

**KARL
MARX
FREDERICK
ENGELS**

**Collected
Works**



**Volume 19
Marx and Engels
1861-1864**

Contents

Preface	XI-XXVIII
---------------	-----------

KARL MARX AND FREDERICK ENGELS

WORKS

January 1861-June 1864

1. <i>F. Engels</i> . German Movements	3
2. <i>K. Marx</i> . The American Question in England	7
3. <i>K. Marx</i> . The British Cotton Trade	17
4. <i>K. Marx</i> . The London <i>Times</i> and Lord Palmerston	21
5. <i>K. Marx</i> . The London <i>Times</i> on the Orleans Princes in America	27
6. <i>K. Marx</i> . The North American Civil War	32
7. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Civil War in the United States	43
8. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Crisis in England	53
9. <i>K. Marx</i> . British Commerce	57
10. <i>K. Marx</i> . Economic Notes	62
11. <i>K. Marx</i> . Intervention in Mexico	66
12. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Intervention in Mexico	71
13. <i>K. Marx</i> . Monsieur Fould	79
14. <i>K. Marx</i> . France's Financial Situation	82
15. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Dismissal of Frémont	86
16. <i>K. Marx</i> . The <i>Trent</i> Case	89
17. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Anglo-American Conflict	92
18. <i>K. Marx</i> . The News and Its Effect in London	95
19. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Principal Actors in the <i>Trent</i> Drama	101

20. <i>K. Marx</i> . Controversy over the <i>Trent Case</i>	105
21. <i>K. Marx</i> . Progress of Feeling in England	110
22. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Crisis over the Slavery Issue	115
23. <i>K. Marx</i> . American Matters	117
24. <i>K. Marx</i> . A Slander Trial	120
25. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Washington Cabinet and the Western Powers	124
26. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Opinion of the Newspapers and the Opinion of the People	127
27. <i>K. Marx</i> . French News Humbug.—Economic Consequences of War	131
28. <i>K. Marx</i> . A Pro-America Meeting	134
29. <i>K. Marx</i> . English Public Opinion	137
30. <i>K. Marx</i> . More on Seward's Suppressed Dispatch	143
31. <i>K. Marx</i> . A Coup d'État by Lord John Russell	145
32. <i>K. Marx</i> . Statistical Observations on the Railway System	149
33. <i>K. Marx</i> . A London Workers' Meeting	153
34. <i>K. Marx</i> . Anti-Intervention Feeling	157
35. <i>K. Marx</i> . On the Cotton Crisis	160
36. <i>K. Marx</i> . English	163
37. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Parliamentary Debate on the Address	167
38. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Mexican Imbroglío	172
39. <i>K. Marx</i> . American Affairs	178
40. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Secessionists' Friends in the Lower House.— Recognition of the American Blockade	182
41. <i>K. Marx and F. Engels</i> . The American Civil War	186
I	186
II	191
42. <i>K. Marx</i> . An International <i>Affaire Mirès</i>	196
43. <i>K. Marx</i> . The English Press and the Fall of New Orleans	199
44. <i>K. Marx</i> . A Treaty Against the Slave Trade	202
45. <i>K. Marx and F. Engels</i> . The Situation in the American Theatre of War	204
46. <i>K. Marx</i> . English Humanity and America	209
47. <i>F. Engels</i> . The American Civil War and the Ironclads and Rams	213
48. <i>K. Marx</i> . Chinese Affairs	216
49. <i>K. Marx</i> . A Scandal	219
50. <i>K. Marx</i> . A Suppressed Debate on Mexico and the Alliance with France	223
51. <i>K. Marx</i> . A Criticism of American Affairs	226

52. <i>K. Marx</i> . Russell's Protest Against American Rudeness.—The Rise in the Price of Grain.—On the Situation in Italy	230
53. <i>K. Marx</i> . Abolitionist Demonstrations in America	233
54. <i>K. Marx</i> . A Meeting for Garibaldi	236
55. <i>K. Marx</i> . Workers' Distress in England	239
56. <i>K. Marx</i> . A Note on the Amnesty	243
57. <i>K. Marx</i> . Garibaldi Meetings.—The Distressed Condition of Cotton Workers	245
58. <i>K. Marx</i> . Comments on the North American Events	248
59. <i>K. Marx</i> . Bread Manufacture	252
60. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Situation in North America	256
61. <i>K. Marx</i> . Symptoms of Disintegration in the Southern Confederacy	260
62. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Election Results in the Northern States	263
63. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Dismissal of McClellan	266
64. <i>K. Marx</i> . English Neutrality.—The Situation in the Southern States	270
65. <i>K. Marx</i> . Letter to the Editors of the <i>Berliner Reform</i>	273
66. <i>F. Engels</i> . Kinglake on the Battle of the Alma	274
I	275
[II]	278
III	281
67. <i>F. Engels</i> . Artillery News from America	289
I	289
II	293
68. <i>K. Marx</i> . Proclamation on Poland by the German Workers' Educational Society in London	296
69. <i>F. Engels</i> . The English Army	298
I	301
II	303
III	309
70. <i>F. Engels</i> . The Strength of the Armies in Schleswig	317
71. <i>K. Marx and F. Engels</i> . Obituary	320
72. <i>F. Engels</i> . England's Fighting Forces as against Germany	321

FROM THE PREPARATORY MATERIALS

73. <i>K. Marx</i> . Ground Rent	329
74. <i>K. Marx</i> . Biographical Notes on Wilhelm Wolff	335

APPENDICES

75. Application by Marx for Restoration of His Prussian Citizenship	339
76. Marx's Statement on the Restoration of His Prussian Citizenship	341
77. Marx's Statement on the Rejection of His Application for Restoration of His Prussian Citizenship	345
78. Answer to Marx's Application for Restoration of His Prussian Citizenship	353
79. Marx's Application for Naturalisation and Right of Domicile in Berlin	355
80. Letter from Marx to Police President von Zedlitz	357
81. Power of Attorney Given by Marx to Ferdinand Lassalle for the Restoration of His Prussian Citizenship	359
82. <i>F. Engels</i> . To the Directorate of the Schiller Institute	360
83. Power of Attorney Issued by Marx to Engels to Take Over Wilhelm Wolff's Estate	363

NOTES AND INDEXES

<i>Notes</i>	365
<i>Name Index</i>	406
<i>Index of Quoted and Mentioned Literature</i>	430
<i>Index of Periodicals</i>	445
<i>Subject Index</i>	450

ILLUSTRATIONS

United States of America on the eve of the Civil War of 1861-65 (map)	32-33
The course of military operations in the USA in 1861-1862 (map)	256-57
First page of Engels's manuscript of "The English Army"	299
Beginning of Marx's notes for a lecture on ground rent	331

TRANSLATORS:

RODNEY LIVINGSTONE: Items 56, 73

HENRY MINS: Items 13, 14, 23, 24, 32, 36, 47-49, 52, 54,
55, 57, 59, 61, 62, 65, 66, 68, 69, 72, 75-80

PETER and BETTY ROSS: Items 81, 82

SALO RYAZANSKAYA: Items 22, 58

VICTOR SCHNITTKE: Items 71, 74

BARRIE SELMAN: Item 67



Preface

Volume 19 of the *Collected Works* of Marx and Engels contains articles, letters and documents written between the end of January 1861 and the beginning of June 1864, except for Engels' articles for *The Volunteer Journal, for Lancashire and Cheshire*, which are published in Volume 18 with other works of his on military subjects.

The first half of the 1860s saw the continued rise of the bourgeois-democratic and national liberation movements that began in Europe and America after the world economic crisis of 1857. In Germany and Italy, which had yet to complete their bourgeois revolutions, the movement for national unity gained fresh impetus; in Russia peasant unrest continued, and revolutionary ideas spread in progressive circles after the abolition of serfdom in February 1861; in the USA civil war broke out between North and South (1861-65); there was growing opposition to the régime of the Second Empire in France; centrifugal tendencies intensified in the Austrian monarchy; in Mexico the bourgeois revolution triumphed; in China the Taiping peasant uprising entered its closing stage.

The industrial revolution in the economically advanced countries led to a great increase in the numerical strength of the proletariat and far-reaching changes in its composition and class-

consciousness. The world economic crisis of 1857, the first of such magnitude in the history of capitalism, and the strikes that followed, vividly demonstrated the opposing economic and political interests of proletariat and bourgeoisie. The working-class movement began to pursue an independent struggle and this created conditions for its liberation from the ideological influence of the bourgeoisie. In the first half of the 1860s this showed itself in the growth of the British trade-union movement and the awakening of political activity of the British proletariat, in particular its demonstrations in defence of the national liberation movements and its opposition to the attempts by the British and French ruling classes to intervene in the US Civil War on behalf of the slave-owning Southern states. This process of working-class emancipation from bourgeois ideology was also expressed in the awakening of class consciousness among the French proletariat; in the attempts by the German workers to shake off the influence of the liberal bourgeoisie, and the foundation in 1863 of the General Association of German Workers; and in the active support by workers of various nationalities of the struggle for greater freedom and democracy in the USA (against the South in the Civil War) and of Garibaldi in Italy. The workers' realisation that their interests were in opposition to those of the ruling classes, an increased sense of proletarian solidarity, and the strengthening of international contacts, finally led to the foundation of the International Working Men's Association (the First International) on September 28, 1864.

Marx's and Engels' theoretical work and political activities during these years were many-sided. As before, Marx's main concern was political economy. From August 1861 to July 1863 he wrote *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*; from the end of July or beginning of August 1863, to the summer of 1864, he worked on Book I of *Capital*—"The Process of Capitalist Production". Meanwhile, Engels continued with the theoretical development of the proletarian party's military strategy and tactics. At the same time they both pursued their interests in problems of philosophy and world history.

At the end of the 1850s, Marx and Engels began their attempts to restore old contacts—and to establish new ones—with German, French, Polish and Italian revolutionary democratic emigrants in London, and above all with the working-class and democratic movements in Britain, Germany, France, Austria and the USA. These efforts, both to consolidate the forces of the working class and to establish contacts with progressive

democratic circles, were dictated by the general revolutionary upsurge.

Marx and Engels were above all guided by the objective interests of the proletariat: the bourgeois-democratic transformation of the countries of Europe and America, and the creation of legal conditions for the development of the working-class and democratic movement. The revolution of 1848-1849 had shown that in the more economically developed capitalist countries of Europe, the liberal bourgeoisie did not want, while the democratic and radical petty bourgeoisie proved unfit, to carry the bourgeois revolution through to the end. So in the 1860s the fulfilment of this historic task was becoming more and more the cause of the working class. Marx and Engels favoured the unification by revolutionary means of Germany and Italy, and the transition to revolutionary methods of conducting the US Civil War. They attached particular importance to the revolutionary movement in France and Russia, regarding Bonapartism and tsarism as the chief obstacles to the national liberation of the oppressed peoples of Europe.

The many-sided activity by Marx and Engels during this period is partly reflected in this volume. Their journalistic work is represented most fully. Until March 1862 Marx continued writing for the progressive American bourgeois newspaper, the *New York Tribune*; from October 1861 to December 1862 he contributed to the Viennese liberal newspaper *Die Presse*. Engels helped Marx in his work as correspondent for these newspapers; furthermore, as has been mentioned above, Engels wrote a great deal about military matters for the English magazine *The Volunteer Journal*, for *Lancashire and Cheshire*, and for the German newspaper *Allgemeine Militär-Zeitung*.

A theme central to the journalistic writings of Marx and Engels during these years was the US Civil War, which they saw as a crucial turning-point in the history of the USA, and of overall progressive significance. Their articles provided the first systematic account of its history, its political and social ramifications, its economic consequences, and the diplomatic struggles that resulted not only in America, but in Europe and especially in Britain. Most of the works on this subject were written by Marx and published in *Die Presse* and the *New-York Daily Tribune* in 1861-62.

For the American paper, Marx wrote mainly about the impact of the Civil War on Great Britain's economy, foreign policy and public opinion. *Die Presse*, which was read not only in Austria, but in Germany, carried articles mainly about the Civil War itself, its

character, motive forces and historical significance. Marx endeavoured to give the European reader more exact information, based on American sources. He wrote to Engels on April 28, 1862 about the need to "disseminate correct views on this important matter in the land of the Teutons" (this edition, Vol. 41).

In the very first articles for European readers—"The North American Civil War" and "The Civil War in the United States"—and in his article for the *Tribune*, "The American Question in England", Marx demonstrated the groundlessness of the claims by the British bourgeois press (*The Times* and other newspapers) that the war between North and South was not a war over slavery, but over tariffs, the political rivalry of North and South for supremacy in the Union and the like. For Marx the conflict between the Northern and Southern states was the struggle between "two social systems"—slavery and wage labour (p. 50). He regarded the Civil War as an inevitable consequence of the long struggle of the industrial North and the slave-owning South, a struggle which "was the moving power of its [America's] history for half a century" (p. 11). Marx saw this war as a form of bourgeois-democratic revolution, the inevitability of which was conditioned by economic and political factors and, above all, by the "growth of the North-West, the immense strides its population has made from 1850 to 1860" (p. 10).

Analysis in depth of social-political relations in the United States throughout the first half of the 19th century enabled Marx to reveal in his articles the contradictory essence of American plantation slavery. A pre-capitalist form of exploitation, slavery was also closely linked with the world capitalist market; cotton produced by slave labour became one of the "monstrous pivots" of British industry (p. 19).

Studying the conditions under which plantation slavery and its primitive technology could exist, Marx wrote: "The cultivation of the Southern export articles, cotton, tobacco, sugar, etc., carried on by slaves, is only remunerative as long as it is conducted with large gangs of slaves, on a mass scale and on wide expanses of a naturally fertile soil, which requires only simple labour" (p. 39). Given the extensive nature of a plantation economy based on slave labour, unlimited reserves of free land were necessary, which resulted in the "continual expansion of territory and continual spread of slavery beyond its old limits" (p. 39).

Analysis of the economic structure of the plantation economy and the conditions for its survival enabled Marx to expose the groundlessness of the claims by the bourgeois press about the

peaceful nature of the Secession (the withdrawal of the Southern states from the Union), and to rebuff attempts to portray the slave-owners of the South as defending the rights of individual states from the encroachments of the Federal Government. Marx stressed that it was the Southern Confederacy that “assumed the offensive in the Civil War” (p. 43). He repeatedly noted that the Secession was a form of aggression by the slave-owning planters against the lawful government, that the “war of the Southern Confederacy is in the true sense of the word a war of conquest for the spread and perpetuation of slavery” (p. 49). He warned against the real danger of slavery spreading all over the Republic: “The slave system would infect the whole Union” (p. 50).

Marx showed that the perpetuation and further spread of slavery would have fatal social consequences. “In the Northern States, where Negro slavery is in practice unworkable, the white working class would gradually be forced down to the level of helotry” (p. 50). In the Southern states, he pointed out, the numerically small slave-owning oligarchy was opposed by the disadvantaged “poor whites”, whose numbers “have been constantly growing through concentration of landed property” (p. 40). These déclassé groups of the population, corrupted by the slave-owning ideology, could only be kept in subjection by flattery of their own hopes of obtaining new territory and by “the prospect of one day becoming slaveholders themselves” (41).

Marx and Engels repeatedly emphasised that the existence of slavery was retarding the development of the American working-class movement, was serving as a foundation for the intensified exploitation of the free workers of the North, and was a threat to the constitutional rights of the American workers.

Marx showed that although slavery partially facilitated the development of capitalism in the USA—as some of the bourgeoisie in the North were living off the trade in cotton and other products of slave labour—it was becoming more and more incompatible with the capitalist development of the Northern states. It was the problem of slavery, as Marx emphasised, that was at the root of the US Civil War: “The whole movement was and is based ... on the *slave question*. Not in the sense of whether the slaves within the existing slave states should be emancipated outright or not, but ... whether the vast Territories of the republic should be nurseries for free states or for slavery” (p. 42).

Using a wealth of factual material, Marx was already pointing out in his first articles on the US Civil War that the more

advanced social system, namely, that of the Northern States, must win. While noting the progressive nature of the war as fought by the North, he also condemned the indecision and vacillation shown in the war by Union bourgeois circles in proclaiming the abolition of slavery. In his articles "The Dismissal of Frémont", "A Criticism of American Affairs" and others, Marx showed the reluctance of the bourgeois Republican Government to make it a popular and revolutionary war. This, in his opinion, showed up the limitations of American bourgeois democracy. The Lincoln government "fights shy of every step that could mislead the 'loyal' slaveholders of the border states" (p. 87), as a result of which the war as a struggle against slavery was being blunted (p. 227). It was this policy of the Northern government during the initial stages of the war that Marx saw as the main reason for the military failures of the Unionists, in spite of their superiority in economic potential and in manpower reserves.

In a series of articles written in 1862, Marx indicated the process of differentiation in the ruling Republican Party under the influence of the growth and consolidation of the forces favouring the immediate abolition of slavery ("Abolitionist Demonstrations in America", "The Election Results in the Northern States"). He noted changes in the balance of forces within the Republican Party, forced under pressure from the general public to take a more decisive stand over the emancipation of the slaves. After analysing the results of the voting in the states, Marx demonstrated that the failure of the Republicans at the elections was caused above all by the discontent of the farmers in the North with the former methods of conducting the war and by a shift to the left of the masses who followed the Republicans: "They came out emphatically for immediate emancipation, whether for its own sake or as a means of ending the rebellion" (p. 264). Summing up the first stage of the war, Marx wrote: "So far, we have only witnessed the first act of the Civil War—the *constitutional* waging of war. The second act, the *revolutionary* waging of war, is at hand" (p. 228).

Marx and Engels followed the increasingly revolutionary nature of the Civil War closely and noted the revolutionary-democratic measures to which the Lincoln government was compelled to resort and which ultimately led to the victory of the North. Marx attached special importance to two social measures: the Homestead Act, which gave a great many American farmers the chance of acquiring land, and the Proclamation that the black slaves of the rebellious planters were free. Marx valued the latter as "the most

important document in American history since the establishment of the Union”, pointing out that it was “tantamount to the tearing up of the old American constitution” (p. 250).

In the initial period of the war, Marx criticised Lincoln for vacillation and indecision, and for the bourgeois limitations of certain of his measures and legal enactments (see, e.g., p. 87). Items in the volume show, however, that the Lincoln government’s revolutionary measures gradually changed the attitude of Marx and Engels to the President himself. In October 1862, Marx gave high praise to Lincoln’s activity, declaring that “Lincoln’s place in the history of the United States and of mankind will ... be next to that of Washington” (p. 250).

In their *New-York Daily Tribune* and *Die Presse* articles, the leaders of the proletariat tried to help the struggle of the revolutionary-democratic forces for a fuller and more consistent solution to the pressing historical tasks during the war. The consolidation of the forces of revolutionary democracy, which was pushing the bourgeois to the left, was regarded by Marx and Engels as an important task for the American working class. The farming and working-class population of the North played a major role in the struggle against slavery. Marx wrote: “New England and the Northwest, which have provided the main body of the army, are determined to force on the government a revolutionary kind of warfare and to inscribe the battle-slogan of ‘Abolition of Slavery’ on the star-spangled banner” (p. 228). Marx noted that although the consolidation of “the parties of the North which are consistent in point of principle”, i.e. confirmed Abolitionists, takes place very slowly, they all nevertheless “are being pushed ... into the foreground by events” (p. 233).

Marx and Engels set great store by the participation of the Black masses in the liberation struggle and severely criticised the policy of the Northern states over the “Negro question”. Fearing revolutionary disturbances, the American government could not at first make up its mind whether or not to admit Blacks into the army. The recruitment of Blacks into the army of the North would, in Marx’s opinion, have had a tremendous influence on the course of the war; it would have considerably increased the North’s chances by weakening the rear of the South. A single Black regiment, he wrote on August 7, 1862, “would have a remarkable effect on Southern nerves” (this edition, Vol. 41). Marx had a high estimation of the new officers brought into being in the course of the Civil War, since they were the ones actually solving the problem of abolition, declaring the slaves free and

demanding that they be armed (see this volume, pp. 115-16).

Even early in the Civil War, Marx perceived the social-economic factors that subsequently, after the victory of the Republicans and the abolition of slavery, favoured the preservation of racial discrimination and of national and social oppression in the USA. Marx stressed the direct interest of the commercial and finance bourgeoisie in preserving the remnants of slave ownership. In his article, "The Election Results in the Northern States", he wrote that it was New York, "the seat of the American money market and full of holders of mortgages on Southern plantations", a city "actively engaged in the slave trade until recently", that had been, immediately before and during the Civil War, the main bulwark of the Democratic party (p. 263).

Much space in Marx's and Engels' articles on the Civil War is taken up by its military aspects. Engels pointed out the decisive role of the masses and the interrelation of economic, political and moral factors in the military operations. "The American Civil War," he wrote, "given the inventive spirit of the nation and the high technical level of engineering in America, would lead to great advances ... in the technical side of warfare..." (p. 289). At the same time, while acknowledging the role of war in technical development, Marx and Engels condemned the social role of the "human slaughter industry" (see letters from Marx to Engels, July 7, 1866, and Engels to Marx, July 12, 1866, this edition, Vol. 42).

In his article, "Artillery News from America", after analysing, on the evidence of individual operations, the forms and methods of conducting the war, Engels demonstrated the natural tendency of military equipment to become obsolete very quickly and the necessity for its continual improvement. Study of the Civil War enabled Engels to plot the main trends in the development of artillery, in the art of fortification and especially in the development of the navy, and to specify and elaborate certain points made in his earlier articles in *The New American Cyclopaedia* (see this edition, Vol. 18). Fundamentally significant, in particular, was Engels' forecast of the predominance in future naval armed forces of armoured vessels with gun turrets (p. 291).

In their jointly written articles, "The American Civil War", "The Situation in the American Theatre of War" and others, Marx and Engels developed the idea, important for military science, of the influence exerted by the character of a war on the methods by which it is conducted. Marx and Engels pointed out the negative role of the cadre officers under McClellan who were

sympathetic to the South. Marx wrote that there was a strong *esprit de corps* among them and that they were more or less closely connected with their old comrades in the enemy camp. "In their view, the war must be waged in a strictly businesslike fashion, with constant regard to the restoration of the Union on its *old* basis, and therefore must above all be kept free from revolutionary tendencies and tendencies affecting matters of principle" (p. 179). Marx and Engels considered that the dismissal from the Northern army of reactionary officers sympathetic to the South was a military measure of the utmost priority. They also demonstrated that the strategic plan of the McClellan command (the North's "Anaconda Plan" envisaged a slowly contracting ring of troops round the rebellious slave-owning states) was not only intended to avoid a true revolutionary war of the people, but was untenable in military terms (pp. 193-95).

In the article "The American Civil War", Marx and Engels put forward their own strategic plan, taking into consideration the class content, the political and social aims of the war, and demanding revolutionary methods of conducting it. This consisted of a decisive blow by concentrated forces against the vitally important enemy centres and envisaged first and foremost the occupation of Georgia, as a result of which the territory of the Confederation would be cut into two parts (pp. 194-95). The subsequent course of the war showed that this plan was the only right one. A turning point in military operations occurred and the North achieved final victory in 1865, but only after the Northern command had carried out a similar plan (General Sherman's "march to the sea") in the second half of 1864 and had taken revolutionary measures the necessity of which Marx and Engels had been indicating all through 1861 and 1862.

The denunciation of bourgeois diplomacy and the reactionary designs of the ruling classes against the revolutionary democratic and national liberation movements were regarded by Marx and Engels as one of the most important tasks of the proletarian revolutionaries. The events of the US Civil War gave Marx the opportunity to denounce in his articles the foreign policy of the British ruling oligarchy which, in spite of Britain's declared neutrality, was secretly supporting the Southern rebels and was preparing an armed intervention to help the slave-owners. In connection with the seizure in November 1861 by an American warship of the British packet boat *Trent* with emissaries of the Confederacy on board, there was a real threat of armed conflict between Britain and the United States. In his articles "The

Anglo-American Conflict”, “Controversy over the *Trent Case*”, “The Washington Cabinet and the Western Powers” and others, Marx irrefutably demonstrated the groundlessness of the arguments put forward by British ruling circles and their allies on the continent, who were trying to use this incident as a pretext for unleashing a war on the side of the slave-owners.

Marx and Engels considered that the attitude of the European and American proletariat to the US Civil War should be determined by the prospects of the revolutionary movement in Europe and America and that the war against slavery in the USA would increase the political activity of the working class. Regarding an active influence on the foreign policy of the ruling classes as one of the most important tasks of the revolutionary proletariat, and as part of its general struggle for the liberation of the working people, Marx and Engels set great store by the demonstrations of the English workers against their government’s intention to create a coalition of reactionary European states to provide armed help to the South. These demonstrations, in Marx’s opinion, played a large part in educating the proletarian masses in the spirit of international solidarity and as a counterweight to the chauvinistic propaganda of the ruling classes, and, above all, of the Palmerston press. Marx demonstrated that the masses in Britain, France, Germany and, indeed, all Europe, considered the defence of the North as their cause, the cause of freedom “now to be defended sword in hand, from the sordid grasp of the slaveholder” (p. 29).

Marx’s articles “The Opinion of the Newspapers and the Opinion of the People”, “English Public Opinion”, “A London Workers’ Meeting”, “Anti-Intervention Feeling” and others, taught the workers how to work out their own revolutionary line and stand up for it in international conflicts. Marx was particularly delighted by the actions of the British proletariat; he considered that “the English working class has won immortal historical honour for itself”, having by means of mass protest meetings foiled the attempts of the ruling classes to organise an intervention on behalf of the South, although the continuation of the US Civil War and also the crisis in the cotton industry connected with it subjected “a million English workers to the most fearful sufferings and privations” (p. 297).

Marx described the appalling poverty of the Lancashire weavers left unemployed by the closure of many cotton mills. He denounced the attempts by the ruling classes (the articles “On the Cotton Crisis”, “Workers’ Distress in England”, etc.) to attribute the stagnation in the British cotton industry exclusively to the cessation of the import of cotton from the USA as a result of the Civil War, to

the protectionist measures of the North and to its blockade of the secessionist South. Marx showed that the disastrous plight of this industry was first and foremost caused by a crisis of overproduction (pp. 160-62, 239). He condemned the pathetic system of social charity in Britain (pp. 241-42). Marx wrote with indignation about the inhuman selfishness of the ruling classes, of the "strange dispute" between the landed and industrial aristocracy "as to which of them grinds the working class down the most, and which of them is least obliged to do something about the workers' distress" (p. 241).

The position of the British workers during the US Civil War, their demonstrations in defence of the Italian national liberation movement and their stand on other issues, enabled Marx to conclude that in the political life of Britain the actions of the working class were acquiring national significance for the first time since the defeat of Chartism. In his article, "Garibaldi Meetings.—The Distressed Condition of Cotton Workers", Marx wrote: "Anyone who has the slightest knowledge of English conditions and the attitude prevailing here knows, in addition, that any interference on the part of the present cabinet with the popular demonstrations can only end in the fall of the government" (p. 246).

Marx also noted that in its political demonstrations the working class was beginning to play an increasingly independent role, pursuing its aims and not acting simply as members of "the chorus" (p. 153). The demonstrations of the British proletariat in connection with international conflicts enabled Marx and Engels further to develop the theory of class struggle, to substantiate the position of the proletariat in problems of foreign policy and to define the strategic and tactical tasks of the proletarian party. Marx became still more convinced of his conclusion that even before the winning of political power, the working class, by influencing the foreign policy of the government of its own country, could compel it to renounce an aggressive course aimed at the enslavement of other peoples. As is known, this conclusion found expression in one of the first programme documents of the International, the Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association, written by Marx in October 1864 (see this edition, Vol. 20).

The problems of international relations and the colonial policy of the European powers are discussed in a group of articles about the beginning of the Anglo-French-Spanish intervention in Mexico in 1861. ("The Intervention in Mexico", "The Parliamentary Debate on the Address" and others). Marx disclosed the true aims of the participants in the "Mexican Expedition" and

denounced its colonial character. Describing the intervention in Mexico as "one of the most monstrous enterprises ever chronicled in the annals of international history" (p. 71), Marx stressed that the real purpose of the intervention was to render assistance to the Mexican reactionaries in the struggle against the progressive Juárez government, to consolidate the anti-popular party of the clericals with the aid of French and Spanish bayonets, and once again to provoke a civil war. In articles filled with deep sympathy for the Mexican people and its liberation struggle, Marx sternly condemned the actions of the interventionists, who had perfidiously started a war against a peace-loving country under the false pretence of a struggle against anarchy. The articles on the intervention in Mexico are a vivid manifestation of the irreconcilable struggle waged by Marx and Engels against colonialism and national oppression, against exploitation and the enslavement of economically backward and dependent countries by European states more developed in the capitalist sense.

Interference by the "European armed Areopagus" in the internal affairs of American countries was seen by Marx as an attempt at the "transplantation of the Holy Alliance to the other side of the Atlantic" (p. 77).

Marx also pointed out another danger associated with the Anglo-French-Spanish intervention. For Palmerston and Napoleon III, the Mexican intervention was a means of provoking an armed conflict with the United States. In his articles "Progress of Feeling in England", "The Mexican Imbroglia" and others, Marx denounced the efforts of the British ruling circles to use the events in Mexico as a pretext, and the territory of Mexico as a base of operations, for the interference of Britain and France in the US Civil War on the side of the Southern slave-owning states. "Decembrist France, bankrupt, paralysed at home, beset with difficulty abroad, pounces upon an Anglo-American War as a real godsend and, in order to buy English support in Europe, will strain all her power to support 'Perfidious Albion' on the other side of the Atlantic" (p. 111).

In his articles "The London *Times* and Lord Palmerston", "The Intervention in Mexico" and others, Marx strips the mask off British diplomacy. Marx and Engels noted during this period an undoubted intensification of the counter-revolutionary role which bourgeois-aristocratic Britain had long played in international affairs. Britain's conversion in the 19th century into the "workshop of the world", and her efforts to preserve her industrial and

colonial monopoly, inevitably made her ruling classes a bulwark of reaction not only in Europe but all over the world.

Exposing the aggressive foreign policy of the European powers—Britain, Austria and France—directed at the suppression of national liberation movements and the enslavement of other peoples, Marx demonstrated the grave consequences of the Palmerston government's colonial expansion for the peoples of China, India, Persia, Afghanistan and other countries (pp. 18-20, 23, 78, 209, 216).

Marx also paid attention to the social and political movements in these countries, especially in his article "Chinese Affairs", in which he discussed the causes and the contradictory nature of the Taiping movement. In this, Marx noted a combination of revolutionary tendencies—the striving for the overthrow of the reactionary system and the domination of the alien Manchurian dynasty—with conservative tendencies, the latter becoming especially pronounced in the last years of the Taiping state, within which a bureaucratic top layer had grown. Marx associated the conservative features of the movement with religious fanaticism, cruel customs inculcated in the army, the aggrandisement and even deification of the leaders, and "destruction without any nucleus of new construction" (p. 216).

A large part of the volume is made up of newspaper articles which Marx and Engels wrote on European problems. The articles about the economic position of Britain and France show that in analysing the internal and foreign policy of the European powers (and also of the USA), Marx and Engels were invariably guided by the principles of historical materialism.

In analysing the state of industry in Britain and its prospects of further development and influence on the world market, Marx took into account the situation that had developed in the cotton industry as a result of the blockade of the Southern states, the stopping of shipments of American cotton, and also the internal laws of capitalist production ("The Crisis in England", "British Commerce", "Economic Notes", "On the Cotton Crisis" and others). Marx noted the growth of economic contradictions between the metropolitan country and its colonies, the attempts of the latter to resort for the defence of their economy to protectionism, which they "find ... better suited to their interests" (p. 162).

Examining the condition of the British working class, Marx not only disclosed the horrors of unemployment among the cotton workers, but also described the ruthless capitalist exploitation of

the workers, including children, in other branches of industry, and the inhuman working conditions in the baking industry (p. 254). He showed how in Britain, the country of machines and steam, there were branches of industry that had hardly experienced the influence of large-scale industry and in which obsolete techniques and heavy manual labour still predominated. Touching on the contradictory nature of technical progress under capitalism, Marx stressed that one of its positive sides was the supplanting of archaic, semi-artisan forms of production organisation. "The triumph of machine-made bread," he wrote, "will mark a turning point in the history of large-scale industry, the point at which it will storm the hitherto doggedly defended last ditch of medieval artisanship" (p. 255).

Marx drew on various examples to illustrate the disgraceful relics of domination by the landed aristocracy in the social life of England (his article "A Scandal"), and the true essence of bourgeois democracy. In his article "A Suppressed Debate on Mexico and the Alliance with France", he disclosed the voting procedure in the House of Commons, which allowed it not to put to the vote any motion that was "equally irksome to *both* oligarchical factions, the *Ins* and the *Outs* (those in office and those in opposition)..." (p. 223).

In his articles, "Economic Notes", "France's Financial Situation" and others, Marx analysed France's economic plight, revealing the causes of the financial, commercial and agricultural crisis and the growth of corruption; he demonstrated that the Bonapartist regime, with its predatory interference in the economy, was the cause of disruption in French finance and economy (pp. 83-84). In the autumn of 1861 Marx forecast that Napoleon III would seek a way out of his internal difficulties in foreign policy escapades (pp. 62-63, 83-84); the very next year, France took an active part in the punitive expedition against the Mexican Republic. In April 1861, in his article "An International *Affaire Mirès*", Marx explained the participation of France in the military intervention as a necessity for supporting "the gambling operations of certain *rouge-et-noir* politicians" (p. 198), i.e. the direct interest of the financial circles of the Second Empire, to extricate themselves by means of the Mexican escapade from the increasingly critical situation.

During the period covered by this volume, Marx and Engels wrote a number of articles about the struggle for national unity in Germany and in Italy ("German Movements", "A Meeting for Garibaldi", "Garibaldi Meetings.—The Distressed Condition of

Cotton Workers" and others), advocating its pursuit by revolutionary-democratic means. The struggle for unification in Germany and Italy by revolutionary means came up against resistance from reactionary forces in Germany itself, especially in Prussia and Austria, and also against countermeasures by the governments of other European powers, particularly Bonapartist France, which was endeavouring to keep Germany disunited and was actively obstructing the final unification of Italy. In his articles "The Strength of the Armies in Schleswig", "Artillery News from America", "England's Fighting Forces as against Germany", written in connection with the exacerbation of the conflict between Denmark and the German Confederation in 1863-1864, Engels analysed the military aspects of the country's unification from the viewpoint of the revolutionary camp's interests.

