’s diplomatic note.

On September 17, 1859, Herr A. Vögele, the compositor, gave me a written declaration (printed in the “*Magnum Opus*”, Documents, Nos. 30, 31), in which he testifies not that *Blind* was the *author* of the pamphlet *Zur Warnung*, but that he (A. Vögele) and his employer, *Fidelio Hollinger*, had set the type for it in the *Hollinger print-shop*, that *the manuscript was in Blind’s hand* and that *Blind had occasionally been mentioned by Hollinger as the author of the pamphlet*.

* This was the meeting held by D. Urquhart on May 9, mentioned above.

^a In the German original the letter is given in Marx’s translation. In the present edition the original English text is given, which Marx supplies in Appendix 9.—*Ed.*

^b Marx quotes this sentence in English in brackets after the German translation. The italics in this paragraph are Marx’s.—*Ed.*

Armed with Vögele's declaration and the "future King of Hungary", *Liebknrecht* again wrote to *Blind* asking for "proofs" of the denunciations made by that statesman in *The Free Press*, pointing out at the same time that he had now a piece of evidence about *his* involvement in the publication of *Zur Warnung*. Instead of answering *Liebknrecht*, *Blind* sent Mr. Collet to me. Mr. Collet was supposed to ask me in *Blind's* name to make no public use of my knowledge of the authorship of the said article in *The Free Press*. I replied that I could give no such assurance. My discretion would keep pace with *Blind's* courage.

In the meantime, the date set down for the hearing of the case in Augsburg was drawing nearer. *Blind* remained silent. *Vogt* had attempted in various public announcements to make *me* as the secret source of it all responsible both for the pamphlet and the *proof* of the facts given in it. To ward off this manoeuvre, to vindicate *Liebknrecht* and to defend the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, which in my view had performed a good deed in denouncing *Vogt*, I informed the editors of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* via *Liebknrecht* that I was prepared to let them have a document regarding the origin of the pamphlet *Zur Warnung*, if I received a written request from them. That is how the "lively correspondence came about which is at present carried on by *Marx* and *Herr Kolb*" as *Herr Vogt* states on p. 194 of the "Magnum Opus".* My "lively correspondence with *Herr Kolb*" consisted in two letters from *Herr Orges* to me, both of the same date, in which he asked me for the document I had promised, which I then sent him together with a few lines from myself.**

The two letters from *Herr Orges*, which were in reality just a double edition of the same letter, arrived in London on October 18, 1859, while the court proceedings were due to begin in Augsburg on the 24th. I therefore wrote at once to *Herr Vögele* to arrange a meeting next day in the office at the Marlborough Street Police Court, where he should give his declaration about the pamphlet *Zur Warnung* the legal form of an affidavit.*** My letter

* It is true that in No. 319 of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, *Herr Kolb* mentions "a very detailed letter from *Herr Marx* which he has not printed". But this "detailed letter" has been printed in the *Hamburg Reform*, No. 139, supplement of November 19, 1859. The "detailed letter" was a declaration from me intended for publication, and I sent it also to the Berlin *Volks-Zeitung*. [See this volume, pp. 4-7.]

** My covering note [see this volume, p. 3] and *Vögele's* declaration can be found in the "Magnum Opus", *Documents*, pp. 30, 31. *Herr Orges's* letters to me are contained in Appendix 10.

*** An affidavit is a statutory declaration given before a court, which, if false, is liable to all the penalties incurred by perjury.

did not reach him in time. Hence, on October 19,* against my original intention, I was compelled to send the above-mentioned written declaration of September 17 instead of the affidavit.**

The court proceedings in Augsburg, as is well known, turned into a true comedy of errors. The *corpus delicti* was the pamphlet *Zur Warnung* sent by *W. Liebknecht* to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and reprinted by it. The publisher and the author of the pamphlet, however, were involved in a game of blind-man's buff. *Liebknecht* could not compel his witnesses, who were in London, to appear before the court in Augsburg; the editors of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, embarrassed by this legal impasse, spouted a lot of political gibberish; Dr. Hermann regaled the court with the tall stories of our "well-rounded character" about the Brimstone Gang, the Lausanne Festival, etc.; and the court finally dismissed *Vogt's* suit because the plaintiff had brought the case to the *wrong* court. The confusion reached its climax when the case in Augsburg had been concluded and the report on the proceedings^a reached London with the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. *Blind*, who had unswervingly preserved his statesman-like silence up to that moment, suddenly leaped into the public arena scared by the testimony of *Vögele*, the compositor, which had been produced by me. *Vögele* had *not* declared that *Blind* was the author of the pamphlet, but only that he had been referred to as such by *Fidelio Hollinger*. However, *Vögele* did declare categorically that the *manuscript of the pamphlet had been written in Blind's hand, with which he was familiar, and that it had been set and printed in Hollinger's print-shop*. *Blind* could be the author of the pamphlet even if it had neither been written down in *Blind's* handwriting, nor set up and printed in *Hollinger's* print-shop. Conversely, the pamphlet could have been *written down* by *Blind* and printed by *Hollinger*, even though *Blind* was *not* the author.

In No. 313 of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, beneath the date London,

* Since I write illegibly my letter of October 19 was regarded by the Augsburg Court as dated October 29. *Vogt's* lawyer, Dr. Hermann, *Vogt* himself, the dignified *Berlin "National-Zeitung" et hoc genus omne* [and that whole tribe] of "critical immediacy" did not doubt at all that a letter written in London on October 29 could arrive in Augsburg by October 24.

** That this quid pro quo was the result of pure chance—namely the belated arrival of my letter to *Vögele*—can be seen from his subsequent affidavit of February 11, 1860.

^a The report in question, "Prozess Vogt gegen die Redaction der Allgemeinen Zeitung", was published in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, Nos. 300 and 301, October 27 and 28, 1859.—*Ed.*

November 3 (see “Magnum Opus”, Documents, pp. 37, 38), the citizen and statesman Blind declared that he was *not the author* of the pamphlet, and as *proof* he was “publishing” the “**following document**”:

“a) I hereby declare that the assertion of the compositor Vögele printed in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 300, to the effect that the pamphlet *Zur Warnung* mentioned there was *printed in my print-shop* or that Herr *Karl Blind* was its author, is a *malicious fabrication*.

“3 Litchfield Street, Soho,
London, November 2, 1859

Fidelio Hollinger”

“b) The undersigned, who *has lived and worked* in No. 3 Litchfield Street for the past eleven months, for his part *testifies to the correctness of Herr Hollinger’s statement*.

“London, November 2, 1859

J. F. Wiehe, Compositor”

Vögele had nowhere *asserted* that *Blind* was the *author* of the pamphlet. Fidelio Hollinger therefore invents Vögele’s assertion so as to be able to dismiss it as a “*malicious fabrication*”. On the other hand, *if* the pamphlet was *not* printed in Hollinger’s print-shop, how can the same Fidelio Hollinger be certain that *Karl Blind* was *not* its author?

And how can the circumstance that the *compositor Wiehe* “*has lived and worked for eleven months*” (up to November 2, 1859) with Hollinger enable him to testify to the “*correctness of Fidelio Hollinger’s statement*”?

My reply^a to *Blind*’s declaration (in No. 325 of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, see “Magnum Opus”, Documents, pp. 39, 40) concluded with the words: “*The transfer of the trial from Augsburg to London would resolve the entire Blind-Vogt mystère.*”

Blind, with all the moral indignation of a beautiful soul cut to the quick, returned to the attack in the “*supplement to the ‘Allgemeine Zeitung’ of December 11, 1859*”:

“Having **repeatedly**” (we must take note of this) “**based my testimony on the documents signed by Herr Hollinger, the printer, and Herr Wiehe, compositor**, I declare here for the last time that the *allegation* (which is latterly put forward merely as an insinuation) that *I am the author* of the pamphlet frequently referred to is a *downright untruth*. The other statements about me contain *distortions of the crudest sort.*”

In a postscript to this declaration the editors of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* remarked that “this discussion is of no further interest to the general public” and they therefore request “the gentlemen

^a See this volume, pp. 8-9.—*Ed.*

concerned to abstain from further replies", a request which our "well-rounded character" interpreted as follows at the end of the "Magnum Opus":

"In other words, the editors of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* request Messrs. Marx, Biscamp* and Liebknecht, who stand revealed as barefaced liars, not to compromise themselves and the *Allgemeine Zeitung* any further."

Thus, for the time being, the Augsburg campaign came to an end.

Reverting to the tone of his *Lousiad*, Vogt made "Vögele the compositor" bear "false witness" to me and Liebknecht ("Magnum Opus", p. 195). He explained the origins of the pamphlet by suggesting that *Blind*

"may well have conceived various suspicions and have spread them abroad. *The Brimstone Gang then used them to fabricate a pamphlet and other articles which they then attributed to Blind who found himself driven into a corner*" (loc. cit., p. 218).

And if the Imperial Vogt failed to resume his indecisive campaign in London, as he had been challenged to do, this was partly because London was "a backwater" ("Magnum Opus", p. 229), but partly because the disputants "were accusing each other of lying" (loc. cit.).

The man's "critical immediacy" can only approve of the intervention of the courts if the parties are *not disputing* about the truth.

I now pass over three months and resume the thread of my story in the beginning of February 1860. Vogt's "Magnum Opus" had not yet reached London, but we had received the *anthology* of the Berlin *National-Zeitung*, which contained the following statement:

"It was very easy for the *Marx party* to lay the authorship of the pamphlet at *Blind's* door, just because the latter had previously uttered similar views in

* In a letter dated October 20 from London, Biscamp had written to the editors of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* in connection with the Vogt affair, ending up by offering his services as news correspondent.^a I knew nothing of this letter until I saw it in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. Vogt has invented a moral doctrine according to which my support of a newspaper which has since folded up makes me responsible for the subsequent private letters written by its editor. How much more responsible would this make Vogt for Kolatschek's *Stimmen der Zeit* since he was a paid contributor to Kolatschek's *Monatsschrift*. When Biscamp was editing *Das Volk*, he made the greatest sacrifices. He gave up a job he had had for many years in order to take on the editorship; he edited the paper *gratis* in very trying circumstances and finally he jeopardised his position as news correspondent for German papers, such as the *Kölnische Zeitung*, so that he could work in accordance with his convictions. Everything else did not and does not concern me.

^a The *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 300 (supplement), October 27, 1859.—*Ed.*

conversation with *Marx* and in the article in *The Free Press*. By using Blind's statements and turns of phrase the pamphlet could be *fabricated* so that it looked like *his* work."

Blind, like Falstaff who thought discretion the better part of valour,^a esteemed silence as the whole art of diplomacy, and so he began to be silent once again. To loosen his tongue I published a circular in English over my signature and dated London, February 4, 1860. (See Appendix 11.)

The circular, addressed to the editor of *The Free Press*, stated *inter alia*:

"Now, before taking any further step, I want to show up the fellows who evidently have played into the hands of Vogt. I, therefore, publicly declare that the statement of Blind, Wiehe and Hollinger, according to which the anonymous pamphlet was *not* printed in Hollinger's office, 3, Litchfield Street, Soho, is an *infamous lie*."*

Having presented the evidence in my possession I end with the words:

"Consequently, I again declare the above said *Charles Blind* to be an *infamous liar* (deliberate liar). If I am wrong, he may easily confound me by appealing to an English Court of Law."^b

On February 6, 1860 a London daily (the **Daily Telegraph**)—to which I shall return in due course—reproduced the anthology of the *National-Zeitung*, under the title "*The Journalistic Auxiliaries of Austria*".^c However, I initiated an action for libel against the *National-Zeitung*, gave the *Daily Telegraph* notice of similar proceedings^d and set about assembling the necessary legal material.

On February 11, 1860 the compositor Vögele swore an affidavit before the Police Court in Bow Street. He repeated the essential contents of his declaration of September 17, 1859, namely that the manuscript of the pamphlet was in **Blind's handwriting** and that

* In the English original I said "a deliberate lie". The *Kölnische Zeitung* translated this as "*infame Lüge*" (infamous lie). I accept this translation, even though "*durchtriebene Lüge*" would be closer to the original.

^a Shakespeare, *Henry IV*, Part I, Act V, Scene 4.—*Ed.*

^b Marx's circular (letter to the editor of *The Free Press* dated February 4, 1860, see this volume, p. 11) was written in English. The original text is reproduced here and in Appendix 11. The last sentence does not occur in the latter.—*Ed.*

^c Marx gives the title in English and supplies the German translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

^d See this volume, pp. 14-15.—*Ed.*

it had been composed **in Hollinger's print-shop**, partly by him (Vögele) and partly by *F. Hollinger*. (See Appendix 12.)

Incomparably more important was the affidavit taken out by the compositor *Wiehe*, whose testimony Blind had **repeatedly**, and with growing self-confidence, quoted in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*.

Apart from the original (see Appendix 13) I am therefore giving here a word-for-word translation^a:

"One of the first days of November last—I do not recollect the exact date—in the evening between nine and ten o'clock I was taken out of bed by Mr. *F. Hollinger*, in whose house I then lived, and by whom I was employed as compositor. He presented to me a paper to the effect, that, during the preceding eleven months I had been *continuously* employed by him, and that during all that time a certain German flysheet '*Zur Warnung*' (A Warning) had *not* been composed and printed in Mr. Hollinger's Office, 3, Litchfield^d Street, Soho. In my perplexed state, and not aware of the importance of the transaction, I complied with his wish, and copied, and signed the document. Mr. *Hollinger* promised me *money*, but I never received anything. *During that transaction Mr. Charles Blind*, as my wife informed me at the time, *was waiting in Mr. Hollinger's room*. A few days later, Mrs. Hollinger called me down from dinner and led me into her husband's room, *where I found Mr. Blind alone*. He *presented me the same paper* which Mr. Hollinger had presented me before, and *entreated me^b to write, and sign a second copy, as he wanted two, the one for himself, and the other for publication in the Press*. He added that he would *show himself grateful to me*. I copied and signed again the paper.

"I herewith declare the truth of the above statements and that:

"1) During the eleven months mentioned in the document I was for six weeks **not** employed by Mr. Hollinger, but by a Mr. Ermani.

"2) I did **not** work in Mr. Hollinger's Office just at that time when the flysheet '*Zur Warnung*' was published.

"3) I heard at the time from Mr. Vögele, who then worked for Mr. Hollinger, that he, Vögele, had, **together with Mr. Hollinger** himself, *composed* the flysheet in question, and that the manuscript was in *Blind's handwriting*.

"4) The types of the pamphlet were still standing when I returned to Mr. Hollinger's service. *I myself broke them into columns* for the reprint of the flysheet (or pamphlet) '*Zur Warnung*' in the German paper *Das Volk* published by Mr. Hollinger, 3, Litchfield Street, Soho. The flysheet appeared in No. 7, d.d. 18th June 1859, of *Das Volk*.

"5) I saw Mr. Hollinger give to Mr. William Liebknecht of 14, Church Street, Soho, the proofsheets of the pamphlet '*Zur Warnung*', on which proofsheets Mr. *Charles Blind with his own hand had corrected four or five mistakes*. Mr. Hollinger hesitated at first giving the proofsheets to Mr. Liebknecht, and when Mr. *Liebknecht* had withdrawn, he, Hollinger, expressed to me and my fellow workman Vögele his regret for having given the proofsheets out of his hands.

Johann Friedrich Wiehe

^a The original English text is given in Appendix 13. The various types of emphasis were introduced by Marx.—*Ed.*

^b In his translation Marx gives the English words "entreated me" in brackets after the German equivalent.—*Ed.*

“Declared and signed by the said Friedrich Wiehe at the Police Court, Bow Street, this 8th day of February, 1860, before me,

Th. Henry, Magistrate of the said court” (Police Court)
(Bow Street)

The two *affidavits* of the composers *Vögele* and *Wiehe* proved that the *manuscript of the pamphlet had been written in Blind's hand, composed in Hollinger's print-shop and that Blind himself had corrected the proofs.*

And the *homme d'état* wrote to Julius Fröbel from London on July 4, 1859:

“A violent attack on Vogt has *appeared* here, accusing him of corruption. *I do not know who is responsible for it.* It contains a number of allegations of *which we had not previously heard.*”^a

And the same *homme d'état* wrote to Liebknecht on September 8, 1859, saying that

“**he had nothing whatever to do with the problem in question**”.

Not content with these achievements citizen and statesman *Blind* had fabricated a false declaration and contrived to induce the composer *Wiehe* to sign it by promises of money from *Fidelio Hollinger* and proofs of his own gratitude in the future.

This, his own fabrication with a signature obtained by false pretences and together with *Fidelio Hollinger's* false testimony, he not only sent to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, but in his second declaration he even “*refers*” “*repeatedly*” to these “*documents*”, and hurls the reproach of “*downright untruth*” at my head with every sign of moral indignation.

I had copies made of the two affidavits of *Vögele* and *Wiehe* and circulated them in different circles, whereupon a meeting took place at *Blind's* house attended by *Blind*, *Fidelio Hollinger*, and *Blind's* house-friend Herr *Karl Schaible*, M.D., a quiet decent fellow who plays the role of tame elephant in *Blind's* political operations.

In the *Daily Telegraph* of February 15, 1860 there appeared an item that was later reprinted in German newspapers and which went as follows:

“The Vogt-Pamphlet

“To the Editor of *The Daily Telegraph*

“Sir,

“In consequence of erroneous statements which have been current, I feel I owe it to Mr. *Blind*, as well as to Mr. *Marx*, formally to declare that neither of them is

^a Marx probably quotes this letter from the *National-Zeitung*, No. 41, July 4, 1859.—Ed.

the *author* of the pamphlet directed some time ago against Professor Vogt, at Geneva. That pamphlet originates from me; and on me the responsibility rests. I am sorry both with regard to Mr. Marx and Mr. Blind, that circumstances beyond my control should have prevented me from making this declaration earlier.

"London, 14 February, 1860

Charles Schaible, M.D."

Herr *Schaible* sent me this declaration.^a I reciprocated his politeness by return of post by sending the affidavits of the compositors Vögele and Wiehe and wrote that his (*Schaible's*) declaration made no difference either to the false statements that *Blind* had sent to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, or to *Blind's conspiracy*^b with *Hollinger* to obtain *Wiehe's* signature for the *false document he had fabricated*.

Blind perceived that he was no longer on the firm territory of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, but under the perilous jurisdiction of England. If he wanted to invalidate the *affidavits* and the "grave insults" of my circular based on them, he and *Hollinger* would have to swear *counter-affidavits*; but felony is no joke.

*Eisele-Blind*¹¹⁸ is not the author of the pamphlet, because *Beisele-Schaible* publicly declares himself its author. *Blind* has only *written* the manuscript of the pamphlet; he has only *had it printed* by *Hollinger*, corrected the proofs in his own hand, *fabricated false statements* together with *Hollinger* in order to refute these facts and sent them to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. But he is nevertheless a wronged innocent, because he was not the *author* or *originator* of the pamphlet. He acted only as *Beisele-Schaible's secretary*. It is just for this reason that on July 4, 1859 he did not know "*who*" had brought the pamphlet into the world and on September 8, 1859 he had "*nothing whatever to do with the problem in question*". It may therefore reassure him that *Beisele-Schaible* is the *author* of the pamphlet in the literary sense of the word, but *Eisele-Blind* is its *author* in the technical sense of the English law, and the *responsible publisher* in the sense of all civilized legislation. *Habeat sibi!*^c

A final word of farewell to Herr *Beisele-Schaible*.

The lampoon published by *Vogt* against me in the *Biel Handels-Courier*, dated *Berne, May 23, 1859*, bore the title *Zur Warnung*. The pamphlet composed by *Schaible* and written out

^a On this see Marx's letters to Engels of February 15, 1860 and to Legal Counsellor Weber of February 24, 1860 (present edition, Vol. 41).—*Ed.*

^b Marx uses the English word.—*Ed.*

^c So be it! Genesis 38:23.—*Ed.*

and published by his secretary *Blind* in the beginning of June 1859, in which Vogt was arraigned as an agent of Louis Bonaparte, and accused in some detail of both “giving” and “taking bribes”, also bears the title *Zur Warnung*. Furthermore, it is signed X. Although in algebra X represents an unknown quantity, it also happens to be the last letter of my name. Were the title and the signature on the pamphlet an attempt to make Schaible’s “warning” look like *my* reply to Vogt’s “warning”? Schaible had promised a Revelation No. 2 as soon as Vogt ventured to deny Revelation No. 1. Vogt not only issued a denial; he instituted an action for libel in reply to Schaible’s “warning”. And Herr Schaible’s Revelation No. 2 has not appeared to this day. At the head of his pamphlet Schaible had printed the words: “*For distribution!*” And when Liebknecht was obliging enough to “distribute” it through the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, “circumstances beyond his control” sealed Herr Schaible’s lips from June 1859 to February 1860, when they were unsealed again by the affidavits taken out in the Police Court in Bow Street.

However that may be, Schaible, the original denouncer of Vogt, has now publicly accepted responsibility for the information given in the pamphlet. Hence the Augsburg campaign ends not with the victory of the defendant Vogt, but with the appearance on the battlefield at long last of the accuser Schaible.

VIII

DÂ-DÂ VOGT AND HIS STUDIES

"SINE STUDIO"¹¹⁹

About a month before the outbreak of the Italian war, Vogt published his so-called *Studien zur gegenwärtigen Lage Europas*, Geneva, 1859. *Cui bono?*^a

Vogt knew that

"in the approaching war *England* would remain *neutral*" (*Studien*, p. 4).

He knew that *Russia*,

"in agreement with France, would do *everything in its power* to injure Austria, short of actual hostilities" (*Studien*, p. 13).^b

He knew that *Prussia*—but let him say for himself what he knows about Prussia.

"Even the most short-sighted will have realised by now *that there is an understanding between the Prussian Government and the Imperial Government of France*; that Prussia will not take up arms to defend Austria's non-German provinces; that it will give its approval to all measures necessitated by the defence of the territory of the Confederation; but apart from this *it will prevent any attempt by the Confederation or any of its members to intervene in support of Austria*, and in the subsequent peace negotiations it will expect *to be rewarded in the northern plains of Germany for these pains*" (loc. cit., pp. [18-]19).

To sum up: In Bonaparte's imminent crusade against Austria, England will *remain neutral*, Russia will adopt a *hostile stance* towards Austria, Prussia will restrain the bellicose members of the Confederation, and Europe will localise the war. As with the Russian war earlier on, Louis Bonaparte will now conduct the Italian war with the permission of the supreme authorities, he will

^a Who benefits?—*Ed.*

^b The quotation actually begins with the words "would do everything".—*Ed.*

act, as it were, as the secret general of a European coalition. What then is the purpose of Vogt's pamphlet? Since Vogt knows that England, Russia and Prussia are acting against Austria, what compels him to write *for Bonaparte*? But it appears that, quite apart from the old Francophobes with "the now childish Father Arndt and the ghost of the wretched Jahn at their head" (loc. cit., p. 121), a sort of national movement was convulsing "the German people" and was echoed in all kinds of "Chambers and newspapers" "while the governments only joined the dominant current hesitatingly and with reluctance" (loc. cit., p. 114). It appears that the "belief in an imminent threat" moved the German "people" to issue a "call for common measures" (loc. cit.). The French **Moniteur** (see *inter alia* the issue of March 15, 1859) looked on at this German movement with "astonishment and regret".^a

"A sort of crusade against France," it declares, "is preached in the Chambers and in the press of some of the states of the German Confederation. They accuse France of entertaining ambitious plans, which it has disavowed, and of preparing for conquests of which it does not stand in need", etc.

In rebuttal of these "slanders" the *Moniteur* argues that "the Emperor's" attitude towards the Italian question should "rather inspire the greatest sense of security in Germany", that German unity and nationhood are, so to speak, the hobby-horses of Decembrist France, etc. The *Moniteur* concedes, however (see April 10, 1859), that certain German anxieties may appear to have been "provoked" by certain Parisian pamphlets—pamphlets in which Louis Bonaparte urgently exhorts himself to provide his people with the "long-desired opportunity" "*pour s'étendre majestueusement des Alpes au Rhin*" (to extend its frontiers majestically from the Alps to the Rhine).

"But," the *Moniteur* asserts, "Germany forgets that France stands under the protection of a legislation which does not authorise any preventive control on the part of the government."^b

This and similar declarations by the *Moniteur* produced the very opposite effect to the one intended, or so it was reported to the Earl of Malmesbury (see the Blue Book *On the Affairs of Italy. January to May 1859*^c). But where the *Moniteur* failed, *Karl Vogt* might perhaps succeed. His *Studien* are nothing but a *compilation*

^a "Partie non officielle. Paris, le 14 mars", *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 74, March 15, 1859.—*Ed.*

^b *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 100, April 10, 1859.—*Ed.*

^c Cowley to Malmesbury, April 10, 1859 (extract). Here and below Marx uses the English title of the Blue Book.—*Ed.*

in German of *Moniteur* articles, *Dentu* pamphlets¹²⁰ and Decembrist maps of the future.

Vogt's tub-thumping about *England* has only one point of interest—as an illustration of the general style of his *Studien*. Following his French sources he transforms the English Admiral, *Sir Charles Napier*, into “*Lord*” *Napier* (*Studien*, p. 4). The literary Zouaves attached to the Decembrists have learnt from the theatre of *Porte St. Martin*¹²¹ that every distinguished Englishman is a Lord at the very least.

“England has never been able,” *Vogt* declares, “to harmonise with Austria for long. Even though a *momentary* community of interests may have united *them for a while*, political necessity always separated them again *immediately*. On the other hand, England constantly formed close alliances with Prussia”, etc. (loc. cit., p. 2.)^a

Indeed! The common struggle of England and Austria against Louis XIV lasted with brief interruptions from 1689 to 1713, i.e. almost a quarter of a century. In the war of the Austrian Succession England fought for about six years together with Austria against Prussia and France. It was not until the Seven Years' War¹²² that England became the ally of Prussia against Austria and France, but as early as 1762 Lord Bute left Frederick the Great in the lurch and put forward proposals for the “partition of Prussia” first to the Russian minister Golitsin and then to the Austrian minister Kaunitz. In 1790 England concluded a treaty with Prussia against Russia and Austria, but it faded away before the year was out. During the Anti-Jacobin War Prussia withdrew from the European Coalition with the Treaty of Basle,¹²³ despite Pitt's subsidies. Austria, on the other hand, urged on by England, fought on with brief interruptions from 1793 to 1809. As soon as Napoleon was eliminated and even before the conclusion of the Congress of Vienna, England concluded a secret treaty (of January 3, 1815) with Austria and France against Russia and Prussia.¹²⁴ In 1821, in Hanover, Metternich and Castlereagh made a new agreement against Russia.¹²⁵ Thus whereas the British themselves, both historians and parliamentarians, mostly refer to Austria as their “*ancient ally*”,^b *Vogt* has discovered from his original source, French pamphlets published by *Dentu*, that Austria and England were always at loggerheads apart from cases of a

^a In this passage the italics are Marx's. The punctuation is slightly altered.—*Ed.*

^b Marx uses the English phrase and gives the German translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

“momentary community of interests”, while England and Prussia were constant allies, which probably explains why Lord *Lyndhurst* warned the House of Lords during the Russian war with Prussia in mind: “*Quem tu, Romane, caveto!*”^a Protestant England has antipathies towards Catholic Austria, liberal England towards conservative Austria, free-trade England towards protectionist Austria, solvent England towards bankrupt Austria. But emotional factors have always been alien to English history. It is true that Lord *Palmerston*, during his thirty years’ rule of England, occasionally glossed over his vassalage to Russia by parading his Austrian antipathies. From “antipathy” to Austria, for example, he rejected in 1848 Austria’s proposal, approved by Piedmont and France, for England to mediate in Italy, a proposal according to which Austria would have withdrawn to Verona and the line of the Adige, Lombardy would have become part of Piedmont, if it so decided, Parma and Modena would have fallen to Lombardy, while Venice would have formed an independent Italian state under an Austrian Archduke and given itself a constitution. (See *Blue Book on the Affairs of Italy*, Part II, July 1849, Nos. 377, 478.) These conditions were at any rate better than those of the Treaty of Villafranca.¹²⁶ After Radetzky had defeated the Italians at all points, Palmerston put forward the same terms that he himself had earlier rejected. As soon as Russia’s interests required the opposite approach, however, such as during the *Hungarian* war of independence, he refused the assistance for which the Hungarians asked on the basis of the treaty of 1711¹²⁷—despite his “antipathy” to Austria—and even refused to make any protest against Russian intervention on the grounds that

“the political independence and liberties of Europe are bound up with the maintenance and integrity of Austria as a great European Power” (sitting of the House of Commons, July 21, 1849).^b

Vogt’s story continues:

“The interests of the United Kingdom ... are *everywhere in opposition* to them” (to the interests of Austria) (loc. cit., p. 2).

“Everywhere” is at once transformed into the Mediterranean.

“England wishes at all costs to preserve its influence in the Mediterranean and the countries along its coastline. Naples and Sicily, Malta and the Ionian Islands, Syria and Egypt are points of support of its policy oriented towards the *East Indies*. At all these points, Austria has set up the *greatest* obstacles to it” (loc. cit.).

^a “Be on your guard against him, Romans!” (Horace, *Satires*, Book I, Satire 4, paraphrased.)—*Ed.*

^b *The Times*, No. 20235, July 23, 1849.—*Ed.*

It is amazing to see how much *Vogt* takes on trust from the original Decembrist pamphlets published by Dentu in Paris! The English had imagined hitherto that they had been fighting the Russians and the French in turn for Malta and the Ionian Islands, but never the Austrians. They imagined that France, not Austria, had earlier sent an expedition to Egypt and was establishing itself at this very moment in the isthmus of Suez; that France, not Austria, had made conquests on the North coast of Africa and, allied with Spain, had striven to snatch Gibraltar from Britain; that England had concluded the treaty of July 1840 referring to Egypt and Syria against France and with Austria¹²⁸; that in "*the policy oriented towards the East Indies*" England had everywhere encountered the "greatest obstacles" set up by Russia, not Austria. They imagined that in the only serious dispute between England and Naples—the sulphur question of 1840—it was a *French*, not an Austrian, company whose monopoly of the Sicilian sulphur trade triggered off the conflict.¹²⁹ And lastly, that on the other side of the Channel, there was occasional talk of transforming the Mediterranean into a "*lac français*", but never into a "*lac autrichien*". However, an important particular has to be considered in this context.

In the course of 1858 a map of Europe appeared in London entitled *L'Europe en 1860* (Europe in 1860).^a This map, which was put out by the French Embassy and for 1858 contained several prophetic hints—Lombardy-Venice, for example, were annexed by Piedmont, and Morocco by Spain—redrew the political geography of the whole of Europe with one exception, that of France, which apparently remained within its old frontiers. The territories designed for it were, with sly irony, donated to impossible owners. Thus *Egypt* fell to *Austria* and the note in the margin of the map read: "*François Joseph I, l'Empereur d'Autriche et d'Égypte*" (Francis Joseph I, Emperor of Austria and Egypt).

Vogt had the map of *L'Europe en 1860* before him as a sort of Decembrist compass. Hence his dispute between England and Austria on account of *Egypt* and *Syria*. Vogt prophesies that this conflict would "end in the destruction of one of the disputants", *if*, as he remembers just in time, "*if Austria possessed a navy*" (loc. cit., p. 2). However, the historical scholarship peculiar to the *Studien* reaches its climax in the following passage:

^a A description of the map was published in *The Times*, Nos. 23228 and 23229, February 12 and 14, 1859.—*Ed.*

"When Napoleon I *once* attempted to break *the English Bank*, the latter *one day*^a resorted to counting the sums, instead of weighing them out, as it had always done previously; the Austrian Treasury finds itself in the same position, or even in a much worse one, for 365 days every year" (loc. cit., p. 43).

It is well known that the Bank of England ("the English Bank" is another figment of Vogt's imagination) suspended payments in cash from February 1797 until 1821,¹³⁰ during which 24 years English banknotes could not be exchanged for metal at all, whether weighed or counted. When the suspension first began there was as yet no Napoleon I in France (although a General Bonaparte was engaged on his first Italian campaign), and when cash payments were resumed in Threadneedle Street, Napoleon I had ceased to exist in Europe. Such "studies" even surpass La Guéronnière's account of the conquest of Tyrol by the "Emperor" of Austria.

Frau von Krüdener, the mother of the Holy Alliance, used to distinguish between the good principle, the "*white angel of the North*" (Alexander I), and the evil principle, the "*black angel of the South*" (Napoleon I).^b Vogt, the adoptive father of the new Holy Alliance, transforms both, Tsar and Caesar, Alexander II and Napoleon III, into "*white angels*". Both are the predestined liberators of Europe.

Piedmont, Vogt claims, "*has even gained the respect of Russia*" (loc. cit., p. 71).^c

What more can be said of a state *than that it has even gained the respect of Russia*. Especially after Piedmont had ceded the naval port of Villafranca to Russia, and as the selfsame Vogt points out in regard to the purchase of the Jade Bay by Prussia¹³¹:

"A naval port on alien territory, without organic connections to the land to which it belongs, is such ridiculous nonsense that its existence can only acquire meaning if it is, as it were, regarded as a target of future aspirations, as a raised pennant on which to train one's sights" (*Studien*, p. 15).

It is common knowledge that Catherine II had already striven to obtain naval ports on the Mediterranean for Russia.

Tender consideration towards the "white angel" of the North leads Vogt into crude exaggerations which violate "the modesty of

^a The italics are Marx's except for the words "one day"; the punctuation is slightly altered.—*Ed.*

^b See J. Turquan, *Une illuminée au XIX^e siècle (la baronne de Krüdener), 1766-1824*, Paris, p. 194.—*Ed.*

^c Marx's italics and bold type.—*Ed.*

nature", insofar as this was still respected by his original source in Dentu. In *La vraie question. France-Italie-Autriche*, Paris, 1859 (published by Dentu) he read on p. 20:

"And besides, with what right could the Austrian Government invoke the inviolability of the treaties of 1815, when it has itself broken them with the *confiscation of Cracow* whose independence the treaties guaranteed?"*

He translates his French original in this way:

"It is strange to hear such language from the mouth of the *only government*^a which up to *now* has insolently violated the treaties [...] by raising its sacrilegious hand, without cause, in the midst of peace, against the *Republic of Cracow*, which had been guaranteed by the treaties, and incorporating it *without more ado* into the Empire" (loc. cit., p. 58).

It was of course out of "respect" for the treaties of 1815 that Nicholas destroyed the Constitution and autonomy of the Kingdom of Poland, which were guaranteed by the treaties of 1815. Russia had no less respect for the integrity of *Cracow* when it occupied the free city with Muscovite troops in 1831. In 1836 *Cracow* was again occupied by the Russians, Austrians and Prussians; it was treated like a conquered nation in every respect and as late as 1840 it vainly appealed to England and France, invoking the treaties of 1815. Finally, on February 22, 1846, Russians, Austrians and Prussians again occupied *Cracow*, to incorporate it into Austria.¹³² Thus all *three Northern powers* violated the treaties and the Austrian confiscation of 1846 was only the sequel to the Russian invasion of 1831. Out of courtesy towards the "white angel of the North" Vogt forgets the confiscation of Poland and falsifies the history of the confiscation of *Cracow*.**

The circumstance that *Russia* is "consistently hostile to Austria and sympathetic to France" leaves Vogt in no doubt about Louis Bonaparte's inclination to liberate all nations, just as the fact that "his" (Louis Bonaparte's) "policies are *today* in the *closest* agreement with those of *Russia*" (p. 30) raises no doubts in his mind about Alexander II's inclination to liberate all nations.

* "De quel droit, d'ailleurs, le gouvernement autrichien viendrait-il invoquer l'inviolabilité de ceux (traités) de 1815, lui qui les a violés en confisquant Cracovie, dont ces traités garantissaient l'indépendance?"

** Palmerston, who fooled Europe with his ridiculous protest, had worked unceasingly in the intrigue against *Cracow* ever since 1831. (See my pamphlet *Palmerston and Poland*, London, 1853.) [See present edition, Vol. 12.]

^a The words "only government" were italicised by Vogt. The other italics in this passage are Marx's.—*Ed.*

Hence in the East Holy Russia must be regarded as the “friend of aspirations to freedom” and of “popular and national development”, just like Decembrist France in the West. This slogan was given out for all the agents of December 2.

“Russia,” Vogt found in *La foi des traités, les puissances signataires et l'empereur Napoléon III*, Paris, 1859, a work published by Dentu, “Russia belongs to the family of the Slavs, a chosen race.... Astonishment has been expressed at the chivalrous concord that has suddenly sprung up between France and Russia. Nothing could be more natural: *agreement on principles, unanimity of purpose, submission to the law of the holy alliance of the governments and peoples*, not to set traps and constrain others, but to guide and support the divine movements of the nations. From this perfect concord” (between Louis Philippe and England there was only an *entente cordiale*, but between Louis Bonaparte and Russia there is *la cordialité la plus parfaite*) “the most happy things have resulted: railways, *emancipation of the serfs*, trading posts in the Mediterranean, etc.”*

Vogt immediately latches on to the “emancipation of the serfs” and suggests that

“the present impulse ... may well make Russia the ally of aspirations to freedom, rather than their enemy” (loc. cit., p. 10).

Like his Dentu original, he attributes the impulse for the so-called emancipation of the serfs in Russia to Louis Bonaparte and for this purpose he transforms the Anglo-Turkish-French-Russian war, which provided the impulse, into a “*French war*” (loc. cit., p. 9).

It is well known that the call to emancipate the serfs first rang out, loud and persistently, under Alexander I. Tsar Nicholas was occupied with emancipation of the serfs throughout his life; in 1838 he created a Ministry of Domains for this very purpose; in 1843 he instructed this Ministry to make the necessary preparations and in 1847 he even issued decrees favourable to the peasantry about the disposal of land belonging to the nobility¹³³ which he only reversed in 1848 from fear of the revolution. Hence, if the emancipation of the serfs has assumed more substantial dimensions under the “benevolent Tsar”, as Vogt genially calls Alexander II, this would appear to be the result of economic developments which even a Tsar cannot subdue. Besides, the emancipation of the serfs as the *Russian Government sees it*, would

* “La Russie est de la famille des Slaves, race d'élite... On s'est étonné de l'accord chevaleresque survenu soudainement entre la France et la Russie. Rien de plus naturel: accord des principes, unanimité du but ... *soumission à la loi de l'alliance sainte des gouvernements et des peuples*, non pour leurrer et contraindre, mais pour guider et aider la marche divine des nations. De la cordialité la plus parfaite sont sortis les plus heureux effets: chemins de fer, *affranchissement des serfs*, stations commerciales dans la Méditerranée, etc.” *La foi des traités, etc.*, Paris, 1859, p. 33.

increase the aggressive power of Russia a hundredfold. It is simply intended to perfect autocratic rule by tearing down the barriers which the big autocrat has hitherto encountered in the shape of the many lesser autocrats of the Russian nobility, whose might is based on serfdom, as well as in the shape of the self-administrating peasant communes, whose material foundation, common ownership of land, is to be destroyed by the so-called emancipation.

The Russian serfs happen to interpret the emancipation differently from the government, and the Russian nobility understands it in yet a third sense. Hence the "benevolent Tsar" discovered that a genuine emancipation of the serfs is incompatible with his own autocratic rule, just as the benevolent Pope Pius IX discovered in his day that the emancipation of Italy was incompatible with the existence of the Papacy. The "benevolent Tsar", therefore, regards wars of conquest and the traditional foreign policy of Russia, which, as the Russian historian Karamzin remarks, is "immutable",^a as the only way to postpone the revolution within. In his work *La vérité sur la Russie*, 1860, Prince *Dolgorukov* has subjected to devastating criticism the tissue of lies about the millennium that is supposed to have dawned under Alexander II, myths zealously disseminated throughout Europe since 1856 by writers in the pay of Russia, loudly proclaimed in 1859 by the Decembrists and blindly repeated by Vogt in his *Studien*.

According to *Vogt*, even before the outbreak of the Italian war the alliance forged between the "white Tsar" and the "Man of December" for the express purpose of liberating the subject nationalities, had shown its worth in the Danubian principalities, where the unity and independence of the Romanian nation were confirmed by the election of Colonel Cuza as ruler of Moldavia and Wallachia.¹³⁴

"Austria protested with might and main, *France and Russia applauded*" (loc. cit., p. 65).

In a memorandum¹³⁵ (printed in the *Preussisches Wochenblatt*, 1855) drawn up in 1837 for the Tsar of the time^b by the Russian Cabinet, we can read:

"Russia prefers not to annex *immediately* states with alien elements.... In any event it seems more fitting to allow countries whose acquisition has been *resolved*

^a Н. М. Карамзинъ, *Исторія Государства Россійскаго*, Т. XI, Спб., 1824, стр. 23 (N. M. Karamzin, *The History of the Russian State*, Vol. XI, St. Petersburg, 1824, p. 23).—*Ed.*

^b Nicholas I.—*Ed.*

upon to exist for a time under separate, but entirely dependent leaders, as we have done in Moldavia and Wallachia, etc.”^a

Before Russia annexed the Crimea it proclaimed its *independence*. In a Russian proclamation of December 11, 1814, it is stated *inter alia*:

“The Emperor Alexander, your protector, appeals to you, Poles: Arm yourselves for the defence of your country and the maintenance of your *political independence*.”^b

And above all the Danubian principalities! Ever since Peter the Great's invasion of the Danubian principalities, Russia has laboured in the cause of their “*independence*”. At the Congress of Niemirow (1737) the Empress Anne demanded that the Sultan should concede the independence of the Danubian principalities under Russian protection. At the Congress of Focșani (1772) Catherine II insisted on the independence of the principalities under *European protection*.¹³⁶ Alexander I continued these efforts and put the seal on them by transforming Bessarabia into a Russian province (by the Peace of Bucharest, 1812¹³⁷). Nicholas even gladdened the hearts of the Romanians through Kiselev by bestowing on them the *Règlement organique*, which established the most hideous form of serfdom while the whole of Europe applauded him for this code of liberty, which is still in force.¹³⁸ By his quasi-unification of the Danubian principalities under Cuza, Alexander II only went one step further in the century-and-a-half's policy of his forbears. *Vogt* now discovers that this unification under a Russian vassal means that “the principalities will constitute a dam blocking the advance of Russia towards the South” (loc. cit., p. 64).

Since Russia has been applauding the election of Cuza (loc. cit., p. 65) it is as clear as daylight that the benevolent Tsar must be doing all he can to block his own “path to the South” even though “Constantinople remains an eternal goal of Russian policy” (loc. cit., p. 9).

There is nothing new in proclaiming Russia the protector of liberalism and of national aspirations. Catherine II was celebrated as the standard-bearer of progress by a whole host of French and

^a “Zur Signatur der russischen Politik”, *Preussisches Wochenblatt*, No. 23, June 9, 1855. Marx gives a summary rather than the exact words of the passage in question.—*Ed.*

^b The source used by Marx has not been established. The text of the proclamation can be found in D'Angeberg's *Recueil des traités, conventions et actes diplomatiques concernant la Pologne*.—*Ed.*

German Enlighteners. The “noble” Alexander I (*Le Grec du Bas Empire*^a as Napoleon meanly described him) in his day played the hero of liberalism throughout Europe. Did he not make Finland happy by bestowing on it the blessings of Russian civilisation? Did he not in his magnanimity give France not only a Constitution, but even a *Russian* Prime Minister, the Duc de Richelieu? Was he not the secret head of the “Hetairia”,¹³⁹ while simultaneously at the Congress of Verona, he urged Louis XVIII through his hired agent Chateaubriand to campaign against the Spanish rebels?¹⁴⁰ Did he not use Ferdinand VII’s confessor to incite Ferdinand to send an expedition to quell the rebellious Spanish-American colonies, while at the same time he promised the President of the United States of North America^b his assistance against the intervention of any European power on the American continent? Did he not send Ypsilanti to Wallachia as the “leader of the Holy Hellenic Host”, and use the same Ypsilanti to betray the host and arrange for the assassination of Vladimirescu, the Wallachian rebel leader? Before 1830 Nicholas, too, was eulogised in every language, in verse and in prose, as the hero who would liberate the subject nationalities. In 1828-29, when he undertook a war against Mahmood II, for the liberation of the *Greeks*, after Mahmood had refused to allow a Russian army to move in to suppress the Greek uprising, Palmerston speaking in the British Parliament declared that the enemies of Russia, the liberator, were necessarily the “friends” of the greatest monsters in the world: Dom Miguel, Austria and the Sultan. Did not Nicholas in paternal solicitude give the Greeks a president, namely Count Capo d’Istria, a Russian general? But the Greeks were not Frenchmen and they murdered the noble Capo d’Istria. And although Nicholas had mainly appeared in his role as guardian of legitimacy ever since the July 1830 revolution, he did not cease for a moment to work for the “liberation of the subject nationalities”. A few illustrations will suffice. The constitutional revolution in *Greece* in September 1843 was led by Katakasi, the Russian minister in Athens and formerly the responsible supervisor over Admiral Heiden at the time of the disaster at Navarino.¹⁴¹ The centre of the *Bulgarian* rebellion in 1842 was the Russian consulate in Bucharest. There in the spring of 1842, the Russian general Duhamel received a Bulgarian

^a Greek of the Byzantine Empire; figuratively, confidence-trickster. See Emmanuel Las Cases, *Mémorial de Sainte-Hélène...*, t. 2, Paris, 1824, p. 407, and François René Chateaubriand, *Congrès de Vérone*, Vol. 1, Paris, 1838, pp. 186-87.—*Ed.*

^b James Monroe.—*Ed.*

deputation whom he presented with a plan for a general insurrection. Serbia was to act as reserve for the revolt and the Russian general Kiselev was to become Hospodar of Wallachia. During the *Serbian* uprising (1843) Russia used its Embassy in Constantinople to drive the Turks to resort to violence against the Serbs, and then made use of this pretext to appeal to the sympathy and fanaticism of Europe against the Turks. *Italy*, too, was by no means excluded from the liberation plans of Tsar Nicholas. *La Jeune Italie*, which was for a time the Paris organ of the Mazzini party, recounts in an issue in November 1843:

“The recent disturbances in the Romagna and the movements in Greece were more or less connected with each other.... The Italian movement failed because the real democratic party refused to join it. The *Republicans* would *not aid* in a movement instigated by *Russia*. Everything was prepared for a general insurrection in Italy. The movement was to commence in Naples, where it was expected that a section of the army would take the lead or make common cause with the patriots. After the outbreak of the revolution, Lombardy, Piedmont and the Romagna would rise and an *Italian Empire* was to be established under the Duke of Leuchtenberg, the son of Eugène Beauharnais and the son-in-law of the Tsar. ‘*Young Italy*’¹⁴² *frustrated this plan.*”^a

The Times of November 20, 1843 commented as follows on this information from *La Jeune Italie*:

“If that great end—the establishment of a new Italian Empire the head of which would be a Russian Prince—could be attained, so much the better; but there was another—an immediate, though perhaps not quite so important advantage to be gained by any outbreak in Italy—the causing of alarm to Austria and the withdrawal of her attention from the fearful^b projects of *Russia on the Danube.*”

After Nicholas had made an unsuccessful approach to “Young Italy” in 1843, he sent Mr. von Butenev to Rome in March 1844. Butenev proposed to the Pope^c in the name of the Tsar that Russian Poland should be ceded to Austria in exchange for Lombardy, which was to become a North Italian kingdom under Leuchtenberg. *The Tablet* of April 1844, which was at that time the English organ of the Roman Curia, commented as follows:

“The bait for the Roman Curia contained in this beautiful plan lay in the fact that Poland would fall into Catholic hands, while Lombardy would remain in the possession of a Catholic dynasty as before. But the diplomatic veterans of Rome perceived that while Austria can barely maintain its hold on its own possessions and in all human probability will be forced sooner or later to relinquish its Slav

^a Here and below Marx probably drew on the item “Express from Paris”, *The Times*, No. 18458, November 20, 1843. The italics are Marx’s.—*Ed.*

^b In the original Marx gives the word “fearful” in brackets after its German equivalent.—*Ed.*

^c Gregory XVI.—*Ed.*

provinces, the cession of Poland to Austria, even if this part of the proposal were seriously intended, would be nothing more than a loan to be repaid at a later date. Whereas North Italy with the Duke of Leuchtenberg would in fact fall under Russian protection and before long would infallibly come beneath the Russian sceptre. The warmly recommended plan was consequently put aside for the present.”^a

Thus far *The Tablet* of 1844.

The only factor that has served as a justification for the existence of Austria as a political entity since the middle of the eighteenth century has been its resistance to the advance of Russia in Eastern Europe, a resistance conducted in a helpless, inconsistent and cowardly, but obstinate manner. This resistance leads *Vogt* to the discovery that “Austria is the source of all discord in the East” (loc. cit., p. 56). With “a certain childlike innocence” so becoming to his tubbiness, he explains the alliance of Russia and France against Austria as the result of the latter’s *ingratitude* for the services rendered it by Nicholas during the Hungarian revolution, to say nothing of the liberating predilections of the “benevolent Tsar”.

“In the Crimean war Austria went to the very edge of hostile, armed neutrality. It is self-evident that such an attitude, which moreover bore all the marks of *falsity and scheming*, was bound to be bitterly resented by the Russian Government and impel it to draw closer to France” (loc. cit., pp. 10, 11).

According to *Vogt*, Russia pursues a sentimental policy. The *gratitude* Austria expressed to the Tsar at Germany’s expense during the Warsaw Congress in 1850 and in the march on Schleswig-Holstein¹⁴³ does not satisfy the grateful *Vogt*.

The Russian diplomat *Pozzo di Borgo* in his celebrated dispatch from Paris in October 1825,¹⁴⁴ having listed Austria’s intrigues to frustrate Russia’s plans for intervention in the East, goes on to say:

“Our policy obliges us, therefore, to present our most terrifying face towards this state” (Austria) “to convince it by our preparations that if it ventures any movement against us we shall unleash upon it the greatest storm it has ever experienced.”

He goes on to threaten war from without and revolution from within, and having hinted at a possible peaceful solution in the suggestion that Austria should annex any Turkish “provinces that appealed to it” and having described Prussia as a subordinate ally of Russia, he continues:

^a “The Papacy and the Great Powers”, *The Tablet*, No. 205, April 13, 1844. Marx gives a summary rather than the exact words of the passage in question. He may have used some other source too.—*Ed.*

“If the Viennese court had yielded to our good purposes and intentions, the plan of the Imperial Cabinet would long since have achieved fulfilment—a plan which embraces not only the annexation of the Danubian principalities and Constantinople, but even provides for the expulsion of the Turks from Europe.”

It is well known that in 1830 a secret treaty was concluded between Nicholas and Charles X. Its terms laid down that France would permit Russia to take possession of Constantinople and would receive the Rhine provinces and Belgium in return. Prussia would be given Hanover and Saxony, and Austria would receive a part of the Turkish provinces on the Danube. Under Louis Philippe, at Russia's suggestion, this plan was again laid before the Russian Cabinet by Molé. A little while after, Brunnow went to London with the document where it was shown to the English Government as proof of France's treachery and helped to set up the anti-French coalition of 1840.

Let us now see how, according to the ideas of *Vogt*, who obtained his inspirations from his original Paris sources, Russia was *supposed* to exploit the Italian war in agreement with France. It might be thought that the “national” composition of Russia and especially the “*Polish nationality*” might well create certain difficulties for a man for whom “the principle of nationality was the Lodestar”.^a However:

“The principle of nationality stands high in our estimation, but the principle of free self-determination stands even higher” (loc. cit., p. 121).

When Russia annexed by far the largest portion of *Poland* proper by virtue of the treaties of 1815, it gained a position which extended so far westward, and drove as it were a wedge not only between Austria and Prussia, but also between East Prussia and Silesia, that even at the time Prussian officers (such as Gneisenau) pointed out that such frontiers could not be tolerated in relation to so powerful a neighbour. However, it was not until 1831, when the defeat of Poland put the whole territory at the mercy of Russia, that the true significance of the wedge became clear. The subjugation of Poland was no more than a pretext for constructing the grandiose chain of fortresses at Warsaw, Modlin and Ivangorod. Its real purpose was complete strategic control of the basin of the Vistula, and the establishment of a base from which to launch attacks to the North, South and West. Even Haxthausen, who enthused about the orthodox Tsar and all things Russian, regards this as a very definite danger and a threat to Germany.

^a Carl Vogt, *Studien...*, Einleitung, S. ix.—*Ed.*

The Russian fortifications on the Vistula pose a greater threat to Germany than all the French fortresses put together, especially if and when Polish national resistance were to cease completely and Russia were able to use Poland's war potential as its own force of aggression. Hence *Vogt* comforts Germany with the thought that *Poland* has become *Russian* from an act of free self-determination.

"There can be no doubt," he says, "that thanks to the great efforts of the Russian people's party, *the gulf that yawned between Poland and Russia has been narrowed significantly* and it perhaps requires only a *small impulse to close it completely*" (loc. cit., p. 12).

This small impulse was to be provided by the Italian war. (However, in the course of this war Alexander II became convinced that Poland had not yet reached such *Vogtian* heights.) The idea was that owing to the law of gravity *Poland*, which had been absorbed into Russia by an act of "free self-determination", would as a central body attract the detached limbs of the former Kingdom of Poland, which were now wasting away under foreign rule. To facilitate this process of attraction *Vogt* counsels Prussia to seize the opportunity and rid itself of its "Slav appendage" (loc. cit., p. 17), that is *Posen* (loc. cit., p. 97) and probably also *West Prussia* since only East Prussia is recognised to be a "genuine German land". The limbs detached from Prussia would, of course, at once revert to the central body absorbed by Russia and the "genuine German land" of East Prussia would be transformed into a Russian enclave. On the other hand, as far as *Galicia* is concerned, which is also shown as a part of Russia on the map of *L'Europe en 1860*, its separation from Austria lay directly in line with the war to free Germany from the non-German possessions of Austria. *Vogt* recollects that

"before 1848 the picture of the Russian Tsar could be seen more frequently in [...] Galicia than that of the Austrian Emperor" (loc. cit., p. 12) and "in view of the uncommon skill displayed by Russia in weaving its intrigues, Austria would have serious cause for anxiety here" (loc. cit.).

It is perfectly self-evident, however, that in order to rid itself of the "internal enemy" Germany should simply allow the Russians "to advance troops to the frontier" (p. 13) to lend their support to these intrigues. While Prussia is detaching itself from its Polish provinces, Russia using the Italian war should separate Galicia from Austria, just as in 1809 Alexander I had received a piece of Galicia in payment for his purely theatrical support of Napoleon I. It is well known that Russia successfully reclaimed parts of Poland

that had originally gone to Austria and Prussia, partly from Napoleon I and partly from the Congress of Vienna. According to *Vogt*, in 1859 the time had come for the *whole* of Poland to be united with Russia. *Vogt* demands not the *emancipation of the Polish nationality* from Russians, Austrians and Prussians, but the *absorption by Russia and the annihilation of the entire former Kingdom of Poland. Finis Poloniae!*¹⁴⁵ This "Russian" conception of the "reconstruction of Poland", which was rife throughout Europe immediately after the death of Tsar Nicholas, was denounced as early as March 1855 by *David Urquhart* in his pamphlet *The New Hope of Poland*.^a

But *Vogt* had not yet done enough for Russia.

"The extraordinary civility," says our *agreeable companion*, "indeed the almost brotherly feelings with which the Russians treated the *Hungarian* revolutionaries formed too great a contrast with the behaviour of the Austrians for it not to have had repercussions. Russia did indeed crush the party" (N.B.: according to *Vogt* the Russians crushed not *Hungary* but the *party*), "but treated it with forbearance and courteousness, and thereby laid the foundations for an attitude which may be characterised by saying that when faced with two evils one must choose the lesser of the two, and *that in the present case, Russia is not the greater*" (loc. cit., pp. 12, 13).

With what "extraordinary civility, forbearance, courteousness", and indeed almost "brotherly feelings" does Plon-Plon's Falstaff conduct the Russians to Hungary, making himself into the "channel" for the illusion which destroyed the Hungarian revolution of 1849. It was *Görgey's* party which disseminated the belief in a Russian prince as the future King of Hungary, a belief which broke the will of the Hungarian revolution to resist.*

Without having particular support in any one race the Habsburgs naturally based their dominion over Hungary *before* 1848 on the dominant nationality—the *Magyars*. We may remark in passing that Metternich was the great protector of the nationalities. He misused them by playing them off against each other, but he needed them in order to misuse them. He therefore

* According to the Polish Colonel Lapinski, who fought against the Russians in the Hungarian revolutionary army up to the fall of Komorn,^b and later in Circassia, "it was the Hungarians' misfortune that they did not know the Russians" (Theophil Lapinski, *Feldzug der Ungarischen Hauptarmee im Jahre 1849*, Hamburg, 1850, p. 216). "The Viennese Cabinet was completely in the hands of the Russians ... it was on their advice that the leaders were murdered ... while the Russians did everything to gain the sympathies of all, *Austria was ordered by them to make itself even more hated than ever in the past*" (loc. cit., pp. 188, 189).

^a Marx gives the English title and supplies the German translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

^b Komárom.—*Ed.*

preserved them. We may compare the situation in Posen and Galicia. After the revolution of 1848-49 the Habsburg dynasty, having used the Slavs to subdue the Germans and Magyars, tried to follow in the footsteps of Joseph II and to impose the rule of the German element in Hungary by force. The fear of Russia prevented the Habsburgs from embracing their rescuers, the Slavs. Their overall reactionary policy in Hungary was aimed more against their saviours, the Slavs, than against their defeated enemies, the Magyars. Hence, as *Szemere* has shown in his pamphlet *Hungary, 1848-1860*, London, 1860, fighting against its own saviours, the Austrian reaction therefore drove the Slavs back under the wing of the Magyars. Austrian rule *over* Hungary and the rule of the Magyars *in* Hungary coincided, therefore, both *before* and *after* 1848. Russia is in a quite different position, whether it rules Hungary directly or indirectly. Taking the racial and religious affinities together, Russia would immediately have the *non-Magyar majority* of the population at its disposal. The Magyar race would instantly succumb to the union of the Slavs, who are akin to the Russians ethnically, and the Wallachians, who are akin to them religiously. Russian domination in Hungary, therefore, is synonymous with the *destruction of Hungarian nationality*, i.e. of a Hungary historically bound up with Magyar rule.*

Vogt, who proposes that the *Poles* by an act of "free self-determination" should be absorbed by *Russia*, also wants to drown the *Hungarians* in a *sea of Slavs* by subjecting them to Russian rule.**

But *Vogt* has still not done enough for Russia.

* General *Moritz Perczel*, famous for his part in the Hungarian revolutionary war, withdrew from the group of Hungarian officers around *Kossuth* in Turin while the Italian campaign was still in progress. In a public declaration he explained the reasons for his resignation—on the one hand, there was *Kossuth*, who merely acted as a Bonapartist bogymen, on the other hand, there was the prospect of a *Russian* future for Hungary. In his reply (from St. Hélier, April 19, 1860) to a letter from me in which I inquired for further information about his declaration, he said *inter alia*: "I shall never consent to act as a tool to rescue Hungary from the claws of the Double Eagle merely to force it into the **deadly embrace** of the Northern Bear."

** Mr. *Kossuth* was never in any doubt about the correctness of the views set forth in the present work. He knew that *Austria* can maltreat Hungary, but not annihilate it. "The Emperor Joseph II," he writes to the Grand Vizier Reshid Pasha from Kütahya, February 15, 1851, "the only man of genius produced by the Habsburg family, exhausted the extraordinary resources of his rare intellect and of the then still common notions of the power of his House, in the attempt to Germanise Hungary, and integrate it within the state as a whole. But Hungary

Among the “non-German provinces” of Austria on behalf of whom the German Confederation should *not* “take up its sword” against France and Russia, which “stands whole-heartedly on the side of France”, are not only Galicia, Hungary and Italy, but in particular *Bohemia and Moravia*, as well.

“Russia,” Vogt says, “provides the firm centre around which the Slav nationalities increasingly strive to congregate” (loc. cit., pp. 9-10).

Bohemia and Moravia belong to the “Slav nationalities”. As Muscovy developed into Russia, so must Russia develop into Pan-Slavonia. “With the *Czechs* ... at our side we shall *succumb to every enemy*” (loc. cit., p. 134). We, i.e. Germany, must attempt to rid ourselves of the Czechs, i.e. of Bohemia and Moravia. “No guarantee for non-German possessions of the rulers” (loc. cit., p. 133). “*No non-German provinces in the Confederation any longer*” (loc. cit.) but only German provinces in France! Hence we must not only “*give the present French Empire a free hand* [...] as long as it does **not** violate the territory of the German Confederation” (Preface, p. 9), but we must also allow **Russia** “a free hand” as long as it only violates “*non-German provinces in the Confederation*”. Russia will help Germany develop its “unity” and “nationhood” by advancing troops to the “Slav appendages” of Austria exposed to Russia’s “intrigues”. While Austria is kept busy in Italy by Louis Bonaparte and Prussia forces the sword of the German Confederation back into its sheath, the “benevolent Tsar” will “be able secretly to support” revolutions in *Bohemia and Moravia* “with money, arms and munitions” (loc. cit., p. 13).

And “with the Czechs at our side we must succumb to every enemy”!

emerged from the struggle with renewed vigour.... In the last revolution Austria only raised itself from the dust in order to collapse once again at the feet of the Tsar, its master, who never *gives* his aid but only *sells* it. And Austria had to pay for this aid dearly” (*Correspondence of Kossuth*, p. 33). On the other hand, he maintains in the same letter that only Hungary and Turkey together can frustrate the *Pan-Slavist intrigues* of Russia. He writes to *David Urquhart* from Kütahya, *January 17, 1851*: “*We must crush Russia*, my dear Sir! and, headed by you, we will! I have not only the resolution of will, but also that of hope! and this is no vain word, my dear Sir! no sanguine fascination; it is the word of a man, who is wont duly to calculate every chance: of a man though very weak in faculties, not to be shaken in perseverance and resolution, etc.” (loc. cit., p. 39.)^a

^a The letter was quoted in the article “Data by Which to Judge of Kossuth”, *The Free Press*, No. 5, May 27, 1859. Marx quotes the original English text and gives the German translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

How magnanimous of the “benevolent Tsar”, then, to relieve us of Bohemia and Moravia with all their Czechs which as “Slav nationalities must” naturally “congregate around Russia”.

