

**KARL
MARX
FREDERICK
ENGELS**

**Collected
Works**



**Volume 7
Marx and Engels
1848**

Contents

Preface	XV
---------------	----

KARL MARX AND FREDERICK ENGELS

March-November 1848

1. <i>Karl Marx and Frederick Engels</i> . Demands of the Communist Party in Germany	3
2. <i>Karl Marx and Frederick Engels</i> . Letter to Étienne Cabet, Editor of the <i>Populaire</i>	8
3. <i>Karl Marx and Frederick Engels</i> . To the Committee of the German Democratic Society in Paris	10
4. <i>Karl Marx</i> . To the Editor of the Newspaper <i>L'Alba</i>	11

KARL MARX AND FREDERICK ENGELS

ARTICLES FROM THE *NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG*

June 1-November 7, 1848

June

5. Statement of the Editorial Board of the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i>	15
6. The Assembly at Frankfurt	16
7. Hüser	20
8. The Latest Heroic Deed of the House of Bourbon	24
9. The Democratic Party	27
10. Camphausen's Statement at the Session of May 30	30
11. Defeat of the German Troops at Sundewitt	34
12. Questions of Life and Death	36
13. The Camphausen Government	39

14. The Question of Union	41
15. The War Comedy	42
16. The Reaction	45
17. <i>Comité de sûreté générale</i> in Berlin	46
18. The Programmes of the Radical-Democratic Party and of the Left at Frankfurt	48
19. The Agreement Debates in Berlin	53
20. The Agreement Debates	57
21. The Question of the Address	62
22. A New Partition of Poland	64
23. The Shield of the Dynasty	66
24. Cologne in Danger	68
25. An Admission of Incompetence by the Assemblies of Frankfurt and Berlin	72
26. The Berlin Debate on the Revolution	73
27. The Position of the Parties in Cologne	87
28. The Agreement Assembly of June 15	89
29. The Prague Uprising	91
30. Valdenaire's Arrest—Sebaldt	94
31. The Agreement Assembly Session of June 17	96
32. The Stupp Amendment	101
33. A New Policy in Posen	104
34. The Downfall of the Camphausen Government	106
35. The Downfall of the Camphausen Government	107
36. The First Deed of the German National Assembly in Frankfurt	109
37. The Hanseemann Government	111
38. The <i>Neue Berliner Zeitung</i> on the Chartists	113
39. Threat of the <i>Gervinus Zeitung</i>	115
40. Patow's Redemption Memorandum	117
41. The Democratic Character of the Uprising	119
42. News from Paris	121
43. Reichensperger	122
44. News from Paris	123
45. Details about the 23rd of June	124
46. News from Paris	128
47. The <i>Northern Star</i> about the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i>	129
48. The 23rd of June	130
49. The 24th of June	134
50. The 25th of June	139
51. The June Revolution	144

July

52. The <i>Kölnische Zeitung</i> on the June Revolution	150
53. The June Revolution (The Course of the Paris Uprising)	157
54. Germany's Foreign Policy	165
55. Marrast and Thiers	168
56. The Agreement Debates	170
57. Arrests	176
58. Arrests	177
59. The Agreement Debates	180
60. Legal Proceedings against the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i>	186
61. The Berlin Agreement Debates	189
62. The Government of Action	194
63. The Agreement Debate	195
64. The Ministerial Crisis	199
65. The Agreement Session of July 4 (Second Article)	200
66. Legal Proceedings against the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i>	208
67. German Foreign Policy and the Latest Events in Prague	212
68. The Agreement Debates of July 7	216
69. Herr Forstmann on the State Credit	223
70. The Agreement Debates	226
71. The Debate on Jacoby's Motion	232
72. The Suppression of the Clubs in Stuttgart and Heidelberg	248
73. The Prussian Press Bill	250
74. The <i>Faedreland</i> on the Armistice with Denmark	253
75. The Civic Militia Bill	256
76. The Armistice with Denmark	266
77. The Armistice "Negotiations"	270
78. The <i>Concordia</i> of Turin	271
79. The Agreement Debates on the District Estates (Agreement Session of July 18)	273
80. The Bill on the Compulsory Loan and Its Motivation	278
81. Armistice Negotiations with Denmark Broken Off	287
82. The Dissolution of the Democratic Associations in Baden	288
83. The Bill Proposing the Abolition of Feudal Obligations	290

August

84. The <i>Kölnische Zeitung</i> on the State of Affairs in England	296
85. The Agreement Debate about the Valdenaire Affair	301
86. The Milan Bulletin	305

87. The Russian Note	307
88. Miscellaneous	314
89. Bakunin	315
90. The Hanseemann Government and the Old-Prussian Criminal Bill	317
91. The <i>Kölnische Zeitung</i> on the Compulsory Loan	319
92. Proudhon's Speech against Thiers	321
93. Dr. Gottschalk	325
94. Debate about the Existing Redemption Legislation	327
95. The "Model State" of Belgium	333
96. The Frankfurt Assembly Debates the Polish Question	337
97. The Danish Armistice and Hanseemann	382
98. The German Citizenship and the Prussian Police	383
99. The Italian Liberation Struggle and the Cause of Its Present Failure	385
100. Charles Albert's Betrayal	388
101. The Attempt to Expel Schapper	390
102. Geiger and Schapper	393
103. The <i>Kölnische Zeitung</i> about Italy	395
104. The <i>Zeitungs-Halle</i> on the Rhine Province	399

September

105. Mediation and Intervention. Radetzky and Cavaignac	402
106. The Antwerp Death Sentences	404
107. The Conflict between Marx and Prussian Citizenship	407
108. The Danish Armistice	411
109. Editorial Note Accompanying the Article "The Financial Project of the Left"	416
110. The Fall of the Government of Action	417
111. His Successors	420
112. The Danish-Prussian Armistice	421
113. Arrests	426
114. The Crisis and the Counter-Revolution	427
115. Army Order, Election Candidates, Semi-Official Comments on Prussian Ambiguity	434
116. Freedom of Debate in Berlin	436
117. Ratification of the Armistice	439
118. The Uprising in Frankfurt	442
119. The <i>Faedreland</i> on the Armistice	446

120. The Government of the Counter-Revolution	448
121. The Cologne Committee of Public Safety	450
122. Public Prosecutor Hecker Questions People Who Had Attended the Worringen Meeting	451
123. Counter-Revolution in Cologne	452
124. An Attempt to Arrest Moll	454
125. State of Siege in Cologne	455

October

126. Editorial Statement Concerning the Reappearance of the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i>	456
127. Revolution in Vienna	457
128. The Latest News from the "Model State"	459
129. The "Revolution of Cologne"	462
130. The Pfuel Government	466
131. Thiers' Speech Concerning a General Mortgage Bank with a Legal Rate	467
132. The <i>Frankfurter Oberpostamts-Zeitung</i> and the Viennese Revolu- tion	472
133. Reply of the King of Prussia to the Delegation of the National Assembly	474
134. Reply of Frederick William IV to the Delegation of the Civic Militia	476
135. The <i>Réforme</i> on the June Insurrection	478
136. English-French Mediation in Italy	480
137. The "Model Constitutional State"	482
138. Public Prosecutor "Hecker" and the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i>	485

November

139. "Appeal of the Democratic Congress to the German People"	490
140. The Paris <i>Réforme</i> on the Situation in France	493
141. The Viennese Revolution and the <i>Kölnische Zeitung</i>	496
142. The Latest News from Vienna, Berlin and Paris	498
143. Our Bourgeoisie and Dr. Nüchel	500
144. News from Vienna	501
145. The Victory of the Counter-Revolution in Vienna	503
146. <i>Frederick Engels</i> . From Paris to Berne	507
I. Seine and Loire	511
II. Burgundy	524

Contents

APPENDICES

1. Receipts of the Central Authority of the Communist League for Money Received and Paid Out	533
2. To All Workers of Germany	535
3. Marx's Application for Prussian Citizenship	537
4. Account of a Statement Made by Karl Marx to the Cologne Police Inspector	538
5. Prospectus for the Founding of the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i>	539
6. Minutes of the Meeting of the Cologne Community of the Communist League	542
7. Articles of the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> Company	543
8. Legal Investigation against the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i>	554
9. Legal Proceedings against the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i>	555
10. Report of the Speeches Made by Marx and Engels at the General Meeting of the Democratic Society in Cologne on August 4, 1848	556
11. Announcement of the Convocation of the Rhenish District Congress of Democratic Associations	558
12. The Legal Proceedings against the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i>	560
13. Karl Marx to Police Superintendent Geiger	561
14. From the Minutes of the General Meeting of the Democratic Society in Cologne Held on August 11, 1848	562
15. Protest of the Democratic Society in Cologne against the Incorporation of Posen in the German Confederation	564
16. The Legal Investigation against the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i>	566
17. Record of Engels' Speech at the Public Meeting of the First Congress of Rhenish Democrats Held at Cologne on August 13, 1848	567
18. Note in the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> on Marx's Departure for Vienna	568
19. From a Newspaper Item Listing the Names of Visitors Who Had Just Arrived in Vienna	569
20. Newspaper Reports of Marx's Speech in the Vienna Democratic Association on August 28, 1848	570
21. Newspaper Reports of Marx's Speech in the First Workers' Association of Vienna on August 30, 1848	572
22. Report of Marx's Lecture on Wage Labour and Capital at the Meeting of the First Workers' Association of Vienna on September 2, 1848	573
23. Report of Platoon Leader Mentés of the Cologne Civic Militia	574
24. Reply	575
25. Legal Proceedings against the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i>	576

26. Address to the German National Assembly in Frankfurt Adopted by a Public Meeting Held in Cologne on September 7, 1848	577
27. Minutes of the Committee Meeting of the Cologne Workers' Association Held on September 11, 1848	579
28. Letter Written by von Kühlwetter, Minister of the Interior, to Karl Marx	581
29. Mass Meeting and the Committee of Public Safety	582
30. Mass Meeting in Worringen	586
31. Decision of the Mass Meeting	588
32. Announcement of the Responsible Publishers of the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i>	590
33. Announcement of the Responsible Publishers of the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i>	591
34. Invitation to Subscribe to the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i>	592
35. Warrant for the Arrest of Heinrich Bürgers and Friedrich Engels	593
36. Black List	594
37. From the Minutes of the Committee Meeting of the Cologne Workers' Association on October 16, 1848. Entry of Marx's Speech in Connection with His Assumption of the Presidency	595
38. From the Minutes of the General Meeting of the Cologne Workers' Association on October 22, 1848	597
39. From the Minutes of the Committee Meeting of the Cologne Workers' Association on November 6, 1848. Entry Relating to Marx's Report on the Events in Vienna	598

NOTES AND INDEXES

<i>Notes</i>	601
<i>Name Index</i>	654
<i>Index of Quoted and Mentioned Literature</i>	681
<i>Index of Periodicals</i>	693
<i>Subject Index</i>	699

ILLUSTRATIONS

<i>Demands of the Communist Party in Germany</i> , leaflet published in Cologne in 1848	5
First page of the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> No. 1	21
First page of the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> containing Marx's article "The June Revolution"	145
Plan of Paris in June 1848	146-47

Passport used by Karl Marx in 1848 and 1849	408-09
First page of Engels' travel notes "From Paris to Berne"	509
Map sketched by Engels, showing his route from Auxerre to Le Loche	508-09
Articles of the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> Company	545

TRANSLATORS

- GREGOR BENTON:** Articles 11, 14, 34, 43, 77, 81, 86, 88, 93, 97, 100-02, 109, 111, 113, 115, 119, 121-24, 128, 143
- CLEMENS DUTT:** Articles 42, 44; Appendices 2, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14-16, 20-22, 24, 25, 29-32, 34-39
- BARBARA RUHEMANN:** Article 3; Appendices 1, 5, 7, 10, 13, 17, 18, 23, 26-28, 33
- SALO RYAZANSKAYA:** Articles 5, 6, 9, 18, 26, 29, 41, 46, 51, 53, 54, 71, 76, 83, 84, 89, 96, 99, 104-06, 112, 114, 116-18, 127, 140, 142, 144, 145; Appendices 3, 4, 19
- KAI SCHOENHALS:** Articles 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15-17, 19-25, 27, 28, 30-33, 35-40, 45, 47-50, 52, 55-70, 72-75, 78-80, 82, 85, 87, 90-92, 94, 95, 98, 103, 107, 108, 110, 120, 125, 126, 129-39, 141
- CHRISTOPHER UPWARD:** Article 146

Preface

The seventh volume of the *Collected Works* of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels covers the period from March to November 1848. It is the first of three volumes (Vols. 7-9) containing their writings during the revolutionary years 1848 and 1849.

The series of revolutions of this period arose primarily from the crisis of feudalism and absolutism, which still prevailed in a considerable part of Europe. Emerging bourgeois society needed to rid itself of feudal relics and abolish such legacies of the feudal age as the political dismemberment of Germany and Italy and the national oppression of the Poles, Hungarians and other European nations that were striving for independence.

Feudalism had already been swept away in France by the revolution of 1789-94. But another bourgeois revolution became inevitable when the rapacious rule of the financial aristocracy, the top crust of the bourgeoisie, and the political monopoly it enjoyed began to hamper the further development of capitalism.

Unlike previous bourgeois revolutions, those of 1848 and 1849 took place when fundamental social contradictions had already developed within bourgeois society and when the proletariat had already entered the political arena. The deepening conflict between proletariat and bourgeoisie—a conflict which became especially acute in France, and also in England, the most advanced capitalist country at that time—left its imprint on the revolutionary events of that period, influenced their course and determined their specific character.

Marx and Engels in these years made clear the organic unity of their revolutionary theory and practice. They were by no means merely detached observers, but played a very active and practical part in the revolutionary events themselves. They demonstrated their qualities as dedicated revolutionary writers, pamphleteers and

true tribunes of the people, who organised and led the democratic and proletarian movements and headed the vanguard of the working class.

The revolutions of 1848-49 were indeed the first crucial practical test for Marxism both as the scientific world outlook of the working class and as a political movement. Revolutionary epochs, with their rapidly and drastically changing situations, the sharp demarcations of class forces and the powerful rise of the revolutionary activities of the masses are always testing times for party doctrines and ideologies. For Marxism this test in 1848-49 demonstrated the solid foundation and viability of its theoretical and tactical principles. Equally it exposed sectarian and dogmatic features of petty-bourgeois utopian socialism and the theoretical and tactical weaknesses of many of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democrats.

Before 1848 what had been of paramount importance in Marxism had been the creation of its general theoretical basis—its philosophy, the working out of its dialectical and materialist method to analyse social phenomena. But now immediate problems of political strategy and tactics had urgently to be solved. And Marx and Engels were able accurately to define the intrinsic nature of the tempestuous events of the revolutionary years by clearly revealing the class forces at work, and in many cases to predict the further course and the after-effects of the events. The political programme they put forward at various stages of the revolution expressed the basic requirements of social change. It was a programme to prepare the ground for further social advance by a consistent and complete bourgeois-democratic revolution.

The analysis of current events by Marx and Engels in 1848-49 permanently enriched revolutionary theory with new conclusions and general principles derived from actual experience of the class struggle waged by the masses and, in particular, by the proletariat. Lenin was later to emphasise that “their participation in the mass revolutionary struggle of 1848-49 ... was their point of departure when determining the future pattern of the workers’ movement and democracy in different countries. It was to this point that they always returned in order to determine the essential nature of the different classes and their tendencies...” (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, Moscow, 1962, p. 37).

The volume opens with the “Demands of the Communist Party in Germany” drawn up by Marx and Engels in the name of the Central Authority of the Communist League. This set forth concrete political objectives for the proletariat in the German revolution which began

with uprisings in Prussia and other German states in March 1848. And running like a single thread throughout was the sense of the indissoluble connection of the class interest of the proletariat with the national interest. The first demand was for the establishment of a single and indivisible German republic. Marx and Engels saw in the abolition of the economic and political dismemberment of the country, which was divided into some three dozen large and small states, and in the creation of a single democratic German state the necessary precondition for further progress. This demand was then closely linked with another—for the abolition of feudal oppression, the liberation of the peasants from all feudal services and the destruction of the whole economic base of the rule of the nobility. The full programme of the “Demands” provided for the democratisation of the entire economic and political system of the country—the creation of a truly democratic and representative legislative assembly, the introduction of universal suffrage, fundamental legal reforms, universal free education, and universal arming of the people as the sure means to defend their democratic rights.

Marx and Engels looked forward to the heightening and intensification of the revolutionary wave, carried forward by the resolute and rising struggle of the German proletariat, the lower middle class in the towns and the small peasants. These they saw as the social forces which could carry through a successful bourgeois-democratic revolution. And this viewpoint was a very important element of the emerging Marxist doctrine of permanent revolution, for which the starting point was the sweeping away of all survivals of feudalism but for which the goal was the overthrow of the capitalist system effected in the interests of the working class and of all exploited people. They saw in the successful bourgeois-democratic revolution the prologue to a proletarian revolution. And accordingly they outlined in the “Demands” a number of transitional measures, such as the transformation of feudal estates into state property and the organisation of large-scale agriculture on these confiscated lands, the nationalisation of the mines and of all means of transport, provision of work for all workers and state maintenance for those unable to work.

Thus in the “Demands of the Communist Party in Germany” the general propositions just announced in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* were already expressed in concrete terms adapted to the specific situation in one country and the particular conditions of the German revolution of 1848-49.

The bulk of the volume consists of articles by Marx and Engels written after their return to Germany and published in the *Neue*

Rheinische Zeitung between June 1 and November 7, 1848. These were articles not just to record and interpret but to influence events. They reflect Marx's and Engels' direct participation in the revolutionary struggle and the tactics they used during the German and the European revolution.

The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was an organ of democracy—but, as Engels wrote, of “a democracy which everywhere emphasised in every point the specific proletarian character” (see “Marx and the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, 1848-1849” written in 1884). This trend of the paper was determined by the specific historical features of the German revolution, the actual alignment of class forces, in which the level of development reached by the German proletariat, its weakness and lack of organisation, made it impracticable to set up immediately a mass proletarian party. Two or three hundred members of the Communist League, scattered throughout the country, could not exert any substantial influence on the broad masses of the people. Marx and Engels, accordingly, decided to take their stand on the extreme Left wing of the democratic movement.

Although the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* carried the banner of democracy, it was nevertheless the official organ of no particular democratic organisation. From the very first days of the revolution Marx and Engels criticised the weaknesses and errors of the German democrats, their inconsistencies and vacillations, and also their inclination to go to extremes and to engage in “revolutionary adventures”. Even before returning from Paris, Marx and Engels strongly opposed a scheme drawn up by Herwegh, Bornstedt and other petty-bourgeois democrats to invade Germany with a volunteer corps in order to start a republican uprising. The documents published in this volume (e.g. “Letter to Étienne Cabet, Editor of the *Populaire*” and “To the Committee of the German Democratic Society in Paris”) show up the real nature of this plan. As a matter of principle, Marx and Engels repudiated any such adventurous and conspiratorial schemes to “export the revolution”. They consistently upheld the proletarian point of view within the general democratic movement. And so they tried to draw the petty-bourgeois democrats into the genuine revolutionary mass struggle and get them to adopt a firmer and more consistent course. At the same time they drew their followers' attention to the importance of organising workers' associations and the political education of the proletariat, indispensable prerequisites for the creation of a workers' mass party.

Marx and Engels defended their line against, in particular, the sectarian views of Gottschalk and his supporters. These had

completely failed to understand the tasks facing the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, and had come out against the workers taking any part in the general democratic movement. They were against the struggle for democratic political demands and against joint action with the democrats. The beginning of the conflict between Marx, together with those who shared his convictions, and Gottschalk is reflected in the "Minutes of the Meeting of the Cologne Community of the Communist League" (see this volume, p. 542). Marx and Engels likewise rejected the tactics of Stephan Born, who wanted to circumscribe the fight of the working class by setting it strictly occupational economic goals, which would in fact have diverted the proletariat from the general political tasks that confronted the German people. Though they did not publicly criticise Born's opportunism, since his endeavour to unite the various workers' associations helped to consolidate the forces of the proletariat, they emphatically protested against any attempt to equate Born's programme and tactics with the course pursued by the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* (see "The *Concordia* of Turin").

The editorial board of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, which was headed by Marx, became the true headquarters of the militant proletariat. It became in effect the leading centre of the Communist League, directing the political activity of its members throughout Germany during the revolutionary period. The paper's revolutionary propaganda, its unmasking of the counter-revolutionary forces and their abettors, and its defence of democratic demands, won the editors immense prestige in democratic circles of Germany and beyond her borders as courageous fighters for the interest of the people. "Outside, throughout the Reich," Engels wrote later, "wonder was expressed that we carried on our activities so unconcernedly within a Prussian fortress of the first rank, in the face of a garrison of 8,000 troops and in the face of the guardhouse" (Marx and Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1970, p. 171).

The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung's* stand against the arbitrary behaviour of the courts, the police and the military, against the victimisation of those who took part in the revolutionary movement and against attempts to muzzle the press (see for example the articles "Hüser", "Arrests", "The Attempt to Expel Schapper", "Public Prosecutor 'Hecker' and the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*", and others) found widespread support. The paper's great popularity was largely due to its brilliant journalism, its militancy, its precise language, the wide use it made of political exposure, and the devastating sarcasm with which it attacked the enemies of the revolution.

Not only did the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* disseminate revolutionary ideas, it also promoted the organisation of the masses and helped them acquire courage, endurance and readiness for resolute action. The example its editors themselves set by their practical activity in the workers' and democratic organisations of the Rhineland (such as the Cologne Workers' Association and the Cologne Democratic Society), and their constant efforts, by means of the newspaper and through personal contacts, to exert a revolutionary influence on the German proletarian and democratic movement also played a great part in rallying people around the revolutionary standard.

The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* carried comments not only on vital questions of the German revolutionary movement but also on those of the European one. In their articles Marx and Engels sought to analyse all important aspects of social development during the revolutionary epoch. They saw the revolution in broad historical perspective, as a phase of universal history, and so understood the interconnectedness of widely dispersed events as separate links in a single chain.

The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, supporting as it did the revolutionary actions in many countries, was rightly regarded as the revolutionary organ not only of German democracy, but also of European democracy. It was the first influential popular newspaper to voice the class interests of the European proletariat and to formulate the democratic and socialist aims of the international proletarian struggle for emancipation. No wonder that progressive leaders of the contemporary European labour movement expressed their admiration for its consistent revolutionary trend. The Chartist *Northern Star* of June 24, 1848, for instance, wrote: "The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* ..., which announces itself 'the organ of democracy', is conducted with singular ability and extraordinary boldness; and we hail it as a worthy, able, and valiant comrade in the grand crusade against tyranny and injustice in every shape and form."

The paper's proletarian and internationalist attitude became especially evident during the uprising of the Paris workers in June 1848. It was the only newspaper in Germany, and practically in the whole of Europe, that from the very outset firmly sided with the insurgents, and fearlessly took their part against the slander and abuse showered on them by the ruling classes and their press. A series of articles and comments by Engels is devoted to the June uprising, as is also one of the most powerful of Marx's articles, "The June Revolution". These articles, which were written while the events were still in progress or immediately afterwards, are imbued

with fighting spirit and at the same time they contain a profound analysis of the causes of the uprising and of its historical significance.

In his article on "The June Revolution" Marx shows the fundamental difference between this uprising and all previous revolutions. It was aimed at the system of exploitation itself, and was the first major manifestation of the profound class contradictions inherent in bourgeois society, "civil war in its most terrible aspect, the war of labour against capital" (see this volume, p. 147). Marx states that the uprising was the predictable consequence of developments in France after February 22 to 24, when the workers and artisans of Paris toppled the July monarchy and set up a bourgeois republic; it was the proletarian masses' reply to the bourgeois attack on their rights. The June events, as Marx demonstrates, destroyed the illusion that universal brotherhood and harmony prevailed in bourgeois society. They revealed the irreconcilable contradictions between the capitalist class and the proletariat, and proved that the only way to emancipate the workers was by the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism. It was this that constituted the world-historic significance of the June uprising, despite the serious defeat the workers suffered.

The military aspects of the June events were examined in Engels' articles, "Details about the 23rd of June", "The 23rd of June", "The 24th of June", "The 25th of June", "The *Kölnische Zeitung* on the June Revolution" and "The June Revolution (The Course of the Paris Uprising)", which describe the June uprising as "the first decisive battle of the proletariat" (see this volume, p. 143) and which contain a number of important observations about the nature, the significance and the methods of street and barricade fighting under the conditions existing at that time. These articles provided the basis of the Marxist theory of armed insurrection. Engels admired not only the heroism and selflessness of the barricade fighters, but also the ability of the Paris workers to acquire the necessary practical military skill and knowledge. He wrote: "It is quite remarkable how quickly the workers mastered the plan of campaign, how well-concerted their actions were and how skilfully they used the difficult terrain" (see this volume, p. 159).

Marx and Engels realised from the start that the June uprising in Paris was an event of European importance and regarded it as a turning-point in the European revolution. They pointed out that the insurgents' victory would have radically changed the balance of forces to the advantage of the revolution in all countries. Their defeat, on the other hand, encouraged the counter-revolutionaries everywhere. The French bourgeoisie, by crushing the insurrection,

fought in fact on the same side as feudal and absolutist reaction in Europe, which was beginning to lift up its head again.

After June 1848 Marx and Engels continued attentively to follow events in France and to discuss them in the pages of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* ("Proudhon's Speech against Thiers", "The Paris Réforme on the Situation in France", and other articles). Their articles on France show that they still expected a new revolutionary upsurge, in which the French proletariat was to play a leading part. Marx and Engels stressed the connection and interdependence existing between the revolutions in the different European countries. And for this very reason they judged that a victory of the French workers would be of decisive importance, for it would give a new and powerful impetus to the revolutionary struggles of the people in the other European countries. They hoped that this victory would make it easier to carry through to the end the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Germany and would pave the way for a proletarian revolution throughout Europe.

Engels wrote later that their expectations at that time of a proletarian revolution in the near future were due to some extent to their having overestimated the level of economic development in Europe and also the degree of organisation and class consciousness reached by the proletariat at that time. But neither the objective nor the subjective prerequisites of the revolution were then mature enough for the liquidation of the capitalist mode of production.

The attention of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was, however, invariably focussed on Germany, on the course of the revolution in the German states and the driving forces of the German revolutionary movement and its perspectives.

In their analysis of the immediate outcome of the German March revolution of 1848 Marx and Engels emphasised that the revolution had not been carried through to the end (e.g. in the articles on "The Berlin Debate on the Revolution", "The Debate on Jacoby's Motion" and "The Suppression of the Clubs in Stuttgart and Heidelberg"). Although in Vienna on March 13, in Berlin on March 18 and 19, and also in various other German states the people forced the monarchs to make a number of concessions (they promised to adopt constitutions, to convene national assemblies and to form liberal or semi-liberal governments) they failed to achieve a decisive victory over feudalism. The entire political structure and the entire civil service and police apparatus were left intact. "The Bastille ... has not yet been stormed," wrote the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, stressing that the decisive battle had not yet been won (see this volume, p. 89).

The reason for this half-heartedness of the German revolution was, according to the founders of Marxism, the policy pursued by the liberal bourgeoisie after it had attained power. The German bourgeoisie, scared by the determination of the masses, and especially by the revolutionary action of the French proletariat, betrayed the interests of the people. "The big bourgeoisie, which was all along anti-revolutionary, concluded a defensive and offensive alliance with the reactionary forces, because it was afraid of the people, i.e. of the workers and the democratic bourgeoisie" (see this volume, p. 74). In the articles which dealt with the debates in the Prussian National Assembly and analysed the policy of the Camphausen-Hanseemann Ministry and the Auerswald-Hanseemann Ministry, which replaced it in July 1848, Marx and Engels firmly opposed the "agreement theory", which the leaders of the Prussian liberal bourgeoisie advanced to justify their compromises with the feudal and monarchical forces (see, *inter alia*, "The Government of Action", "The Crisis and the Counter-Revolution").

Marx and Engels clearly foresaw that two antithetical courses were possible after the March uprising. One was that designed to carry the revolution further in the interest of the broad masses of the people, by radically abolishing all feudal and monarchical institutions, all vestiges of feudalism, first of all in agriculture, just as they had been abolished by the French revolution between 1789 and 1794. The other, pursued by the German liberals, was designed to curtail the revolutionary movement and to come to an arrangement with the feudal aristocracy. The second course, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* warned, would inevitably lead to a monarchical counter-revolution and to the partial or complete restoration of the state of affairs which had existed before the March revolutionary events.

Marx and Engels waged a tireless struggle to solve the principal task facing the German revolution—the national unification of the country. In a number of articles (e.g. "The Programmes of the Radical-Democratic Party and of the Left at Frankfurt", "The *Zeitungs-Halle* on the Rhine Province") they expressed their opposition to plans hatched by the German liberals to unite Germany under the hegemony of Prussia or Austria, and likewise to the setting up of a federal state on Swiss lines, a project that had found wide support in democratic circles. Marx and Engels demonstrated that only the establishment of a truly united and truly democratic state could entirely abolish the economic division and political fragmentation of Germany, together with all survivals of medieval particularism and local isolation. Such centralisation, carried through on a

really democratic basis, would, they thought, create favourable conditions for a genuine consolidation of the German proletariat, and of the German revolutionary movement, too, which was greatly hampered by separatist tendencies and by parochial narrow-mindedness. They advocated the unification of Germany "from below". It should be brought about by the revolutionary onslaught of the people on the decaying absolutist system in the states of the German Confederation, and above all in Prussia and Austria. "Germany," Engels wrote, "must become *one* state not only in word but in deed. And to bring this about it is necessary above all that there should be 'neither an Austria nor a Prussia'" (see this volume, p. 400).

Marx and Engels pointed out that Germany's unification was a European problem, and that it could only be achieved in the course of a struggle waged by the revolutionary forces of the European countries against the internal and external forces of reaction, and above all against the counter-revolutionary rulers of Britain and against Russian Tsarism then acting as the principal gendarme of Europe.

It was from this revolutionary point of view that they approached the question of Schleswig-Holstein. According to the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, the national liberation movement in the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, which were ruled by the Danish King and inhabited mainly by Germans, had become part of the struggle for the unification of Germany into a single democratic state. The Prussian Government, which by the logic of events was involved in the Schleswig-Holstein war waged by the German Confederation against Denmark, tried to come to an arrangement with the Danish Government; it was prepared to sacrifice German national interests, not only in response to the pressure exerted by Britain and Russia, who supported the Danish Crown, but also because it wanted to disengage the Prussian troops so as to be able to employ them against the masses of the people in Prussia itself. This treacherous policy of the Prussian Government, carried on with the collusion of the Prussian and German liberal bourgeoisie, was unequivocally exposed by Marx and Engels, who regarded it as a fatal concession to the counter-revolutionary powers and an obstacle to German unity. "Prussia, England and Russia," wrote Engels in the article "The Danish-Prussian Armistice", "are the three powers which have greater reason than anyone else to fear the German revolution and its first result—German unity: Prussia because she would thereby cease to exist, England because it would deprive her of the possibility of exploiting the German market, and Russia because it

would spell the advance of democracy not only to the Vistula but even as far as the Dvina and the Dnieper. Prussia, England and Russia have conspired against Schleswig-Holstein, against Germany and against the revolution" (see this volume, pp. 424-25).

A revolutionary war against Tsarism and the other reactionary forces in Europe was regarded by Marx and Engels not only as a means to defend the revolution but as a condition of its further development. They reasoned that in the course of such a war the resistance of the people to the counter-revolutionary forces within the country was also bound to grow and that the preconditions for revolutionary outbursts could come into being even in those countries where popular discontent had not yet led to overt revolutionary action. The news about Russia's unstable internal situation—disturbances taking place in various districts, rising discontent in St. Petersburg etc.—received in Germany and printed in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* (see "The Russian Note") justified the hope that, in the event of such a war, a revolutionary outbreak might occur even in the Tsarist Empire.

For Marx and Engels power was the fundamental question in every revolution. And in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* they firmly upheld the concept of the sovereignty of the people and the establishment of a people's democratic government as conditions indispensable for the consolidation of the victory of the revolutionary masses and the implementation of the tasks facing the revolutionary movement. These ideas run through "The Assembly at Frankfurt", one of their first articles to appear in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. Subsequently the concept of the people's sovereignty was continually returned to by them and, on the basis of the experience gained in the revolutionary struggle, further developed and made more concrete at every stage in the German revolution—at the time of the political crisis in Prussia caused by the action of the people in Berlin on June 14, during the intensification of the fight between the counter-revolutionary and the democratic forces in September, and during the October uprising in Vienna and the ensuing events.

Already the experience of the first months of the revolution convinced Marx and Engels of the necessity to abolish all the old administrative, military and judicial authorities, thoroughly purge the entire government apparatus, and end the rule of the bureaucracy, which was especially powerful in Prussia (see "The Agreement Session of July 4" and other articles). They saw in the arming of the people, who stood up against the counter-revolutionary soldiery, the principal guarantee of the sovereignty of

the people (see "The Agreement Assembly Session of June 17", "The Civic Militia Bill" and other articles).

Marx and Engels, who regarded mass revolutionary struggle as the decisive factor in carrying through the revolution, vigorously supported all who fought in the revolutionary battles, e.g. the Viennese workers who fought again on the barricades in May 1848 to compel the ruling circles to make new concessions; the workers of Berlin who in June 1848 stormed the arsenal to obtain weapons and to repulse the counter-revolutionary conspirators; and the insurgents in Frankfurt am Main who rose in September 1848 in protest against the ratification of the infamous armistice with Denmark by the Frankfurt Assembly.

On the other hand, Marx and Engels emphasised again and again that a premature or badly prepared uprising would only result in defeat and thus strengthen the counter-revolutionary forces. For example, in the articles "Cologne in Danger" and "The 'Revolution of Cologne'" they urged the Cologne workers not to allow the Prussian Government to provoke them to action, but to preserve their forces for the decisive battle. The explanatory campaign conducted by Marx and Engels and their comrades-in-arms in Cologne in fact prevented the destruction of the democratic movement in the Rhine Province during the September crisis.

According to the editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, revolutionary action from below must be matched by a vigorous policy in the representative institutions created by the revolution, which should act as constituent assemblies in the name of the people. Marx and Engels fought for the creation of democratic representative bodies, which would reflect the will of the masses, be closely connected with them and rely on their support. By stressing that deputies elected by the people should be accountable to the people and carry out its wishes, they upheld the right of the revolutionary people to exert pressure on elected assemblies and to demand that they adopt effective revolutionary decisions and take steps to implement them ("Freedom of Debate in Berlin" and other articles).

In a number of articles dealing with the German National Assembly and also in a series devoted to the debates in the Prussian National Assembly, Marx and Engels sharply criticised the conduct of the liberal majorities. Because all drastic measures were sabotaged by the liberals, the Frankfurt and Berlin assemblies, which failed to appeal to the masses and never assumed real power, engaged only in futile verbal disputes and became merely pitiable imitations of representative assemblies. The deputies representing the democratic bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie, who formed the Left wing in

these assemblies, failed to display sufficient energy either. Marx and Engels often rebuked the parliamentary leaders of the "Left" and the leaders of democratic organisations for their indecision and their refusal openly to side with the people. (See, for example, Marx's article "Appeal of the Democratic Congress to the German People".) They stressed the detrimental effect of the constitutional illusions in the grip of which many Left-wing politicians still remained, and their unfounded hope of carrying through radical measures by parliamentary means alone, without the support of the revolutionary masses.

During the September days Marx and Engels, who were convinced that the conciliatory policy of the Berlin and Frankfurt assemblies merely led to ever increasing concessions to the counter-revolution, coined the slogan of the revolutionary dictatorship of the people to express the concept of the people's sovereignty during the revolution. In the article "The Crisis and the Counter-Revolution" Marx wrote: "Every provisional political set-up following a revolution requires a dictatorship, and an energetic dictatorship at that" (see this volume, p. 431). For the editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* this dictatorship constituted power genuinely wielded by the people: this power is by its very nature democratic and at the same time bold and vigorous, capable of crushing all counter-revolutionary conspiracies, of abolishing the monarchy and feudal landownership, and of ensuring the complete victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. That Marx and Engels firmly rejected the sectarian interpretation of revolutionary power as the arbitrary dictatorship of a small group of men is evident from the speech against Weitling which Marx made at the meeting of the Cologne Democratic Society on August 4, 1848 (see this volume, pp. 556-57).

The participation of the masses of the peasantry in the revolutionary struggle was regarded by Marx and Engels as a most important condition for the extension and consolidation of the democratic front. They thought that the spontaneous actions of the peasants which were taking place all over Germany should be rendered organised and purposeful. In such articles as "Patow's Redemption Memorandum", "Debate about the Existing Redemption Legislation" and others Marx and Engels set forth the agrarian programme of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. They called upon the peasants to fight for the immediate and complete abolition without compensation of all feudal services. They vehemently denounced the Prussian liberal bourgeoisie, which was betraying the peasants "who are its *natural allies*,.... without whom it cannot stand up to the aristocracy" (see this volume, p. 295), because it was afraid that to abolish feudal property

might lead to attacks on bourgeois property. Marx and Engels, who spoke for the proletariat, the consistently revolutionary class, were convinced champions of the anti-feudal peasant movement, which they regarded as one of the principal motive forces of the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

The struggle for the liberation of the oppressed nations was likewise in the eyes of Marx and Engels integrally connected with this revolution. They welcomed with enthusiasm the upsurge of the national liberation movement among the Poles, Czechs, Hungarians and Italians, and saw in them allies in the fight against feudal and absolutist counter-revolution.

In the articles "Germany's Foreign Policy", "German Foreign Policy and the Latest Events in Prague" and others, Marx and Engels took their stand for the genuine freedom and the brotherhood of all nations and again denounced the German bourgeoisie, which carried on the oppressive national policy of the Hohenzollerns and the Habsburgs. "A revolutionised Germany ought to have renounced her entire past," wrote Engels, "especially as far as the neighbouring nations are concerned. Together with her own freedom, she should have proclaimed the freedom of the nations hitherto suppressed by her" (see this volume, p. 92). According to Marx and Engels the German people could become a free democratic nation only if they supported the liberation movements of the oppressed nations. "Germany will liberate herself to the extent to which she sets free neighbouring nations" (see this volume, p. 166).

The founders of Marxism fought resolutely and consistently for the restoration of an independent Poland and pressed for an alliance of German democrats with the revolutionary wing of the Polish movement, which was fighting not only for national resurrection and liberation but also for the radical democratic reorganisation of Poland. The policy of the Prussian Government, which first provoked a national uprising in Posen and then crushed it, and which under the pretext of "reorganisation" had formally incorporated the greater part of Posen into Germany, was castigated by Engels, in particular in the series of articles entitled "The Frankfurt Assembly Debates the Polish Question". Marx and Engels condemned the attitude of the liberal majority in the Frankfurt National Assembly which sanctioned the new partition of Poland.

In the just-mentioned series of articles on the Polish question, Engels showed that the restoration of the Polish state on a democratic basis would be in the interest of German and international democracy. It would, moreover, strike a heavy blow at the three counter-revolutionary powers—Prussia, Austria, and

Russia—who had shared in the partitioning of Poland. Thus it would help bring about a change in the balance of power in favour of the revolution; and this in turn would make it easier for the Germans “to eradicate patriarchal feudal absolutism in Germany” (see this volume, p. 351).

The national liberation struggle waged by the Czech people in the summer of 1848 was enthusiastically supported by the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. The potential revolutionary significance of this uprising against the arbitrary rule of the Austrian Government and the Czech feudal aristocracy was stressed by Engels in “The Prague Uprising” and “The Democratic Character of the Uprising”. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* bitterly denounced the massacre of the Prague insurgents which the brutal Austrian soldiery carried through with the connivance of the German liberal bourgeoisie, and pointed out that the crushing of the uprising was bound to have serious consequences for the Czech democratic movement and the German revolution. And it is true that after the tragic events in Prague the leadership of the Czech movement passed entirely into the hands of liberal aristocrats and bourgeois, who looked to the Austrian monarchy and the Russian Tsar for assistance.

Warm sympathy for the Italian people, which was fighting for its freedom and independence, was expressed in a letter written by Marx to the editorial board of the Italian democratic newspaper *Alba* and in several articles of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* in which the revolutionary events in Italy were analysed. The Italian revolution, which began with the popular uprising in Sicily in January 1848, was confronted with serious problems. The country consisted of a conglomeration of large and small states, a considerable number of which were oppressively ruled by Austria. The progressive development of Italy was only possible if she liberated herself from foreign domination and abolished the feudal and monarchical regimes. But the Italian liberals, who at the time controlled the Italian movement, were trying to unite the country “from above” within the framework of a constitutional monarchy to be headed by Charles Albert, the King of Sardinia. Marx and Engels called upon the Italian people to take the leadership of the national liberation movement into their own hands, to free themselves from the tutelage of the liberals and monarchists and to frustrate all dynastic intrigues. In many of his articles Engels demonstrated that the self-seeking policy of Charles Albert and his supporters, which counteracted the truly popular resistance to the Austrians, was largely responsible for the reverses the Italians suffered during the Austro-Italian war. He observed that

only a revolutionary people's war could end Austrian domination over Italy.

The articles on the national question which Marx and Engels wrote in 1848 constitute, in sum, an important set of statements making clear their internationalist attitude towards national liberation movements.

Among the most important events of the German and European revolution was the uprising of the Viennese people in October 1848, when for three weeks the workers, students and democratic intellectuals withstood the onslaught of numerically stronger reactionary forces. Marx and Engels believed that the outcome of this rising was bound to affect substantially the fate of the revolution not only in Germany but also in Europe. Marx called the June uprising in Paris the first act of the revolutionary drama, and the October uprising in Vienna the second act (see this volume, p. 505). He emphasised that the Viennese workers had played an outstanding part in this revolutionary battle (*ibid.*, p. 595).

A number of articles published in this volume ("Revolution in Vienna", "The *Frankfurter Oberpostamts-Zeitung* and the Viennese Revolution", "The Viennese Revolution and the *Kölnische Zeitung*", "The Latest News from Vienna, Berlin and Paris" and "The Victory of the Counter-Revolution in Vienna") and also the speeches delivered by Marx at the committee meetings of the Cologne Workers' Association on October 16 and November 6, 1848, are devoted to the Viennese uprising and analyse the causes which led to its defeat. The principal cause, according to Marx, was the fact that the liberal bourgeoisie in Austria and in Germany deserted the revolution. Vienna was captured "only as a result of the manifold betrayal on the part of the bourgeoisie" (see this volume, p. 598). Marx concluded, moreover, that the failure of the German democrats to organise and lead a popular movement in support of the Viennese insurgents had disastrous consequences. The Viennese events confirmed, indeed, Marx's and Engels' conviction that the treacherous tactics of the bourgeoisie had urgently to be countered by rallying all truly revolutionary forces for the decisive battle against the counter-revolutionary offensive.

Marx and Engels also paid attention to those European countries which, although not directly involved in the revolutionary upheaval, were in one way or another affected by it. In "The *Kölnische Zeitung* on the State of Affairs in England" and other articles about Britain, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* exposed the social conflicts which existed in Britain behind the façade of bourgeois and aristocratic security and stability, and the intensification of these conflicts as the result of

the revolutionary upsurge in the whole of Europe. It stressed the magnitude of the class movement of the British workers who were fighting under the Chartist banner, and it described this fight against the official British establishment as the war of “the organised party of the proletariat against the organised political power of the bourgeoisie” (see this volume, p. 297). It was in the true spirit of proletarian internationalism that Marx and Engels supported the Chartists, who were persecuted by the authorities in 1848, and defended them against the slanderous accusations made by the bourgeois press. They also backed the fight for an independent Ireland, one of the principal hotbeds of revolutionary discontent in the British Isles (see “Cologne in Danger”, “*The Neue Berliner Zeitung* on the Chartists”).

The articles “The ‘Model State’ of Belgium” and “The Antwerp Death Sentences” outline the consequences of capitalist development in Belgium, where it was proceeding in an apparently peaceful and constitutional way. But the rule of the liberal bourgeoisie, which was able to crush the incipient republican movement in 1848, had, as is pointed out in these articles, caused the conditions of the workers to deteriorate substantially, and pauperism and criminality to increase. It also strengthened political reaction in the country, so that brutal repressive measures were taken against democrats and socialists, with arrests and deportations of political emigrants. Marx and Engels adduce the example of this bourgeois “model” state to show that in order to preserve its domination and prevent a revolution the ruling bourgeoisie is prepared to resort to the most arbitrary and subtle police methods, which can compete with any that are practised under feudal and absolutist monarchies.

Engels’ unfinished sketch “From Paris to Berne” is published at the end of this volume. After being compelled to leave Germany at the end of September 1848, and after his subsequent deportation from Belgium to France, Engels decided to walk from Paris to Switzerland, where he wrote these travel notes. Considerable space is devoted to a description of the French peasants and their way of life and thinking. Engels notes the antipathy of the French peasants to the revolution of 1848 and to the revolutionary movement in the towns, and especially in Paris, together with their Bonapartist sympathies and illusions. This he attributes to the peasants’ parochialism and political backwardness. And he adds that the demagogic exploitation of the peasants’ proprietary instincts by the bourgeoisie, and the fiscal policy of the Provisional Government, which went against the interests of the peasants and alienated them from the revolution, were also largely responsible for this antipathy.

The Appendices contain a number of documents which illustrate the many-sided revolutionary activity of Marx and Engels in 1848 and their practical work among the people. They comprise papers relating to the Communist League, the Cologne Democratic Society and the Cologne Workers' Association, among the leaders of which were Marx and Engels and their comrades-in-arms. Reports of speeches delivered by Marx and Engels in these organisations and at public meetings are also included: though brief and incomplete, these give some idea of the content of the speeches. The Appendices comprise also a series of documents showing how the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* came into being, and throwing light on the police and court proceedings against its editors and the difficult conditions (they were persecuted by the government authorities and slandered by the "loyal" press) in which Marx and Engels published this newspaper of the revolutionary proletariat.

* * *

The collection of articles written by Marx and Engels in 1848 and 1849 which is presented in Volumes 7 to 9 of this edition is more complete than any previously published. Not only the writings of Marx and Engels which appeared in Volumes 5 and 6 of the Russian and German editions of their *Collected Works* are included, but also many articles from the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* which more recent research carried out in the USSR and the GDR has shown to have been also written by them. Included, too, are a number of documents relating to their activity in workers' and other democratic organisations. This volume contains 16 articles and notes—e.g. "Defeat of the German Troops at Sundewitt", "The Question of Union", "The Downfall of the Camphausen Government", "Reichensperger", "The Milan Bulletin", "Miscellaneous", "The Cologne Committee of Public Safety"—which have never before been published in any edition of the *Collected Works* of Marx and Engels. Of the 146 articles forming the main section of the volume, 103 are published in English for the first time. The Appendices consist entirely of material not previously published in English.

A specific feature of this volume is the fact that in a number of cases it has not been possible to establish whether a given article was written by Marx or by Engels. Since most of the articles published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* are unsigned and none of the manu-

scripts have been preserved, the question of which of them wrote it is, indeed, generally difficult to answer. And many of the articles seem in any case to be their joint work. In those cases where up to now it has proved impossible to ascertain which one of them wrote a particular item, no name is given at the end of the article.

The titles of the articles from the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* are printed according to the table of contents given in the paper. Those supplied by the editors are in square brackets. Those works included in this volume which have been previously published in English are given either in new or in carefully revised translations. Peculiarities in the presentation of the text of some articles, in particular the manuscripts, are described in the notes.

All the texts have been translated from the German except where otherwise indicated.

The volume was compiled and the preface, notes and subject index written by Tatyana Vasilyeva and edited by Lev Golman (Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU). The indexes of names and of books and periodicals mentioned or quoted were prepared by Galina Kostryukova (Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU).

The translations were made by Gregor Benton, Clemens Dutt, Barbara Ruhemann, Salo Ryazanskaya, Kai Schoenhals and Christopher Upward, and edited by Margaret Mynatt and Barbara Ruhemann (Lawrence & Wishart), Salo Ryazanskaya, Yelena Chistyakova, Margarita Lopukhina and Maria Shcheglova (Progress Publishers) and Vladimir Mosolov, scientific editor (Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU).

The volume was prepared for the press by Lyudgarda Zubrilova (Progress Publishers).

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels
DEMANDS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY
IN GERMANY¹

“Workers of all countries, unite!”

1. The whole of Germany shall be declared a single and indivisible republic.

2. Every German, having reached the age of 21, shall have the right to vote and to be elected, provided he has not been convicted of a criminal offence.

3. Representatives of the people shall receive payment so that workers, too, shall be able to become members of the German parliament.

4. Universal arming of the people. In future the armies shall be simultaneously labour armies, so that the troops shall not, as formerly, merely consume, but shall produce more than is necessary for their upkeep.

This will moreover be conducive to the organisation of labour.

5. Legal services shall be free of charge.

6. All feudal obligations, dues, corvées, tithes etc., which have hitherto weighed upon the rural population, shall be abolished without compensation.

7. Princely and other feudal estates, together with mines, pits, and so forth, shall become the property of the state. The estates shall be cultivated on a large scale and with the most up-to-date scientific devices in the interests of the whole of society.

8. Mortgages on peasant lands shall be declared the property of the state. Interest on such mortgages shall be paid by the peasants to the state.

9. In localities where the tenant system is developed, the land rent or the quit-rent shall be paid to the state as a tax.

The measures specified in Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9 are to be adopted in order to reduce the communal and other burdens hitherto imposed upon the peasants and small tenant farmers without curtailing the means available for defraying state expenses and without imperilling production.

The landowner in the strict sense, who is neither a peasant nor a tenant farmer, has no share in production. Consumption on his part is, therefore, nothing but abuse.

10. A state bank, whose paper issues are legal tender, shall replace all private banks.

This measure will make it possible to regulate the credit system in the interest of the people *as a whole*, and will thus undermine the dominion of the big financial magnates. Further, by gradually substituting paper money for gold and silver coin, the universal means of exchange (that indispensable prerequisite of bourgeois trade and commerce) will be cheapened, and gold and silver will be set free for use in foreign trade. Finally, this measure is necessary in order to bind the interests of the conservative bourgeoisie to the Government.^a

11. All the means of transport, railways, canals, steamships, roads, the posts etc. shall be taken over by the state. They shall become the property of the state and shall be placed free at the disposal of the impecunious classes.

12. All civil servants shall receive the same salary, the only exception being that civil servants who have a *family* to support and who therefore have greater requirements, shall receive a higher salary.

13. Complete separation of Church and State. The clergy of every denomination shall be paid only by the voluntary contributions of their congregations.

14. The right of inheritance to be curtailed.

15. The introduction of steeply graduated taxes, and the abolition of taxes on articles of consumption.

16. Inauguration of national workshops. The state guarantees a livelihood to all workers and provides for those who are incapacitated for work.

17. Universal and free education of the people.

It is to the interest of the German proletariat, the petty bourgeoisie and the small peasants to support these demands with all possible energy. Only by the realisation of these demands will the millions in

^a The leaflet published in Cologne has "cause of the revolution" instead of "Government".— *Ed.*

Forderungen der Kommunistischen Partei in Deutschland.

„Proletariat aller Länder vereinigt Euch!“

1. Ganz Deutschland wird zu einer einzigen, unteilbaren Republik erklärt.
2. Jeder Deutsche, der 21 Jahre alt, ist Wähler und wählbar, vorausgesetzt daß er keine Kriminalstrafe erlitten hat.
3. Die Volksvertreter werden besoldet, damit auch der Arbeiter im Parlament des deutschen Volkes sitzen könne.
4. Allgemeine Volksbewaffnung. Die Armeen sind in Zukunft zugleich Arbeiter-Armee, so daß das Heer nicht bloß, wie früher, verzehrt, sondern noch mehr produziert, als seine Unterhaltungskosten betragen. Dies ist außerdem ein Mittel zur Organisation der Arbeit.
5. Die Gerechtigkeitpflege ist unentgeltlich.
6. Alle Feudallasten, alle Abgaben, Frohnden, Zehnten, u., die bisher auf dem Landvolke lasteten, werden ohne irgend eine Entschädigung abgeschafft.
7. Die fürstlichen und andern feudalen Landgüter, alle Bergwerke, Gruben, u. s. w., werden in Staatseigentum umgewandelt. Auf diesen Landgütern wird der Ackerbau im Großen und mit den modernsten Hilfsmitteln der Wissenschaft zum Vortheil der Gesamtheit betrieben.
8. Die Hypotheken auf den Bauerngütern werden für Staatseigentum erklärt. Die Interessen für jene Hypotheken werden von den Bauern an den Staat gezahlt.
9. In den Gegenden, wo das Pachtwesen entwickelt ist, wird die Grundrente oder der Pachtzins als Steuer an den Staat gezahlt. Alle diese unter 6, 7, 8 und 9 angegebenen Maßregeln werden gefaßt, um öffentliche und andere Lasten der Bauern und kleinen Pächter zu vermindern, ohne die zur Bestreitung der Staatskosten nöthigen Mittel zu schmälern und ohne die Produktion selbst zu gefährden. Der eigentliche Grundeigentümer, der weder Bauer noch Pächter ist,

hat an der Produktion gar keinen Antheil. Seine Konsumtion ist daher ein bloßer Mißbrauch.

10. An die Stelle aller Privatbanken tritt eine Staatsbank, deren Papier gesetzlichem Kurs hat.

Diese Maßregel macht es möglich, das Kreditwesen im Interesse des ganzen Volkes zu regeln und untergräbt damit die Herrschaft der großen Geldmänner. Indem sie nach und nach Papiergeld an die Stelle von Gold und Silber setzt, verwandelt sie das unentgeltliche Instrument des bürgerlichen Verkehrs, das allgemeine Tauschmittel, und erlaubt, das Gold und Silber nach außen hin wirken zu lassen. Diese Maßregel ist schließlich nothwendig, um die Interessen der konservativen Bourgeois an die Revolution zu knüpfen.

11. Alle Transportmittel: Eisenbahnen, Kanäle, Dampfschiffe, Wege, Posten, u., nimmt der Staat in seine Hand. Sie werden in Staatseigentum umgewandelt und der unbemittelten Klasse zur unentgeltlichen Verfügung gestellt.

12. In der Befolgung sämtlicher Staatsbeamten findet kein anderer Unterschied statt, als der, daß diejenigen mit Familie, also mit mehr Bedürfnissen, auch ein höheres Gehalt beziehen als die übrigen.

13. Völlige Trennung der Kirche vom Staate. Die Geistlichen aller Konfessionen werden lediglich von ihrer freiwilligen Gemeinde besoldet.

14. Beschränkung des Erbrechts.

15. Einführung von starken Progressivsteuern und Abschaffung der Konsumtionssteuern.

16. Errichtung von Nationalwerkstätten. Der Staat garantiert allen Arbeitern ihre Existenz und versorgt die zur Arbeit Unfähigen.

17. Allgemeine, unentgeltliche Volkserschulung.

Es liegt im Interesse des deutschen Proletariats, des kleinen Bürger- und Bauernstandes, mit aller Energie an der Durchsetzung obiger Maßregeln zu arbeiten. Denn nur durch Verwirklichung derselben können die Millionen, die bisher in Deutschland von einer kleinen Zahl ausgebeutet wurden und die man weiter in der Unterdrückung zu erhalten suchen wird, zu ihrem Recht und zu derjenigen Macht gelangen, die ihnen, als den Hervorbringern alles Reichthums, gebührt.

Das Comité:

Karl Marx. Karl Schapper. H. Bauer. J. Engels.
J. Wolf. W. Wolff.

*Demands of the Communist Party in Germany,
leaflet published in Cologne in 1848*

Germany, who have hitherto been exploited by a handful of persons and whom the exploiters would like to keep in further subjection, win the rights and attain to that power to which they are entitled as the producers of all wealth.

The Committee:

*Karl Marx, Karl Schapper, H. Bauer, F. Engels,
J. Moll, W. Wolff*

Written between March 21 and 24, 1848

First published as a leaflet in Paris on March 24 or 25, 1848, in the supplement to the *Berliner Zeitungs-Halle* No. 82, on April 5, 1848, and in a number of other German newspapers; it was repeatedly reprinted during the revolution and after its defeat, in particular as a leaflet in Cologne issued not later than September 10, 1848

Printed according to the text of the *Berliner Zeitungs-Halle* collated with the leaflet issued in Cologne

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels
LETTER TO ÉTIENNE CABET, EDITOR
OF THE *POPULAIRE*²

Citizen Cabet,

Would you be so kind as to insert the attached Declaration in the next number of the *Populaire*. The point is not to let the Communist Party be made responsible for an enterprise and conduct which have already reawakened in a part of the German nation the old national and reactionary prejudices against the French people. The Alliance of German Workers,^a an association of various workers' societies in all European countries, which counts among its members Mr. Harney and Mr. Jones, the English Chartist leaders, is composed entirely of communists and openly professes itself communist. The so-called German Democratic Society in Paris³ is essentially anti-communist insofar as it claims not to recognise the antagonism and struggle between the proletarian and bourgeois classes. It is, therefore, a question of making a protest and a declaration in the interests of the Communist Party. And it is this which makes us anticipate your compliance. (This note is strictly confidential.)

Fraternal greetings,

Frederick Engels
Karl Marx

The undersigned committee considers it its duty to inform the various branches of the *Alliance of German Workers* in the different European countries that it has in no way participated in the proceedings, posters and proclamations to appeal to the French

^a This refers to the Communist League.—*Ed.*

citizens for clothes, arms and money. The *German Workers' Club*⁴ is the only one in Paris which maintains relations with the *Alliance*, and it has nothing in common with the society in Paris, called the *Society of German Democrats*, whose leaders are Herr Herwegh and Herr von Bornstedt.

The Central Committee of the Alliance of German Workers

(signed) *K. Marx, K. Schapper, H. Bauer,
F. Engels, J. Moll, W. Wolff*

Written at the end of March 1848

First published in English in the journal
Science and Society, 1940, Vol. IV, No. 2

Printed according to the manu-
script

Translated from the French

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

[TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE GERMAN
DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY IN PARIS]

*To Herr Bornstedt and Others*⁵

Paris, April 1, 1848
22 rue Neuve Saint Augustin

Copy

The following will serve as a reply to the note of Herr Bornstedt and others which was this morning left with Marx:

1. Marx has not the least intention of rendering anybody an account for any German newspaper article.

2. Marx has not the least intention of giving an account to any committee or deputation of the German Democratic Society with which he has nothing to do.

3. If Herr Bornstedt and Herr Herwegh demand explanations in their *personal capacity* and not as members of any committee or society, then Herr Bornstedt has already once before privately and also once publicly been told to whom they should address themselves.

First published in Russian in: Marx and Engels, *Collected Works*, first ed., Vol. XXV, Moscow, 1934

Printed according to a copy in Engels' hand

Published in English for the first time

Karl Marx

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEWSPAPER *L'ALBA*⁶

Dear Sir,

A new daily newspaper will be published in Cologne from the first of June; it will be called *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* and will be edited by Herr Karl Marx. This paper will advocate in these latitudes the same democratic principles that *L'Alba* represents in Italy. There can therefore be no doubt about the line we shall take on the questions now pending between Italy and Austria. We shall defend the cause of Italian independence, we shall fight to the death Austrian despotism in Italy as in Germany and Poland. We extend a fraternal hand to the Italian people and want to prove to them that the German nation entirely repudiates the policy of oppression which in your country is carried through by the same men who in our country too have always combated freedom. We shall do our utmost to promote the union of, and good understanding between, two great and free nations which have, until now, been led to believe by a nefarious system of government that they were each other's enemy. We shall therefore demand the immediate withdrawal from Italy of the brutal Austrian soldiery, and that the Italian people be placed in a position to express its sovereign will in the question of the form of government which it wants to choose.

In order to enable us to follow Italian affairs, and in order to give you the opportunity of judging the sincerity of our promises, we suggest an exchange of papers. Thus we propose to send you the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* every day and to receive from you *L'Alba* regularly. We hope that you will accept this proposal and ask you to start sending us *L'Alba* as soon as possible so that already in our first issues we can make use of it.

If you wish to send us other information as well we should be pleased to receive it, and assure you that anything likely to serve the cause of democracy in any country will be given our most careful consideration.

Fraternal greetings.

For the editorial board of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*
Dr. *Karl Marx*, Editor

Written at the end of May 1848

First published in the newspaper
L'Alba No. 258, June 29, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

Translated from the Italian

KARL MARX
and
FREDERICK ENGELS

ARTICLES
FROM THE *NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG*

June 1-November 7, 1848

Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Organ der Demokratie.

N^o 1.

Stuttg., Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

[STATEMENT OF THE EDITORIAL BOARD OF THE *NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG*]

Originally the date of publication of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was to be the first of July, and arrangements with correspondents etc. were made with that date in view.

But since the renewed insolence of the reactionaries foreshadows the enactment of German September Laws⁸ in the near future, we have decided to make use of every available day and to publish the paper as from June the first. Our readers will therefore have to bear with us if during the first days we cannot offer the abundant variety of news and reports that our widespread connections should enable us to do. In a few days we shall be able to satisfy all requirements in this respect too.

Editorial Board:

Karl Marx, editor-in-chief	} editors
Heinrich Bürgers	
Ernst Dronke	
Friedrich Engels	
Georg Weerth	
Ferdinand Wolff	
Wilhelm Wolff	

Written not later than May 31, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 1, June 1, 1848

THE ASSEMBLY AT FRANKFURT⁹

Cologne, May 31. For a fortnight Germany has had a Constituent National Assembly elected by the German people as a whole.

The German people won its sovereign status by fighting in the streets of almost all cities and towns of the country, and especially on the barricades of Vienna and Berlin. It exercised this sovereignty in the elections to the National Assembly.

The first act of the National Assembly should have been to proclaim loudly and publicly this sovereignty of the German people.

Its second act should have been the drafting of a German Constitution based on the sovereignty of the people and the elimination from the regime actually existing in Germany of everything that contradicted the principle of the sovereignty of the people.

During the whole of its session the Assembly ought to have taken all necessary measures to frustrate any reactionary sallies, to maintain the revolutionary basis on which it depends and to safeguard the sovereignty of the people, won by the revolution, against all attacks.

Though the German National Assembly has met about a dozen times already, it has done none of these things.

But it has ensured the salvation of Germany by the following great deeds.

The National Assembly realised that it must have rules, for it knew that when two or three Germans get together they must have a set of rules, otherwise chair legs will be used to decide matters. And now some schoolmaster had foreseen this contingency and drawn up special standing orders for this High Assembly. A motion was

submitted to adopt this scheme provisionally; though most deputies had not read it, the Assembly adopted it without more ado, for what would become of Germany's representatives without regulations? *Fiat reglementum partout et toujours!*^a

Herr Raveaux of Cologne tabled a quite simple motion dealing with conflicts between the assemblies at Frankfurt and at Berlin.¹⁰ But the Assembly debates the final standing orders, and although Raveaux's motion is urgent, the standing orders are still more urgent. *Pereat mundus, fiat reglementum!*^b However, the elected philistines in their wisdom cannot refrain from making a few remarks concerning Raveaux's motion, and while they are debating whether the standing orders or the motion should take precedence, they have already produced up to two dozen amendments to this motion. They ventilate the thing, talk, get stuck, raise a din, waste time and postpone voting from the 19th^c to the 22nd of May. The matter is brought up again on the 22nd, there is a deluge of new amendments and new digressions, and after long-winded speeches and endless confusion they decide that the question, which was already placed on the agenda, is to be referred back to the sections. Thus the time has happily slipped by and the deputies leave to take their meal.

On May 23 they first wrangle about the minutes, then have innumerable motions read out again, and just when they are about to return to the agenda, that is, to the beloved standing orders, Zitz of Mainz calls attention to the brutal acts of the Prussian army and the despotic abuses of the Prussian commandant at Mainz.^d What had occurred was an indubitable and successful sally on the part of reaction, an event with which the Assembly was especially competent to deal. It ought to have called to account the presumptuous soldier who dared threaten to shell Mainz almost within sight of the National Assembly, it ought to have protected the unarmed citizens of Mainz in their own houses from the atrocities of a soldiery which had been forced upon them and incited against them. But Herr Bassermann, the waterman of Baden,^e declares that these are trifles. Mainz must be left to its fate, the whole is more important, the Assembly meets here to consider a set of standing orders in the interests of Germany

^a Let there be regulations everywhere and always.—*Ed.*

^b Engels paraphrases a motto of the German Emperor Ferdinand I: "*Fiat justitia et pereat mundus*" (let justice be done, though the world perish).—*Ed.*

^c The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* has "the 18th", evidently a misprint.—*Ed.*

^d See this volume, pp. 20 and 23.—*Ed.*

^e A pun on the words *Bassermann* and *Wassermann* (waterman).—*Ed.*

as a whole—indeed, what is the shelling of Mainz compared with this! *Perreat Moguntia, fiat reglementum!*^a But the Assembly is soft-hearted, it elects a commission that is to go to Mainz to investigate matters and—it is again just the right time to adjourn and dine.

Finally, on May 24, we lose the parliamentary thread altogether. The standing orders would seem to have been completed or to have got lost, at any rate we hear nothing more about them. Instead we are inundated by a veritable flood of well-intentioned motions in which numerous representatives of the sovereign people obstinately demonstrate the limited understanding of a loyal subject.¹¹ Then follow applications, petitions, protests etc., and in the end the national torrent of hog-wash finds an outlet in innumerable speeches skipping from one subject to another. The fact, however, that four committees have been set up should not be passed over in silence.

Finally Herr Schlöffel asked for the floor. Three German citizens, Esselen, Pelz and Löwenstein, had been ordered to leave Frankfurt that very day, before 4 p.m. The wise and all-knowing police asserted that these gentlemen had incurred the wrath of the townspeople by their speeches in the Workers' Association and must therefore clear out. And the police dare to do this after the German right of citizenship was proclaimed by Preparliament¹² and even after it was endorsed in the draft Constitution^b of the seventeen "trusted men" (*hommes de confiance de la diète*).¹³ The matter is urgent. Herr Schlöffel asks to be allowed to speak on this point. He is refused permission. He asks for the floor to speak on the urgency of the subject, which he is entitled to do according to the standing orders, but on this occasion it was a case of *fiat politia, perreat reglementum!*^c Naturally, for it was time to go home and eat.

On the 25th, the flood of tabled motions caused the thought-laden heads of the deputies to droop like ripe ears of corn in a downpour. Two deputies then attempted once more to raise the question of the expulsion, but they too were not allowed to speak, even about the urgency of the matter. Some of the documents received, especially one sent by Poles, were much more interesting than all the motions of the deputies. Finally the commission that had been sent to Mainz was given the floor. It announced that it could not report until the following day; moreover it had, of course, arrived too late: 8,000

^a Let there be regulations, though Mainz perish.—*Ed.*

^b F. Weichsel, *Deutschlands Einheit und der Entwurf des Deutschen Reichsgrundgesetzes*.—*Ed.*

^c Let polity prevail, though the regulations perish.—*Ed.*

Prussian bayonets had restored order by disarming 1,200 men of the civic guard. Meantime, there was nothing for it but to pass on to the agenda. This was done promptly, the item on the agenda being Raveaux's motion. Since in Frankfurt this had not yet been settled, whereas in Berlin it had already lost all significance because of Auerswald's decree,¹⁴ the National Assembly decided to defer the question till the next day and to go and dine.

On the 26th innumerable new motions were introduced and after that the Mainz commission delivered its final and very indecisive report. Herr Hergenbahn, ex-people's representative and *pro tempore* Minister, presented the report. He moved an extremely moderate resolution, but after a lengthy debate the Assembly concluded that even this mild proposal was too strong and resolved to leave the citizens of Mainz to the tender mercies of the Prussians commanded by a Hüser, and "in the hope that the Government will do its duty" the Assembly passed on to the agenda, that is the gentlemen left to have a meal.

Finally, on May 27, after lengthy preliminaries over the minutes, Raveaux's motion was discussed. There was some desultory talk until half past two and then the deputies went to dine, but this time they assembled again for an evening session and at last brought the matter to a close. Because of the extreme tardiness of the National Assembly, Herr Auerswald had already disposed of Raveaux's motion, therefore Herr Raveaux decided to support an amendment proposed by Herr Werner, which settled the question of the people's sovereignty neither in the affirmative nor in the negative.

Our information concerning the National Assembly ends here, but there is every reason to assume that after having taken this decision the meeting was adjourned and the deputies went to dine. If they were able to do this so early, they have to thank Robert Blum, who said:

"Gentlemen, if you decide to pass on to the agenda today, then the whole agenda of this Assembly may be cut short in a very curious manner."

Written by Engels on May 31, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 1, June 1, 1848

HÜSER¹⁵

Cologne, May 31. With the aid of old fortress regulations and antiquated confederate laws Herr Hüser in Mainz has invented a new method to turn Prussians and other Germans into still greater slaves than they were before May 22, 1815.¹⁶ We are advising Herr Hüser to take out a patent for his new invention which would undoubtedly be very profitable. For according to this method two or more drunken soldiers are sent out, who of course will, of their own accord, pick a quarrel with citizens. The authorities intervene and arrest the soldiers; this is sufficient to enable the commandants of each fortress to declare a state of siege for their respective towns, to confiscate all weapons and to leave the inhabitants to the mercy of the brutal soldiery. This plan would be particularly lucrative in Germany since there are more fortresses here directed against the internal enemy than against the enemy from abroad. It would be especially lucrative here since any publicly paid fortress commandant, a Hüser, a Roth von Schreckenstein or a similar feudal name, may dare more than even a king or an emperor, since he can curb the freedom of the press, since he can, for example, forbid the citizens of Mainz (who are not Prussians) to express their antipathy against the King of Prussia and the Prussian political system.

Herr Hüser's project is only part of the grand plan of the Berlin reactionaries who seek to disarm as rapidly as possible all civic guards (particularly along the Rhine), thus step by step annihilating the nascent popular armed forces and delivering us defenceless into the hands of an army that consists mostly of soldiers from other

parts who can easily be stirred up, or are already stirred up, against us.

. This has happened in Aachen, Trier, Mannheim and Mainz and can also occur elsewhere.

Written by Engels on May 31, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 1, June 1, 1848

[THE LATEST HEROIC DEED OF THE HOUSE
OF BOURBON]

The House of Bourbon has not yet reached the end of its glorious career. True, its white flag has recently been rather besmirched and its withering lilies are drooping sadly enough. Charles Louis of Bourbon bartered away one dukedom^a and had to abandon a second one^b ignominiously; Ferdinand of Bourbon lost Sicily and in Naples was forced to grant a Constitution to the revolution. Louis Philippe, although only a crypto-Bourbon, nevertheless went the way of all French-Bourbon flesh across the Channel to England. But the Neapolitan Bourbon has avenged the honour of his family brilliantly.

The Chambers are convened at Naples. The opening day is to be used for the decisive battle against the revolution. Campobasso, one of the main police chiefs of the notorious Del Carretto, is surreptitiously recalled from Malta. Large bands of armed *Sbirri*, led by their old ringleaders, again patrol Toledo Street for the first time in a long while. They disarm the citizens, rip off their coats and force them to cut off their moustaches. May 14, the opening day of the Chambers, draws near. The King demands that the Chambers should pledge themselves under oath not to change anything in the Constitution he has granted. They refuse. The national guard declares itself for the deputies. Negotiations take place, the King gives way and the Ministers resign. The deputies demand that the King should publicise his concessions in the form of an ordinance. The King promises such an ordinance for the following day. During

^a Lucca.— *Ed.*

^b Parma.— *Ed.*

the night, however, all troops stationed in the vicinity of Naples move into the city. The national guard realises that it has been betrayed and throws up barricades which are manned by 5,000 to 6,000 men. But they are opposed by 20,000 soldiers, partially Neapolitans and partially Swiss, equipped with 18 cannon. Between them stand the 20,000 *lazzaroni*¹⁷ of Naples who are not participating for the time being.

On the morning of the 15th, the Swiss are still declaring that they will not attack the people. One of the police agents, however, who has mingled with the people, fires upon the soldiers in the Strada de Toledo. Thereupon fort St. Elmo at once hoists the red flag and on this signal the soldiers rush at the barricades. A horrible massacre begins. The national guards defend themselves heroically against the superior strength of four to one and against the cannon shots of the soldiers. Fighting rages from 10 a.m. until midnight. The people would have won in spite of the numerical superiority of the soldiery had the miserable conduct of the French Admiral Baudin not induced the *lazzaroni* to join the royal side.

Admiral Baudin was lying with a fairly large French fleet before Naples. A simple but timely threat to fire upon the castle and the forts would have forced Ferdinand to yield. But Baudin, one of Louis Philippe's old servants who was used to the earlier period of the *entente cordiale*¹⁸ when the existence of the French fleet was merely tolerated, remained inactive, thereby causing the *lazzaroni*, who were already leaning towards the people, to join the troops.

This action of the Neapolitan lumpenproletariat decided the defeat of the revolution. Swiss guardsmen, Neapolitan soldiers and *lazzaroni* combined pounced upon the defenders of the barricades. The palaces along Toledo Street, which had been swept clean with grape-shot, collapsed under the cannon-balls of the troops. The frantic mob of victors tore into the houses, stabbed the men, speared the children, violated the women only to murder them afterwards, plundered everything in sight and then set fire to the pillaged dwellings. The *lazzaroni* proved to be the greediest and the Swiss the most brutal. The base acts and barbarities accompanying the victory of the well-armed and four times stronger Bourbon mercenaries and the always *sanfedistic*¹⁹ *lazzaroni* over the nearly destroyed national guard of Naples, are indescribable.

Eventually, things went too far even for Admiral Baudin. Drove of refugees arrived on his ships and told of the events in the city. The French blood of his sailors was brought to boiling point. Now at last, when the victory of the King was assured, he contemplated a bombardment. The slaughter gradually came to an end. One no

longer murdered in the streets but limited oneself to pillage and rape. The prisoners, however, were led off to the forts and shot without further ado. It was all over by midnight. Ferdinand's absolute rule was restored in fact and the honour of the House of Bourbon was purified with Italian blood.

That is the latest heroic deed of the House of Bourbon and as always it is the Swiss who are fighting the people on behalf of the Bourbons. On August 10, 1792, on July 29, 1830, and during the Neapolitan battles of 1820,²⁰ everywhere we find the descendants of Tell and Winkelried serving as mercenaries in the pay of the royal family whose name has for years been synonymous throughout Europe with that of absolute monarchy. Now all this will of course soon come to an end. After long disputes, the more civilised cantons have succeeded in prohibiting the military capitulations.²¹ The sturdy sons of the original free Swiss League will have to give up kicking Neapolitan women with their feet, revelling in the pillage of rebellious towns and, in case of defeat, being immortalised by Thorwaldsen's lions like the fallen of August 10.

The House of Bourbon, however, may for the time being breathe a sigh of relief. Nowhere has the reaction which set in again after February 24^a achieved such a decisive victory as at Naples and this in spite of the fact that the first of this year's revolutions began precisely in Naples and Sicily. The revolutionary tidal wave, however, which has inundated Old Europe, cannot be checked by absolutist conspiracies and coups d'état. By his counter-revolution of May 15, Ferdinand of Bourbon has laid the cornerstone of the Italian republic. Already Calabria is in flames, in Palermo a Provisional Government has been formed and the Abruzzi will also erupt. The inhabitants of all the exploited provinces will move upon Naples and, united with the people of that city, will take revenge on the royal traitor and his brutal mercenaries. And when Ferdinand falls he will at least have had the satisfaction of having lived and died a true Bourbon.

Written by Engels on May 31, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 1, June 1, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a On February 24, 1848, Louis Philippe was overthrown.—Ed.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY²²

Cologne, June 1. Every new organ of public opinion is generally expected to show enthusiasm for the party whose principles it supports, unqualified confidence in the strength of this party, and constant readiness either to give the principles the cover of real power, or to cover up real weaknesses with the glamour of principles. We shall not live up to these expectations, We shall not seek to gild defeats with deceptive illusions.

The democratic party has suffered defeat; the principles which it proclaimed at the moment of victory are called in question; the ground it has actually won is being contested inch by inch; much has been lost already and soon the question will arise—what is left?

What is important for us is that the democratic party should understand its position. People may ask why we are concerned with a party, why we do not concentrate on the aims of the democratic movement, the welfare of the people, the happiness of all without distinction.

For such is the law and usage of struggle, and only from the *struggle* of parties can the future welfare arise—not from seemingly clever compromises or from a hypocritical alliance brought about despite conflicting views, interests and aims.

We demand of the democratic party that it grasp the significance of its position. This demand springs from the experience of the past months. The democratic party has allowed the elation of its first victory to go to its head. Intoxicated with the joy of being able at last to proclaim its principles openly for all to hear, it imagined that one had merely to proclaim these principles for them to be immediately realised. It did not go beyond this proclamation after its first victory and the concessions which directly followed it. But while the party

was lavish with its ideas and treated as a brother everyone who did not immediately dare to challenge them, the others—those who retained or obtained power—were active. And their activity is not to be made light of. Keeping their principles to themselves and divulging only those parts that were directed against old conditions already overthrown by the revolution, they carefully held the movement in check, ostensibly in the interests of the evolving legal system and the establishment of formal order. They made seeming concessions to the advocates of the old order to secure their support for their own plans; then they gradually built up the basic elements of their own political system and thus succeeded in occupying an intermediate position between the democratic party and the defenders of absolutism, on the one hand advancing and on the other retarding the movement, being at once progressive—as regards the absolutists—and reactionary—as regards the democrats.