Marx and Engels also regarded the Polish national liberation movement as closely associated with that in Germany. Written in connection with the Polish national liberation uprising of 1863-64, the "Proclamation on Poland by the German Workers' Educational Society in London" disclosed the significance of the uprising for the future of Germany.

Marx's work on the theory of political economy is only indirectly represented in this volume in the articles on the economic position of Britain, France and the USA, and also in the manuscript, "Ground Rent". This is evidently a draft plan for one of the lectures on political economy that Marx delivered to the London German Workers' Educational Society at the end of the 1850s and the beginning of the 1860s. In it, Marx treated ground rent as the excess of the market price of the agricultural product over the cost of production. This definition echoes the corresponding formulations of the *Theories of Surplus-Value* (part of the above-mentioned manuscript of *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* on which Marx worked from August 1861 to July 1863) and Volume III of *Capital*, which he began writing at the end of summer, 1864.

In addition to the above-mentioned articles on military matters by Engels, the present volume contains his unfinished manuscript "Kriegsbeobachtungen über die Schlacht bei Alma". He attacks the nationalistic tendencies and prejudices typical of bourgeois military historiography, expressed in the exaggerated portrayal of the armed forces of one's own country and in minimising the fighting qualities of the armies of other states. Engels debunked the myth, created by British military writers, about the invincibility of the

British troops during the Crimean War. The ultimate aim of Kinglake's book, writes Engels, was the "glorification, carried to absurdity, of the English army", for the sake of which he filled his work with "embellishments, rodomontades and conjectures" (p. 274).

In his manuscript "The English Army", Engels, discussing the organisation, recruitment and training of the British armed forces, highlighted the conservative features of the British military system. He noted, in particular, the caste spirit prevalent in the officers' corps, the pernicious practice of selling commissions, the archaic forms of recruitment and the barbaric use of corporal punishment for breaches of discipline by the soldiers. Engels concluded that the customs of the British army were typical of the obsolescent régime of a bourgeois-aristocratic oligarchy and testified to the necessity for profound reforms, including radical military changes, in the country's social and political system.

The Appendices to this volume include applications by Marx for the restoration of his Prussian citizenship after the 1861 Amnesty. These steps were taken by him in connection with the rise of the working-class movement and the approaching revolutionary crisis in Germany, so that he could return at the necessary moment to active political work in his homeland. The Berlin Police President rejected Marx's applications (p. 353).

* * *

The volume contains 82 works by Marx and Engels, of which 52 were printed in *Die Presse* and 11 in the *New-York Daily Tribune*. Engels' article "England's Fighting Forces as against Germany" was published in the German *Allgemeine Militär-Zeitung*, and three more works by Engels, "Artillery News from America", "Kinglake on the Battle of the Alma" and "The English Army", also included in this volume, were intended for the same newspaper. Twenty-eight items are being published in English for the first time. Two items, "German Movements" and "British Commerce", have never been reproduced in English since their publication by the *New-York Daily Tribune*. English publications of individual articles by Marx and Engels in various editions, especially in the collection *The Civil War in the United States*, London, 1937 and New York, 1937, are mentioned in the notes.

Most of the articles in this volume were published unsigned in the *New-York Daily Tribune*; the articles in *Die Presse* were also

published anonymously but, as a rule, with a special note "Orig.-Corr.", "Von unserem Londoner Correspondenten". The authorship of the unsigned articles is confirmed by the correspondence between Marx and Engels, by cross references and also by other documents.

When the articles were in preparation, the dates were checked and most of the sources used by the authors were identified. The results of this work will be found at the end of each article and in the editorial notes. Headings given by the editors of the volume are in square brackets.

Obvious errors discovered in the text, in personal and geographical names, figures, dates and so on, have been silently corrected, by reference to sources used by Marx and Engels. The personal and geographical names in the English texts are reproduced as spelled in the originals, which were checked with 19th-century reference books; in translated articles, the modern spelling is given. The use of English words in the German text is indicated in the footnotes. In quoting from newspapers and other sources, Marx sometimes gives a free rendering rather than the exact words. In this edition quotations are given in the form in which they occur in Marx's text.

The volume was compiled, the greater part of the texts prepared and the preface and notes written by Yevgenia Dakhina. The articles from the *New-York Daily Tribune* were prepared and notes to them written by Alexander Zubkov. The volume was edited by Valentina Smirnova except the articles "Kinglake on the Battle of the Alma", "The English Army" and "England's Fighting Forces as against Germany" which were prepared by Tatyana Vasilyeva and edited by Lev Golman. The name index and the index of periodicals were prepared by Tatyana Nikolayeva; the index of quoted and mentioned literature by Alexander Zubkov and the subject index by Marlen Arzumanov (Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU).

The translations were made by Henry Mins (International Publishers), Rodney Livingstone, Peter and Betty Ross and Barrie Selman (Lawrence & Wishart) and Salo Ryazanskaya and Victor Schnittke (Progress Publishers). Items 8, 10, 11, 19, 25-28, 30, 31, 33-35, 37, 40, 42, 46, 50 and 64 were reproduced from the collection *The Civil War in the United States*, International Publishers, N. Y., 1937. Items 6, 7, 15-17, 20, 39, 41, 43-45, 51, 53, 60 and 63 were reproduced from the collection *Marx and Engels on the United States*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1979. The translations, including those from the two collections, were

checked with the German and edited for the present edition by James S. Allen (International Publishers), Nicholas Jacobs (Lawrence & Wishart) and Richard Dixon, Glenys Ann Kozlov, Tatiana Grishina and Victor Schnittke (Progress Publishers) and Norire Ter-Akopyan, scientific editor (USSR Academy of Sciences).

The volume was prepared for the press by editors Nadezhda Rudenko, Anna Vladimirova, and assistant editor Tatyana Bannikova.

KARL MARX
and
FREDERICK ENGELS

WORKS

January 1861-June 1864

Frederick Engels GERMAN MOVEMENTS¹

The year 1861, it appears, has not yet troubles enough to bear. We have our Secessionist Revolution in America; there is the Rebellion in China²; the advance of Russia in Eastern and Central Asia; the Eastern question, with its corollaries of the French occupation of Syria and the Suez Canal; the breaking up of Austria, with Hungary in almost open insurrection; the siege of Gaëta,³ and Garibaldi's promise of liberating Venice on the first of March; and last, but not least, the attempt to restore Marshal MacMahon to his ancestral throne of Ireland.⁴ But all this is not enough. We are now promised, besides, a fourth Schleswig-Holstein campaign.⁵

The King of Denmark,^a in 1851, voluntarily entered into certain obligations to Prussia and Austria with regard to Schleswig.^b He promised that the Duchy should not be incorporated with Denmark; that its Representative Assembly should remain distinct from that of Denmark; and that both the German and Danish nationalities in Schleswig should receive equal protection. Beside this, so far as regards Holstein, the rights of its Representative Assembly were expressly guaranteed. Upon these conditions, the federal troops which had occupied Holstein were withdrawn.

The Danish Government executed its promises in a most evasive way. In Schleswig, the southern half is exclusively German; in the northern half, all the towns are German, while the country people

^a Frederick VII.—*Ed.*

^b Frederik R., *Proclamation du roi de Danemark relative à l'organisation de la monarchie danoise y compris les Duchés de Schleswig, de Holstein et de Lauenbourg, signée le 28 janvier 1852.*—*Ed.*

speak a corrupted Danish dialect, and the written language, from time immemorial, has almost everywhere been German. By the consent of the population, a process of Germanization has been going on there for centuries; so much so that, with the exception of the most northerly border districts, even that portion of the peasantry who speak a Danish dialect (which is, however, so far distant from the written Danish as to be easily intelligible to the German inhabitants of the South), understand the written High German better than the written Danish language. After 1851, the Government divided the country into a Danish, a German, and a mixed district. In the German district, German; in the Danish district, Danish was to be the exclusive official language of the Government, the courts of law, the pulpit, and the schools. In the mixed districts, both languages were to be equally admissible. This looks fair enough, but the truth is that, in establishing the Danish district, the written Danish language was forced upon a population the great majority of whom did not even understand it, and only desired to be governed, tried, educated, christened, and married in the German language. However, the Government now opened a regular crusade for the weeding out of all traces of Germanism from the district, forbidding even private tuition in families in any other than the Danish language; and sought at the same time, by more indirect means, in the mixed district to give the Danish language the preponderance. The opposition created by these measures was very violent, and an attempt was made to put it down by a series of petty acts of tyranny. In the small town of Eckernförde, for instance, about \$4,000 fines were at once inflicted for the crime of unlawfully petitioning the Representative Assembly; and all the parties fined were, as *convicts*, declared to be deprived of their right of voting. Still, the population and the Assembly persisted and now persist in their opposition.

In Holstein, the Danish Government found it impossible to make the Representative Assembly vote any taxes unless they granted concessions in a political and national sense. This they would not do; neither would they do without the revenues of the Duchy. In order, therefore, to manufacture some legal ground on which to levy them, they convoked a Council of the Kingdom, an assembly without any representative character, but supposed to represent Denmark proper, Schleswig-Holstein, and Lauenburg. Although the Holsteiners refused to attend, this body voted the taxes for the whole monarchy, and, based upon this vote, the Government assessed the taxes to be paid in Holstein. Thus Holstein, which was to be an independent and separate Duchy,

was deprived of all political independence, and made subject to an Assembly preeminently Danish.

These are the grounds on which the German press, for five or six years past, have called on the German Governments to employ coercive measures against Denmark. The grounds, in themselves, are certainly good. But the German press—that press which was allowed to exist during the reactionary period after 1849—merely used Schleswig-Holstein as a means of popularity. It was indeed very cheap to hold forth in high indignation against the Danes, when the Governments of Germany allowed it—those Governments which at home tried to emulate Denmark in petty tyranny. War against Denmark was the cry when the Crimean war broke out. War against Denmark again, when Louis Napoleon invaded Austrian Italy. Now, then, they will have it all their own way. The “new era” in Prussia,⁶ hitherto so coy when called upon by the liberal press, in this instance chimes in with it. The new King of Prussia proclaims to the world that he must bring this old complaint to a settlement;^a the decrepit Diet at Frankfort puts all its clumsy machinery in motion for the salvation of German nationality,^b and the liberal press—triumphs? No such thing. The liberal press, now at once put to the test, eats its words, cries out, Caution! discovers that Germany has no fleet wherewith to fight the ships of a naval power, and, especially in Prussia, shows all the symptoms of cowardice. What a few months ago was an urgent patriotic duty, is now all of a sudden an Austrian intrigue, which Prussia is warned not to give way to.

That the German Governments, in their sudden enthusiasm for the cause of Schleswig-Holstein, are in the least sincere, is, of course, out of the question. As the Danish *Dagbladet* says:

“We all know that it is one of the old tricks of the German Governments to take up the Schleswig-Holstein question as soon as they feel themselves to be in want of a little popularity, and to cover their own manifold sins by drawing bills upon the fanaticism against Denmark.”

This has been decidedly the case in Saxony, and to a certain extent it is now the case in Prussia. But in Prussia the sudden starting of this question also signifies, evidently, an alliance with Austria. The Prussian Government behold Austria breaking to pieces from within, while she is menaced from without by a war

^a William I [Speech to the Chambers, January 14, 1861], *The Times*, No. 23832, January 17, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b A report on the subject appeared under the heading “Frankfort-on-the-Main, Thursday”, *The Times*, No. 23833, January 18, 1861.—*Ed.*

with Italy. It certainly is not the interest of the Prussian Government to see Austria annihilated. At the same time, the Italian war, to which Louis Napoleon would not long remain an impartial spectator, would scarcely again come off without touching the territory of the German Confederation, in which case Prussia is bound to interfere. Then the war with France on the Rhine would certainly be combined with a Danish war on the Eider; and while the Prussian Government cannot afford to have Austria broken down, why wait till Austria is again defeated? Why not engage in the quarrel of Schleswig-Holstein, and thereby interest in the war all North Germany which would not fight for the defence of Venetia? If this be the reasoning of the Prussian Government, it is logical enough, but it was quite as logical in 1859, before Austria was weakened by Magenta and Solferino,⁷ and by her internal convulsions. Why was it not then acted upon?

It is not at all certain that this great war will come off next Spring. But if it does come off, although neither party deserves any sympathy, it must have this result, that whichever be beaten in the beginning, there will be a revolution. If Louis Napoleon be defeated, his throne is sure to fall; and if the King of Prussia and the Emperor of Austria^a be worsted, they will have to give way before a German revolution.

Written on January 23, 1861

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6178, February 12, 1861 as a leader

^a Francis Joseph.—Ed.

Karl Marx
THE AMERICAN QUESTION IN ENGLAND

London, Sept. 18, 1861

Mrs. Beecher Stowe's letter to Lord Shaftesbury,⁸ whatever its intrinsic merit may be, has done a great deal of good, by forcing the anti-Northern organs of the London press to speak out and lay before the general public the ostensible reasons for their hostile tone against the North, and their ill-concealed sympathies with the South, which looks rather strange on the part of people affecting an utter horror of Slavery. Their first and main grievance is that the present American war is "not one for the abolition of Slavery," and that, therefore, the high-minded Britisher, used to undertake wars of his own, and interest himself in other people's wars only on the basis of "broad humanitarian principles," cannot be expected to feel any sympathy with his Northern cousins.

"In the first place [...]," says *The Economist*, "the assumption that the quarrel between the North and South is a quarrel between Negro freedom on the one side and Negro Slavery on the other, is as impudent as it is untrue."^a "The North," says *The Saturday Review*, "does not proclaim abolition, and never pretended to fight for Anti-Slavery. The North has not hoisted for its *oriflamme* the sacred symbol of justice to the Negro; its *cri de guerre*^b is not unconditional abolition."^c "If," says *The Examiner*, "we have been deceived about the real significance of the sublime movement, who but the Federalists themselves have to answer for the deception?"^d

^a "American Complaints against England", *The Economist*, No. 942, September 14, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b War-cry.—*Ed.*

^c "Mrs. Beecher Stowe's Wounded Feelings", *The Saturday Review*, No. 307, September 14, 1861.—*Ed.*

^d "Mrs. Stowe on the American War", *The Examiner*, No. 2798, September 14, 1861.—*Ed.*

Now, in the first instance, the premiss must be conceded. The war has not been undertaken with a view to put down Slavery, and the United States authorities themselves have taken the greatest pains to protest against any such idea. But then, it ought to be remembered that it was not the North, but the South, which undertook this war; the former acting only on the defense. If it be true that the North, after long hesitations, and an exhibition of forbearance unknown in the annals of European history, drew at last the sword, not for crushing Slavery, but for saving the Union, the South, on its part, inaugurated the war by loudly proclaiming "the peculiar institution" as the only and main end of the rebellion. It confessed to fight for the liberty of enslaving other people, a liberty which, despite the Northern protests, it asserted to be put in danger by the victory of the Republican party⁹ and the election of Mr. Lincoln to the Presidential chair. The Confederate Congress boasted that its new-fangled constitution,¹⁰ as distinguished from the Constitution of the Washingtons, Jeffersons, and Adams's,¹¹ had recognized for the first time Slavery as a thing good in itself, a bulwark of civilization, and a divine institution.^a If the North professed to fight but for the Union, the South gloried in rebellion for the supremacy of Slavery. If Anti-Slavery and idealistic England felt not attracted by the profession of the North, how came it to pass that it was not violently repulsed by the cynical confessions of the South?

The Saturday Review helps itself out of this ugly dilemma by disbelieving the declarations of the seceders themselves. It sees deeper than this, and discovers "*that Slavery had very little to do with Secession;*" the declarations of Jeff. Davis and company to the contrary being mere "conventionalisms" with "about as much meaning as the conventionalisms about violated altars and desecrated hearths, which always occur in such proclamations."

The staple of argument on the part of the anti-Northern papers is very scanty, and throughout all of them we find almost the same sentences recurring, like the formulas of a mathematical series, at certain intervals, with very little art of variation or combination.

"Why," exclaims *The Economist*, "it is only yesterday, when the Secession movement first gained serious head, on the first announcement of Mr. Lincoln's election, that the Northerners offered to the South, if they would remain in the Union, every conceivable security for the performance and inviolability of the obnoxious institution—that they disavowed in the most solemn manner all

^a Marx is giving the burden of the speech A. H. Stephens, Vice-President of the Confederacy, made at a meeting in Savannah on March 21, 1861.—*Ed.*

intention of interfering with it—that their leaders proposed compromise after compromise in Congress, all based upon the concession that Slavery should not be meddled with.” “How happens it,” says *The Examiner*, “that the North was ready to compromise matters by the largest concessions to the South as to Slavery? How was it that a certain geographical line was proposed in Congress within which Slavery was to be recognized as an essential institution? The Southern States were not content with this.”

What *The Economist* and *The Examiner* had to ask was not only why the Crittenden¹² and other compromise measures were *proposed* in Congress, but why they were not *passed*? They affect to consider those compromise proposals as accepted by the North and rejected by the South, while, in point of fact, they were baffled by the Northern party, that had carried the Lincoln election. Proposals never matured into resolutions, but always remaining in the embryo state of *pia desideria*,^a the South had of course never any occasion either of rejecting or acquiescing in. We come nearer to the pith of the question by the following remark of *The Examiner*:

“Mrs. Stowe says: ‘The Slave party, finding they could no longer use the Union for their purposes, resolved to destroy it.’ There is here an admission that up to that time the Slave party had used the Union for their purposes, and it would have been well if Mrs. Stowe could have distinctly shown where it was that the North began to make its stand against Slavery.”

One might suppose that *The Examiner* and the other oracles of public opinion in England had made themselves sufficiently familiar with the contemporaneous history to not need Mrs. Stowe’s information on such all-important points. The progressive abuse of the Union by the slave power, working through its alliance with the Northern Democratic party,¹³ is, so to say, the general formula of the United States history since the beginning of this century. The successive compromise measures mark the successive degrees of the encroachment by which the Union became more and more transformed into the slave of the slave-owner. Each of these compromises denotes a new encroachment of the South, a new concession of the North. At the same time none of the successive victories of the South was carried but after a hot contest with an antagonistic force in the North, appearing under different party names with different watchwords and under different colors. If the positive and final result of each single contest told in favor of the South, the attentive observer of history could not but see that every new advance of the slave

^a Pious wishes.—*Ed.*

power was a step forward to its ultimate defeat. Even at the times of the Missouri Compromise the contending forces were so evenly balanced that Jefferson, as we see from his memoirs,^a apprehended the Union to be in danger of splitting on that deadly antagonism.¹⁴ The encroachments of the slaveholding power reached their maximum point, when, by the Kansas-Nebraska bill,¹⁵ for the first time in the history of the United States, as Mr. Douglas himself confessed, every legal barrier to the diffusion of Slavery within the United States territories was broken down, when, afterward, a Northern candidate bought his Presidential nomination by pledging the Union to conquer or purchase in Cuba a new field of dominion for the slaveholder¹⁶; when, later on, by the Dred Scott decision,¹⁷ diffusion of Slavery by the Federal power was proclaimed as the law of the American Constitution, and lastly, when the African slave-trade was de facto reopened on a larger scale than during the times of its legal existence. But, concurrently with this climax of Southern encroachments, carried by the connivance of the Northern Democratic party, there were unmistakable signs of Northern antagonistic agencies having gathered such strength as must soon turn the balance of power. The Kansas war,¹⁸ the formation of the Republican party, and the large vote cast for Mr. Frémont during the Presidential election of 1856,¹⁹ were so many palpable proofs that the North had accumulated sufficient energies to rectify the aberrations which United States history, under the slaveowners' pressure, had undergone, for half a century, and to make it return to the true principles of its development. Apart from those political phenomena, there was one broad statistical and economical fact indicating that the abuse of the Federal Union by the slave interest had approached the point from which it would have to recede forcibly, or *de bonne grace*.^b That fact was the growth of the North-West, the immense strides its population had made from 1850 to 1860, and the new and reinvigorating influence it could not but bear on the destinies of the United States.

Now, was all this a secret chapter of history? Was "the admission" of Mrs. Beecher Stowe wanted to reveal to *The Examiner* and the other political illuminati²⁰ of the London press the carefully hidden truth that "up to that time the Slave party had used the Union for their purposes?" Is it the fault of the

^a Th. Jefferson, *Memoirs, Correspondence, and Private Papers...*, Vol. IV, London, 1829, p. 333.—*Ed.*

^b Of its own accord.—*Ed.*

American North that the English pressmen were taken quite unawares by the violent clash of the antagonistic forces, the friction of which was the moving power of its history for half a century? Is it the fault of the Americans that the English press mistake for the fanciful crotchet hatched in a single day what was in reality the matured result of long years of struggle? The very fact that the formation and the progress of the Republican party in America have hardly been noticed by the London press, speaks volumes as to the hollowness of its Anti-Slavery tirades. Take, for instance, the two antipodes of the London press, *The London Times* and *Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper*, the one the great organ of the respectable classes, and the other the only remaining organ of the working class. The former, not long before Mr. Buchanan's career drew to an end, published an elaborate apology for his Administration and a defamatory libel against the Republican movement. Reynolds, on his part, was, during Mr. Buchanan's stay at London,^a one of his minions, and since that time never missed an occasion to write him up and to write his adversaries down. How did it come to pass that the Republican party, whose platform^b was drawn up on the avowed antagonism to the encroachments of the Slaveocracy and the abuse of the Union by the slave interest, carried the day in the North? How, in the second instance, did it come to pass that the great bulk of the Northern Democratic party, flinging aside its old connexions with the leaders of Slaveocracy, setting at naught its traditions of half a century, sacrificing great commercial interests and greater political prejudices, rushed to the support of the present Republican Administration and offered it men and money with an unsparing hand?

Instead of answering these questions *The Economist* exclaims:

"Can we forget [...] that Abolitionists have habitually been as ferociously persecuted and maltreated in the North and West as in the South? Can it be denied that the testiness and half-heartedness, not to say insincerity, of the Government at Washington, have for years supplied the chief impediment which has thwarted our efforts for the effectual suppression of the slave trade on the coast of Africa; while a vast proportion of the clippers actually engaged in that trade have been built with Northern capital, owned by Northern merchants and manned by Northern seamen?"

This is, in fact, a masterly piece of logic. Anti-Slavery England cannot sympathize with the North breaking down the withering

^a As US Minister to London in 1853-56.—*Ed.*

^b The election platform of the Republicans was published in the article "The Platform" in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5950, May 19, 1860.—*Ed.*

influence of slaveocracy, because she cannot forget that the North, while bound by that influence, supported the slave-trade, mobbed the Abolitionists, and had its Democratic institutions tainted by the slavedriver's prejudices. She cannot sympathize with Mr. Lincoln's Administration, because she had to find fault with Mr. Buchanan's Administration. She must needs sullenly cavil at the present movement of the Northern resurrection, cheer up the Northern sympathizers with the slave-trade, branded in the Republican platform, and coquet with the Southern slaveocracy, setting up an empire of its own, because she cannot forget that the North of yesterday was not the North of to-day. The necessity of justifying its attitude by such pettifogging Old Bailey²¹ pleas proves more than anything else that the anti-Northern part of the English press is instigated by hidden motives, too mean and dastardly to be openly avowed.

As it is one of its pet maneuvers to taunt the present Republican Administration with the doings of its Pro-Slavery predecessors, so it tries hard to persuade the English people that *The N. Y. Herald* ought to be considered the only authentic expositor of Northern opinion. *The London Times* having given out the cue in this direction, the *servum pecus*^a of the other anti-Northern organs, great and small, persist in beating the same bush. So says *The Economist*:

"In the height of the strife, New-York papers and New-York politicians were not wanting who exhorted the combatants, now that they had large armies in the field, to employ them, not against each other, but against Great Britain—to compromise the internal quarrel, the slave question included, and invade the British territory without notice and with overwhelming force."

The Economist knows perfectly well that *The N. Y. Herald's* efforts, which were eagerly supported by *The London Times*, at embroiling the United States into a war with England,^b only intended securing the success of Secession and thwarting the movement of Northern regeneration.

Still there is one concession made by the anti-Northern English press. *The Saturday* snob tells us:

"What was at issue in Lincoln's election, and what has precipitated the convulsion, was merely the limitation of the institution of Slavery to States where that institution already exists."

And *The Economist* remarks:

^a Crowd of slaves.—Ed.

^b "Southampton, Friday", *The Times*, No. 24032, September 7, 1861.—Ed.

"It is true enough that it was the aim of the Republican party which elected Mr. Lincoln to prevent Slavery from spreading into the unsettled Territories.... It may be true that the success of the North, if complete and unconditional, would enable them to confine Slavery within the fifteen States which have already adopted it, and might thus lead to its eventual extinction—though this is rather probable than certain."

In 1859, on the occasion of John Brown's Harper's Ferry expedition,²² the very same *Economist* published a series of elaborate articles with a view to prove that, by dint of an *economical law*, American Slavery was doomed to gradual extinction from the moment it should be deprived of its power of expansion.^a That "economical law" was perfectly understood by the Slaveocracy.

"In 15 years more," said Toombs "without a great increase in Slave territory, either the slaves must be permitted to flee from the whites, or the whites must flee from the slaves."

The limitation of Slavery to its constitutional area, as proclaimed by the Republicans, was the distinct ground upon which the menace of Secession was first uttered in the House of Representatives on December 19, 1859. Mr. Singleton (Mississippi) having asked Mr. Curtis (Iowa), "if the Republican party would never let the South have another foot of slave territory while it remained in the Union," and Mr. Curtis having responded in the affirmative, Mr. Singleton *said this would dissolve the Union*. His advice to Mississippi was the sooner it got out of the Union the better—"gentlemen should recollect that [...] Jefferson Davis led our forces in Mexico, and [...] still he lives, perhaps to lead the Southern army."^b Quite apart from the *economical law* which makes the diffusion of Slavery a vital condition for its maintenance within its constitutional areas, the leaders of the South had never deceived themselves as to its necessity for keeping up their *political* sway over the United States. *John Calhoun*, in the defense of his propositions to the Senate, stated distinctly on Feb. 19, 1847, "that the Senate was the only balance of power left to the South in the Government," and that the creation of new Slave States had become necessary "for the retention of the equipoise of power in the Senate."^c Moreover, the Oligarchy of the 300,000

^a "Harper's Ferry", "The Impending Crisis in the Southern States of America", "English Sympathy with the Slavery Party in America", *The Economist*, Nos. 845, 852, 853, November 5, December 24, 31, 1859.—*Ed.*

^b O. Singleton [Speech in the House of Representatives on December 19, 1859], *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5822, December 20, 1859.—*Ed.*

^c J. C. Calhoun [Speech in the Senate on February 19, 1847], *Congressional Globe: New Series: Containing Sketches of the Debates and Proceedings of the Second Session of Twenty-Ninth Congress*, Washington, 1847.—*Ed.*

slave-owners could not even maintain their sway at home save by constantly throwing out to their white plebeians the bait of prospective conquests within and without the frontiers of the United States. If, then, according to the oracles of the English press, the North had arrived at the fixed resolution of circumscribing Slavery within its present limits, and of thus extinguishing it in a constitutional way, was this not sufficient to enlist the sympathies of Anti-Slavery England?

But the English Puritans seem indeed not to be contented save by an explicit Abolitionist war.

"This," says *The Economist* "therefore, not being a war for the emancipation of the Negro race, [...] on what other ground can we be fairly called upon to sympathize so warmly with the Federal cause?" "There was a time," says *The Examiner*, "when our sympathies were with the North, thinking that it was really in earnest in making a stand against the encroachments of the Slave States," and in adopting "emancipation as a measure of justice to the black race."

However, in the very same numbers in which these papers tell us that they cannot sympathize with the North because its war is no Abolitionist war, we are informed that "the desperate expedient of proclaiming Negro emancipation and summoning the slaves to a general insurrection," is a thing "the mere conception of which [...] is repulsive and dreadful," and that "a compromise" would be "far preferable to success purchased at such a cost and stained by such a crime."^a

Thus the English eagerness for the Abolitionist war is all cant. The cloven foot peeps out in the following sentences:

"Lastly, [...]" says *The Economist*, "is the *Morrill Tariff*,²³ a title to our gratitude and to our sympathy, or is the certainty that, in case of Northern triumph, that Tariff should be extended over the whole Republic, a reason why we ought to be clamorously anxious for their success?" "The North Americans," says *The Examiner*, "are in earnest about nothing but a selfish protective Tariff. The Southern States were tired of being robbed of the fruits of their slave-labor by the protective tariff of the North."

The Examiner and *The Economist* comment each other. The latter is honest enough to confess at last that with him and his followers sympathy is a mere question of tariff, while the former reduces the war between North and South to a tariff war, to a war between Protection and Free-Trade. *The Examiner* is perhaps not aware that even the South Carolina Nullifiers of 1832,²⁴ as Gen. Jackson testifies, used Protection only as a pretext for secession;^b

^a "The Probable Continuance of the American Conflict", *The Economist*, No. 941, September 7, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b *President Jackson's proclamation against the Nullification Ordinance of South Carolina*, December 11, 1832.—*Ed.*

but even *The Examiner* ought to know that the present rebellion did not wait upon the passing of the Morrill tariff for breaking out. In point of fact, the Southerners could not have been tired of being robbed of the fruits of their slave labor by the Protective tariff of the North, considering that from 1846-1861 a Free-Trade tariff had obtained.

The Spectator characterizes in its last number the secret thought of some of the Anti-Northern organs in the following striking manner:

"What, then, do the Anti-Northern organs really profess to think desirable, under the justification of this plea of deferring to the inexorable logic of facts?" They argue that disunion is desirable, just because, as we have said, it is the only possible step to a conclusion of this "causeless and fratricidal strife;" and next, of course, only as an afterthought, and as an humble apology for Providence and "justification of the ways of God to man," now that the inevitable necessity stands revealed—for further reasons discovered as beautiful adaptations to the moral exigencies of the country, when once the issue is discerned. It is discovered that it will be very much for the advantage of the States to be dissolved into rival groups. They will mutually check each other's ambition; they will neutralize each other's power, and if ever England should get into a dispute with one or more of them, more jealousy will bring the antagonistic groups to our aid. This will be, it is urged, a very wholesome state of things, for it will relieve us from anxiety and it will encourage political 'competition,' that great safeguard of honesty and purity, among the States themselves.

"Such is the case—very gravely urged—of the numerous class of Southern sympathizers now springing up among us. Translated into English—and we grieve that an English argument on such a subject should be of a nature that requires translating—it means that we deplore the present great scale of this "fratricidal" war, because it may concentrate in one fearful spasm a series of chronic petty wars and passions and jealousies among groups of rival States in times to come. The real truth is, and this very un-English feeling distinctly discerns this truth, though it cloaks it in decent phrases, that rival groups of American States could not live together in peace or harmony. The chronic condition would be one of malignant hostility rising out of the very causes which have produced the present contest. It is asserted that the different groups of States have different tariff interests. These different tariff interests would be the sources of constant petty wars if the States were once dissolved, and Slavery, the root of all the strife, would be the spring of innumerable animosities, discords and campaigns. No stable equilibrium could ever again be established among the rival States. And yet it is maintained that this long future of incessant strife is the providential solution of the great question now at issue—the only real reason why it is looked upon favorably being this, that whereas the present great-scale conflict may issue in a restored and stronger political unity, the alternative of infinitely multiplied small-scale quarrels will issue in a weak and divided continent, that England cannot fear.

"Now we do not deny that the Americans themselves sowed the seeds of this petty and contemptible state of feeling by the unfriendly and bullying attitude they have so often manifested to England, but we do say that the state of feeling on our part is petty and contemptible. We see that in a deferred issue there is no hope of a deep and enduring tranquillity for America, that it means a decline and fall of the American nation into quarrelsome clans and tribes, and yet we hold up our

hands in horror at the present, "fratricidal" strife because it holds out hopes of finality. We exhort them to look favorably on the indefinite future of small strifes, equally fratricidal and probably far more demoralizing, because the latter would draw out of our side the thorn of American rivalry."

Written on September 18, 1861

Reproduced from the *New-York Daily Tribune*

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6403, October 11, 1861, reprinted in the *New-York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, No. 1710, October 15, 1861

Karl Marx
THE BRITISH COTTON TRADE²⁵

London, Sept. 21, 1861

The continual rise in the prices of raw cotton begins at last to seriously react upon the cotton factories, their consumption of cotton being now 25 per cent less than the full consumption. This result has been brought about by a daily lessening rate of production, many mills working only four or three days per week, part of the machinery being stopped, both in those establishments where short time has been commenced and in those which are still running full time, and some mills being temporarily altogether closed. In some places, as at Blackburn, for instance, short time has been coupled with a reduction of wages. However, the short-time movement is only in its incipient state, and we may predict with perfect security that some weeks later the trade will have generally resorted to three days working per week, concurrently with a large stoppage of machinery in most establishments. On the whole, English manufacturers and merchants were extremely slow and reluctant in acknowledging the awkward position of their cotton supplies.

