

**KARL  
MARX  
FREDERICK  
ENGELS**

---

**Collected  
Works**



**Volume 8  
Marx and Engels  
1848-1849**

## Contents

Preface .....	XIII
---------------	------

### KARL MARX AND FREDERICK ENGELS

#### ARTICLES FROM THE *NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG*

November 8, 1848-March 5, 1849

*1848*

*November*

1. The Crisis in Berlin .....	3
2. The Ex-Principality .....	7
3. The New Institutions.— Progress in Switzerland .....	9
4. Counter-Revolution in Berlin .....	14
5. Decision of the Berlin National Assembly .....	20
6. Sitting of the Swiss Chambers .....	22
7. Cavaignac and the June Revolution .....	23
8. Appeal of the Democratic District Committee of the Rhine Province .....	24
9. Impeachment of the Government .....	25
10. Statement .....	29
11. Confessions of a Noble Soul .....	30
12. The <i>Kölnische Zeitung</i> .....	35
13. No More Taxes!!! .....	36
14. A Decree of Eichmann's .....	37
15. Tax Refusal and the Countryside .....	39
16. Appeal .....	41
17. Elections to the Federal Court.— Miscellaneous .....	42
18. The City Council .....	45
19. Appeal .....	46

20. On the Proclamation of the Brandenburg-Manteuffel Ministry about Tax Refusal .....	47
21. The Chief Public Prosecutor and the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> .....	48
22. The Public Prosecutor's Office in Berlin and Cologne .....	50
23. The Frankfurt Assembly .....	51
24. State of Siege Everywhere .....	53
25. Position of the Left in the National Assembly .....	54
26. News from Switzerland .....	55
27. Result of the Elections to the National Council .....	56
28. Elections.—Sydow .....	57
29. Debate in the National Council .....	61
30. Raveaux's Resignation.—Violation of the Swiss Frontier .....	63
31. Manteuffel and the Central Authority .....	65
32. The German Central Authority and Switzerland .....	66
33. Drigalski—Legislator, Citizen and Communist .....	75
34. Three State Trials against the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> .....	81
35. Personalities of the Federal Council .....	83
36. Report of the Frankfurt Committee on Austrian Affairs .....	88
37. News .....	94
38. Sitzings of the Federal Council and the Council of States .....	95
39. Letters Opened .....	96
40. Joint Sitting of the Councils.—The Federal Council .....	97
41. The Organ of Manteuffel and Johann.—The Rhine Province and the King of Prussia .....	99
42. The Revolutionary Movement in Italy .....	101
43. German Professorial Baseness .....	106
44. Sitting of the National Council.—The Council of States.—Protest of the Pope.—Imperial Grain Embargo.—The Valaisan Great Council .....	108
45. Sitting of the National Council .....	111
46. Berne Declared Federal Capital.—Franscini .....	112
47. News from Switzerland .....	113
48. Duel between Berg and Luvini .....	115

*December*

49. The Closing of the German Frontier.—The Empire.—The Council of War .....	116
50. The Federal Council and the Foreign Ambassadors.—The Federal Council in Tessin.—Centralisation of Posts.—German Army Commander's Apology .....	119
51. Swiss Evidence of the Austrian Army's Heroic Deeds in Vienna .....	120
52. The French Working Class and the Presidential Elections .....	123
53. Proudhon .....	129
54. Herr Raumer Is Still Alive .....	133
55. Second Stage of the Counter-Revolution .....	134

56. The Coup d'État of the Counter-Revolution .....	135
57. Measures Concerning the German Refugees .....	136
58. The National Council .....	138
59. The Bourgeoisie and the Counter-Revolution .....	154
60. A New Ally of the Counter-Revolution .....	179
61. The Calumnies of the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> .....	182
62. Ursuline Convent.—Recruiting for the Grape-Shot King.—The "Burghers' Commune".—Commission on a General Customs Tariff .....	183
63. Address of the Central Commission of the Workers'Associations of Switzerland to the Executive of the March Association in Frankfurt am Main .....	185
64. Dismissal of Drigalski .....	187
65. The Trial of Gottschalk and His Comrades .....	188
66. The Prussian Counter-Revolution and the Prussian Judiciary ....	197
67. Measures against German Refugees.—Return of Troops from Tessin.—The Patricians' Commune .....	204
68. Letter of the Central Commission of the Workers' Associations in Switzerland to the Association in Vivis .....	207
69. Refutation .....	210
70. The New "Holy Alliance" .....	211
71. The Revolutionary Movement .....	213
72. Swiss-Italian Affairs .....	216

## 1849

## January

73. A Bourgeois Document .....	218
74. A New-Year Greeting .....	222
75. The Magyar Struggle .....	227
76. Herr Müller.—Radetzky's Chicanery towards Tessin.—The Federal Council.—Lohbauer .....	239
77. The Last Volunteer Insurgents .....	242
78. Budget .....	243
79. Priests' Rebellion .....	244
80. The Swiss Press .....	246
81. Protectionist Agitation.—Recruiting into the Neapolitan Army .....	251
82. Müller.—The Freiburg Government.—Ochsenbein .....	252
83. Montesquieu LVI .....	254
84. Answer from Colonel Engels .....	268
85. The Prussian Warrant for the Arrest of Kossuth .....	269
86. The Berlin <i>National-Zeitung</i> to the Primary Electors .....	271
87. The Situation in Paris .....	281
88. The Situation in Paris .....	284

## February

89. The <i>Kölnische Zeitung</i> on the Elections .....	286
90. The Struggle in Hungary .....	290
91. Camphausen .....	295
92. From the Banat .....	298
93. The 19th Army Bulletin and Commentaries on It .....	300
94. The First Trial of the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> .....	304
Speech by Karl Marx .....	304
Speech by Frederick Engels .....	317
95. The Trial of the Rhenish District Committee of Democrats .....	323
96. The Tax-Refusal Trial .....	340
97. Political Trial .....	342
98. Lassalle .....	344
99. War.—Discord between the Government and the Southern Slavs .....	347
100. The War in Hungary .....	350
101. The Division of Labour in the <i>Kölnische Zeitung</i> .....	354
102. From the Theatre of War .....	360
103. Democratic Pan-Slavism .....	362
104. Prussian Financial Administration under Bodelschwingh and Co. ....	379
105. Stein .....	390
106. Three Stars versus Triangle .....	392
107. The Vienna Correspondent of the <i>Kölnische Zeitung</i> .....	394
108. Saedt .....	396
109. The <i>Kölnische Zeitung</i> on the Magyar Struggle .....	398
110. Bulletin No. 22 .....	404
111. Croats and Slovaks in Hungary .....	409
112. Military Art of the Royal Imperial Army .....	412
113. Proclamation of a Republic in Rome .....	414
114. Windischgrätz.—Jews and Southern Slavs .....	415
115. Further Contribution on the Old-Prussian Financial Administration .....	418
116. A Denunciation .....	421
117. Bulletin No. 23.—From the Theatre of War .....	423
118. Latest News of the Magyars.—Victory on the Theiss.—Brutality of the Austrians.—State of the War in General .....	427
119. More News of the Magyars .....	430
120. The Russians in Transylvania .....	432
121. Russian Invasion.—Serbs.—Prospects for the Austrians.—From the Theatre of War .....	440

## March

122. Speech from the Throne .....	445
123. From the Theatre of War in Transylvania and Hungary .....	451
124. European War Inevitable .....	456

125. From the Theatre of War .....	458
126. Lassalle .....	463
127. The War in Hungary .....	466
128. From the Hungarian Theatre of War .....	471
129. The Proceedings against Lassalle .....	474
130. Magyar Victory .....	477

#### FROM THE PREPARATORY MATERIALS

1. <i>Karl Marx</i> . Prohibition of a Torchlight Procession for Gottschalk. Note .....	483
2. <i>Karl Marx</i> . Fragment of the Draft of "The Bourgeoisie and the Counter-Revolution" .....	484
3. <i>Karl Marx</i> . Draft of a Speech at the Trial of the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> .....	485

#### APPENDICES

1. Summons for Karl Marx .....	495
2. Karl Marx .....	496
3. Frederick Engels' Petition for Permission to Reside in Berne .....	497
4. Decision of the Local Court Chamber .....	499
5. Decision of the Court Chamber Concerning Engels and Other Co-defendants .....	500
6. A Deputation to Chief Public Prosecutor Zweifel .....	501
7. Communication on the Hearing of Marx, Schapper and Schneider II by the Examining Magistrate .....	503
8. Trials of the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> .....	504
9. Mandate of the Lausanne Workers' Association for Frederick Engels .....	505
10. Communication Concerning Orders for the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> for the First Quarter of 1849 .....	509
11. Press Law Proceedings against the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> Adjourned .....	511
12. Drigalski's Lawsuit against the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> .....	512
13. From the Minutes of the Committee Meeting of the Cologne Workers' Association, January 15, 1849 .....	513
14. Record of Engels' Residence Permit for the Canton of Berne and His Departure for Germany .....	515
15. Engels before the Examining Magistrate .....	516
16. Jury Acquits Marx, Engels and Korff .....	517
17. Acquittal of the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> .....	518
18. Jury Acquits Marx, Schneider II and Schapper .....	520
19. Two Trials of the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> .....	521
20. Democratic Banquet .....	522
21. Report on the General Meeting of the Workers' Association, February 1849 .....	523

22. Minutes of the Committee Meeting of the Cologne Workers' Association, February 15, 1849.....	525
23. Letter of the Cologne Commandant Colonel Engels to the <i>Oberpräsident</i> of the Rhine Province .....	527
24. Banquet of February 24 .....	529

#### NOTES AND INDEXES

<i>Notes</i> .....	533
<i>Name Index</i> .....	591
<i>Index of Quoted and Mentioned Literature</i> .....	619
<i>Index of Periodicals</i> .....	632
<i>Subject Index</i> .....	638
<i>Glossary of Geographical Names</i> .....	657

#### ILLUSTRATIONS

First page of the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> No. 138 containing Marx's article "The Crisis in Berlin" .....	5
Special edition of the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> with Marx's article "Impeachment of the Government" .....	27
A page of the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> containing Marx's article "The Bourgeoisie and the Counter-Revolution" and the slogan "No More Taxes!!!" .....	155
Title-page of the pamphlet <i>Two Political Trials</i> containing Marx's and Engels' speeches at the Cologne trials .....	305
A page from Marx's draft of a speech at the trial of the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> .....	487
A page of the minutes of the Congress of German Workers' Associations in Switzerland, at which Engels was the secretary .....	507

## TRANSLATORS

GREGOR BENTON: Articles 5, 6, 15, 25-30, 38-40, 44-49

RICHARD DIXON: Article 19

CLEMENS DUTT: Articles 2, 7, 10-12, 14, 17, 18, 20-22, 24, 31-37, 41, 43, 54, 55, 58, 60, 61, 65, 66, 69, 70, 74, 75, 80, 85-89, 91, 94, 96-98, 101, 103, 105, 107-09, 115, 116, 122, 126; From the Preparatory Materials 3

W. L. GUTTSMAN: Articles 120, 121, 123, 124

FRIDA KNIGHT: Articles 50, 51, 57, 62, 64, 67, 72, 76-79, 81, 82, 84

BARBARA RUHEMANN: Articles 52, 53, 63, 68, 90, 92, 106, 112, 114, 125, 127-30; Appendices 2, 3, 6-13, 17, 19, 20, 24

SALO RYAZANSKAYA: Articles 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 16, 23, 42, 56, 59, 71, 73, 83, 95, 113

BARRIE SELMAN: Articles 117-19

CHRISTOPHER UPWARD: Article 104

JOAN AND TREVOR WALMSLEY: Articles 93, 99, 100, 102, 110, 111; From the Preparatory Materials 1, 2; Appendices 1, 4, 5, 14-16, 18, 21-23





## Preface

Volume Eight of the *Collected Works* of Marx and Engels contains their writings from November 8, 1848, to March 5, 1849. This is the second of three volumes (Vols. 7-9) covering the period of revolutions in 1848 and 1849.

The bulk of the volume consists of articles written by Marx and Engels for the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, organ of the revolutionary-proletarian wing of German and European democracy. These articles, like the rest of the contents of this volume—the letters written by Engels on behalf of the workers' organisations of Switzerland, the accounts (published in the Appendices) of Marx's and Engels' speeches at the meetings of workers and democrats in Cologne, and so on—demonstrate the part which Marx and Engels played in the revolutionary events of those days. Edited by Marx and Engels, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was a fearlessly revolutionary journal. It consistently exposed the manoeuvres of the monarchist-aristocratic circles and of the liberal bourgeoisie whose connivance they enjoyed; it was the genuine organiser of the people's struggle. Through this newspaper, Marx and Engels directed the activity of Communist League members in various parts of Germany, influenced the German working-class and democratic movement as a whole, and promoted the unity and mobilisation of all the country's revolutionary forces.

These articles by Marx and Engels show the continuous, dialectical change in class forces during the revolution, the real meaning of the events taking place in Germany and other countries and the social background to the acute political conflicts. The conclusions they then drew have made a major contribution to the

Marxist teaching on the class struggle, explaining in detail working-class strategy and tactics at each new stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

In the period covered by this volume the counter-revolutionary forces were fighting hard against the people's gains in the first months of the 1848 revolution. The defeat of the Paris proletariat in June was the signal for a general counter-attack by monarchist-aristocratic and Right-wing bourgeois circles whose aim was the complete or partial restoration of the old order.

The bourgeois-democratic revolutions in France and Germany were, indeed, largely in a stage of decline—yet the masses everywhere continued the struggle to defend their achievements. Police persecution notwithstanding, the democratic and proletarian organisations did not abandon their activity.

In these conditions, Marx and Engels concentrated their efforts on explaining the real situation to the broad masses, the real threat of defeat for the revolution, and on mobilising resistance against the counter-revolution. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* editors did everything in their power to unite the workers and revolutionary democrats, urging them to make use of parliamentary as well as other methods to bring about a turn of the tide in favour of the revolution.

Marx and Engels realised that if the revolutionary struggle was to succeed, it must not be confined within a national framework but become international; the international solidarity of the democratic and proletarian movement in all the major European countries should be counterposed to the bloc that was being formed by the internal and external counter-revolutionary forces. They saw in every revolutionary centre in any part of Europe an integral element of the general European revolutionary movement. They devoted particular attention to Italy and Hungary, where, despite the general downward trend of the European revolution, an upsurge of popular revolutionary energy was evident—a fact justifying their hopes that the reactionaries' attempts at restoration would yet be finally frustrated and the revolution be renewed with greater depth and scope.

The volume begins with Marx's article "The Crisis in Berlin". This, together with his series of articles "Counter-Revolution in Berlin", came as the immediate response to the counter-revolutionary coup d'état which had taken place in Prussia. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* had already in September 1848 warned that a coup d'état was imminent, and had pointed out that unless the

Prussian National Assembly took steps to rally the support of the masses, it would first be turned out of Berlin and then dissolved (see present edition, Vol. 7, p. 429). The prognosis proved correct. Early in November 1848, Frederick William IV charged the reactionary General Brandenburg with forming a government, and the provincial city of Brandenburg was declared to be the new seat of the Assembly. Marx saw this coup as a direct result of the suppression of the uprisings of the Paris proletariat in June and of the masses in Vienna in late October and November 1848.

At the moment of political crisis Marx proposed what should be done. His tactical platform of struggle against the counter-revolutionary forces envisaged not only active defence but also a counter-offensive to carry forward and consolidate the revolution. As an immediate reply to the coup d'état, he put forward on November 12, 1848, the slogan of refusal to pay taxes (see this volume, p. 21). This move would not only weaken the counter-revolution by undermining its financial resources, but—most important of all—would draw the masses of the people into action. At the same time, he adapted his tactical proposals to the actually developing conditions of the struggle. Thus the appeal of the Rhenish District Committee of Democrats of November 14, 1848, which was written by Marx, advised, for the time being, against any violent resistance to the collection of unpaid taxes under a writ of execution. While the Prussian National Assembly had as yet not decided to call on the masses to refuse to pay taxes and this slogan was not supported in the other provinces, such resistance could only have developed into premature and sporadic acts of rebellion. The situation changed when, under the influence of numerous local appeals, the National Assembly adopted on November 15 a decision on the refusal to pay taxes which was to come into force on November 17. Non-payment of taxes had now acquired nation-wide significance and the authority of the National Assembly. Marx immediately called on the masses and the workers' and democratic organisations to resist the collection of taxes by all means, including violence. On November 17 he wrote in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*: "It is high treason to pay taxes. Refusal to pay taxes is the primary duty of the citizen!" (see this volume, p. 36). From November 19 to December 17 the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* carried in large type on its front page the slogan "No More Taxes!!!"