This is the party of the prudent, moderate bourgeoisie, and by this party the people's party, in its first intoxication, allowed itself to be taken in till finally it began to see things in their true light after having been contemptuously spurned, after all sorts of reprehensible intentions had been imputed to it, and its members denounced as agitators.²³ Then it perceived that it had actually achieved nothing but what the gentlemen of the bourgeoisie regarded as compatible with their own well-understood interests. Set in conflict with itself by an undemocratic electoral law and defeated in the elections, the party now has against it two elected bodies; the only doubtful thing about them is, which of them will more strongly oppose its demands. Consequently, the enthusiasm of the party has of course melted away and has been replaced by the sober recognition of the fact that a powerful reaction has gained control, and this, strangely enough, happened before any revolutionary action took place.

Although all this is undoubtedly true, it would be dangerous if the bitter feeling engendered by the first and partly self-induced defeat were to impel the democratic party now to revert to that wretched idealism, which is unfortunately characteristic of the German temperament, and according to which a principle that cannot be put into practice immediately is relegated to the distant future while for the present its innocuous elaboration is left to the "thinkers".

We must clearly warn against those hypocritical friends who, while declaring that they agree with the principles, doubt whether they are practicable, because, they allege, the world is not yet ready for them, and who have no intention of making it ready, but on the contrary prefer to share the common lot of the wicked in this wicked earthly

life. If these are the crypto-republicans whom the *Hofrat* Gervinus fears so much, then we whole-heartedly agree with him: "Such men are dangerous."^a

Written by Marx on June 1, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 2, June 2, 1848

^a Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, Act I, Scene 2.—*Ed.*

CAMPHAUSEN'S STATEMENT
AT THE SESSION OF MAY 30²⁴

Cologne, June 2. *Post et non propter*,^a in other words Herr Camphausen did not become Prime Minister *because of* the March revolution but *after* that revolution. On May 30, 1848, in a most solemn manner and with many protestations, displaying as it were a mysterious carriage of the body to cover the defects of the spirit,^b Herr Camphausen has revealed this subsequent significance of his Ministry to the Berlin Assembly which sprang from an agreement between him and the indirect electors.

The *thinking friend of history*^c states that "the Government which was formed on March 29 met soon *after* an occurrence whose significance has not been and will not be misjudged by it".

Herr Camphausen's assertion that he *did not* form a Government *before* March 29 finds confirmation in the issues of the *Preussische Staats-Zeitung* published during the last few months. It may be assumed with confidence that a date, which indicates at least the chronological point of departure of Herr Camphausen's ascension into heaven, possesses great "significance", particularly for Herr Camphausen. What comfort it must be for the fallen barricade fighters to know that their cold corpses serve as visible sign and index finger pointing to the Government of March 29! *Quelle gloire!*^d

^a After and not because of.—*Ed.*

^b Laurence Sterne, *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman*, Vol. I, ch. XI.—*Ed.*

^c An ironical allusion to the subtitle of Karl von Rotteck's *Allgemeine Geschichte vom Anfang der historischen Kenntniss bis auf unsere Zeiten. Für denkende Geschichtsfreunde* (General History from the Beginning of Historical Knowledge Until Our Time. For Thinking Friends of History).—*Ed.*

^d What honour!—*Ed.*

In one word: after the March revolution, a Camphausen Ministry was formed. This same Camphausen Ministry recognises the "*great significance*" of the March revolution, at least it does not *misjudge* it. The revolution itself is a trifle—its *significance* is what matters! It *signifies* precisely the Camphausen Ministry, at least *post festum*.^a

"This occurrence"—the formation of the Camphausen Ministry or the March revolution?—"belongs to the most essential contributing factors in the transformation of our *internal* political structure."

Is this passage supposed to mean that the March revolution is "an essential contributing factor" to the formation of the Government of March 29, i.e. the Camphausen Government; or is it supposed merely to say: the Prussian March revolution has revolutionised Prussia! Such a solemn tautology may perhaps be expected from a "*thinking friend of history*"!

"The Government recognises that we stand at its beginning" (namely of the transformation of our internal political conditions) "and that we have a long road *ahead* of us."

In a word, the Camphausen Ministry recognises that it still has a long way *to travel*, i.e. it is looking forward to a *long* life. Brief is art, i.e. the revolution, and long is life,^b i.e. the Ministry that came after. It gratuitously recognises itself. Or is one to interpret Camphausen's words in some other way? One would certainly not attribute to the *thinking friend of history* the trivial explanation that nations who stand at the beginning of a new historical epoch stand at the beginning and that the road which lies *ahead* of every epoch will be just as long as the *future*.

So much for the *first* part of the laborious, grave, ceremonious, thorough and considered oration of Prime Minister Camphausen. It may be summarised in the following three statements: *After* the March revolution—the Camphausen Ministry. The Camphausen Ministry has great significance. A long road lies *ahead* of the Camphausen Ministry!

Now for the *second* part.

"By no means have we judged the situation to be such," lectures Herr Camphausen, "that a complete upheaval has resulted from this occurrence" (the March revolution), "that the entire structure of our state has been overthrown, that everything that exists has ceased to be legal and that all conditions must be placed on a new legal basis. On the contrary. The Government agreed from the moment of its initial meeting to regard it as essential for its own future that the then convoked

^a After the event.—*Ed.*

^b Modified quotation from Goethe's *Faust*, Erster Teil, "Nacht".—*Ed.*

United Diet²⁵ meet in reality, regardless of the petitions received opposing such a course, and that the new constitution evolve from the existing structure with the legal machinery offered by it without the bond which ties the old to the new being severed. This incontestably correct policy has been maintained. The electoral law has been submitted to the United Diet and passed with its advice. Later on, the attempt was made to induce the Government to alter this law on its own authority, in particular to change the indirect electoral system into a direct one. The Government did not yield. The Government did not act in a dictatorial way; it could not and *would* not act in such a way. The electoral law has in fact been implemented strictly according to the letter. It was on the basis of this electoral law that the electors and deputies were chosen. You are here on the basis of this electoral law with the power to agree with the Crown on a Constitution which it is to be hoped will endure in the future."

A kingdom for a doctrine! A *doctrine* for a kingdom!^a

First there is the "occurrence"—a bashful euphemism for *revolution*. Afterwards there comes the doctrine and dupes the "occurrence".

The illegal "occurrence" turned Herr Camphausen into the *responsible* Prime Minister, i.e. into a creature that had no place and no meaning within the old state of affairs, within the existing structure. We override the old by a *salto mortale* and, fortunately, we find a responsible Minister. The responsible Minister however is even more fortunate in discovering a doctrine. With the first breath of life of a *responsible Prime Minister* the absolute monarchy died and rotted. Among the latter's victims was to be found primarily the blessed "*United Diet*", that disgusting mixture of Gothic delusion and modern deception.^b The "*United Diet*" was the "dear faithful follower", the "pet" of the absolute monarchy. Just as the German republic can only celebrate its entry over the body of Herr Venedey, so the responsible Ministry can only enter over the body of the "dear faithful follower". The responsible Minister now picks out the lost body or conjures up the *ghost* of the dear faithful "*United Diet*", the ghost indeed makes an appearance, but unfortunately hovers suspended in the air, going through all sorts of bizarre capers because it can no longer find any *ground* under its feet, since the old *foundation of law and trust* has been swallowed up by the "occurrence" of the earthquake. The master magician reveals to the ghost that he has summoned it so as to settle its estate and to be able to act the loyal heir. The ghost cannot find enough praise for these polite manners because in ordinary life the deceased are not permitted to issue posthumous testaments. The most highly flattered ghost nods like a pagod to all that the master magician orders, takes a bow at the exit

^a Modified quotation from Shakespeare's *King Richard III*, Act V, Scene 4.—*Ed.*

^b Heinrich Heine, *Deutschland. Ein Wintermärchen*, Caput XVII.—*Ed.*

and disappears. The law on indirect elections²⁶ is its posthumous testament.

The doctrinal trick by which Herr Camphausen “has evolved the new constitution from the existing structure with the legal machinery offered by it” develops as follows:

An illegal occurrence turns Herr Camphausen into an *illegal* person within the meaning of the “existing structure” and of the “old state of affairs”: that is into a responsible Prime Minister, a *constitutional Minister*. The constitutional Minister illegally transforms the *anti-constitutional*, dear faithful “*United Diet*”, based on the *estates*, into a *constituent* assembly. The dear faithful “United Diet” creates unlawfully the law of indirect elections. The law of indirect elections creates the Berlin Chamber, the Berlin Chamber draws up the Constitution and the Constitution produces all successive chambers from here to eternity.

Thus, a goose is transformed into an egg and an egg into a goose. Thanks to the Capitol-saving cackling,²⁷ the nation soon realises, however, that the golden eggs of Leda, which it laid in the revolution, have been stolen. Not even Deputy *Milde* seems to be the bright conspicuous Castor, son of Leda.

Written by Marx on June 2, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 3, June 3, 1848

DEFEAT OF THE GERMAN TROOPS AT SUNDEWITT²⁸

Schleswig. So the German troops have once again been beaten, once again the German-Prussian policy has suffered a brilliant defeat! This is the outcome of all those solemn promises of a strong, united Germany!—The time that could have been used to press home the initial victory they let slip by in useless negotiations which the enemy only entered into under duress in order to gain time for renewed resistance. And when Russia declared that she would intervene if Jutland were not evacuated, they still failed to recognise what lay behind the offer of an armistice, they lacked the courage to accept the impending conflict, the long-awaited and unavoidable conflict with Russia. Indeed, the proponents of a policy of force were at a loss, they gave in like cowards and during the *retreat* the “brave” guards were defeated by the “little” Danes! If this is not a case of open treason, then it is a manifestation of such immense incompetence that in any case the management of the whole affair must be placed in other hands. Will the National Assembly in Frankfurt at last feel compelled to do what it should have done long since, that is take over foreign policy itself? Or will it here too—“in the trust that governments perform what are the duties of their office”—proceed to the order of the day?

There follows the report of the Danish attack at Sundewitt,^a taken from the *Schleswig-Holsteiner Zeitung*.

Rendsburg, May 29. Yesterday (Sunday, the 28th) was assigned to the relief of confederate troops on outpost duty outside Alsen.^b This information must have

^a The Danish name is Sundeved.—*Ed.*

^b The Danish name is Als.—*Ed.*

reached the Danes, who are generally well served by their spies in that region. Considerably reinforced by troops that in the last few days had once more been brought over from Fünen^a to Alsen, they carried out a landing on this side of the river the full significance of which the Germans do not seem to have grasped, since their attention was taken up with the coming on and off guard of their own troops. Soon after the stationing of the new pickets the Germans suddenly found themselves under heavy attack beneath the Düppel^b Heights from a greatly superior force of Danish infantry and artillery, while at the same time the appearance of a number of ships and gunboats west of Erkensund (near Alnver and Treppe) gave the impression that a landing was also to be carried out there. Clearly this was an attempt by the Danes to split the German forces, but they achieved only a slight measure of success. On the Düppel Heights a fierce battle ensued in which both sides suffered heavy casualties, some of them fatal, as a result of cannon-fire (it is not yet possible to give figures). The Danes fought famously. Their numbers are put at 8,000 men, who took up battle-stations under cover of the deck-guns and flanked by cannon on land, while our men can scarcely have numbered 7,000. It was several hours before the battle was decided, when at last, around 7 o'clock in the evening, the German troops were forced to begin the retreat via Gravenstein northwards to Quars, while the Danes got to within an hour's march of Gravenstein, where our rearguard had stopped.

Written by Engels on June 2, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 3, June 3, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a The Danish name is Fyn.—*Ed.*

^b The Danish name is Dybbøl.—*Ed.*

QUESTIONS OF LIFE AND DEATH

Cologne, June 3. The times are changing and we are changing with them. That is a short saying with which our Ministers *Camphausen* and *Hansemann* are also well acquainted. Oh, what they had to put up with from government officials and marshals²⁹ when they were still modest deputies sitting on the school bench of a provincial diet! And how they were kept on a leash like fifth formers in the Rhenish Provincial Diet by His Most Serene Highness, form-master Solms-Lich! Although they were permitted to indulge in a few exercises in elocution after they had been promoted to the sixth form, to the United Diet,³⁰ how they were even then disciplined by their schoolmaster, Herr Adolf von Rochow, with the cane presented to him from on high! How meekly they had to take the impertinences of a Bodelschwingh, how attentively they had to admire the broken German of a Boyen, and how limited an understanding of a loyal subject they were obliged to display in face of the crude ignorance of a Duesberg!

Things have changed now. The 18th of March has put an end to all the pedantic political schooling and the pupils of the Provincial Diet have announced their graduation. Herr Camphausen and Herr Hansemann have become Ministers and are delighted to feel their great importance as "indispensable persons".

Everybody that has come in contact with them has been made to feel just how "indispensable" they consider themselves to be and how audacious they have become since their release from school.

They immediately began to re-establish provisionally their old schoolroom, the United Diet. It was here that the grand act of transition from bureaucratic grammar school to constitutional

university was to take place, the solemn presentation, with all due formality, to the Prussian people of their certificate of maturity.

The people declared in numerous memoranda and petitions that they did not want to have anything to do with the United Diet.

Herr Camphausen replied (e.g. during the session of the Constituent Assembly on May 30^a) that the convocation of the Diet was of *vital importance* to the Ministry and that was that.

The Diet met, a dejected, contrite assembly which despaired of the world, of God and of itself. The Diet had been given to understand that it was merely to adopt the new electoral law; but Herr Camphausen demanded of it not only a paper law and indirect elections, but also twenty-five million in cash. The curiae become confused, they begin to doubt their competence and stammer disjointed objections. There is nothing they can do, however, since after deliberation Herr Camphausen has made up his mind, and if the money is not granted and the "vote of confidence" is withheld Herr Camphausen will depart for Cologne and abandon the Prussian monarchy to its fate. The thought of such a possibility brings cold sweat to the foreheads of the gentlemen of the Diet, all resistance ceases and the vote of confidence is passed with a bitter-sweet smile. These twenty-five million—currency in the airy realm of dreams^b—clearly show where and how they were enacted.

The indirect elections are proclaimed. A wave of speeches, petitions and deputations rises against them. The ministerial gentlemen reply: the Ministry stands or falls with the indirect elections. After that everything becomes calm once more and both parties can go to sleep.

The Agreement Assembly^c meets. Herr Camphausen is resolved that an address should be made in reply to his speech from the throne. Deputy Duncker is to make the proposal. A discussion begins during which a pretty lively opposition to the address emerges. Herr Hansemann is bored by the everlasting, confused cross-talk of the clumsy assembly; it becomes unendurable to his sense of parliamentary tact and he declares curtly that they could be spared all this: either an address is forthcoming and in that case all is well, or no address is made and the Ministry resigns. Nevertheless, the debate goes on and finally Herr Camphausen himself steps up to the rostrum to confirm that the question of the address is of vital importance to the Ministry. Finally, when this also has no effect,

^a See this volume, pp. 30-32.—*Ed.*

^b Heinrich Heine, *Deutschland. Ein Wintermärchen*, Caput VII.—*Ed.*

^c i.e. the Prussian National Assembly convened on May 22, 1848.—*Ed.*

Herr Auerswald also rises and asserts for the third time that the Ministry stands or falls with the address. The assembly was now sufficiently convinced and, of course, voted for the address.

Thus, our "responsible" Ministers have, within two months, already acquired that experience and self-possession necessary for the conduct of an assembly which M. Duchâtel, who certainly is not to be belittled, gained only after several years of intimate dealing with the last but one French Chamber of Deputies. For some time past M. Duchâtel, too, when the Left bored him with its lengthy tirades, used to declare: the Chamber is free to vote for or against, but we shall resign if it votes against. Thereupon, the timorous majority, for which M. Duchâtel was the "most indispensable" man in the world, flocked around its threatened ringleader like a flock of sheep in a thunderstorm. M. Duchâtel was a frivolous Frenchman and played this game until it became too much for his fellow countrymen. Herr Camphausen is a stalwart and composed German and he will know how far he can go.

Of course, one can save both time and arguments by this method if one is as sure of one's supporters as Herr Camphausen is of the "agreers". The opposition is pretty effectively silenced if every issue is made a question of confidence. That is why this method is most suitable for determined men like Duchâtel and Hansemann who know once and for all what they want and who find all further useless palaver unbearable. This little earthly expedient, however, as our Prime Minister will find out by experience, is not at all suitable for men with debating skills who love "to expound and exchange their views about the past, the present, and the future as well, in great debates" (Camphausen, session of May 31), for men who stand their ground on principles and grasp the meaning of current events with the acumen of philosophers, for elevated minds such as Guizot and Camphausen. He should let his Duchâtel-Hansemann handle such matters and keep to the more elevated sphere where we take such a delight in observing him.

Written on June 3, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 4, June 4, 1848

Published in English for the first time

THE CAMPHAUSEN GOVERNMENT³¹

Cologne, June 3. It is well known that the French National Assembly of 1789 was preceded by an assembly of notables which was composed of the *estates* like the Prussian United Diet. In the decree by which he convoked the National Assembly, Minister Necker referred to the expressed desire of the notables to call together the Estates-General. Thus, Minister Necker held a significant advantage over Minister Camphausen. He did not have to wait for the storming of the Bastille or the overthrow of the absolute monarchy in order afterwards to link the old and new in a doctrinaire fashion so that he could laboriously maintain the *illusion* that France had achieved the new Constituent Assembly by the legal machinery of the old constitution. He possessed still other advantages. He was Minister of France and not Minister of Lorraine and Alsace, whereas Herr Camphausen is not Minister of Germany but Minister of Prussia. And in spite of all these advantages Minister Necker did not succeed in transforming a revolutionary movement into a tranquil reform. The serious malady could not be cured by attar of roses.^a Herr Camphausen will succeed even less in changing the character of the movement by an artificial theory that draws a straight line of succession between his Ministry and the old conditions which prevailed in the Prussian monarchy. No device can transform the March revolution and the German revolutionary movement as a whole into *incidents* of more or less consequence. Was Louis Philippe elected King of the French *because* he was a Bourbon?

^a Heinrich Heine, *Deutschland. Ein Wintermärchen*, Caput XXVI (paraphrased).—*Ed.*

Was he chosen *although* he was a Bourbon? One may remember that this question divided the parties shortly after the July revolution.³² And what did the question prove? It proved that the revolution itself was called in question and that the interests of the new ruling class and its political representatives were not the interests of the revolution.

The same significance must be ascribed to the statement of Herr Camphausen that his Government had been brought into the world not *by* the March revolution but *after* the March revolution.

Written by Marx on June 3, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 4, June 4, 1848

THE QUESTION OF UNION

Throughout the whole of North Italy various plots and schemes are being hatched, on the one hand to unite the smaller states with Sardinia and on the other to prevent that union. These intrigues are very similar to those for hegemony in Germany. Charles Albert is seeking to establish an Italian Prussia “on the broadest possible basis”, from Nice to Trieste. The affair is of absolutely no national importance; on both sides it is a question of local interests and the gratification of provincial vanities, such as can only be removed through the creation of a united and indivisible Italy. Until then, the decisive factor will continue to be the needs of the moment, and these are *for* union, since this would bring about, at least in some measure, a certain concentration of forces for the struggle against Austria.

Written by Engels on June 2, 1848

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 4, June 4, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

THE WAR COMEDY

Schleswig-Holstein. Indeed, the annals of all history know of no such campaign, no such striking alternation between the force of arms and diplomacy as our current unitedly-German-national war against little Denmark! All the great deeds of the old imperial army with its six hundred commanders, general staffs and military councils, the mutual chicaneries of the leaders of the 1792 coalition, the orders and counter-orders of the blessed Royal and Imperial War Council, are serious and touchingly tragic events compared to the warlike comedy which the new German federal army³³ is performing in Schleswig-Holstein to the resounding laughter of all Europe.

Let us briefly trace the plot of this comedy.

The Danes advance from Jutland and land troops in North Schleswig. The Prussians and Hanoverians occupy Rendsburg and the Eider line. The Danes, who, in spite of all the German bragging, are an alert and brave people, quickly attack and in a *single* battle drive the army of Schleswig-Holstein back towards the Prussians. The latter calmly look on.

At last, Berlin gives the order to advance. The united German troops attack the Danes and at Schleswig overwhelm them by their numerical superiority. The victory was brought about primarily by the Pomeranian guardsmen who handled their rifle-butts as skilfully as they had done previously at Grossbeeren and Dennewitz.³⁴ Schleswig is conquered once more and Germany is jubilant at the heroic deed of her army.

In the meantime, the Danish fleet which numbers less than twenty ships of any size, seizes the German merchant vessels, blockades all

German ports, and covers the crossings to the islands to which the army withdraws. Jutland is abandoned and partially occupied by Prussian troops who demand an indemnity of 2 million *speciestaler*.

Before a single taler of the indemnity has been received, however, England sends proposals for mediation on the basis of a withdrawal and the neutrality of Schleswig, and Russia sends threatening Notes. Herr Camphausen falls right into this trap and, on his orders, the Prussians, drunk with victory, withdraw from Veile to Königsau, to Hadersleben, Apenrade^a and Flensburg. The Danes, who till then had vanished, reappear at once. They pursue the Prussians day and night, throw their withdrawal into confusion, make landings everywhere, defeat the troops of the 10th Federal Corps at Sundewitt^b and retreat only before superior numbers. In the engagement of May 30, rifle-butts, swung this time by the solid arms of Mecklenburgers, again proved decisive. The German inhabitants flee with the Prussians, all North Schleswig is abandoned to devastation and plunder, and the *Danebrog*^c flies once more over Hadersleben and Apenrade. It is obvious that Prussian soldiers of all ranks obey orders in Schleswig just as they do in Berlin.

Suddenly there comes an order from Berlin: the Prussians are to advance again. Now they merrily advance northward once more, but the comedy still has long to run. We want to wait and see where the Prussians will this time receive orders to retreat.

In short, it is a genuine quadrille, a military ballet which the Camphausen Ministry is having performed for its own amusement and for the glory of the German nation.

We must not forget, however, that it is the burning villages of Schleswig which supply the illumination for the stage and that it is the cries for vengeance from Danish marauders and partisans which provide the chorus for this performance.

The Camphausen Ministry has on this occasion demonstrated its high calling to represent Germany abroad. Schleswig, twice abandoned to Danish invasions through the fault of this Ministry, will gratefully remember the first diplomatic experiment of our "responsible" Ministers.

^a The Danish names are Kongeaa, Haderslev, Aabenraa.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 34-35.—*Ed.*

^c Danish flag.—*Ed.*

Let us have confidence in the wisdom and energy of the
Camphausen Ministry!

Written by Engels on June 4, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische
Zeitung* No. 5, June 5, 1848

Published in English for the first
time

THE REACTION

Cologne, June 5. The dead ride fast.^a Herr Camphausen disavows the revolution and the reaction dares to suggest to the Agreement Assembly that the revolution should be stigmatised as a riot. On June 3, a deputy^b moved that a monument be erected for the soldiers who died on March 18.

Written on June 5, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 6, June 6, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a Gottfried Bürger, "Lenore".—*Ed.*

^b Karl Richter.—*Ed.*

COMITÉ DE SÛRETÉ GÉNÉRALE
IN BERLIN³⁵

Cologne, June 5. Now Berlin, too, has its *Comité de sûreté générale* just as Paris had in the year 1793. There is, however, one difference: the Paris committee was revolutionary, whereas the one in Berlin is reactionary. For according to an announcement which appeared in Berlin, "the authorities entrusted with the maintenance of order" have found it necessary "to join in a combined effort". They have therefore appointed a Committee of Public Safety which has taken up residence in Oberwallstrasse. This new administrative body is composed as follows: 1. President: Puttkamer, director in the Ministry of the Interior; 2. Commandant Aschoff, the former commander-in-chief of the civic militia; 3. Chief of Police Minutoli; 4. Public Prosecutor Temme; 5. Burgomaster Naunyn and two councillors; 6. The chairman of the City Council and three city councillors; 7. Five officers and two soldiers of the civic militia. The committee will

"take notice of all events which disturb or threaten to disturb public order and it promises to subject the facts to a profound and thorough investigation. While circumventing old and inadequate means and methods, and avoiding unnecessary correspondence, the committee will agree upon suitable steps and initiate the rapid and energetic implementation of the necessary orders by the various organs of the administration. Only such joint co-operation can bring speed and safety, combined with the requisite circumspection, into the conduct of business which is often very difficult in the present circumstances. In particular, however, the civic militia, which has assumed the protection of the city, will be enabled, *when required, to lend appropriate weight to the decisions made with its advice by the authorities.* With full confidence in the participation and collaboration of all inhabitants, particularly the honourable (!) estate of artisans *and* (!) workers, the deputies, *free of all party views and aims*, begin their laborious task and hope that they may be able to fulfil it, preferably by the peaceful method of mediation, so that the well-being of all may be assured".

The very unctuous, ingratiating, humbly pleading language used leads one to suspect that what is being formed here is a centre for reactionary activities against the revolutionary people of Berlin. The composition of this committee changes this suspicion to certainty. There is first of all Herr Puttkamer, who as Chief of Police became well known for his expulsions. As under the bureaucratic monarchy, no high authority without at least *one* Puttkamer. Then there is Herr Aschoff, who, because he is as rude as a drill-sergeant and on account of his reactionary intrigues, came to be so hated by the civic militia that it decided to remove him. He has now indeed resigned. Then we come to Herr Minutoli, who in 1846 saved the fatherland in Posen^a by discovering the Polish conspiracy³⁶ and who recently threatened to expel the compositors when they were striking because of wages disagreements.³⁷ Then there are the representatives of two bodies that have become extremely reactionary: the Municipal Government and the City Council, and, finally, among the civic militia officers the arch-reactionary Major Blesson. We hope that the people of Berlin will by no means let themselves be held in tutelage by this arbitrarily constituted committee of reaction.

The committee, by the way, has already started its reactionary activity by asking that the popular procession, announced for yesterday (Sunday),^b to the grave of those killed in March should be called off since this would be a demonstration and demonstrations in general are held to be an evil.

Written on June 5, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 6, June 6, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a The Polish name is Poznań.—*Ed.*

^b June 4, 1848.—*Ed.*

THE PROGRAMMES
OF THE RADICAL-DEMOCRATIC PARTY
AND OF THE LEFT AT FRANKFURT³⁸

Cologne, June 6. Yesterday we acquainted our readers with the "reasoned manifesto of the radical-democratic party in the Constituent National Assembly at Frankfurt am Main".³⁹ Today they will find the manifesto of the Left under the heading Frankfurt. At first sight the two manifestos appear to be almost identical except in form, as the radical-democratic party has a clumsy editor and the Left a skilful one. On closer scrutiny, however, several substantially different points stand out. The manifesto of the radicals demands a National Assembly to be set up "*without any property qualification and by direct elections*", that of the Left wants it to be convened by "*free universal elections*". *Free universal elections* exclude *property qualifications*, but by no means exclude the *indirect* method of election. In any case why use this vague and ambiguous term?

We encounter once more this greater latitude and flexibility in the demands of the Left compared with the demands of the radical party. The Left wants

"an executive Central Authority elected by the National Assembly for a definite period and responsible to it".

It does not say whether this Central Authority has to be elected *from the ranks of the National Assembly*, as the manifesto of the radicals expressly states.

Finally the manifesto of the Left calls for the immediate definition, proclamation and maintenance of the basic rights of the German people against all possible encroachments by individual governments. The manifesto of the radicals is not content with this. It declares that

"all political power of the federal state is now concentrated in the Assembly which must *immediately* bring into operation the various forces and political institutions

falling within its jurisdiction, and direct the home and foreign policies of the federal state”.

Both manifestos agree that the “drafting of the German Constitution should be left solely to the National Assembly” and the governments debarred from taking part in it. Both agree that “without prejudice to the people’s rights to be proclaimed by the National Assembly” it should be left to the individual states to choose their form of government, whether that of a constitutional monarchy or a republic. Both finally agree that Germany should be transformed into a confederation or a federative state.

The manifesto of the radicals at least expresses the *revolutionary* nature of the National Assembly. It demands appropriate revolutionary action. Does not the mere existence of a *Constituent* National Assembly prove that *there is no longer* any Constitution? But if there is no Constitution, then there is no Government either. And if there is no longer any Government, the National Assembly must govern. Its first move should have been a decree of seven words: “*The Federal Diet*⁴⁰ *is dissolved for ever.*”

A Constituent National Assembly must above all be an *active*, revolutionarily active assembly. The Assembly at Frankfurt is engaged in parliamentary school exercises and leaves it to the governments to act. Assuming that this learned gathering succeeds, after mature consideration, in framing the best of agendas and the best of constitutions, of what use is the best agenda and the best Constitution if the governments meanwhile have placed bayonets on the agenda?

Apart from the fact that it was the outcome of *indirect* elections, the German National Assembly suffers from a specifically German malady. It sits at Frankfurt am Main, and Frankfurt am Main is merely an ideal centre, which corresponded to the hitherto ideal, that is merely imaginary, German unity. Frankfurt am Main moreover is not a big city with a large revolutionary population backing the National Assembly, partly defending it, partly spurring it on. It is the first time in world history that the Constituent Assembly of a big nation holds its sessions in a small town. This is the result of Germany’s previous history. While the French and English national assemblies met on volcanic ground—Paris and London—the German National Assembly considered itself lucky to find *neutral* ground, where in the most comfortable peace of mind it could ponder over the best Constitution and the best agenda. Yet the present state of affairs in Germany offered the Assembly an opportunity to overcome the drawbacks of its unfortunate physical

situation. It only needed everywhere to counter dictatorially the reactionary encroachments by obsolete governments in order to win over public opinion, a power against which all bayonets and rifle-butts would be ineffective. Instead Mainz, almost within sight of the Assembly, is abandoned to the arbitrary actions of the army, and German citizens from other parts of the country are exposed to the chicanery of the philistines in Frankfurt.^a The Assembly bores the German people instead of inspiring it or being inspired by it. Although there is a *public* which for the time being still looks with good-natured humour upon the antics performed by the spectre of the resurrected Diet of the Holy Roman Empire,⁴¹ there is no *people* that can find its own life reflected in the life of the Assembly. Far from being the central organ of the revolutionary movement, the Assembly, up till now, was not even its echo.

If the National Assembly forms a Central Authority from its own midst, little satisfaction can be expected from such a Provisional Government, in view of the Assembly's present composition and the fact that it let the favourable moment slip by. If it forms no Central Authority, it puts its seal to its own abdication and will be scattered to the winds at the first stir of a revolutionary current.

It is to the credit of both the programme of the Left and that of the radical group that they have grasped this necessity. Both exclaim with Heine:

"For when I consider the matter with care,
We don't need an Emperor really."^b

Because it is so difficult to decide "*who shall be emperor*", and because there are as many good reasons for an elected emperor as there are for an hereditary emperor, even the conservative majority of the Assembly will be compelled to cut the Gordian knot by electing *no emperor at all*.

It is incomprehensible how the so-called radical-democratic party can advocate, as the ultimate constitutional structure of Germany, a *federation* of constitutional monarchies, small principalities and tiny republics, i.e. a federal state consisting of such heterogeneous elements, headed by a republican Government—for this is what the central body agreed to by the Left really amounts to.

First of all the German Central Government elected by the National Assembly must undoubtedly be set up *alongside* the governments

^a See this volume, pp. 16-19.—Ed.

^b Heinrich Heine, *Deutschland. Ein Wintermärchen*, Caput XVI.—Ed.

which still actually exist. But its struggle against the separate governments begins as soon as it comes into existence, and in the course of this struggle either the Central Government and the unity of Germany are wrecked, or the separate governments with their constitutional princes or petty republics are destroyed.

We do not make the utopian demand that at the outset a *united indivisible German republic* should be proclaimed, but we ask the so-called radical-democratic party not to confuse the starting point of the struggle and of the revolutionary movement with the goal. Both German unity and the German Constitution can result only from a movement in which the internal conflicts and the war with the East will play an equally decisive role. The final act of constitution cannot be *decreed*, it coincides with the movement we have to go through. It is therefore not a question of putting into practice this or that view, this or that political idea, but of understanding the course of development. The National Assembly has to take only such steps as are practicable in the first instance.

Nothing can be more confused than the notion advanced by the editor of the democratic manifesto—for all his assurances that “everybody is glad to get rid of his confusion”—that the *federal state of North America* should serve as a model for the German Constitution.

Leaving alone the fact that all its constituent parts have a similar structure, the United States of America covers an area equal to that of civilised Europe. Only a *European* federation would be analogous to it. But in order to federate with other states Germany must first of all become *one* state. The conflict between centralisation and federalism in Germany is a conflict between modern culture and feudalism. Germany fell into a kind of bourgeoisified feudalism at the very moment the great monarchies arose in the West; she was moreover excluded from the world market just when this market was opened up to the countries of Western Europe. Germany became impoverished while the Western countries grew rich; she became countrified while they became urbanised. Even if Russia did not knock at the gates of Germany, the economic conditions alone would compel the latter to introduce rigorous centralisation. Even from a purely bourgeois point of view, the solid unity of Germany is a primary condition for her deliverance from her present wretchedness and for the building up of her national wealth. And how could modern social problems be solved in a territory that is split into 39 small states?

Incidentally, the editor of the democratic programme does not bother about such a minor question as material economic conditions.

He relies on the concept of federation in his reasoning. *Federation* is an *alliance of free and equal partners*. Hence Germany must be a *federal state*. But cannot the Germans unite in *one* great state without offence to the concept of an alliance of free and equal partners?

Written on June 6, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 7, June 7, 1848

THE AGREEMENT DEBATES IN BERLIN⁴²

Cologne, June 6. The *negotiations for an agreement* etc. are making most satisfactory progress in Berlin. Motions follow motions and most of them are even submitted five or six times to make quite sure that they are not lost on their long way through the sections and committees. At every opportunity the greatest number of preliminary questions, secondary questions, interpolated questions, supplementary questions, and main questions is raised. Whenever one of these great or small questions is taken up, an informal conversation ensues between the delegates "on the floor" and the President, the Ministers etc., thus creating a welcome pause between the demanding "great debates". Especially those anonymous agreeers whom the stenographer is in the habit of designating as "votes", love to express their opinions during such genial discussions. These "votes", by the way, are so proud of their right to vote that sometimes "*they vote both yes and no*" as happened on June 2. Alongside this idyll, however, there arises with all the grandeur of tragedy the battle of the great debate, a battle which is not only conducted verbally from the rostrum but is joined by the chorus of the agreeers with drumming, murmuring, and confused shouting. Each time the drama ends, of course, with a victory for the virtuous Right and is almost always decided by the conservative army calling for a vote.

During the session of June 2 Herr *Jung* questioned the Foreign Minister about the extradition treaty with Russia.⁴³ It is known that already in 1842, public opinion forced the abrogation of the extradition treaty, which was, however, renewed during the reaction of 1844. It is known that the Russian Government orders extradited persons to be knouted to death or to be exiled to Siberia. It is known

that the agreed extradition of common criminals and vagabonds offers the desired pretext for the delivery of political refugees into the hands of the Russians.

Foreign Minister *Arnim* replied:

“Surely, no one will object to the extradition of deserters, since it is an accepted practice between friendly states mutually to extradite such people.”

We take notice that according to our Minister Russia and Germany are “friendly states”. The massive armies which Russia is concentrating along the Bug and Niemen rivers have no other intention, to be sure, than to liberate “friendly” Germany as soon as possible from the terror of the revolution.

“The decision to extradite criminals, by the way, rests in the hands of the courts so that there is every guarantee that the accused will not be extradited before the conclusion of the criminal investigation.”

Herr *Arnim* tries to make the Assembly believe that Prussian courts investigate the evidence which has been gathered against the accused. The opposite is true. Russian or Russian-Polish judicial authorities send a decision to the Prussian judicial authorities, indicting the fugitive. The Prussian court is obliged to check merely the authenticity of this document and if it proves to be genuine, the extradition has to take place. Thus, “there is every guarantee” that the Russian Government has only to beckon to its judges in order to get hold of every fugitive with the aid of Prussian chains as long as the fugitive has not yet been indicted for political offences.

“It goes without saying that *our own subjects* will not be extradited.”

“Our own subjects”, feudal Baron von *Arnim*, cannot be extradited under any circumstances because there are no longer “subjects” in Germany since the people took the liberty of emancipating themselves on the barricades.

“Our own subjects”! Are we, who elect assemblies and prescribe sovereign laws to kings and emperors, “subjects” of His Majesty the King of Prussia?

“Our own subjects”! If the Assembly had even a spark of the revolutionary pride to which it owes its existence, it would have drummed the servile Minister off the rostrum and the ministerial bench in a single outburst of indignation. Instead it calmly allowed the stigmatising expression to go unchallenged. Not the slightest protest was heard.

Herr *Rehfeld* questioned Herr *Hansemann* about the *Seehandlung*'s⁴⁴ renewed buying up of wool and about the advantages enjoyed by British buyers over German buyers as a result of the discount

offered to the British. The wool industry, depressed by the general crisis, expected to gain at least some small benefit by purchasing at this year's very low wool prices. Along comes the *Seehandlung* and drives up the price of wool by its enormous purchases in bulk. At the same time it offers to facilitate considerably the purchases of British buyers by discounting bills of exchange drawn on London—a measure which is also quite apt to raise the price of wool by attracting new buyers and which gives significant advantages to foreign over domestic purchasers.

The *Seehandlung* is a legacy of absolute monarchy which used it for all sorts of purposes. For twenty years it has caused the 1820 Law on Government Debts⁴⁵ to remain an illusion and it has meddled in trade and industry in a most disagreeable fashion.

The question asked by Herr *Rehfeld* is basically of little interest to democracy. It concerns a profit of several thousand talers more or less for either wool producers or wool manufacturers.

The wool producers are almost exclusively large landed proprietors, i.e. feudal lords from Brandenburg, Prussia, Silesia and Posen.

The wool manufacturers are for the most part big capitalists, i.e. gentlemen of the big bourgeoisie.

Hence, the price of wool is a matter not of general interest but of class interests. The question is whether the big landed aristocracy will profit to the exclusion of the big bourgeoisie or whether it will be the other way around.

Herr Hansemann who has been sent to Berlin as the representative of the big bourgeoisie, the party now in power, betrays it to the landed aristocracy, the conquered party.

The only interest which this entire matter holds for us democrats lies in the fact that Herr Hansemann has taken up the cause of the conquered party, that he does not support the merely conservative class but the *reactionary* class. We admit that we did not expect such behaviour from the bourgeois Hansemann.

Herr *Hansemann* assures us, to begin with, that he is no friend of the *Seehandlung* and then adds: Neither the purchasing business nor the mills of the *Seehandlung* can be stopped suddenly. Concerning wool purchases, there are treaties by which the *Seehandlung* ... is committed to buy up a certain amount of wool this year. I believe that if during any year such purchases are not harmful to private trade, it is certainly the case this year (?) ... because otherwise the prices would drop too low.

The entire speech shows that Herr Hansemann is not comfortable while delivering it. He had been induced to do a favour to the

Arnims, Schaffgotsches and Itzenplitzes to the detriment of the wool manufacturers, and he must now defend his rash step with the arguments of modern political economy which is so unmerciful to the interests of the aristocracy. He knows better than anyone else that he is making a fool of the Assembly.

“Neither the purchasing business nor the mills of the *Seehandlung* can be stopped suddenly.” Thus, the *Seehandlung* buys wool and lets its mills work at full speed. If the mills of the *Seehandlung* “cannot be stopped” suddenly then the sales obviously also cannot be ended. Thus, the *Seehandlung* will put its woollen products on the market, glut the already overstocked market and depress the already sinking prices even more. In a word, it will make the current commercial crisis even worse and take away the last few remaining customers from the wool manufacturers in order to supply the landed gentry of Brandenburg etc. with money for their wool.

Concerning the English bills of exchange, Herr Hansemann delivers a brilliant tirade describing the enormous advantages which will accrue to the entire country when English guineas flow into the pockets of the landed gentry of Brandenburg. We will of course not discuss these remarks seriously. What we cannot understand is that Herr Hansemann was able to maintain a straight face during his speech.

The same session also debated a committee which is to be formed because of Posen. Concerning that, tomorrow.

Written by Engels on June 6, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 7, June 7, 1848

Published in English for the first time

THE AGREEMENT DEBATES

Cologne, June 6. At the *Berlin agreement session* of the 2nd, Herr Reuter moved the appointment of a committee of inquiry into the causes of the civil war in Posen.⁴⁶

Herr *Parrisius* demands an immediate debate on this motion.

The President^a gets ready to call for a vote when Herr *Camphausen* recalls that there has as yet been no debate on Herr *Parrisius*' motion:

"May I remind you that the passage of this" (Reuter's) "motion would mean the acceptance of an *important political principle* which is certainly entitled (*sic!*) to a test in the sections."

We are put in suspense about the "important principle" contained in Reuter's motion, a secret which Herr *Camphausen* is not disclosing for the time being.

While we have to show patience in this respect, a complacent debate develops between the Chairman (Herr *Esser*, Vice-President) and several "votes" as to whether or not a debate is permissible on *Parrisius*' motion. Herr *Esser* here debates with arguments which sound strange in the mouth of the President of a *soi-disant* National Assembly: "*I was under the impression* that it is permissible to discuss any matter that the Assembly is called upon to decide."

"I was under the impression"! Man proposes and Herr *Camphausen* disposes by drafting standing orders that nobody can understand and having them adopted provisionally by his Assembly.

Herr *Camphausen* was gracious this time. He had to have the debate. *Parrisius*' and Reuter's motions might have been passed without debate, i.e. an indirect vote of no confidence would have

^a Karl Milde.— *Ed.*

been rendered against him. And, still worse, what would have become of his "important political principle" without a debate?

Hence, a discussion takes place.

Herr *Parrisius* wants an immediate debate on the main motion so that no time is lost and the committee may possibly report before the debate on the address. Otherwise judgment would be made in the address without any factual knowledge about Posen.

Herr *Meusebach* opposes this move although as yet rather mildly.

But now Herr *Ritz* rises impatiently to put an end to Reuter's subversive motion. He is a royal Prussian *Regierungsrat* and will not tolerate that assemblies, even if they are assemblies for the purpose of agreement, meddle in his special field. He knows of but one authority entitled to do so: the *Oberpräsidium*. He prefers the system of successive appeals to everything else.

"What," he exclaims, "do you, gentlemen, intend to send a commission to Posen? Do you intend to *turn yourselves into administrative or judicial authorities?* Gentlemen, I cannot perceive from this motion what you are trying to accomplish. Are you going to demand an inspection of the files of the commanding general" (what outrage!) "or the judicial authorities" (horrible) "or perhaps even the administrative authorities?" (In contemplating that possibility, the *Regierungsrat* is at his wits' end.) "Do you want the investigation to be conducted by an improvised committee" (which perhaps has never taken an examination) "dealing with all these matters *which nobody yet clearly understands?*" (Herr *Ritz* probably only appoints committees to investigate matters which everybody clearly understands.) "This important issue *on which you arrogate to yourselves rights which do not belong to you....*" (Interruption.)

What is one to say to this *Regierungsrat* of sterling worth, to this personification of red tape who has no guile! He is like that provincial character in Cham's little cartoon who, upon arriving in Paris after the February revolution, sees posters with the inscription "*République française*" and runs to the Public Prosecutor-General to denounce these agitators against the royal Government. That man had slept through the entire period.

Herr *Ritz*, too, has been asleep. The thundering words "committee of inquiry for Posen" roughly shake him awake and, still drowsy with sleep, the astonished man exclaims: "Do you wish to arrogate to yourselves rights which do not belong to you?"

Herr *Duncker* regards a committee of inquiry as superfluous "since the committee on the address must demand the necessary clarifications from the Ministry". As if it were not precisely the job of the committee to compare the "clarifications" of the Ministry with the facts.

Herr *Bloem* spoke of the urgency of the motion. The question ought to be settled before there are deliberations on the address. There had been talk about improvised committees. Herr Han-

semann had the previous day similarly improvised a question of confidence and still a vote had been taken.

Herr *Hansemann*, who had probably thought about his new financial plan during the entire unedifying debate, was rudely awakened from his golden dreams by the mention of his name. He evidently had no idea what it was all about but his name had been mentioned and he had to speak. Only two points of contact had remained in his memory: the speeches of his superior, Camphausen, and Herr *Ritz*. After mouthing a few platitudes about the question of the address he composed the following rhetorical masterpiece from these two speeches:

“Precisely because we do not yet know all the tasks which the committee will have to perform, whether it will dispatch some of its own members to the Grand Duchy, whether it will have to take care of this or that matter, *all this proves the great importance of the question that is under discussion* (!). To decide this question here and now right away would mean to *decide one of the most important political questions in an improvised fashion*. I do not believe that the Assembly will want to tread this path and I am confident that it will be careful etc.”

What contempt Herr Hansemann must have for the entire Assembly to be able to fling such conclusions at this body! We want to appoint a committee which will perhaps have to go to Posen and maybe not. Just because we do not know whether it must remain in Berlin or go to Posen, the question whether a committee ought to be appointed at all is of *great importance*. And because it is of great importance, it is one of the *most important political questions*!

Which question, however, this most important political question is, Herr Hansemann keeps to himself for the time being, just as Herr Camphausen does not reveal his important political principle. Let us be patient once more!

The effect of Hansemann’s logic is so crushing that everybody at once begins clamouring for a termination of the debate. Now the following scene ensues:

Herr *Jung* demands the right to speak against the closing of the debate.

The President: It seems to me inadmissible to permit you to speak on this.

Herr *Jung*: It is customary everywhere to have the right to speak against the closing of a debate.

Herr *Temme* reads out Article 42 of the provisional standing orders according to which Herr *Jung* is correct and the President incorrect.

Herr *Jung* is allowed to speak: I am against closing the debate because the Minister was the last person to speak. The words of a

Minister are of the greatest importance because they attract a great party to one side, because a great party does not like to disavow a Minister....

A general, long-drawn-out aha! aha! arises. A terrific uproar begins on the Right.

Commissioner of Justice *Moritz* exclaims from the floor: I move that Jung be called to order since he has offended *the entire Assembly by resorting to personalities!*(!)

Another voice from the “Right” shouts: I second the motion and I protest against....

The uproar grows constantly. *Jung* does his best but finds it impossible to make himself heard. He calls upon the President to uphold his right to speak.

President: Since the Assembly has decided, my duties are over.(!!)

Herr Jung: The Assembly has not decided. You must first call for a formal vote.

Herr Jung is forced to yield. The noise does not abate until he has left the rostrum.

President: The last speaker *seems* (!) to have spoken against the termination of the debate. The question is whether someone else still wants to speak for closure.

Herr Reuter: The debate for and against closure has already taken up 15 minutes of our time. Should we not leave it on the table?

Thereupon the speaker again takes up the urgency of setting up a committee which compels *Herr Hansemann* to rise once more and to explain at last his “most important political question”.

Herr Hansemann: Gentlemen! We are dealing with one of the *greatest political questions*, i.e. whether the Assembly has the desire to venture upon a path that *may involve it in considerable conflicts!*

At last! *Herr Hansemann*, as a consistent Duchâtel, promptly declares once again that it is a *question of confidence*. For him all questions have only one significance, namely whether they are questions of confidence, and a question of confidence is for him naturally the “greatest political question”.

This time *Herr Camphausen* does not seem to be satisfied with this simple method of curtailment. He takes the floor.

“It should be observed that the Assembly could already be informed” (about Posen) “if the deputy had chosen to ask the *question*” (but the deputies wanted to ascertain the facts for themselves). “That would be the *quickest* method of obtaining clarification” (but of what kind?).... “I close with the explanation that the motion simply means that the Assembly ought to decide *whether we should form committees of*

inquiry for one or another purpose. I agree entirely that the question must be *thoroughly considered and examined*, but I do not want it so suddenly here and now to become a topic for debate."

Thus, the "important political principle" turns out to be the question whether the Agreement Assembly has the right to form committees of inquiry or whether it will refuse itself this right!

The French Chambers and English Houses have all along formed such committees (select committees) to conduct an inquiry (*enquête*, parliamentary inquiry)^a and respectable Ministers have never raised objections to them. Without such committees, ministerial responsibility is an empty phrase. But Herr Camphausen contests this right of the members of the Agreement Assembly!

Enough. Talking is easy but voting is difficult. The debate is closed and a vote is to be held. Numerous difficulties, doubts, sophistries and moral scruples make their appearance. But we shall spare our readers the details. After a great deal of speech-making, Parrisius' motion is rejected and Reuter's is sent to the sections. May its ashes rest in peace.

Written by Engels on June 6, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 8, June 8, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a In the German original the terms "select committees" and "parliamentary inquiry" are given in English in brackets after the German.—*Ed.*

THE QUESTION OF THE ADDRESS

Cologne, June 7. The Berlin Assembly thus has decided to send an address to the King to give the *Government* an opportunity to express its views and to vindicate its administration up to now. It is not to be a vote of thanks along the lines of the old Diet, not even an attestation of respect: His Majesty, according to the admission of His Majesty's "responsible ones", only offers the "most suitable" and "best" *occasion* to bring the principles of the majority "into line" with those of the Government.

If in essence the person of the King represents a mere medium of exchange—we refer once again to the very words of the Prime Minister^a—a voucher which merely expedites the business in hand, that person is by no means irrelevant to the form of the negotiations. In the first place the representatives of the popular will are thereby put into direct touch with the Crown, a fact from which, as already evident in the debate on the address, it is easy to infer the recognition of the agreement theory, the renunciation of popular sovereignty. In the second place, however, one would hardly address a sovereign to whom one is required to pay one's respect in the same manner as one would address the Ministers. Greater reserve of expression will prevail and hints will take the place of plain words, particularly since it is still up to the Government to decide whether a slight censure is compatible with its continued existence. It may well be, however, that the difficult questions which throw the contradictions into the boldest relief will be touched upon only superficially or not at all. It will be easy to arouse fears of a premature break with the

^a Ludolf Camphausen.—*Ed.*

Crown perhaps accompanied by serious consequences, and this could be covered up by the assertion that it was not desirable to prejudge matters awaiting more thorough discussion at a later date.

Thus, sincere respect either for the person of the monarch or the monarchical principle in general, apprehension about going too far, and fear of anarchical tendencies offer inestimable advantages to the Ministry during the debate on the address and Herr Camphausen had good reason to call the opportunity "most suitable" and "best" for winning a strong majority.

The question is now whether the people's representatives are inclined to enter into this obedient, dependent relationship. The Constituent Assembly has already greatly weakened its position by failing on its own initiative to call the Ministers to account about their provisional government up to now; that should have been its first task, for it was ostensibly convoked at such an early date because the orders of the Government were to be based upon the indirect will of the people. Indeed, it seems now, *after* it has assembled, that it is supposed to be there merely "for the purpose of agreeing with the Crown upon a Constitution which, it is hoped, will endure in the future".

But instead of proclaiming its true mission from the very start, by proceeding in this way, the Assembly has tolerated the humiliation of being compelled by the Ministers to accept a statement of accounts. It is remarkable that not a single one of its members countered the proposal for the formation of an address committee with a demand that the Ministry appear before the Chamber *without* a special "occasion", solely for the purpose of rendering an account of its activities up to now. And yet this was the only compelling argument against an address, since on all other counts the Ministers were completely right to demand one.

Written on June 7, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 8, June 8, 1848

Published in English for the first time

A NEW PARTITION OF POLAND⁴⁷

Cologne, June 8. The new demarcation line of Herr von Pfuel in Posen is a new rape of Poland. It limits the part that is to be "reorganised" to less than a third of the entire Grand Duchy and joins the far larger part of Great Poland to the German Confederation. The Polish language and nationality are to be recognised only in a small strip along the Russian border. This strip consists of the Wreschen and Pleschen^a districts and parts of the districts of Mogilno, Wongrowiec, Gnesen, Schroda, Schrimm, Kosten, Frau-stadt, Kröben, Krotoschin, Adelnau and Schildberg.^b The other parts of these districts as well as the entire districts of Buk, Posen, Obornik, Samter, Birnbaum, Meseritz, Bomst, Czarnikow, Chodziesen, Wirsitz, Bromberg, Schubin,^c and Inowroclaw are transformed without more ado into German soil by the decree of Herr von Pfuel. And yet there is no doubt that even within this "territory of the German Confederation", the majority of the inhabitants still speak Polish.

The old demarcation line at least gave the Poles the River Warta as their frontier. The new one restricts that part of Poland which is to be reorganised by another quarter. Both "the *desire*" of the Minister of War^d to exclude from reorganisation a three to four mile strip of territory around the fortress of Posen and the wish of various

^a The Polish names are Września, Pleszew.— *Ed.*

^b Wągrowiec, Gniezno, Środa, Śrem, Kościan, Wschowa, Krobia, Krotoszyn, Odolanów, Ostrzeszów.— *Ed.*

^c Poznań, Oborniki, Szamotuły, Międzychód, Międzyrzecz, Bąbimost, Czarnków, Chodzież, Wyrzysk, Bydgoszcz, Szubin.— *Ed.*

^d August Kanitz.— *Ed.*

towns such as Ostrowo^a etc. to be joined to Germany, serve as convenient pretexts for this measure.

The desire of the Minister of War is perfectly natural. First one steals the city and fortress of Posen which lies ten miles deep inside Polish territory; then one finds the new theft of a three-mile strip desirable so as not to be disturbed in the enjoyment of the previously stolen territory. This further acquisition of land leads again to all sorts of small adjustments, and so one has the best occasion to propel the German frontier further and further towards the Russian-Polish border.

The desire to be incorporated expressed by "German" towns may be explained as follows: all over Poland, Germans and Jews form the main part of the artisans and merchants; they are the descendants of immigrants who fled their homeland for the most part because of religious persecutions. Founding towns in the midst of Polish territory, they have shared for centuries all the vicissitudes of the Polish realm. These Germans and Jews, a very large minority in the country, are trying to make use of the country's present situation to gain mastery. They plead their *German* nature; they are no more German than the German Americans: Annexing them to Germany would entail the suppression of the language and nationality of more than half of Posen's Polish population and especially that part of the province in which the national insurrection raged with the greatest violence and intensity, i.e. the districts of Buk, Samter, Posen and Obornik.

Herr von Pfuel declares that he will regard the new frontier as finally settled as soon as the Ministry ratifies it. He mentions neither the Agreement Assembly nor the German National Assembly who after all have also a word to say when it comes to settling the boundary of Germany. But no matter whether the Ministry, the Agreement Assembly, or the Frankfurt Assembly ratify the decision of Herr von Pfuel, the demarcation line will not be "finally settled" so long as two other powers have not ratified it as well: the German nation and the Polish nation.

Written by Engels on June 8, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 9, June 9, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a The Polish name is Ostrów Wielkopolski.—*Ed.*

THE SHIELD OF THE DYNASTY

Cologne, June 9. Herr Camphausen, according to the reports of German newspapers, poured out his overflowing heart to his agreeers on the 6th of this month. He gave

“not so much a brilliant speech as one *that flowed from the innermost recesses of his heart*, a speech which reminds one of the passage in St. Paul which reads: ‘Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass!’^a His speech was full of that holy emotion that we call love ... it spoke inspiringly to the inspired ones, the applause did not seem to come to an end ... and a prolonged intermission was necessary to surrender oneself to and absorb its total impact”.^b

And who was the hero of this speech that was full of love and flowed from the innermost recesses of the heart? Who was the subject that inspired Herr Camphausen so much that he spoke inspiringly to the inspired ones? Who was the Aeneas of this Aeneid of June 6?

Who else but the *Prince of Prussia!*

One can read in the stenographic report how the poetic Prime Minister describes the journeys of the modern son of Anchises, how he acted on the day when

—holy Ilium fell in the fighting,
Priam too, and the folk of the King, skilled javelin-thrower,^c

how after the fall of squirearchical Troy, and after a long odyssey on both water and land, he at last arrived at the shores of modern

^a 1 Corinthians 13:1.—*Ed.*

^b *Kölnische Zeitung* No. 161, June 9, 1848.—*Ed.*

^c Homer, *Iliad*, IV, 164-65, and VI, 448-49 (paraphrased).—*Ed.*

Carthage where he was received in a most friendly fashion by Queen Dido; how he fared better than Aeneas the First since there was a Camphausen who did his utmost to restore Troy and rediscovered the sacred "legal basis", how Camphausen finally permitted Aeneas to return to his Penates and how joy once more reigns in the halls of Troy.⁴⁸ One has to read all this as well as countless poetic embellishments so as to feel what it means when an inspirer speaks to inspired ones.

This entire epic, by the way, only serves Herr Camphausen as a pretext for a dithyramb on himself and his own Ministry.

"Yes," he exclaims, "we believed that we were acting in the spirit of the Constitution when *we* took the place of a high personage, when *we* ourselves posed as the personages against whom all attacks were to be directed.... And so it happened. We placed ourselves as a shield before the dynasty and drew all dangers and attacks upon ourselves."

What a compliment for the "high personage" and what a compliment for the "dynasty"! The dynasty would have been lost without Herr Camphausen and his six paladins. As what a mighty "dynasty deeply rooted in the people" must Herr Camphausen regard the House of Hohenzollern, to speak in such a fashion! Verily, if Herr Camphausen had spoken less "inspiringly to the inspired ones", had he been less "full of that holy emotion that we call love", or had he only let his Hansemann speak who is content with "sounding brass"—it would have been better for the dynasty!

"Gentlemen, I am not saying this, however, with challenging pride but rather with the humility that arises from the conviction that the great task with which you and we are entrusted can only be solved if the spirit of *gentleness* and *conciliation* descends also upon this Assembly, if we can find besides your justice also your forbearance."

Herr Camphausen is correct in pleading for gentleness and forbearance from an Assembly which itself is in such need of gentleness and forbearance from the public!

Written on June 9, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 10, June 10, 1848

Published in English for the first time

COLOGNE IN DANGER

Cologne, June 10. The lovely holiday of Whitsuntide had arrived, the fields were green, the trees were blossoming^a and as far as there are people who confuse the dative with the accusative,^b preparations were made to pour out the holy spirit of reaction over all lands in a *single day*.

The moment is well chosen. In Naples guard lieutenants and Swiss mercenaries have succeeded in drowning the young liberty in the people's blood.^c In France, an Assembly of capitalists fetters the Republic by means of Draconic laws⁴⁹ and appoints General Perrot, who ordered the shooting at the Hôtel Guizot on February 23, commandant of Vincennes. In England and Ireland masses of Chartists and Repealers⁵⁰ are thrown into gaol and unarmed meetings are dispersed by dragoons. In Frankfurt the National Assembly itself now appoints the triumvirate which the blessed Federal Diet proposed and the Committee of Fifty rejected.⁵¹ In Berlin the Right is winning blow by blow through numerical superiority and drumming, and the Prince of Prussia declares the revolution null and void by moving back into the "property of the entire nation".⁵²

Troops are being concentrated in Rhenish Hesse; the heroes who won their spurs fighting the republican partisans in the Lake district⁵³ are encamped all around Frankfurt. Berlin is invested, Breslau^d is

^a The beginning of Goethe's "Reineke Fuchs" (paraphrased).—*Ed.*

^b An allusion to a grammatical mistake commonly made by people speaking the Berlin dialect.—*Ed.*

^c See this volume, pp. 24-26.—*Ed.*

^d The Polish name is Wroclaw.—*Ed.*

besieged and we shall presently discuss how things stand in the Rhine Province.

The reaction is preparing a big coup.

While there is fighting in Schleswig, while Russia sends threatening Notes and gathers 300,000 men at Warsaw, troops are inundating Rhenish Prussia even though the bourgeoisie of the Paris Chamber once again proclaims "peace at any price"!

According to the *Deutsche Zeitung*, fourteen entire infantry regiments (the 13th, the 15th,* the 16th, the 17th, the 25th, the 26th, the 27th, the 28th, the 30th, the 34th, the 35th, the 38th, the 39th, and the 40th), i. e. a third of all the Prussian line and guard infantry (45 regiments), are located in Rhenish Prussia, Mainz and Luxembourg. Some of these forces are fully mobilised for war, the rest have been reinforced by calling up a third of the reserves. Besides these there are three uhlan regiments, two hussar regiments and one dragoon regiment as well as a regiment of cuirassiers that is expected to arrive shortly. In addition there is the major part of the 7th and 8th artillery brigades of which at least half are already mobilised (i.e. each battery of foot-artillery has now 121 horses instead of 19, or 8 instead of 2 horse-drawn cannon). In addition a third company has been formed for Luxembourg and Mainz. These troops are drawn up in a wide arc which extends from Cologne and Bonn to Koblenz and Trier and to the French and Luxembourg frontiers. All fortresses are being armed, the moats are stockaded, and the trees of the glacis are razed either completely or in the line of fire.

And what is the situation here in *Cologne*?

The forts of Cologne are fully armed. The artillery platforms are being extended, the embrasures are being cut and the cannon have arrived and are being set up. Work continues on these projects every day from 6 in the morning until 6 in the evening. It is even said that the cannon were driven out of the city during the night *with wheels wrapped in rags* so as to avoid all noise.

The arming of the city wall started at the Bayen Tower and has already advanced to Bastion No. 6, i.e. half the wall has been fortified. On Sector 1, 20 cannon have already been brought up.

Cannon are installed above the gate of Bastion No. 2 (at the Severin gate). They need only to be turned around to bombard the city.

The best proof that these armaments are only ostensibly directed against an external enemy but in reality are aimed *at Cologne itself* lies

* This is not quite correct since the 13th remains in part and the 15th entirely in Westphalia but they are able to get here by train within a few hours.— *Note by Engels.*

in the fact that here the trees of the glacis have everywhere been left standing. In the event of the troops having to evacuate the city and retreat into the forts, the cannon of the city wall are thereby rendered useless against the forts, whereas the mortars, howitzers and twenty-four pounders of the forts are in no way hindered from lobbing grenades and shells over the trees and into the city. The distance of the forts from the city wall is only 1,400 paces and enables the forts to pour shells that can travel up to 4,000 paces into any part of the city.

Now as to the measures which are *pointed directly against the city*.

The *arsenal* opposite the government building is being *evacuated*. The rifles are nicely wrapped up in order not to attract attention, and are brought into the forts.

Artillery ammunition is brought into the city in *rifle crates* and deposited in bomb-proof magazines all along the city wall.

While we are writing all this, *rifles with bayonets* are being distributed to the *artillery*, although it is a well-known fact that artillery units in Prussia receive no training with these weapons.

Part of the infantry is already in the forts. All of Cologne knows that each company received 5,000 ball-cartridges the day before yesterday.

The following arrangements have been made in case of a clash with the people:

At the first alarm, the 7th (Fortress) Artillery Company is to move into the forts.

Battery No. 37 will then also move out to face the city. This battery has already been equipped fully "ready for war".

The 5th and 8th artillery companies will remain in town for the time being. These companies have 20 shells in each of their caissons.

The hussars are moving from Deutz to Cologne.

The infantry occupies the Neumarkt, the Hahnen gate and the Ehren gate so as to cover the retreat of all troops from the city, and thereafter is also to withdraw into the forts.

The higher officers are moreover doing everything in their power to inculcate in these troops the traditional Prussian hatred for the new order. Nothing is easier during the present state of mounting reaction than to launch, under the pretext of denouncing agitators⁵⁴ and republicans, the most vicious attacks against the revolution and the constitutional monarchy.

Yet Cologne has never been calmer than precisely in recent times. Except for an insignificant gathering in front of the house of the *Regierungspräsident* and a brawl in the Heumarkt, nothing has occurred for the past four weeks that so much as even alarmed the

civic militia in any way whatever. Thus all these measures are *completely unprovoked*.

We repeat: after these otherwise totally incomprehensible measures, after the troop concentrations around Berlin and Breslau, which have been confirmed to us by letters, after the inundation with troops of the Rhine Province, which the reactionaries hate with such passion, we cannot doubt that reactionary forces are preparing a big general coup.

The eruption here in Cologne seems to have been fixed for *Whit Monday*. The rumour is being assiduously spread that things will "start moving" on that day. They will try to provoke a small row so as to call the troops out immediately, threaten the city with bombardment, disarm the civic militia, arrest the chief agitators, in short to maltreat us in the fashion of Mainz and Trier.^a

We warn the workers of Cologne earnestly not to fall into this trap set for them by the reactionaries. We urgently plead with them *not to give* the old-Prussian party *the slightest pretext* for placing Cologne under the despotism of martial law. We beg them to *let Whit Sunday and Whit Monday pass in an especially tranquil atmosphere* and thereby frustrate the entire scheme of the reactionaries.

If we give the reaction a pretext for attacking us we will be lost and our fate will be the same as that of the inhabitants of Mainz. If they should feel compelled to attack us and if they really dare to stage an assault, the inhabitants of Cologne will have plenty of opportunity to prove that they too will not hesitate for one moment to defend the gains of March 18 with their blood and lives.

Postscript. Just now the following orders have been issued:

No watchword will be announced during the two *Whitsuntide holidays* (whereas usually it was issued with special solemnity). The troops will *remain confined to barracks* where the officers will receive the watchword.

As of today, the fortress and auxiliary artillery companies as well as the infantry garrison of the forts will obtain, in addition to their normal rations, daily bread rations for four days in advance *so that they will always have in hand food for eight days*.

The artillery will begin *rifle practice* already at seven o'clock this evening.

Written by Engels on June 10, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 11, June 11, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a See this volume, pp. 20 and 23.—*Ed.*

AN ADMISSION OF INCOMPETENCE
BY THE ASSEMBLIES OF FRANKFURT AND BERLIN

Cologne, June 11. Both assemblies, the one in Frankfurt and the one in Berlin, have solemnly put on record their admission of incompetence. One assembly, by its vote on the question of Schleswig-Holstein, recognises the Federal Diet as its superior authority.⁵⁵ The other, by its decision to reject Deputy Berends' motion and by passing to the substantiated order of the day, not only repudiates the revolution,^a but expressly admits that it is solely empowered to agree upon the Constitution and thereby recognises the basic principle underlying the draft of the Constitution that has been proposed by the Camphausen Government. Both assemblies have given a correct appraisal of their worth. They are both incompetent.

Written on June 11, 1848

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 12-13, June 13, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

^a See this volume, pp. 75-86.—*Ed.*

THE BERLIN DEBATE ON THE REVOLUTION⁵⁶

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 14, June 14, 1848]

Cologne, June 13. At last the Agreement Assembly has made its position clear. It has rejected the idea of revolution and accepted the theory of agreement.

The matter the Assembly had to decide was this.

On March 18 the King promised a Constitution, introduced freedom of the press together with caution money,⁵⁷ and made a series of proposals in which he declared that Germany's unity must be achieved by the merging of Germany in Prussia.

These sum up the real content of the concessions made on March 18. The fact that the people of Berlin were satisfied with this and that they marched to the palace to thank the King is the clearest proof of the necessity of the March 18 revolution. Not only the state, its *citizens* too had to be revolutionised. Their submissiveness could only be shed in a sanguinary liberation struggle.

A well-known "misunderstanding"⁵⁸ led to the revolution. There was indeed a misunderstanding. The attack by the soldiers, the fight which continued for 16 hours and the fact that the people had to force the troops to withdraw are sufficient proof that the people completely *misunderstood* the concessions of March 18.

The results of the revolution were, on the one hand, the arming of the people, the right of association and the sovereignty of the people, won *de facto*; on the other hand, the retention of the monarchy and the Camphausen-Hansemann Ministry, that is a Government representing the big bourgeoisie.

Thus the revolution produced two sets of results, which were bound to diverge. The people was victorious; it had won liberties of a pronounced democratic nature, but direct control passed into the hands of the big bourgeoisie and not into those of the people.

In short, the revolution was not carried through to the end. The people let the big bourgeoisie form a Government and the big bourgeoisie promptly revealed its intentions by inviting the old Prussian nobility and the bureaucracy to enter into an alliance with it. Arnim, Kanitz and Schwerin became members of the Government.

The big bourgeoisie, which was all along anti-revolutionary, concluded a defensive and offensive alliance with the reactionary forces, because it was afraid of the people, i.e. of the workers and the democratic bourgeoisie.

The united reactionary parties began their fight against democracy by *calling the revolution in question*. The victory of the people was denied, the famous list of the "seventeen dead soldiers"⁵⁹ was fabricated, and those who had fought on the barricades were slandered in every possible way. But this was not all. The United Diet convoked before the revolution was now actually convened by the Government, in order *post festum* to fabricate a legal transition from absolutism to the Constitution. Thus the Government openly repudiated the revolution. It moreover invented the theory of agreement, once more repudiating the revolution and with it the sovereignty of the people.

The revolution was accordingly really called in question, and this could be done because it was only a partial revolution, only the beginning of a long revolutionary movement.

We cannot here go into the question as to why and to what extent the present rule of the big bourgeoisie in Prussia is a necessary transitional stage towards democracy, and why, directly after its ascent to power, the big bourgeoisie joined the reactionary camp. For the present we merely report the fact.

The Agreement Assembly had now to declare whether it recognised the revolution or not.

But to recognise the revolution under these circumstances meant recognising the democratic aspects of the revolution, which the big bourgeoisie wanted to appropriate to itself.

Recognising the revolution at this moment meant recognising the *incompleteness* of the revolution, and consequently recognising the democratic movement, which was directed against some of the results of the revolution. It meant recognising that Germany was in the grip of a revolutionary movement, and that the Camphausen Ministry, the theory of agreement, indirect elections, the rule of the big capitalists and the decisions of the Assembly itself could indeed be regarded as unavoidable transitional steps, but by no means as final results.

The debate on the recognition of the revolution was carried on by both sides with great prolixity and great interest, but with remarkably little intelligence. One seldom reads anything so unedifying as these long-winded deliberations, constantly interrupted by noisy scenes or fine-spun arguments about standing orders. Instead of the great passion of party strife, we have a cool, placid temper which threatens at any moment to sink to the level of amiable colloquy; instead of the biting edge of argument we have interminable and confused talk rambling from one subject to another; instead of trenchant retorts we have tedious sermons on the essence and nature of morality.

Nor has the Left particularly distinguished itself in these debates.⁶⁰ Most of its speakers repeat one another; none of them dare tackle the question resolutely and speak their mind in frank revolutionary terms. They are always afraid to give offence, to hurt or to frighten people away. Germany would have been in a sorry plight if the people who fought on March 18 had not shown more energy and passion in battle than the gentlemen of the Left have shown in the debate.

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 15, June 15, 1848]

Cologne, June 14. Deputy *Berends* from Berlin opened the debate by moving:

"In recognition of the revolution, the Assembly declares that those who fought on March 18 and 19 have rendered a genuine service to their country."

The form of the motion, the classical-Roman laconic style, which was revived by the great French Revolution, was quite appropriate.

On the other hand, the way in which Herr *Berends* argued in support of his motion was all the more inappropriate. He spoke not in a revolutionary but in a placating manner. He had to vindicate the anger of the insulted barricade fighters in the face of an Assembly of reactionaries and yet he calmly delivered a completely dry lecture as if he still spoke as a teacher to the Berlin Craftsmen's Association. The cause he had to defend was quite simple and quite clear but the arguments he advanced were the most confused imaginable.

Herr *Berends* begins:

"Gentlemen, recognition of the revolution is entirely in the nature of things (!). Our Assembly is itself an eloquent recognition of the great movement which has swept through all the civilised countries of Europe. The Assembly is a product of this revolution, and consequently its existence is the actual recognition of the revolution."

Firstly. It is by no means a question of recognising in general that the "great movement which has swept through all the civilised countries of Europe" is a fact; it would be quite superfluous and meaningless to recognise this. It is rather a question of recognising the Berlin street battle, which is passed off as a revolt, as a genuine, real revolution.

Secondly. The Assembly in Berlin is in one respect indeed a "recognition of the revolution", since without the Berlin street battle we would have no "agreed" Constitution, but at most an imposed Constitution. But the Assembly is likewise a *rejection* of the revolution, because of the way it was convoked and because of the mandate it was given by the United Diet and by the Ministry. An Assembly standing "on a revolutionary basis" does not agree, it decrees.

Thirdly. By its vote on the address the Assembly has already recognised the agreement theory and by voting against the march to the grave of those killed in the fighting it has already rejected the revolution.⁶¹ It has rejected the revolution by "meeting" at all alongside the Frankfurt Assembly.

Herr Berends' motion has therefore been in fact already twice rejected. Its failure this time was even more inevitable because the Assembly had to express its views openly.

Since the Assembly was reactionary and since it was certain that the people could expect nothing from it, it was in the interest of the Left that the minority who voted *for* the motion should be as small as possible and should comprise only the most resolute members.

Hence there was no need for Herr *Berends* to stand on ceremony. He had to act in the most determined, the most revolutionary way. Instead of clinging to the illusion that it was and wanted to be a constituent assembly, an assembly *standing* on a revolutionary basis, he had to tell the Assembly that it had already rejected the revolution indirectly, and to invite it now to reject it openly.

But not only Berends, the speakers of the Left in general have failed to adhere to this policy, the only policy appropriate to a democratic party. They have been under the illusion that they could persuade the Assembly to make a revolutionary move. They have therefore made concessions, they have tried to soothe, they have spoken of reconciliation and they have consequently *themselves* repudiated the revolution.

It is in a very reserved manner and very wooden language that Herr *Berends* then proceeds to expatiate upon revolutions in general and the Berlin revolution in particular. In the course of his reasoning he encounters the argument that the revolution was

unnecessary because already before the revolution the King^a had conceded everything, and he replies:

“It is true that His Majesty the King conceded *many things* ... but did these concessions satisfy the people? Did we have the guarantee that this promise would become a reality? I *believe* this assurance was ... only obtained after the battle!... It is well established that such a political transformation can only come to birth and be firmly grounded in the great catastrophes of battle. On March 18 one great concession was not yet made; that is the arming of the people.... Only when the people was armed, did it feel secure against possible misunderstandings.... Struggle is *therefore* (!) certainly *a sort of natural occurrence* (!), but an inevitable occurrence ... a catastrophe in which the transformation of political life becomes a reality, a fact.”

This long and confused argument, which abounds in repetitions, shows quite clearly that Herr *Berends* is completely in the dark about the results of the revolution and its necessity. The only results of the revolution known to him are the “guarantee” of the promises of the 18th, and the “arming of the people”. He deduces the necessity of the revolution in a philosophical manner by once more giving a rendering of the “guarantee” in a superior style and finally by asseverating that there can be no revolution without a revolution.

The revolution was necessary, surely this means simply that it was necessary in order to obtain what we have obtained now. The necessity of the revolution is directly proportional to its results. But since Herr *Berends* is in the dark about its results, he has of course to resort to exaggerated asseverations in order to deduce the necessity of the revolution.

What were the results of the revolution? Certainly not the “guarantee” of the promises of the 18th, but rather the subversion of these promises.

The promises made on the 18th included a monarchy in which the aristocracy, the bureaucracy, the military and the clergy remained at the helm, but allowed the big bourgeoisie to exercise control by a *granted* Constitution and freedom of the press together with caution money. For the people: German flags, a German navy and compulsory military service in the army of the German Confederation instead of Prussian flags, a Prussian navy and compulsory military service in the Prussian army.

The revolution overthrew all the powers of the absolute monarchy, the aristocrats, the bureaucrats, the military and the clerics. It brought about the exclusive rule of the big bourgeoisie. It gave the people the weapon of freedom of the press without caution money, the right of association and, to some extent, the physical weapon, the musket.

^a Frederick William IV.— *Ed.*

But even that is not the main result. The people that has fought on the barricades and has been victorious is entirely different from the people that on March 18 marched to the palace to be enlightened, by means of cavalry attacks, about the significance of the concessions it had received. It is able to achieve things of a quite different nature and it confronts the Government in an entirely different way. The most important achievement of the revolution is *the revolution itself*.

“As an inhabitant of Berlin I can indeed say that it has caused us *painful feelings*” (nothing more!) “... to see this struggle maligned.... I take as my starting point the words of the Prime Minister,^a who ... declared that it was up to a great nation and all its representatives to work with *clemency towards reconciliation*. I appeal to this clemency when, as a representative of Berlin, I ask you to recognise the events of March 18 and 19. The people of Berlin has certainly on the whole acted very honourably and righteously during the whole period that has passed since the revolution. It is possible that a few excesses have occurred ... and thus I *believe* that it is *appropriate* for the Assembly to declare etc., etc.”

The only thing we should like to add to this craven conclusion, which rejects the revolution, is that following such reasoning the motion deserved to be lost.

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 16, June 16, 1848]

Cologne, June 14. The first amendment put forward in opposition to Berends' motion owed its short existence to Deputy *Brehmer*. It was a diffuse, well-meaning declaration which firstly recognised the revolution, secondly recognised the agreement theory, thirdly recognised all those who had contributed to the sudden change that had taken place, and fourthly recognised the great truth that

No steed, no mounted knight
Protects the lofty summits
Where princes stand,—^b

thus finally reducing the revolution again to a truly Prussian expression. Herr *Brehmer*, the worthy schoolmaster, wanted to please all parties, and none of them wanted to have anything to do with him. His amendment was dropped without any discussion, and Herr *Brehmer* retired with all the resignation of a disappointed philanthropist.

Herr *Schulze* (from *Delitzsch*) has mounted the rostrum. Herr *Schulze*, too, is an admirer of the revolution, he admires however not

^a Ludolf Camphausen.— *Ed.*

^b Words from the Prussian hymn “Heil Dir im Siegerkranz”.— *Ed.*

so much the barricade fighters as the men of the morning after, those who are called the "people" as distinct from the "fighters". He desires that the "attitude of the people *after* the battle" should be especially recognised. His enthusiasm exceeded all bounds when he heard

"about the restraint and circumspection of the people when it was no longer confronted by an enemy (!) ... about the earnestness and the conciliatory spirit of the people ... about its attitude towards the dynasty ... we observed that the people was well aware that at such moments it *directly faced history itself*!!"

It is not so much the revolutionary activity of the people *during* the battle that enraptures Herr *Schulze*, as its quite non-revolutionary inactivity *after* the battle.

To recognise the magnanimity of the people after the revolution can only signify one of two things:

Either an insult to the people, for to recognise it as a merit that the people did not commit any base acts *after* its victory, is an insult to the people.