“The whole of the last American crop,” they said, “has long since been forwarded to Europe. The picking of the new crop has barely commenced. Not a bale of cotton could have reached us more than has reached us, even if the war and the blockade²⁶ had never been heard of. The shipping season does not commence till far in November, and it is usually the end of December before any large exportations take place. Till then, it is of little consequence whether the cotton is retained on the plantations or is forwarded to the ports as fast as it is bagged. If the blockade ceases any time *before the end of this year*, the probability is that by March or April we shall have received just as full a supply of cotton as if the blockade had never been declared.”^a

^a “The Probable Continuance of the American Conflict”, *The Economist*, No. 941, September 7, 1861.—*Ed.*

In the innermost recesses of the mercantile mind the notion was cherished that the whole American crisis, and, consequently, the blockade, would have ceased before the end of the year, or that Lord Palmerston would forcibly break through the blockade. The latter idea has been altogether abandoned, since, beside all other circumstances, Manchester became aware that two vast interests, the monetary interest having sunk an immense capital in the industrial enterprises of Northern America, and the corn trade, relying on Northern America as its principal source of supply, would combine to check any unprovoked aggression on the part of the British Government. The hopes of the blockade being raised in due time, for the requirements of Liverpool or Manchester, or the American war being wound up by a compromise with the Secessionists, have given way before a feature hitherto unknown in the English cotton market, viz., American operations in cotton at Liverpool, partly on speculation, partly for reshipment to America. Consequently, for the last two weeks the Liverpool cotton market has been feverishly excited, the speculative investments in cotton on the part of the Liverpool merchants being backed by speculative investments on the part of the Manchester and other manufacturers eager to provide themselves with stocks of raw material for the Winter. The extent of the latter transactions is sufficiently shown by the fact that a considerable portion of the spare warehouse room in Manchester is already occupied by such stocks, and that throughout the week beginning with Sept. 15 and ending with Sept. 22, Middling Americans had increased 3/8d. per lb, and fair ones 5/8d.

From the outbreak of the American war the prices of cotton were steadily rising, but the ruinous disproportion between the prices of the raw material and the prices of yarns and cloth was not declared until the last weeks of August. Till then, any serious decline in the prices of cotton manufactures, which might have been anticipated from the considerable decrease of the American demand, had been balanced by an accumulation of stocks in first hands, and by speculative consignments to China and India. Those Asiatic markets, however, were soon overdone.

“Stocks,” says *The Calcutta Price Current* of Aug. 7, 1861, “are accumulating, the arrivals since our last being no less than 24,000,000 yards of plain cottons. Home advices show a continuation of shipments in excess of our requirements, and so long as this is the case, improvement cannot be looked for.... The Bombay market, also, has been greatly oversupplied.”

Some other circumstances contributed to contract the Indian market. The late famine in the north-western provinces has been

succeeded by the ravages of the cholera, while throughout Lower Bengal an excessive fall of rain, laying the country under water, seriously damaged the rice crops. In letters from Calcutta, which reached England last week, sales were reported giving a net return of $9\frac{1}{4}$ d. per pound for 40s twist, which cannot be bought at Manchester for less than $11\frac{3}{8}$ d., while sales of 40-inch shirtings, compared with present rates at Manchester, yield losses at $7\frac{1}{2}$ d., 9d., and 12d. per piece. In the China market, prices were also forced down by the accumulation of the stocks imported. Under these circumstances, the demand for the British cotton manufactures decreasing, their prices can, of course, not keep pace with the progressive rise in the price of the raw material; but, on the contrary, the spinning, weaving, and printing of cotton must, in many instances, cease to pay the costs of production. Take, as an example, the following case, stated by one of the greatest Manchester manufacturers, in reference to coarse spinning:

	Per lb.	Margin.	Cost of spinning per lb
<i>Sept.</i> 17, 1860.			
Cost of cotton	$6\frac{1}{4}$ d.	4d.	3d.
16s warp sold for	$10\frac{1}{4}$ d.
Profit, 1d. per lb.			
<i>Sept.</i> 17, 1861.			
Cost of cotton	9d.	2d.	$3\frac{1}{2}$ d.
16s warp sold for	11
Loss, $1\frac{1}{2}$ d. per lb.			

The consumption of Indian cotton is rapidly growing, and with a further rise in prices, the Indian supply will come forward at increasing ratios; but still it remains impossible to change, at a few months' notice, all the conditions of production and turn the current of commerce. England pays now, in fact, the penalty for her protracted misrule of that vast Indian empire. The two main obstacles she has now to grapple with in her attempts at supplanting American cotton by Indian cotton, is the want of means of communication and transport throughout India, and the miserable state of the Indian peasant, disabling him from improving favorable circumstances. Both these difficulties the English have themselves to thank for. English modern industry, in general, relied upon two pivots equally monstrous. The one was the *potato* as the only means of feeding Ireland and a great part of

the English working class. This pivot was swept away by the potato disease and the subsequent Irish catastrophe.²⁷ A larger basis for the reproduction and maintenance of the toiling millions had then to be adopted. The second pivot of English industry was the slave-grown cotton of the United States. The present American crisis forces them to enlarge their field of supply and emancipate cotton from slave-breeding and slave-consuming oligarchies. As long as the English cotton manufactures depended on slave-grown cotton, it could be truthfully asserted that they rested on a twofold slavery, the indirect slavery of the white man in England and the direct slavery of the black men on the other side of the Atlantic.

Written on September 21, 1861

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6405, October 14, 1861

Karl Marx

THE LONDON *TIMES* AND LORD PALMERSTON²⁸

London, Oct. 5, 1861

“English people participate in the government of their own country by reading *The Times* newspaper.” This judgment, passed by an eminent English author^a on what is called British self-government, is only true so far as the foreign policy of the Kingdom is concerned. As to measures of domestic reform, they were never carried by the support of *The Times*, but *The Times* never ceased attacking and opposing them until after it had become aware of its utter inability to any longer check their progress. Take, for instance, the Catholic Emancipation, the Reform bill, the abolition of the Corn laws, the Stamp Tax, and the Paper Duty.²⁹ When victory had unmistakably declared on the side of the Reformers, *The Times* wheeled round, deserted the reactionary camp, and managed to find itself, at the decisive moment, on the winning side. In all these instances, *The Times* gave not the direction to public opinion, but submitted to it, ungraciously, reluctantly, and after protracted, but frustrated, attempts at rolling back the surging waves of popular progress. Its real influence on the public mind is, therefore, confined to the field of foreign policy. In no part of Europe are the mass of the people, and especially of the middle-classes, more utterly ignorant of the foreign policy of their own country than in England, an ignorance springing from two great sources. On the one hand, since the glorious Revolution of 1688,³⁰ the aristocracy has always monopolized the direction of foreign affairs in England. On the

^a R. Lowe, “The Part of *The Times* in the Government of the Country”, *The Free Press*, No. 8, August 7, 1861.—*Ed.*

other hand, the progressive division of labor has, to a certain extent, emasculated the general intellect of the middle-class men by the circumscription of all their energies and mental faculties within the narrow spheres of their mercantile, industrial and professional concerns. Thus it happened that, while the aristocracy *acted* for them, the press *thought* for them in their foreign or international affairs; and both parties, the aristocracy and the press, very soon found out that it would be their mutual interest to combine. One has only to open Cobbett's Political Register to convince himself that, since the beginning of this century, the great London papers have constantly played the part of attorneys to the heaven-born managers of English foreign policy. Still, there were some intermediate periods to be run through before the present state of things had been brought about. The aristocracy, that had monopolized the management of foreign affairs, first shrunk together into an oligarchy, represented by a secret conclave, called the cabinet, and, later on, the cabinet was superseded by one single man, Lord Palmerston, who, for the last thirty years, has usurped the absolute power of wielding the national forces of the British Empire, and determining the line of its Foreign Policy. Concurrently with this usurpation, by the law of concentration, acting in the field of newspaper-mongering still more rapidly than in the field of cotton-spinning, *The London Times* had attained the position of being the national paper of England, that is to say, of representing the English mind to Foreign nations. If the monopoly of managing the Foreign affairs of the nation had passed from the aristocracy to an oligarchic conclave, and from an oligarchic conclave to one single man, *the Foreign Minister of England*, viz: Lord Palmerston, the monopoly of thinking and judging for the nation, on its own Foreign relations, and representing the public mind in regard to these relations, had passed from the press to one organ of the press, to *The Times*. Lord Palmerston, who secretly and from motives unknown to the people at large, to Parliament and even to his own colleagues, managed the Foreign affairs of the British Empire, must have been very stupid if he had not tried to possess himself of the one paper which had usurped the power of passing public judgment in the name of the English people on his own secret doings. *The Times*, in whose vocabulary the word virtue was never to be found, must, on its side, have boasted more than Spartan virtue not to ally itself with the absolute ruler in fact of the national power of the Empire. Hence, since the French *coup d'état*,^a

^a The reference is to the *coup d'état* in France on December 2, 1851.—Ed.

when the Government by faction was in England superseded by the Government by the coalition of factions,³¹ and Palmerston, therefore, found no longer rivals endangering his usurpation, *The Times* became his mere slave. He had taken care to smuggle some of its virtue into the subordinate posts of the cabinet, and to cajole others by their admission into his social circle.³² Since that time, the whole business of *The Times*, so far as the foreign affairs of the British Empire are concerned, is limited to manufacturing a public opinion to conform to Lord Palmerston's Foreign policy. It has to prepare the public mind for what he intends doing, and to make it acquiesce in what he has done.

The slavish drudgery which, in fulfilling this work, it has to undergo, was best exemplified during the last session of Parliament. That session proved anything but favorable to Lord Palmerston. Some independent members of the H. of C., Liberals and Conservatives, rebelled against his usurped dictatorship, and, by an exposure of his past misdeeds, tried to awaken the nation to a sense of the danger of continuing the same uncontrolled power in the same hands. Mr. Dunlop, opening the attack by a motion for a Select Committee on the Afghan Papers,^a which Palmerston had laid on the table of the House in 1839, proved that Palmerston had actually forged these papers.³³ *The Times*, in its Parliamentary report, suppressed all the passages of Mr. Dunlop's speech which it considered most damaging to its master. Later on, Lord Montagu, in a motion for the publication of all papers relating to the Danish Treaty of 1852, accused Palmerston of having been the principal in the maneuvers intended to alter the Danish succession in the interest of a foreign power,³⁴ and of having misled the House of Commons by deliberate misstatements.^b Palmerston, however, had come to a previous understanding with Mr. Disraeli to baffle Lord Montagu's motion by a count-out of the House, which in fact put a stop to the whole proceeding. Still, Lord Montagu's speech had lasted one hour and a half before it was cut off by the count-out. *The Times* having been informed by Palmerston that the count-out was to take place, its editor specially charged with the task of mutilating and cooking the Parliamentary reports had given himself a holiday, and thus

^a A. M. Dunlop's speech in the House of Commons on March 19, 1861, *The Times*, No. 23885, March 20, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b R. Montagu's speech in the House of Commons on June 18, 1861, *The Times*, No. 23963, June 19, 1861.—*Ed.*

Lord Montagu's speech appeared unmutilated in *The Times's* columns. When, on the following morning, the mistake was discovered, a leader was prepared telling John Bull that the count-out was an ingenious institution for suppressing bores, that Lord Montagu was a regular bore, and that the business of the nation could not be carried on if Parliamentary bores were not disposed of in the most unceremonious way.^a Again Palmerston stood on his trial last session, when Mr. Hennessy moved for a production of the Foreign office dispatches during the Polish revolution of 1831.^b Again *The Times* recurred, as in the case of Mr. Dunlop's motion, to the simple process of suppression. Its report of Mr. Hennessy's speech is quite an edition *in usum delphini*.³⁵ If one considers how much painstaking it must cause to run through the immense Parliamentary reports the same night they are forwarded to the newspaper office from the House of Commons, and in the same night mutilate, alter, falsify them so as not to tell against Palmerston's political purity, one must concede that whatever emoluments and advantages *The Times* may reap from its subserviency to the noble Viscount, its task is no pleasant one.

If, then, *The Times* is able by misstatement and suppression thus to falsify public opinion in regard to events that happened but yesterday in the British House of Commons, its power of misstatement and suppression in regard to events occurring on a distant soil, as in the case of the American war, must, of course, be unbounded. If in treating of American affairs it has strained all its forces to exasperate the mutual feelings of the British and Americans, it did not do so from any sympathy with the British Cotton Lords nor out of regard for any real or supposed English interest. It simply executed the orders of its master. From the altered tone of *The London Times* during the past week, we may, therefore, infer that Lord Palmerston is about to recede from the extremely hostile attitude he had assumed till now against the United States. In one of its to-day leaders, *The Times*, which for months had exalted the aggressive powers of the Secessionists, and expatiated upon the inability of the United States to cope with them, feels quite sure of the military superiority of the North.^c That this change of tone is dictated by the master, becomes quite

^a "We are at last enjoying...", *The Times*, No. 23963, June 19, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b J. P. Hennessy's speech in the House of Commons on July 2, 1861, *The Times*, No. 23975, July 3, 1861.—*Ed.*

^c "The time is now approaching...", *The Times*, No. 24056, October 5, 1861.—*Ed.*

evident from the circumstance that other influential papers, known to be connected with Palmerston, have simultaneously veered round. One of them, *The Economist*, gives rather a broad hint to the public-opinion-mongers that the time has come for "carefully watching" their pretended "feelings toward the United States."^a The passage in *The Economist* which I allude to, and which I think worth quoting as a proof of the new orders received by Palmerston's pressmen, runs thus:

"On one point we frankly avow that the Northerners have a right to complain, and on one point also we are bound to be more upon our guard than perhaps we have uniformly been. Our leading journals have been too ready to quote and resent as embodying the sentiments and representing the position of the United States, newspapers notorious at all times for their disreputable character and feeble influence, and now more than suspected of being Secessionists at heart, of sailing under false colors, and professing extreme Northern opinions while writing in the interests and probably the pay of the South. Few Englishmen can, for example, with any decent fairness, pretend to regard *The N. Y. Herald* as representing either the character or views of the Northern section of the Republic. Again: we ought to be very careful lest our just criticism of the Unionists should degenerate by insensible gradation into approval and defense of the Secessionists. The tendency in all ordinary minds to *partisanship* is very strong. [...] Now, however warmly we may resent much of the conduct and the language of the North, [...] we must never forget that the Secession of the South was forced on with designs and inaugurated with proceedings which have our heartiest and most rooted disapprobation. We, of course, must condemn the protective tariff of the Union as an oppressive and benighted folly. [...] Of course, we reciprocate the wish of the South for low duties and unfettered trade. Of course, we are anxious that the prosperity of States which produce so much raw material and want so many manufactured goods should suffer no interruption or reverse. [...] But, at the same time, it is impossible for us to lose sight of the indisputable fact that the real aim and ultimate motive of secession was *not* to defend their right to hold slaves in their own territory (which the Northerners were just as ready to concede as they to claim), but to extend Slavery over a vast, undefined district, hitherto free from that curse, but into which the planters fancied they might hereafter wish to spread. This object we have always regarded as unwise, unrighteous and abhorrent. The state of society introduced in the Southern States by the institution of domestic servitude appears to English minds more and more detestable and deplorable the more they know of it. And the Southerners should be made aware that no pecuniary or commercial advantage which this country might be supposed to derive from the extended cultivation of the virgin soils of the planting States, and the new Territories which they claim, will ever in the slightest degree modify our views on these points, or interfere with the expression of those views, or warp or hamper our action whenever action shall become obligatory or fitting. [...] ^b It is believed that they (the Secessionists) still entertain the extraordinary notion that by *starving* France and England—by the loss and suffering anticipated as the consequences of

^a "English Feeling towards America", *The Economist*, No. 944, September 28, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b Thus far from the article. "English Feeling towards America."—*Ed.*

an entire privation of the American supply—they will compel those Governments to interfere on their behalf, and force the United States to abandon the blockade.... There is not the remotest chance that either Power would feel justified for a moment in projecting such an act of decided and unwarrantable hostility against the United States.... We are less dependent on the South than the South is upon us, as they will ere long begin to discover. [...] ^a We, therefore, pray them to believe that Slavery, so long as it exists, must create more or less of a moral barrier between us, and that even tacit approval is as far from our thoughts as the impertinence of an open interference: that Lancashire is not England; and, for the honor and spirit of our manufacturing population be it said also, that even if it were, *Cotton would not be King.*" ^b

All I intended to show for the present was that Palmerston, and consequently the London press, working to his orders, is abandoning his hostile attitude against the United States. The causes that have led to this *revirement*, ^c as the French call it, I shall try to explain in a subsequent letter. Before concluding, I may still add that Mr. Forster, M.P. for Bradford, delivered last Tuesday, ^d in the theater of Bradford Mechanics' Institute, ³⁶ a lecture "On the Civil War in America," in which he traced the true origin and character of that war, and victoriously refuted the misstatements of the Palmerstonian press. ^e

Written on October 5, 1861

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6411, October 21, 1861

^a "The Last Movements of the Northern and the Southern Confederation", *The Economist*, No. 943, September 21, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b "English Feeling towards America".—*Ed.*

^c Radical change.—*Ed.*

^d October 1, 1861.—*Ed.*

^e W. E. Forster's lecture "On the Civil War in America" was reported in *The Times*, No. 24054, October 3, 1861.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

THE LONDON *TIMES* ON THE ORLEANS PRINCES
IN AMERICA

London, Oct. 12, 1861

On the occasion of the King of Prussia's^a visit at Compiègne,³⁷ *The London Times* published some racy articles, giving great offense on the other side of the Channel.^b *The Pays, Journal de l'Empire*, in its turn, characterized *The Times* writers as people whose heads were poisoned by gin, and whose pens were dipped into mud.^c Such occasional exchanges of invective are only intended to mislead public opinion as to the intimate relations connecting Printing-House Square to the Tuileries.³⁸ There exists beyond the French frontiers no greater sycophant of the Man of December^d than *The London Times*, and its services are the more invaluable, the more that paper now and then assumes the tone and the air of a Cato censor toward its Caesar. *The Times* had for months heaped insult upon Prussia. Improving the miserable Macdonald affair,³⁹ it had told Prussia that England would feel glad to see a transfer of the Rhenish Provinces from the barbarous sway of the Hohenzollern to the enlightened despotism of a Bonaparte.^e It had not only exasperated the Prussian dynasty, but the Prussian people. It had written down the idea of an Anglo-Prussian alliance in case of a Prussian conflict with France. It had strained all its powers to convince Prussia that she had

^a William I.—*Ed.*

^b Marx refers to the following leading articles: "The popularity of a Government...", *The Times*, No. 24057, October 7, 1861; "The King of Prussia is welcomed to Compiègne...", *The Times*, No. 24058, October 8, 1861; "It is, perhaps, a mistake to attribute...", *The Times*, No. 24059, October 9, 1861.—*Ed.*

^c "Paris, Thursday, Oct. 10, 7 A. M.", *The Times*, No. 24061, October 11, 1861.—*Ed.*

^d Napoleon III.—*Ed.*

^e "We trust we have now heard...", *The Times*, No. 23928, May 9, 1861, leading article.—*Ed.*

nothing to hope from England, and that the next best thing she could do would be to come to some understanding with France.^a When at last the weak and trimming monarch of Prussia resolved upon the visit at Compiègne, *The Times* could proudly exclaim: “*quorum magna pars fui*,”^b but now the time had also arrived for obliterating from the memory of the British the fact that *The Times* had been the pathfinder of the Prussian monarch. Hence the roar of its theatrical thunders. Hence the counter roars of the *Pays*, *Journal de l'Empire*.

The Times had now recovered its position of the deadly antagonist of Bonapartism, and, therefore, the power of lending its aid to the Man of December. An occasion soon offered. Louis Bonaparte is, of course, most touchy whenever the renown of rival pretenders to the French crown is concerned. He had covered himself with ridicule in the affair of the Duke d'Aumale's pamphlet⁴⁰ against Plon Plon,^c and, by his proceedings, had done more in furtherance of the Orleanist cause than all the Orleanist partisans combined. Again, in these latter days, the French people were called upon to draw a parallel between Plon Plon and the Orleans princes.^d When Plon Plon set out for America, there were caricatures circulated in the Faubourg St. Antoine representing him as a fat man in search of a crown, but professing at the same time to be a most inoffensive traveler, with a peculiar aversion to the smell of powder. While Plon Plon is returning to France with no more laurels than he gathered in the Crimea and in Italy, the Princes of Orleans cross the Atlantic to take service in the ranks of the National army. Hence a great stir in the Bonapartist camp. It would not do to give vent to Bonapartist anger through the venal press of Paris. The Imperialist fears would thus only be betrayed, the pamphlet scandal renewed, and odious comparisons provoked between exiled Princes who fight under the republican banner against the enslavers of working millions, with another exiled Prince, who had himself sworn in as an English special constable to share in the glory of putting down an English workingmen's movement.⁴¹

^a “The tone in which the outrage on Captain Macdonald...”, *The Times*, No. 23926, May 7, 1861, leading article; “We trust we have now heard...”, *The Times*, No. 23928, May 9, 1861, leading article.—*Ed.*

^b “Much of the credit for this belongs to me”, Virgil, *Aeneid*, II, 6.—*Ed.*

^c Joseph Charles Paul Bonaparte, Prince Napoléon.—*Ed.*

^d François Ferdinand Philippe Louis Marie d'Orléans, Prince de Joinville; Robert Philippe Louis Eugène Ferdinand d'Orléans, duc de Chartres; Louis Philippe Albert d'Orléans, comte de Paris.—*Ed.*

Who should extricate the Man of December out of this dilemma? Who but *The London Times*? If the same *London Times*, which, on the 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th of October, 1861, had roused the furies of the *Pays*, *Journal de l'Empire*, by its rather cynical strictures on the visit at Compiègne—if that very same paper should come out on the 12th of October, with a merciless onslaught on the Orleans Princes, because of their enlistment in the ranks of the National Army of the United States,^a would Louis Bonaparte not have proved his case against the Orleans Princes? Would *The Times* article not be done into French, commented upon by the Paris papers, sent by the *Préfet de Police* to all the journals of all the departments, and circulated throughout the whole of France, as the impartial sentence passed by *The London Times*, the personal foe of Louis Bonaparte, upon the last proceedings of the Orleans Princes? Consequently, *The Times* of to-day has come out with a most scurrilous onslaught on these princes.

Louis Bonaparte is, of course, too much of a business man to share the judicial blindness in regard to the American war of the official public opinion-mongers. He knows that the true people of England, of France, of Germany, of Europe, consider the cause of the United States as their own cause, as the cause of liberty, and that, despite all paid sophistry, they consider the soil of the United States as the free soil of the landless millions of Europe, as their land of promise, now to be defended sword in hand, from the sordid grasp of the slaveholder. Louis Napoleon knows, moreover, that in France the masses connect the fight for the maintenance of the Union with the fight of their forefathers for the foundation of American independence, and that with them every Frenchman drawing his sword for the National Government appears only to execute the bequest of Lafayette.⁴² Bonaparte, therefore, knows that if anything be able to win the Orleans Princes good opinions from the French people, it will be their enlistment in the ranks of the national army of the United States. He shudders at this very notion, and consequently *The London Times*, his censorious sycophant, tells to-day the Orleans princes that “they will derive no increase of popularity with the French nation from stooping to serve on this ignoble field of action.” Louis Napoleon knows that all the wars waged in Europe between hostile nations since his *coup d'état*, have been mock wars, groundless, wanton, and carried on on false pretenses. The Russian war, and

^a “Perhaps there is no position which an erring mortal...”, *The Times*, No. 24062, October 12, 1861, leading article.—*Ed.*

the Italian war, not to speak of the piratical expeditions against China, Cochin-China,⁴³ and so forth, never enlisted the sympathies of the French people, instinctively aware that both wars were carried on only with the view to strengthening the chains forged by the *coup d'état*. The first grand war of contemporaneous history is the American war.

The peoples of Europe know that the Southern slaveocracy commenced that war with the declaration that the continuance of slaveocracy was no longer compatible with the continuance of the Union. Consequently, the people of Europe know that a fight for the continuance of the Union is a fight against the continuance of the slaveocracy—that in this contest the highest form of popular self-government till now realized is giving battle to the meanest and most shameless form of man's enslaving recorded in the annals of history.

Louis Bonaparte feels, of course, extremely sorry that the Orleans Princes should embark in just such a war, so distinguished, by the vastness of its dimensions and the grandeur of its ends, from the groundless, wanton and diminutive wars Europe has passed through since 1849. Consequently, *The London Times* must needs declare:

"To overlook the difference between a war waged by hostile nations, and this most groundless and wanton civil conflict of which history gives us any account, is a species of offense against public morals."^a

The Times is, of course, bound to wind up its onslaught on the Orleans Princes because of their "stooping to serve on such an ignoble field of action." With a deep bow before the victor of Sevastopol and Solferino, "it is unwise," says *The London Times*, "to challenge a comparison between such actions as Springfield and Manassas,⁴⁴ and the exploits of Sevastopol and Solferino."

The next mail will testify to the premeditated use made of *The Times's* article by the Imperialist organs. A friend in times of need is proverbially worth a thousand friends in times of prosperity, and the secret ally of *The London Times* is just now very badly off.

A dearth of cotton, backed by a dearth of grain; a commercial crisis coupled with an agricultural distress, and both of them combined with a reduction of Custom revenues and a monetary embarrassment compelling the Bank of France to screw its rate of discount to six per cent, to enter into transactions with Rothschilds and Baring for a loan of two millions sterling on the London

^a "Perhaps there is no position..."—*Ed.*

market, to pawn abroad French Government stock, and with all that to show but a reserve of 12,000,000 against liabilities amounting to more than 40,000,000. Such a state of economical affairs prepares just the situation for rival pretenders to stake double. Already there have been bread-riots in the Faubourg St. Antoine, and this of all times is therefore the most inappropriate time for allowing Orleans Princes to catch popularity. Hence the fierce forward rush of *The London Times*.

Written on October 12, 1861

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6426, November 7, 1861

Einzelne Nummern:
Für jeden Quartierpreis 25 Cts.
Für alle Nummern 1/2 Mark.
Für alle Nummern 1/2 Mark.
Für alle Nummern 1/2 Mark.

Die Presse.



Abonnement für Wien:
Für ein Jahr 1 Mark.
Für ein Jahr 1 Mark.
Für ein Jahr 1 Mark.

Wien, Freitag den 25. October 1861.

Nr. 228.

Wien, Freitag den 25. October 1861.

14. Jahrgang

Karl Marx THE NORTH AMERICAN CIVIL WAR⁴⁵

London, October 20, 1861

For months the leading weekly and daily papers of the London press have been reiterating the same litany on the American Civil War. While they insult the free states of the North, they anxiously defend themselves against the suspicion of sympathising with the slave states of the South. In fact, they continually write two articles: one article, in which they attack the North, and another article, in which they excuse their attacks on the North. *Qui s'excuse s'accuse.*

In essence the extenuating arguments read: The war between the North and South is a tariff war. The war is, further, not for any principle, does not touch the question of slavery and in fact turns on Northern lust for sovereignty. Finally, even if justice is on the side of the North, does it not remain a vain endeavour to want to subjugate eight million Anglo-Saxons by force! Would not separation of the South release the North from all connection with Negro slavery and ensure for it, with its twenty million inhabitants and its vast territory, a higher, hitherto scarcely dreamt-of, development? Accordingly, must not the North welcome secession as a happy event, instead of wanting to overrule it by a bloody and futile civil war?

Point by point we will probe the plea of the English press.

The war between North and South—so runs the first excuse—is a mere tariff war, a war between a protectionist system and a free trade system, and Britain naturally stands on the side of free trade. Shall the slave-owner enjoy the fruits of slave labour in their entirety or shall he be cheated of a portion of these by the protectionists of the North? That is the question which is at issue in this war. It was reserved for *The Times* to make this brilliant

discovery. *The Economist*, *The Examiner*, *The Saturday Review* and *tutti quanti*^a expounded the theme further.^b It is characteristic of this discovery that it was made, not in Charleston, but in London. Naturally, in America everyone knew that from 1846 to 1861 a free trade system prevailed, and that Representative Morrill carried his protectionist tariff through Congress only in 1861,⁴⁶ after the rebellion had already broken out. Secession, therefore, did not take place because the Morrill tariff had gone through Congress, but, at most, the Morrill tariff went through Congress because secession had taken place. When South Carolina had its first attack of secession in 1831,⁴⁷ the protectionist tariff of 1828 served it, to be sure, as a pretext, but only as a pretext, as is known from a statement of General Jackson.^c This time, however, the old pretext has in fact not been repeated. In the Secession Congress at Montgomery⁴⁸ all reference to the tariff question was avoided, because the cultivation of sugar in Louisiana, one of the most influential Southern states, depends entirely on protection.

But, the London press pleads further, the war of the United States is nothing but a war for the forcible maintenance of the Union. The Yankees cannot make up their minds to strike fifteen stars from their standard.⁴⁹ They want to cut a colossal figure on the world stage. Yes, it would be different if the war was waged for the abolition of slavery! The question of slavery, however, as *The Saturday Review* categorically declares among other things, has absolutely nothing to do with this war.

It is above all to be remembered that the war did not originate with the North, but with the South. The North finds itself on the defensive. For months it had quietly looked on while the secessionists appropriated the Union's forts, arsenals, shipyards, customs houses, pay offices, ships and supplies of arms, insulted its flag and took prisoner bodies of its troops. Finally the secessionists resolved to force the Union government out of its passive attitude by a blatant act of war, and *solely for this reason* proceeded to the bombardment of Fort Sumter near Charleston. On April 11 (1861) their General Beauregard had learnt in a

^a All such.—*Ed.*

^b Marx means the articles "Few have pretended to give...", *The Times*, No. 24033, September 9, 1861, leading article; "American Complaints against England", *The Economist*, No. 942, September 14, 1861; "Mrs. Stowe on the American War", *The Examiner*, No. 2798, September 14, 1861; "Mrs. Beecher Stowe's Wounded Feelings", *The Saturday Review*, No. 307, September 14, 1861.—*Ed.*

^c President Jackson's proclamation against the Nullification Ordinance of South Carolina, December 11, 1832 (see Note 24).—*Ed.*

meeting with Major Anderson, the commander of Fort Sumter, that the fort was only supplied with provisions for three days more and accordingly must be peacefully surrendered after this period. In order to forestall this peaceful surrender, the secessionists opened the bombardment early on the following morning (April 12), which brought about the fall of the fort in a few hours. News of this had hardly been telegraphed to Montgomery, the seat of the Secession Congress, when War Minister Walker publicly declared in the name of the new Confederacy: "No man can say where *the war opened today* will end."^a At the same time he prophesied "that before the first of May the flag of the Southern Confederacy will wave from the dome of the old Capitol in Washington and within a short time perhaps also from the Faneuil Hall in Boston".⁵⁰ Only now ensued the proclamation in which Lincoln called for 75,000 men to defend the Union.^b The bombardment of Fort Sumter cut off the only possible constitutional way out, namely the convocation of a general convention of the American people, as Lincoln had proposed in his inaugural address.^c For Lincoln there now remained only the choice of fleeing from Washington, evacuating Maryland and Delaware and surrendering Kentucky, Missouri and Virginia, or of answering war with war.

The question of the principle of the American Civil War is answered by the battle slogan with which the South broke the peace. Stephens, the Vice-President of the Southern Confederacy, declared in the Secession Congress that what essentially distinguished the Constitution newly hatched at Montgomery from the Constitution of the Washingtons and Jeffersons was that now for the first time slavery was recognised as an institution good in itself, and as the foundation of the whole state edifice, whereas the revolutionary fathers, men steeped in the prejudices of the eighteenth century, had treated slavery as an evil imported from England and to be eliminated in the course of time.^d Another matador of the South, Mr. Spratt, cried out: "For us it is a question of founding a great slave republic."^e If, therefore, it was

^a Quoted in the report "How the War News Is Received", *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6231, April 15, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b A. Lincoln, *A Proclamation* [April 15, 1861], *New-York Daily Tribune*, same issue.—*Ed.*

^c A. Lincoln, "The Inaugural Address" [March 4, 1861], *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6196, March 5, 1861.—*Ed.*

^d Stephens's speech in Savannah on March 21, 1861.—*Ed.*

^e Marx gives the English words "a great slave republic" in brackets after the German equivalent.—*Ed.*

indeed only in defence of the Union that the North drew the sword, had not the South already declared that the continuance of slavery was no longer compatible with the continuance of the Union?

Just as the bombardment of Fort Sumter gave the signal for the opening of the war, the election victory of the *Republican* Party of the North, the election of Lincoln as President, gave the signal for secession. On November 6, 1860, Lincoln was elected. On November 8, 1860, a message telegraphed from South Carolina said: "Secession is regarded here as a settled thing"^a; on November 10 the legislature of Georgia occupied itself with secession plans, and on November 13 a special session of the legislature of Mississippi was convened to consider secession. But Lincoln's election was itself only the result of a split in the *Democratic* camp. During the election struggle the Democrats of the North concentrated their votes on *Douglas*, the Democrats of the South concentrated their votes on *Breckinridge*, and to this splitting of the Democratic votes the Republican Party owed its victory. Whence came, on the one hand, the preponderance of the *Republican* Party in the North? Whence, on the other, the disunion *within* the *Democratic* Party, whose members, North and South, had operated in conjunction for more than half a century?

Under the presidency of Buchanan the sway that the South had gradually usurped over the Union through its alliance with the Northern Democrats attained its zenith. The last Continental Congress of 1787 and the first Constitutional Congress of 1789-90 had legally excluded slavery from all Territories of the republic northwest of the Ohio.^b (Territories, as is known, is the name given to the colonies lying within the United States itself which have not yet attained the level of population constitutionally prescribed for the formation of autonomous states.⁵¹) The so-called Missouri Compromise (1820), in consequence of which Missouri became one of the States of the Union as a slave state, excluded slavery from every remaining Territory north of 36°30' latitude and west of the Missouri.⁵² By this compromise the area of slavery was advanced several degrees of longitude, whilst, on the other hand, a geographical boundary-line to its future spread

^a Quoted in the report "Columbia, S. C. Thursday, Nov. 8, 1860", *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6098, November 9, 1860.—*Ed.*

^b *An Ordinance for the government of the territory of the United States, north-west of the River Ohio*, adopted by the 1787 Congress, and *An Act to provide for the government of the territory north-west of the River Ohio*, adopted by the 1789-90 Congress.—*Ed.*

seemed quite definitely drawn. This geographical barrier, in its turn, was thrown down in 1854 by the so-called Kansas-Nebraska Bill, the initiator of which was St[ephen] A. Douglas, then leader of the Northern Democrats. The Bill, which passed both Houses of Congress, repealed the Missouri Compromise, placed slavery and freedom on the same footing, commanded the Union government to treat them both with equal indifference and left it to the sovereignty of the people, that is, the majority of the settlers, to decide whether or not slavery was to be introduced in a Territory. Thus, for the first time in the history of the United States, every geographical and legal limit to the extension of slavery in the Territories was removed. Under this new legislation the hitherto free Territory of New Mexico, a Territory five times as large as the State of New York, was transformed into a slave Territory, and the area^a of slavery was extended from the border of the Mexican Republic to 38° north latitude. In 1859 New Mexico received a slave code that vies with the statute-books of Texas and Alabama in barbarity. Nevertheless, as the census of 1860 proves,^b among some 100,000 inhabitants New Mexico does not count even half a hundred slaves. It had therefore sufficed for the South to send some adventurers with a few slaves over the border, and then with the help of the central government in Washington and of its officials and contractors in New Mexico to drum together a sham popular representation to impose slavery and with it the rule of the slaveholders on the Territory.