The Rhenish District Committee of Democrats' appeal of November 18, written by Marx, called for the organisation of a people's militia everywhere, the re-election of municipal councils that had refused to obey the decision of the National Assembly, the

setting up of committees of public safety. Marx saw such committees as embryos of provisional revolutionary organs of power to replace Prussian officialdom. And he was himself a member of the People's Committee in Cologne, which played a considerable role in organising the campaign against tax payments in the Rhine Province. The Second District Congress of Democratic Associations of the province, held on November 23 with Marx as one of the delegates, approved Marx's programme of action (see this volume, p. 46).

Meanwhile, the liberal-democratic majority in the Prussian National Assembly confined itself to passive resistance. Many local democrats also remained irresolute. And Marx warned that their tactics of passive resistance were dooming the movement to failure. Such tactics, he wrote, "resemble the vain struggle of a calf against its slaughterer" (see this volume, p. 38). Profiting by their opponents' weakness, the Prussian counter-revolutionaries carried the coup d'état to its conclusion: on December 5, 1848, the Prussian National Assembly was dissolved.

Marx analysed the causes of the counter-revolutionary victory in Prussia in a series of articles, "The Bourgeoisie and the Counter-Revolution", in his articles "Montesquieu LVI", "The Berlin *National-Zeitung* to the Primary Electors" and "Camphausen", and in his speech at the trial of members of the Rhenish District Committee of Democrats on February 8, 1849. The first of these works was particularly important. It contained a general account of the German revolution and in what respects it differed from the previous battles waged against feudalism by the European bourgeoisie. Contrasting the events of 1848 in Germany with the English revolution of the seventeenth century and the French revolution of the eighteenth, Marx concluded that there were different types of bourgeois revolutions and that the differences between them were determined primarily by historical conditions—the specific features of the different stages in the emergence of bourgeois society, the degree of development of the class contradictions between the bourgeoisie and the oppressed classes, the proletariat above all.

The revolution in Germany, Marx pointed out, was, like the preceding revolutions in England and France, the result of an acute contradiction between the dominance of the feudal ruling class, whose bulwark was the monarchy, and the bourgeois relations which were taking shape. However, as distinct from the English bourgeoisie of the seventeenth century and the French bourgeoisie of the eighteenth, when the proletariat and the other exploited sections of the urban population "did not yet constitute independent classes or

class sub-divisions", the Prussian bourgeoisie was already being challenged by an emerging working class which was beginning to fight for its own interests. And it could see in the example of France what a menacing turn the class struggle of the proletariat could take. That is why "from the first it was inclined to betray the people and to compromise with the crowned representative of the old society.... It stood at the helm of the revolution not because it had the people behind it but because the people drove it before them; it stood at the head not because it represented the initiative of a new social era but only because it represented the rancour of an old one" (see this volume, pp. 161, 162-63).

Whereas in England and France the bourgeois revolutions had led to a radical change in the political system corresponding to the requirements of the capitalist mode of production, the March revolution of 1848 in Prussia left intact "the old bureaucracy, the old army, the old boards of prosecuting magistrates" (see this volume, p. 317). The Prussian bourgeoisie decided to make its way to power, not with the help of revolution but by a deal with the aristocracy and the monarchy. Hence the "theory of agreement with the Crown" which was put forward by the Prussian liberal constitutionalists and which covered up, as Marx and Engels repeatedly stressed, the bourgeoisie's betrayal of the revolutionary cause. The opposition to the revolution by considerable sections of the Prussian, mainly big, bourgeoisie and their fear of the masses thus dictated their efforts to remain on "a legal basis", their renunciation of resolute struggle against the forces of feudal-monarchist reaction. Fearing for their own property, they nipped in the bud every encroachment on feudal property and thereby alienated the peasantry, their natural ally in the struggle against feudalism. This cowardly and essentially treacherous stand of the bourgeoisie doomed the bourgeois-democratic revolution to defeat in conditions when the working class was not yet itself ready to lead a revolutionary-democratic movement of the whole nation and had not yet achieved sufficient class consciousness and organisation.

The coup d'état in Prussia, Marx stressed, was the logical result of the policy of the Prussian so-called liberal governments which succeeded one another after March 1848 and surrendered position after position to the counter-revolutionary monarchists and aristocrats. And so, during the November crisis in Prussia, far from energetically supporting the Prussian National Assembly in its conflict with the Crown, the liberal majority of the Frankfurt National Assembly declared the Berlin decision on the refusal to pay taxes to be illegal and thus actually helped the Brandenburg

Government to implement its counter-revolutionary designs. In his article "The Frankfurt Assembly" Marx branded this as an act of treachery. Subsequently, too, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* continually exposed the Frankfurt Assembly's connivance at counter-revolution (see the article "Report of the Frankfurt Committee on Austrian Affairs" and others).

In 1848-49 Marx and Engels became finally convinced that the bourgeoisie was step by step losing its effectiveness as an advanced opponent of feudalism. The counter-revolutionary degeneration of the European bourgeoisie—even though in certain sectors of the struggle and in certain countries (Hungary, Italy) it was still acting in a revolutionary way—made it necessary drastically to reassess the disposition of class forces in the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the conditions for its victory. Since the bourgeoisie was losing the ability to carry through bourgeois-democratic reforms by means of revolution, it fell to the working class to head the people's struggle for total liquidation of the remnants of feudalism. Thus changes in the position of the various classes by the middle of the nineteenth century led Marx and Engels to the idea of the hegemony of the working class in the bourgeois-democratic revolution—an idea which was elaborated by Lenin in the new historic conditions of the twentieth century. During the 1848-49 revolution, Marx and Engels were already directing their efforts to preparing the working class for this role by accelerating the growth of its class consciousness and the creation of a revolutionary working-class party.

At the trial of the Rhenish District Committee of Democrats, Marx told the bourgeois jury that the bourgeoisie was in duty bound to fight to abolish feudal relations and absolutism. And yet, he said, by their appeals to preserve "a legal basis" the Prussian liberals were merely seeking to perpetuate the old laws and to impose them on the new social system which had arisen during the revolution. Society, he continued, was not founded on the law but, on the contrary, "the law must be founded upon society, it must express the common interests and needs of society... which arise from the material mode of production prevailing at the given time" (see this volume, p. 327). The preservation of old laws in despite of new needs of social development, the striving to impose on society an obsolete political system already doomed by the new conditions, led to social crises only to be resolved by revolution. He accused Prussia's ruling circles of conspiring against the people, against the law and order established as a result of the popular revolution in March 1848. He emphasised that, having in effect violated all legality, the Crown had no right to accuse the revolutionary movement's leaders of illegal

activity. Refusal to pay taxes was a natural and legitimate means of self-defence for the people. "If the Crown makes a counter-revolution, the people has the right to reply with a revolution" (see this volume, p. 339).

Analysing the events in Prussia and Germany, Marx concluded that there was no middle way between the complete victory of the feudal absolutist forces, with the abolition of freedom of assembly, association and the press, and a new upsurge of the revolution, as a result of which the proletariat, the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie would establish a democratic republic and proceed to carry out social measures to prepare the ground for transition to the proletarian revolution. Marx pointed out that "a purely *bourgeois revolution* and the establishment of *bourgeois rule* in the form of a *constitutional monarchy* is impossible in Germany, and that only a feudal absolutist counter-revolution or a *social republican revolution* is possible" (see this volume, p. 178).

Marx and Engels saw the German revolution as part of the European revolution, the course and prospects of which they followed closely in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. It was to these problems that Marx devoted his articles "The Revolutionary Movement in Italy" and "The Revolutionary Movement", in which he noted that the triumphant progress of the European revolution in February and March 1848 had been followed by a reactionary counter-offensive. The prevention of the workers' demonstration of April 10 in London had weakened the revolutionary impetus of Chartism, and the June defeat of the French proletariat was a heavy blow for the European revolutionary movement as a whole. On August 6, Milan was retaken by Austrian troops; on November 1, revolutionary Vienna fell. This was followed by the counter-revolutionary coup d'état in Berlin.

Soberly assessing the consequences of the defeat of the revolution, Marx emphasised the importance of these lessons for the masses who at the beginning of the revolution had been prey to illusions, fine phrases about universal brotherhood and so on. "The chief result of the revolutionary movement of 1848 is not what the peoples won, but what they lost—the *loss of their illusions*" (see this volume, p. 197).

As regards the prospects of the revolution in Europe in 1849, Marx placed his hopes on the imminence of a new victorious rising of the French proletariat which would provide the impulse for a revolutionary upsurge in other countries of Europe, including Germany.

Marx saw in bourgeois-aristocratic England, with its enormous industrial and commercial might, a serious threat to the French



proletariat and the cause of the revolution. He compared the England of that time to "the rock against which the revolutionary waves break.... A revolution of the economic relations in any country of the European continent," he stressed, "in the whole European continent without England, is a storm in a teacup" (see this volume, p. 214). That is why, taking account of the actual situation, Marx predicted that a victorious move by the French proletariat would call forth a military clash on a European and even on a world-wide scale—inasmuch as the involvement of England, as a colonial power, was inevitable. But in the course of this armed struggle between the revolutionary and the counter-revolutionary forces, the preconditions could again mature for a Chartist rising in England itself. "England will head the counter-revolutionary armies, just as it did during the Napoleonic period, but through the war itself it will be thrown to the head of the revolutionary movement and it will repay the debt it owes in regard to the revolution of the eighteenth century" (see this volume, p. 215).

This volume contains a large group of articles and reports written by Engels during his forced stay in Switzerland from November 1848 to the middle of January 1849. While living in that country of "classical" bourgeois federalism, Engels used every opportunity to disabuse of their illusions the South-German petty-bourgeois democrats who rejected the slogan of a centralised German democratic republic and saw the Swiss state system as a model for Germany. Engels' reports on the sittings of the Federal Assembly and its chambers show up the provincial limitations of political life in Switzerland, the narrow-mindedness, pettiness and prejudices of most of the politicians there. At the same time, Engels did not overlook progressive aspects of the struggle against aristocratic reaction and clericalism, the eradication of patriarchalism, the implementation of certain centralising reforms. His article "The German Central Authority and Switzerland" and his reports on the Swiss conflict with Austria and the so-called Imperial Government formed by the Frankfurt National Assembly defended the right of the Swiss to repulse the attempts of the reactionaries to interfere in their internal affairs, in particular the demands for the extradition or expulsion of revolutionary refugees.

Engels followed closely the development of the working-class movement in the Swiss Republic. In his reports "The Ex-Principality", "The New Institutions.—Progress in Switzerland", "Elections.—Sydow" and others, he emphasised that "the actual

revolutionary forces of the people are among the Swiss and German workers" (see this volume, p. 59). He himself took part in the First Congress of the German Workers' Associations of Switzerland held from December 9 to 11, and was able to ensure that many of its decisions stressed the need for drawing the workers into the political struggle, and not merely into the struggle for limited economic demands. This point of view was constantly defended by the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* against some of the leaders in the German working-class movement who were inclined, like Stephan Born, to see the tasks of the proletarian struggle only in terms of economic reforms. Elected by the Congress to the Central Commission of the newly created Union of German Workers' Associations in Switzerland, Engels worked hard to promote international links between the Swiss workers and the proletarian and democratic organisations of Germany (see "Address of the Central Commission of the Workers' Associations of Switzerland to the Executive of the March Association in Frankfurt am Main" and the "Letter of the Central Commission of the Workers' Associations in Switzerland to the Association in Vivis").

In the middle of January 1849, when he was no longer in danger of arrest if he appeared in Germany, Engels, who was eager to engage in active revolutionary work in his own country, returned to Cologne and continued, in association with Marx, to work with great energy on the editorial board of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. This was when the newspaper published a number of his articles on the Hungarian revolution, on the national contradictions and conflicts in the Slav regions of the Austrian Empire, and on the national question as one of the most important problems of the revolution in Europe.

The struggle of oppressed nations for freedom and independence had Marx's and Engels' firm support. In a number of articles, they stressed the high importance for European democracy of the Polish people's national liberation movement. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* wrote with keen sympathy about the Italians' struggle for liberation from Austrian oppression and for national unification. A new wave of revolutionary events in a number of Italian states (the Papal states, Tuscany, Sicily etc.), the fall of the counter-revolutionary and moderate liberal governments there under pressure from the masses, and the prevailing republican influence were all welcomed as portents of possible change in general European revolutionary development in the interests of the working class and democracy. "After six months of almost uninterrupted defeats for democracy, after a series of unprecedented triumphs for the

counter-revolution, there are at last indications of an approaching victory of the revolutionary party," wrote Marx about the turn of events in Italy at the end of November 1848 (see this volume, p. 101). The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* greeted the proclamation of a republic in Rome on February 7, 1849, as an important revolutionary act (see this volume, p. 414).

In Hungary, too, the liberation struggle was entering upon a new phase which Marx and Engels believed could help rekindle the flame of general European revolution. Led by Kossuth's revolutionary Government, the Hungarian people were heroically repulsing the Austrian counter-revolutionaries, who, after the suppression of the Vienna uprising, had hurled heavy armed forces against them. Taking advantage of the contradictions between the Hungarian landowner and bourgeois top crust and the national minorities, the Austrian ruling classes dragged into the war against revolutionary Hungary national formations recruited in the Slav lands of the Austrian Empire and Transylvania—Serbs, Croats, Rumanians and others. They were able to direct the national movements of these peoples against the Hungarian revolution largely also because Kossuth's Government had long refused to grant these peoples autonomy and satisfy other national demands.

Marx and Engels stressed that the Hungarian people's national liberation war against the Habsburg monarchy was a genuinely revolutionary war, part of the revolutionary-democratic struggle of the people of Europe. They saw the fighters for the independence of Hungary, and also of Poland, as allies of the European proletariat and revolutionary democracy, part of the forces undermining such bulwarks of international counter-revolution as the Austrian Empire, the Prussian monarchy and Tsarist Russia. By shaking the might of the Habsburg Empire, the Hungarian revolution, wrote Marx and Engels, was having a big influence on the course of the European revolution.

As early as November 1848, Marx was devoting close attention to the revolutionary events in Hungary and asked Engels, who was then in Switzerland, to write an article about them. In January 1849, this article appeared in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* under the title "The Magyar Struggle". It was followed by a series of articles and reports in which the course of military operations in Hungary was analysed.

These articles refuted the reports of the "brilliant successes" of the Austrian army and the hopeless predicament of the Hungarians, spread by the official Austrian news bulletins and seized on by a number of German newspapers, liberal ones included. Engels noted that the German press as a whole adopted an attitude of open

hostility and nationalist arrogance towards the Hungarians' struggle. Sifting and comparing the forced admissions contained in Austrian bulletins and local newspapers, he pieced together the true picture of the successful defensive battles being fought by the Hungarian army, which in fact possessed resources sufficient not only for defence but also for a counterblow. Subsequent events confirmed the accuracy of Engels' military forecasts (see the articles "European War Inevitable", "From the Theatre of War" and others). He pointed out that on the Hungarian side it was a genuinely revolutionary and popular war, and showed itself to be such in the very methods of warfare being used—mobilisation of all the forces of the people to repulse the invading enemy and the combination of regular army operations with widespread guerilla warfare. Despite the Austrian advantage in numbers and arms, the Hungarian army was superior in its fighting qualities, its revolutionary enthusiasm, its high morale, and in the support of the people and the unity of the rear and the front. The rear of the Austrian army of occupation was, as Engels constantly noted in his articles, extremely unreliable and the rebel movement occasionally flared up behind the lines. He gave a high appraisal of the political and military leaders of the Hungarian revolution, including the Polish revolutionaries who had joined Hungary's liberation struggle, and of the Hungarian Government's energy and resolution and its anti-feudal reforms. He spoke of Lajos Kossuth as a revolutionary leader "who for his nation is Danton and Carnot in one person" (see this volume, p. 227).

Engels saw danger, not only for the Hungarian but also for the European revolution, in the Austrian reactionaries' appeal for military aid from Tsarist Russia. The appearance of the first Tsarist detachments in Transylvania was interpreted by him, on the one hand, as testifying to the weakness of the Habsburg monarchy, which had proved incapable of suppressing the Hungarian revolutionary movement with its own forces, and, on the other hand, as the danger signal of an impending union of the counter-revolutionary states, a rebirth of the policy of the Holy Alliance, a policy of brutally imposing monarchist counter-revolutionary governments on the nations.