Or it means recognising that the people relaxed after the military victory, and that this gave the reaction an opportunity to rise once again.

"Combining both meanings" Herr *Schulze* has expressed his "admiration which turned into enthusiasm" because the people firstly behaved decently and secondly provided an opportunity for the reaction to recover its strength.

The "attitude of the people" consisted in being so busy enthusiastically "facing history itself" when it should have been making history; in the fact that for all this "attitude", "restraint", "circumspection", "profound earnestness" and "inextinguishable dedication", the people never got round to preventing the Ministers from conjuring away one part after the other of the freedom it had won; and that the people declared the revolution to be complete instead of continuing it. How differently did the Viennese act, who rapidly overwhelmed the reaction and have now won a *Constituent Imperial Diet* instead of an *Agreement Assembly*.⁶²

Thus Herr *Schulze* (from *Delitzsch*) recognises the revolution on condition of not recognising it. This earned him resounding cheers.

After a short intermezzo concerning procedure, Herr *Camphausen* himself appears on the scene. He observes that according to Berends' motion "the Assembly should express its opinion and give its verdict on an *idea*". For Herr *Camphausen* the revolution is merely an "*idea*". He "leaves" it therefore to the Assembly to decide whether it wishes to do this. In *Camphausen's* view there "exist perhaps no considerable differences of opinion" about the matter under

discussion, in accordance with the well-known fact that whenever two German burghers quarrel, they are always *au fond* in agreement.

"If one wants to repeat that ... we have entered a phase which *must bring about*" (that is, it has not yet brought about) "very substantial transformations ... then no one can be more in agreement with this than I."

"If, on the other hand, one intends to say that the state and the political authority have lost their legal foundation and that *the existing authority was overthrown by force* ... then I must protest against such an interpretation."

Up to now Herr Camphausen saw his principal merit in having re-tied the broken thread of legality; now he asserts that this thread has never been broken. This may be completely at variance with the facts, but the dogma of the continuity of the legal succession of power from Bodelschwingh to Camphausen cannot bother about facts.

"If one wants to say that we are on the threshold of events similar to those we know from the history of the English revolution in the seventeenth century and of the French revolution in the eighteenth, events whose upshot is the transfer of power into the hands of a dictator",

then Herr Camphausen must likewise protest.

Our thinking friend of history could of course not miss the opportunity the Berlin revolution provided for palming off those observations which the German burgher is the more eager to hear the more often he has read them in Rotteck's work.^a The Berlin revolution must be no revolution even for the reason that otherwise it would have to produce a Cromwell or a Napoleon, and Herr Camphausen objects to this.

In the end Herr Camphausen permits his agreeers "to express their *feelings* for the victims of a *fateful clash*", but he adds that in this case "many and essential aspects depend on the wording", he would therefore like to have the whole matter referred to a committee.

After another point-of-order episode, a speaker finally comes forward who knows how to pluck at people's heart-strings, because he goes to the root of the matter. This is the Reverend Pastor Müller of Wohlau, who supports Schulze's amendment. The pastor does "not want to *take up much* of the Assembly's *time* but wishes merely to broach *one* rather *important* point".

The pastor therefore submits the following question to the Assembly.

"The motion has led us to the *moral* sphere, and if we take the motion not in its *surface*" (how does one set about to take a thing in its surface?) "but in its *depth*" (there

^a Karl von Rotteck, *Allgemeine Geschichte vom Anfang der historischen Kenntniss bis auf unsere Zeiten.*—Ed.

is such a thing as empty depth, just as there is empty length) "we cannot help recognising, however difficult these considerations may be, that the point in question is nothing more nor less than the moral recognition of the uprising. *I therefore ask: is an uprising something moral or is it not?*"

The point at issue is not a party political question but something infinitely more important—a theological-philosophical-moral problem. The Assembly has to come to an agreement with the Crown not about a Constitution but about a system of moral philosophy. "Is an uprising something moral or not?" That is what matters. And what answer does the pastor give to the Assembly which is breathless with suspense?

"I do not believe, however, that we are in the position here of having to solve this high moral principle."!!

The pastor has only tried to get to the bottom of the matter in order to declare that he cannot reach the bottom.

"Many *thoughtful* men have pondered on this subject and have nevertheless not arrived at *any definite solution*. Nor shall we achieve clarity in the course of a brief debate."

The Assembly seems thunderstruck. The pastor presents a moral problem to the Assembly with great trenchancy and all the seriousness that the subject demands; he presents it and then announces that the problem cannot be solved. In this distressing situation, the agreeers must have felt as if they were actually standing already "on a revolutionary basis".

But this was nothing but a simple pastoral stratagem to which the pastor resorted in order to induce the Assembly to do penance. He has moreover prepared some balm for the penitent:

"I believe that there is also a third point of view which has to be considered here. The victims of March 18 *acted in a frame of mind which makes moral judgment impossible.*"!!

The barricade fighters were *non compos mentis*.

"But if you ask me whether they were *morally competent*, my answer is a firm —'yes!'"

We ask: if the word of God from the countryside allows himself to be elected to the Berlin Assembly merely in order to bore the entire public by his moralising casuistry, is such an action *moral* or is it *not moral*?

Deputy *Hofer*, in his capacity of a Pomeranian peasant, protests against the whole thing.

“For who were the military? Were they not our brothers and sons? Consider well the effect it will have, when the father on the seashore” (in Wendish⁶³: *po more*, i.e. Pomerania) “hears how his son has been treated here!”

However the military may have behaved and whether or not they allowed themselves to be made the tools of the most infamous treachery—it makes no difference, they were our Pomeranian boys and therefore three cheers for them!

Deputy *Schultz* of Wanzleben: Gentlemen, the people of Berlin must be recognised. Their courage was boundless. They conquered not only the fear of cannon.

“What is the fear of being pulverised by *grape-shot* compared with the *danger* of being charged with *causing a disturbance in the street* and incurring severe, perhaps even degrading punishment! The *courage* required to take up *this* struggle is so lofty that the courage needed to face the open mouth of a cannon *cannot possibly* be compared with it!”

Accordingly the Germans did not make a revolution before 1848, because they were afraid of the Police Inspector.

Minister *Schwerin* rises to declare that he will resign if Berends' motion is passed.

Elsner and *Reichenbach* speak against Schulze's amendment.

Dierschke observes that the revolution must be recognised, because “the struggle for moral freedom has not yet ended” and because it was likewise “the moral freedom which called this Assembly into being”.

Jacoby demands “full recognition for the revolution with all its consequences”. His was the best speech made during the entire session.

Finally, after so much morality, tedium, irresolution and reconciliation, we are pleased to see our *Hansemann* mount the rostrum. Now at last we shall hear something resolute and to the point. But no, Herr Hansemann too speaks today in a mild and mediating manner. He has his reasons, he does nothing without good reason. He sees that the Assembly wavers, that the vote is uncertain and that the proper amendment has not yet been found. He would like to have the debate adjourned.

To achieve this he summons up all his ability to speak as gently as possible. The fact is there, it is incontestable. Some, however, call it a revolution, others call it “great events”. We must

“not forget that a *revolution* like that in Paris, or like the earlier one in England, has not taken place here, but what has taken place here is a *transaction* between the Crown and the people” (a strange transaction with grape-shot and rifle-bullets!). “Now

precisely because in a certain sense we" (the Ministers) "do not object to the *substance of the matter*, but on the other hand the formulation has to be such that the basis of the Government on which we stand remains feasible"...

therefore the debate ought to be adjourned, so that the Ministers can take counsel.

What it must have cost our Hansemann to use such phrases and to admit that the "basis" on which the Government stands is so weak that it can be overturned by a "formulation"! His only compensation is the pleasure of being able to turn the matter again into a *question of confidence*.

Consequently, the debate was adjourned.

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 17, June 17, 1848]

Cologne, June 14.—*Second day*.—The debate begins again with a long argument on procedure. When this has been settled

Herr Zachariä rises. He wants to propose an amendment designed to help the Assembly out of the predicament. The great ministerial formula has been found. It reads:

"Taking into consideration that the immense importance of the great March events—to which together with the royal consent" (which is itself a "March event", though not a "great" one) "we owe the present constitutional position—and also that the services the fighters have rendered to it" (that is to the royal consent) "are undisputed (!!) and that moreover the Assembly does not regard it as its duty to pass judgments" (the Assembly is to declare that it has no judgment!), "but to agree with the Crown upon the Constitution,—the Assembly passes to the agenda."

This muddled and unprincipled amendment, which pays obedience to all sides, and in which, as Herr Zachariä flatters himself, "everybody, even Herr Berends, will find *everything that he could have possibly intended* in the well-meaning attitude in which the motion was tabled", thus this bitter-sweet pap is the "formulation" on the "basis" of which the Camphausen Government "stands" and is able to stand.

Encouraged by the success of his colleague Müller, Pastor Sydow of Berlin ascends into the pulpit. The moral question is on his mind. *He* will solve the question that Müller was unable to solve.

"Gentlemen, allow me at this point *immediately*" (after having already preached for half an hour) "to express what my sense of duty impels me to say: If the debate continues, then, in my opinion, no one should refrain from speaking until he has discharged his bounden duty. (Cheers.)

"Permit me to make a personal observation. *My view* of revolution is (keep to the point!) that where a revolution occurs it is merely a symptom indicating that both sides, the rulers and those they rule, are to blame. This" (this platitude, the cheapest way of disposing of the matter) "is the *higher morality* of the matter and (!) let us not

anticipate the *Christian-moral judgment* of the nation." (For what purpose do the gentlemen think they are there?) (Agitation. Point of order!)

"But gentlemen," continues the imperturbable champion of the higher morality and of the not-to-be-anticipated Christian-moral judgment of the nation, "I am not of the opinion that there may not be times when, with the inevitability of a natural event, political self-defence (!) is imposed upon a nation, and ... I am of the opinion that then the *individual can participate* in it in an *entirely moral way*." (We are saved, with the help of casuistry!) "*Although it is also possible to participate in an immoral way*, that rests with his conscience."!!

The barricade fighters are not a subject to be examined by the *soi-disant* National Assembly, they ought to be heard in the confessional. Thus the matter is disposed of.

Pastor Sydow announces moreover that he has "courage", speaks at length about the sovereignty of the people from the standpoint of the higher morality, is three more times interrupted by impatient clamour and returns to his seat with the pleasing conviction that he has discharged his bounden duty. Now the world knows what opinion Pastor Sydow holds and what opinion he does not hold.

Herr Plönnis declares that the matter should be dropped. A statement qualified by so many amendments and amendments to amendments, and worn thin by so much discussion and quibbling, has after all no value. Herr Plönnis is right. But he could have rendered the Assembly no worse service than calling attention to this fact, this demonstration of cowardice on the part of so many members of both sides.

Herr Reichensperger from Trier:

"We are not here to construct theories and to *decree history*, we ought to *make history* as far as possible."

By no means! By accepting the substantiated agenda, the Assembly decides that on the contrary its purpose is to *unmake history*. This is indeed also a way of "making history".

"I should like to call your attention to Vergniaud's statement, that the revolution is about to devour its own children."^a

Alas, this is not the case. On the contrary, its own children are about to devour the revolution!

Herr Riedel has discovered that Berends' motion "*is supposed to mean not only what is simply expressed by its words*, but that it conceals a dispute about principles". And this victim of the "higher morality" is a *geheimer Archivrat* and professor!

Another very reverend cleric approaches the platform. It is Herr

^a Cf. Vergniaud's speech before the revolutionary tribunal in October 1793.— *Ed.*

Jonas, the ladies' preacher from Berlin. He really seems to have mistaken the Assembly for an audience made up of daughters of the educated élite. With all the pretentious prolixity of a true adept of Schleiermacher, he utters an endless series of the most banal commonplaces about the exceedingly important difference between revolution and reform. He was three times interrupted before completing the introduction to his sermon; at last he burst out with the grand proposition:

"Revolution is something diametrically opposed to our present religious and moral consciousness. A revolution is an act which was considered great and glorious in ancient Greece and Rome, but Christianity...." (Vehement interruptions. General confusion. Esser, Jung, Elsner, the Chairman^a and numerous other speakers are trying to join in the discussion. At long last the popular pulpit orator can be heard again.)

"At any rate, I dispute the right of the Assembly to vote on religious and moral principles, no assembly can vote on such matters" (? what about the consistory and the synod?). "The attempt to decree or declare that the revolution is a high moral principle or anything else" (that is anything at all), "seems to me to be on a par with the Assembly attempting to assert that there is a God or that there is no God, or that there are several Gods."

There we are. The ladies' preacher has succeeded in transferring the question again to the sphere of the "higher morality", and now of course it falls only within the scope of the Protestant church councils and of the catechism manufacturers in the synod.

Thank God! At last, after all this moral fog, our *Hansemann* speaks. With this practical mind, we are quite safe from the "higher morality". Herr *Hansemann* eliminates the entire moral point of view with one disdainful remark:

"I ask, do we have leisure to indulge in such disputes about principles?"

Herr *Hansemann* recalls that yesterday a deputy spoke about unemployed workers. Herr *Hansemann* uses this observation to perform an adroit turn. He speaks of the distress of the working class, regrets their poverty and asks:

"What is the reason of the general distress? I believe ... everybody has the feeling that there is as yet no certainty that the existing state of affairs is stable, so long as our constitutional position has not yet been put in order."

Herr *Hansemann* now speaks from the heart. He exclaims, confidence must be restored! And the best way to restore confidence is to reject the revolution. Then the speaker for the Government, which "sees no reaction", launches into an alarming account of the importance he attaches to the friendly attitude of the reaction.

^a Karl Milde.— *Ed.*

"I beseech you to promote harmony among *all classes*" (by insulting the classes that carried through the revolution!); "I beseech you to promote harmony between the people and the army; do not forget that our hope of maintaining our independence depends on the army" (! in Prussia where everyone is a soldier!); "do not forget the difficult situation in which we find ourselves, I do not have to explain this to you in greater detail, anyone *who reads the newspapers attentively*" (and surely all the gentlemen do this) "will recognise that the situation is difficult, *extremely difficult*. I consider it inappropriate to sow the *seeds of discord* at this moment.... Therefore, gentlemen, try to *reconcile* the parties, do not raise any question liable to *provoke our opponents*, for this is what *would certainly occur*. The adoption of the motion could have *the most deplorable consequences*."

How the reactionaries must have smiled when they saw Hansemann, who is usually so intrepid, talking not only the Assembly but also himself into a state of alarm.

This appeal to the fear of the big bourgeois, the lawyers and the schoolmasters in the Chamber was more effective than all the sentimental phrases about the "higher morality". The question was decided. D'Estier threw himself once more into the fray to neutralise the effect, but in vain. The debate was closed and with 196 votes to 177 the Assembly passed to the agenda as substantiated by Zachariä.

Thereby the Assembly passed judgment upon itself, i.e. it admitted that it was without judgment.

Written by Engels on June 13-14, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* Nos. 14-17, June 14-17, 1848

THE POSITION OF THE PARTIES IN COLOGNE

Cologne, June 16. A few days ago we had a by-election here which clearly showed how much the position of the parties has changed since the general election.⁶⁴

Police Superintendent Müller, substitute for Frankfurt, was elected in Gummersbach as deputy to Berlin.

Three candidates competed in the elections. The Catholic party nominated Herr *Pellmann*, the constitutional party (the Citizens' Association)⁶⁵ ran Herr *Fay*, a lawyer, and the democratic party backed Herr *Schneider II*, a barrister, and President of the (Stollwerk) Democratic Society.⁶⁶

In the first round (there were 140 voting delegates), Herr Fay received 29 votes, Herr Pellmann 34 and Herr Schneider 52. The rest of the votes were divided.

The second round (139 votes) resulted in 14 votes for Herr Fay, 59 for Herr Pellmann and 64 for Herr Schneider. Thus, the lead of the democratic party was still steadily increasing.

Finally, in the third round (138 votes), Herr Fay did *not* receive a *single* vote. Herr Schneider obtained 55 and Herr Pellmann 75 votes. The gentlemen of the Citizens' Association had given their votes to the Catholic candidate because they feared the Stollwerk democrats.

These votes show how much public opinion here has changed. In the general elections, the democrats were everywhere in the minority. In this by-election, the democrats emerged as the by far most powerful of the three competing parties and only an unnatural coalition of the two other parties was able to defeat them.

We do not blame the Catholic party for entering into this coalition. We only stress the fact that the *constitutional party* has disappeared.

Written on June 16, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 18, June 18, 1848

Published in English for the first time

THE AGREEMENT ASSEMBLY OF JUNE 15⁶⁷

Cologne, June 17. We told you a few days ago: you deny the existence of the revolution. It will prove its existence by a second revolution.^a

The events of June 14 are merely the first harbinger of this second revolution and already the Camphausen Government is in full dissolution. By placing itself under the protection of the people of Berlin, the Agreement Assembly has decreed a vote of confidence in them.⁶⁸ This act is a belated recognition of the March fighters. The Assembly has taken out of the hands of the Ministers the task of drawing up a Constitution and is seeking "agreement" with the people by appointing a committee which will examine all petitions and resolutions relating to the Constitution. This is a belated annulment of its declaration of incompetence.^b The Assembly promises to begin its constitutional work by a deed: the abolition of the very basis of the old system, namely of the feudal obligations with which the land is burdened. This promises to become another night of August 4.⁶⁹

In a word: on June 15 the Agreement Assembly repudiated its own past just as on June 9 it had repudiated the people's past. It has experienced its March 21.⁷⁰

The Bastille, however, has not yet been stormed.

But from the East an apostle of revolution is approaching impetuously and irresistibly. He is already standing at the gates of

^a See this volume, pp. 73-75.—*Ed.*

^b *Ibid.*, p. 72.—*Ed.*

Thorn.^a It is the *Tsar*. *The Tsar will save the German revolution by centralising it.*

Written on June 17, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 18, June 18, 1848

^a The Polish name is Toruń.—*Ed.*

THE PRAGUE UPRISING⁷¹

Cologne, June 17. Another massacre similar to that of Posen⁷² is being prepared in *Bohemia*. The possibility of a continued peaceful association of Bohemia and Germany has been drowned in the blood of the Czech people shed by the Austrian army.

Prince Windischgrätz had cannon mounted on the Vyshehrad and Hradshin^a and trained on Prague. Troops were massed and a sudden attack on the Slav Congress⁷³ and the Czechs was being prepared.

The people discovered these preparations; they went in a body to the Prince's residence and demanded arms. The demand was rejected. Feeling began to run high and the crowds of people with and without arms were growing. Then a shot was fired from an inn opposite the commandant's palace and Princess Windischgrätz dropped, mortally wounded. The order to attack followed immediately; the grenadiers advanced, the people were driven back. But barricades were thrown up everywhere, checking the advance of the military. Cannon were brought into position and the barricades raked with grape-shot. Torrents of blood were shed. The fighting went on throughout the night of the 12th and continued on the 13th. Eventually the troops succeeded in occupying the wide streets and pressing the people back into the narrower quarters of the city where artillery could not be used.

^a *Vyshehrad*—southern part of Prague with the old citadel of the same name standing on the right bank of the Vltava; *Hradshin* (the Czech name is Hradčany)—north-western part of Prague with the old castle.—*Ed.*

That is as far as our latest news goes. But in addition it is stated that many members of the Slav Congress were deported from the city under a strong escort. It would appear that the military won at least a partial victory.

However the uprising may end, a war of annihilation by the Germans against the Czechs is now the only possible outcome.

In their revolution the Germans have to atone for the sins of their whole past. They atoned for them in Italy. In Posen they have brought down upon themselves once more the curse of the whole of Poland, and to that is now added Bohemia.

The French were able to win the recognition and sympathy even of the countries to which they came as enemies. The Germans win recognition nowhere and find sympathy nowhere. Even where they adopt the role of magnanimous apostles of liberty, they are spurned with bitter scorn.

And so they deserve to be. A nation which throughout its history has allowed itself to be used as a tool of oppression against all other nations must first of all prove that it has been really revolutionised. It must prove this not merely by a few indecisive revolutions, whose only consequence is to allow the old irresolution, impotence and discord to continue in a modified form; revolutions which let a Radetzky remain in Milan, a Colomb and Steinäcker in Posen, a Windischgrätz in Prague, a Hüser in Mainz, as if nothing had changed.

A revolutionised Germany ought to have renounced her entire past, especially as far as the neighbouring nations are concerned. Together with her own freedom, she should have proclaimed the freedom of the nations hitherto suppressed by her.

And what *has* revolutionised Germany done? She has fully endorsed the old oppression of Italy, Poland, and now of Bohemia, too, by German troops. Kaunitz and Metternich have been completely vindicated.

And the Germans, after this, demand that the Czechs should trust them?

Are the Czechs to be blamed for not wanting to join a nation that oppresses and maltreats other nations, while liberating itself?

Are they to be blamed for not wanting to send their representatives to our wretched, faint-hearted "National Assembly" at Frankfurt, which is afraid of its own sovereignty?

Are they to be blamed for dissociating themselves from the impotent Austrian Government, which is in such a perplexed and helpless state that it seems to exist only in order to register the disintegration of Austria, which it is unable to prevent, or at least to

give it an orderly course? A Government which is even too weak to save Prague from the guns and soldiers of a Windischgrätz?

But it is the gallant Czechs themselves who are most of all to be pitied. Whether they win or are defeated, their doom is sealed. They have been driven into the arms of the Russians by 400 years of German oppression, which is being continued now in the street-fighting waged in Prague. In the great struggle between Western and Eastern Europe, which may begin very soon, perhaps in a few weeks, the Czechs are placed by an unhappy fate on the side of the Russians, the side of despotism opposed to the revolution. The revolution will triumph and the Czechs will be the first to be crushed by it.⁷⁴

The Germans once again bear the responsibility for the ruin of the Czech people, for it is the Germans who have betrayed them to Russia.

Written by Engels on June 17, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 18, June 18, 1848

VALDENNAIRE'S ARREST—SEBALDT

Cologne. As is well known, the Berlin Agreement Assembly has deferred the debate on Wencelius' motion concerning the imprisonment of *Victor Valdenaire*, the deputy of the district of Trier. And on what grounds! Because no *law* about the immunity of people's representatives can be found in the archives of the old Prussian legislation, just as there are, of course, no people's representatives in the old lumber-room of Prussian history. Nothing is easier than on this basis subsequently to destroy all the achievements of the revolution in the interest of the state treasury. The self-evident demands, requirements and rights of the revolution are not, of course, sanctioned by a legislation whose basis has been exploded by just this revolution. From the moment there were Prussian people's representatives, the *immunity* of the Prussian people's representatives existed. Or should the continued existence of the entire Agreement Assembly be dependent on the mood of a chief of police or a law-court? By all means! *Zweiffel*, *Reichensperger* and the rest of the Rhenish jurists who transform every political question into procedural wrangling and who could not allow the case of Valdenaire to pass without displaying minute casuistry and gigantic servility, will be entirely safe from such a possibility.

On this occasion we would like to pose a question to Herr Reichensperger II: Has Herr Reichensperger not perhaps been appointed to become *President of the court in Cologne* after Herr Schauberg's retirement, which is supposed to take place on July 1, 1848?

Valdenaire was arrested just as he was climbing into the stage-coach to *Merzig* where the election of a *deputy for Frankfurt* was to take place. Valdenaire had secured the great majority of the votes. There

is no easier method to fail an election to which one objects than to arrest the candidate! And the Government, in order to be consistent, does not summon his substitute *Gräff* in spite of his protests. Thus a population of 60,000 fallen out of favour is left unrepresented. We advise Herr *Gräff* to go to Berlin on his own authority.

Finally, we cannot describe the situation in Trier better than by reproducing the following *warning* issued by the high and mighty Herr *Sebaldt*, the royal *Landrat* and Chief Burgomaster of Trier:

WARNING

For several evenings in a row, unusually numerous crowds of people have shown up on the public squares and streets of the city, which have aroused the fear in nervous people that illegal demonstrations are imminent. I am not one of these nervous people, and I like it well if the street traffic moves freely. If, however, contrary to expectations, some immature persons should get the idea of misusing this traffic for knavish tricks and insulting raillery, I must urge the better part of the public to dissociate itself immediately from these elements, for serious disturbances of public order will be met by serious counter-measures and I should be very sorry if during a possible conflict the careless should come to harm rather than the guilty.

Trier, June 16, 1848

The royal *Landrat* and Chief Burgomaster
Regierungs-Rat Sebaldt

How kindly and patriarchally this eminent man writes!

"*He likes it well if the street traffic moves freely.*" What a pleasant liking Herr *Sebaldt* has!

Nervous people fear a demonstration. The dictator of Trier has the quality of not being nervous. Yet he must show his absolute authority, he must transform the chimeras of the nervous people into *official conjecture* so that he can oppose *serious* disturbances with appropriately *serious* counter-measures.

How surprisingly well the great man is able to combine seriousness and kindness! The *better* citizens of Trier may slumber in peace under the protection of this serious, yet kindly *providence*.

Written on June 18, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 19, June 19, 1848

Published in English for the first time

THE AGREEMENT ASSEMBLY SESSION
OF JUNE 17

Cologne, June 19. "Nothing learned and nothing forgotten"^a—this saying is as valid for the Camphausen Government as it is for the Bourbons.

On June 14, the people, enraged by the agreeers' repudiation of the revolution, march upon the arsenal.^b They want a guarantee against the Assembly and they know that weapons are the best guarantee. The arsenal is taken by storm and the people arm themselves.

The storming of the arsenal, an event without immediate results, a revolution that stopped halfway, nevertheless had the effect:

1. That the trembling Assembly retracted its decision of the previous day and declared that it would place itself under the protection of the people of Berlin.

2. That it repudiated the Ministry on a vital question and rejected the Camphausen draft Constitution by a majority of 46 votes.

3. That the Ministry immediately disintegrated, that the Ministers Kanitz, Schwerin and Auerswald resigned (of these up to now only Kanitz has definitely been replaced, by Schreckenstein) and that on June 17 Herr Camphausen asked the Assembly to give him three days to replenish his decimated Ministry.

All this was accomplished by the storming of the arsenal.

And at the same time when the *effects* of this self-arming of the people become so strikingly apparent, the Government dares attack that action itself. At the same time when Assembly and Ministry acknowledge the insurrection, the participants of the insurrection are subjected to a judicial investigation, and are dealt with according

^a A remark Talleyrand is supposed to have made about the Bourbons.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 89-90.—*Ed.*

to old-Prussian laws, slandered in the Assembly and portrayed as common thieves!

On the very same day when the trembling Assembly places itself under the protection of those who stormed the arsenal, they are described as “robbers” and “violent thieves” in decrees issued by Herr *Griesheim* (Commissioner in the Ministry of War) and Herr *Temme* (Public Prosecutor). The “liberal” Herr *Temme* whom the revolution brought back from exile, begins a stringent investigation of those who continue the revolution. *Korn*, *Löwinsohn* and *Urban* are arrested. All over Berlin, police raid after police raid is being carried out. Captain *Natzmer*, who had the sense to recognise the necessity for an immediate withdrawal from the arsenal, the man who by his peaceful retreat saved Prussia from a new revolution and the Ministers from immense danger, this man is tried by a military court which makes use of the articles of war to condemn him to death.

The members of the Agreement Assembly are likewise recovering from their fright. In their session on the 17th, they repudiate the men who stormed the arsenal just as they repudiated the barricade fighters on the 9th. The following events transpired during this session of the 17th.

Herr *Camphausen* explains to the Assembly that he will now reveal all facts in order that it may decide whether or not to impeach the Ministry because of the storming of the arsenal.

There was a reason, indeed, for impeaching the Ministers, not because they tolerated the storming of the arsenal, but rather because they *caused* it by circumventing one of the most significant results of the revolution: the arming of the people.

Then Herr *Griesheim*, Commissioner in the Ministry of War, rises after him. He gives a lengthy description of the weapons in the arsenal, especially of rifles “of an entirely new type of which only Prussia knows the secret”, of weapons “of historical significance” and of all the other marvellous items. He describes the guarding of the arsenal: upstairs there are 250 army troops and downstairs is the civic militia. He refers to the fact that the flow of weapons to and from the arsenal, which is the main armoury of the whole Prussian state, was hardly interrupted by the March revolution.

After all these preliminary remarks with which he tried to arouse the sympathy of the agreeers for the arsenal, this most interesting institution, he finally comes to the events of June 14.

The people’s attention had always been drawn to the arsenal and the arms deliveries and they had been told that these weapons belonged to them.

The weapons belonged indeed to the people, first of all as national property and secondly as part of the acquired and guaranteed right of the people to bear arms.

Herr Griesheim "could state with certainty that the first shots were fired by the people against the civic militia".

This assertion is a counterpart to the "seventeen dead soldiers" of March.⁷⁵

Herr Griesheim now relates that the people invaded the arsenal, that the civic militia retreated and that "1,100 rifles of the new type of rifle were then *stolen*, an irreplaceable loss" (!). Captain Natzmer had been talked into a "*dereliction of duty*", i.e. into retreating, and the military had withdrawn.

But now the Commissioner from the Ministry of War comes to a passage of his report which causes his old-Prussian heart to bleed: the people desecrated the sacred shrine of old Prussia. Listen:

"Thereafter *downright atrocities* began to occur in the rooms upstairs. *Theft, robbery and destruction* took place. New weapons were flung down and broken. *Antiques* of irreplaceable value, rifles inlaid with silver and ivory and artistic, hard-to-replace artillery models were destroyed. *Trophies and flags won by the blood of the people, symbols of the nation's honour, were torn and besmirched!*" (General indignation. Calls from all sides: Shame! Shame!)

This indignation of the old blade at the frivolity of the people is indeed laughable. The people have committed "downright atrocities" against old spiked helmets, the shakos of the army reserve and other junk "of irreplaceable value"! They have flung down the "new weapons"! What an "atrocious" act such an act must represent in the eyes of a veteran lieutenant-colonel who was only allowed to admire the "new weapons" respectfully in the arsenal while his regiment had to practise with the most antiquated rifles! The people have destroyed the artillery models! Perhaps Herr Griesheim is demanding that the people are supposed to put on kid gloves before starting a revolution? But the most horrible event has yet to come—the trophies of old Prussia have been besmirched and torn!

Herr Griesheim relates an event which demonstrates that the people of Berlin showed a most correct revolutionary attitude on June 14. The people of Berlin disavowed the wars of liberation by trampling upon the flags captured at Leipzig and Waterloo.⁷⁶ The first thing the Germans have to do in their revolution is to break with their entire disgraceful past.

The old-Prussian Agreement Assembly, however, had of course to cry shame! shame! over an action in which the people for the first time confront in a revolutionary way not only their oppressors but also the glittering illusions of their own past.

In spite of all his whisker-raising indignation over such an outrage, Herr Griesheim does not, however, fail to remark that the whole matter "cost the state 50,000 talers as well as enough weapons to equip several battalions of troops".

He continues:

"It was not the desire to arm the people which caused the assault since the weapons were sold for a few groschen."

The storming of the arsenal, according to Herr Griesheim, was merely the deed of a number of thieves who stole rifles in order to sell them again for a dram of liquor. The Commissioner from the Ministry of War so far owes us an explanation why the "robbers" plundered the arsenal rather than the wealthy shops of the goldsmiths and money-changers.

"Much sympathy has been shown for the unfortunate (!) captain because he violated his duty allegedly to prevent the shedding of citizens' blood; his action has even been portrayed as commendable and deserving of thanks. Today I was even visited by a delegation which is demanding that this deed should be acknowledged by the entire fatherland as deserving of thanks. (Indignation.) It consisted of representatives of the various clubs which are under the chairmanship of Assessor Schramm. (Indignation on the Right and calls of "shame!") One thing is certain, the captain has broken the first and foremost law of the soldier: he has abandoned his post in spite of explicit instructions given him not to leave it without explicit orders. It was put to him that his withdrawal would save the throne, that all troops had left the city and the King had fled from Potsdam. (Indignation.) *He acted in exactly the same manner as the fortress commandant in 1806* who also surrendered that which had been entrusted to him without further ado instead of defending it.⁷⁷ Incidentally, the rejoinder that his withdrawal prevented the shedding of citizens' blood does not hold water. Not a hair on anybody's head would have been touched since he surrendered his post at the moment when the rest of the battalion was coming to his aid." (Shouts of "bravo" from the Right, hissing from the Left.)

Herr Griesheim has, of course, forgotten again that Captain Natzmer's restraint saved Berlin from renewed armed fighting, the Ministers from the greatest danger and the monarchy from being overthrown. Herr Griesheim, who again plays the role of lieutenant-colonel to the hilt, sees in Natzmer's act nothing but insubordination, cowardly desertion of his post and treason in the well-known old-Prussian manner of 1806. The man to whom the monarchy owes its continued existence is to be condemned to death. What a wonderful example for the entire army!

And how did the Assembly act at this tale by Herr Griesheim? It became the echo of his indignation. The Left finally protested — by hissing. The Berlin Left is generally behaving in a more and more cowardly and ambiguous manner. Where were these gentlemen, who exploited the people during the elections, on the night of June

14, when the people soon let the advantages gained slip from their grasp again, solely because of their perplexity, and when only a leader was lacking to make the victory complete? Where were Herr Berends, Herr Jung, Herr Elsner, Herr Stein, and Herr Reichenbach? They remained at home or made innocuous complaints to the Ministers. But that is not all. They do not even dare to defend the people against the calumnies and vilifications of the Government Commissioner. Not a single one of them speaks up. Not a single one wants to be responsible for the action of the people which gave them their first victory. They dare not do anything but—*hiss*. What heroism!

Written by Engels on June 19, 1848

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 20, June 20, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

THE STUPP AMENDMENT

Cologne, June 20. Herr *Stupp* from *Cologne* has proposed an amendment to the law concerning the *immunity of deputies* which was not discussed in the Agreement Assembly but which might not be uninteresting to his fellow citizens from *Cologne*. We do not want to deprive them of the undivided enjoyment of this legislative work of art.

The Amendment of Deputy Stupp

Paragraph 1. "No member of the Assembly may be called to account in any manner whatsoever either for his votes or for the words and opinions that he expresses in his capacity as deputy."

Amendment: "Delete the word 'words' in the third line."

Reason: "It suffices that a deputy may freely express his *opinion*. The expression '*words*' may also comprise slander which entitles the insulted person to sue for libel in a *civil action*. To protect the deputies from such suits seems to be contrary to the respect and honour of the Assembly."

It suffices that the deputy expresses *no opinion at all* but simply drums and votes. Why then not also delete "*opinions*" since opinions must be expressed in "words", may even be expressed in "slanderous" words, and since also slanderous opinions may be "*subsumed*" under the expression "opinions"?

Paragraph 2. "For the duration of the Assembly none of its members may be called to account or arrested for an act liable to punishment without the permission of the Assembly except when that member is caught in the act or within 24 hours thereafter. A similar permission is necessary for an arrest on account of debts."

Amendment: "Delete the final sentence: 'A similar permission is necessary' for an arrest on account of debts."

Reason: "We are dealing here with an *infringement of the civil rights of citizens* and the ratification of such an infringement seems to me to be questionable. Though it might be greatly in the interest of the Assembly to keep some deputy in its midst, I still find respect for *civil rights* more important."

“We must, however, bear in mind especially that we are promulgating this law not for the future, i.e. not for the members of a future Chamber, but *for us*. Let us assume that there are members among us who have to fear arrest on account of debts; it would certainly make a bad impression on our voters if we were to protect ourselves against the *legitimate* prosecution of our creditors by a law which we have passed ourselves.”

Rather the other way around! It makes a bad impression upon Herr Stupp that the voters have sent members “among us” who could be arrested on account of debts. How lucky were *Mirabeau* and *Fox* not to have had to live under the legislation of Stupp. One single difficulty disconcerts Herr Stupp for a moment, it is “the interest of the Assembly to keep some deputy in its midst”. The *interest of the people*—but who wants to speak of that? It is only a question of the interests of a “closed society” which wants to keep someone in its midst while the creditors would like to see him outside in gaol. Collision of two important interests! Herr Stupp could have given a more convincing version of his amendment: individuals who are embarrassed by debts may only be elected representatives of the people with the permission of their respective creditors. They may be recalled at any time by their creditors. In the final analysis, both Assembly and Government are subject to the supreme decision of the *creditors of the state*.

Second *amendment* to Paragraph 2:

“While the Assembly is in session none of its members may be prosecuted or arrested by the authorities without the permission of the Assembly for a punishable act unless he is caught in the act.”

Reason: “The word ‘Assembly’ in the first line is taken to mean a corporation, and with regard to this the expression ‘duration of the Assembly’ seems unsuitable. I am proposing the substitution of ‘while the Assembly is in session’.

“It also seems more fitting to replace ‘an act liable to punishment’ with ‘a punishable act’.

“I am of the opinion that we must not exclude *civil proceedings* on account of punishable acts because we would thereby allow an infringement of *civil law*. Hence the addition ‘by the authorities’.

“If the addition ‘or within the next 24 hours etc.’ remains, the judge may arrest any deputy within 24 hours after any transgression.”

The Bill assures the immunity of the deputies for the duration of the Assembly, the amendment of Herr Stupp only for “the duration of the sessions”, i.e. for 6, or at most 12 hours per day. And what an ingenious justification! One can speak of the *duration of a session* but can one speak of the *duration of a corporation*?

Herr Stupp does not want *the authorities* to prosecute or arrest the deputies without the Assembly’s permission. He thus takes the liberty to infringe *criminal law*. But as regards *civil proceedings*! On no account should there be an encroachment upon civil law! Long live

civil law! What the state has no right to do, the private person may carry out! Civil proceedings above everything! Civil proceedings are Herr Stupp's fixed idea. Civil law is Moses and the prophets! Swear by civil law, particularly civil proceedings! People, show respect for the Holy of Holies!

There are no infringements of civil law upon public law but there are "questionable" encroachments of public law upon civil law. Why bother with a Constitution since we possess the *Code civil*⁷⁸ as well as civil courts and lawyers?

Paragraph 3. "Any criminal procedure against a member of the Assembly and any arrest is suspended for the duration of the session if the Assembly demands it."

Motion to change Paragraph 3 in the following manner:

"Any criminal procedure against a member of the Assembly and any arrest arising out of it—unless the arrest has been made by virtue of a *judicial verdict*—shall be cancelled at once if the Assembly so decides."

Reason: "It is surely not the intention to release deputies from gaol who have already been sentenced to imprisonment by a judicial verdict.

"If the amendment is passed, it will apply also to those who are in gaol on account of debts."

Could the Assembly have the treasonable intention to weaken the "force of a judicial verdict" or even to take into its midst a man who is "in gaol" on account of debts? Herr Stupp is trembling at this assault upon civil proceedings and the force of judicial verdicts. Any question of the sovereignty of the people has now been disposed of. Herr Stupp has proclaimed the *sovereignty of civil proceedings and civil law*. How cruel to snatch such a man away from civil law practice and to throw him into the *inferior* sphere of the legislative power! The sovereign people has committed this "questionable" infringement of "civil law". Herr Stupp, on the other hand, starts civil proceedings against the sovereignty of the people and public law.

Emperor Nicholas, however, may calmly turn back. Upon the first crossing of the Prussian frontier he will be met by Deputy Stupp who will hold in one hand "civil proceedings" and in the other hand a "judicial verdict". For, he will declare with appropriate solemnity: War, what is war? A questionable infringement of civil law! A questionable infringement of civil law!

Written on June 20, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 21, June 21, 1848

Published in English for the first time

A NEW POLICY IN POSEN

Cologne, June 20. Once again there is a new twist to the Posen affair! After the Willisen phase with its lofty promises and enthusiastic proclamations came the Pfuel phase with shrapnel, brandings and shaved heads,⁷⁹ the phase of the blood bath and Russian barbarity. Now after the Pfuel phase comes a new phase of reconciliation!

Major *Olberg*, Chief of the General Staff at Posen and chief participant in the massacres and brandings, is suddenly transferred against his will. General *Colomb* is also transferred against his will from Posen to Königsberg. General *Pfuel* (von Höllenstein^a) has been ordered to go to Berlin and *Oberpräsident Beurmann* has already arrived there.

Thus Posen has been completely deserted by the knights who bore lunar caustic in their coat of arms, were swinging shearing knives and bravely, from secure ambush, mowed down defenceless scythemen with shrapnel at a distance of 1,000 to 1,200 paces. The German-Jewish Polonophobes are shaking. Just like the Poles at an earlier time they find themselves betrayed by the Government.

A light has suddenly dawned upon the Camphausen Government. The danger of a Russian invasion has convinced it that it made an enormous mistake when it surrendered the Poles to the wrath of the bureaucracy and the Pomeranian army reserve. Now that it is too late, it wants to regain the sympathy of the Poles at any price!

Moreover, the entire bloody war of extermination against the Poles with all its cruelties and barbarities which will for ever form a disgraceful chapter in German history, the justifiable deadly hatred

^a *Höllenstein* means "lunar caustic".—*Ed.*

of the Poles against us, the now inevitable Russian-Polish alliance against Germany, an alliance by which the enemies of the revolution will be reinforced by a brave people of 20 million, has all this happened and taken place merely in order to give Herr Camphausen the opportunity to stammer his *pater peccavi*?

Does Herr Camphausen really believe that now when he is in need of the Poles, it is possible through gentle oratory and concessions to regain former sympathies which have been drowned in blood? Does he really believe that the stigmatised hands will ever be raised in his defence or that the shaven foreheads will ever expose themselves to Russian sabres? Does he really believe that he can ever lead those who escaped Prussian shrapnel against Russian grape-shot?

And does Herr Camphausen believe that his Government can survive now that he himself has so unambiguously admitted his inability?

Written by Engels on June 20, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 21, June 21, 1848

Published in English for the first time

THE DOWNFALL OF THE CAMPHAUSEN GOVERNMENT

Cologne, June 21. 10 p.m. We received the following information from Berlin, June 20: **The Camphausen Government has fallen**; at 8 o'clock this morning Herr Camphausen returned his portfolio to the King.^a When the Agreement Assembly met this morning after an adjournment due to the proposed changes, the President^b read out a letter from Camphausen announcing his resignation to the Chamber because he had not succeeded in filling the ministerial vacancies. Herr Hansemann, Herr von Auerswald, Herr Bornemann, Herr von Patow, Herr Roth von Schreckenstein and Herr Schleinitz sat on the ministerial bench, Schreckenstein as newly appointed Minister of War and Schleinitz, the well-known favourite of the **Princess of Prussia**^c and **Russophile**, as **Minister of Foreign Affairs**. Hansemann and von Auerswald further declared that now that the Prime Minister had resigned they were all provisional, with the exception of von Schreckenstein and Schleinitz, and would merely handle day-to-day affairs until the formation of a new Cabinet.

The Agreement Assembly was moreover asked for an indefinite adjournment of the Chamber.

It has been decided to adjourn until next Monday.

*Our readers will not be surprised by this news. For days now we have been predicting the downfall of the Camphausen Government. And we added: Either a new revolution or a definitely reactionary Government. The attempt at a new revolution has failed. A **Russophile Government will pave the way for the Tsar.***

Written on June 21, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the special supplement to the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 22, June 22, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a Frederick William IV.—*Ed.*

^b Karl Milde.—*Ed.*

^c Augusta, Marie Luise Katharina.—*Ed.*

THE DOWNFALL OF THE CAMPHAUSEN
GOVERNMENT⁸⁰

Cologne, June 22.

May the sun shine very clear
Once it, too, will disappear,^a

and the sun of March 30, tinged by the hot blood of the Poles, has also set.⁸¹

The Camphausen Government has covered the counter-revolution with its liberal-bourgeois cloak. The counter-revolution now feels strong enough to shake off this irksome mask.

It is possible that the Government of March 30 will be followed for a few days by some untenable Government of the Left Centre. Its real successor will be the *Government of the Prince of Prussia*. Camphausen has the honour of having given the absolutist feudal party its natural boss and himself a successor.

Why pamper the bourgeois guardians any longer?

Are the Russians not standing on the eastern frontier and the Prussian troops on the western border? Have not shrapnel and lunar caustic prepared the Poles for the Russian propaganda campaign?

Have not all steps been taken to repeat in almost all Rhenish towns the bombardment of Prague?^b

Have not the Danish and Polish wars, and the many small clashes between the military and the people, provided the army with all the time and opportunity in the world to form itself into a brutal soldiery?

^a Quotation from Ferdinand Raimund's play *Das Mädchen aus der Feenwelt oder der Bauer als Millionär*, Act II, Scene 6.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 91-93.—*Ed.*

Is not the bourgeoisie tired of revolution? And is there not standing in the middle of the ocean the rock upon which the counter-revolution will build its church^a: *England?*

The Camphausen Government seeks to snatch a pennyworth of popularity,^b to stir up public compassion by the assurance that it is making its exit from the stage of the state as a *dupe*. It certainly is a case of the deceived deceiver.^c Since it served the big bourgeoisie, it was compelled to try to cheat the revolution out of its democratic gains; in combating democracy it was forced to ally itself with the aristocratic party and become the tool of its counter-revolutionary aims. The aristocratic party is now strong enough to throw its protector overboard. *Herr Camphausen has sown reaction as envisaged by the big bourgeoisie and he has reaped reaction as envisaged by the feudal party.* One was the well-meant intention of the man, the other his evil fate. A penny's worth of popularity for the disappointed man.

A penny's worth of popularity!

May the sun shine very clear
Once it, too, will disappear!

But it will rise again in the *East*.

Written on June 22, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 23, June 23, 1848

^a Matthew 16:18 (paraphrased).—*Ed.*

^b Cf. Heinrich Heine, *Deutschland. Ein Wintermärchen*, Caput XXIV.—*Ed.*

^c G. E. Lessing, *Nathan der Weise*, Act III, Scene 7.—*Ed.*

THE FIRST DEED OF THE GERMAN NATIONAL
ASSEMBLY IN FRANKFURT

Cologne. The German National Assembly has at last risen to its task! It has at last made a decision of immediate practical value, it has intervened in the Austro-Italian war.⁸²

And how has it intervened? Has it proclaimed Italy's independence? Has it sent a courier to Vienna with the order that Radetzky and Welden must at once withdraw behind the River Isonzo? Has it issued a congratulatory message to the Provisional Government of Milan?⁸³

Not at all! It has declared that it would *regard any attack upon Trieste as a casus belli.*

This means: The German National Assembly, in cordial agreement with the Federal Diet, allows the Austrians to commit the greatest brutalities in Italy, to plunder, to murder, to pour incendiary rockets into every village and town (see under *Italy*) and then to retreat safely to neutral territory of the German Confederation! It allows the Austrians at any time to inundate Lombardy from German soil with Croats and Pandours⁸⁴ but it wants to prohibit the Italians from pursuing the beaten Austrians into their hiding-places! It permits the Austrians to use Trieste to blockade Venice and the mouths of the Piave, the Brenta, the Tagliamento; but it prohibits any hostile action of the Italians against Trieste!

The German National Assembly could not have acted with greater cowardice than it did by adopting this decision. It does not have the courage openly to sanction the Italian war. It has even less courage to prohibit the Austrian Government from conducting the war. Caught in this embarrassing situation, it passes the decision on Trieste (to top it all by acclamation, so as to still its secret fear by loud cries) which

formally neither approves nor disapproves of the war against the Italian revolution but which, nevertheless, approves of it in fact.

This decision is an indirect *declaration of war on Italy*, and because it is an indirect declaration, doubly disgraceful for a nation of 40 million people like the German.

The decision of the Frankfurt Assembly will evoke a storm of protest in all Italy. If the Italians still have some pride and energy, they will answer by a bombardment of Trieste and a march on the Brenner.

But while the Frankfurt Assembly proposes, the French people disposes. Venice has appealed for French aid. After this, the French will probably soon cross the Alps and then it will not be long before we have them on the Rhine.

One deputy^a has accused the Frankfurt Assembly of being idle. On the contrary! It has already worked so hard that we have one war in the north^b and another one in the south and that wars in the west and east have become inevitable. We shall be in the fortunate position of having to fight simultaneously the Tsar and the French Republic, reaction and revolution. The Assembly has made sure that Russian and French, Danish and Italian soldiers will meet at St. Paul's Church in Frankfurt.^c And it is said the Assembly has been idle!

Written by Engels on June 22, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 23, June 23, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a Kohlpfarrer.—*Ed.*

^b The war with Denmark over Schleswig-Holstein.—*Ed.*

^c The meeting place of the German National Assembly.—*Ed.*

THE HANSEMANN GOVERNMENT⁸⁵

Cologne, June 23. A new turn in the government crisis in Berlin! Our *Hansemann* has been entrusted with the formation of a Cabinet and he will drop pathetically into the arms of the Left Centre together with *Patow*, *Bornemann*, *Schleinitz* and *Schreckenstein*, the debris of the old Cabinet. Herr *Rodbertus* is supposed to participate in the new combination. He is the mediator who obtains favour and forgiveness from the Left Centre for the contrite wreckage of the Camphausen Government.

By the grace of Herr Rodbertus, our Prussian Duchâtel sees his wildest dreams coming true—he becomes Prime Minister. Camphausen's laurels did not let him rest. Now he will at last have the opportunity to prove what he is capable of when he is in a position to spread his wings unhindered. Now we will be able to admire in all their glory his gigantic financial plans and his limitless projects for the elimination of all want and misery—those plans which he used to present in such a magnificent light to his deputies. Only now is he in a position to devote to the state the entire range of his talents which he earlier displayed so brilliantly and successfully as railwayman and in other posts. And now it will begin to rain votes of confidence.

Herr Hansemann has surpassed his model. Thanks to Rodbertus' devotion he will be Prime Minister, a position never held by Duchâtel. But we warn him. Duchâtel had his reasons for always remaining ostensibly in the background. Duchâtel knew that the more or less cultured circles of the country both within and without the Chamber need a well-spoken knight of the "great debate", a Guizot or Camphausen, who on every occasion could soothe the consciences and capture the hearts of all audiences with the required arguments, philosophical deductions, statesman-like theories and

other empty phrases. Duchâtel never envied his loquacious ideologists the nimbus of the Prime Minister's office. Caring for real, actual power, he considered vain glitter worthless. He knew that where *he* was, there was real power. Herr Hansemann wants to try it another way, he must know what he is doing. But we repeat, being Prime Minister is not the natural role for a Duchâtel.

We are struck with a painful feeling when we contemplate how soon Herr Hansemann must plunge from his dizzy height. For before the Hansemann Government has been formed, before it has had a single moment to enjoy its existence, it is already doomed.

"The hangman stands at the door,"^a

reaction and the Russians are knocking and before the cock will have crowed thrice,^b the Hansemann Government will have fallen despite Rodbertus and despite the Left Centre. Then good-bye to the Prime Minister's office, good-bye financial plans and gigantic projects for the elimination of want; the abyss will swallow them all and best wishes to Herr Hansemann when he quietly returns to his humble civil hearth and can contemplate the fact that life is but a dream.^c

Written on June 23, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 24, June 24, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a Heinrich Heine, "Ritter Olaf", Caput II.—*Ed.*

^b Cf. Mark 14:30.—*Ed.*

^c An allusion to the title of Calderón de la Barca's play *La vida es sueño* (Life Is a Dream).—*Ed.*

THE *NEUE BERLINER ZEITUNG*
ON THE CHARTISTS

Cologne, June 23. The first issue of the *Neue Berliner Zeitung* reports all sorts of curious things about England. It is nice to be original; the *Neue Berliner Zeitung* has at least the merit that it describes conditions in England in quite brand-new fashion. First of all, it says:

“O’Connor, who, indeed, seems to be a man without intelligence or principles, enjoys no esteem here at all.”^a

It is not up to us to decide whether O’Connor possesses as much intelligence and principle as the *Neue Berliner Zeitung*. This scion of ancient Irish kings, this leader of Great Britain’s proletariat may in these advantages lag behind the educated Berlin newspaper. You are entirely correct, however, oh educated Berlin newspaper, in what you have to say about his reputation: O’Connor, like all revolutionaries, is held in very bad odour. He has never been able to gain the respect of all the pious people the way you have already done by your first issue. The Berlin newspaper says further:

“O’Connell said that he” (that is O’Connor) “possesses energy but no logic.”

That is just splendid. The blessed Dan^b was an honourable man; the logic of his energy consisted in pulling an annuity of 30,000 pound sterling from the pockets of his poor countrymen. The logic of O’Connor’s agitation resulted only in the sale of the entire worldly possessions of this notorious Chartist.

^a From an article dated “London, 15. Juni”, published in the *Neue Berliner Zeitung* No. 1, June 20, 1848, supplement, p. 9.—*Ed.*

^b Daniel O’Connell.—*Ed.*

“Mr. Jones, the second leader of the extreme faction of the Chartists, who is now being sought by the courts and who is nowhere to be found, cannot even find anyone to put up bail of 1,000 pound sterling.”

That is the third piece of news from our extremely well-educated Berlin newspaper. In these three lines, it states three extreme absurdities. In the first place, bail is out of the question so long as the courts are still searching for someone. Secondly, Mr. Ernest Jones has already been in Newgate^a for a fortnight. The educated Berlin newspaper was perhaps only invited to tea at another extremely well-educated and well-informed fellow newspaper when quite recently the entire bourgeois press of England gave expression to its brutal joy over Jones' arrest. Thirdly, Mr. Jones has indeed at last found someone who gladly offered to pay 1,000 pound sterling for him, namely none other than the unintelligent and unprincipled O'Connor himself who was, however, turned down by the courts since as a Member of Parliament he cannot put up bail.

The Berlin newspaper ends by alleging that the Chartists in the country's smaller towns frequently have fisticuffs with each other. If you had only once read an English newspaper, esteemed Berlin paper! You would have made the discovery that the Chartists have always had more fun in beating up the police than each other.

We commend the intelligent and principled *Neue Berliner Zeitung* to the special attention of our readers.

Written on June 23, 1848

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 24, June 24, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

^a The London prison.—*Ed.*

THREAT OF THE GERVINUS ZEITUNG^a

Cologne, June 24.

"There will not be *any trouble* if the prestige of the Frankfurt Assembly and its constitutional provisions keep France in check; Prussia will restore its prestige from its eastern provinces and *in doing this it may perhaps hardly shrink from the temporary loss of its Rhine Province.*" (*Gervinus Zeitung* of June 22.)

How diplomatically the Berlin correspondent of the professorial newspaper writes! Prussia will restore "its prestige *from* its eastern provinces". Where will it restore its prestige? *In* the eastern provinces? Oh no, *from* the eastern provinces. *In* the Rhine Province? Even less so, since in connection with this *restoration* of its prestige it counts "*on a temporary loss of the Rhine Province*", i.e. a temporary *loss* of its "prestige" in the Rhine Province.

Thus in *Berlin* and *Breslau*.^b

And why will it not restore *with* its eastern province rather than *from* its eastern province the prestige it has apparently lost in Berlin and Breslau?

Russia is not the *eastern province* of Prussia, Prussia is rather the *western province* of Russia. But *from* the Prussian eastern province, the Russians will move arm in arm with the worthy Pomeranians to *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah* and restore the "*prestige*" of Prussia, i.e. the Prussian dynasty and absolute monarchy. This "prestige" was lost on the day when absolutism was forced to push a "*written scrap of paper*", soiled by plebeian blood, between itself and *its* people, and when the Court was compelled to place itself under the protection and supervision of bourgeois grain and wool merchants.³⁶

Thus the friend and saviour is to come from the East. What then is the purpose of concentrating soldiers that side of the frontier? It is from the West that the enemy is approaching and it is therefore in the West that the troops should be concentrated. A naive Berlin

^a *Deutsche Zeitung* edited by Professor Gervinus.— *Ed.*

^b Wrocław.— *Ed.*

correspondent of the *Kölnische Zeitung* does not comprehend the heroism of *Pfuel*, that upright Polonophile who accepts a mission to Petersburg without an escort of 100,000 men behind him. *Pfuel* travels to Petersburg *unafraid!* *Pfuel in Petersburg!* *Pfuel* does not hesitate to cross the Russian frontier and the German public spins yarns about Russian forces along the German frontier! The correspondent of the *Kölnische Zeitung* feels sorry for the German public. But let us return to our professorial newspaper!

If from the East the Russians rush to the aid of the Prussian dynasty, from the West the French will rush to help the German people. The "Frankfurt Assembly" may continue to debate calmly the best agenda and the best "constitutional provisions". The correspondent of the *Gervinus Zeitung* hides this opinion by the rhetorical embellishment "that the Frankfurt Assembly and its constitutional provisions" will keep France "in check". Prussia will *lose* the Rhine Province. But why should it *shrink* from such a loss? It will only be "temporary". German patriotism will march once again under Russian command against the French Babylon and also restore for good "the *prestige of Prussia*" in the Rhine Province and in all South Germany. Oh, you foreboding angel, you!^a

If Prussia does not "*shrink from the temporary loss of the Rhine Province*," the Rhine Province shrinks even less from the "*permanent*" loss of Prussian rule. If the Prussians ally themselves with the Russians, the Germans will ally themselves with the French and united they will wage the war of the West against the East, of civilisation against barbarism, of the republic against autocracy.

We want the unification of Germany. Only as the result of the disintegration of the large German monarchies, however, can the elements of this unity crystallise. They will be welded together only by the stress of war and revolution. Constitutionalism, however, will disappear of itself as soon as the *watchword of the time* is: *Autocracy or Republic*. But, the bourgeois constitutionalists exclaim indignantly, who has brought the Russians into German affairs? Who else but the democrats? Down with the democrats!—And they are right!

If we ourselves had introduced the Russian system in our country, we would have saved the Russians the trouble of doing it and we would have saved *the costs of war*.

Written on June 24, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 25, June 25, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a Goethe, *Faust*, Erster Teil, "Marthens Garten".—*Ed.*

PATOW'S REDEMPTION MEMORANDUM⁸⁷

Cologne, June 24. During the agreement session of the 20th of this [month], that fateful session during which Camphausen's sun went down and the ministerial chaos began, Herr Patow submitted a memorandum^a which contains the chief principles according to which he intends to regulate the abolition of feudalism in the countryside.

Reading this memorandum, one cannot understand why there had not been a peasant war long ago in the old-Prussian provinces. What a mess of services, fees and dues, what a jumble of medieval names, one more fantastic than the other! Seignior, death dues, heriot,^b tithes on livestock, protection money, Walpurgis rent, bee dues, wax rent, commonage, tithe, liege money,⁸⁸ additional rent—all that has been in existence until today in the “best-administered state of the world” and would have continued into all eternity if the French had not made their February revolution.

Yes, most of these obligations, particularly the *most burdensome* among them, would continue into all eternity if Herr Patow were to get his way. It was exactly for this reason that Herr Patow was put in charge of this department so that he should spare the squires from the backwoods of Brandenburg, Pomerania and Silesia as much as possible and cheat the peasants as much as possible of the fruits of the revolution!

^a Patow, *Promemoria, betreffend die Massregeln der Gesetzgebung, durch welche die zeitgemässe Reform der guts- und grundherrlichen Verhältnisse und die Beseitigung der noch vorhandenen Hemmungen der Landeskultur bezweckt wird.*—*Ed.*

^b In the original *Besthaupt* and *Kurmede* are used, which are regional variants of the German expression for heriot.—*Ed.*

The Berlin revolution has rendered these feudal conditions impossible for all time. The peasants, as was quite natural, abolished them at once in practice. All the Government had to do was to legalise the *abolition of all feudal obligations which had in fact already been abrogated by the people's will.*

But its castles must go up in flames before the aristocracy decides upon a fourth of August.⁸⁹ The Government, itself represented in this case by an aristocrat, declares for the aristocracy; it submits to the Assembly a memorandum in which the agreeers are requested now also to betray to the aristocracy the peasant revolution which broke out in all Germany in March. The Government is responsible for the consequences which the application of Patow's principles will have in the countryside.

For Herr Patow wants the peasants to pay indemnities for the abrogation of all feudal obligations, even the liege money. The only obligations which are to be abolished without compensation are those which are derived from serfdom, from the old tax system and from patrimonial jurisdiction⁹⁰ or those which are worthless to the feudal lords (how gracious!), i.e. on the whole *those* obligations which constitute the smallest part of the entire feudal burden.

On the other hand, all feudal redemption payments which have previously been fixed by contract or judgment are to be definitive. This means: the peasants, who have paid off their obligations under the reactionary, pro-aristocratic laws issued since 1816 and particularly those issued since 1840, and who have been cheated out of their property in favour of the feudal lords, first by the law and then by bribed officials, will receive no compensation.

Instead mortgage banks⁹¹ are to be created so as to throw dust into the peasants' eyes.

If all were to go according to the wishes of Herr Patow, the feudal obligations would be just as little removed under his laws as under the old laws of 1807.⁹²

The correct title of Herr Patow's essay should be: "Memorandum concerning the Preservation of Feudal Obligations for All Time by Way of Redemption."

The *Government is provoking a peasant war.* Perhaps Prussia will also "*not shrink from the temporary loss*" of Silesia.

Written on June 24, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 25, June 25, 1848

THE DEMOCRATIC CHARACTER OF THE UPRISING⁹³

Prague. Every day brings further confirmation of our view of the Prague uprising (No. 18 of this paper^a), and shows that the insinuations of German newspapers which alleged that the Czech party served reaction, the aristocracy, the Russians etc. were downright lies.

They only saw Count Leo Thun and his aristocrats, and failed to notice the mass of the people of Bohemia—the numerous industrial workers and the peasants. The fact that at one moment the aristocracy tried to use the Czech movement in its own interests and those of the camarilla at Innsbruck,⁹⁴ was regarded by them as evidence that the revolutionary proletariat of Prague, who, already in 1844, held full control of Prague for three days, represented the interests of the nobility and reaction in general.

All these calumnies, however, were exploded by the first decisive act of the Czech party. The uprising was so decidedly democratic that the Counts *Thun*, instead of heading it, immediately withdrew from it, and were detained by the people as Austrian hostages. It was so definitely democratic that all Czechs belonging to the aristocratic party shunned it. It was aimed as much against the Czech feudal lords as against the Austrian troops.

The Austrians attacked the people not because they were Czechs, but because they were *revolutionaries*. The military regarded the storming of Prague simply as a prelude to the storming and burning down of Vienna.

^a See this volume, pp. 91-93.—*Ed.*

Thus the *Berliner Zeitungs-Halle* writes:

"Vienna, June 20. The deputation which the local Citizens' Committee⁹⁵ had sent to Prague has returned today. Its sole errand was to arrange for some sort of supervision of telegraphic communications, so that we should not have to wait for information 24 hours, as was often the case during the last few days. The deputation reported back to the Committee. They related dreadful things about the military rule in Prague. Words failed them to describe the horrors of a conquered, shelled and besieged city. At the peril of their lives they drove into the city from the last station before Prague by cart, and at the peril of their lives they passed through the lines of soldiers to the castle of Prague.

"Everywhere the soldiers called out to them: 'So you're here, too, you Viennese dogs! Now we've got you!' Many wanted to set upon them, even the officers were extremely rude. Finally the deputies reached the castle. Count Wallmoden took the credentials the Committee had given them, looked at the signature and said: 'Pillersdorf? He is of no account here.' Windischgrätz treated the plebeian rabble more arrogantly than ever, saying: 'The revolution has been victorious everywhere; here we are the victors and we recognise no civilian authority. While I was in Vienna things were quiet there. But the moment I left everything was suddenly upset.' The members of the deputation were disarmed and confined in one of the rooms of the castle. They were not allowed to leave until two days later, and their arms were not returned to them.

"This is what our deputies reported, this is how they were treated by the Tilly of Prague⁹⁶ and this is how the soldiers behaved, yet people here still act as though they believe that this is merely a fight against the Czechs. Did our deputies perhaps speak Czech? Did they not wear the uniform of the Viennese national guard? Did they not have a warrant from the Ministry and the Citizens' Committee which the Ministry had recognised as a legal authority?

"But the revolution has gone too far. Windischgrätz thinks he is the man who can stem it. The Bohemians are shot down like dogs, and when the time for the venture comes the advance against Vienna will begin. Why did Windischgrätz set Leo Thun free, the same Leo Thun who had put himself at the head of the Provisional Government in Prague and advocated the separation of Bohemia? Why, we ask, was he freed from Czech hands if his entire activity were not a game prearranged with the aristocracy in order to bring about the explosion?

"A train left Prague the day before yesterday. On it travelled German students, Viennese national guards, and families who were fleeing from Prague, for, despite the fact that tranquillity had been restored, they no longer felt at home there. At the first station the military guard posted there demanded that all the passengers without exception hand over their weapons, and when they refused the soldiers fired into the carriages at the defenceless men, women and children. Six bodies were removed from the carriages and the passengers wiped the blood of the murdered people from their faces. This was how Germans were treated by the very military whom people here would like to regard as the guardian angels of German liberty."

Written by Engels on June 24, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 25, June 25, 1848

[NEWS FROM PARIS]

Cologne, June 24, 10 p.m. Letters of the 23rd from Paris have failed to arrive. A courier who has passed through Cologne has told us that when he left fighting had broken out in Paris between the people and the national guard,⁹⁷ and that he had heard heavy cannon-fire at some distance from Paris.⁹⁸

Written on June 24, 1848

First published in the special supplement
to the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 25, June
25, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first
time

REICHENSBERGER

Cologne, June 25. We have the misfortune to be good prophets. What we foretold in No. 19 has come to pass.^a Herr Reichensperger from Trier really has become President of the provincial court of justice. That is a consolation in these hard times. Guizot-Camphausen may have been overthrown, Duchâtel-Hansemann may be tottering—but the Guizot-Duchâtel system of corruption seems to be intent on striking new roots here. And what do the individuals matter, as long as the thing itself is at hand?—Incidentally, we would recommend Herr Reichensperger to read the address from Berncastel⁹⁹ in our special supplement published this morning.^b

Written on June 25, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 26, June 26, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a See this volume, p. 94.—*Ed.*

^b “Berncastel, 18. Juni”, *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 25, June 25, 1848.—*Ed.*

[NEWS FROM PARIS]

Cologne, June 25, 10 p.m. Letters from Paris have again failed to arrive; the Paris newspapers which came today are those of the 23rd and in the regular course of the postal service they should have arrived already yesterday evening. In these circumstances, the only sources at our disposal are the confused and contradictory reports of Belgian newspapers and our own knowledge of Paris. Accordingly we have tried to give our readers as accurate a picture as possible of the uprising of June 23.^a

There is no time for further comments. Tomorrow we shall publish a detailed account of our views^b as well as a detailed report of the meeting of the Paris Chamber on June 23.

Written on June 25, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the special supplement to the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 26, June 26, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a See next article.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 128 and 130-33.—*Ed.*

DETAILS ABOUT THE 23rd OF JUNE

The insurrection is purely a workers' uprising. The workers' anger has burst forth against the Government and the Assembly which had disappointed their hopes, taken daily recourse to new measures which served the interests of the bourgeoisie against the workers, dissolved the Labour Commission at the Luxembourg, limited the national workshops and issued the law against gatherings.¹⁰⁰ The decidedly proletarian nature of the insurrection emerges from all the details.

The boulevards, the great arteries of Parisian life, became the scenes of the first gatherings. All the way from the Porte St. Denis down to the old rue du Temple was thronged with people. Workers from the national workshops declared that they would not go to Sologne to the national workshops there. Others related that they had left for that place yesterday but had waited in vain at the Barrière Fontainebleau for the travel papers and orders to start the journey which had been promised them the evening before.

Around ten o'clock the call went out for the erection of barricades. The eastern and south-eastern parts of Paris, starting with the Quartier and Faubourg Poissonnière, were quickly barricaded but, it seems, in somewhat unsystematic and desultory fashion. The rues St. Denis, St. Martin, Rambuteau, Faubourg Poissonnière and on the left bank of the Seine the approaches to the faubourgs St. Jacques and St. Marceau—the rues St. Jacques, La Harpe and La Huchette and the adjacent bridges—were more or less strongly fortified. Flags were raised on the barricades which bore the inscription: "Bread or Death!" or "*Work or Death!*"

Thus the insurrection was definitely based on the eastern part of the city which is predominantly inhabited by workers, first of all on

the “*aimables faubourgs*”,^a those of Saint Jacques, Saint Marceau, Saint Antoine, du Temple, Saint Martin and Saint Denis, then on the districts between them (quartiers Saint Antoine, du Marais, Saint Martin and Saint Denis).

The erection of the barricades was followed by attacks. The guard post of the boulevard Bonne Nouvelle, which in almost every revolution is first to be seized, had been occupied by the mobile guard.¹⁰¹ The post was disarmed by the people.

Soon afterwards, however, the bourgeois guard from the western parts of the city came to the rescue. It reoccupied the post. A second unit occupied the high pavement in front of the Théâtre du Gymnase which commands a large section of the boulevards. The people attempted to disarm the advanced posts, but, for the time being, neither side made use of arms.

At last the order came to capture the barricade across the boulevard at the Porte Saint Denis. The national guard, led by the Police Inspector, advanced; there were negotiations; a few shots were fired—it is not clear from which side—and the firing quickly became general.

Immediately, the guard post of Bonne Nouvelle also opened fire. A battalion of the second legion, which had occupied the boulevard Poissonnière, also advanced with loaded rifles. The people were surrounded on all sides. The national guard, firing from their advantageous and partially secure positions, caught the workers in an intense cross-fire. The workers defended themselves for half an hour. Finally, the boulevard Bonne Nouvelle and the barricades up to the Porte Saint Martin were seized. Here, too, the national guard, attacking around eleven o'clock from the direction of the Temple, had taken the barricades and occupied the approaches to the boulevard.

The heroes who stormed these barricades belonged to the bourgeoisie of the second arrondissement, which extends from the Palais Ex-Royal¹⁰² over the entire Faubourg Montmartre. The wealthy *boutiquiers*^b of the rues Vivienne and Richelieu and the boulevard des Italiens live here. Here, too, dwell the great bankers of the rues Laffitte and Bergère and also the merry gentlemen of private means of the chaussée d'Antin. Rothschild and Fould, Rougemont de Lowemberg and Ganneron live here. In a word, here lies the Stock Exchange, Tortoni¹⁰³ and all that is connected with or dependent on them.

^a As Louis Philippe called these suburbs.—*Ed.*

^b Shopkeepers.—*Ed.*

These heroes, who were threatened first and foremost by the red republic, were also the first on the scene. It is significant that *the first barricade of June 23 was captured by those who were conquered on February 24*. They advanced three thousand men strong. Four companies, marching at the double, captured an overturned omnibus. The insurgents, meanwhile, seemed to have entrenched themselves once again at the Porte Saint Denis, for towards noon General Lamoricière had to move up with strong detachments of the mobile guard, regular troops, cavalry and two cannon in order to seize a strong barricade in conjunction with the second legion (the national guard of the 2nd arrondissement). The insurgents forced a platoon of the mobile guard to retreat.

The battle on the boulevard Saint Denis was the signal for engagements in all eastern districts of Paris. The fighting was bloody. Over 30 insurgents were killed or wounded. The enraged workers vowed to attack from all sides during the following night and to fight the "municipal guard of the republic"¹⁰⁴ to the death.

At eleven o'clock fighting also took place in the rue Planche-Mibray (the continuation of the rue Saint Martin towards the Seine) and one man was killed.

There were also bloody clashes in the region of the Halles, the rue Rambuteau etc. Four or five dead were left lying.

At one o'clock a fight took place in the rue du Paradis-Poissonnière. The national guard fired but the result is unknown. After a bloody clash in the Faubourg Poissonnière, two non-commissioned officers of the national guard were disarmed.

The rue Saint Denis was cleared by cavalry charges.

During the afternoon heavy fighting took place in the Faubourg Saint Jacques. Barricades in the rues Saint Jacques and La Harpe and in the Place Maubert were assaulted with varying degrees of success and *much use of grape-shot*. In the Faubourg Montmartre troops were also using cannon.

The insurgents were on the whole pushed back. The Hôtel de Ville^a remained free. By three o'clock, the insurrection was confined to the faubourgs and the [Quartier du] Marais.

By the way, *few non-uniformed* national guardsmen (i.e. workers who do not have the money for the purchase of uniforms) were seen under arms. On the other hand, there were people among them who carried *luxury weapons*, hunting rifles etc. Men of the mounted national guards (traditionally the scions of the wealthiest families), too, had entered the ranks of the infantry on foot. On the boulevard

^a Town Hall.— Ed.

Poissonnière, national guardsmen calmly let themselves be disarmed by the people and then took to their heels.

At five o'clock the battle was still going on when it was all of a sudden suspended by a downpour.

In some places, however, the fighting lasted until late in the evening. At nine o'clock, there was still rifle-fire in the Faubourg St. Antoine, the centre of the working-class population.

Up to then the battle had not yet been fought with the full intensity of a decisive revolution. The national guard, with the exception of the second legion, seems for the most part to have hesitated to attack the barricades. The workers, angry though they were, understandably limited themselves to the defence of their barricades.

Thus, the two parties separated in the evening after making a date for the following morning. The first day of battle resulted in no advantages for the Government. The insurgents, who had been pushed back, could reoccupy the lost positions during the night, as indeed they did. The Government, on the other hand, had two important points against it: it had fired with grape-shot and it had been unable to crush the rebellion during its first day. With grape-shot, however, and one night, not of victory but of mere truce, *rebellion ceases and revolution begins.*

Written by Engels on June 25, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the special supplement to the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 26, June 26, 1848

Published in English for the first time

NEWS FROM PARIS¹⁰⁵

Cologne, June 26. The news just received from Paris takes up so much space that we are obliged to omit all articles of critical comment.

Therefore only a few words to our readers. The latest news received from Paris is: *The resignation of Ledru-Rollin and Lamartine and their Ministers; the transfer of Cavaignac's military dictatorship from Algiers to Paris; Marrast the dictator in civilian clothes; Paris bathed in blood; the insurrection growing into the greatest revolution that has ever taken place, into a revolution of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie.* Three days which sufficed for the *July revolution* and the *February revolution* are insufficient for the colossal contours of this *June revolution*, but the *victory of the people is more certain than ever. The French bourgeoisie has dared to do what the French kings never dared—it has itself cast the die.* This *second act of the French revolution* is only the beginning of the *European tragedy.*

Written by Marx on June 26, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 27, June 27, 1848

THE NORTHERN STAR
ABOUT THE NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG¹⁰⁶

The *Northern Star*, the organ of the English Chartists, which is edited by Feargus O'Connor, G. Julian Harney and Ernest Jones, contains in its latest issue an appreciation of the manner in which the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* interprets the English people's movement and advocates democracy in general.

We thank the editors of the *Northern Star* for the friendly and genuinely democratic way in which they have mentioned our newspaper. At the same time we want to assure them that the *revolutionary Northern Star* is the only English newspaper for whose appreciation we care.

Written on June 26, 1848

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 27, June 27, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

THE 23rd OF JUNE

We are still finding numerous new facts about the battle of the 23rd. The available material is inexhaustible; time, however, allows us only to publish what is most important and characteristic.

The June revolution offers the spectacle of an embittered battle such as Paris and the world in general have never seen before. The fiercest fighting of all previous revolutions took place during the March days at Milan. An almost entirely unarmed population of 170,000 souls beat an army of 20,000 to 30,000 men! Yet the March days of Milan are child's play compared with the June days of Paris.

What distinguishes the June revolution from all previous revolutions is the *absence of all illusions and all enthusiasm*.

The people are not standing on the barricades as in February singing "*Mourir pour la patrie*".¹⁰⁷ The workers of June 23 are fighting for their existence and the fatherland has lost all meaning for them. The *Marseillaise* and all memories of the great Revolution have disappeared. The people as well as the bourgeoisie sense that the revolution which they are experiencing will be more significant than that of 1789 or 1793.

The June revolution is the revolution of despair and is fought with silent anger and the gloomy cold-bloodedness of despair. The workers know that they are involved in a *fight to the death* and in the face of the battle's terrible seriousness, even the cheerful French *esprit* remains silent.

History offers only two other examples which show similarities with the battle that is probably still being fought in Paris at this very moment: the Roman slave war and the 1834 insurrection at Lyons. The old Lyons motto "to work while one lives or to die fighting" has also suddenly reappeared after fourteen years and has been written on the banners.

The June revolution is the first which has actually divided all society into two large hostile armed camps which are represented by Eastern Paris and Western Paris. The unanimity of the February

revolution, that poetic unanimity full of dazzling delusions and beautiful lies so appropriately symbolised by that windbag and traitor Lamartine, has disappeared. Today the inexorable seriousness of reality tears up all the hypocritical promises of February 25. Today the February fighters are battling against each other, and—what has never happened before—all indifference is gone and every man who can bear arms really takes part in the fight either *inside* or *outside* the barricade.

The armies which are fighting each other in the streets of Paris are as strong as the armies which fought in the battle of the nations at Leipzig.¹⁰⁸ This fact alone proves the tremendous significance of the June revolution.

But let us go on to describe the battle itself.

The information which reached us yesterday led us to believe that the barricades had been constructed in somewhat haphazard fashion. The extensive reports of today prove the opposite. Never before have the defence works of the workers been constructed with so much composure and so methodically.

The city was divided into two armed camps. The dividing line ran along the north-eastern edge of the city from Montmartre down to the Porte St. Denis and from there down to the rue St. Denis across the Île de la Cité and along the rue St. Jacques up to the *barrière*. Everything east of that line was occupied and fortified by the workers. The bourgeoisie attacked from the western part and obtained its reinforcements from there.

Starting early in the morning, the people silently began to erect their barricades. They were higher and firmer than ever before. A colossal red flag was flying on the barricade at the entrance to the Faubourg St. Antoine.