However, this convenient method did not prove applicable in other Territories. The South accordingly went a step further and appealed from Congress to the Supreme Court of the United States. This Court, which numbers nine judges, five of whom belong to the South, had long been the most willing tool of the slaveholders. It decided in 1857, in the notorious Dred Scott case,⁵³ that every American citizen possesses the right to take with him into any Territory any property recognised by the Constitution.^c The Constitution, it maintained, recognises slaves as property and obliges the Union government to protect this property. Consequently, on the basis of the Constitution, slaves could be forced to labour in the Territories by their owners, and

^a Marx uses the English word.—*Ed.*

^b Its data were cited in a report date-lined "New York, March 26", *The Times*, No. 23903, April 10, 1861.—*Ed.*

^c The ruling of the US Supreme Court on the Dred Scott case was quoted in the article "The Dred Scott Case Decided", *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 4955, March 7, 1857.—*Ed.*

so every individual slaveholder was entitled to introduce slavery into hitherto free Territories against the will of the majority of the settlers. The right to exclude slavery was taken from the Territorial legislatures and the duty to protect pioneers of the slave system was imposed on Congress and the Union government.

If the Missouri Compromise of 1820 had extended the geographical boundary-line of slavery in the Territories, if the Kansas-Nebraska Bill of 1854 had erased every geographical boundary-line and set up a political barrier instead, the will of the majority of the settlers, now the Supreme Court of the United States, by its decision of 1857, tore down even this political barrier and transformed all the Territories of the republic, present and future, from nurseries of free states into nurseries of slavery.

At the same time, under Buchanan's government the severer law on the surrendering of fugitive slaves enacted in 1850 was ruthlessly carried out in the states of the North.⁵⁴ To play the part of slave-catchers for the Southern slaveholders appeared to be the constitutional calling of the North. On the other hand, in order to hinder as far as possible the colonisation of the Territories by free settlers, the slaveholders' party frustrated all the so-called free-soil^a measures, i. e., measures which were to secure for the settlers a definite amount of uncultivated state land free of charge.⁵⁵

In the foreign, as in the domestic, policy of the United States, the interests of the slaveholders served as the guiding star: Buchanan had in fact obtained the office of President through the issue of the Ostend Manifesto, in which the acquisition of Cuba, whether by purchase or by force of arms, was proclaimed as the great task of national policy.⁵⁶ Under his government northern Mexico was already divided among American land speculators, who impatiently awaited the signal to fall on Chihuahua, Coahuila and Sonora.⁵⁷ The unceasing piratical expeditions of the filibusters against the states of Central America were directed no less from the White House at Washington. In the closest connection with this foreign policy, whose manifest purpose was conquest of new territory for the spread of slavery and of the slaveholders' rule, stood the *reopening of the slave trade*,⁵⁸ secretly supported by the Union government. St[ephen] A. Douglas himself declared in the American Senate on August 20, 1859: During the last year more Negroes have been imported from Africa than ever before in any single year, even at the time when the slave trade was still legal.

^a Marx uses the English term.—Ed.

The number of slaves imported in the last year totalled fifteen thousand.^a

Armed spreading of slavery abroad was the avowed aim of national policy; the Union had in fact become the slave of the 300,000 slaveholders who held sway over the South. A series of compromises, which the South owed to its alliance with the Northern Democrats, had led to this result. On this alliance all the attempts, periodically repeated since 1817, to resist the ever increasing encroachments of the slaveholders had hitherto come to grief. At length there came a turning point.

For hardly had the Kansas-Nebraska Bill gone through, which wiped out the geographical boundary-line of slavery and made its introduction into new Territories subject to the will of the majority of the settlers, when armed emissaries of the slaveholders, border rabble from Missouri and Arkansas, with bowie-knife in one hand and revolver in the other, fell upon Kansas and sought by the most unheard-of atrocities to dislodge its settlers from the Territory colonised by them. These raids were supported by the central government in Washington. Hence a tremendous reaction. Throughout the North, but particularly in the Northwest,⁵⁹ a relief organisation was formed to support Kansas with men, arms and money.⁶⁰ Out of this relief organisation arose the *Republican Party*, which therefore owes its origin to the struggle for Kansas. After the attempt to transform Kansas into a *slave Territory* by force of arms had failed, the South sought to achieve the same result by political intrigues. Buchanan's government, in particular, exerted its utmost efforts to have Kansas included in the States of the Union as a *slave state* with a slave constitution imposed on it.^b Hence renewed struggle, this time mainly conducted in Congress at Washington. Even St[ephen] A. Douglas, the chief of the Northern Democrats, now (1857-58) entered the lists against the government and his allies of the South, because imposition of a slave constitution could have been contrary to the principle of sovereignty of the settlers passed in the Nebraska Bill of 1854. Douglas, Senator for Illinois, a Northwestern state, would naturally have lost all his influence if he had wanted to concede to the South the right to steal by force of arms or through acts of Congress Territories colonised by the North. As the struggle for

^a Douglas's statement, made at a reception in Washington on August 19, 1859, was reported in the article "Douglas Sure of the South", *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5720, August 23, 1859.—*Ed.*

^b Its basic provisions were set forth in the article "The Great Swindle", *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5171, November 16, 1857.—*Ed.*

Kansas, therefore, called the *Republican Party* into being, it at the same time occasioned the first *split within the Democratic Party* itself.

The Republican Party put forward its first platform for the presidential election in 1856. Although its candidate, John Frémont, was not victorious, the huge number of votes cast for him at any rate proved the rapid growth of the Party, particularly in the Northwest. At their second National Convention for the presidential elections (May 17, 1860), the Republicans again put forward their platform of 1856, only enriched by some additions.^a Its principal contents were the following: Not a foot of fresh territory is further conceded to slavery. The filibustering policy abroad must cease. The reopening of the slave trade is stigmatised. Finally, free-soil^b laws are to be enacted for the furtherance of free colonisation.

The vitally important point in this platform was that not a foot of fresh terrain was conceded to slavery; rather it was to remain once and for all confined within the boundaries of the states where it already legally existed. Slavery was thus to be formally interned; but continual expansion of territory and continual spread of slavery beyond its old limits is a law of life for the slave states of the Union.

The cultivation of the southern export articles, cotton, tobacco, sugar, etc., carried on by slaves, is only remunerative as long as it is conducted with large gangs of slaves, on a mass scale and on wide expanses of a naturally fertile soil, which requires only simple labour. Intensive cultivation, which depends less on fertility of the soil than on investment of capital, intelligence and energy of labour, is contrary to the nature of slavery. Hence the rapid transformation of states like Maryland and Virginia, which formerly employed slaves in the production of export articles, into states which raise slaves to export them into the deep South. Even in South Carolina, where the slaves form four-sevenths of the population, the cultivation of cotton has been almost completely stationary for years due to the exhaustion of the soil. Indeed, by force of circumstances South Carolina has already been transformed in part into a slave-raising state, since it already sells slaves to the sum of four million dollars yearly to the states of the extreme South and Southwest. As soon as this point is reached, the acquisition of new Territories becomes necessary, so that one section of the slaveholders with their slaves may occupy new fertile

^a Both platforms were cited in the article "The Platform", *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5950, May 19, 1860.—*Ed.*

^b Marx uses the English term.—*Ed.*

lands and that a new market for slave-raising, therefore for the sale of slaves, may be created for the remaining section. It is, for example, indubitable that without the acquisition of Louisiana, Missouri and Arkansas by the United States, slavery in Virginia and Maryland would have become extinct long ago. In the Secessionist Congress at Montgomery, Senator Toombs, one of the spokesmen of the South, strikingly formulated the economic law that commands the constant expansion of the territory of slavery.

"In fifteen years," said he, "without a great increase in slave territory, either the slaves must be permitted to flee from the whites, or the whites must flee from the slaves."

As is known, the representation of the individual states in the Congress House of Representatives depends on the size of their respective populations. As the populations of the free states grow far more quickly than those of the slave states, the number of Northern Representatives was bound to outstrip that of the Southern very rapidly. The real seat of the political power of the South is accordingly transferred more and more to the American Senate, where every state, whether its population is great or small, is represented by two Senators. In order to assert its influence in the Senate and, through the Senate, its hegemony over the United States, the South therefore required a continual formation of new slave states. This, however, was only possible through conquest of foreign lands, as in the case of Texas, or through the transformation of the Territories belonging to the United States first into slave Territories and later into slave states, as in the case of Missouri, Arkansas, etc. *John Calhoun*, whom the slaveholders admire as their statesman *par excellence*, stated as early as February 19, 1847, in the Senate, that the Senate alone placed a balance of power in the hands of the South, that extension of the slave territory was necessary to preserve this equilibrium between South and North in the Senate, and that the attempts of the South at the creation of new slave states by force were accordingly justified.

Finally, the number of actual slaveholders in the South of the Union does not amount to more than 300,000, a narrow oligarchy that is confronted with many millions of so-called poor whites,^a whose numbers have been constantly growing through concentration of landed property and whose condition is only to be compared with that of the Roman plebeians in the period of

^a Marx gives the English words "poor whites" in parenthesis after their German equivalent.—*Ed.*

Rome's extreme decline. Only by acquisition and the prospect of acquisition of new Territories, as well as by filibustering expeditions, is it possible to square the interests of these "poor whites" with those of the slaveholders, to give their restless thirst for action a harmless direction and to tame them with the prospect of one day becoming slaveholders themselves.

A strict confinement of slavery within its old terrain, therefore, was bound according to economic law to lead to its gradual extinction, in the political sphere to annihilate the hegemony that the slave states exercised through the Senate, and finally to expose the slaveholding oligarchy within its own states to threatening perils from the "poor whites". In accordance with the principle that any further extension of slave Territories was to be prohibited by law, the Republicans therefore attacked the rule of the slaveholders at its root. The Republican election victory was accordingly bound to lead to open struggle between North and South. And this election victory, as already mentioned, was itself conditioned by the split in the Democratic camp.

The Kansas struggle had already caused a split between the slaveholders' party and the Democrats of the North allied to it. With the presidential election of 1860, the same strife now broke out again in a more general form. The Democrats of the North, with Douglas as their candidate, made the introduction of slavery into Territories dependent on the will of the majority of the settlers. The slaveholders' party, with Breckinridge as their candidate, maintained that the Constitution of the United States, as the Supreme Court had also declared,^a brought slavery legally in its train; in and of itself slavery was already legal in all Territories and required no special naturalisation. Whilst, therefore, the Republicans prohibited any extension of slave Territories, the Southern party laid claim to all Territories of the republic as legally warranted domains. What they had attempted by way of example with regard to Kansas, to force slavery on a Territory through the central government against the will of the settlers themselves, they now set up as law for all the Territories of the Union. Such a concession lay beyond the power of the *Democratic* leaders and would only have occasioned the desertion of their army to the Republican camp. On the other hand, Douglas's "settlers' sovereignty" could not satisfy the slaveholders' party. What it wanted to effect had to be effected within the next four years under the new President, could only be effected by the

^a In its ruling on the Dred Scott case.—*Ed.*

resources of the central government and brooked no further delay. It did not escape the slaveholders that a new power had arisen, the *Northwest*, whose population, having almost doubled between 1850 and 1860, was already pretty well equal to the white population of the slave states—a power that was not inclined either by tradition, temperament or mode of life to let itself be dragged from compromise to compromise in the manner of the old Northeastern states. The Union was still of value to the South only so far as it handed over Federal power to it as a means of carrying out the slave policy. If not, then it was better to make the break now than to look on at the development of the Republican Party and the upsurge of the Northwest for another four years and begin the struggle under more unfavourable conditions. The slaveholders' party therefore played *va banque!* When the Democrats of the North declined to go on playing the part of the “poor whites” of the South, the South secured Lincoln's victory by splitting the vote, and then took this victory as a pretext for drawing the sword from the scabbard.

The whole movement was and is based, as one sees, on the *slave question*. Not in the sense of whether the slaves within the existing slave states should be emancipated outright or not, but whether the 20 million free men of the North should submit any longer to an oligarchy of 300,000 slaveholders; whether the vast Territories of the republic should be nurseries for free states or for slavery; finally, whether the national policy of the Union should take armed spreading of slavery in Mexico, Central and South America as its device.

In another article we will probe the assertion of the London press that the North must sanction secession as the most favourable and only possible solution of the conflict.

Written on October 20, 1861

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in *Die Presse*, No. 293,
October 25, 1861

Karl Marx

THE CIVIL WAR IN THE UNITED STATES⁶¹

“Let him go, he is not worth your anger!”^a Again and again English statesmanship cries—recently through the mouth of Lord John Russell^b—to the North of the United States this advice of Leporello to Don Juan’s deserted love. If the North lets the South go, it then frees itself from any association with slavery, from its historical original sin, and creates the basis of a new and higher development.

In reality, if North and South formed two independent countries, like, for example, England and Hanover, their separation would be no more difficult than was the separation of England and Hanover.⁶² “*The South*”, however, is neither a territory closely sealed off from the North geographically, nor a moral unity. It is not a country at all, but a battle slogan.

The advice of an amicable separation presupposes that the Southern Confederacy, although it assumed the offensive in the Civil War, at least wages it for defensive purposes. It is believed that the issue for the slaveholders’ party is merely one of uniting the territories it has hitherto dominated into an independent group of states and withdrawing them from the supreme authority of the Union. Nothing could be more false. “*The South needs its entire territory*. It will and must have it.” With this battle-cry the secessionists fell upon Kentucky. By their “entire territory” they

^a From Mozart’s opera *Don Giovanni*.—*Ed.*

^b Russell’s speech in Newcastle on October 14, 1861. Reported in *The Times*, No. 24064, October 15, 1861.—*Ed.*

understand in the first place all the so-called *border states*^a—Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri and Arkansas. Besides, they lay claim to the entire territory south of the line that runs from the northwest corner of Missouri to the Pacific Ocean. What the slaveholders, therefore, call the South, embraces more than three-quarters of the territory hitherto comprised by the Union. A large part of the territory thus claimed is still in the possession of the Union and would first have to be conquered from it. None of the so-called border states, however, not even those in the possession of the Confederacy, were ever *actual slave states*. Rather, they constitute the area of the United States in which the system of slavery and the system of free labour exist side by side and contend for mastery, the actual field of battle between South and North, between slavery and freedom. The war of the Southern Confederacy is, therefore, not a war of defence, but a war of conquest, a war of conquest for the spread and perpetuation of slavery.

The chain of mountains that begins in Alabama and stretches northwards to the Hudson River—the spinal column, as it were, of the United States—cuts the so-called South into three parts. The mountainous country formed by the Allegheny Mountains with their two parallel ranges, the Cumberland Range to the west and the Blue Mountains^b to the east, divides wedge-like the lowlands along the western coast of the Atlantic Ocean from the lowlands in the southern valleys of the Mississippi. The two lowlands separated by the mountainous country, with their vast rice swamps and far-flung cotton plantations, are the actual area of slavery. The long wedge of mountainous country driven into the heart of slavery, with its correspondingly clear atmosphere, an invigorating climate and a soil rich in coal, salt, limestone, iron ore, gold, in short, every raw material necessary for a many-sided industrial development, is already for the most part free country. In accordance with its physical constitution, the soil here can only be cultivated with success by free small farmers. Here the slave system vegetates only sporadically and has never struck root. In the larger part of the so-called border states, the dwellers of these highlands comprise the core of the free population, which sides with the North if only for the sake of self-preservation.

Let us consider the contested territory in detail.

^a Marx gives the English words “border states” in parenthesis after their German equivalent.—*Ed.*

^b Marx uses the English names: “Cumberland Range” and “Blue Mountains”.—*Ed.*

Delaware, the most northeastern of the border states, is factually and morally in the possession of the Union. All the attempts of the secessionists at forming even one faction favourable to them have since the beginning of the war suffered shipwreck on the unanimity of the population. The slave element of this state has long been in process of dying out. From 1850 to 1860 alone the number of slaves diminished by half, so that with a total population of 112,218 Delaware now numbers only 1,798 slaves.^a Nevertheless, Delaware is demanded by the Southern Confederacy and would in fact be militarily untenable for the North as soon as the South possessed itself of Maryland.

In *Maryland* itself the above-mentioned conflict between highlands and lowlands takes place. Out of a total population of 687,034 there are here 87,188 slaves. That the overwhelming majority of the population is on the side of the Union has again been strikingly proved by the recent general elections to the Congress in Washington. The army of 30,000 Union troops which holds Maryland at the moment, is intended not only to serve the army on the Potomac as a reserve, but, in particular, also to hold in check the rebellious slave-owners in the interior of the country. For here we observe a phenomenon similar to what we see in other border states where the great mass of the people stands for the North and a numerically insignificant slaveholders' party for the South. What it lacks in numbers, the slaveholders' party makes up in the means of power that many years' possession of all state offices, hereditary engagement in political intrigue and concentration of great wealth in few hands have secured for it.

Virginia now forms the great cantonment where the main army of secession and the main army of the Union confront each other. In the northwest highlands of Virginia the number of slaves is 15,000, whilst the twenty times as large free population consists mostly of free farmers. The eastern lowlands of Virginia, on the other hand, count well-nigh half a million slaves. Raising Negroes and the sale of the Negroes to the Southern states form the principal source of income of these lowlands. As soon as the ringleaders of the lowlands had carried through the secession ordinance by intrigues in the state legislature at Richmond^b and had in all haste opened the gates of Virginia to the Southern army, northwest Virginia seceded from the secession, formed a

^a Here and below Marx cites data of the 1860 US census contained in a report datelined "New York, March 26", *The Times*, No. 23903, April 10, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b On April 17, 1861.—*Ed.*

new state, and under the banner of the Union now defends its territory arms in hand against the Southern invaders.

Tennessee, with 1,109,847 inhabitants, 275,784 of whom are slaves, finds itself in the hands of the Southern Confederacy, which has placed the whole state under martial law and under a system of proscription which recalls the days of the Roman Triumvirates. When in the winter of 1861 the slaveholders proposed a general convention of the people which was to vote for secession or non-secession, the majority of the people rejected any convention, in order to remove any pretext for the secession movement. Later, when Tennessee was already militarily overrun and subjected to a system of terror by the Southern Confederacy, more than a third of the voters at the elections still declared themselves for the Union. Here, as in most of the border states, the mountainous country, *east Tennessee*, forms the real centre of resistance to the slaveholders' party. On June 17, 1861, a General Convention of the people of east Tennessee assembled in Greeneville, declared itself for the Union, deputed the former governor of the state, Andrew Johnson, one of the most ardent Unionists, to the Senate in Washington and published a "declaration of grievances",^a which lays bare all the means of deception, intrigue and terror by which Tennessee was "voted out" of the Union.^b Since then the secessionists have held east Tennessee in check by force of arms.

Similar relationships to those in West Virginia and east Tennessee are found in the north of Alabama, in northwest Georgia and in the north of North Carolina.

Further west, in the border state of *Missouri*, with 1,173,317 inhabitants and 114,965 slaves—the latter mostly concentrated in the northwest of the state—the people's convention of August 1861 decided for the Union.^c Jackson, the governor of the state and the tool of the slaveholders' party, rebelled against the legislature of Missouri, was outlawed and took the lead of the armed hordes that fell upon Missouri from Texas, Arkansas and Tennessee, in order to bring it to its knees before the Confederacy and sever its bond with the Union by the sword. Next to Virginia, Missouri is at the present moment the main theatre of the Civil War.

^a Marx uses the English expression and gives the German equivalent.—*Ed.*

^b The resolutions of the Convention were reported by the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6308, July 4, 1861, in the item "The Knoxville (Tenn.) Whig..."—*Ed.*

^c The convention actually adopted this decision on March 9, 1861.—*Ed.*

New Mexico—not a state, but merely a Territory, into which 25 slaves were imported during Buchanan's presidency in order to send a slave constitution after them from Washington—had no craving for the South, as even the latter concedes. But the South has a craving for New Mexico and accordingly spewed an armed gang of adventurers from *Texas* over the border. New Mexico has implored the protection of the Union government against these liberators.

It will have been observed that we lay particular emphasis on the numerical proportion of slaves to free men in the individual border states. This proportion is in fact decisive. It is the thermometer with which the vital fire of the slave system must be measured. The soul of the whole secession movement is *South Carolina*. It has 402,541 slaves and 301,271 free men. *Mississippi*, which has given the Southern Confederacy its dictator, Jefferson Davis, comes second. It has 436,696 slaves and 354,699 free men. *Alabama* comes third, with 435,132 slaves and 529,164 free men.

The last of the contested border states, which we have still to mention, is *Kentucky*. Its recent history is particularly characteristic of the policy of the Southern Confederacy. Among its 1,135,713 inhabitants Kentucky has 225,490 slaves. In three successive general elections by the people—in the winter of 1861, when elections to a congress of the border states were held; in June 1861, when elections to the Congress in Washington took place; finally, in August 1861, in elections to the legislature of the State of Kentucky—an ever increasing majority decided for the Union. On the other hand, Magoffin, the Governor of Kentucky, and all the high officials of the state are fanatical supporters of the slaveholders' party, as is Breckinridge, Kentucky's representative in the Senate in Washington, Vice-President of the United States under Buchanan and candidate of the slaveholders' party in the presidential elections of 1860. Too weak to win over Kentucky for secession, the influence of the slaveholders' party was strong enough to make this state amenable to a declaration of neutrality on the outbreak of war. The Confederacy recognised the neutrality as long as it served its purposes, as long as the Confederacy itself was engaged in crushing the resistance in east Tennessee. Hardly was this end attained when it knocked at the gates of Kentucky with the butt of a gun to the cry of: "*The South needs its entire territory*. It will and must have it!"

From the southwest and southeast its corps of free-booters simultaneously invaded the "neutral" state. Kentucky awoke from its dream of neutrality, its legislature openly sided with the Union,

surrounded the traitorous Governor with a committee of public safety, called the people to arms, outlawed Breckinridge and ordered the secessionists to evacuate the invaded territory immediately. This was the signal for war. An army of the Southern Confederacy is moving on Louisville, while volunteers from Illinois, Indiana and Ohio flock hither to save Kentucky from the armed missionaries of slavery.

The attempts of the Confederacy to annex Missouri and Kentucky, for example, against the will of these states, prove the hollowness of the pretext that it is fighting for the rights of the individual states against the encroachments of the Union. On the individual states that it considers to belong to the "South" it confers, to be sure, the right to secede from the Union, but by no means the right to remain in the Union.

Even the slave states proper, however much external war, internal military dictatorship and slavery give them everywhere for the moment a semblance of harmony, are nevertheless not without oppositional elements. A striking example is *Texas*, with 180,388 slaves out of 601,039 inhabitants. The law of 1845,^a by virtue of which Texas became a State of the Union as a slave state, entitled it to form not merely one, but five states out of its territory. The South would thereby have gained ten new votes instead of two in the American Senate, and an increase in the number of its votes in the Senate was a major object of its policy at that time. From 1845 to 1860, however, the slaveholders found it impracticable to cut up Texas, where the German population plays an important part, into even two states without giving the party of free labour the upper hand over the party of slavery in the second state.⁶³ This furnishes the best proof of the strength of the opposition to the slaveholding oligarchy in Texas itself.

Georgia is the largest and most populous of the slave states. It has 462,230 slaves out of a total of 1,057,327 inhabitants, therefore nearly half the population. Nevertheless, the slaveholders' party has not so far succeeded in getting the Constitution imposed on the South at Montgomery^b sanctioned by a general vote of the people in Georgia.

In the State Convention of *Louisiana*, meeting on March 21, 1861, at New Orleans, Roselius, the political veteran of the state, declared:

^a *Joint Resolution for annexing Texas to the United States* [1845].—Ed.

^b *Constitution of the Confederate States of America* (*New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6206, March 16, 1861).—Ed.

"The Montgomery Constitution is not a constitution, but a conspiracy. It does not inaugurate a government of the people, but *an odious and unmitigated oligarchy*. The people were not permitted to have any say in this matter. The Convention at Montgomery has dug the grave of political liberty, and now we are called upon to attend its funeral."^a

Indeed, the oligarchy of three hundred thousand slaveholders utilised the Congress of Montgomery not only to proclaim the separation of the South from the North. It exploited it at the same time to reshape the internal constitutions of the slave states, to subjugate completely the section of the white population that had still preserved some independence under the protection and the democratic Constitution of the Union. Between 1856 and 1860 the political spokesmen, jurists, moralists and theologians of the slaveholders' party had already sought to prove, not so much that Negro slavery is justified, but rather that colour is a matter of indifference and the working class is everywhere born to slavery.

One sees, therefore, that the war of the Southern Confederacy is in the true sense of the word a war of conquest for the spread and perpetuation of slavery. The greater part of the border states and Territories are still in the possession of the Union, whose side they have taken first through the ballot-box and then with arms. The Confederacy, however, counts them for the "*South*" and seeks to conquer them from the Union. In the border states which the Confederacy has occupied for the time being, it is holding the relatively free highlands in check by martial law. Within the actual slave states themselves it is supplanting the hitherto existing democracy by the unrestricted oligarchy of the 300,000 slaveholders.

Were it to relinquish its plans of conquest, the Southern Confederacy would relinquish its capacity to live and the purpose of secession. Secession, indeed, only took place because within the Union the transformation of the border states and Territories into slave states seemed no longer attainable. On the other hand, were it to cede the contested territory peacefully to the Southern Confederacy, the North would surrender to the slave republic more than three-quarters of the entire territory of the United States. The North would lose the whole of the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Ocean, except the narrow strip from Penobscot Bay to Delaware Bay, and would even cut itself off from the Pacific Ocean. Missouri, Kansas, New Mexico, Arkansas and Texas would draw California after them.⁶⁴ Incapable of wresting the mouth of

^a Reported in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6217, March 29, 1861.—*Ed.*

the Mississippi from the hands of the strong, hostile slave republic in the South, the great agricultural states in the basin between the Rocky Mountains and the Alleghenies, in the valleys of the Mississippi, the Missouri and the Ohio, would be compelled by their economic interests to secede from the North and enter the Southern Confederacy. These northwestern states,⁶⁵ in their turn, would draw after them into the same whirlpool of secession all the Northern states lying further east, with perhaps the exception of the states of New England.⁶⁶

What would in fact take place would be not a dissolution of the Union, but a *reorganisation* of it, a *reorganisation on the basis of slavery*, under the recognised control of the slaveholding oligarchy. The plan of such a reorganisation has been openly proclaimed by the principal speakers of the South at the Congress of Montgomery and explains the paragraph of the new Constitution which leaves it open to every state of the old Union to join the new Confederacy. The slave system would infect the whole Union. In the Northern states, where Negro slavery is in practice impossible, the white working class would gradually be forced down to the level of helotry.⁶⁷ This would fully accord with the loudly proclaimed principle that only certain races are capable of freedom, and as the actual labour is the lot of the Negro in the South, so in the North it is the lot of the German and the Irishman, or their direct descendants.

The present struggle between the South and North is, therefore, nothing but a struggle between two social systems, the system of slavery and the system of free labour. The struggle has broken out because the two systems can no longer live peacefully side by side on the North American continent. It can only be ended by the victory of one system or the other.

If the border states, the disputed areas in which the two systems have hitherto contended for domination, are a thorn in the flesh of the South, there can, on the other hand, be no mistake that, in the course of the war up to now, they have constituted the chief weakness of the North. One section of the slaveholders in these districts simulated loyalty to the North at the bidding of the conspirators in the South; another section found that in fact it was in accordance with their real interests and traditional ideas to go with the Union. The two sections have equally crippled the North. Anxiety to keep the "loyal" slaveholders of the border states in good humour; fear of throwing them into the arms of secession, in a word, tender regard for the interests, prejudices and sensibilities of these ambiguous allies, has smitten the Union

government with incurable weakness since the beginning of the war, driven it to half measures, forced it to dissemble away the principle of the war, and to spare the foe's most vulnerable spot, the root of the evil—*slavery itself*.

When, only recently, Lincoln pusillanimously revoked^a Frémont's Missouri proclamation on the emancipation of Negroes belonging to the rebels,⁶⁸ this was done solely out of regard for the loud protest of the "loyal" slaveholders of Kentucky. However, a turning point has already been reached. With Kentucky, the last border state has been pushed into the series of battlefields between South and North. With the real war for the border states in the border states themselves, the question of winning or losing them is withdrawn from the sphere of diplomatic negotiations and parliamentary discussions. One section of slaveholders will throw off the mask of loyalty; the other will content itself with the prospect of a financial compensation such as Great Britain gave the West Indian planters.⁶⁹ Events themselves drive to the promulgation of the decisive slogan—*emancipation of the slaves*.

That even the most hardened Democrats and diplomats of the North feel themselves drawn to this point, is shown by some announcements of very recent date. In an open letter, General Cass, Secretary of State for War under Buchanan and hitherto one of the most ardent allies of the South, declared emancipation of the slaves the *conditio sine qua non* of the Union's salvation.^b In his last *Review* for October, Dr. *Brownson*, the spokesman of the Catholic party of the North, on his own admission the most energetic adversary of the emancipation movement from 1836 to 1860, publishes an article *for Abolition*.

"If we have opposed Abolition heretofore," he says among other things, "because we would preserve the Union, we must *a fortiori* now oppose slavery whenever, in our judgement, its continuance becomes incompatible with the maintenance of the Union, or of our nation as a free republican state."^c

Finally, the *World*, a New York organ of the diplomats of the Washington Cabinet, concludes one of its latest blustering articles against the Abolitionists with the words:

^a In a letter to Frémont of September 11, 1861, (*New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6380, September 15, 1861).—*Ed.*

^b Cass's statement was quoted in a leading article in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6381, September 16, 1861.—*Ed.*

^c Marx presumably quotes from the leading article in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6401, October 9, 1861, which contains this passage from the article in *Brownson's Quarterly Review*.—*Ed.*

“On the day when it shall be decided that either slavery or the Union must go down, on that day sentence of death is passed on slavery. If the North cannot triumph *without* emancipation, it will triumph *with* emancipation.”

Written about October 20, 1861

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in *Die Presse*, No. 306,
November 7, 1861

Karl Marx
THE CRISIS IN ENGLAND⁷⁰

Today, as fifteen years ago, England faces a catastrophe that threatens to strike at the root of her entire economic system. As is known, the *potato* formed the exclusive food of Ireland and a not inconsiderable section of the English working people when the potato blight of 1845 and 1846 struck the root of Irish life with decay. The results of this great catastrophe are known. The Irish population declined by two million, of whom one part died of starvation and the other fled across the Atlantic Ocean. At the same time, this dreadful misfortune helped the English Free Trade party to triumph; the English landed aristocracy was compelled to sacrifice one of its most lucrative monopolies, and the abolition of the Corn Laws^a assured a broader and sounder basis for the reproduction and maintenance of the working millions.

What the *potato* was to Irish agriculture, *cotton* is to the dominant branch of Great Britain's industry. On its manufacture depends the subsistence of a mass of people greater than the total number of inhabitants of Scotland and than two-thirds of the present number of inhabitants of Ireland. For according to the census of 1861, the population of Scotland consisted of 3,061,117 persons, that of Ireland now only 5,764,543,^b whilst more than four millions in England and Scotland live directly or indirectly by the cotton industry. Now the cotton plant is not, indeed, diseased. Just as little is its production the monopoly of a few regions of the earth. On the contrary, no other plant that yields clothing material

^a "An Act to Amend the Laws Relating to the Importation of Corn" [1846].—*Ed.*

^b *Population of the United Kingdom according to the Census of 1861* (*The Times*, No. 23992, July 23, 1861).—*Ed.*

thrives in equally extensive areas of America, Asia and Africa. The cotton monopoly of the slave states of the American Union is not a natural, but an historical monopoly. It grew and developed simultaneously with the monopoly of the English cotton industry on the world market. In the year 1793, shortly after the time of the great mechanical inventions in England, a Quaker⁷¹ of Connecticut, Ely Whitney, invented the cotton gin,^a a machine for cleaning cotton, which separates the cotton fibre from the cotton seed. Prior to this invention, a day of a Negro's most intensive labour barely sufficed to separate a pound of cotton fibre from the cotton seed. After the invention of the cotton gin, an old Negrowoman could comfortably supply fifty pounds of cotton daily, and gradual improvements have subsequently doubled the efficiency of the machine. The fetters on the cultivation of cotton in the United States were now burst asunder. Hand in hand with the English cotton industry, it grew swiftly to a great commercial power. Now and then in the course of development, England seemed to take fright at the monopoly of American cotton, as at a spectre that threatened danger. Such a moment occurred, for example, at the time when the emancipation of the Negroes in the English colonies was purchased for £20,000,000.⁷² It was a matter for misgiving that the industry in Lancashire and Yorkshire should rest on the sovereignty of the slave-whip in Georgia and Alabama, whilst the English nation imposed on itself so great a sacrifice to abolish slavery in its own colonies. Philanthropy, however, does not make history, least of all commercial history. Similar doubts arose as often as a cotton crop failure occurred in the United States and as, in addition, such a natural phenomenon was exploited by the slaveholders to artificially raise the price of cotton still higher through combination. The English cotton spinners and weavers then threatened rebellion against "King Cotton". Manifold projects for procuring cotton from Asiatic and African sources came to light. This was the case, for example, in 1850.^b However, the following good crop in the United States triumphantly dispelled such yearnings for emancipation. Indeed, in the last few years the American cotton monopoly attained dimensions scarcely dreamt of before, partly in consequence of the free trade legislation, which repealed the hitherto existing differential tariff on the cotton grown by slaves; partly in

^a Marx uses the English term.—*Ed.*

^b This may refer to articles on cotton cultivation published in *The Economist*, Nos. 370, 371 and 372, September 28, October 5 and 12, 1850.—*Ed.*

consequence of the simultaneous giant strides made by the English cotton industry and American cotton cultivation during the last decade. In the year 1857 the consumption of cotton in England already amounted to nearly 1,500 million pounds.