The use by the counter-revolutionary forces of a number of Slav peoples against Hungary, and also what was known as Austro-Slavism, a programme for uniting the Slavs under the aegis of the Habsburgs, provoked Engels to a violent attack on pan-Slavism. The denunciation of pan-Slavism was, for him, an integral part of the struggle against the bourgeois-landowner nationalist ideology. This campaign was vigorously fought by the editors of the *Neue Rheinische*

*Zeitung*, who also condemned other forms of nationalism—pan-Germanism, pan-Scandinavianism and the like.

In their entire approach to the national question, Marx and Engels invariably asked which class forces were playing the leading role in the national movements, to what extent they were helping to weaken the reactionary states, and whether they were reserves of the revolution or were, on the contrary, playing into the hands of counter-revolution. The class criterion was for them decisive in assessing any national movement. For in the course of the revolution, the entire character of a national movement may change depending on the preponderance of the various classes in it. In 1848-49, when the struggle against absolutism and the remnants of feudalism was complicated by violent national conflicts, the ruling classes deliberately sought to fan the flames of national hatred still higher, by deceit or violence to involve individual nations in predatory and counter-revolutionary wars, and to incite them against those peoples who were fighting for the victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and for truly national liberation. It was in this sense that Engels spoke in 1848-49 of revolutionary and counter-revolutionary peoples (see his article "The Magyar Struggle", "Democratic Pan-Slavism" and others).

In those years, owing to a number of historical causes, the development of the national movement of some of the Austrian Slav peoples was complicated and rife with contradictions. When the representatives of revolutionary-democratic trends had been defeated or pushed into the background, the leadership of these movements fell into the hands of monarchistic bourgeois and landowner elements who in effect subordinated them to the interests of the Habsburg monarchy and Russian Tsarism. Just before the 1848 revolution, Marx and Engels had sympathised with the independence struggle of the Slav peoples in the Austrian Empire (see Engels' article "The Beginning of the End in Austria", Vol. 6 of the present edition); and in June 1848 they expressed complete solidarity with the popular uprising in Prague (see Vol. 7 of the present edition, pp. 92 and 119). But after the defeat of the uprising, as the character of the national movements of a number of Slav peoples changed and reactionary Austro-Slavism showed its hand, they condemned these movements, describing them as counter-revolutionary and hostile to the cause of democracy and the working class.

Nor did Engels forget that the Austrian Slavs themselves were in many respects victims of the cunning and provocative policy of the Austrian reactionaries, who were only too free with their demagogi-

cal promises of autonomy. The Slav peoples, he wrote, would have to pay dearly for this deception: when they had finished with the Hungarians, the Habsburgs would trample on the illusions of a "Slav Austria", of a "federative state of nations with equal rights", and in particular of "democratic institutions" for the Austrian Slavs. These peoples "will have to suffer the same military despotism which they helped to impose on the Viennese and Magyars" (see this volume, pp. 375 and 376). In "War.—Discord between the Government and the Southern Slavs", "The War in Hungary", "Croats and Slovaks in Hungary" and other articles, Engels cited numerous facts showing how the Slav peoples had become painfully aware that they had been deceived and were being used for purposes contrary to their real interests. He noted with satisfaction the emerging sympathy for revolutionary Hungary among some of the Austrian Slavs, for instance in Slovakia (see this volume, pp. 442 and 469).

However, it must be evident to us today that the articles "The Magyar Struggle" and "Democratic Pan-Slavism" contain some erroneous judgments on the past and future of the small Slav peoples incorporated into Austria. Contrary to the picture of the predatory, oppressive policy of the German states in the east of Europe which Engels gave in his series of articles "The Frankfurt Assembly Debates the Polish Question" (see Vol. 7 of the present edition) and other works, in these articles he represented the subjugation of some of the Slav peoples as having been connected exclusively with the spread of civilisation and culture. History has not confirmed Engels' opinion that the small Slav peoples of Central Europe were doomed to be absorbed and assimilated by their larger and more highly civilised neighbours. The tendency towards political centralisation which resulted from the development of capitalism and caused the small peoples to lose their national independence, concealed from Engels another tendency which was not sufficiently manifest at the time, namely, the sharpening of the oppressed peoples' struggle for independence, for setting up their own states.

In these pronouncements, Engels was probably influenced by the gravity of the political situation at the time, and this accounted for the sharp polemical tone of his articles, all the heat of which was directed against the counter-revolutionary forces then going over to the offensive. A certain part was played in this by the idea which Marx and Engels entertained at that time of the nearness of a simultaneous victory of the proletarian revolution in the developed countries, a revolution which would have put an end to both social and national oppression and for which more favourable conditions would have been provided by capitalism drawing into its orbit the

backward peoples still in the stage of feudalism. As for the tendencies towards decentralisation, including those which took the form of national demands, Marx and Engels regarded them often enough as a factor slowing down the development of the favourable conditions.

This point of view was not final. Later on, substantial corrections were made which took into account the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples in Europe and in the colonial countries against national enslavement, a struggle which was developing with ever growing vigour. Thus already at the period when the Crimean war of 1853-56 was looming ahead, Engels supported the demand of national independence for the small Slav and other peoples in the Balkan Peninsula who were oppressed by the reactionary Turkish Empire.

Yet Engels' opinion in 1848-49 that the small Slav peoples of the Austrian Empire would hardly play a progressive role in the future was not expressed without reservations. "If at any epoch while they were oppressed the Slavs had begun a *new revolutionary history*, that by itself would have proved their viability," he wrote (see this volume, p. 371). Subsequent developments have shown that the Slav peoples who were oppressed and enslaved under the Austrian Empire proved entirely viable in the national sense, succeeded in creating their own statehood, and later, as a result of the victorious socialist revolution, set about establishing a highly advanced social system, greatly contributing to human progress.

Much of the material in this volume reflects the struggle waged by Marx and Engels to rally the revolutionary-democratic forces in Germany after the counter-revolutionary coup d'état in Prussia, as well as their efforts to develop the class consciousness of the German proletariat and to prepare the ground for the creation of a mass independent proletarian party. An important place in this struggle was occupied by the defence of the German people's democratic rights and liberties against the reactionaries, in particular against their encroachments on the revolutionary press, one of their main targets being the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. The article "Three State Trials against the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*", the speeches for the defence by Marx and Engels at the trial of the newspaper's editors on February 7, 1849, and other writings, administered a body blow against the initiators of these reactionary moves. They bore witness to the effectiveness of the revolutionary press in forming progressive public opinion, exposing the arbitrariness of counter-revolutionary

power and organising the struggle against a reactionary political system (see this volume, pp. 316-17).

In the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, Marx and Engels defended members of the democratic movement in general who were victims of police persecution. The articles "The Prussian Counter-Revolution and the Prussian Judiciary", "The Tax-Refusal Trial", "Lassalle" and others informed the public of the lawlessness of the Prussian police authorities and showed up the whole Prussian police and judicial system.

During preparations for the elections for the Second Chamber of the Prussian Diet, which replaced the dissolved National Assembly, Marx and Engels worked to unite all the democratic forces without, however, glossing over the disagreements existing in the democratic camp. They punctured the parliamentary illusions associated with the Constitution imposed by the King, which not only the liberals but also certain democrats represented as a guarantee that democratic reforms would be carried out by peaceful and constitutional means.

In his articles "The Berlin *National-Zeitung* to the Primary Electors" and "The *Kölnische Zeitung* on the Elections", Marx exposed the vain belief that this Constitution would be a means of solving the social question, and also the attempts of the liberals to comfort themselves and the people with hopes of its revision in a progressive spirit. He foretold that it would indeed be revised, but only "insofar as it suits the King and the Second Chamber consisting of country squires, financial magnates, high-ranking officials and clerics" (see this volume, p. 257).

In opposition to the liberals and some of the democrats, Marx considered broad popular participation in the elections not as a means of directly achieving political and social aims by constitutional methods, but primarily as a means of politically activating the masses and preparing them for future revolutionary battles. The successes of the democrats at the electoral meetings and in the Chamber itself, he thought, would provide them with additional opportunities to influence the masses in this direction and resist the reactionaries. But he never ceased to emphasise that the pressing political and social problems could be solved only by a new revolution carried out by the working class, the urban petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry. "Are not precisely these classes the most radical, the most democratic, of society as a whole?" Marx wrote. "Is it not precisely the proletariat that is the specifically *red* class?" (see this volume, p. 289).

Marx and Engels also defended their tactical line in the revolutionary struggle in heated arguments with sectarians in the working-class movement. In particular, the adherents of Gottschalk



in the Cologne Workers' Association were arguing against taking any part in the parliamentary elections, and trying to convince the workers that it would make no difference to them whether Germany was a monarchy or a republic. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* pointed out that this could lead only to the isolation of the proletariat from the other democratic forces, and that the democratic republic was the form of state which corresponded most closely to the interests of the working class and its allies and was best adapted to the tasks of their future revolutionary struggle. Under the influence of Marx and his supporters it was decided at committee meetings of the Workers' Association in January 1849 "to take part in the general electoral committees ... and to represent the general democratic principle there" (see this volume, p. 514).

While calling on the workers to take an active part in the democratic movement, Marx and Engels at the same time tried to help them become aware how much their own interests were politically and socially opposed to those of the bourgeoisie. Characteristic in this respect is Marx's article "A Bourgeois Document" which describes the Prussian bourgeoisie crawling "in the most servile reverence before throne, altar, army, bureaucracy and feudalism" and its "*shameless maltreatment of the working class*" (see this volume, p. 219).

The section "From the Preparatory Materials" contains the rough drafts of two of Marx's articles and also the draft of the judiciary part of his speech at the trial of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* on February 7, 1849.

The Appendices include reports on the meetings of the Committee of the Cologne Workers' Association and on the general meeting of its members. Although these reports are extremely brief and resemble minutes, they give a vivid picture of the ideological, educational and organisational work carried out by Marx and Engels in a mass workers' association which they were striving to transform into the foundation on which the future party of the German proletariat was to be built. The Cologne Workers' Association of which Marx was elected President *pro tem.* in the autumn of 1848 was becoming, due to the influence of Marx and other members of the Communist League, more and more a proletarian class organisation which took an increasingly active part in the political struggle.

Also included in the Appendices are reports on the "democratic banquets", or people's meetings, which took place in February 1849. Such banquets became a recognised form of political work among the masses and were held to commemorate the anniversaries of the

February and March revolutions. A number of the documents in this section convey the extent of official harassment and police persecution to which the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* and its editors were subjected.

\* \* \*

In compiling this volume, account has been taken, not only of the contents of Volume 6 of the German and Russian editions of Marx's and Engels' *Works*, but also of the results of research carried out in recent years in the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic to establish the authorship of articles in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. Newly discovered articles by Marx, "Decision of the Berlin National Assembly", "Tax Refusal and the Countryside", "Position of the Left in the National Assembly", together with Engels' reports from Switzerland and his articles on the revolutionary war in Hungary—in all 52 articles and reports—have been included in this volume. Of the 130 works in the main section, 114 are being published in English for the first time, as is noted on each occasion at the end of the translation. Articles previously translated into English are accompanied by editorial notes giving the date of the first English publication. All the items in "From the Preparatory Materials" and the Appendices are being published in English for the first time.

Account has also been taken of the latest conclusions of German and Soviet research concerning the insufficiently justified inclusion in previous editions of certain articles attributed to Marx.

Wherever it has been impossible, on the basis of the materials available, to ascertain to which of the two authors—Marx or Engels—an article or item in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* belongs, the author's name is not included at the end of the translation. If such data are available, the author's name is given.

The titles of articles published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* are taken from the table of contents in the newspaper. Titles provided by the editors of the present edition have been printed in square brackets. When newspaper sources quoted by Marx or Engels are not available, references are given to reproductions of the corresponding items in other newspapers.

The volume is provided with Notes, a Name Index, an Index of Quoted and Mentioned Literature, an Index of Periodicals and a Subject Index. For the reader's convenience, there is a Glossary of Geographical Names occurring in the text in the form customary in the German press of the time, but now archaic or Germanised.

Explanatory footnotes are provided for Swiss geographical names still current in a German, French or Italian form.

The volume was compiled and the Preface and Notes written by Vladimir Sazonov and edited by Lev Golman (Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU).

Albina Gridchina and Yuri Vasin (Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU) prepared the Name Index, the Index of Quoted and Mentioned Literature, the Index of Periodicals and the Glossary of Geographical Names, and Vladimir Sazonov the Subject Index.

The translations were made by Gregor Benton, Clemens Dutt, W. L. Guttman, Frida Knight, Barbara Ruhemann, Barrie Selman, Christopher Upward, Joan and Trevor Walmsley (Lawrence & Wishart), and Richard Dixon and Salo Ryazanskaya (Progress Publishers), and edited by Maurice Cornforth, Clemens Dutt, Frida Knight, Christian Maxwell and Margaret Mynatt (Lawrence & Wishart), Richard Dixon, Lydia Belyakova, Tatyana Grishina and Natalia Karmanova (Progress Publishers), and Larisa Miskievich, scientific editor (Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU).

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

KARL MARX  
and  
FREDERICK ENGELS

ARTICLES FROM THE *NEUE RHEINISCHE  
ZEITUNG*

November 8, 1848-March 5, 1849



N e u e  
**Rheinische Zeitung**  
Organ der Demokratie.

---

Nr. 183.

BONN, Donnerstag den 8. November.

1848.

---

THE CRISIS IN BERLIN<sup>1</sup>

Cologne, November 8. The situation looks very complicated, but it is very simple.

The King, as the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* correctly notes,<sup>2</sup> stands "on the broadest basis" of his "hereditary" rights "by the grace of God".

On the other side, the *National Assembly* has *no basis whatever*, its purpose being to constitute, to lay the basis.

Two sovereign powers.

The connecting link between the two is *Camphausen*, the *theory of agreement*.<sup>2</sup>

When these two sovereign powers are no longer able to agree or do not want to agree, they become two hostile sovereign powers. The King has the *right* to throw down the gauntlet to the Assembly, the Assembly has the *right* to throw down the gauntlet to the King. The *greater right* is on the side of the *greater might*. Might is tested in *struggle*. The test of the struggle is *victory*. Each of the two powers can prove that it is right only by its *victory*, that it is wrong only by its *defeat*.

The King until now has not been a *constitutional* king. He is an *absolute* monarch who decides for or against constitutionalism.

The Assembly until now has not been *constitutional*, it is *constituent*. It has so far attempted to constitute constitutionalism. It can continue or discontinue its *attempts*.

Both the King and the Assembly temporarily acquiesced in the constitutional ceremonial.

---

<sup>1</sup> In the article "Ministerium Brandenburg" published on November 5, 1848.—Ed.

The King's demand that a Brandenburg Ministry which is to his liking be appointed in defiance of the majority in the Chamber, is the demand of an *absolute monarch*.

The Chamber's presumption, by means of a deputation *straight* to the King, to forbid the formation of a Brandenburg Ministry is the presumption of an *absolute Chamber*.

The King and the Assembly have sinned against constitutional convention.

The King and the Assembly have both retreated to their original sphere, the King deliberately, the Chamber unwittingly.

The King is at an advantage.

*Right* is on the side of *might*.

*Legal phrases* are on the side of *impotence*.

A *Rodbertus* Ministry would be a cipher in which plus and minus neutralise each other.

Written by Marx on November 8, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 138, November 9, 1848

# Neue Rheinische Zeitung

## Organ der Demokratie.

№ 138.

Samstag den 9. November.

1848.

**Wien.**  
Die Wiener sind sehr unzufrieden mit dem Verhalten der Regierung, besonders mit dem Verhalten des Ministers des Innern, des Grafen von Schmerling. Sie verlangen die Absetzung desselben und die Ernennung eines Ministers, der die Interessen der Demokratie wahrnimmt. Die Wiener sind auch unzufrieden mit dem Verhalten der Regierung in Bezug auf die Angelegenheiten der Nationalgarde. Sie verlangen die Absetzung der Regierung und die Ernennung einer demokratischen Regierung.

Die Wiener sind sehr unzufrieden mit dem Verhalten der Regierung, besonders mit dem Verhalten des Ministers des Innern, des Grafen von Schmerling. Sie verlangen die Absetzung desselben und die Ernennung eines Ministers, der die Interessen der Demokratie wahrnimmt. Die Wiener sind auch unzufrieden mit dem Verhalten der Regierung in Bezug auf die Angelegenheiten der Nationalgarde. Sie verlangen die Absetzung der Regierung und die Ernennung einer demokratischen Regierung.