Let us examine how our Vogt of the Empire protects the Eastern German frontier by incorporating Bohemia and Moravia in Russia. Bohemia Russian! But Bohemia lies in the middle of Germany, separated from Russian Poland by Silesia, and from the Galicia and Hungary Russified by *Vogt*, by a Moravia also Russified by *Vogt*. Thus Russia acquires an expanse of German federal territory 50 German miles long and 25-35 miles broad.^a Its Western frontier will advance westwards by a full 65 German miles. Since the distance between Eger^b and Lauterburg in Alsace is no more than 45 German miles as the crow flies, North Germany will be totally separated from South Germany by the French wedge in the West and even more by the Russian wedge in the East, and the *partition of Germany would be complete!* The direct route from Vienna to Berlin would pass *through Russia*, and the same would apply even to the direct route from Munich to Berlin. Dresden, Nuremberg, Regensburg and Linz would be our frontier towns bordering on Russia; our position *vis-à-vis* the Slavs would, at least in the South, be the same as it was *before* Charlemagne (while in the West *Vogt* does not allow us to go back as far as Louis XV), and we could simply erase 1,000 years of our history.

What could be accomplished with the aid of Poland, could be accomplished even better with the aid of Bohemia. If Prague were transformed into a fortified encampment, with secondary fortresses at the confluence of the Moldau and the Eger^c with the Elbe, the Russian army in Bohemia could calmly stand and wait for the German army which, divided from the outset, would approach from Bavaria, Austria and Brandenburg. Falling upon the smaller German units it would be able to destroy them while allowing the larger ones to run up against the fortresses.

Let us look at a linguistic map of Central Europe, taking, for example, a Slav authority, the “*slovanský zeměvid*” of Šafařík.¹⁴⁶ According to this the Slav-language frontier runs from the Pomeranian coast near Stolp via Zastrow south of Chodziehen^d on the Netze, and advances westwards to Meseritz. However, from there it suddenly curves south-east. Here the massive German

^a A German mile is equal to 7,420 metres.—*Ed.*

^b Modern name: Cheb.—*Ed.*

^c Now the Vltava and the Ohře.—*Ed.*

^d Modern names: Stölpchen (Stölpgen), Jastrow and Colmar.—*Ed.*

territory of Silesia drives a deep wedge between Poland and Bohemia. In Moravia and Bohemia the Slavonic language again protrudes far to the west, although it is greatly eroded by the advance of German from all directions and the whole area is interspersed with German towns and linguistic islands, just as in the north, the whole Lower Vistula and the best part of East and West Prussia are German and push forward uncomfortably towards Poland. Between the most westerly point of the Polish tongue and the most northerly point of Bohemian, the Lusatian or Wendish linguistic enclave lies in the middle of German-speaking territory, but in such a way that it almost cuts off Silesia.

For the Russian Pan-Slavist *Vogt*, who has Bohemia to play with, there is no doubt where the natural frontier of the Slav Empire lies. It goes from Meseritz directly to Lieberose and Lübben, then south of where the Elbe passes through the mountains on the Bohemian frontier, after which it follows the Western and Southern frontier of Bohemia and Moravia. Everything to the east of this is Slav: the few German enclaves and other interlopers on Slav soil can no longer withstand the development of the great Slav nation. And anyway they have no right to be where they are. Once this "Pan-Slavist state of affairs" has been brought about, a similar rectification of the frontiers will become inevitable in the south. Here too a German wedge has of its own accord thrust itself between the North and South Slavs and occupied the valley of the Danube and the Styrian Alps. *Vogt* cannot tolerate this wedge and, being consistent, he therefore has Russia annex Austria, Salzburg, Styria and the German parts of Carinthia. In this construction of the Slav-Russian Empire, *Vogt* has already demonstrated, Austria notwithstanding, that according to the well-tested axioms of the "principle of nationality" small numbers of Magyars and Romanians as well as various groups of Turks must fall to Russia (for the "benevolent Tsar" also contributes to the "principle of nationality" by his subjugation of Circassia and the extermination of the Crimean Tartars!)—as a punishment for being wedged between the North and South Slavs.

In this operation, we Germans lose—nothing more than East and West Prussia, Silesia, parts of Brandenburg and Saxony, the whole of Bohemia, Moravia and the rest of Austria apart from Tyrol (part of which falls to the Italian "principle of nationality")—and our national existence to boot!

But let us just consider the first stage, according to which Galicia, Bohemia and Moravia become *Russian*!

In such circumstances German Austria, Southwest Germany and North Germany can never act in concert, except—and this would inevitably come about—*under Russian leadership*.

Vogt makes us Germans sing what his Parisians sang in 1815:

“Vive *Alexandre*,
Vive *le roi des rois*,
Sans rien *prétendre*,
Il nous donne *des lois*.”^a

Vogt’s “principle of nationality”, which he desired to realise in 1859 through the alliance between the “white angel of the North” and the “white angel of the South”, should according to *his* views prove its worth by the absorption of Polish nationality, the disappearance of Magyar nationality and vanishing of German nationality in—*Russia*.

I have not mentioned his original source in *Dentu’s* pamphlets on this occasion because I was reserving a *single* conclusive quotation as proof that everything that he either hints at or blurts out stems from slogans issued by the Tuileries. In the *Pensiero ed Azione’s* issue of May 2-16, 1859, in which *Mazzini* forecasts events that later took place, he remarks *inter alia* that the first condition of the alliance agreed between Alexander II and Louis Bonaparte was: “*abbandono assoluto della Polonia*” (absolute abandonment of Poland by France, which *Vogt* translates as “completely closing the gulf yawning between Poland and Russia”).

“Che la guerra si prolunghi e assuma ... proporzioni europee, l’insurrezione delle provincie oggi turche preparata di lunga mano e quelle dell’*Ungheria*, daranno campo all’Alleanza di rivelarsi... Principi russi governerebbero le provincie che surgerebbero *sulle rovine* dell’Impero Turco e dell’*Austria*... *Constantino di Russia* è già proposto ai malcontenti ungheresi.” (See *Pensiero ed Azione*, May 2-16, 1859.) (“If the war be prolonged so as to assume ... European proportions, the insurrection of the Turkish provinces, prepared a long time since, and that of Hungary, would enable the alliance to assume palpable forms... Russian princes would govern the states established on the ruins of the Turkish Empire and Austria... Constantine of Russia is already proposed to the Hungarian malcontents.”)^b

^a “Long live *Alexander*,
Long live *the king of kings*;
He gives us *laws* and *never*
Asks for the least of things.”
(*Le Peuple de 1850*, No. 26, September 27).—*Ed.*

^b From *Mazzini’s* manifesto entitled “*La Guerra*”. Marx translated it into English and published it with a brief introduction in the *New-York Daily Tribune* (see present edition, Vol. 16, p. 357).—*Ed.*

But *Vogt's Russophile posture* is only secondary. He is merely repeating one of the catch-phrases issued by the Tuileries and his aim is merely to prepare Germany for manoeuvres agreed between Louis Bonaparte and Alexander II if certain contingencies of the war against Austria should eventuate. In fact, he merely echoes slavishly the Pan-Slavist phraseology of his original Paris pamphlets. His true task is to sing the *Lay of Ludwig*¹⁴⁷:

“Einan kùning wèiz ih, hèizit hêr Hlùdowíg
ther gêrno Gôde” (i.e. the nationalities) “dionôt.”^a

We saw earlier how *Vogt* praised Sardinia by pointing out that “*it had even gained the respect of Russia*”. We now have the parallel assertion.

“There is no mention of Austria,” he says, “in” (Prussia’s) “declarations ... in the event of an imminent war between North America and Cochin China the wording would be the same. But the German mission of Prussia, its German obligations, the old Prussia—that is where the emphasis is put for preference. *France*” (in accordance with his statement on p. 27 that “France is now summed up [...] exclusively in the person of its ruler”) “*therefore bestows praise through the ‘Moniteur’ and the rest of the press.—Austria fumes*” (*Studien*, p. 18).

“The fact that Prussia correctly interprets its ‘*German mission*’ follows from the *praise bestowed on it* by Louis Bonaparte in the *Moniteur* and the rest of the Decembrist press.” What brazen impudence! We remember how from a feeling of tenderness towards the “white angel of the North” *Vogt* made Austria the *sole* offender against the treaties of 1815 and the sole state to confiscate Cracow. He now performs the same labour of love for the benefit of the “white angel of the South”.

“This ecclesiastical state against whose republic” (republic of an ecclesiastical state!) “*Cavaignac*, the representative of the doctrinaire republican party [...] and the military counterpart of Gagern” (a fine parallel!), “perpetrated the abominable *act of massacre*” (to commit massacre against the republic of a state!), “a crime which, however, did not help him to reach the presidential chair” (loc. cit., p. 69).

So it was *Cavaignac* and not *Louis Bonaparte* who perpetrated “the *abominable act of massacre*” against the *Roman Republic*! *Cavaignac* did indeed send a navy to Civitavecchia in November 1848 for the personal protection of the Pope. But it was only in the following year, on *February 9, 1849*, several months after *Cavaignac* had failed to get the presidential chair, that the temporal role of the Pope was abolished and *the republic proclaimed in Rome*. So *Cavaignac* could not possibly murder a republic that

^a “I know of a king, he is called Lord Ludwig
who gladly serves God” (i.e. nationalities).—*Ed.*

did not yet exist while he was in power. On April 22, 1849 Louis Bonaparte sent General Oudinot with 14,000 men to Civitavecchia after he had tricked the National Assembly into giving him the funds necessary for the expedition against Rome by solemnly declaring several times over that his intention was merely to resist an invasion of the Roman states planned by Austria. It is well known that the Paris catastrophe of June 13, 1849¹⁴⁸ arose from the resolution moved by Ledru-Rollin and the Montagne to exact vengeance for the "abominable act of massacre against the Roman Republic" which was also an "abominable breach of the French Constitution" and an "abominable violation of the resolution of the National Assembly", from *Louis Bonaparte*, who was responsible for all these abominations, *by instituting proceedings for impeachment against him*. We see how "abominably" the base sycophant of the coup d'état, how brazenly *Karl Vogt falsifies history* in order to elevate the mission of Lord "Hlûdowîg" to liberate the subject nationalities in general and Italy in particular beyond all doubt.

Vogt remembers from the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* that alongside the class of the lumpenproletariat it is the class of peasant smallholders that in France constitutes the sole social basis of the *bas empire*. He now adjusts this as follows:

"The present Empire has no party among the educated, no party [...] in the French bourgeoisie—only two masses *belong* to it, the army and the rural proletariat,^a *which cannot read or write*. But this constitutes $\frac{9}{10}$ of the population and embraces the mighty organised instrument with whose aid resistance can be smashed, and the *herd of mortgage helots* who own nothing but their *vote*" (p. 25).

The non-urban population of France, including the army, amounts to scarcely $\frac{2}{3}$ of the total population. *Vogt* transforms less than $\frac{2}{3}$ into $\frac{9}{10}$. Moreover, he transforms the whole non-urban population of France, of which around $\frac{1}{5}$ consists of well-to-do landowners and another $\frac{1}{5}$ of people with neither land nor other possessions, lock, stock and barrel into smallholders, "mortgage helots". Finally, he abolishes all reading and writing in France outside the cities. Just as he earlier distorted history, so now he falsifies statistics in order to enlarge the pedestal of his hero. Having done this he installs his hero on this pedestal.

"Thus France is now indeed summed up exclusively in the person of its ruler, of whom Masson" (also an authority) "said 'he possesses great qualities as a statesman and a sovereign, an unshakable will, sure sense of tact, vigorous resolution, a stout heart, a bold, noble spirit and utter ruthlessness'" (loc. cit., p. 27).

^a Vogt in his *Studien* has *Landvolk* (rural people).—Ed.

“wie saeclëfiche stât im an
 allez daz, daz êr begât!
 wie gâr sîn lîp ze wunsche stât!
 wie gënt im so gefliche inein
 die finen keiserlichen bein.”

(*Tristan*)^a

Vogt snatches the censer from Masson's hands in order to swing it himself. To Masson's catalogue of virtues he adds "cold calculation", "bold planning", "serpentine cunning", "tenacious patience" (p. 28) and then, as the Tacitus of the antechamber, he stammers: "The *origins* of this reign are *monstrous*", which is certainly—nonsense. Above all he has to melodramatise the grotesque figure of his hero into a great man and so "*Napoléon le Petit*"¹⁴⁹ becomes a "*man of destiny*" (loc. cit., p. 36).

"Even if *present circumstances*," Vogt exclaims, "lead to a *change*" (what a modest word: a *change*!) "in the government" (of this man of destiny), "we shall not be behindhand with our *warmest congratulations*, even though we can see *no prospect* of this for the time being!" (loc. cit., p. 29.)

How serious the warm fellow is with his congratulations *in petto*^b can be seen from the following:

"Hence with a **lasting peace** the *internal situation* becomes **more and more untenable day by day**, because the French army is much more closely involved with the parties of the educated than is the case, for example, in the German states, in Prussia and Austria; because these parties find an echo, above all among the officers, so that one fine day the *only active pillar* of the power that the Emperor holds in his hands might slip away" (loc. cit., pp. [26-]27).^c

So the "*internal situation*" became "*more and more untenable day by day*" with a "**lasting peace**". This is why Vogt had to assist Louis Bonaparte to *violate the peace*. The army, the "only active pillar" of his "power", threatened to "slip away". This is why Vogt had to prove that it was Europe's task to bind the French "army" to Louis Bonaparte once again by means of a "localised" war in Italy. And indeed at the end of 1858 it looked as though things were going to end dreadfully¹⁵⁰ with Badinguet, as the Parisians unrespectfully call the "nephew of his uncle". The general trade crisis of 1857-58 had paralysed French industry.* The government

* It is in fact the industrial prosperity that has sustained the regime of Louis Bonaparte for so long. As the result of the discoveries in Australia and California

^a "Everything he does, how divinely it becomes him! What a perfect body he has! How evenly those royal legs move together!" (Gottfried von Strassburg, *Tristan und Isolde*.) Marx quotes according to an entry he made in his notebook entitled *Vogtiana* (1860).—*Ed.*

^b Up his sleeve.—*Ed.*

^c The italics and bold type are Marx's.—*Ed.*

manoeuvres to prevent the crisis from becoming acute made the malady chronic, so that the stagnation in French trade dragged on until the outbreak of the Italian war. On the other hand, grain prices fell so low between 1857 and 1859 that a loud cry went up at various *congrès agricoles* to the effect that French agriculture was being ruined by low prices and the heavy burdens imposed on it. Louis Bonaparte's absurd attempt to raise grain prices artificially by a fiat designed to force the bakers throughout France to set up granaries only reveals the helpless confusion of his government.

The foreign policy of the coup d'état exhibited nothing but a series of unsuccessful attempts to play Napoleon—mere trials, invariably crowned by official withdrawals. For example, his intrigue against the United States of America, his manoeuvres to revive the slave trade,¹⁵¹ the melodramatic threats directed against England. The insolence with which Louis Bonaparte at that time ventured to treat Switzerland, Sardinia, Portugal and Belgium—even though in Belgium he could not even prevent the fortification of Antwerp—only throws the fiasco of his policy *vis-à-vis* the great powers into even starker relief. In the British Parliament "*Napoléon le Petit*" became a standard expression and *The Times* heaped ridicule on the "Man of Iron" in its articles at the end of 1858, by describing him as the "Man of Gutta-Percha". In the meantime, Orsini's hand-grenades¹⁵² had burst like a thunderbolt, illuminating the internal situation in France. It turned out that Louis Bonaparte's regime was just as insecure as it had been in the first days after the coup d'état. The *Lois de sûreté publique*¹⁵³ revealed his total isolation. He had to abdicate to his own generals. In an unprecedented development, France was divided into 5 General Captaincies, in the Spanish manner. With the introduction of the Regency Pélissier was in fact recognised as the highest authority in France.¹⁵⁴ Moreover, the renewed *terreur* intimidated no one. Instead of presenting a terrible appearance, the Dutch nephew of the battle of Austerlitz only looked grotesque.¹⁵⁵ Montalembert was able to play Hampden in Paris, Berryer and Dufaure to disclose the hopes of the bourgeoisie in their summings-up and in Brussels Proudhon to proclaim Louis-Philippism with an *acte additionnel*,¹⁵⁶ while Louis Bonaparte himself disclosed the growing power of Marianne to the whole of Europe.

and their effects on the world market, French export trade had more than doubled, a hitherto unprecedented advance. And in general the failure of the February revolution may be attributed in the last analysis to California and Australia.

In the course of the uprising in Chalon¹⁵⁷ the officers, on hearing that a republic had been proclaimed in Paris, cautiously inquired at the Prefecture whether a republic had actually been proclaimed, instead of just falling upon the insurgents, an event which demonstrated in a striking manner that even the army regarded the restored Empire as a pantomime, whose closing scene was drawing near. Scandalous duels of the arrogant officers in Paris coincided with scandalous deals on the Stock Exchange in which the top leaders of the Gang of December 10 were involved. The Palmerston Government in England fell because of its alliance with Louis Bonaparte!¹⁵⁸ And lastly, a treasury that could only be replenished by resorting to exceptional subterfuges! Such was the situation of the *bas empire* at the end of 1858. The Brummagem^a Empire would collapse, or else the absurd farce of a Napoleonic empire *within* the frontiers of the treaties of 1815 would have to cease. But for this a *localised war* was essential. The mere prospect of a war with Europe would then have sufficed to produce an explosion in France. A child could understand what *Horsman* said in the British Parliament:

“We know that France will support the Emperor as long as our vacillation allows him success in his foreign policy, but we have grounds to believe that it will abandon him as soon as we show resolute opposition.”

All depended on *localising* the war, i.e. on conducting it with the supreme sanction of Europe. To begin with, France itself had to be prepared gradually for the war with the aid of a series of hypocritical peace negotiations and their repeated failure. Louis Bonaparte came to grief even here. Lord Cowley, the English Ambassador in Paris, had gone to Vienna with proposals drawn up by Louis Bonaparte and approved by the (Derby) Cabinet in London. In Vienna (see the Blue Book quoted above^b), under English pressure, the proposals were unexpectedly accepted. Cowley had just returned to London with the tidings of a “peaceful solution” when suddenly the news came that Louis Bonaparte had abandoned his own proposals and had supported the convocation of a congress suggested by Russia to discipline Austria. The war became possible only through the intervention of Russia. If Russia had no longer needed Louis Bonaparte in order to carry out its own plans—either *to enforce them with French assistance* or *to use the French to beat Austria and Prussia into passive instruments of Russia*—Louis Bonaparte would have fallen

^a Marx uses the English word.—*Ed.*

^b This refers to *Correspondence Respecting the Affairs of Italy* (see this volume, p. 134).—*Ed.*

then. But despite Russia's covert support, despite the promises of Palmerston, who had given his blessing at Compiègne to the conspiracy of Plombières,¹⁵⁹ everything depended on the attitude of Germany, since on the one hand the Tory Cabinet was still at the helm in England, and on the other hand the silent rebellion of France against the Bonapartist regime would have been driven out into the open by the prospect of a European war.

Vogt himself lets slip that he sang his *Lay of Ludwig* neither from a lively sympathy for Italy, nor from fear of the timid, conservative despotism of Austria, which was as clumsy as it was brutal. On the contrary, he believed that if Austria, which, it should be noted, was *forced* to start the war, should gain the advantage in Italy at first,

"the revolution would certainly be unleashed in France, the Empire would be overthrown and the future would be different" (loc. cit., p. 131). He believed that "the Austrian armies would in the last resort be unable to withstand the liberated forces of the French people" (loc. cit.) and that "the victorious armies of Austria, by provoking revolutions in France, Italy and Hungary, would themselves create the enemy who would crush them".^a

But the issue for him was not the liberation of Italy from Austria, but the enslavement of France by Louis Bonaparte.

What further proof is required that Vogt was merely one of the countless mouthpieces through whom the grotesque ventriloquist in the Tuileries spoke in foreign tongues?

It will be remembered that at the time when Louis Bonaparte first discovered his mission to liberate the subject nationalities in general and Italy in particular, France presented a spectacle unprecedented in its history. The whole of Europe marvelled at the stubborn obstinacy with which it rejected the "*idées napoléoniennes*".^b People still remember very well the enthusiasm with which even the "*chiens savants*"^c of the *Corps législatif* welcomed Morny's assurances of peace^d; the irritated tone in which the *Moniteur* lectured the nation, now for its immersion in material interests, now for its lack of patriotic vigour and its doubts about Badinguet's talents as a general and his wisdom as a politician^e;

^a Marx's italics.—Ed.

^b An allusion to N.-L. Bonaparte's book *Des idées napoléoniennes*, Paris, 1839.—Ed.

^c "Trained dogs".—Ed.

^d This refers to Morny's speech at the opening of the Legislative Assembly on February 8, 1859, *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 40, February 9, 1859.—Ed.

^e "Partie non officielle. Paris, le 4 mars", *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 64, March 5, 1859.—Ed.

the soothing official messages to all the chambers of commerce throughout France and the imperial assurance that “*étudier une question n’est pas la créer*”.^a At the time, the English press, astonished at the extraordinary spectacle, was crammed full of well-meaning nonsense about the transformation of the French into a peace-loving people, the Stock Exchange treated the issue of “war” or “not war” as a “duel” between Louis Bonaparte, who wanted war, and the nation, which did not, and bets were placed as to who would prevail, the nation or “his uncle’s nephew”. To give an idea of the situation as it was at the time I shall simply quote a few passages from the London *Economist*, which, as the organ of the City, as the spokesman of the Italian war and as the property of Wilson (the recently deceased Secretary of the Treasury for India and a tool of Palmerston), was highly influential:

“Alarmed at the colossal uproar which has been created, the French Government is now trying the soothing system” (*The Economist*, January 15, 1859).

In its issue of January 22, 1859, in an article entitled “*The Practical Limits of the Imperial Power in France*”, *The Economist* says:

“Whether the Emperor’s designs for a war in Italy are or are not carried out to their completion, one fact at least has become conspicuous enough,—that his plans have received a very severe and probably unexpected check in the chilling attitude assumed by popular feeling in France and the complete absence of any sympathy with the Emperor’s scheme.... He proposes a war [...] and the French people show nothing but alarm and discontent;—the Government securities are depreciated, the fear of the tax-gatherer subdues every gleam of political or martial enthusiasm, the commercial portion of the nation is simply panic-struck, the rural districts are dumb and dissatisfied, fearing fresh conscriptions and fresh imposts;—the political circles which have supported the Imperial régime most strongly, as a *pis aller* against anarchy,^b discourage war for exactly the same reason for which they support that régime [...] it is certain that Louis Napoleon has found an extent and depth of opposition throughout all classes in France to a war, even in Italy, which he did not anticipate.”*

* Lord Chelsea, who deputised for Lord Cowley in Paris during the latter’s absence, writes: “The official disavowal” (in the *Moniteur* of March 5, 1859) “of all warlike intentions on the part of the Emperor, this Imperial message of peace,^c has been received by all classes of Paris with feelings of what may be called exultation” (No. 88 of the Blue Book *On the Affairs of Italy*. January to May 1859). [Marx quotes in English and gives the German translation in brackets.]

^a “To study a question is not to create it.”—*Ed.*

^b *Pis aller* means “last resort”. *The Economist* has “as against the alternative of anarchy”.—*Ed.*

^c “Partie non officielle. Paris, le 4 mars”, *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 64, March 5, 1859.—*Ed.*

Faced with this mood of the French people *that* section of the original Dentu pamphlets was launched which “in the name of the people” peremptorily called on the “Emperor” “at last to assist France in the majestic extension of its frontiers from the Alps to the Rhine” and no longer to resist the “nation’s pugnacious spirit and desire to bring about the liberation of the subject nationalities”. *Vogt* plays the same tune as the prostitutes of December. At the very moment when Europe stood amazed at France’s obstinate longing for peace, *Vogt* made the discovery that “today, the fickle nation” (the French) “*appears to be filled with a warlike passion*” (loc. cit., pp. 29, 30), and Lord Hlûdowîg was only following the “dominant trend of the age” which was intent on the “independence of the nationalities” (loc. cit., p. 31). Naturally, he did not believe a *single* syllable of what he was writing. In the *Programme* in which he called upon democrats to co-operate in his Bonapartist propaganda he makes it crystal clear that the Italian war was *unpopular* in France.

“*I cannot foresee any immediate threat to the Rhine; but one could arise in the future. A war there or against England would make Louis Napoleon almost popular; the Italian war does not possess this popular aspect*” (“Magnum Opus”, Documents, p. 34).*

If now one portion of the original Dentu pamphlets sought to rouse the French nation from its “peace lethargy” with the aid of the traditional visions of conquest and to put the private wishes of Louis Bonaparte into the mouth of the nation, the other portion, with the *Moniteur* in the vanguard, had the task of convincing Germany in particular of the Emperor’s repugnance to foreign conquests and of his ideal mission as the Messiah who would bring freedom to the subject nationalities. The proofs of the disinterestedness of his policy on the one hand and of his desire to free the subject nationalities on the other are easy to remember because they are constantly repeated and revolve round only two axes. Proof of the disinterestedness of Decembrist policies—*the Crimean war*. Proof of his desire to free the subject nationalities—*Colonel Cuza and the Romanian nationality*. The tone was set by the

* *N. B.* In his *Studien* he echoes the *Moniteur* and the original Dentu pamphlets to the effect that “it is a peculiar whim of fate which compels this man” (Louis Bonaparte) “to place himself in the forefront as the *liberator of the subject nationalities*” (p. 35), that one “must agree to assist this policy as long as it keeps within the framework of the liberation of subject nationalities” and *must wait* “until this liberation has been brought about by this man of destiny” (p. 36). In his *Programme* for the democrats, on the other hand, he says: “We can and *must warn against such a helper*” (“Magnum Opus”, Documents, p. 34).

Moniteur. See the *Moniteur* of March 15, 1859 on the *Crimean war*. The *Moniteur* of April 10, 1859 writes about the *Romanian nationality*:

"In Germany as in Italy it" (France) "desires that the nationalities recognised by the treaties should continue to exist and become even stronger. In the *Danubian principalities* he" (the Emperor) "has endeavoured to help the legitimate wishes of these provinces to triumph so that an order based on national interests might be established in this part of Europe too."

See also the pamphlet published by *Dentu* at the beginning of 1859 with the title *Napoléon III et la question roumaine*. With regard to the *Crimean war*:

"Lastly, what compensation has France requested for the blood it has shed and the millions it has expended in the East in the service of an exclusively European cause?" (*La vraie question*, *Dentu*, Paris, 1859, p. 13.)

This theme, played with endless variations in Paris, was translated so well into German by *Vogt* that *E. About*, that gossipy magpie of Bonapartism, appears to have translated *Vogt's* German translation back into French. See *La Prusse en 1860*. Here too we are again pursued by the *Crimean war* and *Romanian nationality under Colonel Cuza*.

"But this much at least is clear," *Vogt* announces, echoing the *Moniteur* and *Dentu's* original pamphlets, "that France did not conquer a single square foot of land" (in the Crimea) "and that after such a *victorious campaign* the *uncle* would not have rested content with the meagre gain of having proved his superiority in the art of warfare" (*Studien*, p. 33). "Here we can see an *essential* difference between the present and the old Napoleonic policies"* (loc. cit.).

* Incidentally, "*Napoléon le Petit*" also copied the catchword "liberation of subject nationalities" from the real Napoleon. In *May 1809*, for example, Napoleon issued a proclamation from Schönbrunn to the *Hungarians*, in which he says *inter alia*: "Hungarians! The moment is come to recover your *independence*.... I ask *nothing* of you. I only desire to see you a *free and independent nation*. Your union with Austria has been your bane, etc."^a On May 16, 1797 Bonaparte concluded a treaty with the Republic of Venice whose first article states: "In future peace and understanding shall govern relations between France and the Venetian Republic." He revealed his intentions in concluding this peace three days later in a secret dispatch to the French Directory which opens with these words: "You receive herewith the treaty that I have concluded with the Republic of Venice and under the terms of which General Baraguay d'Hilliers has occupied the city with 5,000-6,000 men. In making this peace I had a number of aims in mind." As the final aim he mentions: "To silence all the talk in Europe since it will now seem as if our occupation of Venice is merely a temporary operation which *the Venetians themselves* urgently requested." Two days later, on May 26, Bonaparte wrote to the Venice municipality: "The treaty concluded

^a "Proclamation Addressed to the Hungarians by Napoleon I. From Schoenbrunn, in May, 1809" (see Bartholomäus Szemere, *Hungary, from 1848 to 1860*, London, 1860).—*Ed.*

As if Vogt had to prove to us that "*Napoléon le Petit*" is not the real Napoleon! With just as much justification *Vogt* could have prophesied in 1851 that the nephew, who had nothing to set against the first Italian campaign and the expedition to Egypt but the Strasbourg adventure, the expedition to Boulogne and the sausage review of Satory,¹⁶⁰ could never emulate the 18 Brumaire, to say nothing of acquiring the Imperial Crown. There was after all "an essential difference between the present and the old Napoleonic policies". Yet another difference was between waging a war against a European coalition and waging one with the permission of a European coalition.

The "glorious campaign in the Crimea" in which England, France, Turkey and Sardinia in concert "captured" half a Russian fortress after two years, and in exchange lost a whole Turkish fortress (Kars) to the Russians, and at the conclusion of peace were forced humbly to "request" the enemy at the Paris Congress¹⁶¹ for "permission" to evacuate their troops without interference and ship them home—that was indeed anything but "Napoleonic". It

in Milan can be signed by the municipality in the meantime—the secret articles by three of its members. I shall always do everything in my power to provide you with proofs of my desire to consolidate *your liberties* and to see *this unfortunate Italy* at last occupy the place it deserves on the world stage, *free and independent of all alien rule.*" A few days later he wrote to General Baraguay d'Hilliers^a: "On receipt of this letter present yourself to the Provisional Government of Venice and point out to them that in accordance with the principles which now unite the Republics of France and Venice, and with the immediate protection granted to Venice by the French Republic, it is essential to place its sea power on a footing that will inspire respect. *On this pretext* you will take possession of everything, while at the same time you will do all in your power to remain on good terms with the Venetians and to recruit all the sailors of the Republic to our service—while *constantly speaking in the name of Venice.* In brief, you must manage matters so that you can transport the entire stock of ships and naval supplies in the harbour of Venice to Toulon. By virtue of a secret article in the treaty, the Venetians are obliged to provide the French Republic with naval supplies to the value of 3 million for the Toulon navy, but *it is my intention* to take possession on behalf of the French Republic of *all* the Venetian ships and *all* their naval supplies for the benefit of Toulon" (see *Correspondance secrète et confidentielle de Napoléon*, 7 vols., Paris, 1817). These commands were carried out to the letter; and as soon as Venice had been plundered of *all* its naval and war supplies, Napoleon, without the slightest hesitation, handed over his new ally, *the liberated Republic of Venice*, whom he had solemnly sworn to defend at whatever the risk, to *the despotic yoke of Austria.*

^a Napoléon Bonaparte, "Au chef de division commandant la marine française dans le golfe Adriatique. Montebello, le 25 prairial, an 5 (13 juin 1797)", *Correspondance inédite...*, v. 5, livre 1, pp. 304-05. Baraguay d'Hilliers is named by mistake here.—*Ed.*

was glorious only in *Bazancourt's* novel.^a But the Crimean war proved all sorts of things. Louis Bonaparte *betrayed* his ostensible allies (the Turks) in order to gain the alliance of the ostensible enemy. The first success of the Paris peace was the sacrifice of the "Circassian nationality" and the extermination of the Crimean Tartars by the Russians, and likewise the destruction of the national hopes that the Poles and Swedes had pinned to a West European crusade against Russia. A further moral of the Crimean war was: Louis Bonaparte could *not* afford a *second Crimean war*, could not afford to lose an old army and gain new national debts in exchange for the knowledge that France was rich enough "*de payer sa propre gloire*",^b that the name of Louis Napoleon figured in a European treaty, that "the conservative and dynastic press of Europe" unanimously acknowledged "the ruling virtues, the wisdom and the moderation of the Emperor"—a fact which *Vogt* counts to Louis Bonaparte's credit (loc. cit., p. 32)—and that at the time the whole of Europe paid him all the honour due to a genuine Napoleon, on the express condition that Louis Bonaparte, following the example of Louis Philippe, should quietly stay within "the limits of practical reason", i.e. of the treaties of 1815, and not forget for a single moment the fine line that distinguishes a buffoon^c from the hero he represents. The political combinations, the ruling powers and the social conditions that provided the leader of the December Gang with the opportunity to play at being Napoleon, first in France and then even beyond French territory, do in fact belong to *his* epoch, and not to the annals of the Great French Revolution.

"This fact at any rate is established, that present French policy in the East has fulfilled the aspirations of one nationality" (the *Romanian*) "for unification" (*Studien*, pp. 34-35).

Cuza, as we have mentioned, is keeping the place open for either a Russian governor or a Russian vassal. On the map of *L'Europe en 1860* a Grand Duke of Mecklenburg figures as that vassal. Russia naturally allowed Louis Bonaparte all the *honour* for *this* Romanian emancipation, reserving all its advantages for itself. Austria stood in the way of further benevolent intentions. Hence the Italian war had the function of *remodelling* Austria, *changing it from an obstacle into an instrument*.

^a *L'Expédition de Crimée jusqu'à la prise de Sébastopol*, t. I-II, Paris, 1857.—*Ed.*

^b "To pay for its own fame".—*Ed.*

^c Marx uses the word *Pickelhäring*, the name for the buffoon in Old German comedies.—*Ed.*

The ventriloquist in the Tuileries was already playing the tune of "Romanian nationality" on his innumerable mouthpieces as early as 1858. One of *Vogt's* authorities, *Mr. Kossuth*, was thus in a position to give an answer as early as November 20, 1858 in a lecture in Glasgow^a:

"Wallachia and Moldavia receive a Constitution, hatched in the caverns of secret diplomacy... It is in reality no more nor less than a charter granted to Russia for the purpose of disposing of the Principalities."^b

Thus the "principle of nationality" was abused by Louis Bonaparte in the Danubian principalities so as to mask the fact that they were being handed over to Russia, just as in 1848-49 the *Austrian Government* had abused the "principle of nationality" to strangle the Magyar and German revolution with the aid of the Serbs, Slovenes, Croats, Wallachians, etc.

Good care is taken both by the Russian consul in Bucharest and by the rabble of Moldavian and Wallachian Boyars, most of whom are not even Romanian but a motley mosaic of adventurers from God-knows-where—a sort of oriental December Gang—that the *Romanian people* should still groan beneath the burdens of a villeinage so monstrous that it could *only* have been set up by *Russians* with their *règlement organique* and could only be sustained by an oriental *demi-monde*.

Vogt, in the attempt to deck out the wisdom quarried from his original Dentu sources with his own eloquence, says:

"Austria already had enough on her hands with one Piedmont in the South; it had no need of another in the East" (loc. cit., p. 64).

Piedmont annexes *Italian* lands. So are the Danubian principalities, the least warlike of the Turkish lands, to annex Romanian territory, that is, conquer Bessarabia from Russia, and Transylvania, the Banat of Temesvár and the Bukovina from Austria? *Vogt* not only forgets the "benevolent Tsar", he also forgets that in 1848-49 *Hungary* did not seem in the least inclined to part with these more or less Romanian provinces, that it answered their "cry of distress" with a drawn sword, and that on the contrary it was *Austria* which used "propaganda about the principle of nationality" as a weapon *against Hungary*.

But the historical scholarship of his *Studien* shows itself in its full splendour when *Vogt*, relying on half-remembered bits from

^a Kossuth actually gave the lecture on November 19 (Kossuth, *L'Europe, l'Autriche et la Hongrie*, Bruxelles, 1859, pp. 54-55).—*Ed.*

^b Marx gives this sentence in English in brackets after its German equivalent.—*Ed.*

an ephemeral pamphlet, which he had skimmed through, with perfect calm

“*deduces* the wretched condition of the principalities ... from the destructive poison of the *Greeks and Fanariots*” (loc. cit., p. 63).

He had no idea that the *Fanariots* (so called after a district in Constantinople) are these very same *Greeks* who have lorded it in the Danubian principalities under Russian protection since the beginning of the eighteenth century. They are, in part, the descendants of the *limondji* (lemonade-sellers) of Constantinople that are now once again playing at “Romanian nationality” by order of the Russians.

While the white angel of the North advances from the East, destroying the various nationalities for the benefit of the Slav race, the white angel of the South advances from the opposite direction as the standard-bearer of the principle of nationality, and

“we must *wait until* the liberation of the subject nationalities has been brought about by this man of destiny” (*Studien*, p. 36).

Now while these combined operations of the two angels and the “two greatest external enemies of Germany’s unity” (*Studien*, 2nd edition, Afterword, p. 154) are being conducted “in close concert”—what role is assigned to *Germany* by our Imperial Vogt, who is, however, no “Augmentor of the Realm”^a?

“The most short-sighted persons,” Vogt remarks, “*must* have realised by now that there is an understanding between the Government of Prussia and the Imperial Government of France, that Prussia will not unsheath its sword to defend the non-German provinces of Austria” (including Bohemia and Moravia, of course), “that it will give its approval to all measures affecting the defence of the territory of the Confederation” (excluding its “non-German” provinces), “but will otherwise prevent any intervention of the Confederation or its individual members on Austria’s behalf, so that in the subsequent peace negotiations *it will receive its reward for these efforts in the North German plains*” (*Studien*, 1st edition, pp. 18-19).

By proclaiming from the housetops, even before the outbreak of the war against Austria, the secret entrusted to him by the Tuileries that Prussia was acting in “secret *understanding*” with the “external enemy of Germany”, who would reward it with territory “in the North German plains”, Vogt was of course giving Prussia the best possible assistance in achieving its alleged ends. He roused

^a Medieval title bestowed on the German Emperor.—*Ed.*

the suspicions of the other German governments both towards Prussia's initial attempts to neutralise them and towards its military preparations and its claim to the supreme command during the war.

"Whatever path Germany has to choose in the present crisis," Vogt says, "one thing is certain: that as a whole it must pursue one definite path with energy, whereas as things are the unhappy Federal Diet, etc." (loc. cit., p. 96).

By spreading the view that Prussia goes arm in arm with "the external enemy" and that this will lead to its devouring the Northern plains, Vogt presumably intends to restore the unity in the Federal Diet which is so badly lacking. *Saxony*, in particular, is reminded explicitly that Prussia has already once occasioned "the loss of some of its finest provinces" (loc. cit., p. 93). The "purchase of the Jade Bay" is denounced (loc. cit., p. 15).

"*Holstein* was to have been the reward for Prussia's participation" (in the Turkish War) "when the notorious theft of the dispatch gave the negotiations a different turn" (loc. cit., p. 15). "Mecklenburg, Hanover, Oldenburg, Holstein and other miscellaneous appendages ... these fraternal German states are the bait at which Prussia greedily snatches"—and does so moreover "at every possible opportunity" (loc. cit., pp. 14, 15).

And as Vogt reveals, on this occasion it has been firmly hooked by Louis Bonaparte. On the one side, as the result of its secret "understanding" with Louis Bonaparte Prussia must and will "reach the coasts of the North Sea and the Baltic at the expense of its German brothers" (loc. cit., p. 14). On the other side,

"Prussia will have obtained a *natural frontier* only when the *watershed* of the Erzgebirge and the Fichtelgebirge is extended *through* the white Main and *along* the Main up to Mainz" (loc. cit., p. 93).

Natural frontiers in the depth of Germany! Formed, moreover, by a *watershed* which *passes through a river*! It is this sort of discovery in the realm of physical geography—to which we may add the channel that rose to the surface (see "Magnum Opus")—that puts "the well-rounded character" on a par with Alexander von Humboldt. At the same time as he was preaching to the German Confederation on the confidence it must have in the leadership of Prussia, Vogt, not satisfied with the "ancient rivalry between Prussia and Austria on German, etc., territory", invented another rivalry between these two states which "has so frequently broken out on *non-European* soil" (loc. cit., p. 20). This *non-European* soil is probably on the moon.

In fact Vogt simply translates into words the map of *L'Europe en 1860* published by the *French* Government in 1858. The map

shows Hanover, Mecklenburg, Brunswick, Holstein, the Electorate of Hesse together with sundry territories such as Waldeck, Anhalt, Lippe, etc., as having been annexed to Prussia, while "*l'Empereur des Français conserve ses (!) limites actuelles*", the Emperor of the French preserves his (!) existing frontiers. "Prussia down to the Main" is also a slogan of Russian diplomacy. (See, for example, the memorandum of 1837 mentioned above.^a) A Prussian North Germany would counterbalance an Austrian South Germany, separated by natural frontiers, tradition, denomination, dialect and tribal differences. The *division* of Germany into two parts would be completed by simplifying the contradictions within it and the Thirty Years' War¹⁶² would be declared in permanence.

According to the first edition of the *Studien*, Prussia was supposed to receive such a "reward" for its "efforts" in forcing the sword of the German Confederation back into its sheath during the war. In Vogt's *Studien*, as on the French map *L'Europe en 1860*, it is *not Louis Bonaparte, but Prussia* that seeks and achieves the enlargement of its territory and attains natural frontiers as a result of the *French* war against Austria.

Vogt only reveals Prussia's true task in the Afterword to the second edition of his *Studien*,^b which appeared while the Franco-Austrian war was still in progress. Prussia was to initiate a "**civil war**" (see the 2nd edition, p. 152) so as to establish a "unified central power" (loc. cit., p. 153), to incorporate Germany in the Prussian monarchy. While Russia advances from the East and Austria is held down by Louis Bonaparte in Italy, Prussia is to embark on a *dynastic "civil war"* in Germany. Vogt guarantees the Prince Regent^c that

"the war that has broken out" in Italy "will last out the year 1859 at the very least, whereas the unification of Germany, if prosecuted resolutely, will not take *as many weeks* as the Italian campaign months" (loc. cit., p. 155).

The civil war in Germany will only be a matter of weeks! Apart from the Austrian troops which would immediately march on Prussia, Italian war or no Italian war, Prussia would meet resistance, as *Vogt* himself explains, from "*Bavaria*^d ... which is entirely under Austrian influence" (*Studien*, 1st edition, p. 90), from *Saxony*, which would be the first to be threatened and which

^a See this volume, p. 141.—*Ed.*

^b The Preface to the first edition of the *Studien* was dated "March 31, 1859", and the Afterword to the second edition, "June 6, 1859".—*Ed.*

^c William, Prince of Prussia.—*Ed.*

^d Vogt's italics.—*Ed.*

would no longer have any reason to do violence to its "sympathies for Austria" (loc. cit., p. 93), from "Württemberg, Hesse-Darmstadt and Hanover" (loc. cit., p. 94), in short from "nine-tenths" (loc. cit., p. 16) of the "German governments". And these governments, as Vogt further demonstrates, would not lack support in the event of such a *dynastic* "civil war", especially if initiated by Prussia at a time when Germany was threatened by its "two greatest external enemies".

"The court" (in Baden), says Vogt, "goes along with Prussia, but the people, and there is no doubt about that, certainly does not share the predilections of the ruling family. The Breisgau, no less than Upper Swabia, is bound much more closely to the Emperor and the Imperial state by ties of sympathy, religious confession and old memories of the Austrian Forelands, to which it formerly belonged, than one would have supposed after such a long separation" (loc. cit., pp. 93-94). "With the exception of Mecklenburg" and "perhaps" the Electorate of Hesse, "in North Germany the attitude to the theory of incorporation is one of mistrust and Prussia's policy is accepted only with reluctance. The instinctive *feeling of dislike, indeed of hatred*, aroused by Prussia in *South Germany* ... has not been eliminated or talked out of existence by the full-throated cry of the Imperial party.^a It lives on in the people, and no government, not even that of Baden, can resist it for long. Thus Prussia has no real support either among the German people, or in the governments of the German Confederation" (loc. cit., p. 21).

Thus speaks Vogt. And for that very reason, according to that same Vogt, a *dynastic* "civil war" initiated by Prussia in "secret understanding" with the "two greatest external enemies of Germany", would only be a matter of "weeks". But there is more to come.

"The Old Prussian provinces go along with the government—the *Rhineland and Westphalia* with Catholic Austria. If the popular movement there does not succeed in pushing the government over to Austria's side, the *immediate consequence would be to reopen the gulf between the two parts of the monarchy*" (loc. cit., p. 20).

Thus, according to Vogt, if the simple non-intervention of Prussia on Austria's behalf was enough to reopen the gulf between Rhineland-Westphalia and the Old Prussian provinces, then clearly, in the eyes of the same Vogt, a "civil war", undertaken by Prussia with the aim of expelling Austria from Germany, was bound to wrench Rhineland-Westphalia from Prussia for good and all. But "what does Germany matter to these papists?" (loc. cit., p. 119), or as he really thinks, what do these papists matter to Germany? The *Rhineland and Westphalia* are ultramontane "*Roman-Catholic*" and not "*true German*" provinces. Hence they must be expelled from the territory of the Confedera-

^a i.e. the supporters of Austria.—Ed.

tion just like Bohemia and Moravia. And this process of expulsion is to be accelerated by the *dynastic "civil war"* recommended to Prussia by *Vogt*. And in fact in its map published in 1858 of *L'Europe en 1860*, which served *Vogt* as a compass throughout his *Studien*, the *French Government*, which had annexed Egypt to Austria, also showed the Rhine provinces as countries of "*Catholic nationality*" and annexed by *Belgium*—an ironic formula for the annexation of Belgium and the Rhine provinces by France. The fact that *Vogt* goes even further than the map of the French Government and throws in Catholic Westphalia as an extra, can be explained by the "scientific relations" between the fugitive Regent of the Empire and Plon-Plon, the son of the ex-King of Westphalia.^a

To sum up: On the one hand, Louis Bonaparte will give Russia leave to extend its rule from Posen to Bohemia and from Hungary right down to Turkey. On the other hand, he himself will establish a united and independent Italy on France's frontier by force of arms, and all that—*pour le roi de Prusse*^b; all that to give Prussia an opportunity to bring Germany under its wing by means of a civil war and to "secure" the "Rhine provinces for ever" against France (loc. cit., p. 121).

"But, it will be said, the territory of the Confederation is in danger, the hereditary foe threatens, his real goal is the Rhine. Then, defend the Rhine and defend the territory of the Confederation" (loc. cit., p. 105),

and in fact defend the territory of the Confederation by ceding Bohemia and Moravia to Russia, and defend the Rhine by starting a German "civil war" with the aim, among others, of tearing Rhineland and Westphalia from Prussia.

"But, it will be said, Louis Napoleon ... desires to satisfy his Napoleonic thirst for conquest by some means or other! We do not think so, we have the example of the Crimean campaign before our eyes!" (loc. cit., p. 129.)

Apart from his scepticism about the Napoleonic thirst for conquest and his faith in the Crimean campaign, *Vogt* has yet another argument *in petto*. The Austrians and the French will follow the example of the Kilkenny cats¹⁶³ and keep on biting each other in Italy until there is nothing left of them but their tails.

"It will be a terribly bloody, stubborn and perhaps indecisive war" (loc. cit., pp. 127, 128). "Only by exerting its strength to the very utmost will France, together with Piedmont, be able to triumph, and it will not recover from these efforts for decades" (loc. cit., p. 129).

^a Jérôme Bonaparte.—*Ed.*

^b For the King of Prussia, i.e. for nothing.—*Ed.*

This prospect of a *long-lasting* Italian war silences his critics. And the method by which *Vogt* manages to prolong Austria's resistance to French arms in Italy and to cripple France's aggressive power, is indeed original enough. On the one hand, the French are given *carte blanche* in Italy; on the other hand, the "benevolent Tsar" is given leave by manoeuvres in Galicia, Hungary, Moravia and Bohemia and by revolutionary machinations within the country and military demonstrations on its frontiers

"to hold down a significant part of the Austrian forces in those parts of the monarchy which are exposed to Russian attack or vulnerable to Russian intrigue" (loc. cit., p. 11).

And lastly, by means of a dynastic "civil war" simultaneously unleashed in Germany by Prussia, Austria will be compelled to withdraw its main forces from Italy to protect its German possessions. It is obvious that in such circumstances Francis Joseph and Louis Bonaparte will not conclude a Treaty of Campofornio¹⁶⁴ but "will both bleed to death in Italy".

Austria will not make any concessions to the "benevolent Tsar" in the East and accept the long-standing offer of indemnification in Serbia and Bosnia. Nor will it guarantee the Rhine provinces to France and fall on Prussia in league with Russia and France. Not on your life! It will insist on "bleeding to death in Italy". In any event, however, Vogt's "man of destiny" would indignantly reject such a compensation on the Rhine. Vogt knows that

"the foreign policy of the present Empire has only one principle, that of self-preservation" (loc. cit., p. 31).

He knows that Louis Bonaparte

"is intent on pursuing a single idea [...] that of preserving his power" (over France) (loc. cit., p. 29).

He knows that the "Italian war does not increase his popularity in France" whereas the acquisition of the Rhine provinces would make him and his dynasty "popular". He says:

"The Rhine provinces are indeed a pet ambition of the French chauvinist and perhaps, if one were to go into it, one would discover only a very small minority of the nation which did not bear this wish deep in its heart" (loc. cit., p. 121).

On the other hand, "perceptive Frenchmen", and therefore presumably also Vogt's "man of destiny who is as wise as a serpent", know that

"they can only hope to see this realised" (namely France's acquisition of the natural frontier of the Rhine) "as long as Germany possesses 34 different

governments. [...] Let a real Germany come into existence, with unified interests and a firm organisation—and the Rhine frontier will be secure for all time” (loc. cit., p. 121).

For this very reason, Louis Bonaparte, who at Villafranca offered the Emperor of Austria Lombardy in exchange for a guarantee of the Rhine provinces (see the statement by Kinglake in the House of Commons, July 12, 1860^a), would have indignantly rejected Austria’s offer of the Rhine provinces in exchange for French aid against Prussia.

Vogt’s original *Dentu* sources likewise not only indulged in lyrical effusions on the subject of German unity under the aegis of Prussia*: they also spurned every suggestion of ambitions in the Rhine provinces with virtuous indignation.

“The Rhine!... What is the Rhine?—A frontier. Frontiers will soon be anachronisms” (*La foi des traités, etc.*, Paris, 1859, p. 36).**

In the millennium that is to be established by Badinguet on the foundations of the principle of nationality, who will be concerned about the Rhine frontier, or indeed any frontiers at all!

“Does France insist on compensation for the sacrifices it is prepared to make in the cause of equity, of legitimate influence and in the interest of European equilibrium? Does it demand the left bank of the Rhine? Does it so much as lay claim to Savoy and the County of Nice?” (*La vraie question, etc.*, Paris, 1859, p. 13.)***

* “La Prusse est l’espoir de l’Allemagne ... l’esprit allemand a son centre à Berlin ... l’esprit allemand cherche l’unité de son corps, la vérité de la Confédération. C’est par cet entraînement que s’élève la Prusse... D’où vient-il que, lorsque l’Italie réclame l’intégrité, l’unité nationale, ce que l’Allemagne désire, celle-ci favorise l’Autriche, négation vivante de toute nationalité?... C’est que la Prusse n’est pas encore la tête; c’est que la tête est l’Autriche qui, pesant avec ces forces hétérogènes sur l’Allemagne politique, l’entraîne à des contradictions avec l’Allemagne véritable” (*La foi des traités, etc.*, p. 34). [“Prussia is the hope of Germany ... the German spirit has its centre in Berlin ... the German spirit seeks the unity of its body, a real confederation. It is this desire that induces Prussia to rise.... How does it come about that while Italy demands national integrity and unity, which Germany too longs for, the latter can still favour Austria, the living negation of all nationality?... The reason is that Prussia is not yet in command; the reason is that Austria is still in command and weighing with its heterogeneous forces on the political entity called Germany, and brings it into contradiction with the real Germany.”]

** “Le Rhin!... Qu’est-ce que le Rhin? Une frontière. Les frontières seront bientôt des anachronismes” (loc. cit., p. 36).

*** “La France stipule-t-elle des dédommagements pour les sacrifices qu’elle est prête à faire dans un but d’équité, de juste influence, et dans l’intérêt de l’équilibre

^a *The Times*, No. 23671, July 13, 1860.—Ed.

France's renunciation of Savoy and Nice as proof of France's renunciation of the Rhine! Vogt did not translate that into German.

Before the start of the war it was of crucial importance for Louis Bonaparte, if he was unable to lure Prussia into an understanding, at least to make the German Confederation believe that he had done so. *Vogt* attempts to disseminate this belief in the first edition of his *Studien*. During the war it became even more important for Louis Bonaparte to induce Prussia to take steps that would provide Austria with proof or apparent proof of such an understanding. In the second edition of the *Studien*, which appeared while the war was in progress, *Vogt* therefore calls on Prussia in an Afterword to conquer Germany and initiate a dynastic "civil war" which, as the text of his book makes clear, would be "bloody, stubborn and perhaps indecisive" and would cost Prussia Rhineland and Westphalia at the very least. And in the Afterword to the same book he solemnly assures his readers that it will "only cost a matter of weeks". *Vogt's* voice is in truth not that of the siren. Hence Louis Bonaparte, seconded in his knavish plot by bottle-holder^a *Palmerston*, was forced to present *Prussian proposals he himself had drawn up* to Francis Joseph in Villafranca; Austria had to use Prussia's modest claims to the military leadership of Germany as an excuse for concluding a peace* which Louis Bonaparte had to excuse in France by saying that the Italian war was threatening to become a general war which

"would bring about German unity and thus accomplish a work which ever since Francis I it had been the object of French policy to prevent".**

européen? Demande-t-elle la rive gauche du Rhin? Élève-t-elle même des prétentions sur la Savoie et sur le Comté de Nice?" (*La vraie question, etc.*, p. 13.)

* A few days after the conclusion of peace in Villafranca the *Prager Zeitung* printed the following official declaration: "This insistence" (Prussia's insistence on taking over the supreme command of the federal army *under federal control*) "provides clear proof that *Prussia is striving for hegemony in Germany and thus for the expulsion of Austria from Germany*. Since faithless Lombardy is infinitely less valuable than *the maintenance of our position in Germany*, we sacrificed it so as to achieve peace which had become an urgent necessity for us *in view of Prussia's attitude*."^b

** *Galignani's Messenger* of Paris, which only carries leading articles by way of exception and then in response to special official request, states in its issue of July 22, 1859 [Marx quotes in English]: "To give another province to the King of Piedmont, it would not only have been necessary to support a war against

^a Marx uses the English expression.—*Ed.*

^b "Politische Übersicht, Wien, 13. Juli", *Prager Zeitung*, No. 165, July 15, 1859.—*Ed.*

After France had acquired Savoy and Nice as a result of the Italian war, and with them a position worth more than an army in the event of a war on the Rhine, "German unity under Prussian hegemony" and "cession of the left bank of the Rhine to France" became interchangeable factors in the probability calculations of the 2nd December. The map of *L'Europe en 1860* published in 1858 was interpreted by the map *L'Europe pacifiée* (Europe pacified?) which appeared in 1860. According to this map Egypt was no longer given to Austria and the Rhine provinces together with Belgium were annexed by France in return for the "*Northern plains*" that were now assigned to Prussia.*

Finally, *Persigny* made an official pronouncement in Etienne that, if only in the "interest of European equilibrium", any further centralisation on the part of Germany would entail the advance of France to the Rhine.** But neither before nor after the Italian war had the grotesque ventriloquist of the Tuileries expressed himself with such insolence as through the mouthpiece of the fugitive Imperial Regent.

two-thirds of Europe, but *German unity would have been realised*, and a work thus accomplished, which ever since the time of Francis I it has been the object of French policy to prevent." ["*Latést Intelligence*", *Galignani's Messenger*, No. 13876, July 22, 1859.]

* Plon-Plon's special organ, *L'Opinion nationale*, said in an article of July 5, 1860: "The day of demanding the return of territories by force is past. The Emperor has too much tact and too accurate a feeling for the trend of public opinion for that.... But is *Prussia* obliged by oath never to think of *German unity*? Can it guarantee never to cast a covetous eye on Hanover, Saxony, Brunswick, Hesse, Oldenburg and Mecklenburg? Today the rulers embrace each other and their sincerity is certainly genuine. But who knows what the people will demand of them in a few years' time? And if, under the pressure of public opinion, Germany is *unified* would it be fair, would it be reasonable not to allow *France* to *expand its territory at the expense of its neighbours*?... If the Germans were to think it right and proper to alter their hitherto existing political constitution and to put a strong centralised government in the place of the impotent Confederation, then we cannot guarantee that *France would not think it right and proper to demand compensation and assurances from Germany*."

** The Imperial Pecksniff excels himself in the Dentu pamphlet *La politique anglaise*, Paris, 1860. According to this a few million Germans and Belgians have to be purloined in order to improve the moral constitution of France, whose southerly element requires a greater admixture of northern solidity. Having argued that for political and military reasons France *requires the frontiers given it by nature itself*, it continues: "A second factor makes such an annexation" (of the Rhine provinces and Belgium) "necessary. France desires and demands a rational freedom (*the sage liberté*) and the southerly element plays an important role in its public institutions. This southerly element has many wonderful qualities ... but it lacks stamina and

Vogt "the New Swiss, citizen of the Canton of Berne and member of the Council of States¹⁶⁵ for Geneva" (loc. cit., Preface), opens the *Swiss* section of his *Studien* with a prologue (loc. cit., pp. 37-39) in which he calls upon Switzerland to utter a *paean of joy* at the replacement of Louis Philippe by Louis Bonaparte. It is true that Louis Bonaparte was demanding that the Federal Council should "put controls on the press", but "the Napoleonides seem in this respect to have extremely sensitive skins" (loc. cit., p. 36). A mere skin disease, so engrained in the family that it is transmitted not only in the family blood, but even—*teste* Louis Bonaparte—by the mere family name. However,

"The persecution of innocent men in Geneva which has been carried out by the Federal Council on *instructions from the Emperor* against poor devils whose only crime was that they were Italians; the establishment of consulates; the harassment of the press; the senseless police regulations of every conceivable kind and, finally, the negotiations about the cession of the Vallée des Dappes,¹⁶⁶ have all played an essential part in obliterating in the minds of the Swiss the memories of those *services* which *the Emperor really rendered* in the *Neuchâtel affair*,¹⁶⁷ and in particular for the very party which has now turned most violently against him" (loc. cit., pp. 37, 38).

Magnanimous Emperor, ungrateful party! The Emperor's aim in the Neuchâtel affair was by no means the creation of a precedent for the violation of the treaties of 1815, the humiliation of Prussia and the establishment of a protectorate over Switzerland. What he was really concerned with was "to render" Switzerland "*a real service*", in his capacity as "New Swiss, citizen of the Canton of Thurgau and artillery captain of Oberstrass". The accusation of ingratitude levelled by *Vogt* against the anti-Bonapartist party in Switzerland in March 1859, was extended to the whole of Switzerland in June 1860 by another servant of the Emperor, M. de *Thouvenel*. *The Times* of June 30, 1860 writes that

"A few days ago a meeting took place between Dr. Kern and M. de Thouvenel in the Foreign Ministry in Paris in the presence of Lord Cowley. Thouvenel informed the honourable representative of Switzerland that the doubts and protestations of the Federal Government were insulting inasmuch as they seemed to imply a want of faith in the government of His Imperial Majesty. Such treatment was base ingratitude in view of the *services* which the Emperor Napoleon had *rendered*^a the Confederation on many occasions, and in particular in the

firmness. It stands in need of patient steadfastness, the cold, unbending resolution of our northern brothers. The frontiers destined for us by providence, therefore, are as essential to our freedom as to our independence."

^a Marx gives the English words "services" and "rendered" in brackets after their German equivalents.—*Ed.*

Neuchâtel affair. However that may be, since Switzerland had been so *blind* as to mistrust her benefactor, she must herself bear the consequences."

Nevertheless *Vogt* tried to open the eyes of the *blind* anti-Bonapartist party in Switzerland as early as March 1859. On the one hand, he points to "the real services" which "the Emperor has rendered". On the other hand, "the Imperial harassments shrink to vanishing point" beside the royal harassments under Louis Philippe (*loc. cit.*, p. 39). For example, in 1858 the Federal Council "on instructions from the Emperor" expelled some "poor devils whose only crime was that they were Italians"^a (p. 37); in 1838, notwithstanding Louis Philippe's threats, it refused to expel Louis Bonaparte, whose only crime was to have used Switzerland as a base from which to conspire against Louis Philippe. In 1846, despite Louis Philippe's "warlike gestures", Switzerland ventured upon the Sonderbund war,¹⁶⁸ for it refused to let itself be bullied by the peaceful King; in 1858 it was hardly prudish in its reaction to Louis Bonaparte's groping in the Vallée des Dappes.

"Louis Philippe," *Vogt* says himself, "had dragged out a miserable existence in Europe, snubbed by everybody, even by the lesser legitimate rulers, because he had not dared to conduct a strong foreign policy" (*loc. cit.*, p. 31). However, "*Imperial policy vis-à-vis Switzerland* is without any doubt that of a powerful neighbour who knows that in the end he can enforce whatever he likes" (*loc. cit.*, p. 37).

Therefore, *Vogt* concludes, with a logic worthy of *Grandguillot*, "from a purely Swiss point of view one can only rejoice heartily" (p. 39) because instead of "Louis Philippe who was snubbed by everybody" Switzerland has received a "powerful neighbour who knows that with respect to Switzerland he can do whatever he likes".