The boulevard St. Denis was fortified very heavily. The barricades of the boulevard, the rue de Cléry, and the adjacent houses which had been transformed into regular fortresses formed a complete system of defence. Here, as we already reported yesterday, the first significant battle broke out. The people fought with indescribable defiance of death. A strong detachment of the national guard made a flanking attack upon the barricade of the rue de Cléry. Most of the barricade's defenders withdrew. Only seven men and two women, two beautiful young *grisettes*, remained at their post. One of the seven mounts the barricade carrying a flag. The others open fire. The national guard replies and the standard-bearer falls. Then a *grisette*, a tall, beautiful, neatly-dressed girl with bare arms, grasps the flag, climbs over the barricade and advances upon the national guard. The firing continues and the bourgeois members of the national

guard shoot down the girl just as she has come close to their bayonets. The other *grisette* immediately jumps forward, grasps the flag, raises the head of her companion and, when she finds her dead, furiously throws stones at the national guard. She, too, falls under the bullets of the bourgeoisie. The firing gets more and more intense and comes both from the windows and the barricade. The ranks of the national guard grow thinner. Aid finally arrives and the barricade is stormed. Of the barricade's seven defenders, only one is left alive and he is disarmed and taken prisoner. The lions and stock exchange wolves of the second legion have carried out this heroic deed against the seven workers and two *grisettes*.

After the joining of the two corps and the capture of the barricade, there is a short and ominous silence. But it is soon interrupted. The courageous national guard opens up a heavy platoon-fire against the unarmed and quiet masses of people who occupy part of the boulevard. They scatter in horror. The barricades, however, were not taken. It was only when Cavaignac himself moved up with infantry and cavalry units that the boulevard up to the Porte Saint Martin was taken after long fighting and only towards three o'clock.

A number of barricades had been erected in the Faubourg Poissonnière, particularly at the corner of the Allée Lafayette, where several houses also served the insurgents as fortresses. An officer of the national guard led them. The 7th Light Infantry Regiment, the mobile guard and the national guard moved against them. The battle lasted half an hour. The troops finally won but only after they had lost about 100 dead and wounded. This engagement took place after 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

Barricades had also been erected in front of the Palace of Justice, in the rue Constantine and the adjacent streets as well as on the Saint Michel Bridge where the red flag was waving. After prolonged fighting these barricades, too, were captured.

The dictator Cavaignac ordered his artillery to take up positions along the Notre-Dame Bridge. From here he took the rue Planche-Mibray and the Cité under fire and could easily bring it [the artillery] into play against the barricades of the rue Saint Jacques.

This latter street was intersected by numerous barricades and the houses were transformed into genuine fortresses. Only artillery could be effective here and Cavaignac did not hesitate for one moment to use it. The roar of the cannon could be heard during the entire afternoon. Grape-shot swept the street. At 7 o'clock in the evening only one barricade had still to be taken. The number of dead was very large.

Cannon were also fired along the Saint Michel Bridge and the rue Saint-André des Arts. Right at the north-eastern end of the city, at the rue Château Landon where a troop detachment had dared to advance, a barricade was also battered down with cannon-balls.

During the afternoon the fighting in the north-eastern faubourgs grew in intensity. The inhabitants of the suburbs of La Villette, Pantin etc. came to the aid of the insurgents. Barricades were erected again and again in very great numbers.

In the Cité a company of the republican guard, under the pretext of wanting to fraternise with the insurgents, had crept between two barricades and then opened fire. The people fell furiously upon the traitors and beat them to the ground one by one. Barely 20 of them found a chance to escape.

The intensity of the fighting grew all along the line. Cannon were fired everywhere as long as daylight prevailed. Later on the fighting was limited to rifle-fire which continued till late into the night. At 11 o'clock the sounds of the military rally could still be heard all over Paris and at midnight there was still shooting in the direction of the Bastille. The Place de la Bastille together with all its approaches was entirely controlled by the insurgents. The centre of their power, the Faubourg Saint Antoine, was heavily fortified. Cavalry, infantry, national guard and mobile guard units stood massed along the boulevard from the rue Montmartre to the rue du Temple.

At 11 p.m. there were already over 1,000 dead and wounded.

This was the first day of the June revolution, a day unequalled in the revolutionary annals of Paris. The workers of Paris fought all alone against the armed bourgeoisie, the mobile guard, the newly organised republican guard and against regular troops of all arms. They held their own with unprecedented bravery equalled only by the likewise unprecedented brutality of their foe. One becomes forbearing towards a Hüser, a Radetzky and a Windischgrätz if one observes how the Parisian bourgeoisie participates with genuine enthusiasm in the massacres arranged by Cavaignac.

The Society of the Rights of Man¹⁰⁹ which had again been set up on June 11, decided in the night of the 23rd-24th to make use of the insurrection in order to advance the *red flag* and accordingly to play its part in the uprising. The Society then held a meeting, decided upon the necessary measures and appointed two permanent committees.

Written by Engels on June 27, 1848

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 28, June 28, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

THE 24th OF JUNE

Paris was occupied by the military throughout the entire night. Strong pickets were stationed in the squares and boulevards.

At four o'clock in the morning the rally was sounded. An officer and several men of the national guard went from house to house and fetched out men of their company who had failed to report voluntarily.

At the same time the roar of the cannon resumes most violently in the vicinity of the Saint Michel Bridge which forms the juncture between the insurgents on the left bank and those of the Cité. General Cavaignac who this morning has been invested with dictatorial powers, is burning with the desire to employ them against the uprising. Yesterday the artillery was used only in exceptional cases and for the most part only in the form of grape-shot. Today, however, the artillery is brought everywhere into action not only against the barricades but also against houses. Not only grape-shot is used but *cannon-balls, shells* and *Congreve rockets*.

This morning a heavy clash began in the upper part of the Faubourg Saint Denis. Near the northern railway, the insurgents occupied several barricades and a house which was under construction. The first legion of the national guard attacked without, however, gaining any advantage. It used up its ammunition and lost about fifty dead and wounded. It barely held its own position until the artillery arrived (towards 10 o'clock) and blew the house and the barricades to smithereens. The troops reoccupied the northern railway. The battle in this whole neighbourhood (called Clos Saint Lazare which the *Kölnische Zeitung* has transformed into "courtyard of Saint Lazare") continued, however, for a long time and was conducted with great bitterness. "It is a veritable massacre," writes

the correspondent of a Belgian newspaper.^a Strong barricades went up at the *barrières* of Rochechouart and Poissonnière. The fortification at the Allée Lafayette was also built up again and yielded only in the afternoon to cannon-balls.

The barricades in the *rues* Saint Martin, Rambuteau and du Grand Chantier could likewise only be captured with the aid of cannon.

The Café Cuisinier opposite the Saint Michel Bridge was destroyed by cannon-balls.

The main battle, however, took place towards three o'clock in the afternoon on the *Quai aux Fleurs* where the famous clothing store *La Belle Jardinière* was occupied by 600 insurgents and transformed into a fortress. Artillery and regular troops attack. A corner of the wall is smashed in. Cavaignac, who here commands the firing himself, calls on the insurgents to surrender, otherwise they will all be put to the sword. The insurgents reject this demand. The cannonade begins anew and finally incendiary rockets and shells are poured in. The house is totally destroyed, burying eighty insurgents under the rubble.

The workers also fortified themselves on all sides in the *Faubourg Saint Jacques*, in the neighbourhood of the *Panthéon*. Every house had to be besieged as in *Saragossa*.¹¹⁰ The efforts of dictator Cavaignac to storm these houses proved so fruitless that the brutal Algerian soldier declared that he would set them on fire if the occupants refused to surrender.

In the *Cité*, girls were firing from windows at the troops and the civic militia. Here, too, howitzers had to be used in order to achieve any success at all.

The Eleventh Battalion of the mobile guard which attempted to join the insurgents was wiped out by the troops and the national guard. So at least goes the story.

Around noon the insurrection had definitely gained the advantage. All *faubourgs*, the suburbs of *Les Batignolles*, *Montmartre*, *La Chapelle* and *La Villette*, in brief, the entire outer rim of Paris from the *Batignolles* to the *Seine* as well as the greater part of the left bank of the *Seine* were in their hands. Here they had seized 13 cannon which they did not use. In the centre, in the *Cité* and in the lower part of the *rue Saint Martin*, they advanced towards the *Hôtel de Ville* which was guarded by masses of troops. Nevertheless, *Bastide* declared in the Chamber that within an hour the *Hôtel de Ville* might fall to the insurgents and the stupefaction which this piece of

^a *L'Indépendance belge* No. 179, June 27, 1848, p. 3, column 2.—Ed.

news evoked caused the Chamber to proclaim a dictatorship and martial law. Cavaignac had hardly been endowed with his new powers when he took the most extreme and cruel measures, such as never before have been used in a civilised city, measures that even Radetzky hesitated to employ in Milan. Once again the people were too magnanimous. Had they used arson in reply to the incendiary rockets and howitzers, they would have been victorious by the evening. They had, however, no intention to use the same weapons as their opponents.

The ammunition of the insurgents consisted mostly of gun-cotton, large amounts of which were produced in the Faubourg Saint Jacques and in the Marais. A cannon-ball foundry was set up in the Place Maubert.

The Government continuously received support. Troops were rolling into Paris throughout the entire night. National guards arrived from Pontoise, Rouen, Meulan, Mantes, Amiens and Le Havre. Troops came from Orléans and artillery and sappers from Arras and Douai; a regiment came from Orléans. On the morning of the 24th, 500,000 rounds of ammunition and twelve artillery pieces arrived in the city from Vincennes. By the way, the railway workers on the northern railway have torn up the tracks between Paris and Saint Denis in order to prevent the arrival of further reinforcements.

These combined forces and that unprecedented brutality succeeded in pushing back the insurgents during the afternoon of the 24th.

The fact that not only Cavaignac but the national guard itself *wanted to burn down* the entire quarter of the Panthéon shows how savagely the national guard fought and how well it knew that it was fighting for its very survival!

Three points were designated as headquarters of the attacking troops: the Porte Saint Denis where General Lamoricière was in command, the Hôtel de Ville where General Duvivier stood with 14 battalions, and the Place de la Sorbonne whence General Damesme attacked the Faubourg Saint Jacques.

Towards noon the approaches to the Place Maubert were taken and the square itself was encircled. At one o'clock the square fell; fifty members of the mobile guard were killed there! At the same time, after an intense and persistent cannonade, the Panthéon was taken, or rather, it surrendered. The 1,500 insurgents who had entrenched themselves here capitulated, probably upon the threat of M. Cavaignac and the infuriated bourgeoisie to set fire to the entire quarter.

At the same time, the "defenders of order" advanced further and further along the boulevards and captured the barricades of the adjacent streets. At the rue du Temple, the workers were forced to retreat to the corner of the rue de la Corderie. Fighting was still going on in the rue Boucherat and also on the other side of the boulevard in the Faubourg du Temple. Single rifle shots were still being fired in the rue Saint Martin and one barricade was still holding out at the Pointe Saint Eustache.

Around 7 p.m. General Lamoricière received two national guard battalions from Amiens which he immediately used to encircle the barricades behind the Château d'Eau.^a The Faubourg Saint Denis and also almost the entire left bank of the Seine were at that time peaceful and free. The insurgents were besieged in a part of the Marais and the Faubourg Saint Antoine. These two quarters were, however, separated by the boulevard Beaumarchais and the Saint Martin Canal behind it, and the latter could be used by the military.

General Damesme, the commander of the mobile guard, received a bullet wound in his thigh at the barricade of the rue l'Estrapade. The wound is not dangerous. Nor are the representatives Bixio and Dornès as severely injured as was at first believed.

The wound of General Bedeau is also light.

At nine o'clock the Faubourg Saint Jacques and the Faubourg Saint Marceau were as good as captured. The battle had been exceptionally fierce. General Bréa was in command there at the time.

General Duvivier at the Hôtel de Ville had less success. But even here the insurgents were pushed back.

General Lamoricière had cleared the faubourgs Poissonnière, Saint Denis and Saint Martin up to the barrières after overcoming heavy resistance. Only in the Clos Saint Lazare were the workers still holding out; they were entrenched in the Louis Philippe Hospital.

This same information was given by the President^b to the National Assembly at 9:30 p.m. He was forced, however, to disavow his own statements several times. He admitted that heavy shooting was still going on in the Faubourg Saint Martin.

Thus the situation in the evening of the 24th was as follows:

The insurgents still held about half the terrain which they had occupied in the morning of the 23rd. This terrain consisted of the eastern part of Paris, i.e. the faubourgs St. Antoine, du Temple, St. Martin and the Marais. The Clos St. Lazare and a few barricades along the Botanical Gardens formed their outposts.

^a Water Tower.—*Ed.*

^b Senard.—*Ed.*

All the rest of Paris was in the hands of the Government.

What is most striking in this desperate battle is the savagery with which the "defenders of order" fight. They who in former times displayed such tender feelings for every drop of "citizen's blood" and who had even sentimental fits over the death of the municipal guards¹¹¹ on February 24, shoot down the workers like wild beasts. Not a word of compassion or of reconciliation and no sentimentality whatever, but violent hatred and cold fury against the insurgent workers reign in the ranks of the national guard and in the National Assembly. The bourgeoisie, fully conscious of what it is doing, conducts a war of extermination against them. The workers will wreak terrible vengeance on the bourgeoisie no matter whether it wins for the moment or is defeated at once. After a battle like that of the three June days, only *terrorism* is still possible whether it be carried out by one side or the other.

We shall end by quoting some passages from a letter written by a captain of the republican guard who describes the events of the 23rd and 24th as follows:

"I am writing to you while muskets are rattling and cannon are thundering. By about 2 o'clock we had captured three barricades at the head of the Notre-Dame Bridge. Later we moved to the rue St. Martin and marched down its entire length. When we arrived at the boulevard, we saw that it was abandoned and as empty as at 2 o'clock in the morning. We ascended the Faubourg du Temple and stopped before reaching the barracks. Two hundred paces further on there was a formidable barricade supported by several others and defended by about 2,000 people. We negotiated with them for two hours, but in vain. The artillery finally arrived towards 6 o'clock. The insurgents opened fire first.

"The cannon replied and until 9 o'clock windows and bricks were shattered by the thunder of the artillery. The firing was terrible. Blood flowed in streams while at the same time a tremendous thunderstorm was raging. The cobblestones were red with blood as far as one could see. My men are falling under the bullets of the insurgents; they defend themselves like lions. Twenty times we mount an assault and twenty times we are driven back. The number of dead is immense and the number of injured much greater still. At 9 o'clock we take the barricade with the bayonet. Today (June 24) at 3 o'clock in the morning we are still up. The cannon are thundering incessantly. The Panthéon is the centre. I am in the barracks. We guard *prisoners* who are being brought in all the time. There are many injured among them. *Some are shot out of hand.* I have lost 53 of my 112 men."

Written by Engels on June 27, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 28, June 28, 1848

Published in English for the first time

THE 25th OF JUNE

Every day the intensity, violence and fury of the battle increased. The bourgeoisie became more and more ruthless towards the insurgents the more its brutality failed to lead to immediate success, the more it was itself becoming exhausted as a result of fighting, night-watches and bivouacking, and the closer it came to final victory.

The bourgeoisie declared the workers to be not ordinary enemies who have to be defeated but *enemies of society* who must be destroyed. The bourgeois spread the absurd assertion that the workers, whom they themselves had forcibly driven to revolt, were interested only in plunder, arson and murder and that they were a gang of robbers who had to be shot down like beasts in the forest. Yet, for 3 days the insurgents held a large part of the city and behaved with great restraint. Paris would have been reduced to ruins but they would have triumphed had they used the same violent means as were employed by the bourgeoisie and its mercenaries led by Cavaignac.

All the details show with what barbarism the bourgeois conducted themselves during the fighting. Disregarding for the moment the grape-shot, the shells, and the incendiary rockets which they used, it is an established fact that *they gave no quarter at most of the captured barricades*. The bourgeois massacred everyone they found there without exception. In the evening of the 24th over 50 captured insurgents were shot in the Allée de l'Observatoire without any trial. "It is a war of extermination," writes a correspondent of the *Indépendance belge*^a which itself is a bourgeois paper. On all the

^a "Paris, dimanche, 23 juin, 2 heures de relevée", *L'Indépendance belge* No. 179, June 27, 1848.—Ed.

barricades it was understood that the insurgents would be killed without exception.

When Larochejaquelein said in the National Assembly that something should be done to counteract this belief, the bourgeois would not even let him finish speaking but made such a clamour that the President had to put on his hat and suspend the session. The same kind of clamour broke out again when M. Senard himself later (see below, session of the Assembly^a) wanted to say a few hypocritical words of mildness and reconciliation. The bourgeois did not want to hear of forbearance. Even at the risk of losing part of their property by a bombardment, they were determined to put an end once and for all to the enemies of order, to plunderers, robbers, incendiaries and communists.

Yet the bourgeois did not display any of that heroism which their journals attempted to attribute to them. From today's session of the National Assembly it is clear that the national guard was paralysed with fear at the outbreak of the insurrection. In spite of all the pompous phrases, reports from all the newspapers of the most diverse trends reveal that on the first day the national guard was very weak, that on the second and third day Cavaignac had to get them out of bed and that he had a corporal and four soldiers lead them into battle. The fanatical hatred of the bourgeois for the revolutionary workers was not capable of overcoming their natural cowardice.

The workers on the other hand fought with unequalled bravery. Although they were less and less capable of replacing their casualties and more and more pushed back by superior strength, they did not tire for one moment. Already from the morning of the 25th they must have realised that the chance of victory had decisively turned against them. Masses upon masses of new troops arrived from all regions. Large contingents of the national guard came to Paris from the outskirts and more distant towns. The regular troops who fought on the 25th numbered 40,000 more men than the normal garrison. In addition, there was the mobile guard of 20,000 to 25,000 men as well as national guard units from Paris and other towns. Moreover, there were several thousand men from the republican guard. The entire armed force which took the field against the insurrection on the 25th certainly numbered some 150,000 to 200,000 men, whereas the workers had at most a quarter of that strength, had less ammunition, no military leadership and no serviceable cannon. Yet they fought silently and desperately against colossal superior

^a "Schluss der Sitzung der Nationalversammlung vom 25. Juni", *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 29, June 29, 1848.—*Ed.*

strength. Masses upon masses of troops moved on the breaches in the barricades which the heavy guns had created; the workers met them without uttering a sound and fought everywhere down to the last man before they let a barricade fall into the hands of the bourgeois. On Montmartre the insurgents called out to the inhabitants: Either we shall be cut to pieces or we shall cut the others to pieces, but we will not budge. Pray God that we may win because otherwise we shall burn down all Montmartre. This threat, which was not even carried out, counts, of course, as a "despicable plan", whereas Cavaignac's shells and incendiary rockets "are skilful military measures which are admired by everyone"!

On the morning of the 25th, the insurgents occupied the following positions: the Clos Saint Lazare, the suburbs of St. Antoine and du Temple, the Marais and the Quartier Saint Antoine.

The Clos Saint Lazare (the former monastery precinct) is a large expanse of land which is partly built on and partly covered as yet only with houses in construction, streets merely laid out etc. The Northern Railway Station is situated exactly in its middle. In this quarter, which has many irregularly placed buildings and a lot of building material, the insurgents had established a mighty stronghold. Its centre was the Louis Philippe Hospital which was under construction. They had raised imposing barricades which were described by eyewitnesses as quite impregnable. Behind them was the city wall which was hemmed in and occupied by the insurgents. From there their fortifications ran to the rue Rochechouart, that is to the area of the barrières. The barrières of Montmartre were heavily defended and Montmartre itself was completely occupied by them. Forty cannon, which had been firing at them for two days, had not yet reduced them.

Once again the 40 cannon bombarded these fortifications during the entire day. At last, at 6 in the evening, the two barricades at the rue Rochechouart were taken and soon thereafter the Clos Saint Lazare also fell.

At 10 a.m. the mobile guard captured several houses on the boulevard du Temple from which the insurgents had directed their bullets into the ranks of the attackers. The "defenders of order" had advanced approximately to the boulevard des Filles du Calvaire. The insurgents, in the meantime, were driven further and further into the Faubourg du Temple. The Saint Martin Canal was seized in places and from here as well as from the boulevard, the broad and straight streets were taken under heavy artillery fire. The battle was unusually violent. The workers knew full well that here the core of their position was being attacked and they defended themselves

furiously. They even recaptured barricades which they had earlier been forced to abandon. After a long battle, however, they were crushed by the superiority of numbers and weapons. One barricade after another fell. At nightfall, not only the Faubourg du Temple, but, by way of the boulevard and the canal, the approaches to the Faubourg Saint Antoine and several barricades in the faubourg had also been captured.

At the Hôtel de Ville, General Duvivier made slow but steady progress. Moving from the direction of the quays, he made a flanking attack upon the barricades of the rue Saint Antoine and, at the same time, used heavy guns against the Île St. Louis and the former Île Louvier.¹¹² Here, too, a very bitter battle was fought, details of which are lacking, however. All that is known is that at four o'clock the *Mairie* of the ninth arrondissement and the adjacent streets were captured, that one after another the barricades of the rue Saint Antoine were stormed and that the Damiette Bridge, which gave access to the Île Saint Louis, was taken. At nightfall, the insurgents here had everywhere been driven off and all access routes to the Place de la Bastille had been freed.

Thus the insurgents had been driven out of all parts of the city with the exception of the Faubourg Saint Antoine. This was their strongest position. The many approaches to this faubourg, which had been the real focus of all Paris insurrections, were guarded with special skill. Slanting barricades covering each other, reinforced by cross-fire from the houses, represented a terrifying objective for an attack. Storming them would have cost an infinite number of lives.

The bourgeois, or rather their mercenaries, were encamped in front of these fortifications. The national guard had done little that day. The regular troops and the mobile guard had accomplished most of the work. The national guard occupied the quiet and conquered parts of the city.

The worst conduct was displayed by the republican guard and the mobile guard. The newly organised and purged republican guard fought the workers with great animosity and thereby won its spurs as the republican municipal guard.¹¹³

The mobile guard, which was mostly recruited from the Paris lumpenproletariat, has already during its brief period of existence, thanks to good pay, transformed itself into the praetorian guard of whoever was in power. The organised lumpenproletariat has given battle to the unorganised working proletariat. It has, as was to be expected, placed itself at the disposal of the bourgeoisie, just as the *lazzaroni* in Naples placed themselves at the disposal of

Ferdinand.^a Only those detachments of the mobile guard that consisted of *real* workers changed sides.

But in what a contemptible light the entire present state of affairs in Paris appears when one observes how these former beggars, vagabonds, rogues, gutter-snipes and small-time thieves of the mobile guard are being pampered, praised, rewarded and decorated when only in March and April every bourgeois described them as a ruffianly gang of robbers capable of all sorts of reprehensible acts, no longer to be tolerated. These “young heroes”, these “children of Paris”, whose courage is unrivalled, who climb barricades with the most dashing bravery etc., are treated that way because these ignorant barricade fighters of February now fire just as ignorantly upon the working proletariat as they had formerly fired upon soldiers, because they let themselves be bribed to massacre their brothers for thirty sous a day! Honour to these corrupt vagabonds because they have shot down the best and most revolutionary part of the Parisian workers for thirty sous a day!

The courage with which the workers have fought is truly marvellous. For three full days, 30,000 to 40,000 workers were able to hold their own against more than 80,000 soldiers and 100,000 men of the national guard, against grape-shot, shells, incendiary rockets and the glorious war experiences of generals who did not shrink from using methods employed in Algeria! They have been crushed and in large part massacred. Their dead will not be accorded the honour that was bestowed upon the dead of July and February. History, however, will assign an entirely different place to them, the martyrs of the first decisive battle of the proletariat.

Written by Engels on June 28, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 29, June 29, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a See this volume, p. 25.—*Ed.*

THE JUNE REVOLUTION¹¹⁴

The workers of Paris were *overwhelmed* by superior strength, but they were not *subdued*. They have been *defeated* but their enemies are *vanquished*. The momentary triumph of brute force has been purchased with the destruction of all the delusions and illusions of the February revolution, the dissolution of the entire moderate republican party and the division of the French nation into two nations, the nation of owners and the nation of workers. The tricolour republic now displays only *one colour*, the colour of the defeated, the *colour of blood*. It has become a *red republic*.

None of the big republican figures, whether of the *National* or the *Réforme*,¹¹⁵ sided with the people. In the absence of leaders and means other than rebellion itself, the people stood up to the united forces of the bourgeoisie and army longer than any French dynasty with the entire military apparatus at its disposal was ever able to stand up to any group of the bourgeoisie allied with the people. To have the people lose its last illusions and break completely with the past, it was necessary that the customary poetic trimmings of French uprisings—the enthusiastic bourgeois youth, the students of the *école polytechnique*, the tricornes—should be on the side of the suppressors. The medical students had to deny the wounded plebeians the succour of their science. Science does not exist for the plebeian who has committed the heinous, unutterable crime of fighting this time for his own existence instead of for Louis Philippe or Monsieur Marrast.

The Executive Committee,¹¹⁶ that last official vestige of the February revolution, vanished like a ghost in the face of these grave events. Lamartine's fireworks have turned into the incendiary rockets of Cavaignac.

Fraternité, the brotherhood of antagonistic classes, one of which exploits the other, this *fraternité* which in February was proclaimed

and inscribed in large letters on the façades of Paris, on every prison and every barracks—this *fraternité* found its true, unadulterated and prosaic expression in *civil war*, civil war in its most terrible aspect, the war of labour against capital. This brotherhood blazed in front of all the windows of Paris on the evening of June 25, when the Paris of the bourgeoisie held illuminations while the Paris of the proletariat was burning, bleeding, groaning in the throes of death.

This brotherhood lasted only as long as there was a fraternity of interests between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Pedants sticking to the old revolutionary tradition of 1793; socialist doctrinaires who begged alms for the people from the bourgeoisie and who were allowed to deliver lengthy sermons and compromise themselves so long as the proletarian lion had to be lulled to sleep; republicans who wanted to keep the old bourgeois order *in toto*, but without the crowned head; members of the dynastic opposition¹¹⁷ on whom chance imposed the task of bringing about the downfall of a dynasty instead of a change of government; legitimists,¹¹⁸ who did not want to cast off their livery but merely to change its style—these were the allies with whom the people had fought their February revolution. What the people instinctively hated in Louis Philippe was not Louis Philippe himself, but the crowned rule of a class, capital on the throne. But magnanimous as always, the people thought they had destroyed their enemy when they had overthrown the enemy of their enemies, their *common* enemy.

The *February revolution* was the *nice* revolution, the revolution of universal sympathies, because the contradictions which erupted in it against the monarchy were still *undeveloped* and peacefully dormant, because the social struggle which formed their background had only achieved a nebulous existence, an existence in phrases, in words. The *June revolution* is the *ugly* revolution, the nasty revolution, because the phrases have given place to the real thing, because the republic has bared the head of the monster by knocking off the crown which shielded and concealed it.

Order! was Guizot's war-cry. *Order!* shouted Sébastiani, the Guizotist, when Warsaw became Russian. *Order!* shouts Cavaignac, the brutal echo of the French National Assembly and of the republican bourgeoisie.

Order! thundered his grape-shot as it tore into the body of the proletariat.

None of the numerous revolutions of the French bourgeoisie since 1789 assailed the existing *order*, for they retained the class rule, the slavery of the workers, the *bourgeois order*, even though the political

form of this rule and this slavery changed frequently. The June uprising did assail this *order*. Woe to the June uprising!

Under the *Provisional Government* it was considered good form and, moreover, a *necessity* to preach to the magnanimous workers—who, as a thousand official posters proclaimed, “*placed three months of hardship at the disposal of the republic*”—it was both politic and a sign of enthusiasm to preach to the workers that the February revolution had been carried out *in their own interests* and that the principal issue of the February revolution was the *interests of the workers*. With the *opening* of the National Assembly the speeches became more prosaic. Now it was only a matter of *leading labour back to its old conditions*, as Minister Trélat said. Thus the workers fought in February in order to be engulfed in an industrial crisis.

It is the business of the National Assembly to undo the work of February, at least as far as the workers are concerned, and to fling them back to their old conditions. But even this was not done, because it is not within the power of any assembly any more than of a king to tell a universal industrial crisis—*advance up to this point and no further*. In its crude eagerness to end the embarrassment of the February phraseology, the National Assembly did not even take the measures that were *possible* on the basis of the old conditions. Parisian workers aged 17 to 25 were either pressed into the army or thrown onto the street; those from other parts were ordered out of Paris to Sologne without even receiving the money normally due to them under such an order; adult Parisians could for the time being secure a pittance in workshops organised on military lines on condition that they did not attend any public meetings, in other words on condition that they ceased to be republicans. Neither the sentimental rhetoric which followed the February events nor the brutal legislation after May 15¹¹⁹ achieved their purpose. A real, practical decision had to be taken. For whom did you make the February revolution, you rascals—for *yourselves* or for *us*? The bourgeoisie put this question in such a way that it had to be answered in June with grape-shot and barricades.

The entire National Assembly is nevertheless struck with paralysis, as one representative of the people^a put it on June 25. Its members are stunned when question and answer make the streets of Paris flow with blood; some are stunned because their illusions are lost in the smoke of gunpowder, others because they cannot understand how the people dare stand up *on their own* for their *own vital interests*. *Russian money, British money, the Bonapartist eagle, the lily*, amulets of

^a Ducoux.—*Ed.*

all kinds—this is where they sought an explanation of this strange event. *Both parts* of the Assembly feel however that a vast gulf separates them from the people. None of them dares stand up for the people.

As soon as the stupor has passed frenzy breaks out. The majority quite rightly greets with catcalls those pitiful utopians and hypocrites guilty of the anachronism of still using the term *fraternité*, brotherhood. The question at issue was precisely that of doing away with this term and with the illusions arising from its ambiguity. When the legitimist *Larochejaquelein*, the chivalrous dreamer, protested against the infamy of those who cried “*Vae victis! Woe to the vanquished!*” the majority of the deputies broke into a St. Vitus’s dance as if stung by a tarantula. They shouted *woe!* to the workers in order to hide the fact that it is precisely they themselves who are the “*vanquished*”. Either the Assembly must perish now, or the republic. And that is why it frantically yells—long live the republic!

Is the deep chasm which has opened at our feet to be allowed to mislead the democrats, to make us believe that the struggle over the form of the state is meaningless, illusory and futile?

Only weak, cowardly minds can pose such a question. Collisions proceeding from the very conditions of bourgeois society must be fought out to the end, they cannot be conjured out of existence. The best form of state is that in which the social contradictions are not blurred, not arbitrarily—that is merely artificially, and therefore only seemingly—kept down. The best form of state is that in which these contradictions reach a stage of open struggle in the course of which they are resolved.

We may be asked, do we not find a tear, a sigh, a word for the victims of the people’s wrath, for the national guard, the mobile guard, the republican guard and the troops of the line?

The state will care for their widows and orphans, decrees extolling them will be issued, their remains will be carried to the grave in solemn procession, the official press will declare them immortal, European reaction in the East and the West will pay homage to them.

But the plebeians are tormented by hunger, abused by the press, forsaken by the doctors, called thieves, incendiaries and galley-slaves by the respectabilities; their wives and children are plunged into still greater misery and the best of those who have survived are sent overseas. It is the *right* and the *privilege of the democratic press* to place laurels on their clouded threatening brow.

Written by Marx on June 28, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 29, June 29, 1848

THE KÖLNISCHE ZEITUNG ON THE JUNE REVOLUTION

Cologne, June 30. If one reads the following passages from the *London Telegraph* and compares them to the babble about the Paris June revolution that emanates from the German liberals, especially Herr Brüggemann, Herr Dumont and Herr Wolfers, one will have to admit that the English bourgeois, apart from many other distinctions, surpass the *German philistines* in at least *this* regard: although they judge great events from a bourgeois point of view, they judge them as *men* and not in the manner of *gutter-snipes*.

The *Telegraph* comments in its issue No. 122:

"... And here we may be expected to say something of the origin and consequence of this terrible bloodshed.

"At once it proclaims itself a complete battle between classes."

(A kingdom for such a thought—is the mental exclamation of the august *Kölnische Zeitung* and its "Wolfers".)

"It is an insurrection of the workmen against the government they believed themselves to have created, and the classes who now support it. How the quarrel immediately originated is less easy to explain, than to detect its lasting and ever present causes. *The revolution of February* was chiefly effected by the *working classes* [...] and it was proclaimed *to have been made for their advantage*. It was a social, more than a political revolution. The masses of discontented workmen have not all of a sudden sprung, endowed with all the capabilities of soldiers, into existence; nor are their distress and their discontent the offspring merely of the events of the last four months. On Monday only we quoted the statement, perhaps exaggerated, of M. Leroux, which was made, however, in the National Assembly, and not denied [...] that there are in France 8,000,000 beggars and 4,000,000 workmen who have no secure wages. He spoke generally, and meant expressly to describe the time *before* the revolution; for his complaint was, that *since* the revolution nothing had been done to remedy that great disease. The theories of Socialism and Communism which had become rife in France, and now exercise such influence over the public mind, grew

from the terribly depressed condition of the bulk of the population under the government of Louis Philippe [...]. The main fact to be kept in view is *the distressed condition of the multitude as the great living cause of the revolution*. [...]

... "The National Assembly [...] speedily voted to deprive the workmen of the advantages which the politicians of the revolution [...] had so hastily and unthinkingly conferred on them. In a *social*, if not *political*, point of view, a *great reaction* was apparent, and authority was invoked, backed by a large part of France, to *put down the men who had given that authority existence* [...]. That they should from such proceedings—first flattered and fed, then divided and threatened with starvation, drafted off to the country, where all the labour connections were destroyed, and a deliberate plan adopted to annihilate their power—that they should have been irritated can surprise no man; that after accomplishing one successful revolution they should have spontaneously thought they could bring about another, is not astonishing, and their chances of success against the armed force of the government, from the great length of time they have already resisted, seem greater than most people were prepared to expect. According to this view, which is confirmed by no political leaders having been detected amongst the people, and by the fact that the *ouvriers* ordered to quit Paris [...] proceeded no further than just outside the banners and then returned, *the insurrection is the consequence of a general feeling of indignation amongst the working classes and not of any political agency*. They fancy their interest is again betrayed by their own government, and they have taken up arms now as they took them up in February to fight against the terrible distress of which they have so long been the victims.

"The present battle, then, [...]^a is but a continuation of the battle which took place in February [...]. The contest is only a continuation of that struggle which pervades all Europe, more or less, for a fairer distribution of the annual produce of labour. Put down in Paris now it probably will be; for the force which the new authority has inherited from the old authority that it displaced, is apparently overwhelming. But, however successfully put down, it will be again and again renewed, till government either makes a fairer distribution of the produce of labour, or, finding that impossible, retreats from the awful responsibility of attempting it and leaves it to be decided by the [...] open competition of the market.... The real fight is for the means of comfortable subsistence; the middle classes have been deprived of them by the politicians who undertook to guide the revolution; they have been savaged as well as the workmen; the strongest passions of both are now roused into mischievous activity; and, forgetting their brotherhood, they make brutal war on each other. The ignorant if not ill-meaning government, which seems to have no conception of its duty in this extraordinary crisis, [...] has first hurled the workmen on the middle classes, and is now helping the middle classes to exterminate the deceived, deluded, and indignant workmen. The principle of the Revolution, the resolve to fight against distress and oppression, must not be suffered to bear the blame of this great calamity, it must be thrown rather on those ignorant meddling politicians who have so aggravated all the disasters bequeathed to them by Louis Philippe."

Thus writes a London newspaper of the bourgeoisie about the June revolution, a newspaper which represents the principles of Cobden, Bright etc. and which after the *Times* and the *Northern Star*, the two despots of the English press, according to the *Manchester Guardian*, is the most widely read paper in England.

^a Modified quotation. The *Telegraph* has: "The battle, then, that was raging on Friday, Saturday and Sunday."

Let us compare No. 181 of the *Kölnische Zeitung*! This remarkable newspaper transforms the *battle between two classes* into a *battle between respectable people and rogues*! What a worthy paper! As if the two classes did not hurl these epithets at each other. It is the same newspaper which *at first*, when rumours about the June uprising began to circulate, admitted *its total ignorance as to the nature* of the insurrection, and *then* had to get the information *from Paris* that an *important social revolution* was taking place whose scope would not be circumscribed *by one defeat*. Finally, strengthened by *one* defeat of the workers, it sees in the insurrection nothing but a battle between “the enormous majority” and a “wild horde” of “cannibals, robbers and murderers”.

What was the Roman slave war? *A war between respectable people and cannibals!* Herr Wolfers will write Roman history and Herr Dumont and Herr Brüggemann will enlighten the workers, the “unfortunate ones”, as to their real rights and duties and

“initiate them into the science which leads to order and which forms the true citizen”!

Long live the science of Dumont-Brüggemann-Wolfers, the secret science! To cite one example of this secret science: This praiseworthy triumvirate has told its gullible readers throughout two issues that General Cavaignac *wants to mine the district of St. Antoine*. The district of St. Antoine happens to be somewhat larger than the golden city of Cologne. The scientific triumvirate, however, that we recommend to the German National Assembly for ruling Germany, the triumvirate Dumont-Brüggemann-Wolfers, have overcome this difficulty; they know how to blow up the city of Cologne with one mine! Their notions of the mine which blows up the Faubourg St. Antoine correspond to the notion of the subterranean forces which undermine modern society, caused the Paris earthquake in June and spat up bloody lava from its revolutionary crater.

But dearest triumvirate! Great Dumont-Brüggemann-Wolfers, great personalities proclaimed by the world of advertisement! Cavaignacs of the world of advertisement! We modestly bowed our heads, bowed them before the greatest historical crisis that has ever broken out: the class war between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. We have not created the fact, we have stated it. We have stated that one of the classes is the conquered one as Cavaignac himself says.¹²⁰ On the grave of the conquered, we have cried “woe!” to the victors and even Cavaignac shrinks from his historical responsibility! And the National Assembly charges with cowardice every member who does not openly accept the terrible historical responsibility. Did we open up the Sibylline Book for the Germans so that they should burn it? Do we ask the

Germans to become Englishmen when we describe the battle between the Chartists and the English bourgeoisie?

Germany, however, ungrateful Germany, you may know the *Kölnische Zeitung* and its advertisements but you do not know your greatest men, your *Wolfers*, your *Brüggemann* and your *Dumont*! How much sweat of the brain, sweat of the face and sweat of the blood has been shed in the *battle between classes*, in the battle between free men and slaves, patricians and plebeians, feudal lords and serfs, capitalists and workers! *But only because there was no Kölnische Zeitung*. But, most courageous triumvirate, if modern society produces “criminals”, “cannibals”, “murderers” and “plunderers” in such masses and with such energy that their insurrection shakes the basis of official society, what kind of society is this? What anarchy in alphabetical order! And you believe that you can heal the schism, that you have uplifted the actors and spectators of this terrible drama by dragging them down into a servant tragedy à la Kotzebue.

Among the *national guardsmen of the faubourgs St. Antoine, St. Jacques and St. Marceau* only 50 could be found who followed the call of the bourgeois bugle. Thus reports the *Paris Moniteur*, the official newspaper, the paper of Louis XVI, *Robespierre, Louis Philippe and Marrast-Cavaignac*! There is nothing simpler for the *science* which “turns” a man into a *true citizen*! The three largest faubourgs of Paris, the three most industrialised faubourgs of Paris, whose patterns made the muslins of Dacca and the velvet of Spitalfields pale and fade, are supposed to be inhabited by “cannibals”, “plunderers”, “robbers” and “criminals”. So says *Wolfers*!

And *Wolfers* is an honourable man!^a He has bestowed honours upon the rogues by having them fight greater battles, produce greater works of art and accomplish more heroic deeds than those of Charles X, Louis Philippe, Napoleon and the spinners of Dacca and Spitalfields.

We were just now mentioning the *London Telegraph*. Yesterday our readers heard *Emil Girardin*. The working class, he says, after allowing its debtor, the February revolution, to delay paying off its debts for a month, the working class, the creditor, knocked at the debtor’s house with the musket, the barricade and its own body! But *Emil Girardin*! Who is he? No anarchist! Heaven forbid! He is, however, a *republican of the coming day, a republican of the morrow (républicain du lendemain)* whereas the *Kölnische Zeitung*, the *Wolferses, Dumonts and Brüggemanns* are all *republicans of the day before yesterday, republicans before the republic and republicans of the eve (répub-*

^a Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, Act III, Scene 2.—Ed.

licains de la veille)! Can *Emil Girardin* give evidence by the side of *Dumont*?

Admire the patriotism of the Cologne newspaper as it *gloats with malicious pleasure over the deportations and hangings*. It only wants to prove to the world, to the incredulous, stone-blind German world, that the *republic is more powerful than the monarchy* and that the republican National Assembly with Cavaignac and Marrast was able to carry out what the constitutional Chamber of Deputies with Thiers and Bugeaud was unable to do! *Vive la république!* Long live the republic! exclaims the Spartan Cologne paper at the sight of Paris, bleeding, moaning and burning. The crypto-republican! That is why this paper is suspected of being *cowardly and unprincipled* by a *Gervinus*, by an *Augsburg paper*^a! The immaculate one! The Charlotte Corday of Cologne!

Please notice that *not one Paris newspaper*, not the *Moniteur*, not the *Débats* and not the *National*, speaks of “*cannibals*”, “*plunderers*”, “*robbers*” and “*murderers*”. There is only one newspaper, the paper of *Thiers*, the man whose immorality was condemned by *Jacobus Venedey* in the *Kölnische Zeitung*, the man against whom the Cologne paper screamed at the top of its voice:

They are not going to get it,
Our own free German Rhine,^b

it is *Thiers*' paper, the *Constitutionnel*, from which the Belgian *Indépendance* and Rhenish science embodied in *Dumont*, *Brüggemann* and *Wolfers* derive their knowledge!

Examine now in a critical vein these scandalous anecdotes with which the *Kölnische Zeitung* brands the oppressed, the same newspaper which *at the outbreak of fighting* declared its complete *ignorance* of the nature of the struggle, which *during the battle* declared it to be an “*important social revolution*”, and which *after the battle* calls it a boxing match between *the police and the robbers*.

They *looted!* But what did they loot? *Weapons, ammunition, surgical dressings* and the *most necessary items of food*. The robbers wrote on the window shutters: “*Mort aux voleurs!*” *Death to the robbers!*

They “*murdered like cannibals*”. The cannibals did not willingly permit the *national guardsmen*, who advanced upon the barricades *behind the regular troops*, to *smash the skulls* of their *wounded*, to shoot their overwhelmed comrades and to stab their women. The cannibals who *exterminated* during a *war of extermination* as a French bourgeois

^a *Allgemeine Zeitung*.—Ed.

^b Nikolaus Becker, “Der deutsche Rhein”.—Ed.

newspaper writes! They *set on fire*? Yet the *sole* incendiary torch which they hurled against the *legitimate* incendiary rockets of Cavaignac in the 8th arrondissement was a *poetic, imaginary* torch, as the *Moniteur* confirms.

"Some," says Wolfers, "held up high the programme of Barbès, Blanqui and Sobrier, the others hailed Napoleon and Henry V."

The chaste *Cologne* newspaper, which has not been pregnant either with the descendants of Napoleon or with Blanqui, declared already on the second day of the insurrection that the "fight was waged in the name of the *red republic*". What then is she babbling about *pretenders*? She is, however, as has already been intimated, an obdurate *crypto-republican*, a female Robespierre that scents pretenders everywhere, and these pretenders cause her morality to shudder.

"Almost all of them had money and several of them had considerable sums."

There were from 30,000 to 40,000 workers and "almost all of them had money" during this time of want and business slump! The money was probably *so scarce because the workers had hidden it!*

The Paris *Moniteur* has published with the greatest conscientiousness all cases where *money* was found on the insurgents. There were at most *twenty* such cases. Different newspapers and correspondents have repeated these cases and cited different sums. The *Kölnische Zeitung*, with its tried critical tact, which takes all these different reports of the *twenty* cases for so many different cases and then still adds all the cases circulated by rumours, might at best perhaps arrive at 200 cases. And that entitles the paper to state that almost all the 30,000 to 40,000 workers had money! All that has been established is that legitimist, Bonapartist and perhaps Philippist emissaries provided with money mingled or intended to mingle with the barricade fighters. M. Payer, that most conservative member of the National Assembly, who spent 12 hours as a prisoner among the insurgents, declares:

"Most of them were workers who had been driven to desperation by four months of misery. They said: *Better to die of a bullet than of starvation!*"

"Many, very many of the dead," affirms Wolfers, "bore the ominous mark with which society stigmatises crime."

That is one of the base lies, shameful calumnies and infamies which *Lamenais*, the foe of the insurgents and the man of the *National*, has stigmatised in his *Peuple constituant*—and which the always chivalrous legitimist *Larochejaquelain* has stigmatised in the National Assembly. The entire lie is based upon the quite

unconfirmed assertion of *one* press-agency, which has *not been corroborated* by the *Moniteur*, that *eleven corpses* had been discovered which were marked with the letters T. F.^a And in which revolution have the eleven corpses not been found? And which revolution will not brand with these letters eleven times 100?

Let us note that the newspapers, proclamations and illuminations of the victors testify that they starved out, drove to desperation, bayoneted, fusilladed, buried alive and deported the vanquished and desecrated their corpses. And against the conquered there are only *anecdotes*, and only anecdotes that are related by the *Constitutionnel*, reprinted by the *Indépendance* and translated into German by the *Kölnische*. There is no greater insult to truth than to try to prove it by an *anecdote*, says—Hegel.^b

The women are sitting in front of the houses of Paris and scraping *lint* for dressings for the wounded, even the wounded insurgents. The editors of the *Kölnische Zeitung* pour *sulphuric acid* into their wounds.

They have denounced *us* to the bourgeois *police*. We recommend in return that the *workers*, the “*unfortunate ones*”, let themselves “be enlightened as to their real rights and duties and initiated into the *science* which leads to order and which forms the true citizen”, by the immortal triumvirate *Dumont-Brüggemann-Wolfers*.

Written by Engels on June 30, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 31, July 1, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a Convict brand (*travaux forcés*: forced labour).—Ed.

^b G. W. F. Hegel, *Phänomenologie des Geistes*. VI. “Der Geist”, § Die Bildung und ihr Reich der Wirklichkeit.—Ed.

THE JUNE REVOLUTION¹²¹

[THE COURSE OF THE PARIS UPRISING]

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 31, July 1, 1848]

Gradually we gain a more comprehensive view of the June revolution; fuller reports arrive, it becomes possible to distinguish facts from either hearsay or lies, and the nature of the uprising stands out with increasing clarity. The more one succeeds in grasping the interconnection of the events of the four days in June, the more is one astonished by the vast magnitude of the uprising, the heroic courage, the rapidly improvised organisation and the unanimity of the insurgents.

The workers' plan of action, which Kersausie, a friend of Raspail and a former officer, is said to have drawn up, was as follows:

The insurgents, moving in four columns, advanced concentrically towards the Hôtel de Ville.

The first column, whose base of operations was the suburbs of Montmartre, La Chapelle and La Villette, advanced southwards from the barrières of Poissonnière, Rochechouart, St. Denis and La Villette, occupied the boulevards and approached the Hôtel de Ville through the rues Montorgueil, St. Denis and St. Martin.

The second column, whose base was the faubourgs du Temple and St. Antoine, which are inhabited almost entirely by workers and protected by the St. Martin Canal, advanced towards the same centre through the rues du Temple and St. Antoine and along the quays of the northern bank of the Seine as well as through all other streets running in the same direction in this part of the city.

The third column based on the Faubourg St. Marceau advanced towards the Île de la Cité through the rue St. Victor and the quays of the southern bank of the Seine.

The fourth column, based on the Faubourg St. Jacques and the vicinity of the Medical School, advanced along the rue Saint Jacques

also to the Cité. There the two columns joined, crossed to the right bank of the Seine and enveloped the Hôtel de Ville from the rear and flank.

Thus the plan, quite correctly, was based on the districts in which only workers lived. These districts form a semicircular belt, which surrounds the entire eastern half of Paris, widening out towards the east. First of all the eastern part of Paris was to be cleared of enemies, and then it was intended to move along both banks of the Seine towards the west and its centres, the Tuileries and the National Assembly.

These columns were to be supported by numerous flying squads which, operating independently alongside and between the columns, were to build barricades, occupy the smaller streets and be responsible for maintaining communications.

The operational bases were strongly fortified and skilfully transformed into formidable fortresses, e.g. the Clos St. Lazare, the Faubourg and Quartier St. Antoine and the Faubourg St. Jacques, in case it should become necessary to retreat.

If there was any flaw in this plan it was that in the beginning of the operations the western part of Paris was completely overlooked. Here there are several districts eminently suitable for armed action on both sides of the rue St. Honoré near the Halles and the Palais National, which have very narrow, winding streets inhabited mainly by workers. It was important to set up a fifth centre of the insurrection there, thus cutting off the Hôtel de Ville and at the same time holding up a considerable number of troops at this projecting strongpoint. The success of the uprising depended on the insurgents reaching the centre of Paris as quickly as possible and seizing the Hôtel de Ville. We cannot know what prevented Kersausie from organising insurgent action in this district. But it is a fact that no uprising was ever successful which did not at the outset succeed in seizing the centre of Paris adjoining the Tuileries. It suffices to mention the uprising which took place during General Lamarque's funeral¹²² when the insurgents likewise got as far as the rue Montorgueil and were then driven back.

The insurgents advanced in accordance with their plan. They immediately began to separate their territory, the Paris of the workers, from the Paris of the bourgeoisie, by two main fortifications—the barricades at the Porte Saint Denis and those of the Cité. They were dislodged from the former, but were able to hold the latter. June 23, the first day, was merely a prelude. The plan of the insurgents already began to emerge clearly (and the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* grasped it correctly at the outset, see No. 26, special

supplement^a), especially after the first skirmishes between the advanced guards which took place in the morning. The boulevard St. Martin, which crosses the line of operation of the first column, became the scene of fierce fighting, which, partly due to the nature of the terrain, ended with a victory for the forces of "order".

The approaches to the Cité were blocked on the right by a flying squad, which entrenched itself in the rue Planche-Mibray; on the left by the third and fourth columns, which occupied and fortified the three southern bridges of the Cité. Here too a very fierce battle raged. The forces of "order" succeeded in taking the St. Michel Bridge and advancing to the rue St. Jacques. They felt sure that by the evening the revolt would be suppressed.

The plan of the forces of "order" stood out even more clearly than that of the insurgents. To begin with, their plan was merely to crush the insurrection with all available means. They announced their design to the insurgents with cannon-ball and grape-shot.

But the Government believed it was dealing with an uncouth gang of common rioters acting without any plan. After clearing the main streets by the evening, the Government declared that the revolt was quelled, and the stationing of troops in the conquered districts was undertaken in an exceedingly negligent manner.

The insurgents made excellent use of this negligence by launching the great battle which followed the skirmishes of June 23. It is quite remarkable how quickly the workers mastered the plan of campaign, how well-concerted their actions were and how skilfully they used the difficult terrain. This would be quite inexplicable if in the national workshops the workers had not already been to a certain extent organised on military lines and divided into companies, so that they only needed to apply their industrial organisation to their military enterprise in order to constitute immediately a fully organised army.

On the morning of the 24th they had not only completely regained the ground they had lost, but even added new terrain to it. True, the line of boulevards up to the boulevard du Temple remained in the hands of the troops, thus cutting off the first column from the centre, but on the other hand the second column pushed forward from the Quartier St. Antoine until it almost surrounded the Hôtel de Ville. It established its headquarters in the church of St. Gervais, within 300 paces of the Hôtel de Ville. It captured the St. Merri monastery and the adjoining streets and advanced far beyond the Hôtel de Ville, so that together with the columns in the Cité it almost

^a See this volume, pp. 124-27.—*Ed.*

completely encircled the Hôtel de Ville. Only one way of approach, the quays of the right bank, remained open. In the south the Faubourg St. Jacques was completely reoccupied, communication with the Cité was restored, reinforcements were sent there, and preparations were made for crossing to the right bank.

There was no time to be lost. The Hôtel de Ville, the revolutionary centre of Paris, was threatened and was bound to fall unless the most resolute measures were taken.

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 32, July 2, 1848]

Cavaignac was appointed dictator by the terrified National Assembly. Accustomed as he was in Algeria to "energetic" action, he did not have to be told what to do.

Ten battalions promptly moved towards the Hôtel de Ville along the wide Quai de l'École. They cut off the insurgents in the Cité from the right bank, secured the safety of the Hôtel de Ville and even made it possible to attack the barricades surrounding it.

The rue Planche-Mibray, and its continuation, the rue Saint Martin, were cleared and kept permanently clear by cavalry. The Notre-Dame Bridge, which lies opposite and leads to the Cité, was swept by heavy guns, and then Cavaignac advanced directly on the Cité in order to take "energetic" measures there. The "*Belle Jardinière*", the main strongpoint of the insurgents, was first shattered by cannon and then set on fire by rockets. The rue de la Cité was also seized with the aid of gun-fire; three bridges leading to the left bank were stormed and the insurgents on the left bank were pressed back. Meanwhile, the 14 battalions deployed on the Place de Grève and the quays freed the besieged Hôtel de Ville and reduced the church of Saint Gervais from a headquarters to a lost outpost of the insurgents.

The rue St. Jacques was not only bombarded from the Cité but also attacked in the flank from the left bank. General Damesme broke through along the Luxembourg to the Sorbonne, seized the Quartier Latin and sent his columns against the Panthéon. The square in front of the Panthéon had been transformed into a formidable stronghold. The forces of "order" still faced this unassailable bulwark long after they had taken the rue St. Jacques. Gun-fire and bayonet attacks were of no avail until finally exhaustion, lack of ammunition and the threat of the bourgeois to set the place on fire compelled the 1,500 workers, who were completely hemmed in, to surrender. At about the same time, the Place Maubert fell into the hands of the forces of "order" after a long and courageous resistance, and the insurgents,

deprived of their strongest positions, were forced to abandon the entire left bank of the Seine.

Meanwhile the troops and national guards stationed on the boulevards of the right bank of the Seine were likewise put into action in two directions. Lamoricière, who commanded them, had the streets of the faubourgs St. Denis and St. Martin, the boulevard du Temple and part of the rue du Temple cleared by heavy artillery and swift infantry attacks. By the evening he could boast of brilliant successes. He had cut off and partly surrounded the first column in the Clos St. Lazare; he had pushed back the second column and by advancing along the boulevards had thrust a wedge into it.

How did Cavaignac win these advantages?

First, by the vastly superior force he was able to use against the insurgents. On the 24th he had at his disposal not only the 20,000-strong Paris garrison, the 20,000 to 25,000 men of the mobile guard and the 60,000 to 80,000 available men of the national guard, but also the national guard from the whole environs of Paris and from many of the more distant towns (20,000 to 30,000 men) and in addition 20,000 to 30,000 soldiers who were called in with the utmost dispatch from the neighbouring garrisons. Even on the morning of the 24th he had well over 100,000 men at his disposal, and by the evening their numbers had increased by half. The insurgents, on the other hand, numbered 40,000 to 50,000 men at most!

Secondly, by the brutal means he used. Until then cannon had been fired in the streets of Paris only once, i.e. in Vendémiaire 1795, when Napoleon dispersed the insurgents in the rue Saint Honoré with grape-shot.¹²³ But no artillery, let alone shells and incendiary rockets, was ever used against barricades and against houses. The people were unprepared for this, they were unable to defend themselves, for the only counteraction they could take was to set fire to houses, but this was repugnant to their sense of what was right. Up till then the people had no idea that this brand of Algerian warfare could be used right in the centre of Paris. They therefore retreated, and their first retreat spelt their defeat.

On the 25th Cavaignac attacked with even larger forces. The insurgents were confined to a single district, the faubourgs Saint Antoine and du Temple; in addition they still held two outposts, the Clos St. Lazare and a part of the St. Antoine district up to the Damiette Bridge.

Cavaignac, who had received further reinforcements of 20,000 to 30,000 men as well as a substantial park of artillery, first attacked the isolated outposts of the insurgents, especially the Clos St. Lazare. The insurgents were entrenched here as in a fortress. After a

12-hour bombardment with cannon and mortar shells, Lamoricière finally succeeded in dislodging the insurgents and occupying the Clos St. Lazare, but not until he had mounted a flank attack from the rues Rochechouart and La Poissonnière, and had demolished the barricades by bombarding them with 40 guns on the first day and with an even greater number on the next.

Another part of his column penetrated through the Faubourg Saint Martin into the Faubourg du Temple, but was not very successful. A third section moved along the boulevards towards the Bastille, but it did not get very far either, because a number of the most formidable barricades there resisted for a long time and only succumbed after a fierce cannonade. The houses here suffered appalling destruction.

Duvivier's column advancing from the Hôtel de Ville pressed the insurgents back still further with the aid of incessant artillery fire. The church of St. Gervais was captured, a long stretch of the rue Saint Antoine well beyond the Hôtel de Ville was cleared, and several columns moving along the quay and streets running parallel to it seized the Damiette Bridge, which connected the insurgents of the St. Antoine district with those of the St. Louis and Cité islands. The Saint Antoine district was outflanked and the insurgents had no choice but to fall back into the faubourg, which they did in fierce combat with a column advancing along the quays to the mouth of the St. Martin Canal and thence along the boulevard Bourdon skirting the canal. Several insurgents who were cut off were massacred, hardly any were taken prisoner.

The St. Antoine district and the Place de la Bastille were seized in this operation. Lamoricière's column managed to occupy the whole boulevard Beaumarchais by the evening and join up with Duvivier's troops on the Place de la Bastille.

The capture of the Damiette Bridge enabled Duvivier to dislodge the insurgents from the Île St. Louis and the former Île Louvier. He did this with a commendable display of Algerian barbarity. Hardly anywhere in the city was heavy artillery used with such devastating effect as in the Île St. Louis. But what did that matter? The insurgents were either driven out or massacred and among the blood-stained ruins "order" triumphed.

One more post remained to be seized on the left bank of the Seine. The Austerlitz Bridge, which east of the St. Martin Canal links the Faubourg St. Antoine with the left bank of the Seine, was heavily barricaded and had a strong bridgehead on the left bank where it adjoins the Place Valhubert in front of the Botanical Gardens. This bridgehead, which after the fall of the Panthéon and the Place

Maubert was the last stronghold of the insurgents on the left bank, was taken after stubborn resistance.

Only their last bulwark, the Faubourg St. Antoine and a part of the Faubourg du Temple, was thus left to the insurgents on the following day, the 26th. Neither of these faubourgs is very suitable for street-fighting; the streets there are fairly wide and almost perfectly straight, offering full play for the artillery. Their western side is well protected by the St. Martin Canal, but the northern side is completely exposed. Five or six perfectly straight, wide streets run from the north right into the centre of the Faubourg Saint Antoine.

The principal fortifications were at the Place de la Bastille and in the rue Faubourg St. Antoine, the main street of the whole district. Remarkably strong barricades were set up there, built partly of big flagstones and partly of wooden beams. They were constructed in the form of an angle pointing inward in order partly to weaken the effect of the gun-fire, partly to offer a larger defensive front making cross-fire possible. Openings had been made in the fire-proof walls of the houses so that the rows of houses were connected with each other, thus enabling the insurgents to open rifle-fire on the troops or withdraw behind the barricades as circumstances demanded. The bridges and quays along the canal as well as the streets running parallel to it were also strongly fortified. In short, the two faubourgs the insurgents still held resembled a veritable fortress, in which the troops had to wage a bloody battle for every inch of ground.

On the morning of the 26th the fighting was to be resumed, but Cavaignac was not keen on sending his troops into this maze of barricades. He threatened to shell them; mortars and howitzers were brought up. A parley was held. Cavaignac meanwhile ordered the nearest houses to be mined, but this could only be done to a very limited extent, because the time was too short and because the canal covered one of the lines of attack; he also ordered internal communication to be established between the occupied houses and the adjoining houses through gaps in the fire-proof walls.

The negotiations broke down and fighting was resumed. Cavaignac ordered General Perrot to attack from the Faubourg du Temple and General Lamoricière from the Place de la Bastille. The barricades were heavily shelled from both directions. Perrot pushed forward fairly rapidly, occupied the remaining section of the Faubourg du Temple and even penetrated into the Faubourg St. Antoine at several points. Lamoricière's advance was slower. The first barricades withstood his guns, although his grenades set the first houses of the faubourg on fire. He began once more to negotiate. Watch in hand he awaited the moment when he would have the

pleasure of shelling and razing to the ground the most thickly populated district of Paris. Some of the insurgents at last capitulated, while others, attacked in the flank, withdrew from the city after a short battle.

It was the end of the June barricade fighting. Skirmishes still continued outside the city, but they were of no significance. The insurgents who fled were scattered in the neighbourhood and were one by one captured by cavalry.

We have given this purely military description of the struggle to show our readers with what heroic courage, unity, discipline and military skill the Paris workers fought. For four days 40,000 of them opposed forces four times their strength, and were within a hairbreadth of victory. They almost succeeded in gaining a footing in the centre of Paris, taking the Hôtel de Ville, forming a Provisional Government and doubling their number not only by people from the captured parts of the city joining them but also from the ranks of the mobile guard, who at that time needed but a slight impetus to make them go over to their side.

German newspapers assert that this was the decisive battle between the red and the tricolour republics, between workers and bourgeois. We are convinced that this battle will decide *nothing* but the disintegration of the victors. Moreover, the whole course of events proves that, even from a purely military standpoint, the workers are bound to triumph within a fairly short space of time. If 40,000 Paris workers could achieve such tremendous things against forces four times their number, what will the whole mass of Paris workers accomplish by concerted and co-ordinated action!

Kersausie was captured and by now has probably been shot. The bourgeois can kill him, but cannot take from him the fame of having been the *first to organise street-fighting*. They can kill him, but no power on earth can prevent his techniques from being used in all future street-fighting. They can kill him, but they cannot prevent his name from going down in history as the *first commander-in-chief of barricade fighting*.

Written by Engels on June 30 and July 1,
1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* Nos. 31 and 32, July 1 and 2, 1848

GERMANY'S FOREIGN POLICY¹²⁴

Cologne, July 2. All hitherto existing rulers and their diplomats have employed their skill and efforts to set one nation against another and use one nation to subjugate another, and in this manner to perpetuate absolute rule. Germany has distinguished herself in this respect. During the last 70 years alone, she has furnished the British, in exchange for English gold, with mercenaries to be used against the North Americans fighting for their independence; when the first French revolution broke out it was the Germans again who, like a rabid pack, allowed themselves to be set upon the French; in a vicious manifesto issued by the Duke of Brunswick they threatened to raze the whole of Paris to the ground¹²⁵; they conspired with the émigré aristocrats against the new order in France and were paid for this in the form of subsidies received from England. When the Dutch, for the first time in two hundred years, finally hit upon the sensible idea of putting an end to the mad rule of the House of Orange and establishing a republic,¹²⁶ it was the Germans again who acted as the hangmen of freedom. The Swiss, too, could tell a tale about their German neighbours, and it will be some time before the Hungarians recover from the harm which Austria, i.e. the German Imperial Court, inflicted upon them. Indeed, German mercenary troops were sent as far as Greece to prop up the little throne of dear Otto,¹²⁷ and German policemen were sent even to Portugal. Then there were the congresses after 1815, Austria's expeditions to Naples, Turin and the Romagna; the imprisonment of Ypsilanti, the German-imposed war of suppression which France waged against Spain¹²⁸; Dom Miguel¹²⁹ and Don Carlos,¹³⁰ who were supported by Germany; the reaction in Britain had Hanoverian troops at its disposal; German influence has led to the dismemberment of Belgium and the establishment of a Thermidorian rule there; in the

very heart of Russia Germans are the mainstay of the *one* autocrat and of the smaller ones; all Europe is flooded with sprigs of the House of Coburg.

Poland has been plundered and dismembered and Cracow throttled with the help of German soldiers.¹⁵¹ German money and blood have helped to enslave and impoverish Lombardy and Venice, and directly or indirectly to stifle any movement of liberation throughout Italy by means of bayonets, gallows, prisons and galleys.^a The list of sins is much longer, let us close it.

The blame for the infamies committed with the aid of Germany in other countries falls not only on the governments but to a large extent also on the German people. But for the delusions of the Germans, their slavish spirit, their aptitude as mercenaries and "benign" jailers and tools of the masters "by divine right", the German name abroad would not be so detested, cursed and despised, and the nations oppressed by Germany would have long since been able to develop freely. Now that the Germans are throwing off their own yoke, their whole foreign policy must change too. Otherwise the fetters with which we have chained other nations will shackle our own new freedom, which is as yet hardly more than a presentiment. Germany will liberate herself to the extent to which she sets free neighbouring nations.

Things are indeed beginning to look brighter. The lies and misrepresentations which the old government organs have been so busy spreading about Poland and Italy, the attempts at stirring up enmity artificially, the turgid phrases proclaiming that German honour or German power is at stake—all these formulas have lost their magic power. The official patriotism is effective only when these patriotic postures conceal material interests, only among a section of the big bourgeoisie whose business depends on this official patriotism. The reactionary party knows this and makes use of it. But the great mass of the German middle class and the working class understand or feel that the freedom of the neighbouring nations is the guarantee of their own freedom. Is Austria's war against Italy's independence or Prussia's war against the restoration of Poland popular, or on the contrary do they not destroy the last illusions about such "patriotic" crusades? However, neither this understanding nor this feeling is sufficient. If Germany's blood and money are no longer to be squandered, to her own detriment, in suppressing other nations, then we must achieve a really popular government, and the old edifice must be razed to the ground. Only then can an

^a See this volume, pp. 385-87 and 395-98.—*Ed.*

international policy of democracy take the place of the sanguinary, cowardly policy of the old, revived system. How can a democratic foreign policy be carried through while democracy at home is stifled? Meanwhile, everything possible must be done to prepare the way for the democratic system on this side and the other side of the Alps. The *Italians* have issued a number of declarations which make their friendly attitude towards Germany perfectly clear. We would mention the Manifesto of the Provisional Government at Milan¹³² addressed to the German people^a and the numerous articles written in the same vein, which are published in the Italian press. We have now received further evidence of this attitude—a private letter from the administrative committee of the newspaper *L'Alba*, published in Florence, to the editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. It is dated June 20, and says among other things:

“We thank you sincerely for the esteem in which you hold our poor Italy.^b Meanwhile we whole-heartedly assure you that all Italians know who really violates and attacks their liberty; they know that their most deadly enemy is not the strong and magnanimous German people, but rather their unjust, despotic, and cruel government; we assure you that every true Italian longs for the moment when he will be free to shake hands with his German brother, who, once his inalienable rights are established, will be able to defend them, to respect them himself and to secure the respect of all his brothers for them. Placing our trust in the principles to whose careful elaboration you have dedicated yourselves, we remain

Your faithful friends and brothers
(signed) *L. Alinari*”

The *Alba* is one of the few papers in Italy which firmly advocate democratic principles.

Written by Engels on July 2, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 33, July 3, 1848

^a *Il Governo provvisorio alla Nazione Germanica*, April 6, 1848.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 11-12.—*Ed.*

MARRAST AND THIERS

We have continuously drawn the attention of the readers of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* to the intrigues of the party of the *National*, personified by *Marrast*. We have investigated the underhanded means by which this party strives to seize the dictatorship. At the same time we have pointed out how the dictatorship of *Marrast* conjures up the dictatorship of *Thiers*.

Several facts strikingly illustrate how much the party of the *National*, due to its victory, has already succumbed to the party of *Thiers* which is now closely fused with the dynastic opposition.¹³³

The appointment of *Carnot*, a man of the *National*, as Minister has stirred up a violent uproar in the National Assembly. *Marie's* candidature for the presidency of the National Assembly was rivalled by *Dufaure's* candidature and, as the *Débats* reports, was only approved because he was known as "the wisest and most moderate man of the old Executive Committee",^a i.e. because he made the most concessions to the old dynastic party and because he drafted the Bill on gatherings, the continuation of the September Laws,¹³⁴ and sponsored and defended it in the National Assembly! The fact remains that "Marrast" and "Thiers" threw dice for the presidency of the National Assembly.

This does not satisfy, however, the "dynastic opposition". One of the first laws that it is preparing is a law concerning the municipal councils, a law which is directly aimed against the autocracy and influence of *Marrast*, the Mayor of Paris. And he will fall.

In a few days the entire National Assembly will tear itself apart. The reaction will proceed until the party of the *National* is excluded

^a "Paris, 29 juillet", *Journal des Débats*, July 30, 1848.—Ed.

from all exercise of power. "Republic" and "dynastic opposition" will confront each other once more, but the republic will no longer win on the terms of February.

The people will no longer indulge in fancies. It will no longer "hide its revenge under a bushel" as Caussidière puts it and it will no longer "fling its wrath into the torrents of Styx".^a *Qui vivra verra.*

Written on July 2, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 33, July 3, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a From Caussidière's speech in the National Assembly on June 27, 1848 (*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 31, July 1, 1848, supplement).—*Ed.*

THE AGREEMENT DEBATES

Cologne, July 2. After the tragedy the idyll, after the thunder of the Paris June days, the beating of the drums of the Berlin agreeers. We had completely lost sight of the gentlemen but now we learn that at the very moment when Cavaignac shelled the Faubourg St. Antoine, Herr Camphausen gave a nostalgic farewell address and Herr Hansemann submitted the programme of the new Ministry.

First of all, we observe with pleasure that Herr Hansemann has taken our advice and has *not* become Prime Minister.^a He has realised that it is greater to *make* Prime Ministers than to *be* one.

The new Government, in spite of the borrowed name (*prête-nom*) of Auerswald, is and remains the *Hansemann* Government. It shows itself as such by presenting itself as the Government of *Action* and of accomplishing things. Herr Auerswald has certainly no claim to be a Minister of action!

Herr Hansemann's programme is well known. We will not examine the points of his political programme since they have already provided feed for the more or less petty German newspapers. There is only one point that nobody has dared to examine. We want to make up for that omission so that Herr Hansemann should not feel neglected.

Herr Hansemann declares:

"There is at present no more effective means to revive industry and thus to eliminate the poverty of the labouring classes than to restore the weakened confidence in the preservation of law and order and to establish soon a firm constitutional monarchy. By concentrating all our efforts on this aim, *we can best counteract unemployment and poverty.*"

^a See this volume, pp. 111-12.—*Ed.*

At the beginning of his programme, Herr Hansemann has already said that he proposes to submit new repressive laws for this purpose insofar as the old (police state!) legislation does not suffice.

That is plain enough. The old despotic legislation does not suffice! The abolition of the poverty of the working class is not the province of the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Finance but of the Minister of *War!* First repressive laws, to be followed by grape-shot and bayonets—indeed, “there is no more effective means”! Perhaps Herr Schreckenstein,^a whose mere name—according to the Westphalian address^b—strikes terror into the agitators, wants to continue his heroic deeds of Trier¹³⁵ and become a Cavaignac on a reduced Prussian scale?

But Herr Hansemann has still other means besides the “most effective” one:

“What is *also* necessary for this purpose is to procure employment by public works projects of genuine usefulness to the country.”

Herr Hansemann will thus “order still more comprehensive work for the good of *all* industrious classes of the people” than Herr Patow. But he will do this

“when the Government succeeds in removing the anxieties over the possible overthrow of the political system which are nourished by unrest and *agitation* and in restoring the general *confidence* necessary to obtain the required *finances*”.

For the moment Herr Hansemann cannot order any public works to be started because he cannot obtain any money. He can only obtain the money when confidence is restored. But, as he himself says, when confidence is restored, the workers will be employed and the Government will no longer *need* to procure jobs for them.

Herr Hansemann's measures for the abolition of poverty are going round in a circle which is by no means vicious but rather very virtuous in a bourgeois sense. For the moment Herr Hansemann has nothing to offer the workers but the September Laws¹³⁶ and a reduced version of Cavaignac. This is indeed a Government of *Action!*

It is not our purpose to examine the recognition of the revolution in his programme. The “well-informed G-correspondent” of the *Kölnische Zeitung* has already hinted to the public how far Herr Hansemann has saved the legal basis for the benefit of the

^a The name, literally translated, means “terror-stone”.—*Ed.*

^b “Adresse der Krieger und Wehrmänner des Kreises Hagen vom 19. Juni 1848” (*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 25, June 25, 1848, special supplement).—*Ed.*

neighbouring journalist.^a As regards the revolution Herr Hansemann has recognised that it is basically no revolution.

Herr Hansemann had hardly finished when Prime Minister *Auerswald* rose, for he was obliged to say something as well. He took out a written scrap of paper and read approximately the following thoughts, only not in verse:

Gentlemen! I am happy today
To tarry at your meeting,
Where many a noble kindred spirit
Lovingly howls a greeting.
My feelings at this very moment
Are quite beyond all measure;
And oh! these truly blissful hours
All my life I'll treasure!^b

We want to emphasise that we have given the most favourable interpretation to the somewhat unintelligible scrap of paper of the Prime Minister.

Herr *Auerswald* had hardly finished when our Hansemann jumps up again in order to prove by raising a question of confidence that he has not changed his tune. He demands that the draft address^c be referred back to committee and says:

“The reception which this first motion will find in the Assembly will be a measure of the amount of confidence that the High Assembly has in the new Ministry.”

This was really too much. Deputy *Weichsel*, no doubt a reader of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, angrily rushes to the rostrum and protests emphatically against this everlasting method of the question of confidence. So far, so good. But once a German has begun to talk, it is hard to stop him, and so Herr *Weichsel* let himself go in a long discourse about this and that, about the revolution, the year 1807 and the year 1815, about a warm heart beating beneath a shirt and several other topics. All this he said because “he felt it necessary to get these matters off his chest”. A dreadful clamour, mingled with a few bravos from the Left, forced the worthy fellow to leave the rostrum.

Herr Hansemann assured the Assembly that it was by no means the Ministry's intention to raise *frivolous questions of confidence*. It would not be worth the trouble to discuss the issue further since on

^a Marx and Engels frequently use this expression when referring to Karl Brüggemann, the editor-in-chief of the *Kölnische Zeitung*.—*Ed.*

^b Heinrich Heine, *Deutschland. Ein Wintermärchen*, Caput XII.—*Ed.*

^c See this volume, pp. 62-63.—*Ed.*

this occasion it was not really a full question of confidence but only half a question.

There ensues debate such as seldom occurs. Everybody speaks at once and the debate wanders off into a myriad trivialities. The question of confidence, the agenda, standing orders, Polish nationality, adjournment, accompanied by bravos and clamour, all circulate for some time. At last Herr *Parrisius* observes that Herr *Hänsemann* has put a motion on behalf of the Government, whereas the Government as such cannot put motions but can only make communications.

Herr *Hänsemann* replies that it was a slip of the tongue. The motion was really no motion but merely a *request* from the Government.

The grandiose question of confidence is thus reduced to a mere "request" of the Ministers!

Herr *Parrisius* rushes to the rostrum from the left side, Herr *Ritz* from the right. At the summit they confront each other. A collision is unavoidable since neither of the two heroes wants to withdraw. At this point, the Chairman, Herr *Esser*, begins to speak and both heroes turn back.

Herr *Zachariä* adopts the Government's motion as his own and demands an immediate debate.

Herr *Zachariä*, the obedient servant of this as well as the previous Government, who had once before played the redeeming angel by just at the right moment proposing an amendment to Berends' motion, could not find anything to say in support of his motion. What had been stated by the Finance Minister sufficed entirely.

A lengthy debate now ensues with the indispensable amendments, interruptions, table-banging, blustering and sophistries about rules of procedure. It would be asking too much of us to lead our readers through this labyrinth. We can merely point out to them some of the more charming aspects of this confusion:

1. Deputy *Waldeck* enlightens us: the address cannot be referred back to the committee since the committee no longer exists.

2. Deputy *Hüffer* elaborates: the address is not a reply to the Crown but to the Ministers. The Ministers who produced the speech from the throne no longer exist. How are we supposed to reply to someone who does not exist any more?

3. Deputy *d'Ester* draws the following conclusion in the form of an amendment: the Assembly wishes to drop the address.

4. The amendment is disposed of by Chairman *Esser* in the following manner: This proposal seems to be a new motion and not an amendment.

That is the whole skeleton of the debate. To this meagre skeleton, however, there adheres a mass of bloated flesh in the form of speeches by the Ministers Rodbertus and Kühlwetter, the deputies Zachariä, Reichensperger II etc.

The situation is exceedingly strange. Herr Rodbertus himself says that it is

“unprecedented in the history of parliaments that a Government resigns while the draft of an address is on the table and the debate about it is supposed to begin!”

During its first six weeks of parliamentary life, Prussia has on the whole had the good fortune of encountering events almost all of which were “unprecedented in the history of parliaments”.

Herr Hansemann finds himself in the same dilemma as the Chamber. The address, ostensibly a reply to the speech from the throne by Camphausen-Hansemann, is in reality supposed to be a reply to the Hansemann-Auerswald programme. The committee which was complaisant towards Camphausen is therefore supposed to show similar complaisance towards Herr Hansemann. The difficulty is merely to convince people of the need for this demand which is “unprecedented in the history of parliaments”. All means are employed. Rodbertus, the Aeolian harp of the Left Centre, murmurs the most gentle sounds. Kühlwetter makes soothing gestures in all directions: it is, of course, possible that a new examination of the draft address “might convince everybody that *no changes need now be made after all* (!) but in order to win this conviction” (!!) the draft ought to be returned once more to the committee! Finally, Herr Hansemann, who as always is bored by a long debate, cuts the knot by stating bluntly why the draft should be returned to the committee: he does not want the new changes to slip in through the back door in the form of ministerial amendments, they should rather, in the form of committee proposals, strut into the hall through a large folding-door with wide-open leaves.

The Prime Minister declares that it is necessary that

“the Government should *collaborate in a constitutional way* in the drafting of the address”.

Even after much cogitation, we are unable to explain what this is supposed to mean and which Constitution Herr Auerswald has in mind, particularly since Prussia *does not have* a Constitution at all at this moment.