Die Wiener sind sehr unzufrieden mit dem Verhalten der Regierung, besonders mit dem Verhalten des Ministers des Innern, des Grafen von Schmerling. Sie verlangen die Absetzung desselben und die Ernennung eines Ministers, der die Interessen der Demokratie wahrnimmt. Die Wiener sind auch unzufrieden mit dem Verhalten der Regierung in Bezug auf die Angelegenheiten der Nationalgarde. Sie verlangen die Absetzung der Regierung und die Ernennung einer demokratischen Regierung.

### Die Krise in Berlin.

Die Krise in Berlin ist eine Krise der Demokratie. Die Berliner sind unzufrieden mit dem Verhalten der Regierung, besonders mit dem Verhalten des Ministers des Innern, des Grafen von Schmerling. Sie verlangen die Absetzung desselben und die Ernennung eines Ministers, der die Interessen der Demokratie wahrnimmt. Die Berliner sind auch unzufrieden mit dem Verhalten der Regierung in Bezug auf die Angelegenheiten der Nationalgarde. Sie verlangen die Absetzung der Regierung und die Ernennung einer demokratischen Regierung.

Die Berliner sind unzufrieden mit dem Verhalten der Regierung, besonders mit dem Verhalten des Ministers des Innern, des Grafen von Schmerling. Sie verlangen die Absetzung desselben und die Ernennung eines Ministers, der die Interessen der Demokratie wahrnimmt. Die Berliner sind auch unzufrieden mit dem Verhalten der Regierung in Bezug auf die Angelegenheiten der Nationalgarde. Sie verlangen die Absetzung der Regierung und die Ernennung einer demokratischen Regierung.

Die Berliner sind unzufrieden mit dem Verhalten der Regierung, besonders mit dem Verhalten des Ministers des Innern, des Grafen von Schmerling. Sie verlangen die Absetzung desselben und die Ernennung eines Ministers, der die Interessen der Demokratie wahrnimmt. Die Berliner sind auch unzufrieden mit dem Verhalten der Regierung in Bezug auf die Angelegenheiten der Nationalgarde. Sie verlangen die Absetzung der Regierung und die Ernennung einer demokratischen Regierung.

Die Berliner sind unzufrieden mit dem Verhalten der Regierung, besonders mit dem Verhalten des Ministers des Innern, des Grafen von Schmerling. Sie verlangen die Absetzung desselben und die Ernennung eines Ministers, der die Interessen der Demokratie wahrnimmt. Die Berliner sind auch unzufrieden mit dem Verhalten der Regierung in Bezug auf die Angelegenheiten der Nationalgarde. Sie verlangen die Absetzung der Regierung und die Ernennung einer demokratischen Regierung.

Die Berliner sind unzufrieden mit dem Verhalten der Regierung, besonders mit dem Verhalten des Ministers des Innern, des Grafen von Schmerling. Sie verlangen die Absetzung desselben und die Ernennung eines Ministers, der die Interessen der Demokratie wahrnimmt. Die Berliner sind auch unzufrieden mit dem Verhalten der Regierung in Bezug auf die Angelegenheiten der Nationalgarde. Sie verlangen die Absetzung der Regierung und die Ernennung einer demokratischen Regierung.

Die Berliner sind unzufrieden mit dem Verhalten der Regierung, besonders mit dem Verhalten des Ministers des Innern, des Grafen von Schmerling. Sie verlangen die Absetzung desselben und die Ernennung eines Ministers, der die Interessen der Demokratie wahrnimmt. Die Berliner sind auch unzufrieden mit dem Verhalten der Regierung in Bezug auf die Angelegenheiten der Nationalgarde. Sie verlangen die Absetzung der Regierung und die Ernennung einer demokratischen Regierung.

First page of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 138 containing Marx's article "The Crisis in Berlin".





## THE EX-PRINCIPALITY<sup>3</sup>

*From the Republic of Neuchâtel, November 7.* You will be interested to hear something also from a little country that until recently enjoyed the blessings of Prussian rule, but which was the first of all the lands under the Prussian Crown to raise the banner of revolution and drive out the Prussian paternal Government. I am speaking of the former "principality of Neuenburg and Vallendis",<sup>4</sup> in which Herr Pfuel, the present Prime Minister, performed his first administrative exercises as Governor and was deposed by the people in May of this year, even before he could win laurels in Posen<sup>5</sup> and gather votes of no confidence as Prime Minister in Berlin. This little country has now assumed the prouder title of "République et Canton de Neuchâtel", and the time is probably not far off when the last Neuchâtel guardsman brushes his green tunic in Berlin. I must confess it gave me an amusing feeling of satisfaction five weeks after my flight from the Prussian Holy Hermandad<sup>6</sup> to be able once more to walk about unmolested on what is *de jure* still Prussian soil.

Incidentally, the Republic and Canton of Neuchâtel evidently finds itself in much more comfortable circumstances than the late principality of Neuenburg and Vallendis; for at the recent elections to the Swiss National Council the republican candidates received over 6,000 votes, whereas the candidates of the royalists, of the *bédouins*,<sup>8</sup> as they are called here, hardly mustered 900 votes. The Great Council,<sup>7</sup> too, consists almost entirely of republicans, and only Les Ponts, a small mountain village dominated by the aristocrats, sent

---

<sup>4</sup> This nickname of the Swiss royalists is an allusion to the fact that the old Swiss cantons preserved patriarchal relations similar to those found in the social organisation of an Arab nomadic tribe, the Bedouin.—*Ed.*

Calame, ex-State Councillor of the royal Prussian Neuenburg principality, as its representative to Neuchâtel, where a few days ago he had to swear an oath of loyalty to the Republic. Instead of the old royalist *Constitutionnel Neuchâtelois*, there is published now—in La Chaux-de-Fonds, the largest, most industrialised and most republican place in the canton—a *Républicain Neuchâtelois*, written it is true in very bad Swiss-French of the Jura, but otherwise not at all badly edited.

The clock- and watch-making industry of the Jura and the lace manufacture of Traverstal, which are the main sources of livelihood of this little country, are beginning to prosper again, and the Montagnards,<sup>a</sup> in spite of the snow here being already a foot deep, are gradually regaining their old cheerfulness. Meanwhile the *bédouins* go about looking very dejected, displaying uselessly the Prussian colours on their breeches, blouses and caps, and sighing in vain for the return of the worthy Pfuel and the decrees that began: "*Nous Frédéric-Guillaume par la grâce de Dieu.*" High up in the Jura, 3,500 feet above sea-level, the Prussian colours, black caps with white edging, have the same dejected look and are as ambiguously smiled at as among us on the Rhine; if one did not see the Swiss flags and the big placards with the words "République et Canton de Neuchâtel", one might think one was at home. Incidentally, I am glad to be able to report that in the Neuchâtel revolution, as in all the revolutions of 1848, the *German workers* played a decisive and very honourable role. For that reason, too, they are allotted the fullest measure of the aristocrats' hatred.

Written by Engels on November 7, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 140, November 11, 1848

Published in English for the first time

---

<sup>a</sup> i.e. the revolutionary-minded population of the mountain canton of Neuchâtel who were engaged mainly in clock- and watch-making. They were given the name by analogy with the representatives of the revolutionary Montagne—the Jacobins—in the French Convention of 1792-93.—Ed.

THE NEW INSTITUTIONS.—PROGRESS  
IN SWITZERLAND<sup>a</sup>

*Berne*, November 9. The new legislative Federal Assembly, consisting of the Swiss National Council and the Council of States, has been gathered here since the day before yesterday. The city of *Berne* has done its utmost to give them as brilliant and seductive a reception as possible. There has been music, festive processions, illuminations, the boom of cannon and the peal of bells—nothing has been forgotten. The sessions began the day before yesterday. In the National Council, which is elected by universal suffrage and according to the number of inhabitants (*Berne* has returned 20 deputies, *Zurich* 12, the smallest cantons two or three each), the overwhelming majority of deputies are liberals of a radical hue. The decidedly radical party is strongly represented, and the conservatives have only six or seven seats out of over a hundred. The Council of States, which is made up of two deputies from each canton and one deputy from each demi-canton, on the whole resembles the last Diet<sup>9</sup> as regards composition and character. The *Ur*-cantons have once again returned several true separatists,<sup>10</sup> and as a result of the indirect elections, the reactionary element, though definitely in a minority, is nevertheless more strongly represented in this Council than it is in the National Council. As a matter of fact, by abolishing binding mandates<sup>a</sup> and invalidating half votes, the Council of States has been turned into a rejuvenated version of the Diet and has been

---

<sup>a</sup> i. e. the instructions which the deputies of the Swiss Diet received from their cantonal governments and which greatly impeded the adoption of general decisions.—*Ed.*

pushed into the background by the creation of the National Council. It plays the thankless role of a Senate or a Chamber of Peers, of a drag on the assumed excessive desire for innovation of the National Council, the role of heir to the mature wisdom and careful reflection of the forefathers. This dignified and sedate institution already shares the fate of similar bodies in England and America, and the now defunct one in France. Even before it has shown any signs of life it is looked down upon by the press and overshadowed by the National Council. Practically no one talks about the Council of States, and if it does make itself talked about it will be so much the worse for it.

Although the National Council is supposed to represent the entire Swiss "nation", it has already at its first sitting given proof of typically Swiss disunity and absorption with trifles, if not of petty cantonal spirit. Three votes had to be taken to elect a President, although there were only three candidates with any serious chances, and moreover all three of them from Berne. The three gentlemen in question were Ochsenbein, Funk and Neuhaus; the first two represent the old radical party of Berne, the third the old liberal, semi-conservative party. In the end Herr Ochsenbein was elected by 50 votes out of 93, that is, with a very narrow majority. One can understand the Zurich and other *Moderados*<sup>11</sup> preferring the wise and very experienced Herr Neuhaus to Herr Ochsenbein, but the fact that Herr Funk, who has exactly the same political colouring as Herr Ochsenbein, should have been put forward as a competing candidate and received support in two votings, shows how unorganised and undisciplined the parties still are. At any rate the election of Ochsenbein means that the radicals gained a victory in the first contest of the parties. In the subsequent election of a Vice-President, five votes had to be taken to produce an absolute majority. On the other hand, the staid and experienced Council of States almost unanimously elected the *Moderado* Furrer from Zurich as its President in the first round of voting. These two elections amply illustrate how different a spirit reigns in the two Chambers and that they will soon take different courses and enter into conflict with each other.

The choice of a federal capital will be the next interesting issue to be debated. It will be interesting for the Swiss because the financial interests of very many of them are involved, and interesting for people abroad because precisely this debate will reveal most clearly to what extent the old parochial patriotism, the petty cantonal narrow-mindedness has been discarded. The competition is most intense between Berne, Zurich and Lucerne. Berne would like to see

Zurich satisfied with the federal university, and Lucerne with the federal court of law, but in vain. Berne at any rate is the only suitable city, being the point where German and French Switzerland merge, the capital of the largest canton and the emerging centre of the whole Swiss movement. But in order to become a real centre, Berne must also possess the university and the federal court. But try and explain that to the Swiss whose fanaticism for their cantonal town has been roused! It is quite possible that the more radical National Council will vote for radical Berne, and the sedate Council of States for sedate, wise and prudent Zurich. An extremely difficult situation will then arise.

There has been considerable unrest in *Geneva* during the last three weeks. The reactionary patricians and bourgeois, who, from their villas, keep the villages around Geneva in almost feudal dependence, managed with the help of their peasants to push through all their three candidates in the elections to the National Council. But the committee declared the elections invalid, as more ballot-papers were returned than had been issued. Only this measure was able to pacify the revolutionary workers of Saint-Gervais, crowds of whom were already marching through the streets and shouting "*Aux armes!*" The attitude of the workers in the course of the week that followed was so menacing that the bourgeois preferred not to vote at all rather than provoke a revolution with the inevitable scenes of horror of which there had already been warning, especially since the Government threatened to resign if the reactionary candidates were once more elected. The radicals meanwhile altered their list of candidates, to which they added some more moderate names, made up for lost canvassing time, and obtained 5,000 to 5,500 votes in the new elections, that is almost a thousand more than the reactionaries had received in the previous round. The three reactionary candidates obtained hardly any votes; General Dufour, who received the highest number, managed to poll 1,500 votes. Elections to the Great Council were held a week later. The city elected 44 radicals, and the countryside, which had to elect 46 councillors, returned almost exclusively reactionaries. The *Revue de Genève* is still arguing with the bourgeois newspapers as to whether all 46 are reactionary or half a dozen of them will vote for the radical Government. We shall soon know. The confusion in Geneva may increase; for if the Government, which is here elected directly by the people, is forced to resign, then during the new elections the same thing might easily happen as during the second elections to the National Council, and a radical government could be confronted with a reactionary majority in the Great Council. It is moreover certain that the workers of

Geneva are only waiting for an opportunity to safeguard the threatened gains of 1847<sup>12</sup> by a new revolution.

On the whole, compared with the early forties, Switzerland has made considerable progress. This is nowhere so striking as among the working class. Whereas the old spirit of parochial narrow-mindedness and pedantry still holds almost undivided sway among the bourgeoisie and especially in the old patrician families, or has, at best, assumed more modern forms, the Swiss workers have developed to a remarkable degree. Formerly, they kept aloof from the Germans and displayed the most absurd "free Swiss" national arrogance, complained about the "foreign rogues" and showed no interest whatever in the contemporary movement. Now this has changed. Ever since working conditions have deteriorated, ever since Switzerland has been democratised, and especially since the minor riots have given place to European revolutions and battles such as those waged in Paris in June and in Vienna in October<sup>13</sup>—ever since then the Swiss workers have participated more and more in the political and socialist movements, have fraternised with the foreign workers, especially the German workers, and have abandoned their "free Swiss attitude". In the French part of Switzerland and in many of its German districts, Germans and German Swiss are members of the same workers' association on an equal footing, and associations consisting mainly of Swiss workers have decided to join the proposed organisation of German democratic associations which has partly come into being. Whereas the extreme radicals of official Switzerland dream at best of a Helvetic republic,<sup>14</sup> one and indivisible, Swiss workers often express the view that the whole of little Switzerland's independence will soon perish in the impending European storm. And this is said quite calmly and indifferently, without a word of regret, by these proletarian traitors! All the Swiss I have met expressed great sympathy for the Viennese, but among the workers it amounted to real fanaticism. No one speaks about the National Council, the Council of States, the riot of the priests in Freiburg,<sup>15</sup> but Vienna was on everybody's lips all day long. One would think that Vienna were again the capital of Switzerland as it was in the days before William Tell, that Switzerland belonged again to Austria. Hundreds of rumours were bruited about, debated, called in question, believed, refuted, and all possible aspects were thoroughly discussed. And when, at last, the news of the defeat of the heroic Viennese workers and students and of Windischgrätz's superior strength and barbarity was definitely confirmed, the effect on these Swiss workers was as though their own fate had been decided in Vienna and their own country had succumbed. Though

this feeling is not yet a universal one, it is steadily gaining ground among the Swiss proletariat, and the fact that it already exists in many localities is, for a country like Switzerland, a tremendous advance.

Written by Engels on November 9, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 143, November 15, 1848



COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN BERLIN<sup>16</sup>

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 141, November 12, 1848]

Cologne, November 11. The *Pfuel Ministry* was a "misunderstanding"; its real meaning is the *Brandenburg Ministry*. The *Pfuel Ministry* was the *table of contents*, the *Brandenburg Ministry* is the *content* itself.

*Brandenburg in the Assembly and the Assembly in Brandenburg.*<sup>17</sup>

**Thus runs the epitaph of the House of Brandenburg.**<sup>a</sup>

The Emperor Charles V was admired because he had himself buried while still alive.<sup>18</sup> To have a bad joke engraved on one's tombstone is to go one better than the Emperor Charles V and his penal system, his criminal code.<sup>19</sup>

*Brandenburg in the Assembly and the Assembly in Brandenburg!*

A King of Prussia once put in an appearance in the Assembly. That was not the real Brandenburg. The Marquis of Brandenburg who appeared in the Assembly the day before yesterday was the real King of Prussia.