This prologue, which establishes the necessary mood, is followed by a German translation of the note of the Federal Council of March 14, 1859,^b and curiously enough *Vogt* is full of praise for this note in which the Federal Council referred to the treaties of 1815,¹⁶⁹ though the same *Vogt* declares that it is "hypocrisy" to refer to these treaties. "Get along with your hypocrisy!" (*loc. cit.*, p. 112.)*

* In reality it was not the "treaties" which had protected Swiss neutrality, but the fact that the interests of the various neighbouring powers cancelled each other out. "The Swiss feel," wrote Captain Harris, the English chargé d'affaires in Berne, in a letter to Lord John Russell after an interview with Frey-Hérosé, the Federal President, "that ... recent events have fundamentally altered the balance of power

^a In early 1858 Napoleon III demanded that the Swiss Government should extradite the political refugees accused of being implicated in the Orsini conspiracy.—*Ed.*

^b Carl *Vogt*, *Studien...*, S. 80-83.—*Ed.*

Vogt now goes on to consider “from which side *the first attack on Swiss neutrality will come*” (loc. cit., p. 84) and proves, quite unnecessarily, that the French army, which had no need to conquer Piedmont this time, would march through neither the Simplon nor the Great St. Bernard. At the same time he discovers a non-existent land route “over the Mont Cenis, via Fenestrelle and through the Stura valley” (loc. cit., p. 84). He means the Dora valley. From *France*, then, there is no threat to Switzerland.

“But respect for Swiss neutrality *on the part of Austria* cannot be looked for with similar confidence, and various factors even suggest that in certain eventualities Austria is indeed prepared to violate it” (loc. cit., p. 85). “Of significance in this respect is *the concentration of a military force in Bregenz and Feldkirch*” (loc. cit., p. 86).

Here the thread which runs through the *Studien* and leads straight from Geneva to Paris becomes visible.

The Blue Book on *The Affairs of Italy. January to May 1859* published by the Derby Cabinet says that “the concentration of an Austrian military force near Bregenz and Feldkirch” was a rumour assiduously cultivated by Bonapartist agents in Switzerland without a jot of factual evidence to support it (No. 174 of the Blue Book in question: letter from Captain Harris to Lord Malmesbury, Berne, March 24, 1859). In this connection Humboldt-Vogt also made the discovery that in Bregenz and Feldkirch

“one is in the immediate vicinity of the valley of the Rhine, which is the starting-point for *three* great Alpine passes with viable roads, viz., the Via Mala, the Splügen and the Saint Bernard, the latter leading to the Ticino, the first two to Lake Como” (loc. cit., p. 86).

In reality the Via Mala leads firstly over the Splügen, secondly over the Saint Bernard and thirdly nowhere else.

After all this Polonius chatter designed to direct the apprehensions of the Swiss from the Western to the Eastern frontier, “the well-rounded character” at last rolled on to its real task.

“Switzerland,” Vogt announces, “is utterly *in the right* when it *firmly rejects* the obligation not to permit troop movements on this railway” (from Culoz to Aix and Chambéry) “and will confine itself, should the case arise, to make use of the neutralised territory only insofar as it is necessary for the defence of its own territory” (loc. cit., p. 89).

among Switzerland’s neighbours, as ever since the Neuchâtel affair, Prussia has been indifferent, Austria paralysed, and France incomparably more powerful than before.”^a

^a Harris to Russell, received January 25, *Correspondence Respecting the Proposed Annexation of Savoy and Nice to France...*, London, 1860, p. 12.—Ed.

And he assures the Federal Council that “the whole of Switzerland will support the *policy indicated in its note of March 14 to a man*”.

Vogt published his *Studien* at the end of March. It was not until April 24 that Louis Bonaparte used the above-mentioned railway for troop movements and he did not declare war until even later. Thus Vogt, who was privy to the details of the Bonapartist plan of war, knew very well “*from which side the first attack on Swiss neutrality would come*”. His mission was explicitly to decoy Switzerland into condoning an initial violation of its neutrality, which would lead logically to the annexation of the neutralised territory of Savoy by the December Empire. Patting the Federal Council on the back, he attributes to the note of March 14 the meaning that it *ought to have* from the point of view of the Bonapartists. The Federal Council stated in its note that Switzerland would fulfil its “mission” of neutrality as stipulated in the treaties, “faithfully and with complete impartiality”. It goes on to quote an article of the treaties according to which “*no troops belonging to any other power may pass through or be stationed there*” (in the neutralised territory of Savoy). It does not mention *at all* that it would permit the French to use the railway which passes through the neutralised territory. Conditionally, as a “measure designed to secure and defend the territory of the Confederation”, it reserves the right of the Confederation to a “military occupation” of the neutralised territory. The fact that Vogt deliberately and on instructions from above *distorts* the note of the Federal Council is not only evident from its own wording; it is corroborated also by the statement made in the House of Lords on April 23, 1860 by Lord *Malmesbury*, then British Foreign Secretary:

“When the French troops were about to march through Savoy into Sardinia” (more than a month *after* the Federal Council’s note of March 14), “the Swiss Government, true to the neutrality upon which depends its independence, [...] at first objected that these troops had no right to pass through the neutralised territory.”^a

And by what means did Louis Bonaparte and the Swiss party allied with him manage to allay the doubts of the Federal Council? Vogt, who was aware at the end of March 1859 that French troop trains would violate the neutralised territory at the end of April 1859, was naturally able to foresee by the end of March the euphemism which Louis Bonaparte would use at the end of April to palliate his act of violence. He casts doubt on whether the

^a Marx gives the quoted passage in English in a footnote.—*Ed.*

“head of the line from Culoz to Aix and Chambéry comes within the neutral territory” (loc. cit., p. 89) and shows that “the demarcation of neutral territory was not carried out with the purpose of cutting off communications between France and Chambéry”, so that morally the railway in question does not come within the neutral territory.*

Let us, on the other hand, listen to what Lord *Malmesbury* says about it:

“Subsequently, there being some question as to whether the line of railway did not avoid the neutralised portion of Savoy, the Swiss Government withdrew their objection, and allowed the troops of France to pass. I think that they were wrong in doing so.^a We thought the maintenance of the neutrality of such European consequence ... that we protested at the French Court against the passage of those troops to Sardinia on 28 April 1859.”

This protest led to Palmerston accusing Malmesbury of “pro-Austrian” sympathies, as he “had uselessly offended the French Government”,^b just as *Vogt* in his “Magnum Opus” (p. 183) accuses *Das Volk* of

“doing everything in its power to embarrass Switzerland”, on behalf of Austria, of course.... “Read the articles which *Das Volk* published about the question of neutrality and the passage of the French troops through Savoy if you wish to have tangible evidence of these views, which are fully shared by the *Allgemeine Zeitung*”.**

* The fact that the railway *does* come within the neutralised territory was explicitly conceded in a note addressed to Captain Harris on November 18, 1859 by Stämpfli, the President of the Confederation, and Schiess, the Chancellor. It says there: “Il pourrait être aussi question d’un autre point qui concerne la neutralité de la Savoie ... nous voulons parler du chemin de fer dernièrement construit de Culoz à Chambéry, à l’égard duquel on peut se demander s’il devait continuer à faire partie du territoire neutralisé.” [“A further question could arise concerning the neutrality of Savoy ... we refer to the railway recently constructed between Culoz and Chambéry, regarding which it may be questionable whether it can continue to form part of the neutralised territory.”]

** *Vogt* accuses *Das Volk* in particular of having attempted “to bring about a conflict between the Swiss Confederation and its more powerful neighbours”. When the annexation of Savoy actually took place, the *Eidgenössische Zeitung*, a Bonapartist paper, criticised the official journal, *Der Bund*, because “its views on Savoy and France were a feeble echo of the policy which had aimed at involving Switzerland in the conflicts of Europe ever since 1848” (see *Der Bund*, Berne, No. 71, March 12, 1860). It is evident that the Bonapartist scribes receive the phrases ready-made.

^a Marx gives this sentence in English in brackets after its German equivalent.—*Ed.*

^b Marx gives this phrase in English in brackets after its German equivalent.—*Ed.*

The reader will now have “tangible evidence” that the entire section of Vogt’s *Studien* that deals with Switzerland had no other purpose than to prepare the ground for the *first violation of Swiss neutrality* by his “man of destiny”. It was the first step towards the annexation of Savoy and hence of French Switzerland. The fate of Switzerland depended on the vigour with which it opposed this first step, maintained its rights by availing itself of them at the decisive moment and raised the matter at European level at a time when the support of the English Government was assured and Louis Bonaparte, who was just launching into his localised war, would not venture to throw down the gauntlet. Once the English Government had become officially committed, it could not back out * Hence the mighty efforts of our “New Swiss, citizen of the Canton of Berne and member of the Council of States for Geneva” to distract attention by representing it as a **right** to be asserted by Switzerland and as a courageous gesture of defiance towards Austria to *grant permission* to the French troops to march through the neutralised territory. After all, he had saved Switzerland from Catiline-Cherval!

At the same time as Vogt reiterates and amplifies the denial put out in his original *Dentu* pamphlets with regard to ambitions on the Rhine frontier, he avoids making *any* reference, even the most tentative, to the renunciation of Savoy and Nice contained in the *same pamphlets*. Even the names of Savoy and Nice do not appear at all in his *Studien*. Now, as early as February 1859, Savoyard delegates in Turin had protested against the Italian war on the grounds that the annexation of Savoy by the December Empire would be the price of purchasing the French alliance. This protest had never reached Vogt’s ears. Nor had the terms of the agreement reached at Plombières by Louis Bonaparte and Cavour in *August 1858* (published in one of the first issues of *Das Volk*^a) even though they were well known in émigré circles. In the issue of *Pensiero ed Azione* already cited (May 2-16, 1859), *Mazzini* had predicted, literally:

“But if Austria were to be defeated right at the start of the war and if it were to revive the proposals which it had put to the English Government for some time in 1848, namely the surrender of Lombardy on condition that it could keep Venice, then peace would be accepted. The only conditions to be implemented would be

* “Had those provinces (Chablais and Faucigny) been occupied by the Federal troops ... there can be little doubt they would have remained in them up to this moment” (L. Oliphant, *Universal Suffrage and Napoleon III*, London, 1860, p. 20).

^a “Mazzini und Monsieur Bonaparte”, *Das Volk*, No. 5, June 4, 1859.—*Ed.*

the enlargement of the Sardinian monarchy and the *cession of Savoy and Nice to France.*"*

Mazzini published his prediction in the middle of May 1859 and the second edition of Vogt's *Studien* appeared in the middle of June 1859, but it did not contain a single word about Savoy and Nice. Even before Mazzini and the Savoyard delegates, as early as *October 1858*, a month and a half after the conspiracy at Plombières, the President of the Swiss Confederation informed the English Ministry in a dispatch that

"he had reason to believe that a conditional agreement about the cession of Savoy had been reached between Louis Bonaparte and Cavour".**

In the beginning of June 1859 the President of the Confederation again informed the English chargé d'affaires in Berne of his fears about the imminent annexation of Savoy and Nice.*** *Vogt*, the professional saviour of Switzerland, never received the least intimation either of the protest of the Savoyard delegates or of Mazzini's revelations, or of the anxieties of the Swiss Federal Government which persisted from October 1858 to June 1859. Indeed, as we shall see later, *even in March 1860*, when the secret of Plombières was circulating in all the streets of Europe, it took care to keep out of Vogt's way. "Silence is the virtue of slaves",^a the motto of the *Studien*, refers presumably to their failure to mention the threatened annexation. They do, however, contain *one* oblique reference to it:

"But even assuming," Vogt says, "even assuming that the *improbable* were to take place and that territory in Italy, whether to the south or the north, were to be the prize for victory.... *Undoubtedly, from an extremely narrow German point of view ... one might fervently wish that the French wolf will get his teeth into an Italian bone*" (loc. cit., pp. 129, 130).

* "Ma dove l'Austria, disfatta in sulle prime, affacciasse proposte eguali, a quelle ch'essa affacciò per breve tempo nel 1848 al Governo Inglese, abbandono della Lombardia a patto di serbare il Veneto, la pace ... sarebbe accettata: le sole condizioni dell'ingrandimento della Monarchia Sarda e della cessione della Savoia e di Nizza alla Francia, riceverebbero esecuzione."

** In the speech mentioned above, Lord *Malmesbury* said: "There is a despatch now in the Foreign Office, dated as long back as October 1858 ... from the President of the Swiss Republic, stating that he had reason to believe that some conditional agreement had been come to between the Emperor of the French and Count Cavour with respect to Savoy."

*** See No. I of the first Blue Book *On the Proposed Annexation of Savoy, etc.*

^a Paraphrased dictum from Heinrich Heine's *Reisebilder*, Zweiter Teil, Italien. III. Die Stadt Lucca, Kap. XVII.—*Ed.*

Italian territory to the north of course meant Nice and Savoy. After the New Swiss, citizen of the Canton of Berne and member of the Council of States for Geneva has called on Switzerland “*from a purely Swiss point of view*” (loc. cit., p. 39) to “*rejoice with all its heart*” at having Louis Bonaparte for a neighbour, it suddenly occurs to the fugitive Regent of the Empire that “undoubtedly, *from an extremely narrow German point of view*” he would “*fervently wish*” that the French wolf “*will get his teeth into the bone*” of Nice and Savoy, and *hence, of French Switzerland.**

Some time ago a pamphlet appeared in Paris with the title *Napoléon III*, not *Napoléon III et l'Italie*, or *Napoléon III et la question Roumaine*, or *Napoléon III et la Prusse*,^a but quite simply *Napoléon III*, Napoleon III without any qualification. Couched entirely in hyperboles, it is a panegyric on Napoleon III written by Napoleon III. The pamphlet was translated by an Arab called *Dâ-Dâ* into his native tongue.^b In the Afterword the intoxicated *Dâ-Dâ* is unable to contain his enthusiasm any longer and overflows into radiant verse. In the Foreword, however, he is still sober enough to confess that his pamphlet had been published at the behest of the local authorities in Algiers and was destined for distribution among the indigenous Arab tribes beyond the Algerian frontiers so that “the idea of unity and nationhood under a common leader might take hold of their imagination”.

* The wish which, “from an extremely narrow German point of view”, Vogt has to force Italian “bones” between the jaws of the “French wolf” to give the wolf indigestion, will undoubtedly be fulfilled in increasing measure. The semi-official *Revue contemporaine*—*Vogt's special patron*, incidentally—on October 15, 1860 carries a report from Turin of October 8 which states *inter alia*: “*Genoa and Sardinia* would be the legitimate prize for a new (French) war on behalf of Italian unity. I may add that the possession of Genoa would be the necessary instrument of our influence on the peninsula and the only effective means of preventing the sea power whose establishment we had aided from defecting from an alliance with us at a later date in order to enter into league with someone else. *Only with our knee on Italy's throat can we be sure of its loyalty. Austria, a good judge on this point, knows this very well. We shall apply pressure less crudely, but more effectively than Austria,—that is the only difference.*” [Quoted from “La situation de l'Italie, Turin, le 8 octobre 1860”.]

^a Marx refers to the following pamphlets: Arthur La Guéronnière, *Napoléon III, portrait politique*, Paris, 1853 and *L'empereur Napoléon III et l'Italie*, Paris, 1859; A. Lévy, *L'empereur Napoléon III et les principautés roumaines*, Paris, 1858; and Edmond About, *La Prusse en 1860*, Paris, 1860.—*Ed.*

^b La Guéronnière, *Portrait politique de l'empereur Napoléon III*, trad. en arabe par M. Rochaid Dahdah, Paris, 1860.—*Ed.*

This common leader who would lay the foundations for "the unity of the Arab nation" is, as Dâ-Dâ makes clear, none other than "the sun of beneficence, the glory of the firmament,—the Emperor Napoleon III". Vogt, although his writing is unrhymed,^a is none other than *the German Dâ-Dâ*.

That *Dâ-Dâ Vogt* should employ the word "studies" to describe his German paraphrase of the "*Moniteur*" articles, *Dentu pamphlets and revised maps of Europe* inspired by the sun of beneficence and the glory of the firmament, is the best joke that has ever occurred to him in the course of his hilarious career. It even surpasses his Regency of the Empire, the Imperial Wine-Bibbing and his invention of the Imperial passports. The fact that the "educated" German citizen was able to accept in good faith "studies" in which Austria fought against Britain for the possession of *Egypt*, Austria and Prussia were waging their struggle on *non-European* terrain, Napoleon I compelled the Bank of England to weigh its gold instead of counting it, Greeks and Fanariots were racially distinct, a land route went from Mont Cenis through Fenestrelle via the Stura valley, etc.,—all this bears witness to the high pressure which a ten-year-long reaction had exerted on his liberal skull.

Curiously enough, the same liberal German sluggard who had applauded the crude exaggerations of *Vogt's German version of the original Decembrist pamphlets*, leaped up in fury from his sleep when *Edmond About* produced a prudently restrained French retranslation of Dâ-Dâ's compilation with the title *La Prusse en 1860* (originally *Napoléon III et la Prusse*). This chattering magpie of Bonapartism, incidentally, has a dash of waggishness. As evidence of Bonapartist sympathies for Germany, *About* points out, e.g., that the December Empire no more distinguishes between *Dâ-Dâ Vogt* and *Humboldt* than it does between *Lazarillo Hackländer* and *Goethe*.^b At any rate his bracketing of *Vogt* with *Hackländer* suggests a more profound study on the part of *About* than is to be found anywhere in the *Studien* of our German Dâ-Dâ.

^a Marx puns on the word *ungereimt*, which means "unrhymed" and also "without rhyme or reason".—*Ed.*

^b *Edmond About. La Prusse en 1860, Paris, 1860, p. 6.—Ed.*

IX

AGENCY

“So muosens alle strîten.
 in vil angestlichen zîten
 wart gescheiden doch her dan
 ... der *Vogt* da von Bërne.”^a

(*Klage*)*

In a Programme which Dâ-Dâ Vogt in a fit of great hilarity has dated *April 1*, namely April 1, 1859,^c he called upon democrats of every shade of opinion to collaborate in a paper which was to appear in Geneva and propagate the Decembrist-Russian views of his *Studien*. Circumspect as the Programme naturally had to be, the cloven hoof can occasionally be glimpsed beneath the blotting-paper in which it is wrapped. But we shall not dwell on this aspect of it.

At the conclusion of his Programme Vogt asks his readers to give him the names of “like-minded comrades” who “would be

* In *Iwein*, on the other hand, *Hartmann* makes the *Vogt* say, evidently alluding to his dispute with the bears of Berne^b:

“von Bêrn mac wol heizen ich,
 wand ich dâ nîht ze schaffen hân.”

[“Von Bern I may be called
 Though no business have I there.”]

This *Hartmann* is not to be confused with Vogt’s friend, the lyrical parliamentary mollusc of the same name.

^a “Thus, all to war must go
 In times of grief and woe.
 He had to take leave of that place
 ...the *Vogt* of Berne.”¹⁷⁰—*Ed.*

^b i.e. the people of Berne.—*Ed.*

^c Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess...*, Dokumente, S. 33-37.—*Ed.*

prepared to support similar aims in newspapers and journals to which they had access". At the Joint Festival in Lausanne he declared he had formulated a Programme with an invitation to

"those people who were in agreement with it and were prepared to work for it, in exchange for an appropriate remuneration, in organs of the press at their disposal" (*Centralfest, etc.*, p. 17).^a

Lastly, in a letter to *Dr. Loening* he writes:

"Can you put me in touch with *people* who could influence newspapers and journals in this sense from Frankfurt? I am in a position to offer respectable remuneration for the contributions offprints of which I am sent" ("Magnum Opus", Documents, p. 36).

The "*like-minded comrades*" of the Programme become "*those people who*" at the Joint Festival of Lausanne, and they in turn are transformed into "*people*", people *sans phrase*, in the letter to Dr. Loening. Vogt the Treasurer in Chief and Inspector General of the German press has had "funds placed at his disposal" (loc. cit., p. 36) with which to commission not only articles "in newspapers and journals", but even "pamphlets" (loc. cit.). It is easy to see that an agency on this scale stands in need of quite substantial "funds".

—er sante nach allen den hêrren
die in diusken rîchen wâren;
er klagete in allen sîn nôt,
unde bôt in ouch sîn golt rôt."

(*Kaiserchronik*)^b

But to what purpose were newspapers, journals and pamphlets to be "influenced" and "sent to" Vogt by *those people who* would then receive "respectable" remuneration from him? "It is Italy that is at stake", that is all; for in order to ward off the danger threatening on the Rhine it "appears advantageous" to Herr Vogt "to bleed Louis Bonaparte in Italy" (*Programme*, loc. cit., p. 34). No, "it is not Italy that is at stake" (letter to Dr. Loening, loc. cit., p. 36). "Hungary is at stake" (letter to Herr H. in N., loc. cit.). No, Hungary is not at stake. "What is at stake ... is something that I cannot disclose" (loc. cit., Documents, p. 36).

^a Georg Lommel, *Das Centralfest der Deutschen Arbeiterbildungsvereine in der Westschweiz*, Genf, 1859, S. 17.—*Ed.*

^b "For all the noble lords sent he
That dwelt in the lands of Germany.
All them of his great need he told,
And offered them his bright red gold." 171—*Ed.*

As controversial as the question of what is at stake is the problem of the source from which these respectable “funds” flow. It lies in “a remote corner of French Switzerland” (“Magnum Opus”, p. 210). No, “it is Hungarian ladies from the West” (letter to Karl Blind, supplement to No. 44 of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of February 13, 1860).^a On the contrary, it is some *masculini* “within the reach of the German and especially the Austrian police” (*Centralfest*, p. 17). The size of his funds is no less chameleon-like than their purpose and source. They amount to “a few francs” (“Magnum Opus”, p. 210). “The funds are small” (*Centralfest*, p. 17). The funds are adequate to provide respectable remuneration for all those able to exert a Vogtian influence in the German press and in pamphlets. To cap it all there are even two accounts of the formation of the funds. Vogt has “*scraped them together* slowly and painfully” (“Magnum Opus”, p. 210). No, they “have been placed at his disposal” (loc. cit., Documents, p. 36).

“If I am not mistaken,” says the “well-rounded character”, “to *bribe* means to offer someone money or other advantages to perform actions or make utterances contrary to his own convictions” (loc. cit., p. 217).

Hence anyone whose convictions bid him to allow himself to be *bought* cannot be *bribed*, likewise anyone whose convictions run counter to this cannot be bribed. For example, if the department of the Paris Ministry responsible for the foreign press offers Swiss newspapers copies of the Paris *Lithographierte Correspondenz* which appears daily and costs 250 francs, at half or a quarter of the price, or even for nothing, and if it intimates to “editors who are well disposed” that they can expect a cash bonus of 50, 100 or 150 francs each month “depending on their success”, this cannot be called bribery by any stretch of the imagination. The editors whose convictions run counter to the daily *Correspondenz* and the monthly bonus are not compelled to accept the one or the other. And has Granier de Cassagnac been “bribed”, or La Guéronnière, or About, or Grandguillot, or Bullier, or Jourdan of *Le Siècle*, or Martin or Boniface of *Le Constitutionnel*, or Rochaid Dâ-Dâ Albert? Has a remunerative action or utterance ever come into conflict with the convictions of any of these gentlemen? Or again, did Vogt bribe the agent of a certain Swiss newspaper formerly hostile to him when he placed several hundred copies of his *Studien* at his disposal free of charge? In any event it is a strange

^a In Karl Blind’s article “Gegen Karl Vogt”.—Ed.

invitation, Vogt's invitation to journalists to work in the spirit of their own convictions in organs at their disposal and to be rewarded for their efforts by the organ of Herr Karl Vogt in Geneva. The fact that Vogt makes no distinction between the fee paid by a particular newspaper to its own contributors and the secret subsidies which a third party draws from an anonymous source and offers to the correspondents of newspapers quite unconnected with him and even to the press of a whole nation—this quid pro quo shows the extent to which the German Dâ-Dâ "familiarised" himself with the morality of December 2.

"At the source there sat a youth."^a But at which source?

Instead of the weekly *Die Neue Schweiz* intended by Vogt, there appeared somewhat later in Geneva the *Neue Schweizer Zeitung*, founded by Herr A. Brass, Dâ-Dâ's friend of many years' standing. One cool morning in November Herr Brass declared to the astonishment of the whole of Geneva that he had

"written to Vogt spurning the *French feeding-trough* that Vogt had tried to set before him".

At the same time he declared his willingness to stand by his denunciation before a court (*Neue Schweizer Zeitung*, November 12, 1859). And the cock or rather the capon that had crowed so merrily until that moment suddenly fell silent as soon as he was attacked on his own dung-heap. The "New Swiss, citizen of the Canton of Berne and member of the Council of States for Geneva" now stood publicly accused in the middle of Geneva by one of his "notorious" friends of having *attempted to bribe him* with *French* money. And the Genevan Councillor fell silent.

It should not be imagined that Vogt could simply ignore the *Neue Schweizer Zeitung* with an air of superiority. The denunciation of his actions had appeared, as we have said, in the issue of November 12, 1859. Shortly after this the same paper published a piquant description of Plon-Plon and the *Revue de Genève*, the organ of James Fazy, the dictator of Geneva, immediately retorted in a four-column leading article (*Revue de Genève*, December 6, 1859). It protested "*au nom du radicalisme genevois*", in the name of Genevan radicalism. Such was the importance attached to the *Neue Schweizer Zeitung* by James Fazy himself. The four-column leading article of the *Revue de Genève* shows the unmistakable signs of Vogt's helping hand. Brass himself is half-excused. He had not contrived the attack on Plon-Plon, but

^a From Schiller's poem "Der Jüngling am Bache".—*Ed.*

had merely been led astray. In the authentic Vogtian style the *corpus delicti* is placed at the doorstep of the same L. Häfner whom Vogt suspected, in the "Magnum Opus" too (p. 188), of spreading "unsavoury pieces of personal gossip about the Emperor and Prince Napoleon". There is also Vogt's inevitable allusion to "the notorious former Baden lieutenant Clossmann" as the Berne correspondent of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* (cf. "Magnum Opus", p. 198). Let us dwell for a moment on the protest which master and servant, *James Fazy* and *Karl Vogt*, published on December 6, 1859 in the *Revue de Genève* "in the name of Genevan radicalism" and in vindication of Plon-Plon.

Brass is accused of attempting "to validate his German opinion of France by insulting a Prince of the House of Bonaparte". As had long been common knowledge in Geneva, *Plon-Plon* was a liberal of the purest water who during his exile had magnanimously refused "to play a part of any sort at the court of Stuttgart or even Petersburg". Nothing would be more ridiculous than to impute to him, as does the libellous article in the *Neue Schweizer Zeitung*, the idea of forming a small sovereign realm here and there, an Etruscan kingdom, for instance.

"Prince Napoleon, who is acutely aware of his own *genius* and his own *talents*, has too lofty an opinion of himself to stoop to such petty thrones."

Rather does he prefer "as citizen-prince" (*prince-citoyen*) to play the part of Marquis Posa at the court of his exalted cousin in France, "the centre of high civilisation and the fount of general inspiration". "His cousin loves and respects him, whatever people may say of this." The Prince is not only Bonaparte's Marquis Posa. He is "the disinterested friend" of Italy, of Switzerland, in short, of the subject nationalities.

"Prince Napoleon, like the Emperor, is a great economist.... Undoubtedly, if the sound principles of political economy ever triumph in France, this will be due in no small measure to the influence of Prince Napoleon."

He was and is "the advocate of the most far-reaching freedom of the press", the enemy of all preventive measures on the part of the police, the adherent of "ideas of freedom in the broadest sense of the word, both in theory and practice". If this Egeria finds that the Emperor's malicious entourage has made him deaf to his voice, he makes a dignified withdrawal, but "without sulking". It is simply "*his merits* that have exposed him to the slanders of Europe". The

"enemies of France fear him because he relies on the revolutionary support of the peoples of Europe to restore to them their nationhood and their liberty".

Hence he is a misunderstood genius, Marquis Posa, Egeria, an economist, the protector of the subject nationalities, a democrat of the purest water and—can it be possible?—Plon-Plon is “*habile comme général et brave comme tout officier français*” (“a skilful general and valiant like every French officer”).

“He proved this in the Eastern campaign, during and following the battle on the Alma.” And in the Italian campaign “he ably organised his army corps of 50,000 men” (the celebrated *corps de touristes*; I was almost tempted to write *corps de ballet*) “and within a short space of time he made a hard march through mountainous country without his men wanting for anything”.

The French troops in the Crimea are known to have said of anyone who got into a funk that he was suffering from *la maladie Plon-Plonienne*, and it is likely that Plon-Plon only withdrew from the peninsula because of the increasing shortage of provisions.¹⁷²

“We,” the *Revue de Genève* concludes triumphantly, “we have portrayed him”, namely Plon-Plon, “as he really is”.

Three cheers for General Plon-Plon!

No wonder therefore that *Vogt* can announce that he received his war chest from “democratic hands”. Plon-Plon, the *Prince Rouge*,^a is the ideal of both *Vogt* and *Fazy*; he is, as it were, the enchanted prince of European democracy. *Vogt* could not receive his money from purer democratic hands than those of Plon-Plon. Even if some of the monies made over directly to Mr. Kossuth by Plon-Plon’s exalted cousin had been transmitted to *Vogt* through Hungarian hands, their “origins would still be monstrous”.^b But from the hands of Plon-Plon...! And even if the monies that *Vogt* obtained from Klapka’s friend, Countess K.,^c at the time of the Neuchâtel affair might come from more delicate hands, they could not possibly come from purer or more democratic ones. A well-known French writer has said that “*Plon-Plon est voluptueux comme Héliogabale, lâche comme Ivan III et faux comme un vrai Bonaparte*”.^d Plon-Plon’s most disastrous achievement is that he has turned his cousin into *un homme sérieux*. Victor Hugo could still say of Louis Bonaparte “*n’est pas monstre qui veut*”.^e But ever since Louis Bonaparte invented Plon-Plon, the business side

^a Red Prince.—*Ed.*

^b Carl Vogt, *Studien...*, S. 28.—*Ed.*

^c Countess Károlyi.—*Ed.*

^d “Plon-Plon is as dissolute as Heliogabalus, as cowardly as Ivan III and as false as a real Bonaparte” (Victor Hugo, *Napoléon le Petit*, paraphrased).—*Ed.*

^e “One is not a monster because one wishes to be one” (*ibid.*).—*Ed.*

of the Imperial Janus has been concentrated in the hands of the man in the Tuileries, and the grotesque side in the man residing in the Palais Royal. The false Bonaparte, who is his uncle's nephew without being his father's son,¹⁷³ appeared authentic when compared with this authentic Bonaparte. So that the French still say: "*l'autre est plus sûr*".^a Plon-Plon is both the Don Quixote and the Hudibras of the *bas empire*. Hamlet thought it disquieting that the dust of Alexander might have been used to stop a bung-hole.^b What would Hamlet have said if he had seen the disintegrated head of Napoleon on the shoulders of Plon-Plon?*

Although Vogt obtained the main supplies of money for his war chest "*from the French feeding-trough*", it is of course possible that to conceal this he also organised ostentatious collections of "a few francs" from more or less democratically inclined friends. The contradictions about the source, quantity and formation of his funds are thus quite easily resolved.

Vogt's agency did not confine itself to the *Studien*, the *Programm* and the setting up of a recruitment office. At the "*Joint Festival in Lausanne*" he informed the German workers in Switzerland of Louis Bonaparte's mission to liberate the subject nationalities, and he did so of course in more radical terms than he had used in the *Studien*, which had been intended for the liberal German philistines. In the latter case his penetrating study of the relation between "matter and energy"¹⁷⁴ had led him to the conclusion that there could be no question of "undermining and destroying the existing governments in Germany" (*Studien*, Preface, p. VII), and he appealed to the "German bourgeois" in particular (loc. cit., p. 128) "to take to heart" the consideration that the Bonapartist "liberation" of Italy would help to ward off "revolution" in Germany. He informed the German workers, on the other hand, that "Austria is the *only pillar* shoring up their" (i.e. the German rulers') "existence" (*Centralfest, etc.*, p. 11).^c

* Vogt recounts that as early as 1852 he was supposed to embark on a voyage of discovery (Bacchic procession?) with Plon-Plon, to whom he had been enthusiastically recommended by a "Proudhonist" because of his "astounding studies in natural history" "*mais do que promettia a força humana*" ["which showed promise of superhuman strength", Camoens, *Lusiads*, First Canto] ("Magnum Opus", Documents, p. 24).

^a "The other one is safer."—*Ed.*

^b Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, Act V, Scene 1.—*Ed.*

^c Here and below Marx quotes Vogt's speech at the Joint Festival of the German Workers' Educational Associations in Lausanne (Georg Lommel, *Das Centralfest der Deutschen Arbeiterbildungsvereine in der Westschweiz*).—*Ed.*

"As I have just pointed out," he said, "Germany does not exist as far as the outside world is concerned, it has still to be created, and I am convinced that it can only be created *in the form of a federation of republics* similar to the Swiss Confederation" (loc. cit., p. 10).

He said this on June 26 (1859), while on June 6, in the Afterword to the second edition of the *Studien* he entreated the Prince Regent of Prussia^a to bring Germany beneath the sway of the House of Hohenzollern by force of arms and a dynastic civil war. Monarchic centralisation by force of arms is, of course, the shortest way to a federal republic "similar to the Swiss Confederation". He further developed the theory of the "external enemy", France, with which Germany should ally itself in opposition to the "internal enemy", Austria.

"If I am presented with the choice," he exclaimed, "between the Devil (Habsburg) and his grandmother (Louis Bonaparte), *I will choose the latter*, since she is an old woman and must die."

This direct appeal to Germany to throw itself into the arms of Decembrist France on the pretext of hatred for Austria seemed to him too compromising to be put into print, so in the *published* speech we find this emended version:

"And if we are obliged to take up sides in the dispute between the Devil and his grandmother we think it would be best *if the two were to kill and devour each other*, thus saving us the trouble" (*Centralfest, etc.*, p. 13).

Finally, whereas in the *Studien* he raises the standard of Louis Bonaparte as the Emperor of the peasants and soldiers, when faced with an audience of workers he declares that

"it is *especially the great majority of workers in Paris* who have been won over to Louis Bonaparte".

In the view of the French workers

"Louis Bonaparte is doing everything the Republic should have done *since he is giving work to the proletariat and ruining the bourgeoisie, etc.*" (*Centralfest, etc.*, p. 9).

Thus Louis Bonaparte is a *workers' dictator* and eulogised as such before the German workers in Switzerland by the very same *Vogt* who in the "Magnum Opus" flared up in bourgeois indignation at the mere mention of the words "workers' dictatorship"!^b

The Paris programme which laid down the line to be followed by the Decembrist agents in Switzerland on the question of the

^a William.—*Ed.*

^b Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess*, S. 136-10. Vogt has "dictatorship of the proletariat".—*Ed.*

annexation of Savoy consisted of three points: (1) For as long as possible rumours of the imminent danger were to be completely ignored and if necessary they were to be dismissed as an Austrian invention. (2) At a more advanced stage it should be put about that Louis Bonaparte wished to incorporate the neutralised territory into Switzerland. (3) And finally, once the annexation had been carried out it should be used as a justification for a *Swiss alliance with France*, i.e. for Switzerland's voluntary submission to a Bonapartist protectorate. We shall now see how faithfully master and servant, *James Fazy* and *Karl Vogt*, the dictator of Geneva and the member of the Council of States for Geneva created by him, adhered to the terms of this programme.

We have already seen in the *Studien* that Vogt assiduously avoided all mention of the idea on behalf of which his man of destiny was embarking on war. The same silence prevails at the Joint Festival in Lausanne, in the National Council,¹⁷⁵ at the celebrations in memory of Schiller and Robert Blum, in the Biel *Commis voyageur* and, lastly, in the "Magnum Opus". And yet the "idea" was even older than the conspiracy of *Plombières*.¹⁷⁶ As early as *December 1851*, a few days after the coup d'état, one could read in *Le Patriote savoisien*.

"The official positions in Savoy are already being shared out in the antechambers of the Elysée. Its newspapers find the subject a great source of amusement."*

On December 6, 1851 M. Fazy considered Geneva as good as lost to the December Empire.**

On July 1, 1859 *Stämpfli*, who was President of the Confederation at the time, had an interview with Captain Harris, the British chargé d'affaires in Berne. He repeated his fears that in the event of the expansion of Sardinian rule in Italy, the annexation of Savoy by France was a settled matter, and he emphasised that the annexation of North Savoy in particular would completely *expose* one flank of Switzerland and this would entail the loss of Geneva in the near future (see the first Blue Book *On the Proposed*

* "On se partage déjà les places ... de la Savoie dans les antichambres de l'Elysée. Ses journaux plaisantent même assez agréablement là-dessus."

** "Peut-être le citoyen Thurgovien que nous avons si bien défendu contre les menaces de Louis-Philippe, nous fera-t-il la grâce de vouloir bien se constituer comme médiateur, *et reprendre de nous Genève*" ["Perhaps the citizen of Thurgau whom we defended so well against the threats of Louis Philippe will do us the favour of offering himself as mediator and *recover Geneva from us*"] (*Revue de Genève*, December 6, 1851).

Annexation of Savoy and Nice, No. I). Harris reported to Malmesbury, who for his part instructed Lord Cowley in Paris to ask Walewski to explain the nature of the Emperor's intentions. Walewski in no way denied that

"France and Sardinia had more than once discussed the problem of annexation and that the Emperor entertained the idea that if Sardinia was to be enlarged and become an Italian Kingdom, it was not unreasonable to expect that she should, on the other hand, make territorial concessions to France" (loc. cit., No. IV).^a

Walewski's reply was written on July 4, 1859 and hence pre-dated the peace of Villafranca. In August 1859 Petétin's pamphlet^b appeared in Paris, preparing Europe for the annexation of Savoy. *That same August*, after the summer session of the Swiss National Assembly, Herr Vogt slunk into Paris to receive his instructions from Plon-Plon. To put people off the scent he arranged for his fellow-scoundrels, Ranickel and Co., to spread the rumour in Geneva that he had gone for a cure on the Lake of Lucerne.

"ze Pâris lëbt er mangel tac,
vil kleiner wîsheit er enpfîlac,
sîn zerung was unmâzen grôz;...
ist ër ein esel und ein gouch,
daz sëlbt ist ër zuo Pâris ouch."^c

In September 1859 the Swiss Federal Council saw the threat of annexation looming nearer (loc. cit., No. VI) and on November 12 it resolved to address a memorandum to this effect to the great powers. On November 18 President Stämpfli and Chancellor Schiess handed an official note to the English chargé d'affaires in Berne (loc. cit., No. IX). *James Fazy*, who had returned in October from his abortive journey to Tuscany where he had vainly striven to advance the cause of Plon-Plon's Etruscan kingdom, now tried to stem the rumours of annexation in his usual loud and cantankerous manner and with an affectation of rage: no one has ever dreamt of annexation, either in France or in Sardinia. As the danger drew nearer, the confidence of the *Revue de Genève* increased accordingly and in November and December 1859 its

^a Cowley to Russell, received July 5, 1860.—*Ed.*

^b Anselme Petétin, *De l'annexion de la Savoie*.—*Ed.*

^c "In Paris many a day he dwelt,
For learning no great love he felt;
He ate and drank more than his fill...
Since he is ass and fool together,
He doesn't change in Paris either."

(Ulrich Bonerius, *Der Edel Stein*, Berlin, 1816.)—*Ed.*

Corybantic cult¹⁷⁷ of the Napoleonides surpassed all bounds (see, for example, the article on Plon-Plon quoted above^a).

With the year 1860 we enter the second phase of the annexation affair.

Issuing denials or just turning a deaf ear was no longer in the interest of the Decembrists. The problem now rather was to make Switzerland more amenable to the idea of annexation and manoeuvre it into a false position. The second point of the Tuileries programme had to be put into action, i.e. the alleged intention of donating the neutral territory to Switzerland had to be publicised as loudly as possible. These efforts of the Swiss Decembrists were of course supported by simultaneous manoeuvres in Paris. Thus *Baroche*, the Minister of the Interior, told the Swiss Ambassador, *Dr. Kern*, at the beginning of January 1860, that

“should any change in the ownership of Savoy occur hereafter it should only be made with due regard to those provisions of the Treaties of 1815 which stipulated that a portion of it sufficient to ensure a good line of defence should be at the same time ceded to Switzerland” (see the Blue Book, op. cit., No. XIII).^b

And even on February 2, 1860, on the same day that *Thouvenel* told the British Ambassador, Lord Cowley, that the annexation of Savoy and Nice was a “possibility”, he informed him at the same time that

“indeed, in the opinion of the French Government, it would be well if in these circumstances the districts of Chablais and Faucigny should be united *permanently* to Switzerland” (loc. cit., No. XXVII).^c

The dissemination of this illusion was designed not only to make the Swiss more amenable to the idea of the annexation of Savoy by the December Empire, but also to blunt their subsequent protest, and to compromise them in the eyes of Europe by making them the accomplices, albeit the cheated accomplices, of the Decembrists. *Frey-Hérosé*, President of the Confederation since 1860, avoided the pitfall and even informed Captain Harris of his misgivings about the supposed advantages of incorporating the neutralised territory into Switzerland. For his part, *Harris* warned the Federal Government about the Bonapartist intrigue, so that

^a The leading article in the *Revue de Genève*, December 6, 1859 (see this volume, p. 187).—*Ed.*

^b Grey to Russell, received January 10, *Correspondence Respecting the Proposed Annexation of Savoy and Nice to France...*, p. 9.—*Ed.*

^c Cowley to Russell, received February 8, *ibid.*, p. 28.—*Ed.*

"Switzerland should not appear as a Power eager for annexation or extension of territory" (loc. cit., No. XV).^a

On the other hand, *Sir James Hudson*, the British Ambassador in Turin, wrote to Lord John Russell after a lengthy interview with *Cavour*:

"I have good ground for believing that Switzerland also is anxious to annex to herself a portion of Savoy. Consequently, it ought to be clearly understood, that when France is blamed for seeking this cession, Switzerland is no less to blame.... This question therefore, becoming more complicated by this double attack, renders the position of Sardinia more defensible" (loc. cit., No. XXXIV).^b

Finally, as soon as Louis Bonaparte threw away the mask, Thouvenel quite unceremoniously revealed the mystery behind the slogan of the Swiss annexation of the neutral territory. In a dispatch to the French chargé d'affaires in Berne he openly derided the Swiss protest against the French annexation of Savoy, and how? By using the "plan for the *partition* of Savoy" foisted on Switzerland by Paris (see Thouvenel's dispatch of March 17, 1860).^c

And what did the Swiss agents of December meanwhile contribute to the web of delusion? In January 1860, in the course of discussion with the British chargé d'affaires in Berne, *James Fazy* was the first to represent the annexation of Chablais and Faucigny to Switzerland not as something promised by Louis Bonaparte, but as the desire of Switzerland and of the inhabitants of the neutralised districts (loc. cit., No. XXIII). *Vogt*, who until that moment had never dreamt of the possibility of a French annexation of Savoy, was suddenly inspired by the spirit of prophecy, and *The Times*, which had never mentioned the name *Vogt* since its inception, suddenly announced in a correspondence dated January 30:

"The Swiss Professor *Vogt* pretends to know that France will procure for Switzerland Faucigny, Chablais, and the Genevese, the neutral provinces of Savoy, if the Grand Council of the Republic will let her have the free use of the Simplon" (*The Times*, February 3, 1860).^d

Even more! At the end of January 1860 *James Fazy* assured the British chargé d'affaires in Berne that *Cavour*, with whom he had had a long interview in Geneva hardly two months previously, was foaming with rage at the idea of making any concession to France

^a Harris to Russell, received January 25, *ibid.*, p. 12.—*Ed.*

^b Hudson to Russell, received February 16, *ibid.*—*Ed.*

^c *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 82, March 22, 1860.—*Ed.*

^d "Austria", *The Times*, No. 23533, February 3, 1860.—*Ed.*

(see the Blue Book,^a op. cit., No. XXXIII). Thus while Fazy plays guarantor for Cavour to England, Cavour exculpates himself in English eyes by revealing the territorial ambitions of the same Fazy (loc. cit., No. XXXIII). And finally, *Tourte*, the Swiss Ambassador in Turin, hastens to the British Ambassador, Hudson, as late as February 9, 1860 to assure him that

“no engagement subsists between Sardinia and France for the cession of Savoy to France, and that Sardinia is not in the least disposed to cede or exchange Savoy to France” (loc. cit.)^b

The decisive moment was drawing nearer. The Paris *Patrie* of January 25, 1860 began to prepare the way for the annexation of Savoy in an article entitled “*Les vœux de la Savoie*”. In another article, on January 27, “*Le comté de Nice*”, it foreshadowed in its Decembrist style the annexation of Nice. On February 2, 1860 Thouvenel announced to the British Ambassador, Cowley, that even before the war France and Sardinia had agreed that the annexation of Savoy and Nice was a “possibility”. However, an official note on France’s *actual* decision to absorb Savoy and Nice was not given to Lord Cowley until February 5 (see Lord Cowley’s speech in the House of Lords on April 23, 1860)^c and Dr. Kern was not told until February 6. And both the British and Swiss Ambassadors were explicitly informed that the neutralised territory was to be absorbed into Switzerland. *Prior* to these official announcements, *James Fazy* was instructed from the Tuileries that Sardinia had *already* ceded Savoy and Nice to France in a secret treaty and that the treaty contained *no clause in favour of Switzerland*. *Prior* to Thouvenel’s official announcements to Lord Cowley and Dr. Kern, *Fazy* was to sugar the Imperial pill and present it to his Genevan subjects. On *February 3*, therefore, he arranged for his blindly devoted tool, *John Perrier*, to organise a popular meeting on the premises of the *Club populaire* of Geneva, a meeting which he attended apparently by chance, on the pretext that

“he had just heard (*je viens d’entendre*) that the treaties were being discussed which may have been concluded between France and Sardinia for the cession of Savoy. Unfortunately, such a treaty was signed on *January 27* by the Sardinian Government; but from this *positive fact* we cannot yet deduce that our security is really threatened.... It is true that there is no written reservation made in the treaty

^a Harris to Russell, received February 6, *Correspondence Respecting the Proposed Annexation of Savoy and Nice to France...*, p. 24.—Ed.

^b Hudson to Russell, received February 16, *ibid.*—Ed.

^c *The Times*, No. 23602, April 24, 1860.—Ed.

in favour of our rights over the Sardinian neutralised territory; but we do not know whether in the intention of the contracting parties there may not exist some reservation in this sense.... It may have been taken into consideration, and, so to speak, understood as taken for granted (*sous-entendu comme allant de soi*).... We should beware of introducing any spirit of premature distrust.... We should rely on the sympathy" (for the coup d'état monarchy) "...and abstain from any hostile word."

(See Fazy's "confidential" speech, in its own way a masterpiece of demagoguery, in the *Revue de Genève* of February 3, 1860.) The British chargé d'affaires in Berne found Fazy's prophetic knowledge remarkable enough for him to send a special dispatch to Lord John Russell about it.^a

The *official* treaty relating to the cession of Savoy and Nice to France was due to be concluded on March 24, 1860. So there was no time to be lost. The Swiss patriotism of the Genevan Decembrists had to be officially established before the official proclamation of the annexation of Savoy. Signor *Vogt* therefore journeyed to Paris early in March, accompanied by General *Klapka*, who might well be acting *de bonne foi*,^b with the intention of bringing *his* influence to bear on Plon-Plon, the Egeria of the Palais Royal, the misunderstood genius, and, in full view of the whole of Switzerland, of throwing *his personal weight* into the scales in favour of the incorporation of the neutralised territory into Switzerland. From the Lucullan table of Plon-Plon—in the art of gastronomy, as is well known, Plon-Plon rivals both Lucullus and Cambacérès, so that if Brillat-Savarin were to rise from the grave, even he would marvel at Plon-Plon's *genius, economics, liberal ideas, military talent* and *personal valour* in this field—from the Lucullan table of Plon-Plon, where as an "agreeable companion" he tucked in heartily, Falstaff-Vogt called on the Swiss to show their valour (see his long letter from Paris in the supplement to the *Biel Commis voyageur* of March 8, 1860). Switzerland should prove that

"its militia was not there *just* to parade and play at being soldiers". The "cession of the neutralised territory to Switzerland" was an illusion. "The abandonment of Chablais and Faucigny to France was a *first* step, to be followed by others." "*Mounted on the two stilts: nationality and natural frontiers*, one can advance from the Lake of Geneva to the Aar and right up to Lake Constance and the Rhine—if one's legs are strong enough."

But—and this is the point—Falstaff-Vogt *still does not give credence* to what the French Minister Thouvenel himself had

^a Harris to Russell, received February 9, *Correspondence Respecting the Proposed Annexation of Savoy and Nice to France*....—Ed.

^b In good faith.—Ed.

officially revealed a month before and what all Europe knew by now—that the cession of Savoy and Nice had been agreed on *as long ago as August 1858 in Plombières*, as the price of French intervention against Austria. His “man of destiny” had only just been driven against his will into the arms of chauvinism by the priests and coerced into confiscating the neutralised territory.

“Evidently,” our embarrassed apologist stammers, “evidently the leading circles have been **looking** for a counterweight to the *steady growth of the clerical movement* and hope that this might be found in so-called chauvinism—in that most narrow-minded sense of nationality that knows of nothing beyond the acquisition of a **bit** (!) of territory.”

After Vogt, intoxicated by the smells issuing from Plon-Plon’s kitchen, had laid about him so heartily in the Biel *Commis voyageur*, he romanced wildly in the same mouthpiece on his return from Paris about the absolute love of the French to be found among the inhabitants of Nice. He thus came into a disagreeable conflict with *Vegezzi-Ruscalla*, one of the chief leaders of the Italian National Association and the author of the pamphlet *La nazionalità di Nizza*. And when the same hero who had played Winkelried from the safety of Plon-Plon’s table came to speak in the National Council in Berne, the warlike clarion call turned into a diplomatic piping on the flute, which recommended calmly to carry on the negotiations with *the Emperor who had always been amicably disposed towards the Swiss* and which warned emphatically against any *alliance with the East*. The President of the Confederation, *Frey-Hérosé*, made some strange insinuations regarding *Vogt*, who on the other hand had the satisfaction of seeing his speech praised by the *Nouvelliste Vaudois*.^a The *Nouvelliste Vaudois* is the organ of Messrs. Blanchenay, Delarageaz and other Vaudois magnates, in short of the Swiss Western railway, just as the *Neue Zürcher-Zeitung* is the organ of Zurich Bonapartism and the Northeastern railway. To characterise the patrons of the *Nouveliste Vaudois* it is enough to point out that on the occasion of the well-known dispute about the Oron railway five Vaudois government councillors were repeatedly and with impunity accused by the opposition press of having each received a present of 20 shares to the value of 10,000 francs from the Paris *Crédit Mobilier*,¹⁷⁸ the chief shareholder of the Swiss Western railway.

A few days after *Vogt* had set off in the company of Klapka to visit the Egeria of the Palais Royal, *James Fazy*, accompanied by

^a Marx is drawing on data from a letter by Georg Lommel of April 19, 1860. There is an entry to this effect in Marx’s notebook.—*Ed.*

John Perrier, embarked on a journey to the sphinx in the Tuileries.^a It is known that Louis Bonaparte relishes the role of sphinx and maintains his Oedipuses just as former kings of France maintained their own court jesters. In the Tuileries, *Fazy* interposed himself between Switzerland and the sphinx. As we have said, *John Perrier* was his companion. This John is the very shadow of his James, he does everything the latter desires, nothing which he does not desire, lives through him and for him, became a member of the Grand Council of Geneva through him, prepares all festivals and toasts for him and acts, in short, as his Leporello and his Fialin. Both returned to Geneva having achieved nothing as far as the threat to Switzerland was concerned, and with astonishing success, as far as the threat to *Fazy's* own position was concerned. *Fazy* thundered in public, saying that the scales had now fallen from his eyes and that in future he would hate Louis Bonaparte as passionately as he had loved him hitherto. A strange love, this nine-year-long passion of the republican *Fazy* for the murderer of two republics! *Fazy* acted the disillusioned patriot with such virtuosity that the whole of Geneva wallowed in *Fazy-enthusiasm* and the demise of *Fazy's* illusions was felt almost more keenly than the loss of the neutralised provinces. Even *Théodore de Saussure*, the head of the aristocratic opposition and his enemy of many years' standing, confessed that it was no longer possible to doubt the sincerity of James *Fazy's* Swiss patriotism.

Having been the recipient of such well-merited popular ovations, the tyrant of Geneva hastened to the National Council in Berne. Shortly after his departure, his loyal squire, his Paris travelling companion, in short, his own *John Perrier*, embarked on a voyage of the Argonauts of a very special sort. A band of Swiss drunkards (at least this is how they were described in the columns of the *London Times*), chosen from the company of "*fruitiers*", *Fazy's* democratic bodyguard, set sail unarmed under *Perrier's* leadership for *Thonon* at which spot of the neutralised territory they intended to stage an *anti-French* demonstration. To this day no one can say in what this demonstration consisted or was supposed to consist, whether the Argonauts intended to search for the Golden Pelt^b or to sell their own skins. For no Orpheus accompanied *Perrier's* Argonauts and no Apollonius has sung of

^a An allusion to Karl Grün's pamphlet *Louis Bonaparte, die Sphinx auf dem französischen Kaiserthron*, Hamburg, 1860.—*Ed.*

^b Marx ironically writes *goldenes Fell* (Golden Pelt) instead of *goldenes Vlies* (Golden Fleece).—*Ed.*

their deeds. It seems to have involved a sort of symbolic occupation of the neutralised territory by a Switzerland represented by *John Perrier* and his band. The real Switzerland now found its hands so full with diplomatic excuses and declarations of loyalty and indignant repudiations of *John Perrier's* symbolic occupation of Thonon as to make Louis Bonaparte appear the soul of magnanimity when he contented himself with the actual occupation of Thonon and the rest of the neutralised territory.

John Perrier was arrested in Geneva with several thousand francs in his pockets. On the basis of Perrier's testimony *M. Ducommun*, the Vice-Chancellor of the state and editor of the *Revue de Genève*, a young man without private means, and dependent for his incumbency of these two posts on *James Fazy*, President of the State Council and owner of the *Revue de Genève*, was likewise arrested. He confessed to having given Perrier the money which had been taken from a fund set up to establish a volunteer corps—a fund whose existence had been quite unknown to the Geneva radicals up to that moment. The judicial investigation ended with the dismissal firstly of Ducommun and then of Perrier.

On March 24 Nice and Savoy, together with the neutralised territory, were officially ceded to Bonaparte by Victor Emmanuel. On March 29-30 *John Perrier*, who had returned from Paris to Geneva with *Fazy*, embarked on his Argonaut adventure, a burlesque demonstration which just at the crucial moment made any real demonstration impossible. In Berne, *James Fazy* insisted that "he had no knowledge of the incident".* In the former neutral territory *Laity* boasted that if the Swiss had actually launched an attack there his Emperor would have at once ordered three divisions to march into Geneva. *Vogt*, finally, was quite in

* The realisation that with the annexation of North Savoy Geneva had become an enclave of France and, in no less measure, the impact of the French fortification of the harbour of Thonon, have recently, as everybody knows, greatly roused the anti-Decembrist feeling of the ancient Republic. However, the authentic outbreaks of popular indignation are accompanied by false ones, inspired from Paris and set in motion in part by French police personnel. Thus, for example, we can read in the *Saturday Review* of September 22, 1860: "A party of self-styled Swiss were giving vent to gross insults against the Empire at Thonon, when a blundering gendarme, in an excess of official zeal, seized them, and insisted on looking at their passports. They turned out to be Frenchmen, with papers perfectly *en règle*.... The gravest fact relating to these artificial collisions is, that in one of the earliest and the worst of them, a close adherent of Mr. Fazy" (friend Perrier) "was prominently implicated."^a

^a Marx gives the last sentence in brackets in English after its German equivalent.—*Ed.*

the dark about the secret of the journey of the Argonauts, for a few days before it took place he made a prophylactic *denunciation to the Genevan police* warning them of a conflict due to be engineered from Geneva on the Savoy frontier—but in so doing he was laying a false trail. I have in my possession a letter from a refugee living in Geneva, a former friend of Vogt's, to a refugee living in London. It says *inter alia*:

"Vogt was putting it about that I was continuously dashing backwards and forwards between West Switzerland and Savoy organising a revolution to the detriment of Switzerland and the advantage of powers hostile to it. This was only a few days before *Perrier's* adventure about which Vogt was undoubtedly in the know, but of which I was as ignorant as yourself. Evidently he attempted to cast suspicion on me and to ruin me. Fortunately, *he also denounced me to Duj, the Director of Police* who summoned me and was not a little surprised when I burst into laughter at his opening question and said: 'Aha! that well-known intrigue of Vogt's!' He then asked for details about my relations with *Vogt*. My statement was also confirmed by a government secretary, a member of the Helvetia,¹⁷⁹ who went to the Central Assembly in Berne on the following day where he met Vogt's brother and criticised Karl's behaviour to him, whereupon Gustav replied laconically that he had long since gathered from Karl's letters how things stood with his politics."^a

If, to begin with, silence, denials and sermons of confidence in Louis Bonaparte were supposed to blind the Swiss to the impending danger, if later on the clamour about the intended incorporation of Faucigny, Chablais and the Genevese into Switzerland was designed to make the annexation of Savoy by France acceptable for the people, and if, finally, the burlesque at Thonon was intended to break any serious resistance, then, in accordance with the Paris programme, the annexation which had actually taken place and the danger that could no longer be denied were now to be put forward to induce the Swiss to surrender voluntarily, *i.e. to enter an alliance with the December Empire*.

This task was of such an extreme delicacy that its accomplishment could only be entrusted to *James Fazy* himself. His servant *Vogt* was allowed to warn against an *alliance with the East*, but only *Fazy* himself could advocate an *alliance with the West*. He first hinted at the necessity of this in the *Revue de Genève*. On *April 18, 1860* an excerpt from a London letter was circulating in Geneva which said, among other things:

"Our influential fellow-citizens should be warned to be on their guard against the advice of *J. Fazy*, who may well recommend that Switzerland should *abandon its neutrality*. It is highly likely that this advice emanates from the *French Government*

^a Marx is quoting Georg Lommel's letter of April 19, 1856.—*Ed.*

itself, whom *James Fazy* has served zealously down to this very day.... He now assumes the posture of a good Swiss who is striving to thwart the designs of the French. However, I am told by someone who has always shown himself to be well informed that this is all just a snare. As soon as Switzerland has declared that it neither can nor will continue to remain *neutral*, the French Government will take notice of this and force it into an alliance as in the days of the First Empire."

Whereupon *Fazy* caused this reply to appear in the *Revue de Genève*:

"The day that Savoy is united with France the neutrality of Switzerland will cease of itself, so that any advice to that effect from *Fazy* would be superfluous."

Three months later, on *July 10*, *James Fazy* made a speech in the Swiss National Council in which

"fuming and raging and shaking his clenched fist at the Bonapartist financiers and the barons of the Confederation—he denounced them as *le gouvernement souterrain*^a—he marched straight into the Bonapartist camp".

The official French party of Zurich and the Vaud, seemingly the chief victim of his attack, therefore allowed him to continue blustering.

"Europe, and *Germany in particular*, has left Switzerland in the lurch. *Neutrality has thereby become impossible; Switzerland must look around for alliances*, but where?"

The old demagogue then muttered something to the effect that

"France, which was so near and closely related, would one day recognise and make good the wrong it had done. It might even become a republic, etc. But the financiers and barons of the Confederation who had outlived their day should not be allowed to initiate *the new policy*. Helvetia, the people must do that: Just wait and see, the next elections will teach you a lesson. The troops of the Confederation are most welcome in Geneva. However, if their presence raises the slightest doubts about the existing government of Geneva, then away with them. Geneva is able to look after itself and to defend itself."

On *July 10*, then, *James Fazy* elaborated in the National Council upon what he had hinted at in the *Revue de Genève* of *April 18*—"the new policy", the alliance between Switzerland and France, i.e. the annexation of Switzerland by the Decembrists. Well-informed Swiss thought that it was premature for *Fazy* to drop the anti-Bonapartist mask he had been wearing since his return from the Tuileries. However, it is precisely *Fazy* who displays a virtuosity in the art of calculated indiscretion that to some extent is reminiscent of that of Palmerston.

It is well known that the most disreputable members of the "*gouvernement souterrain*" moved a vote of censure on *Stämpfli* in

^a The underground government.—*Ed.*

the National Council, because as Federal President he had grasped the situation and at one point had made the correct decision to use Federal troops to defend the neutralised territory against French violations. The motion of censure was defeated by an enormous majority, but *Vogt's* vote was not among them.

"Very typical," I was told in a letter from Switzerland at the time, "of *Karl Vogt* was his absence during the discussions in the Swiss Council of States on the motion of censure on *Stämpfli*, the President of the Confederation. As representative of the Canton of Geneva under threat from Bonaparte *Vogt* had perforce to vote for *Stämpfli*, the most energetic defender of this Canton. He is, moreover, both a personal friend of *Stämpfli's* and also greatly indebted to him. *Vogt's* father and two of his brothers earn their bread as employees of the Canton of Berne; a third brother was recently given a lucrative post as a senior Federal statistician, thanks to *Stämpfli's* mediation. Consequently it was hardly possible for *Vogt* to vote against his friend, benefactor and man of the people in an open ballot. On the other hand, it was even less possible for a Plon-Plonist to approve publicly a policy which was fighting Bonapartist aggression to the death. Hence his running away and sticking his head in the sand, but this left his broad backside clearly visible and exposed to a beating—the usual stratagem and the mundane destiny of the modern Falstaff."