Only two speeches from the side of the opposition need be mentioned: those of Herr d’Ester and Herr Hüffer. Herr d’Ester successfully ridiculed Herr Hansemann’s programme by using Herr

Hansemann's former disparaging remarks about abstractions, useless quarrels over principles etc. against the very abstract programme. D'Ester called upon the Government of *Action* "at last to proceed to action and to set aside questions of principle". We have already mentioned above his proposal, which was the only sensible one that was made in the course of the day.

Herr *Hüffer*, who most clearly expressed the correct point of view in relation to the address, also formulated it most clearly in relation to Herr Hansemann's request: the Government demands that we should have enough confidence in it to send the address back to the committee and it makes the continuation of its existence dependent upon such a decision. The Government, however, can only demand a vote of confidence for actions which *it carries out itself* but not for actions which *it requires of the Assembly*.

In short: Herr Hansemann demanded a vote of confidence and the Assembly, to spare Herr Hansemann unpleasantness, gave an indirect vote of censure to its address committee. Under the Government of *Action* the deputies will soon find out what the famous treasury-whip^a is.

Written by Engels on July 2, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 34, July 4, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a Engels uses the English term and adds a German translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

ARRESTS

Cologne, July 3. Up to now the Government of *Action* has only proved itself as the Ministry of the Police. Its first act was the arrest of Herr *Monecke* and Herr *Fernbach* in Berlin. Its second act was the arrest of Bombardier *Funk* in Saarlouis. Now "action" is beginning to make itself felt here in Cologne too. This morning Dr. *Gottschalk* and Lieutenant (ret.) *Anneke* were arrested. We are reserving our judgment since we are still lacking definite information about the reasons for their arrest and the manner in which it was carried out.

The workers will be sensible enough not to let themselves be provoked into creating a disturbance.

Written on July 3, 1848

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 34, July 4, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

ARRESTS

Cologne, July 4. We promised our readers yesterday that we would come back to the arrest of Dr. *Gottschalk* and *Anneke*. Up to now we have only been able to obtain greater details about Anneke's arrest.

Six to seven policemen entered Anneke's residence between six and seven in the morning, immediately maltreated the maid in the hall and then silently sneaked up the stairs. Three of them remained in the anteroom while four invaded the bedroom where Anneke and his wife, who is in an advanced state of pregnancy, were asleep. One of these four pillars of justice was already at this early hour somewhat unsteady, being filled with "spirit", the true fluid of life: firewater.

Anneke asked what they wanted. He should go along with them! was the laconic answer. Anneke asked that at least his sick wife should be spared and asked the gentlemen to go into the anteroom. The gentlemen of the Holy Hermandad¹³⁷ declared that they would not leave the bedroom. They urged Anneke to dress quickly and did not even permit him to speak to his wife. Once they found themselves in the anteroom, the urging turned into assault during which one of the policemen smashed a glass door. Anneke was *pushed down* the stairs. Four policemen led him off to the new gaol. Three of them remained with Frau Anneke to guard her until the arrival of the Public Prosecutor.

According to the law, there must be at least one *official of the court police* (a police inspector or similar person) present during an arrest. Why such formalities, however, since the people possess two assemblies, one in Berlin and one in Frankfurt, to represent their rights?

Half an hour later, Public Prosecutor *Hecker* and Examining Magistrate *Geiger* came to search the house.

Frau Anneke complained that the Public Prosecutor had left the arrest to police whose brutality was unconstrained by the presence of any member of the municipal authorities. Herr Hecker declared that he had given *no orders to commit brutalities*. As if Herr Hecker could order brutalities!

Frau *Anneke*: It seems that the police were sent ahead *alone* so that the authorities would not have to assume the responsibility for their brutality. Besides, the arrest was not carried out according to legal procedure since none of the police produced a warrant. One of them merely pulled a scrap of paper out of his pocket which Anneke was not allowed to read.

Herr *Hecker*: "The police were *judicially commanded* to proceed with the arrest." Does not the command of a judge also fall under the command of the law? The Public Prosecutor and the Examining Magistrate confiscated a mass of papers and pamphlets, including Frau Anneke's whole briefcase, etc. Incidentally, Examining Magistrate Geiger has been designated as *Police Superintendent*.

Anneke was interrogated for half an hour in the evening. A supposedly seditious speech that he made during the last popular assembly at the Gürzenich Hall¹³⁸ was given as the reason for his arrest. Article 102 of the *Code pénal*¹³⁹ speaks of public orations which *directly* incite to conspiracy against the Emperor and his family or which aim at disturbing the public peace by civil war, the illegal use of armed force or open vandalism and looting. The Code does not contain the Prussian "excitement of dissatisfaction". For lack of the Prussian law, Article 102 will be employed for the time being wherever its employment is a judicial impossibility.

A great show of military force accompanied the arrest. From four o'clock onwards the troops were confined to barracks. Bakers and artisans were allowed in but not let out again. Towards six o'clock the hussars moved from Deutz to Cologne and rode through the whole city. The new gaol was occupied by 300 men. For today, four new arrests have been announced, those of Jansen, Kalker, Esser and a fourth one. *Eyewitnesses* assure us that Jansen's posters, in which he urged the *workers to remain calm*, were *torn down from the walls* by the police yesterday evening. Was that done in the interest of order? Or was someone looking for a pretext to carry out carefully prepared plans in the good old city of Cologne?

Chief Public Prosecutor Zweifel is supposed to have inquired earlier at the Provincial Court of Appeal at Arnsberg whether he should arrest Anneke on the basis of his former conviction¹⁴⁰ and

have him transported to Jülich. The royal amnesty seems to have stood in the way of this well-meaning intention. The matter was referred to the Ministry.

Chief Public Prosecutor Zweifel, moreover, is supposed to have declared that he would within a week put an end to March 19, the clubs, freedom of the press and other outrages that the evil year 1848 had brought to Cologne on the Rhine. Herr Zweifel is not among the sceptics.

Is Herr Zweifel perhaps combining the executive with the legislative power? Are the laurels of Chief Public Prosecutor supposed to cover the weak points of the people's representative? Once again we will scrutinise our much beloved stenographic reports and give the public a true picture of the work of the people's representative and Chief Public Prosecutor Zweifel.^a

Those are the actions of the *Government of Action*, the Government of the Left Centre, the Government of transition to an old aristocratic, old bureaucratic and old Prussian Government. As soon as Herr Hansemann has fulfilled his transitory function, he will be dismissed.

The Berlin Left, however, must realise that the old regime is willing to let it keep its small parliamentary victories and large constitutional designs as long as the old regime in the meantime is able to seize all the really important positions. It can confidently recognise the revolution of March 19 inside the Chamber provided the revolution can be disarmed outside of it.

Some fine day the Left may find that its parliamentary victory coincides with its real defeat. *Perhaps German development needs such contrasts.*

The Government of Action recognises the revolution in principle in order to carry out the counter-revolution in practice.

Written on July 4, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 35, July 5, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a See this volume, pp. 94-95.—*Ed.*

THE AGREEMENT DEBATES

Cologne, July 4. Today we will take up the agreement session of June 28. The Assembly is confronted by a new President,^a a new set of standing orders and new Ministers. One can therefore imagine how great is the confusion.

After lengthy preliminary debates about standing orders and other matters, Deputy *Gladbach* was finally allowed to speak. A few days ago in Spandau, the Prussian soldiery forcibly disarmed, and in some instances even arrested, on their return from Schleswig-Holstein, the members of the 6th Company of the Volunteer Corps which had been disbanded for republican sentiments. It had no legitimate reason or legal authority whatever to carry out this act. In law, the army cannot take such steps on its own initiative at all. Most of these volunteers, however, had formerly fought on the barricades of Berlin and the gentlemen of the guard had to get even with them.

Herr *Gladbach* questioned the Ministry on this act of military despotism.

The Minister of War, *Schreckenstein*, declares that he does not know anything about this matter and that he must reserve the right to demand a report on it from the appropriate authority.

Hence the people pay a Minister of War so that he does not yet know in Berlin on the 28th what steps the military took on the 25th a mere three hours from Berlin, in Spandau, and so that, right in front of his eyes, as it were, a mere three hours from Berlin, lieutenants of the guard should occupy the railway stations and seize the weapons from the armed nation (weapons which belong to the people, and

^a Wilhelm Grabow.—*Ed.*

which they captured on the battlefield), without even deigning to honour the Minister of War with a report! But to be sure, Lieutenant-Colonel Schlichting who accomplished this heroic deed acted according to "instructions", which he probably receives from Potsdam, and it is probably also to Potsdam that he reports!

Tomorrow, the well-informed Minister of War pleads, tomorrow I will *perhaps* be able to give an answer!

There follows a question by Zacharias: The Ministry had promised a Bill on the civic militia. Will this Bill be based upon the principle of arming the whole nation?

The new Minister of the Interior, Herr Kühlwetter, answers: Indeed, a civic militia Bill was under consideration, but it had not yet been discussed in the Ministry, hence he could not say anything further about it.

Thus the new Ministry has been formed so precipitously and has reached so little agreement upon its guiding principles that even the burning question of the arming of the nation has not yet been debated!

A second question by Deputy *Glabach* concerned the definitive appointing of burgomasters and other officials by the authorities hitherto empowered to do so. Since the entire prevailing administration will continue to exist only on a provisional basis, it will be able to fill the existing vacancies also only provisionally until it is determined by legislation how and by whom the different authorities are to be appointed. Nevertheless, burgomasters and other officials have been appointed definitively.

Minister *Kühlwetter* expresses his general agreement with Herr *Glabach* and will allow only provisional burgomasters to be appointed.

President Grabow skilfully evades a further question by Herr *Glabach* about the suspension of the many officials hated by those they administer; during the initial flush of revolutionary ardour a number of these officials, especially in the country, having been put to flight.

After some debates on procedure, the question of Deputy *Dierschke* concerning the Köslin address¹⁴¹ and its furtherance by the governments and the rural district administrations was reached. But the deputy had completely forgotten that his question had been put on the agenda and he had failed therefore to bring along the papers necessary to substantiate his case. Thus there was nothing left for him to do but to indulge in a few general phrases about the reaction, to accept a highly unsatisfactory reply from the Minister and to be told by the President that he must surely be satisfied with it.

But he had still to put a second question: Whether or not the Ministers intended to oppose the reactionary schemes of the aristocracy and the party of the officials.

In this case, too, he seems to have forgotten the necessary papers. Once again he spouts declamatory phrases instead of quoting facts and demands nothing better from the Ministry than that it issue a proclamation against reaction.

Herr *Kühlwetter* answers, of course, that the views of lords of the manor and of officials were not his concern, only their actions were. These people had the same freedom as Herr *Dierschke*, and besides, would Herr *Dierschke* please cite facts. In duly dignified manner, he rejected the absurd idea of an "enactment" against reaction. Herr *Dierschke* then cited the fact that in his district of Ohlau the *Landrat* had stated that the National Assembly would not be unanimous until it was glued together with grape-shot, and that their deputy (*Dierschke* himself) had said that it would be a trifle to string up a Minister.

The Chairman deduced from this remark that Herr *Dierschke* was now also satisfied in regard to the second question and Herr *Dierschke* could not think of any objections to raise.

Herr *Hansemann*, however, is not satisfied. He accuses the speaker of having digressed from the main question. He

"leaves it to the Assembly to judge the propriety of making personal accusations against officials when proof of these accusations is not supplied at the same time".

After delivering this proud challenge and being greeted by the resounding applause of the Right and the Centre, Herr *Hansemann* sits down.

Deputy *Elsner* puts an urgent motion. He calls for the immediate appointment of a committee of inquiry into the situation of the spinners and weavers as well as of the entire Prussian linen manufacture.

In a brief and striking speech Herr *Elsner* tells the Assembly how the old Government had in every single case sacrificed the linen industry to dynastic and legitimist interests or rather notions. Spain, Mexico, Poland and Cracow served as proofs.¹⁴²

Fortunately the facts were striking and affected only the old Government. Therefore no difficulties were raised by any side. The Government put itself at the disposal of the committee in advance and the motion was passed unanimously.

There follows a question by *d'Ester* concerning the shaved Poles.¹⁴³

D'Ester declares that he does not just seek information about the fact but specifically about the measures taken by the Government

against this treatment. That was the reason why he was not just addressing himself to the Minister of War but to the entire Government.

Herr *Auerswald*: If d'Ester does not want an answer to this specific case "the Government is not *interested*" in replying.

Really, the Government is not "interested" in replying to the question! What novelty! It is indeed customary to ask questions precisely in those cases in which "the Government is *not a bit interested*". Precisely *because* it is not interested in answering it, precisely for that reason, Herr Prime Minister, the Government is asked the question.

The Prime Minister, by the way, must have believed that he was not among his superiors but among his subordinates. He attempts to make the reply to the question dependent upon the interest shown not by the Assembly but by the Government.

We attribute it solely to the inexperience of President Grabow that he did not call Herr *Auerswald* to order for this bureaucratic arrogance.

The Prime Minister, by the way, gave the assurance that the shaving of Poles would be vigorously counteracted but that he could not reveal any details until a later date.

D'Ester is very willing to agree to a delay but wants to know the date when *Auerswald* intends to answer.

Herr *Auerswald*, who must be hard of hearing, replies: I believe that there is nothing in my declaration which indicates that the Ministry does not wish (!) to revert to this matter at a later date. But he cannot yet fix the date.

Behnsch and *d'Ester* moreover declare explicitly that they are also demanding further information about the fact itself.

Then follows *d'Ester's* second question: What was the meaning of the military preparations in the Rhine Province, particularly in Cologne, and did perhaps the necessity arise to protect the frontier with France?

Herr *Schreckenstein* replies: For several months now no troops have gone to the Rhine with the exception of individual reservists. (To be sure, brave Bayard, but there were already too many troops there.) Not just Cologne but *all* fortresses are being fortified so that the fatherland should not be endangered.^a

Thus if the troops are not drafted into the forts at Cologne where they have nothing to do and are in very poor quarters, if the artillery units do not get any rifles, if the troops do not receive bread for a

^a See this volume, pp. 68-71.—*Ed.*

week in advance and if the infantry is not provided with live bullets and the artillery with grape and ball shot, the fatherland is in danger? Thus, according to Herr Schreckenstein, the fatherland is only *out of danger* when Cologne and the other big cities are *in danger*!

By the way,

“all troop movements must be left entirely to the judgment of a military person, i.e. the Minister of War, otherwise he cannot be responsible”!

Imperial Baron Roth von Schreckenstein^a of the terror-inspiring name sounds like a young girl whose virtue is threatened rather than the Prussian *pro tempore* Bayard without fear and reproach!

When Deputy d’Ester, M.D., who truly is a dwarf by the side of the mighty Imperial Baron Roth von Schreckenstein, asks the said Schreckenstein about the meaning of one or another measure, the great Imperial Baron believes that the little M.D. wants to take away his prerogative freely to decide on the disposition of troops. In such an event he could of course no longer be responsible!

In a word, the Minister of War declares that he must not be *called to account*; otherwise he would not *be accountable* at all.

By the way, what weight does a deputy’s question carry compared with the “judgment of a military person, and particularly a Minister of War”!

Although d’Ester declares that he is not satisfied, he nevertheless draws from Schreckenstein’s answer the conclusion that the military preparations are designed to protect the French frontier.

Prime Minister Auerswald protests against this conclusion.

If *all* border fortresses are fortified, it stands to reason that *all* frontiers are “protected”. If *all* frontiers are protected, surely the *French* frontier, too, is “protected”.

Herr Auerswald admits the correctness of the premises but “rejects” the deduction “in the name of the Government”.

We, on the other hand, “assume in the name” of common sense that Herr Auerswald is not merely hard of hearing.

D’Ester and Pfahl protest at once. Reichenbach declares that Neisse,^b the most significant Silesian fortress against the East, is not being fortified at all and that it is in a most sorry plight. When he begins to give details, the Right supported by the Centre makes a terrible racket and Reichenbach is forced to leave the rostrum.

Herr Moritz:

“Count Reichenbach has given *no* reason for addressing the Assembly (!). I believe that I may speak for *the same reason* (!!). I consider it to be unparliamentary and

^a The name, literally translated, means “terror-stone”.—*Ed.*

^b The Polish name is Nysa.—*Ed.*

unheard of in the history of parliaments to *embarrass* the Ministry in such a manner ... (great commotion), to bring up matters which should not be discussed before the public ... we have not been sent here to *endanger* the fatherland." (A terrible din ensues. Our Moritz has to get off the rostrum.)

Deputy Esser I calms the tumult by a disquisition, as thorough as it is appropriate, on Paragraph 28 of the standing orders.

Herr *Moritz* protests; he had not intended to correct a fact but merely "wanted to speak for the same reason as Count Reichenbach"! The conservative faction supports him and grants him a loud cheer, whereas the extreme Left bangs on the tables.

Auerswald:

"Is it appropriate to discuss in detail the defensive capacity of Prussia either in individual cases or as a whole?"

We note in the first place that the discussion did not deal with the defensive capacity of the state but rather with the *defencelessness* of the state. Secondly, what is inappropriate is not that the Minister of War should be reminded of his duties but rather that he should make military preparations against domestic opponents and not against external foes.

The Right is terribly bored and calls for an end to the debate. The President, in the midst of much noise, declares that the matter is settled.

Next on the agenda is a motion by *Jung*. Herr Jung deems it appropriate to be absent. What a wonderful representation of the people!

Now comes a question by Deputy *Scholz*. It reads literally as follows:

"Question to the Minister of the Interior inquiring whether he is able or inclined to supply information on the *inopportune introduction of constables in the districts.*"¹⁴⁴

President: To begin with I am asking whether this question has been *understood*.

(It has not been understood and it is read once again.)

Minister *Kühlwetter:* Indeed, I do not know what information is demanded of me. I do not understand the question.

President: Is there support for the question? (It is not supported.)

Scholz: I withdraw my motion for the time being.

We, too, are "withdrawing" for today after this priceless scene which is "unheard of in the history of parliaments".

Written by Engels on July 4, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 35, July 5, 1848

Published in English for the first time

LEGAL PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE *NEUE*
RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG

Cologne, July 6. We have just received the following rejoinder to the article printed in yesterday's [*Neue*] *Rheinische Zeitung* dated "Cologne, July 4" which dealt with the arrest of Dr. Gottschalk and Anneke.^a

"I declare it to be a falsehood that I answered the complaint of Frau Anneke concerning the arrest of her husband without the presence of a member of the municipal authorities in the following manner:

"I have given *no orders to commit brutalities.*'

"Rather, I merely remarked that I should regret it if the police had conducted themselves in an unseemly manner.

"I furthermore declare it to be a falsehood to state that I used the expression:

"The police were *judicially commanded* to proceed with the arrest.'

"I merely observed that the arrest was effected by virtue of a warrant to appear in court issued by the Examining Magistrate.

"Under the law, such warrants are discharged by court bailiffs or agents of the armed forces. The presence of an official of the court police is nowhere prescribed.

"The defamations and insults contained in this article, directed against Chief Public Prosecutor Zweifel and the police who carried out the arrest, will be evaluated in the legal proceedings which will be initiated on this count.

Cologne, July 5, 1848

Hecker, Public Prosecutor"

Our esteemed readers may perceive from the preceding that the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* has gained a new contributor of great promise—the *Public Prosecutor's office.*

We have erred on a *single* point of law. During an arrest there is no need for an "*official of the court police*" but merely for an *agent of the*

^a See this volume, pp. 177-79.—*Ed.*

public authority. With what careful guarantees the Code assures the safety of the person!

Incidentally, the fact that the police did not produce their warrant remains illegal. It also remains illegal that they, as we are subsequently informed, *scrutinised documents* even *before* the appearance of Herr Hecker and his companion. But above all the *brutalities*, which Herr Hecker *regretted*, remain illegal. We are amazed to see court proceedings pending not against the police but against the newspaper that has denounced their impropriety.

The *insult* could only refer to one of the policemen of whom it was said that he "*was unsteady*" at an early hour for more or less spiritual or spirituous reasons. If the investigation, however, as we do not doubt for one moment, should prove the correctness of the evidence, namely the brutalities committed by the agents of the public authority, then we believe that we shall have only acted in the interests of the gentlemen accused by us by carefully emphasising, with the complete impartiality becoming the press, the only "*extenuating circumstance*". And this affable statement of the only extenuating circumstance is transformed into an "insult" by the Public Prosecutor.

And now as to the insult or defamation of Chief Public Prosecutor Zweifel!

We have simply reported, and as we have ourselves indicated in the report, we have reported *rumours*, rumours which reached us from a reliable source. The press not only has the right but the duty to keep a close watch on the conduct of the people's representatives. At the same time we pointed out that Herr Zweifel's past parliamentary activity seems to be in line with the anti-popular remarks ascribed to him. Is it really the intention to deprive the press of the right to *judge* the parliamentary activity of a representative of the people? What then is the purpose of the press?

Or does not the press have the right to detect in the people's representative Zweifel too much of the Chief Public Prosecutor and in the Chief Public Prosecutor too much of the people's representative? Why then in Belgium, France etc. the debate on incompatibilities?

As to the *constitutional usage*, one should read again how the *Constitutionnel*, the *Siècle* and the *Presse* during the reign of Louis Philippe judged the parliamentary activity of *Hébert*, *Plougouln* etc. at the time when these men occupied the highest positions in the Public Prosecutor's office and at the same time served as deputies. One should read how the Belgian newspapers, particularly the strictly constitutional ones such as the *Observateur*, the *Politique* and

the *Emancipation*, barely a year ago judged the parliamentary activity of M. *Bavay* when he combined in one person the office of deputy and Public Prosecutor-General.

And what was always allowed under the Guizot Ministry and the Rogier Ministry should not be allowed under a *monarchy built on the broadest democratic foundation*? A right which was not contested by any Administration of the French Restoration becomes a wrong under the *Government of Action* which recognises the *revolution in principle*?

Incidentally, the public has been able to convince itself from our special supplement of this morning just how correctly we have judged the course of events. *Rodbertus* has left the Government and *Ladenberg* has entered it. The Government of the Left Centre has transformed itself in a few days into a decidedly *old-Prussian reactionary Government*. The *Right* has dared a *coup d'état*,¹⁴⁵ and the *Left* has withdrawn with the threats.

And is it not palpably clear that the most recent acts in Cologne were part of the great plan of campaign of the *Government of Action*?

Just now we are being informed that the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* has been banned from the house of detention. Do the prison rules provide for such a prohibition? Or are the politically accused condemned to the penalty of having to read exclusively the *Kölnische Zeitung*?

Written by Marx on July 6, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 37, July 7, 1848

Published in English for the first time

THE BERLIN AGREEMENT DEBATES

Cologne, July 6. While ministerial crisis No. 2 continues in Berlin, we would like for the time being, in the words of Deputy *Mätze*, to return "from these tempests" to the hitherto "calm lake" of the agreement debates. Say what you like, we have spent here more than one hour of genial cheerfulness—

Here, breeding and custom hold sway,
And many a quiet pleasure blooms
Amidst us to this day.^a

It is the turn of the session of *June 30*. Right from the beginning it opens with significant and very peculiarly characteristic occurrences.

Who has not heard of the great campaign of the 57 family heads from Berg and Mark who set out to save the fatherland? Who does not know with what defiance of death this cream of conservative philistinism, forsaking wives, children and business, set out to step into the breach to give battle to the revolution in a fight to the death, in a word, to go to Berlin and present to the Ministry a petition against agitators?

These 57 paladins then also presented to the Agreement Assembly an address containing mild, reactionary pious wishes. The address is read. A few gentlemen of the Right wish also to have the signatures read. The secretary begins to read but is interrupted by shouts of "Enough, enough!"

Deputy *Berg*:

"The document which has just been read must be either a motion or a petition. If it is a motion I would like to know which member has adopted it. If it is a petition, let it be sent to the appropriate committee so that we may no longer be bored with it."

^a Heinrich Heine, *Deutschland. Ein Wintermärchen*, Caput XXV.—*Ed.*

This laconic answer of Herr Berg disposes of the matter. The President^a stammers a few apologies and puts aside the address of the 57 family heads.

Thereupon rises an old friend of ours and of the Left, Deputy *Schultz* from Wanzleben:

“The day before yesterday I withdrew my motions concerning civil marriage etc. with the explanation that my proposed Bills are to be drafted differently by me. I find in the stenographic reports that my remarks are followed by the comment: ‘*Laughter.*’ It may be that somebody or other has laughed at my remarks, but if so, he certainly did it *without reason.*” (Renewed laughter.)

Deputy *Schultz* from Wanzleben explains now with the most ingenuous good nature that he only wanted to do his best, that he would be happy to be taught better, that he had been convinced of the imperfections of his Bills, that he could, however, hardly move amendments to his own proposals and that he therefore considered it his duty not to “submit” his motion to the Assembly in its original form but to withdraw it for the time being.

“I cannot find anything laughable in this and I must protest if by the word ‘laughter’ my judicious procedure is presented as *laughable.*”

Deputy *Schultz* from Wanzleben fares like the Knight Tannhäuser:

Whenever I think about this *laughter*,
My eyes shed sudden tears.^b

Deputy *Brill* remarks that the otherwise excellent stenographic reports lack the statement by Minister Hansemann that the programme of the present Ministry is a continuation of the speech from the throne. He remembered this particularly well because being a printer it had reminded him of the phrase “to be continued”, which he used to print so often.

This frivolous treatment of the most serious subjects enrages Deputy *Ritz* exceedingly. He rushes to the rostrum and states:

“Gentlemen, I believe that the dignity of this Assembly demands that in our speeches we refrain from relating *parables* and comparisons which are out of place here. They are also *unparliamentary*. (Considerable agitation.) I do not consider our great *hilarity* during the previous session as commensurate with the dignity of the Assembly ... in the interest of this Assembly’s dignity I would recommend a certain *sobriety.*”

“In the interest” of the “sobriety” recommended by Deputy *Ritz* we would recommend that “in the interest of the Assembly’s dignity”

^a Wilhelm Grabow.— *Ed.*

^b Heinrich Heine, “Der Tannhäuser”, Caput 2.— *Ed.*

Deputy Ritz should speak as little as possible because his words are always followed by "great hilarity".

It became revealed at once, however, how much the well-meaning intentions of such worthies as Herr Schultz from Wanzleben and Herr Ritz are inevitably misunderstood in this wicked world. For President *Grabow* appointed the scrutineers and among them were to be found none others than Herr Schultz from Wanzleben for the Left Centre (laughter) and Herr Brill for the Right Centre (hilarity). Concerning Herr Brill, our readers should know that this deputy who belongs to the extreme Left has seated himself in the Right Centre smack into the midst of the Upper Silesian and Pomeranian peasants where, by his popular oratorical talents, he has defeated quite a number of the reactionary party's insinuations.

Then follows the question of Herr *Behnsch* concerning the Russian Note which is supposed to have caused the withdrawal of Wrangel from Jutland.^a *Auerswald* denies the existence of this Note despite the *Morning Chronicle* and the Russian *Bee*.^b We believe that Herr *Auerswald* is right. We do not believe that Russia has sent an official "Note" to Berlin. But neither we nor Herr *Auerswald* can know what Nicholas sent to Potsdam.

Herr *Behnsch* also puts a question on the Note of Major Wildenbruch addressed to the Danish Government¹⁴⁶ according to which the Danish war was merely a feigned war and a dalliance designed to work off "superabundant patriotism".^c

Herr *Auerswald* finds some reason for *not* answering this question.

After a boring and confused discussion about the committee of experts there occurs finally a truly interesting parliamentary scene, a scene during which a certain amount of indignation and passion victoriously rises above the stereotyped drumming of the Right. We owe this scene to Deputy *Glabach*. The Minister of War had promised today to answer his question on the disarming and arrest of the returned volunteers.^d

As soon as the President indicates that this subject is reached, Lieutenant-Colonel *Griesheim*, who is an old acquaintance of ours, rises and begins to speak. This bureaucratic-soldierly importunity is, however, rejected at once by a vigorous interruption.

The *President* states that under Paragraph 28 of standing orders

^a See this volume, pp. 42-44.—*Ed*

^b A reference to the Russian periodical *Severnaya Pchela* (The Bee of the North).—*Ed*

^c Heinrich Heine, "Bei des Nachtwächters Ankunft zu Paris". In *Zeitgedichte*.—*Ed*

^d See this volume, pp. 180-81.—*Ed*

assistants to Ministers may only speak with the permission of the Assembly.

Griesheim: I am here as representative of the Minister of War.

President: I have *not* been so informed.

Griesheim: Well, if the gentlemen do not want to listen to what I have to say.... (Aha! Agitation.)

"The gentlemen!" For Herr Griesheim "the gentlemen" surely ought to be the "High Assembly"! The President should have called Herr Griesheim to order because of his repeated disregard for all propriety.

The Assembly wants to listen to Herr Griesheim. First, however, Herr *Glabach* is given the floor to amplify his question. He explains first of all that he has put the question to the Minister of War and he demands that he be present and under standing orders the Assembly has the right to demand this. The President, however, sets this aside and Mr. *Glabach*, bearing in mind the urgency of the matter, goes into the substance of his question. He relates that the volunteers, after they had left their corps and returned home because of the application of military despotism, had been branded in Spandau as vagabonds "by the execrable police system that had crept out of its hiding places overnight". He relates that in Spandau they had been disarmed, detained and sent home under police orders. Herr *Glabach* is the first deputy who has succeeded in relating such an ignominious deed with entirely appropriate indignation.

Herr *Griesheim* declares that this measure was taken upon the request of police headquarters in Berlin.

Herr *Glabach* now reads the honourable discharge of one of the volunteers signed by Prince Friedrich of Schleswig-Holstein and contrasts it to the police pass, quite vagabond-like in tone, which was issued to the same volunteer "*upon ministerial decision*" in Spandau. He points to the *arrest, forced labour* and *cash fines* threatened in the police pass, gives the lie to Herr Griesheim's assertion that this measure originated with the Chief of Police by citing an official document, and asks whether perhaps there existed a special *Russian Ministry* in Spandau.

For the first time the Ministry was caught out in a direct lie. The entire Assembly becomes extremely excited.

The Minister of the Interior, Herr *Kühlwetter*, finally has to get up perforce and stammer a few apologies. *All that had happened* had been the disarming of 18 armed men—merely an illegal act! One could not tolerate armed bands moving through the countryside without permission—22 volunteers who are returning home! (Without permission!)

The initial words of the Minister are received with unambiguous signs of displeasure. Even the Right is still too much under the depressing influence of the facts not to keep at least quiet. But they soon pull themselves together as they perceive how their unfortunate Minister painfully manoeuvres under the laughter and the grumbling of the Left, and greet his lame excuses with loud cheers; part of the Centre joins in and Herr Kühlwetter finally gathers enough courage to say: Not I, but my predecessor has ordered this measure, but I herewith declare that I fully approve it and should the case arise I would do the same.

The Right and the Centre reward the courage of their heroic Kühlwetter with a thundering cheer.

Gladbach, however, does not let himself be intimidated. He mounts the rostrum amidst the noise and clamour of the conservatives and asks once more: How is it possible that Herr Schreckenstein, who was the Minister already before the Spandau incident, *did not know anything about it?* How is it possible that *four* volunteers with good testimonials can endanger the security of the state? (Interruption—the gentlemen of the Centre raise points of order.) The question is not settled. How can one forcibly send these people home like vagabonds? (Interruption and noise.) I still have not received an answer to my question about the police pass. These people have been maltreated. Why does one tolerate a pack of Sunday-school heroes who to the disgrace of the capital (loud noise) have arrived armed from Wuppertal? (Noise. Cheers.)

Kühlwetter finally comes clean: this action had been taken under the pretext of a doubtful proof of identity! Thus an honourable discharge signed by the General Staff of Schleswig-Holstein is for the police bureaucrats of Herr Kühlwetter proof of identity which is “open to doubt”? What a strange bureaucracy!

Several more deputies speak against the Ministers until the President finally drops the matter and Deputy *Mätze* leads the Assembly from the tempests of this debate to the calm seas of the life of a schoolteacher where we leave them, wishing them the most beautiful idyllic joys.

We are pleased that a deputy of the Left has at long last succeeded by a well-reasoned question and resolute demeanour in forcing the Ministers to run the gauntlet and in causing a scene which recalls French and English parliamentary debates.

Written by Engels on July 6, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 37, July 7, 1848

Published in English for the first time

THE GOVERNMENT OF ACTION

Cologne, July 7. We have a *new ministerial crisis*. The *Camphausen Ministry fell*, the *Hansemann Ministry faltered*. The *Government of Action* had a life-span of *a week* in spite of all the little household remedies, cosmetics, press trials, arrests, in spite of the arrogant impudence with which the bureaucracy once again reared its document-dusty head, hatching petty, brutal plots of vengeance for its dethronement. The "*Government of Action*", composed entirely of mediocrities, was at the start of the Agreement Assembly's most recent session still so deluded as to believe in its own imperturbability.

By the end of the session^a it was completely routed. This momentous session convinced Prime Minister von *Auerswald* that he should tender his resignation; nor did Minister von *Schreckenstein* want any longer to remain as Hansemann's train-bearer and thus the entire Ministry yesterday betook themselves to the King at Sanssouci. What was decided there we shall learn tomorrow.

Our Berlin correspondent writes in a postscript:

"Just now the rumour is spreading that *Vincke*, *Pinder* and *Mevissen* have been urgently sent for to help in the formation of a new Ministry."

If this rumour is confirmed we shall *finally* have come from the Government of mediation through the Government of Action to the Government of the counter-revolution. *At last!* The very brief life-span of this ministerial counter-revolution would suffice to show to the people in full life-size these dwarfs who raise their diminutive heads at the slightest stirring of reaction.

Written by Marx on July 7, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 39, July 9, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a July 4, 1848.—*Ed.*

THE AGREEMENT DEBATE

Cologne, July 8. Simultaneously with the news of the dissolution of the Hanseemann Ministry the stenographic report about the agreement session of July 4 reached us. It was during this session that the resignation of Herr Rodbertus, the first symptom of this dissolution, was announced, and at the same time the two contradictory votes concerning the Posen committee and the exodus of the Left have greatly accelerated the Ministry's disintegration.

The announcements of the Ministers regarding the resignation of Rodbertus published in the stenographic report contain nothing new. We shall skip them.

Herr *Forstmann* rose: He had to protest against the expressions which Herr Gladbach used on June 30^a in referring to the "deputation of the most honourable men of Rhineland and Westphalia".

Herr *Berg*: I have already a few days ago observed in connection with the standing orders that the reading of this petition is out of place here and that it bores me.^b (Exclamation: It bores us!) Well then, us. I have spoken for myself and *several others* and the circumstance that we are being bored today by a supplementary observation does not invalidate this remark.

Herr *Tüshaus*, the expert adviser of the central section on the question of the Posen committee, gives a report. The central section proposes that a committee be formed to investigate all questions concerning the Posen affair, and leaves open the question what funds shall be put at the committee's disposal for this purpose.

^a See this volume, p. 193.—*Ed.*

^b *Ibid.*, p. 189.—*Ed.*

Herr Wolff, Herr Müller, Herr Reichensperger II and Herr Sommer have proposed amendments which have all met with support and are down for discussion.

Herr *Tüshaus* adds to his report a few comments directed against the idea of a committee. The truth, in this case, too, was evidently to be found as always in the middle and after long and contradictory reports one would merely arrive at the conclusion that both sides were to blame. With that one would be exactly where one is at present. One should at least first ask for a detailed report by the Government and then decide what to do further.

Why did the central section select a reporter who speaks against his own report?

Herr *Reuter* explains the reasons which caused him to put the motion to appoint the committee. Finally he remarks that he had no intention of making an accusation against the Ministers and that as a jurist he knew only too well that up to now all ministerial responsibility was illusory so long as there existed no law concerning this point.

Herr *Reichensperger II* rises. He protests his boundless sympathies for Poland and hopes that the day may not be far when the German nation pays off its old debt of honour to the grandchildren of Sobieski. (As if this debt of honour had not been paid off a long time ago by the eight partitions of Poland, by shrapnel, lunar caustic and canings!)

"We must, however, also maintain the calmest circumspection since German interests must always come first."

(The German interests are, of course, to keep as much as possible of this territory.) And Herr Reichensperger is especially opposed to the appointment of a committee to investigate the evidence:

"This is a question which should be dealt with expressly by *history* or the courts."

Has Herr Reichensperger forgotten that he himself declared during the debate on the revolution that the gentlemen were here "*to make history*"?^a He concludes with a juridical sophistry about the position of the deputies. We shall return later to the question of competence.

Now, however, Herr *Bauer* from Krotoschin,^b himself a German Pole, rises to defend the interests of his community.

"I would like to ask the Assembly to draw a veil over the past and to occupy itself solely with the future of a people that has every right to lay claim to our sympathy."

^a See this volume, p. 84.—*Ed*

^b The Polish name is Krotoszyn.—*Ed*

How touching! Herr Bauer from Krotoschin is so taken up with sympathy for the future of the Polish people that he wants to "draw a veil" over its past, over the barbarities of the Prussian soldiery, the Jews and the German Poles. The matter should be dropped in the interest of the Poles themselves!

"What does one hope to gain from such depressing discussions? If you find the Germans guilty will you, therefore, be less concerned for the preservation of their nationality, and the safety of their person and their property?"

That was, indeed, a magnificent show of candour! Herr Bauer from Krotoschin admits that the Germans could possibly be wrong, but even so German nationality must be supported at the expense of the Poles!

"I am unable to perceive how digging through the rubbish of the past can produce anything beneficial for a satisfactory solution of these difficult questions."

There certainly would not be anything "beneficial" in store for the German Poles and their fervent allies. That is why they are so much opposed to it.

Herr Bauer then seeks to intimidate the Assembly: such a committee would inflame the minds of people once again, incite fanaticism anew, and might lead to a new bloody clash. These philanthropic considerations prevent Herr Bauer from voting for the committee. Nor can he vote against it since that might create the impression that his mandataries have reason to fear the committee. Thus out of consideration for the Poles he is *against* the committee and out of consideration for the Germans he is *for* it, and to maintain his perfect impartiality in this dilemma, he does not vote at all.

Bussmann of Gnesen,^a another deputy from Posen, regards his mere presence as proof that Germans, too, live in Posen. He wants to prove statistically that there are "whole masses of Germans" who live in his region. (Interruption.) Furthermore, over two-thirds of the entire property is supposed to be in German hands.

"On the other hand I believe that I can provide the proof that we Prussians not merely *conquered* Poland *with our weapons* (!?) in 1815 but that we have conquered it a second time by our intelligence" (of which this session offers samples) "through 33 years of peace. (Interruption. The President asks Herr Bussmann not to digress from the question.) I am not opposed to a reorganisation; but the most sensible reorganisation would be a system of local government with election of officials. Such a measure combined with the Frankfurt decisions for the protection of all nationalities would offer Poland every guarantee. I am, however, very much opposed to the line of demarcation. (Interruption. A second reprimand.) Well, if I must not digress from the subject, I am against the committee because it is useless and provocative; incidentally,

^a The Polish name is Gniezno.—*Ed.*

I am not afraid of it and I shall support the committee if it comes to the point... (Interruption: He is therefore speaking in favour of it!) No, I am speaking against it.... Gentlemen, in order that you may at least understand why the insurrection came about I will explain to you in a few words...." (Interruption. Disagreement.)

Cieszkowski: "Don't interrupt! Let him finish speaking!"

President^a: "I am asking the speaker again to speak strictly to the question."

Bussmann: "I have spoken out against the idea of a committee and I have nothing further to add!"

With these angry words the enraged German-Polish lord of the manor leaves the rostrum and hurries back to his seat to the ringing laughter of the Assembly.

Herr *Heyne*, the deputy from the Bromberg district, tries to save the honour of his countrymen by voting for the committee. Nevertheless, he cannot refrain either from accusing the Poles of deceit, fraud etc.

Herr *Baumstark*, also a German Pole, is likewise against the committee. The reasons are always the same.

The Poles abstain from the discussion. Only Pokrzywnicki speaks for the committee. It is well known that the Poles have all along pressed for an investigation while it now becomes apparent that the German Poles, with one exception, have all protested against it.

Herr *Pohle* is so much a Pole that he regards all Posen as part of Germany and declares the border between Germany and Poland to be a "dividing wall running through Germany".

The defenders of the committee were mostly long-winded and their arguments betrayed little acumen. Just like their opponents, they repeated themselves over and over again. Their arguments were mostly of a hostile and trivial nature and much less entertaining than the biased protestations of the German Poles.

Tomorrow we shall come back to the attitude of the Ministers and officials in regard to this question and to the well-known question of competence.

Written by Engels on July 8, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 39, July 9, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a Wilhelm Grabow.—*Ed.*

THE MINISTERIAL CRISIS

Cologne, July 8.¹⁴⁷ With great tenacity, the *Hansemann* Ministry postpones its dissolution by a few days. The Finance Minister especially seems to be too patriotic to leave the administration of the exchequer in unskilled hands. From a parliamentary point of view the Ministry was dissolved, and yet it continues to exist in fact. It seems that it has been decided in Sanssouci to make one more attempt to prolong its life. The Agreement Assembly itself, on the point of administering the death blow to the Ministry at any moment, recoils the next, frightened by its own desires, and the majority seems to surmise that if the Hansemann Ministry is not yet a Ministry to its liking, a Ministry to its liking would at the same time be a Ministry of crisis and of decision. Hence its vacillations, its inconsistencies, its wanton invectives and its sudden turns to remorse. And the *Government of Action*, with unshakeable, almost cynical equanimity, accepts this borrowed, humiliating life which at any moment may be called into question and which only feeds on the alms of weakness.

Duchâtel! Duchâtel! The inevitable demise of the Ministry, laboriously postponed by only a few days, will be as inglorious as its existence. Tomorrow's edition^a will present to our readers a further contribution to the evaluation of this existence by our Berlin correspondent. We can summarise the agreement session of July 7 in a few words.^b The Assembly teases the Hansemann^c Ministry, it takes pleasure in inflicting partial defeats upon it; the Ministry bows its head half smiling, half frowning, but at the leave-taking, the High Assembly calls after it: "*No harm meant!*" and the stoic triumvirate *Hansemann-Kühlwetter-Milde* murmurs in response: *Pas si bête! Pas si bête!*^d

Written by Marx on July 8, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the special supplement to the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 39, July 9, 1848, and in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 40, July 10, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a The version printed in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 40 has: "Today's edition".— *Ed.*

^b For a more detailed report see this volume, pp. 216-22 and 226-31.— *Ed.*

^c In the original a play on the words *hänseln* (to tease) and Hansemann.— *Ed.*

^d We are not that stupid!— *Ed.*

THE AGREEMENT SESSION OF JULY 4

(SECOND ARTICLE)

Cologne, July 9. The series of articles^a based upon authentic documents, which we started three days ago, clearly show that the appointment of an investigation committee with unrestricted powers is an urgent and necessary act of justice towards the Poles.

The old-Prussian officials, who from the outset assumed a hostile attitude towards the Poles, saw their existence threatened by the promises of reorganisation. They sensed danger in the smallest act of justice towards the Poles. Hence the fanatical fury with which, supported by the unrestrained soldiery, they fell upon the Poles, broke the conventions, maltreated the most harmless people and permitted or sanctioned the greatest infamies merely to force the Poles to a fight in which the Poles were bound to be crushed by vastly superior forces.

The Camphausen Ministry, which was not only weak, perplexed and badly informed but remained *deliberately*, on principle, inactive, allowed everything to go its own way. The most horrifying barbarities were perpetrated, and Herr Camphausen did not stir.

What reports are now available on the civil war in Posen?

On the one hand there are the biased, slanted reports of the originators of this war: the officials and the officers, and the data based on their evidence which the Ministry can quote. The Ministry *itself* is biased as long as it includes Herr Hanseemann. These documents are biased, but they are *official*.

On the other hand there are the facts collected by the Poles, their written complaints to the Ministry, especially the letters of Arch-

^a [Ernst Dronke,] "Die preussische Pacificirung und Reorganisation Posens", *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* Nos. 38-40, July 8-10, 1848.—*Ed.*

bishop Przyłuski to the Ministers.^a These documents for the most part have no official character, but their authors are prepared to prove the truth of their statements.

The two kinds of reports totally contradict each other and the committee is supposed to investigate which side is right.

The committee, except in a few instances, can only do this by travelling to the spot in order to clear up at least the most significant points by the hearing of witnesses. If it is forbidden to do this, its entire activity becomes illusory. It may practise a certain historical-philological criticism and it may declare that one or another report is more trustworthy, but it will not be able to resolve anything.

Thus the entire importance of the committee depends on its authority to question witnesses, hence the eagerness of all the Polonophobes in the Assembly to remove this authority by all sorts of subtle and ingenious arguments, hence also the coup d'état at the end of the session.¹⁴⁸

Deputy *Bloem* said in the debate on the 4th [of July]:

“Does one genuinely seek the truth if, as a few amendments want it, the truth is to be derived from documents submitted by the Government? Most certainly not! Whence did the government documents originate? For the most part from the reports of officials. Whence did the officials originate? From the old system. Have these officials vanished? Have new *Landräte* been appointed through new, popular elections? By no means. Do the officials inform us about the true mood? The old officials report today just as they did formerly. It is, therefore, apparent that a mere examination of ministerial records will lead us nowhere.”

Deputy *Richter* goes even further. He sees in the behaviour of the Posen officials only the most extreme, but inevitable, result of the preservation of the old system of administration and the old officials in general. Similar conflicts between the duties and the interests of the old officials could also occur at any time in other provinces.

“Since the revolution we have had a new Ministry and even a second one but a Ministry is, of course, only the soul which has to set up a uniform organisation everywhere. In the provinces, however, the old administrative organisation has remained the same everywhere. Do you expect a different picture? One does not pour new wine into old rotten skins. Accordingly we have the most terrible complaints in the Grand Duchy. Should we not *therefore* form a committee even if only to show how very necessary it is in the other provinces as well as in Posen to replace the old organisation by a new one suited to the times and circumstances?”

Deputy *Richter* is right. After a revolution, the first necessity is to replace all civil and military officials as well as part of the judiciary,

^a Leon Przyłuski, [“Die Korrespondenz des Erzbischofs von Posen, Przyłuski, mit dem Berliner Kabinett”.] *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* Nos. 5, 7, 10, 14, 38 and 39, June 5, 7, 10 and 14, and July 8 and 9, 1848.— *Ed.*

and especially officials in the *Public Prosecutor's office*. Otherwise the best measures of the Central Authority fail through the obstinacy of subordinates. The weakness of the French Provisional Government and the weakness of the Camphausen Ministry are the bitter fruits of just such a situation.

In Prussia, however, where for forty years a thoroughly organised bureaucratic hierarchy has dominated the administration and the military with absolute force, in Prussia where that very same bureaucracy was the chief enemy that was vanquished on March 19, there the complete replacement of all civil and military officials was infinitely more urgent. The Government of mediation, of course, did not feel called upon to carry through revolutionary necessities. It had admittedly the task not to do anything and therefore left the real power for the time being in the hands of its old enemies, the bureaucrats. It "mediated" between the old bureaucracy and the new conditions. In return the bureaucracy through its "mediation" presented the Ministry with the civil war in Posen and the responsibility for barbarities such as have not occurred since the Thirty Years' War.¹⁴⁹

As heir to the Camphausen Ministry, the Hansemann Ministry was forced to take over all the assets and liabilities of its testator, that is not only the majority in the Chamber but also the events and officials in Posen. Thus the Ministry had a direct interest in making the committee's investigation as illusory as possible. The speakers representing the Ministry's majority, especially the jurists, used their entire stock of casuistry and sophistry to discover a profound, principled reason for prohibiting the committee from questioning witnesses. We would stray too far afield if we allowed ourselves to be involved here in admiring the jurisprudence of a Reichensperger etc. We have to limit ourselves to bringing to light the painstaking disquisition of Minister *Kühlwetter*.

Herr *Kühlwetter*, leaving entirely aside the material question, begins with the declaration that the Government would be extremely pleased if such committees were to assist it in performing its difficult task by clarifications etc. Indeed, if Herr Reuter had not had the fortunate idea of proposing such a committee,^a Herr *Kühlwetter* himself would undoubtedly have insisted upon it. One should give the committee the most far-reaching tasks (so that it may never finish its business); he entirely agreed that any scrupulous weighing of its actions was unnecessary. Let the committee include the entire past,

^a See this volume, pp. 57-61.— *Ed.*

present and future of the Province of Posen in the scope of its activity; the Ministry would not scrupulously examine the committee's competence insofar as it was only a question of clarifications. One could, of course, go too far, but he would leave it up to the wisdom of the committee whether it wanted to take into its scope, for example, the question of the dismissal of the Posen officials as well.

So much for the introductory concessions of the Minister which, embellished with a few philistine declamations, were given several vigorous cheers. However the "*buts*" were to follow.

"*But* since it has been remarked that the reports about Posen cannot possibly shed accurate light because they came only from *officials*, and moreover old-time officials, I consider it to be my duty to defend an honourable profession. If it be proved true that individual officials have neglected their duty, then let us punish the individuals who neglect their duty but *officialdom* as such must never be denigrated just because a few individuals have violated their duty."

What a bold stand Herr Kühlwetter has taken! To be sure a few individual violations of duty have taken place but on the whole the officials have done their duty honourably.

And, indeed, the mass of Posen officials *have* done their "duty", their "duty to their official oath", to the entire old-Prussian system of bureaucracy and to their own interests which concur with this duty. They have fulfilled their duty by using every means to destroy the 19th of March in Posen. It is exactly for that reason, Herr Kühlwetter, that it is your "duty" to dismiss these officials *en masse*.

But Herr Kühlwetter speaks of a duty which is determined by pre-revolutionary laws, whereas here it is a matter of an entirely different duty which arises after every revolution and which consists of interpreting correctly the altered conditions and of furthering their development. To ask of the officials to replace the bureaucratic with the constitutional standpoint and to support the revolution in the same way as the new Ministers, that means, according to Herr Kühlwetter, to denigrate an honourable profession.

Herr Kühlwetter also rejects the general accusation that favouritism was shown to party chiefs and that crimes remained unpunished. Specific cases should be cited.

Does Herr Kühlwetter perhaps maintain in all seriousness that even a small part of the brutalities and atrocities committed by the Prussian soldiery, tolerated and supported by the officials and cheered by the German Poles and Jews, have been punished? Herr Kühlwetter states that he has not yet been able to examine the colossal amount of material in all its aspects. Indeed, he seems at the most to have examined it in one aspect alone.

It is now that Herr Kühlwetter takes up “the most difficult and delicate question”, namely the *forms* in which the committee should transact its business. Herr Kühlwetter would have liked to have this question discussed more thoroughly, for,

“as has been rightly remarked, this question contains a question of principle, the question of the *droit d'enquête*”.^a

Herr Kühlwetter now blesses us with a longish discourse about the separation of powers in the state which surely contains much that is new for the Upper Silesian and Pomeranian peasants in the Assembly. To hear in the year of our Lord 1848 a Prussian Minister, and a “Minister of action” at that, solemnly interpreting Montesquieu from the rostrum makes a strange impression.

The separation of powers which Herr Kühlwetter and other great political philosophers regard with the deepest reverence as a sacred and inviolable principle is basically nothing but the profane industrial division of labour applied for purposes of simplification and control to the mechanism of the state. Just like all sacred, eternal and inviolable principles it is only applied as long as it suits existing conditions. Thus, for example, in a constitutional monarchy, the ruler possesses both legislative and executive power; in the Chambers, furthermore, legislative power mingles with control over executive power etc. This indispensable limitation on the division of labour in the state is expressed by political sages of the calibre of a “Minister of action” in the following manner:

“The legislative power, inasmuch as it is exercised by popular representation, has its own organs; the executive power has its own organs, and the judicial power no less so. It is *therefore* (!) inadmissible for one branch to lay claim to the organs of another unless such power has been transferred to it *by a special law*.”

A divergence from the separation of powers is inadmissible “unless” it is dictated “by a special law”. And the other way round: the application of the dictated separation of powers is similarly inadmissible “unless” it is dictated “by special laws”! What profundity! What revelations!

Herr Kühlwetter does not mention the case of a revolution where the separation of powers comes to an end without “a special law”.

Herr Kühlwetter now argues at great length that the authority of the committee to question witnesses under oath, to summon officials etc., in short, to see with *its own eyes*, is an infringement upon the separation of powers and must be established by a special law. As

^a The right of investigation.— *Ed.*

an example, the Belgian Constitution is cited, Article 40 of which expressly gives the Chambers the *droit d'enquête*.

But, Herr Kühlwetter, is there in Prussia legally and factually a separation of powers in the sense that you interpret it, i.e. in the constitutional sense? Is not the existing separation of powers the limited, trimmed one which corresponds to the *absolute*, the bureaucratic monarchy? How then can one use constitutional phrases for it before it has been reformed constitutionally? How can Prussia have an Article 40 of a Constitution as long as this Constitution itself does not yet exist at all?

Let us summarise. According to Herr Kühlwetter the appointment of a committee with unlimited authority is an infringement on the constitutional separation of powers. The constitutional separation of powers does not yet exist at all in Prussia; hence there can also be no infringement upon it.

It is supposed to be introduced, however, and according to Herr Kühlwetter it must be regarded as *already existing* during the provisional revolutionary state of affairs in which we live. If Herr Kühlwetter were right we would surely also have to presume the existence of constitutional *exceptions*! And these constitutional exceptions surely include the right of legislative bodies to carry out investigations!

But Herr Kühlwetter is by no means right. On the contrary: the provisional revolutionary state of affairs consists in the fact that the separation of powers has been provisionally *abolished* and that the legislative authority seizes executive power or that the executive authority seizes legislative power for the time being. It does not make any difference whether the revolutionary dictatorship (and it is a dictatorship no matter how feebly it is enforced) is in the hands of the Crown or of an Assembly or both. French history since 1789 provides plenty of examples of all three cases if Herr Kühlwetter wants them.

The provisional state of affairs to which Herr Kühlwetter appeals actually speaks against him. It gives the Assembly yet other attributes besides the mere right of investigation; it even empowers it, if need be, to transform itself into a *court of justice* and to judge without laws!

Had Herr Kühlwetter been able to foresee these results, he might perhaps have been more careful in speaking of the "recognition of the revolution".

But he may rest assured:

Germany, pious nursery,
Is not a Roman cutthroats' den,^a

^a Heinrich Heine, "Zur Beruhigung". In *Zeitgedichte*.—Ed.

and Messrs. the agreeers may sit as long as they like, they will never become a "Long Parliament".¹⁵⁰

We find, by the way, a significant difference when we compare the bureaucratic doctrinaire of the Government of Action with his doctrinaire predecessor, Herr Camphausen. Herr Camphausen, at any rate, possessed infinitely more originality. He almost approached Guizot whereas Herr Kühlwetter does not even reach the tiny Lord John Russell.

We have sufficiently admired the state philosophical wealth of Kühlwetter's oration. Let us now examine the purpose, the actual practical reason for this moss-covered wisdom, for this entire separation theory *à la Montesquieu*.

For Herr Kühlwetter now comes to the results of his theory. The Ministry, by way of exception, is inclined to instruct the authorities to comply with the requirements of the committee. It must, however, oppose the committee giving direct instructions to the authorities, i.e. the committee, which has no direct connection with the authorities and which has no power over them, cannot force them to convey other information to it than they consider appropriate. In addition there is the tedious routine and the endless hierarchy of appeals authorities! It is quite a pretty trick to render the committee illusory under the pretext of the separation of powers!

"It cannot be the intention to transfer to the committee the entire job of the Government!"

As if anybody intended giving the committee the right to *govern*!

"*In addition* to the committee, the Government would have to continue its inquiry into the underlying causes of dissension in Posen" (it is exactly because it has already "inquired" for such a long time without finding *out* anything that there is reason enough to exclude it now altogether from such an inquiry), "and since this purpose would be served by a double road there would often be unnecessary waste of time and effort and conflicts could hardly be avoided."

According to all hitherto existing precedents, the committee would certainly spend much "unnecessary time and effort" if it were to agree to Herr Kühlwetter's proposal for the protracted hierarchy of appeals authorities. In this way, conflicts would also occur much more easily than if the committee were to deal directly with the authorities and could immediately clear up misunderstandings as well as put down bureaucratic obduracy.

"It seems *therefore* (!) to be in the nature of things that the committee will seek to achieve its purpose in *agreement* with the Ministry and with its *constant co-operation*."

It gets better and better! A committee which is supposed to control the Ministry is also supposed to work in agreement with it

and with its constant co-operation! Herr Kühlwetter is not at all embarrassed to let it be known that he would find it desirable to have the committee under his control and not the other way round.

"If, on the other hand, the committee should want to assume an isolated position, the question must arise whether the committee wants to and is able to assume the responsibility which rests with the Government. It has already been observed with as much truth as intelligence that the inviolability of the deputies is incompatible with this responsibility."

The question is not one of administration but merely of establishing facts. The committee is to receive the authority to employ the means necessary for this purpose. That is all. It goes without saying that the committee will be responsible to the Assembly for either the neglect or the excessive use of these means.

The whole matter has as little to do with ministerial responsibility and deputies' irresponsibility as with "truth" and "intelligence".

In short, under the pretext of the separation of powers Herr Kühlwetter warmly recommends these proposals to the agreeers for the solution of the conflict without, however, making a precise proposal. The Government of Action feels that it stands on uncertain ground.

We cannot go into the debate which ensued. The results of the voting are known: the defeat of the Government in the roll-call vote and the coup d'état of the Right which adopted a motion after it had already been defeated. We have already reported all that.^a We only add that among the Rhinelanders who voted *against* giving unlimited authority to the committee we noticed the names of:

Arntz, LL. D., Bauerband, Frencken, Lensing, von Loe, Reichensperger II, Simons and last but not least our Chief Public Prosecutor *Zweiffel*.

Written by Engels on July 9, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 41, July 11, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a See this volume, p. 188.— *Ed.*

LEGAL PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE *NEUE*
RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG

Cologne, July 10. Yesterday *eleven* compositors of our newspaper as well as Herr Clouth were summoned to appear as witnesses before the examining magistrate on Tuesday, July 11. It is still a question of finding the author of the incriminatory article.^a We recall that at the time of the old *Rheinische Zeitung*, the time of the censorship and the Arnim Government, when they tried to find out who had sent in the famous "Marriage Bill",¹⁵¹ there were neither house searches nor were examinations of compositors and the printshop owner resorted to. In the meantime, of course, we have experienced a revolution which had the misfortune to be recognised by Herr Hansemann.

We have to revert once again to the July 5 "rejoinder" of Public Prosecutor *Hecker*.^b

In this rejoinder Herr Hecker accuses us of *lying* with respect to one or another remark which we ascribed to him. Perhaps we have now the means at our disposal to correct the correction, but who will vouch that during this unequal battle we will not once again be answered with Paragraph 222 or Paragraph 367 of the Penal Code?

Herr *Hecker's* rejoinder ends with the following words:

"The *defamations and insults* contained in this article" (dated *Cologne*, July 4), "directed against Chief Public Prosecutor Zweifel and the police who carried out the arrest, will be *evaluated* in the *legal proceedings* which will be initiated on this count."

Evaluation! Have the *black-red-gold* colours been "*evaluated*" in the "legal proceedings" which were initiated by the *Kamptz* Government?¹⁵²

^a See this volume, pp. 177-79.— *Ed.*

^b *Ibid.*, p. 186. In the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*: "July 6", which is a misprint.— *Ed.*

Let us consult the Penal Code.¹⁵³ Paragraph 367 reads:

"Whosoever at public places ... or in an authentic and public document, or in a printed or unprinted piece of writing which has been posted, sold or distributed, accuses someone of facts which, *if they were true,*^a could result in the prosecution of the accused in a criminal or police court, or merely expose him to the contempt and hatred of his fellow citizens, is guilty of the offence of defamation."

Paragraph 370: "If the fact which forms the subject of the accusation should, after *due process of law*, prove to be true, then the originator of the accusation shall go free of all punishment. Only proof which is derived from a *verdict* or some other *authentic document* is regarded as *legal*."

In order to elucidate this paragraph we shall still add Paragraph 368:

"Consequently it will be *of no avail* to the originator of the accusation to *plead* in his defence that *he will undertake to provide proof*; nor can he enter the *plea* that the *documents or the facts are notorious* or that the accusations which gave rise to the prosecution were copied or extracted from foreign papers or *other printed matter*."

The imperial era with all its crafty despotism radiates from these paragraphs.

According to *ordinary* human understanding, somebody is *defamed* if he is charged with fictitious evidence. According to the *extraordinary* understanding of the Penal Code, however, he is defamed if he is charged with *real* facts that can be *proved* but not in an *exceptional* manner, not by a *verdict* or by an *official document*. Oh for the miraculous power of verdicts and official documents! Only facts which have been *judged in court*, only *officially documented* facts are *true* and *genuine* facts. Has there ever been a penal code which has more maliciously *defamed* the most ordinary common sense? Has any bureaucracy ever thrown up a similar Chinese Wall between itself and the public? Covered with the shield of this paragraph, officials and deputies are *immune* like constitutional kings. These gentlemen may *commit* as many facts as they deem proper "which will expose them to the hatred and contempt of their fellow citizens", but these facts must not be pronounced, written or printed on penalty of loss of civil rights in addition to the inevitable prison sentence and fine. Long live the freedom of the press and free speech moderated by Paragraphs 367, 368 and 370! You are arrested illegally. The press denounces this illegality. *Result*: the denunciation is "*evaluated*" in "legal proceedings" because of the "defamation" of the venerable official who has committed the illegality, unless a miracle occurs and a *verdict* has already been rendered yesterday about the illegality which he commits today.

^a All italics in the quotations from the Penal Code are by Marx.—*Ed.*

No wonder that the Rhenish jurists, among them the *people's representative Zweifel*, voted against a *Polish commission* with absolute authority! From their point of view, the Poles ought to have been sentenced to loss of their civil rights and also mandatory imprisonment and fine because of their "*defamation*" of Colomb, Steinäcker, Hirschfeld, Schleinitz, the Pomeranian army reserve and the old-Prussian police. Thus this peculiar pacification of Posen would be most gloriously crowned.

And what a contradiction it is to use these paragraphs of the Penal Code in order to label the rumour of the threat of getting rid of "March 19, the clubs and freedom of the press" a "*defamation*"! ^a As if the use of Paragraphs 367, 368 and 370 of the Penal Code against political speeches and writings were not the real definitive destruction of March 19, clubs and freedom of the press! What is a club without freedom of speech? And what is freedom of speech with Paragraphs 367, 368 and 370 of the Penal Code? And what is March 19 without clubs and freedom of speech? The suppression of freedom of speech and the press in *deed*: is there a more striking proof that only *defamation* could tell fables about the *intention* of this deed? Beware of signing the address which was drawn up yesterday at the Gürzenich Hall.¹⁵⁴ The Public Prosecutor's office would "*appreciate*" your address by initiating "*legal proceedings*" on the count of the "*defamation*" of *Hansemann* and *Auerswald*. Or may only *Ministers* be defamed with impunity, defamed in the sense of the French Penal Code, that code of political slavery carved in such a pithy style? Do we have responsible Ministers and irresponsible policemen?

Thus it is not that the incriminatory article can be *evaluated* by the use of the paragraphs on "*defamation in a juridical sense*", a defamation in the sense of *despotic fiction* which is an outrage to common sense. All that can thereby be evaluated are purely and simply the accomplishments of the March revolution, that is the height reached by the counter-revolution and the recklessness with which the bureaucracy may revive and enforce weapons still to be found in the arsenal of the old legislation against the new political life. This use of the calumny paragraphs in attacks upon the *people's representatives* is a marvellous method of shielding these gentlemen from criticism and of depriving the press of the protection of the jury system.

Let us now pass from the charge of *defamation* to the charge of *insult*. Here Paragraph 222 is applicable; it reads as follows:

^a See this volume, p. 179.—*Ed.*

“If one or more officials from the administrative or judicial authorities *during the exercise of their official duties* or *as a result of these duties* suffer any *verbal* insults which aim at an attack upon their honour or delicacy of feeling, the person who insults them in this way shall be punished with imprisonment of from one month to two years.”

When the article appeared in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, Herr Zweifel was acting as *people’s representative in Berlin* and by no means as an *official of the judicial authorities in Cologne*. It was indeed impossible to insult him in the exercise of his official duties or as a result of these duties since he was not performing any official duties. The honour and delicacy of feeling of the gentlemen of the police, however, could only then come under the protection of this article if they had been insulted *in words (par parole)*. We have *written*, however, and not *spoken*, and *par écrit* is not *par parole*. Thus, what is there left to do? The moral is to speak with more circumspection of the lowest of policemen than of the foremost of princes and in particular not to take liberties with the most irritable gentlemen of the Public Prosecutor’s office. We remind the public once more that *similar* prosecutions have been started simultaneously in different places such as Cologne, Düsseldorf and Koblenz. What a strange method of coincidence!

Written by Marx on July 10, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 41, July 11, 1848

Published in English for the first time

GERMAN FOREIGN POLICY
AND THE LATEST EVENTS IN PRAGUE

Cologne, July 11. Despite the patriotic shouting and beating of the drums of almost the entire German press, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* from the very first moment has sided with the Poles in Posen, the Italians in Italy, and the Czechs in Bohemia. From the very first moment we saw through the machiavellian policy which, shaking in its foundations in the interior of Germany, sought to paralyse democratic energies, to deflect attention from itself, to dig conduits for the fiery lava of the revolution and forge the weapon of suppression within the country by calling forth a narrow-minded *national hatred* which runs counter to the cosmopolitan character of the Germans, and in national wars of unheard-of atrocity and indescribable barbarity trained a brutal soldiery such as could hardly be found even in the Thirty Years' War.¹⁵⁵

What deep plot it is to let the Germans under the command of their governments undertake a crusade against the freedom of Poland, Bohemia and Italy at the same moment that they are struggling with these same governments to obtain freedom at home! What an historical paradox! Gripped by revolutionary ferment, Germany seeks relief in a *war of restoration*, in a campaign for the consolidation of the old authority *against* which she has just revolted. Only a *war against Russia* would be a war of *revolutionary Germany*, a war by which she could cleanse herself of her past sins, could take courage, defeat her own autocrats, spread civilisation by the sacrifice of her own sons as becomes a people that is shaking off the chains of long, indolent slavery and make herself free within her borders by bringing liberation to those outside.

The more the light of publicity reveals in sharp outlines the most recent events, the more facts confirm our view of the national wars

by which Germany has dishonoured her new era. As a contribution to this enlightenment we publish the following report by a *German* in Prague even though it reached us belatedly:

Prague, June 24, 1848 (delayed)

The *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* of the 22nd [of this month] contains an article^a about the assembly of Germans held in Aussig^b on the 18th [of this month] in which speeches were made which show such ignorance of our recent events and, in part, to put it mildly, such a willingness to heap abusive accusations upon our independent press that [this] writer considers it his duty to correct these errors as far as this is now possible and to confront these thoughtless and malicious persons with the firmness of truth. It comes as a surprise when a man like "the founder of the League to Preserve German Interests in the East"^c exclaims before an entire assembly: "There can be no talk of forgiveness so long as the battle in Prague continues and, should the victory be ours, we must make full use of it in future." What victory then have the Germans achieved and what conspiracy then has been crushed? Whoever, of course, lends credence to the correspondent of the *Deutsche Allgemeine*, who, it seems, is always only superficially informed, and whoever trusts the pathetic catchwords of "a small-time Polonophobe and Francophobe" or the articles of the perfidious *Frankfurter Journal* which seeks to incite Germans against Bohemians just as it stirred up Germans against Germans during the events in Baden, such a person will never obtain a clear view of the situation here. Everywhere in Germany the opinion seems to prevail that the battle in the streets of Prague was aimed solely at the suppression of the German element and the founding of a Slav republic. We will not even discuss the latter suspicion, for it is too naive; in regard to the former, however, not the smallest trace of a rivalry between nationalities could be observed during the fighting on the barricades. Germans and Czechs stood side by side ready for defence, and I myself frequently requested a Czech-speaking person to repeat what he had said in German, which was always done without the slightest remark. One hears it said that the outbreak of the revolution came two days too early; this would imply that there must already have been a certain degree of organisation and at least provisions made for the supply of ammunition; however, there was no trace of this either. The barricades grew out of the ground in a haphazard way wherever ten to twelve people happened to be together; incidentally, it would have been impossible to raise any more barricades, for even the smallest alleys contained three or four of them. The ammunition was mutually exchanged in the streets and was exceedingly sparse. There was no question whatsoever of a supreme command or of any other kind of command. The defenders stayed where they were being attacked and fired without direction and without command from houses and barricades. No thought of a conspiracy could have had any foundation in such an unguided and unorganised resistance, unless this is suggested by some official declaration and publication of the results of an investigation. The Government, however, does not seem to find this appropriate, for nothing has transpired from the castle that might enlighten Prague about its bloody June days. With the exception of a few, the imprisoned members of the Svornost¹⁵⁶ have all been released again. Other prisoners are also being released, only Count

^a "Aussig, 18. Juni", *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, supplement to No. 174, June 22, 1848.— *Ed.*

^b The Czech name is Usti.— *Ed.*

^c Johann Wuttke.— *Ed.*

Buquoy, Villány and a few others are still under arrest, and one fine morning we will perhaps read a poster on the walls of Prague according to which it was all based on a misunderstanding. The operations of the commanding general do not suggest protection of Germans against Czechs either; for in that case, instead of winning the German population to his side by explaining the situation to them, storming the barricades and protecting the life and property of the "loyal" inhabitants of the city, he evacuates the Old City, moves to the left bank of the Moldau^a and shoots down Czechs and Germans alike; for the bombs and bullets that flew into the Old City could not possibly seek out only Czechs, they mowed people down without looking at the cockade. How can one rationally deduce a Slav conspiracy when the Government up to now has been unable or unwilling to give any clarification?

Dr. Göschen, a citizen of Leipzig, has drawn up a letter of thanks to Prince von Windischgrätz, to which the general should not ascribe too much importance as an expression of the popular voice. Citizen Göschen is one of those circumspect liberals who suddenly turned liberal after the February days; he was the initiator of a letter of confidence to the Saxon Government concerning the electoral law while the whole of Saxony cried out in indignation, for one-sixth of her inhabitants, especially some of her more able citizens, thereby lost their first civil right, the right to vote; he is one of those who spoke out emphatically in the German League against the admission of German non-Saxons to the election in Saxony and—listen to the double-dealing—who shortly afterwards in the name of his club promised to the League of the non-Saxon German citizens who reside in Saxony complete co-operation in the election of a deputy of its own for Frankfurt. In short, to characterise him in a word: he is the founder of the German League. This man has addressed a letter of thanks to the Austrian general and thanked him for the protection which he allegedly bestowed upon the entire German fatherland. I believe that I have shown that the events do not as yet prove at all to what extent, if any, Prince von Windischgrätz has deserved well of the German fatherland. Only the result of the investigation will determine that. We will, therefore, leave the "high courage, the bold enterprise and firm endurance" of the general to the judgment of history. As for the expression "cowardly assassination" in regard to the death of the Princess^b we will only mention that it has by no means been proved that that bullet was intended for the Princess who had enjoyed the undivided respect of all Prague. If it should be the case, however, the murderer will not escape his punishment, and the grief of the Prince was surely no greater than that of the mother who saw her nineteen-year-old daughter, also an innocent victim, carried off with a shattered skull. I am in complete agreement with Citizen Göschen concerning the passage in the address which speaks of "brave bands that fought so gallantly under your leadership", for if he had been able to observe, as I did, the warlike vehemence with which these "brave bands" rushed upon the defenceless crowd in the Zeltner Lane on Monday at noon, he would have found his expressions much too weak. Much as it hurts my military vanity, I have to admit that I myself, peacefully strolling among a group of women and children near the temple, allowed thirty to forty royal and imperial grenadiers to put myself to flight together with these people and so effectively that I had to leave my entire baggage, i.e. my hat, in the hands of the victors, for I considered it unnecessary to wait for the beatings, which were being administered to the crowd behind me, to reach me as well. I had the opportunity, nevertheless, to observe that six hours later at the Zeltner Lane barricade these same royal and imperial grenadiers thought it proper to fire for half an hour with canister-shot and six-pounders at this barricade which was defended by at most

^a The Czech name is Vltava.— *Ed.*

^b Maria Eleonora Windischgrätz.— *Ed.*

twenty men, and then not to take it, however, until it was abandoned by its defenders around midnight. There was no hand-to-hand fighting except in a few instances where the superior strength was on the side of the grenadiers. To judge by the devastation of the houses, the Graben and the Neue Allee were largely cleared by artillery, and I leave it open whether or not it takes great defiance of death to clear a broad avenue of a hundred barely armed defenders with canister-shot.

Concerning the most recent speech by Dr. Stradal from Teplitz^a according to which "the Prague newspapers are acting for foreign interests", that is presumably Russian, I declare in the name of the independent press of Prague that this comment is either an abundance of ignorance or an infamous calumny whose absurdity has been and will be sufficiently proved by the attitude of our newspapers. Prague's free press has never defended any other goal than the preservation of Bohemia's independence and the equal rights of both nationalities. It knows, however, very well that German reaction is seeking to rouse a narrow-minded nationalism just as in Posen and in Italy, partly *in order to suppress the revolution in the interior of Germany* and partly to *train the soldiery for civil war*.

Written on July 11, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 42, July 12, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a The Czech name is Teplice.— *Ed.*

THE AGREEMENT DEBATES OF JULY 7

Cologne, July 12. It was not until late last night that we received the report about the agreement session of July 7. The stenographic reports, which usually arrived here not more than 24 hours after the epistolary reports, are constantly arriving later instead of earlier.

How easily this delay could be remedied is demonstrated by the speed with which the French and English newspapers carry the reports of their legislative assemblies. The sessions of the English Parliament often last until four o'clock in the morning and yet four hours later the stenographic report of the session is printed in *The Times* and distributed to all parts of London. The French Chamber, which seldom began its sessions before one o'clock, terminated them between five and six and yet already around seven o'clock the *Moniteur* had to deliver a copy of the deliberations taken down in shorthand to all Paris newspaper offices. Why cannot the praiseworthy *Staats-Anzeiger* get ready just as quickly?

Let us now turn to the session of the 7th, the session during which the Hansemann Ministry was teased. We shall pass over the protests which were submitted immediately at the start, d'Ester's motion concerning the repeal of the decision adopted towards the end of the session of the 4th^a (this motion remained on the agenda) and several other motions which were on the agenda. We shall begin right away with the questions and the disagreeable motions which today were raining down upon the Ministry.

Herr *Philipps* was the first to speak. He asked the Ministry what measures had been taken to protect our borders against Russia.

^a See this volume, p. 207.— *Ed.*

Herr *Auerswald*: I do not consider this question suitable for an answer in this Assembly.

We very readily believe Herr *Auerswald*. The only reply that he could possibly give would be "*None*", or, if you want to be precise: the transfer of several regiments from the Russian frontier to the Rhine. The only thing that surprises us is that the Assembly allowed this amusing reply of Herr *Auerswald*, this appeal to the *car tel est notre bon plaisir*,^a to pass, without much ado, with merely some hissing and cheering.

Herr *Borries* proposes that the graduated income tax of the lowest tax level should be remitted for the last six months of 1848 and that all coercive measures to collect the arrears for the first six months at the same level should be discontinued immediately.

The motion goes to the relevant committee.

Herr *Hansemann* rises and declares that such financial matters ought to be very thoroughly examined. One could, incidentally, wait the more readily as next week he proposes to table several financial Bills among which will be one referring to the graduated income tax.

Herr *Krause* asks the Minister of Finance whether it would be possible to replace the milling and slaughter taxes as well as the graduated income tax with an income tax by the beginning of 1849.

Herr *Hansemann* has to get up again and declare irritably that he had already stated that he will table the financial Bills next week.

But his ordeal is not yet over. Only now Herr *Grebel* rises and submits a lengthy motion every word of which must be a stab through Herr *Hansemann's* heart:

Considering that it was by no means sufficient to motivate the prospective compulsory loan by merely asserting that the treasury and finances were exhausted;

Considering that for the debate on the compulsory loan itself (against which Herr *Grebel* protests as long as a Constitution is not in force which fulfils all promises) an examination of all books and records of the state budget was necessary, Herr *Grebel* submits:

that a committee be appointed which will inspect all books and records concerning the administration of the finances and the treasury since 1840 and report on the matter.

But even worse than Herr *Grebel's* motion are his arguments in support of it. He mentions the many rumours about the squandering and unlawful spending of the state treasury that alarm public

^a Because this is our will (the closing phrase of royal edicts introduced by Louis XI).— *Ed.*

opinion. In the interest of the people, he demands to know where all the money has gone that it has paid during 30 years of peace. He declares that the Assembly could not vote a single penny as long as such an explanation is not given. The compulsory loan has created an enormous sensation. The compulsory loan condemns the entire hitherto existing financial administration. The compulsory loan is the penultimate step towards the bankruptcy of the state. The compulsory loan surprised us all the more since we were accustomed to hear constantly that the financial situation was excellent and that the state treasury would make unnecessary any loan even in the case of an important war. Herr Hansemann himself had estimated at the United Diet that the state funds must amount to at least 30 million. This, of course, was only to be expected since not only were the same high taxes paid as during the war years, but the amount of the taxes was constantly increasing.

Then, suddenly, there came the news of the intended compulsory loan and with that, with this painful disappointment, confidence sank at once to zero.

The only means of restoring confidence was the immediate, unreserved explanation of the financial situation of the state.

Herr Hansemann, to be sure, had attempted to sweeten the bitter pill of his communication on the compulsory loan by a humorous address; but he had nevertheless to admit that a compulsory loan would produce an unpleasant impression.