*The guardroom in the Assembly, the Assembly in the guardroom*—that means: *Brandenburg in the Assembly, the Assembly in Brandenburg!*

Or will the *Assembly in Brandenburg*—Berlin, as is well known, is situated in the Province of Brandenburg—be master ... of the *Brandenburg in the Assembly*? Will Brandenburg seek the protection of the Assembly as a Capet once did in another Assembly?<sup>20</sup>

**Brandenburg in the Assembly and the Assembly in Brandenburg** is an expression with many meanings, ambiguous and portentous.

As we know, it is much easier for the peoples to cope with *kings* than with *legislative assemblies*. History gives us a whole list of abortive revolts of the people against national assemblies. It knows only two important exceptions to this rule. The English people in the person

---

<sup>a</sup> This refers to the Hohenzollerns, who became hereditary margraves of Brandenburg in 1417.—Ed.

of *Cromwell* dissolved the *Long Parliament*, and the French people in the person of *Bonaparte* dissolved the *Corps legislatif*. But the Long Parliament had long ago become a *Rump*, and the *Corps legislatif* a *corpse*.

Are the *kings* more fortunate than the peoples in their *revolts against legislative assemblies*?

*Charles I, James II, Louis XVI* and *Charles X* are hardly promising ancestral examples.

There are luckier ancestors in *Spain* and *Italy* however. And recently in *Vienna*?

But one must not forget that a *Congress of Nations* was in session in Vienna and that the *representatives of the Slavs*, except for the Poles, went over to the imperial camp with bands playing.<sup>21</sup>

The struggle of the camarilla in Vienna against the Imperial Diet was at the same time a struggle of the *Slav* Diet against the *German* Diet. It was not *Slavs*, however, who seceded in the Berlin Assembly, it was only *slaves*, and slaves do not constitute a party; at best they are camp-followers of a party. The members of the Right who left the Berlin Assembly<sup>22</sup> have not strengthened the enemy camp, they have infected it with a fatal malady—with *treason*.

The *Slav* party was *victorious* in Austria together with the camarilla. It will now *fight* the camarilla over the spoils. If the Berlin camarilla is victorious it will not have to share the victory with the *Right* or to defend it against the *Right*; the *Right* will be given a *tip*—and *kicks*.

The Prussian Crown is within its *rights* in confronting the Assembly as an *absolute Crown*. But the Assembly is in the *wrong* because it does not confront the Crown as an *absolute assembly*. To begin with it should have had the Ministers *arrested as traitors, traitors to the sovereignty of the people*. It should have *proscribed* and *outlawed* all officials who obey orders others than those of the Assembly.

But the *political* weakness characterising the actions of the National Assembly in *Berlin* may become a source of *civic* strength in the *provinces*.

The bourgeoisie would have liked so much to transform the *feudal monarchy* into a *bourgeois monarchy* in an *amicable* way. After depriving the feudal party of armorial bearings and titles, which are offensive to its civic pride, and of the dues appertaining to feudal property, which violate the bourgeois mode of appropriation, the bourgeoisie would have liked so much to unite with the feudal party and together with it enslave the people. But the old bureaucracy does not want to be reduced to the status of a servant of a bourgeoisie for whom, until now, it has been a despotic tutor. The feudal party does not want to see its marks of distinction and interests burnt at the altar of the

bourgeoisie. Finally, the Crown sees in the elements of the old feudal society—a society of which it is the crowning excrescence—its true, native social ground, whereas it regards the bourgeoisie as an alien, artificial soil which bears it only under the condition that it withers away.

The bourgeoisie turns the intoxicating “*grace of God*” into a sober *legal title*, the rule of blood into the rule of paper, the royal sun into a civic astral lamp.

Royalty, therefore, was not taken in by the bourgeoisie. Its reply to the partial revolution of the bourgeoisie was a full-fledged counter-revolution. It drove the bourgeoisie once more into the *arms of the revolution, of the people*, by crying out to it:

*Brandenburg in the Assembly and the Assembly in Brandenburg.*

While admitting that we do not expect the bourgeoisie to answer in a manner befitting the occasion, we must not omit to remark, on the other hand, that in its rebellion against the National Assembly the Crown, too, resorts to hypocritical half measures and hides its head under the constitutional veil at the very moment when it tries to cast off this irksome veil.

*Brandenburg* makes the *German Central Authority*<sup>23</sup> give him the order for his *coup d'état*. *The regiments of the guards marched into Berlin by order of the Central Authority*. The Berlin counter-revolution is carried out by order of the German Central Authority. *Brandenburg* orders Frankfurt to give him this order. It denies its sovereignty at the very moment when it wants to establish it. Herr Bassermann of course eagerly seized the opportunity to play the servant as master. But he has the satisfaction that the master in his turn plays the servant.

Whatever the outcome in Berlin may be, the *dilemma* is: either the *King* or the *people*—and the people will be victorious with the cry, *Brandenburg in the Assembly and the Assembly in Brandenburg*.

We may have to go through a hard school, but it is the preparatory school for a **complete revolution**.

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 141, November 12, 1848, second edition]

Cologne, November 11. The *European revolution* is describing a *circle*. It started in Italy and assumed a European character in Paris; the first repercussion of the February revolution took place in Vienna; the repercussion of the Viennese revolution followed in Berlin; *European counter-revolution* struck its first blow in Italy, in Naples; it assumed a European character in Paris in June; the first repercussion of the June counter-revolution followed in Vienna; it

comes to a close and discredits itself in Berlin. *The crowing of the Gallic cock in Paris will once again rouse Europe.*<sup>24</sup>

But in *Berlin the counter-revolution is bringing itself into disrepute. Everything becomes disreputable in Berlin, even counter-revolution.*

In *Naples the lazzaroni*<sup>25</sup> are leagued with the monarchy against the bourgeoisie.

In *Paris* the greatest struggle ever known in history is taking place. The bourgeoisie is leagued with the *lazzaroni* against the working class.

In *Vienna* we have a whole swarm of nationalities who imagine that the counter-revolution will bring them emancipation. In addition—the secret spite of the bourgeoisie against the workers and the Academic Legion; strife within the civic militia itself<sup>26</sup>; finally, attack by the people supplying a pretext for the attack by the Court.

*Nothing like that is happening in Berlin.* The bourgeoisie and the people are on one side and the drill-sergeants on the other.

*Wrangel and Brandenburg*, two men who have no head, no heart, no opinions, nothing but mustachios<sup>a</sup>—such is the antithesis of this querulous, self-opinionated, irresolute National Assembly.

*Will*—be it even that of an ass, an ox, a moustache<sup>a</sup>—is all that is needed to tackle the weak-willed grumblers of the March revolution. And the *Prussian Court*, which has just as little will as the National Assembly, seeks out the *two most stupid men* in the monarchy and tells these lions: *represent will*. Pfuel still had a few grains of brain. But *absolute stupidity* makes even the grumblers of the March achievements flinch.

*"With stupidity the gods themselves struggle in vain",<sup>b</sup>*

exclaims the perplexed National Assembly.

These *Wrangels* and *Brandenburgs*, these blockheads who can *want* because they have no will of their own, because they want what they are *ordered*, and who are too stupid to question the orders they are given with a faltering voice and trembling lips—they, too, *discredit* themselves because they do not get down to *skull-cracking*, the only job these *battering-rams* are good for.

*Wrangel* does not go beyond confessing that he recognises only a National Assembly that obeys orders. *Brandenburg* is given a lesson in parliamentary behaviour, and after having shocked the Chamber with his crude, repulsive jargon appropriate to a drill-sergeant, he

<sup>a</sup> In the original *Schnurrbart* in both cases.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Schiller, *Die Jungfrau von Orleans*, Act III, Scene 6.—*Ed.*

allows the "tyrant to be tyrannised" and carries out the orders of the National Assembly by humbly *begging* for permission to speak, though he had just attempted to *take this right*.<sup>27</sup>

*"I had rather be a tick in a sheep  
Than such a valiant ignorance."*<sup>a</sup>

Berlin's calm attitude *delights* us; the ideals of the Prussian drill-sergeants prove unavailing against it.

But the National Assembly? Why does it not pronounce the *mise hors de loi*?<sup>b</sup> Why does it not outlaw the Wrangels? Why does not one of the deputies step into the midst of Wrangel's bayonets to outlaw him and address the soldiers?

Let the Berlin National Assembly leaf through the *Moniteur*, the *Moniteur* for 1789-95.

And what should *we* do at the present time?

**We should refuse to pay taxes.** A Wrangel and a Brandenburg understand—for these creatures learn Arabic from the Hyghlans<sup>28</sup>—that they wear a sword and get a uniform and a salary. But *where* the sword, the uniform and the salary come from—that they do not understand.

*There is only one means of defeating the monarchy*, and that is to do it before the *advent of the anti-June revolution*, which will take place in Paris in December.<sup>29</sup>

The monarchy defies not only the people, but the bourgeoisie as well.

Defeat it therefore in a bourgeois manner.

And how can one defeat the monarchy in a bourgeois manner?

By starving it out.

And how can one starve it out?

By refusing to pay taxes.

Consider it well. All the princes of Prussia, all the Brandenburgs and Wrangels produce no *bread for the army*. It is you who produce even the bread for the army.

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 142, November 14, 1848]

*Cologne*, November 13. Just as once the French National Assembly, on finding its official meeting place closed, had to continue its session in the *tennis-court*, so now the Prussian National Assembly has to meet in the *shooting-gallery*.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Shakespeare, *Troilus and Cressida*, Act III, Scene 3.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> Outlawing.—Ed.

A decision adopted in the shooting-gallery declares *Brandenburg a traitor*. The text, as received from our Berlin correspondent (who signs his articles ⊙), is contained in our special edition issued this morning, but it is not mentioned in the report published in the *Kölnische Zeitung*.<sup>2</sup>

However, we have just received a letter from a **member of the National Assembly** which we quote *word for word*:

"The National Assembly has unanimously (242 members) declared that by introducing this measure (dissolution of the civic militia) **Brandenburg has committed high treason, and any person who actively or passively co-operates in the implementation of this measure is to be regarded as a traitor.**"<sup>31</sup>

*Dumont's* trustworthiness is well known.

Since the National Assembly has declared *Brandenburg a traitor*, the **obligation to pay taxes ceases automatically**. *No taxes are to be paid to a government guilty of high treason*. Tomorrow we shall inform our readers in greater detail **how in England, the oldest constitutional country, a refusal to pay taxes** operated during a similar conflict.<sup>32</sup> Incidentally, the *traitorous Government itself* has shown the people the right way **when it immediately refused to pay taxes** (allowances etc.) **to the National Assembly in order to starve it out**.

The aforementioned deputy writes further:

"The civic militia will not hand over its arms."

*A fight therefore seems inevitable*, and it is the **duty of the Rhine Province to hasten to the assistance of the Berlin National Assembly with men and weapons**.

Written by Marx on November 11 and 13,  
1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* Nos. 141, 141 (second edition) and 142, November 12 and 14, 1848

---

<sup>2</sup> On November 12, 1848 (special supplement).—*Ed.*

[DECISION OF THE BERLIN NATIONAL ASSEMBLY]<sup>33</sup>

*Berlin*, November 11, 7.45 p.m.

About 6 o'clock news came that Rimpler had been ordered to hand over all arms of the civic militia by 4 o'clock tomorrow. In the meantime the Assembly had adopted the following decision:

1) That General Brandenburg is **guilty of high treason**; 2) that the civic militia shall not give up its arms and, if necessary, shall repel **force by force**; 3) that any officer who gives the order to fire against citizens shall be charged with **high treason**.—In addition, a commission was appointed to discuss the question of **tax refusal**.

At its morning sitting the Assembly had already appointed a commission to discuss *tax refusal*.

When the National Assembly reached the playhouse, they found the entrance barred. Inside a company of soldiers was bivouacking. Their captain refused to allow Herr von Unruh to enter. The National Assembly then proceeded from there to the assembly hall, where they were likewise refused admittance. They then met in the Hotel de Russie.

*Evening of November 11.* The National Assembly transferred its afternoon sitting to the shooting-gallery in Lindenstrasse. On Monday it will move into the Köllnische Rathaus.<sup>34</sup> From what I hear, the Stock Exchange has offered credit and the city councillors are willing to guarantee the deputies' allowances. Several deputations from Spandau, Magdeburg and Pomerania have arrived here to acknowledge the authority of the Assembly.

During the course of the day a "*proclamation*" of the King was published, countersigned by the Ministers. This proclamation, which is reminiscent of similar proclamations by *Dom Miguel*, seeks to justify the prorogation of the National Assembly. A second royal decree disbands the civic militia; and a third appoints *Rintelen*, chief presiding judge of the Court of Appeal at Naumburg, to be Minister of Justice.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 142, November 14, 1848.—Ed.

**The royal Supreme Court, asked by Herr Bornemann whether the Crown had the right to prorogue, to transfer or to close down the National Assembly convened here in the name of the whole country, replied with a unanimous "No!"**

In Berlin the rumour was circulating that at *Breslau* the troops have been driven out of the town and Brandenburg's hotel destroyed.

We cannot give credence to this rumour, for a letter which has just reached us from *Breslau*, dated 1 o'clock in the morning of November 11, contains no mention of this. The main contents of this letter are as follows:

At its sitting on November 10 the Central Committee of the civic militia decided to request that the City Council (and the City Councillors) take steps for the immediate general arming of all men capable of bearing arms and declare that it will recognise and protect the National Assembly under all circumstances and acknowledge it as the only seat of government. The *Oberpräsident*<sup>a</sup> declared to a deputation sent to meet him that he would not go beyond the law, but that he would never undertake any action against the National Assembly, nor lend his hand to such action. He would resign from office immediately if he was asked to do anything contrary to the law. He did not recognise the necessity for prorogation of the National Assembly.

The Chief of Police,<sup>b</sup> who was also present, gave his support to these declarations. He did not recognise any right to dissolve the Chamber and would immediately resign from office if anything of the sort were to happen.

The Central Committee of the *Breslau* civic militia has declared itself a permanent body.

Since the National Assembly **has declared Prime Minister Brandenburg guilty of high treason, the obligation to pay taxes automatically ceases**, for it would be impermissible to support his treasonable administration with taxes.—**Therefore, to pay taxes is now tantamount to high treason and refusal to pay taxes is the primary duty of the citizen.**

Written by Marx on November 11, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 141 (special edition), November 12, 1848

Published in English for the first time

<sup>a</sup> Eichmann.— *Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Minutoli.— *Ed.*



## [SITTING OF THE SWISS CHAMBERS]

Berne, November 12. In the sittings held so far, the two Swiss Chambers have not yet debated any of the more important questions. Last week the main business was the constituting of the two Councils; the debate on the publication of proceedings (which, as is known, has been dropped for the present without any conclusion being reached); the recall of deputies elected with reservations regarding the new Constitution.<sup>35</sup> During yesterday's sitting the oath for the federal authorities was finalised and the salaries of the Federal Council fixed (6,000 Swiss francs for the President, 5,000 for each of the councillors, and 4,000 and free residence for the Chancellor). It will now no longer be possible to delay the choice of the federal capital and the appointment of the Federal Council. In addition the *Vorort*<sup>a</sup> yesterday informed both Councils of the measures taken with regard to Tessin.<sup>36</sup> Tessinners have appealed against the *Vorort* to the new federal authorities; however, it is not to be expected that the latter will modify or revoke altogether the decisions taken by their predecessors.

Written by Engels on November 12, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 147 (second edition), November 19, 1848

Published in English for the first time

---

<sup>a</sup> Berne.—*Ed.*

[CAVAIGNAC AND THE JUNE REVOLUTION]<sup>37</sup>

*E. Girardin* is pitiable in his apologia for the imperialistic cretin *Louis Napoleon*, the "little constable"<sup>38</sup>; he is likeable in his attacks on *Cavaignac*, the warrior hero of *M. Marrast*. Since November 7 he has been publishing in consecutive issues a philippic against the *hero of the European bourgeoisie*, which has fallen in love with his Arabian nightcap.<sup>39</sup> Perfidious as this bourgeoisie is, it has sacrificed him to the *Sipehsalar*<sup>a</sup> *Jellachich*, who is now the *lion* of the European hucksters.

We give our readers in full the *acte d'accusation* made by *La Presse*. In contrast to all European newspapers of great or small format, we have conceived the *June revolution* in a way that history has confirmed.<sup>b</sup> We insist on coming back from time to time to its chief factors and chief *dramatis personae*, since the *June revolution* is the *centre* around which the European revolution and counter-revolution revolve.<sup>c</sup> The distance from the *June revolution*, as we stated at the time when it was taking place, marked the zenith of counter-revolution, which had to make its tour of Europe. The return to the *June revolution* is the real beginning of the European revolution. Therefore, back to *Cavaignac*, to the *inventor of the state of siege*.