Now, all of a sudden, the American Civil War menaces this great pillar of English industry. Whilst the Union blockades the harbours of the Southern states, in order to cut off the secessionists' chief source of income by preventing the export of their cotton crop of this year, the Confederacy lends compelling force to this blockade with the decision not to export a bale of cotton of its own accord, but rather to compel England to come and fetch her cotton from the Southern harbours herself. England is to be driven to the point of forcibly breaking through the blockade, of then declaring war on the Union and so of throwing her sword into the scale of the slave states.

From the beginning of the American Civil War the price of cotton in England rose continuously; for a considerable time, however, to a less degree than was to be expected. On the whole, the English commercial world appeared to look down very phlegmatically on the American crisis. The cause of this cold-blooded way of viewing things was unmistakable. The whole of the last American crop was long ago in Europe. The yield of a new crop is never shipped before the end of November, and this shipment seldom attains considerable dimensions before the end of December. Till then, therefore, it remained pretty much a matter of indifference whether the cotton bales were held back on the plantations or forwarded to the harbours of the South immediately after their packing. Should the blockade cease at any time before the end of the year, England could safely count on receiving her customary cotton imports in March or April, quite as if the blockade had never taken place. The English commercial world, in large measure misled by the English press, succumbed, however, to the delusion that a spectacle of about six months' war would end with recognition of the Confederacy by the United States. But at the end of August, North Americans appeared in the market of Liverpool to buy cotton, partly for speculation in Europe, partly for reshipment to North America. This unheard-of event opened the eyes of the English. They began to understand the seriousness of the situation. The Liverpool cotton market has since been in a state of feverish excitement; the prices of cotton were soon driven 100 per cent above their average level; the speculation in cotton assumed the same wild features that characterised the speculation in railways in 1845.⁷³ The spinning

and weaving mills in Lancashire and other seats of the British cotton industry limited their labour time to three days a week; a number of mills stopped their machines altogether; the disastrous reaction on other branches of industry was not wanting, and at this moment all England trembles at the approach of the greatest economic catastrophe that has yet threatened her.

The consumption of *Indian* cotton is naturally increasing, and the rising prices will ensure further increase of importation from the ancient home of cotton. Nevertheless, it remains impossible radically to change the conditions of production and the course of trade at, so to speak, a few months' notice. England is, in fact, now expiating her long mismanagement of India. Her present spasmodic attempts to replace American cotton by Indian encounter two great obstacles: the lack of means of communication and transport in India, and the miserable condition of the Indian peasant, which prevents him from taking advantage of the momentarily favourable circumstances. But, apart from this, apart from the process of improvement that Indian cotton has still to go through to be able to take the place of American, even under the most favourable circumstances it will be *years* before India can produce for export the requisite quantity of cotton. It is statistically established, however, that in *four months* the stocks of cotton in Liverpool will be exhausted. They will hold out even as long as this only if the limitation of the labour time to three days a week and the complete stoppage of a part of the machinery is effected by the British cotton spinners and weavers to a still greater extent than hitherto. Such a procedure is already exposing the factory districts to the greatest social sufferings. But if the American blockade continues over January! What then?

Written about November 1, 1861

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in *Die Presse* No. 305,
November 6, 1861

Karl Marx
BRITISH COMMERCE

London, Nov. 2, 1861

The English Board of Trade Returns for the nine months ending Sept. 30, 1861, show in exports a large diminution, and in imports a still larger increase. A comparison between the export lists of the last three years gives the following general result:

Value of Exports for the nine months ending Sept. 30.

1859	£98,037,311
1860	101,724,346
1861	93,795,332 ^a

Consequently the exports of this year, if compared to the corresponding period of 1860, have decreased by £7,929,014; of which total decrease the by far larger portion, viz.: £5,671,730, is accounted for by the sudden contraction of the American trade. The rates in which the general loss derived from this source has affected the different branches of British industry may be seen from the annexed table:

Value of Exports to the United States in the nine months ending Sept. 30.

	1859. £	1860. £	1861. £
Beer and ale	78,060	76,843	25,642
Coals and culm	144,556	156,665	200,244
Cottons	2,753,782	2,776,472	1,130,973
Earthenware and porcelain	448,661	518,778	191,606

^a Here and below the tables are quoted from "The Board of Trade Returns", *The Economist*, No. 949, November 2, 1861.—*Ed.*

Haberdashery and millinery	1,204,085	1,083,438	542,312
Linens	1,486,276	1,337,778	493,654
Hardwares and cutlery	865,066	776,772	446,095
Metals—Iron—Pig	205,947	165,052	79,086
Bar, bolt, and rod	642,822	546,493	148,587
Railway of all kinds	744,505	665,619	168,657
Cast	16,489	17,056	9,239
Wrought of all kinds	357,162	378,842	125,752
Steel, unwrought	372,465	457,490	216,246
Copper, sheets and nails	99,422	44,971	10,005
Lead, pig	53,451	66,015	1,451
Tin plates	935,692	833,644	274,488
Oil Seed	122,570	72,915	1,680
Salt	63,876	84,818	59,809
Silk stuffs, handkerchiefs, and ribbons	197,605	102,393	88,360
Other silk articles	129,557	93,227	22,984
Soda	439,584	399,153	142,311
Spirits, (British)	53,173	56,423	12,430
Woolens—Cloths of all kinds	586,701	535,130	250,023
Mixed stuffs, flannels, blankets, etc.	1,732,224	1,612,284	652,399
Worsted Stuffs	1,052,053	840,507	377,597
<hr/> Total	<hr/> 15,785,784	<hr/> 13,698,778 ⁷⁴	<hr/> 5,671,730

Beyond the diminution due to the decrease of the American trade, the general exports show, moreover, a decline of £2,257,284. The greater part of this loss was incurred during the month of September, when the high price of cotton, and the consequent rise in cotton manufactures and yarns, had begun to powerfully react on the markets of British North America,^a East India, and Australia. During the whole period of nine months ended September, 1861, Turkey and Germany were, next to the United States, the countries foremost in restraining their absorption of British merchandise. The export trade to France has not grown in any observable degree, the only striking instance of increase being limited to an agricultural article, viz., sheeps' and lambs' wool. During the first nine months of 1860, England exported to France 4,735,150 pounds of wool, worth £354,047.^b

^a Canada.—Ed.

^b The figures here and below are quoted from the *Accounts relating to Trade and Navigation for the Nine Months ended September 30, 1861* (*The Economist*, No. 949, November 2, 1861).—Ed.

During the corresponding period of this year, that export has risen to 8,716,082 pounds, valued at £642,468. The only other remarkable feature in the export returns refers to Italy. British exports to the new kingdom are evidently enlarging, which fact will go a great length in accounting for English sympathies with Italian liberty.⁷⁵ Thus, for instance, the export of British cottons to Sardinia, Tuscany, Naples, and Sicily, has increased from £756,892 in 1860, to £1,204,287 in 1861; the export of cotton yarns from £348,158 in 1860 to £538,373 in 1861; the export of irons from £120,867 in 1860, to £160,912 in 1861.

The import tables extend only to the first *eight months* of the current year. Their general result is shown by the subsequent figures:

Real Value of Imports.

1859	£	88,993,762
1860		106,894,278
1861		114,588,107

The principal part of that increase of imports is due to a large addition in the purchase of foreign wheat, which, from £6,796,131 in the first eight months of 1860, had risen to £13,431,487 in the corresponding period of 1861. As to raw cotton, the quantity imported had, during the period referred to, only slightly fallen off, while the price of the article had largely increased, as will be seen from the annexed figures:

Quantity of Cotton imported (during the first eight months).

	Cwts. ^a	Value.
1859	8,023,082	£24,039,197
1860	10,616,347	28,940,676
1861	9,616,087	30,809,279

There exist no general politics at the present moment in England. Everything and everybody are absorbed in the industrial question and the American crisis. I called your attention in a former letter to the feverish state of the Liverpool cotton market.^b For the last two weeks it has exhibited, in fact, all the symptoms of the railway mania in 1845.⁷⁶ Surgeons, dentists, physicians, barristers, cooks, workingmen, clerks and lords, comedians and parsons, soldiers and sailors, newspaper writers and boarding-

^a The figures in this column are given for the period of nine months.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 17-20.—*Ed.*

school mistresses, males and females, all were speculating in cotton. Many of the lots purchased, sold and resold amounted to only one, two, three, or four bales. More considerable quantities remained in the same warehouses, although changing their proprietors twenty times. One who had purchased cotton at 10 o'clock offered it for sale at 11 o'clock, and realized a profit of $\frac{1}{2}$ d. on one pound. Many lots circulated in this way through several hands in 12 hours. This week, however, a sort of reaction has taken place, due to the single circumstance that a shilling is a round number, being composed of 12d., and that most people had resolved upon selling out so soon as the price of the pound of cotton should have been pushed to one shilling; consequently, there set in suddenly a great increase in the offers of cotton, and hence a reaction in its price. This, however, can be only transitory.

The British mind once become familiar with the idea that a pound of cotton may cost 15d., the temporary barrier to speculation will break down, and the speculating mania reappear with redoubled fury. There is one thing favorable to the United States in this movement. It is hostile to the breaking-of-blockade party. Already there have been published protests on the part of the speculators, in which it is reasonably said that any warlike movement by the British Government would be an act of direct injustice to those merchants who, on the faith of the British Government's adherence to its recognized and avowed principle of non-interference, had made their calculations, speculated at home, sent out their orders abroad and purchased cotton on an estimate of the price which it would reach under the operation of natural, probable and foreseeable courses.

This day's *Economist* publishes a very foolish article, in which, from statistics given as to the population and the area of the United States, he arrives at the conclusion that there would be room enough for the establishment of at least seven vast empires, and that, consequently, "the dream of universal dominion" ought to be banished from the hearts of the Unionists.^a The only rational inference which *The Economist* might have drawn from its own statistical statements, viz., that the Northerners, even if they liked to do so, could not desist from their claims without sacrificing to Slavery the vast States and Territories "in which Slavery still lingers, but cannot maintain itself as a permanent institution"—this only rational conclusion he successfully contrives not even to touch upon.

^a "Motives of the Federalists in Coercing the Secessionists", *The Economist*, No. 949, November 2, 1861.—Ed.

Apart from its own commercial difficulties, England is simultaneously bothered by the critical state of the French finances. The maneuvers of the Bank of France to stay the bullion drain to England by accommodation bills, obtained from the Rothschilds and other great firms, have, as was to be foreseen, resulted in a but temporary mitigation of her embarrassments. She has now successively applied for succor to the banks at Berlin, Hamburg, and St. Petersburg; but all these tentatives, instead of procuring relief, have only betrayed despair. The straits to which the French Government is actually put appear from two measures recurred to in the course of a fortnight. The interest on the Treasury bills, in order to keep them afloat, had to be raised to $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, while Victor Emmanuel was commanded to partially postpone the instalments of the new Italian loan, of which French capitalists hold a very large amount. He, of course, acceded to the application of his patron.

In the Tuileries there are now two opposite influences, proposing two opposite nostrums for the temporary cure of the financial disease. The real Bonapartists, Persigny, and the *Crédit Mobilier*,⁷⁷ cherish a project by which to subject the Bank of France to the direct and complete control of the Government, to convert her into a mere dependency on the Treasury, and to use the power thus obtained for the unrestricted emission of inconvertible State paper money. The other party, represented by Fould, and other renegades of former regimes, propose a new loan, whose amount is variously estimated by the most modest at £16,000,000, by the more daring at £30,000,000.

Written on November 2, 1861

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6440, November 23, 1861

Karl Marx
ECONOMIC NOTES⁷⁸

London, November 3

At the present moment general politics are non-existent in England. The interest of the country is absorbed in the French financial, commercial and agricultural crisis, the British industrial crisis, the dearth of cotton and the American question.

Competent circles here are not for a moment deceived concerning the Bank of France's bill-jobbing with a few big houses on both sides of the Channel being a palliative of the weakest sort.^a All that could be achieved and has been achieved thereby was a *momentary* abatement of the drain of gold to England. The repeated attempts of the Bank of France to raise metallic auxiliary troops in Petersburg, Hamburg and Berlin damage its credit, without filling its coffers. The raising of the rate of interest on treasury bills, in order to keep them in currency, and the necessity of securing a remission of the payments for the new Italian loan from Victor Emmanuel—both are held here to be serious symptoms of French financial sickness. It is known, moreover, that at the present moment two projects contend in the Tuileries for precedence. The full-blooded Bonapartists, with Persigny and Péreire (of the Crédit Mobilier)^b at their head, want to make the Bank of France completely subject to governmental authority, to reduce it to a mere office of the Finance Ministry, and to use the institution, thus transformed, as an assignat factory.

It is known that this principle was originally at the bottom of the organisation of the Crédit Mobilier. The less adventurous party,

^a See this volume, p. 61.—*Ed.*

^b The Crédit Mobilier bank was founded by the brothers Émile and Isaac Péreire. Marx presumably means the latter.—*Ed.*

represented by Fould and other renegades of Louis Philippe's time, proposes a *new national loan*, which is to amount to 400 million francs, according to some; to 700 million, according to others. *The Times*, in a leading article today, probably reflects the view of the City⁷⁹ when it states that France is completely paralysed by her economic crisis and robbed of her European influence.^a Nevertheless, *The Times* and the City are wrong. Should the December power⁸⁰ succeed in outlasting the winter without great internal storms, it will then blow the war trumpet in the spring. The internal distress will not thereby be remedied, but its voice will be drowned.

In an earlier letter^b I pointed out that the cotton swindle in Liverpool during the last few weeks fully reminds one of the maddest days of the railway mania of 1845. Dentists, surgeons, barristers, cooks, widows, workers, clerks and lords, comedians and clergymen, soldiers and tailors, journalists and persons letting apartments, man and wife, all speculated in cotton. Quite small quantities of from 1 to 4 bales were bought, sold and sold again. More considerable quantities lay for months in the same warehouse, although they changed owners twenty times. Whoever had bought cotton at 10 o'clock, sold it again at 11 o'clock with an addition of a halfpenny a pound. Thus the same cotton often circulated from hand to hand six times in ten hours. This week, however, there came a lull, and for no more rational reason than that a pound of cotton (namely, middling Orleans cotton) had risen to a shilling, that 12 pence make a shilling and are therefore a round figure. So everyone had purposed selling out, as soon as this maximum was reached. Hence sudden increase of the supply, and consequent reaction. As soon as the English make themselves conversant with the possibility that a pound of cotton can rise *above* a shilling, the St. Vitus's dance will return more madly than ever.

The last official monthly report of the *Board of Trade*^c on British exports and imports^d has by no means dispelled the gloomy feeling. The *export tables* cover the nine months' period from January to September 1861. In comparison with the same period of 1860, they show a falling-off of about £8,000,000. Of this,

^a "To those who concern themselves with French politics...", *The Times*, No. 24080, November 2, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 53-56.—*Ed.*

^c Marx uses the English name.—*Ed.*

^d *Accounts relating to Trade and Navigation for the Nine Months ended September 30, 1861* (*The Economist*, No. 949, November 2, 1861, Supplement).—*Ed.*

£5,671,730 fall to exports to the United States alone, whilst the remainder is distributed over British North America,^a the East Indies, Australia, Turkey and Germany. Only in Italy is an increase shown. Thus, for example, the export of British cotton commodities to Sardinia, Tuscany, Naples and Sicily has risen from £756,892 for the year 1860 to £1,204,287 for the year 1861; the export of British cotton yarn from £348,158 to £538,373; the export of iron from £120,867 to £160,912, etc. These figures are not without weight in the scale of British sympathy for Italian freedom.⁸¹

Whilst the export trade of Great Britain has thus declined by nearly £8,000,000 her *import trade* has risen in still higher proportion, a circumstance that by no means facilitates the adjustment of the balance. This rise in imports stems, in particular, from the increase in wheat imports. Whereas for the first *eight* months of 1860 the value of the wheat imported amounted to only £6,796,131, for the same period of the present year it totals £13,431,487.

The most remarkable phenomenon revealed by the *import tables* is the rapid increase of *French imports* which have now attained a volume of nearly £18,000,000 (yearly), whilst English exports to France are not much bigger than, perhaps, those to Holland. Continental politicians have hitherto overlooked this entirely new phenomenon of modern commercial history. It proves that the economic dependence of France on England is, perhaps, six times as great as the economic dependence of England on France, if, that is, one not only considers the English export and import tables, but also compares them with the French export and import tables. It then follows that England has now become the principal export market for France, whereas France has remained a quite secondary export market for England. Hence, despite all chauvinism and all Waterloo⁸² rodomontade, the nervous dread of a conflict with "perfidious Albion".⁸³

Finally, one more important fact emerges from the latest English export and import tables. Whilst in the first *nine* months of this year English exports to the *United States* declined by more than 65 per cent^b in comparison with the same period of 1860, the port of New York alone has *increased* its exports to England by

^a Canada.—*Ed.*

^b The original mistakenly says 25 per cent. Marx took the figure from *The Economist*, No. 949, November 2, 1861, where an error had been made in the calculation.—*Ed.*

£6,000,000 during the first *eight* months of the present year. During this period the export of American gold to England had almost ceased, while now, on the contrary, gold has been flowing for weeks from England to New York. It is in fact England and France whose crop failures cover the North American deficit, while the Morrill tariff⁸⁴ and the economy inseparable from a civil war have simultaneously decimated the consumption of English and French manufactures in North America. And now one may compare these statistical facts with the jeremiads of *The Times* on the financial ruin of North America!

Written on November 3, 1861

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in *Die Presse*, No. 308,
November 9, 1861

Karl Marx
INTERVENTION IN MEXICO⁸⁵

London, November 7

The Times of today has a leading article^a in its well-known, confusedly kaleidoscopic, affectedly humorous style, on the French government's invasion of Dappenthal and on Switzerland's protest against this violation of territory.⁸⁶ The oracle of Printing House Square⁸⁷ recalls how, at the time of most acute struggle between English manufacturers and landowners, little children employed in the factories were led to throw needles into the most delicate parts of the machinery to upset the motion of the whole powerful automaton. The machinery is Europe, the little child is Switzerland and the needle that *she* throws into the smoothly running automaton is—*Louis Bonaparte's* invasion of her territory or, rather, her outcry at his invasion. Thus the needle is suddenly transformed into the outcry at the needle's prick and the metaphor into a piece of buffoonery at the expense of the reader who expects a metaphor. *The Times* is further enlivened by its own discovery that Dappenthal consists of a single village called Cressonnières. It ends its short article with a complete contradiction of its beginning. Why, it exclaims, make so much ado about this infinitely small Swiss bagatelle, when every quarter of Europe will be ablaze next spring? One may not forget that, shortly before, Europe was a well regulated automaton. The whole article appears sheer nonsense and yet it has its sense. It is a declaration that Palmerston has given *carte blanche* in the Swiss incident to his ally on the other side of the Channel. The explanation of this

^a "Some of our middle-aged readers may recollect the time...", *The Times*, No. 24083, November 6, 1861.—*Ed.*

declaration is found in the dry notice in the *Moniteur*^a that on October 31 England, France and Spain concluded a convention on joint *intervention in Mexico*.⁸⁸ The article of *The Times* on Dappenthal and the note of the *Moniteur* on Mexico stand as close together as the Canton of Waadt and Vera Cruz lie far apart.

It is credible that Louis Bonaparte counted on intervention in Mexico among the many possibilities which he continually has ready to divert the French people. Surely Spain, whose cheap successes in Morocco and St. Domingo⁸⁹ have gone to her head, dreams of a Restoration in Mexico. But it is certain that France's project had not yet matured and that both France and Spain were opposed to a crusade against Mexico under *English* command.

On September 24, Palmerston's private *Moniteur*, the *Morning Post*, announced the details of an agreement that England, France and Spain had reached for joint intervention in Mexico.^b The following day the *Patrie* denied the existence of any such agreement. On September 27 *The Times* refuted the *Patrie*, without naming it. According to *The Times'* article, Lord Russell had *communicated* the English decision on intervention to the French government, whereupon M. Thouvenel had answered that the Emperor of the French had arrived at a like conclusion. It was now the turn of Spain. In a semi-official organ the Spanish government declared that it purposed an intervention in Mexico, but by no means an intervention alongside of England. It rained *dementis*. *The Times* had categorically announced that "the full assent of the American President had been given to the planned expedition". Hardly had the report reached the other side of the Atlantic Ocean when all the organs of the American government branded it as a lie, since President Lincoln was going with and not against Mexico. From all this it follows that the plan of intervention in its present form originated in the Cabinet of St. James.⁹⁰

No less puzzling and contradictory than the statements concerning the origin of the convention were the statements concerning its points at issue. One organ of Palmerston, the *Morning Post*, announced that Mexico was not an organised state, with an established government, but a mere robbers' nest. It was to be treated as such. The expedition had only one object—the satisfaction of the Mexican state's creditors in England, France and

^a "Bulletin", *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 309, November 5, 1861.—Ed.

^b Here and below Marx draws on the press review published in *The Free Press*, No. 10, October 2, 1861 ("The Projected Intervention in Mexico").—Ed.

Spain. To this end the combined forces would occupy the principal ports of Mexico, collect the import and export duties on her coast and hold this "material guarantee"^a till all debt claims were satisfied.

The other organ of Palmerston, *The Times*, declared, on the contrary, that England was "steeled against plunderings on the part of bankrupt Mexico by long experience". It was not a question of the private interests of the creditors, but "they hope that the mere presence of a combined squadron in the Gulf of Mexico and the seizure of certain ports, will urge the Mexican government to *new* exertions in keeping the internal peace, and will compel the malcontents to confine themselves to some form of opposition more constitutional than brigandage".

According to this, the expedition would therefore take place to support the official government of Mexico. At the same time, however, *The Times* intimates that "the City of Mexico was sufficiently healthy, should it be necessary to penetrate so far".

The most original means of consolidating a government indisputably consists in the sequestration of its revenues and its territories by force. On the other hand, mere occupation of the ports and collection of the duties in them can only cause the Mexican government to set up a more inland-lying line of custom houses. Import duties on foreign commodities, export duties on American commodities would in this way be doubled; the intervention would in fact satisfy the claims of European creditors by extortions from European-Mexican trade. The Mexican government can become solvent only by internal consolidation, but it can consolidate itself at home only so long as its independence is respected abroad.

If the expedition's ostensible ends are so contradictory, then the ostensible means to these ostensible ends are still more contradictory. The English government organs themselves admit that if one thing or another would be attainable by a unilateral intervention of France or England or Spain, everything becomes unattainable by a *joint* intervention of these states.

One may recall that the Liberal Party in Mexico under Juárez, the official President of the republic, has now the upper hand at almost all points; that the Catholic Party under General Márquez has suffered defeat after defeat, and that the robber band organised by it has been driven back to the sierras of Queretaro and is dependent on an alliance with Mejía, the Indian chief there. The last hope of the Catholic Party was *Spanish* intervention.

^a The phrase occurs in an item published in the column "Great Britain" in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6462, December 19, 1861.—Ed.

"The only point," says *The Times*, "on which there may possibly be a difference between ourselves and our allies, regards the *government of the republic*. England will be content to see it remain in the hands of the Liberal Party, while France and Spain are suspected of a partiality for the ecclesiastical rule which has recently been overthrown. It would be strange, if France were, in both the old and the new world, to make herself the protector of priests and bandits. Just as in Italy the partisans of Francis II at Rome are being equipped for their work of making Naples ungovernable, so in Mexico the highways, indeed, the streets of the capital, are infested with robbers, whom the church party openly declares to be its friends."

And just for this reason England strengthens the Liberal government; in undertaking a crusade against it with France and Spain she seeks to suppress anarchy by supplying the clerical party lying at its last gasp with fresh allied troops from Europe!

Save during the short winter months the coasts of Mexico, pestilential as they are, can only be held by conquest of the country itself. But a third English government organ, *The Economist*, declares the conquest of Mexico to be impossible.

"If it is desired," says this paper, "to thrust upon her a British prince with an English army, then the fiercest wrath of the United States is excited. France's jealousy would make such a conquest impossible, and a motion to this effect would be rejected almost unanimously by an English parliament the moment it was submitted to it. England, for her part, cannot entrust the government of Mexico to France. Of Spain there can be no question whatever."^a

The whole expedition is therefore a mystification, the key to which the *Patrie* gives in these words:

"The convention recognises the necessity of installing in Mexico a strong government that can maintain tranquillity and order there."^b

The question is simply one of applying to the states of America through a new Holy Alliance the principle according to which the Holy Alliance held itself called on to interfere in the internal governmental affairs of the countries of Europe.⁹¹ The first plan of this sort was drawn up by Chateaubriand for the Bourbons of Spain and France at the time of the Restoration.⁹² It was frustrated by *Canning* and *Monroe*, the President of the United States, who declared any European interference in the internal affairs of American states to be forbidden. Since then the American Union has constantly asserted the Monroe Doctrine⁹³ as an international law. The present Civil War, however, created the right situation for securing to the European monarchies an

^a "The Case of Mexico", *The Economist*, No. 947, October 19, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b Marx presumably quotes this passage (*La Patrie*, October 29, 1861) from a reprint in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6434, November 16, 1861.—*Ed.*

intervention precedent on which they can build later. That is the real object of the English-French-Spanish intervention. Its immediate result can only be and is only intended to be the *restoration* of the anarchy just dying out in Mexico.

Apart from all standpoints of international law in general, the affair has the great significance for Europe that by concessions in the domain of Continental politics England has purchased the support of Louis Bonaparte in the Mexican expedition.

Written on November 6-7, 1861

First published in *Die Presse*, No. 311,
November 12, 1861

Printed according to the news-
paper

Karl Marx
THE INTERVENTION IN MEXICO

London, Nov. 8, 1861

The contemplated intervention in Mexico by England, France, and Spain, is, in my opinion, one of the most monstrous enterprises ever chronicled in the annals of international history. It is a contrivance of the true Palmerston make, astounding the uninitiated by an insanity of purpose and an imbecility of the means employed which appear quite incompatible with the known capacity of the old schemer.

It is probable that, among the many irons which, to amuse the French public, Louis Bonaparte is compelled to always keep in the fire, a Mexican Expedition may have figured. It is sure that Spain, whose never overstrong head has been quite turned by her recent cheap successes in Morocco and St. Domingo, dreams of a restoration in Mexico. But, nevertheless, it is certain that the French plan was far from being matured, and that both France and Spain strove hard against a joint expedition to Mexico under English leadership.

On Sept. 24, Palmerston's private *Moniteur*, *The London Morning Post*, first announced in detail the scheme for the joint intervention, according to the terms of a treaty just concluded, as it said, between England, France, and Spain.^a This statement had hardly crossed the Channel, when the French Government, through the columns of the Paris *Patrie*, gave it the lie direct. On Sept. 27, *The London Times*, Palmerston's national organ, first broke its silence

^a Here and below Marx makes use of the press review from the article "The Projected Intervention in Mexico", *The Free Press*, No. 10, October 2, 1861.—Ed.

on the scheme in a leader contradicting, but not quoting, the *Patrie*. *The Times* even stated that Earl Russell had communicated to the French Government the resolution arrived at on the part of England of interfering in Mexico, and that M. de Thouvenel replied that the Emperor of the French had come to a similar conclusion. Now it was the turn of Spain. A semi-official paper of Madrid, while affirming Spain's intention to meddle with Mexico, repudiated at the same time the idea of a joint intervention with England. The *dementis* were not yet exhausted. *The Times* had categorically asserted that "the full assent of the American President had been given to the Expedition." All the American papers taking notice of *The Times* article, have long since contradicted its assertion.

It is, therefore, certain, and has even been expressly admitted by *The Times*, that the joint intervention in its present form is of English—i.e., Palmerstonian—make. Spain was cowed into adherence by the pressure of France; and France was brought round by concessions made to her in the field of European policy. In this respect, it is a significant coincidence that *The Times* of November 6, in the very number in which it announces the conclusion at London of a convention for the joint interference in Mexico,^a simultaneously publishes a leader, pooh-poohing and treating with exquisite contumely the protest of Switzerland against the recent invasion of her territory—viz., the Dappenthal—by a French military force.^b In return for his fellowship in the Mexican expedition, Louis Bonaparte has obtained *carte blanche* for his contemplated encroachments on Switzerland and, perhaps, on other parts of the European continent. The transactions on these points between England and France have lasted throughout the whole of the months of September and October.

There exist in England no people desirous of an intervention in Mexico save the Mexican bondholders, who, however, had never to boast the least sway over the national mind. Hence the difficulty of breaking to the public the Palmerstonian scheme. The next best means was to bewilder the British elephant by contradictory statements, proceeding from the same laboratory, compounded of the same materials, but varying in the doses administered to the animal.

^a "Paris, Tuesday, Nov. 5, 7 A.M.", *The Times*, No. 24083, November 6, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b "Some of our middle-aged readers may recollect the time...", *The Times*, No. 24083, November 6, 1861.—*Ed.*

The Morning Post, in its print of September 24, announced that there would be "no territorial war on Mexico," that the only point at issue was the monetary claims on the Mexican exchequer; that "it would be impossible to deal with Mexico as an organized and established Government," and that, consequently, "the principal Mexican ports would be temporarily occupied and their customs revenues sequestered."^a

The Times of September 27 declared, on the contrary, that "to dishonesty, to repudiation, to the legal and irremediable plunder of our countrymen by the default of a bankrupt community, we were steeled by long endurance," and that, consequently, "the private robbery of the English bondholders" lay not, as *The Post* had it,^b at the bottom of the intervention. While remarking, *en passant*, that "the City of Mexico was sufficiently healthy, should it be necessary to penetrate so far," *The Times* hoped, however, that "the mere presence of a combined squadron in the Gulf, and the seizure of certain ports, will urge the Mexican Government to *new* exertions in keeping the peace, and will convince the malcontents that they must confine themselves to some form of opposition more constitutional than brigandage."

If, then, according to *The Post*, the expedition was to start because there "exists no Government in Mexico," it was, according to *The Times*, only intended as encouraging and supporting the *existing* Mexican Government. To be sure! The oddest means ever hit upon for the consolidation of a Government consists in the seizure of its territory and the sequestration of its revenue.

The Times and *The Morning Post* having once given out the cue, John Bull was then handed over to the minor ministerial oracles, systematically belaboring him in the same contradictory style for four weeks, until public opinion had at last become sufficiently trained to the idea of a joint intervention in Mexico, although kept in deliberate ignorance of the aim and purpose of that intervention. At last, the transactions with France had drawn to an end; the *Moniteur* announced that the convention between the three interfering powers had been concluded on October 31;^c and the *Journal des Débats*, one of whose coproprietors is appointed to the command of one of the vessels of the French squadron, informed the world that no permanent territorial conquest was intended;

^a Here and below Marx draws on the press review given in the article "The Projected Intervention in Mexico", *The Free Press*, No. 10, October 2, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b *The Morning Post*.—*Ed.*

^c "Bulletin", *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 309, November 5, 1861.—*Ed.*

that Vera Cruz and other points on the coast were to be seized, an advance to the capital being agreed upon in case of non-compliance by the constituted authorities in Mexico with the demands of the intervention; that, moreover, a strong government was to be imported into the Republic.^a

The Times, which ever since its first announcement on September 27,^b seemed to have forgotten the very existence of Mexico, had now again to step forward. Everybody ignorant of its connection with Palmerston, and the original introduction in its columns of his scheme, would be induced to consider the to-day's leader of *The Times* as the most cutting and merciless satire on the whole adventure. It sets out by stating that "the expedition is a *very remarkable one*" [later on it says *a curious one*].

"Three States are combining to coerce a fourth into good behavior, *not so much by way of war as by authoritative interference in behalf of order.*"^c

Authoritative interference in behalf of order! This is literally the Holy Alliance⁹⁴ slang, and sounds very *remarkable* indeed on the part of England, glorying in the non-intervention principle! And why is "the way of war, and of declaration of war, and all other behests of international law," supplanted by "an authoritative interference in behalf of order?" Because, says *The Times*, there "exists no Government in Mexico." And what is the professed aim of the expedition? "To address demands to the constituted authorities at Mexico."

The only grievances complained of by the intervening Powers, the only causes which might give to their hostile procedure the slightest shade of justification, are easily to be summed up. They are the monetary claims of the bondholders and a series of personal outrages said to have been committed upon subjects of England, France and Spain. These were also the reasons of the intervention as originally put forth by *The Morning Post*, and as some time ago officially indorsed by Lord John Russell in an interview with some representatives of the Mexican bondholders in England. The to-day's *Times* states:

"England, France, and Spain have concerted an expedition to bring Mexico to the *performance of her specific engagements*, and to *give protection to the subjects of the respective crowns.*"

^a "France. Paris, 3 novembre", *Journal des Débats*, November 6, 1861.—Ed.

^b "The assurance, in spite of the denial of the *Patrie*...", *The Times*, No. 24049, September 27, 1861, leading article.—Ed.

^c "In a very short time...", *The Times*, No. 24085, November 8, 1861.—Ed.

However, in the progress of its article, *The Times* veers round, and exclaims:

“We shall, no doubt, succeed in obtaining at least a recognition of our pecuniary claims; in fact, a single British frigate could have obtained that amount of satisfaction at any moment. We may trust, too, that the more scandalous of the outrages committed will be expiated by more immediate and substantial atonements; but it is clear that, if only this much was to be brought about, we need not have resorted to such extremities as are now proposed.”

The Times, then, confesses in so many words that the reasons originally given out for the expedition are shallow pretexts; that for the attainment of redress nothing like the present procedure was needed; and that, in point of fact, the “recognition of monetary claims, and the protection of European subjects” have nothing at all to do with the present joint intervention in Mexico. What, then, is its real aim and purpose?