The slogan of "*Austrianism*", which had emanated from the Tuileries, and had then been echoed so loudly by *James Fazy* in the *Revue de Genève* and by his servant *Vogt* in the *Biel Commis voyageur*, in the *Studien* and in the "*Magnum Opus*", etc., now finally rebounded on Switzerland. Around the middle of April a poster appeared everywhere on the walls of Milan entitled: "*Conflict between Napoleon and Switzerland.*" In it we read:

"Savoy appeared to Switzerland as an appetising tit-bit and, *egged on by Austria*, Switzerland hastened to obstruct the plans of Napoleon III on a matter that is exclusively the concern of Italy and France.... England and the other great powers of the north, *except Austria*, are not in the least opposed to the incorporation of Savoy. *Switzerland alone, spurred on by Austria*, which attempts to stir up trouble and rebellion in all the states allied to Sardinia, put in its veto.... *Switzerland* is an *abnormal state* which cannot resist the *tide of the great principle of nationality* for a long time. Germans, Frenchmen and Italians are not capable of submitting to the same laws. If Switzerland knows this it should reflect that in the Canton of Ticino it is the language of Foscolo and Giusti that is spoken, it should not forget that a large part of its population belongs to the great and magnanimous nation that calls itself *French.*"

In short, it appears that Switzerland is an *Austrian* invention.

While *Vogt* was at such pains to rescue *Switzerland* from the clutches of *Austria*, he charged one of his most trusted accomplices with the task of rescuing *Germany*. This was the garrulous Swabian, *Karl Mayer of Esslingen*, Rump parliamentarian, a would-be great man and at present owner of a bijouterie factory. At the ceremony to dedicate the banner of the Neuchâtel German

Workers' Association, held at The Crown in St. Blaise, the official speaker, Rump parliamentarian and jeweller, *Karl Mayer of Esslingen*, called upon Germany

"just to allow the French across the Rhine because otherwise things would never improve in Germany".

Two representatives of the Workers' Association of Geneva who returned in the new year (1860) after attending the ceremony, reported the incident. When their account was confirmed by the representatives of a number of other West Swiss associations, the Genevan headquarters released a circular containing a general warning about Bonapartist intrigues among German workers in Switzerland. I quote from a report of the circular lying before me:

"According to a reminiscence of the First Empire when a few Germans also tried to uphold Napoleon's dominion of the world truly believing that the colossus would not survive the demise of its hero and that then a unified Germany would at any rate be one of the provinces into which the Frankish Empire would disintegrate, and such a Germany would find it easier to win freedom—it was dismissed as political quackery to believe that one could drain a living body of blood and trust to the fantastic miracle that fresh blood would be produced to replace it. Moreover, the attempt was denounced to deny a great people the strength to help itself and the right to determine its own destiny. Finally, it was noted that Germany's hoped-for Messiah had just demonstrated in Italy precisely what *he* understood by the liberation of subject nationalities, etc., etc. The circular was addressed, as it stated, only to those Germans who were choosing the wrong means to achieve a good end, but it refused to become involved with **venal journalists** and **ambitious ci-devants**."

Simultaneously, the *Aargauer Nachrichten*, organ of the *Helvetia*, castigated

"the logic that the hedgehog should be allowed to enter the mole's burrow so that one could better catch hold of it and throw it out again, according to which fine logic the Ephialtes of this world should be given a free hand so that Leonidases might arise. **A certain professor** was behaving like Duke Ulrich of Württemberg in reverse; for the Duke attempted to return home from exile by making use of the Bundschuh,¹⁸⁰ after the Riding Boot did not want to have anything to do with him, while **the above-mentioned professor** had ruined his relations with the Shoe and so was trying to patch things up with the Boot, etc."

This denunciation of *Professor Vogt* was significant because it appeared in an organ of the *Helvetia*. By way of compensation, as it were, he was given a favourable reception in *L'Espérance*, a paper founded in 1859 in Geneva by the French Treasury and which appeared in large format and with no expense spared. It was the task of *L'Espérance* to preach in favour of the annexation of Savoy and the Rhineland in particular and of Louis Bonaparte's Messianic destiny to liberate the subject nationalities in general. It is common knowledge in *Geneva* that *Vogt* was an *habitué* of the

editorial office of *L'Espérance* and one of its most active contributors. I myself have been informed of details which put this fact *beyond all doubt*. What *Vogt* hints at in his *Studien*, what he had his accomplice *Karl Mayer*, the garrulous Swabian, Rump parliamentarian and jeweller from *Esslingen*, proclaim so loudly at Neuchâtel, is developed further in *L'Espérance*. For example, it says in its issue of *March 25, 1860*:

"If war with France is the only hope of the German patriots, what reason can they have for wishing to weaken the government of that country and to prevent it from attaining its *natural frontiers*? Could it be that the German people is far from sharing this hatred of France? However that may be, *there are some very sincere German patriots, in particular among the most progressive German democrats*" (namely the Vogt of the Empire, the Ranickel, Karl Mayer from Esslingen and *tutti quanti*), "*who do not regard the loss of the left bank of the Rhine as a great misfortune, but who on the contrary are convinced that only after that loss political life will begin in Germany, a revived Germany founded on the alliance and merging with the civilisation of the European West.*"*

Having been so precisely informed by *Vogt* of the views of the most progressive elements among the German democrats, *L'Espérance* declared in a leading article on May 30 that

"a plebiscite on the left bank of the Rhine would soon show that everyone there was in favour of the French".^c

Der Postheiri, a humorous Swiss magazine, then overwhelmed *L'Espérance* with bad jokes, referring to it as the "miserable jade" which in addition to the light laurels of Bacchus Plon-Plon now had also to endure the "weighty paunch" of his Silenus on its back.

The precision with which the Decembrist press manoeuvres were orchestrated can be seen in the following example. On *May*

* "Si la seule espérance des patriotes allemands est fondée sur une guerre avec la France, quelle raison peuvent-ils avoir de chercher à affaiblir le gouvernement de ce pays et l'empêcher de former ses^a frontières naturelles? Serait-il que le peuple en Allemagne est loin de partager cette haine de la France? Quoi qu'il en soit, il y a des patriotes allemands très sincères, et notamment parmi les démocrates les plus avancés, qui ne voient pas un grand malheur dans la perte de la rive gauche du Rhin, qui sont, au contraire, convaincus que c'est après cette perte seulement que commencera la vie politique d'une Allemagne régénérée, appuyée sur l'alliance et se confondant avec la civilisation de l'Occident européen" (*L'Espérance*, March 25, 1860).^b

^a In *L'Espérance*: "et l'empêcher de réclamer les" ("and to prevent it from claiming the").—*Ed.*

^b Marx quotes from the article "Allemagne. Correspondance particulière de l'Espérance". The italics and bold type are Marx's.—*Ed.*

^c "Le Rhin", *L'Espérance*, No. 149, May 30, 1860.—*Ed.*

30 *L'Espérance* in Geneva spoke of the cession of the left bank of the Rhine to the Decembrists by plebiscite; on May 31 Louis Jourdan in *Le Siècle* in Paris started to dig the trenches for the annexation of the Rhine,^a and in the beginning of June *Le Propagateur du Nord et du Pas-de-Calais* opened up with crude artillery fire against Belgium. Shortly before the statements of the Genevan mouthpiece, Edmond About declared in *L'Opinion nationale* that Sardinia's aggrandizement had compelled the Emperor "de prendre la Savoie ... c.-à-d. nous fermons notre porte",^b and, he continued, if Germany's desire for unification led to a similar enlargement of Prussia, "alors nous aurions à veiller à notre sûreté, à prendre la rive gauche du Rhin, c.-à-d. nous fermerions notre porte".^c This frivolous door-keeper was immediately followed by A. A.,^d that ponderous blockhead, the correspondent of *L'Indépendance belge*, a sort of Joseph Prudhomme and Sybil Extraordinary of the "providence" dwelling in the Tuileries.^e Meanwhile the enthusiasm for German unity peculiar to *L'Espérance* and the same paper's indignant denunciation of German anti-Decembrists who had fallen into the clutches of Austria, had reached such giddy heights that James Fazy, who was forced to observe certain diplomatic proprieties and who was moreover on the point of converting his *Revue de Genève* into *La Nation suisse*, magnanimously condescended to declare in the *Revue* that it was possible to oppose Bonapartism without being an Austrian.

Karl Vogt, German Dâ-Dâ, owner of a Decembrist recruitment office for the German press, Fazy's sub-agent, "agreeable companion" in the Palais Royal, Plon-Plon's Falstaff, Ranickel's "friend", prompter to the Biel *Commis voyageur*, contributor to *L'Espérance*, protégé of Edmond About, bard of the *Lousiad*—Karl Vogt had still to plumb the ultimate depths of depravity. In Paris he was to appear before the eyes of the world in the *Revue contemporaine*, arm in arm with **Monsieur Edouard Simon**. Let us consider for a moment what the *Revue contemporaine* is and who *Monsieur Edouard Simon*.

The *Revue contemporaine* was originally the official Decembrist publication in sharp contrast to the *Revue des deux Mondes*, which

^a Louis Jourdan's article "Les frontières naturelles".—*Ed.*

^b "To take Savoy ... in other words, we are closing our door".—*Ed.*

^c "Then we should have to look to our security, occupy the left bank of the Rhine, in other words, we should close our door".—*Ed.*

^d An allusion to the item "Autre correspondance. Paris, 27 avril" signed A. A., which appeared in *L'Indépendance belge*, No. 120, April 29, 1860.—*Ed.*

^e i.e. of Napoleon III.—*Ed.*

received contributions from the elegant writers, the men of the *Journal des Débats*, Orleanists, Fusionists, and above all professors of the *Collège de France* and members of the *Institut*.¹⁸¹ Since the latter could not be directly assigned to the *Revue contemporaine*, the attempt was made to detach them from the *Revue des deux Mondes* and so indirectly to force them to join the Decembrist *Revue*. However, the coup did not have much success. The proprietors of the *Revue contemporaine* even found it inexpedient to do business with the editorial committee foisted onto them by M. *La Guéronnière*. But since the ventriloquist of the Tuileries stood in need of mouthpieces tuned in various keys, the *Revue contemporaine* was then transformed into a *semi-official* magazine while the *Revue européenne* with the editorial committee imposed by *La Guéronnière* was installed as *official* review.

Now to **Monsieur Edouard Simon**, by nature a Rhine-Prussian Jew called *Eduard Simon*, who however cuts the most comical capers to pass himself off as an authentic Frenchman, while his style constantly betrays the fact that he is a Rhine-Prussian Jew translated into French.

Shortly after the Schiller festivities (November 1859) in the home of a London acquaintance I met a highly respectable businessman who had lived many years in Paris. He gave me a detailed account of the Parisian Schiller festivities, Schiller societies, etc. I interrupted him with a question about how German societies and meetings in Paris had managed to accommodate themselves to the Decembrist police. He replied with a humorous grin:

“Naturally, there is no meeting without a *mouchard*,^a nor any society without its *mouchard*. To avoid all complications we decided once and for all to adopt the simple tactic—*probatum est*^b—of attracting a *known spy* and voting him on to the committee from the start. And we always have **Edouard Simon** at our disposal, a man who might have been made for the job. You are aware that *La Guéronnière*, who was formerly Lamartine’s lackey and the manufacturer of long rigmaroles for Émile de Girardin, is now the Emperor’s favourite, his privy stylist and at the same time the supreme censor of the French press. Well, *Edouard Simon* is *La Guéronnière’s* lap-dog, and,” he added screwing up his nose, “he is a cur with a very unpleasant smell at that. *Edouard Simon* was unwilling to work *pour le roi de Prusse*,^c as I am sure you will find understandable, but decided that he would perform an incalculable service for civilisation and himself if he were to make common cause with the Decembrist system. He is a fellow with a small mind and a nasty character, but in the sphere of petty intrigue he is not without a certain ability. *La Guéronnière* installed his *Edouard Simon* in *La Patrie* to write some of the leading articles. This well illustrated the tact of the privy stylist. For the

^a Spy.—*Ed.*

^b It has been shown to work.—*Ed.*

^c For the King of Prussia, i.e. for nothing.—*Ed.*

proprietor of *La Patrie*, a banker called *Delamarre*, is an arrogant, headstrong, surly parvenu who cannot endure anyone around him who is not an utterly servile and pliable creature. So *Edouard Simon* was the right man for the position, since despite his poisonous malice, he can be as smooth as an angora cat. Under the republic *La Patrie* was, as you know, one of the most brazen mouthpieces of the *rue de Poitiers*.¹⁸² Since the December coup it has quarrelled with *Le Pays* and *Le Constitutionnel* for the honour of being recognised as the semi-official organ of the Tuileries and ever since the signal was given it has gone in for the annexation-fever in a big way. You know of those beggars who pretend to have epileptic attacks on the street so as to swindle passers-by of a few coppers. It was indeed an honour to *La Patrie* that it was allowed to be the first to announce the imminent annexation of Savoy and Nice. Scarcely had the annexation taken place when it enlarged its format, for, as M. Delamarre naively declared: 'La Savoie et le Comté de Nice ayant été annexés à la France, la conséquence naturelle est *l'agrandissement de la Patrie*.'^a Who is not put in mind of the witticism of a Parisian cynic who when asked 'Qu'est-ce que la patrie?' replied 'Journal du soir'.^b If moreover the Rhine provinces were annexed, what an increase there would be then in *La Patrie* and its format and in the *salaires* of *Edouard Simon*! As far as economic policy is concerned *La Patrie* believes that the salvation of France is to be achieved by abolishing the *tourniquet de la Bourse*,^c as a result of which business on the Exchange and hence throughout the land would again soar to the desired level. *Edouard Simon* is equally enthusiastic about the abolition of the *tourniquet de la Bourse*. However, our *Edouard Simon* is not only a writer of leading articles for *La Patrie* and La Guéronnière's lap-dog. He is the most sincere friend and informer of the new *Jerusalem*, alias the Prefecture of Police, and of M. *Palestrina* in particular. In short, gentlemen," the narrator concluded, "a committee with M. **Edouard Simon** in its bosom is by that very fact in the very best *police odour*."

And Herr ... gave a curiously shrill laugh as if there were a further ineffably secret connection between Monsieur *Edouard Simon* and the *odeur de mauvais lieu*.^d

Mr. *Kinglake* has drawn the attention of the House of Commons to the pleasant confusion of foreign policy, the police and the press, so characteristic of the Decembrist agents (session of the House of Commons, July 12, 1860).^e Of course, **Monsieur Edouard Simon**—Vogt's infamous^f *Eduard* is not to be confused with Vogt's gentle *Kunigunde*, alias *Ludwig Simon of Trier**—**Monsieur Edouard Simon**, La Guéronnière's lap-dog, Delamarre's

* Thanks to the intervention of the gentle *Kunigunde* some of Vogt's attacks against me were inserted in a local sheet in my home town of Trier. They included

^a "Savoy and the county of Nice having been annexed by France, the natural consequence is the *enlargement of the Patrie*" (*Patrie* can mean both "motherland" and the title of the newspaper).—*Ed.*

^b "What is the motherland?" "An evening paper."—*Ed.*

^c Whirligig of the Stock Exchange.—*Ed.*

^d The smell of a place of ill-repute.—*Ed.*

^e Mr. *Kinglake*'s speech was reported in *The Times*, No. 23671, July 13, 1860.—*Ed.*

^f Marx puns on the word *ruchbar* (notorious, infamous) which in this context can also mean "ill-smelling".—*Ed.*

poodle, Palestrina's spy^a and general dogsbody, clearly belongs if not to the cream at least to the Limburg cheese of the 10th December, to the Second Circle where

"s'annida
Ipocrisia, lusinghe, e chi affatura,
Falsità, ladroneccio, e *simonia*,
Ruffian, baratti, e simile lordura".^b

Many weeks before the publication of the "Magnum Opus" *Karl Vogt* had commissioned his *Edouard Simon* to review it in the French press. *Edouard Simon* opted for *double emploi*. First, he privately translated the "Magnum Opus" for M. *La Guéronnière* and in this connection his patron then assigned him to the *Revue contemporaine*. It was in vain that the editorial board of the *Revue contemporaine* humbly pleaded that if *Edouard Simon* were to appear in their columns it should at least be anonymously. *La Guéronnière* was inexorable. *Edouard Simon* made his debut in the *Revue contemporaine* of February 15, 1860 with an advertisement for his friend *Vogt* under the title: "*Un tableau de mœurs politiques de l'Allemagne. Le procès de M. Vogt avec la Gazette d'Augsbourg*" (Political Portrait of Germany. Herr Vogt's Action against the Augsburg Gazette), signed—**Edouard Simon**.

The "Romanic" *Edouard Simon* does not believe that "he needs to hurl invective at the noble German race in order to prove himself a good Frenchman" (*Revue contemporaine*, loc. cit., p. 531), but as a "good Frenchman" and a "Romanic by birth" he must at least exhibit his innate ignorance of German affairs. Thus among other statements he asserts of his *Karl Vogt*: "He was one of the *three Regents*^c of the short-lived Empire." * *Monsieur Edouard Simon*

references to my "carnal miscegenation" with the *Allgemeine*. What an association of ideas for the chaste *Kunigunde*! Very shocking indeed! [Marx wrote the last sentence in English. The reference is to an item published in the *Trier Volksblatt* on November 7, 1859. Marx mentions it also in a letter to Engels of November 19, 1859 (see present edition, Vol. 40).]

* "Il fut un des trois régents de l'empire éphémère" (loc. cit., p. 518).

^a Marx uses the word *Spitzel* which means "spy" but in this context also suggests "spitz".—*Ed.*

^b "Hypocrites, flatterers, dealers in sorcery.
Panders and cheats, and all such filthy stuff,
With theft, and *simony* and barratry
All have their nest."
(Dante, *The Divine Comedy*, Inferno, Canto XI, adapted.)—*Ed.*

^c Marx's italics.—*Ed.*

does not know of course that the Empire *in partibus*^a groaned under the rule of a *pentarchy*,^b and “as a Frenchman” he imagines that if only for the sake of symmetry there were three parliamentary Regents of the Empire in Stuttgart corresponding to the three wise kings of Cologne.¹⁸³ “Friend” *Vogt*’s jokes in the “Magnum Opus” “frequently go beyond the limits of French taste”.* *Edouard* the Frenchman will remedy this and will “strive to make a judicious selection”.** “Friend” *Vogt* has a natural liking for “garish colours” and “is not exactly subtle in his use of language”.*** Naturally! For “friend” *Vogt* is only a German who has been annexed, just as *Dâ-Dâ* is only an Arab who has been annexed, whereas *Edouard Simon* is a “good Frenchman” by birth and belongs to the “Romanic” race. Did *Herr Orges* and *Herr Dietzel* ever go so far in their slander of the “Romanic race”?

Monsieur Edouard Simon amuses his superiors by exhibiting one of the “three” wise German Rump-Kings to the Paris public, with the agreement, moreover, and on the instructions of that Holy German Rump-King, and parading him as a voluntary prisoner in the wake of the triumphal carriage of the Imperial *Quasimodo*. It is obvious, says *Edouard Simon*, after quoting from *Vogt*’s “Magnum Opus”,

“it is obvious that it did not matter to *Herr Vogt* from where help might come in favour of German unity, provided only that it did come; he even regarded the French Empire as particularly well fitted to hasten the realisation of the solution he favoured. Perhaps *Herr Vogt* abandoned his old antecedents **too cheaply** (?), and his former colleagues who had sat with him on the extreme Left of the Frankfurt Parliament must have been astonished to see this intransigent opponent of every unified power, this passionate zealot of anarchy, **display such lively sympathies for the sovereign who has subdued anarchy in France**”****

* “Il dépasserait le but au goût des Français” (loc. cit., p. 519).

** “Nous nous efforcerons de choisir” (loc. cit.).

*** “M. *Vogt* aime beaucoup les couleurs tranchantes, et il n’est pas précisément un gourmet en matière de langage” (loc. cit., p. 530).

**** “On le voit, M. *Vogt* se souciait peu d’où vint le secours en faveur de l’unité allemande, pourvu qu’il vint; l’empire français lui semblait même singulièrement propre à hâter le dénouement qu’il désire. Peut-être en cela M. *Vogt* faisait-il bon marché de ses antécédents, et il dut paraître étrange, à ses anciens collègues qui siégeaient avec lui à l’extrême gauche dans le Parlement de Francfort, de voir ce fougueux antagoniste de tout pouvoir unique, ce fervent zélateur de l’anarchie manifester de si vives sympathies envers le souverain qui l’a vaincue en France” (loc. cit., p. 518).

^a The words *in partibus infidelium* (in lands inhabited by infidels) were added to the title of Catholic bishops appointed to purely nominal dioceses in non-Catholic countries. Here *in partibus* means non-existent.—*Ed.*

^b Marx means the five Imperial Regents (*Franz Raveaux*, *Karl Vogt*, *Heinrich Simon*, *Friedrich Schüler* and *August Becher*).—*Ed.*

Edouard transfers the “fugitive Regent of the Empire” from the un-“committed” Left to the extreme Left of the Frankfurt Parliament. The man who voted in favour of “the hereditary German Emperor”¹⁸⁴ is transformed into an “intransigent opponent of every unified power”, and the member of the Central March Association who preached “order” at any price to the motley parties inhabiting the taverns of Frankfurt becomes a “passionate zealot of anarchy”. And all this to put the achievement of the 10th December in capturing the “fugitive Regent of the Empire” into its proper perspective. All the more precious are the “*lively sympathies*” which Herr Vogt “cherishes for the man who had subdued anarchy in France”, all the more valuable his present recognition “*that the French Empire is particularly well fitted to bring about the unity of Germany*”, and all the more comprehensible is “friend” Simon’s broad hint that “friend” Vogt “perhaps abandoned his antecedents *too cheaply (de bon marché)*”, i.e. the December man at any rate did not have to pay “*too dearly*”. And in order to remove every doubt that might have remained in higher places that “friend” Vogt might not be as utterly reliable as “friend” Simon, Monsieur Edouard Simon explains with a grin and a wink, rubbing his hands the while, that Vogt in his passion for order, “*if he has understood him rightly, has even notified the Genevan authorities of revolutionary intrigues*”^{*} that have come to his attention, just as Monsieur Edouard Simon “notified” Messrs. Palestrina and La Guéronnière.

It is common knowledge that About and Jourdan and Granier de Cassagnac and Boniface and Dr. Hoffmann, that the monks of *L’Espérance*, the knights of *Les Nationalités*, the bellows of *L’Opinion nationale*, the penny-a-liners^a of *L’Indépendance*, *The Morning Chronicle*, the *Nouvelliste Vaudois*, etc., that the La Guéronnières and the Simons, the stylists, civilisationists, Decembrists, Plon-Plonists, Dentuists and dentists one and all take their inspiration from one and the same illustrious—**money-box**. So we see that Dâ-Dâ Vogt is no solitary partisan fighting a lonely battle, but is subsidised, indoctrinated, enlisted, enrolled along with the *canaille*, bound up with Edouard Simon, annexed by Plon-Plon, and sticking to them through thick and thin. The remaining question is whether *Karl Vogt* has been *paid* for his agency?

* “Si nous l’avons bien compris, il a *même* appelé l’attention des *autorités* de Genève sur ces menées” (loc. cit., p. 529).

^a Marx uses the English expression.—*Ed.*

"If I am not mistaken, to bribe means to offer someone money or other advantages to perform actions or make utterances contrary to his own *convictions*" ("Magnum Opus", p. 217).

And Plon-Plonism is the sum of *Vogt's* convictions. So that even if he was *paid* in cash, he was by no means *bribed*. But the modes of payment are at least as various as the different forms of coinage.

Who knows whether Plon-Plon did not promise his Falstaff the post of governor of the Mouse Tower near the Binger Loch?¹⁸⁵ Or nomination as corresponding member of the *Institut*, now that About in his *La Prusse en 1860* has made French naturalists quarrel over the honour of corresponding *simultaneously* with the living *Vogt* and the dead *Dieffenbach*? Or perhaps he held out prospects of a restoration of his Regency of the Empire?

I know of course that current reports provide a more prosaic explanation. Thus it is said that "with the change of circumstances since 1859" there has been a change in the circumstances of our "agreeable companion"^a (who had shortly before been one of the managers of a joint-stock company which had run aground and became the subject of a criminal investigation¹⁸⁶). His anxious friends tried to explain away these developments by claiming that an Italian mining company had presented *Vogt* with a large number of shares in recognition of his contributions to "mineralogy", a gift which he had turned into cash during his first stay in Paris. People conversant with the situation but who do not know each other, have written to me almost simultaneously from Switzerland and France informing me that the "agreeable companion" had assumed the fairly profitable superintendence of an estate called "La Bergerie" near Nyon (in the Vaud). The estate is the widow's seat which Plon-Plon purchased for the Iphigenia of Turin.^b I have even seen a letter written by a "New Swiss" who was still on terms of intimacy with *Vogt* long after "the change in circumstances of 1859" to a "Mr. P. B. B. of 78 Fenchurch Street, London" early in 1860 in which he *mentions a very considerable sum of money* which his ex-friend had received from the treasury in Paris, not as a *bribe*, but as *payment in advance*.

Such items of news and worse have made their way to London,

^a Carl *Vogt*, "Zur Warnung", *Schweizer Handels-Courier*, No. 150 (special supplement), June 2, 1859.—*Ed.*

^b Princess Clothilde of Savoy, daughter of the Sardinian King Victor Emmanuel.—*Ed.*

but for my part I would not give a brass farthing for them. I rather believe *Vogt* implicitly, when he says that

“it is no one’s business where I” (*Vogt*) “get my money from. *I shall continue to try to obtain whatever resources are needed to achieve my political ends, and conscious that I am working for a good cause I shall continue to obtain them from wherever I can*” (“Magnum Opus”, p. 226) —

hence also from the Paris treasury.

Political ends!

“Nugaris, cum tibi, Calve,
Pinguis aqualiculus propenso sesquipede extet.”^a

Good cause! This is apparently the German idealistic expression for what the Englishman with his coarse materialism calls “the good things of this world”.^b

Whatever *Dr. Schaible* may think of it, why should we not believe *Vogt* implicitly, since in the same “Magnum Opus” he declares with equal seriousness at the end of his *tall stories* about the Brimstone Gang, etc.:

“That concludes this phase of **contemporary history**. *What I have described are no mere day-dreams; they are pure facts!*” (“Magnum Opus”, p. 182.)

Why shouldn’t his *agency* be just as *pure* as the **facts** recounted in the “Magnum Opus”?

For my part, I am firmly convinced that, in contrast to all the other writing, agitating, politicising, conspiring, propagandising, boasting, Plon-Plonising, plotting and self-compromising members of the *December Gang*, it is solely and exclusively the unique *Vogt* who regards his Emperor as “*l’homme qu’on aime pour lui-même*”.^c

“*Swerz niht geloubt, der sündet*”, as Wolfram von Eschenbach says,^d or “He errs who does not believe it”, as a contemporary song says.

^a “You’re drivelling, Calvus, with your
Fat little paunch protruding in front of you eighteen inches.”
(Persius, *Satires*, Book I, First Satire.)—*Ed.*

^b Marx uses the English phrase.—*Ed.*

^c “A man whom one loves for his own sake.”—*Ed.*

^d “He sins who does not believe it” (Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Parzival*, IX. Buch).—*Ed.*

X

PATRONS AND ACCOMPLICES

Principibus placuisse viris non ultima laus est.^a

As guarantors of his "good behaviour"^b the ex-Vogt of the Empire proposes

"Kossuth" and "the two other men—*Fazy*, the regenerator of Geneva, and *Klapka*, the defender of Komorn"¹⁸⁷—whom he "proudly calls his friends" ("Magnum Opus", p. 213).

I call them his *patrons*.

After the battle of Komorn (July 2, 1849) *Görgey* usurped the supreme command of the Hungarian army in defiance of the orders of the Hungarian Government, which had dismissed him.

"If an energetic man had stood at the head of the government," writes Colonel *Lapinski*, who was still a supporter of *Kossuth* when he wrote his book, "a stop could have been put to all of *Görgey's* intrigues even at that time. *Kossuth* needed only to come into the camp and say a few words to the army and all of *Görgey's* popularity would not have saved him from defeat.... But *Kossuth* did not come; he was not forceful enough to oppose *Görgey* in public and so while he intrigued against the general in secret, he attempted to justify the latter's misdemeanours in the eyes of the world." (Th. *Lapinski*, *Feldzug der Ungarischen Hauptarmee*, etc., pp. 125, 126).

On his own admission, *Kossuth* was officially informed of *Görgey's* intended betrayal some time later by General *Guyon* (see David *Urhart*, *Visit to the Hungarian Exiles at Kutayah*^c).

"It is true that *Kossuth* did say in the course of a fine speech in Szeged that if he knew that anyone was a traitor he would murder him with his own hands. He may have had *Görgey* in mind as he spoke. However, not only did he not carry out this somewhat theatrical threat, he did not even tell all his Ministers just whom he

^a To have pleased great men is not the greatest glory (Horace, *Epistles*, I, 17).—*Ed.*

^b Marx uses the English phrase.—*Ed.*

^c *Kütahya*.—*Ed.*

had under suspicion; while he *was busy forging miserable plans against Görgey with some of them, [...] he always spoke of him with the greatest respect and even wrote letters to him couched in the most amicable terms.* Others may understand him but I cannot understand how it was possible for him to realise that the salvation of the nation wholly depended on the fall of a dangerous man and yet to make no more than a tentative gesture to bring him down, while at the same time supporting him, winning new adherents and admirers to his cause by expressing his confidence in him, and thus placing all the power into his hands. While Kossuth vacillated *in this pusillanimous way*, working now for Görgey and now against him ... *Görgey, who was more consistent and resolute than Kossuth, put his evil plan into practice*" (Th. Lapinski, loc. cit., pp. 163, 164).

On August 11, 1849, on Görgey's orders, Kossuth issued a manifesto, ostensibly from the fortress of Arad, announcing his abdication and conferring on Görgey "supreme government authority in both military and civilian affairs". He went on to say:

"After the unfortunate outcome of the battles which *God has visited* upon the nation in recent days, *there is no longer any hope that we can continue our defensive struggle against the combined forces of the two great powers [...] with any prospect of success.*"^a

Having thus stated at the beginning of the manifesto that Hungary's cause was *irrevocably lost*, and moreover as a result of *Divine visitation*, Kossuth goes on to make Görgey "responsible *before God* for deploying the power" placed by Kossuth at his disposal "*for the salvation*" of Hungary. He trusted Görgey enough to deliver Hungary up to him, but too little to deliver up his own person to him. His personal distrust of Görgey was so intense that he contrived it so that the arrival of his deed of abdication in Görgey's hands coincided with his own arrival on Turkish soil. This is why he concludes his manifesto with the words:

"If my death can be of any use to my country, I shall sacrifice my own life with joy."

What he had sacrificed on the altar of his country, handing it over to Görgey, was the *government*, the *title* to which however he at once usurped again under Turkish protection.

In Kütahya His Excellency, the Governor *in partibus*, received a copy of the first Blue Book on the Hungarian catastrophe laid before Parliament by Palmerston.^b As he wrote to David Urquhart, the study of these diplomatic documents convinced him that "*Russia had a spy, nay an agent even, in every Cabinet*" and that *in the*

^a Lajos Kossuth, "An die Nation! Festung Arad am 11. August 1849". Quoted in Theophil Lapinski's *Feldzug der Ungarischen Hauptarmee...* Hamburg, 1850, S. 175.—Ed.

^b *Correspondence relative to the Affairs of Hungary, 1847-1849. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.* August 15, 1850, London.—Ed.

Russian interest Palmerston had betrayed dear Hungary.^a* And the first words that fell from his lips when he stepped onto English soil in Southampton were: "Palmerston, the dear friend of my bosom!"^b

After he was freed from internment in Turkey Kossuth sailed to England. Off the coast of Marseilles, where he was forbidden to land, he issued a manifesto whose tenor and phraseology were those of French social democracy.^c Having set foot on English soil he at once *repudiated*

"that *novel doctrine*, social democracy, which rightly or wrongly is held to be incompatible with social order and the security of property. Hungary neither has nor wishes to have anything to do with these doctrines, if only for the extremely simple reason that in Hungary there is no opportunity nor even the slightest inducement for them to be introduced."^d (Cf. the letter from Marseilles.)

During the first two weeks of his stay in England he changed his confession of faith as frequently as his audience—he was all things to all men. Count *Kasimir Batthyány* gave this explanation of his public breach with Kossuth which took place at this time:

"It is not just the *tévénes*^e that Kossuth has committed in the first two weeks since his release that have induced me to take this step, but all my experience of him, everything I have seen, suffered, allowed, endured, and, as you will recall, disguised and concealed, at first in Hungary and then in exile,—in short it is a matter of the opinion I have formed about the man.... Permit me to remark that whatever Mr. Kossuth has said or may say in Southampton, Wisbech or London, in England, in short, cannot undo what he said in Marseilles. In the land of the 'young giant' (America) "he will again sing a different tune, for just as he is unscrupulous^f in other matters and bends like a reed beneath any gust of wind, so too does he gainsay his own words *sans gêne*,^g and does not hesitate to hide behind

* Kossuth did not understand then how Palmerston's feigned hostility to Russia "could" deceive anyone of ordinary intelligence. "*How could a man of any intellect for a single moment believe that the Minister who allowed Russia's intervention in Hungary, would give the word of attack against her?*" (Letter dated Kutayah, December 17, 1850. *Correspondence of Kossuth*.)

^a Marx uses the English phrase "dear Hungary".—*Ed.*

^b Marx quotes this sentence in English and gives its German equivalent in brackets.—*Ed.*

^c Lajos Kossuth, "An die Marseiller Demokratie" [Bord des Mississippi, 29. September 1851], quoted in Gustav von Alvensleben's *L. Kossuth nach der Capitulation von Vilagos*, Weimar, 1852, S. 65-66.—*Ed.*

^d From Kossuth's speech at a workers' meeting at Copenhagen House. Quoted in *Authentic Life of His Excellency Louis Kossuth...*, London, 1851, p. 76.—*Ed.*

^e Blunders.—*Ed.*

^f Marx gives the English words "unscrupulous" and, further on in the text, "a most undeserving heart" in brackets after their German equivalents.—*Ed.*

^g Without the slightest embarrassment.—*Ed.*

the great names of men now dead whom he has ruined, such as my poor cousin, Louis Batthyány.... I do not hesitate to declare that before Kossuth leaves England you will have good reason to regret the honours you have squandered on a most undeserving heart" (*Correspondence of Kossuth*, letter of Count Batthyány to Mr. Urquhart, Paris, October 29, 1851).

Kossuth's performance in the United States, where he spoke *against* slavery in the North and *for* slavery in the South, left behind nothing but a great sense of disappointment and 300 dead speeches. Bringing the curtain down hastily on this peculiar episode, I would only remark that he strongly recommended the *Germans* in the *United States*, and in particular the *German emigration*, to conclude an alliance between Germany, Hungary and Italy, to the *exclusion of France* (and not just the coup d'état government, but France itself, and even the French emigration together with the parties in France represented by it). No sooner had he returned to London than he attempted *to establish relations with Louis Bonaparte* through the agency of Count Szirmay, a dubious character, and through Colonel Kiss in Paris (see my letter in the *New-York Tribune* of *September 28, 1852* and my public declaration in the same paper on November 16, 1852^a).

During the Mazzini rising in Milan in 1853¹⁸⁸ a proclamation appeared on the walls of the town addressed to the Hungarian troops stationed there and calling on them to join the Italian insurgents.^b It bore the signature: *Louis Kossuth*. Scarcely had the news of the defeat of the insurgents reached London when Kossuth hastened to publish a statement in *The Times*^c and other English papers, declaring the proclamation to be a *forgery* and thereby publicly contradicting his friend Mazzini. The proclamation was nevertheless *authentic*. Mazzini had obtained it from Kossuth, he owned the original manuscript in Kossuth's handwriting and he had acted in concert with Kossuth. Convinced that Austrian despotism in Italy could only be overthrown by the united action of Italy and Hungary, Mazzini then first tried to replace Kossuth with a more reliable Hungarian leader, but after this attempt had failed because of the divisions within the Hungarian emigration, he forgave his unreliable ally and mag-

^a Karl Marx, "Movements of Mazzini and Kossuth.—League with Louis Napoleon.—Palmerston" and "Kossuth, Mazzini, and Louis Napoleon. To the Editor of *The N. Y. Tribune*, London, November 16, 1852" (see present edition, Vol. 11).—*Ed.*

^b L. Kossuth, "In the Name of the Hungarian Nation. To the Soldiers Quartered in Italy, February 1853", *The Times*, No. 21348, February 10, 1853.—*Ed.*

^c "Italy. The 'Voce della Verita!'", *The Times*, No. 21366, March 3, 1853.—*Ed.*

unanimously abstained from an exposure which was bound to destroy Kossuth's reputation in England.

The same year, 1853, it will be remembered, saw the beginning of the Russo-Turkish war. On December 17, 1850 Kossuth had written to David Urquhart from Kütahya:

"Take away the Turkish supremacy from Turkey and it will cease to be. And after all, as matters stand, *Turkey is indispensably necessary to the freedom of the world.*"^a

His enthusiasm for the Turks was even greater in a letter he wrote to the Grand Vizier *Reshid Pasha* on February 15, 1851. In extravagant phrases he offered his services to the Turkish Government. On January 22, 1852, during his tour of the *United States*, he wrote to *David Urquhart*:

"Would you feel inclined, knowing how much the interests of Hungary and Turkey were identical, to plead my cause at Constantinople? The Porte did not know who I am when I was there. My reception in England and America, and the position in which the chances of fortune, and I may say Providence, have placed me, could show the Porte that I am a true friend, and perhaps a not unimportant one, of Turkey and her future."

On November 5, 1853 he wrote to Mr. *Crawshay* (an Urquhartist), offering to go to Constantinople as an ally of Turkey, but "not with empty hands",^b and therefore asked Mr. Crawshay to raise funds

"by private applications addressed confidentially to such liberal men as might well afford the assistance he required".

In this letter he says: "I hate and despise the artifice of making revolutions." At the same time as he was penning letters to the Urquhartists that overflowed with hatred of revolutions and love for the Turks, he issued manifestos together with Mazzini which proclaimed the expulsion of the Turks from Europe and the transformation of Turkey into an "oriental Switzerland", and also signed the exhortations to revolution in general put out by the so-called Central Committee of European Democracy.¹⁸⁹

Since as early as the end of 1853 Kossuth had aimlessly squandered the money he had collected in America in 1852 by his speechifying in the name of Hungary, and since moreover his plea to Mr. Crawshay fell on deaf ears, the Governor abandoned his intended chivalrous journey to Constantinople, but instead he sent

^a Here and below Marx quotes from the article "Data by Which to Judge of Kossuth", *The Free Press*, No. 5, May 27, 1859. The italics are in the article.—*Ed.*

^b Marx gives the English words "not with empty hands" and, below, "I hate and despise the artifice of making revolutions" in brackets after their German equivalents.—*Ed.*

his agent, Colonel *Johann Bangya*, supplying him with the best possible recommendations.*

* I myself had made the acquaintance of *Bangya* in London in 1850, together with his friend at the time, the present *General Türr*. His underhand dealings with parties of every complexion, Orleanists, Bonapartists, etc., and his association with policemen of every "nationality" made me suspect him, but he dispelled my suspicions quite simply by showing me a document in *Kossuth's* own hand in which he (who had formerly been provisional chief commissioner of the police in Komorn^a under *Klapka*) was appointed chief commissioner of the police *in partibus*. As a secret chief of police in the service of the revolution he naturally had to keep in "touch" with police in the service of the governments. In the course of the summer of 1852 I discovered that he had appropriated a manuscript^b I had asked him to convey to a bookseller in Berlin and steered it into the hands of a German government. After I had written to a Hungarian in Paris^c describing this incident and a number of other striking peculiarities of the man's, and after the *Bangya* mystery had been completely cleared up thanks to the intervention of a third person well informed in the matter,^d I sent an open denunciation, signed by myself, to the *New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung* early in 1853.^e In a letter, still in my possession, in which he attempted to justify his actions, *Bangya* emphasised that I had less reason than anyone to regard him as a spy, since he had always (and this was perfectly true) avoided discussing with me the affairs of my own party. Although *Kossuth* and his supporters did not drop *Bangya* at the time, my revelations in the *Criminal-Zeitung* made it nevertheless difficult for him to continue operating in London and so he was all the more ready to grasp the opportunity provided by the troubles in the Orient of employing his talents in another setting. Soon after the conclusion of the Peace of Paris in 1856 I saw from the English newspapers that a certain *Mehemed Bey*, a colonel in the Turkish service, formerly a Christian known under the name of *Johann Bangya*, had sailed from Constantinople to Circassia, in the company of some Polish refugees, and that once there he figured as *Sepher Pasha's* Chief of the General Staff, and as what might be termed the "Simon Bolivar" of the Circassians. In the columns of the London *Free Press*, of which many copies are sent to Constantinople, I drew attention to the liberator's past.^f On January 20, 1858 *Bangya* was, as is mentioned in the text, sentenced to death in *Aderbi* by a military tribunal of the Polish Legion under the command of Colonel *Th. Lapinski* for plotting treason against Circassia. As *Bangya* was a Turkish colonel, *Sepher Pasha* decided that execution of the sentence was incompatible with the respect due to the Sublime Porte and therefore shipped the condemned man to *Trebizond* from where he soon returned to Constantinople, a free man. In the meantime the Hungarian emigration in Constantinople had enthusiastically taken up his cause against the Poles. Shielded from the *Divan* (which, since he was a "colonel", had moreover to feed both him and his harem) by the protection of the Russian Embassy, and from the Poles by

^a Komárom.—*Ed.*

^b The pamphlet *The Great Men of the Exile* by Marx and Engels (see present edition, Vol. 11).—*Ed.*

^c Gustav Zerfy (see Marx's letter to him of December 28, 1852, present edition, Vol. 39).—*Ed.*

^d Bartholomäus Szemere.—*Ed.*

^e See Karl Marx, "Hirsch's Confession" (present edition, Vol. 12).—*Ed.*

^f Karl Marx, "A Traitor in Circassia", *The Free Press*, No. 34, April 1, 1857.—*Ed.*

A military tribunal held in Aderbi in Circassia on *January 20, 1858* unanimously passed a sentence of death on "*Mehemed Bey, formerly Johann Bangya d'Illosfalva, who on his own admission and on the evidence of witnesses had been found guilty of high treason and conducting a secret correspondence with the enemy*" (the Russian general Philipson).^d However, this did not prevent him from living peacefully in Constantinople to this very day. In a handwritten confession submitted to the tribunal, *Bangya* said *inter alia*.

"My political action was entirely dictated by the chief of my country, *Louis Kossuth*.... Provided with letters of introduction from my political chief, I came to Constantinople on the 22nd December, 1853."^e

He goes on to describe how he became a Moslem and entered the Turkish service with the rank of colonel.

"My instructions" (from Kossuth) "insisted that I should get attached in some way or other to troops which were to take part in operations on the Circassian coast."

His task there was to prevent the Circassians from taking any part in the war against Russia. He carried out his mission successfully and towards the close of the war he sent "Kossuth a detailed account of the situation in Circassia" from Constantinople. Before his second expedition to Circassia, which he undertook together with the Poles, he received an order from Kossuth to collaborate with certain Hungarians, among whom was General Stein (Ferhad Pasha).

the prejudices of his fellow-countrymen, *Bangya* coolly proceeded to publish a self-apologia in the *Journal de Constantinople*. However, a Circassian deputation arrived presently and this put an end to his games. The Hungarian emigration officially dropped their favourite, though *de très mauvaise grâce*.^a All the papers relating to the military tribunal in Aderbi, including *Bangya's* own confession of guilt, and all the documents produced later in Constantinople were sent on to London by the Polish emigration, and once there they were published in extracts in *The Free Press* (May 1858).^b The documents were also published more extensively by me in the *New-York [Daily] Tribune* on June 16, 1858.^c

^a With great reluctance.—*Ed.*

^b "Extract from the Minutes of the Council of War, held at Aderbi...", *The Free Press*, No. 16, May 12, 1858.—*Ed.*

^c See "A Curious Piece of History", *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5352.—*Ed.*

^d "Sentence. January 20, 1858", *The Free Press*, No. 16, May 12, 1858.—*Ed.*

^e Here and below Marx quotes from "Confession of *Bangya* before the Council of War", *ibid.*—*Ed.*

"Captain Franchini," he says, "military secretary to the Russian Ambassador,^a was present at several of our conferences. The object was to win over Circassia to Russian interests in a peaceable, slow, but sure manner. [...] Before the expedition set out from Constantinople" (mid-February 1857), "I received letters and instructions from Kossuth approving my plan of operations."

Bangya's treachery came to light in Circassia when a letter to Philippon, the Russian general, was intercepted.

"In conformity with my instructions," Bangya says, "I was to get in touch with the Russian general. For a long time I could not make up my mind to do this, but at last I received orders so precise that it was impossible for me to hesitate any longer."

The proceedings of the military tribunal in Aderbi and especially *Bangya's confession* made a great sensation in Constantinople, London and New York. Kossuth was repeatedly and urgently pressed, even from the Hungarian side, to make a public statement, but to no avail. To this day he has maintained timorous silence on Bangya's mission in Circassia.

In the autumn of 1858 Kossuth was busy hawking around England and Scotland moderately priced lectures in which he denounced the Austrian concordat¹⁹⁰ and Louis Bonaparte. The passionate fanaticism with which he warned the English to beware of the treacherous designs of Louis Bonaparte, whom he described as the secret ally of Russia, can be seen, e.g., from *The Glasgow Sentinel* of November 20, 1858.^b When Louis Bonaparte revealed his Italian plans early in 1859, Kossuth denounced him in *Mazzini's Pensiero ed Azione* and warned "all true republicans", Italians, Hungarians and even Germans, to beware of allowing themselves to be used as a cat's-paw by the Imperial Quasimodo. In February 1859 Kossuth ascertained that Colonel Kiss, Count Teleki and General Klapka, all of whom had long since belonged to the red camarilla of the Palais Royal, were hatching a conspiracy with Plon-Plon to provoke an uprising in Hungary. Kossuth now threatened a public polemic in the English press unless he too were admitted to the "secret league". Plon-Plon was more than willing to open the doors of the conclave to him. Travelling under the name of Mr. Brown and furnished with an English passport, Kossuth went to Paris in the beginning of May. He hastened to the Palais Royal and expounded his plans for a Hungarian uprising to Plon-Plon at great length.¹⁹¹ On the evening of May 3 the Prince Rouge accompanied the ex-Governor to the Tuileries in his own carriage, to present him there to the saviour of society. Throughout the meeting with Louis

^a Apollinary Petrovich Butenev.—*Ed.*

^b This refers to the article "Louis Kossuth and Panslavism".—*Ed.*

Bonaparte, words failed the normally so eloquent speaker, so that Plon-Plon had to act as spokesman and present Kossuth's programme to his cousin. Kossuth later praised the almost literal accuracy of Plon-Plon's rendering. Having listened attentively to his cousin's exposition, Louis Bonaparte declared that there was only one obstacle preventing him from adopting Kossuth's proposals, and this was Kossuth's republican convictions and republican connections. Thereupon the ex-Governor solemnly abjured his republican faith, protesting that he neither was a republican now, nor had he ever been one, but that political necessity alone and a strange concatenation of circumstances had forced him into an alliance with the republican party of the European emigration. As proof of his anti-republicanism he offered Plon-Plon the Hungarian crown in the name of his country. At that time, this crown had not yet been abolished. Moreover, Kossuth was not officially authorised to auction it, but everyone who has followed his appearances abroad with any attention will have observed that he had long been accustomed to speak of his "dear Hungary"^a much as a backwoods squire will speak of his estate.*

I take his repudiation of republicanism to be sincere. A civil list of 300,000 florins, claimed in Pest to maintain the dignity of the executive; the transfer of the patronage of the hospitals from an Austrian Archduchess^b to his sister^c; the attempt to christen a number of regiments with the name of Kossuth; his efforts to form a camarilla; the stubbornness with which he clung to the title of governor when abroad, a title which he had renounced in the moment of danger; his entire subsequent behaviour, much more that of a pretender than a refugee—all that points to tendencies alien to republicanism.

After his formal cleaning of the suspicion of republicanism, an agreement was reached placing 3 million francs at Mr. Kossuth's disposal. There was nothing objectionable about this clause in itself since money was needed to finance the military organisation of the Hungarian refugees, and why should the Governor be denied the same right to receive subsidies from his new ally as had

* That such matters come to light appears less strange if it is borne in mind that at least two loquacious parties were involved here. Incidentally, English papers reported these facts during Kossuth's stay in London (in the late summer of 1859).

^a Marx uses the English expression.— *Ed.*

^b Maria Theresa.— *Ed.*

^c Zsuzsánna Meszlenyi.— *Ed.*

been enjoyed by all the despotic powers of Europe who had been subsidised by England throughout the anti-Jacobin war? Kossuth was given 50,000 francs^a on the spot as an advance on his personal expenses and he secured certain other pecuniary advantages, a sort of insurance premium, in the event of the premature end to the war. Financial flair and melodramatic emotions are by no means mutually exclusive. After all, as his ex-Finance Minister, Dušek, must be aware, even during the Hungarian revolution Kossuth had taken the precaution of receiving his salary not in Kossuth-notes but in silver or in Austrian banknotes.

Before Kossuth left the Tuileries it was agreed that he should undertake to neutralise the alleged "Austrian tendencies" of the Derby Ministry by launching a neutrality campaign in England. It is known how the voluntary support of the Whigs and the Manchester School enabled him to carry out this initial part of the agreement with the greatest success. A lecturing tour from the Mansion House in London to the Free Trade Hall in Manchester formed an antithesis to the Anglo-Scottish tour of autumn 1858 when he hawked his hatred of Bonaparte and Cherbourg, "the standing menace to England",^b at a shilling per head.

The larger part of the Hungarian emigration in Europe had withdrawn its support for Kossuth since the end of 1852. The prospect of an invasion of the Adriatic coast with French assistance brought the majority back to his flag. His negotiations with the military sector of his new-found supporters were not without a certain Decembrist flavour. In order to be in a position to assign a larger amount of French money to them he advanced them to higher military rank, lieutenants, for instance, were promoted to major. To begin with each man received travelling expenses to Turin, then a lavish sum for a uniform (the cost of a major's outfit amounted to £150), and finally six months' advance of salary with the promise of one year's retirement pay after the conclusion of peace. The salaries themselves were not unduly high: 10,000 francs^c for the supreme general (Klapka), 6,000 francs for the generals, 5,000 for the brigadiers, 4,000 for the lieutenant-colonels, 3,000 for the majors, and so on. The Hungarian forces assembled in Turin consisted almost entirely of officers without

^a *The Free Press* of September 28, 1859 ("Particulars of Kossuth's Transaction with Louis Napoleon"), and the *New-York Daily Tribune* of September 24, 1859 ("Kossuth and Louis Napoleon") have: "75,000 francs".—*Ed.*

^b Marx uses the English phrases "lecturing tour" and "the standing menace to England".—*Ed.*

^c *The Free Press* of September 28, 1859 has: "12,000 francs".—*Ed.*

the rank and file, and I have heard many bitter words about this from the "lesser" Hungarian emigration.

General Moritz Perczel, as has already been mentioned, resigned publicly as soon as he had seen through the diplomatic game. Despite Louis Bonaparte's order to the contrary, *Klapka* insisted on a landing near Fiume, but *Kossuth* made sure that the Hungarian refugee corps stayed within the theatrical limits laid down by the director of the troupe.

The rumours of the peace signed at Villafranca had hardly arrived in Turin when Kossuth, terrified of being handed over to the Austrians, took to his heels and escaped to Geneva, secretly, behind the back of the military forces at his disposal. At the time neither the name of Francis Joseph, nor that of Louis Bonaparte, stood in such bad odour in the Hungarian camp in Turin as that of Louis Kossuth, but for the fact that the comic side of his latest escapade somewhat overshadowed all criticism. On his return Kossuth published in London a letter to his tame elephant, a certain McAdam in Glasgow,^a declaring himself to be disillusioned, but not cheated and closing with the emotional statement that he had nowhere to lay his head and that therefore all letters for him should be sent to his friend F. Pulszky who had offered shelter to the refugee. The more than Anglo-Saxon gruffness with which the London press intimated to Kossuth that he should use the Bonapartist subsidies to rent himself a house in London convinced him that for the time being his role in London was at an end.

Apart from his talent as an orator Kossuth also possesses the great gift of silence as soon as the audience shows definite signs of displeasure or he finds himself at a loss for words by which to justify himself. Like the sun he knows all about eclipses. That he was capable of consistency at least once in his life was demonstrated by his recent letter to Garibaldi in which he warned him not to make an attack on Rome lest he offend the Emperor of the French, "the only support of the oppressed nationalities".^b

Just as, in the first half of the eighteenth century, Alberoni was known as the colossal cardinal, so we may think of Kossuth as a colossal *Langenschwarz*. He is essentially an improviser who is

^a Passages from the letter were quoted in a leading article in *The Times*, No. 23428, October 4, 1859. A statement by McAdam to the effect that Kossuth's letter was a private one was published in *The Times*, No. 23431, October 7. Marx mentioned the fact in a letter to Bartholomäus Szemere on October 8 (see present edition, Vol. 40).—*Ed.*

^b Cf. Kossuth's letter to Garibaldi, Turin, September 14, in L. Kossuth, *Meine Schriften aus der Emigration*, Bd. III, S. 24.—*Ed.*

moulded by the impressions he receives from the audience facing him at a given moment, not an author who stamps his original ideas on the world. Like Blondin on his rope, Kossuth dances on his tongue. Cut off from the mood of his people he was bound to lapse into mere virtuosity and the vices of the virtuoso. The insubstantiality of thought characteristic of the improviser is inevitably reflected in the ambivalence of his actions. If Kossuth was once the Aeolian harp through which the hurricane of the people reverberated, he is now merely the Dionysian ear which echoes in a murmur the whisperings in the mysterious apartments of the Palais Royal and the Tuileries.

It would be quite unjust to place *General Klapka*, Vogt's second patron, on the same level as Kossuth. Klapka was one of the best Hungarian revolutionary generals. Like the majority of officers who gathered in Turin in 1859 he regards Louis Bonaparte much as Franz Rákóczy regarded Louis XIV. In their eyes Louis Bonaparte represents France's military power, a power which might serve Hungary but which, if only on geographical grounds, could never endanger it.* But why does Vogt appeal to the authority of Klapka? Klapka has never made a secret of the fact that he belongs to Plon-Plon's red camarilla. So that "friend" Klapka can vouch for "friend" Vogt? Klapka has shown no great talent in the selection of his friends. One of his closest friends in Komorn was Colonel *Assermann*. Let us hear about this Colonel Assermann from Colonel *Lapinski*, who served under Klapka up to the surrender of Komorn and who subsequently distinguished himself in Circassia fighting against the Russians.

* Although I can understand how Klapka can entertain such views, it is astonishing to find similar ones in the above-quoted work of Szemere's^a and I have frankly told him what I think of it in this respect.^b I find it even harder to understand his latest statement about the Austrian concession.¹⁹² I am aware that Szemere does not allow private considerations to influence his decisions on public affairs and that he had very important reasons for declaring that with the concessions granted by Vienna, the Hungarians could take all they wanted in Pest; that any Hungarian insurrection from abroad, especially with the aid of the French, would necessarily provoke Russian intervention in Hungary, whether for or against Austria; and finally, that the autonomy granted to Transylvania, Slavonia and Croatia, as well as to the Voivodina, would at this particular moment ensure that the Vienna Cabinet had the loyalty of these "nationalities" against the Magyars just as it did in 1848-49. All that is true enough, but could have been said without appearing to recognise the Hungarian Constitution "in usum delphini"¹⁹³ in the mutilated Viennese edition.

^a This refers to Bartholomäus Szemere's pamphlet *Hungary, from 1848 to 1860*, London, 1860.—*Ed.*

^b Marx to Szemere, June 2, 1860 (see present edition, Vol. 41).—*Ed.*

“The betrayal at Világos,”¹⁹⁴ Lapinski says, “threw the numerous and idle staff officers in Komorn into a state of great terror.... The scented gentlemen with golden collars, many of whom were able neither to hold a rifle nor to command three men, were full of fear running about in confusion and devising plans to save their own skins at any price. These men, who had managed on one pretext or another to leave the main army and withdraw to the cosy safety of the impregnable fortress, without having to perform any labour over and above putting their signature to a receipt once a month acknowledging that their salaries were correct and in order, were terrified by the thought that they were now faced with a life-and-death struggle.... It was these wretches who conjured up dreadful visions of internal unrest, mutiny, etc., in order to make the general surrender the fortress as quickly as possible [...] if they could only save themselves and their property. The latter was of special concern to many of them, for all their endeavours throughout the revolution had been concentrated on enriching themselves, and a number had succeeded. Some individuals managed to enrich themselves quite easily for often half a year would pass before it was necessary to give an account of the funds they had received. Since this was a situation which favoured treachery and fraud many people may have dipped their hands more deeply into the cash-box than they could have justified.... The armistice had been concluded: how was it used? From the supplies in the fortress, which would have lasted a year, unnecessarily large rations were distributed among the villages, while no provisions were brought in from the surrounding area; even the hay and oats which the peasants in the nearby villages wanted to sell was left lying there so that a few weeks later the Cossacks' horses devoured the property of the peasants while we in the fortress complained about the lack of supplies. The cattle in the fortress were for the most part sold off outside the town on the pretext that there was a shortage of fodder. Colonel Assermann presumably did not know that meat can be pickled. A large part of the grain was also sold off on the grounds that it was going mouldy; this was done openly, and even more such things were done secretly. With such a man as Assermann at his side and with a number of similar individuals in his entourage Klapka had of course quickly to abandon every good idea that came into his head; those gentlemen took good care of that...” (Lapinski, loc. cit., pp. 202-06).^a

The memoirs of both Görgey and Klapka^b provide no less eloquent testimony to Klapka's lack of character and political understanding. All the errors he committed during the defence of Komorn stem from this defect.

“If Klapka with his knowledge and patriotism *also had a firm will of his own*, and if he had acted in accordance with opinions he had formed himself, rather than with those *suggested* to him by fools and cowards, the defence of Komorn would sparkle in the annals of history like a meteor” (loc. cit., p. 209).

On August 3, Klapka had gained a brilliant victory over the besieging Austrian corps at Komorn, he had scattered it and put it out of action for some time. He followed this up by taking Raab^c

^a Theophil Lapinski, *Feldzug der Ungarischen Hauptarmee im Jahre 1849.*—Ed.

^b Arthur Görgey's *Mein Leben und Wirken in Ungarn in den Jahren 1848 und 1849*, Bd. 1-2, Leipzig, 1852, and *Memoiren von Georg Klapka. April bis October 1849*, Leipzig, 1850.—Ed.

^c Now Győr.—Ed.

and could easily take Vienna as well, but for eight days remained irresolute and inactive at Raab and then returned to Komorn where he was met by the news of Görgey's surrender and found a letter from the latter awaiting him. The enemy requested an armistice so that the scattered besieging corps of the Austrians and the Russians advancing from Rima Szombat^a could be concentrated near Komorn and invest the fortress at their leisure. Instead of attacking and defeating the enemy formations piecemeal before they could join up, Klapka again vacillated irresolutely, but rejected the request of the Austrian and Russian spokesmen for an armistice. At that moment, says Lapinski,

"an adjutant of the Emperor Nicholas arrived in Komorn on August 22.... But, said the Russian Mephisto in honeyed tones, *surely you will grant us a two weeks' armistice, General. It is His Majesty, my gracious Emperor, who is asking you!* This worked like a quick poison. Where the efforts of the Austrian spokesmen and the arguments of the Russian negotiators had failed, this cunning Russian emissary succeeded with a few brief words. *Klapka* could not resist the subtle compliment and signed an armistice for 14 days. The fall of Komorn dates from this act".^b

Klapka allowed the armistice to be used by *Colonel Assermann*, as we have already mentioned, to disperse *in two weeks* the *provisions* of the fortress, *which would have lasted a whole year*. At the end of the armistice Grabbe invested Komorn from the Vag, while the Austrians, whose forces had gradually grown to 40,000 men, camped on the right bank of the Danube. The inactive life behind the walls and fortifications demoralised the troops inside Komorn. *Klapka* did not launch a single attack on the Russian besieging corps, which had seen no action yet and was only 19,000 strong. The enemy's preparations for the siege were not disturbed for an instant. In fact, from the moment he had signed the armistice, *Klapka* prepared everything not for defence but for capitulation. The only energy he showed was of an inquisitorial nature and was directed at the upright officers who were opposed to capitulation.

"In the end," *Lapinski* says, "it became dangerous to say anything about the Austrians if one wished to avoid arrest."

Finally, on September 27, the capitulation was signed.

"In view of the power, of the desperate situation of the nation, which had put its last hopes in Komorn," *Lapinski* says, "in view of the situation in Europe and the impotence of Austria, which would have made the greatest sacrifices for the sake of Komorn, *the surrender conditions were as wretched as could be imagined.*"^c

^a Rimavska Sobota.—*Ed.*

^b Theophil Lapinski, op. cit., S. 201-02.—*Ed.*

^c *Ibid.*, S. 230.—*Ed.*

They “were just sufficient to enable us to escape quickly from Komorn over the frontier”, but they did not contain the slightest guarantee either for Hungary or even for the revolutionary generals in the hands of the Austrians. Moreover, they were drawn up in great haste and were so imprecise and ambiguous that it was easy for Haynau to violate them later on.

So much for *Klapka*. If Vogt is lacking in “character”, Klapka is the last man to make good the deficiency.

Vogt’s third patron is “*James Fazy*, the regenerator of Geneva”,^a as he is described by Vogt, his court jester. The following letters, written by *Johann Philipp Becker*^b to the addressee of his letter reproduced earlier,^c contain a portrait of Fazy which is so apt that any additional comment will only spoil it. I would make only one preliminary remark. The most nauseating feature of Vogt’s so-called *Studien* is the hypocritical show of Lutheran and even Calvinist horror of the “*ultramontane party*”.¹⁹⁵ Thus, for example, he confronts Germany with the absurd alternative of either giving Louis Bonaparte a free hand or submitting to the domination of the Austrian concordat, and “verily we should rather prefer to undergo a second period of national humiliation” (*Studien*, p. 52). In the nasal tones of the puritan he fumes about

“the ultramontane party, the sworn enemy of humanity, this monster that is attacking its very core” (loc. cit., p. 120).^d

He has of course never heard of the fact which even Dupin Aîné revealed in the Decembrist Senate, that

“under Louis Bonaparte’s régime the congregations, associations and foundations of all kinds directly subject to the Order of Jesuits have become more numerous than they were under the *ancien régime*, and that all the state regulations which restricted the ultramontane organs of propaganda even before 1789 have been systematically dismantled by Decembrist legislation and administration”.