Written by Marx on November 13, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 142 (second edition), November 14, 1848

Published in English for the first time

<sup>a</sup> Supreme commander.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See Karl Marx, "The June Revolution" (present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 144-49).—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See Karl Marx, "The Victory of the Counter-Revolution in Vienna" (present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 503-06).—*Ed.*

APPEAL  
OF THE DEMOCRATIC DISTRICT COMMITTEE  
OF THE RHINE PROVINCE<sup>40</sup>

APPEAL

*Cologne*, November 14. The Rhenish District Committee of Democrats calls upon all democratic associations in the Rhine Province immediately to convene their associations and organise everywhere in the neighbourhood popular meetings in order to encourage the entire population of the Rhine Province to refuse to pay taxes, since this is the most effective means to oppose the arbitrary acts committed by the Government against the assembly of Prussian people's representatives.

It is necessary to advise against any violent resistance in the case of taxes collected under a writ of execution, but it can be recommended that at public sales people should refrain from bidding.

In order to agree on further measures, the District Committee is of the opinion that a congress of deputies from all associations should be held, and herewith invites them to meet on Thursday, November 23, at 9 a.m. (in the Eiser Hall, Komödienstrasse).

Cologne, November 14, 1848

For the District Committee

**Karl Marx**     **Schneider II**

Written by Marx on November 14, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 143, November 15, 1848

## IMPEACHMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT<sup>41</sup>

*The city of Brandenburg refuses to have anything to do with the Brandenburg Ministry and sends an address of thanks to the National Assembly.*

*In its addresses the whole country recognises only the government of the National Assembly.*

*The Ministry has committed a further act of high treason by defying the Habeas Corpus Act<sup>42</sup> and proclaiming a state of siege without the assent of the National Assembly and by expelling the National Assembly itself from the shooting-gallery at the point of the bayonet.*

*The National Assembly has its seat in the people and not in the confines of this or that heap of stones. If it is driven out of Berlin it will meet elsewhere, in Breslau, Cologne, or any other place it thinks fit. It has declared this in the decision it adopted on the 13th.<sup>a</sup>*

*The Berliners scoff at the state of siege and will not allow themselves to be in any way restrained by it. Nobody is handing over his arms.*

*Armed men from various parts of the country are hurrying to the assistance of the National Assembly.*

*The guards refuse to obey orders. More and more soldiers are fraternising with the people.*

*Silesia and Thuringia are in full revolt.*

We, however, appeal to you, citizens—send money to the democratic Central Committee in Berlin. But pay no taxes to the counter-revolutionary Government. The National Assembly has

<sup>a</sup> This decision was adopted at the evening sitting of November 12, 1848.—Ed.

declared that refusal to pay taxes is justified in law. It has not yet adopted a decision on this out of consideration for the officials. A *starvation diet* will make these officials realise the power of the citizenry and will make them also good citizens.

Starve the enemy and refuse to pay taxes! Nothing is sillier than to supply a traitorous government with the means to fight the nation, and the means of all means is *money*.

Written by Marx on November 15, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 143 (special edition), November 15, 1848

# Extra-Blatt

zu Nr. 143 der Neuen Rheinischen Zeitung.

Mittwoch, den 15. November.

## Das Ministerium ist in Anklagezustand versetzt.

Die Stadt Brandenburg will nichts wissen von dem Ministerium Brandenburg und schiebt eine Dank-Adresse an die Nationalversammlung.

Das ganze Land erkennt in seinen Adressen nur die Regierung der Nationalversammlung an.

Das Ministerium begeht neuen Hochverrath, indem es im Gegensatz zu dem Habeas-Corpus-Act ohne Genehmigung der Nationalversammlung den Belagerungszustand ausgesprochen und die Nationalversammlung selbst mit Bajonetten aus dem Schützenhause vertrieben hat.

Die Nationalversammlung hat ihren Sitz im Volke, nicht in dem Umkreis dieser oder jener Steinhaufen. Vertreibt man sie aus Berlin, so wird sie in einem andern Orte tagen, in Breslau, Köln oder wo es ihr gutdünkt. Sie hat in ihrer Sitzung vom 13. diesen Beschluß gefaßt.

Die Berliner moquieren sich über den Belagerungszustand und lassen sich in keiner Weise durch denselben einschränken. Niemand liefert die Waffen ab.

Von verschiedenen Gegenden sind Bewaffnete der Nationalversammlung zur Hülfe geeilt.

Die Garden verweigern den Gehorsam. Die Soldaten fraternisiren immer mehr mit dem Volke.

Schlesien und Thüringen sind in vollem Aufstande.

Wir aber, Bürger, rufen euch zu: Schickt Geld dem demokratischen Centralausschuß nach Berlin. Zahlt dagegen keine Steuern an die contrarevolutionäre Regierung. Die Nationalversammlung hat erklärt, daß die Steuerverweigerung rechtlich begründet sei. Sie hat sie noch nicht beschlossen aus Rücksicht für die Beamten. Die Hungerstar wird diese Beamten die Wacht des Bürgers kennen lehren, und sie selbst zu guten Bürgern machen.

Hungert den Feind aus und verweigert die Steuern! Nichts thörichteres als einer hochverrätherischen Regierung Mittel zum Kampfe gegen die Nation zu bieten und das Mittel aller Mittel ist — Geld.

---

## Das Vaterland in Gefahr.

Heute Mittwoch den 15. November Mittags halb 1 Uhr

**V e r s a m m l u n g**

der Landwehrmänner und Reservisten aller Waffengattungen einschließlich deren Offiziere im Eiser'schen Saale.

Der Comm. Koell.

Druck J. W. Dietz, unter Quincke'scher Str.

Special edition of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* with Marx's article "Impeachment of the Government"



## STATEMENT

Cologne, November 16. The *Kölnische Zeitung* in its issue of November 16 draws a wholly invented connection between the "Appeal of the Rhenish District Committee of Democrats"<sup>a</sup> and an "Assurance" about the refusal to pay taxes<sup>43</sup> alleged to have been sent to the provinces by the extreme Left of the Prussian National Assembly. Nothing is known to the undersigned of a news report spread by members of the extreme Left concerning a refusal to pay taxes already decided on by the National Assembly.

**Karl Marx**

**Schneider II**

Written by Marx on November 16, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 145, November 17, 1848

Published in English for the first time

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 24.—*Ed.*



## CONFESSIONS OF A NOBLE SOUL\*

Cologne, November 16. We predicted to the Right what would await them if the camarilla was victorious—a *tip* and *kicks*.<sup>b</sup>

We were mistaken. The struggle has not yet been decided, but they are already being given *kicks* by their chiefs, without receiving any *tip*.

The *Neue Preussische Zeitung*, Dame of the Army Reserve Cross "with God for King and Fatherland", the official organ of those now in power, states in one of its recent issues that the deputies *Zweiffel* (Chief Public Prosecutor in Cologne) and *Schlink* (Counsellor of the Court of Appeal in Cologne) are—let the reader guess—"revolutionary stomachs" [*Magen*] (the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* writes "*Mägen*"<sup>c</sup>). It speaks of these gentlemen's "inexpressible emptiness of thought and absence of thought". It finds even "*Robespierre's fantasies*" far superior to the ideas of these "gentlemen of the central section". *Avis à<sup>d</sup> Messieurs Zweiffel et Schlink!*

In the same issue of this newspaper *Pinto-Hansemann*<sup>44</sup> is declared to be a "leader of the extreme Left",<sup>e</sup> and according to the same newspaper there is only one remedy for leaders of the extreme Left—summary justice—the rope. *Avis à M. Pinto-Hansemann, ex-Minister of action and of the constabulary.*<sup>45</sup>

<sup>a</sup> This is the title of the sixth book of Goethe's novel *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, p.15.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> "Der Bericht der Zentralabteilung über Kirche und Schule", *Neue Preussische Zeitung* No. 115 (supplement), November 11, 1848.—Ed.

<sup>d</sup> Take notice.—Ed.

<sup>e</sup> In the leading article of the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* No. 115, November 11, 1848.—Ed.

For an *official news-sheet*, the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* is too naively frank. It tells the various parties too explicitly what is locked in the files of the Santa Casa.<sup>46</sup>

In the Middle Ages, people used to open Virgil at random in order to prophesy. In the Prussian Brumaire of 1848, people open the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* to save themselves the trouble of prophesying.<sup>47</sup> We shall give some new examples. What has the camarilla in store for the Catholics?

Listen!

No. 115 of the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* states:

*"It is equally untrue that the state"* (namely the royal Prussian state, the state of the Army Reserve Cross in its pre-March period) *"has assumed a narrow denominational character and has guided religious affairs from this one-sided standpoint. Admittedly this reproach, if it were true, would be an expression of definite praise. But it is untrue; for it is well known that our Government has expressly abandoned the old and good standpoint of an evangelical government."*

It is well known that *Frederick William III* made religion a branch of *military discipline* and had dissenters<sup>48</sup> thrashed by the police. It is well known that *Frederick William IV*, as one of the twelve minor prophets, wanted through the agency of the *Eichhorn-Bodelschwingh-Ladenberg* Ministry to convert the people and men of science forcibly to the *religion of Bunsen*. It is well known that even under the *Camphausen* Ministry the *Poles* were just as much plundered, scorched and clubbed because they were *Poles* as because they were *Catholics*. The *Pomeranians* always made a point of *thrusting their bayonets* through images of the *Virgin Mary* in Poland and *hanging Catholic priests*.

The persecution of *dissenting Protestants* under *Frederick William III* and *Frederick William IV* is equally well known.

The former immured in fortresses the Protestant pastors who repudiated the ritual and dogmas that he himself had invented. He was a great inventor of soldiers' uniforms and rituals. And the latter? The *Eichhorn* Ministry? It suffices to mention the name of the *Eichhorn* Ministry.

But all that was a mere nothing!

**"Our Government had expressly abandoned the old and good standpoint of an evangelical government."** Await therefore the restoration of *Brandenburg-Manteuffel*, you *Catholics of the Rhine Province* and *Westphalia* and *Silesia*! Previously you were punished with rods, you will be scourged with *scorpions*.<sup>a</sup> You will get to know **"expressly the old and good standpoint of an evangelical government"!**

<sup>a</sup> Paraphrased words of Rehoboam, King of Judah. See 1 Kings 12:11.—Ed.

And as for the *Jews*, who since the emancipation of their sect have everywhere put themselves, at least in the person of their eminent representatives, at the *head of the counter-revolution*—what awaits them?

There has been no waiting for victory in order to throw them back into their ghetto.

In *Bromberg* the Government is renewing the old restrictions on freedom of movement and thus robbing the *Jews* of one of the first of Rights of Man of 1789, the right to move freely from one place to another.

That is “one” aspect of the government of voluble **Frederick William IV** under the auspices of *Brandenburg-Manteuffel-Ladenberg*.

In its issue of November 11<sup>a</sup> the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* threw out *well-being* as bait to the “liberal-constitutional party”. But it was already shaking its head doubtfully over the *constitutionalists*.

“For the time being at any rate, our *constitutionalists* are still exceedingly shy of admitting, when together in their clubs or in their public press, that they are *reactionaries*.”

However, it adds soothingly and pertinently:

“Every single one” (of the liberal-constitutionalists) “has long ago ceased to conceal that at the present time there is no salvation except in *legal reaction*.”

that is to say, in making the *law* *reactionary* or *reaction* *legal*, *elevating reaction to the level of law*.

In its issue of November 15<sup>b</sup> the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* already makes short work of the “*constitutionalists*” who want *reaction* elevated to the level of *law*, but are opposed to the *Brandenburg-Manteuffel* Ministry because it wants *counter-revolution sans phrase*.<sup>c</sup>

“The *ordinary constitutionalists*,” it says, “must be left to their fate.”

Captured together! Hanged together!

*For the information of the ordinary constitutionalists!*

And wherein lies the *extraordinary constitutionalism* of *Frederick William IV* under the auspices of *Brandenburg-Manteuffel-Ladenberg*?

The official government organ, the *Dame of the Army Reserve Cross with God for King and Fatherland*, betrays the secrets of *extraordinary constitutionalism*.

<sup>a</sup> “Aus Breslau, den 8. November”, *Neue Preussische Zeitung* No. 115, November 11, 1848.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> “Ob Königtum, ob Republik”, *Neue Preussische Zeitung* No. 118, November 15, 1848.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Without mincing the matter.—*Ed.*

The "simplest, most straightforward and least dangerous remedy", of course, is "to remove the Assembly to another place", from a capital to a guardroom, from Berlin to Brandenburg.

However, this removal is, as the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* reveals, only an "attempt".

"The attempt must be made," it says, "to see whether the Assembly by removal to another place regains internal freedom along with the re-achievement of external freedom of movement."

In Brandenburg the Assembly will be *externally free*. It will no longer be under the influence of the blouses,<sup>a</sup> it will only still be under the influence of the sabres of moustached cavalymen.

But what about *internal freedom*?

Will the Assembly in Brandenburg *free* itself from the prejudices and reprehensible revolutionary sentiments of the nineteenth century? Will its *soul* be *free* enough to proclaim once more as *official articles of faith* feudal hunting rights, all the musty lumber of former feudal burdens, social estate distinctions, censorship, tax inequalities, aristocracy, absolute monarchy and the death penalty, for which Frederick William IV is so enthusiastic, the plundering and squandering of national labour by

"the pale canaille who are looked upon  
as faith, love and hope"<sup>b</sup>

by starved country junkers, guard lieutenants and personifications of good conduct records? Will the National Assembly even in Brandenburg be *internally free* enough to proclaim once more all these items of the old wretchedness to be *official articles of faith*?

It is known that the counter-revolutionary party put forward the constitutional watchword: "*Completion of the work on the Constitution!*"

The organ of the Brandenburg-Manteuffel-Ladenberg Ministry *scorns* to wear *this mask* any longer.

"The state of affairs," the *official organ* admits, "has reached a point at which *even the long desired completion of the work on the Constitution can no longer help us*. For who can any longer conceal from himself that a legal document which has been dictated to the people's representatives, *paragraph by paragraph*, under threat of the wheel and the gallows, and which has been *wrung from the Crown* by these same representatives, *will be considered binding only as long as the most direct compulsion is capable of maintaining it in force.*"

Therefore, to *abolish* once again, *paragraph by paragraph*, the meagre rights of the people achieved through the National Assembly in Berlin—such is the task of the National Assembly in Brandenburg!

<sup>a</sup> That is workers.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Heinrich Heine, *Deutschland. Ein Wintermärchen*, Caput VIII.—*Ed.*

If it does not completely restore the old lumber, *paragraph by paragraph*, that just proves that while it is true that it has regained "external freedom of movement" in Brandenburg, it has not regained internal freedom as claimed by Potsdam.<sup>49</sup>

And how should the Government act against the spiritual obduracy, against the internal lack of freedom of the Assembly that has migrated to Brandenburg?

"Dissolution ought to follow," exclaims the *Neue Preussische Zeitung*.

But the idea occurs to it that perhaps the people is internally still less free than the Assembly.

"It would be possible," it says, shrugging its shoulders, "for doubt to arise whether new primary elections might not produce a still more pitiful result than the first."

In its primary elections the people is said to have external freedom of movement. But what about internal freedom?

That is the question!

The statutes of the Assembly resulting from new primary elections could exceed the old ones in their iniquity.

What is to be done then against the "old" statutes?

The Dame of the Army Reserve Cross strikes an attitude.

"The fist gave birth to them" (the old statutes of the Assembly after March 19), "the fist will overthrow them—and that in the name of God and right."

The fist will restore the "good old government".

The fist is the ultimate argument of the Crown, the fist will be the ultimate argument of the people.

Above all, let the people ward off the mendicant hungry fists which take out of their pockets civil lists—and cannon. The boastful fists will become emaciated as soon as they are no longer fed. Above all, let the people refuse to pay taxes and—later it will be able to count on which side is the greater number of fists.

All the so-called March achievements will be considered binding only as long as the most direct compulsion is capable of maintaining them in force. The fist gave birth to them, the fist will overthrow them.

That is what the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* says, and what the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* says, Potsdam has said. Therefore, let there be no more illusion! The people must put an end to the halfway measures of March, or the Crown will put an end to them.