Herr *Hansemann* answers: It goes without saying that if the Ministry requests money, it will also give all the necessary information as to how the money that has so far been raised was spent. You should wait until I submit the financial Bills which I have already mentioned twice. As to the rumours, it is incorrect that the state treasury contained enormous sums and that they have been reduced during recent years. It is natural that an excellent financial position should have been transformed into a critical one, considering the recent years of distress and the current political crisis which goes hand in hand with unprecedented economic stagnation.

"It has been stated that the compulsory loan will be a precursor of the state's bankruptcy. No, gentlemen, it *must* not be that. On the contrary, it *must* serve the *invigoration of credit*."

(It *must*, it *must*, as if the effect of the compulsory loan upon credit depends upon the pious wishes of Herr Hansemann!) How unfounded these apprehensions are is shown by the rise of the government securities. Gentlemen, wait for the financial Bills which I am herewith promising you for the fourth time.

(Hence the credit of the Prussian state is in such bad shape that no

capitalist will advance money even at usurious rates of interest and Herr Hansemann sees no other alternative than the compulsory loan, the last resort of bankrupt states. And all the while Herr Hansemann speaks of rising state credit because the government stocks have laboriously crept upward by two to three per cent to the same extent that March 18 has receded! And how the stocks will tumble when the compulsory loan is put into effect!)

Herr *Behnsch* urges the appointment of the proposed financial investigation committee.

Herr *Schramm*: The relief of want from state funds was not worth mentioning and if freedom has cost *us* money, it has up to now certainly not cost the *Government* anything. On the contrary, the Government has rather spent money in order that freedom may not advance to its present state.

Herr *Mütze*: In addition to our knowledge that there was nothing left in the state treasury, we are now being informed that it has been empty for a long time. This piece of news is new proof of the need to appoint a committee.

Herr *Hansemann* has to get up once more:

"I have never said that there is nothing and that there has not been anything in the state treasury. On the contrary, I declare that the state treasury has significantly increased during the past six to seven years."

(Compare Herr Hansemann's memorandum to the United Diet with the speech from the throne and now we shall all the less know where we stand.)

Cieszkowski: I am in favour of Grebel's motion because Herr Hansemann keeps making us promises and yet every time when financial matters come up for debate, he refers us to elucidations that *he* will make in the near future but that are never given. This dilatoriness is the more incomprehensible as Herr Hansemann has now been a Minister for over three months.

Herr *Milde*, the Minister of Trade, at last comes to the aid of his hard pressed colleague. He implores the Assembly not to appoint the committee. He promises the greatest frankness on the part of the Ministry. He protests that it will be given a detailed account of the state of affairs. But now the Government should be left alone, for at the moment it is busy steering the ship of state out of the difficulties in which it finds itself at present. The Assembly will surely lend a helping hand. (Cheers.)

Herr *Baumstark*, too, attempts to some extent to come to Herr Hansemann's aid. The Minister of Finance, however, could not have found a worse and more tactless defender:

"It would be a *bad* Minister of Finance who attempted to conceal the financial situation, and if a Minister of Finance says that he will make the necessary submissions we must either consider him an *honest man or the contrary* (!!!). (Commotion.) Gentlemen, I have not insulted anybody. I have said if a Minister of Finance, not if the Minister of Finance (!!!)."

Reichenbach: What has happened to the wonderful days of the great debates, of questions of principle and of confidence? In those days Herr Hansemann longed for nothing more than to be able to enter the fray and now, when he has the opportunity to do so, and in his own field at that, he is evasive! Indeed, the Ministers keep making promises and establishing principles for the sole purpose of violating them a few hours later. (Commotion.)

Herr *Hansemann* waits to see whether anyone will rise to defend him, but there is no one to speak for him. At last he sees with horror that Deputy Baumstark is rising and in order to prevent him from labelling him once again as an "honest man", he quickly takes the floor himself.

We expect the tormented Lion Duchâtel, pricked by needles and tugged by the whole opposition, to rise to his full stature, to crush his opponents, in short, to ask for a *vote of confidence in the Government*. Alas, there is nothing left of his original firmness and daring, and the old greatness has all melted away just like the state treasury during the hard times! The great financier stands bent, broken and misunderstood; things have come to such a pass that he has to give *reasons*! And what reasons, to boot!

"Anybody who concerns himself with financial affairs and the many *figures* (!) which occur in them, knows that a thorough discussion of financial matters is not possible on the occasion of a question, that the problems of taxation are so comprehensive that legislative assemblies have spent days and even weeks debating them" (Herr Hansemann thinks of his brilliant speeches in the erstwhile United Diet).

But who is demanding a thorough discussion? What has been requested of Herr Hansemann first of all has been an answer, a simple yes or no, concerning the question of taxes. Furthermore, he has been asked for his approval of a committee to investigate the administration of the state treasury etc. up to now. When he refused both, reference was made to the contrast between his former promises and his present reticence.

The committee should start its work immediately precisely because it takes time "to discuss financial affairs and the many figures which occur in them".

"I had good reasons, by the way, for not raising financial matters at an earlier date since I believed that it would be better for the country's position if I waited a little longer. I had hoped that the peace of the country and with it the state credit would

somewhat increase. I do not want to see these hopes disappointed and it is my conviction that *I did well not to table these Bills at an earlier date.*"

What disclosures! Herr Hansemann's financial Bills which were supposed to shore up the state credit are of such a nature that they are a threat to the state credit!

Herr Hansemann deemed it better to keep the financial situation of the country a secret for the time being!

If the state finds itself in such a situation, it is irresponsible of Herr Hansemann to make such a vague statement instead of immediately presenting the state of the finances frankly and, by letting the facts speak for themselves, vanquish all doubts and rumours. In the English Parliament, such a tactless utterance would immediately be followed by a vote of no confidence.

Herr Siebert:

"Up to now we have done nothing. All important questions, as soon as they matured for solution, were broken off and pushed aside. We have not yet made a single decision which contained anything in its *entirety*, we have not completed anything. Shall we once more proceed in this fashion today and postpone answering the question merely on the basis of promises? Who can guarantee that the *Ministry will remain at the helm for another week?*"

Herr *Parrisius* moves an amendment according to which Herr Hansemann is called upon to present within a fortnight the necessary documents on the administration of the finances and the treasury from the year 1840 to an auditing committee of 16 members to be elected immediately. Herr *Parrisius* explains that this is a special mandate from his electorate: they want to know what has happened to the state funds which had amounted to over 40 million in 1840.

Surely this amendment, which is stronger than the original motion, will sting the weary Duchâtel into action! Surely he will now put the question of confidence in the Government!

On the contrary! Herr Hansemann who *opposed* the motion has no objections whatsoever to this amendment with its insulting time limit! He merely observes that the matter will require an astonishing amount of time and expresses his sympathy for the unfortunate members of the committee who will have to take on this laborious task.

There follows a debate about the voting during which a few more unpleasant comments are made concerning Herr Hansemann. Then the vote is taken, the various motivated and unmotivated demands to proceed to the order of the day are rejected and the *Parrisius* amendment, which is supported by Herr Grebel, is almost unanimously adopted.

Herr Hanseemann escaped a decisive defeat only by his lack of resistance and the self-abnegation with which he accepted Parrisius' insult. Bent, broken and destroyed he sat on his bench like a defoliated tree that arouses the compassion of even the most cruel mockery. Let us remember the words of the poet:

It ill beseems the sons
Of Germany to mock the fallen
Great with heartless puns!^a

The second half of the session will be reported tomorrow.

Written by Engels on July 12, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 44, July 14, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a Heinrich Heine, "Der Tambourmajor". In *Zeitgedichte*.—Ed.

HERR FORSTMANN ON THE STATE CREDIT

Cologne, July 13. During the agreement session of the 7th [of this month], Herr *Forstmann* knocked down all doubts of the unprincipled Left concerning the imperturbability of the Prussian state credit by the following irrefutable argument:

“Please decide whether the confidence in Prussia’s finances sank to zero when yesterday on the Stock Exchange a $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent government security stood at 72 per cent while the rate of discount was $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.”

One can see that Herr Forstmann is no more a speculator on the Stock Exchange than he is an economist. If Herr Forstmann’s hypothesis that the price of government securities stands always in an inverse relationship to the price of money were correct, then the quotations of the Prussian $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent securities would indeed be unusually favourable. In that case, with a discount rate of $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, they should be listed not at 72 per cent but only at $63\frac{7}{11}$. But who has told Herr Forstmann that this inverse relationship exists at every particular moment of a business slump and not as an average over 5 to 10 years.

On what does the price of money depend? It depends on the relationship of supply and demand at a given time and upon the currently existing scarcity or abundance of money. On what does the scarcity or abundance of money depend? It depends on the state of industry at the particular time and on the stagnation or prosperity of commerce in general.

On what does the price of government securities depend? It depends likewise on the relationship of supply and demand at the time. But on what does this relationship depend? It depends on many circumstances, which in Germany, in particular, are extremely complicated.

State credit is of decisive importance in France, England, Spain and in general in those countries whose government securities are traded on the *world market*. State credit plays a secondary role in Prussia and the smaller German states whose securities are quoted only on the small local exchanges. Here most government securities are not used for speculation but for the safe investment of capital and to secure a fixed *rent*. Only a disproportionately small part reaches the stock exchanges and is traded. Almost the entire national debt is in the hands of small pensioners, widows and orphans, boards of guardians, etc. A fall of the exchange quotations due to the decrease of the state credit is an additional reason for this type of state creditors *not* to sell their stocks. The interest is just enough for them to get by. If they sell these stocks at a heavy loss, they are ruined. The small number of securities which circulates on the few small local exchanges cannot, of course, be subject to the enormous and rapid fluctuations of supply and demand, of rise and fall like the enormous mass of French, Spanish etc. securities which are mainly designed for speculation and are traded on all the world's great stock exchanges in large quantities.

Hence it happens only rarely in Prussia that capitalists, through lack of money, are forced to sell their bonds at any price and thereby push down the exchange prices, while in Paris, Amsterdam etc. that is an everyday occurrence, which particularly after the February revolution affected the incredibly rapid fall of the French government securities much more than the diminished state credit.

In addition, fictitious purchases (*marchés à terme*),¹⁵⁷ which make up the bulk of the stock exchange transactions in Paris, Amsterdam etc., are *prohibited* in Prussia.

This entirely different commercial position of the Prussian securities based on local exchanges and the French, English, Spanish etc. securities which are traded on the world market, explains the fact that the prices of the Prussian securities do not reflect the most minute political complications of their state in anything like the measure in which this is the case with French etc. securities, that the state credit has not by a long shot the decisive and rapid influence on the market price of the Prussian stocks that it has upon the securities of other states.

In the measure in which Prussia and the small German states are pulled into the maelstrom of European politics and in which the domination of the bourgeoisie is developing, in the same measure government securities, just like landed property, will lose this patriarchal, inalienable character, will be drawn into circulation, become an ordinary, frequently exchanged article of commerce, and

perhaps even be allowed to lay claim to a modest existence on the world market.

Let us draw from these facts the following conclusions:

Firstly: It is not contested that the market price of government securities will *on average over a lengthy period* rise everywhere in the same ratio as the rate of interest falls and vice versa, given that the state credit remains unchanged.

Secondly: In France, England etc. this ratio prevails even during shorter periods because there the speculators own the largest part of the government securities and because, due to shortage of money, people are frequently compelled to sell and this governs the daily ratio between the exchange price and the rate of interest. Hence, this ratio often really prevails even at a particular moment.

Thirdly: In Prussia, on the other hand, this ratio exists only on average over relatively long periods because the amount of disposable government securities is small and the stock exchange business is limited; because sales due to shortage of money, which actually govern this relation, occur only rarely; because the prices of securities at these local stock exchanges are primarily determined by local influences whereas the price of money is determined by the influence of the world market.

Fourthly: If thus Herr Forstmann wants to draw conclusions for the Prussian state credit from the ratio of the price of money to the market price of the government securities, he only proves his total ignorance of these relations. The quotation of 72 for the $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent stocks, with a discount rate of $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, demonstrates *nothing in favour of* the Prussian state credit, and the compulsory loan speaks *entirely against* it.

Written on July 13, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 44, July 14, 1848

Published in English for the first time

THE AGREEMENT DEBATES

Cologne, July 14. Today we come to the second half of the agreement session of the 7th [of this month]. After the debate about the financial committee, which was so painful for Herr Hansemann, there occurred yet another series of small woes for the ministerial gentlemen. It was a day of urgent motions and questions, of attacks on and embarrassment for the Ministry.

Deputy *Wander* proposed that any official who orders the unjust arrest of a citizen should be obliged to make full reparation and besides should be jailed for a period four times as long as the person he arrested.

The motion, as not urgent, is sent to the relevant committee.

Minister of Justice *Märker* declares that the adoption of this motion would not only fail to strengthen the legislation hitherto in force against officials who carry out unlawful arrests, but that it would actually weaken this legislation. (Cheers.)

The Minister of Justice only forgot to observe that according to the laws hitherto in force, particularly the old Prussian Law, it is *hardly possible* for an official to arrest anybody *unlawfully*. The most arbitrary arrest may be justified by the paragraphs of the most time-honoured Prussian Law.

We want to call attention, by the way, to the most unparliamentary method which the Ministers have fallen into the habit of using. They wait until a motion is *referred* to the relevant committee or section and then they still continue to discuss it. They are then certain that *nobody* can *answer* them. Thus Herr Hansemann acted in the case of Herr Borries' motion^a and now Herr Märker follows suit.

^a See this volume, p. 217.— *Ed.*

Ministers trying to get away with such parliamentary improprieties in England and France would have been called to order very differently. But not in Berlin!

Herr *Schulze* (from *Delitzsch*): A motion to request the Government *at once* to hand over to the Assembly for debate in committee the already completed or soon to be completed constitutional Bills.

This motion again contained an indirect reproof of the Government for its negligence or intentional delay in submitting Bills to supplement the Constitution. The reproof was the more painful as during that same morning two Bills had been submitted, including the Bill on the civic militia. Thus, had the Prime Minister shown any energy, he would have decisively rejected this motion. But instead he makes only a few general remarks about the Government's desire to meet all just wishes of the Assembly in every possible way and the motion is adopted by a large majority.

Herr *Besser* asks the Minister of War about the absence of service regulations. The Prussian army is the only one which lacks such regulations. Hence there exist in all army units down to company and squadron level the greatest differences of opinion about the most important service matters, particularly about the rights and duties of the various ranks. There exist, to be sure, thousands of orders, ordinances and instructions but they are worse than useless precisely because of their countless number, their confusion and the contradictions which prevail in them. Besides, every such official document is mixed up and rendered unrecognisable by as many different corollaries, elucidations, marginal notes and notes to the marginal notes as there are intermediate authorities through which it passes. This confusion naturally works to the advantage of the superior in all kinds of arbitrary acts whereas the subordinate only reaps the disadvantage of it. The subordinate, therefore, knows no rights but only duties. There used to be service regulations called the pigskin regulations, but they were *taken away from those individuals who had a copy of them* during the 1820s. Since then *no subordinate* may cite them *to his advantage* whereas the *higher* authorities are allowed to cite them constantly *against* the subordinates! It is the same with the service regulations of the guard corps which are never communicated to the army or made accessible to subordinates who are nevertheless punished under them! The staff officers and generals naturally only profit from this confusion which allows them to exercise the most extreme arbitrariness and the harshest tyranny. The subaltern officers, non-commissioned officers and soldiers, however, suffer under it and it is in their interest that Herr *Besser* questions General *Schreckenstein*.

How Herr *Schreckenstein* must have been astonished when he had to listen to this lengthy "quill-driving"—to use a popular term from the year 1813! What, the Prussian army does not have service regulations? What absurdity! Honestly, the Prussian army has the best, and at the same time the shortest, regulation in the world consisting of only two words: "*Obey orders!*" If a soldier of this "unbeaten" army is cuffed, kicked and struck with rifle-butts, if he has his beard or nose pulled by a lieutenant not yet of age and just escaped from officers' training school, and if he should complain, it is: "*Obey orders!*" If a tipsy major after dinner and for his special amusement marches his battalion into a swamp up to the waist, and there lines them up in square formations, and a subordinate dares to complain, it is: "*Obey orders!*" If officers are forbidden to visit one or another café and they take the liberty to comment, it is: "*Obey orders!*" This is the best service regulation, for it fits every occasion.

Of all the Ministers, Herr *Schreckenstein* is the only one who has not yet lost heart. This soldier who served under Napoleon, who for thirty-three years has practised the senseless Prussian spit and polish and has heard many a bullet whistle, will certainly not be afraid of agreeers and questioners, particularly not when the great "*Obey orders!*" is in danger!

Gentlemen, he says, I am bound to know better. I ought to know what changes have to be made. It is here a question of tearing down, and tearing down must not be allowed to prevail since rebuilding is very difficult. The military organisation has been created by Scharnhorst, Gneisenau, Boyen and Grolmann, it comprises 600,000 armed and tactically trained citizens and offers a secure future to every citizen as long as there is discipline. I shall maintain it and that is all I have to say.

Herr *Besser*: Herr *Schreckenstein* has not answered the question at all. It seems evident, however, from his remarks that he believes service regulations would slacken discipline!

Herr *Schreckenstein*: I have already stated that I will do what is expedient for the army and benefits the *service*.

Herr *Behnsch*: We can at least demand that the Minister answers yes or no or declares that he does not wish to reply. Up to now we have only heard evasive phrases.

Herr *Schreckenstein*, annoyed: I do not consider it in the interest of the *service* to discuss this question any further.

The service, always the service! Herr *Schreckenstein* believes that he is still the commander of a division and that he is speaking to his officer corps. He imagines that as Minister of War, too, he only needs be concerned with the service and not with the legal relations

between the individual ranks of the army, least of all with the relations of the army to the state as a whole and its citizens! We are still living under Bodelschwingh; the spirit of the old Boyen seems to prevail unbroken at the Ministry of War.

Herr *Piegsa* asks about the maltreatment of Poles at *Mielzyn* on June 7.

Herr *Auerswald* declares that he must first wait for full reports.

Thus *an entire month* of 31 days after the event Herr *Auerswald* is not yet fully informed! What a wonderful administration!

Herr *Behnsch* asks Herr *Hansemann* as to whether at the presentation of the budget he will give a survey of the administration of the *Seehandlung*¹⁵⁸ since 1820 and of the state treasury since 1840.

Herr *Hansemann* declares amidst resounding laughter that he will be able to reply in a week's time.

Herr *Behnsch* once again inquires about government support of emigration.

Herr *Kühlwetter* replies that this is a German affair and refers Herr *Behnsch* to Archduke John.

Herr *Grebel* asks Herr *Schreckenstein* about the officials of the Military Administration who are simultaneously officers of the army reserve and who do active service during the army reserve exercises thereby depriving other officers of the army reserve of the opportunity to perfect their training. He moves that these officials be released from service in the army reserve.

Herr *Schreckenstein* declares that he will do his duty and even take the matter into consideration.

Herr *Feldhaus* asks Herr *Schreckenstein* about the soldiers who lost their lives on the march from Posen to Glogau^a on June 18 and the measures taken to punish this barbarity.

Herr *Schreckenstein*: The matter has taken place. The report of the regimental commander has been submitted. The report of the General Command which arranged the stages of the march is still lacking. I cannot yet say, therefore, whether the order of march was transgressed. Besides, we are in this case passing judgment on a staff officer and such judgments are painful. It is to be hoped that the "High General Assembly" (!!!) will wait until the reports have arrived.

Herr *Schreckenstein* does not consider this barbarity a barbarity, he merely asks whether the major in question has "*obeyed orders*". What does it matter if 18 soldiers die miserably like so many heads of cattle on a country road so long as *orders* are *obeyed*!

^a The Polish name is Glogów.— *Ed.*

Herr *Behnsch* who had asked the same question as Herr *Feldhaus* says: I withdraw my question which has now become superfluous but I demand that the Minister of War fixes a day on which he will answer. Three weeks have already passed since this incident and the reports could have been here long ago.

Herr *Schreckenstein*: We have not wasted a moment; the reports from the General Command were requested immediately.

The *President*^a wants to skip over the matter.

Herr *Behnsch*: I am only asking the Minister of War to give an answer and to fix a day.

President: Would Herr *Schreckenstein*....

Herr *Schreckenstein*: It is not yet possible to surmise when that will be.

Herr *Gladbach*: Paragraph 28 of standing orders lays the obligation upon Ministers to fix a day. I also insist upon it.

President: I am asking the Minister once again.

Herr *Schreckenstein*: I cannot fix a specific day.

Herr *Gladbach*: I insist upon my demand.

Herr *Temme*: I am of the same opinion.

President: Would the Minister of War perhaps in a fortnight....

Herr *Schreckenstein*: That could very well be. I shall answer as soon as I know whether or not orders have been obeyed.

President: All right then, in a fortnight.

This is how the Minister of War carries out "his duty" to the Assembly!

Herr *Gladbach* has yet another question, directed to the Minister of the Interior concerning the suspension of unpopular officials and the merely temporary, provisional filling of vacancies.

Herr *Kühlwetter*'s answers are most unsatisfactory and further remarks of Herr *Gladbach* are drowned after brave resistance by the muttering, shouting and hissing of the Right which is at last moved to fury by so much insolence.

A motion by Herr *Berends* to place the army reserve, which has been called up for domestic service, under the command of the civic militia is not recognised as urgent and is thereupon withdrawn. Thereafter a pleasant conversation begins about all sorts of subtleties linked to the Posen committee. The storm of questions and urgent motions has passed and the last conciliatory sounds of the famous session of July 7 fade away like the soft whispering of zephyr and the pleasant murmuring of a meadow brook. Herr *Hansemann* returns

^a Wilhelm Grabow.—Ed.

home with the consolation that the blustering and table-banging of the Right has woven a few flowers into his crown of thorns, and Herr Schreckenstein smugly twirls his moustache and murmurs: "Obey orders!"

Written by Engels on July 14, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 45, July 15, 1848

Published in English for the first time

THE DEBATE ON JACOBY'S MOTION¹⁵⁹

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 48, July 18, 1848]

Cologne, July 17. Again a "great debate", to use an expression of Herr Camphausen, has taken place, a debate which lasted two full days.

The substance of the debate is well known—the reservations the Government advanced regarding the immediate validity of the decisions passed by the National Assembly and Jacoby's motion asserting the Assembly's right to pass legally binding decisions without having to await anyone's consent, and at the same time objecting to the resolution on the Central Authority.¹⁶⁰

That a debate on this subject was possible at all may seem incomprehensible to other nations. But we live in a land of oaks and lime-trees^a where nothing should surprise us.

The people send their representatives to Frankfurt with the mandate that the Assembly assume sovereign power over the whole of Germany and all her governments, and, by virtue of the sovereignty the people have vested in the Assembly, adopt a Constitution for Germany.

Instead of immediately proclaiming its sovereignty over the separate states and the Federal Diet,¹⁶¹ the Assembly timidly avoids any question relating to this subject and maintains an irresolute and vacillating attitude.

Finally it is confronted with a decisive issue—the appointment of a provisional Central Authority. Seemingly independent, but in fact guided by the governments with the help of Gagern, the Assembly elects as Imperial Regent a man whom these governments had in advance designated for this post.^b

^a Heinrich Heine, "Zur Beruhigung". In *Zeitgedichte*.—Ed.

^b Archduke John of Austria.—Ed.

The Federal Diet recognises the election, pretending, as it were, that only its confirmation makes the election valid.

Reservations are nevertheless made by Hanover and even by Prussia, and it is the Prussian reservation that has caused the debate of the 11th and 12th.

This time, therefore, it is not so much the fault of the Chamber in Berlin^a that the debates are vague and hazy. The irresolute, weak-kneed, ineffectual Frankfurt National Assembly itself is to blame for the fact that its decisions can only be described as so much twaddle.

Jacoby introduces his motion briefly and with his usual precision. He makes things very difficult for the speakers of the Left, because he says everything that can be said about the motion if one is to avoid enlarging upon the origin of the Central Authority, whose history is so discreditable to the National Assembly.

In fact, the deputies of the Left who follow him advance hardly any new arguments, while those of the Right fare much worse—they lapse either into sheer twaddle or juridical hair-splitting. Both sides endlessly repeat themselves.

Deputy *Schneider* has the honour of first presenting the case for the Right to the Assembly.

He begins with the grand argument that the motion is self-contradictory. On the one hand, the motion recognises the sovereignty of the National Assembly, on the other hand, it calls upon the Agreement Chamber to censure the National Assembly, thus placing itself above it. Any individual could express his disapproval but not the Chamber.

This subtle argument, of which the Right seems to be very proud seeing that it recurs in all the speeches of its deputies, advances an entirely new theory. According to this theory, the Chamber has fewer rights with regard to the National Assembly than an individual.

This first grand argument is followed by a republican one. Germany consists for the most part of constitutional monarchies, and must therefore be headed by a constitutional, irresponsible authority and not by a republican, responsible one. This argument was rebutted on the second day by Herr *Stein*, who said that Germany, under her federal constitution, had always been a republic, indeed a very edifying republic.

"We have been given a mandate," says Herr *Schneider*, "to agree on a constitutional monarchy, and those in Frankfurt have been given a similar mandate, i.e. to agree with the German governments on a Constitution for Germany."

^a The Prussian National Assembly.— *Ed.*

The reaction indulges in wishful thinking. When, by order of the so-called Preparliament¹⁶²—an assembly having no valid mandate—the trembling Federal Diet convened the German National Assembly, there was no question at the time of any agreement; the National Assembly was then considered to be a sovereign power. But now things have changed. The June events in Paris have revived the hopes of both the big bourgeoisie and the supporters of the overthrown system. Every squire from the backwoods hopes to see the old rule of the whip re-established, and a clamour for “an agreed German Constitution” is already arising from the Imperial Court at Innsbruck to the ancestral castle of Henry LXXII. The Frankfurt Assembly has no one but itself to blame for this.

“In electing a constitutional supreme head the National Assembly has therefore acted according to its mandate. But it has also acted in accordance with the will of the people; the great majority want a constitutional monarchy. Indeed, had the National Assembly come to a different decision, I would have regarded it as a misfortune. *Not* because I am *against the republic*; in *principle* I admit that the republic—and I have quite definitely made up my mind about it—is *the most perfect and most noble form of state*, but in reality we are still very far from it. We cannot have the form unless we have the spirit. We cannot have a republic while we lack *republicans*, that is to say, noble minds capable, at all times, with a clear conscience and noble selflessness, and not only in a fit of enthusiasm, of subordinating their own interests to the common interest.”

Can anyone ask for better proof of the virtues represented in the Berlin Chamber than these noble and modest words of Deputy Schneider? Surely, if any doubt still existed about the fitness of the Germans to set up a republic, it must have completely vanished in face of these examples of true civic virtue, of the noble and most modest self-sacrifice of our Cincinnatus-Schneider! Let Cincinnatus pluck up courage and have faith in himself and the numerous noble citizens of Germany who likewise regard the republic as the most noble form of state but consider themselves bad republicans—they are ripe for the republic, they would endure the republic with the same heroic equanimity with which they have endured the absolute monarchy. The republic of worthies would be the happiest republic that ever existed—a republic without Brutus and Catiline, without Marat and upheavals like those of June, it would be a republic of well-fed virtue and solvent morality.^a

How mistaken is Cincinnatus-Schneider when he exclaims:

“A republican mentality cannot be formed under absolutism; it is not possible to create a republican spirit *offhand*, we must first educate our children and grandchildren in this way. At present I would regard a republic as the greatest

^a Modified quotation from Heinrich Heine’s “Anno 1829”. In *Romanzen*.—*Ed.*

calamity, for it would be anarchy under the desecrated name of republic, despotism under the cloak of liberty."

On the contrary, as Herr Vogt (from Giessen) said in the National Assembly, the Germans are republicans *by nature*, and to educate his children in the republican spirit Cincinnatus-Schneider could do no better than bring them up in the old German tradition of propriety, modesty and God-fearing piety, the plain and honest way in which he himself grew up. Not anarchy and despotism, but those cosy beer-swilling proceedings, in which Cincinnatus-Schneider excels, would be brought to the highest perfection in the republic of worthies. Far removed from all the atrocities and crimes which defiled the First French Republic, unstained by blood, and detesting the red flag, the republic of worthies would make possible something hitherto unattainable: it would enable every respectable burgher to lead a quiet, peaceful life marked by godliness and propriety. Who knows, the republic of worthies might even revive the guilds together with all the amusing trials of non-guild artisans. This republic of worthies is by no means a fanciful dream; it is a reality existing in Bremen, Hamburg, Lübeck and Frankfurt, and even in some parts of Switzerland. But its existence is everywhere threatened by the contemporary storms, which bid fair to engulf it everywhere.

Therefore rise up, Cincinnatus-Schneider, leave your plough and turnip field, your beer and agreement policy, mount your steed and save the threatened republic, *your* republic, the *republic of worthies!*

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 49, July 19, 1848]

Cologne, July 18. Herr Waldeck takes the floor after Herr Schneider, in support of the motion.

"The present position of the Prussian state is surely quite without precedent, and one *really* cannot conceal the fact that it is also *somewhat* precarious."

This beginning is likewise somewhat precarious. We get the impression that we are still listening to Deputy Schneider:

"It must be said that Prussia was destined to exercise hegemony in Germany."

This is the same old-Prussian illusion, the cherished dream of merging Germany in Prussia and of declaring Berlin the German Paris. Herr Waldeck, it is true, sees this cherished hope dwindling, but he hankers after it with painful feelings, and he blames both the previous and the present Government for the fact that Prussia is not at the head of Germany.

Unfortunately the fine days have passed when the Customs Union¹⁶³ paved the way for Prussian hegemony in Germany, days when provincial patriots could believe that "the Brandenburg stock has determined the fate of Germany for 200 years" and will continue to do so in the future, the fine days when the disintegrating Germany of the Federal Diet could regard even the Prussian bureaucratic strait jacket as a last means of maintaining some sort of cohesion.

"The Federal Diet, on which public opinion has passed judgment long since, is disappearing and suddenly the Constituent National Assembly in Frankfurt emerges before the eyes of an *astonished world!*"

The "world" was naturally "astonished" when it saw *this* Constituent National Assembly. One need only read the French, English and Italian newspapers to understand this.

Herr Waldeck then explains at some length that he is against the idea of a German emperor and gives up his place on the rostrum to Herr Reichensperger II.

Herr *Reichensperger II* declares the supporters of Jacoby's motion to be republicans and desires them to state their aims as candidly as did the republicans in Frankfurt. Then he too asserts that Germany is not yet in possession of the

"full measure of civic and political virtues which have been described by a great political scientist^a as the essential precondition for a republic".

If Reichensperger, the patriot, says this, Germany must be in a bad way!

Herr Reichensperger continues, the Government has made no reservations (!) but merely expressed wishes. There was reason enough for this and I also hope that the National Assembly will not always ignore the opinions of governments when making decisions. It is outside our competence to lay down the sphere of competence of the Frankfurt National Assembly; the National Assembly itself has refused to advance theories concerning its own competence; it has acted in a practical manner when necessity has demanded action.

In other words, at the time when the Frankfurt Assembly was omnipotent, it failed during the revolutionary agitation to settle the inevitable conflict with the German governments with one decisive stroke. It has preferred to postpone the decision and to fight small skirmishes with one or another Government over each individual resolution, skirmishes which weaken the Assembly the further it recedes from the time of the revolution and the more it compromises itself in the eyes of the people by its feeble actions. And

^a Montesquieu.— *Ed.*

in this respect, Herr Reichensperger is quite right: it is not worth our while to come to the aid of an Assembly which has forsaken itself!

But it is touching when Herr Reichensperger says:

"It is therefore *unstatesmanlike* to discuss such questions of competence; what matters is simply to solve practical questions as they arise."

It is indeed "unstatesmanlike" to dispose of these "practical questions" once and for all by means of a forceful decision; it is "unstatesmanlike" if, in the face of reactionary attempts to halt the movement, the revolutionary mandate were asserted, a mandate which every Assembly that has come into being as a result of barricade fighting possesses. Cromwell, Mirabeau, Danton, Napoleon and the entire English and French revolutions were indeed exceedingly "unstatesmanlike", but Bassermann, Biedermann, Eisenmann, Wiedenmann and Dahlmann behave in a very "statesmanlike" manner! "Statesmen" disappear altogether when a revolution takes place, and the revolution must be temporarily dormant for "statesmen" to re-emerge, and, moreover, statesmen of the caliber of Herr Reichensperger II, the deputy for the Kempen district.

"If you depart from this system, it will be difficult to avoid conflicts with the German National Assembly and with the governments of individual [German] states; at any rate you will unfortunately promote discord and, as a result of discord, anarchy will raise its head and nothing will then save us from civil war. Civil war, however, marks the beginning of still greater misfortune.... It is not out of the question that people may in that case say—order has been restored in Germany, by our Eastern and Western friends!"

Herr Reichensperger may be right. If the Assembly engages in a discussion of competence, it may give rise to clashes, possibly leading to a civil war and intervention by the French and the Russians. If the Assembly does not discuss this, however, and, in fact, it has not done so, a civil war is even more certain. The conflicts which, at the beginning of the revolution, were still fairly simple, every day become more involved, and the longer the decision is delayed, the more difficult and the more bloody will be the solution.

A country like Germany, which is forced to work its way up from indescribable fragmentation to unity, which, if it does not want to perish, needs the more stringent revolutionary centralisation, the more divided it has been up to now, a country which contains twenty Vendées,¹⁶⁴ which is sandwiched between the two most powerful and most centralised states of the Continent and surrounded by numerous small neighbours, with whom it is on strained terms, if not

at war—such a country cannot, in the present period of universal revolution, avoid *either civil war or war with other countries*. These wars, which we will certainly have to face, will be the more perilous and devastating, the more irresolute is the conduct of the people and its leaders and the longer the decision is postponed. If Herr Reichensperger's "statesmen" remain at the helm, we might witness another Thirty Years' War.¹⁶⁵ But, fortunately, the force of events, the German people, the Emperor of Russia and the French people also have a say in the matter.

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 53, July 23, 1848]

Cologne, July 22. Current events, Bills, armistice proposals etc. at last allow us once more to return to our beloved agreement debates. On the rostrum we see Deputy von *Berg* from Jülich, a man in whom we are interested for two reasons; first, because he is a Rhinelander, and second, because he is a ministerialist of very recent date.

Herr Berg has several reasons for opposing Jacoby's motion. The first is this:

"The first part of the motion, which requires us to express our disapproval of a decision made by the German Parliament, this first part is nothing but a protest made in the name of a minority against a legal majority. It is nothing but an attempt by a party which has been *defeated within* a legislative body *to obtain support from outside*; it is an attempt whose consequences are *bound to lead to civil war*."

Mr. Cobden, with his motion to abolish the Corn Laws, also belonged to the minority in the House of Commons from 1840 to 1845. He belonged to "a party which" had "been defeated within a legislative body". What did he do? He sought "support from outside". He did not simply state his disapproval of parliamentary decisions, he went much further; he set up and organised the Anti-Corn Law League¹⁶⁶ and the Anti-Corn Law press, in short, the whole enormous agitation against the Corn Laws. According to Herr Berg, this was an attempt that was "bound to lead to civil war".

The minority in the erstwhile United Diet likewise sought "support from outside". Herr Camphausen, Herr Hansemann and Herr Milde had no scruples whatever over this. The facts that stand as proof of this are well known. It is obvious that the consequences of their conduct, according to Herr Berg, were "bound to lead to civil war". They led not to civil war, however, but to the Ministry.

We could cite a hundred more such examples.

The minority in a legislative body, if it does not want to bring about civil war, must not, therefore, seek support from outside. But

what then does "from outside" mean? It means the constituents, i.e. the people who *create* the legislative body. If one is no longer supposed to obtain "support" by influencing these constituents, where is one to gain support?

Are the speeches of Hansemann, Reichensperger, von Berg and so on, delivered merely for the benefit of the Assembly or also for the public, to whom they are presented in stenographic reports? Are not these speeches likewise means by which this "party within a legislative body" seeks, or *hopes*, to obtain "support from outside"?

In short, Herr Berg's principle would lead to the abolition of all political propaganda. For propaganda is simply the practical application of the immunity of advocates of freedom of the press and of freedom of association, i.e. of freedoms which legally exist in Prussia. Whether these freedoms lead to civil war or not is not our concern. It is sufficient that they exist, and we shall see where it "leads", if they continue to be infringed.

"Gentlemen, these efforts of the minority to find strength and recognition outside the legislative authority did not begin today or yesterday, they date from the first day of the German uprising. The minority expressed its objections and left the Preparliament, and the result was civil war."

First, as regards Jacoby's motion, there is no question of a "minority objecting and leaving".

Secondly, "the efforts of the minority to find recognition outside the legislative authority" did, it is true, "not begin today or yesterday", for they date from the moment when legislative authorities and minorities came into being.

Thirdly, it is not the fact that the minority expressed its objections and left the Preparliament which led to civil war, but Herr Mittermaier's "moral conviction" that Hecker, Fickler and their associates were traitors to their country, and the measures which the Government of Baden consequently took and which were dictated by the most abject fear.¹⁶⁷

The civil war argument, which is, of course, apt to throw the German burgher into a dreadful state of alarm, is followed by the argument about the absence of a mandate.

"We have been elected by our constituents in order to establish a Constitution in Prussia; the same constituents have sent other citizens to Frankfurt, to set up a Central Authority there. It cannot be denied that the constituent who gives the mandate is certainly entitled to approve or disapprove the mandatary's actions, but the constituents have not authorised us to speak on their behalf in this respect."

This weighty argument has been greatly admired by the legal experts and legal dilettanti in the Assembly. We have no mandate!

Nevertheless, two minutes later, the same Herr Berg asserts that the Frankfurt Assembly was "convoked in order to create the future Constitution of Germany, in concert with the German governments", and it is to be hoped that the Prussian Government will *not*, in this case, ratify it without consulting the Agreement Assembly or the Chamber which is to be elected under the new Constitution. The Ministry has nevertheless immediately informed the Assembly of its recognition of the Imperial Regent,^a as well as of its reservations, thereby inviting the Assembly to pronounce its decision.

It is therefore precisely the point of view expressed by Herr Berg, his own speech and Herr Auerswald's information which lead to the conclusion that the Assembly certainly has a mandate to deal with the Frankfurt resolutions.

We have no mandate! Hence, if the Frankfurt Assembly reintroduces censorship, if it sends Bavarian and Austrian troops to Prussia to support the Crown in a conflict between the Chamber and the Crown, then Herr Berg has "no mandate"!

What mandate has Herr Berg? Literally only this: "to agree with the Crown upon the Constitution". By no means has he, therefore, a mandate to put down parliamentary questions, and to agree to laws on immunity, on the civic militia, on redemption and to all other laws not mentioned in the Constitution. This is what reactionaries daily assert. Berg himself says:

"Every step beyond this mandate is a breach of faith, it is an abandonment of the mandate or even a betrayal!"

Nevertheless, under the force of necessity, Herr Berg and the entire Assembly constantly abandon their mandate. The Assembly must do so due to the revolutionary, or rather, at present, reactionary, provisional state of affairs. Because of this provisional state, everything serving to safeguard the achievements of the March revolution falls within the competence of the Assembly and if it can achieve this by exerting moral influence on the Frankfurt Assembly, then the Agreement Chamber is not only entitled, but even obliged, to do so.

Then follows the Rhenish-Prussian argument, which is of special importance for us Rhinelanders, because it shows how we are represented in Berlin.

"We Rhinelanders and Westphalians and the inhabitants of other provinces as well have *absolutely* no bond with Prussia other than the fact that we have *come under the jurisdiction of the Prussian Crown*. If we dissolve this bond, the state disintegrates. I do not understand at all, and I believe most deputies from my province do not

^a Archduke John of Austria.—*Ed.*

understand either, what benefit a Berlin republic would be to us. We might prefer rather a republic in Cologne."

We shall not discuss at all the idle speculations about what we "might prefer" if Prussia is turned into a "Berlin republic", nor the new theory about the conditions of existence of the Prussian state etc. As Rhinelanders, we simply protest against the statement that "we have come under the jurisdiction of the Prussian Crown". On the contrary the "Prussian Crown" has come to us.

The next speaker against the motion is Herr *Simons* from Elberfeld. He repeats everything that Herr Berg has said.

He is followed by a speaker from the Left and then by Herr *Zachariä*. *Zachariä* repeats everything that Herr *Simons* has said.

Deputy *Duncker* repeats everything that Herr *Zachariä* has said, but he also adds a few other things, or he expresses what has been said before in such an extreme way, that we find it advisable to deal briefly with his speech.

"Do we, the Constituent Assembly of 16 million Germans, reinforce the authority of the German Central Government and the authority of the German Parliament in the minds of the people by thus censuring the Constituent Assembly of all Germans? Do we not thereby undermine the willing obedience which the individual nationalities must [accord] it, if it is to work for Germany's unity?"

According to Herr *Duncker*, the authority of the Central Government and the National Assembly and this "willing obedience" exist; the obedience consists in the *people* submitting blindly to this authority, whereas the individual *governments* make *reservations* and, when it suits them, refuse to obey.

"What is the point of making theoretical statements in our time, when the force of fact is so immense?"

Recognition of the sovereignty of the Frankfurt Assembly by the representatives "of 16 million Germans" is thus merely a "theoretical statement"!?

"If, in future, a resolution passed in Frankfurt were to be *regarded* by the Government and Parliament of Prussia as impossible and impracticable, would there then be any possibility of carrying through such a resolution?"

Hence, the mere opinions, the *views* held by the Prussian Government and Parliament are supposed to be capable of making the resolutions of the National Assembly *impossible*.

"Today, we may say whatever we like, but the Frankfurt resolutions could not be carried through, if the entire Prussian people, if two-fifths of Germany, refused to submit to them."

Here we have again all the old Prussian arrogance, the Berlin national patriotism in all its old glory, with the pigtail and crooked

stick of old Fritz.^a It is true, we are only a minority, only two-fifths (and not even that) but we will certainly show the majority that *we* are masters in Germany, that we are Prussians!

We do not advise the gentlemen of the Right to provoke a conflict of this kind between “two-fifths” and “three-fifths”. The numerical balance may prove to be quite different, and many a province may remember that it has been German from time immemorial, but that it has been Prussian for only thirty years.

Herr Duncker has a remedy, however. Those in Frankfurt must, along with us, “pass only those resolutions that express the reasonable collective will, the true opinion of the public, so that they can be approved by the moral consciousness of the nation”, i.e. resolutions after Deputy Duncker’s own heart.

“If we, and those in Frankfurt, pass such resolutions then we are, and they are, sovereign, otherwise we are *not* sovereign, even if we decree it ten times over.”

After this profound definition of sovereignty, which is in keeping with his moral consciousness, Herr Duncker heaves a sigh: “In any case, this belongs to the future”, and thus concludes his speech.

Lack of space and time prevents us from discussing the speeches of the Left made on the same day. Nevertheless, even from the speeches of the Right presented here, our readers will have realised that Herr Parrisius was not entirely mistaken when he moved the adjournment because “the temperature in the hall has risen so high that it is impossible to maintain *absolute clarity of thought*”!

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 55, July 25, 1848]

Cologne, July 24. A few days ago, when the pressure of world events caused us to interrupt our account of the debate, a neighbouring journalist^b was kind enough to carry on the report in our stead. He has already drawn the attention of the public to “the profusion of penetrating thoughts and bright ideas” and to “the fine and healthy feeling for true freedom” displayed by “the speakers of the majority”, and especially by our incomparable Baumstark, “during this great debate, which lasted two days”.^c

We must bring our report of the debate to a hasty close, but cannot refrain from presenting a few examples from the “profusion”

^a King Frederick II of Prussia.— *Ed.*

^b Karl Brüggemann.— *Ed.*

^c “Köln, 20. Juli. Die Debatte über den Jacobyschen Antrag”, *Kölnische Zeitung* No. 203, July 21, 1848.— *Ed.*

of "penetrating thoughts and bright ideas" expressed by the Right.

Deputy *Abegg* opened the second day of the debate^a with a threat to the Assembly: to get to the bottom of this motion, one would have to repeat all the Frankfurt debates in their entirety—and the High Assembly is obviously not entitled to do this! Their constituents "with their practical tact and practical sense" would never approve of this! Incidentally, what is to become of German unity, if (now follows a particularly "penetrating thought") people "do *not simply* confine themselves to making *reservations*", but express their "firm approval or disapproval of the Frankfurt resolutions". In this case nothing remains but "purely formal submissiveness"!

Of course, "purely formal submissiveness" can be evaded by "reservations" and, if need be, even directly denied—that cannot harm German unity; but to approve or disapprove of these resolutions and to judge them with regard to their style, logic or usefulness—that's the limit!

Herr *Abegg* concludes with the observation that it was for the Frankfurt Assembly, and *not* the Berlin Assembly, to comment upon the reservations presented to the Assembly in Berlin, *not* that in Frankfurt. One ought not to anticipate the Frankfurt deputies as this would surely be an insult to them!

The gentlemen in Berlin are not competent to express an opinion on statements made by their own Ministers.

Let us skip the idols of the small people, such as *Baltzer*, *Kämpf* and *Gräff*, and make haste to hear the hero of the day, the incomparable *Baumstark*.

Deputy *Baumstark* declares that he would never pronounce himself incompetent, unless he is forced to admit no knowledge of the matter in hand—and surely eight weeks of debate cannot leave one with no knowledge of the matter?

Consequently, Deputy *Baumstark* is *competent*. Namely, in the following manner:

"I ask whether, as a result of the wisdom we have shown so far, we are fully entitled" (i.e. competent) "to confront an Assembly, which has attracted general interest in Germany, and the admiration of the whole of Europe, thanks to its noble-mindedness, its high intelligence and its moral political standpoint, that is thanks to everything that has made the name of Germany great and glorious throughout history? I *submit* to it" (i.e. I declare myself *incompetent*) "and wish that the Assembly, sensing the truth (!!), would likewise submit" (i.e. declare itself *incompetent*)!

^a July 12, 1848.—*Ed.*

"Gentlemen," continues the "competent" Deputy Baumstark, "it was stated at yesterday's session that there has been talk of a republic etc. which is unphilosophical. But it cannot possibly be unphilosophical to describe the responsibility of the person who heads the state, as a characteristic feature of the republic, in the democratic sense. Gentlemen, it is certain that all political philosophers, from *Plato down to Dahlmann*" (Deputy Baumstark could indeed not go further "down"), "have expressed this view, and we must not contradict this more than a thousand-year-old truth (!) and historical fact, without very special reasons, which have yet to be adduced."

Herr Baumstark thinks, therefore, that sometimes there can be "very special reasons" to contradict even "historical facts". Indeed, the gentlemen of the Right usually have no scruples in this respect.

Herr Baumstark, moreover, declares himself once again *incompetent*, by pushing the competence on to the shoulders of "all political philosophers, from Plato down to Dahlmann". Herr Baumstark, of course, does not belong to this category of political philosophers.

"Let us consider this political edifice! *One* Chamber and a responsible Imperial Regent, and this on the basis of the present electoral law! Further examination will show that it is against all *common sense*."

Then Herr Baumstark makes the following penetrating pronouncement which, even on the closest examination, will not be against all "common sense".

"Gentlemen, a republic requires two things, popular opinion and leading personalities. If we make a closer examination of our German popular opinion, we shall find that it contains very little about *this* republic (namely that of the Imperial Regent previously mentioned).

Thus, Herr Baumstark once more declares himself *incompetent*, and this time, in his place, it is *popular opinion* that is competent to judge the republic. Popular opinion, therefore, has more "knowledge" about the matter than Deputy Baumstark.

At last, however, the speaker proves that there are also matters about which he has some "knowledge", and first and foremost among these is popular sovereignty.

"Gentlemen, history—I have to return to this—proves that *we have had popular sovereignty since time immemorial*, but it has assumed different forms under different conditions."

Then follows a series of "extremely penetrating thoughts and bright ideas" about Brandenburg-Prussian history and popular sovereignty causing the neighbouring journalist to forget all worldly sufferings in a fit of constitutional ecstasy and doctrinaire bliss.

"When the Great Elector^a disregarded, and *indeed* (!) crushed" (to "crush" something is certainly the best way of disregarding it), "the decaying elements of the

^a Frederick William of Brandenburg.—*Ed.*

estates, which were infected with the poison of French demoralisation" (the right of the first night had in fact been gradually buried by the "French demoralised" civilisation!), "he was generally acclaimed by the people, deeply imbued with the moral feeling that this gave strength to the German, and especially the Prussian, political edifice."

One has to admire the "deep moral feeling" of the Brandenburg philistines of the seventeenth century who, profoundly moved by their profits, acclaimed the Elector when he attacked their enemies, the feudal lords, and sold privileges to the philistines—but one has to admire even more the "common sense" and "bright ideas" of Herr Baumstark, who regards this acclamation as an expression of "popular sovereignty"!

"At that time, everybody, without exception, paid homage to the absolute monarchy" (since otherwise he would have been flogged) "and the Great Frederick would never have achieved such importance had he not been supported by *genuine* popular sovereignty."

The popular sovereignty of flogging, serfdom and soccage services is, for Herr Baumstark, *genuine* popular sovereignty. An artless admission!

From *genuine* popular sovereignty, Herr Baumstark now goes on to consider *false* popular sovereignties.

"But there followed a different period, that of constitutional monarchy."

This is then proved by a long "constitutional rigmarole" in which, to cut a long story short, he asserts that, from 1811 to 1847, the people of Prussia called continuously for a Constitution, and never for a Republic (!). This is naturally followed by the remark that "the people has turned away in indignation" from the recent republican insurrection in Southern Germany.

From this it follows quite naturally that the second kind of popular sovereignty (although it is no longer the "genuine" one) is the "constitutional sovereignty proper".

"This is the kind of popular sovereignty which divides political power between the King and the people, it is *divided* popular sovereignty" (let the "political philosophers, from Plato down to Dahlmann", tell us what this is supposed to mean), "which the people must receive *unimpaired* and *unconditionally* (!), but without depriving the King of any of his constitutional power" (what laws define this power in Prussia since the 19th March?). "This point is quite clear" (especially in Deputy Baumstark's mind); "the concept has been determined by the history of the constitutional system and no one can still entertain any doubts about it" (it is only when one reads Deputy Baumstark's speech that, unfortunately, "doubts" arise again).

Finally "there is a third kind of popular sovereignty, the democratic-republican kind, which is supposed to rest on the so-called broadest basis. What an unfortunate expression is '*broadest basis*'!"

Then Herr Baumstark "raises a word" against this broadest basis. This basis leads to the decline of countries, to barbarism! We have no Cato, who could give the republic a moral foundation. Herr Baumstark then begins to blow Montesquieu's old horn of republican virtue—a horn which has long been out of tune and full of dents—and to blow it so loudly that the neighbouring journalist,^a in transports of admiration, chimes in likewise and, to the astonishment of all Europe, demonstrates brilliantly that it is "precisely republican virtue ... which leads to constitutionalism"! Meanwhile, Herr Baumstark changes his tune and also comes to constitutionalism but through the *absence* of republican virtue. The reader can imagine the splendid effect of this duet when, after a series of the most heart-rendingly discordant notes, the two voices finally unite to produce the conciliatory chord of constitutionalism.

After a lengthy argument, Herr Baumstark comes to the conclusion that the Ministers have actually made "no *real* reservation" at all, but merely "a *slight* reservation concerning the future" and, in the end, he finds himself on the broadest basis, since he considers only a *democratic* and constitutional state to be Germany's salvation. He is so "overwhelmed by the prospect of Germany's future" that he gives vent to his feelings by crying:

"Cheers, three cheers for the popular-constitutional, hereditary German monarchy!"

He was indeed quite right when he said—this unfortunate broadest basis!

Several speakers from both sides then take the floor but, after Deputy Baumstark, we dare not present them to our readers. We shall just mention Deputy *Wachsmuth's* declaration that his principal tenet is the point made by the noble Stein: The will of free men is the unshakeable support of every throne.

"That strikes right to the core of the matter!" exclaims our enraptured neighbouring journalist. "Nowhere does the will of free men prosper more than in the shelter of the unshakeable throne, and nowhere does the throne rest more securely than on the intelligent love of free men!"^b

^a Karl Brüggemann.—*Ed.*

^b "Köln, 20. Juli. Die Debatte über den Jacobyschen Antrag", *Kölnische Zeitung* No. 203, July 21, 1848.—*Ed.*

Indeed, the “profusion of penetrating thoughts and bright ideas” and the “healthy feeling for true freedom” displayed by the speakers of the majority in this debate are far from matching the depth and penetration of the thoughts of the neighbouring journalist!

Written by Engels between July 17
and 24, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische
Zeitung* Nos. 48, 49, 53 and 55, July 18, 19,
23 and 25, 1848

Published in full in English for the
first time

THE SUPPRESSION OF THE CLUBS
IN STUTT GART AND HEIDELBERG

Cologne, July 19.

My Germany got drunk with toasts,
You, you believed them all,
And every black-red-golden tassel
As well as each pipe-bowl!^a

And that, upright German, has indeed been your fate once again. You believe you have made a revolution? Deception! You believe that you have overcome the police state? Deception! You believe that you possess freedom of association, freedom of the press, the arming of the people and other beautiful slogans which were bandied about on the March barricades? Deception, nothing but deception!

But when the blissful glow wore off,
Beloved friend, you stood bewildered.^b

Bewildered about your indirectly chosen, so-called National Assemblies,¹⁶⁸ bewildered about the renewed expulsions of German citizens from German cities, bewildered about the tyranny of the sabre in Mainz, Trier, Aachen, Mannheim, Ulm, and Prague, bewildered about the arrests and political trials in Berlin, Cologne, Düsseldorf, Breslau^c etc.

But there was one thing left to you, upright German, the clubs! You were able to attend the clubs and to complain to the public about the political swindles of the last few months. You could pour out your heavy heart to like-minded fellow citizens and find consolation in the words of like-minded, equally oppressed patriots!

^a Heinrich Heine, "An Georg Herwegh". In *Zeitgedichte*.— *Ed.*

^b *Ibid.*— *Ed.*

^c Wrocław.— *Ed.*

But now even this has come to an end. The clubs are incompatible with the preservation of "order". In order that "confidence may be restored" it is urgently necessary to put an end to the subversive activities of the clubs.

Yesterday we related that the *Württemberg* Government downright *prohibited* the Democratic District Association in Stuttgart by a royal ordinance.^a One does not even bother any longer to haul the leaders of the clubs before a court but instead falls back upon the old police measures. Yes, the gentlemen *Harpprecht*, *Duvernoy* and *Maucler* who countersigned this ordinance go even further: they prescribe extra-legal penalties for the violators of this prohibition, penalties of up to one-year imprisonment. They devise penal laws, without the Chambers' approval, and exceptional penal laws at that, merely "on the strength of Paragraph 89 of the Constitution".

It is no better in *Baden*. Today we report the prohibition of the Democratic Student Union in Heidelberg.^b There, generally, the right of association is not so openly contested except in the case of the *students*, on the strength of the old, long abolished special laws of the Federal Diet,¹⁶⁹ the students are threatened by the penalties prescribed by these invalid laws.

We shall now probably have to expect the suppression of our clubs next.

We have a National Assembly in Frankfurt so that the governments may take such measures in complete safety without incurring the wrath of public opinion. This Assembly will, of course, pass over these police measures to the agenda just as lightly as over the revolution in Mainz.^c

Thus it is not in order to achieve anything in the Assembly but merely in order to force the majority of the Assembly to proclaim once again before all Germany its alliance with reaction that we call upon the deputies of the extreme Left in Frankfurt to propose:

That the originators of these measures, particularly Herr Harpprecht, Herr Duvernoy, Herr Maucler and Herr Mathy, *be impeached* for violating the fundamental rights of the German people.

Written by Engels on July 19, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 50, July 20, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a "Stuttgart, 15. Juli", *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 49, July 19, 1848.—*Ed.*

^b "Heidelberg, 17. Juli", *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 50, July 20, 1848.—*Ed.*

^c See this volume, pp. 17-19.—*Ed.*

THE PRUSSIAN PRESS BILL¹⁷⁰

Cologne, July 19. We had thought that today we might be able to amuse our readers once again with the agreement debates, in particular to present to them the brilliant speech of Deputy Baumstark,^a but events prevent us from doing so.

Charity begins at home. When the existence of the press is threatened, even Deputy Baumstark is abandoned.

Herr Hansemann has submitted to the Agreement Assembly a provisional press law. The paternal solicitude of Herr Hansemann for the press calls for immediate consideration.

In former times the *Code Napoléon* was beautified by the most edifying headings of the Prussian Law. Now, after the revolution, this has been changed: now, the Prussian Law is enriched by the most fragrant blossoms of the Code and the September Laws. Duchâtel, of course, is no Bodelschwingh.

We have already several days ago given the main points of the press Bill.^b No sooner had a defamation trial given us the chance to prove that Articles 367 and 368 of the *Code pénal* stand in starkest contradiction to freedom of the press,^c than Herr Hansemann proposes not only to extend them to the entire kingdom but also to make them three times worse. We rediscover in the new draft all that has already become dear and valued to us by practical experience:

^a See the end of the article "The Debate on Jacoby's Motion", July 24, 1848 (this volume, pp. 242-47).— *Ed.*

^b "Berlin, 14. Juli (Pressgesetz)", *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 47, July 17, 1848.— *Ed.*

^c See this volume, pp. 209-10.— *Ed.*

We find it prohibited—on pain of imprisonment from three months to three years—to make a charge against anybody which would make him punishable by law or merely “expose him to public contempt”. We find it prohibited to demonstrate the truth of the matter in any other way than by a “valid legal document”, in short, we rediscover the most classical monuments of the Napoleonic despotism over the press.

Indeed, Herr Hansemann keeps his promise to let the old provinces share in the advantages of Rhenish legislation!

Paragraph 10 of the Bill tops all these regulations: in the case of calumny directed at *state officials* in respect to the exercise of their official duties, the ordinary punishment may be *increased by half*.

If an official in the exercise or on the occasion (*à l'occasion*) of the exercise of his duties is *insulted in words* (*outrage par parole*), the punishment under Article 222 of the Penal Code is a prison sentence of from one month to two years. Despite the benevolent efforts of the Public Prosecutor's office, this article has hitherto not been used against the press, and for very good reasons. In order to remedy this situation, Herr Hansemann has transformed this article into the above-mentioned Paragraph 10. In the first place, “on the occasion” is transformed into the more convenient “in respect to the exercise of their duties”. Secondly, the troublesome *par parole* is changed to *par écrit*. In the third place, the penalty is trebled.

From the day when this Bill becomes law, Prussian officials may relax. If Herr Pfuel brands Polish hands and ears with lunar caustic and the press publishes it—four and a half months to four and a half years imprisonment! If citizens are inadvertently thrown into prison even though it is known that they are not the right ones and the press communicates this fact—four and a half months to four and a half years imprisonment! If *Landräte* turn themselves into *commis voyageurs* for reaction and collectors of signatures for royalist addresses and the press unmasks these gentlemen—four and a half months to four and a half years imprisonment!

From the day when this Bill becomes law, officials may with impunity carry out any arbitrary act, any tyrannical and any unlawful act. They may calmly administer beatings or order them, arrest and detain people without a hearing; the press, the only effective control, has been rendered ineffective. On the day when this Bill becomes law, the bureaucracy may celebrate a festival: it will have become mightier, less restrained and stronger than it was in the pre-March period.

Indeed, what remains of freedom of the press if that which *deserves* public contempt can no longer be held up to public contempt?

According to the laws hitherto in force the press could at least adduce facts to back up its general assertions and accusations. This will now come to an end. The press will no longer *report*, it will be allowed merely to *speak* in general *phrases* so that well-meaning people from Herr Hansemann down all the way to the beer-parlour politicians will have the right to say that the press is merely *reviling* and is not *proving* anything! Precisely for this reason the press is being prohibited from offering proofs!

We recommend, by the way, that Herr Hansemann make the following addition to his well-meaning draft. He should also declare it punishable to expose the officials to public ridicule besides penalising their exposure to public contempt. This omission might otherwise be painfully regretted.

We will not go in detail into the paragraphs dealing with obscenity or the regulations concerning confiscations etc. They surpass the *crème* of the press legislation of Louis Philippe and the Restoration. We do want to mention just one regulation: under Paragraph 21, the Public Prosecutor may request the confiscation not only of materials already printed but even of a *manuscript* which has only just been *handed over for printing*, if its contents condone a crime or offence that is liable to official prosecution! What a wide field of activity for philanthropic prosecutors! What a charming diversion to be able to go at any time to newspaper offices and demand to be shown for examination any "manuscript which has just been handed over for printing" since it might just be possible that it condoned a crime or offence!

Compared with this, how odd seems the solemn paragraph of the draft Constitution and of the "Fundamental Rights of the German Nation" which reads: *The censorship can never again be restored!*

Written by Marx on July 19, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 50, July 20, 1848

THE *FAEDRELAND* ON THE ARMISTICE
WITH DENMARK¹⁷¹

Cologne, July 20. In order that the fatherland may see for itself that the so-called revolution with its National Assembly, Imperial Regent^a etc. accomplished nothing more than a thorough revival of the famous Holy Roman Empire of the German nation,¹⁷² we reprint the following article from the Danish *Faedreland*. It is to be hoped that the article will suffice to prove to even the most trusting friends of the established order that forty million Germans have once again been duped by two million Danes with the assistance of English mediation and Russian threats just as happened all the time under the "constant augmenters of the Empire".^b

The *Faedreland*, Minister Orla Lehmann's own newspaper, speaks about the armistice as follows^c:

"If one looks at the armistice solely from the vantage point of our own hopes and wishes one cannot, of course, be satisfied with it; if one assumes that the Government had the choice between this armistice and the prospect of expelling the Germans from Schleswig with Swedish and Norwegian aid, forcing them to recognise Denmark's right to settle the affairs of this duchy in conjunction with its inhabitants—then, indeed, one would have to admit that the Government has acted irresponsibly by agreeing to the armistice. This choice, however, did not exist. One has to assume that both England and Russia, the two great powers which have the most direct interest in this controversy and its settlement, have demanded the conclusion of an armistice as a condition for their future sympathy and mediation; that the Swedish-Norwegian Government has likewise demanded that an attempt at a peaceful arrangement be made before it decides to render any effective aid and that it will give such aid only with the delimitation set out at the very beginning, namely that such aid must not serve a reconquest of Schleswig but merely the defence of Jutland and the

^a Archduke John of Austria.—*Ed.*

^b Part of the title of the Holy Roman Emperors.—*Ed.*

^c No. 179 of July 13, 1848.—*Ed.*

islands. Thus the alternative was as follows: on the one hand the gain of a respite so as to await the course of events abroad and to complete the political and military organisation at home; on the other hand the prospect of desperate single combat against superior strength; even if our army, which is half as strong as the federal army, were to have launched an assault upon the advantageous positions of the enemy, it would have been as good as impossible to achieve victory but the fight could well have led to the occupation of the entire peninsula by the Germans after the withdrawal of the Swedish-Norwegian forces; a combat which would at best have led to dearly bought, useless victories and at worst held out the prospect of the exhaustion of all our defence forces and a humiliating peace."

The Danish newspaper then proceeds to defend the conditions of the armistice as advantageous to Denmark. It describes as groundless the fear that the resumption of war would occur during the winter when the German troops could cross the ice to Fünen and Alsen.^a The Germans would be as incapable as the Danes of sustaining a winter campaign in such a climate whereas the advantages of a three-month truce would be very great for both Denmark and the loyal population of Schleswig. If no peace was concluded within the three months, the armistice would be automatically prolonged until spring. The paper continues:

"The lifting of the blockade and the freeing of the prisoners will be approved; the return of the seized ships, however, may perhaps have aroused the dissatisfaction of certain individuals. It must be remembered that the capture of German ships was rather a means of coercion to deter the Germans from crossing our frontier, and had by no means the purpose of enriching ourselves by the acquisition of foreign private property; moreover, the value of these ships is not nearly so great as some would like to believe. If these ships were to come under the hammer during the present stagnation both in our own and in European trade generally, they would at the very most fetch $1\frac{1}{2}$ million, i.e. the cost of the war for two months. And in exchange for these ships we obtain the evacuation of both duchies by the Germans as well as compensation for the goods requisitioned in Jutland. Thus the means of coercion we have used has fulfilled its purpose and its now being halted is quite in order. It seems to us that the evacuation of three counties by a superior army which we had no prospect of evicting by our own strength makes up tenfold for the small advantage that the state might have derived from the sale of the seized ships."

Paragraph 7 is described as the most questionable one. It is supposed to prescribe the continuation of the special Government for the duchies which in fact means a continuation of "Schleswig-Holsteinism". The King of Denmark is supposed to be bound to the *notables* of Schleswig-Holstein for the selection of the two members of the Provisional Government and it would be quite difficult to find one who is not a "Schleswig-Holsteinian". In return, however, the "entire insurrection" is expressly disavowed, all decisions of the

^a The Danish names are Fyn and Als.— *Ed.*

Provisional Government are annulled and the *status quo ante* March 17 is restored.

"Thus we have examined the most essential conditions of the armistice from a Danish point of view. Now, for a change, let us try to take the German point of view.

"All that Germany is demanding is the release of the ships and the lifting of the blockade.

"It gives up the following:

"Firstly, *the duchies*, occupied by an army which up to now has suffered no defeat and is strong enough to maintain its positions against an army twice as strong as the one which has confronted it up to now;

"Secondly, *Schleswig's admission to the Confederation*, which was solemnly announced by the Federal Diet and confirmed by the National Assembly's admission of the deputies from Schleswig;

"Thirdly, the *Provisional Government*, which it recognised as legitimate and with which it negotiated in that capacity;

"Fourthly, the *Schleswig-Holstein party*, whose demands, which were supported by the whole of Germany, have not been ratified but referred to the decision of non-German powers;

"Fifthly, the *Augustenburg pretenders*,^a to whom the King of Prussia had personally pledged his support but who are not mentioned at all in the armistice, and who have been assured of neither amnesty nor asylum;

"Finally, *the costs caused by the war*, which are borne in part by the duchies and in part by the Confederation, but *which will be refunded insofar as they were borne by Denmark proper*.

"It seems to us that our overwhelmingly strong enemies have much more to find fault with in this armistice than we, the small, despised nation."

Schleswig has had the incomprehensible desire to become German. It is quite in order that it should be punished for that and that it should be left in the lurch by Germany.

Tomorrow we shall carry the text of the armistice.^b

Written by Engels on July 20, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 51, July 21, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a Duke Christian August and Prince Frederick of Schleswig-Holstein.— *Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 266-69.— *Ed.*

THE CIVIC MILITIA BILL

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 51, July 21, 1848]

Cologne, July 20. The civic militia is disbanded, that is the chief paragraph of the Bill on the establishment of a civic militia, even though this paragraph appears at the very end of it as Paragraph 121, in the modest form:

"By the establishment of the civic militia under this law, all armed units, which at present either belong to or exist side by side with the civic militia, are herewith disbanded."

The disbandment of the units which do not belong directly to the civic militia has started without much ado. The disbandment of the civic militia itself can only be brought about under the pretext of *reorganising* it.

Legislative propriety necessitated the inclusion of the conventional constitutional phrase in Paragraph 1:

"It is the *function* of the civic militia to *protect constitutional freedom* and lawful order."

In order to live up to the "*nature of this function*", however, the civic militia may neither think nor speak of public affairs nor consult or decide about them (Paragraph 1), neither assemble nor arm (Paragraph 6), nor show any sign of life except by permission of the superior authorities. It is not that the civic militia "protects" the Constitution from the authorities but rather the authorities protect the Constitution from the civic militia. Thus the civic militia has to "obey" blindly the "demands of the authorities" (Paragraph 4) and to abstain from all interference "in the activities of communal, administrative or judicial authorities", and must also abstain from all arguments. If it "refuses" to obey passively, the *Regierungspräsident*

may “*suspend it from service*” for four weeks (Paragraph 4). If it should moreover arouse the royal displeasure, a “royal decree” may order “its *suspension*” for “six months”, or even “disbandment”; thereupon it *shall* be re-formed only after six months have passed (Paragraph 3). Thus there “shall exist a civic militia in every community of the kingdom” (Paragraph 2), that is insofar as the *Regierungspräsident* or the King does not find it necessary to order the exact opposite in every community. Whereas matters of state are not within the “competence” of the civic militia, the civic militia, on the contrary, is “within the competence of the Minister of the Interior”, i.e. the *Police Minister* who is its natural superior and who “by the nature of his function” is the faithful Eckart of “constitutional freedom” (Paragraph 5). Insofar as the civic militia is not ordered by the *Regierungspräsident* and the other officials “to protect constitutional freedom”, i.e. to carry out the judgment of the authorities, i.e. to be commandeered for *service*, its specific life’s work is to implement a set of *service regulations* designed by a royal *colonel*. This set of service regulations is its Magna Carta¹⁷⁸ for whose protection and execution it was, so to speak, created. Long live the *service regulations*! Finally, enrolment in the civic militia provides the occasion to make every Prussian “after completion of his 24th and before the completion of his 50th year of life” swear the following *oath*:

“I swear loyalty and obedience to the King, the Constitution and the laws of the kingdom.”

The poor Constitution! How cramped, bashful, civilly modest and with what submissive attitude it stands between the King and the law. First there is the royalist oath, the oath of the dear faithful ones, then the constitutional oath and finally an oath which does not make any sense at all unless it be a legitimist one indicating that besides the laws derived from the Constitution there are still other laws which originate from royal authority. And now the good citizen belongs from head to foot to the “competence of the Ministry of the Interior”.

This worthy fellow has received weapons and uniform on condition that he first of all relinquish his primary political rights, the right of association, etc. He fulfils his task to protect “constitutional freedom”, according to the “nature of the function”, by blindly carrying out the orders of the authorities, by exchanging the usual civil liberty which was tolerated even under the absolute monarchy for the passive, automatic and disinterested obedience of the soldier. A fine school, as Herr Schneider said in the Agreement

Assembly,^a to bring up the republicans of the future! What has become of our *citizen*? A hybrid between a Prussian policeman and an English constable! Yet for all his losses he is consoled by the set of *service regulations* and the knowledge that he is obeying orders. Would it not be more original to dissolve the nation in the army rather than to dissolve the army in the nation?

This *transformation of constitutional phrases into Prussian facts* is a truly bizarre spectacle.

If Prussianism condescends to become constitutional, constitutionalism ought surely to take the trouble to become Prussian. Poor constitutionalism! Worthy Germans! They have been moaning for so long that the “*most solemn*” promises were not fulfilled. Soon they will have only *one* fear, the fear of seeing the fulfilment of these solemn promises! The nation is punished *par où il a péché*.^b You have demanded *freedom of the press*? You will be *punished* by freedom of the press, and you will get censorship without censors, censorship by the Public Prosecutor’s office, censorship by a law that discovers in the “*nature of the function*” of the press that it must be concerned with everything except the authorities, the infallible authorities, the censorship of prison sentences and fines. As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so you are to pant after the good old much-maligned and much-misunderstood censor, the last of the Romans under whose ascetic providence you led such a comfortable and safe life.

You demanded a *people’s militia*? You will get a set of *service regulations*. You will be put at the disposal of the authorities. You will get military drill and schooling in passive obedience until your eyes water.

Prussian acumen has found out that every new constitutional institution offers the most interesting opportunity for new penal laws, new rules, new punishments, new supervision, new chicanery and new bureaucracy.

Still more constitutional demands! Still more constitutional demands! exclaims the Government of Action. We have an *act* for every demand!

Demand: Every citizen must be armed to protect “*constitutional freedom*”.

Answer: From now on every citizen comes under the competence of the Ministry of the Interior.

^a See this volume, pp. 233-35.— *Ed.*

^b By its sins.— *Ed.*

It would be easier to recognise the Greeks in the shape of the animals into which Circe transformed them than to recognise the constitutional institutions in the fantastic images into which they have been transfigured by *Prussianism* and its *Government of Action*.

The *Prussian reorganisation of Poland* is followed by the *Prussian reorganisation of the civic militia!*

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 52, July 22, 1848]

Cologne, July 21. We have seen that the "general stipulations" of the *civic militia* Bill amount to the following: the civic militia has ceased to exist. We shall touch very briefly upon yet some other sections of the Bill to distil from them the spirit of the "Government of Action", and here, too, we have to be selective in handling the raw materials of the pseudonymous institute. A great number of paragraphs presuppose new community and district regulations, a new administrative division of the monarchy etc., all creatures that conduct their hidden lives, as is well known, in the secret-pregnant womb of the Government of Action. Why then has the Government of Action issued the Bill on the reorganisation of the civic militia before the promised Bills on the community and district regulations etc.?

In Section III we find two service lists: the list of the respectable people serving in the civic militia and the list of citizens who are supported from public funds (Paragraph 14 [and Paragraph 16]). The host of officials, of course, is not included among the people who are supported from public funds. It is generally known that in Prussia these officials constitute the productive class proper. The poor, however, like the slaves in ancient Rome, "are only to be called up under extraordinary circumstances". If because of their civil dependence the poor are as little qualified to protect "constitutional freedom" as the *lazzaroni* in Naples,¹⁷⁴ do they deserve to occupy a subordinate position in this new institute of passive obedience?

Apart from the poor, we find a far more important distinction between the *solvent* and *insolvent* people on the active list of the militia.

But first another observation. Under Paragraph 53:

"Throughout the country, the civic militia must wear the same simple uniform prescribed by the King. The uniform must not be of such a kind that it gives occasion for confusion with the army."

Of course! The clothing must be of such a kind that the army is distinct from the civic militia and the civic militia from the people, and that no confusion can occur on such occasions as hand-to-hand combat, shooting and similar war manoeuvres. The *service* uniform *as such* is, however, as indispensable as the *service* list and the *service* regulations. It is precisely the *service* uniform which is the livery of freedom. This livery causes a significant rise in the cost of equipping a civic militiaman and the increased cost of this equipment gives the welcome excuse for creating an infinite abyss between *bourgeois* and *proletarian* members of the civic militia.

Listen to this:

Paragraph 57: "Every member of the civic militia must pay out of his own pocket for uniform (in case one is required), service badges and weapons. The community, however, is obliged to provide these items at its expense in the quantities required for the equipment of *soldiers on duty who cannot pay the costs from their own means.*"

Paragraph 59: "The community retains the right of possession of the items of equipment that it has supplied and *it can keep these in special stores when not in service use.*"

Thus, all those who cannot equip themselves militarily from top to toe, and that is the great majority of the Prussian population, the entire working class and a large part of the middle class, are all legally *disarmed* "except during the period of service", whereas the *bourgeois* section of the civic militia remains at all times in possession of its weapons and uniforms. Since in the guise of the "community" the same bourgeoisie "can keep in special stores the items of equipment that it has supplied", it is not only in possession of its *own* weapons but, in addition, is in possession of the weapons of the proletariat of the civic militia, and it "can" and "will" refuse to hand out these weapons even for "*service use*" if political collisions occur which are not to its liking. Thus the political privilege of capital has been restored in its most inconspicuous but most effective and decisive form. Capital has the privilege of possessing arms as opposed to those who own little, just as medieval feudal barons over against their serfs.

In order that this privilege should operate in its full exclusiveness, Paragraph 56 states that

"in the countryside and in towns of less than 5,000 inhabitants it suffices to arm civic militiamen with pikes or swords, and with this kind of armament only a *service badge* to be determined by the colonel need be worn in place of a uniform".

In all towns of *more than 5,000* inhabitants the *uniform* must enlarge the *property qualification*, which alone enables a man to bear arms, and with it increase the numbers of the proletariat in the civic

militia. Just as this proletariat, that is the largest part of the population, have uniforms and weapons only *on loan*, so they have the *right to bear arms* in general only *on loan*; their existence as servicemen is only on loan and—*beati possidentes*, blessed are the propertied! The moral uneasiness with which a *borrowed garb* envelops an individual, particularly in the case of soldiers where the borrowed uniform flits successively from one body to another, this moral uneasiness is, of course, the first requisite for Romans called upon “to protect constitutional freedom”. By contrast, however, will not the proud self-esteem of the *solvent* civic militia grow, and what more can be desired?

And even these stipulations, which render the right to bear arms illusory for the greater part of the population, are encased in still more novel and more restrictive stipulations, in the interests of the propertied section of the population, the privileged capitalists.

For the community needs to have in stock merely enough items of equipment required by that part of the insolvent servicemen “who are on active service”. Under Paragraph 15, the conditions for “active service” are as follows:

“In all communities where the total number of men currently available for service exceeds the 20th part of the population, the representatives of the community have the right to limit the personnel on active service to that part of the population. If they make use of this authorisation, they must lay down a service roster in such a way that all men currently available for service take their turn in due course. At every turn, however, not more than a third may leave at any one time; and all age groups must be called up at the same time in proportion to the available number of civic militiamen contained in each group.”

And now one should try to calculate for what tiny fraction of the proletariat of the civic militia and the total population these items of equipment are *really* provided by the community?

In yesterday's article we observed how the *Government of Action* is reorganising the constitutional institution of the civic militia along the lines of the old-Prussian, bureaucratic state. Only today we see it at the height of its mission and observe how it is forming this institution of the civic militia along the lines of the July revolution and Louis Philippe and in the spirit of the epoch which crowns capital and pays homage

With drums and trumpets
To its youthful splendour.^a

^a Modified quotation from Heinrich Heine's poem “Berg-Idylle”. In *Die Harzreise.—Ed.*

A few words to the Hansemann-Kühlwetter-Milde Government. A few days ago a circular letter against the intrigues of the reaction was sent by Herr Kühlwetter to every *Regierungspräsident*. What has led to this phenomenon?

The Government of Action intends to establish the rule of the bourgeoisie by simultaneously reaching a compromise with the old police and feudal state. While it is engaged in this dual and contradictory task, it sees that the rule of the bourgeoisie, which has still to be set up, and the existing Government itself are constantly outflanked by the absolutist and feudal reaction—and it is bound to succumb. The bourgeoisie cannot achieve domination without previously gaining the support of the people as a whole, and hence without acting more or less democratically.