But Vogt must at any rate know that the rule of his local Bonaparte, M. *James Fazy*, is based on a long-standing coalition between the so-called radical party and the ultramontane party. When the Vienna Congress incorporated Geneva, the traditional home of Calvinism, into the Swiss Confederation, it added to its

^a Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess...*, S. 213.—*Ed.*

^b Becker wrote them at Marx’s request (see Marx’s letter to him of April 9, 1860, present edition, Vol. 41). For tactical reasons Becker addressed them to Georg Friedrich Rheinländer.—*Ed.*

^c See this volume, pp. 60-64.—*Ed.*

^d The words in quotation marks are Marx’s summary of several passages from the *Studien*.—*Ed.*

territory, along with certain Savoyard districts, a rural Catholic population and the *crème* of the ultramontane priesthood. It is the alliance with this "sworn enemy of humanity, this monster" which has made *Fazy* the *dictator* of Geneva and *Vogt Fazy's member of the Council of States*. So much by way of introduction.

"Paris, July 2, 1860

"Dear R...,

"At long last I really must comply with your wish and give you my opinion of M. James Fazy....

"Just as the political sciences are of no avail unless one knows how to apply them in real life, so too statesmanship is sterile unless it is based on science and philosophical thought. A so-called statesman who has nothing but theory will not fool anyone and he will soon reveal his incapacity. On the other hand, a man who has a one-track talent for statesmanship can more easily conceal his lack of knowledge and intellectual prowess, he may pass for a practical statesman and gain the support of the great market of mediocrity. Whether or not the rule of such a man can advance the culture of a nation and can create conditions ensuring its undisturbed progress, lies beyond the powers of judgment of the blindly adulating crowd. If there is only the appearance that things are going well and are improving and if only everything is done in the name of freedom and civilisation!

"M. *James Fazy* is an outstanding specimen of the breed of political virtuosos. This astute man is distinguished not only for his statecraft but largely for his political craftiness. He resorts to all sorts of artifices and produces *tours de force* as often as the 'public interest' requires it, but with his usual cunning avoids every *salto mortale*. Full of guile in his manipulation of roles behind the scenes, a skilful director and prompter, he is the *ne plus ultra* of a French actor. His 'strength of character', which recoils from nothing if only it will serve his purposes, would be much to be admired, were it not for the fact that it is so intimately bound up with the disreputable nature of those purposes. Once one is familiar with the man's lack of principles and moral character, one will be less inclined to admire his ingenuity in devising means and his adroitness in employing them. This political virtuoso contrives by a sleight of hand boldly to appropriate everything good that occurs in the life of the people he governs; he then presents it to the great mass of the people in his own name so that they believe and are prepared to swear that it has all been brought about by or through the agency of 'Papa Fazy'. With equal skill he manages to shrug off the responsibility for everything that is bad or unpopular and to blame it on others. In his government he will not endure any independent personality, his colleagues must submit to being arbitrarily repudiated or forced to act as godfather for his abortive undertakings. Submitting to his despotic brutality *à discrétion*,^a they have always to be prepared to act as the scapegoats and whipping-boys for the sake of the people and the glory of their President. Just as a crowned monarch will always ask himself whether a political measure will damage his dynasty, however much it may be to the advantage of the people, before he 'is pleased' to approve it, so too Papa Fazy asks himself, whenever he plans to take action: 'Will it not topple my presidential chair?' Hence our hero always adapts his policies to circumstances and lives from hand to mouth: on one day he will act out an uproarious comedy in the government, the next day he will perform a conjuring trick in the Grand Council and the day after that he will produce a sensational

^a Unconditionally.—*Ed.*

coup at a popular assembly, and the great mass, skilfully cosseted by him, only too happy to believe in a visible and audible God whom it can worship and pray to, becomes credulous and believes in pennies from heaven when it is only a heavy shower beating down on the roofs. I do not wish to suggest that the people of Geneva are immature and lacking in intelligence; on the contrary, I am convinced that hardly anywhere can one find a more active public life, a more vigorous and conscious endeavour to evolve a free civil society than here on the banks of the Lake of Geneva. I shall return later to the subject and attempt to explain why M. Fazy has nevertheless been able on so many occasions to secure a majority of votes.

"All that has been achieved in Geneva in fifteen years by an energetic generation he has chalked up to the credit of his rule, or he has caused his lackeys and worshippers to do so. The demolition of the fortifications, the impressive extension and improvement of the capital of the Canton, for instance, pass for his achievement. But every administration, including that of M. Fazy, would have been ruthlessly pushed aside if it had attempted to resist the mighty pressure from the populace to tear down fortifications that had become useless and to expand a town in which health conditions were increasingly deteriorating because of the terrible overcrowding. This question thus also became a question of Fazy's own survival and he energetically took it in hand—honour to whom honour is due—and has helped to carry out many improvements to the general satisfaction of the public. But without arrogant insolence no individual can set himself up as the originator or creator of what has been achieved by the strenuous and joint efforts of a whole generation to satisfy a great need of the age. It is only society as a whole that creates, and then only in a relative sense, an integral whole, to which the members according to their strength and position contribute a larger or smaller share. Blind faith in the authorities is a superstition like any other and is detrimental to any healthy development.

"I am well aware that our M. Fazy is like everyone else in that he only does those things which he cannot refrain from doing, and he only refrains from doing things that he cannot do, and that like every living being, in his desire to develop his own individuality completely, he pursues his own needs. It is just as impossible to expect him to act otherwise as to demand that a cat should go into the water of its own accord or a horse climb trees. If he acted differently he would not be James Fazy, and if he were not James Fazy he might perhaps be Louis Bonaparte or something of the sort. If greatness in a man who possesses power is to keep a people in leading-strings, to dazzle them with conjuring tricks, without impressing the stamp of intensive progress on their moral and intellectual culture, but instead branding society with the marks of corruption, then Fazy would surely be great and worthy of being envied by tyrants more powerful than he.

"He is as capable as anyone of sustaining contradictory policies and from them he produces the magic formula with which, as with a compass, he steers his little ship of state. At one moment radicalism will supply the crew and ultramontanism the cargo, at another, it will be the other way about—just as it suits the book and the latest tactics of the helmsman. So the machine of state is constantly in motion, heaving from one side to the other, like the balance wheel of a watch. And with what a happy effect! The radicals swear that things are moving forwards, the ultramontanists are convinced that they are going backwards. Both views are correct; both sides are happy in their faith and the Lord God Fazy remains at the helm.

"Now, my dear friend, let these lines be enough for the moment.

"Warmest greetings from

Your Joh. Philipp Becker"

"Paris, July 20, 1860

"Dear R....,

"So you think that my portrait of Fazy is perhaps somewhat exaggerated. By no means, my dear friend! Moreover, one cannot just think and judge things and people according to one's whims, but only in accordance with the logic of one's understanding and inner experience. Anyone whose words differ from his thoughts in such matters, and whose acts differ from his words, is untrue to himself and a scoundrel.

"Fazy, who received his earliest education in a Herrnhut school¹⁹⁶ in Neuwied and speaks good German, still gives the appearance, at the age of 65, of judging Germany and its people according to the impressions gained at that model institution. Nothing German, and even Swiss German, is to his taste, and only in rare cases does he make an exception of this. As a native of Geneva and as a man who has spent a long time in the United States of North America, he is intimately familiar with republican institutions, with the methods of agitation and, owing to his natural disposition, especially with the various stratagems of intrigue. He is more of a demagogue than a democrat and his chief political slogan, his badge: *laissez aller et laissez faire*,¹⁹⁷ would not be so bad, if only he could refrain from having a finger in every pie in which people attempt to do something without the blessing of the state. His interventions are designed either to achieve something that adds to his own glory, or where this proves to be impossible, to frustrate the enterprise, as he did in the project of Herr Mayer and others to establish the Banque de Cr dit et d' change and to set up a Chamber of Commerce. During the Genevan revolution of 1846¹⁹⁸ M. James acted in accordance with the precept: away from the danger zone makes for a long life, and he thought more of how to escape than of how to win. He was just on the point of leaving Geneva in secret when Albert Galeer, the heart and soul of the entire movement, made a last mighty effort to resolve the struggle which had long raged indecisively, and gained a total victory. Galeer, who was single-mindedly devoted to the cause and cared nothing for fame, firmly believed, at least at that time, that Fazy was motivated by a sincere love of the people. He was not at all put out when that hero, who had been saved from a precipitate flight in the nick of time, posed as the conqueror at a popular assembly immediately after the victory. Galeer himself could not contemplate a government post for himself immediately after the revolution, especially as he was not a Genevan, but a citizen of the Canton of Berne and so could neither vote nor be elected according to the confederate laws in force at the time. It is true that citizenship was soon conferred on him and after that he was elected into the Grand Council and was also given a post as translator of state papers. As the focus of the most energetic among the young people of Geneva he became a firm pillar of radical rule. Thanks to him Fazy's position as the hero of the great mass was strengthened still further. Using the phraseology of French radicalism which he had acquired when working on *Le National* in Paris in the day of Louis Philippe, James Fazy agitated in the press and on the podium, disguising his true thoughts and desires to his heart's content. Nevertheless, despite all his demagoguery a year had scarcely passed before he began to be seriously accused in various circles of entertaining secret relations with the leaders of the ultramontane party, and soon after of being a Francophile. In German Switzerland, where people look at these things more coolly and their judgments are more detached, they seem to have seen through his game even earlier. Towards the end of 1847, immediately after the conclusion of the Sonderbund War,¹⁹⁹ M. James Fazy went to the offices of the War Department to pay a call on General Ochsenbein; I was the only person there, as Ochsenbein was with the rest of the officers visiting the wounded in the

hospitals. When Ochsenbein returned I told him that M. Fazy had called, to which he responded contemptuously: 'Oh, that perfidious hypocrite!' General Ochsenbein, the former President of the Swiss Confederation and head of the Berne Government, who for years has been living on an Imperial French pension in Switzerland, may now perhaps think more charitably of an old colleague who is certainly his equal. However, it is a noteworthy fact that M. Fazy was never elected into the Federal Council by the Swiss National Assembly, despite all the efforts of his friends and himself, and despite the tendency, so dominant in this Assembly as almost to have become an inflexible dogma, to ensure that the important cantons should be guaranteed a turn in the Central Government. He always was a recalcitrant in relation to, and when possible tried to put a spoke in the wheel of, the federal authority which provided him with no opportunity to exercise power, and instead limited the cantonal sovereignty so convenient for him.

"When, early in 1849, the Federal police deemed it politically expedient to persecute me for organising a Sicilian legion,²⁰⁰ I went to Geneva where Fazy told me that I could organise to my heart's content and had no need to concern myself about the Federal Council. I am well aware that M. Fazy will instantly sacrifice anyone as soon as things take a bad turn for the person concerned, even if the law is on that person's side, and I have later experienced this myself in an incident which is too complicated to explain in a letter but to the facts of which the Federal Commissars Dr. Kern and Trog can testify.

"As far as the refugees were concerned, he used the watchword of humanity to resist the measures of the Federal Council and with callous arbitrariness persecuted refugees who were in his bad books. Above all, outstanding people close to Galeer, in whom he suspected a future rival, were subjected to ruthless persecution. Mazzini had good cause to fear him more than the Federal police. The tall Heinzen was abhorrent to him and had to leave the Canton almost at once. 'He thumps around as if the ground belonged to him', was the only explanation Fazy naively offered. Struve was arrested while out walking with his wife, even though there had been no instructions from the Federal Council, and was pushed over the frontier to the Canton of Vaud on the grounds that he was a *Russian* spy. Galeer managed to get to Fazy in time and tried to rectify this error. The two became embroiled in loud discussions since Fazy believes he is more convincing the more he shouts and the more indignant he pretends to be. Struve had to remain a Russian spy. If I remember rightly this scene took place in the *Hôtel des Bergues* in the presence of Mr. Herzen, the Russian refugee with whom the head of the Geneva Government liked to dine. However, this gentleman certainly had no part in the sordid accusations brought against Struve. Fazy is undoubtedly a greater Russophile than Struve, for I once heard him say in a speech at some celebration: 'The works of Jean Jacques Rousseau are more read and better understood in Russia than in Germany.' It is true that his principal intention here was to snipe at Galeer's German friends and the Germans in general.

"Galeer, who up till then had gone along with Fazy through thick and thin on political matters and whom I spoke to just after he had crossed swords with Fazy on Struve's account, told me sadly: 'I am through with Fazy now. As a matter of honour I can no longer associate with him. The man is a veritable monster politically, a mere animal in his desires. If I were to remain in league with him this would mean helping to destroy the cause of the people from within. Only if he is confronted by a truly liberal party, will he be compelled to uphold the banner of radicalism to save his position. As long as he is opposed only by the old aristocracy things will only get worse, since he has long been flirting with the ultramontane party and can really do what he likes. Moreover, he is no true Swiss in his attitudes

and looks more to Paris than to Berne. I have for a long time now had reason enough to turn my back on him but I was prevented by the fact that I had been accustomed to look on him as a worthy man for so long. Only repeated internal struggles and the external clash today have finally prevailed on me to settle accounts with him.'

"All the people with independent minds and especially the members of the young school of political economy gathered round Galeer, and the committed radical and socialist elements thus 'united' soon became known as the democratic party. Henceforth radicalism, with few exceptions, consisted solely in conscious or unconscious servility towards Fazy, who had now found, in the Catholic districts of Savoy united with Geneva after 1815, a lever by which to control the majority. The ultramontane priests, all-powerful in that region, now entered into an alliance with 'radicalism', which was the upshot of Fazy's activity. Galeer was subjected to the basest sort of calumny, persecuted and was finally removed from his post. The young democratic party now found itself caught between the party of the aristocrats on the one hand and the party of the united old radicals and the ultramontanists on the other, and was as yet unable to put up its own independent list at the approaching elections. And although M. James Fazy refused to include the names of some of the democrats in his own list, Galeer and his friends, scorning the offers of the aristocratic party, resolved to give their votes this time to Fazy, looking for victory to the future. So if Fazy had been sincere in what he said about progress and a radically bourgeois development he would have had no need to attach himself to the filthy wing of the eternally backward-looking ultramontanists. In order to prosecute the malicious attacks and accusations against Galeer with greater effect the satellites of His Excellency, the 'radical' President, founded a special abusive paper to relieve that astute lord and master of the necessity of befouling his own *Moniteur*, the *Revue de Genève*, with his invective, more and more of which now appeared in the paper of his whipping-boys, whom he could disown at will. Galeer, whose health was weak, succumbed to this dastardly campaign and died in the course of the same year (1851) when he was still no more than thirty-five years of age. How often did I not hear it said in Geneva: '*Our good, noble Galeer was the victim of the inexorable revenge of our jesuitical tyrant.*' In the following elections Galeer's friends entered into the alliance offered by the aristocratic party, and they did so all the more willingly since the latter declared themselves content with the fall of Fazy and with a very modest share in the government. Galeer, who always remained true to his principles, would probably have rejected this alliance even now, but, as the members of his party said, to what end has M. Fazy given us the fine example of his alliance with the ultramontane party, why should we be ashamed of joining up with the decent wing of the aristocratic party when Fazy does not blush to be associated with the indecent wing of the ultramontanists? Can we not progress at least as far with the cultured aristocracy as M. Fazy claims to with the ignorant ultramontanists?

"When it came to the elections, then (I believe they took place in November 1853) many radicals and even a number of Fazy's ministerial colleagues went over to the democrats, so that the hero of 1846 was unseated from his presidential chair by a great majority. The ex-President, who had run up lots of debts, now found himself in an extremely embarrassing situation. In this context I must digress to reveal a number of characteristic facts about his life.

"Even before entering the government M. James Fazy had run through a substantial inheritance in fine style. Up to his ears in debts and mercilessly pursued by his creditors, he sought as soon as he had arrived at the presidential chair quickly to abolish the practice of arresting debtors. Of course, he was acting 'in the

interests of personal liberty'. In 1856 I was told by a Genevan citizen plagued by debts: 'It is a good thing that we had a spendthrift as head of the government. Though he could not abolish debts, at least he abolished the debtors' prison.'

"In the beginning of the fifties, however, M. Fazy found himself in sore straits materially, so that a 'grateful people' had to come to his rescue and make him a present of a large building site that had become available with the razing of the fortifications. And why not indeed? Since he had been instrumental in cleaning this area of the fortifications, why should he not 'annex' a portion of it, especially as greater potentates than he do not disdain to do things of that sort. M. Fazy was now able to sell many large building sites and build a big beautiful house for himself. Unfortunately, he soon incurred new debts and could not pay the wages of his builders. Early in 1855 he was forced to endure being shouted at on the street by a master carpenter to whom he owed a few thousand francs: 'Pay me, you rogue, so that I can buy bread for my children.' It was in these circumstances that the hard-pressed man became an ex-President, and, to crown it all, he found himself in an even more painfully embarrassing situation. What happened was that the Caisse d'Escompte, a radical bank, was forced to suspend payments. Fazy's friends in the bank, themselves overburdened with debts, had advanced credit to him and to each other far beyond what was permitted in the statutes and was actually at the disposal of the bank. The director, who is in jail to this day, had been even less restrained—bad examples ruin good habits—in advancing credit to himself. Thus the Caisse d'Escompte found itself on the brink of a grave emergency: bankruptcy. The savings of a hundred thrifty workers' families were in jeopardy. Good counsel and, even more urgently, action were needed, cost what it might, otherwise Fazyism would have been swept away by the deficit like chaff in the wind. Naturally enough in the circumstances, there could be no question of raising money for the Caisse d'Escompte directly. However, at that time there was another bank in Geneva labouring to establish itself, the Banque Générale Suisse. A considerable amount of capital had to be procured for this bank so that in return it would rescue the Caisse d'Escompte from its financial ebb and M. Fazy from the flood of debts. Fazy had to act as rescuer in order to be rescued himself. In case of success he was guaranteed a substantial commission expressed in so and so many per cent and the Caisse d'Escompte the badly needed additional capital. So on behalf of the Banque Générale Suisse and also *pro domo*,^a M. Fazy went to Paris where, after a sojourn lasting several weeks and, as rumour would have it, *thanks to the gracious assistance of 'His Majesty'*,^b he succeeded in persuading the Crédit Mobilier²⁰¹ to provide millions of francs towards the rescue operation. At around the same time (November 1855) the preparations for the new elections were being made and the *sauveur*^c therefore sent letters home to Geneva in advance, announcing that he would presently arrive bearing in person his cargo of millions. This was a healing plaster for the stricken hearts of the shareholders of the Caisse d'Escompte, and a magic wand for the ultramontane-radical voters. At that time a good likeness of him appeared in a caricature showing him as a gigantic swan entering the harbour of Geneva weighed down with sacks of gold. A joker told me at the time that according to the story he had heard over a beer Fazy had brought back 50 million, over a glass of wine the sum rose to 100 million and when the absinthe was reached it had become 200 million. In the eyes of his children, the reputation of Papa Fazy's miraculous powers was fully restored. The democrats,

^a For his own benefit.—*Ed.*

^b Napoleon III.—*Ed.*

^c Saviour.—*Ed.*

fondly imagining that their victory at the hustings was assured, did not exert themselves very much. A society of muscular young men that had been formed some time before—*les fruitiers*—now established themselves as Fazy's bodyguard. They terrorised the electorate in the most brutal manner possible and their idol ascended the presidential throne once more.

"This time, however, it soon became perfectly clear that the ultramontane faction had not lent their massive support for nothing, but that they were determined to have their share of the rewards of victory. M. Marilley, the Bishop of Fribourg, an eternal agitator and trouble-maker who had been driven out of Switzerland as a result of the Sonderbund War, left France and reappeared in Geneva one fine day with the official permission of M. Fazy. Once in Geneva he began to celebrate 'Holy' Mass once again. The entire city reverberated with anger, and popular fury soon echoed throughout Switzerland. It was too much even for the blindest radicals, the most subservient *fruitiers*. A popular assembly was convened without delay and the head of the government was presented with a vote of no-confidence. His colleague, Councillor Tourte, although himself merely a disciple and pupil of Fazy, suddenly displayed a very dubious desire for independence and he thundered away at his lord and master without any scruples whatever. However, M. Fazy had taken good care to absent himself from the country before the arrival of the Lord Bishop, just as he always did leaving his colleagues to drink what he had brewed. M. de Marilley, of course, had to leave the city and the country without more ado. Papa Fazy however wrote from Berne giving his unruly children a dressing down and asserting that he had been the victim of a misunderstanding, the government had not handled the affair correctly, he had merely acted in the 'interest of freedom of religion' and had simply permitted the Bishop to make a visit. After the storm had abated a much wronged Papa Fazy returned to Geneva. It was now all the simpler to re-establish his injured authority and restore faith in his pure love of freedom and of his country, by the simple device of uttering a few oracular statements which ring very true and fit any situation, because his colleagues were decent enough to shoulder the main responsibility. But Fazy had thus achieved the satisfactory end of demonstrating to his friends of the ultramontane faction *that he was always prepared to do for them—whatever lay in his power*. For a number of years now M. James Fazy has been a very wealthy man. Not only is the Banque Générale Suisse said to have guaranteed him a certain percentage for the duration of his life, but he has also, as head of the government, revealed great understanding of his own interests in such matters as the development of railways in his own Canton, etc. In his large and beautiful mansion (the Hôtel Fazy on the Quai du Mont Blanc) the beau monde moves among the *cercle des étrangers*.^a And ever since Piedmont found the 'gambling dens' of the Savoy spas incompatible with its political morality, the compassionate President of the Republic of Geneva has touchingly offered such a den asylum in his roomy dwelling. Long live freedom! *Laissez aller et laissez faire! Allez chez moi et faites votre jeu!*^b

"Darling, what more can you desire?"^c

Your Johann Philipp Becker"

^a Circle of foreigners.—*Ed.*

^b Let people do as they think best. Come to my place and make your stake.—*Ed.*

^c From Heinrich Heine's cycle of poems, "Die Heimkehr", No. 64, *Buch der Lieder*, Erster Teil.—*Ed.*

Leaving Vogt's patrons, I descend now to his *accomplices*.

Peace and goodwill to this fair meeting,
I come not with hostility, but greeting.^a

At the head of the procession, from which I intend only to single out a few of the more striking figures, we encounter the Berlin *National-Zeitung*, under the command of Herr F. Zabel. A comparison between the review of the "Magnum Opus" which appeared at Vogt's prompting in the *Revue contemporaine* from the pen of M. Edouard Simon^b and the corresponding articles in the *National-Zeitung*, *Breslauer Zeitung*, etc., almost leads one to the conclusion that the "well-rounded character" issued two programmes, one dealing with the Italian campaign, the other with the Augsburg campaign. What on earth could have induced Herr F. Zabel, that fat and tedious bore of the *National-Zeitung*, who is usually so cautious, to kick over the traces and translate Vogt's street-songs into leading articles?

The first detailed reference to the *National-Zeitung* appeared in No. 205 of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* on January 26, 1849, in a leading article beginning with the words "*Signpost to Schilda*".²⁰² However, the arms of this signpost are too long to reprint them here. In a leading article of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 224 of February 17, 1849, it is stated:

"The Berlin *National-Zeitung* represents *triviality portentously expressed*. Some recent samples. They are taken from its discussion of the Prussian circular note.... Althoughs and buts! Can and may and seem! Consider and wish that the Prussian Government may wish! Like the inmate of a bagnio each phrase has a hundredweight tied to it, and is therefore weighty. Each 'if', each 'although', each 'but' is a real *Dr. utriusque juris*.^c And if you take all that Christian-Germanic padding, all those cotton rags in which the *National-Zeitung* has solicitously enveloped its wisdom and unwrap them just as carefully, what remains? ... *Political hot air*, in black and white, Berlin leading articles *en grande tenue*^d.... The *National-Zeitung* is obviously written for the *thinking reader*, just like Rotteck's *Weltgeschichte*²⁰³.... The French have an apt formula for thought of this kind which is active purely at a linguistic level. '*Je n'aime pas les épinards et j'en suis bien aise; car si je les aimais, j'en mangerais beaucoup, et je ne peux pas les souffrir*.' 'I do not like spinach and that is a good thing; for if I liked it I would not be able to eat enough of it and I can't stand it.' ... The *National-Zeitung* has Prussia's happiness at heart and so it wants—another Ministry. What it wants in any case is—a *Ministry*. And this is the only thing which the patrons of the *National-Zeitung* are definite and self-confident about."

^a Marx quotes the verses in English and gives the German translation in a footnote.—*Ed.*

^b Edouard Simon, "Un tableau de moeurs politiques en Allemagne...", *Revue contemporaine*, t. 13, Paris, 1860.—*Ed.*

^c Doctor of both laws (civil and canon).—*Ed.*

^d In full dress.—*Ed.*

In the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 296,^a the following can be found:

“*Berlin, May 9, 1849.*... It is interesting to observe the attitude of the Berlin press towards the Saxon revolution. *The ‘National-Zeitung’* knows only one emotion: the fear of being banned.”

But fear is an elixir of life, as the *National-Zeitung* has demonstrated throughout the decade of Manteuffel’s rule.

The *National-Zeitung* has proved the truth of Pope’s dictum:

Still her old empire to restore she tries,
For, born a goddess, Dullness never dies.*²⁰⁴

The only thing that distinguishes Pope’s realm of *Dullness* from that of the *National-Zeitung* is that in the former “now^b Dunce the second reigns like Dunce the first”, whereas in the latter, the old dunce, *Dunce the first*,^c still holds sway.

The *Breslauer Zeitung*, which follows hard on the heels of the *National-Zeitung*, is now in raptures about the Hohenzollern Ministry as it had been about the Manteuffel Ministry before it. Early in 1860 I received the following letter^d:

“Breslau, February 27, 1860

“Dear Marx,

“I saw in the *Volks-Zeitung* your address and your declaration against the *National-Zeitung*.^e An article similar to that in the *National-Zeitung* appeared also in the *Breslauer Zeitung* from the pen of its *daily* contributor, **Dr. Stein**. This is the same Dr. Stein who used to sit with D’Ester on the extreme left of the Berlin National Assembly and who proposed the famous motion against the officers of the Prussian army. This great Stein with the diminutive body was suspended from his post as teacher. When the new Ministry was installed he set himself the task of agitating on its behalf, not just in the past year, in preparation for the elections, but even now, to bring about a merger of the Silesian democrats and the constitutionalists. Despite this his application to the present Ministry for permission to give private lessons has been refused, not just once but over and over again. The previous Ministry had tacitly allowed him to teach, while the present one prohibits him from doing so on the grounds that it is unlawful. He has now gone to Berlin to obtain permission there but without success, as you can see elsewhere in the

* It is impossible to find a German equivalent for Dullness. It is more than boredom, it is ennui elevated into a principle, soporific lifelessness, blunted stupor. As a quality of style Dullness is what the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* called “triviality portentously expressed”. [Marx quotes the two lines from Alexander Pope in English and gives the German translation at the beginning of this footnote.]

^a Of May 12, 1849.—*Ed.*

^b Pope has “still”.—*Ed.*

^c Marx uses the English phrase “Dunce the first”.—*Ed.*

^d An entry in Marx’s notebook says the letter was written by Peter Nothjung.—*Ed.*

^e See this volume, pp. 12-13.—*Ed.*

same issue of the *Volks-Zeitung* which printed your declaration. *Dr. Stein* has now made the Brimstone Gang play their part in the procession of fools in the *Breslauer Ressourcen-Gesellschaft*. Nevertheless, *Dr. Stein, Schlehan, Semrau* and their cronies have to put up with one humiliation after the other at the hands of the constitutionalists; but men of their stamp will not let themselves be deflected from their patriotic purposes. What do you say to this fine company?"

What should I say about my colleague Stein, for in fact, Stein was my colleague, since I was for a full six months, in 1855, a correspondent of the *Neue Oder-Zeitung*²⁰⁵ and this was the only German paper for which I wrote while I was abroad. Clearly, Stein is a man with a stony [*steinern*] heart and even the refusal to allow him to give private lessons could not soften him. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* hammered away at Stein a great deal in order to knock him into shape. Thus in No. 225, for example:

"Cologne, February 16, 1849.... As for Herr Stein himself, we recall the time when he attacked the republicans on fanatically constitutional grounds, when in the *Schlesische Zeitung* he roundly **denounced** the representatives of the working class and had them denounced by a schoolteacher whose ideas were akin to his own and who is now a member of the 'Association for Law and Order'. Just as pitiful as the Agreers Assembly itself was the so-called democratic group of this Assembly. It could be foreseen that these gentlemen, in order to be *re-elected*, would now recognise the *imposed Constitution*. It is even more characteristic of the standpoint of these gentlemen that *after* the elections they are disavowing in the democratic clubs what *before* the elections they assented to at meetings of the electors. This petty, crafty liberal slyness was never the diplomacy of revolutionaries."²⁰⁶

The [*Neue*] *Rheinische Zeitung* had not sculptured this stone [*Stein*] in vain, as he demonstrated as soon as Manteuffel had dictated the dictated Chamber out of existence once again, for Dr. Julius Stein then proclaimed in the "chief democratic club in Breslau":

"We" (the extreme Berlin Left) "have regarded the German question as a lost cause from the outset.... People must *now* realise that *no united Germany is possible as there are still German Princes*" (*Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 290).

It is indeed a heart-rending sight, it is enough to melt a stone, to see how Schwerin time and time again rejects this same Stein, even though he is no longer a stumbling-block [*Stein des Anstosses*], and refuses to use him—as a building stone [*Baustein*].^a

I do not know if my readers have ever themselves seen a copy

^a Cf. Psalms 118:22, Matthew 21:42 and Luke 20:17.—*Ed.*

of *Punch*, the London equivalent of the *Kladderadatsch*. The title-page shows a picture of Punch sitting down and behind him stands his dog Toby with a grumpy expression on his face and a pen behind his ear, both of which point to his being a born penny-a-liner.^a If it is fair to compare small things with large^b then one could perhaps compare Vogt with Punch, especially since the latter has lost his wit, a misfortune that struck him in 1846 with the abolition of the Corn Laws.²⁰⁷ His companion, however, Toby the dog, can only be compared to himself or to—**Eduard Meyen**. And in fact if Eduard Meyen were ever really to die he would not stand in need of any Pythagorean migration of the soul. Toby has already taken care of that during his lifetime. I would not go as far as to claim that Eduard Meyen sat for the artist who designed the title vignette, but in any case I have never in my life seen a greater similarity between a man and a dog. But there is nothing surprising about this, since Eduard Meyen is a penny-a-liner by nature, and the penny-a-liner is by nature—Toby. E. Meyen has always inclined to devote his obtrusively versatile pen to ready-made party-organisation-literary-enterprise institutions. An imposed programme saves one the trouble of thinking for oneself, the feeling of togetherness with a more or less organised mass of people stifles the sense of one's own inadequacy, and the realisation that a war-chest is available can overcome, momentarily at least, even Toby's professional peevishness. Thus we find Eduard Meyen attached to the unfortunate Central Democratic Committee, that empty nut which grew out of the German Democratic Assembly in Frankfurt am Main in 1848.²⁰⁸ As an exile in London he was engaged as the most indefatigable producer of the lithographed flysheets on which a portion of the money Kinkel had raised by loan to manufacture a revolution was frittered away, a circumstance which did not of course prevent the selfsame Eduard Meyen from rushing with bag and baggage into the camp of the Prince Regent^c to beg for an amnesty and in fact to obtain permission to go to Wandsbek and pester the Hamburg *Freischütz* with articles on foreign policy. Vogt, who was busy enlisting the services of "people who" would "follow his Programme" and were prepared to bring him articles, and who was dangling the tempting sight of a well-filled war-chest before their eyes, came as a godsend to Eduard Meyen, who was running around without a

^a Here and below Marx uses the English term.—*Ed.*

^b Cf. Virgil, *Georgics*, Book IV, 176.—*Ed.*

^c William, Prince of Prussia.—*Ed.*

master just then, for no one was willing to pay the dog tax during those hard times. And you can just imagine the howls of rage when Toby heard a rumour that I was about to cheat Vogt's party literary-enterprise institution of its credit and its pen-pushing pugs of their fees! *Quelle horreur!* Vogt's instructions to his Eduard Meyen about the obligatory treatment of the "Magnum Opus" were just as detailed as those given to Edouard Simon, and in fact Eduard Meyen did adorn 5 numbers of *Der Freischütz* (Nos. 17-21, 1860) with pieces from the "Magnum Opus".^a But what a difference! Whereas Edouard Simon corrected the original, Eduard Meyen bowdlerised it. The simplest evidence of the objective understanding of a given topic is surely the ability to *copy* printed matter, but our Eduard Meyen is utterly incapable of copying even a single line correctly. Toby's mind lacks even the strength requisite for correct copying. Just listen:

Der Freischütz, No. 17:

"The paper" (*Allgemeine Zeitung*) "... has now been found guilty ... also ... of having made use of the assistance of a revolutionary party which Vogt has stigmatised as the *Brimstone Gang of the German republicans*."

When and where has Vogt prated about the Brimstone Gang of the German republicans?

Der Freischütz, No. 18:

"It is Liebknecht who has launched an attack on Vogt in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*,^b by repeating there the accusations made by Biscamp in the London *Volk*. However, the accusations did not develop their full force until Marx sent to the offices of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* a pamphlet that had appeared in London and which he attributed to Blind."

Vogt was able to tell many lies but even his lawyer, Hermann, forbade him the lie that the article by Biscamp, which had *not* been reprinted in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, was "repeated" there by Liebknecht. Nor has Vogt ever thought of maintaining that it was I who sent the pamphlet *Zur Warnung* to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. On the contrary, he says quite explicitly: "It was Herr Liebknecht ... who sent the libellous pamphlet to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*" ("Magnum Opus" p. 167).

Der Freischütz, No. 19:

"Blind positively denied that he was the pamphlet's author, and the printer certified that it was not *given* to him to print by Blind. What is however certain is that

^a This refers to Eduard Meyen's article "Carl Vogts Kampf gegen die Augsburger Allgem. Zeitung und die Marxianer" published in *Der Freischütz* in February 1860.—*Ed.*

^b Wilhelm Liebknecht [An die Redaction der *Allgemeinen Zeitung*, Augsburg], *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 300, October 27, 1859.—*Ed.*

the lampoon was immediately taken over in the same type-setting in *Das Volk*, and that Marx caused it to be published in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, etc.”

In his “Magnum Opus” Vogt on the one hand prints Fidelio Hollinger’s declaration asserting that the pamphlet *had not been set* in his print-shop,^a and, on the other, my counter-declaration that the original type of the lampoon was *still* standing at Hollinger’s when it was reprinted in *Das Volk*.^b What chaos did our unfortunate Toby make out of this!

Der Freischütz, No. 19:

“As far as the people themselves are concerned” (Engels and I are supposed to say in Techow’s letter) “they are pure rationalists who have no patience with nationality.”

No *sentimentality*, my dear Toby; no sentimentality, writes Techow, according to Vogt.

Der Freischütz, No. 20:

“Marx ... did not prevent the duellists from going to *Ostend* to fight a pistol duel. Techow acted as Willich’s second, etc. After this incident [...] Techow broke off relations with Marx and his League.”

Eduard Meyen is not content to substitute *Ostend* for *Antwerp*. He had probably heard about the Frenchman in the West End of London complaining that the English write “London” and pronounce it “Constantinople”. Techow, who had only met me once in his life at the time of his correspondence and who moreover writes explicitly that he had at first intended to *join* me and my League, is made by Eduard Meyen to *break off* relations with me and my League, of which he was never a member.

Der Freischütz, No. 21:

“This incident” (the Joint Workers’ Festival in Lausanne) “explains the violent attack on Vogt which was made in *Das Volk* in London.”

In the “Magnum Opus” Vogt himself gives the date of the “violent attack” on him in *Das Volk*—*May 14, 1859*.^c (The pamphlet appeared in *Das Volk* on June 18, 1859.) However, the Lausanne Joint Festival took place on *June 26 and 27, 1859*, i.e. long *after* the “violent attack” which according to Meyen it provoked.

But we have quoted enough of Toby’s reading. It is not surprising that Toby having managed to read all sorts of things in

^a Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess...*, Dokumente, S. 38.—*Ed.*

^b *ibid.*, S. 39-40. See also this volume, pp. 8-9.—*Ed.*

^c *ibid.*, S. 17.—*Ed.*

Vogt that were not there should also have made this discovery:

“Vogt’s book will take its rightful place among the boldest, wittiest and most useful polemics in our literature” (*Der Freischütz*, No. 17).

Just think of this wretched Toby, incapable as he is of even copying out two lines of a printed book correctly, just think of him condemned to sit in Wandsbek, having to decipher the book of world history²⁰⁹ every day, straining to read a record of events barely hinted at in the obscurest of scripts, copying away by the hour and having to produce life-size photographs of the dissolving views^a of the present in the columns of *Der Freischütz*! Unhappy Wandsbek Messenger!^b Happy Hamburg reader of *Der Freischütz*!

A few days ago the London *Times* published a strange news item which went through the entire English press and bore the title: “A Man Shot by a Dog.” It seems therefore that Toby knows how to use a gun and thus it is not surprising to find Eduard Meyen sing in *Der Freischütz*: “A marksman am I in the pay of the Regent.”^c

The *Kölnische Zeitung* confined itself to a few malicious little paragraphs and insinuations in favour of Vogt. A week after the “Magnum Opus” had appeared it spread the fairy-tale in its columns that it was already out-of-print, probably so as not to have to lay violent hands upon it. But what an irony of history!

If only I had been able to foresee in 1848-49, at the time of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, when we had daily to cross swords with our Cologne neighbour for the Poles, Hungarians and Italians, that this very same *Kölnische Zeitung* would in 1859 become the chivalrous protagonist of the principle of nationality, and that the simple Herr **Jusepp Dumont** would emerge from his chrysalis as Signor Giuseppe Del Monte! But of course at that time no Louis Bonaparte had as yet given the nationalities the superior blessing of morality and liberalism, and the *Kölnische Zeitung* will always remember that Louis Bonaparte has saved society. The red fury with which it attacked *Austria* at the time can be seen from the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 144^d:

“Cologne, November 15 (1848). At a moment when the whole of Germany cries out in indignation because the blood-stained minion of the Austrian bandit, because a Windischgrätz could dare to have the deputy **Robert Blum** shot down

^a Marx uses the English phrase “dissolving views”.—*Ed.*

^b Marx here puns on *Wandsbeker Bote*—Wandsbek Messenger, a celebrated paper published by the poet Matthias Claudius from 1770 to 1775.—*Ed.*

^c See B. von Braunthal, *Das Nachtlager in Granada*.—*Ed.*

^d This refers to the item “Köln, 15. November” in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* of November 16, 1848. Marx quotes from his notebook.—*Ed.*

like a dog—at such a moment it is fitting to take note of two German papers of which one has attempted with almost unheard-of perfidy to vilify the last few days of the dead man's life, while the other pursues him to the grave with its insipid cretinism. We are referring to the *Kölnische Zeitung* and the *Rheinische Volks-Halle* (*vulgo* Narrhalla^a).... In No. 292 the *Kölnische Zeitung* reported: 'On the 22nd of this month' (October) 'the *enthusiastic leaders* of the democratic party ... left Vienna; so did ... **Robert Blum**.' The *Kölnische Zeitung* made this statement without any qualification, but set its denunciation of Blum in Garamond type to print it more firmly on the reader's memory. The *Kölnische Zeitung* reached the heights of perfection in its subsequent issues. It was not ashamed to find space in its columns even for the articles of the most black and yellow paper of the camarilla, news items from the journal of the Archduchess Sophie [...], the most infamous of all Austrian papers [...]" (there then follows a quotation including this passage): "Robert Blum earned no laurels in Vienna.... For he spoke in the great hall of the internal enemies—timorousness, lack of courage and of stamina; but if there were to arise *other enemies* in addition to these internal ones—he hoped this would not be the case—but if there were still people in the city who preferred the victory of the military to the victory of freedom, then the life-and-death battle waged before the walls of the city must be just as ruthlessly waged against them too.... In Herr Blum's speech there lay the madness of a September²¹⁰.... If Herr Blum really spoke those words then we must say quite frankly that he has **dishonoured himself**.' So much for the *Kölnische Zeitung*."

By means of an ingenious system of concealed plumbing, all the lavatories of London empty their physical refuse into the Thames. In the same way every day the capital of the world spews out all its social refuse through a system of goose quills, and it pours out into a great central paper *cloaca*—the *Daily Telegraph*. Liebig rightly criticises the senseless wastefulness which robs the Thames of its purity and the English soil of its manure.^b **Levy**, however, the proprietor of this central paper *cloaca*, is an expert not only in chemistry, but even in alchemy. Having transformed the social refuse of London into newspaper articles, he transforms the newspaper articles into copper, and finally the copper into gold. At the entrance which leads to the central paper *cloaca*, the following words are written *di colore oscuro*: "*hic ... quisquam faxit oletum!*"^c or as *Byron* translated it so poetically "*Wanderer, stop and—piss!*"^d

Levy, like *Habakkuk*, *est capable de tout*.^e He is capable of printing a leading article three columns long on a single case of rape. Earlier this year he treated his numerous public of gourmets to an

^a Roughly=fool's paradise, a pun on Valhalla.—*Ed.*

^b Justus von Liebig, *Die Chemie in ihrer Anwendung auf Agricultur und Physiologie*, Braunschweig, 1840, S. 216.—*Ed.*

^c In sombre colours: "Here ... it is permitted to make bad odours!" The Latin words are a paraphrased line from *Persius*, *Satires*, Book I, First Satire.—*Ed.*

^d *Byron*, "Epitaph".—*Ed.*

^e Is capable of everything.—*Ed.*

asafoetida stew that had been ingeniously brewed from ingredients of a certain court case that were so nauseating that the judge ordered the court to be cleared of women and children. Unfortunately Levy had spiced the stew with the name of an innocent person. The resulting libel action brought against Levy ended with his conviction and the public condemnation of his newspaper by the English judiciary. As everyone knows, libel actions, like all other actions, are shamelessly expensive in England; they are in a sense the privilege of the *coffre fort*.^a However, a number of unemployed lawyers in the City now discovered that Levy was fair game; they joined forces and offered their services gratis as a speculation to anyone who wished to take action against Levy for libel. Levy himself thereupon complained loudly in his paper that a new kind of blackmail had become fashionable: libel actions against Levy. Since then it has become precarious to sue Levy. One lays oneself open to ambiguous talk, for just as you can read on walls in London the notice: Commit no Nuisance, so too you can find written on the entrances to the English courts: *Commit Levy*.^b

Politicians refer to the *Daily Telegraph* as “Palmerston’s mobpaper”, but Levy’s refuse barge only carries politics as ballast. The *Saturday Review* aptly described his penny-rag as “cheap and nasty”.

“It is a fatal symptom,” it says *inter alia*, “that it should have given such a definite preference for dirt to cleanliness. In every case it will exclude the most important report in order to leave space for a disreputable article.”

Nevertheless, Levy also has a prudery of his own. He criticises immorality in the theatre, for instance, and like a second Cato the Censor, he pursues the dress of the ballet dancers, which according to him starts too late and ends too soon. Such fits of virtue only take Levy out of the frying-pan into the fire. O Logic! a London theatrical journal, *The Players*, exclaims, O Logic! where is thy blush? How the rogue^c must have laughed in his sleeve!... The *Telegraph* as guardian of the decency of female costume on the stage! Holy Jupiter, what will happen next? Earthquakes and fiery comets are the least that can be expected now. Decency! “I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me that word.”^d And as Hamlet

^a Of the strong-box, i.e. of the rich.—*Ed.*

^b Here and below Marx uses English: “Commit no Nuisance”, “Commit Levy”, “mobpaper”, “cheap and nasty”.—*Ed.*

^c Marx gives the English word in brackets after its German equivalent.—*Ed.*

^d Shakespeare, *The Merchant of Venice*, Act IV, Scene 1. In Marx’s original the English sentence is followed by its German equivalent in brackets.—*Ed.*

advises Ophelia, the "Player" advises Levy to clear off to a nunnery: "Get thee to a nunnery,^a Levy!" Levy in a nunnery! And perhaps "nunnery" is just a printing error for a nonaria^b so that we should really read it "Get thee to a nonaria, Levy!" and in that case, everyone will be

"multum gaudere paratus,
Si Cynico" (the cynic Levy) "barbam petulans nonaria vellat".^c

The *Weekly Mail* maintains that although Levy really fools no one,^d he has changed "i" into "y", and it is true that among the 22,000 Levites²¹¹ whom Moses counted in the journey through the wilderness, there was not a single Levi who spelled his name with a "y". Just as Edouard Simon spares no effort to be regarded as belonging to the Romance people, so Levy is determined to be an Anglo-Saxon. Therefore, at least once a month he attacks the un-English policies of Mr. Disraeli, for Disraeli, "the Asiatic mystery",^e is, unlike the *Telegraph*, not an Anglo-Saxon by descent. But what does it profit Levy to attack Mr. D'Israeli and to change "i" into "y", when Mother Nature has inscribed his origins in the clearest possible way right in the middle of his face. The nose of the mysterious stranger of Slawkenbergius (see *Tristram Shandy*) who had got the finest nose from the promontory of noses^f was just a nine days' wonder in Strasbourg,^g whereas Levy's nose provides conversation throughout the year in the City of London. A Greek epigrammatist describes the nose of a certain Castor which could be used for all sorts of things: as a shovel, a trumpet, a sickle, an anchor, etc. He concludes his description with the words:

"Οὕτως εὐχρήστου σκεύους Κάστωρ τετύχηκε,
ῥίνα φέρων πάσης ἄρμενον ἐργασίας" *

* Thus was Castor equipped with a tool that was truly amazing,
Owning a nose that served almost every conceivable purpose."
[Anonymous epigram from *Anthologia Graeca*, XI, 203, Verses 7 and 8.]

^a Shakespeare. *Hamlet*, Act III, Scene 1.—*Ed.*

^b Harlot.—*Ed.*

^c "...always ready to be delighted,
Should the harlot playfully tug at the beard of the Cynic" (Persius, *Satires*, Book I, First Satire).—*Ed.*

^d Marx puns on the idiom "ein X für ein U vormachen" (to put an X in place of a U) which means to try to fool someone.—*Ed.*

^e Marx gives the English phrase in brackets after its German equivalent.—*Ed.*

^f Marx uses English: "finest nose" and "promontory of noses".—*Ed.*

^g Cf. Laurence Sterne, *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman*, Vol. IV, Slawkenbergius.—*Ed.*

But even Castor could not have guessed the purpose to which Levy puts his nose. The English poet comes nearer to it in the lines:

"And 'tis a miracle we may suppose,
No nastiness offends his skilful nose."^a

Indeed the great skill of Levy's nose consists in its ability to titillate with a rotten smell, to sniff it out a hundred miles away and to attract it. Thus Levy's nose serves the *Daily Telegraph* as elephant's trunk, antenna, lighthouse and telegraph. It is therefore no exaggeration to say that Levy writes his paper with his nose.

The clean-minded *Daily Telegraph* was of course the *only* English paper in which Vogt's *Lousiad*, not only could, but had to be printed. In Levy's organ an article two-and-a-half columns long appeared on February 6, 1860, with the title: "The Journalistic Auxiliaries of Austria",^b which was in fact a mere translation into malodorous English of the two leading articles from the Berlin *National-Zeitung*. To lead the reader astray, the article bore the superscription: "From an occasional correspondent, Frankfort on the Main, February 2."^c I knew of course that the only correspondent of the *Telegraph* was based in Berlin where Levy's nose had sniffed him out with its customary virtuosity. I therefore wrote at once to a friend in Berlin asking him to see if he could discover the name of Levy's correspondent.²¹² My friend, a man whose learning has been acknowledged even by Alexander von Humboldt, was obdurate enough to insist that there was no *Daily Telegraph* in London and consequently no correspondent belonging to it in Berlin. I therefore turned to another acquaintance in the City on the Spree. Reply: the Berlin correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* exists and is called—**Abel**. I thought this might well conceal a gross mystification. Abel was obviously just an abbreviation of Zabel. Nor was I led astray by the fact that Zabel cannot write English. If Abel can edit the *National-Zeitung* as Zabel without knowing any German, why should not Zabel be able to contribute to the *Telegraph* as Abel without knowing any English. So Zabel, Abel, Abel, Zabel? How to find a way out of this Babel? I examined the Berlin organ of wisdom once again, comparing it with Levy's, and this time I discovered the following passage in No. 41 of the *National-Zeitung*:

^a Marx quotes in English and gives the German translation in a footnote.—*Ed.*

^b Marx gives the title in English and supplies the German translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

^c Marx gives the words of the superscription in English and supplies the German translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

"Liebknecht strangely enough adds: 'We asked the *magistrate* (?) to authenticate our signatures.'"

This passage about the magistrate and Zabel's astonished question mark after the word "magistrate" puts one in mind of the Swabian who "as soon as he got off the ship in Asia asked: 'Isn't there some good fellow from Bebbingen here?'" Levy's paper omits not only the entire passage, but even the question mark, which proves conclusively that Levy's correspondent does not share F. Zabel's belief that London police-court judges or magistrates^a are the same thing as the Berlin *Magistrat*.²¹³ Hence Zabel was not Abel and Abel was not Zabel. In the meantime, however, other acquaintances in Berlin had heard of my difficulties. One of them wrote: "Among the 22,000 Levites in *Numbers* there is an Abel, but it is spelt Abigail." Another wrote: "On this occasion it is Abel who killed Cain, not Cain who killed Abel." In this way I went deeper and deeper into the maze until, finally, the editor of a London newspaper assured me with the dry earnestness of the English that Abel was not a joke, but a Jewish-born man of letters in Berlin whose full name was **Dr. Karl Abel**. This noble youth had served for a considerable time under Stahl and Gerlach as a zealous drudge for the *Kreuz-Zeitung*, but with the change of Ministry he had changed, if not his skin, at least his colours. The over-eager zeal of the renegade would indeed explain why Levy's Berlin correspondent imagines that the freedom of the press in England has been specially designed to allow him to peddle his compulsive admiration of the Hohenzollern Ministry. Hypothetically, then, we may assume that there is an Abel in Berlin as well as a Levy in London—*par nobile fratrum*.^b

Abel supplies his Levy simultaneously from everywhere under the sun: from Berlin, Vienna, Frankfurt am Main, Stockholm, Petersburg, Hong Kong, etc.,—a much greater achievement than De Maistre's *Voyage autour de ma chambre*. But whatever address Abel chooses when he writes to his Levy, his dominant sign of the Zodiac remains constant: Cancer. In contrast to the procession in Echternach where those taking part move two steps forward and one step back,²¹⁴ Abel's articles take one step forward and two steps back.

"No crab more active in the dirty dance,
Downward to climb, and backward to advance." (*Pope*)^c

^a Marx gives the English term in brackets after its German equivalent.—*Ed.*

^b A noble pair of brothers (Horace, *Satires*, Book II, Satire 3).—*Ed.*

^c Alexander Pope, *The Dunciad*, Book II. Marx quotes in English and gives the German translation in a footnote.—*Ed.*

Abel has an undeniable talent for providing his Levy with the state secrets of the Continent. For example, if the *Kölnische Zeitung* publishes a leading article it has borrowed from the *Baltische Monatschrift* on the state of the Russian finances, Abel will let a month go by and will suddenly send the *Kölnische Zeitung's* article to London from Petersburg, not omitting to hint of course that he acquired the statistical secrets *entre deux cigares*, not indeed from the Tsar himself, or even from the Russian Minister of Finance, but assuredly from one of the directors of the State Bank. And he will declare triumphantly: "I am in a position to state, etc."^a Or the official *Preussische Zeitung* puts out a ministerial feeler, for instance indicating Herr von Schleinitz's unauthoritative ideas about the problem of the Electorate of Hesse. This time Abel wastes no time. The very same day he writes to his Levy openly from Berlin about the problem of the Electorate of Hesse. A week later he reports: The *Preussische Zeitung*, the organ of the Ministry, has printed the following article on the problem of the Electorate of Hesse and "I owe it to myself" to point out that a week ago I myself, etc. Or he translates an article from the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, and gives it a date-line perhaps from Stockholm. This is inevitably followed by the phrase, "I must warn your readers" to beware—not of the article he has copied, but of some other article in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* that he has not copied. Yet, whenever he happens to mention the *Kreuz-Zeitung* he makes the sign of the cross so as to disguise his true identity.

As to Abel's style, we can give the reader an idea of what it is like by saying that it is a poor imitation of the styles of Stern Gescheidt, Isidor Berlinerblau and Jacob Wiesenriesler.

With Abel's permission we shall make a digression at this point. The original Stern Gescheidt is another accomplice of Vogt. He is a certain **L. Bamberger** who in 1848 was the editor of a provincial rag in Mainz^b and is at present a *loup-garou*^c married "on full pay" in Paris and a *Decembrist democrat* "in the *simplest* meaning of the word". To grasp the significance of this "simple" meaning, it is necessary to be acquainted with the jargon of the Paris Stock Exchange synagogue. Stern Gescheidt's "simple" democracy is identical with what Isaac Péreire calls "*la démocratisation du crédit*",

^a This phrase and, below, the expressions "I owe it to myself" and "I must warn your readers" are in English in the original. The German equivalents are given in brackets.—*Ed.*

^b The *Mainzer Zeitung*.—*Ed.*

^c Werewolf.—*Ed.*

the democratisation of credit. This consists in transforming the entire nation, and not just certain strata in it, into a gambling den so that the people can be swindled *en masse*.²¹⁵ Under Louis Philippe the oligarchic Stock Exchange wolf had been so strait-laced that he confined his depredations to the national wealth accumulated by the upper bourgeoisie; under the aegis of Louis Bonaparte, however, all is fair game^a for the democratic Stock Exchange wolf, who like the Roman Emperor exclaims: *non olet*,^b adding with Stern Gescheidt Bamberger: “It’s the quantity that does it.” This is Stern Gescheidt’s democracy in its extreme “simplicity”. More recently, Stern Gescheidt Bamberger has come to be known under the name of “Hurrah, on to Italy!”^c In contrast to that, during the campaign for the Imperial Constitution he answered to the name of “Ouch, away from Kirchheimboland!” I have in my possession a priceless manuscript describing the heroic deeds of Stern Gescheidt Bamberger, who absconded from Kirchheimboland and led the volunteer corps of the Rhine-Palatinate by the nose. He was much too smart^d not to have sensed that the bloated, blood-streaked soil of December was gold-bearing for smart treasure-seekers. So he went to Paris where, as his friend Isidor Berlinerblau alias *H. B. Oppenheim* puts it so aptly, “one feels freer than one knows”. Stern Gescheidt, whose “circulation was coming to a standstill” in 1858 (see the declaration of the Banque de France on circulation in 1858-59^e), was overjoyed when he suddenly saw the dirty soil of December glistening with the bright colours of high-faluting ideas. Stern Gescheidt, as smart as he is brightly democratic, realised that if Paris had a flood which were to wash over the soil of December, it would sweep away the *Credit* in his ledger, while leaving the *Debit* behind. It is common knowledge that Stern Gescheidt Bamberger has added a tenth, Hebrew, muse to the nine Greek ones: it is “the muse of time”, as he calls the Stock Exchange list.

But to return to Abel. Abel’s style is saturated with the *odor specificus* inseparable from the *Daily Telegraph*, the paper cloaca of

^a Marx writes “fish” in the original.—*Ed.*

^b It doesn’t smell (these words are usually attributed to Emperor Vespasian who introduced a tax on public lavatories).—*Ed.*

^c An allusion to Ludwig Bamberger’s book *Juchhe nach Italia!* published anonymously in Berne and Geneva in 1859.—*Ed.*

^d Marx uses the word *gescheit*, punning on the name Gescheidt. On Bamberger’s part in the events of 1849 see Engels’ *The Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution* (present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 196 and 224).—*Ed.*

^e “The Bank of France”, *The Times*, No. 23203, January 14, 1859.—*Ed.*

the capital of the world. When Levy finds himself genuinely moved by the scent of Abel's news reports, Abel's learning and the energy and zeal with which Abel writes from 20 different latitudes at the same time—at such moments of the greatest exaltation Levy has a very special term of endearment for Abel: he calls him his “industrious bug”.^a

Poetic justice demands that at the end of the comedy the “well-rounded character” should not get stuck together with Abel in the London muck, but who is to pull him out of it? Who is to be his saviour? A mudlark is to be his saviour, namely *Baron von Vincke*,^b a squire of the red earth,^c a knight of the joyful countenance, *chevalier sans peur et sans reproche*.²¹⁶

As already mentioned, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* as early as 1848 revealed the identity of the opposites Vogt and Vincke,^d and Vogt himself had a presentiment of this identity as early as 1859 when he wrote in his *Studien*:

“Herr von Vincke as the apostle of a new political freedom ... really verges on the realm of the ridiculous” (loc. cit., p. 21),

i.e. Vogt's own realm. However, on March 1, 1860 Vincke publicly extended the hand of friendship in a speech in which, as Johann Philipp Becker expressed it, he “used the *Brimstone Gang* as an illustration of the modest Prussian Chamber”. Hardly a year had passed since he had recommended to that same house the pamphlet *Po and Rhine*^e whose sulphurous origins he had of course been unable to detect, since he lacked Levy's nose. When moreover Vincke began to play the Italian just like Vogt, when Vincke, like Vogt, insulted the Poles and when Vincke, like Vogt, proclaimed the partition of Germany, the feuding brothers fell into each other's arms for ever.

It is well known that like poles are bound to repel each other. So for a long time Vogt and Vincke repelled each other. Both men drivel too much so that each imagined that the other wished to prevent him from speaking.

Vogt is a great zoologist, as Ranickel testifies, and so is Vincke, as is demonstrated by his pig-farm at Ickern.

^a Alexander Pope, *The Dunciad*, Book I. Marx uses the English phrase and gives the German translation and the author's name in a footnote.—*Ed.*

^b Marx puns on the name Vincke and the word *Mistfinke* (mudlark, filthy fellow).—*Ed.*

^c Westphalia.—*Ed.*

^d This refers to an item in the column “Deutschland” in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 181, December 29, 1848.—*Ed.*

^e See present edition, Vol. 16.—*Ed.*

In Spanish drama there are always two clowns per hero. Calderón equips even St. Cyprian, the Spanish Faust, with a Moscon and a Clarin.^a In the same way, in the Frankfurt Parliament, the reactionary General von Radowitz had two comic adjutants, his harlequin Lichnowski and his clown Vincke. Vogt, however, the liberal counter-clown, had to do everything on his own, for Jacobus Venedey only knew how to act the sentimental role of Pantalone, and so inevitably, he came to resent Vincke. Vincke liked occasionally to take off the fool's cap and bells. On June 21, 1848, for example, he declared in Parliament:

"He sometimes imagined that he was in a theatre rather than in such an assembly."^b

And at a party of the Tories of the Frankfurt Parliament he made an appearance as the *Prince of Fools*, sat on a barrel and sang²¹⁷:

"The Prince of Fools am I,
I'll booze until I die."

This too offended his counterpart. Furthermore, Vogt and Vincke could not intimidate each other so they both imagined that their best course was for each to set upon the other. Falstaff Vogt knew what to think of the knight without fear or reproach, and vice versa. The Westphalian Bayard had in his time studied law at German universities, not so much the Roman *corpus juris*²¹⁸ for, as he said, his ancestors of the red earth had not defeated Varus for nothing. To make up for it he threw himself on Teutonic law, i.e. the *students' code of behaviour*, whose basis he thoroughly explored in every direction and subsequently made notorious as the *legal basis*.^c As a result of this profound and casuistical research into the students' code of behaviour he later on, whenever faced with a duel, always found some Duns-Scotian hair which at the decisive moment interposed itself as hair-splittingly sharply between our knight and the shedding of blood as the naked sword in the bridal bed which separated the princess from the *locum tenens*.^d From the adventure with the Supreme Court advocate Benda at the time of the United Diet of 1847²¹⁹ to the no less notorious adventure with the

^a Calderón, *El Mágico prodigioso*.—*Ed.*

^b The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 25, June 25, 1848.—*Ed.*

^c A reference to Georg Vincke's speech in the Frankfurt National Assembly on June 21, 1848, in which he said "my standpoint is that of the undermined legal basis" (*ibid.*).—*Ed.*

^d Substitute.—*Ed.*

Prussian Minister of War^a in the Chamber of Deputies in 1860, this hair-splitting always intervened with the regularity of a recurrent fever. We can see how unfair was the reproach, recently levelled at the squire, that he had lost his legal basis. It is not his fault if his legal basis consists entirely of trapdoors. Moreover, since the students' code of behaviour is really only applicable in the higher reaches of legal debate, the ingenious squire replaces it at the ordinary parliamentary level by the *code of the cudgels*.

In the frog-pond of Frankfurt Vincke once bitterly referred to his counterpart Vogt as the "*Minister of the Future*".^b But it really struck home when he heard in Ickern that Vogt, mindful of the maxim

"Once a position of power you've found,
You're lord and master the whole year round",^c

had not only become Imperial Regent, but even Minister of Foreign Affairs *in partibus*, and he grumbled irritably that the rights of seniority had been ignored. For as early as the United Diet of 1847 Vincke as a frondeur had been against the Ministry and as a representative of the nobility against the bourgeois opposition. Hence on the outbreak of the March revolution he thought that he above all others was predestined to save the crown. But his rivals became Ministers of the Present, whereas he was appointed "*Minister of the Future*", a post that he has filled with unbroken success to this day.

In revenge he shook the dust of Berlin from his feet and went to St. Paul's Church in Frankfurt, where he joined the extreme Right wing, acting as a clown, claqueur and bully for General Radowitz.

Our finch^d was a fanatical and zealous Austrian as long as this had the approval of the authorities. He thundered frantically against the *nationalities*.