Written by Marx on November 16, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 145, November 17, 1848

Published in English for the first time

<sup>49</sup> Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, Act III, Scene 1; these words are written by Marx in English.—Ed.

## THE KÖLNISCHE ZEITUNG

Cologne, November 16. The editorial board of the *Kölnische Zeitung* in its issue of November 16 describes itself brilliantly as follows:

"In our *wavering* between fear of anarchy today and fear of reaction tomorrow one is forcibly reminded of Luther's words: 'Man is like a drunken peasant; if he mounts a horse on one side, he falls off on the other.'"

*Fear* is the emotion of the *Kölnische Zeitung*.

Written by Marx on November 16, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 145, November 17, 1848

Published in English for the first time

NO MORE TAXES!!!<sup>50</sup>

Cologne, November 16. All the Berlin newspapers, with the exception of the *Preussische Staats-Anzeiger*, *Vossische Zeitung*, and *Neue Preussische Zeitung*, have failed to appear.

The civic militia has been disarmed in the Privy Councillors' quarter,<sup>51</sup> but only there. It is the same battalion that dastardly murdered the engineering workers on October 31.<sup>52</sup> The disarming of this battalion strengthens the popular cause.

The National Assembly has again been driven out of the Köllnische Rathaus by force of arms. It assembled then in the Mielentz Hotel, where finally it unanimously (by **226 votes**) adopted the following decision on the *refusal to pay taxes*:

*"So long as the National Assembly is not at liberty to continue its sessions in Berlin, the Brandenburg Ministry has no right to dispose of government revenues and to collect taxes.*

*"This decision comes into force on November 17.*

*The National Assembly, November 15."*

***From today, therefore, taxes are abolished!!! It is high treason to pay taxes. Refusal to pay taxes is the primary duty of the citizen!***

Written by Marx on November 16, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the special supplement to the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 145, November 17, 1848

## A DECREE OF EICHMANN'S

*Cologne, November 18.*

"The calls which are to be heard for a refusal to pay taxes make it my duty to utter a serious warning against them to the province entrusted to my care.

"After the King has publicly set out the weighty reasons for the removal of the National Assembly from Berlin, after a large part of the deputies has acknowledged the right of the Crown, and the German National Assembly equally with the Central Authority in Frankfurt has concurred with this acknowledgement, it cannot be my intention to add my voice to the verdict on this act of the Government which is being arrived at by the inhabitants of the Rhine Province.

"My official position alone obliges me to oppose with all the means at my disposal every attack against the laws and their implementation, without which no state can exist. Such an attack is to be seen in the calls to stop paying taxes, which are the indispensable means for maintaining law and order, taxes which have been legally imposed and can only be altered through a law.

"After my experience of the respect which the inhabitants of the province have for the law, I cannot envisage its violation by them, which would have serious consequences. On the contrary, I am confident that they will unshakably resist such temptations directed against their honour and the common weal. As regards those unexpected cases where this confidence should nevertheless prove mistaken, I expect from all provincial and local authorities that they will ensure the payment of taxes by employing all the powers conferred on them by the laws and that they will do their duty without hesitation.

Cologne, November 17, 1848

*Oberpräsident of the Rhine Province  
(signed) Eichmann"*

Such is the text of the reply of ex-Minister and *Oberpräsident Eichmann* to the appeal of the Rhenish Committee of Democrats.<sup>a</sup>

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 24.—*Ed.*



When Herr Eichmann wrote this, his Epistle to the Thessalonians,<sup>a</sup> did he already know of the *decision of the National Assembly on the refusal to pay taxes?*

Eichmann previously represented the Brandenburg-Manteuffel elements within the Pful Ministry. He represents them now at the head of the Rhine Province. Eichmann embodies the *counter-revolution of the Government* in the Rhine Province.

Herr Eichmann's decrees, therefore, have the same value as those of Herr Brandenburg. *Arraignment for high treason* will sooner or later be the most fitting termination of the career of Herr Eichmann, this worthy man who in his youthful years with indefatigable zeal dispatched "traitors to the state" to imprisonment in fortresses.

In the above decree, Herr *Oberpräsident* Eichmann declares himself an *open enemy of the National Assembly*, in complete contrast to Herr *Oberpräsident* Pinder in Silesia, who is known to be a royalist. Herr Eichmann has *therefore ceased to be Oberpräsident*, just as his master, Brandenburg, has ceased to be a Minister. *Herr Eichmann has dismissed himself*. Officials who carry out his counter-revolutionary orders do so at their risk.

If the inhabitants of the Rhine Province wish to support the National Assembly in a more effective way than by mere addresses, if they are not prepared to kneel stupidly and unresistingly before the knout, they must compel *all authorities*, in particular the *Regierungspräsidenten, Landräten, burgomasters* and urban authorities, to make a *public declaration* as to whether they recognise the National Assembly and are willing to carry out its decisions, *oui ou non?* In case of refusal, and especially of direct contravention of these decisions, such officials are to be declared 1. *dismissed from office*, 2. *guilty of high treason*, and provisional *committees of public safety* appointed in their place, whose orders are alone to be regarded as valid. Where counter-revolutionary authorities seek forcibly to frustrate the formation and official activity of these committees of public safety, *force must be opposed by every kind of force*. *Passive resistance must have active resistance as its basis.*<sup>53</sup> *Otherwise it will resemble the vain struggle of a calf against its slaughterer.*

Written by Marx on November 18, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 147, November 19, 1848

Published in English for the first time

<sup>a</sup> An allusion to the Epistles of St. Paul to Thessalonians.—Ed.

## [TAX REFUSAL AND THE COUNTRYSIDE]

*Cologne*, November 18. Lack of space prevents publication today of the numerous fresh messages of support for the National Assembly in Berlin. They will be published in one of our next issues.<sup>54</sup>

There are reports that barricades have been erected in *Wittlich* (Trier administrative district) to prevent the entry of the 27th Regiment. We have an eyewitness report that townsmen in *Berncastel* are sharpening up old lances and manufacturing scythes with which they mean to hasten to Wittlich.

It is reported that in *Bonn* force was used at the gates to bring in flour and cattle *tax-free* and that this led to a conflict.

Today the new acting Chief Burgomaster of this city, Herr *Gräff*, Counsellor of the Court of Appeal, protected by a body of armed men who occupied the entrance to the Town Hall, first attended a sitting of the Municipal Council. In order to prevent possible conflicts in case of refusal to pay the slaughter tax on the *oxen* to be brought in in the next few days by the cattle-dealers, the Municipal Council is said to have decided to send a deputation to meet the dealers at the gate and come to an *agreement* with them.

The following report has reached us from Westphalia:

"The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* has already succeeded in having the tax-collector who was sent the day before yesterday from Arnsberg to Neheim forced to leave almost empty-handed, since the peasants refused to pay any taxes at all."

We have received similar reports from various country places in the Rhine Province.

Berlin can only be safeguarded through the revolutionary energy of the provinces. The larger provincial towns, in particular the

provincial capitals, can only be safeguarded through the revolutionary energy of the countryside. The **refusal to pay taxes** (whether *direct* or *indirect* taxes) gives the *countryside* the best opportunity to serve the revolution.

Written by Marx on November 18, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 147 (second edition), November 19, 1848

Published in English for the first time

APPEAL<sup>55</sup>

*Cologne*, November 18. The Rhenish District Committee of Democrats calls upon all democratic associations in the Rhine Province to have the following measures decided upon and carried out:

1. Since the Prussian National Assembly itself has ruled that taxes are not to be paid,<sup>a</sup> their forcible collection must be resisted everywhere and in every way.

2. In order to repulse the enemy a people's militia must be organised everywhere. The cost of weapons and ammunition for impecunious citizens is to be defrayed by the community or by voluntary contributions.

3. The authorities are to be asked everywhere to state publicly whether they recognise the decisions of the National Assembly and intend to carry them out. In case of refusal committees of public safety are to be set up, and where possible this should be done with the consent of the local councils. Local councils opposed to the Legislative Assembly should be elected afresh by a universal vote.

*Cologne*, November 18

For the Rhenish District Committee  
of Democrats

**Karl Marx   Karl Schapper   Schneider II**

Written by Marx on November 18, 1848  
First published in the *Neue Rheinische  
Zeitung* No. 147 (second edition),  
November 19, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 36.— *Ed.*

ELECTIONS TO THE FEDERAL COURT.—  
MISCELLANEOUS

*Berne*, November 18. Yesterday I gave you the names of the eight members of the Federal Court just elected.<sup>56</sup> In the course of yesterday's joint sitting the following were also appointed: *Jolly* from Freiburg (one of the local National Councillors, whose election had been annulled), Dr. Karl *Brenner*, editor of the *Schweizerische National-Zeitung* in Basle, and the lawyer *Jauch* from Uri, thus bringing the membership of the Federal Court up to the full complement of eleven judges. *Kern* was appointed President and Dr. *K. Pfyffer* Vice-President.

As you know, the National Council annulled the elections in the Freiburg canton because only those electors who were prepared to swear allegiance to the new Federal Constitution were allowed to vote.<sup>57</sup> The next day it confirmed its decision by rejecting almost unanimously (73 against 13) Funk's motion for the matter to be decided by *both* Councils. Apart from the local gossip which this decision evoked in Berne, it gave rise also to very bitter discussions between the radicals of German and French Switzerland. The matter stands as follows: according to the Federal Constitution, the first National Council is to be elected by all Swiss citizens of at least 20 years of age who are in other respects qualified to vote in their canton. For the rest, all arrangements, regulations and more detailed provisions are left to the individual cantons. The oath of allegiance demanded by the Freiburg administration is a condition for the suffrage in many other cantons as well; in these cantons every Swiss citizen who exercises his right to vote for the first time must swear allegiance to the cantonal Constitution. Clearly, the *intention* of the authors of the new Constitution was to ensure universal suffrage for the elections; but according to the *wording* of the Constitution the Freiburg administration is in the right, and in the circumstances in

which it finds itself confronted by a compact hostile majority dominated by the priests, it had either to demand the oath or resign. The German radicals stand by the intention of the legislators, whereas the French, with Waadt<sup>a</sup> at their head, base themselves on the letter of the Constitution in order to rescue the Freiburg administration and the five radical votes in the National Council which they so much desire. They declare the decision of the National Council to be an indirect approval of the rebellion of the Bishop of Freiburg,<sup>b</sup> which—and in this they are quite correct—is bound to bring about the overthrow of the Freiburg radical administration and the establishment of a Sonderbund government in this canton.<sup>58</sup> They call the Berne and other German radicals “theoreticians”, “makers of empty abstractions”, “doctrinaires” etc. It is true that the German-Swiss radicals, most of whom are lawyers, often adhere too closely to their legalistic standpoint, whereas the men of Waadt and Geneva, who have been trained in the revolutionary French school, are better politicians and sometimes make light of questions of law.

The most forthright newspaper of this French-Swiss trend is the *Nouvelliste Vaudois* of Lausanne, the “organ of the revolution declared permanent”, as the conservatives and even the moderate liberals call it. This newspaper, which moreover is written not without wit and a light hand, hoists the banner of the red republic without reservation, declares its support of the June insurgents in Paris, calls the death of Latour in Vienna “a mighty act of justice of the sovereign people” and with bitter irony ridicules the pietistic-reactionary *Courrier Suisse*, which rolled its eyes and howled at such an abomination. Yet this *Nouvelliste* is the organ of a powerful party in the Waadt administration, indeed one can almost say the organ of the majority in this administration. Nevertheless in Waadt absolutely everything goes on in an orderly way, the people are calm and enthusiastically support their Government, as the elections to the National Council prove once again.

According to a semi-official report of the *Revue de Genève*, the decisions of the diocesan conference about the Bishop of Freiburg (you will have learnt of them long ago<sup>59</sup>) will be ratified by Geneva, with a few small reservations due to previous concordats. The other cantons in the diocese have already ratified them. The newspaper further reports that as soon as all ratifications have been received Bishop Marilley will be set free, since the Freiburg canton has stated that it is ready to put a stop to the criminal proceedings begun

<sup>a</sup> The French name is Vaud.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> Marilley.—Ed.

against him for participation in the recent attempt at an uprising.

People are very excited over the choice of the federal capital. If Berne is not going to be chosen—and it is regarded as a portent of this that no one from Berne has been appointed either as President<sup>a</sup> or Vice-President<sup>b</sup> of the Federal Council—a movement will break out here which would result in the overthrow of Ochsenbein, a majority for the radical trend (Stämpfli, Niggeler, Stockmar etc.) and the revision of the Federal Constitution which has only just been adopted. For, according to the Constitution, both Councils must be dissolved and new ones elected for a revision of the Constitution, if 50,000 enfranchised Swiss citizens demand it. Berne by itself can easily collect this number of signatures, without counting the masses who would come from the leading Romance-speaking cantons, stimulated by the prospect of a one-Chamber system and greater centralisation. However, all suppositions about the votes of the Swiss Councils are guesswork; the unlimited fragmentation, that inevitable consequence of the historical federative republic, the indescribable confusion of interests, and the inconceivable medley of determining motives must render futile all talk about probabilities and possibilities.

Written by Engels on November 18, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 150, November 23, 1848

Published in English for the first time

---

<sup>a</sup> The President was Furrer.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The Vice-President was Druey.—*Ed.*

## THE CITY COUNCIL

*Cologne*, November 20. The Cologne Municipal Council has sent a petition to Berlin in which it urgently begs the King<sup>a</sup> to dismiss the Ministry in order to save the monarchy.<sup>b</sup>

The Cologne City Council, or Herr Dumont and Co., addresses itself to the King at a time when the entire Rhine Province is turning away from the King in order to turn towards the Constituent Assembly. Herr Dumont, or the City Council, wants to save the King, whereas the Rhine Province is thinking only of saving itself. As if the salvation of the King had any connection with the salvation of the Rhine Province! At a moment when the kings and emperors are trying to save themselves by means of martial law and bombardments, the City Council wants to save the King. Who has authorised the City Council to save the King and issue a petition which is a most servile product of Cologne good-for-nothings? Judging from previous relations between the King and the Cologne City Council, the latter is begging for nothing more than to be kicked.

If the City Council had paid more attention to the decision of the Berlin deputies<sup>c</sup> than to the King's autocratic will and his salvation, it would long ago have ordered the Cologne city gates to be manned in order to prevent the levying of taxes and to emphasise the will of the Chamber. The Cologne City Council, therefore, must be dismissed without delay. All judicial and tax authorities that do not exert the utmost energy to hinder the levying of taxes must be treated as guilty of high treason.

If the city of Cologne does not dismiss its City Council and at once send two new deputies to Berlin in place of the two who ran away,<sup>d</sup> it deserves—the *knout*.

Written by Marx on November 20, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 148, November 21, 1848

Published in English for the first time

---

<sup>a</sup> Frederick William IV.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "Petition des Kölner Gemeinderates", *Kölnische Zeitung* No. 311 (second edition), November 19, 1848.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See this volume, p. 36.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The reference is to Haug and Wittgenstein who left the Assembly—together with other Right-wing deputies—after hearing the King's order transferring its sitting from Berlin to Brandenburg.—*Ed.*



## APPEAL

*Cologne, November 20.*

*Democrats of the Rhine Province,*

Instead of summoning *Oberpräsident* Eichmann, the well-known Chief Public Prosecutor **Zweifel** has, through Examining Magistrate **Leuthaus**, summoned your Committee to appear tomorrow on a charge of public incitement to rebellion.

A scandal is expected; the Cologne Garrison Headquarters has made all preparations; in accordance with the order issued by a treacherous Ministry, on this occasion Cologne is to be declared in a state of siege.

Frustrate this hope. Whatever may befall us, conduct yourselves calmly.

The Congress is going to take place under any circumstances.<sup>60</sup>

The Rhine Province will sooner shed its last drop of blood than submit to the rule of the sword.

**Karl Marx   Karl Schapper   Schneider II**

Written by Marx on November 20, 1848

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 148 (second edition),  
November 21, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first  
time

ON THE PROCLAMATION  
OF THE BRANDENBURG-MANTEUFFEL MINISTRY  
ABOUT TAX REFUSAL

*Cologne*, November 21. The Brandenburg-Manteuffel Ministry has issued an order to all royal administrative authorities to employ forcible measures to collect taxes.<sup>a</sup>

The Brandenburg-Manteuffel Ministry, whose position is illegal, recommends coercion against the recalcitrant and mildness towards the propertyless.