Before following *The Times* in its further explanations, we will, *en passant*, note some more “curiosities” which it has taken good care not to touch upon. In the first instance, it is a real “curiosity” to see Spain—Spain out of all other countries—turn crusader for the sanctity of foreign debts! Last Sunday’s^a *Courrier du Dimanche* already summons the French Government to improve the opportunity, and compel Spain, “into the eternally delayed performance of her old standing engagements to French bondholders.”

The second still greater “curiosity” is, that the very same Palmerston who, according to Lord John Russell’s recent declaration, is about invading Mexico to make its Government pay the English bondholders, has himself, voluntarily, and despite the Mexican Government, *sacrificed* the treaty rights of England and the security mortgaged by Mexico to her British creditors.^b

By the treaty concluded with England in 1826, Mexico became bound to not allow the establishment of Slavery in any of the territories constituting her then empire.^c By another clause of the same treaty, she tendered England, as a security for the loans obtained from British capitalists, the mortgage of 45,000,000 acres of the public lands in Texas. It was Palmerston who, ten or twelve years later,^d interfered as the mediator for Texas against Mexico. In the treaty then concluded by him with Texas, he sacrificed not

^a November 3, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b *The Times*, No. 24049, September 27, 1861.—*Ed.*

^c Here and below Marx draws on documents cited in the article “Annexation of the Texas, a Case of War between England and the United States”, *The Portfolio; Diplomatic Review* (new series), London, 1844, Vol. III, No. XI.—*Ed.*

^d In 1840.—*Ed.*

only *the Anti-Slavery cause*, but also the *mortgage on the public lands*, thus robbing the English bondholders of their security. The Mexican Government protested at the time, but meanwhile, later on, Secretary John C. Calhoun could permit himself the jest of informing the Cabinet of St. James that its desire "of seeing Slavery abolished in Texas would be" best realized by annexing Texas to the United States. The English bondholders lost, in fact, any claim upon Mexico, by the voluntary sacrifice on the part of Palmerston of the mortgage secured to them in the treaty of 1826.

But, since *The London Times* avows that the present intervention has nothing to do either with monetary claims or with personal outrages, what, then, in all the world, is its real or pretended aim?

"An authoritative interference in behalf of Order."^a

England, France, and Spain, planning a new Holy Alliance, and having formed themselves into an armed areopagus for the restoration of order all over the world, "Mexico," says *The Times*, "must be rescued from anarchy, and put in the way of self-government and peace. A strong and stable government must be established" there by the invaders, and that government is to be extracted from "some Mexican party."

Now, does any one imagine that Palmerston and his mouth-piece, *The Times*, really consider the joint intervention as a means to the professed end, viz: The extinction of anarchy, and the establishment in Mexico of a strong and stable government? So far from cherishing any such chimerical creed, *The Times* states expressly in its first leader of September 27:

"The only point on which there may possibly be a difference between ourselves and our allies, regards *the government of the Republic*. England will be content to see it remain in the hands of the *liberal party which is now in power*, while France and Spain are suspected of a partiality for the *ecclesiastical rule which has recently been overthrown*.... It would, indeed, be strange, if France were, in both the old and new world, to make herself the protector of priests and bandits."

In its to-day's leader, *The Times* goes on reasoning in the same strain, and resumes its scruples in this sentence:

"It is *hard to suppose* that the intervening powers could all concur in the absolute preference of either of the two parties between which Mexico is divided, and *equally hard to imagine* that a compromise would be found practicable between enemies so determined."

Palmerston and *The Times*, then, are fully aware that there "exists a government in Mexico," that "the Liberal party,"

^a *The Times*, No. 24085, November 8, 1861.—Ed.

ostensibly favored by England, "is now in power," that "the ecclesiastical rule has been overthrown;"^a that Spanish intervention was the last forlorn hope of the priests and bandits; and, finally, that Mexican anarchy was dying away. They know, then, that the joint intervention, with no other avowed end save the rescue of Mexico from anarchy, will produce just the opposite effect, weaken the Constitutional Government, strengthen the priestly party by a supply of French and Spanish bayonets, rekindle the embers of civil war, and, instead of extinguishing, restore anarchy to its full bloom.

The inference *The Times* itself draws from those premises is really "remarkable" and "curious."

Although, it says, "these considerations may induce us to look with some anxiety to the results of the expedition, they do not militate against *the expediency of the expedition itself.*"^b

It does, consequently, not militate against the expediency of the expedition itself, that the expedition militates against its only ostensible purpose. It does not militate against the means that it baffles its own avowed end.

The greatest "curiosity" pointed out by *The Times*, I have, however, still kept in petto.

"If," says it, "President *Lincoln* should accept the invitation, which is provided for by the convention, to participate in the approaching operations, *the character of the work would become more curious still.*"

It would, indeed, be the greatest "curiosity" of all if the United States, living in amity with Mexico, should associate with the European order-mongers, and, by participating in their acts, sanction the interference of a European armed Areopagus with the internal affairs of American States. The first scheme of such a transplantation of the Holy Alliance to the other side of the Atlantic was, at the time of the restoration, drawn up for the French and Spanish Bourbons by *Chateaubriand*.⁹⁵ The attempt was baffled by an English Minister, Mr. *Canning*, and an American President, Mr. *Monroe*. The present convulsion in the United States appeared to Palmerston an opportune moment for taking up the old project in a modified form. Since the United States, for the present, must allow no foreign complication to interfere with their war for the Union, all they can do is to *protest*. Their best well-wishers in Europe hope that they will protest, and thus,

^a *The Times*, No. 24049, September 27, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b Here and below, *The Times*, No. 24085, November 8, 1861.—*Ed.*

before the eyes of the world, firmly repudiate any complicity in one of the most nefarious schemes.

This military expedition of Palmerston's, carried out by a coalition with two other European powers, is started during the prorogation, without the sanction, and against the will of the British Parliament. The first extra Parliamentary war of Palmerston's was the Afghan war softened and justified by the production of *forged papers*.^a⁹⁶ Another war of that sort was his Persian war of 1856-1857.⁹⁷ He defended it at the time on the plea that "the principle of the previous sanction of the House did not apply to *Asiatic* wars."^b It seems that it does neither apply to *American* wars. With the control over foreign wars, Parliament will lose all control over the national exchequer, and Parliamentary government turn to a mere farce.

Written on November 8, 1861

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6440, November 23, 1861

^a *Correspondence Relating to Persia and Afghanistan*, London, 1839.—*Ed.*

^b H. J. Palmerston's speech in the House of Commons on July 16, 1857, *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, Third series, Vol. CXLVI, London, 1857.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx
MONSIEUR FOULD⁹⁸

Paris, November 16

Art experts in the field of high political comedy find a source of the purest pleasure in the French *Moniteur* of November 14. As in the ancient classical drama, Fate invisibly, irresistibly enmeshes the heroes—Fate in the form of a thousand million-franc deficit. As in ancient drama, the dialogue is only between two persons, Oedipus-Bonaparte and Teiresias-Fould. The tragedy turns into comedy, however, since Teiresias says only what Oedipus has whispered to him in advance.^a

One of the most characteristic tricks of Bonapartist comedy is to put its old, worn *dramatis personae* on stage over and over again as brand-new heroes. Billault comes on in place of Persigny, and then Persigny comes on in place of Billault! And likewise in the Decembrist press!^b Grandguillot, Cassagnac, Limayrac are tossed to and fro between the *Constitutionnel*, the *Pays* and the *Patrie*. Monsieur Véron, the “Bourgeois de Paris”,^c is replaced by Cesena as director of the *Constitutionnel*, Cesena by Cucheval, Cucheval by Cassagnac, Cassagnac by Renée, Renée by Grandguillot, and after six years Véron comes on again in his old spot—as a brand-new hero.

Likewise under the constitutional system Thiers became new as soon as Guizot was worn out, and Molé new as soon as Thiers was worn out, and then the round was repeated. However, these

^a An allusion to Napoleon III's message to Fould and the latter's “Mémoire à l'Empereur”, both published in *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 318, November 14, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b The press of Louis Bonaparte, who staged a *coup d'état* on December 2, 1851.—*Ed.*

^c An allusion to L. Véron's book *Mémoires d'un bourgeois de Paris*.—*Ed.*

different men represented different parties and tendencies. If they pushed one another out, in order to follow one another, and followed one another in order to push one another out again, then their toing and froing only showed the oscillations in the balance of the parties that in general formed the *pays légal*^a under Louis Philippe. But Billault or Persigny, Walewski or Thouvenel, Laroquette or Fould, Grandguillot or Limayrac? It is what the English call "a distinction without a difference".^b They all represent the same thing—the *coup d'état*. They do not represent different interests and parties among the people. They only represent different facial features of the Emperor. They are only different masks, behind which the same head is hidden.

The Times, whose weak point is comparisons, compares Louis Bonaparte with Louis XVI and Fould with Turgot.^c Fould and Turgot! It is like trying to compare M. Vaillant with Carnot, because both of them were Ministers of War. Turgot was the head of the new economic school of the eighteenth century, the Physiocratic School.⁹⁹ He was one of the intellectual heroes who overthrew the old regime, while Louis XVI was the incarnation of that old regime. But who is Fould? Fould, a member of the dynastic opposition¹⁰⁰ under Louis Philippe, was always passed over on principle despite the most obtrusive solicitation, whenever the dynastic opposition was in a position to nominate a Finance Minister. Fould was held to be a "*financier dangereux*", a reputation he had earned owing to his various unlucky financial operations. He needed only to defend a proposal, and the Chambers rejected it. Then came the provisional government. It had hardly been proclaimed, when Fould rushed to Ledru-Rollin, offered his services as Finance Minister and—proposed *national bankruptcy*. The courtship was unsuccessful, and the rejected suitor got his revenge by writing the pamphlet, *Pas d'assignats!* Finally Fould recognised in Louis Bonaparte the man who was foolhardy enough to hand the French treasury over to Mr. Fould.

Fould was closely involved in the manoeuvres that ensured the "nephew's"^d election to the presidency on December 10, 1848. Fould was a very active friend and made the financial preparations for the *coup d'état*. December 2, 1851 was not only the victory of

^a The section of the people having the right to vote.—*Ed.*

^b Marx uses the English phrase and gives the German translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

^c "The hour of reckoning has at length overtaken France...", *The Times*, No. 24091, November 15, 1861, leading article.—*Ed.*

^d Louis Bonaparte's.—*Ed.*

Louis Bonaparte but also the victory of Fould. Fould became all-powerful. Fould became Minister of State. Fould could raise even his *menus plaisirs*^a to the level of affairs of state. He seized hold of the dictatorship of the theatre along with the dictatorship of finances. Like other notorious men of *haute finance*,^b Fould shared a passion for the dollar with a passion for the heroines of the wings. Fould became a sultan of the wings. Fould, with Péreire, is the inventor of imperialist finance. He is the direct cause of nine-tenths of the current deficit. Finally, in 1860, the great Fould withdrew into private life, to reappear in 1861 as “a new man” (“a brand new man”)^c in the imperialist finance comedy. Fould appears again as Turgot, Fould as Marquis Posa! *Applaudite, amici!*¹⁰¹

Written on November 16, 1861

First published in *Die Presse*, No. 318,
November 19, 1861

Printed according to the news-
paper

Published in English for the first
time

^a Lesser pleasures.—*Ed.*

^b High finance.—*Ed.*

^c Marx uses the English phrase “a new man” and adds “a brand new man” in German in brackets.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

FRANCE'S FINANCIAL SITUATION

The *Times*, which at first praised the imperialist *coup d'éclat*^a moderately and then lauded it in hyperboles, makes a sudden switch today from panegyrics to criticism.^b The way in which this manoeuvre is executed is typical of the Leviathan of the English press:

"We will leave to others the task of congratulating Caesar on his admission that he is a finite and fallible being, and that, indisputably reigning by the power of the sword, he does not pretend to rule by virtue of Divine right. We had rather inquire what have been the financial results of ten years of Imperial sway, which are better worth thinking of than the phrases in which those results have been made known.... The Executive did what it pleased; the Ministers were responsible to the Emperor alone; the state of the finances was entirely concealed from the public and the Chambers. The annual form of voting a budget, instead of a check, was a mask; instead of a protection, a delusion. What, then, have the French people achieved by placing their liberties and their possessions at the disposal of a single man?... M. Fould himself admits that between 1851 and 1858 extraordinary credits have been opened to the amount of 2,800,000,000 francs, and that the deficit for the present year amounts to no less than 1,000,000,000 francs.

"We do not know how these sums were raised, but assuredly it has not been by taxation. We are told that four millions paid by the Bank of France for the renewal of its privileges have been spent, that five millions and a half of the Army Dotation Fund have been borrowed, and that securities of different kinds have been thrown into circulation. *As to the present state of affairs*, our Correspondent in Paris assures us *that there is not money in the Treasury to pay the half-yearly dividends due next month*. Such is the disastrous, the disgraceful state of French Finance, after ten years of brilliant and successful Imperialism, and it is only now, at a moment when it is unable to discharge its current obligations, that the French Government has taken the nation in some degree into its confidence and shown it a little of the reality that

^a Glorious exploit.—*Ed.*

^b "The extraordinary frankness of M. Fould...", *The Times*, No. 24093, November 18, 1861, leading article.—*Ed.*

has lain hidden behind the glamorous phantasmagoria of the financial prosperity of which it has been so often assured. Nay, at this very moment the *Revue des Deux Mondes* is being prosecuted for making statements with regard to the financial position of France, the only fault of which is that they are far too rosy."

The Times goes on to enquire into the causes of this collapse. During the imperialist decade France's exports have more than doubled. Agriculture has developed along with industry, and the railway system with both. The credit system, only incipient before 1848, has shot up in all directions. All these developments did not arise from any decree of the Emperor's, but from the revolutionary changes in the world market since the discovery of gold in California and Australia. Then what has caused the catastrophe?

The Times mentions the extraordinary expenditures on the army and navy, the natural fruit of Louis Bonaparte's efforts to play Napoleon in Europe. It mentions the wars, and finally the gigantic outlays on public works in order to occupy the entrepreneurs and the proletariat and keep them in good humour.

"But," it continues, "all this is insufficient to account for this frightful deficit, the largest of which the history of mankind furnishes us with an example.... To the aggressive military and naval armaments, public works, and occasional wars, has been added a *shameless and universal system of pillage*. A shower of gold has descended upon the *Empire* and its supporters. The enormous fortunes suddenly and unaccountably acquired have been the cause of scandal and wonder till scandal grew dumb and wonder weak from the frequency, indeed the universality, of the phenomenon. Modern France has taught us better to understand those passages in Juvenal's satires which treat suddenly acquired wealth as a crime against the people.^a The splendid mansions, the brilliant equipages, the enormous wastefulness of men who till the *coup d'état* notoriously starved, have been in every one's mouth. The Court has been conducted on a scale of almost incredible wastefulness. New palaces have arisen as by the wand of an enchanter, and the splendours of the *ancien régime*^b have been surpassed. Extravagance has had no limits but public money and public credit; the one is gone and the other shattered. *This is what ten years of Imperialism have done for France.*"

The most important question for Europe is without doubt whether the imperialist finance system *can be converted* into a constitutional finance system, as the correspondence between Louis Bonaparte and Fould contemplates.^c What is involved here is not the momentary intentions of persons. It is the economic *conditions for the life* of the restored empire. The financial fraud

^a Juvenal, *Satires*, XIV, 173-78.—*Ed.*

^b The political and social system of France before the revolution of 1789.—*Ed.*

^c This refers to Napoleon III's message to A. Fould and the latter's "Mémoire à l'Empereur..." published in *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 318, November 14, 1861.—*Ed.*

system could only be converted into a prosaic finance system by eliminating corruption as a general means of government; by reducing the army and navy to a peace footing, and therefore by *abandoning the Napoleonic character* of the present regime; finally, by complete renunciation of the plan followed hitherto of binding a part of the middle class and of the city proletariat to the existing government by means of great government construction projects and other public works. Would not meeting all these conditions mean: *Et propter vitam vivendi perdere causas?*^a Is it actually believed that the modest system of Louis Philippe can be brought into being again under Napoleonic auspices? As little as that the July monarchy could be established under the *drapeau blanc*.¹⁰²

We therefore called the *coup d'éclat* of November 14 a comedy^b from the outset, and did not doubt for a moment that this comedy had only two aims in view: remedying the immediate difficulty and—getting through the winter. Once these two goals had been achieved, the war bugles would blow in the spring and the attempt would be undertaken to make the war pay its own way this time. It should not be forgotten that up to now—and this was a necessary consequence of a merely *simulated* Napoleonism—Decemberist France has paid for all its glory out of the French state treasury.

After a brief period of wavering, the English press has arrived at the same conclusions with respect to the *seriousness* of the November 14 promises and the *possibility* of their being carried out.

Thus, *The Times* of to-day says in the leader cited above:

“The Emperor gives up the power of originating extraordinary credits. This is exactly one of those pieces of self-denying virtue which usually precede, but seldom survive, a new French loan.”

And its Stock Exchange article says:

“Whether the financial sanctity suddenly adopted at the crisis of the Treasury sickness will outlast the fit for a long time after the Exchequer has been replenished and a new loan secured, is now the question.... Public opinion, it is asserted, will force the Emperor, whether he will or not, to carry out Fould's programme. Would it not be more correct to say that every one is prepared to accept this self-delusion, while army and navy contractors and speculators firmly rely on it that in the spring, after the present danger has been weathered, the *Moniteur* will find sufficient reasons, in ‘the changed circumstances of Europe’, or the necessity of rectifying something that somewhere threatens French honour, the Catholic faith, or the civilisation and liberty of the human race, for a recurrence to the old financial system, which can never be permanently abandoned in any

^a “And for life's sake, destroy the very basis of life” (Juvenal, *Satires*, VIII, 84).—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 79-81.—*Ed.*

country under military dictatorship, and unpossessed of constitutional rights that are universal and inviolable?"^a

The Economist expresses itself similarly. It concludes its analysis with the following words:

"Despite the decree, *political risk* must still be the first thought of a man who looks to his dynasty as something which any incidental failure may uproot."^b

So far, Louis Bonaparte has only exposed Europe to dangers because he himself has been continually exposed to danger in France. Is it believed that his danger to Europe will decrease to the same extent as the danger to himself in France increases? Only if the internal danger is given time to explode.

Written on November 18, 1861

First published in *Die Presse*, No. 322,
November 23, 1861

Printed according to the news-
paper

Published in English for the first
time

^a "Money-Market and City Intelligence", *The Times*, No. 24093, November 18, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b "The Constitutional Change in France", *The Economist*, No. 951, November 16, 1861.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx
THE DISMISSAL OF FRÉMONT¹⁰³

Frémont's dismissal from the post of Commander-in-Chief in Missouri forms a turning point in the history of the development of the American Civil War. Frémont has two great sins to expiate. He was the first candidate of the Republican Party for the presidential office (1856), and he is the first general of the North to have threatened the slaveholders with emancipation of slaves (August 30, 1861).^a He remains, therefore, a rival of candidates for the presidency in the future and an obstacle to the makers of compromises in the present.

During the last two decades the singular practice developed in the United States of not electing to the presidency any man who occupied an authoritative position in his own party. The names of such men, it is true, were utilised for election demonstrations, but as soon as it came to actual business, they were dropped and replaced by unknown mediocrities of merely local influence. In this manner Polk, Pierce, Buchanan, etc., became Presidents. Likewise Abraham Lincoln. General Andrew Jackson was in fact the last President of the United States who owed his office to his personal importance, whilst all his successors owed it, on the contrary, to their personal unimportance.

In the election year 1860, the most distinguished names of the Republican Party were Frémont and Seward. Known for his adventures during the Mexican War,¹⁰⁴ for his intrepid exploration of California and his candidacy of 1856, Frémont was too striking a figure even to come under consideration as soon as it was no longer a question of a Republican demonstration, but of a

^a See this volume, pp. 51-52.—*Ed.*

Republican success. He did not, therefore, stand as a candidate. It was otherwise with Seward, a Republican Senator in the Congress of Washington, Governor of the State of New York and, since the rise of the Republican Party, unquestionably its leading orator. It required a series of mortifying defeats to induce Mr. Seward to renounce his own candidacy and to give his oratorical patronage to the then more or less unknown Abraham Lincoln. As soon, however, as he saw his attempt to stand as a candidate fail, he imposed himself as a Republican Richelieu on a man whom he considered a Republican Louis XIII. He contributed towards making Lincoln President, on condition that Lincoln made him Secretary of State, an office which is in some measure comparable with that of a British Prime Minister. As a matter of fact, Lincoln was hardly President-elect, when Seward secured the Secretaryship of State. Immediately a singular change took place in the attitude of the Demosthenes of the Republican Party, whom the prophesying of the "irrepressible conflict"^a between the system of free labour and the system of slavery had made famous.^b Although elected on November 6, 1860, Lincoln took up office as President only on March 4, 1861. In the interval, during the winter session of Congress, Seward made himself the central figure of all attempts at compromise; the Northern organs of the South, such as the *New-York Herald*, for example, whose *bête noire* Seward had been till then, suddenly extolled him as the statesman of reconciliation and, indeed, it was not his fault that peace at any price was not achieved. Seward manifestly regarded the post of Secretary of State as a mere preliminary step, and busied himself less with the "irrepressible conflict" of the present than with the presidency of the future. He has provided fresh proof that virtuosos of the tongue are dangerously inadequate statesmen. Read his state dispatches! What a repulsive mixture of magniloquence and petty-mindedness, of simulated strength and real weakness!

For Seward, therefore, Frémont was the dangerous rival who had to be ruined; an undertaking that appeared so much the easier since Lincoln, in accordance with his legal tradition, has an aversion for all genius, anxiously clings to the letter of the Constitution and fights shy of every step that could mislead the "loyal" slaveholders of the border states. Frémont's character

^a Marx gives the English phrase.—*Ed.*

^b W. H. Seward [Speech at Rochester, October 25, 1858], *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5466, October 28, 1858.—*Ed.*

offered another hold. He is manifestly a man of pathos, somewhat pompous and haughty, and not without a touch of the melodramatic. First the government attempted to drive him to voluntary retirement by a succession of petty chicaneries. When this did not succeed, it deprived him of his command at the very moment when the army he himself had organised came face to face with the enemy in southwest Missouri and a decisive battle was imminent.

Frémont is the idol of the states of the Northwest, which sing his praises as the "pathfinder".^a They regard his dismissal as a personal insult. Should the Union government meet with a few more mishaps like those of Bull Run and Ball's Bluff,¹⁰⁵ it has itself given the opposition, which will then rise up against it and smash the hitherto prevailing diplomatic system of waging war, its leader in John Frémont. We shall return later to the indictment of the dismissed general^b published by the War Department in Washington.

Written about November 19, 1861

First published in *Die Presse*, No. 325,
November 26, 1861

Printed according to the newspaper

^a Marx uses the English word.—*Ed.*

^b The reference is to Brigadier General A. Thomas's report on the investigation of General Frémont's activity as Commander of the Western military area, published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6419, October 30, 1861.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx
THE TRENT CASE¹⁰⁶

London, November 28

The conflict of the English mail ship *Trent* with the North American warship *San Jacinto* in the narrow passage of the Old Bahama Channel is the lion among the events of the day. In the afternoon of November 27 the mail ship *La Plata* brought the news of the incident to Southampton, whence the electric telegraph at once flashed it to all parts of Great Britain. The same evening the London Stock Exchange was the stage of stormy scenes similar to those at the time of the announcement of the Italian war. Quotations for government stock sank $\frac{3}{4}$ to 1 per cent. The wildest rumours circulated in London. The American Ambassador, *Adams*, was said to have been given his passports, an embargo to have been imposed on all American ships in the Thames, etc. At the same time a protest meeting of merchants was held at the Stock Exchange in Liverpool, to demand measures from the British Government for the satisfaction of the violated honour of the British flag. Every sound-minded Englishman went to bed with the conviction that he would go to sleep in a state of peace but wake up in a state of war.

Nevertheless, the fact is well-nigh categorically established that the conflict between the *Trent* and the *San Jacinto* brings *no war* in its train. The semi-official press, like *The Times* and *The Morning Post*, strikes a peaceful note and pours juridically cool deductions on the flickerings of passion.^a Papers like the *Daily Telegraph*, which at the faintest *mot d'ordre*^b roar for the British

^a The reference is to the leading articles "It requires a strong effort...", *The Times*, No. 24102, November 28, 1861 and "The Government of the United States has taken a step...", *The Morning Post*, No. 27440, November 28, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b Watchword.—*Ed.*

lion, are true models of moderation. Only the Tory opposition press, *The Morning Herald* and *The Standard*, hits out. These facts force every expert to conclude that the ministry has already decided not to make a *casus belli* out of the "untoward event".^a

It must be added that the event, if not the details of its enactment, was anticipated. On October 12, Messrs. Slidell, Confederacy emissary to France, and Mason, Confederacy emissary to England, together with their secretaries Eustis and MacFarland, had run the blockade of Charleston on the steamship *Theodora* and sailed for Havana, there to seek the opportunity of a passage to Europe under the British flag. In England their arrival was expected daily. North American warships had set out from Liverpool to intercept the gentlemen, with their dispatches, on this side of the Atlantic Ocean. The British ministry had already submitted the question whether the North Americans were entitled to take such a step to its official juriconsults for their opinion. Their answer is said to have been in the affirmative.

The legal question turns in a narrow circle. Since the foundation of the United States, North America has adopted *British* maritime law in all its rigour. A major principle of this maritime law is that all *neutral merchantmen* are subject to *search* by the belligerent parties.

"This right," said Lord Stowell in a judgment which has become famous, "offers the sole security that no contraband is carried on neutral ships."^b

The greatest American authority, *Kent*, states in the same sense:

"The right of self-preservation gives belligerent nations this right. The doctrine of the *English* admiralty on the right of visitation and search ... has been recognised in its fullest extent by the courts of justice in this country."^c

It was not opposition to the right of search, as is sometimes erroneously suggested, that brought about the Anglo-American War of 1812 to 1814.¹⁰⁷ Rather, America declared war because England *unlawfully* presumed to search even American *warships*, on the pretext of catching deserters from the British Navy.

The *San Jacinto*, therefore, had the right to search the *Trent* and to confiscate any contraband stowed aboard her. That *dispatches* in the possession of Mason, Slidell and Co. come under

^a Marx uses the English expression here and below, and gives the German translation in brackets in the first case.—*Ed.*

^b Quoted from the leading article "It requires a strong effort...", *The Times*, No. 24102, November 28, 1861.—*Ed.*

^c *Ibidem*; *The Times* quotes from J. Kent's book *Commentaries on American Law*—*Ed.*

the category of contraband even *The Times*, *The Morning Post*, etc., admit. There remains the question whether Messrs. Mason, Slidell and Co. were themselves contraband and might consequently be confiscated! The point is a ticklish one and differences of opinion prevail among the doctors of law. Pratt, the most distinguished British authority on "Contraband", in the section "*Quasi-Contraband—Dispatches, Passengers*" specifically refers to "communication of information and orders from a belligerent government to its officers abroad, or the conveyance of military passengers".^a Messrs. Mason and Slidell, if not officers, were just as little ambassadors, since their governments are recognised neither by Britain nor by France. What are they, then? In justification of the very broad conceptions of contraband asserted by Britain in the Anglo-French wars,¹⁰⁸ Jefferson already remarks in his memoirs that contraband, by its nature, precludes any exhaustive definition and necessarily leaves great scope for arbitrariness.^b In any event, however, one sees that from the standpoint of English law the *legal question* dwindles to a Duns Scotus controversy,¹⁰⁹ the explosive force of which will not go beyond exchange of diplomatic notes.

The *political* aspect of the North American procedure was estimated quite correctly by *The Times* in these words:

"Even Mr. Seward himself must know that the voices of the Southern commissioners, sounding from their captivity, are a thousand times more eloquent in London and in Paris than they would have been if they had been heard in St. James's and the Tuileries."^c

And is not the Confederacy already represented in London by Messrs. Yancey and Mann?

We regard this latest operation of Mr. Seward as a characteristic act of tactlessness by self-conscious weakness simulating strength. If the naval incident hastens Seward's removal from the Washington Cabinet, the United States will have no reason to record it as an "untoward event" in the annals of its Civil War.

Written on November 28, 1861

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in *Die Presse*, No. 331,
December 2, 1861

^a F. Th. Pratt, *Law of Contraband of War...*, London, 1856, pp. LIV-LV.—Ed.

^b Th. Jefferson, *Memoirs, Correspondence, and Private Papers...*, Vol. III, London, 1829, p. 488.—Ed.

^c "It requires a strong effort..."—Ed.

Karl Marx
THE ANGLO-AMERICAN CONFLICT¹¹⁰

London, November 29

The law officers of the Crown^a had yesterday to give their opinion on the naval incident in the Bahama Channel.^b Their records of the case consisted of the written reports of the British officers who have remained on board the *Trent* and of the oral testimony of Commodore Williams, who was on board the *Trent* as Admiralty agent, but disembarked from the steamer *La Plata* on November 27 at Southampton, whence he was immediately summoned by telegraph to London. The law officers of the Crown acknowledged the right of the *San Jacinto* to visit and search the *Trent*. Since Queen Victoria's proclamation of neutrality on the outbreak of the American Civil War^c expressly lists *dispatches* among articles of contraband,^d there could be no doubt on this point either. There remained, then, the question whether Messrs. Mason, Slidell and Co. were themselves contraband and therefore confiscable. The law officers of the Crown appear to hold this view, for they have dropped the *material* legal question entirely. According to the report of *The Times*,^e their opinion blames the commander of the *San Jacinto*^f only for an *error in procedure*. Instead of Messrs. Mason, Slidell and Co., he should have taken

^a The Attorney-General and the Solicitor-General. At the time, the posts were held by R. Palmer and W. Atherton.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 89-91.—*Ed.*

^c Victoria, R. A Proclamation [May 13, 1861], *The Times*, No. 23933, May 15, 1861.—*Ed.*

^d See this volume, pp. 105-107.—*Ed.*

^e "Wherever two or three men met together yesterday...", *The Times*, No. 24103, November 29, 1861, leading article.—*Ed.*

^f Ch. Wilkes.—*Ed.*

the *Trent* herself in tow as a prize, brought her to the nearest American port and there submitted her to the judgment of a North American prize court.¹¹¹ This is incontestably the procedure corresponding to British and therefore to North American maritime law.

It is equally incontestable that the British frequently violated this rule during the anti-Jacobin war and proceeded in the summary fashion of the *San Jacinto*. However that may be, the whole conflict is reduced by this opinion of the law officers of the Crown to a *technical error* and consequently deprived of any immediate import. Two circumstances make it easy for the Union government to accept this point of view and therefore to afford formal satisfaction. In the first place, Captain Wilkes, the commander of the *San Jacinto*, could have received no direct instructions from Washington. On the voyage home from Africa to New York, he called on November 2 at Havana, which he left again on November 4, whilst his encounter with the *Trent* took place on the high seas on November 8. Captain Wilkes's stay of only two days in Havana did not permit any exchange of notes between him and his government. The consul of the Union^a was the only American authority with whom he could deal. In the second place, however, he had obviously lost his head, as his failure to insist on the surrender of the dispatches proves.

The importance of the incident lies in its moral effect on the English people and in the political capital that can easily be made out of it by the British cotton friends of secession. Characteristic of the latter is the Liverpool protest meeting organised by them and previously mentioned by me.^b The meeting took place on November 27 at three in the afternoon, in the cotton auction-rooms of the Liverpool Exchange, an hour after the alarming telegram from Southampton had arrived.

After vain attempts to press the chairmanship on Mr. Cunard, the owner of the Cunard steamships laying between Liverpool and New York, and other high trade officials, a young merchant named *Spence*, notorious for a work he wrote in support of the slave republic,^c took the chair. Contrary to the rules of English meetings, he, the chairman, himself proposed the motion to

"call upon the government to assert the dignity of the British flag by requiring prompt reparation for this outrage".^d

^a Charles J. Helm.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, p. 89.—*Ed.*

^c J. Spence, *The American Union...*, London, 1861.—*Ed.*

^d "Liverpool, Wednesday", *The Times*, No. 24102, November 28, 1861.—*Ed.*

Tremendous applause, clapping and cheers upon cheers! The main argument of the opening speaker for the slave republic was that slave ships had hitherto been protected by the American flag from the right of search claimed by Britain. And then this philanthropist launched a furious attack on the slave trade! He admitted that England had brought about the war of 1812-14 with the United States by insisting on searching Union warships for deserters from the British Navy.

"But," he continued with wonderful dialectic, "there is a difference between the right of search to recover deserters from the British Navy and the right to seize passengers, like Mr. Mason and Mr. Slidell, men of the highest respectability, regardless of the fact that they were protected by the British flag!"

He played his highest trump, however, at the close of his diatribe.

"The other day," he bellowed, "while I was on the European Continent, I heard observations made as to our conduct in regard to the United States which made me blush. What is the feeling of every intelligent man upon the Continent? That we would slavishly submit to any outrage and suffer every indignity offered to us by the Government of the United States. What could I reply to this? I could only blush. But the pitcher goes so often to the well that it is broken at last. Our patience had been exercised long enough—as long as it was possible to control it. At last we have arrived at facts [!]: this is a very hard and startling fact [!] and it is the duty of every Englishman to apprise the Government of how strong and unanimous is the feeling of this great community of the outrage offered to our flag."

This senseless rigmarole was greeted with a peal of applause. Opposing voices were howled down and hissed down and stamped down. To the remark of a Mr. Campbell that the whole meeting was "irregular", the inexorable Spence replied: "So may it be, but the fact that we have met to consider is rather an irregular fact." To the proposal of a Mr. Turner to adjourn the meeting to the following day, in order that "the city of Liverpool can have its say and not a clique of cotton brokers usurp its name", cries of "Collar him, throw him out!" resounded from all sides. Unperturbed, Mr. Turner repeated his motion, which, however, was not put to the vote, again contrary to all the rules of English meetings. Spence triumphed. But, as a matter of fact, nothing has done more to cool London's temper than the news of Mr. Spence's triumph.