"On the left they are infatuated with every conceivable nationality in turn—Italians, Poles, and now even Magyars" (session of October 23, 1848).²²⁰

The three knights Vincke, Lichnowski and Arnim played a musical trio:

^a Albrecht Roon.—*Ed.*

^b Report on the session of the Frankfurt National Assembly of September 16, 1848 in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 106, September 19, 1848 in the column "Deutschland".—*Ed.*

^c Johann Fischart, *Affentheurliche, Naupengeheurliche Geschickklitterung...*, S. 76.—*Ed.*

^d Marx puns on *Fink* (finch) and Vincke.—*Ed.*

“To ox’s bellow and cow’s fart
The ass provides the underpart.”

They performed this with such virtuosity in opposition to those who spoke in support of Poland (session of June 5, 1848)^a that even the President’s bell ran out of breath, and when Radowitz went so far as to put forward military and “natural” arguments in favour of incorporating the Mincio into the German Empire (session of August 12, 1848),^b Vincke stood on his head and signalled his applause with his legs, to the delight of the whole gallery and the secret admiration of Vogt. As the chief claqueur for the resolutions by means of which the Frankfurt frog-pond stamped the dynastic subjugation of Poland, Hungary and Italy with the approval of the German people, the squire of the red earth shouted even more excitedly when the claims of the German nation had to be sacrificed because of the humiliating armistice of Malmö. To secure a majority for the ratification of the cease-fire, diplomatic and other observers sneaked down from the gallery and joined the Right-wing benches. The fraud was discovered and Raveaux pressed for a new vote. The finch protested that it was not a matter of who voted but of what was voted for (session of September 16, 1848).^c During the September rising in Frankfurt that had been provoked by the resolution approving the Malmö armistice the Westphalian Bayard vanished without a trace, but reappeared after the state of siege had been proclaimed and avenged himself in a series of reactionary somersaults for the fright which no one could ever make up to him.

Not content with his verbal fulminations against Poles, Italians and Hungarians, he proposed that the Archduke John of Austria should be made president of the provisional central authority (session of June 21, 1848),^d but he obsequiously added the rider that the Habsburg executive of the German Parliament should neither implement nor proclaim, nor in any way concern itself with the Parliament’s plebeian resolutions. He even fell into a rage when, just to make a change, his colleagues in the majority voted that the Imperial Administrator should at least graciously deign to secure the previous agreement of the Parliament on matters of war and peace or the conclusion of treaties with foreign powers (session of June 27, 1848). And the extreme heat which the finch

^a The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 10, June 10, 1848.—*Ed.*

^b *ibid.*, No. 76, August 15, 1848.—*Ed.*

^c *ibid.*, No. 106, September 19, 1848.—*Ed.*

^d *ibid.*, No. 25, June 25, 1848.—*Ed.*

generated in his noisy efforts to extort from the German Parliament a vote of confidence for the Imperial Minister Schmerling and his associates by way of reward for their and the Imperial Administrator's complicity in the bloody and infamous betrayal of Vienna²²¹ (session of October 23, 1848), triumphantly refuted Fischart's slanderous words:

"Oh, what cold mouths
Are Westphalian mouths!"^a

Thus Vincke was amiably pro-Habsburg until the Fata Morgana of Little Germany²²² suddenly came into view, looming above the parliamentary Sahara, and the squire perceived a life-size ministerial portfolio with a finch under its arm. Since the walls of St. Paul's Church had unusually long ears, he might well flatter himself that the noise he had made in Frankfurt with his outbursts about loyalty to the Hohenzollern dynasty had produced an agreeable effect in Berlin. Had he not declared before a crowded St. Paul's Church on June 21, 1848:

"I have been sent here by the electorate to defend the rights not only of the people, but also of the princes. I always comfort myself with the saying of the Great Elector^b who once described the inhabitants of the Mark^c as his most loyal and obedient subjects. And we in the Mark are proud of it."^d

And our Bayard from the Mark proceeded from phrases to fisticuffs in the celebrated parliamentary battle in which he won his spurs (sessions of August 7 and 8, 1848). What happened was that when Brentano, in the course of the debate on the proposed amnesty for Friedrich Hecker, let fall an ambiguous reference to one of the Hohenzollern princes from the rostrum, the finch had a veritable attack of loyalty rabies and rushing from his seat he hurled himself upon Herr Brentano and tried to drag him from the rostrum, shouting "Come down, you dirty dog!" Brentano was not to be dislodged. Later on the squire assaulted him a second time and threw down the gauntlet of knighthood, though naturally he reserved the right to later and more mature reflections on scruples arising from the legal basis. Brentano accepted his challenge with the words:

"Outside the church you may say whatever you wish to me; but if you do not let go of me here I shall hit you in the face."

^a Johann Fischart, *Affentheurliche, Naupengeheurliche Geschichtklitterung...*, S. 68.—*Ed.*

^b Frederick William.—*Ed.*

^c A county in Westphalia.—*Ed.*

^d In this passage Marx summarises Vincke's speech, which was reported in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 25, June 25, 1848.—*Ed.*

The squire then reached into his quiver of invective and showered the Left with a series of dirty dogs until Reichardt shouted at him: "Von Vincke, you are a skunk" (session of August 7, 1848).^a The finch tried to cut short the debate on the disagreement between the Brandenburg Ministry and the Berlin Agreers Assembly by simply proposing that the Assembly should proceed to the next item on the agenda.

"Ever since Wrangel's triumphant entry into Berlin," he said, "order had reigned, stocks have risen on the Exchange.... The Berlin Assembly has no right to issue proclamations to the people, etc."^b

The members of the Agreers Assembly had hardly been dispersed before our knight without fear or reproach fell upon them with even greater fury.

"We lack the political experience," he lamented in the session of December 12, 1848, "needed for a republic. This has been proved to us by the members of the former Berlin Assembly who approved resolutions dictated by base personal ambitions."^c

He sought to appease the storm this provoked by declaring that

"he was ready to defend his words against anyone, in a *chivalrous manner*", but, the cautious knight added, "he was not referring to any member of this Assembly, only the members of the dispersed Berlin Assembly".²²³

This was the defiant challenge that our Bayard of the Mark hurled at the entire army of dispersed Agreers. One of them heard his call, pulled himself together and succeeded in bringing about an unheard-of event: he managed to induce our squire of the red earth to venture bodily onto the battlefield at Eisenach. Bloodshed seemed inevitable when, at the decisive moment, our Bayard smelled a Duns-Scotian rat. His opponent bore the name of Georg Jung and while the laws of honour enjoined the knight without fear or reproach to do battle with dragons, they would not allow him under any circumstances to take up the cudgels with a namesake of the dragon killer.^d The finch simply could not be made to give up this *idée fixe*. He swore by all that is holy that he would rather slit his stomach like a Japanese *daimio*²²⁴ than touch

^a Joseph Reichardt made this remark on August 8. It was included in the report on the session published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 72, August 11, 1848.—*Ed.*

^b Georg Vincke's speech of November 14, 1848, *ibid.*, No. 145, November 17, 1848.—*Ed.*

^c Georg Vincke's speech of December 12, 1848, *ibid.*, No. 169, December 15, 1848.—*Ed.*

^d St. George.—*Ed.*

a hair of the head belonging to a man with the name of Georg, especially if he was below duelling age.^a The knight invulnerable to duels showed all the less restraint in his onslaughts in St. Paul's Church against Temme and other persons unpalatable to the government who were safely under lock and key in the gaol at Münster (session of January 9, 1849).^b While he scorned no detail that might ingratiate him in high places his zeal to prove his loyalty surpassed itself in his titanic efforts to bring about the creation of a lesser Germany and a greater crown for Prussia. Warwick the King-Maker was a child compared to Vincke the Emperor-Maker.

Our Bayard from the Mark now imagined that he had heaped enough burning coals on the heads of the ingrates of March 1848. When the Ministry of Action²²⁵ fell, Vincke vanished for a time from St. Paul's Church and held himself in readiness. He did likewise on the fall of the von Pfuel Ministry. But as the mountain still failed to come to Mahomet, Mahomet resolved to go to the mountain. Having been elected in the first available rotten borough,^c the knight of the red earth suddenly reappeared in Berlin as a deputy in the imposed Chamber,^d fully expectant that the reward for his deeds in Frankfurt would now be forthcoming. Moreover, the knight felt entirely at home in the state of siege which would not deny him any unparliamentary freedom. He lapped up the hisses and jeers with which the people of Berlin greeted him as he stood with the other "imposed" deputies in front of the palace, waiting to be admitted to the White Hall, all the more eagerly as Manteuffel had dropped a delicate hint to the effect that they were inclined in the very highest places to accept the gift of the lesser German crown from the hands of the Emperor-Makers of Frankfurt if only to find a vacant ministerial portfolio in payment for a certain service. Full of such sweet dreams the finch sought to make himself useful for the time being by acting as the dirty boy of the Cabinet. He drew up a draft address to the Crown on lines laid down by the *Kreuz-Zeitung*,^e

^a Marx puns on the name Jung and the adjective *jung* (young).—*Ed.*

^b The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 196, January 16, 1849.—*Ed.*

^c Marx uses English: "rotten borough" and, below, "dirty boy".—*Ed.*

^d i.e. the Chamber set up under the Constitution imposed by Frederick William IV in December 1848. It was dissolved in February 1849.—*Ed.*

^e This refers to a motion Georg Vincke tabled in the Second Chamber of the Prussian National Assembly on March 31, 1849 (see the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 262, April 3, 1849).—*Ed.*

inveighed against amnesty,^a and was only willing to accept the imposed Constitution on the express condition that it would be revised and revoked^b by a "strong state power". He insulted the Left-wing deputies suffering from the rigours of the state of siege, etc., and patiently awaited the hour of his triumph.

The catastrophe drew nearer, the Frankfurt deputation bringing the offer of the Imperial Crown had arrived in Berlin and on April 2 (1849) Vincke put forward the most loyal amendment to the proposals about the Emperor,^c an amendment for which Manteuffel voted in all innocence. As soon as the session was over Vincke rushed into a neighbouring second-hand shop where he personally purchased a portfolio, a portfolio of black cardboard, with a red velvet cover edged in gold. The following day our knight of the joyous countenance sat contentedly in his seat in the middle of the Chamber, grinning like a triumphant faun—but the words he heard from Manteuffel's mocking lips were "never, never, never"²⁶; and the fearless squire, the colour drained from his cheeks, and quivering like an electric eel with emotion, gasped to his friends: "Hold me back, or I shall do something terrible." The *Kreuz-Zeitung*, whose prescriptions Vincke had been anxiously following for months and to whose proposed address of the Chamber he had stood godfather, the *Kreuz-Zeitung*, to hold him back, published an article on the following day with the headline "The Nation in Danger" in which it declared *inter alia*:

"The Ministry remains and the King's^d answer to Herr von Vincke and his associates is that they should not involve themselves in matters which do not concern them."^e

Finding himself cheated our knight *sans peur et sans reproche* left Berlin for Ickern with a nose longer than Levy had ever had, a nose, moreover, which simply could not have been fobbed off onto anyone except a—*Minister of the Future!*

Having spent many a long anxious year vegetating in the pursuit of practical zoology in Ickern, our Cincinnatus of the red earth awoke one fine day in Berlin to find himself the official

^a Georg Vincke's speech of March 22, 1849, *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 255, March 22, 1849.—*Ed.*

^b A pun in the original: *ausgemerzt* (eradicated) puts the reader in mind of *März* (March) and the March revolution in Germany.—*Ed.*

^c See the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 263, April 4, 1849.—*Ed.*

^d Frederick William IV.—*Ed.*

^e "Das Vaterland ist in Gefahr!", *Neue Preussische Zeitung*, April 3, 1849. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* commented on this article in its issue No. 260, April 7, 1849.—*Ed.*

leader of the opposition in the Prussian Chamber of Deputies. Having had such ill luck with his rightist speeches in Frankfurt he now embarked on left-handed speeches in Berlin. It was not possible to discover whether he represented the opposition of confidence or the confidence of the opposition. But however that may be, he once again overplayed his hand. He soon became so indispensable to the Cabinet on the opposition benches that he was forbidden ever to take his leave of them. The squire of the red earth thus remained—a *Minister of the Future*.

In the circumstances the finch became tired of the whole business and so he concluded his famous Treaty of Ickern. *Vogt* gave it him in black and white: as soon as Plon-Plon had conquered the first parliamentary island of Barataria^a on the German continent, and as soon as he had peopled it with Sch-Oppenheimers^b and had installed his Falstaff as its Regent, *Vogt* would appoint the Westphalian Bayard to be his Prime Minister and confer on him the right to adjudicate in all matters concerning duelling. Furthermore, he would make him Real and Privy General Masterbuilder in charge of all the roads,* and would moreover raise him to a princely rank giving him the title of a Prince of Fools. Lastly, he would have a coin struck in the *metal*^c that passes for money in the insular realm of *Vogt* and this coin would have engraved on it a pair of Siamese twins, with *Vogt* on the right as Plon-Plon's Regent, Vincke on the left as *Vogt*'s Minister, and a vine-adorned inscription wound round the voluminous double-figure, stating

"Check by jowl with you
I throw down this challenge to the age."^d

* See the pamphlet *Auch eine Charakteristik des liberalen Abgeordneten von Vincke und erbauliche Geschichte des Sprochhövel-Elberfelder Wegbaues*, Hagen, 1849.

^a The island of which Sancho Panza became Governor in *Don Quixote*, Book II, Chap. 44.—*Ed.*

^b A pun on the name Oppenheim and Schoppen (pint pot). *Sch-Oppenheimers* suggests "boozers".—*Ed.*

^c A pun on *Blech*, which means both "sheet metal" and, in a figurative sense, "nonsense".—*Ed.*

^d Adaptation of the lines: "Arm in arm with you I throw down this challenge to the age." From Schiller's *Don Carlos*, Act I, Scene 9.—*Ed.*

XI

A LAWSUIT

At the end of January 1860 two numbers of the Berlin *National-Zeitung* arrived in London containing two leading articles, the first bearing the title "*Karl Vogt und die 'Allgemeine Zeitung'*" (*National-Zeitung*, No. 37), and the second, "*Wie man radikale Flugblätter macht*" (*National-Zeitung*, No. 41). Under these headings **F. Zabel** presented a version of Vogt's "*Magnum Opus*"^a prepared *in usum delphini*.²²⁷ The "*Magnum Opus*" itself did not reach London until much later. I decided at once to start proceedings for libel against this **F. Zabel** in Berlin.

In the previous ten years a vast number of vilifications of myself had appeared in the German and German-American press, but they only rarely drew any literary response from me, and then only if a real party interest seemed to be at stake, as with the Cologne communist trial. In my view the press has *the right to insult* writers, politicians, actors and other public figures. If I regarded an attack to be worth answering my motto in such cases was: *à corsaire, corsaire et demi*.^b

Here the position was different. *Zabel* accused me of a series of *criminal* and *infamous* actions and he did so for the benefit of a public whose political prejudices inclined it to credit the greatest atrocities and who, moreover, in view of my eleven-year absence from Germany, had nothing to enable it to form a judgment of me. Quite apart from any political considerations, I therefore owed it to my family, my wife and children, to have *Zabel's* *defamatory* accusations tested in a court of law.

^a Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung*.—Ed.

^b Pay rogues in their own coin.—Ed.

The method of procedure I selected excluded from the outset any legal comedy of errors along the lines of Vogt's action against the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. Even if I had indulged in the fantastic idea of appealing against Vogt before the same Fazyesque court which had already quashed one criminal action in Vogt's interests,^a there were a number of important and even decisive points that could *only* be settled in Prussia and not in Geneva. Conversely, the only one of Zabel's statements for which he might have sought proof from Vogt was based on alleged documents which Zabel could produce just as easily in Berlin as his friend Vogt in Geneva. My "complaint" against Zabel contained the following points:

1. In No. 37 of the *National-Zeitung* dated January 22, 1860, in an article entitled "Karl Vogt und die 'Allgemeine Zeitung'" Zabel writes:

"Vogt reports on p. 136 et seq.: Among the refugees of 1849 the term *Brimstone Gang*, or the name of the *Bristlers*, referred to a number of people who, originally scattered throughout Switzerland, France and England, gradually congregated in London, where they revered Herr Marx as their visible leader. The political principle of these fellows was the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' and with the aid of this illusion they succeeded in deceiving for a while not only some of the best among the refugees but also the workers from Willich's volunteer corps. They continued the work of the '*Rheinische Zeitung*'^b among the refugees. In 1849 this paper had counselled against any participation in the movement and had also constantly attacked all the members of Parliament because the Imperial Constitution was the only aim of the movement. The *Brimstone Gang* maintained a frightfully strict discipline among its supporters. Any of them who sought in any way to make a decent living in the bourgeois world was branded a traitor to the revolution merely for attempting to become independent. It was expected that the revolution would break out again at any moment and it was vital to keep its soldiers mobile and ready to be sent into battle. With the aid of rumours, letters, etc., dissension, brawling and duels were artificially fomented in this carefully nurtured class of loafers. Each one suspected the other of being a spy and a reactionary; distrust was universal. One of the chief occupations of the *Brimstone Gang* was to compromise people at home in Germany in such a way that they were forced to pay money so that the gang should preserve their secret without compromising them. Not just one, but hundreds of letters were written to people in Germany, threatening to denounce them for complicity in this or that act of revolution unless a certain sum of money had been received at a specified address by a given date. Following the principle that 'whoever is not unconditionally for us, is against us', the reputation of anyone who opposed these intrigues was 'ruined', not just among the refugees, but also by means of the press. The 'proletarians' filled the columns of the reactionary press in Germany with their denunciations of those democrats who did not subscribe to their views; they became the confederates of the secret police in France and Germany. To fill in the picture Vogt publishes among other documents a long letter by Techow, a former lieutenant, dated

^a The action against the joint-stock company La Cimentaire. See Appendix 16 and also Marx's letter to Engels of November 16, 1860 (present edition, Vol. 41).—Ed.

^b The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*.—Ed.

August 26, 1850, in which the principles, the intrigues, the feuds and the various hostile secret unions of the 'proletarians' are described, and in which we see how Marx, puffed up with Napoleonic pride in his intellectual superiority, *rules the members of the Brimstone Gang with a rod of iron.*"

We should note at once, so as better to understand what follows, that *Zabel*, who was ostensibly allowing *Vogt* to "speak for himself" in the passage quoted above, now goes on in his own name to throw further light on the Brimstone Gang, by mentioning one after the other the Cherval trial in Paris, the communist trial in Cologne, the pamphlet I wrote about the last,^a Lieb knecht's revolutionary congress in Murten and his relations with the *Allgemeine Zeitung* in which I acted as mediator, Ohly, who is "likewise a channel of the Brimstone Gang", and lastly, Biscamp's letter of October 20, 1859 to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*.^b He concludes with the statement:

"A week after Biscamp *Marx*, too, wrote to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, offering it a 'legal document' as evidence against *Vogt* about which we shall perhaps speak at a later date. *These then are the correspondents of the 'Allgemeine Zeitung.'*"

Of the whole of this leading article No. 1, I made use only of the section printed under I. in my submission, and in that passage I was concerned only with the following sentences:

"One of the chief occupations of the Brimstone Gang" (commanded by *Marx*) "was to compromise people at home in Germany in such a way that they were forced to pay money so that the gang should preserve their secret without compromising them. Not just one, but hundreds of letters were written to people in Germany, threatening to denounce them for complicity in this or that act of revolution unless a certain sum of money had been received at a specified address by a given date."

Here, of course, what I required from *Zabel* was *proof that his claims were true*. In my first advice to my lawyer, Legal Counsellor *Weber* in Berlin, I wrote that I did not require *Zabel* to produce "hundreds of threatening letters",^c or even one, but just a single line showing that any one of my notorious party associates had been guilty of the infamous deeds imputed to them. *Zabel*, after all, only needed to turn to *Vogt*, who could have sent him dozens of "threatening letters" by return. And if by any chance *Vogt* were unable to produce even a single line from the hundreds of threatening letters, he would in any case still be able to give the names of the several hundred "people in Germany" who had been

^a Karl Marx, *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne* (present edition, Vol. 11).—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, p. 127.—*Ed.*

^c See *Marx's* letter to *Weber* of February 13, 1860 (present edition, Vol. 41).—*Ed.*

plundered in the manner described. Since these people are to be found in "Germany" they would undoubtedly be more accessible to a court in Berlin than to one in Geneva.

Thus my ground of complaint against Zabel's leading article No. 1 confined itself to a single point: *political compromising of people in Germany for the purpose of extorting money from them*. In order at the same time to refute the other statements made in his leading article No. 1, I produced a series of facts. Here I did not require Zabel to *prove that his claims were true*; I showed that *they were false*.

As to the *Brimstone Gang or Bristlers*, *Johann Philipp Becker's* letter^a has thrown sufficient light on them. As far as the *character of the Communist League* was concerned, and my involvement with it, *H. Bürgers* of Cologne, one of the condemned in the Cologne communist trial, belonged to those people who could have been subpoenaed as witnesses to Berlin and made to testify under oath during the proceedings. Furthermore, *Frederick Engels* had discovered amongst his papers a letter dated November 1852^b and *authenticated* by its postmarks in London and Manchester, in which I informed him of the dissolution of the League at my suggestion together with the reasons for that dissolution as they were set forth in the resolution: viz. that since the arrest of the accused in Cologne all contacts with the Continent had been broken off and that a propaganda society of this kind was no longer opportune. As for Zabel's shameless allegations about my contacts "with the secret police in Germany and France", these were supposed to have been verified partly by the Cologne communist trial and partly by the Cherval trial in Paris. I shall have more to say about the latter in due course. With reference to the former I sent my defence counsel a copy of my *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne*, which had appeared in 1853, and pointed out that the lawyer Schneider II could be subpoenaed from Cologne to Berlin where he could testify under oath to my part in uncovering the nefarious activities of the police.^c Zabel's claim that my party associates and myself had "filled the columns of the reactionary press in Germany with denunciations of those democrats who did not subscribe to our views"—this claim was to be confronted with the fact that I *never* either directly or indirectly wrote for German newspapers from abroad, with the single

^a See this volume, pp. 60-64.—*Ed.*

^b Marx to Engels, November 19, 1852 (see present edition, Vol. 39). An extract from this letter is contained in Marx's notebook.—*Ed.*

^c See Marx's letters to Weber of February 24 and March 3, 1860 (present edition, Vol. 41).—*Ed.*

exception of the *Neue Oder-Zeitung*. My printed contributions to that paper and, if need be, the testimony of one of its editors, Dr. Elsner, would prove that I *never* thought it worth the trouble to mention even one “democrat” by *name*. As for *Liebknecht’s* reports to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, they began in the spring of 1855, three years after the “League” was dissolved, and moreover they appeared *without my knowledge*, and as a scrutiny of the back numbers will reveal they contain accounts of English politics written from his political standpoint, but not a word about “democrats”. When, during my absence from London, Liebknecht sent a pamphlet printed in London and attacking the “democrat” Vogt^a to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, he was perfectly entitled to do so for he knew that the pamphlet had been published by a “democrat” whom the “democrat” Vogt had himself invited to collaborate on his “democratic” propaganda, i.e. whom Vogt had recognised as a “democrat” of equal standing with himself. Zabel’s comic tale making me a “correspondent of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*” was utterly refuted by a letter written to me by *Herr Orges* a few days before the opening of the Augsburg trial (see Appendix 10), in which he, *inter alia*, sought to correct my presumed “liberal” prejudices against the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. Lastly, Zabel’s lie that “a week after Biscamp Marx, too, wrote to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*” collapsed of its own accord since Biscamp’s letter was dated October 20, 1859 and the brief note I sent to Herr Orges along with the “document” he had asked for, was already in the hands of the Augsburg Court on October 24, 1859 and so could not possibly have been written in London on October 29, 1859.

For the benefit of the court it seemed appropriate to supplement the evidence already mentioned with a few documents which would serve to reflect back on “democrat” Zabel the grotesquely defaming light in which he had sought to place my situation within the emigration and my “intrigues” abroad.

I first lived in Paris from the end of 1843 until early in 1845, when I was expelled by Guizot. To indicate my position within the French revolutionary party during my stay in Paris I sent my counsel a letter from *Flocon* which in the name of the Provisional Government of 1848 revoked Guizot’s decree of expulsion and invited me to return to France from Belgium (Appendix 14). I lived in Brussels from the beginning of 1845 until the end of February 1848, when Rogier had me expelled from Belgium. Subsequently the Brussels Municipal Council dismissed the police

^a *Zur Warnung* by Karl Blind.—*Ed.*

commissar who had arrested my wife and myself on the occasion of my expulsion. In Brussels there was an international democratic association²²⁸ in which the aged General *Mellinet* who had saved Antwerp from the Dutch held the office of Honorary President. The lawyer *Jottrand*, a former member of the Belgian Provisional Government, was President; the Vice-President for the Poles was *Lelewel*, a former member of the Polish Provisional Government; the Vice-President for the French was *Imbert*, who had been Governor of the Tuileries after the February revolution of 1848, and I held the post of Vice-President for the Germans, having been elected at a public meeting consisting of the members of the German Workers' Association and the entire German emigration in Brussels. A letter from Jottrand to me at the time of the establishment of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* (Jottrand belongs to what is known as the American school of republicanism, i.e. a trend alien to me), and a few otherwise insignificant lines from my friend Lelewel provide a sufficient indication of my position in the democratic party in Brussels. I added them therefore to the material in my defence (Appendix 14).

After I had been driven out of Prussia in the spring of 1849 and out of France in the late summer of the same year, I went to London, where following the dissolution of the League (1852) and the departure of most of my friends from London, I have been living without joining *any* associations whether public or secret, and indeed without society of any sort. I do, however, from time to time, with the permission of "democrat" Zabel, give free lectures on political economy to a select group of workers. *The German Workers' Educational Society in London*, from which I resigned on September 15, 1850, celebrated its twentieth anniversary on February 6, 1860. It invited me to attend the celebrations, at which it passed a unanimous resolution "*to brand as slander*" Vogt's allegation that I had "exploited" the German workers in general and the London workers in particular. Herr Müller, who was at that time the President of the Workers' Society, had this resolution authenticated on March 1, 1860 at the Police Court in Bow Street. Together with this document I sent my lawyer a letter from the English lawyer and leader of the Chartist Party, Ernest Jones (Appendix 14), in which he expresses his indignation about the "infamous articles"^a of the *National-Zeitung* and draws

^a Marx uses the English phrase and gives the German translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

attention *inter alia* to my unpaid collaboration over a period of years on the London organs of the Chartist Party. (It should be noted, incidentally, that Ernest Jones, who was born and brought up in Berlin, knows more German than Zabel.) I may also mention here that when the English Labour Parliament assembled in Manchester at the end of 1853,²²⁹ Louis Blanc and I were the only members of the London emigration to be invited to attend as honorary members.

Finally, since our honorary Vogt has represented me as “living from the sweat of the workers”, from whom I have never either asked or received a penny, and since “democrat” Zabel has suggested that I have “compromised people in Germany” politically “in such a way that they were forced to pay money so that the gang should preserve their secret without compromising them”, I requested Mr. *Charles A. Dana*, the managing editor^a of the *New-York Tribune*, the first Anglo-American paper which has 200,000 subscribers and is thus almost as widely known as the *Biel Commis voyageur* and Zabel’s “organ of democracy”,^b to give me a statement in writing about my ten-year-long paid collaboration on the *Tribune*, the *Cyclopaedia Americana*, etc. His letter, extremely flattering for me (see Appendix 14), was the last document I thought it necessary to forward to my lawyer to defend myself against the stink-ball No. 1 of Vogt and Zabel.

2. In Zabel’s leading article No. 2, “Wie man radikale Flugblätter macht” (*National-Zeitung*, No. 41, January 25, 1860), it is stated:

“Where the money for this generously distributed paper” (i.e. *Das Volk*) “came from, is known to the gods; men, however, are well aware that *Marx* and *Biscamp* have no money to spare.”

Looked at in isolation this passage might appear to be no more than a frank expression of astonishment, as if I were to say: “How a certain stout party whom I knew in my student days in Berlin as a dunce bereft of all intellectual and material charms—he was the owner of a day nursery and his literary accomplishments prior to the revolution of 1848 were confined to a few furtive contributions to a literary local rag—how the above-mentioned stout dunce managed to become editor-in-chief of the *National-Zeitung*, a shareholder in it and ‘a democrat in possession of spare money’—that is known to the gods. Men, however, who have read

^a Marx uses English: “managing editor”.—*Ed.*

^b The *Schweizer Handels-Courier* and the *National-Zeitung*.—*Ed.*

a certain novel by Balzac^a and who have made a study of the Manteuffel era, may be able to hazard a guess.”

Zabel’s remark acquires quite a different, and far more malicious inflection from the circumstance that it follows his allegations about my connections with the secret police of France and Germany and my conspiratorial and police efforts to extort money with the aid of threatening letters, and leads on directly to the “manufacture of counterfeit paper money on a massive scale” to be treated under 3. Obviously he intends to imply that I obtained financial contributions for *Das Volk* in a disreputable manner.

In order to refute Zabel in court I obtained an affidavit from Manchester dated March 3, 1860 according to which all the money I gave to *Das Volk* (with the exception of a specified amount out of my own pocket) came, not, as Vogt opined, from “the other side of the Channel”, but from the pockets of my friends in Manchester (see “The Augsburg Campaign”).^b

3. “To throw light on” the “tactics” of the “‘proletarian’ party under Marx”, F. Zabel narrates the following story (leading article No. 2 *inter alia*):

“In this way a conspiracy of the most infamous sort was devised in 1852, which aimed at damaging the Swiss workers’ associations by **manufacturing counterfeit paper money on a massive scale**. See Vogt for further details, etc.”

This is how Zabel interprets Vogt’s assertions about the *Cherval affair* and makes me the moral source and criminal accomplice in the “manufacture of counterfeit paper money on a massive scale”. The evidence I assembled in refutation of these allegations by “democrat” Zabel extended over the whole period from Cherval’s admission to the “Communist League” to his flight from Geneva in 1854. An affidavit taken out by *Karl Schapper* at the Police Court at Bow Street on March 1, 1860^c proved that Cherval had been admitted to the League in London *before* I myself joined it. It showed further that when he was in Paris, where he lived from the summer of 1850 until the spring of 1852, he entered into relations not with myself, but with the rival League of Willich and Schapper which was hostile to me. Finally, it proved that after his feigned escape from the prison of St. Pélagie and his return to

^a Presumably *Illusions perdues*.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 118, 119.—*Ed.*

^c On this see Marx’s letter to Karl Schapper of February 27, 1860 (present edition, Vol. 41). Extracts from the letter and from the affidavit are contained in Marx’s notebook.—*Ed.*

London (spring 1852), he joined the public *German Workers' Educational Society* there to which I had ceased to belong in September 1850. Here he was finally exposed, condemned and expelled. Moreover, the lawyer Schneider II in Cologne could be made to testify under oath that the revelations about Cherval made *while* the Cologne communist trial was in progress, the account of his relations with the Prussian police in London, etc., all came from me. My *Revelations*, which were published in 1853, proved that I had publicly denounced him *after* the conclusion of the trial. Finally, Johann Philipp Becker's letter^a provided information about Cherval's Geneva period.

4. Having with genuinely dunce-like logic babbled about the pamphlet *Zur Warnung*, which had been aimed at Vogt, and having done his best to discredit Vögele's testimony^b about the *origins* of the pamphlet, which testimony I had forwarded to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, "democrat" F. Zabel concludes his peroration in leading article No. 2 as follows:

"He" (Blind) "is obviously not a member of the *Marx party in the narrower sense*. It appears to us that the *latter* did not find it too difficult to turn him into a scapegoat, and if the charges levelled at Vogt were to carry any weight, they had to be attributed to a definite person who would have to be responsible for them. The *Marx party* could very easily saddle Blind with the authorship of the pamphlet because and after he had expressed similar views to those contained in it in *conversation with Marx* and in an article in *The Free Press*. By making use of Blind's assertions and turns of phrase the pamphlet could be **fabricated** and made to look as if he had concocted it.... Anybody is at liberty to regard either *Marx* or Blind as its author", etc.

Zabel here accuses me of having **fabricated** a document, viz. the pamphlet *Zur Warnung*, in **Blind's name** and of having subsequently, in a false testimony sent by me to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, represented Blind as the author of the *pamphlet fabricated* by myself. The legal refutation of "democrat" Zabel's allegations was as decisive as it was simple. It consisted of Blind's letter to Liebknecht, cited earlier on, of Blind's article in *The Free Press*,^c the two affidavits of Wiehe and Vögele (Appendices 12 and 13) and the printed declaration of M. D. Schaible.^d

Vogt, who is known to have jeered at the Bavarian Government in his *Studien*,^e launched an action against the *Allgemeine Zeitung* at

^a See this volume, pp. 60-64.—*Ed.*

^b *ibid.*, Appendix 12.—*Ed.*

^c *ibid.*, pp. 122, 122-23.—*Ed.*

^d *ibid.*, pp. 130-31.—*Ed.*

^e Carl Vogt, *Studien zur gegenwärtigen Lage Europas*, S. 91.—*Ed.*

the end of August 1859. As early as September the *Allgemeine Zeitung* had to request a postponement of the hearing and although the postponement had been granted the trial actually took place on *October 24, 1859*. If this was possible in the *obscurantist state of Bavaria*, what might not be expected from the *enlightened state of Prussia*, quite apart from the proverbial truth that "in Berlin there are judges".

My lawyer, *Counsellor Weber*, formulated my case thus:

"The editor of the *National-Zeitung*, Dr. Zabel, has repeatedly and publicly libelled me in leading articles in Nos. 37 and 41 of that paper of this year. In particular he has accused me (1) of acquiring and having acquired money in a dishonourable and criminal manner; (2) of having fabricated the anonymous pamphlet *Zur Warnung* and of having not only represented a certain Blind as its author to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* against my better knowledge, but also of having sought to prove this assertion with the aid of a document of whose inaccurate contents I must have been convinced."

Counsellor Weber elected to proceed first by means of an *official investigation*, i.e. he denounced Zabel's libels to the Public Prosecutor with the idea that proceedings against Zabel should then be initiated by the Public Prosecutor's Office. This resulted in the following "*ruling*" which was handed down on *April 18, 1860*:

"The original documents are returned to Dr. Karl Marx c/o Counsellor Weber, together with the notification that *no issue of public importance* is raised by this matter which could make it desirable for me to take any action (Article XVI of the Prolegomena to the Penal Code of April 14, 1851).^a Berlin, April 18.

"Public Prosecutor at the Royal Municipal Court,

(signed) **Lippe**"

My counsel appealed to the Chief Public Prosecutor and on *April 26, 1860* he received a second "*ruling*" worded thus:

"To the Royal Counsellor Weber, acting on behalf of Dr. Karl Marx of London. I hereby return to you the documents accompanying the complaint of April 20 of this year concerning the denunciation against Dr. Zabel. The only criterion by which the Public Prosecutor may act in considering what discretion he is allowed by Article XVI of the Prolegomena to the Penal Code is, of course, the question whether prosecution is required by any discernible public interest. Concurring with the judgment of the Royal Public Prosecutor I must answer this question negatively in the present instance, and I accordingly reject your complaint. Berlin, April 26, 1860.

"Chief Public Prosecutor at the Royal High Court,

(signed) **Schwarck**"

^a "Gesetz über die Einführung des Strafgesetzbuchs für die Preussischen Staaten. Vom 14. April 1851", *Gesetz-Sammlung für die Königlichen Preussischen Staaten 1851.—Ed.*

I found these two refusals on the part of Public Prosecutor *Lippe* and Chief Public Prosecutor *Schwarck* entirely justified. In every state throughout the world, and hence presumably in the state of Prussia also, the public interest is interpreted as the *interest of the government*. As far as the Prussian Government was concerned there neither was nor could there be “*any discernible public interest*” in the *prosecution* of “democrat” Zabel for libels against my person. If anything, the interest lay in the opposite direction. Moreover, the Public Prosecutor does not have the judicial authority to pass judgment; he has to follow blindly the regulations laid down by his superior, the *Minister of Justice* in the final instance, and he must do this regardless of his own views or convictions.

In actual fact, then, I am quite in agreement with the decisions of Messrs. Lippe and Schwarck, although I have legal reservations about Lippe’s reference to Article XVI of the Prolegomena to the Penal Code of April 14, 1851. There is no paragraph in the Prussian Code which obliges the Public Prosecutor’s Office to give a reason for its *refusal* to intervene. Nor is there any single syllable about this in the Article XVI referred to by Lippe. So why quote it?

My lawyer now proceeded to launch a *civil action*, and I breathed a sigh of relief. Though the Prussian Government had no public interest in prosecuting F. Zabel, I had the strongest private interest to defend myself. And I could now act in my own name. The *verdict* was a matter of indifference to me, if only I could compel F. Zabel to appear at the bar of a public court. But just imagine my astonishment! I was told that it was not yet a matter of instituting legal proceedings, but of a court hearing to settle the question whether I had a *right to bring an action* against F. Zabel.

I was disconcerted to discover that, according to the Prussian judicial regulations, before the judge can hear the action and proceed to judgment, every plaintiff must plead his case to the same judge to enable the latter to see whether the plaintiff has the *right to sue*. In the course of this preliminary investigation the judge may call for additional evidence, or he may suppress part of the old evidence, or he may find that the plaintiff has no **right to sue**. If he sees fit to allow the right to sue, the judge arranges the hearing; the case is heard and is settled by a verdict. If the judge refuses the right to sue, he simply stops the action by a decree, by a *ruling*. This procedure applies not only to actions for libel, but to all civil cases. Thus an action for libel, like any other civil action,

can be dismissed in all instances by such an official *ruling* and therefore will never be settled.

It will be granted that a code of law which does not recognise the *right* of the private individual *to sue* in his own private interests, ignores the simplest and most basic laws of civil society. The right to sue, a self-evident right of the independent private individual, is turned into a privilege granted by the state through the agency of its judiciary. In every legal conflict the state intervenes placing itself between the private individual and the gateway to the court, which is its *private property* and which it opens or closes as it thinks fit. First the judge *gives a ruling* in his capacity as an official; later on he *gives his verdict*, in his capacity as a judge. The same judge who, without hearing the accused, without hearing the pros and cons of the case, *prejudges* the issue of whether there are grounds for an action, and who, let us say, places himself on the side of the plaintiff, who thus decides to a certain degree *in favour of* the legitimacy of the complaint, who decides therefore to a certain degree against the defendant, this very same judge is supposed subsequently, in the actual trial, to *decide impartially* between the plaintiff and defendant, i.e. to pass a verdict on his own prejudgment. B. boxes A.'s ears. A. cannot sue the attacker until he has civilly acquired a licence to do so from the court official. A. withholds from B. a piece of land that belongs to him. B. requires a preliminary licence enabling him to assert his property rights before the court. He may receive it or he may not. B. libels A. publicly in the press, and an official of the judiciary, sitting *in camera*, may "rule" that A. may not sue B. It is easy to see what monstrous injustices may be perpetrated because of this procedure even in civil cases in the strict sense of the word. Still more so in case of libels made in the press against political parties. In all countries, and even in Prussia, judges are known to be human beings like everyone else. Even one of the Vice-Presidents of the Royal Prussian Supreme Tribunal, *Dr. Götze*, has declared in the Prussian Upper House that Prussian law was embarrassed by the disturbances of the years 1848, 1849 and 1850, and needed some time to orientate itself. Who can guarantee that *Dr. Götze* has not miscalculated the time required for orientation? The fact that in Prussia the right to take action against a slanderer, for example, depends on the *interim "ruling"* of an official whom the government, moreover, may punish for so-called "derelictions of duty while in office", with censure, fines, forced transfer and even dishonourable dismissal from the judiciary (see the interim ordinance of July 10, 1849

and the Law concerning discipline of May 7, 1851^a)—how shall I even begin to make this credible, if not clear, to English readers?

For it is my intention to publish an English pamphlet about my case against F. Zabel.²³⁰ And when Edmond About wrote his *La Prusse en 1860* what would he not have given for the information that in the entire realm of the Prussian monarchy the *right to sue* does not exist anywhere but in the Rhine Province, which has been “blessed” with the possession of the *Code Napoléon*²³¹! Men must *suffer* everywhere under the courts, but only in a very few countries are they forbidden to *sue*.

In the circumstances it is understandable that *my action* against Zabel in the *Prussian courts* had to change into *my dispute with the Prussian courts* about Zabel. Leaving the theoretical beauties of the law to one side, let us now cast a glance at the charms of applying it in practice.

On June 8, 1860 the Royal *Municipal Court* in Berlin issued the following “*ruling*”:

“*Ruling regarding the suit for libel brought on June 5, 1860*

“*Marx contra Zabel. M. 38 de 1860*

“1. The suit is dismissed for *lack of an indictable offence*, because the two incriminating leading articles of the local ‘*National-Zeitung*’ merely make the *political views of the Augsburg ‘Allgemeine Zeitung’* and the *history of the anonymous pamphlet ‘Zur Warnung’* the object of discussion. *The statements and assertions contained therein, insofar as they are those of the author himself and are not merely quotations from other persons, do not exceed the bounds of legitimate criticism.* In accordance with § 154 of the Penal Code, therefore, since *the intention to insult* is evident neither *from the form of these utterances, nor from the circumstances in which they were made*, they cannot be held to be punishable.

Berlin, June 8, 1860

“Royal Municipal Court, Criminal Division
“Commission I for Libel Cases (L.S.b)”

Thus the *Municipal Court* forbids me to *sue F. Zabel* and absolves Zabel of the irksome necessity of having to answer for his public libels! And why? “*For lack of an indictable offence.*” The Public Prosecutor’s Office refused to take action against Zabel on my behalf because *no discernible public interest was involved*. The *Municipal Court* forbids me to proceed against Zabel on my own behalf because there is *no indictable offence*. And why is there no indictable offence?

^a “Verordnung, betreffend die Dienstvergehen der Richter ... vom 10. Juli 1849” and “Gesetz, betreffend die Dienstvergehen der Richter ... vom 7. Mai 1851”.—*Ed.*

^b *Locus sigilli*: the place of the seal.—*Ed.*

First: "Because the two leading articles of the '*National-Zeitung*' merely relate to the political views of the '*Allgemeine Zeitung*.'"

Because Zabel has for the time being deceitfully transformed me into a "correspondent of the '*Allgemeine Zeitung*'" he has the right to make me the whipping-boy in his feud with that paper, and I do not even have the right to complain about this "ruling" of the mighty Zabel! Brimstone Gang, Bristlers, *complot franco-allemand*, revolutionary congress in Murten, Cologne communist trial, fabrication of counterfeit paper money in Geneva, "work of the '*Rheinische Zeitung*'", etc., etc.—all this "merely relates to the political views of the '*Allgemeine Zeitung*'".

Second: F. Zabel had "no intention to insult". Of course not! The good fellow only had the intention of killing me off politically and morally with his lies.

When "democrat" F. Zabel asserts in the *National-Zeitung* that I have counterfeited money on a massive scale, fabricated documents in the name of third persons, politically compromised people in Germany so as to extort money from them by threatening to denounce them, etc., it is evident that according to legal terminology he can have had only one of two things in mind: either to libel me or to denounce me. If the first, then he is legally punishable; if the second, then he must prove the truth of his assertions in a court of law. What do I care for any other private intentions of "democrat" F. Zabel?

Zabel libels me, but without "the intention to insult". He injures my reputation like the Turk who cut off the head of a Greek, but without intending to injure him.

If one speaks of "insulting" and "the intention to insult", if one speaks of the kind of infamous actions which "democrat" F. Zabel imputes to me, then the specific "*intention*" to "*insult*", the *utterly malicious intention* of the *good* Zabel—why it breathes from every pore of his leading articles Nos. 1 and 2.

Vogt's "Magnum Opus", appendices included, has no fewer than 278 pages. And F. Zabel, who is accustomed "to draw out the thread of his verbosity finer than the staple of his argument",^a our conceited F. Zabel, Dunce Zabel has succeeded in compressing these 278 pages into approximately five small newspaper columns without forgoing a *single one* of Vogt's libels against me and my party. F. Zabel provides an anthology of the most scurrilous parts and a table of contents for the less drastic portions. F. Zabel, accustomed to expanding two molecules of ideas into 278 pages,

^a Shakespeare, *Love's Labour's Lost*, Act V, Scene 1.—Ed.

now condenses 278 pages into two leading articles without losing a single atom of dirt in the process. *Ira facit poetam.*^a How potent a malice it must have been to transform the hydrocephalic Zabel into a hydraulic press of such force!

On the other hand, his malice blinds him to such an extent that he ascribes miraculous powers to me, actual miraculous powers, only to enable him to make one more slanderous insinuation at my expense.

Having begun in the first leading article with a description of the Brimstone Gang under my command, and having happily turned me and my associates into the “*confederates of the secret police in France and Germany*”, having recounted, *inter alia*, that “these people” hated Vogt because he was continuously rescuing Switzerland from their clutches, he goes on:

“Now when last year Vogt had brought an action against the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, the latter received a communication from another London accomplice, Biscamp.... In the most shameless manner the writer offered ... his services as a second correspondent along with Herr Liebknecht. [...] A week after Biscamp Marx, too, wrote to the ‘*Allgemeine Zeitung*’, offering it a ‘legal document’ as evidence against Vogt about which”^b (the document, the evidence or Vogt?) “we shall perhaps speak at a later date.”

Zabel gave this promise on January 22 and carried it out as early as January 25 in the *National-Zeitung*, No. 41, where we can read:

“So Blind denies being the author of the pamphlet; he is ... referred to as such for the first time in Biscamp’s letter to the ‘*Allgemeine Zeitung*’ of October 20.... To strengthen the case for Blind’s authorship Marx wrote to the ‘*Allgemeine Zeitung*’ on October 29.”

So F. Zabel credits me, not once, but twice, first on January 22 and then again on January 25, having had three days to think it over, with the magic power of writing a letter in London on October 29, 1859 which had been in the possession of the Augsburg District Court on October 24, 1859. And both times he credits me with this magic power in order to establish a link between the “document” I forwarded to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, and the objectionable letter sent to it by Biscamp,^c i.e. to make my letter look like the *pedisequus*^d to Biscamp’s. So was it not malice, pigheaded malice which made F. Zabel stupid to the point of

^a Anger makes the poet (Virgil, *The Aeneid*, Book VII, 507, paraphrased).—*Ed.*

^b In German: *von dem*, but *dem* can refer either to the document, the evidence or Vogt.—*Ed.*

^c See this volume, p. 127.—*Ed.*

^d Sequel.—*Ed.*

beginning to believe in magic, far beyond the average degree of duncedom?

But, the *Municipal Court* “argues further”, Zabel’s leading article No. 2 “*merely makes the history of the anonymous pamphlet Zur Warnung*” the “object of discussion”. The *object*? Read *pretext*.

Eisele-Beisele, concealed this time under the name of “*German Patriots*”, had, it appears, sent an “open letter” in November 1859 to the “National Association” which was printed in the reactionary *Neue Hannoversche Zeitung*.²³² This “open letter” offended against the “democracy” of Zabel, a democracy in which the heroic courage to attack the Habsburg dynasty was neatly balanced by the servility shown to the Hohenzollern dynasty. The *Neue Preussische Zeitung* took the opportunity provided by the “open letter” to make the not very original discovery that once democracy has got under way it need not necessarily end up in—**F. Zabel** and his “organ of democracy”. Zabel flew into a rage and wrote leading article No. 2, “*Wie man radikale Flugblätter macht*” [“*How Radical Pamphlets Are Made*”].

“By inviting the *Kreuz-Zeitung*,” Zabel begins portentously, “to go through the history of the pamphlet (*Zur Warnung*) with the help of the documents and explanations provided by Vogt, we express the hope that it will finally admit that we were in the right when we said two months ago that the open letter to the National Association was something for it, not for us, that it had been designed for its columns, not for ours.”

So “democrat” Zabel, who has been so radically initiated by Vogt into the mysteries of radicalism, wishes for his part to read the *Kreuz-Zeitung* a lecture on the mystery of “how radical pamphlets are made”, or as the *Municipal Court* expresses it: “he **merely wishes to make the history of the pamphlet ‘Zur Warnung’ the object of discussion**”. And how does F. Zabel set about his task?

He starts with the “tactics” of the “‘proletarian’ party *under Marx*”. First, he recounts how, *in the name* of a Workers’ Association but behind its back, the “proletarians *under Marx*” send letters from London for foreign workers’ associations “which are to be compromised”, hatch “intrigues”, set up a secret league, etc.; and how they, finally, compose “documents” which “inevitably attract the protests of the police” to those associations “which are to be compromised”. Thus in order to teach the *Kreuz-Zeitung* “how radical pamphlets are made”, Zabel begins by explaining that “the ‘proletarian’ party *under Marx*” manufactures police “reports” and “documents”, which are not “pamphlets” at all. In

order to explain “how radical pamphlets are made” he goes on to recount that the “proletarians under Marx” manufactured “*counterfeit paper money on a massive scale*” in Geneva in 1852, which are likewise not “radical pamphlets”. In order to demonstrate “how radical pamphlets are made”, he reports that the “proletarians under Marx” carried out “*manoeuvres*” hostile to the Swiss and compromising for the associations during the Lausanne Joint Festival in 1859—and these too are not “radical pamphlets”. He explains that “Biscamp and Marx” with the aid of funds whose source was known only “to the gods” produced *Das Volk*, which was not a “radical pamphlet” either but a weekly journal. And after all this he puts in a good word for the immaculate purity of Vogt’s recruiting agency, which once again was no “radical pamphlet”. In this way he fills 2 of the $3\frac{1}{4}$ columns of the article entitled “*How Radical Pamphlets Are Made*”. Thus for these $\frac{2}{3}$ of the article the *history* of the anonymous pamphlet serves merely as a *pretext* for reproducing those of Vogt’s slanders which F. Zabel, his “friend” and accomplice, has not dealt with under the heading “*Political Views of the ‘Allgemeine Zeitung’*”. Lastly at the very end Dunce I comes to the art of “making radical pamphlets”, namely to “the history” of the pamphlet *Zur Warnung*.

“Blind denies being the author of the pamphlet; he is impudently referred to as such for the first time in Biscamp’s letter to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of October 20.... To strengthen the case for Blind’s authorship Marx wrote to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* on October 29: ‘I have obtained the *accompanying document* because Blind refused to stand by statements which he made to me and to other persons.’”

Now Zabel suspects this document in particular because Lieb knecht ... “strangely enough” adds: “We requested the magistrate (?)” (this question mark stands in Zabel’s text) “to authenticate our signatures” and Zabel has resolved once and for all not to recognise any magistrate but the Berlin magistrate. Zabel goes on to report the contents of Vögele’s declaration which had caused Blind to send the statements of Hollinger and Wiehe to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* to prove that the pamphlet had not been printed on Hollinger’s press and was therefore not composed by Blind. He continues:

“Marx, always ready with an answer, replied in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* on November 15.”

Zabel lists the various points in my reply. Marx says this ... Marx says that..., “**in addition**, Marx refers”. So since I do not say anything “*in addition*”, surely Zabel has informed his readers of *all* the points I make in my reply? But we know our Zabel! He

conceals, leaves out, *suppresses* the decisive point of my reply.^a In my declaration of November 15^b I make a number of points, all of which are numbered. Thus “1. ... 2. ... and finally, 3. ...”: “It so happened that the reprint” (of the pamphlet) “in *Das Volk* was made from the type still standing in Hollinger’s print-shop. Thus *without the need to call witnesses*, a simple comparison of the pamphlet and the reprint of it in *Das Volk* would be sufficient to prove to a court that the former came from F. Hollinger’s print-shop.” That’s the conclusive piece of evidence, Zabel said to himself. My readers must not hear of this. So he spirits away the strongest point of my reply and instead burdens my conscience with a suspect gift of repartee.^c Thus Zabel’s account of “the history of the pamphlet” contains two intentional falsehoods. He falsifies first the chronology and then the contents of my declaration of November 15. His *twofold falsification* prepares the way for his conclusion that I “fabricated” the pamphlet, and that I did so in such a way that it “looked like Blind’s fabrication” and hence that in sending Vögele’s testimony to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* I likewise sent a false testimony, and did so *knowingly*. The accusation of fabricating documents with the intention of saddling a third person with responsibility for them does not, in the view of the Berlin *Municipal Court*, “exceed the bounds of legitimate criticism” and even less does it imply “an intention to insult”.

At the end of his recipe describing “how radical pamphlets are made” it suddenly occurs to Zabel that there is *one* shameless invention of Vogt’s that he has omitted to make use of, and so right at the end of his leading article No. 2 he hastily adds the following note:

“In 1850 another circular” (as Vogt recollects) “written by Parliamentary Wolf, *alias Casemate Wolf*, was sent to the ‘proletarians’ in Germany, and *simultaneously* allowed to fall into the hands of the Hanover police.”^d

With this pretty police anecdote about one of the former editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, our stout party, democrat Zabel, grins and takes his leave of his readers. The words “alias

^a Marx puns on the words *unterschlagen* (suppress) and *schlagend* (decisive).—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 8-9. The italics were introduced by Marx in *Herr Vogt*.—*Ed.*

^c Marx puns on the words *Schlagkraft* (forcefulness, striking power, here—strongest point) and *Schlagfertigkeit* (gift of repartee).—*Ed.*

^d From the article “Wie man radikale Flugblätter macht”, *National-Zeitung*, No. 41, January 25, 1860.—*Ed.*

Casemate Wolf" belong not to Vogt but to F. Zabel. His Silesian readers were to be clearly informed that he is talking about their countryman *W. Wolff*, the former co-editor of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. How assiduously our good Zabel toils to ensure that the connection between the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* and the police in France and Germany is established down to the last detail! His Silesians might imagine otherwise that it was Zabel's own *B. Wolff* that was under discussion, Zabel's natural superior^a who, as is well known, rearranges world history with the aid of telegrams and in "secret league" with such well-known manufacturers of false reports as *Reuter* in London and *Havas* in Paris. *Sigmund Engländer*, the notorious secret police agent, is the heart and soul of the Reuter bureau and hence the presiding genius of the trinity *B. Wolff-Reuter-Havas*.

Despite all this and despite democrat Zabel's intention not to insult, the Berlin *Municipal Court* declares that Zabel's two leading articles do indeed "contain statements and assertions" which "exceed the bounds of legitimate criticism" and are therefore "punishable", or at least *actionable*. So produce this Zabel! Hand him over and let him wriggle in court! Not so fast! the *Municipal Court* exclaims. The "statements and assertions" contained in the two leading articles, the Municipal Court says, do not, "insofar as they are those of the author" (Zabel) "himself **and are not merely quotations from other persons**", exceed "the bounds of legitimate criticism" and are not "punishable". Hence Zabel is not only not punishable, he is not even actionable and "the costs are therefore to be borne by the plaintiff". So the libellous part of Zabel's "statements and assertions" is "**mere quotation**". *Voyons!*

It will be remembered from the opening part of this chapter that my action for libel was based on four passages in Zabel's two leading articles. In the passage dealing with *Das Volk's* financial resources (*sub 2* of the points listed above), *Zabel himself does not claim* to quote nor does he quote in fact, for:

Zabel (*National-Zeitung*, No. 41)

"Where the money for this generously distributed paper" (*Das Volk*) "came from, is known to the gods; men, however, are well aware that Marx and Biscamp have no money to spare."

Vogt ("Magnum Opus", p. 212)

"The regular correspondent of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* is a collaborator on this paper" (*Das Volk*) "which was established with the aid of unknown funds, for neither Biscamp nor Marx have the requisite means for it" (i.e. to establish a paper on the basis of *unknown funds?*).

^a Marx gives the English phrase in brackets after its German equivalent.—*Ed.*

In the second incriminating passage (see above *sub* 4), in which I am accused of fabricating a document in Blind's name, Zabel even states *explicitly* that **he** is speaking in *his own* name, as Zabel, and not in Vogt's.

"It appears to **us**", as monarch in the Kingdom of Dullness^a Zabel naturally makes use of the *pluralis majestatis*,^b "it *appears to us* that the latter" (the Marx party) "did not find it too difficult to turn him" (Blind) "into a scapegoat.... By making use of Blind's assertions and turns of phrase the pamphlet could be *fabricated* and made to *look as if he*" (Blind) "had concocted it" (*National-Zeitung*, No. 41).

The third of the incriminating passages (see above *sub* 3) must be "quoted" again in full:

"In this way a conspiracy of the most infamous sort was devised in 1852, which aimed at damaging the Swiss workers' associations by manufacturing counterfeit paper money on a massive scale. (See *Vogt for further details*.) This conspiracy would have caused the greatest difficulties for the Swiss authorities if it had not been uncovered in time."

Is this "**merely a quotation**", as the *Municipal Court* maintains, is it in fact a quotation of any kind? It is indeed partly plagiarised from Vogt, but it is *not a quotation in any sense of the word*.

In the first place *Zabel himself* does not claim that he is quoting, but implies that he is speaking in his own right when he remarks in a parenthesis: "See Vogt for further details." And now look at the passage itself! In Geneva it was known that *Cherval* did not arrive in Geneva before *spring 1853* and that his "conspiracy" and flight took place in *spring 1854*. So Vogt, writing in Geneva, does not venture to assert that the "conspiracy ... was devised in **1852**". This lie he leaves to our good Zabel in Berlin. Furthermore, Vogt says:

"Various stone and copper plates had already been *engraved* for this purpose" (the manufacture of counterfeit banknotes, etc.) "by Nugent" (Cherval) "himself" ("Magnum Opus", p. 175).

Hence various stone and copper plates had *already* been engraved for the forgery, but the banknotes and treasury bills had *not yet* been manufactured. According to *Zabel*, however, "the manufacture of counterfeit paper money" had already taken place, and "*on a massive scale*", moreover. Vogt states that the statutory "purpose" of Cherval's conspiracy was

"to attack despotism with its own weapons, by manufacturing counterfeit banknotes and treasury bills on a massive scale" (loc. cit.).

^a Marx uses the English word.—*Ed.*

^b The royal plural.—*Ed.*

Zabel deletes the attack on despotism and holds fast to the "manufacture of counterfeit paper money on a massive scale". In Zabel, then, what we have is an ordinary criminal act which is not even palliated for the benefit of the members of the "secret league" by the pretence of a political purpose. And *this* is how Zabel "**quotes**" from the "Magnum Opus" throughout. *Vogt* felt it necessary to turn his tall stories into a "book". So he fills it with details, spins it out, scrawls, splutters, colours, daubs, arranges, develops, complicates, explains, fantasises, *fa del cul trombetta*^a with the result that at every point his Falstaffian soul shines through the purported facts, which are once more dissolved by his own narrative, though he is not aware of this, into the void from which they had emerged. Zabel, by contrast, who had to compress the book into two leading articles and did not wish to omit a single slander, suppresses everything but the *caput mortuum*^b of every purported "fact", he strings the dry bones of these slanders together and then counts his rosary with the zeal of a Pharisee.

Take the following case. Starting with the fact revealed first by myself, that Cherval was a secret police agent and *agent provocateur* in the pay of various embassies, *Vogt's* imagination takes wing. He says *inter alia*:

"Various stone and copper plates had *already* been engraved for this purpose" (forgery) "by Nugent" (Cherval) "himself; the gullible members of the secret league had *already* been selected to go to France, Switzerland and Germany with packets of these" (as yet unmanufactured) "counterfeit banknotes. But *denunciations had already been made to the police* and scandalously enough these also incriminated the workers' associations, etc." ("Magnum Opus", p. 175.)

Vogt thus makes Cherval *denounce* his own operations to the police even though he has done *no more* than engrave the stone and copper plates for the intended forgery, even before the purpose of his conspiracy has been achieved, before a *corpus delicti* has appeared and anyone apart from himself has been compromised. But the *Vogtian* Cherval is eager to "scandalously" incriminate "the workers' associations" in his "conspiracy". The *foreign embassies* that make use of Cherval are as stupid as he is and are equally precipitate

"in indicating to the Swiss police in confidence that political intrigues were being devised in the workers' associations, etc."^c

^a Makes a bugle of his rear (Dante, *The Divine Comedy*, Inferno, Canto XXI).—*Ed.*

^b Literally: dead head; a term used in chemistry for the residuum left after distillation; here: remainder, residue.—*Ed.*

^c *op. cit.*, S. 176.—*Ed.*

Simultaneously, these ambassadorial numskulls, who are too impatient to allow the conspiracy hatched by Cherval on their orders to come to fruition and who, in their childish impatience, reveal the identity of their own agent to no purpose, have police lying in wait at “the frontiers” to receive Cherval’s emissaries, “if matters had developed to such a pitch” as they had prevented them from developing, “to receive them with counterfeit bank-notes” whose manufacture they had thwarted,

“and turn the whole affair into an occasion for a general witch-hunt in which masses of innocent people would have had to pay for the misdeeds of a few wicked men”.^a

When *Vogt goes on* to say that “the plan of the whole conspiracy had been *monstrously conceived*”, everyone will agree that its conception was *monstrously stupid*, and when he concludes with the boast

“I cannot deny that I contributed a **substantial part** in frustrating these *devilish plans*”,^b

everyone will get the point and collapse with laughter at the whimsical devil. But compare this with the ascetic account given in Zabel’s annals!

“In this way a conspiracy of the most infamous sort was devised in 1852, which aimed at damaging the Swiss associations by manufacturing counterfeit paper money on a massive scale. (See *Vogt* for further details.) This conspiracy would have caused the greatest difficulties for the Swiss authorities if it had not been uncovered in time.”

Here, condensed into a single brief sentence, we find a whole bundle of facts, as dry as they are scandalous. “A conspiracy of the most infamous sort” dated 1852. “Manufacture of counterfeit paper money on a massive scale”, i.e. an ordinary criminal act. The intentional compromising of the “Swiss workers’ associations”, i.e. betrayal of one’s own party. The “greatest difficulties” which might have arisen for the “Swiss authorities”, i.e. *agent provocateur* against the Swiss Republic in the interests of Continental despots. Lastly, “timely discovery of the conspiracy”. Here criticism is deprived of all the vital clues provided by *Vogt’s* account, they have been simply conjured away. One has to believe or disbelieve. And this is how Zabel treats the entire “Magnum Opus” insofar as it deals with my party associates and myself. As *Heine* so rightly says, no human being is as dangerous as an addle-brained ass.