But attempting to combine the Restoration period with the July period, and causing the bourgeoisie, which is still grappling with absolutism, feudalism, the country squires, and the rule of the military and the bureaucracy, already at this stage to exclude the people, and to subjugate and bypass it, is tantamount to attempting to square the circle. This is a historical problem which will frustrate the efforts even of a Government of Action, even of the Hansemann-Kühlwetter-Milde triumvirate.

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 54, July 24, 1848]

Cologne, July 23. The section of the *civic militia Bill* which deals with the “*election and appointment of superiors*” is a genuine *labyrinth of electoral methods*. We want to play Ariadne and give the modern Theseus, the praiseworthy civic militia, the thread that will guide him through the labyrinth. The modern Theseus, however, will be as ungrateful as the ancient one and, having killed the Minotaur, will treacherously abandon his Ariadne, the press, upon the rock of Naxos.

Let us number the different passages of the labyrinth.

Passage One. Direct elections.

Paragraph 42. “The leaders of the civic militia up to and including captains, are elected by the civic militiamen on *active service*.”

Side passage. “The civic militiamen on active service” constitute only a small part of the really “able-bodied” personnel. Compare Paragraph 15^a and our article of the day before yesterday.

^a The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* has “Paragraph 25”, evidently a misprint.—*Ed.*

Thus the "direct" elections, too, are only so-called direct elections.

Passage Two. Indirect elections.

Paragraph 48. "The battalion's major is elected with an absolute majority of votes by the captains, platoon leaders and corporals of the respective companies."

Passage Three. Combination of indirect elections with royal appointment.

Paragraph 49. "The *colonel* is appointed by the *King* from a list of three candidates elected by the leaders of the respective battalions down to and including the platoon leaders."

Passage Four. Combination of indirect elections with appointment by the commanders.

Paragraph 50. "The respective commanders will appoint adjutants from among the platoon leaders, battalion clerks from among the corporals and battalion drum-majors from among the drummers."

Passage Five. Direct appointment by bureaucratic means.

Paragraph 50. "The sergeant and the clerk of a company are appointed by the captain, the sergeant-major and the clerk of a squadron by a cavalry captain and the corporal by the platoon leader."

Thus if these electoral methods begin with adulterated direct elections, they end with the unadulterated cessation of *all* elections, namely with the discretion of the captains, cavalry captains and platoon leaders. *Finis coronat opus.*^a This labyrinth has its apex, its point.

The crystals—ranging from the effulgent colonel to the insignificant corporal—which are precipitated in this complicated chemical process, settle for six years.

Paragraph 51. "Elections and appointments of leaders are made for six years."

It is hard to understand why after such precautionary measures the Government of Action needed to commit another gaffe by shouting in the face of the civic militia, in the "general regulations": You are to be transformed from a *political* into a purely *police* institution and you are to be reorganised as a nursery for *old-Prussian drill*. Why take away the illusion?

The *royal* appointment is so like a *canonisation* that in the section on "*Civic Militia Courts*" we find no courts for "*colonels*" but only courts for ranks up to *major*. How could a royal colonel possibly commit a crime?

In contrast, the mere existence as a militiaman is to such an extent a *profanation* of the citizen, that a word from his superior officers, a

^a The end crowns the work.—*Ed.*

word from the infallible royal colonel, or even from the first chap that comes along who has been appointed sergeant by the captain or corporal by the platoon leader, is enough to rob the militiaman of his *personal freedom* for 24 hours and to have him arrested.

Paragraph 81. "Every superior may reprimand his *subordinate* while on service; he can even *order his immediate arrest and imprisonment for 24 hours* if the subordinate is guilty of drunkenness while on duty or *some other gross violation of service regulations.*"

The superior, of course, decides *what* constitutes *some other* gross violation of service regulations and the *subordinate* has to obey orders.

Thus if the citizen at the very beginning of the Bill matures towards the "nature of his function", the "protection of constitutional freedom", by ceasing to be what according to Aristotle is the function of man—a "*zoon politikon*", a "political animal"^a—he only completes his calling by surrendering his freedom as a citizen to the discretion of a colonel or a corporal.

The "*Government of Action*" seems to subscribe to some peculiar oriental-mystical notions, to a sort of *Moloch cult*. To protect the "constitutional freedom" of *Regierungspräsidenten*, burgomasters, police superintendents, chiefs of police and police inspectors, officials of the public prosecution, presidents or directors of law-courts, examining magistrates, justices of the peace, village mayors, Ministers, clergymen, military personnel on active service, frontier, customs, tax, forestry and postal officials, superintendents and warders of all kinds of penal institutions, the executive security officers and of the people under 25 and over 50 years of age—all of them persons who according to Paragraphs 9, 10, and 11 do not belong to the civic militia—to protect the "constitutional freedom" of this élite of the nation, the rest of the nation must let its constitutional freedom and even personal freedom die a bloody sacrificial death upon the altar of the fatherland. *Pends-toi, Figaro! Tu n'aurais pas inventé cela!*^b

It is hardly necessary to mention that the section dealing with *penalties* has been worked out with voluptuous thoroughness. The entire institution, in accordance with "the nature of its function", is, of course, to be purely a penalty for the desire of the praiseworthy citizenry to have a Constitution and a civic militia. We merely observe that in addition to the *legally* determined criminal cases, the *service regulations*, the Magna Carta of the civic militia, devised by the *royal colonel* in consultation with the major and with the permission of the

^a Aristotle, *Politica*, I, 1, 9.—*Ed.*

^b Hang yourself, Figaro, you would not have thought of that! (Modified quotation from Beaumarchais' *La folle journée, ou le mariage de Figaro*, Act V, Scene 8.)—*Ed.*

apocryphal "district representation", give rise to a new specimen collection of penalties (see Paragraph 82 and the subsequent paragraphs). It goes without saying that *finis* can be substituted for *imprisonment* so that the difference between the *solvent* and *insolvent* members of the civic militia, i.e. the difference between the *bourgeoisie* and the *proletariat* of the civic militia invented by the "Government of Action", may enjoy penal sanction.

The *exempt judiciary*, which the Government of Action had by and large to give up in the Constitution, is smuggled back again into the civic militia. All disciplinary offences of the men and corporals of the civic militia are within the competence of company courts consisting of two platoon leaders, two corporals and three civic militiamen (Paragraph 87). All disciplinary offences of "leaders of companies belonging to the battalion, from platoon leaders up to and including majors", are under the jurisdiction of battalion courts consisting of two captains, two platoon leaders and three corporals (Paragraph 88). For the major there is a specially exempt judiciary since the same Paragraph 88 prescribes that "if the investigation concerns a major, the battalion court will be joined by two majors serving as members of the court". Finally, a colonel, as has already been mentioned, is *exempt* from any court.

The admirable Bill ends with the following paragraph:

(Paragraph 123.) "The rules concerning the participation of the civic militia in the defence of the fatherland in case of war and its armament, equipment and provisioning to be carried out then are reserved for the law on the organisation of the army."

In other words: *the old army reserve continues to exist side by side with the reorganised civic militia.*

Does not the *Government of Action* deserve to be *impeached* just because of this Bill and the projected armistice with Denmark?

Written on July 20-23, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* Nos. 51, 52 and 54, July 21, 22 and 24, 1848

Published in English for the first time

THE ARMISTICE WITH DENMARK¹⁷⁵

Cologne, July 21. As our readers know, we have always regarded the Danish war with great equanimity. We have joined neither in the blatant bluster of the nationalists, nor in the well-worn tune of the sham enthusiasm for sea-girt Schleswig-Holstein.^a We knew our country too well, we knew what it means to rely on Germany.

Events have fully borne out our views. The unimpeded capture of Schleswig by the Danes, the recapture of the country and the march to Jutland, the retreat to the Schlei, the repeated capture of the duchy up to Königsau^b—this utterly incomprehensible conduct of the war from first to last has shown the Schleswigers what sort of protection they can expect from the revolutionary, great, strong, united etc. Germany, from the supposedly sovereign nation of forty-five million. However, in order that they lose all desire to become German, and that the “Danish yoke” appear infinitely more desirable to them than “German liberty”, Prussia, in the name of the German Confederation,¹⁷⁶ has negotiated the armistice of which we print today a word-for-word translation.

Hitherto it has been the custom, when signing an armistice, for the two armies to maintain their positions, or at most a narrow neutral strip was interposed between them. Under this armistice, the first result of the “prowess of Prussian arms”, the victorious Prussians withdraw over 20 miles, from Kolding to this side of Lauenburg, whereas the defeated Danes maintain their positions at Kolding and

^a Engels paraphrases the first words of a song which was written by Matthäus Friedrich Chemnitz in 1844.—*Ed.*

^b The Danish name is Kongeaa.—*Ed.*

relinquish only Alsen.^a Furthermore, in the event of the armistice being called off, the Danes are to advance to the positions they held on June 24, in other words they are to occupy a six to seven miles wide stretch of North Schleswig without firing a shot—a stretch from which they were *twice* driven out—whereas the Germans are allowed to advance only to Apenrade^b and its environs. Thus “the honour of German arms is preserved” and North Schleswig, exhausted because it was deluged with troops four times, is promised a possible fifth and sixth invasion.

But that is not all. A part of Schleswig is to be occupied by Danish troops even during the armistice. Under Clause 8, Schleswig is to be occupied by regiments recruited in the duchy, i.e. partly by soldiers from Schleswig who took part in the movement, and partly by soldiers who at that time were stationed in Denmark and fought in the ranks of the Danish army against the Provisional Government. They are commanded by Danish officers and are in every respect *Danish* troops. That is how the Danish papers, too, size up the situation.

The *Faedreland* of July 13 writes:

“The presence in the duchy of *loyal* troops from Schleswig will undoubtedly substantially harden popular feeling which, now that the country has experienced the misfortunes of war, will forcefully turn against those who are the cause of these misfortunes.”

On top of that we have the movement in Schleswig-Holstein. The Danes call it a *riot*, and the Prussians *treat* it *as a riot*. The Provisional Government, which has been recognised by Prussia and the German Confederation, is mercilessly sacrificed; all laws, decrees etc., issued after Schleswig became independent, are abrogated; on the other hand, the repealed Danish laws have again come into force. In short, the reply concerning *Wildenbruch*'s famous Note, a reply which Herr Auerswald refused to give,^c can be found here in Clause 7 of the proposed armistice. Everything that was revolutionary in the movement is ruthlessly destroyed, and the Government created by the revolution is to be replaced by a legitimate administration nominated by three legitimate monarchs. The troops of Holstein and Schleswig are again to be *commanded by Danes and thrashed by Danes*; the ships of Holstein and Schleswig are to remain “*Dansk-Eiendom*”^d as before, despite the latest order of the Provisional Government.

^a The Danish name is Als.— *Ed.*

^b The Danish name is Aabenraa.— *Ed.*

^c See this volume, p. 191.— *Ed.*

^d “Danish property.”— *Ed.*

The new Government which they intend to set up puts the finishing touch to all this. The *Faedreland*^a declares:

"Though in the limited electoral district from which the Danish-elected members of the new Government are to be chosen we shall probably not find the combination of energy, talent, intelligence and experience which Prussia will dispose of when making her selection", this is not decisive. "The members of the Government must of course be elected from among the population of the duchies, but no one prevents us giving them secretaries and assistants *born and residing in other parts of the country*. In selecting these secretaries and administrative advisers one can be guided by considerations of fitness and talent without regard to local considerations, and it is likely that these men will exert a great influence on the spirit and trend of the administration. Indeed, it is to be hoped that even *high-ranking Danish officials* will accept such a post, though its official status may be inferior. Every true Dane will consider such a post an honour under the present circumstances."

This semi-official paper thus promises the duchies that they will be swamped not only with Danish troops but also with Danish civil servants. A partly Danish Government will take up its residence in Rendsburg on the officially recognised territory of the German Confederation.

These are the advantages which the armistice brings Schleswig. The advantages for Germany are just as great. The admission of Schleswig to the German Confederation is not mentioned at all. On the contrary, the decision of the Confederation is *flatly repudiated* by the composition of the new Government. The German Confederation chooses the members for Holstein, and the King of Denmark chooses those *for Schleswig*. Schleswig is therefore under Danish, and not German, jurisdiction.

Germany would have rendered a real service in this Danish war if she had compelled Denmark to abolish the Sound tax, a form of old feudal robbery.¹⁷⁷ The German seaports, hard hit by the blockade and the seizure of their ships, would have willingly borne the burden even longer if it led to the abolition of the Sound tax. The governments also made it known everywhere that the abolition of this tax must at any rate be brought about. And what came of all this boastfulness? Britain and Russia want the tax kept, and of course Germany obediently acquiesces.

It goes without saying that in exchange for the return of the ships, the goods requisitioned in Jutland have to be refunded, on the principle that Germany is rich enough to pay for her glory.

These are the advantages which the Hansemann Ministry offers to the German nation in this draft armistice. These are the fruits of a war waged for three months against a small nation of a million and a

^a No. 180, July 14, 1848.— *Ed.*

half. That is the result of all the boasting by our national papers, our formidable Dane-haters!

It is said that the armistice will not be concluded. General Wrangel, encouraged by Beseler, has definitely refused to sign it, despite repeated requests by Count Pourtalès, who brought him Auerswald's order to sign it, and despite numerous reminders that it was his duty as a Prussian general to do so. Wrangel stated that he is above all subordinated to the German Central Authority, and the latter will not approve of the armistice unless the armies maintain their present positions and the Provisional Government remains in office until the peace is concluded.

Thus the Prussian project will probably not be carried out, but it is nevertheless interesting as a demonstration of how Prussia, when she takes over the reins, defends Germany's honour and interests.

Written by Engels on July 21, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 52, July 22, 1848

THE ARMISTICE "NEGOTIATIONS"

The armistice has still neither been signed nor definitively rejected. Reports both from Wrangel's headquarters and from Copenhagen continually contradict one another. All that is certain is that Wrangel initially refused to sign, that Mr. Reedtz returned to Copenhagen with this refusal and that as a result fresh troops were embarked for Jutland from the 15th July onwards. The *Börsen-Halle* says^a that on receiving the news of another three-day cease-fire the English and Swedish ambassadors,^b together with Mr. Reedtz, left Copenhagen for Kolding. They are said to be joining General Neumann, who has been sent there from Berlin, in an attempt to overcome Wrangel's opposition.

All this news reaches us via Copenhagen, while from Berlin and from Wrangel's headquarters we hear nothing but empty rumours. Our present constitutional right of access to information is in this sense no different from the old mystery-mongering. We read of the things which concern us most closely in the newspapers of countries furthest away from us.

According to a letter in the *Fædreland* the Jutes have reacted fairly peacefully to the German invasion.

Written by Engels on or about July 23,
1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische
Zeitung* No. 54, July 24, 1848

Published in English for the first
time

^a "Kopenhagen, den 19. Juli", *Börsen-Halle* No. 11224, July 21, 1848.—*Ed.*

^b Henry Wynn and Elias Lagerheim.—*Ed.*

THE CONCORDIA OF TURIN

Cologne, July 23. We have recently mentioned the newspaper *L'Alba* which appears in Florence and which has held out its fraternal hand to us across the Alps.^a It was to be expected that another journal, *La Concordia* in Turin, a newspaper of opposite colours, should declare itself in an opposite, though by no means hostile, manner. In a former issue *La Concordia* expressed the opinion that the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* backs any group as long as it is "oppressed".^b The paper was led to this not very sensible invention by our judgment of the events in Prague and our sympathy for the democratic forces against the reactionary Windischgrätz and Co.^c Perhaps the Turin journal has become more enlightened in the meantime about the so-called *Czech* movement.

Lately, however, *La Concordia*^d felt induced to devote a more or less doctrinaire article to the *Nuova Gazzetta Renana*.^e It has read in our newspaper the programme for the Workers' Congress¹⁷⁸ which is to be convened in Berlin and the eight points which are to be discussed by the workers are disturbing it to a significant degree.

After faithfully translating the whole, it begins a sort of criticism with the following words:

"There is much that is true and just in these proposals, but the *Concordia* would betray its mission if it did not raise its voice against the errors of the socialists."

^a See this volume, p. 167.—*Ed.*

^b *La Concordia* No. 161, July 7, 1848.—*Ed.*

^c See this volume, pp. 91-93 and 119-20.—*Ed.*

^d *La Concordia* No. 168, July 15, 1848.—*Ed.*

^e *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*.—*Ed.*

We on our part protest against the "error" of the *Concordia* which consists in mistaking the programme issued by the respective commission for the Workers' Congress, and which we merely reported, for *our own*. We are nevertheless ready to enter upon a discussion on political economy with the *Concordia* as soon as its programme offers something more than a few well-known philanthropic phrases and picked-up free trade dogmas.

Written on July 23, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 55, July 25, 1848

Published in English for the first time

THE AGREEMENT DEBATES ON THE DISTRICT ESTATES

(AGREEMENT SESSION OF JULY 18)

Cologne, July 25. Among the many confused, purposeless and purely personal documents and negotiations that occur at the beginning of each session, we want to stress today two points.

The first one is the declaration by ex-Minister *Rodbertus*, submitted in writing to the President and repeated from the rostrum: It is true that he had put his name down as a speaker *against* Jacoby's motion^a but, for all that, had wanted to speak *only* against its first part, which disapproves of the Frankfurt decision, and *at the same time against* the respective *declaration of the Ministry* made on July 4. As is known, the debate was broken off before Herr Rodbertus had the opportunity to speak.

The second point is a declaration by Herr *Brodowski* in the name of all Polish deputies made with regard to any possible declaration of the German-Polish delegates: He did not recognise the legality of the incorporation of a part of Posen into the German Confederation on the grounds of the treaties of 1815 and the declaration of the Provincial Estates, provoked by the King, *against* its admission into the Confederation.¹⁷⁹

"I do not know of a subsequent *legal way* because *the nation has not yet been consulted on it.*"

Then follows the final debate on the address. As is known, the address was rejected amid shouts of the Left: "Twice repeated question of confidence!" and general laughter.

Now it was the turn of the committee's report dealing with the motion of 94 deputies to rescind the authority of the District Estates to levy taxes.

^a See this volume, p. 232.—*Ed.*

We are going into this matter deliberately. It makes us recall once again a piece of genuine old-Prussian legislation, and the mounting reaction more and more holds up this legislation to us as a faultless model, while the Government of Action, not wanting to represent the Government of transition, becomes every day more of an unabashed eulogist for the Bodelschwingh Ministry.

By a series of laws, all of which are of more recent date than 1840, the District Estates have been authorised to decide upon taxes with binding effect for the inhabitants of the districts.

These District Estates are a marvellous example of old-Prussian "representation". All the large landowning peasants of the district send *three* deputies. As a rule, every town sends *one*; but *every squire* is a *member of the District Estates by virtue of his birth*. Not at all represented are the workers and part of the petty bourgeoisie in the towns, and the small proprietors and non-established inhabitants in the countryside, who together form the overwhelming majority. These non-represented classes are nevertheless taxed by the deputies, namely by the gentlemen who are "members of the District Estates by virtue of their birth"; how and for which purposes we shall see presently.

These District Estates, who moreover are entitled to dispose quite independently of the district assets, are in decisions on taxation bound by the permission either of the *Oberpräsident* or of the King, and additionally, when they are divided and one estate votes in a different way, by the decision of the Minister of the Interior. One can see how cunningly the old Prussianism knew how to preserve the "vested rights" of the big landowners, but at the same time also the right of superintendence of the bureaucracy.

The fact that the right of superintendence of the bureaucracy exists only in order to prevent any encroachment by the District Estates on the rights of the officialdom and not in order to protect the inhabitants of the district, particularly those who are not represented at all, from encroachments by the District Estates, has been expressly recognised by the report of the central commission.

The report closes with the motion to rescind the laws which entitle the District Estates to levy taxes.

Herr *Bucher*, who gave the report, speaks to the motion. Precisely those decisions of the District Estates which most oppressed and embittered the non-represented ones, had been singled out by the local governments for confirmation.

"It is precisely a curse of the police state, which in principle has been abolished but which in fact unfortunately continues to exist to this day, that the higher the standing of an official or authority in this hierarchy of mandarins, the more they feel that they

are able also to understand such detailed measures although they are that much further removed from local needs."

The proposal was the more commendable since it was not constructive but merely *destructive*.

"It cannot be denied that up to now the Assembly has *not* been *fortunate* in its attempts at *productive* activity ... it might be advisable, therefore, to devote ourselves for the time being more to *destructive* activity."

The speaker suggests accordingly that especially the reactionary laws issued since 1815 should be abolished.

This was too much. The reporter had not only denounced old Prussianism, bureaucracy and the District Estates, he had even cast an ironic side-glance at the products of the agreement debates so far. Here was a favourable opportunity for the Ministry. In any case, even out of consideration for the Court, it could not admit that only the laws issued by the present King^a would be rescinded.

Herr *Kühlwetter* therefore rises.

"The District Estates are constituted in such a way that their constitution will undoubtedly be changed because"—the whole business of estates altogether contradicts the principle of equality before the law? On the contrary! Merely "because now every squire is still a member of the District Estates by virtue of his birth, a town, however, no matter *how many manors* it may contain, is entitled to send only one deputy to the District Estates and the rural communities are represented by only three deputies".

Let us take a look at the hidden plans of the Government of Action. The estate system had to be abolished in the central national representation, that could not be avoided. In the smaller areas of representation, however, that is in the local districts (perhaps also in the provinces?), the attempt will be made to *preserve the representation by estates* by doing away with only the most egregious advantages of the squirearchy over the burghers and peasants. That Herr *Kühlwetter's* explanation cannot be interpreted in any other way emerges from the fact that the report of the central commission directly refers to the application of the principle of equality before the law in the district representation. Herr *Kühlwetter*, however, passes over this point in deepest silence.

Herr *Kühlwetter* has no objection to the *content* of the motion. He is merely asking whether it is necessary to give validity to the motion by "way of legislation".

"The danger that the District Estates may abuse their right to tax is *surely not so great*.... The Government's right of supervision is *by no means so illusory* as has been presented; it has *always* been exercised conscientiously and in that way 'the lowest class of tax payers has been relieved from contributions as much as possible'."

^a Frederick William IV.—*Ed.*

Of course! Herr Kühlwetter was a bureaucrat under Bodelschwingh and even at the risk of compromising the entire Government of Action he has to defend the past heroic deeds of the Bodelschwingh bureaucracy. We notice that Herr Hansemann was absent when his colleague Kühlwetter made him fraternise so much with Herr Bodelschwingh.

Herr Kühlwetter declares that he has already instructed all the local governments not to confirm any more taxation by the District Estates until further notice, and with that the purpose is surely achieved.

Herr *Jentzsch* spoils the Minister's game by observing that it is the District Estates' custom to assess the turnpike tolls, which benefit the manorial estates most, in accordance with the *principles of the graduated tax from which the estates of the aristocracy are entirely exempted*.

Herr *Kühlwetter* and Herr *von Wangenheim*, who is an interested party, attempt to defend the District Estates. In particular von Wangenheim, a Justice of the Court of Appeal, District Estate of Saatzig, delivers a long eulogy on this laudable institution.

Deputy *Moritz*, however, again thwarts the effect. What good is Herr Kühlwetter's instruction? If the Ministry should one day have to resign, the local governments would disregard the instruction. If we have laws as bad as these, I cannot see why we should not rescind them. And as far as the denied abuses are concerned,

"not only have the District Estates abused their authority to levy taxes by showing *personal favouritism*, by deciding upon expenditures which were not for the common good of the district, but they have even decided upon highway construction in the interest of certain individuals, of a privileged class.... The district town of Ruppın was to be connected to the railway line Hamburg-Berlin. Instead of letting the highway pass through the town of Wusterhausen, the *local Government refused* to let this highway run through this small, impoverished town—even though this town declared that it would pay the additional cost from its own funds—and on the contrary decided that the highway was to run through *three estates of one and the same lord of the manor*"!!

Herr *Reichenbach* calls attention to the fact that the Ministry's instruction has no effect whatsoever upon the district assets which are entirely at the disposal of the District Estates.

The *Minister* replies with a few lame phrases.

Herr *Bucher* declares that in his opinion the Minister is by no means *entitled* to issue instructions, which *in effect rescind* existing laws. Only by legislation could an improvement be brought about.

Herr Kühlwetter stammers yet a few more incoherent words to defend himself, and then a vote is taken.

The Assembly adopts the motion of the central commission whereby the laws authorising the District Estates to levy taxes and dispose of the district assets are rescinded, with the addendum:

“decisions of the District Estates taken on the basis of these decrees notwithstanding”.

It is obvious that the “acts” of the Government of Action consist of police-type attempts at reaction and parliamentary defeats.

(To be continued)^a

Written by Engels on July 25, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 56, July 26, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a See Engels' article "The Agreement Debate about the Valdenaire Affair" (pp. 301-04 of this volume).—*Ed.*

THE BILL ON THE COMPULSORY LOAN
AND ITS MOTIVATION¹⁸⁰

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 56, July 26, 1848]

Cologne, July 25. A notorious rogue of London's blessed district of St. Giles appeared before the Assizes. He was accused of having relieved the chest of a notorious City miser of £2,000.

"Gentlemen of the jury," began the accused, "I will not lay claim to your patience for very long. Since my defence will be of an economical nature, I shall use words economically. I have taken £2,000 from Mr. Cripps. Nothing is more certain than that. I have, however, only taken from a private person in order to give to the public. What happened to the £2,000? Did I perhaps keep them egoistically? Search my pockets. I will sell you my soul for a farthing if you are able to find one penny. You will find the £2,000 at the tailor's, the shopkeeper's,^a the restaurateur's etc. Thus what have I done? I have taken 'idle sums of money which' could be retrieved from the grave, in which avarice kept them, '*only by a compulsory loan*' and '*put them into circulation*'. I was an agent of circulation and circulation is the foremost requirement for national wealth. Gentlemen, you are Englishmen! You are economists! You will surely not condemn a benefactor of the nation!"

The economist of St. Giles resides in Van Diemen's Land^b and has the opportunity to think about the blind ingratitude of his fellow countrymen.

He did not live in vain, however. His principles form the basis of *Hansemann's compulsory loan*.

Explaining the *motives* for this measure, Herr Hansemann states that "the admissibility of the compulsory loan rests upon the well-founded supposition that a major portion of the available-cash lies *idle* in the possession of private individuals in *small and large sums* and *can be put into circulation only by a compulsory loan*".

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

^b Now Tasmania. From 1803 to 1854 a British penal colony.—*Ed.*

When you *consume* a capital, you bring it into circulation. If you do not bring it into circulation, the state will *consume* it in order to bring it into circulation.

A cotton manufacturer employs 100 workers, for example. He pays to each of them 9 silver groschen daily. Thus every day 900 silver groschen, i.e. 30 talers, migrate from his pocket into the pockets of the workers and from there into the pockets of the *epiciers*,^a landlords, shoemakers, tailors etc. This migration of the 30 talers is known as their *circulation*. From the moment when the manufacturer can sell his cotton material only at a loss or not at all, he ceases to produce and to employ his workers, and with the cessation of production the migration of the 30 talers, i.e. their *circulation*, ceases. We shall create circulation by force! exclaims Hansemann. Why does the manufacturer let his money lie *idle*? Why does he not let it circulate? When the weather is fine, many people circulate in the open air. Hansemann drives the people outside and forces them to circulate so as to create fine weather. What a great weather-maker!

The ministerial and commercial crisis robs the capital of bourgeois society of its interest. The state helps society to its legs by taking away its capital as well.

In his book on *Circulation*^b the Jew *Pinto*, the famous eighteenth-century stock exchange speculator, recommends speculating in stocks. He states that although speculation does not produce circulation, it promotes circulation, that is the migration of wealth from one pocket into another. Hansemann is transforming the exchequer into a wheel of fortune upon which the property of the citizens circulates. Hansemann-Pinto!

In his "*preamble*" for the "Bill on the Compulsory Loan", Hansemann is encountering one great difficulty. Why has the *voluntary loan* not produced the required sums?

The "unreserved confidence" which the present Government enjoys is well known. Also well known is the rapturous patriotism of the big bourgeoisie whose main complaint is that a few agitators have the insolence not to share its confidence. The loyalty declarations from all the provinces are well known. But "for a' that and a' that",^c Hansemann is compelled to transform the poetic voluntary loan into the prosaic compulsory loan!

For example, in the district of Düsseldorf, aristocrats have

^a Grocers.—*Ed.*

^b Isaac Pinto, *Traité de la circulation et du crédit*.—*Ed.*

^c Quoted from Ferdinand Freiligrath's translation ("Trotz alledem!") of Robert Burns' poem "For a' that and a' that".—*Ed.*

contributed 4,000 talers and officers 900 talers, and where does more confidence reign than among the aristocrats and officers of the district of Düsseldorf? We will not even mention the contributions of the princes of the Royal House.

But let Hansemann explain this phenomenon to us.

“Up to now *voluntary* contributions have come in slowly. This is *probably* to be ascribed *less to a lack of confidence* in our state of affairs than to the *uncertainty* about the *real needs* of the state, since people seem to believe it permissible to wait and see *if and to what extent the monetary resources of the nation might be drawn upon*. On this *circumstance* rests the hope that everybody will contribute *voluntarily* according to his ability once the *duty to contribute* has been demonstrated to be an *imperative necessity*.”

The state, finding itself in dire need, appeals to patriotism. It politely asks patriotism to deposit 15 million talers on the altar of the fatherland, and moreover not as a gift but only as a voluntary *loan*. One possesses the greatest confidence in the state but turns a deaf ear towards its cry for help! Unfortunately one finds oneself in such a state of “*uncertainty*” about the “*real needs* of the state” that one decides after the greatest spiritual torment not to give the state *anything* for the time being. One has, indeed, the greatest confidence in the state authority, and the honourable state authority claims that the state needs 15 million talers. It is certainly due to confidence that one does not trust the assertions of the state authority and rather views its clamour for 15 million as a mere frivolity.

There is a famous story about a stout-hearted *Pennsylvanian* who never lent a dollar to his friends. He had such confidence in their orderly mode of life, and he gave such credit to their business that to the day of his death he never gained the “certainty” that they were in “real need” of a dollar. He regarded their impetuous demands as rather a test of his confidence, and the confidence of this man was unshakeable.

The Prussian state authority found the entire state inhabited by Pennsylvanians.

Herr Hansemann, however, explains this strange economic phenomenon by yet another peculiar “*circumstance*”.

The people did not contribute voluntarily “because they believed it permissible to wait and see *if and to what extent their monetary resources might be drawn upon*”. In other words: nobody paid voluntarily because everybody waited to see *if and to what extent* he would be *forced* to pay. What circumspect patriotism! What most canny confidence! It is upon this “*circumstance*”, namely that behind the blue-eyed, sanguine voluntary loan there stands now the sinister, hypochondriacal compulsory loan, that Herr Hansemann “rests his *hope* that everybody will contribute *voluntarily* according to

his ability". By now even the most obdurate doubter must have lost his uncertainty and must have gained the conviction that the state authority is really serious about its need for money. The entire misfortune, as we have seen, lay just in this embarrassing uncertainty. If you do not give, it will be taken from you, and the taking will cause both you and us inconvenience. We hope, therefore, that your confidence will lose some of its exaggerated character and will express itself in well-ringing talers instead of hollow-sounding phrases. *Est-ce clair?*^a

Much as Herr Hansemann is basing his "hopes" upon this "circumstance", he has nevertheless himself become infected by the brooding temperament of his *Pennsylvanians* and he feels induced to look around for yet stronger *incentives* to confidence. The confidence indeed exists but it does not want to reveal itself. It needs *incentives* to drive it out of its latent state.

"In order to create an even stronger motive" (than the prospect of the compulsory loan) "for voluntary participation, however, Paragraph 1 projects an interest rate of $3\frac{1}{3}$ per cent for the loan, and a date" (October 1) "is left open up to which voluntary loans are to be accepted at 5 per cent."

Thus Herr Hansemann puts a *premium* of $1\frac{2}{3}$ per cent upon voluntary loans, and now, to be sure, patriotism will flow freely, coffers will jump open and the golden flood of confidence will stream into the exchequer.

Herr Hansemann naturally finds it "just" to pay the big shots $1\frac{2}{3}$ per cent more than he is paying the little people who will part with their essentials only under duress. In addition they will have to bear the *cost of the appeal* as punishment for their less comfortable circumstances.

Thus the biblical saying is realised. For whosoever hath, to him shall be given; but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath.^b

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 60, July 30, 1848]

Cologne, July 29. Just as Peel once invented a "sliding scale"¹⁸¹ for the duty on corn, Hansemann-Pinto has invented one for involuntary patriotism.

"A progressive scale will be employed for the obligatory contributions," our Hansemann says in his preamble, "since the ability to supply money obviously rises in *arithmetical* progression with the amount of a person's wealth."

^a Is that clear?—*Ed.*

^b Matthew 13:12.—*Ed.*

The ability to supply money rises with wealth. In other words: the more money one has at one's disposal the more money one has to dispose of. So far, it is undoubtedly correct. The fact, however, that the ability to supply money rises only in *arithmetical* progression even if the various amounts of wealth are in *geometrical* proportion is a discovery by Hansemann which is bound to earn him greater fame with posterity than Malthus gained by the statement that food supply grows only in arithmetical progression whereas population grows in geometrical progression.^a

Thus, for example, if different amounts of wealth are to each other as

1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, 512,

then, according to Herr Hansemann's discovery, the ability to supply money grows in the ratio of

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

In spite of the apparent growth of the obligatory contribution, the ability to supply money, according to our economist, decreases to the same degree that wealth increases.

In a short story by Cervantes^b we find the chief Spanish financier in a lunatic asylum. This man had discovered that the Spanish national debt would vanish as soon as

"the Cortes approve a law that all vassals of His Majesty between the ages of 14 and 60 are obliged to fast on bread and water for one day during each month, and that on a day freely to be chosen and decided. The monetary value of the fruits, vegetables, meat dishes, fish, wines, eggs and beans which would otherwise have been consumed on that day would be delivered to His Majesty, without holding back one penny on pain of punishment for perjury".

Hansemann shortens the procedure. He calls upon all his Spaniards who possess an annual income of 400 talers to find one day in the year on which they can do without 20 talers. According to the sliding scale, he has asked the small fry to refrain from just about all consumption for 40 days. If they cannot find the 20 talers between August and September, a bailiff will look for them in October in accordance with the words: seek and ye shall find.^c

Let us further examine the "*preamble*" which the Prussian Necker reveals to us.

"Any income," he instructs us, "derived from industry in the widest sense of the word, that is irrespective of whether it is subject to a business tax, as is the case with

^a [Th. R. Malthus,] *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, pp. 25-26.—Ed.

^b Cervantes, *Novelas ejemplares: Coloquio de los perros*.—Ed.

^c Matthew 7:7; Luke 11:9.—Ed.

doctors, lawyers etc., can only be taken into consideration *after the subtraction of the operating expenditures* including any interest to be paid on debts, *since the net income can only be found in this way*. For the same reason the *working capital* must be disregarded if the loan contribution which is calculated from *income exceeds that calculated from the working capital*."

Nous marchons de surprise en surprise.^a The *income* can only be taken into consideration *after the subtraction of the working capital* since the compulsory loan can and ought to be nothing but an extraordinary form of *income tax*. And the operating costs belong as little to the income of an industrialist as the stem and root of a tree belong to its fruits. Hence *for the reason* that only the income is to be taxed and not the working capital, it is precisely the working capital that is taxed and not the income if this first method seems more profitable to the exchequer. Thus it is a matter of complete indifference to Herr Hansemann "in which way the *net* income is found". He is looking for "the way in which the *greatest* income is found" for the exchequer.

Herr Hansemann who lays hands on the working capital itself can be compared to a savage who cuts down a tree in order to seize hold of its fruits.

"Thus if" (Art. 9 of the Bill) "the loan contribution to be calculated from the working capital is greater than the tenfold amount of the income, the first method of estimation will be employed", that is one "will resort to" the "working capital" itself.

Hence the exchequer may base its demands upon wealth rather than income whenever it chooses.

The people demands inspection of the mysterious Prussian exchequer. The Government of Action answers this tactless demand by reserving the right to make a thorough inspection of the ledgers of all merchants and an inventory of the wealth of everybody. The constitutional era in Prussia opens not with the control of the finances of the state by the people but rather by letting the state control the wealth of the people so as to open the door to the most brazen intervention of the bureaucracy into civil intercourse and private relationships. In Belgium, too, the state has had recourse to a compulsory loan, but there it modestly limited itself to tax records and mortgage deeds, i.e. to available public documents. The Government of Action on the other hand introduces the Spartanism of the Prussian army into the Prussian national economy.

Hansemann, to be sure, attempts in his "preamble" to appease the citizen by all sorts of mild phrases and friendly persuasion.

^a We go from one surprise to another.—*Ed.*

“The distribution of the loan,” he whispers to him, “will be based upon *self-assessment*.” All “recrimination” is to be avoided.

“*Not even a summary* listing of the individual parts of one’s property will be required.... The district commission set up to *examine self-assessments* will call for appropriate contributions by way of *amicable* exhortations, and only if this method should be unsuccessful will it estimate the amount. The citizen can *appeal* against this decision to a regional commission etc.”

Self-assessment! Not even a *summary* listing of the individual parts of one’s property! Amicable exhortations! Appeal!

Tell me, what more do you want?^a

Let us start at the end, with the *appeal*.

Article 16 lays down:

“The collection will be carried out at the fixed dates *irrespective of any appeals made* with the proviso of repayment if the appeal is found justified.”

Thus first comes the *execution*, the appeal notwithstanding, and afterwards the justification, the execution notwithstanding!

There is more to come!

“The costs” which are caused by the appeal “shall be borne by the appellant if his appeal is totally *or partially* rejected and if need be will be collected by executive action” (Art. 19).

Anybody who is familiar with the economic impossibility of an exact estimate of wealth will realise at first sight that an appeal can *always* be *partially* rejected and that the appellant will always be the loser. No matter what the nature of the appeal, a fine is its inseparable shadow. Let us have every respect for the appeal!

Let us return from the appeal, the end, to the beginning, the *self-assessment*.

Herr Hansemann does not appear to be afraid that his Spartans will assess themselves too heavily.

Under Art. 13

“voluntary declarations of the persons obliged to contribute are the *foundation* of the distribution of the loan”.

Herr Hansemann’s architecture is such that one cannot deduce the further outline of his structure from its foundation.

Or rather the “voluntary declaration” which, in the form of a “statement”, is “to be filed with officials appointed by the Finance

^a Modified quotation from Heinrich Heine, “Du hast Diamanten und Perlen”. In *Die Heimkehr*.—Ed.

Minister or by the regional administration on his behalf", this foundation is now substantiated more thoroughly. Under Art. 14

"one or more commissions will be formed to examine the filed declarations; their presidents and other members to the number of not less than five are to be appointed by the Finance Minister or an authority acting on his behalf".

Thus the *appointment* made by the Finance Minister or the authority acting on his behalf forms the *foundation* proper of the examination.

If the self-assessment varies from the "*estimate*" made by the district or town commission appointed by the Finance Minister, the "self-assessor" is called upon to give an *explanation* (Art. 15). He may give an explanation or not, it all depends whether it "*suffices*" for the commission appointed by the Finance Minister. If it does not suffice,

"it is the duty of the commission to determine the contribution by its *own assessment* and to *inform* the contributories thereof".

First the contributory assesses himself and informs the official thereof. Then the official makes an assessment and informs the contributory thereof. What has become of the "self-assessment"? The foundation has foundered. Whereas the self-assessment only gives rise to a serious "examination" of the contributory, the assessment by a stranger turns at once into execution. For Art. 16 decrees:

"The transactions of the district (town) commissions are to be filed with the regional administration which will *forthwith* compile the lists of the bond amounts and pass them on to the respective collectors for collection—if necessary by way of execution—under the regulations governing the collection of [...] taxes."

We have already seen that all is not "roses" with the appeals. The appeals path hides still other thorns.

Firstly: The regional commission which examines the appeals consists of deputies who are elected by the delegates etc. elected under the law of April 8, 1848.

But the compulsory loan divides the entire state into two hostile camps, the camp of the obstructionists and the camp of the men of good will against whose rendered or proffered contributions no objections have been raised by the district commission. The deputies may only be elected from the camp of the men of good will (Art. 17).

Secondly: "A commissioner appointed by the Finance Minister will preside; an official may be attached to him for his assistance" (Art. 18).

Thirdly: "The regional commission is authorised to *order* special appraisal of *property or incomes* and for this purpose is entitled to *draw*

up inventories or order the inspection of commercial ledgers. If these measures do not suffice, the appellant may be required to swear an affidavit" [Art. 19].

Thus, whoever refuses to accept without reservation the "assessment" of the officials appointed by the Finance Minister, may, as a penalty, have to reveal all his financial affairs to two bureaucrats and 15 competitors. Thorny path of appeal! Thus Hansemann only mocks his public when he says in his preamble:

"The distribution of the loan is based upon self-assessment. In order to make sure that this is *in no way offensive, not even a summary listing of the individual parts of one's property will be required.*"

Not even the penalty for "perjury" of Cervantes' project designer is lacking in the project of the Minister of action.

Instead of tormenting himself with his sham arguments, our Hansemann would have done better to join the character in the comedy who says:

"How can you expect me to pay old debts and enter upon new ones *unless you lend me money?*"^a

At this moment, however, when Prussia, attending to her particularist interests, is seeking to commit a treachery against Germany and to rebel against the Central Authority, it is the *duty of every patriot* to refuse to contribute a single penny voluntarily to the compulsory loan. Only by persistent deprivation of nourishment can Prussia be forced to surrender to Germany.

Written on July 25 and 29, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* Nos. 56 and 60, July 26 and 30, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a Cervantes, *Novelas ejemplares: Coloquio de los perros*.—Ed.

ARMISTICE NEGOTIATIONS WITH DENMARK
BROKEN OFF

Cologne, July 27. We have just received letters from *Copenhagen* according to which the *armistice negotiations have really been broken off*. On July 21, the Swedish and British ambassadors,^a with the rest of the diplomats who had gone to the headquarters, returned to *Copenhagen without having achieved their object*. Although General Neumann brought General Wrangel a *definite order* from the King of Prussia^b to sign the armistice and although the armistice had already been ratified on the Prussian and Danish sides, *Wrangel's refusal was as definite* and instead he set new conditions which were firmly rejected by the Danes. It is said that he did not even grant the foreign diplomats an audience. The Danes were particularly opposed to Wrangel's stipulation that final consent *was up to the Imperial Regent*.^c

It is therefore solely thanks to General Wrangel's firm stand that Germany has this time been saved from one of the most ignominious treaties that history has ever known.

Written by Engels on July 27, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 58, July 28, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a Elias Lagerheim and Henry Wynn.—*Ed.*

^b Frederick William IV.—*Ed.*

^c Archduke John of Austria.—*Ed.*

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE DEMOCRATIC
ASSOCIATIONS IN BADEN

Cologne, July 27. The reactionary police measures against the right of association follow each other in rapid succession. First it was the Democratic Association in Stuttgart that was abolished, then it was the turn of the Association in Heidelberg.^a Success made the gentlemen of the reaction bold; now the Baden Government has banned all democratic associations in Baden.

All this occurs at the same moment when the *soi-disant* National Assembly in Frankfurt is occupied with the task of securing for all time the right of association as one of the "fundamental rights of the German people".

The primary condition for the right of free association must be that no association and no society can be dissolved or prohibited by the police, that such measures can only be taken after a court sentence has established the illegality of the association or of its actions and purposes and the originators of these actions have been punished.

This method, of course, is much too protracted for the disciplinarian impatience of Herr *Mathy*. Just as it was too much trouble for him first to obtain a warrant of arrest or at least to have himself appointed as a special constable, before, in virtue of the policeman in his nature, he arrested Fickler¹⁸² as a "traitor to his country", just so contemptible and impractical the judicial and legal path appears to him now.

The motives for this new police violence are most edifying. The associations had allegedly affiliated to an organisation of democratic

^a See this volume, pp. 248-49.—*Ed.*

associations for all of Germany which had originated at the Democratic Congress in Frankfurt.¹⁸³ This Congress is alleged to have

“set as its goal the establishment of a democratic republic” (as if that were prohibited!) “and what is meant by the means by which this goal is to be reached is shown by, among other things, sympathies for the rebels expressed in those resolutions” (since when are “sympathies” unlawful “means”?), “as well as by the fact that the Central Committee of these associations even refused to grant any further recognition to the German National Assembly and called for the formal separation of the minority for the purpose of forming a new Assembly by unlawful means”.^a

There follow the resolutions of the Congress concerning the organisation of the democratic party.

Thus, according to Herr Mathy, the associations of Baden are to be held responsible for the resolutions of the Central Committee even if they do *not carry them out*. For if these associations, following the request of the Frankfurt Committee, had really issued an address to the Left in the National Assembly urging its withdrawal, Herr Mathy would not have failed to announce this. Whether or not the request concerned is illegal is for the courts and not for Herr Mathy to decide. And to declare illegal the organisation of the party into districts, congresses and central committees, one has really to be Herr Mathy! And are not the constitutional and reactionary associations¹⁸⁴ organising themselves according to this model?

Well, of course!

It “appears inadmissible and pernicious to undermine the basis of the constitution and thus to shake the entire state edifice by the force of the associations”.

The right of association, Herr Mathy, exists just so that one may “undermine” the constitution with impunity, provided, of course, one does it legally! And if the power of the associations is greater than that of the state, so much the worse for the state!

We are calling once more upon the National Assembly to indict Herr Mathy at once if it does not want to lose all prestige.

Written by Engels on July 27, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 58, July 28, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a Quoted from the article “Karlsruhe, 23. Juli. Ernst der Regierung, die Aufhebung der demokratischen Vereine betreffend”, *Deutsche Zeitung* No. 206, July 26, 1848.—*Ed.*

THE BILL PROPOSING THE ABOLITION
OF FEUDAL OBLIGATIONS¹⁸⁵

Cologne, July 29. If any Rhinelander should have forgotten what he owes to the "foreign rule", to the "yoke of the Corsican tyrant", he ought to read the Bill providing for the abolition without compensation of various obligations and dues. The Bill has been submitted by Herr Hansemann in this year of grace 1848 "for the consideration" of his agreeers.¹⁸⁶ Seignior, allodification rent, death dues, heriot,^a protection money, legal dues and fines, signet money, tithes on live-stock, bees etc.—what a strange, what a barbaric ring these absurd terms have for our ears, which have been civilised by the French Revolution's destruction of feudalism and by the *Code Napoléon*. How incomprehensible to us is this farrago of medieval dues and taxes, this collection of musty junk from an antediluvian age.

Nevertheless, put off thy shoes from off thy feet, German patriot, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground. These barbarities are the last remnants of Christian-German glory, the last links of the historical chain which connects you with your illustrious ancestors all the way back to the forests of the Cherusci. The musty air, the feudal mire which we find here in their classic unadulterated form are the very own products of our fatherland, and every true German should exclaim with the poet:

For oh, this is the wind of home
on my cheeks and caressing my hand!
And all this country highway dirt
is the dirt of my fatherland!^b

^a In the original *Besthaupt* and *Kurmede* are used, which are regional variants of the German expression for heriot.—*Ed.*

^b Heinrich Heine, *Deutschland. Ein Wintermärchen*, Caput VIII. The English translation is taken from Heinrich Heine, *Germany. A Winter's Tale*, L. B. Fischer, New York, 1944.—*Ed.*

Reading the Bill, it seems at first glance that our Minister of Agriculture Herr *Gierke*, on the orders of Herr Hansemann, has brought off a terrifically "bold stroke";^a has done away with the Middle Ages by a stroke of the pen, and of course quite gratuitously.

But when one looks at the Bill's *motivation*, one discovers that it sets out straight away to prove that in fact *no* feudal obligations *whatever* ought to be abolished without compensation, that is to say, it starts with a bold assertion which directly contradicts the "bold stroke".

The Minister's practical timidity now manoeuvres warily and prudently between these two bold postures. On the left "the general welfare" and the "demands of the spirit of our time"; on the right the "established rights of the lords of the manor"; in the middle the "praiseworthy idea of a freer development of rural relations" represented by Herr Gierke's shamefaced embarrassment — what a picture!

In short, Herr Gierke fully recognises that feudal obligations in general ought to be abolished only against compensation. Thus the most onerous, the most widespread, the principal obligations are to *continue* or, seeing that the peasants have in fact already done away with them, they are to be *reimposed*.

But, Herr Gierke observes,

if, nevertheless, particular relations, whose intrinsic justification is insufficient or whose continued existence is incompatible with the demands of the spirit of our time and the general welfare, are abolished *without compensation*, then the persons affected by this should appreciate that they are making a few sacrifices not only for the good of all but also in their own well-understood interests, in order that relations between those who have claims and those who have duties shall be peaceful and friendly, thereby helping landed property generally to maintain the political status which befits it for the good of the whole".

The revolution in the countryside consisted in the actual abolition of all feudal obligations. The Government of Action, which recognises the revolution, recognises it in the countryside by destroying it surreptitiously. It is quite impossible to restore the old *status quo* completely; the peasants would promptly kill their feudal lords—even Herr Gierke realises that. An impressive list of insignificant feudal obligations existing only in a few places are therefore abolished, but the principal feudal obligation, simply epitomised in the term *compulsory labour*, is reintroduced.

^a The expression *ein kühner Griff* (a bold stroke) was first used by Karl Mathy and Heinrich von Gagern in the Frankfurt National Assembly in 1848 and quickly became popular.— *Ed.*

As a result of all the rights that are to be abolished, the aristocracy will sacrifice less than 50,000 talers a year, but will thereby save several million. Indeed the Minister hopes that they will thus placate the peasants and even gain their votes at future parliamentary elections. This would really be a very good deal, provided Herr Gierke does not miscalculate.

In this way the objections of the peasants would be removed, and so would those of the aristocrats, insofar as they correctly understand their position. There remains the Chamber, the scruples of the legal and radical pettifoggers. The distinction between obligations that are to be abolished and those that are to be retained—which is simply the distinction between practically worthless obligations and very valuable obligations—must be based as regards the Chamber on some semblance of legal and economic justification. Herr Gierke must prove that the obligations to be abolished 1. have an insufficient inner justification, 2. are incompatible with the general welfare, 3. are incompatible with the demands of the spirit of our time, and 4. that their abolition is fundamentally no infringement of property rights, no expropriation without compensation.

In order to prove the insufficient justification of these dues and services Herr Gierke delves into the darkest recesses of feudal law. He invokes the entire, “originally very slow development of the Germanic states over a period of a thousand years”. But what use is that to Herr Gierke? The deeper he digs, the more he stirs up the stagnant mire of feudal law, the more does that feudal law prove that the obligations in question have, not an insufficient justification, but from the feudal point of view, a very solid justification. The hapless Minister merely causes general amusement when he tries his hardest to induce feudal law to make oracular pronouncements in the style of modern civil law, or to make the feudal lord of the twelfth century think and judge like a bourgeois of the nineteenth century.

Herr Gierke fortunately has inherited Herr von Patow’s principle that everything emanating from feudal sovereignty and serfdom is to be abolished without payment, but everything else is to be abolished only against payment of compensation.^a But does Herr Gierke really think that special perspicacity is required in order to show that all and every obligation subject to repeal “emanates from feudal sovereignty”?

It is hardly necessary to add that for the sake of consistency Herr

^a See this volume, pp. 117-18.—*Ed.*

Gierke constantly insinuates modern legal concepts into feudal legal regulations, and in an extremity he always invokes them. But if Herr Gierke evaluates some of these obligations in terms of the modern ideas of law, then it is incomprehensible why the same should not be done with all obligations. In that case, however, compulsory labour service, faced with the freedom of the individual and of property, would certainly come off badly.

Herr Gierke fares even worse when he advances the argument of public welfare and the demands of the spirit of our time in support of his differentiations. Surely it is self-evident that if these insignificant obligations impede the public welfare and are incompatible with the demands of the spirit of our time, then this applies in still greater measure to such obligations as labour service, the *corvée*, liege money¹⁸⁷ etc. Or does Herr Gierke consider that the right to pluck the peasants' *geese* (Clause 1, No. 14) is out of date, but the right to pluck the *peasants themselves* is not?

Then follows the demonstration that the abolition of those particular obligations does not infringe any property rights. Of course, only spurious arguments can be adduced to prove such a glaring falsehood; it can indeed only be done by reckoning up these rights to show the squires how worthless they are for them, though this, obviously, can be proved only approximately. And so Herr Gierke sedulously reckons up all the 18 sections of Clause 1, and does not notice that, to the extent in which he succeeds in proving the given *obligations* to be worthless, he also succeeds in proving *his proposed legislation to be worthless*. Virtuous Herr Gierke! How it pains us to have to destroy his fond delusions and obliterate his Archimedean-feudalist diagrams.

But there is another difficulty. Both in previous commutations of the obligations now to be abolished and in all other commutations, the peasants were flagrantly cheated in favour of the aristocracy by corrupt commissions. The peasants now demand the revision of all commutation agreements concluded under the previous Government, and they are quite justified in doing so.

But Herr Gierke will have nothing to do with this, since "formal right and law are opposed" to it; such an attitude is altogether opposed to any progress, since every new law nullifies some old formal right and law.

"The consequences of this, it can confidently be predicted, will be that, in order to secure advantages to those under obligations by means that run counter to the eternal legal principles" (revolutions, too, run counter to the eternal legal principles), "*incalculable damage* must be done to a very large section of landed property in the state, and hence (!) to the state itself."

Herr Gierke now proves with staggering thoroughness that such a procedure

“would call in question and undermine the entire legal framework of landed property and this together with numerous lawsuits and the great expenditure involved would cause great damage to landed property, which is the principal foundation of national welfare”; that it “would be an encroachment on the legal principles underlying the validity of contracts, an attack on the most indubitable contractual relations, the consequences of which would shake all confidence in the stability of civil law, thereby constituting a grave menace to the whole of commercial intercourse”!!!

Herr Gierke thus sees in this an infringement of the rights of property, which would undermine all legal principles. Why is the abolition of the obligations under discussion without compensation not an infringement? These are not merely indubitable contractual relations, but claims that were invariably met and not contested since time immemorial, whereas the demand for revision concerns contracts that are by no means uncontested, since the bribery and swindling are notorious, and can be proved in many cases.

It cannot be denied that, though the abolished obligations are quite insignificant, Herr Gierke, by abolishing them, secures “advantages to those under obligation by means that run counter to the eternal legal principles” and this is “directly opposed to formal right and law”; he “undermines the entire legal framework of landed property” and attacks the very foundation of the “most indubitable” rights.

Really, Herr Gierke, was it worth while to go to all this trouble and commit such a grievous sin in order to achieve such paltry results?

Herr Gierke does indeed attack property—that is quite indisputable—but it is feudal property he attacks, not modern, bourgeois property. By destroying feudal property he *strengthens* bourgeois property which arises on the ruins of feudal property. The only reason he does not want the commutation agreements revised is because by means of these agreements feudal property relations were converted into *bourgeois* ones, and consequently he cannot revise them without at the same time formally infringing bourgeois property. Bourgeois property is, of course, as sacred and inviolable as feudal property is vulnerable and—depending on the requirements and courage of the Ministers—violable.

What in brief is the significance of this lengthy law?

It is the most striking proof that the German revolution of 1848 is merely a *parody of the French revolution of 1789*.

On August 4, 1789, three weeks after the storming of the Bastille,

the French people, in a *single* day, got the better of the feudal obligations.¹⁸⁸

On July 11, 1848, four months after the March barricades, the feudal obligations got the better of the German people. *Teste Gierke cum Hansemanno.*^a

The French bourgeoisie of 1789 never left its allies, the peasants, in the lurch. It knew that the abolition of feudalism in the countryside and the creation of a free, landowning peasant class was the basis of its rule.

The German bourgeoisie of 1848 unhesitatingly betrays the peasants, who are its *natural allies*, flesh of its own flesh, and without whom it cannot stand up to the aristocracy.

The perpetuation of feudal rights and their endorsement in the form of the (illusory) commutations—such is the result of the German revolution of 1848. That is much ado about nothing.

Written by Marx on July 29, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 60, July 30, 1848

^a Testified by Gierke and Hansemann.—*Ed.*

THE KÖLNISCHE ZEITUNG ON THE STATE
OF AFFAIRS IN ENGLAND¹⁸⁹

Cologne, July 31.

"Where is it possible in England to discover *any trace of hatred* against the class which in France is called the *bourgeoisie*? This hatred was *at one time* directed against the aristocracy, which by means of its corn monopoly imposed a heavy and unjust tax on industry. The bourgeois in England enjoys no *privileges*, he depends on his own diligence; in France under Louis Philippe he depended on monopolies, on *privileges*."^a

This great, this scholarly, this veracious proposition can be found in Herr Wolfers' leading article in the always well-informed *Kölnische Zeitung*.

It is indeed strange. England has the most numerous, the most concentrated, the most classic proletariat, a proletariat which every five or six years is decimated by the crushing misery of a commercial crisis, by hunger and typhus; a proletariat which for half its life is redundant to industry and unemployed. One man in every ten in England is a pauper, and one pauper in every three is an inmate in one of the Poor Law Bastilles.¹⁹⁰ The annual cost of poor-relief in England almost equals the entire expenditure of the Prussian state. Poverty and pauperism have been openly declared in England to be necessary elements of the present industrial system and the national wealth. Yet, despite this, where in England is there any trace of hatred against the bourgeoisie?

There is no other country in the world where, with the huge growth of the proletariat, the contradiction between proletariat and

^a "Köln, 28. Juli. Die europäische Revolution und die Handelsfreiheit", *Kölnische Zeitung* No. 211, July 29, 1848.—Ed.

bourgeoisie has reached such a high level as in England; no other country presents such glaring contrasts between extreme poverty and immense wealth—yet where is there any trace of hatred against the bourgeoisie?

Obviously, the associations of workers, set up secretly before 1825 and openly after 1825,¹⁹¹ associations not for just *one* day against a *single* manufacturer, but permanent associations directed against entire groups of manufacturers, workers' associations of entire industries, entire towns, finally associations uniting large numbers of workers throughout England, all these associations and their numerous fights against the manufacturers, the strikes, which led to acts of violence, revengeful destructions, arson, armed attacks and assassinations—all these actions just prove the love of the proletariat for the bourgeoisie.

The entire struggle of the workers against the manufacturers over the last eighty years, a struggle which, beginning with machine wrecking, has developed through associations, through isolated attacks on the person and property of the manufacturers and on the few workers who were loyal to them, through bigger and smaller rebellions, through the insurrections of 1839 and 1842,¹⁹² has become the most advanced class struggle the world has seen. The class war of the Chartists, the organised party of the proletariat, against the organised political power of the bourgeoisie, has not yet led to those terrible bloody clashes which took place during the June uprising in Paris, but it is waged by a far larger number of people with much greater tenacity and on a much larger territory—this social civil war is of course regarded by the *Kölnische Zeitung* and its Wolfers as nothing but a long demonstration of the love of the English proletariat for its bourgeois employers.

Not so long ago it was fashionable to present England as the classic land of social contradictions and struggles, and to declare that France, compared with England's so-called unnatural situation, was a happy land with her Citizen King, her bourgeois parliamentary warriors and her upright workers, who always fought so bravely for the bourgeoisie. It was not so long ago that the *Kölnische Zeitung* kept harping on this well-worn tune and saw in the English class struggles a reason for warning Germany against protectionism and the "unnatural" hothouse industry to which it gives rise. But the June days have changed everything. The horrors of the June battles have scared the *Kölnische Zeitung*, and the millions of Chartists in London, Manchester and Glasgow vanish into thin air in face of the forty thousand Paris insurgents.

France has become the classic country as regards hatred of the bourgeoisie and, according to the present assertions of the *Kölnische Zeitung*, this has been the case since 1830. How strange. For the last ten years English agitators, received with acclamation by the entire proletariat, have untiringly preached fervent hatred of the bourgeoisie at meetings and in pamphlets and journals, whereas the French working-class and socialist literature has always advocated reconciliation with the bourgeoisie on the grounds that the class antagonisms in France were far less developed than in England. The men at whose very name the *Kölnische Zeitung* makes the triple sign of the cross, men like Louis Blanc, Cabet, Caussidière and Ledru-Rollin, have, for many years before and after the February revolution, preached peace with the bourgeoisie, and they generally did it *de la meilleure foi du monde*.^a Let the *Kölnische Zeitung* look through any of the writings of these people, or through the *Réforme*, the *Populaire*, or even the working-class journals published during the last few years like the *Union*, the *Ruche populaire* and the *Fraternité*—though it should be sufficient to mention two works which everybody knows, Louis Blanc's entire *Histoire de dix ans*, especially the last part, and his *Histoire de la révolution française* in two volumes.

But the *Kölnische Zeitung* is not content with merely asserting as a fact that no hatred exists in England against "the class which in France is called the bourgeoisie" (in England too, our well-informed colleague, cf. the *Northern Star* for the last two years)—it also explains *why* this must be so.

Peel saved the English bourgeoisie from this hatred by repealing the monopolies and establishing Free Trade.

"The bourgeois in England enjoys no privileges, no monopolies; in France he depended on monopolies.... It was Peel's measures that saved England from the most appalling upheaval."

By doing away with the monopoly of the *aristocracy*, Peel saved the *bourgeoisie* from the threatening hatred of the proletariat, according to the amazing logic of the *Kölnische Zeitung*.

"The English people, we say: the *English people* day by day increasingly realise that only from *Free Trade* can they expect a solution of the vital problems bearing on all their present afflictions and apprehensions, a solution which was recently attempted amid streams of blood.... We must not forget that the first notions of Free Trade came from the *English people*."

The English people! But the "English *people*" have been fighting the Free Traders since 1839 at all their meetings and in the press,

^a In good faith.—Ed.

and compelled them, when the Anti-Corn Law League¹⁹³ was at the height of its fame, to hold their meetings in *secret* and to admit only persons who had a ticket. The people with bitter irony compared the practice of the Free Traders^a with their fine words, and fully identified the bourgeois with the Free Trader. Sometimes the English people were even forced temporarily to seek the support of the aristocracy, the monopolists, against the bourgeoisie, e.g. in their fight for the ten-hour day.¹⁹⁴ And we are asked to believe that the people who were so well able to drive the Free Traders off the rostrum at *public* meetings, that it was these "English *people*" who originally conceived the ideas of Free Trade! The *Kölnische Zeitung*, in its artless simplicity, not only repeats mechanically the illusions of the big capitalists of Manchester and Leeds, but lends a gullible ear to their deliberate lies.

"The bourgeois in England enjoys no privileges, no monopolies." But in France things are different:

"The worker for a long time regarded the bourgeois as the monopolist who imposed a tax of 60 per cent on the poor farmer for the iron of his plough, who made extortionate profits on his coal, who exposed the vine-growers throughout France to death from starvation, who added 20, 40, 50 per cent to the price of everything he sold them...."

The only "monopoly" which the worthy *Kölnische Zeitung* knows is the *customs* monopoly, i.e. the monopoly which only *appears* to affect the workers, but actually falls on the bourgeoisie, on all industrialists, who do not profit from tariff-protection. The *Kölnische Zeitung* knows only a local, legally created monopoly, the monopoly which was attacked by the Free Traders from Adam Smith to Cobden.

But the *monopoly of capital*, which comes into being without the aid of legislation and often exists despite it, this monopoly is not recognised by the gentlemen of the *Kölnische Zeitung*. Yet it is this monopoly which directly and ruthlessly weighs upon the workers and causes the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Precisely this monopoly is the *specifically modern* monopoly, which produces the modern class contradictions, and the solution of just these contradictions is the specific task of the nineteenth century.

But this *monopoly of capital* becomes more powerful, more comprehensive, and more threatening *in proportion as the other small and localised monopolies disappear*.

The freer competition becomes as a result of the abolition of all "monopolies", the more rapidly is capital concentrated in the hands

^a Here and below these two words are given in English in the German original.—*Ed.*

of the industrial barons, the more rapidly does the petty bourgeoisie become ruined and the faster does the industry of England, the country of capital's monopoly, subjugate the neighbouring countries. If the "monopolies" of the French, German and Italian bourgeoisie were abolished, Germany, France and Italy would be reduced to proletarians compared with the all-absorbing English bourgeoisie. The pressure which the individual English bourgeois exerts on the individual English proletarian would then be matched by the pressure exerted by the English bourgeoisie as a whole on Germany, France and Italy, and it is especially the petty bourgeoisie of these countries which would suffer.

These are such commonplace ideas that today they can no longer be expounded without causing offence—to anyone but the learned gentlemen of the *Kölnische Zeitung*.

These profound thinkers see in Free Trade the only means by which France can be saved from a devastating war between the workers and the bourgeois.

To reduce the bourgeoisie of a country to the level of the proletariat is indeed a means of solving class contradictions which is worthy of the *Kölnische Zeitung*.

Written by Engels on July 31, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 62, August 1, 1848

THE AGREEMENT DEBATE
ABOUT THE VALDENAIRE AFFAIR

Cologne, August 1. Once again we have to catch up with a couple of agreement sessions.

During the session of July 18 the motion calling for the summoning of Deputy Valdenaire was discussed.^a The central section called for its adoption. Three Rhenish jurists spoke against it.

First there was Herr *Simons* of Elberfeld, a former Public Prosecutor. Herr Simons was apparently under the impression that he was still in the Assizes or in the police court. He demeaned himself like a Public Prosecutor by making a formal plea against Herr Valdenaire and for the judicature. He said: The matter has been placed before the indictment board and will be quickly decided there. Valdenaire will either be freed or referred to the Assizes. If the latter should occur

“it would be exceedingly desirable that the whole case is not then pulled apart so that judgment is not delayed”.

As far as Herr Simons is concerned, the interests of the judicature, i.e. the convenience of the indictment board, the Public Prosecutor and the Court of Assizes, carry much more weight than the interest of freedom and the immunity of the people’s representatives.

Herr Simons then throws suspicion first upon Valdenaire’s defence witnesses and afterwards upon Valdenaire himself. He declares that the Assembly “would not be deprived of any talent” by

^a See this volume, pp. 94-95.—*Ed.*

his absence. He then proceeds to pronounce him unfit to sit in the Assembly as long as he is not completely cleared of every suspicion of having plotted against the Government or rebelled against the armed forces. As far as talent is concerned, one could, according to Herr Simons' logic, arrest nine-tenths of the praiseworthy Assembly just as well as Herr Valdenaire and still not deprive it of any talent whatever. As far as the second argument is concerned, it does indeed redound to Herr Simons' honour that he has never hatched any "plots" against absolutism nor been guilty of "rebellion against the public authority" on the March barricades.

After Valdenaire's substitute, Herr *Gräff*, had irrefutably proved that neither was there the slightest suspicion against Valdenaire nor had the action in question been unlawful (since it consisted in having helped the *legally constituted civic militia*, which was occupying the barricades of Trier with the *approval of the Municipal Council* in the execution of its functions), Herr Bauerband rises to support the Public Prosecutor's office.

Herr *Bauerband* also has a very weighty scruple:

"Would not the summoning of Valdenaire prejudice the future judgment of the jury?"

Profoundly thoughtful doubts which are made still more insoluble by the simple remark of Herr *Borchardt*: Whether the *non*-summoning of Valdenaire would not likewise prejudice the jury? The dilemma is really so profound that a thinker of even greater mental force than Herr Bauerband might spend years trying in vain to resolve it. There is perhaps only *one* man in the entire Assembly who has enough strength to solve the riddle: Deputy *Baumstark*.^a

Herr Bauerband continues to plead for a while in an extremely verbose and confused manner. Herr *Borchardt* answers him briefly. After him, Herr *Stupp* gets up in order to say also so much against Valdenaire that he "had in every respect nothing (!) to add" to the speeches of Simons and Bauerband. All this is, of course, enough reason for him to continue speaking until he is interrupted by shouts calling for the closure of the debate. Herr *Reichensperger II* and Herr *Wencelius* speak briefly in favour of Valdenaire and, as we know, the Assembly decides to summon him. Herr Valdenaire has played a trick on the Assembly by not obeying the summons.

Herr *Borchardt* puts the following motion: In order to prevent the impending executions of the death penalty before the Assembly has given its decision on Herr *Lisiecki's* motion which advocates the

^a The name, literally translated, means as strong as a tree, i.e. very strong.—*Ed.*

abolition of capital punishment, a decision should be made on this motion within a week.

Herr *Ritz* is of the opinion that such a precipitous procedure would not be *parliamentary*.

Herr *Brill*: If we shall in the near future, as I certainly hope, abolish the death penalty it would certainly be very *unparliamentary* to decapitate somebody in the meantime.

The President would like to terminate the discussion but the popular Herr *Baumstark* has already mounted the rostrum. Casting fiery glances and his face flushed with noble indignation, he exclaims:

“Gentlemen, permit me to say a *serious word!* The subject here in question is not of the kind that should be treated lightly from this rostrum by referring to decapitation as an unparliamentary matter!” (The Right, which looks upon decapitation as the height of parliamentarism, bursts into tempestuous shouts of bravo.) “It is a subject of the greatest, most serious significance” (it is well known that Herr Baumstark says this of every topic he discusses). “Other parliaments ... the greatest men of legislation and science” (i.e. “all political philosophers, from Plato down to Dahlmann”) “have occupied themselves with this problem for 200 to 300 years” (each of them?) “and if you want us to be blamed for having passed over such an important question with such levity....” (Bravo!) “Nothing but my conscience impels me ... but the question is too serious ... *surely, one more week* will not make any difference!”

Because the subject is of the greatest, most serious significance the serious words of the noble Deputy Baumstark become the rashest frivolity. Is there, indeed, greater frivolity than Herr Baumstark’s apparent intention to discuss the abolition of capital punishment for the next 200 to 300 years and in the meantime to let decapitations continue at a smart pace? “Surely, one more week will not make any difference” and the heads which will roll during this time will not make any difference either!

Incidentally, the Prime Minister^a declares that it is not intended to carry out death sentences for the time being.

After Herr Schulze from Delitzsch has expressed a few ingenious scruples concerning rules of procedure, Borchardt’s motion is rejected. On the other hand, an amendment by Herr Nethe, which recommends greater dispatch to the central commission, is adopted.

Deputy *Hildenhagen* proposes the following motion: Until the relevant Bill has been submitted, the President should terminate every session with the following solemn pronouncement:

“We, however, are of the opinion that the Ministry should work most zealously on the submission of the new municipal laws.”

^a Rudolf von Auerswald.—*Ed.*

This edifying proposal was unfortunately not designed for our bourgeois times.

We are not Romans, we smoke tobacco.^a

The attempt to carve from the raw material of President Grabow the classical figure of an Appius Claudius and to apply the solemn *Ceterum censeo*^b to the municipal legislation failed under "huge mirth".

After Deputy *Bredt* of Barmen has asked the Minister of Trade three fairly mildly-worded questions on the unification of all Germany into a customs union and into a maritime league with navigation duties, and finally on provisional protective tariffs, and after he has received similarly mild, but also rather unsatisfactory answers to his questions from Herr *Milde*, Herr *Gladbach* is the last speaker of the session. Herr *Schütze* of Lissa^c had intended to move that he be called to order because of his vigorous language during the debate over the disarming of the volunteers.^d He decided, however, to withdraw his motion. Herr Gladbach, however, quite unceremoniously challenged the brave Schütze and the entire Right and to the great annoyance of the hidebound Prussians related the amusing anecdote of a Prussian lieutenant who, having fallen asleep on his horse, rode into the midst of the volunteers. These troops greeted the officer with the song "Sleep, Baby, Sleep" and for this offence they were to be court-martialled! Herr Schütze stammered a few words which were as indignant as incoherent and the session was terminated.

Written by Engels on August 1, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 63, August 2, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a Heinrich Heine, "Zur Beruhigung". In *Zeitgedichte*.—*Ed.*

^b "*Ceterum censeo, Carthaginem esse delendam*" (As for the rest, Carthage must be destroyed)—the words with which Cato the Elder usually concluded every speech in the Senate (from 157 B. C. onwards).—*Ed.*

^c The Polish name is Leszno.—*Ed.*

^d See this volume, pp. 180-81 and 191-93.—*Ed.*

THE MILAN BULLETIN

In yesterday's issue of this newspaper we published the victory bulletin of the Provisional Government in Milan and then went on to mention the conflicting victory bulletins from Bolzano in the Augsburg newspaper^a and from Trieste.^b

We held the *first* of these to be the more credible because the information contained in the bulletin that reached us direct from Milan was simultaneously confirmed by reports from two different cities in Switzerland—Zurich and Basle—which have numerous commercial and close geographical links with Milan. But in evaluating the information we had to give special weight to the fact that the Austrian reports of victory were dated earlier and spoke of the battle on July 23, whereas the Milan bulletin dealt with the events of the 24th and the early hours of the 25th.¹⁹⁵ Because of this combination of circumstances we did not doubt that the Italian victory had actually taken place. The Austrians, moreover, had already previously published reports of victories, for example of a victory at Curtatone¹⁹⁶ which later turned out to have been an Austrian defeat, and furthermore it was none other than the Augsburg paper that had acclaimed this alleged victory.^c A comparison of the reports of both sides shows that the Italians really did win a victory, but that this victory was wrenched from them by the advance of fresh Austrian troops. If anything could have led us

^a i.e. the *Allgemeine Zeitung*.—*Ed.*

^b "Mailand, 25. Juli", "Mailand, 26. Juli", *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 62, August 1, 1848.—*Ed.*

^c The *Allgemeine Zeitung* No. 155 (special supplement), June 3, 1848, p. 4, and No. 156, June 4, 1848, pp. 2486-2487.—*Ed.*

astray, it would have been that ambitious but totally incompetent individual *Charles Albert*, about whom we have already repeatedly expressed our opinion. Despite all the bad qualities of this “sword of Italy”, the possibility still existed that at least one of his generals, favoured by such uncommonly advantageous positions, might have possessed the military skill to claim the victory for the Italian colours. Reality shows that this has not happened. And therewith Charles Albert’s fate is sealed. Even his present throne, not to mention the visionary one of the whole of Italy, must shortly collapse. As victor, he could have looked forward to gratifying his ambition for a while; vanquished, he will very soon be tossed to one side as a useless tool by the Italians themselves. After many bloody sacrifices, Italy will surely triumph and show that it has no need of that wretched individual the King of Sardinia to achieve its freedom and national independence.

Written by Engels on August 1, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 62, August 2, 1848

Published in English for the first time

THE RUSSIAN NOTE¹⁹⁷

Cologne, August 1. Russian diplomacy has invaded Germany for the time being not with an army, but with a Note in the form of a circular to all Russian Embassies. This Note found its first lodgings in the official organ of the German Imperial Administration at Frankfurt^a and it was soon also well received at other official and unofficial newspapers. The more extraordinary it is that Mr. Nesselrode, the Russian Foreign Minister, should indulge in this sort of public statecraft, the more important it is to subject this action to a closer inspection.

During the happy period preceding 1848, German censorship saw to it that no word could be printed which might incur the displeasure of the Russian Government, not even under the heading of Greece or Turkey.

Since the evil March days, however, this convenient expedient is unfortunately no longer available. Nesselrode therefore becomes a journalist.

According to him it is the "German press, whose hatred for Russia seemed for a moment suspended", which with respect to the Russian "security measures" along the frontier had seen fit to make the "most unfounded assumptions and commentaries". After this restrained introduction there follow stronger words which read:

"The German press is daily spreading the most absurd rumours and the most malicious calumnies against us."

^a "Die russische Note", *Frankfurter Oberpostamts-Zeitung* No. 210 (second supplement), July 28, 1848.—*Ed.*

Soon, however, there is talk of "raving declamations", "madmen" and "perfidious malevolence".

At the next press trial, a German Public Prosecutor may well use the Russian Note in his evidence as an authenticated document.

And why is the German, especially the "democratic" press to be attacked, and if possible, to be destroyed? Because it misjudges the Russian Emperor's "benevolent as well as unselfish sentiments" and his "openly peaceful intentions"!

"Has Germany ever had to complain about us?" asks Nesselrode on behalf of his ruler.^a "During the entire time when the Continent had to endure the oppressive rule of a conqueror, Russia shed her blood to *help* Germany *preserve her integrity and independence*. The Russian territory had long been liberated when Russia still continued to follow her German allies to all the battlefields of Europe, and to assist them."

In spite of her numerous and well-paid agents, Russia is labouring under the gravest delusion if she thinks that in the year 1848 she can arouse sympathies by evoking the memory of the so-called wars of liberation. And are we to believe that Russia shed her blood for us Germans?

Apart from the fact that before 1812 Russia "supported" Germany's "integrity and independence" by an open alliance and secret treaties with Napoleon, she was later sufficiently indemnified for her so-called aid by robbery and pillage. Her aid was for the princes who were allied to her, her assistance, in spite of the Proclamation of Kalisch,¹⁹⁸ for the representatives of absolutism, "by the grace of God", against a ruler who had emerged from the revolution. The Holy Alliance and its unholy works, the bandit congresses of Carlsbad, Laibach, Verona etc.,¹⁹⁹ the Russian-German persecutions of every enlightened word, as a matter of fact all politics since 1815 which were guided by Russia ought indeed to have impressed upon our memories a profound sense of gratitude. The House of Romanov, along with its diplomats, may rest assured; we will never forget *this* debt. As for Russia's aid during the years 1814 and 1815, we would sooner be susceptible to any other feeling than that of gratitude for that aid paid for with English subsidies.