Written on November 29, 1861

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in *Die Presse*, No. 332,
December 3, 1861

Karl Marx
THE NEWS AND ITS EFFECT IN LONDON

London, Nov. 30, 1861

Since the declaration of war against Russia I never witnessed an excitement throughout all the strata of English society equal to that produced by the news of the *Trent* affair, conveyed to Southampton by the *La Plata* on the 27th inst. At about 2 o'clock p.m., by means of the electric telegraph, the announcement of the "untoward event" was posted in the news-rooms of all the British Exchanges. All commercial securities went down, while the price of saltpeter went up. Consols declined $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent, while at Lloyds¹¹² war risks of five guineas were demanded on vessels from New-York. Late in the evening the wildest rumors circulated in London, to the effect that the American Minister^a had forthwith been sent his passports, that orders had been issued for the immediate seizure of all American ships in the ports of the United Kingdom, and so forth. The cotton friends of Secession at Liverpool improved the opportunity for holding, at ten minutes' notice, in the cotton salesroom of the Stock Exchange, an indignation meeting, under the presidency of Mr. Spence, the author of some obscure pamphlet in the interest of the Southern Confederacy.^b Commodore Williams, the Admiralty Agent on board the *Trent*, who had arrived with the *La Plata*, was at once summoned to London.

On the following day, the 28th of November, the London press exhibited, on the whole, a tone of moderation strangely contrasting with the tremendous political and mercantile excitement of the previous evening. The Palmerston papers, *Times*, *Morning Post*,

^a Ch. Adams.—*Ed.*

^b J. Spence, *The American Union...*, London, 1861.—*Ed.*

Daily Telegraph, *Morning Advertiser*, and *Sun*, had received orders to calm down rather than to exasperate. *The Daily News*, by its strictures on the conduct of the *San Jacinto*, evidently aimed less at hitting the Federal Government than clearing itself of the suspicion of "Yankee prejudices," while *The Morning Star*, John Bright's organ, without passing any judgment on the policy and wisdom of the "act," pleaded its lawfulness. There were only two exceptions to the general tenor of the London press. The Tory-scribblers of *The Morning Herald* and *The Standard*, forming in fact one paper under different names, gave full vent to their savage satisfaction of having at last caught the "republicans" in a trap, and finding a *casus belli*, ready cut out. They were supported by but one other journal, *The Morning Chronicle*, which for years had tried to prolong its checkered existence by alternately selling itself to the prisoner Palmer and the Tuileries.¹¹³ The excitement on the Exchange greatly subsided in consequence of the pacific tone of the leading London papers. On the same 28th of Nov., Commander Williams attended at the Admiralty, and reported the circumstances of the occurrence in the old Bahama Channel. His report, together with the written depositions of the officers on board the *Trent*, were at once submitted to the law officers of the Crown,^a whose opinion, late in the evening, was officially brought under the notice of Lord Palmerston, Earl Russell and other members of the Government.

On the 29th of November there was to be remarked some slight change in the tone of the ministerial press. It became known that the law officers of the Crown, on a technical ground, had declared the proceedings of the frigate *San Jacinto* illegal, and that later in the day, the Cabinet, summoned to a general council, had decided to send by next steamer to Lord Lyons instructions to conform to the opinion of the English law officers. Hence the excitement in the principal places of business, such as the Stock Exchange, Lloyd's, the Jerusalem, the Baltic,¹¹⁴ etc., set in with redoubled force, and was further stimulated by the news that the projected shipments to America of saltpeter had been stopped on the previous day, and that on the 29th a general order was received at the Custom-House prohibiting the exportation of this article to any country except under certain stringent conditions. The English funds further fell $\frac{3}{4}$, and at one time a real panic prevailed in all the stock markets, it having become impossible to transact any business in some securities, while in all descriptions a

^a R. Palmer and W. Atherton.—*Ed.*

severe depression of prices occurred. In the afternoon a recovery in the stock market was due to several rumors, but principally to the report that Mr. Adams had expressed his opinion that the act of the *San Jacinto* would be disavowed by the Washington Cabinet.

On the 30th of November (to-day) all the London papers, with the single exception of *The Morning Star*, put the alternative of reparation by the Washington Cabinet or—*war*.

Having summed up the history of the events from the arrival of the *La Plata* to the present day, I shall now proceed to recording opinions. There were, of course, two points to be considered—on the one hand the law, on the other hand the policy, of the seizure of the Southern Commissioners^a on board an English mail steamer.

As to the legal aspect of the affair, the first difficulty mooted by the Tory press and *The Morning Chronicle* was that the United States had never recognized the Southern Secessionists as belligerents, and, consequently, could not claim belligerent rights in regard to them.

This quibble was at once disposed of by the Ministerial press itself.

"We," said *The Times*, "have already recognized these Confederate States as a belligerent power, and we shall, when the time comes, recognize their Government. Therefore we have imposed on ourselves all the duties and inconveniences of a power neutral between two belligerents."^b

Hence, whether or not the United States recognize the Confederates as belligerents, they have the right to insist upon England submitting to all the duties and inconveniences of a neutral in maritime warfare.

Consequently, with the exceptions mentioned, the whole London press acknowledges the right of the *San Jacinto* to overhaul, visit, and search the *Trent*, in order to ascertain whether she carried goods or persons belonging to the category of "contraband of war." *The Times's* insinuation that the English law of decisions¹¹⁵ "was given *under circumstances very different from those which now occur*;" that "steamers did not then exist," and mail vessels, "carrying letters wherein all the nations of the world have immediate interest, were unknown;" that "we (the English) were *fighting for existence*, and did in those days *what we should not allow others to do*," was not seriously thrown out. Palmerston's private

^a J. Mason and J. Slidell.—*Ed.*

^b "It requires a strong effort..." *The Times*, No. 24102, November 28, 1861, leading article.—*Ed.*

Moniteur, *The Morning Post*, declared on the same day that mail steamers were simple merchantmen, not sharing the exemption from the right of search of men-of-war and transports.^a The *right of search*, on the part of the *San Jacinto*, was in point of fact, conceded by the London press as well as the law officers of the Crown. The objection that the *Trent*, instead of sailing from a belligerent to a belligerent port, was, on the contrary, bound from a neutral to a neutral port, fell to the ground by Lord Stowell's decision that the right of search is intended to ascertain the destination of a ship.^b

In the second instance, the question arose whether by firing a round shot across the bows of the *Trent*, and subsequently throwing a shell, bursting close to her, the *San Jacinto* had not violated the usages and courtesies appurtenant to the exercise of the right of visitation and search. It was generally conceded by the London press that, since the details of the event have till now been only ascertained by the depositions of one of the parties concerned, no such minor question could influence the decision to be arrived at by the British Government.

The right of search, exercised by the *San Jacinto*, thus being conceded, what had she to look for? For *contraband of war*, presumed to be conveyed by the *Trent*. What is contraband of war? Are the *dispatches* of a belligerent Government contraband of war? Are the *persons* carrying those dispatches contraband of war? And, both questions being answered in the affirmative, do those dispatches and the bearers of them continue to be contraband of war, if found on a merchant ship bound from a neutral port to a neutral port? The London press admits that the decisions of the highest legal authorities on both sides of the Atlantic are so contradictory, and may be claimed with such appearance of justice for both the affirmative and the negative, that, at all events, a *prima facie*^c case is made out for the *San Jacinto*.

Concurrently with this prevalent opinion of the English press, the English Crown lawyers have altogether dropped the material question, and only taken up the formal question. They assert that the law of nations was not violated in *substance*, but in *form* only. They have arrived at the conclusion that the *San Jacinto* failed in seizing, on her own responsibility, the Southern Commissioners,

^a "The Government of the United States has taken a step...", *The Morning Post*, No. 27440, November 28, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b "It requires a strong effort..."—*Ed.*

^c Plausible.—*Ed.*

instead of taking the *Trent* to a Federal port and submitting the question to a Federal Prize-Court, no armed cruiser having a right to make himself a Judge at sea. A violation in the *procedure* of the San Jacinto is, therefore, all that is imputed to her by the English Crown lawyers, who, in my opinion, are right in their conclusion. It might be easy to unearth precedents, showing England to have similarly trespassed on the formalities of maritime law; but violations of law can never be allowed to supplant the law itself.

The question may now be mooted, whether the reparation demanded by the English Government—that is, the restitution of the Southern Commissioners—be warranted by an injury which the English themselves avow to be of *form* rather than of *substance*? A lawyer of the Temple,¹¹⁶ in the to-day's *Times*, remarks, in respect to this point:

“If the case is not so clearly in our favor as that a decision in the American Court condemning the vessel would have been liable to be questioned by us as manifestly contrary to the laws of nations, then the irregularity of the American Captain^a in allowing the *Trent* to proceed to Southampton, clearly redounded to the advantage of the British owners and the British passengers. Could we in such a case find a ground of international quarrel in an error of procedure which in effect told in our own favor?”^b

Still, if the American Government must concede, as it seems to me, that Capt. Wilkes has committed a violation of maritime law, whether formal or material, their fair fame and their interest ought alike to prevent them from nibbling at the terms of the satisfaction to be given to the injured party. They ought to remember that they do the work of the Secessionists in embroiling the United States in a war with England, that such a war would be a godsend to Louis Bonaparte in his present difficulties, and would, consequently, be supported by all the official weight of France; and, lastly, that, what with the actual force under the command of the British on the North American and West Indian stations, what with the forces of the Mexican Expedition,^c the English Government would have at its disposal an overwhelming maritime power.

As to the policy of the seizure in the Bahama Channel, the voice not only of the English but of the European press is unanimous in expressions of bewilderment at the strange conduct of the

^a Ch. Wilkes.—*Ed.*

^b Justitia, “To the Editor of *The Times*”, *The Times*, No. 24104, November 30, 1861.—*Ed.*

^c See pp. 71-78 of this volume.—*Ed.*

American Government, provoking such tremendous international dangers, for gaining the bodies of Messrs. Mason, Slidell & Co., while Messrs. Yancey and Mann are strutting in London. *The Times* is certainly right in saying:

“Even Mr. Seward himself must know that the voices of these Southern Commissioners, sounding from their captivity, are a thousand times more eloquent in London and in Paris than they would have been if they had been heard at St. James’s and the Tuileries.”^a

The people of the United States having magnanimously submitted to a curtailment of their own liberties in order to save their country, will certainly be no less ready to turn the tide of popular opinion in England by openly avowing, and carefully making up for, an international blunder the vindication of which might realize the boldest hopes of the rebels.

Written on November 30, 1861

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6462, December 19, 1861

^a “It requires a strong effort...”, *The Times*, No. 24102, November 28, 1861, leading article.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

THE PRINCIPAL ACTORS IN THE TRENT DRAMA¹¹⁷

London, December 4

At the present moment it is of interest to get acquainted in some measure with the leading figures in the *Trent* drama. On one side stands the active hero, Captain *Wilkes*, the commander of the *San Jacinto*; on the other, the passive heroes, *J. M. Mason* and *John Slidell*. Captain Charles Wilkes is a direct descendant of the brother of the celebrated English demagogue, [John] Wilkes, who threatened for a moment to shake the throne of George III.¹¹⁸ The struggle with the North American colonies saved the Hanoverian dynasty at that time from the outbreak of an English revolution, symptoms of which were alike perceptible in the cry of a Wilkes and the letters of a Junius. Captain Wilkes, born in New York in 1798, forty-three years in the service of the American navy, commanded the squadron that from 1838 to 1842 explored the North and South Pacific Ocean by order of the Union government. He has published a report on this expedition in five volumes.^a He is also the author of a work on *Western America*, which contains some valuable information on California and the Oregon district.^b It is now certain that Wilkes improvised his *coup de main*^c independently and without instructions from Washington.

The two intercepted commissioners of the Southern Confederacy—Messrs. *Mason* and *Slidell*—form a contrast in every respect. *Mason*, born in 1798, is descended from one of those old

^a Ch. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition...*, Vols. I-V, Philadelphia, 1845.—*Ed.*

^b Ch. Wilkes, *Western America, including California and Oregon...*, Philadelphia, 1849.—*Ed.*

^c An impetuous and unexpected attack.—*Ed.*

aristocratic families of Virginia that fled from England after the Royalists had been defeated at the battle of Worcester.¹¹⁹ The grandsire of our hero^a belongs to the circle of men who, along with Washington, Jefferson, etc., are designated by the Americans as “the revolutionary fathers”.^b John Slidell is neither, like Mason, of aristocratic lineage, nor, like his colleague, a slaveholder by birth. His native town is New York, where his grandfather and his father lived as honest tallow-chandlers.^c *Mason*, after he had occupied himself for some years with the study of law, stepped on the political stage. He figured repeatedly since 1826 as a member of the House of Representatives of Virginia; made his appearance in 1837 in the House of Representatives of the American Congress for a session; but his importance only dates from 1847. In that year Virginia elected him to the American Senate, in which he held his seat until the spring of 1861. *Slidell*, who is now sixty-eight years old, was obliged to leave New York as a young man in consequence of adultery and a duel, in short, of a scandal. He betook himself to New Orleans, where he lived first by gambling, later by practising law. Having become first a member of the legislature of Louisiana, he soon made his way to the House of Representatives and finally to the Senate of the American Congress. As a director of election rogueries during the presidential election of 1844 and, later, as a participant in a swindle in state lands, he had even somewhat shocked the sort of morals that prevail in Louisiana.

Mason inherited influence; Slidell acquired it. The two men found and supplemented each other in the American Senate, the bulwark of the slave oligarchy. In accordance with the American Constitution, the Senate elects a special Committee of Foreign Relations, which plays about the same role as the Privy Council^{d 120} formerly played in England, before the so-called Cabinet, a quantity theoretically unknown to the English Constitution, usurped the Privy Council’s functions. Mason was for a long time chairman of this committee; Slidell, a prominent member of it.

Mason, firmly convinced that every Virginian is a demi-god and every Yankee a plebeian rascal, never sought to conceal his contempt for his Northern colleagues. Haughty, overbearing,

^a G. Mason.— *Ed.*

^b Marx uses the English expression and gives the German translation in parenthesis.— *Ed.*

^c Marx uses the English words “tallow-chandlers” and gives the German translation in parenthesis.— *Ed.*

^d Marx gives the English name in brackets after its German equivalent.— *Ed.*

insolent, he knew how to knit his brows in a somber, Zeus-like frown and in fact transported to the Senate the manners native to the plantation. A fanatical eulogist of slavery, a shameless slanderer of the North and particularly of the Northern working class, a blusterer against England, Mason wearied the Senate with the prolix importunity of a persistent flow of speech that vainly sought to hide its complete vacuity under a hollow pomp. As a sort of demonstration, he went around in recent years in Virginian home-made gray linen; but, and this is characteristic of the man, the gray coat was adorned with loud buttons, all of which came from a state of New England, from Connecticut.

Whilst Mason played the *Jupiter Tonans*^a of the slave oligarchy on the proscenium, Slidell worked behind the scenes. With a rare talent for intrigue, tireless perseverance and an unscrupulous lack of regard, but at the same time wary, covert, never strutting, but always insinuating himself, Slidell was the soul of the Southern conspiratorial conclave. One may judge the man's repute from the fact that when in 1845, shortly before the outbreak of war with Mexico, he was sent there as Ambassador, Mexico refused to treat with such an individual.¹²¹ Slidell's intrigues made Polk President. He was one of the most pernicious counsellors of President Pierce and the evil genius of Buchanan's administration. The two, Mason and Slidell, were the chief sponsors of the law on runaway slaves¹²²; they brought about the bloodbath in Kansas,¹²³ and both were wirepullers for the measures whereby Buchanan's administration smuggled all the means to secession into the hands of the South, whilst it left the North defenceless.¹²⁴

As early as 1855 Mason declared on a public occasion in South Carolina that "for the South only one way lies open—immediate, absolute and eternal separation".^b In March 1861 he declared in the Senate that "he owed the Union government no *allegiance*";^c but retained his seat in the Senate and continued to draw his senatorial salary as long as the safety of his person allowed—a spy in the supreme council of the nation and a fraudulent parasite on the public exchequer.

Mason's great-grandmother was a daughter of the celebrated Sir William Temple. He is therefore a distant relative of Palmerston.

^a Jupiter the thunderer.—*Ed.*

^b J. M. Mason [Statement urging the separation of the South], *New-York Times*, October 14, 1856.—*Ed.*

^c J. M. Mason [Speech in the Senate on March 11, 1861], *The New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6202, March 12, 1861. In quoting, Marx uses the English word "allegiance" and gives the translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

Mason and Slidell appeared to the people of the North not merely as their political opponents, but as their *personal enemies*. Hence the general jubilation over their capture, which in its first days even overwhelmed regard for the danger threatening from England.

Written on December 4, 1861

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in *Die Presse*, No. 337,
December 8, 1861

Karl Marx

[CONTROVERSY OVER THE TRENT CASE]¹²⁵

London, December 7

The Palmerston press—and on another occasion I will show that in foreign affairs Palmerston's control over nine-tenths of the English press is just as *absolute* as Louis Bonaparte's over nine-tenths of the French press^a—the Palmerston press feels that it works among “pleasing hindrances”.^b On the one hand, it admits that the law officers of the Crown^c have reduced the accusation against the United States to a *mere mistake in procedure*, to a *technical error*. On the other hand, it boasts that on the basis of such a legal quibble a *compelling ultimatum* has been presented to the United States, such as can only be justified by a gross violation of law, but not by a formal error in the exercise of a recognised right. Accordingly, the Palmerston press now pleads the question of *material* right again. The great importance of the case appears to demand a brief examination of the question of *material* right.

By way of introduction, it may be observed that not a single English paper ventures to reproach the *San Jacinto* for the visitation and search of the *Trent*. This point, therefore, falls outside the controversy.

First, we again call to mind the relevant passage in Queen Victoria's proclamation of neutrality of May 13, 1861. The passage reads:

“*Victoria R.*

“As we are at peace with the United States ... we warn all our beloved subjects ... to abstain from contravening our Proclamation ... by breaking the legally

^a See this volume, pp. 127-30.—*Ed.*

^b Heinrich Heine, “Neuer Frühling”, Prolog.—*Ed.*

^c R. Palmer and W. Atherton.—*Ed.*

recognised blockade or by *carrying officers ... dispatches ...* or any other contraband of war. All persons so offending will be liable to the various penalties imposed in that behalf by the English municipal law and by the law of nations.... Such persons will in no way receive our *protection* against the consequences of their conduct but will, on the contrary, incur our displeasure.”^a

This proclamation of Queen Victoria, therefore, in the first place declares *dispatches* to be contraband and makes the ship that carries such contraband liable to the “penalties of the law of nations”. What are these penalties?

Wheaton, an American writer on international law whose authority is recognised on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean alike, says in his *Elements of International Law*, p. 565^b:

“The carrying of dispatches of the enemy subjects the *neutral* vessel in which they are transported to *capture* and *confiscation*. The consequences of such a service are infinitely beyond the effect of conveying ordinary contraband.... As Sir *W. Scott*, the *English* judge, says, the carrying of military stores is necessarily of limited nature, while the carrying of dispatches is an act that may defeat the entire plan of campaign of the other belligerent.... The confiscation of the noxious article, which constitutes the usual penalty for contraband, would be ridiculous when applied to dispatches. There would be no freight dependent on their transportation. Therefore, their confiscation does not affect the shipowner and hence does not punish the ship carrying them. The vehicle, in which they are carried, must, therefore, be *confiscated*.”

Walker, in his *Introduction to American Law*, says:

“Neutrals may not be concerned in bearing *hostile dispatches*, under the penalty of confiscation of the vehicle, and of the cargo also.”

Kent, who is accounted a decisive authority in English courts, states in his *Commentaries*:

“If, on search of a ship, it is found that she carries *enemy dispatches*, she incurs the penalty of capture and of confiscation by judgment of a prize court.”

Dr. Robert Phillimore, Advocate of Her Majesty in Her Office of Admiralty,^c says in his latest work on international law, p. 370:

“Official communications from an official person^d on the affairs of a belligerent Government are such *dispatches* as impress an hostile character upon the carriers of them. The mischievous consequences of such a service cannot be estimated, and extend far beyond the effect of any Contraband that can be conveyed, for it is manifest that by the carriage of such dispatches the most important plans of a

^a Here and below Marx quotes from the article “The Capture of Mason and Slidell”, *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6435, November 18, 1861.— *Ed.*

^b Here and below Marx gives the English titles of the books and the German translation in brackets.— *Ed.*

^c Marx gives the English designation and supplies the German translation in brackets.— *Ed.*

^d Marx gives the English words “official” and, below, “carriers” in brackets after their German equivalents.— *Ed.*

Belligerent may be forwarded or obstructed.... The penalty is confiscation of the ship which conveys the dispatches and of the cargo."^a

Two points are therefore established. Queen Victoria's proclamation of May 13, 1861, subjects *English* ships that carry dispatches of the Confederacy to the penalties of international law. International law, according to its English and American interpreters, imposes the *penalty* of capture and confiscation on such ships.

Palmerston's organs consequently *lied* on orders from above—and we were naive enough to believe their lie—in affirming that the captain of the *San Jacinto* had neglected to seek for *dispatches* on the *Trent* and therefore had of course found none; and that the *Trent* had consequently become shot-proof through this oversight. The American journals of November 17 to 20, which *could not* yet have been aware of the English lie, *unanimously* state, on the contrary, that the dispatches *had been seized* and were already in print for submission to Congress in Washington. This changes the whole state of affairs. Because of these dispatches, the *San Jacinto* had the right to take the *Trent* in tow and every American prize court had the duty to confiscate her and her cargo. With the *Trent*, her passengers also naturally came within the pale of American jurisdiction.

Messrs. Mason, Slidell and Co., as soon as the *Trent* had touched at Monroe, came under American jurisdiction as rebels. If, therefore, instead of towing the *Trent* herself to an American port, the captain of the *San Jacinto* contented himself with seizing the dispatches and their bearers, he in no way worsened the position of Mason, Slidell and Co., whilst, on the other hand, his *error in procedure* benefited the *Trent*, her cargo and her passengers. And it would be indeed unprecedented if Britain wished to declare war on the United States because Captain Wilkes committed an *error in procedure* harmful to the United States, but profitable to Britain.

The question whether Mason, Slidell and Co. were themselves contraband, was only raised and could only be raised because the Palmerston journals had broadcast the *lie* that Captain Wilkes had neither searched for dispatches, nor seized dispatches. For in this case Mason, Slidell and Co. in fact constituted the sole objects on the ship *Trent* that could possibly fall under the category of contraband. Let us, however, disregard this aspect for the moment. Queen Victoria's proclamation designates "*officers*"^b of a belligerent party as contraband. Are "*officers*" merely military

^a R. Phillimore, *Commentaries upon International Law*.—Ed.

^b Here and further on Marx uses the English word.—Ed.

officers? Were Mason, Slidell and Co. “officers” of the Confederacy? “Officers,” says *Samuel Johnson* in his dictionary of the English language, are “men employed by the public”,^a that is, in German: *öffentliche Beamte*. *Walker* gives the same definition. (See his dictionary, 1861 edition.)

According to the usage of the English language, therefore, Mason, Slidell and Co., these emissaries, *id est*, officials of the Confederacy, come under the category of “officers”, whom the royal proclamation declares to be *contraband*. The *Trent* captain *knew* them in this capacity and therefore rendered himself, his ship and his passengers confiscable. If, according to *Phillimore* and all other authorities, a ship becomes confiscable as the carrier^b of an enemy dispatch because it violates neutrality, in a still higher degree is this true of the *person* who carries the dispatches. According to *Wheaton*, even an enemy *ambassador*, so long as he is *in transitu*, may be intercepted. In general, however, the basis of all international law is that any member of the belligerent party may be regarded and treated as “belligerent” by the opposing party.

“So long as a man,” says *Vattel*, “continues to be a citizen of his own country, he is the enemy of all those with whom his nation is at war.”^c

One sees, therefore, that the law officers of the English Crown reduced the point of contention to a mere *error in procedure*, not an *error in re*,^d but an *error in forma*,^e because, actually, no *violation of material right* is to hand. The *Palmerston* organs chatter about the question of material right again because a mere error in procedure, *in the interest of the “Trent”* at that, gives no plausible pretext for a haughty-toned ultimatum.

Meanwhile, important voices have been raised in this sense from diametrically opposite sides: on the one side, Messrs. *Bright* and *Cobden*; on the other, *David Urquhart*. These men are enemies on grounds of principle and personally: the first two, peaceable cosmopolitans; the third, the “*last of the Englishmen*”¹²⁶; the former always ready to sacrifice all international law to international trade; the other hesitating not a moment: “*Fiat justitia, pereat mundus*”,^f and by “justice” he understands “English” justice. The

^a Marx gives the definition in English.—*Ed.*

^b Marx uses the English word and gives the German translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

^c E. de *Vattel*, *Le Droit des gens...*, Tome II, livre III, chapitre V, § 71.—*Ed.*

^d In substance.—*Ed.*

^e In form.—*Ed.*

^f Let justice be done, though the world perish.—*Ed.*

voices of *Bright* and *Cobden* are important because they represent a powerful section of middle-class interests and are represented in the ministry by Gladstone, Milner Gibson and also, more or less, by Sir Cornwall Lewis. The voice of Urquhart is important because international law is his life-study and everyone recognises him as an *incorruptible* interpreter of this international law.

The usual newspaper sources will communicate Bright's speech in support of the United States and Cobden's letter, which is conceived in the same sense.^a Therefore I will not dwell on them.

Urquhart's organ, *The Free Press*, states in its latest issue, published on December 4:

"'We must bombard New York!' Such were the frantic sounds which met the ears of every one who traversed the streets of London on the evening of this day week, on the arrival of the intelligence of a trifling warlike incident. The act was one which, in every war, England has committed as a matter of course—namely, the seizure on board of a neutral of the persons and property of her enemies."

The Free Press further argues that, in 1856 at the Congress of Paris, Palmerston, without any authority from the Crown or Parliament, sacrificed English maritime law *in the interest of Russia*, and then says:

"In order to justify this sacrifice, Palmerston's organs stated at that time that if we maintained the right of visitation and search, we should assuredly be involved in a war with the United States on the occasion of the first war in Europe. And now he calls on us through the same organs of public opinion to bombard New York because the United States act on those laws which are theirs no less than our own."^b

With regard to the utterances of the "organs of public opinion", *The Free Press* remarks:

"The bray of Baron Munchausen's thawing post-horn was nothing to the clangour of the British press on the capture of Messrs. Mason and Slidell."^c

Then humorously, it places side by side, in "strophe" and "antistrophe", the contradictions by which the English press seeks to convict the United States of a "breach of law".

Written on December 7, 1861

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in *Die Presse*, No. 340,
December 11, 1861

^a J. Bright's speech and R. Cobden's letter were reported in the note, "Mr. Bright on America", *The Times*, No. 24109, December 6, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b Here and above Marx quotes from the article, "We must bombard New York! Such were...", *The Free Press*, No. 12, December 4, 1861.—*Ed.*

^c "Public Opinion" on the *San Jacinto* Affair", *The Free Press*, same issue.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx
PROGRESS OF FEELING IN ENGLAND

London, Dec. 7, 1861

The friends of the United States on this side of the Atlantic anxiously hope that conciliatory steps will be taken by the Federal Government. They do so not from a concurrence in the frantic crowing of the British press over a war incident, which, according to the English Crown lawyers themselves, resolves itself into a mere error of procedure, and may be summed up in the words that there has been a breach of international law, because Capt. Wilkes, instead of taking the *Trent*, her cargo, her passengers, and the Commissioners,^a did only take the Commissioners. Nor springs the anxiety of the well-wishers of the Great Republic from an apprehension lest, in the long run, it should not prove able to cope with England, although backed by the civil war; and, least of all, do they expect the United States to abdicate, even for a moment, and in a dark hour of trial, the proud position held by them in the council of nations. The motives that prompt them are of quite a different nature.

In the first instance, the business next in hand for the United States is to crush the rebellion and to restore the Union. The wish uppermost in the minds of the Slaveocracy and their Northern tools was always to plunge the United States into a war with England. The first step of England as soon as hostilities broke out would be to recognize the Southern Confederacy, and the second to terminate the blockade. Secondly, no general, if not forced, will accept battle at the time and under the conditions chosen by his enemy.

^a J. Mason and J. Slidell.—*Ed.*

"A war with America," says *The Economist*, a paper deeply in Palmerston's confidence, "must always be one of the most lamentable incidents in the history of England; but if it is to happen, *the present is certainly the period at which it will do us the minimum of harm, and the only moment in our joint annals at which it would confer on us an incidental and partial compensation.*"^a

The very reasons accounting for the eagerness of England to seize upon any decent pretext for war at this "only moment" ought to withhold the United States from forwarding such a pretext at this "only moment." You go not to war with the aim to do your enemy "*the minimum of harm,*" and, even to confer upon him by the war, "*an incidental and partial compensation.*" The opportunity of the moment would all be on one side, on the side of your foe. Is there any great strain of reasoning wanted to prove that an internal war raging in a State is the least opportune time for entering upon a foreign war? At every other moment the mercantile classes of Great Britain would have looked upon a war against the United States with the utmost horror. Now, on the contrary, a large and influential party of the mercantile community has for months been urging on the Government to violently break the blockade, and thus provide the main branch of British industry with its raw material. The fear of a curtailment of the English export trade to the United States has lost its sting by the curtailment of that trade having already actually occurred. "They" (the Northern States), says *The Economist*, "are wretched customers, instead of good ones." The vast credit usually given by English commerce to the United States, principally by the acceptance of bills drawn from China and India, has been already reduced to scarcely a fifth of what it was in 1857. Last, not least, Decembrist France, bankrupt, paralyzed at home, beset with difficulty abroad, pounces upon an Anglo-American war as a real godsend, and, in order to buy English support in Europe, will strain all her power to support "Perfidious Albion" on the other side of the Atlantic. Read only the French newspapers. The pitch of indignation to which they have wrought themselves in their tender care for the "honor of England," their fierce diatribes as to the necessity on the part of England to revenge the outrage on the Union Jack, their vile denunciations of everything American, would be truly appalling, if they were not ridiculous and disgusting at the same time. Lastly, if the United States give way in this instance, they will not derogate one iota of their dignity. England has reduced her complaint to a mere *error of procedure, a technical blunder* of which

^a "The Effect of an American War upon English Commerce", *The Economist*, No. 954, December 7, 1861.—*Ed.*

she has made herself systematically guilty in all her maritime wars, but against which the United States have never ceased to protest, and which President Madison, in his message inaugurating the war of 1812,^a expatiated upon as one of the most shocking breaches of international law. If the United States may be defended in paying England with her own coin, will they be accused for magnanimously disavowing, on the part of a single American captain,^b acting on his own responsibility, what they always denounced as a systematic usurpation on the part of the British Navy! In point of fact, the gain of such a procedure would be all on the American side. England, on the one hand, would have acknowledged the right of the United States to capture and bring to adjudication before an American prize court every English ship employed in the service of the Confederation. On the other hand, she would, once for all, before the eyes of the whole world, have practically resigned a claim which she was not brought to desist from either in the peace of Ghent, in 1814,^c or the transactions carried on between Lord Ashburton and Secretary Webster in 1842.¹²⁷ The question then comes to this: Do you prefer to turn the "untoward event" to your own account, or, blinded by the passions of the moment, turn it to the account of your foes at home and abroad?

Since this day week, when I sent you my last letter,^d British consols have again lowered, the decline, compared with last Friday, amounting to 2 per cent, the present prices being $89\frac{3}{4}$ to $7\frac{1}{8}$ for money and 90 to $90\frac{1}{8}$ for the new account on the 9th of January. This quotation corresponds to the quotation of the British consols during the first two years of the Anglo-Russian war.^e This decline is altogether due to the warlike interpretation put upon the American papers conveyed by the last mail, to the exacerbating tone of the London press, whose moderation of two days' standing was but a feint, ordered by Palmerston, to the dispatch of troops for Canada, to the proclamation forbidding the export of arms and materials for gunpowder^f and lastly, to the

^a J. Madison, *To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States* [Washington, June 1, 1812].—*Ed.*

^b Ch. Wilkes.—*Ed.*

^c *A Treaty of Peace and Amity between his Britannic Majesty and the United States of America; signed at Ghent, December 24, 1814.*—*Ed.*

^d See this volume, pp. 95-100.—*Ed.*

^e *The Crimean War of 1853-56.*—*Ed.*

^f Victoria, R., *A Proclamation* [December 4, 1861], *The Times*, No. 24108, December 5, 1861.—*Ed.*

daily ostentatious statements concerning the formidable preparations for war in the docks and maritime arsenals.

Of one thing you may be sure, Palmerston wants a legal pretext for a war with the United States, but meets in the Cabinet councils with a most determinate opposition on the part of Messrs. Gladstone and Milner Gibson, and, to a less degree, of Sir Cornwall Lewis. "The noble viscount" is backed by Russell, an abject tool in his hands, and the whole Whig Coterie. If the Washington Cabinet should furnish the desired pretext, the present Cabinet will be sprung, to be supplanted by a Tory Administration. The preliminary steps for such a change of scenery have been already settled between Palmerston and Disraeli. Hence the furious war-cry of *The Morning Herald* and *The Standard*, those hungry wolves howling at the prospect of the long-missed crumbs from the public almoner.