^a *ibid.*, S. 177.—*Ed.*

^b *ibid.*—*Ed.*

Lastly, the fourth incriminating passage (see above *sub* 1) with which leading article No. 1 opens its revelations about the “Brimstone Gang”. It is true that *Zabel* begins with the words: “*Vogt reports on p. 136 et seq.*” But *Zabel* does not make it clear whether he is summarising or quoting. He takes care not to use quotation marks. In fact, *he does not quote*. There could be no doubt about it from the outset since he condenses pp. 136, 137, 138, 139, 140 and 141 of the “Magnum Opus” into 51 lines of about 48 letters each, does not indicate omissions, but packs the sentences as tightly as Dutch herrings, and lastly even has space in these 51 lines for reflections of his own. Wherever he comes upon a particularly vile sentence, he incorporates it more or less as it stands. For the rest, he mixes up his excerpts so that they do not follow the pagination of the “Magnum Opus” but are brought in as and when they suit his purpose. He equips the head of one Vogtian sentence with the tail of another Vogtian sentence. Or again, he composes a *single* sentence from the keywords of a dozen of Vogt’s sentences. Should it occur that in Vogt’s original the stylistic rubble prevents the light from falling right on the slander, *Zabel* clears away the rubble. For example, *Vogt* talks of

“compromising people at home in Germany in such a way that *they could no longer resist the attempts to blackmail them* and were forced to pay money”.

According to *Zabel*, however, this reads:

“compromising people in such a way that they were forced to pay money”.

Elsewhere *Zabel* *alters* anything that appears to him to be *ambiguous* in Vogt’s unstylish mess. Thus *Vogt*:

“they were forced to pay money so that the gang should preserve the secret of *their* having been compromised”.

Whereas in *Zabel*:

“so that the gang should preserve their secret *without* compromising [them]”.

Finally, *Zabel* interpolates entire sentences of his *own* invention, such as:

“The Brimstone Gang maintained a frightfully strict discipline among its supporters” and “they”—namely “*the fellows who continued the work of the ‘Rheinische Zeitung’ among the refugees*”—“**they became the confederates of the secret police in France and Germany.**”

Thus of the four passages regarded by me as libellous three stem *from Zabel on Zabel’s own admission*, while the fourth alleged “quotation”, although containing quotations, is *not a quotation*, and even less is it “*merely a quotation*”, as the *Municipal Court*

maintains, and least of all is it a quotation “from other persons” in the plural, as the same *Municipal Court* contends. Conversely, among all Zabel’s “statements and assertions” about me there is not a *single line* of “criticism and appraisal” (“legitimate” or “illegitimate”).

But even supposing that *the actual assumption of the Municipal Court* is as true as it is false; even supposing that Zabel’s libellous statements about me were merely *quotations*, would the *Municipal Court* because of this circumstance be *legally justified* in *forbidding* me to bring an *action* against *F. Zabel*? On the contrary, in a “ruling” handed down by the **Royal Prussian High Court** which we shall give *in extenso*, we find that

“It would **not** affect the situation as laid down in §156 of the Penal Code if the facts set out in the aforementioned articles turned out to be *the author’s own assertions* or **quotations** from the assertions of third persons.”

So whether he quotes or not, “democrat” Zabel remains responsible for his “assertions”. The *Municipal Court* has already *declared* that Zabel published assertions about me which are in themselves “punishable”; *but* these assertions are **quotations** and **hence** unassailable. Away with this pretext, which is *legally untenable*, cries the **High Court**. So finally I shall be able to lay hands on Zabel; the doors of the law will open, *Italiam, Italiam!*^a

My lawyer appealed from the *Municipal Court* to the *High Court* and on *July 11, 1860* he received the following “ruling”:

“In the leading articles published in Nos. 37 and 41 of the *National-Zeitung* on January 22 and 25 of this year under the titles ‘Karl Vogt and the *Allgemeine Zeitung*’ and ‘How Radical Pamphlets Are Made’, a libel on the plaintiff Dr. Karl Marx of London cannot be found. Even though it would not affect the situation as laid down in §156 of the Penal Code if the facts set out in the aforementioned articles turned out to be the author’s own assertions or the assertions of third persons, it would be wrong to restrict the right of the press to subject the activities of the parties and the published expression of their disagreements to analysis and criticism, insofar as the form of the polemic does not indicate an *intention to insult*. In the present case this intention *cannot be presumed to exist*.”

“In the aforementioned articles light is thrown above all on the conflict that prevailed between the views of Dr. Karl Vogt, on the one hand, and the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*, on the other, concerning the support expressed for the interests of the Italians and for the interests of Austria on the occasion of the recent war; in this context the intervention of the so-called *German emigration* in London on the side of the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* and against Vogt, as well as some of the *factional quarrels* and the machinations of these refugees among themselves, are also discussed!

^a Virgil, *The Aeneid*, Book III.—*Ed.*

“If in the course of these discussions the relations of *the plaintiff* to these parties and his partial involvement in their aspirations and in particular his efforts to assist the Augsburg ‘*Allgemeine Zeitung*’ in its polemic against Vogt by supplying it with evidence are drawn into the debate, the relevant allegations concerning this involvement which are contained in the two articles are *not so much refuted as the plaintiff intended, but rather confirmed* by the facts which he himself includes in his complaint. If on the other hand he goes on to assert that he is *identified, in a defamatory manner*, with those political activities, on which the articles in question admittedly pass severe strictures, referring to them as *eccentric*, and even unprincipled and *dishonourable*, this assertion cannot be regarded as substantiated. For when the first article quotes from Vogt’s account: ‘that the refugees of 1849 gradually congregated in London, where they revered the above mentioned Marx as their visible leader’; and refers to a letter by Techow: ‘in which we see how Marx, puffed up with Napoleonic pride in his intellectual superiority, rules the members of the Brimstone Gang with a rod of iron’—what we have here is in essence only a description of what Vogt calls the ‘Brimstone Gang’, and not an invective against Marx, who is portrayed rather as a restraining influence and intellectually superior. Least of all is his person associated with those people who are accused of blackmail and denunciation. Likewise, in the second article, it is nowhere stated that the plaintiff ascribed the authorship of the pamphlet *Zur Warnung* to the abovementioned Blind *against his better knowledge*, and that he *knowingly* sent false testimonies of third persons to that effect to the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*. However, the fact that the testimony of the compositor Vögele was disputed is conceded by the plaintiff himself in his complaint when he cites the conflicting statements by Hollinger, the printer, and Wiehe, the compositor. Furthermore, on his own admission a certain Schaible later disclosed that he was the author of the pamphlet, and he did this moreover only *after* the two articles in the *National-Zeitung* had appeared.

“The appeal of the 21st of last month against the negative ruling of the Royal Municipal Court of the 8th of the same month is adjudged to be without foundation and is therefore dismissed. Twenty-five silver groschen in costs for assessing the unfounded appeal are to be paid to the Treasury of the local Municipal Court without delay on pain of distraint.

“Berlin, July 11, 1860

Criminal Senate of the Royal High Court
Second Division
Guthschmidt Schultze

“To D. Phil. Karl Marx c/o Legal
Counsellor Weber”

When I first received this “*ruling*” from my lawyer, I did not notice the address and conclusion on the first reading and, unfamiliar as I am with Prussian law, I imagined that I had been sent a copy of the *defence* handed in to the High Court by “democrat” F. Zabel. I said to myself that what Zabel had to say about “the views” (see Appendix 15) “of Dr. Karl Vogt and the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*”, and about “the interests of the Italians and the interests of the Austrians”, all this must have accidentally strayed into his petition from a leading article intended for the *National-Zeitung*.

In any event, “democrat” F. Zabel does not mention in so much as a *single syllable* either these views or those interests in the four columns that concern *me* in his two leading articles (which themselves amount to hardly six columns). In his petition Zabel says that I

“assisted the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* in its *polemic* against Vogt by supplying it with evidence”.

He refers to *Vogt's legal action against the “Allgemeine Zeitung”* as the *polemic of the “Allgemeine Zeitung” against Vogt*. If legal action and polemic were identical things why should I require the permission of the Public Prosecutor, the Municipal Court, the High Court, etc., for my “polemic” against Zabel? And Zabel even asserts that the “relevant allegations” in his two leading articles concerning my relations with the *Allgemeine Zeitung* were “*not so much refuted as I had intended, but rather confirmed*” by the facts I had myself included”. Not so much—but rather! In *jus*^a it must be either-or. And what “relevant allegations” were made by Zabel?

The “relevant allegations” in Zabel’s leading article No. 1 concerning my relations with the *Allgemeine Zeitung* were as follows:

1. Liebknecht became correspondent for the *Allgemeine Zeitung* on the strength of a reference which I had given him officially. I declared, in my complaint, that Zabel was lying, but thought it unnecessary to advance any further “facts” on such an absurdity.
2. According to Zabel I sent a “legal document” to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* from London on October 29, which in fact had been in the possession of the Augsburg District Court on October 24, and he found this “allegation” confirmed by the “facts” produced by me! From the facts I had advanced in my complaint, Zabel could indeed see that, quite apart from any political motives, it had become necessary for me to send in a document relating to *the origins* of the pamphlet *Zur Warnung*, because Vogt had *publicly* attempted to saddle me with the authorship of it even before the institution of legal proceedings.
3. Zabel’s “allegation” that I was one of the correspondents of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* was refuted by me with the aid of authentic documents. Zabel’s *leading article No. 2*, “How Radical Pamphlets Are Made”, contained, as shown earlier on, no “allegations” concerning my relations with the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, other than the “allegation” that I myself had fabricated the pamphlet, that I had then laid it at Blind’s door and

^a Law.—Ed.

tried to prove that it was his work by means of Vögele's false testimony. Were all these "relevant allegations not so much refuted as I had intended, but rather confirmed by the facts included 'in my complaint'?" Zabel himself admits the opposite.

Could Zabel have known that Schaible had written the pamphlet *Zur Warnung*? Did Zabel have to believe that compositor Vögele's testimony, which on my own admission was "disputed", was in fact correct? But where in the world have I laid down that Zabel must have this knowledge or that belief? My complaint refers "rather" to Zabel's "relevant allegation" that I "*fabricated* the pamphlet and made it *look* as if *he*" (Blind) "had concocted it" and that I later used Vögele's testimony to try and prove that it was Blind's work.

Finally, I came across an argument in Zabel's defence which at least looked interesting.

"If on the other hand he" (the plaintiff Marx) "goes on to assert that he is *identified*, in a *defamatory* manner, with those political activities" (of the Brimstone Gang), "on which the articles in question" (Zabel's leading articles) "admittedly pass severe strictures, referring to them as *eccentric*, and even *unprincipled* and *dishonourable*, this assertion cannot be regarded as substantiated... *Least of all is his person associated with those people who are accused of blackmail and denunciation.*"^a

Zabel is manifestly not one of those Romans of whom it is said: "*memoriam quoque cum voce perdidissimus.*"^b He has lost his memory, but not his tongue. He transforms not just brimstone but the Brimstone Gang from its crystalline state into a liquid and from a liquid into a gas, and he uses the red gas to throw dust in my eyes.^c The Brimstone Gang, he claims, is a "party" with whose "activities" he has never "*identified*" me, and with whose "blackmail and denunciations" he never even associated people "associated" with me. It is essential to convert this sulphurous gas back into the original flowers of sulphur.

In *leading article No. 1 (National-Zeitung, No. 37, 1860)* Zabel opens his "relevant allegations" about the *Brimstone Gang* by describing "*Marx*" as its "visible leader". The second member of the Brimstone Gang whom he alludes to "to fill in the picture", but does not name, is Frederick Engels. He refers in particular to the letter in which Techow reports on his meeting with Fr. Engels, K. Schramm and myself. Zabel draws attention to the two last as illustrations of the "*Brimstone Gang*". Immediately after he mentions *Cherval* as a London emissary. Then it is Liebknecht's turn.

^a See this volume, p. 283.—*Ed.*

^b "We lost our memories along with our vices" (Tacitus, *Vita Julii Agricola*).—*Ed.*

^c Marx puns on *roter Dampf* (red gas) and *blauen Dunst vormachen* (literally: to produce blue smoke; figuratively: to throw dust in someone's eyes).—*Ed.*

"This Liebknecht, *in nomine omen*,^a one of the most servile supporters of Marx... Immediately after his arrival Liebknecht took up service with Marx, and his labours were to the complete satisfaction of his master."

"Ohly", who marches directly behind Liebknecht, is "**likewise** a channel of the Brimstone Gang". Finally, "another London accomplice, Biscamp". All these details follow in quick succession in leading article No. 1, but at the end of leading article No. 2 yet another member of the Brimstone Gang is named, W. Wolff—"Parliamentary Wolf, alias Casemate Wolf"—who had been entrusted with the vital mission of "sending out circulars". According to Zabel's "relevant allegations", then, the *Brimstone Gang* consists of: Marx, leader of the Brimstone Gang; F. Engels, illustration of the Brimstone Gang; Cherval, London emissary of the Brimstone gang; Liebknecht, "one of the most servile supporters of Marx"; Ohly, "**likewise** a channel of the Brimstone Gang"; Biscamp, "*another*" London "accomplice"; lastly, Wolff, the Brimstone Gang's writer of circulars.

In his first 51 lines Zabel makes this miscellaneously constituted *Brimstone Gang* figure variously under the names: "Brimstone Gang or Bristlers", "fellows who continued the work of the **Rheinische Zeitung** among the refugees", the "*proletarians*" or, as we find in leading article No. 2, "the 'proletarian' party under Marx".

So much for the personnel and the names of the Brimstone Gang. In his "relevant allegations" Zabel gives a brief and impressive account of its *organisation*. "Marx" is the "*leader*". The "*Brimstone Gang*" itself comprises the circle of his "*close*" supporters or, as Zabel says in his second leading article, "*the Marx party in the narrower sense*". Zabel even provides a touchstone for defining "*the Marx party in the narrower sense*". A member of the Marx party in the narrower sense must have seen Biscamp at least once in his life.

"He" (Blind), Zabel writes in leading article No. 2, "he declares that he has never seen Biscamp in the whole of his life. He is *obviously not a member of the Marx party in the narrower sense.*"

The "Marx party in the narrower sense", or the Brimstone Gang proper, is therefore the aristocracy of the gang, not to be confused with the third category, the mass of "*supporters*" or "this carefully nurtured *class of loafers*". So first comes leader Marx, then the "Brimstone Gang" proper, or "the Marx party in the

^a The name says everything. *Lieb-knecht*—dear servant.—Ed.

narrower sense”, and lastly, the mass of “supporters” or the “class of loafers”. The Brimstone Gang, subdivided into these three categories, enjoys a truly Spartan discipline. “The *Brimstone Gang*,” says Zabel, “maintained a frightfully strict discipline among its *supporters*.” While at the same time “*Marx ... rules the members of the Brimstone Gang with a rod of iron*”. It is obvious that in such a well-organised “gang” as this, its characteristic “activities”, its “chief occupations”, the deeds the gang carries out qua gang, all take place on the orders of its leader and they are explicitly presented by Zabel as the actions of this leader with his rod of iron. And what was, if we may use the term, the official occupation of the gang?

“One of the chief occupations of the Brimstone Gang was to compromise people at home in Germany in such a way that they were forced to pay money so that the gang should preserve their secret without compromising them. Not just one, but hundreds of letters were written to people in Germany, threatening to denounce them for complicity in this or that act of revolution unless a certain sum of money had been received at a specified address by a given date.... The reputation of anyone who opposed **these** intrigues was ruined, not just among the refugees, but also by means of the press. The ‘proletarians’ filled the columns of the reactionary press in Germany with *their denunciations* of those democrats who did not subscribe to their views; they became the *confederates* of the secret police in France and Germany, etc.” (*National-Zeitung*, No. 37.)^a

After beginning the “relevant allegations” about the Brimstone Gang with the observation that I was its “visible leader”, and after listing its “chief occupations”, namely blackmail, denunciation, etc., Zabel concludes his general description of the Brimstone Gang with the words:

“...*They became the confederates of the secret police in France and Germany. To fill in the picture Vogt publishes a letter by Techow, a former lieutenant, dated August 26, 1850 ... in which we see how Marx, puffed up with Napoleonic pride in his intellectual superiority, rules the members of the Brimstone Gang with a rod of iron.*”

Having caused me to be “revered” as the “visible leader” of the Brimstone Gang in his introductory remarks, Zabel fears that the reader might imagine that behind the visible leader there was an invisible one, or that, like the Dalai Lama, I was content to be “revered”. So at the end of his description he transforms me (in *his* words, not *Vogt’s*) from the merely “visible” leader into the leader who wields a rod of iron, from the Dalai Lama into the Napoleon of the “Brimstone Gang”. And it is precisely this remark that he cites in his petition as *proof* that he does *not* “*identify*” me with the “political activities” of the Brimstone Gang,

^a Here and below cf. this volume, pp. 260-61.—*Ed.*

on which “severe strictures are passed” and which are “referred to as *eccentric*, and even *unprincipled* and *dishonourable*”. Of course he doesn’t! Or not entirely! He does “*identify*” me with them, but *not* “in a *defamatory manner*”. “Rather” he has done me the *honour* of appointing me the Napoleon of blackmailers, threatening-letter writers, *mouchards*, *agents provocateurs*, forgers, etc. Zabel clearly takes his conception of honour from the vocabulary of the *December Gang*. Hence the epithet “Napoleonic”. But I am taking him to court because of this very *honour* he has shown me! With the “facts” adduced in my complaint I have **proved**, and proved so decisively that Zabel absolutely refuses to follow me to any public court, **proved** that all his “relevant allegations” about the Brimstone Gang are Vogtian inventions and lies, and that Zabel only “quotes” them in order to be able to “*honour*” me as the Napoleon of this Brimstone Gang. But am I not depicted by him as “a restraining influence and intellectually superior”? Does he not describe me as maintaining *discipline* in the gang? He himself explains what this restraint, this superiority and this *discipline* consisted in.

“The Brimstone Gang maintained a *frightfully strict discipline* among its supporters. Anyone who sought in any way to secure a decent living in the bourgeois world was branded a traitor to the revolution merely for attempting to become independent.... With the aid of rumours, letters, etc., dissension, brawling and duels were fomented in this carefully nurtured class of loafers, etc.”

But Zabel is not content with this *general description* of the “political activities” of the Brimstone Gang with which he has honourably “identified” me.

Liebknecht, a “notorious member of the Marx party”, “one of the most servile supporters of Marx, whose labours were to the complete satisfaction of his master”, intentionally compromises the workers in Switzerland with the “revolutionary congress in Murten” and joyfully “leads” them “into the arms” of the waiting “gendarmes”. “In the Cologne trial the authorship of the forged minute-book was attributed to this Liebknecht.” (Zabel omits to add, of course, that this lie of Stieber’s was publicly *shown* to be a lie of Stieber’s during the actual proceedings.) *Wolff*, the former co-editor of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, is accused of sending “a circular to the proletarians” from London and at the same time “allowing it to fall into the hands of the Hanover police”.

While Zabel thus presents people who are “notoriously” connected with me as agents of the secret police, on the one hand, he also connects me with a “notorious” secret police agent, *agent provocateur* and forger, namely Cherval, on the other. Immediately

following his general description of the Brimstone Gang he makes “a number of people” including *Cherval* travel from London to Paris “in the double role of revolutionary seducers of workers and confederates of the secret police” and bring about the “so-called communist trial”, etc. In leading article No. 2 he takes up the story:

“In this way a conspiracy of the most infamous sort was devised in 1852 which involved the manufacture of counterfeit paper money on a massive scale (see **Vogt for further details**), etc.”

Now if the reader of the *National-Zeitung* carries out Zabel's peremptory instructions and *sees for further details in Vogt*, what does he find? He finds that Cherval was sent by me to Geneva where under my direct orders he set in motion “the most infamous conspiracy involving counterfeit paper money”, etc. The reader, referred by Zabel to Vogt, will further find this:

“However, the personal involvement of Marx is quite irrelevant in this context, for, as we have already remarked, it is a matter of complete indifference whether Marx does something himself or has it done by a member of his gang; his control over his people is absolute.”

But Zabel could not rest content even with this. At the end of his two leading articles he felt impelled to whisper a final word into the ear of his readers. He says:

“He” (Blind) “declares at the same time that he has never seen Biscamp in the whole of his life. He is obviously not a member of the *Marx party in the narrower sense*. It appears to us that the latter” (i.e. the Marx party in the narrower sense) “did not find it too difficult to turn him” (Blind) “into a scapegoat.... The *Marx party* could very easily saddle Blind with the authorship of the pamphlet because ... he had expressed similar views to those contained in it in conversation with *Marx* and in an article in *The Free Press*. By making use of Blind's assertions and turns of phrase the pamphlet could be fabricated and made to look as if he” (Blind) “had concocted it.”

Hence “*the Marx party*” or “*the Marx party in the narrower sense*” alias the Brimstone Gang “fabricated” the pamphlet so that it looked as if Blind had concocted it? Having unfolded this hypothesis Zabel summarised its implications in the following laconic words: “**Anybody is now at liberty to regard either Marx or Blind as its author.**”

Thus it is not the Marx party or Blind, and not even Blind or the Marx party in the narrower sense, *vulgo* Brimstone Gang, but Blind or Marx, *Marx sans phrase*. Hence the Marx party, the Marx party in the narrower sense, the Brimstone Gang, etc., were merely pantheistic names for *Marx*, the person Marx. Zabel not only “*identifies*” Marx with the “party” of the Brimstone Gang, he

personifies the Brimstone Gang in Marx. And the *selfsame* Zabel has the effrontery to assert before a court that, in his leading articles, he did not “*identify* the plaintiff” Marx with the “activities” of the Brimstone Gang in a “defamatory manner”. With his hand on his heart he swears that “*least of all*” has he “associated” my “person with those people” whom he “accuses of blackmail and denunciation”! What a figure Zabel will cut in the public session of the court, I thought to myself. What a figure indeed! With this consoling exclamation, I turned once more to the document I had received from my lawyer and read it through again, vaguely noticing that it was signed by some such names as Müller and Schultze.^a But I soon discovered my error. What I had in my hands was not Zabel’s proposed petition, but—a “*ruling*” handed down by the *High Court* over the signatures of *Guthschmidt and Schultze*, a ruling that refused me the *right to proceed with my action* against Zabel, and, to cap it all, by way of punishing me for my “complaint” it ordered me to pay 25 silver groschen to the Treasury of the Berlin Municipal Court without delay, on pain of distraint. I was indeed *attonitus*!^b However, on carefully reading the “*ruling*” once more my astonishment faded away.

Example 1

Zabel prints in the leading article of the “National-Zeitung”, No. 37, 1860:

“Vogt reports on p. 136 et seq.: Among the refugees of 1849 the term Brimstone Gang, or the name Bristlers, referred to a number of people who, originally scattered throughout Switzerland, France and England, gradually congregated in London, where they revered Herr Marx as their visible leader.”

Messrs. Guthschmidt and Schultze read in the leading article of the “National-Zeitung”, No. 37, 1860:

“For when the first article quotes from Vogt’s account: ‘that the refugees of 1849 gradually congregated in London, where they revered the above mentioned Marx as their visible leader’”.

Zabel says: Among the refugees of 1849 *the term Brimstone Gang, or the name Bristlers*, referred to a number of people, etc., who gradually congregated in London, where they revered myself as their visible leader. Messrs. *Guthschmidt and Schultze*, however, make *Zabel* say: *The refugees of 1849 gradually congregated in London* (which is not even true since a large proportion of the refugees congregated in Paris, New York, Jersey, etc.) where they revered me as their visible leader, an honour which I have not

^a The names of two philistines, the characters of many skits and jokes in the satirical journal *Kladderadatsch*.—*Ed.*

^b Thunderstruck.—*Ed.*

received, nor is it imputed to me by either Zabel or Vogt. Now Messrs. *Guthschmidt and Schultze* are by no means giving a summary, they *quote in inverted commas* a sentence *nowhere* printed by Zabel as if it were *quoted* by Zabel in his first article “from Vogt’s account”. Messrs. *Guthschmidt and Schultze* evidently had before them a *secret edition* of No. 37 of the *National-Zeitung*, known neither to me nor the public. This must be the explanation of all these misunderstandings.

This *secret edition* of No. 37 of the *National-Zeitung* differs from the vulgar edition of the same issue not just by a *different formulation* of particular sentences. The *entire context* of the first leading article in the *vulgar edition* has nothing but a few words in common with its context in the *secret edition*.

Example II

Having appointed me the leader of the Brimstone Gang, Zabel goes on to say in No. 37 of the “National-Zeitung”:

“These fellows” (the Brimstone Gang) “...continued the work of the *Rheinische Zeitung* among the refugees.... One of the chief occupations of the Brimstone Gang was to compromise people at home in Germany in such a way that they were forced to pay money.... The ‘proletarians’ filled the columns of the reactionary press in Germany with their denunciations ... they became the confederates of the secret police in France and Germany. To *fill in* the picture” (of the “Brimstone Gang” or “proletarians”) “Vogt publishes a letter by Techow ... in which the principles, the *activities*, etc., of the ‘proletarians’ are described, and in which we see how Marx, puffed up with Napoleonic pride in his intellectual superiority, rules the members of the Brimstone Gang with a rod of iron.”

After Zabel has appointed me the leader of the refugees of 1849, Messrs. *Guthschmidt and Schultze* read in No. 37 of the “*National-Zeitung*”:

“and when it” (the first article in the *National-Zeitung*) “*goes on* to refer to a letter by Techow, ‘in which we see how Marx, puffed up with Napoleonic pride in his intellectual superiority, rules the members of the Brimstone Gang with a rod of iron’”.

Given that judges have the legal authority to grant or refuse private individuals the right to bring an action, it is clear that Messrs. *Guthschmidt and Schultze* were not only justified in refusing me the right to sue Zabel, they were obliged to do so. For the context of the leading article in No. 37 of the *secret edition* of the *National-Zeitung*, which they reproduce *in nuce*,^a flatly precludes

^a In brief.—*Ed.*

any *corpus delicti*. For what in fact does Zabel say in this *secret edition*? In the first place he confers on me the undeserved honour of causing me to be "revered" as the "visible leader" by the entire community of refugees living in London in 1849. And why should I wish to "bring an action" against him for that? And secondly, he does me the no less undeserved honour of making me "rule with a rod of iron" over a *Brimstone Gang* without connecting me with that gang in any other way whatever, more or less as I had ruled over Zabel and his companions in 1848-49. And what is there in that to make me "bring an action" against Zabel?

It is obvious what confusions can arise when the law permits officials of the judiciary to "give a ruling" and "rule" in secret on the question of whether or not someone has the right to bring an action against another person, e.g. for libel in the *National-Zeitung*. The plaintiff *sues* on the basis of a vulgar edition of No. 37 of the *National-Zeitung* of which perhaps 10,000 copies are available to the public, and the judge bases his *ruling* on a secret edition of the same issue produced *for him alone*. So little care is taken in this procedure to preserve the identity even of the *corpus delicti*.

By making the right of private individuals to bring an action dependent on a judicial permit in each particular case, Prussian law proceeds from the assumption that the state is a paternal authority which must regulate and act as guardian over the civil existence of its children. But even from the standpoint of Prussian law the "ruling" of the *High Court* seems strange. The intention of Prussian law is evidently to prevent the bringing of frivolous actions and therefore, if I understand its spirit correctly, and if I am right in assuming that its aim is not the systematic refusal of justice, it gives the judge the right to refuse permission for a case to proceed, but only if the *complaint* is *prima facie* unfounded, if the suit appears frivolous on the face of it. Is that the case in the present instance? The *Municipal Court* concedes that Zabel's leading articles *in fact* contain "defamatory" and hence "punishable" statements about me. It only places *F. Zabel* beyond the reach of my legal vengeance because *F. Zabel* has "merely quoted" his libels. The *High Court* declares: defamatory statements are equally punishable by law whether they are quoted or not quoted, but it goes on to *deny* for its part that Zabel's leading articles contain any defamatory statements about myself whether quoted or unquoted. Thus the *Municipal Court* and the *High Court* have not merely *divergent*, but directly *conflicting* views of the *facts of the case*. The

^a At first view.—*Ed.*

one finds defamatory statements about me where the other fails to do so. The *contradictory* judicial findings about the *facts of the case* demonstrate clearly that *prima facie* there are grounds for complaint. If Papinian and Ulpian say: This printed statement is defamatory; and if Mucius Scaevola and Manilius Brutus assert the opposite: This printed statement is not defamatory, what will the nation of quirites²³³ think? Why should the people not believe with Ulpian and Papinian that Zabel had in fact published defamatory statements about me in Nos. 37 and 41 of the *National-Zeitung*? And if I assure the nation of the quirites that Mucius Scaevola and Manilius Brutus have given me a secret certificate stating that Zabel's "*defamatory*" statements and assertions in no way referred to my person, the nation of the quirites will undoubtedly shrug their shoulders and say: *à d'autres*.^a

Since the *High Court* is the final court of appeal as far as the *facts of a case* are concerned, in this case therefore it was the court of last instance that had to decide whether Zabel's two leading articles *in fact* contained defamatory statements about me and whether the intention to insult was present; and since the *High Court* denies that the *facts of the case* provided sufficient grounds for action, a further appeal to the **Supreme Tribunal** could only relate to the question whether the *substantive findings* of the High Court were not based on an *error in law*. In its "*ruling*" the *High Court* had **established** that Zabel had accused the *Brimstone Gang* of "unprincipled and dishonourable activities", "denunciations and blackmail", the same *Brimstone Gang* that in the same leading article the same Zabel had expressly described as "*the Marx party*", or "*the Marx party in the narrower sense*", with "Marx" as its visible "leader", ruling it with a rod of iron. Was the High Court within its *legal* rights in not regarding this as an insult to me? My lawyer, Counsellor *Weber*, comments on the question as follows in his submission to the *Supreme Tribunal*:

"It is true that it is nowhere stated in so many words" (by Zabel) "that Marx had extorted or forged money, or denounced anybody. But is anything more explicit required than the statement: Marx was the leader of a party which was engaged in the above-mentioned criminal and immoral activities? No sensible and unprejudiced person can deny that the leader of an association whose purpose and chief activities consist in the execution of crimes, not only condones these activities, but initiates and organises them and enjoys their fruits. And this leader is, unquestionably, doubly responsible, both as participant and as the intellectual inspiration, even if it cannot be proved in any particular instance that he was actually implicated in a specific act of crime. *The view expressed in the disputed ruling*" (of the High Court) "*would imply that a man's good name was utterly at the*

^a Tell us another one.—*Ed.*

mercy of anyone who wished to discredit him. Instead of fraudulently asserting that A. had committed murder, a would-be slanderer would need only to say that somewhere or other a gang was engaged in committing murder and that A. was the leader of the gang. The view expressed by the High Court grants this slanderer complete impunity. According to the correct view, however, the same punishment for slander should be imposed on the slanderer irrespective of whether he falsely accuses a man of being a robber or a robber-chief."

From the standpoint of ordinary *common sense* a libel has undoubtedly been committed. Does it also exist in the *view of Prussian law*? The High Court says no, my lawyer says yes. If the High Court has ruled, contrary to the Municipal Court, that the *form of a quotation* should not grant *immunity* to a libeller, why should not the Supreme Tribunal rule, contrary to the High Court, that the libeller is *not protected* by the "*tapeworm*" form? My lawyer appealed to the **Supreme Tribunal**, hence so to speak to the *Areopagus* itself, on this *legal point*, on the argument that there had been an *error in law* on the part of the High Court in its appraisal of the facts of the case. The *Supreme Tribunal* "*ruled*":

"I. Your appeal of August 23 of this year against the ruling on July 11 of this year of the Criminal Senate of the Royal High Court in the action for libel brought by Dr. K. Marx against Dr. Zabel, editor of the *National-Zeitung*, is hereby dismissed as without foundation after consideration of the relevant documents. II. For the Royal High Court did not find an objective defamation of the plaintiff in the two leading articles of the *National-Zeitung* in question, nor did it find that there was an intention to insult the plaintiff. It was right, therefore, to refuse permission to proceed with the proposed action for libel. The question whether there is an objective act of defamation, or an intention to insult, essentially pertains to matters of fact and the conclusions regarding them can only be disputed by appeal to the Royal Supreme Tribunal if the decision of the Appeal judge is based on an error in law. III. However, such an error is not evident in the present instance. IV. The costs of this ruling are to be borne by you and for this purpose 25 silver groschen should be deposited with the Treasury of the local Royal Municipal Court within a week.

"Berlin, October 5, 1860

Royal Supreme Tribunal, von Schlickmann

"To Legal Counsellor Weber in Berlin"

For the sake of clarity I have numbered the various sections of the "*ruling*" of the *Supreme Tribunal*.

Sub I. Herr von Schlickmann states that the appeal against the High Court has been "*dismissed*". *Sub II.* Herr von Schlickmann informs us of the respective spheres of competence of the High Court and the Supreme Tribunal—evidently a didactic digression irrelevant to the matter in hand. *Sub IV.* Herr Weber is ordered to pay the sum of 25 silver groschen into the Treasury of the Berlin

Municipal Court within a week. This is a *consequence* of the “ruling”, but certainly not its *reason*.

Where then is the “dismissal” of the appeal *substantiated*? Where is the answer to the very detailed case set out by my lawyer? It is:

Sub III. “However, such an error is **not** *evident* in the present instance.”

If we strike out the little word *not* from this sentence *sub III*, the explanation reads: “However, such an error is *evident* in the present instance.” And this of course would overturn the ruling of the High Court. Thus this ruling is sustained only by the word “*not*” with which Herr *von Schlickmann* “dismisses” in the name of the Supreme Tribunal the appeal put forward by Counsellor Weber.

Ἀυτότατος ἔφη.^a *Not!* Herr *von Schlickmann* does *not* refute the legal objections raised by my lawyer; he does *not* discuss them; he does *not* even *mention* them. Of course, Herr *von Schlickmann* had reasons enough for his “ruling”, but he fails to state them. *Not!* The demonstrative force of this little word lies entirely in the authority of the man who utters it, in the position he holds in the hierarchy. In itself “not” proves nothing. *Not!* Ἀυτότατος ἔφη.

Thus the *Supreme Tribunal* too **forbade** me to **bring an action** against “democrat” **F. Zabel**.

Thus ended *my lawsuit with the Prussian courts*.

^a He himself hath spoken (the words are attributed to the disciples of Pythagoras).—*Ed.*

XII

APPENDICES

I. SCHILY'S EXPULSION FROM SWITZERLAND

A letter from Schily about his expulsion from Switzerland which exemplifies the treatment meted out to non-parliamentary refugees²³⁴ can unfortunately only be printed in extract, owing to lack of space. The letter begins by recounting how two German refugees, B. and I.,^a both friends of Schily, left Geneva, were arrested during their journey through Switzerland and, having been liberated by Druey, returned again to *Geneva*.

"At their request," Schily continues, "I went to Fazy to find out whether anyone was looking for them and he reassured me by saying that there was no reason at Cantonal level to disturb their incognito and that no inquiries about them had reached him at Federal level either. I would do well, however, to have an interview with the *chef du département de justice et de police*, M. Girard, mentioning his name and what he had told me. This I did with more or less the same success and leaving my address behind in case there were any Federal inquiries. A few weeks later I was visited by a police officer who requested me to give him the address of B. and I. I refused, hurried around to the aforementioned Girard and upon being threatened by him with expulsion unless I gave him the address, I explained to him that according to our previous agreement I could be appealed to as an *intermédiaire*, but not as a *dénonciateur*. To which he replied: 'Vous avez l'air de vouloir vous interposer comme ambassadeur entre moi et ces réfugiés, pour traiter de puissance à puissance.'^b I replied: 'Je n'ai pas l'ambition d'être accredité ambassadeur près de vous.'^c And in fact I was then dismissed without any of the ceremony to which ambassadors are entitled. On my way home I learnt that B. and I. had just been discovered, and that they had been arrested and led off so that I could regard Girard's threat as superseded by events. But I had reckoned without April 1, for on this ominous day in 1852 I was requested by a police officer, in the middle of the street, to accompany him to the Hôtel de Ville, where some questions

^a Elard Biscamp and Peter Imandt.—*Ed.*

^b "It looks as if you would like to act the ambassador between me and these refugees, to mediate as between equal powers."—*Ed.*

^c "I have no ambition to become an ambassador accredited to you."—*Ed.*

were to be put to me. Once arrived there it was explained to me by State Councillor Tourte, the Genevan Commissar for the expulsion of refugees and *ad latus*^a to Trog, his counterpart at Federal level, who happened to be in Geneva at the time, that I was expelled and that he must send me to Berne without delay; all of this to his greatest regret, since there was no complaint against me at Cantonal level, but the Federal Commissar insisted on my expulsion. To my request to be allowed to see the latter he replied: 'Non, nous ne voulons pas que le commissaire fédéral fasse la police ici.'^b This statement, of course, contradicted his earlier one and in general he now abandoned his role of Genevan State Councillor, which consisted in resisting Federal demands for expulsion with liberal prudery, in yielding only to force, sometimes also yielding, with pleasure or resignation, to the application of gentle pressure.^c Another feature of this role was to noise it abroad that the person expelled was a spy and that it had been necessary to remove him in the interests of the 'good cause'.... Thus Tourte told the refugees afterwards that he had had to get rid of me because I was in league with the Federal Commissar, together with whom I had sought to frustrate *his* (Tourte's) measures to protect the refugees, i.e. that I was in league with the same Commissar who, much to his regret, had given orders to expel me. *Quelles tartines!*^d What lies and contradictions! And all for a little *aura popularis!*^e Of course, wind is what that gentleman uses to keep his balloon airborne. Grand Councillor and State Councillor of Geneva, member of the Swiss Council of States or National Council, a born Counsellor of Confusion, he needs only to become a member of the Federal Council²³⁵ to ensure that Switzerland will enjoy peaceful days in accordance with the saying: *Providentia Dei et confusione hominum Helvetia salva fuit.*^f

On arriving in London Schily sent a letter of protest about Tourte's slander to the Genevan *Indépendant*, which was under the influence of *Raisin*, whom we shall mention later, and which had shortly before printed a scathing attack on the assinine slanderous fabrications with which "the liberal *faiseurs*^g were driving the refugees out of Switzerland". His letter was *not* published.

"From the Hôtel de Ville in Geneva," Schily continues, "I was transferred to gaol, and on the following day I was sent by mail coach to Berne with a police guard. There M. Druey held me in close confinement for two weeks in the so-called Old Tower...."

In his correspondence with the imprisoned Schily, which we shall refer to in due course, *Druey* placed all the guilt on the Canton of Geneva, while for his part Tourte had asserted that the entire responsibility lay with the Federal authorities, since *there was*

^a Assistant.— *Ed.*

^b "No, we don't want the Federal Commissar playing the policeman here."— *Ed.*

^c Marx uses English: "gentle pressure".— *Ed.*

^d What follies!— *Ed.*

^e Whiff of popularity (a phrase from Cicero's *De haruspicum responso*, 20, 43).— *Ed.*

^f The providence of God and the confusion of man have been the salvation of Switzerland.— *Ed.*

^g Busybodies.— *Ed.*

no complaint against him on the part of the Canton of Geneva. He had received a similar assurance shortly before from *Raisin*, the Genevan examining magistrate. Schily has this to say, among other things, about the latter gentleman:

“On the occasion of the Federal Shooting Competition which was held in Geneva in the summer of 1851, *Raisin* had taken over the editorship of the *Journal du tir fédéral*, which appeared in French and German. He engaged me to work on the paper, promising me a fee of 300 francs in exchange for which I was supposed *inter alia* to record *flagrante delicto*^a the opening and closing speeches in German of the President of the Committee Tourte. I owe a debt of gratitude to Tourte for having made my task much easier by his habit of addressing more or less the same enthusiastic words to the various deputations of marksmen, varying his phrases slightly according to whether he was eulogising the Bear of Berne, the Bull of Uri,^b or other members of the Confederation. In particular, when he would come to the refrain ‘But if the moment of danger ever arrives, then we shall, etc.’, I would calmly lay down my pen and when *Raisin* asked *why*, I could answer: *c’est le refrain du danger, je le sais par coeur*.^c Instead of my hard-earned fee of 300 francs, I managed only to extract 100 from *Raisin*, and only with the greatest difficulty although he did open up the prospect of collaborating on a political review he intended to establish in Geneva in order to be independent of all the existing parties and be able to oppose any side and especially the then ‘liberal’ government of Fazy and Tourte, even though he belonged to it himself. He was the very man for such an enterprise—able, as he used to boast, ‘d’arracher la peau à qui que ce soit’...^d .Accordingly, he commissioned me to establish contacts for this journal in the course of a journey through Switzerland which I undertook after my Federal Shooting labours. I did so and on my return I drew up a written report on the results achieved. In the meantime, however, the wind had begun to blow from another direction and he found himself returning full sail from his expedition of piracy into the peaceful harbour of the existing government. *J’en étais donc pour mes frais et honoraires*,^e for which I vainly pestered him and continue to do so to this day, and have still received nothing even though he is now a wealthy man.... Shortly before my arrest he asserted categorically that there was no question of my being expelled, his friend Tourte had himself assured him that it was not necessary for me to take any preventive measures with regard to Girard’s threats, etc. ... In reply to a letter which I sent him *de profundis*,^f from my old prison tower, asking him for a small instalment of the money he owed me and for an explanation of the incident (my arrest, etc.), he preserved a stubborn silence, even though he assured the person who brought him the message that he would comply with all my requests....

“A few months later I received a letter from K.,^g a reliable, unprejudiced man, informing me that my expulsion had been the work of the refugee *parliamen-*

^a In the very act of committing an offence.—*Ed.*

^b An allusion to the arms of the Cantons of Berne and Uri.—*Ed.*

^c “It is the refrain about danger, I know it by heart.”—*Ed.*

^d “To skin a man alive.”—*Ed.*

^e That was the last I heard of my expenses and fees.—*Ed.*

^f Literally: out of the depths. Figuratively: from a state of extreme suffering (Psalms 130:1).—*Ed.*

^g Presumably a letter from Friedrich Kamm written in 1852.—*Ed.*

tarians, and this was confirmed *mordicus*^a by a few lines written by *Ranickel*, which he enclosed. This view was also confirmed by many experienced observers with whom I later had an opportunity to discuss the matter.... Yet I did not hate the parliamentarians like that hyena *Reinach*, who used to drag the late-lamented Imperial Regent *Vogt*, day after day, from the Imperial tomb to the dinner table in Berne where Vogt sat like the reincarnation of the 'chained Prometheus', and then, *entre poire et fromage*,^b would savagely devour both his mummy and the reincarnated form to the horror of those present. It is true that I was no admirer of the parliamentarians' deeds, quite the reverse! But is it likely that these gentlemen intended to punish me for this by an Imperial ban—regarding Switzerland as part of the Empire because both the Imperial Constitution²³⁶ and the most recent resolution of the Imperial Diet lie buried there? I think it more likely that the presumption of their persecution of myself is connected with the parliamentary rebellion mentioned in my previous letter^c against the Geneva Refugee Committee formed by myself, Becker and a number of Genevan citizens.... Why these gentlemen wished to usurp the right to distribute the refugee funds was a matter about which even they differed among themselves. Some of them, among them *Dentzel* from the little Chamber of Baden, *preferred*, contrary to our practice of giving aid above all to penniless workers, to wipe away the tears of professional sufferers, heroes of the revolution, patriotic sons of the nation, who had seen better days.... *Is fecit cui prodest*,^d as the saying goes in the trade, and since my activities were, it is true, inconvenient to these gentlemen, the suspicion arose that they had made use of their influence in important places to bring about my removal. It was known that they had the *aurem principis*^e or, at any rate, they were close enough to it to whisper something or other about my *restiveness*, and that *princeps* Tourte especially had frequently gathered them around himself...."

Having described how he was moved from the Old Tower in Berne to Basle and then over the French frontier, Schily continues:

"As far as the expense entailed in expelling refugees is concerned, I cherish the hope that the costs were defrayed not by the Federal Treasury, but by that of the Holy Alliance. For one day a considerable time after our entry into Switzerland, *Princess Olga* was sitting at luncheon in a Berne restaurant with the *Russian* chargé d'affaires there.^f *Entre poire et fromage* (*sans comparaison* to the terrible *Reinach*) Her Highness remarked to her table companion: 'Eh bien, Monsieur le baron, avez-vous encore beaucoup de réfugiés ici?' 'Pas mal, Princesse,' he replied, 'bien que nous en ayons déjà beaucoup renvoyé. M. Druey fait de son mieux à cet égard, et si de nouveaux fonds nous arrivent, nous en renverrons bien encore.'^g This was overheard and passed on to me by the waiter on duty, a quondam volunteer in the Imperial campaign where he served under my august command."

^a Convincingly.—*Ed.*

^b Over the dessert.—*Ed.*

^c Schily's letter of February 8, 1860 (see this volume, pp. 43-46).—*Ed.*

^d He did it who benefits by it (Seneca, *Medea*, III, 500-01).—*Ed.*

^e Ear of the authorities.—*Ed.*

^f Pavel Alexeyevich Krüdener.—*Ed.*

^g "Well, Baron, are there still many refugees here?" "Quite a few, Your Highness, although we have already sent many of them back. M. Druey does his best in this respect, and if we receive new funds we shall be able to send back even more."—*Ed.*

During Schily's removal his travel-effects vanished mysteriously and irretrievably.

"It has remained a mystery to this very day how my effects could have vanished in Le Havre from the chaos of bundles accompanying a German émigré train (into which we had been incorporated in Basle by *Klenk*, the emigration agent, whom the Federal authorities had hired to transport us to Le Havre, with the result that all the luggage belonging to the refugees and emigrants had become hopelessly confused), *unless* it had been achieved *with the aid of a list of the refugees and their baggage*. Perhaps the Swiss Consul in Le Havre, the merchant *Wanner*, to whom we were sent for further transportation, knows more about it. He promised that we would be fully compensated. Druey later confirmed this promise in a letter which I sent to *Advocate Vogt in Berne* to enable him to pursue the matter in the Federal Council. However, I have not been able to get it back from him up to now, *nor have I ever received a reply to any of the letters I wrote to him*. On the other hand, in the summer of 1856 my complaint was rejected by the Federal Council and I was warned to keep the peace, without being given any reasons for this decision....

"All this and all the expulsions involving so many gendarmes, handcuffs, etc., are mere trivia, however, compared to the peculiarly cosy good-neighbourly arrangement of sending home the so-called less serious offenders of the Baden campaign, providing them with special travel passes and directing them to report on their arrival to the local authorities where, instead of being allowed to resume their occupations, as they had been led to expect, they were subjected to all sorts of unexpected penances. The silent sufferings of all those extradited in this way (for extradition is the correct word) are still waiting for their chronicler and avenger.

"The Swiss Tacitus speaking of Switzerland says that it does a man credit 'if his faults may be mentioned without detracting from his greatness'. There is no lack of materials for praise of this kind; to praise Switzerland in this manner does not spoil its figure ... *qui aime bien châtie bien*.^a And in fact I for my part have an irrepressible love for Switzerland by and large. I like both the country and the people. Keeping a gun as part of his household equipment, always ready and skilful in using it to protect historical traditions of good repute and modern achievements of good quality, the Swiss in my eyes definitely deserves respect. He is entitled to the sympathies of others because he himself feels sympathy for others who struggle to improve their situation. 'I would rather that God had lost his best pair of angels,' a Swiss farmer said in his annoyance at the failure of the South German uprising. He might not have been prepared to risk a team of *his* horses for it, but he would have been more likely to risk his skin and his gun. In his heart of hearts the Swiss is not *neutral*, even if he practises neutrality because of, and in order to preserve, his inherited possessions. Incidentally the old crust of neutrality which cloaks his better nature will probably soon burst asunder with all these foreign feet trampling on it—for that is after all the essence of neutrality—and there will be a big bang and that will clear the air."

Thus far Schily's letter. In the Prison Tower in Berne he was not able to arrange a personal meeting with Druey, but he did manage to exchange letters with that gentleman. In reply to a letter from Schily inquiring into the reasons for his arrest and asking permission to consult his lawyer, Herr Wyss in Berne, Druey wrote on *April 9, 1852*:

^a He who loves well chastises well.—*Ed.*

"... L'autorité genèvoise a ordonné votre renvoi du Canton, vous a fait arrêter et conduire à Berne à la disposition^a de mon département, parce que vous vous êtes montré un des réfugiés les plus remuants et que vous avez cherché à cacher I. et B., que vous vous étiez engagé à représenter à l'autorité. Pour ce motif et parce que votre séjour ultérieur en Suisse nuirait aux relations internationales de la Confédération, le Conseil fédéral a ordonné votre renvoi du territoire suisse, etc. ... Comme votre arrestation n'a pas pour but un procès criminel ou correctionnel, mais une mesure de haute politique^b ... il n'est pas nécessaire que vous consultiez l'avocat. D'ailleurs, avant de ... autoriser l'entrevue que vous me demandez avec M. l'avocat Wyss, je désire savoir le but de cette entrevue."^c

The letters which Schily was permitted, after numerous complaints, to write to his friends in Geneva had all to be submitted beforehand to M. Druey to inspect. In one of these letters Schily used the expression "*Vae victis*".²³⁷ Druey wrote to him about it in a letter dated *April 19, 1852*:

"Dans le billet que vous avez adressé à M. J.,^d se trouvent les mots: *vae victis*... Cela veut-il dire que les autorités fédérales vous traitent en vaincu? S'il en était ainsi, ce serait une accusation mensongère, contre laquelle je devrais protester."^e

Schily replied to the mighty Druey in a letter dated *April 21, 1852*:

"Je ne pense pas, M. le conseiller fédéral, que cette manière de caractériser les mesures prises à mon égard puisse me valoir le reproche d'une accusation mensongère; du moins un pareil reproche ne serait pas de nature à me faire revenir de l'idée que je suis traité avec dureté; au contraire, adressé à un prisonnier, par celui qui le tient en prison, une telle réponse me paraîtrait une dureté de plus."^f

^a Marx has: "déposition".—Ed.

^b Marx has: "police".—Ed.

^c "...The Genevan authorities have ordered your expulsion from the Canton; they have had you arrested and conducted to Berne and put at the disposition of my department, because you have shown yourself to be one of the most restive of the refugees and have tried to conceal the whereabouts of I. and B., of which you were obliged to inform the authorities. For this reason and because your further residence in Switzerland would have harmed the *international relations of the Confederation*, the Federal Council has resolved on expelling you from Swiss territory, etc. ... Since the purpose of your arrest was not the institution of any criminal or civil action against you, but is a *measure necessitated by considerations of high politics* ... there is no need for you to consult a lawyer. *In any event before ... authorising the interview you request with M. Wyss, your lawyer, I should have to know for what purpose you want to consult him.*"—Ed.

^d Abraham Jacoby.—Ed.

^e "The note you have written to M. J. contains the words: *vae victis*... Is that supposed to mean that the Federal authorities treat you as one treats a defeated opponent? If this is the implication, it is a *lying accusation* against which I should feel bound to protest."—Ed.

^f "I do not believe, Federal Councillor, that the way in which I have described the measures taken in my regard can be thought to merit the reproach of making *lying accusations*; at the very least such a reproach is hardly likely to persuade me that I am not being treated harshly; on the contrary, for me *as a prisoner to receive an answer like this from the person who keeps me in prison* seems to be another harsh act."—Ed.

Towards the close of *March 1852*, shortly before Schily's arrest and the deportation of other *unparliamentary* refugees, the reactionary *Journal de Genève* published all sorts of wild gossip about communist plots among the German refugees in Geneva: Herr Trog was said to be busy cleaning out a nest of German communists with a brood of 84 communist dragons inside it, etc. Alongside this reactionary Genevan paper a scribbler in Berne who belonged to the parliamentary gang—it must be assumed that it was **Karl Vogt** since he repeatedly claims in the “Magnum Opus” that it was he who had rescued Switzerland from the clutches of the communist refugees—was busy spreading similar news in the *Frankfurter Journal* over the initials “ss”. For example, he wrote that the Genevan Committee to aid German refugees, a committee consisting of communists, had been overthrown because of its inequitable distribution of the available funds, and that it had been replaced by upright men (namely parliamentarians) who would soon put an end to these evil practices. He wrote further that the dictator of Geneva seemed at last to be prepared to comply with the ordinances of the Federal Commissars, since two German refugees belonging to the communist faction had shortly before been put under arrest and brought from Geneva to Berne, etc.²³⁸ The *Schweizerische National-Zeitung*, which appears in Basle, published an answer from Geneva in its issue No. 72, of *March 25, 1852*, in which it said *inter alia*:

“Every unbiased person knows that just as Switzerland is concerned only with the consolidation and constitutional development of its political achievements, so too the feeble remnants of the German emigration in this country are occupied entirely with earning their daily bread and other perfectly harmless pursuits, and that the fairy-tales about communism are the product of hallucinations on the part of philistines or else are concocted by politically or personally interested *informers*.”

After the Berne parliamentary correspondent of the *Frankfurter Journal* had been described as one of these *informers*—the article concludes:

“The refugees here are of the opinion that in their ranks there are a number of so-called ‘decent men’ on the pattern of the former ‘Biedermen and Bassermen of the Empire’^a who, driven by nostalgia for the flesh-pots of home,²³⁹ seek to pave the way for their own pardon at the hands of their native rulers by reactionary exhortations of this kind. We should like to send them our best wishes for a

^a A pun on the names of Friedrich Karl Biedermann and Friedrich Daniel Bassermann, *Biedermann* means “honest man” and, in an ironical sense, “philistine”. *Bassermansch* means “homeless tramp” or “beggar”.—*Ed.*

speedy departure as they will then cease to compromise the refugees and the government that gives them asylum."

Schily was known to the refugee *parliamentarians* as the author of this article. It appeared in the Basle *National-Zeitung* on *March 25*, and on *April 1* *Schily's* wholly unmotivated arrest took place. "Tantaene animis caelestibus irae?"^a

2. THE REVOLUTIONARY CONGRESS IN MURTEN

After the Murten scandal^b the German refugees in Geneva, with the exception of the refugee *parliamentarians*, issued a protest addressed "To the Supreme Department of Justice and the Police of the Confederation", from which I print the following passage²⁴⁰:

"... The monarchs did not rest content with their previous diplomatic gains. They rattled their sabres all around Switzerland and threatened military occupation so as to make a clean sweep of the refugees. The Federal Council at any rate has expressed its concern about this danger in an official document. And lo and behold! There were further deportations, justified this time by the notorious assembly in Murten and the claim that traces of political and propagandistic activities had been uncovered by the investigation following it. As far as the facts are concerned this claim must be categorically rejected.... From the legal point of view, however, it is important to bear in mind that wherever the rule of law obtains, *actions proscribed by the law can only be punished by penalties laid down by the law*, and this holds good for deportation too, if it is not to appear as the arbitrary action of the police. Or was perhaps here too the intention to play off *diplomacy* against us and to say: we have been forced to act thus out of *consideration for foreign powers*, in the interests of international relations? Very well, then, if this is the position, the *cross of the Confederation*^c should hide its head in shame before the *Turkish crescent*, which, when the myrmidons searching for refugees knock on the *Porte*,^d shows its horns and does not eat humble pie.^e If this is the position, then give us our passports so that we can go to *Turkey* and when the door has closed behind us, hand over the keys to the Swiss bastion of liberty to the *Holy Alliance* as a *feudum oblatum*,^f and hold them in future as the insignia of chamberlains of the Holy Alliance, with the motto: *Finis Helvetiae!*"^g

^a "Can heavenly spirits cherish resentment so dire?" Virgil, *Aeneid*, I, 11.— *Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 50-55.— *Ed.*

^c Switzerland's national flag.— *Ed.*

^d A pun in the original: *an der Pforte klopft* (literally, "knocks on the door". *Pforte* in German means both "door" and "the Porte", i.e. the Turkish Government).— *Ed.*

^e In the original: *nicht zu Kreuze kriecht*—"does not crawl to the cross".— *Ed.*

^f Feudal fief.— *Ed.*

^g End to Switzerland! (by analogy with *Finis Poloniae!*— End to Poland! See p. 148 of this volume).— *Ed.*

3. CHERVAL

I realised from Joh. Ph. Becker's letter^a that the "associate of Marx" or the "associates" of Cherval mentioned by the Vogt of the Empire^b could only be Herr *Stecher*, now resident in London. Up to that time I had not had the honour of making his personal acquaintance, although I had heard many complimentary descriptions of his great and many-sided artistic talents. In consequence of Becker's letter we met for the first time. The following is a letter from my "associate" to me.^c

"17 Sussex St., London W. C.
October 14, 1860

"Dear Herr Marx,

"I am glad to be able to give you some information about *Nugent* (Cherval-Crämer) who was mentioned in Vogt's pamphlet of which you were kind enough to send me an extract. In March 1853 I came to Geneva after a trip to Italy. Nugent arrived in Geneva at around the same time and I made his acquaintance in a lithography workshop. I had myself just taken up lithography and since Nugent had a thorough knowledge of it, and since he was extremely agreeable, energetic and industrious by nature, I accepted his proposal to share an atelier with him. What Vogt says about Nugent's activities in Geneva is roughly the same as what I heard for myself at the time, if you discount the usual exaggerations to be expected from journalists or pamphleteers. There was very little success. I knew only one of the group, a good-natured and hard-working, but otherwise imprudent and light-minded young man. And since he was one of the leaders it must be presumed that N. was everything in the group and the others nothing but curious listeners. I am convinced that neither stone nor copper plates were ever engraved, although I heard N. talk of such matters. My own acquaintances were mainly Genevans and Italians. I was aware that later on I was thought to be a spy by Vogt and other German refugees, whom I did not know. But I took no notice of it—the truth will always out. I was not even offended; it was so easy to arouse suspicion as there were spies aplenty and to discover who they were was not always a simple matter. I am almost certain that Nugent did not correspond with anyone in Geneva after he had been expelled from there. I later received two letters from him inviting me to join him in Paris to help him with a project on medieval architecture, which I did. In Paris I found Nugent to be utterly remote from politics and correspondence. All this of course suggests that I myself could be 'the associates of Marx' since I neither saw nor heard of *anyone else whom Nugent had induced to come to Paris*. Of course Herr Vogt could not know that I had never had any contact with you, either direct or indirect, and that I probably never would have had, if I had not moved to London where by chance I have had the pleasure of meeting you and your esteemed family.

"With best wishes to you and your ladies,

H. Cal. Stecher"

^a See this volume, pp. 60-64.—*Ed.*

^b See Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozess...*, S. 175.—*Ed.*

^c This letter has not been found.—*Ed.*

4. THE COMMUNIST TRIAL IN COLOGNE

In this section I wish to make public information concerning the Prussian Embassy in London and its correspondence with Prussian authorities on the Continent during the Cologne trial. This information is based on the confessions of Hirsch which were published by A. Willich in April 1853 in the *New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung* under the title "Die Opfer der Moucharderie, Rechtfertigungsschrift von Wilhelm Hirsch".^a Hirsch, who is at present in a Hamburg gaol, was the principal tool of Police Lieutenant Greif and his agent Fleury. It was on instructions from them and under their direction that he forged the *false* Minute-Book submitted as evidence by Stieber in the course of the communist trial. I give here a number of excerpts from Hirsch's memoirs.

(During the Great Exhibition) "the German associations were kept under surveillance by a police triumvirate: Police Superintendent Stieber for Prussia, a Herr Kubesch for Austria and Police Commissioner Huntel of Bremen".

Having volunteered to act as an informer, Hirsch had an interview in London with *Alberts* who was Secretary at the Prussian Embassy. He gives this account of their first meeting:

"The meetings of the Prussian Embassy in London with its secret agents take place at a public house well fitted for the purpose. The Cock, in Fleet St., Temple Bar, is so unobtrusive that but for a golden cock pointing to the entrance the casual passer-by would hardly notice it. I went through a narrow passage leading to the interior of this old English tavern and asked for Mr. Charles, whereupon a corpulent personage introduced himself to me with such an amiable smile that anyone seeing us would have taken us to be old friends. The Embassy agent (for this is what he was) seemed to be in very high spirits and his mood was still further improved by brandy and water. He enjoyed it so much that for a long time he seemed to have completely forgotten the purpose of our meeting. Mr. Charles at once revealed that his true name was *Alberts* and that he was the *Embassy Secretary*. To begin with, he informed me that in fact he had nothing to do with the police but that he would act as an intermediary in this case... A second meeting took place at his home in 39 Brewer St., Golden Square, and it was here that I made the acquaintance of Police Lieutenant *Greif*. Greif looked the true policeman: medium height, dark hair and a beard of the same colour cut in the regulation style, with the moustache meeting the side-whiskers and the chin left shaven. His eyes looked anything but intelligent and they protruded fiercely in a permanent glare, apparently the result of frequent association with thieves and rogues.... Like Herr *Alberts*, Herr *Greif* introduced himself to me by the pseudonym of Mr. Charles. The latest Mr. Charles was at least in a more serious mood and he even felt it was necessary to test me.... Our first meeting ended with his instructing me to give him an accurate report on all the activities of the revolutionary émigrés.... On the next

^a This article was published in instalments in the *Belletristisches Journal und New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung* on April 1, 8, 15 and 22, 1853. Excerpts from it are contained in Marx's notebook. For his assessment of it see his article "Hirsch's Confessions" (present edition, Vol. 12).—*Ed.*

occasion Herr Greif introduced me to what he called 'his right hand', namely 'one of his agents', he added. This turned out to be a tall elegantly dressed young man who also gave his name as Mr. Charles. The whole political police seems to have adopted this pseudonym and I now had three Charleses to deal with. The latest specimen seemed to be the most remarkable. He said that 'he too had been a revolutionary but that all things were possible and I had only to go along with him'."