The reasons are obvious for discerning minds. If Napoleon had remained victor in Germany, he would have removed at least three dozen beloved "fathers of their people" with his well-known energetic formula. French legislation and administration would have created a solid base for German unity and spared us 33 years of humiliation and the tyranny of the Federal Diet which is, of course,

^a Nicholas I.—*Ed.*

highly praised by Mr. Nesselrode. A few Napoleonic decrees would have completely destroyed the entire medieval chaos: the compulsory labour services and tithes, exemptions and privileges, the entire feudal and patriarchal systems which still torment us from end to end of our fatherlands. The rest of Germany would long since have reached the level which the left bank of the Rhine reached soon after the first French revolution; we would have neither Uckermark grandees nor a Pomeranian Vendée²⁰⁰ and we would no longer have to inhale the stuffy air of the "historical" and "Christian-Germanic" swamps.

Russia, however, is magnanimous. Even if no gratitude is expressed, the Emperor retains as much as ever his old "benevolent as well as unselfish sentiments" towards us. Yes, "in spite of insults and challenges the attempt to change our" (Russia's) "sentiments has not been successful".

These sentiments manifest themselves for the time being in a "passive and watchful method", a method in which Russia has undeniably achieved great virtuosity. She knows how to wait until the appropriate moment seems to have arrived. Notwithstanding the colossal troop movements which have taken place in Russia since March, Mr. Nesselrode is so naive as to try to make us believe that the Russian troops "remained immobile within their cantonments". The Russian Government remains animated by sentiments of "peace and reconciliation" in spite of the classical: "Gentlemen, saddle your horses!";^a in spite of the confidential outpouring of heart and bile against the German people by Abramowicz, Chief of Police in Warsaw, and in spite of or rather because of the threatening and successful Notes from Petersburg. Russia perseveres in her "openly peaceful and defensive attitude". In the Nesselrode circular, Russia is portrayed as patience personified and as a pious, much-maligned and insulted innocence.

We want to enumerate some of Germany's crimes against Russia which are listed in the Note: 1. "hostile mood", and 2. "fever of change in the whole of Germany". Such a "hostile" mood towards so much benevolence on the part of the Tsar! How grievous this must be for the paternal heart of our dear brother-in-law. And to top it all, this execrable disease called "fever of change"! This is actually the first, albeit in this case the second, dreadfulness. From time to time Russia bestows another kind of disease upon us: the cholera. Be that as it may! Not only is this "fever of change" contagious but it often

^a Nicholas I is reported to have addressed these words to his officers after being informed that the February 1848 revolution had taken place in France.—*Ed.*

reaches such a virulent intensification that highly-placed personages are easily compelled to make hasty departures for England!^a Was the "German fever of change" perhaps one of the reasons for dissuading Russia from an invasion in March and April? The third crime: The Preparliament of Frankfurt²⁰¹ has represented war against Russia as a necessity of the time. The same has happened in associations and newspapers and is all the more unpardonable since according to the clauses of the Holy Alliance and the later treaties between Russia, Austria and Prussia, we Germans are only supposed to shed our blood in the interest of the princes and not in our own interest. 4. There has been talk in Germany of reconstituting old Poland within her true borders of 1772.²⁰² The knout over you and then off to Siberia! But no, when Nesselrode wrote his circular, he had not yet heard of the Frankfurt Parliament's vote on the question of incorporating Posen. Parliament has atoned for our sins and a mild, forgiving smile now hovers upon the lips of the Tsar. The 5th crime of Germany: "Her regrettable war against a Nordic monarchy." In view of the success of the menacing Note from Russia, the rapid retreat of the German army ordered by Potsdam and the declaration issued by the Prussian Ambassador in Copenhagen on the motives and purposes of the war,²⁰³ Germany deserved a milder punishment for her impertinence than would have been admissible without these circumstances. 6. "Open advocacy of a defensive and offensive alliance between Germany and France." Lastly, 7. "The reception given to the Polish refugees, their free trips on the railways and the insurrection in the Posen region."

If the diplomats and similar persons had not received the gift of language "so as to conceal their thoughts"^b both Nesselrode and brother-in-law Nicholas would have embraced us with shouts of joy and thanked us ardently for having lured so many Poles from France, England, Belgium etc. to the Posen region and for having made it easy for them to be transported there only to have them mowed down by grape-shot and shrapnel, branded with lunar caustic, slaughtered, sent off with shorn heads etc., and, on the other hand, to exterminate them in Cracow by a treacherous bombardment, if possible completely.

And Russia, faced with these seven mortal sins of Germany, has nevertheless remained on the defensive and not taken the offensive? Yes, that's how it is, and it is for this reason that the Russian diplomat

^a An allusion to the flight of the Prince of Prussia to England during the March revolution.— *Ed.*

^b Words attributed to Talleyrand.— *Ed.*

is asking the world to admire the love of peace and the moderation of his Emperor.

The Russian Emperor's rule of procedure "from which he has so far not deviated for one moment", according to Mr. Nesselrode,

"is not to interfere in any way in the internal affairs of countries which want to change their organisation; on the contrary, to allow these nations complete freedom to effect the political and social experiments which they want to undertake without let or hindrance on his part, and not to attack any power which has not attacked him. On the other hand, he is determined to repel any encroachment upon his own internal security and to make sure that if the territorial balance of power is anywhere destroyed or altered, that will not be done at the expense of our own legitimate interests."

The Russian Note forgets to add the illustrative examples. After the July revolution the Emperor assembled an army along the western frontier so as, allied with his faithful followers in Germany, to give practical proof to the French how he would allow the nations "complete freedom to effect their political and social experiments". The fact that he was disturbed in his rule of procedure was not his fault but that of the Polish revolution of 1830²⁰⁴ which gave his plans a different direction. Soon thereafter, we saw the same procedure with respect to Spain and Portugal. The evidence is his open and secret support of Don Carlos and Dom Miguel. When at the end of 1842 the King of Prussia wanted to issue a sort of constitution according to the estates principle, on the most comfortable "historical" basis, which had played such an admirable role with respect to the Patents of 1847,²⁰⁵ it was, of course, Nicholas who would not tolerate it and thus cheated us "Christian Germans" out of the joy of having these Patents for several years. He did all this, as Nesselrode says, because Russia never interferes in the internal organisation of a country. We hardly need to mention Cracow.²⁰⁶ Let us merely recall the most recent sample of the imperial "rule of procedure": the Wallachians overthrow the old Government and replace it provisionally by a new one. They want to transform the entire old system and create an organisation patterned after those of civilised nations. "So as now to let them effect their political and social experiments in complete freedom" a Russian army corps invades the country.²⁰⁷

After that anybody can guess the nature of the application of this "rule of procedure" to Germany. But the Russian Note makes our own deduction unnecessary. It reads:

"So long as the *Confederation*, no matter what *new forms* it may assume, leaves the neighbouring states untouched, and does not seek to expand its territorial limits by force or try to assert its lawful authority beyond the *limits* set by the *treaties*, the Emperor will also *respect* its *internal* independence."

The second passage which refers to the same subject reads still more clearly:

"If Germany should actually succeed in solving her organisational problem without detriment to her internal calm, and without the new forms impressed on her nationality being of a kind which endanger the tranquillity of other states, we shall sincerely congratulate ourselves on that for the same reasons which made us hope for her strength and unity under her previous political forms."

But the following passage sounds most clear and removes any possible doubt; here the circular speaks of Russia's incessant efforts to recommend and preserve harmony and unity in Germany:

"Of course, we are not referring to that material unity of which a democracy addicted to a levelling and aggrandising process is dreaming today, and which, if it could realise its ambitious theories as it interprets them, would inevitably sooner or later plunge Germany into a state of war with all adjacent states, but rather to the moral unity, that sincere conformity of views and intentions in all political questions which the German Confederation had to negotiate in external affairs.

"Our policy had only one aim: to preserve this unity and to strengthen the bonds which link the German governments with each other.

"That which we wanted in those days, we still desire today."

As one can see from the preceding passage, the Russian Government most willingly allows us *moral* unity, only no *material* unity, no replacement of the present Federal Diet by a central authority, not the mere semblance of central authority, but a genuine and seriously effective central authority based on popular sovereignty. What magnanimity!

"That which we wanted in those days" (before February 1848), "we still desire today."

That is the only phrase of the Russian Note which nobody will call in question. But we should like to tell Mr. Nesselrode that desire and fulfilment are still two separate things.

The Germans now know exactly where they stand as far as Russia is concerned. As long as the old system, painted over with new, modern colours, persists, or if one obediently moves back again to the Russian and "historical" track after having strayed from it in a "moment of intoxication and exultation", Russia will remain "openly peaceful".

The internal conditions of Russia, the raging cholera, the partial insurrections in individual districts, the revolution plotted in Petersburg which was, however, prevented just in time, the conspiracy inside the citadel of Warsaw, the volcanic soil of the Kingdom of Poland,²⁰⁸ all these are at any rate circumstances which have contributed to the Tsar's benevolent as well as "unselfish sentiments" towards Germany.

But of much greater influence upon the "passive and watchful method" of the Russian Government was undoubtedly the course of events in Germany proper up to the present.

Could Nicholas in person have taken better care of his affairs and carried out his intentions sooner than has up to now been done in Berlin-Potsdam, in Innsbruck, in Vienna and Prague, in Frankfurt and in Hanover and in almost every other cosy corner of our fatherland, now again filled with Russian moral unity? Have not (lunar caustic) Pfuel, Colomb and the shrapnel general^a in Posen and Windischgrätz in Prague worked so well as to enrapture the Tsar's heart? Did not Windischgrätz receive a brilliant letter of commendation from Nicholas via Potsdam from the hands of young Mr. Meyendorf? And do the gentlemen Hansemann-Milde-Schreckenstein in Berlin and the Radowitzes, Schmerlings and Lichnowskis in Frankfurt leave anything to be desired as far as Russia is concerned? Must not the *Bieder-* and *Basserdom*^b in the Frankfurt Parliament form a soothing balm for many a pain of the most recent past? In such circumstances Russian diplomacy did not need any armies to invade Germany. It is perfectly right to be content with the "passive and watchful method", and the just discussed Note!

Written on August 1, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 64, August 3, 1848

^a Alexander Adolf von Hirschfeld.—*Ed.*

^b An allusion to the deputies Biedermann and Bassermann; the German word *Biederkeit* means "respectability".—*Ed.*

MISCELLANEOUS²⁰⁹

Very shortly a Bill on defamation along entirely new lines will be laid before the Chamber. Our criticism of the article of the *Code Napoléon* in connection with Hecker's suit against the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was evidently only too well founded.^a

Written by Marx on August 2, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 64, August 3, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a See this volume, pp. 208-11.—*Ed.*

BAKUNIN²¹⁰

In number 36, of this paper, we communicated a rumour circulating in Paris, according to which George Sand was stated to be possessed of papers which placed the Russian refugee, Bakunin, in the position of an agent of the Emperor Nicholas.^a We gave publicity to this statement, because it was communicated to us simultaneously by two correspondents wholly unconnected with each other. By so doing, we only accomplished the duty of the public press, which has severely to watch public characters. And, at the same time we gave to Mr. Bakunin an opportunity of silencing suspicions thrown upon him in certain Paris circles. We reprinted also from the *Allgemeine Oder Zeitung* Mr. Bakunin's declaration, and his letter addressed to George Sand, without waiting for his request.^b We publish now a literal translation of a letter addressed to the Editor of the *New Rhenish Gazette*, by George Sand, which perfectly settles this affair.^c

To the editor

Sir,

Under the date line Paris, July 3, you have published the following article (there follows a translation of the relevant item) in your newspaper. The facts conveyed by your correspondent are entirely false and do not have even the slightest semblance of truth. I have never had the smallest scrap of evidence in support of the imputations you seek to make against Mr. Bakunin, who was banished from France by the dethroned King.^d I have therefore never had any warrant for the slightest doubt about the sincerity of Mr. Bakunin's character and the honesty of his views.

Yours etc.
George Sand

^a "Bakunin", *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 36, July 6, 1848.—*Ed.*

^b "Bakunin. Erklärung", *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 46 (supplement), July 16, 1848.—*Ed.*

^c This passage is given in Marx's own translation as printed in *The Morning Advertiser*, September 2, 1853.—*Ed.*

^d Louis Philippe.—*Ed.*

P.S. I appeal to your honour and your conscience to publish this letter immediately in your newspaper.

La Châtre (Dept. Indre), July 20, 1848

Written by Marx on August 2, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 64, August 3, 1848

Published in English for the first time

THE HANSEMANN GOVERNMENT
AND THE OLD-PRUSSIAN CRIMINAL BILL

Cologne, August 3. We have already often said that the Hansemann Government extols the Bodelschwingh Ministry in every possible way.^a After the recognition of the revolution follows the recognition of the old-Prussian state of affairs. That's the way of the world.^b

That Herr Hansemann, however, would achieve *such* virtuosity that he even praises *those* deeds of such gentlemen as Bodelschwingh, Savigny and consorts which he used to combat with the greatest vehemence in his days as Rhenish deputy to the Provincial Diet, that is a triumph with which the Potsdam camarilla had certainly not counted. And yet! Please read the following article of the latest *Preussische Staats-Anzeiger*:

Berlin, August 1. The most recent issue of the journal of the Ministry of Justice reported in its "unofficial part" statistical observations about the death penalty as well as a survey of death sentences passed and confirmed between the years 1826 and 1843 (inclusive) with the exception of sentences passed in the so-called demagogical investigations. This work was undertaken with the utilisation of documents of the Ministry of Justice and, because of the importance of the issue, should claim the special attention of the reader in this respect. According to the survey, in the aforementioned period of time:

1. In the Rhine Province	189	death sentences were passed,	6	confirmed
2. In the other provinces	237	" " " "	94	"
altogether	426	death sentences were passed,	100	confirmed,

of which, however, four were not carried out because of flight or death of the criminals.

If the Bill on the new Penal Code of 1847 had been in force during that period there would have been:

1. In the Rhine Province only	53	death sentences passed,	5	confirmed
2. In the other provinces only	134	" " " "	76	"
altogether	187	death sentences passed,	81	confirmed,

provided that the same principles were applied to the confirmation as heretofore. Thus, the death penalty would not have been imposed on 237 criminals who were

^a See this volume, p. 274.—*Ed.*

^b Modified quotation from Goethe's *Faust*, Erster Teil, "Garten".—*Ed.*

^c "Berlin, 1. August", *Preussischer Staats-Anzeiger* No. 90, August 2, 1848.—*Ed.*

sentenced to death under the existing laws. Nor would the death penalty have been carried out on 19 executed criminals.

According to the survey, there were annually on the average:

1. In the Rhine Province 10⁹/₁₈ death sentences passed and ⁶/₁₈ confirmed
2. In the other provinces 13 " " " " ⁵/₄/₁₈ "

If, however, the Bill had been in force at the time, there would have been annually on the average:

1. In the Rhine Province only 2¹⁷/₁₈ death sentences passed and ⁵/₁₈ confirmed
2. In the other provinces only 7⁷/₁₈ " " " " ⁴/₁₈ "

And now admire the mildness, the excellence and the glory of the Royal Prussian Criminal Bill of 1847! Perhaps as much as one entire death sentence less would have been carried out in the Rhine Province in 18 years! What advantages!

But the innumerable defendants who would have been deprived of a jury and sentenced and jailed by royal justices, the disgraceful corporal punishments which here on the Rhine would have been carried out with old-Prussian rods, here, where we freed ourselves of the rod forty years ago; the dirty proceedings consequent upon the crimes against morals, unknown to the Code, which would have been conjured up again by the depraved haemorrhoidal imagination of the knights of the Prussian Law; the most inexorable confusion of juridical concepts, and finally the innumerable political trials consequent upon the despotic and insidious regulations of that contemptible patchwork, in a word, the *Prussianising* of the entire Rhine Province; do the Rhenish renegades in Berlin really believe that we would forget all this on the account of *one* fallen head?

It is clear: Herr Hanseemann, through his agent in the judicial branch, Herr Märker, wants to carry through that which was beyond Bodelschwingh. He really wants now to bring into force the thoroughly hated old-Prussian criminal Bill.

At the same time we learn that the jury system will only be introduced in Berlin, and even there only on an experimental basis.

Thus: not the introduction of Rhenish law to the old-Prussians but the introduction of old-Prussian law to the Rhinelanders is the great result, the tremendous "achievement" of the March revolution! *Rien que ça.*^a

Written on August 3, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 65, August 4, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a Nothing but that.—*Ed.*

THE KÖLNISCHE ZEITUNG
ON THE COMPULSORY LOAN

Cologne, August 3. Number 215 of the *Kölnische Zeitung* carries the following appeal to Rhenish patriotism:

“As we have just been reliably informed, up to today, about 210,000 talers in contributions to the voluntary loan, partly in cash and partly by subscription, have been received here in the city of Cologne. It is to be expected that persons who up to now have not contributed to this government loan will recognise and fulfil their duty as citizens within the next ten days, *the more so* since their own advantage is bound to counsel them to lend their money at 5 per cent interest *before* August 10—rather than at $3\frac{1}{3}$ per cent after that date. It is particularly necessary that the rural inhabitants, who up to now have not yet contributed to the loan in the right proportion, should not miss this deadline. *Otherwise compulsion would have to be used where patriotism and correct insight are lacking.*”

A total of $1\frac{2}{3}$ per cent premium has been placed upon the patriotism of the taxpayers and yet “for a’ that and a’ that”^a patriotism persists in its latent condition! *C’est inconceivable.*^b A difference of $1\frac{2}{3}$ per cent! Can patriotism resist this ringing argument of $1\frac{2}{3}$ per cent?

It is our duty to explain this wonderful phenomenon to our beloved fellow newspaper.

By what means does the Prussian state want to pay not 5, but only $3\frac{1}{3}$ per cent? By new taxes. And if the usual taxes are not enough, as is to be expected, by a new compulsory loan. And by what means compulsory loan No. II? By compulsory loan No. III. And by what means compulsory loan No. III? By *bankruptcy*. Thus patriotism

^a Quoted from Ferdinand Freiligrath’s translation (“Troiz alledem!”) of Robert Burns’ poem “For a’ that and a’ that”.—*Ed.*

^b This is incomprehensible.—*Ed.*

commands that the road which the Prussian Government has entered upon must be barricaded in every possible way, not by talers but by protests.

Prussia, moreover, is already enjoying an extra debt of 10 million talers for the Hunnish war in Posen. Thus a voluntary loan of fifteen million talers would only be a bill of indemnity for the intrigues of the secret cabinet in Potsdam²¹¹ which, against the orders of the weak cabinet at Berlin, conducted this war in the interests of the Russians and the reaction. The junker counter-revolution condescends sufficiently to appeal to the purse of the townsmen and peasants who afterwards must pay for its heroic deeds. And the hard-hearted "rural inhabitants" resist such condescension? The "Government of Action", moreover, demands money for the *constabulary business* and you do not possess the "correct insight" into the blessings of the constabulary which has been brought from England to Prussia? The "Government of Action" wants to gag you and you refuse to give it the money for the gags? What a strange lack of insight!

The Government of Action needs money to make the particular interests of the Uckermark prevail against German unity. And the rural inhabitants of the administrative district of Cologne are deluded enough not to want to bear the costs for the defence of Uckermark-Pomeranian nationality in spite of the premium of $1\frac{2}{3}$ per cent? What has become of patriotism?

Finally, our patriotic fellow newspaper which threatens "*execution*" forgets in its ardour that the compulsory loan has not yet been voted by the Agreement Assembly^a and the ministerial Bills have the same force of law as editorials of the *Kölnische Zeitung*.

Written on August 3, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 65, August 4, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a The Prussian National Assembly.— *Ed.*

PROUDHON'S SPEECH AGAINST THIERS

Paris, August 3. The day before yesterday we were able to render Proudhon's speech only piecemeal.²¹² We will now enter upon a thorough discussion of it.^a M. Proudhon starts with the explanation that the February revolution was nothing but the emergence of socialism which attempted to assert itself in all the following events and phases of this revolution.

"You want to finish with socialism. Oh well, just watch. I will lend you a helping hand. The success of socialism does not by any means depend upon a single man; the present battle is by no means a battle between myself and M. Thiers, but between labour and privilege."

M. Proudhon demonstrates instead that M. Thiers has only attacked and slandered his private life.

"If we proceed on that level, I would suggest to M. Thiers: let us both go to confession! You confess your sins, and I will confess mine!"

The point at issue was the revolution. The financial committee regarded the revolution as a fortuitous event, as a surprise, whereas he, Proudhon, had taken it seriously. In the year 93 property had paid its debt to the republic by paying a third of taxes. The revolution of 48 must remain in a "proportional relationship". In the year 93 the foes had been despotism and foreign countries. In the year 48, pauperism was the foe. "What is this *droit au travail*", this right to work?

^a "Paris, 31. Juli...—National-Versammlung", *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 64, August 3, 1848, pp. 3-4.—*Ed.*

"If the demand for labour were greater than the supply there would be no need for any promises on the part of the state. This, however, is not the case. Consumption is very low. The stores are full of goods and the poor are naked! And yet which country has a greater propensity to consume than France? If instead of 10 million, we were given 100, i.e. 75 francs per head and per day, we certainly would know how to consume it." (Hilarity in the Chamber.)

The rate of interest is supposed to be the basic cause of the people's ruin. The creation of a national bank of two milliards which would lend its money without interest and grant the free use of the land and of houses would bring immense advantages. (Vigorous interruptions.)

"If we stick to *this* (laughter), if the fetishism of money were supplanted by the realism of gratification (renewed laughter), then there would exist the guarantee of labour. Let the duties on the instruments of labour be abolished and you are saved. Those who maintain the opposite, may they be called Girondists or Montagnards, are no socialists and no republicans (Oh! Oh!).... Either property will smash the republic or the republic will smash property." (Calls of: enough!)

M. Proudhon now becomes enmeshed in a lengthy discourse about the significance of interest and how the rate of interest could be reduced to zero. M. Proudhon stands on weak grounds as long as he maintains this economic point of view even though he creates an immense scandal in this bourgeois Chamber. But whenever, excited by just this scandal, he adopts the proletarian point of view, the Chamber seems to go into nervous convulsions.

"Gentlemen, my ideas are different from yours. I represent a different point of view from yours! The liquidation of the old society began on February 24 with the fight between the bourgeoisie and the working class. This liquidation will be accomplished either by violent or by peaceful means. All will depend upon the discernment of the bourgeoisie and its greater or lesser resistance."

M. Proudhon now proceeds to elaborate his idea of "the abolition of property". He does not intend to abolish property all at once but only gradually. It is for this reason that he had stated in his journal^a that *rent of land was a voluntary gift of the earth* which the state must gradually abolish.

"I have thus on the one hand explained the meaning of the February revolution to the bourgeoisie; I have given notice to property so that it may hold itself ready for liquidation and so that the property owners may be held responsible for their refusal."

A thunderous roar arises from several sides: responsible in what way?

^a *Le Représentant du Peuple. Journal quotidien des travailleurs.—Ed.*

"By that I mean if the property owners will not liquidate voluntarily, *we* will carry through this liquidation."

Several voices: Who are *we*?

Other voices: Send him to the lunatic asylum at Charenton. (Tremendous excitement; a proper storm accompanied by thunder and the roaring of wind.)

"If I say *we*, I identify *myself* with the proletariat and you with the bourgeoisie."

M. Proudhon then enters upon the specification of his tax system and he becomes once again "scientific". This "science" which has always been Proudhon's weakness becomes his strength in this narrow-minded Chamber by giving him the boldness to combat with his pure, genuine "science" the defiled financial science of M. Thiers. M. Thiers has proved his practical financial discernment. During his administration, the state treasury decreased while his personal fortune increased.

When the Chamber paid little attention to Proudhon's further arguments, he declared bluntly that he would continue speaking for at least $\frac{3}{4}$ of an hour. When the majority of the Chamber was thereupon getting ready to leave he proceeded once again to direct attacks upon property.

"By the February revolution alone you have abolished property!"

One could almost say that terror kept the people glued to their seats every time that Proudhon said anything against property.

"By recognising in the Constitution the right to work, you have proclaimed the recognition of the abolition of property."

Larochejaquelein asks whether one has the right to steal. Other deputies do not want to let M. Proudhon continue.

"You cannot destroy the consequences of the *faits accomplis*" (accomplished facts). "If debtors and tenants are still paying, they are doing so of their own free will." (Tremendous uproar. The President calls the speaker to order: Everybody is obliged to pay his debts.)

"I am not saying that the liabilities have been repealed but those who are trying to defend them here are destroying the revolution...."

"What are we, representatives? Nothing. Nothing at all. The power which gave us power lacked principle and basis. Our entire authority is force, despotism and the might of the stronger. (New eruption of the storm.) Universal suffrage is an accident and in order that it may gain significance, it must be preceded by organisation. We are not ruled by law or justice. We are ruled by force, necessity, providence.... April 16th, May 15th, June 23rd, 24th and 25th are facts, nothing more than facts, which are legitimised by history. We can do today whatever we want to. We are the stronger ones. Let us not speak therefore of rebels. Rebels are those who have no other right than that of superior might but will not recognise this right for others. I know that my

motion will not be accepted. But you are in a position where you can only escape death by accepting my motion. It is a question of credits and labour. Confidence will never return, nay, it is impossible for it to return...." (Horrible!) "For all that you might say that you are trying to create a respectable, moderate republic, capital does not dare to show itself under a republic which has to hold demonstrations in favour of the workers. While capital is thus waiting for us so as to liquidate us, we are waiting for capital so as to liquidate it. February 24 has proclaimed the right to work. If you eliminate this right from the Constitution, you proclaim the right to insurrection.

"Place yourselves for ever under the protection of bayonets, prolong the state of siege for ever: capital will still be afraid and socialism will keep its eyes on it."

The readers of the *Kölnische Zeitung* know M. Proudhon of yore. M. Proudhon, who, according to the reasoning of the agenda, has attacked morality, religion, family and property, was not so long ago still the acclaimed hero of the *Kölnische Zeitung*. Proudhon's "so-called social-economic system" was thoroughly glorified in articles from correspondents in Paris, in feuilletons and in lengthy treatises. All social reforms were to proceed from Proudhon's determination of value. The story of how the *Kölnische Zeitung* made this dangerous acquaintance does not belong here. But how strange! The very newspaper which in those days looked upon Proudhon as a saviour, now cannot find enough invective to label him and his "lying party" as corrupters of society. Is M. Proudhon no longer M. Proudhon?

What we were attacking in M. Proudhon's theory was the "utopian science" by which he wanted to settle the antagonism between capital and labour, between proletariat and bourgeoisie.^a We shall come back to this point. His whole system of banking and his entire exchange of products is nothing but a petty-bourgeois illusion. Now, when to realise this pale illusion he is compelled to speak as a democrat in the face of the whole bourgeois Chamber and is expressing this antagonism in harsh terms, the Chamber cries of offence against morality and property.

Written on August 3, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 66, August 5, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a See Karl Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy. Answer to the "Philosophy of Poverty" by M. Proudhon.*—Ed.

DR. GOTTSCHALK

Cologne, August 4. Dr. Gottschalk had his three first interrogations published in the *Zeitung des Arbeiter-Vereines zu Köln*. As a punishment, the warders he has had up to now have been removed and a new gaoler appointed in the person of warder *Schröder*.^a

"The latter was not willing to take over his duties without an exact inventory," writes the local workers' paper, "and so Dr. Gottschalk and his cell were searched again, customs-style. Although nothing suspicious was found, a much closer watch than before is being kept on him."^b

Public proceedings in the Rhine Province are a sheer illusion as long as they are supplemented by "*Spanish Inquisition proceedings*".²¹³

In order to appreciate Gottschalk's arrest, one should read the *Gervinus Zeitung*.^c The forceful intervention of the Public Prosecutor, it says, has *restored confidence once more*. On the other hand, the approaching festivities^d are diverting the attention of the frivolous citizens of Cologne from all thought of politics. And these same citizens of Cologne, to whom the Government has handed over Gottschalk and the Cathedral festivities, these same ungrateful citizens, the *Gervinus Zeitung* exclaims, forget all these good deeds of the Prussian Government as soon as it stammers the first word about a compulsory loan!

^a "Die Beiden Verhöre des Herren Dr. Gottschalk" and "Der dritte Verhör des Dr. Gottschalk" (*Zeitung des Arbeiter-Vereines zu Köln* Nos. 16 and 18, July 20 and 27, 1848).—*Ed.*

^b "Köln", *ibid.*, No. 20, August 3, 1848.—*Ed.*

^c *Deutsche Zeitung*.—*Ed.*

^d Celebration of the 600th anniversary of the Cologne Cathedral in August 1848.—*Ed.*

The arrest of Gottschalk and Anneke, the press trials, and so on, have restored *confidence*. In the city, confidence is the basis of *public credit*. Therefore lend the Prussian Government money, a great deal of money, and it will lock up even more people, stage even more press trials, manufacture even more confidence. More arrests, more press trials, more reaction from the Government. But in honest exchange—mark this well—more money, more and more money from the citizens!

We advise the Prussian Government in its financial difficulties to take refuge in a measure tried and tested under Louis XIV and Louis XV. Let it sell *Lettres de cachet!* *Lettres de cachet!* *Lettres de cachet!*²¹⁴ as a means of restoring confidence and filling up the Prussian treasury!

Written on August 4, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 66, August 5, 1848

Published in English for the first time

DEBATE ABOUT THE EXISTING REDEMPTION LEGISLATION

Cologne, August 4. The Berlin Assembly from time to time unearthes all sorts of old-Prussian dirt and just now when the black-white knighthood becomes daily more insolent, such revelations come in very handy.

The session of July 21st dealt again with the feudal obligations. Following a deputy's motion, the central section proposed that the pending negotiations or court hearings on redemptions and the division of common property be suspended either by the authorities or on application by one of the interested parties.

Deputy *Dierschke* examined the mode of redemption existing up to now. He explained, to begin with, how the method of redemption itself already takes advantage of the peasant:

"Compensation for *corvée*" (compulsory labour),^a "for instance, has been fixed in a very partial manner. It has not been taken into account that the wages for *corvée*, which in former centuries were stipulated at 1 or 2 silver groschen, corresponded to the *then prevailing prices* of natural produce and the conditions of the times, and that they represented, therefore, an appropriate equivalent for work done, so that neither the lords of the manor nor the serfs should have a preponderant advantage. A free labourer, however, must now be paid 5 to 6 instead of 2 silver groschen per day. If now one of the interested partners of a service relationship requests redemption he will have to pay, after first converting *corvée* days into substitute days, a differential amount of at least 3 silver groschen per day, which will amount to a yearly rent (based upon 50 days) of 4 to 5 talers. The poor peasant cannot afford such payments since he often possesses barely a quarter of a morgen^b of land and cannot find sufficient opportunity for work elsewhere."

^a *Dierschke* used the word *Robotdienste* (*corvée*). Engels has inserted *Frondienste* (compulsory labour) in brackets.—*Ed.*

^b An old German land measure, varying in different localities between 0.25 and 1.23 hectares.—*Ed.*

This passage of Herr Dierschke's speech leads to all sorts of observations about the famous enlightened legislation of 1807-11,²¹⁵ none of which made it appear in a very favourable light.

First of all, it is evident from this that the compulsory labour services (especially those in Silesia of which Herr Dierschke is speaking) are certainly not a rent or fee which is paid in kind, they are not a compensation for the use of the land; despite Herr Patow and Herr Gierke they are nothing but an "outcome of seignior and serfdom" and hence ought to be *abolished without compensation* according to the very *own principles* of these great statesmen.

Wherein consisted the obligation of the peasant? In placing himself at the disposal of the lord of the manor during certain days of the year or for certain specified duties. But certainly not gratuitously. He received a wage for this which originally completely equalled the daily wage of free labour. Thus the advantage of the landlord consisted not in the gratuitous or merely cheaper labour of the peasant but in the fact that he had labourers at his disposal for the usual wage whenever he needed them without being obliged to employ them when he did not need them. The advantage to the landlord did not consist in the monetary value of the service in kind but rather in its *compulsory* nature. It did not consist in the economic disadvantage but rather in the *constraint* of the peasant. And this obligation is not supposed to be an "outcome of seignior and serfdom"!

If Patow, Gierke and Co. want to be consistent, there is no doubt that in accordance with their original character, these labour services must be *abolished without compensation*.

But what is the situation if we take their *present* nature into account?

For centuries the compulsory services remained the same and so did the wages for these services. But the price of food increased and so did the wages for free labour. The compulsory service, which at the beginning brought equal economic advantage to both parties and often even resulted in well-paid work during the peasant's idle days, gradually became, to use the language of Herr Gierke, an "actual charge on his land" and a direct monetary gain for the gracious landlord. To the certainty that he will always have a sufficient number of labourers at his disposal, he could now add a hefty cut which he made in the wages of these workers. By means of a consistent, century-old trickery the peasants were cheated of a steadily growing part of their wage so that they finally received only a third or a quarter of it. Let us assume that a farmstead is obliged to supply only *one* worker for only 50 days a year and that the daily

wage has increased on the average by only 2 silver groschen for the past 300 years. Then the gracious landlord will have earned a full 1,000 talers off this *one* worker. The interest on 500 talers over 300 years at 5 per cent will be 7,500 talers. Altogether he will have made 8,500 talers off *one* worker, and that according to an estimate which does not take into account half the actual position!

What deduction can be made from all this? A rent ought to be paid not by the peasant to the gracious lord but by the gracious lord to the peasant, that is not by the farmstead to the manor, but by the manor to the farmstead.

The Prussian liberals of 1848, however, do not judge like this. On the contrary, the Prussian judicial conscience declares that it is not the nobleman who must indemnify the peasant but the peasant who must pay compensation to the nobleman for the difference between statute wages and free wages. It is exactly *because* the peasant has been cheated out of the wage difference for so long by his gracious lord that he has now to indemnify his gracious lord for the cheating. For whosoever hath, to him shall be given; but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath.^a

The difference in wages is therefore calculated and the annual amount is regarded as rent of land. It flows in this form into the pockets of the gracious lords. If the peasant wants to redeem it, it will be capitalised at 4 per cent (not even at 5 per cent) and this capital, which is 25 times the amount of the rent, will have to be paid off. It is obvious that the peasant is being dealt with in a thoroughly businesslike fashion. Our foregoing estimate of the aristocracy's profits was thus entirely justified.

The upshot is that peasants often have to pay from 4 to 5 talers rent for a quarter of a morgen of bad land whereas one morgen of good land free from *corvée* can be had for three talers rent per annum!

The redemption can also be achieved by surrendering a piece of land of the same value as the capital sum that is outstanding. Only the more prosperous peasants, of course, can do this. In that case, the lord of the manor gets a piece of land as premium for the skill and persistence with which he and his ancestors have defrauded the peasants.

That is the theory of redemption. It corroborates entirely what has taken place in all other countries where feudalism has gradually been abolished, in particular in England and Scotland: the transformation of feudal into bourgeois property and of seignior

^a Matthew 13:12.—*Ed.*

into capital means in every case a new crass defrauding of the bondsman to the advantage of the feudal lord. The bondsman must *purchase* his freedom every time and he must buy it dearly. The bourgeois state acts according to the principle: only death is gratuitous.

The theory of redemption, however, proves even more.

As Deputy *Dane* observes, the inevitable result of these enormous demands upon the peasants is that they fall into the hands of usurers. Usury is the inevitable companion of a class of *free* small peasants as has been demonstrated in France, the Palatinate and the Rhine Province. The Prussian science of redemption managed to let the small peasantry of the old provinces partake of the joys of being squeezed by usurers even before they were freed. The Prussian Government, in general, has always had a knack for subjecting the oppressed classes to the pressure of feudal and of modern bourgeois conditions at the same time, thus making the yoke twice as heavy.

One has to add to this another matter, to which Deputy *Dane* also calls attention: the tremendous costs which mount in proportion to the negligence and inaptness of the commissioner who is paid by the term.

“The town of Lichtenau in Westphalia paid 17,000 talers for 12,000 morgen and *this has not yet covered the costs (!!).*”

Even more telling proof is provided by the practice of redemption. The land commissioners, continues Herr Dierschke, i.e. the officials who prepare the redemption,

“appear in three capacities. First, they appear as *examining officials*. In this capacity they interrogate the parties, determine the factual basis of the redemption and calculate the amount of compensation. They often carry out their task in a very one-sided manner and often do not take into account the existing legal conditions for in part they lack legal knowledge. Furthermore, they appear in part as *experts* and *witnesses* by themselves autonomically appraising the value of the redeemable objects. In the end they give their *testimony* which almost amounts to a decision since the general commission must as a rule rely on their opinions which are derived from local conditions.

“Finally there is the fact that the land commissioners do not enjoy the confidence of the rural population because they often put the parties at a disadvantage by letting them wait for hours while they *eat with relish at the table of the landlord*” (who is himself a party) “whereby they particularly arouse the mistrust of the parties against themselves. When after a waiting period of three hours, the threshing gardeners²¹⁶ are finally admitted, the land commissioners often roar at them and brusquely reject their rejoinders. Here I can speak from my own experience because I assisted the interested party of peasants in my capacity as attorney-at-law in cases involving redemptions. The dictatorial power of the land commissioners must therefore be removed. The combination of the threefold capacity as examining magistrate, witness and judge in *one and the same* person cannot be justified either.”

Deputy *Moritz* defends the land commissioners. Herr *Dierschke* answers: I can state that there are very many among them who disregard the interests of the peasants. I myself have even called for the investigation of some of them and I can give proof of this if demanded.

Minister *Gierke*, of course, appears again as defender of the old-Prussian system and the institutions which have emerged from it. The land commissioners must, of course, also be praised again:

"I must leave it to the judgment of the Assembly, however, to decide whether it is just to use this rostrum to make accusations which *lack all proof and are entirely unsubstantiated!*"

And Herr *Dierschke* is offering proofs!

Since, however, his Excellency *Gierke* seems to be of the opinion that notorious facts can be knocked down by ministerial assertions, we shall shortly submit a few "proofs" which will show that Herr *Dierschke*, far from exaggerating, has not by a long way condemned the conduct of the land commissioners sufficiently strongly.

So much for the debate. The amendments submitted were so numerous that the report accompanied by them had to be referred back to the central section. Thus the definitive decision of the Assembly has yet to be made.

Among these amendments, there is one by Herr *Moritz* which calls attention to a further edifying measure of the old Government. He proposes the cessation of all negotiations concerning mill dues.

For when in the year 1810 it was decided to abolish the feudal prerogatives and banalities,²¹⁷ a commission was appointed simultaneously to compensate the millers for the fact that they were now exposed to free competition. This was already a paradoxical decision. Were the guild masters compensated for the abolition of their privileges? But there are special circumstances in this case. The mills paid extraordinary dues for the enjoyment of feudal prerogatives and banalities. Instead of simply abolishing these, they were given a compensation and the dues were continued. The form is paradoxical but there remains at least a *semblance* of justice in this case.

It so happens, however, that in the provinces added since 1815, the mill dues have been kept, the feudal prerogatives and banalities have been abolished and yet *no compensation* has been given. This is old-Prussian equality before the law. The industrial law, to be sure, abolishes all business taxes but under the trade regulations of 1845 and the law on compensation all mill dues are in case of doubt to be regarded not as business taxes but as *land taxes*. Innumerable law

cases have resulted from this jumble and these violations of the law. The law-courts have contradicted each other in their sentences and even the Supreme Court has pronounced the most contradictory judgments. Just what was formerly regarded by the ex-legislative power as “land tax” emerges from a case cited by Herr Moritz: a mill in Saxony to which belongs, except for the mill buildings, only the water power but not the land, is burdened with a “land tax” of *four wispels*^a of grain!

Indeed, say what you like, Prussia has always been the most wisely, most justly and best administered state!

Written by Engels on August 4, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 67, August 6, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a Prior to 1872 a grain measure in Germany; in Prussia it was equal to 1,319 litres (approximately 36 bushels).—*Ed.*

THE "MODEL STATE" OF BELGIUM

Cologne, August 6. Let us once again cast a glance upon Belgium, our constitutional "*model state*", the monarchical El Dorado with the broadest *democratic* basis, the university of the Berlin statesmen and the pride of the *Kölnische Zeitung*.

Let us look, to begin with, at the economic conditions of which the much-praised political constitution only forms the gilded frame.

The Belgian *Moniteur*—Belgium has her *Moniteur*—carries the following piece of news about Leopold's greatest vassal: *pauperism*.^a

In the								
province of			inhabitant	out	of	69	receives	support
"	"	<i>Luxembourg</i>	1	"	"	17	"	"
"	"	<i>Namur</i>	1	"	"	16	"	"
"	"	<i>Antwerp</i>	1	"	"	7	"	"
"	"	<i>Liège</i>	1	"	"	7	"	"
"	"	<i>Limburg</i>	1	"	"	6	"	"
"	"	<i>Hainaut</i>	1	"	"	5	"	"
"	"	<i>Eastern</i>						
"	"	<i>Flanders</i>	1	"	"	4	"	"
"	"	<i>Brabant</i>	1	"	"	3	"	"
"	"	<i>Western</i>						
"	"	<i>Flanders</i>	1	"	"			

This growth of pauperism will necessarily be followed by a further increase in pauperism. All individuals who maintain an independent existence lose their civil equilibrium as a result of the assistance tax with which these poor fellow citizens burden them and they too plunge into the abyss of public charity. Pauperism creates pauperism

^a "Emigration aux Etats-Unis de l'Amérique du Nord", *Le Moniteur belge* No. 212, July 30, 1848, p. 2074.—*Ed.*

at an increasing rate. To the same extent, however, that pauperism increases, *crime* increases and the life source of the nation itself, the *youth*, is demoralised.

The years 1845, 1846 and 1847 offer sad documents on that score.^a

The number of young boys and girls under 18 years of age who were in judicial confinement:

	1845	1846	1847
Boys	2,146	4,607	7,283
Girls	429	1,279	2,069
Sum:	2,575	5,886	9,352
Sum total:	17,813		

Thus starting with 1845 there is an approximately annual doubling of the number of juvenile delinquents *under* 18 years of age. According to this ratio, Belgium would have 74,816 juvenile delinquents in the year 1850 and 2,393,312 in the year 1855, i.e. more than the number of young people under 18 years of age she has and more than half her population. By 1856 all Belgium would be in gaol, the unborn children included. Could the monarchy hope for a *broader* democratic basis? *Equality* prevails in gaol.

Both types of Morison pill have been tried in vain on the national economy: on the one hand free trade and on the other hand protective tariffs. Pauperism in Flanders was born under the system of free trade, it grew and became stronger under the protective tariffs against foreign linen goods and linen yarn.

Thus while pauperism and crime grow among the proletariat, the bourgeoisie's sources of income are drying up as the recently published comparative tabulation of the Belgian foreign trade during the first six months of the years 1846, 1847 and 1848 proves.

With the exception of arms and nail factories, which have been exceptionally favoured by circumstances, the cloth factories which maintain their ancient renown and the zinc production which compared to overall production is insignificant, the whole of Belgian industry is in a condition of decay or stagnation.

With a few exceptions, there is a considerable decrease in the *export* of the products of the Belgian mines and metalworks.

^a The data on juvenile delinquency are taken from: Edouard Ducpétiaux, *Mémoire sur l'organisation des écoles de réforme*, pp. 4-5.—Ed.

We quote a few examples^a:

	First six months 1847	First six months 1848
Coal (in metric tons)	869,000	549,000
Pig iron	56,000	35,000
Cast iron wares	463	172
Iron, rails	3,489	13
Wrought iron wares	556	434
Nails	3,210	3,618
Total:	932,718	588,237

Thus the total decrease of these three types of articles for the first six months of 1848 amounts to 344,481 tons which is somewhat more than $\frac{1}{3}$.

We come to the linen industry.

	First six months 1846	First six months 1847	First six months 1848
Linen yarn [in kilo- grams]	1,017,000	623,000	306,000
Linen fabric	1,483,000	1,230,000	681,000
Total:	2,500,000	1,853,000	987,000

The decrease of the first six months of 1847 compared with those of 1846 amounted to 657,000 kilograms, the decrease in 1848 compared with that in 1846 amounts to 1,613,000 kilograms or 64 per cent.

The export of books, crystal ware and window glass has decreased enormously. So has the export of raw and dressed flax, tow, tree bark and manufactured tobacco.

The spreading pauperism, the unprecedented hold that crime has over young people, and the systematic deterioration of Belgian industry form the material basis of the following constitutional gaieties: The pro-government journal *Indépendance* numbers over 4,000 subscribers as it never grows tired of proclaiming. The aged *Mellinet*, the only general who saved Belgian honour, is confined to quarters and in a few days will appear before the Assizes in Antwerp.^b The lawyer *Rolin* from Ghent, who conspires against

^a The figures are quoted from "Exportations.—Marchandises belges", *Le Moniteur belge* No. 213, July 31, 1848, pp. 2085-2087.—*Ed.*

^b See this volume, pp. 404-06.—*Ed.*

Leopold in the interest of the Orange family and conspires against his later allies, the Belgian liberals, in the interest of Leopold of Coburg, this Rolin, the double apostate, has obtained the portfolio of Public Works. The ex-pedlar Cha-a-azal, *Fransquillon*,^a Baron and Minister of War, swings his large sabre and saves the European equilibrium. The *Observateur* has augmented the programme of the September Day Celebrations²¹⁸ by a new amusement: a procession, an *Ommeganck General*, in honour of the *Doudou* of Mons, the *Houplala* of Antwerp and the *Mannequin Pisse* of Brussels. The *Observateur*, the journal of the great *Verhaegen*, is perfectly in earnest. Finally, what compensates for Belgium's suffering is the fact that it has risen to become the university of Berlin's Montesquieus—of a Stupp, a Grimm, a Hansemann and a Baumstark—and that it enjoys the admiration of the *Kölnische Zeitung*. Oh happy Belgium!

Written by Marx on August 6, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 68, August 7, 1848

Published in English for the first time

^a A Belgian name for an admirer of everything French.—*Ed.*

THE FRANKFURT ASSEMBLY DEBATES
THE POLISH QUESTION²¹⁹

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 70, August 9, 1848]

Cologne, August 7. The Frankfurt Assembly, whose debates even during the most excited moments were conducted in a truly German spirit of geniality, at last pulled itself together when the Posen question came up. On this question, the ground for which had been prepared by Prussian shrapnel and the docile resolutions of the Federal Diet, the Assembly had to pass a clear-cut resolution. No middle course was possible; it had either to save Germany's honour or to blot it once again. The Assembly acted as we had expected; it sanctioned the seven partitions of Poland, and shifted the disgrace of 1772, 1794 and 1815 from the shoulders of the German princes to its own shoulders.²²⁰

The Frankfurt Assembly, moreover, declared that the seven partitions of Poland were benefactions wasted on the Poles. Had not the forcible intrusion of the Jewish-German race lifted Poland to a level of culture and a stage of science which that country had previously never dreamed of? Deluded, ungrateful Poles! If your country had not been partitioned you would have had to ask this favour yourselves of the Frankfurt Assembly.

Pastor Bonavita Blank of the Paradise monastery near Schaffhausen trained magpies and starlings to fly in and out. He had cut away the lower part of their bill so that they were unable to get their own food and could only receive it from his hands. The philistines who from a distance saw the birds alight on the Reverend's shoulders and seem to be friendly with him, admired his great culture and learning. His biographer says that the birds *loved their benefactor*.^a

^a [F. G. Benkert.] *Joseph Bonavita Blank's ... kurze Lebens-Beschreibung*.—Ed.

Yet the fettered, maimed, branded Poles refuse to love their Prussian benefactors!

We could not give a better description of the benefactions which Prussia bestowed on the Poles than that provided by the report which the learned historiographer Herr *Stenzel* submitted on behalf of the Committee for International Law, a report which forms the basis of the debate.

The report, entirely in the style of the conventional diplomatic documents, first recounts how the Grand Duchy of Posen was set up in 1815 by "incorporation" and "merging". Then follow the promises which at the same time Frederick William III made to the inhabitants of Posen, i.e. the safeguarding of their nationality, language and religion, the appointment of a native governor, and participation in the famous Prussian Constitution.²²¹

The extent to which these promises were kept is well known. The freedom of communication between the three fragments of Poland, to which the Congress of Vienna could the more easily agree the less feasible it was, was of course never put into effect.

The make-up of the population is then examined. Herr *Stenzel* calculates that 790,000 Poles, 420,000 Germans and about 80,000 Jews lived in the Grand Duchy in 1843, making a total of almost 1,300,000.

Herr *Stenzel's* statement is challenged by the Poles, notably by Archbishop *Przyluski*,^a according to whom there are considerably more than 800,000 Poles, and, if one deducts the Jews, officials and soldiers, hardly 250,000 Germans, living in Posen.

Let us, however, accept Herr *Stenzel's* figures. For our purposes it is quite sufficient. To avoid all further discussion, let us concede that there are 420,000 Germans living in Posen. Who are these Germans, who by the inclusion of the Jews have been brought up to half a million?

The Slavs are a predominantly agricultural people with little aptitude for urban trades in the form in which up to now they were feasible in the Slav countries. The first crude stage of commerce, when it was still mere hawking, was left to *Jewish* pedlars. With the growth of culture and population the need for urban trades and urban concentration made itself felt, and *Germans* moved into the Slav countries. The Germans, who after all had their heyday in the philistinism [*Kleinbürgerei*] of the imperial cities of the Middle Ages, in the sluggish inland trade conducted in caravan style, in a restricted

^a Leon *Przyluski*, ["Die Korrespondenz des Erzbischofs von Posen, *Przyluski*, mit dem Berliner Kabinett".] *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* Nos. 5, 7, 10, 14, 38 and 39, June 5, 7, 10 and 14, and July 8 and 9, 1848.—*Ed.*

maritime trade, and in the handicraft workshops of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries organised on guild lines—the Germans demonstrated their vocation as the philistines of world history by the very fact that they still to this day form the core of the petty bourgeoisie throughout Eastern and Northern Europe and even in America. Many, often most of the craftsmen, shopkeepers and small middlemen in Petersburg, Moscow, Warsaw and Cracow, in Stockholm and Copenhagen, in Pest, Odessa and Jassy, in New York and Philadelphia are Germans or of German extraction. All these cities have districts where only German is spoken, and some of them, for example Pest, are almost entirely German.

This German immigration, particularly into the Slav countries, went on almost uninterruptedly since the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Moreover, from time to time since the Reformation, as a result of the persecution of various sects large groups of Germans were forced to migrate to Poland, where they received a friendly welcome. In other Slav countries, such as Bohemia and Moravia, the Slav population was decimated by German wars of conquest, whereas the German population increased as a result of invasion.

The position is clearest in Poland. The German philistines living there for centuries never regarded themselves as politically belonging to Germany any more than did the Germans in North America; just as the "French colony" in Berlin and the 15,000 Frenchmen in Montevideo do not regard themselves as belonging to France. As far as that was possible during the days of decentralisation in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, they became Poles, German-speaking Poles, who had long since renounced all ties with the mother country.

But the Germans brought to Poland culture, education and science, commerce and trades.—True, they brought retail trade and guild crafts; by their consumption and the limited intercourse which they established they stimulated production to some extent. Up to 1772 Poland as a whole was not particularly well known for her high standard of education and science, and the same applies to Austrian and Russian Poland since then; of the Prussian part we shall speak later. On the other hand, the Germans in Poland prevented the formation of Polish towns with a Polish bourgeoisie. By their distinct language, their separateness from the Polish population, their numerous different privileges and urban judicial systems, they impeded centralisation, that most potent of political means by which a country achieves rapid development. Almost every town had its own law; indeed towns with a mixed population had, and often still have, different laws for Germans, Poles and Jews. The German Poles

remained at the lowest stage of industrial development; they did not accumulate large capitals; they were neither able to establish large-scale industry nor control any extensive system of commerce. The Englishman Cockerill had to come to Warsaw for industry to strike root in Poland. The entire activity of the German Poles was restricted to retail trade, the handicrafts and at most the corn trade and manufacture (weaving etc.) on the smallest scale. In considering the merits of the German Poles it should not be forgotten also that they imported German philistinism and German petty-bourgeois narrow-mindedness into Poland, and that they combined the worst qualities of both nations without acquiring their good ones.

Herr Stenzel seeks to enlist the sympathy of the Germans for the German Poles:

“When the kings ... especially in the seventeenth century, became increasingly powerless and were no longer able to protect the native Polish peasants against the severest oppression by the nobles, the German villages and towns, too, declined, and many of them became the property of the nobility. Only the larger royal cities kept some of their old liberties” (read: privileges).

Does Herr Stenzel perhaps demand that the Poles should have protected the “Germans” (i.e. German Poles, who are moreover also “natives”) better than themselves? Surely it is obvious that foreigners who immigrate into any country must expect to share the good and bad with the indigenous inhabitants.

Let us pass now to the blessings for which the Poles are indebted to the Prussian Government in particular.

Frederick II seized the Netze district^a in 1772, and in the following year the Bromberg canal was built, which made inland navigation between the Oder and Weichsel^b possible.

“The region, which for centuries was an object of dispute between Poland and Pomerania, and which was largely desolate as a result of countless devastations and because of vast swamps, was now brought under cultivation and populated by numerous colonists.”

Thus, the first partition of Poland was no robbery. Frederick II merely seized an area which “for centuries was an object of dispute”. But since when has there no longer existed an independent Pomerania which *could* have disputed this region? For how many centuries were in fact the rights of Poland to this region no longer challenged? And in general, what meaning has this rusted and rotten

^a After the name of the River Netze (the Polish name is Noteć).—*Ed.*

^b The Polish name is Vistula.—*Ed.*

theory of “disputes” and “claims”, which, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, served the purpose of covering up the naked commercial interests and the policy of rounding off one’s lands? What meaning can it have in 1848 when the bottom has been knocked out of all “historical justice” and “injustice”?

Incidentally, Herr Stenzel ought to bear in mind that according to this junk-heap doctrine the Rhine borders between France and Germany have been “an object of dispute for millennia”, and that Poland could assert her claims to suzerainty over the province of Prussia and even over Pomerania.

In short, the Netze district became part of Prussia and hence ceased to be “an object of dispute”. Frederick II had it colonised by Germans, and so the “*Netze brethren*”, who received such praise in connection with the Posen affair, came into being. The state-promoted Germanisation began in 1773.

“According to all reliable information, all the Jews in the Grand Duchy are Germans and *want* to be Germans.... The religious toleration which used to prevail in Poland and the possession of certain qualities which were lacking in the Poles, enabled the Jews in the course of centuries to develop activities which penetrated deep into Polish life” (namely into Polish purses). “As a rule they have a thorough command of both languages, although they, and their children from the earliest years, speak *German* at home.”

The unexpected sympathy and recognition which Polish Jews have lately received in Germany has found official expression in this passage. Maligned wherever the influence of the Leipzig fair extends as the very incarnation of haggling, avarice and sordidness, they have suddenly become German brethren; with tears of joy the honest German presses them to his bosom, and Herr Stenzel lays claim to them on behalf of the German nation as Germans who *want* to remain Germans.

Indeed, why should not Polish Jews be genuine Germans? Do not “they, and their children from the earliest years, speak German at home”? And what German at that!

Incidentally, we would point out to Herr Stenzel that he might just as well lay claim to the whole of Europe, one half of America, and even part of Asia. German, as everyone knows, is the universal language of the Jews. In New York and Constantinople, in St. Petersburg and Paris “the Jews, and their children from the earliest years, speak German at home”, and some of them even a more classical German than the Posen Jews, the “kindred” allies of the “*Netze brethren*.”

The report goes on to present the national relations in terms that are as vague as possible and as favourable as possible to the alleged half a million Germans consisting of German Poles, “*Netze*

brethren", and Jews. It says that German peasants own more land than the Polish peasants (we shall see how this has come to pass), and that since the first partition of Poland enmity between Poles and Germans, especially Prussians, reached its highest degree.

"By the introduction of its exceptionally rigidly regulated political and administrative orders" (what excellent style!) "and their strict enforcement, Prussia in particular seriously disturbed the old customs and traditional institutions of the Poles."

Not only the Poles but also the other Prussians, and especially we from the Rhine, can tell a tale about the "rigidly regulated" and "strictly enforced" measures of the worthy Prussian bureaucracy, measures which "*disturbed*" not only the old customs and traditional institutions, but also the *entire social* life, industrial and agricultural production, commerce, mining, in short all social relations without exception. It is, however, not to the bureaucracy of 1807-48 that Herr Stenzel refers here but to that of 1772-1806, to the officials of the most genuine, dyed-in-the-wool Prussianism, whose baseness, corruptibility, cupidity and brutality were clearly evident in the treacherous acts of 1806.²²² These officials are supposed to have protected the Polish peasants against the nobles and received in return nothing but ingratitude; of course the officials ought to have understood "that nothing, not even the good things granted or imposed, can compensate for the loss of national sovereignty".

We too know the way in which quite recently the Prussian officials used "to grant or impose everything". What Rhinelander, who had dealings with recently imported old-Prussian officials, did not have an opportunity to admire their inimitable, impertinent obtrusiveness, their impudent meddlesomeness, their overriding insolence and combination of narrow-mindedness and infallibility. True, among us, in most cases, these old-Prussian gentry soon lost some of their roughness for they had at their disposal no "Netze brethren", no secret inquisition, no Prussian law and no floggings which last deficiency even brought some of them to an early grave. We do not have to be told what havoc they wrought in Poland, where they could indulge in floggings and secret inquisitions to their heart's content.

In short, the arbitrary Prussian rule won such popularity that "already after the battle of Jena, the hatred of the Poles found vent in a general uprising and the ejection of the Prussian officials". This, for the time being, put an end to the bureaucratic rule.

But in 1815 it returned in a somewhat modified form. The "best", "reformed", "educated", "incorruptible" officialdom tried its hand at dealing with these refractory Poles.

“The founding of the Grand Duchy of Posen, too, was not conducive to the establishment of cordial relations, since ... at that time the King of Prussia could not possibly agree to have any single province set up as an entirely independent unit, thus turning his state, as it were, into a federal state.”

Thus according to Herr Stenzel, the King of Prussia could “not possibly agree” to keep his own promises and the treaties of Vienna!²²⁵

“When, in 1830, the sympathies which the Polish nobility showed for the Warsaw uprising caused anxiety, and after systematic efforts were subsequently made by means of various arrangements (!)—notably by buying up the Polish landed estates, dividing them and handing them over to the Germans—gradually to eliminate the Polish nobility altogether, the latter’s resentment against Prussia increased.”

“By means of various arrangements”! By prohibiting Poles from buying land brought under the hammer, and similar measures, which Herr Stenzel covers with the cloak of charity.

What would Rhinelanders say if among us, too, the Prussian Government were to prohibit Rhinelanders from buying land put up for sale by order of the court. Sufficient pretexts could easily be found, namely: in order to amalgamate the population of the old and new provinces; in order that the natives of the old provinces could share in the blessings of parcellation and of the Rhenish laws; in order that Rhinelanders be induced to emigrate to the old provinces and implant their industries there as well, and so on. There are enough reasons to bestow Prussian “colonists” on us too. How would we look upon people who bought our land for next to nothing while competition was excluded, and who did it moreover with the support of the Government; people who were thrust upon us for the express purpose of accustoming us to the intoxicating motto “With God for King and Fatherland”^a?

After all we are Germans, we speak the same language as the people in the old provinces. Yet in Posen those colonists were sent methodically, with relentless persistence, to the domains, the forests and the divided estates of the Polish nobility in order to oust the native Poles and their language from their own country and to set up a truly Prussian province, which would surpass even Pomerania in black-and-white fanaticism.

In order that the Prussian peasants in Poland should not be left without their natural masters, they were sent the flower of Prussian knighthood, men like *Tresckow* and *Lüttichau*, who also bought landed estates for next to nothing, and with the aid of government

^a These words are taken from the decree on the establishment of an army reserve issued by Frederick William III on March 17, 1813.—*Ed.*

loans. In fact, after the Polish uprising of 1846,²²⁴ a joint-stock company was formed in Berlin, which enjoyed the gracious protection of the highest personages in the land, and whose purpose was to buy up Polish estates for German knights. The poor starvelings from among the Brandenburg and Pomeranian aristocracy foresaw that trials instituted against the Poles would ruin numerous big Polish landowners, whose estates would shortly be sold off dirt-cheap. This was a real godsend for many a debt-ridden Don Ranudo from the Uckermark. A fine estate for next to nothing, Polish peasants who could be thrashed, and what is more, a good service rendered to King and Fatherland—what brilliant prospects!

Thus arose the third German immigration into Poland, Prussian peasants and Prussian noblemen settled throughout Posen with the declared intention, supported by the Government, not of Germanising, but of *Pomeranising* Posen. The German Poles had the excuse of having contributed in some measure to the promotion of commerce, the “Netze brethren” could boast that they had reclaimed a few bogs, but this last Prussian invasion had no excuse whatever. Even parcellation was not consistently carried through, the Prussian aristocrats following hard on the heels of the Prussian peasants.

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 73, August 12, 1848]

Cologne, August 11. In the first article we have examined the “historical foundation” of Stenzel’s report insofar as he deals with the situation in Posen before the revolution. Today we proceed to Herr Stenzel’s history of the revolution and counter-revolution in Posen.

“The German people, who at all times is filled with compassion for all the unfortunate” (so long as this compassion costs nothing), “always deeply felt how greatly its princes wronged the Poles.”

Indeed, “deeply felt” within the calm German heart, where the feelings are so “deeply” embedded that they never manifest themselves in action. Indeed, there was “compassion”, expressed by a few alms in 1831 and by dinners and balls in aid of the Poles, so long as it was a matter of dancing and drinking champagne for the benefit of the Poles, and of singing “Poland is not yet lost!”^a But when were the Germans prone to do something really decisive, to make a real sacrifice!

^a The words are from the Polish national anthem.—*Ed.*

"The Germans honestly and fraternally proffered their hand to expiate the wrongs their princes had perpetrated."

Indeed, if it were possible to "expiate" anything with sentimental phrases and dull tub-thumping, then the Germans would emerge as the purest people in the annals of history.

"Just at the moment, however, when the Poles shook hands" (that is, took the fraternally proffered hand) "the interests and aims of the two nations already diverged. The Poles' only thought was for the restoration of their old state at least within the boundaries that existed before the first partition of 1772."

Surely, only the unreasoning, confused, haphazard enthusiasm, which from time immemorial has been a principal adornment of the German national character, could have caused the Germans to be surprised by the Polish demands. The Germans wanted to "*expiate*" the injustice the Poles had suffered. What started this injustice? To say nothing of earlier treacheries, it certainly started with the first partition of Poland in 1772. How could this be "expiated"? Of course, only by restoration of the *status quo* existing *before* 1772, or at least by the Germans returning to the Poles what *they* had robbed them of since 1772. But this was against the interests of the Germans? Well, if we speak of interests, then it can no longer be a question of sentimentalities like "expiation" etc.; here the language of cold, unfeeling practice should be used, and we should be spared rhetorical flourishes and expressions of magnanimity.

Moreover, firstly, the Poles did not at all "*only think*" of the restoration of the Poland of 1772. In any case what the Poles did "*think*" is hardly our concern. For the time being they *demanded* only the reorganisation of the *whole* of Posen and mentioned other eventualities only in case of a German-Polish war against Russia.

Secondly, "the interests and aims of the two nations diverged" only insofar as the "interests and aims" of revolutionary Germany in the field of international relations remained exactly the same as those of the old, absolutist Germany. If Germany's "interest and aim" is an alliance with Russia, or at least peace with Russia at any price, then of course everything in Poland must remain as it was hitherto. We shall see later, however, to what extent the *real* interests of Germany are identical with those of Poland.

Then follows a lengthy, confused and muddled passage, in which Herr Stenzel expatiates on the fact that the German Poles were right when they wanted to do justice to Poland, but at the same time to remain Prussians and Germans. Of course it is of no concern to Herr Stenzel that the "when" excludes the "but" and the "but" the "when".

Next comes an equally lengthy and confused historical account, in which Herr Stenzel goes into detail in an attempt to prove that, owing to the "diverging interests and aims of the two nations" and the ensuing mutual enmity which was steadily growing, a bloody clash was *unavoidable*. The Germans adhered to the "*national*" interests, the Poles merely to the "*territorial*" interests. In other words, the Germans demanded that the Grand Duchy should be divided according to nationalities, the Poles wanted the whole of their old territory.

This is again not true. The Poles asked for reorganisation but at the same time stated that they were quite willing to relinquish the frontier districts with a mixed population where the majority are Germans and *want* to join Germany. The inhabitants, however, should not be declared German or Polish by the Prussian *officials* at will, but according to their *own* wishes.

Herr Stenzel goes on to assert that Willisen's mission was of course bound to fail because of the (alleged, but nowhere existing) resistance of the Poles to the cession of the predominantly German districts. Herr Stenzel was able to examine the statements of Willisen about the Poles and those of the Poles about Willisen. These *published* statements prove the opposite. But this happens if "one is a man who", as Herr Stenzel says, "has studied history for many years and deems it his duty never to utter an untruth and never to conceal what is true".

With the same truthfulness which never conceals what is true, Herr Stenzel easily passes over the cannibalism perpetrated in Posen, the base and perfidious violation of the Convention of Jaroslawiec,²²⁵ the massacres of Trzemeszno, Miloslaw and Wreschen,^a the destructive fury of a brutal soldiery worthy of the Thirty Years' War,²²⁶ and does not say a word about it.

Now Herr Stenzel comes to the four partitions of Poland recently effected by the Prussian Government. First the Netze district and four other districts were torn away (April 14); to this were added certain parts of other districts. This territory with a total population of 593,390 was incorporated in the German Confederation on April 22. Then the city and fortress of Posen together with the remainder of the left bank of the Warta were also included, making an additional 273,500 persons and bringing the combined population of these lands to *double* the number of Germans living in the whole of Posen even according to *Prussian* estimates. This was effected by an Order in Council on April 26,^b and already on May 2 they were

^a The Polish name is Wrzeźnia.— *Ed.*

^b The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* has "April 29", evidently a misprint.— *Ed.*

admitted to the German Confederation. Now Herr Stenzel pleads with the Assembly that it is absolutely essential for Posen to remain in German hands, that Posen is an important, powerful fortress, with a population of over 20,000 Germans (most of them Polish Jews) who own two-thirds of all the landed property etc. That Posen is situated in the midst of a purely Polish territory, that it was forcibly Germanised, and that Polish Jews are not Germans, does not make the slightest difference to men who "never utter an untruth and never suppress what is true", to historians of Herr Stenzel's calibre.

In short, Posen, for military reasons, should not be relinquished. As though it were not possible to raze the fortress, which, according to Willisen, is one of the greatest strategic blunders, and to fortify Breslau^a instead. But ten million (incidentally this is again not true—barely five million) have been invested, and it is of course more advantageous to retain this precious work of art and 20 to 30 square miles of Polish land into the bargain.

With the "city and fortress" of Posen in one's hands, it will be all the easier to seize still more.

"But to keep the fortress it will be necessary to secure its approaches from Glogau, Küstrin and Thorn^b as well as a fortified area facing the east" (it need be only 1,000 to 2,000 paces wide, like that of Maestricht facing Belgium and Limburg). "This," continues Herr Stenzel with a smile of satisfaction, "will at the same time ensure undisturbed possession of the Bromberg canal; but numerous areas with a predominantly Polish population will have to be incorporated into the German Confederation."

It was for all these reasons that lunar caustic Pfuel, the well-known philanthropist, carried through two new partitions of Poland, thus meeting all the desires of Herr Stenzel and incorporating three-fourths of the Grand Duchy into Germany. Herr Stenzel is the more grateful for this procedure, since the revival of Louis XIV's chambers of reunion²²⁷ with augmented powers must evidently have demonstrated to this historian that the Germans have learned to apply the lessons of history.

According to Herr Stenzel, the Poles ought to find consolation in the fact that their share of the land is more fertile than the incorporated territory, that there is considerably less landed property in their part than in that of the Germans and that "no unbiassed person will deny that the lot of the Polish peasant under a German Government will be far more tolerable than that of the

^a The Polish name is Wrocław.—*Ed.*

^b The Polish names are Głogów, Kostrzyn and Toruń.—*Ed.*

German peasant under a Polish Government"! History provides some curious examples of this.

Finally, Herr Stenzel tells the Poles that even the small part left to them will enable them, by practising all the civic virtues,

"to befittingly prepare themselves for the moment, which at present is still shrouded in the mists of the future, and which, quite pardonably, they are trying—perhaps too impatiently—to precipitate. One of their most judicious fellow citizens exclaimed very pertinently. 'There is a crown which is also worthy of your ambition, it is the *civic crown!*' A German would perhaps add: It does not shine, but it is solid!"

"It is solid!" But even more "solid" are the real reasons for the last four partitions of Poland by the Prussian Government.

You worthy German—do you believe that the partitions were undertaken in order to deliver your German brothers from Polish rule; to ensure that the fortress of Posen serves as a bulwark protecting you from any attack; to safeguard the roads of Küstrin, Glogau and Bromberg,^a and the Netze canal? What a delusion!

You have been shamefully deceived. The sole reason for the recent partitions of Poland was to *replenish the Prussian treasury*.

The earlier partitions of Poland^b up to 1815 were annexations of territory by force of arms; the partitions of 1848 are *robbery*.

And now, worthy German, see how you have been deceived!

After the third partition of Poland the estates of the Polish *starosten*^c and those of the Catholic clergy were confiscated by Frederick William II in favour of the state. As the Declaration of Appropriation issued on July^d 28, 1796, says, the estates of the church in particular constituted "a *very considerable* part of landed property as a whole". The new domains were either managed on the King's account or leased, and they were so extensive that 34 crown-land offices and 21 forestry divisions had to be set up for their administration. Each of these crown-land offices was responsible for a large number of villages; for example, altogether 636 villages came under the ten offices of the Bromberg district, and 127 were administered by the Mogilno crown-land office.

In 1796, moreover, Frederick William II confiscated the estates and woodlands of the convent at Owinsk and sold them to the merchant von Tresckow (forefather of the brave Prussian troop leader in the last heroic war^e). These estates comprised 24 villages

^a The Polish name is Bydgoszcz.—*Ed.*

^b In 1795.—*Ed.*

^c *Starosten*—formerly a nobleman in Poland who held a fief of the Crown.—*Ed.*

^d The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* has "March".—*Ed.*

^e An ironic allusion to the war against Denmark over Schleswig-Holstein.—*Ed.*

with flour mills and 20,000 morgen^a of forest land, worth at least 1,000,000 talers.

Furthermore, the crown-land offices of Krotoschin, Rozdrazewo, Orpizewo and Adelnau,^b worth at least two million talers, were in 1819 made over to the Prince of Thurn und Taxis to compensate him for the post-office privileges in several provinces which had become part of Prussia.

Frederick William II took over all these estates on the pretext that he could administer them better. Nevertheless, these estates, the property of the Polish nation, were given away, ceded or sold, and the proceeds flowed into the *Prussian* treasury.

The crown lands in Gnesen, Skorzencin and Trzemeszno were broken up and sold.

Thus 27 crown-land offices and forestry divisions, to a value of *twenty million talers* at the very least, still remain in the hands of the Prussian Government. We are prepared to prove, map in hand, that all these domains and forests—with very few exceptions, if any at all—are located in the incorporated part of Posen. To prevent this rich treasure from reverting to the Polish nation it had to be absorbed into the German Confederation, and since it could not go to the German Confederation, the German Confederation had to come to it, and three-fourths of Posen were incorporated.

That is the true reason for the four famous partitions of Poland within two months. Neither the protests of this or that nationality nor alleged strategic reasons were decisive—the frontier was determined solely by the position of the domains, and the rapacity of the Prussian Government.

While German citizens were shedding bitter tears over the invented sufferings of their poor brothers in Posen, while they were waxing enthusiastic about the safety of the Eastern Marches of Germany, and while they allowed themselves to be infuriated against the Poles by false reports about Polish barbarities, the Prussian Government acted on the quiet, and feathered its nest. This German enthusiasm without rhyme or reason merely served to disguise the dirtiest deed in modern history.

That, worthy German, is how you are treated by your responsible Ministers!

Actually however you ought to have known this beforehand. Whenever Herr Hansemann has a hand in something, it is never

^a An old German land measure, varying in different localities between 0.25 and 1.23 hectares.—*Ed.*

^b The Polish name is Odolanów.—*Ed.*

a matter of German nationality, military necessity or suchlike empty phrases, but always a matter of cash payment and of net profit.

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 81, August 20, 1848]

Cologne, August 19. We have examined in detail Herr Stenzel's report, which forms the basis of the debate. We have shown that he falsifies both the earlier and the more recent history of Poland and of the Germans in Poland, that he confuses the whole issue, and that Stenzel the historian is not only guilty of deliberate falsification but also of gross ignorance.

Before dealing with the debate itself we must take another look at the Polish question.

The problem of Posen taken by itself is quite meaningless and insoluble. It is a fragment of the Polish problem and can only be solved in connection with and as a part of it. Only when Poland exists again will it be possible to determine the borders between Germany and Poland.

But can and will Poland exist again? This was denied during the debate.

A French historian has said: *Il y a des peuples nécessaires*—there are *necessary nations*. The Polish nation is undoubtedly one of the necessary nations of the nineteenth century.

But for no one is Poland's national existence more necessary than for us Germans.

What is the main support of the reactionary forces in Europe since 1815, and to some extent even since the first French revolution? It is the Russian-Prussian-Austrian *Holy Alliance*. And what holds the Holy Alliance together? The *partition of Poland*, from which all the three allies have profited.

The tearing asunder of Poland by the three powers is the tie which links them together; the robbery they jointly committed makes them support one another.

From the moment the first robbery of Polish territory was committed Germany became dependent on Russia. Russia ordered Prussia and Austria to remain absolute monarchies, and Prussia and Austria had to obey. The efforts to gain control—efforts which were in any case feeble and timid, especially on the part of the Prussian bourgeoisie—failed entirely because of the impossibility of breaking away from Russia, and because of the support which Russia offered the feudal-absolutist class in Prussia.

Moreover, as soon as the allies attempted to introduce the first

oppressive measures the Poles not only rose to fight for their independence, but simultaneously came out in *revolutionary* action against their own internal social conditions.

The partition of Poland was effected through a pact between the big feudal aristocracy of Poland and the three partitioning powers. It was not an advance, as the ex-poet Herr Jordan maintains, it was the last means the big aristocracy had to protect itself against a revolution, it was thoroughly reactionary.

Already the first partition led quite naturally to an alliance of the other classes, i.e. the nobles, the townspeople and to some extent the peasants, both against the oppressors of Poland and against the big Polish aristocracy. The Constitution of 1791²²⁸ shows that already then the Poles clearly understood that their independence in foreign affairs was inseparable from the overthrow of the aristocracy and from the agrarian reform within the country.

The big agrarian countries between the Baltic and the Black seas can free themselves from patriarchal feudal barbarism only by an agrarian revolution, which turns the peasants who are serfs or liable to compulsory labour into free landowners, a revolution which would be similar to the French revolution of 1789 in the countryside. It is to the credit of the Polish nation that it was the first of all its agricultural neighbours to proclaim this. The first attempted reform was the Constitution of 1791; during the uprising of 1830 Lelewel declared an agrarian revolution to be the only means of saving the country, but the Diet recognised this too late; during the insurrections of 1846 and 1848 the agrarian revolution was openly proclaimed.

From the day of their subjugation the Poles came out with revolutionary demands, thereby committing their oppressors still more strongly to a counter-revolutionary course. They compelled their oppressors to maintain the patriarchal feudal structure not only in Poland but in all their other countries as well. The struggle for the independence of Poland, particularly since the Cracow uprising of 1846, is at the same time a struggle of *agrarian democracy*—the only form of democracy possible in Eastern Europe—against *patriarchal feudal absolutism*.

So long, therefore, as we help to subjugate Poland, so long as we keep part of Poland fettered to Germany, we shall remain fettered to Russia and to the Russian policy, and shall be unable to eradicate patriarchal feudal absolutism in Germany. The creation of a democratic Poland is a primary condition for the creation of a democratic Germany.

But the restoration of Poland and the settlement of her frontiers

with Germany is not only necessary, it is the most easily solvable of all the political problems which have arisen in Eastern Europe since the revolution. The struggle for independence of the diverse nationalities jumbled together south of the Carpathians is much more complicated and will lead to far more bloodshed, confusion and civil wars than the Polish struggle for independence and the establishment of the border line between Germany and Poland.

Needless to say, it is not a question of restoring a bogus Poland, but of restoring the state upon a viable foundation. Poland must have at least the dimensions of 1772, she must comprise not only the territories but also the estuaries of her big rivers and at least a large seaboard on the Baltic.

The Germans could have secured all this for Poland and at the same time protected their own interests and their honour, if after the revolution they had had the courage, for their own sake, arms in hand, to demand that Russia relinquish Poland. Owing to the commingling of Germans and Poles in the border regions and especially along the coast, it goes without saying that both parties would have had to make some concessions to one another, some Germans becoming Polish and some Poles German, and this would have created no difficulties.

After the indecisive German revolution, however, the courage for so resolute an action was lacking. It is all very well to make florid speeches about the liberation of Poland and to welcome passing Poles at railway stations, offering them the most ardent sympathies of the German people (to whom had these sympathies not been offered?); but to start a war with Russia, to endanger the European balance of power and, to cap all, hand over some scraps of the annexed territory — only one who does not know the Germans could expect that.

And what would a war with Russia have meant? A war with Russia would have meant a complete, open and effective break with the whole of our disgraceful past, the real liberation and unification of Germany, and the establishment of democracy on the ruins of feudalism and on the wreckage of the short-lived bourgeois dream of power. War with Russia would have been the only possible way of vindicating our honour and our interests with regard to our Slav neighbours, and especially the Poles.

But we were philistines and have remained philistines. We made several dozen small and big revolutions, at which we ourselves took fright even before they were accomplished. We talked big, but carried nothing through. The revolution narrowed our mental horizon instead of broadening it. All problems were approached from the standpoint of the most timid, most narrow-minded, most