Palmerston's designs may be shown up by calling into memory a few facts. It was he who insisted upon the proclamation, acknowledging the Secessionists as belligerents, on the morning of the 14th of May, after he had been informed by telegraph from Liverpool that Mr. Adams would arrive at London on the night of the 13th May. He, after a severe struggle with his colleagues, dispatched 3,000 men to Canada, an army ridiculous, if intended to cover a frontier of 1,500 miles, but a clever sleight-of-hand if the rebellion was to be cheered, and the Union to be irritated. He, many weeks ago, urged Bonaparte to propose a joint armed intervention "in the internecine struggle," supported that project in the Cabinet council, and failed only in carrying it by the resistance of his colleagues. He and Bonaparte then resorted to the Mexican intervention as a *pis aller*.^a That operation served two purposes, by provoking just resentment on the part of the Americans, and by simultaneously furnishing a pretext for the dispatch of a squadron, ready, as *The Morning Post* has it, "to perform whatever duty the hostile conduct of the Government of Washington may require us to perform in the waters of the Northern Atlantic."^b At the time when that expedition was started, *The Morning Post*, together with *The Times* and the smaller fry of Palmerston's press slaves, said that it was a very fine thing, and a philanthropic thing into the bargain, because it would expose the slaveholding Confederation to two fires—the Anti-

^a The last means.—*Ed.*

^b "We are glad to be able to inform our readers...", *The Morning Post*, No. 27442, November 30, 1861.—*Ed.*

Slavery North and the Anti-Slavery force of England and France. And what says the very same *Morning Post*, this curious compound of Jenkins and Rhodomonte, of plush and swash, in its to-day's issue, on occasion of Jefferson Davis's address?^a Hearken to the Palmerston oracle:

"We must look to this intervention as one that may be in operation during a considerable period of time; and while the Northern Government is too distant to admit of its attitude entering materially into this question, the Southern Confederation, on the other hand, stretches for a great distance along the frontier of Mexico, so as to render its friendly disposition to the authors of the insurrection of no slight consequence. The Northern Government has invariably railed at our neutrality, but the Southern with statesmanship and moderation has recognized in it all that we could do for either party; and whether with a view to our transactions in Mexico, or to our relations with the Cabinet at Washington, the *friendly forbearance* of the Southern Confederacy is an important point in our favor."^b

I may remark that the *Nord* of December 3—a Russian paper, and consequently a paper initiated into Palmerston's designs—insinuates that the Mexican expedition was from the first set on foot, not for its ostensible purpose, but for a war against the United States.^c

Gen. Scott's letter had produced such a beneficent reaction in public opinion, and even on the London Stock Exchange, that the conspirators of Downing street and the Tuileries¹²⁸ found it necessary to let loose the *Patrie*, stating with all the airs of knowledge derived from official sources that the seizure of the Southern Commissioners from the *Trent* was directly authorized by the Washington Cabinet.

Written on December 7, 1861

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6467, December 25, 1861

^a J. Davis, "To the Congress of the Confederate States. Richmond, Nov. 18, 1861", *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6441, November 25, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b "The principal intelligence conveyed by the Edinburgh...", *The Morning Post*, No. 27448, December 7, 1861.—*Ed.*

^c "Résumé politique", *Le Nord*, No. 337, December 3, 1861.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

THE CRISIS OVER THE SLAVERY ISSUE¹²⁹

London, December 10

The United States has evidently entered a critical stage with regard to the *slavery question*, the question underlying the whole Civil War. General Frémont has been dismissed for declaring the slaves of *rebels* free.^a A directive to General Sherman, the commander of the expedition to South Carolina, was a little later published by the Washington Government, which goes further than Frémont, for it decrees that fugitive slaves even of *loyal* slave-owners should be welcomed and employed as workers and paid a wage, and under certain circumstances armed, and consoles the “loyal” owners with the prospect of receiving compensation later.^b Colonel Cochrane has gone even further than Frémont, he demands the arming of all slaves as a military measure.^c The Secretary of War Cameron publicly approves of Cochrane’s “views”.^d The Secretary of the Interior,^e on behalf of the government, then repudiates the Secretary of War. The Secretary of War expresses his “views” even more emphatically at a public meeting stating that he will vindicate these views in his report to Congress.^f General Halleck, Frémont’s successor in Missouri, and General Dix in east Virginia have driven fugitive Negroes from their military camps and forbidden them to appear in future in the vicinity of the positions held by their armies. General Wool at the same time has received the black “contraband” with open

^a See this volume, pp. 86-88. Frémont’s proclamation was published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6366, September 1, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b The directive was discussed in the item “Instructions to Gen. Sherman”, *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6445, November 29, 1861.—*Ed.*

^c Cochrane’s message to soldiers, *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6433, November 15, 1861.—*Ed.*

^d Cameron’s speech to soldiers, *New-York Daily Tribune*, same issue.—*Ed.*

^e C. B. Smith.—*Ed.*

^f The Smith-Cameron polemic was discussed in a report from Washington and published in *The Times*, No. 24111, December 9, 1861.—*Ed.*

arms at Fort Monroe.¹³⁰ The old leaders of the *Democratic Party*, Senator Dickinson and Croswell (a former member of the so-called Democratic regency¹³¹), have published open letters in which they express their agreement with Cochrane and Cameron,^a and Colonel *Jennison* in Kansas has surpassed all his military predecessors by an address to his troops which contains the following passage:

“No temporising with rebels and those sympathising with them.... I have told General Frémont that I would not have drawn my sword had I thought that slavery would outlast this struggle. The slaves of rebels will always find protection in this camp and we will defend them to the last man and the last bullet. I want no men who are *not Abolitionists*,^b I have no use for them and I hope that there are no such people among us, for everyone knows that slavery is the basis, the centre and the vertex of this infernal war.... Should the government disapprove of my action it can take back my patent, but in that case I shall act on my own hook even if in the beginning I can only count on six men.”^c

The slavery question is being solved in practice in the border slave states even now, especially in *Missouri* and to a lesser extent in *Kentucky*, etc. A large-scale dispersal of slaves is taking place. For instance 50,000 slaves have disappeared from *Missouri*, some of them have run away, others have been transported by the slave-owners to the more distant southern states.

It is rather strange that a most important and significant event is not mentioned in any English newspaper. On November 18, delegates from 45 North Carolina counties met on Hatteras Island, appointed a provisional government, revoked the Ordinance of Secession and proclaimed that North Carolina was returning to the Union. The counties of North Carolina represented at this convention have been called together to elect their Representatives to Congress at Washington.^d

Written on December 10, 1861

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in *Die Presse*, No. 343,
December 14, 1861

^a Croswell's letter in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6441, November 25, 1861. In a postscript to it Dickinson declared himself in agreement with Croswell.—*Ed.*

^b Marx gives the beginning of this sentence in English in brackets, after the German equivalent. In the same manner he gives the phrase “on my own hook” further in this paragraph.—*Ed.*

^c Jennison's address was reproduced in the item “Camp Jennison. Kansas City, Tuesday, Nov. 12, 1861”, *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6441, November 25, 1861.—*Ed.*

^d These events were reported in the item “Hatteras Inlet, N.C., Nov. 18, 1861”, *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6438, November 21, 1861.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx
AMERICAN MATTERS

London, December 13

The news of the fate of the *Harvey Birch* and the visit of the cruiser *Nashville* in Southampton harbour reached New York on November 29, but does not seem to have provoked the sensation that was every bit as expected in certain circles here as it was feared in others, hostile to the war.¹³² This time, one wave broke on another. For New York was stirred up by the campaign for the election of the Mayor on December 3. The Washington correspondent of *The Times*, Mr. Russell, who spoils his Celtic talent by affecting English ways, pretends to shrug his shoulders in wonder at this excitement over the mayoral election.^a Of course, Mr. Russell is flattering the illusion of the London cockney that the election of the Mayor in New York is the same kind of old-fashioned tomfoolery as the election of a Lord Mayor in London. It is well known that the Lord Mayor of London has nothing to do with the greater part of London. He is the nominal ruler of the City, a story-book character who strives to prove his reality by producing good turtle soups at banquets and bad judgments in cases of violation of police regulations. A Lord Mayor of London is a government figure only in the imagination of Paris writers of vaudeville and *faits divers*.^b The Mayor of New York, on the contrary, is a real power. At the beginning of the secession movement the then Mayor, the notorious *Fernando Wood*, was on the point of proclaiming New York an independent city republic,¹³³ in collusion, of course, with Jefferson Davis. His plan

^a [W. H. Russell] "Washington, Nov. 29", *The Times*, No. 24115, December 13, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b Local news items.—*Ed.*

founded owing to the energy of the Republican Party of the Empire City.¹³⁴

On November 27, Charles Sumner of Massachusetts, a member of the American Senate, where he had been beaten with a stick by a Southern senator^a at the time of the Kansas affair,¹³⁵ delivered a brilliant speech before a large meeting in Cooper Union¹³⁶ in New York on the origin and secret motives of the slaveholder rebellion.^b After his speech the meeting adopted the following resolution:

“The doctrine enunciated by General Frémont, with respect to the emancipation of the slaves of rebels, and the more recent utterances of General Burnside, Senator Wilson,^c George Bancroft (the famous historian), Colonel Cochrane and Simon Cameron, foreshadowing the eventual rooting out of slavery as the cause of the rebellion, indicate a moral, political, and military necessity. In the judgment of this meeting, the public sentiment of the North is now fully in sympathy with any practicable scheme which may be presented for the extirpation of this national evil, and it regards such a result as the only consistent issue of this contest between civilisation and barbarism.”^d

The *New-York Tribune* comments, in particular, on Sumner’s address:

“The allusion of Mr. Sumner to the coming discussions of Congress on the subject of slavery will kindle a hope that that body will at last understand where Southern weakness and Northern strength really lie, and will seize the instrumentality by which alone the rebellion is to be brought to a speedy and final extirpation.”^e

A private letter from *Mexico* states among other things:

“The English ambassador^f pretends to be a warm friend of the administration of President Juárez. Persons well acquainted with the Spanish intrigues assure us that General Marquez has been instructed by Spain to bring the scattered forces of the Clerical party together again, its Mexican as well as Spanish elements. This party is then to take advantage of the opportunity soon to be offered to beg Her Catholic Majesty^g to provide a king for the Mexican throne. An uncle of the

^a P. S. Brooks.—*Ed.*

^b Sumner’s speech was published in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6444, November 28, 1861.—*Ed.*

^c Presumably Henry Wilson.—*Ed.*

^d “The Sentiment of the Cooper Institute Meeting Last Night”, *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6444, November 28, 1861.—*Ed.*

^e “It is certainly an indicative and important fact...”, *New-York Daily Tribune*, same issue, leading article.—*Ed.*

^f Th. Murphy.—*Ed.*

^g Isabella II.—*Ed.*

Queen^a is said to have been selected for the position already. As he is an old man, he would soon leave the stage in the natural course of events, and since any clause concerning the nomination of his successor is to be avoided, Mexico would thus revert to Spain—so that the same policy would triumph in Mexico as in Haiti.”¹³⁷

Written on December 13, 1861

First published in *Die Presse*, No. 346,
December 17, 1861

Printed according to the news-
paper

Published in English for the first
time

^a Francisco de Paula Antonio de Borbón.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx
A SLANDER TRIAL

London, December 19

The ancient Egyptians are known to have developed the *division of labour* to a high degree, so far as it extended to the whole of society and not to the individual workshop. With them almost every particular part of the body had its own special physician, whose therapy was confined by law to this particular region. Theft was the occupation of a special trade, the head of which was an officially recognised person. But how inadequate the ancient Egyptian division of labour appears when compared to that of modern England! The strange nature of some trades in London amazes us no less than the extent to which they are carried on.

One of these curious industries is *espionage*. It divides into two big branches, *civil espionage* and *political espionage*. We leave the latter entirely out of account here. Civil espionage is again broken down into two large subdivisions—*official* and *private espionage*.

The *official* sort is carried on, on the one hand, by detectives, who are paid either by the government or the municipal authorities, and on the other hand, by common informers, who spy on their own and are paid by jobwork^a by the police.

The business of private espionage breaks down into many subtypes, which may be united under two major headings. One comprises *non-commercial* private relations, the other *commercial*. Under the first heading, in which espionage on marital infidelity plays an important part, the establishment of *Mr. Field* has won European fame. The business of *commercial espionage* will be better understood from the following incident.

Last Tuesday^b the Court of Exchequer¹³⁸ dealt with a suit for

^a Marx uses the English words “detectives”, “common informers” and “jobwork” and gives the German translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

^b December 17.—*Ed.*

slander, in which a local weekly paper, *Lloyd's Weekly News*, was the defendant and Stubbs and Comp. the plaintiff. Stubbs and Comp. publish a weekly under the title of *Stubbs' Gazette*, the organ of *Stubbs' Trade Protection Company*. The paper is sent privately to subscribers, who pay 3 guineas a year, but is not sold by single copies, as other newspapers are, in stationers'^a shops, on the street, at railway stations, and so on. Actually, it is a proscription list of bad debtors, whatever their position in life. Stubbs' "Protection Company" spies out the solvency of private individuals, *Stubbs' Gazette* records them in black and white. The number of subscribers runs to 20,000.

Well, *Lloyd's Weekly News* had published an article in which the following statement appeared: "It is the duty of every honourable man to put an end to this disgraceful system of *espionage*." Stubbs demanded judicial revenge for this slander.

After the attorney for the plaintiff, Serjeant Shee, had poured out the stream of his Irish eloquence, the plaintiff Stubbs underwent a cross examination^b (in effect, the cross fire to which the witnesses are subjected during the hearing) by Serjeant Ballantine, the attorney for *Lloyd's Weekly News*. The following comical dialogue ensued.^c

Ballantine: "Do you ask your subscribers for information?"

Stubbs: "I invite the subscribers to send me the names of persons they consider to be swindlers. We then investigate these cases. I do not investigate them myself. I have agents in London and other large cities. I have 9 or 10 agents in London, who get a yearly salary."

Ballantine: "What do these gentlemen receive for hunting out information?"

Stubbs: "From 150 to 200 pounds sterling."

Ballantine: "And a new suit? Well, when one of these well-paid gentlemen catches a swindler, what happens then?"

"We publish his name."

Ballantine: "When he is a thorough swindler?"

"Yes."

"But if he is only half a swindler?"

"Then we enter it in our register."

^a Marx uses the English word.—*Ed.*

^b Marx uses the English words "serjeant", "cross examination" and, below, "solicitor".—*Ed.*

^c Marx draws on a report published in *The Times*, No. 24119, December 18, 1861.—*Ed.*

“Until he is in full bloom, and then you publish it?”

“Yes.”

“Do you publish autographs of swindlers?”

“Yes.”

“And you go to even greater expense for the benefit of trade. You publish photographs of swindlers?”

“Yes.”

“Do you not have a secret police agency? Are you not connected with Mr. Field?”

“I am glad to be able to say No!”

“What is the difference?”

“I decline to answer that.”

“What do you mean by your ‘legal agents?’”

“That concerns collection of debts. I mean by it solicitors (something between attorney and bailiff) who take care of subscribers’ business according to the conditions stated in the prospectus.”

“So, you are a collector of debts, too?”

“I collect debts through 700 solicitors.”

“Good Lord, you have 700 solicitors, and the world still exists! Do you keep the solicitors or do the solicitors keep you?”

“They keep themselves.”

“Have you had other court cases?”

“Yes, half a dozen.”

“Did you ever contest them?”

“Yes.”

“Was the decision ever in your favour?”

“Once.”

“What do you mean by the heading in your paper, ‘Addresses Wanted’, followed by a long list of names?”

“Absconding debtors whose whereabouts neither we nor our subscribers could trace.”

“How is your business organised?”

“Our central office is in London, with branch offices in Birmingham, Glasgow, Edinburgh and Dublin. My father left me the business. He carried it on in Manchester originally.”

Attorney Ballantine in his plea pounced mercilessly on Stubbs, whose “smiling and self-complacent attitude during his testimony proved at any rate that he had no more idea than a dung-beetle of the filth of the material he moved in”. English trade must have sunk deep indeed, if it needed such a protector. This unworthy spy system would give Stubbs a fearful weapon for extortion, etc.

The Lord Chief Baron,¹³⁹ who was sitting as judge,^a threw his summing-up into the balance for the defence. He concluded with the words:

“The jury owe much to the freedom of the press; but juries are not independent because the press is free, but the press is free because the juries are independent. You must consider whether the incriminated article goes beyond the bounds of honest criticism. Stubbs is a public character and as such is subject to criticism. Should you believe that *Lloyd's Weekly News* has gone beyond the bounds of honest criticism, then it is up to you to award the plaintiff *appropriate* damages.”

The jurors withdrew to the jury room to deliberate. After debating for a quarter of an hour they reappeared in the courtroom with the verdict: Plaintiff Stubbs is in the right; damages for his wounded honour—*one farthing*. The farthing is the smallest English coin, corresponding to the French centime and the German pfennig. Stubbs left Guildhall amidst the loud laughter of the large audience, escorted by a number of admirers, from whose urgent ovations only speedy flight could save his modest dignity.

Written on December 19, 1861

First published in *Die Presse*, No. 353,
December 24, 1861

Printed according to the news-
paper

Published in English for the first
time

^a J. F. Pollock, the Chief Justice of the Court of Exchequer. Marx gives the English title: “Lord Chief Baron”.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

THE WASHINGTON CABINET
AND THE WESTERN POWERS¹⁴⁰

One of the most striking surprises of a war so rich in surprises as the Anglo-French-Turkish-Russian^a was incontestably the declaration on maritime law agreed at Paris in the spring of 1856.¹⁴¹ When the war against Russia began, England suspended her most formidable weapons against Russia: confiscation of enemy-owned goods on neutral ships and privateering. At the conclusion of the war, England broke these weapons in pieces and sacrificed the fragments on the altar of peace. Russia, the ostensibly vanquished party, received a concession that, by a series of "armed neutralities",¹⁴² wars and diplomatic intrigues, she had tried in vain to extort since Catherine II. England, the ostensible victor, renounced, on the other hand, the great means of attack and defence that had grown up out of her sea power and that she had maintained for a century and a half against a world in arms.

The humanitarian grounds that served as a pretext for the Declaration of 1856 vanish before the most superficial examination. Privateering is no greater *barbarism* than the action of volunteer corps or guerillas in land warfare. The privateers are the guerillas of the sea. Confiscation of the private goods of a belligerent nation also occurs in land warfare. Do military requisitions, for example, hit only the cash-box of the enemy government and not the property of private persons also? The nature of land warfare safeguards enemy possessions that are on neutral soil, therefore under the sovereignty of a neutral power. The nature of sea warfare obliterates these barriers, since the sea,

^a The Crimean War.—Ed.

as the common highway of the nations, cannot fall to the sovereignty of any neutral power.

As a matter of fact, however, the Declaration of 1856 veils under its philanthropic phrases a great inhumanity. In principle it transforms war from a war of peoples into a war of governments. It endows property with an inviolability that it denies to persons. It emancipates trade from the terrors of war and thereby makes the classes carrying on trade and industry callous to the terrors of war. For the rest, it is self-understood that the humanitarian pretexts of the Declaration of 1856 were only addressed to the European gallery, just like the religious pretexts of the Holy Alliance.

It is a well-known fact that Lord *Clarendon*, who signed away Britain's maritime rights at the Congress of Paris, acted, as he subsequently confessed in the Upper House, without the foreknowledge or instructions of the Crown. His sole authority consisted in a *private letter* from Palmerston. Up to the present Palmerston has not dared to demand the sanction of the British Parliament for the Declaration of Paris and its signature by Clarendon. Apart from the debates on the contents of the Declaration, there was fear of debates on the Constitutional question whether, independently of Crown and Parliament, a British minister might usurp the right to sweep away the old basis of English sea power with a stroke of the pen. That this ministerial *coup d'état* did not lead to stormy interpellations, but, rather, was silently accepted as a *fait accompli*, Palmerston owed to the influence of the Manchester school.¹⁴³ It found to be in accordance with the interests represented by it, and therefore also with philanthropy, civilisation and progress, an innovation which would allow English commerce to continue to pursue its business with the enemy undisturbed on neutral ships, whilst sailors and soldiers fought for the honour of the nation. The Manchester men were jubilant over the fact that by an unconstitutional *coup de main* the minister had bound England to international concessions whose attainment in the constitutional parliamentary way was wholly improbable. Hence the present indignation of the Manchester party in England over the disclosures of the Blue Book submitted by Seward to the Congress in Washington!

As is known, the United States was the only great power that refused to accede to the Paris Declaration of 1856. If they had renounced privateering, then they would have to create a great state navy. Any weakening of their means of war at sea simultaneously threatened them with the dreadful prospect of

having to maintain a standing land army on the European scale. Nevertheless, President Buchanan stated that he was ready to accept the Declaration of Paris provided that the same inviolability would be assured to all property, enemy or neutral, found on ships, with the exception of contraband of war. His proposal was rejected. From Seward's Blue Book it now appears that Lincoln, immediately after his assumption of office, offered England and France the adhesion of the United States to the Declaration of Paris, so far as it abolishes privateering, on condition that the prohibition of privateering should be extended to the parts of the United States in revolt, that is, the Southern Confederacy. The answer that he received amounted in practice to recognition of the belligerent rights of the Southern Confederacy.^a

"Humanity, progress and civilisation" whispered to the Cabinets of St. James's and the Tuileries that the prohibition of privateering would extraordinarily reduce the chances of secession and therefore of dissolution of the United States. The Confederacy was therefore recognised in all haste as a belligerent party, in order afterwards to reply to the Cabinet at Washington that England and France could naturally not recognise the proposal of one belligerent party as a binding law for the other belligerent party. The same "noble uprightness" inspired all the diplomatic negotiations of England and France with the Union government since the outbreak of the Civil War, and had the *San Jacinto* not held up the *Trent* in the Bahama Channel, any other incident would have sufficed to provide a pretext for the conflict that Lord Palmerston aimed at.

Written about December 20, 1861

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in *Die Presse*, No. 354,
December 25, 1861

^a The reference is to Queen Victoria's proclamation of neutrality of May 13, 1861 (see this volume, pp. 92).—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

THE OPINION OF THE NEWSPAPERS
AND THE OPINION OF THE PEOPLE¹⁴⁴

London, December 25

Continental politicians, who imagine that in the London press they possess a thermometer for the temper of the English people, inevitably draw false conclusions at the present moment. With the first news of the *Trent* case the English national pride flared up and the call for war with the United States resounded from almost all sections of society.^a The London press, on the other hand, affected moderation and even *The Times* doubted whether a *casus belli* existed at all.^b Whence this phenomenon? Palmerston was uncertain whether the Crown lawyers were in a position to contrive any legal pretext for war. For, a week and a half before the arrival of the *La Plata* at Southampton, agents of the Southern Confederacy had turned to the English Cabinet from Liverpool, denounced the intention of American cruisers to put out from *English* ports and intercept Messrs. Mason, Slidell, etc., on the high seas, and demanded the intervention of the English government. In accordance with the opinion of its Crown lawyers, the latter refused the request. Hence, in the beginning, the peaceful and moderate tone of the London press in contrast to the warlike impatience of the people. So soon, however, as the Crown lawyers—the Attorney-General and the Solicitor-General,^c both themselves members of the Cabinet^d—had worked out a *technical* pretext for a quarrel with the United States, the relationship

^a See this volume, pp. 89-94.—*Ed.*

^b The reference is to the article "It requires a strong effort...", *The Times*, No. 24102, November 28, 1861.—*Ed.*

^c Marx gives the titles in English.—*Ed.*

^d W. Atherton and R. Palmer.—*Ed.*

between the people and the press turned into its opposite. The war fever increased in the press in the same measure as the war fever abated in the people. At the present moment a war with America is just as unpopular with all sections of the English people, the friends of cotton and the country squires excepted, as the war-howl in the press is overwhelming.

But now, consider the London press! At its head stands *The Times*, whose leading editor, *Bob Lowe*, was formerly a demagogue in Australia, where he agitated for separation from England. He is a subordinate member of the Cabinet, a kind of minister for education, and a mere creature of Palmerston. *Punch* is the court jester of *The Times* and transforms its *sesquipedalia verba*^a into flat jokes and spiritless caricatures. A principal editor of *Punch* was accommodated by Palmerston with a seat on the Board of Health^b and an annual salary of a thousand pounds sterling.

The *Morning Post* is in part Palmerston's private property. Another part of this singular institution is sold to the French Embassy. The rest belongs to the *haute volée*^c and supplies the most precise reports for court flunkeys and ladies' tailors. Among the English people the *Morning Post* is accordingly notorious as the *Jenkins* (the stock figure for the lackey) of the press.

The *Morning Advertiser* is the joint property of the "licensed victuallers",^d that is, of the public houses, which, besides beer, may also sell spirits. It is, further, the organ of the English *Pietists*¹⁴⁵ and ditto of the sporting characters, that is, of the people who make a business of horse-racing, betting, boxing and the like. The editor of this paper, Mr. *Grant*, previously employed as a stenographer by the newspapers and quite uneducated in a literary sense, has had the honour to get invited to Palmerston's private *soirées*. Since then he has been enthusiastic for the "truly English minister"¹⁴⁶ whom, on the outbreak of the Russian war, he had denounced as a "Russian agent". It must be added that the pious patrons of this liquor-journal stand under the ruling rod of the Earl of Shaftesbury and that Shaftesbury is Palmerston's son-in-law. Shaftesbury is the pope of the Low Churchmen,¹⁴⁷ who

^a Words of a foot and a half long (Horace, *Art of Poetry*, 97).—*Ed.*

^b Marx uses the English name and gives the German translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

^c High society.—*Ed.*

^d Here and below Marx uses the English expressions "licensed victuallers", "sporting characters", "Low Churchmen", "truly English minister" (he translates the last phrase into German in brackets).—*Ed.*

blend the *spiritus sanctus*^a with the profane spirit of the honest *Advertiser*.

The *Morning Chronicle*! *Quantum mutatus ab illo!*^b For well-nigh half a century the great organ of the Whig Party and the not unfortunate rival of *The Times*, its star paled after the Whig war.¹⁴⁸ It went through metamorphoses of all sorts, turned itself into a penny paper^c and sought to live by "sensations",¹⁴⁹ thus, for example, by taking the side of the poisoner, *Palmer*. It subsequently sold itself to the French Embassy, which, however, soon regretted throwing away its money. It then threw itself into anti-Bonapartism, but with no better success. Finally, it found the long missing buyer in Messrs. Yancey and Mann—the agents of the Southern Confederacy in London.

The *Daily Telegraph* is the private property of a certain *Levy*. His paper is stigmatised by the English press itself as *Palmerston's* mob paper. Besides this function it conducts a *chronique scandaleuse*.^d It is characteristic of this *Telegraph* that, on the arrival of the news about the *Trent*, by *ordre* from above it declared *war to be impossible*. In the dignity and moderation dictated to it, it seemed so strange to itself that since then it has published half-a-dozen articles about this instance of moderation and dignity displayed by it. As soon, however, as the *ordre* to change its line reached it, the *Telegraph* has sought to compensate itself for the constraint put upon it by outbawling all its comrades in howling loudly for war.

The *Globe* is the ministerial evening paper which receives official subsidies from all Whig ministries.

The Tory papers, *The Morning Herald* and *The Evening Standard*, both belonging to the same *boutique*, are governed by a double motive: on the one hand, hereditary hate for "the *revolted* English colonies"^e; on the other hand, a chronic ebb in their finances. They know that a war with America must shatter the present coalition Cabinet and pave the way for a Tory Cabinet. With the Tory Cabinet official subsidies for *The Herald* and *The Standard* would return. Accordingly, hungry wolves cannot howl louder for prey than these Tory papers for an American war with its ensuing shower of gold!

^a Holy Spirit.—*Ed.*

^b How changed from what he once was! (Virgil, *Aeneid*, II, 274).—*Ed.*

^c Marx uses the English expression "penny paper" and, below, "mob paper", the latter with the German translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

^d Chronicle of scandal.—*Ed.*

^e An allusion to the leading article "Let those who believe...", *The Times*, No. 24122, December 21, 1861.—*Ed.*

Of the London daily press, *The Daily News* and *The Morning Star* are the only papers left that are worth mentioning; both work counter to the trumpeters of war. *The Daily News* is restricted in its movement by a connection with Lord John Russell; *The Morning Star* (the organ of Bright and Cobden) is diminished in its influence by its character as a "peace-at-any-price paper".

Most of the London weekly papers are mere echoes of the daily press, therefore overwhelmingly warlike. *The Observer* is in the ministry's pay. *The Saturday Review* strives for *esprit* and believes it has attained it by affecting a cynical elevation above "humanitarian" prejudices.^a To show "*esprit*", the corrupt lawyers, parsons and schoolmasters that write this paper have smirked their approbation of the slaveholders since the outbreak of the American Civil War. Naturally, they subsequently blew the war-trumpet with *The Times*. They are already drawing up plans of campaign against the United States displaying a hair-raising ignorance.

The Spectator, *The Examiner* and, particularly, *MacMillan's Magazine* must be mentioned as more or less respectable exceptions.

One sees: On the whole, the London press—with the exception of the cotton organs, the provincial papers form a commendable contrast—represents nothing but Palmerston and again Palmerston. Palmerston wants war; the English people don't want it. Imminent events will show who will win in this duel, Palmerston or the people. In any case, he is playing a more dangerous game than Louis Bonaparte at the beginning of 1859.¹⁵⁰

Written on December 25, 1861

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in *Die Presse*, No. 359,
December 31, 1861

^a An allusion to the article "Unblessed Peacemakers", *The Saturday Review*, No. 320, December 14, 1861.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx
 FRENCH NEWS HUMBUG.—
 ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF WAR¹⁵¹

London, December 31

The belief in miracles seems to be withdrawn from one sphere only in order to settle in another. If it is driven out of nature, it now rises up in politics. At least, that is the view of the Paris newspapers and their confederates in the telegraph agencies and the newspaper-correspondence shops. Thus, Paris evening papers of yesterday announce: Lord Lyons has stated to Mr. Seward that he will wait until the evening of December 20, but then depart for London, in the event of the Cabinet at Washington refusing to surrender the prisoners.^a Therefore, the Paris papers already knew *yesterday* the steps that Lord Lyons took *after* receiving the dispatches transmitted to him on the *Europa*. Up to *today*, however, news of the arrival of the *Europa* in New York has not yet reached Europe. The *Patrie* and its associates, *before* they are informed of the arrival of the *Europa* in America, publish in Europe news of the events that ensued on the heels of the *Europa*'s arrival in the United States. The *Patrie* and its associates manifestly believe that legerdemain requires no magic. One journal over here remarks in its stock exchange article that these Paris inventions, quite like the provocative articles in some English papers, serve not only the political speculations of certain persons in power, but just as much the *stock exchange speculations* of certain private individuals.

^a J. Mason and J. Slidell. Marx cites the statement according to *The Times*, No. 24130, December 31, 1861.—*Ed.*

The Economist, hitherto one of the loudest bawlers of the war party, publishes in its last number a *letter from a Liverpool merchant* and a leading article in which the English public is warned not on any account to underestimate the dangers of a war with the United States.^a England imported grain worth £15,380,901 during 1861; of the whole amount nearly £6,000,000 fell to the United States.^b England would suffer more from the inability to buy American grain than the United States would suffer from the inability to sell it. The United States would have the advantage of *prior information*. If they decided for war, then telegrams would fly forthwith from Washington to San Francisco, and the American ships in the Pacific Ocean and the China seas would commence war operations many weeks before England could bring the news of the war to India.

Since the outbreak of the Civil War the American-Chinese trade, and the American-Australian trade quite as much, has diminished to an enormous extent. So far, however, as it is still carried on, it buys its cargoes in most cases with English letters of credit, therefore with English capital. English trade from India, China and Australia, always very considerable, has, on the contrary, grown still more since the interruption of the trade with the United States. American privateers would therefore have a great field for privateering; English privateers, a relatively insignificant one. English investments of capital in the United States are greater than the whole of the capital invested in the English cotton industry. American investments of capital in England are nil. The English navy eclipses the American, but not nearly to the same extent as during the war of 1812 to 1814.¹⁵²

If at that time the American privateers already showed themselves far superior to the English, then how about them now? An effective blockade of the North American ports, particularly in winter, is quite out of the question. In the inland waters between Canada and the United States—and superiority here is decisive for the land warfare in Canada—the United States would, with the opening of the war, hold absolute sway.

In short, the Liverpool merchant comes to the conclusion:

“Nobody in England dares to recommend war for the sake of mere cotton. It would be cheaper for us to feed the whole of the cotton districts for three years at

^a “The Mercantile Realities of an American War”, signed “A Liverpool Merchant”, and the article “Operation of a War with America on England” published in *The Economist*, No. 957, December 28, 1861.—*Ed.*

^b “The Board of Trade Tables”, *The Economist*, same issue.—*Ed.*

state expense than to wage war with the United States on their behalf for one year.”

Ceterum censeo^a that the *Trent* case will not lead to war.

Written on December 31, 1861

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in *Die Presse*, No. 4,
January 4, 1862

^a “*Ceterum censeo Carthaginem esse delendam*” (“By the way, I believe that Carthage should be destroyed”, Plutarch, *Life of Cato the Elder*)—the words with which Cato, Roman soldier and statesman (234-149 B.C.) usually concluded, refrain-like, his speeches in the Senate. Here the phrase means, roughly: “I repeat”.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx
A PRO-AMERICA MEETING¹⁵³

London, January 1

The anti-war movement among the *English people* gains from day to day in energy and extent. Public meetings in the most diverse parts of the country insist on settlement *by arbitration* of the dispute between England and America. Memoranda in this sense rain on the chief of the Cabinet,^a and the independent *provincial press* is almost unanimous in its opposition to the war-cry of the London press.

Subjoined is a detailed report of the meeting held last Monday^b in *Brighton*, since it emanated from the working class, and the two principal speakers, Messrs. *Coningham* and *White*, are influential members of Parliament who both sit on the *ministerial* side of the House.

Mr. *Wood* (a worker) proposed the first motion, to the effect

“that the dispute between England and America arose out of a misinterpretation of international law, but not out of an intentional insult to the British flag; that accordingly this meeting is of the opinion that the whole question in dispute should be referred to a *neutral power* for decision by arbitration; that under the existing circumstances a war with America is not justifiable, but rather merits the condemnation of the English people”.

In support of his motion Mr. *Wood*, among other things, remarked:

“It is said that this new insult is merely the last link in a chain of insults that America has offered to England. Suppose this to be true, what would it prove in regard to the cry for war at the present moment? It would prove that so long as America was undivided and strong, we submitted quietly to her insults; but now, in

^a H. J. Palmerston.—*Ed.*

^b December 30, 1861.—*Ed.*