Greif left London for some time and parted from Hirsch

"expressly commending me to the latest Mr. Charles who, he said, acted always on his instructions. I should not hesitate to confide in him. Moreover, even if certain things should appear strange to me I should not be surprised. To make this clearer he added: "The Ministry sometimes requires various things, *chiefly documents; if these are unobtainable we should find some way out!*"

Hirsch states further that the latest Charles was *Fleury*.

"He had earlier been employed in the office of the *Dresdner Zeitung*, which was edited by L. Wittig. When he was in Baden, he was, as a result of recommendations he had brought from Saxony, sent by the provisional government to the Palatinate to take in hand the organisation of the Landsturm, etc. When the Prussians occupied Karlsruhe he was taken prisoner, etc. He suddenly reappeared in London towards the end of 1850 or early in 1851; from the outset he went here by the name of de Fleury and was known by this name in refugee circles. He was hard up, at least he seemed to be, stayed in the refugee barracks set up by the Refugee Committee and drew subsidies. Early in the summer of 1851 his position suddenly improved; he moved into a respectable apartment and at the end of the year he married the daughter of an English engineer. He turned up later in Paris as a police agent.... His real name is *Krause* and he is the son of Krause the cobbler who was executed some 15 or 18 years ago in Dresden together with Backhof and Beseler for the murder of Countess Schönberg and her maid.... Fleury-Krause told me many times that he had been working for different governments since he was 14."

It is this same *Fleury-Krause* whom Stieber admitted in open court in Cologne to be a secret Prussian police agent working directly under Greif. In my *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne* I wrote of Fleury:

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

This prophecy has in a sense been fulfilled; some months after the communist trial Fleury was sentenced in England to several years in the hulks^b for forgery.

* *Fleurs-de-lys* [lilies] is the French colloquial name of the letters T. F. (*travaux forcés*, forced labour), the brand-mark of criminals. [Note by Engels to the 1885 edition of the *Revelations*. See present edition, Vol. 11, p. 442.]

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

^b Marx uses the English word.—*Ed.*

“As the right-hand man of Police Lieutenant Greif,” Hirsch writes, “Fleury dealt directly with the Prussian Embassy during Greif’s absence.”

Fleury was in contact with Max Reuter who stole the letters from Oswald Dietz, at that time archivist of the Schapper-Willich League.²⁴¹

“Stieber,” says Hirsch, “had learned from the agent of the Prussian Ambassador in Paris Hatzfeldt, the notorious *Cherval*, of the letters written by the latter to London. Stieber got Reuter to find out where they were, whereupon Fleury stole them on Stieber’s orders and with Reuter’s aid. These are the stolen letters which Herr Stieber was not ashamed to exhibit ‘*as such*’ to the jury in Cologne.... In autumn 1851 Fleury had been in Paris with Greif and Stieber after the latter had, through the mediation of Count Hatzfeldt, made contact with *Cherval*, or more correctly, *Joseph Crâmer* with whose assistance he hoped to engineer a plot. With this end in view consultations were held in Paris between Messrs. Stieber, Greif, Fleury, two other police agents, Beckmann* and Sommer, and the famous French spy *Lucien de la Hodde* (who went by the name of Duprez) and they gave *Cherval* directions according to which he was to tailor his correspondence. Fleury often laughed in my presence over the scuffle he had provoked between Stieber and *Cherval*. And the man called Schmidt who in the guise of secretary of a revolutionary league in Strasbourg and Cologne had gained admission to the society founded at the behest of the police by *Cherval*, was none other than M. de Fleury.... Fleury was undoubtedly the sole agent of the Prussian secret police in London and all proposals and offers that the Embassy received went through his hands.... Messrs. Greif and Stieber were accustomed to relying on his judgment.”

Fleury informed Hirsch:

“Herr Greif has told you what has to be done.... At Police Headquarters in Frankfurt they are themselves of the opinion that our primary aim must be to make *the position of the political police secure*; the means we use to achieve this are immaterial; the September plot in Paris is already *one step in this direction*.”^a

Greif returned to London and expressed satisfaction with Hirsch’s work but demanded more. In particular he wanted reports on “*the secret meetings of the Marx party*”.

“At all costs,” the Police Lieutenant concluded, “we must draw up reports on the League meetings. Do it any way you wish as long as you don’t overstep the limits of credibility. I am too *occupied* to attend to it myself. M. de Fleury will work with you as my representative.”

Greif’s occupation at that time consisted, as Hirsch states, in a correspondence via de la Hodde-Duprez with Maupas concerning

* The same man^b who figures in the Arnim Trial. [Note by Marx in the 1875 edition of the *Revelations*, to which Appendix 4 to *Herr Vogt* was supplemented.] He was already then Paris correspondent for the *Kölnische Zeitung* and was to remain so for many years. [Engels’ addition to Marx’s note in the 1885 edition of the *Revelations*.]

^a Beckmann.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 55-56.—*Ed.*

the arrangements for the mock escape of Cherval and Gipperich from the St. Pélagie gaol. On being assured by Hirsch that

“Marx had not founded any new central organisation of the League in London ... Greif agreed with Fleury that in the circumstances we should for the time being prepare reports on meetings of the League ourselves. He, Greif, would vouch for their authenticity, and in any case his submissions would be accepted”.

So Hirsch and Fleury set to work. “The content” of their reports on the secret meetings of the League I held

“was provided”, Hirsch states, “by reports of discussions that took place from time to time; the admission of new members, the founding of new sections in obscure corners of Germany, or a new organisation; speculation to the effect that in Cologne Marx’s imprisoned friends did or did not have any prospects of being released; letters that had come from this person or that, and so on. On this last point Fleury usually took care to mention people in Germany who had become suspect as a result of political investigations or who had been involved in some political activity or other. Very often, however, we had to have recourse to our imagination and then we would report on the activities of a non-existent member of the League. But Herr Greif said that the reports were excellent and that anyway we had to have them at all costs. Some of the writing was done by Fleury alone but mostly I had to help him as he was unable to describe the smallest detail without errors of style. In this way the reports came into being and without a moment’s hesitation Herr Greif declared his willingness to vouch for their authenticity”.

Hirsch then describes how Fleury and he visited Arnold Ruge in Brighton, and Eduard Meyen (of Tobian memory^a) and stole letters and lithographed material from them. Not content with this, Greif-Fleury rented a lithographic press from Stanbury Press, Fetter Lane, and together with Hirsch began to produce “radical pamphlets”. That “democrat”, *F. Zabel*, could learn a lesson or two here. Let him take note of this:

“The first pamphlet I” (Hirsch) “wrote was entitled *An das Landproletariat* at Fleury’s suggestion; and we managed to make a few good copies of it. Herr Greif sent these copies as documents emanating from the *Marx party*. To make it seem more plausible we included in the reports of the so-called League meetings, which came into being in the manner described above, a few words about the dispatch of such a pamphlet. One other product of this kind was fabricated; its title was *An die Kinder des Volkes* and I do not know under whose auspices Herr Greif sent this one in. We later abandoned this trick chiefly because it was so costly.”

At this point Cherval arrived in London after his mock escape from Paris and was attached to Greif at a weekly salary of £1 10s.,

“in return for which he was required to make reports on the contacts between the German and French émigrés”.

Publicly exposed and expelled from the Workers’ Society as a spy,²⁴²

^a See this volume, p. 239.—*Ed.*

“Cherval very understandably described the German émigrés and their organs as being as insignificant as could be—since he found it quite impossible to get hold of any information on the subject which he could pass on. By way of compensation he compiled a report for Greif on the non-German revolutionary party which put Munchausen's tall stories in the shade”.

Hirsch now returns to the Cologne trial.

“Herr Greif had already been questioned a number of times about the contents of the League reports prepared at his instance by Fleury in so far as they had any bearing on the Cologne trial.... There were also particular commissions in connection with the trial. On one occasion Marx was alleged to be corresponding with *Lassalle* via an ‘ale-house’ and the Public Prosecutor required further information.... Rather more naïve was the Public Prosecutor's request asking for precise information about the financial assistance that *Lassalle* in Düsseldorf was allegedly sending to the defendant Röser in Cologne ... it was believed that the true source of the money was in London.”

I have already recounted in Section III, 4 how Fleury, acting on instructions from Hinckeldey, was to find someone in London who would be willing to appear before the jury in Cologne in the guise of H.,^a the witness who had disappeared, etc. After a detailed account of this incident Hirsch goes on:

“Herr Stieber had meanwhile urgently requested Greif to supply him, if at all possible, with the original minutes of the League meetings that he had been reporting on. Fleury was of the opinion that he could produce an original minute-book if only the requisite people were available. Above all, however, he would need *specimens of the handwriting of some of Marx's friends*. I made use of this last remark in order to extricate myself from the whole undertaking; Fleury alluded to the topic only once again and after that he said nothing more. Around this time Stieber suddenly appeared in Cologne with a Minute-Book of the League's central organisation in London.... I was even more astonished when I found that the minutes as reported in extract in the papers were absolutely identical with the reports concocted by Fleury at Greif's behest. It was evident that Herr Greif or Herr Stieber himself had had a *copy* made somehow or other, *for the minutes in this allegedly original document bore signatures while those submitted by Fleury had none*. From Fleury himself I learned about this miracle only that ‘Stieber can contrive anything, it will be a sensation!’”

As soon as Fleury heard that “Marx” had had the handwriting of the ostensible signatories of the minutes (*Liebknecht*, *Rings*, *Ulmer*, etc.) witnessed in a London Police Court^b he wrote the following letter:

“*To the Royal Police Presidium in Berlin; dated from London.*”

“It is the intention of Marx and his friends here to discredit the signatures on the League Minutes by having handwriting specimens legally authenticated. These specimens are to be produced in the Court of Assizes as the really authentic ones. Everyone familiar with the English laws knows that on this point they can be

^a Haupt (see this volume, p. 67).—*Ed.*

^b Marx uses English: Police Court.—*Ed.*

manipulated and that a person who vouches for the authenticity of a thing does not actually give any true guarantee. The person who gives you this information does not recoil from giving you his name in a matter like this where the truth is at stake. *Becker*, 4, Litchfield St." "Fleury knew the address of Becker, a German refugee living in the same house as *Willich*. It might very easily happen later on that the suspicion of authorship would fall on the latter who was an opponent of Marx.... Fleury looked forward eagerly to the scandal that would result. The letter would be read out in court, but of course too late, he thought, for any doubts about its authenticity to arise before the trial was over.... The letter, signed by Becker, was addressed to the *Police Presidium in Berlin*, however it went not to Berlin but to 'Police Officer Goldheim, Frankfurter Hof in Cologne', and an *envelope for this letter* arrived at the Police Presidium in Berlin with a note stating that '*Herr Stieber in Cologne would give a complete explanation as to its use....*' Stieber made no use of this letter; he was unable to do so because he was forced to drop the whole *Minute-Book*."

With regard to the *Minute-Book* Hirsch says that

"Herr Stieber declared" (in court) "that he had had the *Minute-Book* in his hands for two weeks but had scrupled to produce it; he declared further that it had come to him by a courier called Greif.... Hence Greif had personally delivered his own work. How can this be reconciled with a letter of Herr *Goldheim's* in which he informed the Embassy that 'the *Minute-Book* was produced so late only in order to avoid scrutiny as to its authenticity....'"

On Friday, October 29, Herr Goldheim arrived in London.

"As Herr Stieber had to face the fact that it was not possible to uphold the authenticity of the *Minute-Book* he sent a deputy to negotiate with Fleury about it on the spot. At issue was the question whether a proof could not be obtained after all. His discussions were fruitless and he returned without any decision having been reached. Fleury was left in a state of despair for Stieber was now resolved to expose him rather than compromise the police chiefs. But I did not realise that this was the cause of Fleury's disquiet until Herr Stieber made his declaration soon afterwards. In panic, M. Fleury now resorted to his last expedient. He brought me a specimen of handwriting for me to use to copy out a declaration, sign it 'Liebknecht' and take an oath before the Lord Mayor of London that I was Liebknecht.... Fleury told me that the handwriting was that of the person who had written the *Minute-Book* and that *Herr Goldheim had brought it with him*" (from *Cologne*). "But if Herr Stieber had received the *Minute-Book* per Greif, the courier from London, how was it possible for Herr Goldheim to bring a specimen of the handwriting of the alleged *Minute-Book* writer from Cologne at the very moment when Greif had just arrived back in London?.... What Fleury gave me consisted of a few phrases and a signature...." Hirsch "copied the handwriting as closely as he could and wrote that the undersigned, i.e. Liebknecht, declared that the signature of Liebknecht legally witnessed by Marx and Co. was false and that this, his signature was the only genuine one. When I had finished and had the handwriting in my hands" (i.e. the specimen given him by Fleury to copy), "which fortunately I still possess, I told Fleury, who was not a little taken aback, that I had had second thoughts and would not go through with it. Inconsolable at first, he then announced that he would swear to it himself.... For safety's sake he would *have the writing countersigned by the Prussian Consul*; and he went to the Consulate at once. I waited for him in a tavern; when he got back he had the countersignature

and he next went to the Lord Mayor to swear the oath. But the plan fell through as the Lord Mayor wanted further guarantees and Fleury could not give them—so the oath remained unsworn.... Late in the evening I saw M. de Fleury again, and for the last time. That very day he had been unpleasantly surprised to read Herr Stieber's declaration concerning him in the *Kölnische Zeitung*. 'But I know that Stieber could not have acted differently, otherwise he would have had to compromise himself,' M. de Fleury said very truly by way of consoling himself.... 'There will be a great explosion in Berlin if the Cologne prisoners are convicted,' M. de Fleury said to me at one of our last meetings".

Fleury's last meetings with Hirsch took place at the *end of October 1852*. Hirsch's confessions are dated the *end of November 1852*; and at the *end of March 1853* came the "*explosion in Berlin*" (the Ladendorf conspiracy).*²⁴³

* The reader will be interested to see the testimonials that Stieber himself gave his two accomplices Fleury-Krause and Hirsch. He writes of the first in the *Black Book*,²⁴⁴ II, p. 69:

"No. 345. *Krause*, Carl Friedrich August, from Dresden. He is the son of Friedrich August Krause, a farmer executed for his part in the murder of Countess Schönberg in Dresden in 1834, and afterwards" (after his execution?) "a corn-dealer, and of his widow Johanna Rosine née Göllnitz, who is still living. Carl Friedrich was born on January 9, 1824, in the vineyard houses at Coswig near Dresden. From October 1, 1832, he went to the charity school in Dresden; in 1836 he was admitted to the orphanage in Antonstadt, Dresden, and in 1840 he was confirmed. He was then apprenticed to Herr Gruhle, a Dresden merchant, but in the following year he was arrested and detained by the Dresden Municipal Court for *repeated theft*. However, the period of detention was counted towards his sentence and he was released. After this he lived with his mother without taking a job, but in March 1842 he was arrested again for *breaking and entering* and this time he was sentenced to *four years' imprisonment*. On October 23, 1846, he came out of gaol and returned to Dresden and began to *associate with the most notorious thieves*. Then, the Rehabilitation Society took him up and found him a job in a cigar factory and he remained in this job without interruption or any further misdemeanour until March 1848. But after that date he gave in to his idleness again and began to frequent political societies" (as a government spy; see above his admission to Hirsch in London). "Early in 1849 he became a salesman of the *Dresdner Zeitung* edited by the republican literateur E. L. Wittig who is now in America but who at that time was in Dresden. In May 1849 he took part in the Dresden uprising and became commandant of the barricade in the Sophienstrasse. He fled to Baden after the uprising was quelled and there he was empowered by the provisional government of Baden (the decrees of June 10 and 23, 1849) to raise a Landsturm and requisition supplies for the insurgents. He was taken prisoner by Prussian soldiers but on October 8, 1849, he escaped from Rastatt." (Just as, later on, Cherval "escaped" from Paris. But now comes the part of the bouquet which has the authentic police aroma—it should be borne in mind that this was printed two years after the Cologne Trial.) "According to a report in the Berlin *Publizist*, No. 39 of May 15, 1853, taken from a book printed in New York with the title *Die Opfer der Spionage* by Wilhelm Hirsch, a Hamburg shop-assistant" (O Stieber, you foreboding angel!^b). "Krause

^a *Die Opfer der Moucharderie, Rechtfertigungsschrift von Wilhelm Hirsch.*—Ed.

^b See this volume, p. 71.—Ed.

5. SLANDERS

When the communist trial in Cologne was over, Vogt-like calumnies about my “exploitation” of the workers were busily disseminated, especially in the German-American press. Some of my friends living in America—Messrs. J. Weydemeyer, Dr. A. Jacoby (a practising doctor in New York and one of the defendants in the Cologne communist trial) and A. Cluss (an official in the U.S. Navy Yard in Washington)—published a detailed refutation of these absurdities dated New York, November 7, 1853. Their article contained the comment that I was in the right to preserve *silence* about my private affairs insofar as it was a matter of gaining the *approval* of the philistines. “But when faced by the *hostility* of the mob, the philistines and the

turned up in London late in 1850 or early in 1851 as a political émigré bearing the name of *Charles de Fleury*. At first he lived in somewhat straitened circumstances but later, in 1851, his position improved. For after he was admitted to the Communist League” (another Stieber lie), “he worked as an agent for a number of governments in the course of which, however, he became involved in a number of swindles.”

So much for Stieber’s gratitude to his friend Fleury who, moreover (as we noted above), was sentenced to several years’ imprisonment in London for forgery just a few months after the Cologne trial.

Concerning the worthy Hirsch we can read (op. cit., p. 58):

“No. 265. Hirsch, Wilhelm, shop-assistant from Hamburg. It appears that he went to London not as a refugee but of his own accord.” (Why this wholly superfluous lie? After all, Goldheim tried to arrest him in Hamburg!) “But once there he associated with refugees and especially with the communist party. He played a double game. On the one hand, he was active on behalf of the revolutionary party, while, on the other, he offered to spy on political criminals and forgers for a number of continental governments. But he himself became implicated in the *worst possible frauds* and swindles. In particular, he was guilty of *forgery*, so that everyone should be on their guard *against him*. Together with various other individuals he even *manufactured false paper money* merely in order to extract high rewards from the police for uncovering forgeries. He was eventually unmasked by both sides” (namely, both by police forgers and non-police ones?) “and he has now returned from London to Hamburg where he lives in poor circumstances.”

Thus far Stieber on his London accomplices to whose “truthfulness and reliability” he is never tired of testifying. It is interesting to see how utterly impossible it is for this model Prussian to speak the simple truth. He cannot even restrain himself from smuggling^a quite purposeless lies into the—true and false—facts taken from the documents. On the testimony of such professional liars—and they are more numerous now than ever—hundreds of people are sent to prison and in this lies what is nowadays called salvation of the state. [This note to Appendix 4 was added by Engels in the 3rd (1885) edition of the *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne*.]

^a A pun on the name *Stieber* and the verb *hineinstiebern* (to smuggle in, insert).—*Ed.*

degenerate idlers, it does harm to the cause in our view and so *we* break that silence.”^a

6. THE WAR BETWEEN FROGS AND MICE^b

In my pamphlet *The Knight, etc.*, from which I quoted above, I wrote on p. 5:

“...On July 20, 1851 the ‘Agitation Union’ was founded, and on July 27, 1851 the German ‘Émigré Club’. From that day ... dates the struggle on both sides of the ocean between the ‘Émigrés’ and the ‘Agitators’, the great war between frogs and mice.

Now who will give me words and who the tongue,
To sing of such brave deeds in sonorous sounds!
For ne’er was strife upon this earth begun
More proudly fought on bloodier battle grounds;
Compared to this all other wars are roses.
To tell of it my lyric art confounds
For on this earth there ne’er was seen such glory
Or noble valour bright as in this story.

(After Boiardo, *Orlando innamorato*,
Canto 27.)”^c

Now it is by no means my intention to go into the details of “the story” of this strife or into the agreement entitled, *verbotenus*,^d “The Preliminary Agreement about the *Treaty on the Alliance*” (under which name it was publicised throughout the entire German-American press), which was reached between *Gottfried Kinkel* in the name of the Émigré Club, and *A. Goegg* on behalf of the “Revolutionary League of the Two Worlds”, on August 13, 1852. I would only remark that with a few exceptions the entire *parliamentary* emigration joined in the farce on one side or the other. (Of course, names like *K. Vogt* were at that time avoided by every party if only for propriety’s sake.)

At the end of his revolutionary pleasure and fund-raising tour of the United States, *Gottfried Kinkel*, the passion flower of German philistinism, wrote a “*Denkschrift über das deutsche Nationalanlehn zur Förderung der Revolution*”, dated Elmira, N. Y., February 22, 1852, in which he gave vent to views which at least

^a J. Weydemeyer, A. Cluss, A. Jacoby, “An die Redaktion der *New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung*, November 7, 1853”, *New-Yorker Criminal Zeitung*, No. 37, November 25, 1853.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, p. 87.—*Ed.*

^c See present edition, Vol. 12, p. 488.—*Ed.*

^d Literally.—*Ed.*

possess the merit of great simplicity. Gottfried believes that engineering a revolution is much like making a railway. Once the money is there, the railway, or the revolution will follow in due course. Whereas the nation should cherish a longing for revolution in its heart, the makers of revolution should have cash in their pockets, and everything therefore depends on “a small well-equipped band of men with a **plentiful** supply of money”. It is remarkable into what bizarre byways of thought even melodramatic minds are driven by England’s commercial wind. Since everything here, even public opinion,^a is organised with the aid of shares, why not float a joint-stock company “for the promotion of the revolution”?

In a public meeting with *Kossuth*, who was also engaged at that time on a revolutionary fund-raising campaign in the United States, *Gottfried* expressed himself in highly aesthetic terms:

“Even from your clean hands, Governor, the gift of freedom would be a bitter pill, and I would moisten it *with the tears of my shame*.”^b

Hence *Gottfried*, having looked the gift-horse so sharply in the mouth, assured the governor that if the latter should present to him “the revolution in the east” with his right hand, he, *Gottfried*, would present to him “the revolution in the west” in return. Seven years later, in the *Hermann*, a paper he had founded himself, the very same *Gottfried* assured his readers that he was a man of rare consistency,^c and that having proclaimed the Prince Regent^d as Emperor of Germany before the military court in Rastatt,²⁴⁵ he had always kept this as his motto.

Count Oskar Reichenbach, one of the three original regents and the Treasurer of the Revolutionary Loan, published the accounts in *London* on *October 8, 1852*, together with a statement in which he dissociated himself from the enterprise. At the same time he declared that “in any event I neither can nor will hand the money over to citizens Kinkel, etc.” Instead he invited the shareholders to hand in their provisional loan certificates in exchange for the money in his hands. His own resignation as treasurer, etc., he said,

“was motivated by political and legal considerations.... The assumptions on which the idea of the loan was based have not been realised. The sum of 20,000

^a Marx uses the English phrase: “public opinion”.—*Ed.*

^b G. Kinkel, “Denkschrift über das deutsche Nationalanlehn zur Förderung der Revolution”, *New-Yorker Staats-Zeitung*, March 2, 1852.—*Ed.*

^c G. Kinkel, “Brief des Herausgebers an einen Freund in Amerika”, *Hermann*, March 26, 1859.—*Ed.*

^d William.—*Ed.*

dollars which had to be raised before the loan could be proceeded with, has therefore not been acquired.... The proposal to found a periodical and to promote agitation found no echo. Only political charlatans or revolutionary monomaniacs could deem the loan to be practicable at present and imagine that an equitable, and hence impersonal, actively revolutionary use of the money by all party groups is possible at this moment."

But Gottfried's faith in revolution could not be shaken so easily and so he procured a "resolution" that allowed him to carry on the business under another name.

Reichenbach's statement of the accounts contains some interesting data.

"The Trustees," he says, "cannot be held responsible for contributions which may have been made later by the committees *to persons other than myself*, and I would ask the committees to take note of this when calling in the certificates and settling accounts."

According to his computations £1,587 6s. 4d. was *received*, of which London had contributed £2 5s., and "Germany" £9. The *expenditure* amounted to £584 18s. 5d. and was broken down as follows: *Kinkel's and Hillgärtner's travel expenses: £220; other travel expenses: £54; lithographic press: £11; cost of provisional certificates: £14; lithographed correspondence, stamps, etc.: £106 1s. 6d. On Kinkel's instructions, etc.: £100.*

The Revolutionary Loan ended up with £1,000, which Gottfried Kinkel keeps in the Westminster Bank as earnest money for the first German provisional government. And despite all this, there is still no provisional government. Perhaps Germany believes that 36 actual governments are quite sufficient.

Certain American loan funds which were not incorporated into the central London Treasury were at least employed here and there for patriotic purposes. Such was the case with the £100 which Gottfried Kinkel gave to Karl Blind early in 1858 to transform into "radical pamphlets", etc.

7. PALMERSTON-POLEMIC

"Council Hall, Sheffield, May 6th, 1856

"Doctor,

"The Sheffield Foreign Affairs Committee instruct me to convey to you an expression of their warm thanks for the great public service you have rendered by your admirable *exposé* of the Kars-Papers^a published in the *People's Paper*.

"I have the honour, &c.

"Dr. Karl Marx"^b

Wm. Cycles, *Secretary*

^a Marx's series of articles "The Fall of Kars" (see present edition, Vol. 14).—*Ed.*

^b Marx quotes the letter in English.—*Ed.*

8. STATEMENT BY HERR A. SCHERZER

Herr A. Scherzer, a man who has played a praiseworthy role in the workers' movement since the 1830s, wrote to me from London on April 22, 1860:

"Dear Citizen,

"I cannot let the occasion pass without protesting about a passage in the monstrous tissue of lies and the infamous calumnies of Vogt's pamphlet which concerns me personally. I am referring to the statement in Document No. 7, printed in the supplement to the *Schweizer Handels-Courier*, No. 150, of June 2, where it says: 'We know that at this very time fresh efforts are being made from London. Letters signed by A. Sch... are being sent from there to both associations and individuals, etc.' These 'letters' appear to be the reason why Herr K. Vogt wrote elsewhere in his book: 'At the beginning of this year (1859) a new arena for political agitation seemed to be opening up. The opportunity was seized in a moment so as to regain some influence if possible. The tactics have not altered in this respect for years. A committee about which "no-one knows nothing", as it says in the old song, circulates letters through an equally unknown president or secretary, etc., etc. Having reconnoitred the terrain in this manner, a number of "travelling brethren" turn up in the country and at once start to organise a secret league. The association which is to be compromised learns nothing of these goings-on which remain the work of a number of sectarian individuals. For the most part even the correspondence conducted in the name of the association remains quite unknown to it, but the letters refer always to "our association", etc., and the inquiries of the police, which follow inexorably, and are based on documents that have fallen into their hands, always affect the association as a whole, etc.'

"Why did Herr K. Vogt not *print the whole letter* which he alludes to in Document No. 7? Why not 'reconnoitre' the source he has relied on for his information? It would have been easy for him to discover that the public *Workers' Educational Society in London* chose its correspondence committee, to which I had the honour to be elected, in *open* session. When Herr Vogt speaks of unknown secretaries and the like, I am very pleased to be unknown to him, but am happy to be able to say that I am known to thousands of German workers, who have all derived benefit from the erudition of the men whom he vilifies now. Times have changed. The period of secret societies is past. It is ridiculous to talk of secret leagues or sects, when problems are dealt with openly in a workers' society, where strangers attend as visitors at every meeting. The letters signed by me were so formulated that it was impossible for anyone to come to harm in consequence. We German workers in London had only one interest at heart and that was to learn about the mood of the workers' associations on the Continent, and to found a newspaper which would represent the interests of the working class and which would do battle with writers in the pay of the enemy. It naturally did not occur to a single German worker to act in the interests of a Bonaparte, a thing of which only a Vogt or people of his kind are capable. We undoubtedly hate the despotism of Austria with a far deeper loathing than Herr Vogt, but we do not seek its defeat in the victory of another despot. Every people must liberate itself. Is it not striking that Herr Vogt arrogates for himself the very means which he accuses us of having used against his own activities? Herr Vogt asserts that he is not in the pay of Bonaparte, and that he only received money to set up a newspaper from democratic sources. In saying this he hopes to exonerate himself, but how can he

be so obtuse, with all his learning, to cast suspicion on workers, and hurl accusations at them for concerning themselves with the well-being of their country and for making propaganda about the need to establish a newspaper?

“With my most sincere respects,
A. Scherzer”

9. BLIND'S ARTICLE IN *THE FREE PRESS*
OF MAY 27, 1859^a

“*The Grand Duke Constantine to be King of Hungary*

“A Correspondent, who encloses his card, writes as follows:—

“Sir,—Having been present at the last meeting in the Music Hall, I heard the statement made concerning the Grand Duke Constantine. I am able to give you another fact:—

“So far back as last summer, Prince Jérôme-Napoléon detailed to some of his confidants at Geneva a plan of attack against Austria, and prospective rearrangement of the map of Europe. I know the name of a Swiss senator to whom he broached the subject. Prince Jérôme, at that time, declared that, according to the plan made, *Grand Duke Constantine was to become King of Hungary.*

“I know further of attempts made, in the beginning of the present year, to win over to the Russo-Napoleonic scheme some of the exiled German Democrats, as well as some influential Liberals in Germany. Large pecuniary advantages were held out to them as a bribe. I am glad to say that these offers were rejected with indignation.”^b

10. HERR ORGES' LETTERS

“Dear Sir,

“I heard today from Herr Liebknecht that you would be kind enough to put a legal document at our disposal, *relating to the origins* of the pamphlet against Vogt.^c May I ask you urgently to send it to us as quickly as possible, so that we can produce it in court. Please, send the document against a receipt and charge us for any expenses you may have incurred. Incidentally, my dear Sir, the liberal party sometimes misjudges the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. We (the editors) have gone through fire and water and have passed all the tests of political commitment. If you do not consider the separate piece of work, the individual article, but our whole activity you will probably come to realise that no German newspaper strives as we do, without haste, but without rest, for unity and freedom, power and culture, for spiritual and material progress, for greater patriotic awareness and higher moral standards of the German nation, and that no paper achieves more than ours. You should judge our deeds by their effects. Asking you once more most urgently to grant my request, and assuring you of my greatest respect,

“Yours sincerely,

Hermann Orges

“Augsburg, 16/10”

^a See this volume, pp. 122-24.—*Ed.*

^b Marx quotes this report in English.—*Ed.*

^c See this volume, pp. 119-24.—*Ed.*

The second letter, dated the *same* day, was only an *extract* of the first, and was posted, as Herr Orges states, “only for safety’s sake”. In it he likewise requests “the most urgent dispatch of the document *about the origins* of the well-known pamphlet against Vogt, a document which, as Herr Liebknecht writes, you have been so kind as to put at our disposal”.

11. CIRCULAR AGAINST K. BLIND

I include here only the concluding section of my circular against Blind of February 4, 1860, which was written in English^a:

“Now, before taking any further step, I want to show up the fellows who evidently have played into the hands of Vogt. I, therefore, publicly declare that the statement of Blind, Wiehe and Hollinger, according to which the anonymous pamphlet was *not* printed in Hollinger’s office, 3, Litchfield Street, Soho, is a *deliberate lie*. First, Mr. Vögele, one of the compositors, formerly employed by Hollinger, will declare upon oath that the said pamphlet *was* printed in Hollinger’s office, was written in the hand-writing of *Mr. Blind*, and partly composed by Hollinger himself. Secondly, it can be judicially proved that the pamphlet and the article in *Das Volk* have been taken off the same types. Thirdly, it will be shown that Wiehe was *not* employed by Hollinger for eleven consecutive months, and, especially, was *not* employed by him at the time of the pamphlet’s publication. Lastly, witnesses may be summoned in whose presence Wiehe himself confessed having been persuaded by Hollinger to sign the *wilfully false declaration in the Augsburg Gazette*.^b Consequently, I again declare the above said *Charles Blind* to be a *deliberate liar*.

Karl Marx”

From the London “Times”, February 3rd.

“Vienna, January 30th.—The Swiss Professor Vogt pretends to know that France will procure for Switzerland Faucigny, Chablais, and the Genevese,^c the neutral provinces of Savoy, if the Grand Council of the Republic will let her have the free use of the Simplon.”^d

^a Marx quotes this excerpt from the circular in English (see this volume, pp. 10-11).—*Ed.*

^b The Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*.—*Ed.*

^c Genevois.—*Ed.*

^d Marx quotes this report in English (see also this volume, p. 195).—*Ed.*

12. VÖGELE'S AFFIDAVIT

"I declare herewith:

that the German flysheet *Zur Warnung* (A Warning) which was afterwards reprinted in No. 7 (d.d. 18th June 1859) of *Das Volk* (a German paper which was then published in London) and which was again reprinted in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of Augsburg (the Augsburg Gazette)—that this flysheet was composed partly by Mr. Fidelio Hollinger of 3, Litchfield Street, Soho, London, partly by myself, who was then employed by Mr. Fidelio Hollinger, and that the flysheet was published in Mr. F. Hollinger's Printing office, 3, Litchfield Street, Soho, London; that the manuscript of the said flysheet was in the handwriting of Mr. Charles Blind; that I saw Mr. F. Hollinger give to Mr. William Liebknecht of 14, Church Street, Soho, London, the proofsheets of the flysheet *Zur Warnung*; that Mr. F. Hollinger hesitated at first giving the proofsheets to Mr. W. Liebknecht, and, that, when Mr. W. Liebknecht had withdrawn, he, Mr. F. Hollinger, expressed to me, and to my fellow workman J. F. Wiehe, his regret for having given the proofsheets out of his hands.

"Declared at the Police Court, Bow Street, in the County of Middlesex, the eleventh day of February 1860, before me, *Th. Henry*, one of the Police Magistrates of the Metropolis.

"L.S.

A. Vögele"^a

13. WIEHE'S AFFIDAVIT

"One of the first days of November last—I do not recollect the exact date—in the evening between nine and ten o'clock I was taken out of bed by Mr. F. Hollinger, in whose house I then lived, and by whom I was employed as compositor. He presented to me a paper to the effect, that, during the preceding eleven months I had been continuously employed by him, and that during all that time a certain German flysheet *Zur Warnung* (A Warning) had not been composed and printed in Mr. Hollinger's Office, 3, Litchfield Street, Soho. In my perplexed state, and not aware of the importance of the transaction, I complied with his wish, and copied, and signed the document. Mr. Hollinger promised me money, but I never received anything. During that transaction Mr. Charles Blind, as my wife informed me at the time, was waiting in Mr. Hollinger's room. A few days later, Mrs. Hollinger called me down from dinner and led me into her husband's room, where I found Mr. Charles Blind alone. He presented me the same paper which Mr. Hollinger had presented me before, and entreated me to write, and sign a second copy, as he wanted two, the one for himself, and the other for publication in the Press. He added that he would show himself grateful to me. I copied and signed again the paper.

"I herewith declare the truth of the above statements and that:

"1) During the 11 months mentioned in the document I was for six weeks *not* employed by Mr. Hollinger, but by a Mr. Ermani. 2) I did not work in Mr. Hollinger's Office just at that time when the flysheet *Zur Warnung* (A Warning) was published. 3) I heard at the time from Mr. Vögele, who then worked for Mr. Hollinger, that he, Vögele, had, together with Mr. Hollinger himself, composed the flysheet in question, and that the manuscript was in Mr. Blind's handwriting. 4) The types of the pamphlet were still standing when I returned to Mr. Hollinger's service. I myself broke them into columns for the reprint of the

^a Marx gives this document in English (see also this volume, p. 128).—*Ed.*

flysheet (or pamphlet) *Zur Warnung* (A Warning) in the German paper *Das Volk* published at London, by Mr. Fidelio Hollinger, 3, Litchfield Street, Soho. The flysheet appeared in No. 7, d. d. 18th June 1859, of *Das Volk* (The People). 5) I saw Mr. Hollinger give to Mr. William Liebknecht of 14, Church Street, Soho, London, the proofsheet of the pamphlet *Zur Warnung*, on which proofsheet Mr. Charles Blind with his own hand had corrected four or five mistakes. Mr. Hollinger hesitated at first giving the proofsheet to Mr. Liebknecht, and when Mr. Liebknecht had withdrawn, he, F. Hollinger, expressed to me and my fellow workman Vögele his regret for having given the proofsheet out of his hands.

“Declared and signed by the said Johann Friedrich Wiehe at the Police Court, Bow Street, this 8th day of February, 1860, before me *Th. Henry*, Magistrate of the said court.

“L.S.

Johann Friedrich Wiehe”^a

14. FROM THE TRIAL PAPERS

“*Gouvernement Provisoire*

République Française. Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité.

Au nom du Peuple Français

“Paris, 1 Mars 1848

“Brave et loyal Marx,

“Le sol de la république française est un champ d’asile pour tous les amis de la liberté. La tyrannie vous a banni, la France libre vous rouvre ses portes, à vous et à tous ceux qui combattent pour la cause sainte, la cause fraternelle de tous les peuples. Tout agent du gouvernement français doit interpréter sa mission dans ce sens. Salut et fraternité.

Ferdinand Flocon, Membre du gouvernement provisoire”^b

“Bruxelles, le 19 Mai 1848

“Mon cher Monsieur Marx,

“J’entends avec un grand plaisir par notre ami Weerth que vous allez faire paraître à Cologne une *Nouvelle Gazette Rhénane* dont il m’a remis le prospectus. Il

^a Marx gives this document in English (see also this volume, pp. 129-30).—*Ed.*

^b “*Provisional Government*

French Republic. Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.

In the name of the French People

“Paris, March 1, 1848

“Honest, worthy Marx,

“The soil of the French Republic is a place of asylum for all the friends of freedom. Tyranny has expelled you, a free France opens its doors to you once more, to you and to all those who fight for the sacred cause, the fraternal cause of all the peoples. Every official of the French Government should interpret his task in this sense. With fraternal greetings.

Ferdinand Flocon, Member of the Provisional Government.”—*Ed.*

est bien nécessaire que cette feuille nous tienne au courant en Belgique des affaires de la démocratie allemande, car il est impossible d'en rien savoir de certain ici par la *Gazette de Cologne*, la *Gazette Universelle* d'Augsbourg et les autres gazettes aristocratiques de l'Allemagne que nous recevons à Bruxelles, non plus que par notre *Indépendance Belge* dont toutes les correspondances particulières sont conçues au point de vue des intérêts de notre aristocratie bourgeoise. M. Weerth me dit qu'il va vous joindre à Cologne pour contribuer à l'entreprise de la *Nouvelle Gazette Rhénane*: et il me promet en votre nom l'envoi de cette feuille en échange du *Débat social* que je vous enverrai de mon côté. Je ne demande pas mieux aussi que d'entretenir avec vous une correspondance sur les affaires communes à nos deux pays. Il est indispensable que les Belges et les Allemands ne restent pas trop étrangers les uns aux autres, dans l'intérêt commun des deux pays: car il se prépare en France des événements qui ne tarderont pas à mettre en jeu des questions qui toucheront les deux pays ensemble. Je reviens de Paris où j'ai passé une dizaine de jours que j'ai employés de mon mieux à me rendre compte de la situation de cette grande capitale. Je me suis trouvé, à la fin de mon séjour, juste au milieu des affaires du 15 mai.²⁴⁶ J'assistais même à la séance où s'est passé le fait de l'irruption du peuple dans l'assemblée nationale.... Tout ce que j'ai compris, à voir l'attitude du peuple parisien et à entendre parler les principaux personnages qui sont en ce moment dans les affaires de la république française, c'est qu'on s'attend à une forte réaction de l'esprit bourgeois contre les événements de février dernier; les affaires du 15 mai précipiteront sans doute cette réaction. Or, celle-ci amènera indubitablement dans peu de temps un nouveau soulèvement du peuple... La France devra bientôt recourir à la guerre. C'est pour ce cas-là que nous aurons à aviser, ici et chez vous, sur ce que nous aurons à faire ensemble. Si la guerre se porte d'abord vers l'Italie nous aurons du répit... Mais si elle se porte sur-le-champ vers ce pays-ci je ne sais pas trop encore ce que nous aurons à faire, et alors nous aurons besoin du conseil des Allemands... En attendant j'annoncerai dans le *Débat social* de dimanche la publication prochaine de votre nouvelle feuille... Je compte aller à Londres vers la fin du mois de juin prochain. Si vous avez occasion d'écrire à Londres à quelques amis, veuillez les prier de m'y faire accueil. Tout à vous cordialement,

L. Jottrand, Avt."^a

^a "My dear Mr. Marx, I hear with great pleasure from our friend Weerth that you intend to publish a *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* in Cologne of which he has sent me the prospectus. It is extremely necessary for this paper to keep us in Belgium informed about the affairs of German democracy, since it is not possible to learn anything definite about this from the *Kölnische Zeitung*, the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* and the other aristocratic German papers which we receive here in Brussels, any more than from our *Indépendance Belge*, all of whose special reports are written from the standpoint of the interests of our bourgeois aristocracy. Herr Weerth has told me that he is going to join you in Cologne to collaborate on the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* and he has promised me in your name to send me copies of it in exchange for the *Débat social* which I shall forward to you. I can ask nothing better than to correspond with you about the affairs common to our two nations. It is in the interest of both our countries that Belgians and Germans should become better acquainted with each other, for in France events are about to take place which in a short time will pose problems affecting both our countries. I have just come back

“Bruxelles, 10 Février, 1860

“Mon cher Marx,

“N'ayant pas de vos nouvelles, depuis très longtemps, j'ai reçu votre dernière^a avec la plus vive satisfaction. Vous vous plaignez du retard des choses, et du peu d'empressement de ma part de vous répondre à la question que vous m'aviez faite. Que faire: l'âge ralentit la plume; j'espère cependant que vous trouverez mes avis et mon sentiment toujours les mêmes. Je vois que votre dernière est tracée à la dictée par la main de votre secrétaire intime, de votre adorable moitié: or Madame Marx ne cesse de se rappeler du vieux hermite de Bruxelles. Qu'elle daigne recevoir avec bonté mes salutations respectueuses.

“Conservez-moi, cher confrère, dans vos amitiés. Salut et fraternité.

Lelewel”^b

from Paris after spending ten days there during which time I did my best to gain an understanding of what is happening in this great metropolis. At the end of my stay I found myself in the midst of the events of May 15. I was even present at the session of the National Assembly during which the people rushed into the Chamber.... As far as I have understood both from seeing the attitude of the people of Paris and from listening to the speeches of the leading statesmen in the French Republic at the present time, a powerful reaction is expected against the events of February last on the part of the bourgeoisie; the events of May 15 will doubtless hasten this reaction. And this will undoubtedly lead in a short time to a new uprising by the people.... France will soon have to have recourse to war. It is for this reason that we ought to consider here and in your country what common action we should take in that event. If to start with the war is directed against Italy we shall have a breathing space; ... but if it is directed against this country from the very beginning I do not yet know what we should do, and we should then be in need of the advice of the Germans.... In the meantime I shall announce the approaching publication of your new paper in the Sunday edition of the *Débat social*.... I plan to go to London towards the end of June. Should you have occasion to write to any of your friends in London, I would be grateful if you could ask them to receive me kindly.

“With cordial greetings,

L. Jottrand, Lawyer”

See also this volume, pp. 263-66.—*Ed.*

^a This refers to Marx's letter to Lelewel of February 3, 1860 (present edition, Vol. 41).—*Ed.*

^b “My dear Marx, not having heard any news from you for a long time, I was very glad to receive your last communication. You complain about the delay and the lack of urgency on my part in answering the question you put to me. But what can one do: age slows down the pen. Nevertheless, I hope that you will find my opinions and my feelings the same as ever. I see that your last letter was written at your dictation by the hand of your private secretary, your charming wife. So Madame Marx still remembers the old hermit in Brussels. Please, convey to her my respectful greetings.

“Continue to include me, dear colleague, among your friends. With fraternal greetings.

Lelewel”.—*Ed.*

“5, Cambridge Place,
Kensington, London,
February 11th, 1860

“My dear Marx,

“I have read a series of infamous articles against you in the *National-Zeitung* and am utterly astonished at the falsehood and malignity of the writer. I really feel it a duty that every one who is acquainted with you, should, however unnecessary such a testimony must be, pay a tribute to the worth, honour and disinterestedness of your character. It becomes doubly incumbent in me to do so, when I recollect how many articles you contributed to my little magazine, the *Notes to the People*, and subsequently to the *People's Paper*, for a series of years, utterly gratuitously; articles which were of such high value to the people's cause, and of such great benefit to the paper. Permit me to hope that you will severely punish your dastardly and unmanly libeller.

“Believe me, my dear Marx, most sincerely, yours,

Ernest Jones

“Dr. Karl Marx”^a

“Tribune Office,
New York,
March 8th, 1860

“My dear Sir,

“In reply to your request I am very happy to state the facts of your connection with various publications in the United States concerning which I have had a personal knowledge. Nearly nine years ago I engaged you to write for the *New York Tribune*, and the engagement has been continued ever since. You have written for us constantly, without a single week's interruption, that I can remember; and you are not only one of the most highly valued, but one of the best paid contributors attached to the journal. The only fault I have had to find with you has been that you have occasionally exhibited too German a tone of feeling for an American newspaper. This has been the case with reference both to Russia and France. In questions relating to both, Czarism and Bonapartism, I have sometimes thought that you manifested too much interest and too great anxiety for the unity and independence of Germany. This was more striking perhaps in connection with the late Italian war than on any other occasion. In that I agreed perfectly with you: *sympathy with the Italian people*. I had as little confidence as you in the sincerity of the French Emperor, and believed as little as you that *Italian liberty* was to be expected from him; but I did not think that Germany had any such ground for alarm as you, in common with other patriotic Germans, thought she had.

“I must add that in all your writings which have passed through my hands, you have always manifested the most cordial interest in the welfare and progress of the labouring classes; and that you have written much with direct reference to that end.

“I have also at various times within the past five or six years been the medium through which contributions of yours have been furnished to *Putnam's Monthly*,²⁴⁷ a literary magazine of high character; and also to the *New American Cyclopaedia*, of which I am also an editor, and for which you have furnished some very important articles.

^a Marx gives the letter in English.—*Ed.*

"If any other explanations are needed I shall be happy to furnish them. Meanwhile I remain, yours very faithfully,

Charles A. Dana, Managing Editor of the *N. Y. Tribune*

"Dr. Charles Marx"^a

15. DENTU PAMPHLETS

I have shown that the Dentu pamphlets are the source from which the German Dâ-Dâ derives his wisdom about world history in general and "*Napoleon's salutary policy*" in particular. The "*salutary policy of Napoleon*" is a phrase from a recent leading article by "democrat" *F. Zabel*. What the *French themselves* think and know about these pamphlets can be seen from the following extract from the Paris weekly, the *Courrier du Dimanche*, No. 42, of *October 14, 1860*.

"Pour ce qui regarde le moment actuel, prenez dix brochures au hasard, et vous reconnaîtrez que neuf au moins ont été pensées, élaborées, écrites ... par qui? par des romanciers de profession, par des chansonniers, par des vaudevillistes, par des sacristains!

"Parle-t-on dans les gazettes de mystérieuses entrevues entre les puissances du Nord, de la Sainte-Alliance qui ressuscite? Vite voilà un faiseur agréable de couplets assez littéraires, et même (jadis) passablement libéraux, qui court chez l'inévitable *M. Dentu* et lui apporte sous ce titre ronflant: La coalition, une longue et fade paraphrase des articles de *M. Grandguillot*. L'alliance anglaise semble déplaire parfois à *M. Limayrac*? Vite, un *M. Châtelet*, chevalier de l'ordre de Grégoire le Grand,²⁴⁸ et qui doit être sacristain quelque part, si j'en crois son style, publie ou republie un long et ridicule factum: *Crimes et délits de l'Angleterre contre la France*. Déjà l'auteur du *Compère Guillery* (*Edmond About*) avait jugé à propos de nous édifier sur les arcanes politiques de la monarchie prussienne, et avait donné du haut de ses chutes théâtrales, des conseils de prudence aux chambres de Berlin. On annonce que *M. Clairville* va prochainement élucider la question de l'isthme de Panama, si fort embrouillée par *M. Belly*; et sans doute quelques jours après la conférence royale du 21 Octobre,²⁴⁹ on verra paraître à toutes les vitrines de nos libraires une splendide brochure rose qui portera ce titre: *Mémoire sur l'entrevue de Varsovie par le corps de ballet de l'Opéra*.

"Cette invasion, en apparence inexplicable, des questions politiques par les *dii minores* de la littérature, se rattache à bien des causes. Nous en citerons ici une seule, mais qui est la plus immédiate et la plus incontestable.

"Dans le marasme presque universel d'esprit et de coeur, ces messieurs, qui font le triste métier d'amuseurs publics, ne savent plus par quel moyen secouer et réveiller leurs lecteurs. Les vieilles gâtés de leurs refrains et de leurs anecdotes leur reviennent sans cesse. Eux-mêmes se sentent aussi mornes, aussi tristes, aussi ennuyés que ceux qu'ils entreprennent de dérider. Voilà pourquoi à bout de ressources, ils se sont mis, en désespoir de cause, à écrire les uns des mémoires de courtisanes, les autres des brochures diplomatiques.

"Puis, un beau matin, un aventurier de la plume, qui n'a jamais fait à la politique le sacrifice d'une heure sérieuse d'étude, qui n'a pas même au coeur le

^a Marx gives the letter in English.—*Ed.*

semblant d'une conviction, quelle qu'elle soit, se lève et se dit: 'J'ai besoin de frapper un grand coup! Vovons! que ferai-je pour attirer sur moi l'attention générale qui me fuit d'instinct? Écrirai-je un opuscule sur la question Léotard ou sur la question d'Orient? Révélerai-je au monde surpris le secret de boudoirs où je n'entr'ai jamais, ou celui de la poitique russe qui m'est plus étrange encore? Dois-je m'attendrir en prose voitairienne sur *les femmes éclaboussées* ou en prose évangélique sur les malheureuses populations maronites²⁵⁰ traquées, dépouillées, massacrées par le fanatisme mahométan? Lancerai-je une apologie de mademoiselle Rigol-boche ou un plaidoyer en faveur du pouvoir temporel? Décidément, j'opte pour la politique. J'amuserai encore mieux mon public avec les rois et les empereurs, qu'avec les lorettes.' Cela dit, notre surnuméraire de la littérature bohème compulse le *Moniteur*, hante quelques jours les colonnades de la Bourse, rend visite à quelques fonctionnaires et sait enfin de quel côté souffle le vent de la curiosité à la ville, ou celui de la faveur à la cour: il choisit alors un titre que ce vent puisse enfler d'une façon suffisante et se repose content sur ses lauriers. Aussi bien son oeuvre est faite désormais; car aujourd'hui, en matière de brochure, il n'y a que deux choses qui comptent, le titre et les relations que l'on suppose entre l'écrivain et 'de hauts personnages'.

"Est-il nécessaire de dire, après cela, ce que valent les brochures qui nous inondent? Ramassez un jour tout ce que vous avez de courage, tâchez de les lire jusqu'au bout et vous serez effrayés de l'ignorance inouïe, de la légèreté intolérable, voire même de l'amointrissement de sens moral qu'elles décelent dans leurs auteurs. Et je ne parle pas ici des plus mauvaises... Et chaque année nous courbe plus bas, chaque année voit apparaître un nouveau signe de décadence intellectuelle. chaque année ajoute une honte littéraire nouvelle à celles dont il nous faut déjà rougir. De telle sorte que les plus optimistes se prennent quelquefois à douter de demain, et se demandent avec angoisse: Sortirons-nous de là?"^a

^a "As to the present state of affairs, pick any ten pamphlets at random and you will find that at least nine of them have been devised worked out and written ... by whom? By professional novelists, song-writers, vaucerville-writers or sextons.

"If the newspapers mention mysterious meetings between the northern powers or a project to resurrect the Holy Alliance, immediately some amiable person manufacturing fairly literary songs, and even (formerly) passably liberal songs, will run off to the inevitable *M. Dentu* and supply him, under the resounding title: 'La Coalition', with a lengthy and insipid paraphrase of the articles of *M. Grandguillot*. If the alliance with England seems sometimes to displease *M. Limayrac*, a *M. Châtelet*, knight of the Order of Gregory the Great, and a man who must be a sexton somewhere or other, to judge him by his style, quickly publishes or republishes a long, ridiculous account: *Crimes et délits de l'Angleterre contre la France*. The author of *Compère Guillery* (*Edmond About*) has already deemed it expedient to edify us with stories about the political secrets of the Prussian monarchy and from the heights of his theatrical fiascos he has honoured the Chambers of Berlin with his prudent advice. It has been announced that *M. Clairville* will soon elucidate the problem of the Isthmus of Panama which has been so thoroughly obscured by *M. Bely*; and no doubt a few days after the royal conference of October 27 we shall see in the windows of all our bookshops a splendid pink pamphlet bearing the title: *Mémoire sur l'entrevue de Varsovie par le corps de ballet de l'Opéra*.

This apparently inexplicable invasion of the political arena by the *lesser gods* of literature has many causes. We shall only mention one here, but that one is the most palpable and the most indisputable of all.

The phrase “*the salutary policy of Napoleon*” quoted above was taken from the *National-Zeitung*. Strangely enough the Paris correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* which is regarded throughout England as a paper publishing mostly reliable news—has reported the following curiosity:

“Paris, November 8.... Louis-Napoleon spends his gold in vain in supporting such newspapers as the *National-Zeitung*.” (*Manchester Guardian* of November 12, 1860.)^a

“Amidst the almost universal decline of intellect and heart, the gentlemen who have the dreary task of amusing the public are at a loss for the means to astonish and rouse their readers. They continually reproduce the old jokes of their refrains and their anecdotes. They are themselves as depressed, as melancholy and as bored as those whom they undertake to cheer up. This is why out of sheer despair, when they have come to their wits' end, some of them begin to write the memoirs of courtesans, and others diplomatic pamphlets.

“Then, one fine morning, an adventurer of the pen who has never sacrificed a single hour of serious study to politics, who does not even have the ghost of a genuine conviction of any sort in his heart, gets out of bed and says to himself: ‘I must strike a great blow! Let’s see. what shall I do to attract the notice of the general public which instinctively ignores me? Shall I write an article on the Leotard affair or on the Eastern Question? Shall I reveal to an astonished world the secrets of boudoirs which I have never entered, or the mysteries of Russian politics of which I know even less? Shall I melt with emotion in the Voltairian manner about the fate of *fallen women*, or bewail in Biblical prose the wretched Maronite population persecuted, plundered and slaughtered by Moslem fanaticism? Shall I sing the praises of Mademoiselle Rigolboche or pen an apologia of temporal power? I have it: I shall settle for politics. I shall entertain my public better with kings and emperors than with loose women.’ Having said which, our supernumerary of the literary *Bohème* wades through the *Moniteur*, hangs around the colonnades of the Stock Exchange for several days, visits a few officials and in the end he knows which way the wind of the town’s curiosity is blowing, or the direction of the favour of the Court. He then selects a title capable of capturing a sufficient portion of this wind, whereupon he rests on his laurels. He has now done everything necessary: for these days only two things are needed to make a pamphlet: the title and the relations that may be supposed to exist between the author and ‘people in high places’.

“Is it still necessary, after all this, to speak of the value of the pamphlets which are flooding the market? If one day you pluck up all your courage and try to read them right through to the end you will be appalled by the extraordinary ignorance, the unbearable frivolousness and especially the utter debasement of utoral principles that they reveal in their authors. And I am not speaking of the worst of them.... And every year sees the standard sink still lower, every year brings new evidence of intellectual decadence, every year brings a new literary dishonour to add to those which already make us blush. Things have come to such a pass that even the greatest optimists sometimes wonder what the morrow will bring and anxiously ask themselves: Shall we ever be able to escape from all this?”—*Ed.*

^a Marx quotes the passage from *The Manchester Guardian* in English and gives the German translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

However, I think that the normally so well-informed correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* is mistaken this time. For F. Zabel is said to have gone over to the Bonapartist camp to prove that he is *not in the pay of Austria*. At any rate, this information reached me from Berlin and it fits well into the—*Dunoiad*.

16. POSTSCRIPT

a) K. VOGT AND *LA CIMENTAIRE*

While the last of these pages were being printed, I accidentally came across the *October issue* (1860) of the *Stimmen der Zeit*. A. Kolatschek, the former publisher of the *Deutsche Monatsschrift*, the organ of the refugee parliamentarians, and hence, in a manner of speaking, the literary superior of the “fugitive Regent of the Empire”, tells the following story about his *friend Karl Vogt* on p. 37:

“The Geneva joint-stock company, *La Cimentaire*, which numbered none other than Herr *Karl Vogt* himself among its *directors*, was founded in 1857. By 1858 the shareholders were down to their last farthing and the public prosecutor immediately put one of the directors in gaol on charges of fraud. At the time of the arrest Herr Vogt happened to be away in Berne; he returned in haste, the man who had been arrested was set at liberty, the charges were suppressed ‘for fear of causing a scandal’, but the shareholders lost everything. But after such an example as this it cannot really be maintained that property is very well protected in Geneva and the error of Herr *Karl Vogt* in this respect is all the stranger since he was, as we have mentioned, *one of the directors of the company concerned*. And even in France in similar cases it is customary to search for the culprits among the directors, to put them into gaol and to use their property to satisfy the civil claims of the shareholders.”

This should be compared with the account given by Joh. Ph. Becker in his letter (in Chapter X) about the bank incident which drove M. *James Fazy* into the arms of the Decembrists.^a Such details as this are a great help in solving the riddle of how “*Napoléon le Petit*” became the greatest man of his age. As is well known “*Napoléon le Petit*” himself had to choose between a coup d’état and—Clichy.²⁵¹

b) KOSSUTH

The following excerpt from a memorandum of a conversation with *Kossuth* proves incontrovertibly that *Kossuth* knows perfectly well that it is *Russia* that constitutes the greatest threat to

^a See this volume, pp. 230-35.—*Ed.*

Hungary. The memorandum²⁵² comes from one of the most celebrated radical members^a of the present House of Commons.^b

“*Memorandum of a conversation with M. Kossuth on the evening of May 30th, 1854, at....*

“... A return to strict legality in Hungary (said he, viz. *Kossuth*) might renew the union of Hungary and Austria, and *would prevent Russia from finding any partisan in Hungary*. He (*Kossuth*) would not offer any opposition to a return to legality. He would advise his countrymen to accept with good faith such a restoration, if it could be obtained, and would pledge himself not in any way to be an obstacle to such an arrangement. He would not himself return to Hungary. He would not himself put forward such a course for Austria as he had no belief in Austria's return to legality, except under pressure of dire necessity. He gave me authority to say, such were his sentiments, and if appealed to, he would avow them, though he could not commit himself to any proposal, as he could not expect Austria to abandon her traditional scheme of centralisation till forced to do so.... He would have consented in 1848 to Hungarian troops being sent to resist attacks of the Piedmontese” (*M. Kossuth* went much further in 1848 since he ensured that Hungarian troops would be sent against the Italian “rebels” by delivering a violent speech in the Imperial Diet in Pest), “but would not employ them to coerce Austrian Italy, as he would not consent to foreign troops in Hungary.”²⁵³

The mythopoeic power of popular fantasy has always shown itself in the creation of “great men”. *Simon Bolivar* is undeniably the most convincing illustration of this. As for *Kossuth*, he is, for example, celebrated as the man who abolished feudalism in Hungary. Nevertheless he is in no way connected with the three great measures: universal taxation, the abolition of the feudal burden of the peasantry and the abolition without compensation of the tithes paid to the Church. The motion for *universal taxation* (the nobility having previously been exempt) was put by *Szemere*; the motion to do away with *corvée*, etc., by *Bonis*, the deputy for Szabolcz, and the clergy itself, acting through *Jekelfalussy*, a deputy and a canon, voluntarily relinquished its rights to raise tithes.²⁵⁴

c) EDMOND ABOUT'S *LA PRUSSE EN 1860*

At the end of Chapter VIII I expressed the opinion that *E. About's* pamphlet *La Prusse en 1860*, or as it was originally called, *Napoléon III et la Prusse*, was a retranslation into French of an excerpt of *Dâ-Dâ Vogt's* German compilation of the *Dentu* pamphlets.^c The only objection to this view was the total ignorance

^a William Sandford.—*Ed.*

^b Marx uses the English term and gives the text of the memorandum, which follows, in English too.—*Ed.*

^c See this volume, pp. 182-83.—*Ed.*

of the German language on the part of that unsuccessful comedy writer, E. About. But was it out of the question for the *compère Guillery* to have discovered a *commère allemande*^a somewhere or other in Paris? Who this *commère* was remained a matter of conjecture. *La Prusse en 1860* was known to have been published as a vademecum for Louis Bonaparte's trip to Baden-Baden²⁵⁵; it was designed to foreshadow his request to the Prince Regent and to make it clear to Prussia that in the December 2 Empire Prussia possessed, in the concluding words of the pamphlet, an "allié très utile qui est peut-être appelé à lui" (Prussia) "rendre de grands services, *pourvu qu'elle s'y prête un peu*".^b E. About had already revealed in French (see Chapter IX, "Agency"^c) in *L'Opinion Nationale* as early as the spring of 1860 that "*pourvu qu'elle s'y prête un peu*" translated into German means: "on the condition that Prussia sells the Rhine Province to France". In view of these aggravating circumstances I could not name anyone as the German prompter of E. About, the unsuccessful comedy writer and Dentu pamphletist, simply on the basis of a conjecture. But I am now justified in declaring that the German *commère* of the *compère Guillery* is none other than Vogt's gentle Kunigunde—*Herr Ludwig Simon of Trier*. This was hardly suspected by the German refugee in London^d who penned the well-known answer to About's pamphlet.^e

^a *Compère*—godfather, *commère allemande*—German godmother.—*Ed.*

^b "A very useful ally, who is still ready to render her" (Prussia) "great service, provided that she will help herself."—*Ed.*

^c See this volume, pp. 211-12.—*Ed.*

^d S. L. Borkheim.—*Ed.*

^e *Napoléon III und Preussen. Antwort eines deutschen Flüchtlings auf die Broschüre "Preussen in 1860" von Edmond About, London, 1860.*—*Ed.*