It thus establishes two categories of non-payers: those who refuse to pay in order to comply with the will of the National Assembly, and those who do not pay because they are unable to pay. The intention of the Ministry is only too clear. It wants to divide the democrats; it wants to make the peasants and workers count themselves as non-payers owing to lack of means to pay, in order to split them from those not paying out of regard for legality, and thereby deprive the latter of the support of the former. But this plan will fail; the people realises that it is responsible for solidarity in the refusal to pay taxes, just as previously it was responsible for solidarity in payment of them.

The struggle will be decided between the force that pays and the force that is paid.

Written by Marx on November 21, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 149, November 22, 1848

Published in English for the first time

---

<sup>a</sup> "An sämtliche königlichen Regierungen", *Preussischer Staats-Anzeiger* No. 200, November 20, 1848.— *Ed.*

THE CHIEF PUBLIC PROSECUTOR  
AND THE NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG

Cologne, November 21. Who takes a legal stand, *Oberpräsident* Eichmann or the editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*? Who ought to be put in prison, the editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* or *Oberpräsident* Eichmann? This question is at present awaiting decision by Chief Public Prosecutor Zweifel. Will the Public Prosecutor's office, which Zweifel represents, side with the Brandenburg Ministry or will he, as an old contributor to the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*,<sup>61</sup> take the side of his colleagues? This question is at present awaiting decision by the public.

The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was pressing for cessation of payment of taxes prior to the decision of the National Assembly<sup>62</sup>; it upheld legality before the legislative power did so. And if this anticipation of legality is an illegality, then for six whole days the editorial board of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* had been taking an illegal stand. Six days Herr Zweifel could have instituted proceedings, but on the seventh day he would have had to give up his inquisitorial zeal.

On the seventh day, however, when the work of creation had been completed and Herr Zweifel had celebrated the Sabbath, and the National Assembly had elevated the refusal to pay taxes to the level of law, *Präsident* Eichmann proposed to Herr Zweifel to institute proceedings against those who had provoked the refusal to pay taxes. Who provoked the refusal to pay taxes? The editorial board of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* or the National Assembly in Berlin? Whom should Herr Zweifel arrest: his old colleagues, the deputies in Berlin, or his old co-workers, the editors of the *Neue Rheinische*

<sup>61</sup> See this volume, pp. 20-21, 24 and 25-26.—Ed.

*Zeitung*, or the Prefect, Herr Eichmann? So far Herr Zweifel has not arrested anyone.

We propose, therefore, that some other Zweifel should arrest Herr Zweifel because before the Sabbath he did not arrest the editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, and after the Sabbath he did not arrest Herr Eichmann.

Written by Marx on November 21, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 149, November 22, 1848

Published in English for the first time

THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE  
IN BERLIN AND COLOGNE

*Cologne*, November 21. In Berlin the Public Prosecutor's office has capitulated to a *traitor to the state*. The Chief Public Prosecutor, Herr Sethe, instead of complying with the National Assembly's demand that he should do his duty in respect of the traitor Brandenburg, has resigned.

The Rhenish District Committee of Democrats, which is endeavouring to make the legal decision of the National Assembly as widely known as possible, and which therefore demands that the plans of a *traitor to the state* should be frustrated,<sup>a</sup> is being prosecuted by the Cologne Public Prosecutor on a charge of—*rebellion* (!).

"He who has might, has right."—The representatives of the *right* are everywhere on the side of *might*.

Written by Marx on November 21, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 149, November 22, 1848

Published in English for the first time

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 41.—*Ed.*

THE FRANKFURT ASSEMBLY<sup>62</sup>

*Cologne, November 22.* The Frankfurt Parliament has declared the decision of the Berlin Assembly regarding the refusal to pay taxes null and void as being illegal. It has thereby sided with Brandenburg, with Wrangel, with specific Prussianism. Frankfurt has moved to Berlin, and Berlin to Frankfurt. The German Parliament is in Berlin, and the Prussian Parliament in Frankfurt. The Prussian Parliament has become a German Parliament, and the German one has become a Brandenburg-Prussian Parliament. Prussia was to be merged into Germany, now the German Parliament at Frankfurt wants Germany to be merged into Prussia!

German Parliament! Whoever spoke of a German Parliament after the grave events in Berlin and Vienna. After the death of Robert Blum no one gave another thought to the life of the noble Gagern. After the setting up of the Brandenburg-Manteuffel Ministry no one thought any more about a Schmerling. The professors who "made history" for their own amusement had to allow the shelling of Vienna, the murder of Robert Blum and the barbarity of Windischgrätz! The gentlemen who were so greatly concerned about the cultural history of Germany left the practical management of culture in the hands of a Jellachich and his Croats! While the professors were evolving the theory of history, history ran its stormy course without bothering about the professorial history.

The decision taken the day before yesterday has destroyed the Frankfurt Parliament. It has driven the Frankfurt Parliament into the arms of the traitor Brandenburg. The Frankfurt Parliament is guilty of high treason, it must be brought to trial. If a whole people rises to protest against an act of royal tyranny, and if this protest is

made in an entirely legal way—by refusing to pay taxes—and an assembly of professors declares—without being at all competent to do so—that the refusal to pay taxes, this revolt of the whole people, is illegal, then this assembly places itself outside the law, it commits high treason.

It is the duty of all members of the Frankfurt Assembly who voted against this decision to resign from this “deceased Federal Diet”.<sup>63</sup> It is the duty of all democrats to elect these resigned “Prussians” to the German National Assembly in Berlin in place of the “Germans” who have left. The National Assembly in Berlin is not a “fragment”, it is a complete entity, for it has the right to take decisions. But the Brandenburg Assembly at Frankfurt will become a “fragment”, for the inevitable resignation of the 150 deputies will surely be followed by that of many others who do not wish to set up a Federal Diet at Frankfurt. The Frankfurt Parliament! It fears a red republic and decrees a *red monarchy*! We do not want a *red monarchy*, we do not want the crimson Crown of Austria to extend its sway over Prussia, and we therefore declare that the German Parliament is guilty of high treason! Nay, we do it too much honour; we impute to it a political importance which it has long since lost. The severest judgment has already been passed upon it—disregard of its rulings and total oblivion.

Written by Marx on November 22, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 150, November 23, 1848

## [STATE OF SIEGE EVERYWHERE]

*Cologne*, November 22. We predicted that the Cologne City Council would receive kicks in answer to its petition to the King.<sup>a</sup> We were mistaken. It is true that the Municipal Council did receive kicks, although not from the King, but from Manteuffel-Brandenburg.<sup>6d</sup> *Tant pis!*<sup>b</sup> We said further that after the decision of the Frankfurt Parliament, it was the duty of the Left to withdraw from it.<sup>c</sup> According to what we hear, not only the Left, but also the Left Centre has withdrawn in order to form a democratic Central Committee. *Tant mieux!*<sup>d</sup>

States of siege everywhere, such are the achievements of the March revolution. Düsseldorf in a state of siege! A town is besieged in order to be conquered. All Prussian towns are being gradually declared in a state of siege, in order to be reconquered. The whole of Prussia has to be reconquered because the whole of Prussia has become disloyal to Prussia. How is the state of siege put into effect? By disarming the citizens. How can a city like Cologne, which is already disarmed, be declared in a state of siege for a second time? By first of all being given back its arms. To put Cologne in a state of siege for a second time means putting weapons in its hands. Long live the state of siege!

Written by Marx on November 22, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 150 (special edition), November 23, 1848

Published in English for the first time

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 45.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> So much the worse!—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See this volume, p. 52.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> So much the better!—*Ed.*



[POSITION OF THE LEFT IN THE NATIONAL  
ASSEMBLY]

*Cologne, November 22.* We have heard from private sources that the **Left** and the **Left Centre** of the National Assembly in Frankfurt decided yesterday evening at a closed sitting **to withdraw, to constitute themselves a democratic committee for Germany, and at the same time to issue an appeal to the German people.**

In publishing this information, we do not guarantee its authenticity, but we are convinced this is the only course open to the Left and the Left Centre. Were they not to take it, they would be signing their own death warrants.

Written by Marx on November 22, 1848

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 150 (special edition), November 23, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

## NEWS FROM SWITZERLAND

*Berne*, November 20. I have just heard from officials of the Federal War Department that the *German Central Authority is reported to have declared war on Switzerland*.<sup>65</sup> The courier arrived yesterday evening, and the *Vorort* was said to have gone into session at 11 o'clock the same evening. Measures had already been taken for serious war preparations. It was stated further that *50,000 imperial troops were concentrating on the Swiss frontier* to begin hostilities.

I am passing this news to you exactly as I heard it. I myself do not believe it, although the source is reliable. I would not credit even the Imperial Government with *such* lunacy.

Written by Engels on November 20, 1848

First published in the supplement to the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 151, November 24, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

[RESULT OF THE ELECTIONS  
TO THE NATIONAL COUNCIL]

*Berne*, November 21. Here is the result of the elections to the National Council which took place the day before yesterday: ex-member of the Great Council Fischer (conservative), 1,793 votes, elected. Weingart 1,315, Matthys 1,266, Blösch (conservative) 1,256 votes. As none of the last three has an absolute majority, the two radicals Weingart and Matthys still remain in the ballot and Weingart will probably be elected. The fact that the radicals are having at least one of their candidates returned is due to the participation of the Berne militia battalion which happened to be on service in Freiburg and voted to a man for the radicals.

Written by Engels on November 21, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 152, November 25, 1848

Published in English for the first time

## ELECTIONS.—SYDOW

Berne, November 21. At yesterday's sitting the *Federal Assembly* (the two Councils in joint session) dealt with the Freiburg elections.<sup>65</sup> Earlier, the *Vorort* had announced that it intended to come to an agreement with Tessin and therefore desired the withdrawal of the troops that had been ordered there.<sup>66</sup> Further (because of the complications with the Imperial Government), the *Vorort* wants the Federal Diet to constitute itself as soon as possible.

Herr Escher wishes to resign as representative of the Confederation in Tessin.

Herr Furrer declares that for the time being, until the next session, he accepts the position of Federal Councillor and Federal President. This means that four members (Furrer, Ochsenbein, Frei-Herose and Näff) are present; Herr Ochsenbein declares the Federal Council to be constituted, and leaves the chair of the Assembly, which Herr Escher takes over, and the four Federal Councillors are sworn in.<sup>67</sup>

Proceeding to the agenda, Herr Brugisser proposes a motion in the name of the majority of the commission concerned calling for the revocation of the decision by which the National Council annulled the Freiburg elections.<sup>68</sup> The minority demands that the decision of the National Council be confirmed. Messrs. Kopp, Anton Schnyder, Pottier, Eytel, Pittet, Castella (Freiburg), Weder (St. Gallen), Ochsenbein and Fazy spoke in support of the majority motions and Messrs. Tanner, Trog, Escher, Frei, Streng and Imobersteg in support of the minority. The arguments were mostly of a legal nature, but the defenders of the Freiburg elections laid tremendous

<sup>65</sup> See this volume, pp. 42-43.—*Ed.*

emphasis on the political necessity to retain the Freiburg Government and to avoid exposing the canton once again to the intrigues of the clergy. The majority motion of the commission was finally adopted by 68 votes to 53, which meant that the decision of the National Council annulling the Freiburg elections was revoked.

The *Suisse* and the *Verfassungsfreund* are jubilant, for this decision ensures them five votes for Berne as the federal capital. The *Nouvelliste Vaudois* will also rejoice, for the radical Freiburg Government and the five radical votes on the National Council are for the time being guaranteed. The *Berner Zeitung*, although much closer in its principles to the *Nouvelliste* than to the two above-mentioned Ochsenbein newspapers, nevertheless declares that the decision of the Federal Assembly is the first victory for cantonal sovereignty in the new Confederation. In our opinion, the *Berner Zeitung* is wrong. Most speakers for the majority were certainly not serious about the issues of principle which were advanced during this debate, least of all Herr Eytel, who even went so far as to speak against the supporters of unity. With them it was purely a matter of practical interests; this is clear from the newspapers mentioned above, which pay homage to diametrically opposed parties and whose followers nevertheless used the same arguments in support of the same side. Most members of the minority, on the other hand, and especially the Berne radicals, were serious about the principles involved. But it is open to question whether these gentlemen did not allow themselves to be carried rather too far by their legal conscience.

To everyone's surprise, His Excellency Herr von Sydow, the Prussian envoy, returned here the day before yesterday after a year's absence. It is known that after the Sonderbund war<sup>69</sup> he took up residence in worthy Basle—birds of a feather etc. The significance of his sudden return is not yet known. Probably it has none at all. At least he has made no communication to the *Vorort*<sup>70</sup> or to the Federal Council. Besides, his whole staff has for the time being remained in Basle.

So my report yesterday<sup>a</sup> about disagreements with the Imperial Government did have some truth in it.—To be sure, there is no question of a declaration of war, nor has any new Note arrived from the Empire. But news of the 50,000 imperial troops said to be concentrating on the Swiss frontier and forming a cordon between Constance and Basle was certainly received the day before yesterday in the evening by the *Vorort* which, as I wrote to you, thereupon went

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 55.—Ed.

into session the very same evening. We shall soon learn what sort of counter-measures it and the now constituted Federal Council have decided on.

The day before yesterday elections took place in the Mittelland district (Berne and vicinity) for two National Councillors to take the places of Dufour, who was elected in three constituencies and opted for Seeland, and of Ochsenbein, who on account of his election to the Federal Council loses his title of National Councillor. The conservative (i. e. reactionary) candidates Fischer and Blösch obtained 1,059 and 893 of the city's votes respectively, the two radicals Weingart and Matthys, 559 and 540.<sup>a</sup> Fischer's election is certain, while that of Blösch, who is the object of greater antipathy, is less so. The considerable conservative majority in the city of Berne is mainly due to the influence exercised on the elections by the rich and long established patrician families here. By far the greater part of the electorate is dependent on them and only breaks away from their tutelage in moments of crisis or when a candidate presents himself who, like Ochsenbein, has popular antecedents and has managed to achieve a respected position in Switzerland. Here, as in most places in Switzerland, the actual revolutionary forces of the people are among the Swiss and German workers, but since they have no permanent residence in the city, they only very rarely have the right to vote, even if they are citizens of the canton.<sup>71</sup> This circumstance, together with the fact that as soon as things become quieter the influence of the patricians once more begins to spread, explains the conservative elections which never fail to come about a few years after each liberal or radical revolution.

At today's sitting of the National Council, Dr. Steiger of Lucerne was elected President in place of Ochsenbein. The Assembly is debating the Tessin affair. In the course of a long and, for an Italian, very lifeless speech, Pioda (of Tessin) made numerous accusations against the representatives and troops of the Confederation in Tessin. Escher of Zurich, however, strove to refute these charges. If possible I shall send an additional report on the outcome of the sitting.<sup>b</sup> It looks as though this will be unqualified approval for the *Vorort* and the representatives, and at best simply an agenda based on the *Vorort's* announcement yesterday (see above) that everything has been settled.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 56. The difference in the number of votes is explained by the fact that in the previous report Engels quoted the preliminary result of the voting.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 142-53.—*Ed.*

There were several more speeches, including a final one from Colonel Ziegler. In this he supplemented the majority motions approving the steps taken by the *Vorort* with a motion ordering the Government of Tessin to pay at least a part of the costs and to express its appreciation of the representatives. The discussion was then adjourned until tomorrow on a motion from the President.

Written by Engels on November 21, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the supplement to the  
*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 153,  
November 26, 1848

Published in English for the first  
time

## [DEBATE IN THE NATIONAL COUNCIL]

*Berne*, November 22. At today's sitting of the National Council, there was a long debate in which General Dufour made an excellent speech in support of Tessin. All the other military men in the Council—Ziegler, Michel, Benz etc.—bitterly opposed Tessin and after Pioda had made an admirable reply to all the attacks, a motion of the minority on the commission

“to intern the Italian refugees who took part in the recent uprising and to leave the execution of this decision to the Government of Tessin”

was rejected on a roll-call by 62 votes to 31. On the other hand, the majority motions

“1) to expel *all* Italian refugees from the canton of Tessin into the Swiss interior, taking into account humanitarian considerations, on which the representatives of the Confederation shall decide”,

and

“2) to forbid the canton of Tessin until further notice to allow Italian refugees to remain there”,

were adopted by 62 votes to 31 and 50 votes to 46 respectively. The two Zurich deputies, Escher and Furrer, decided the issue by skilfully influencing the German Swiss; Furrer threw his whole weight as President of the Federal Council onto the scales against Dufour's noble gentlemanliness and almost brought the matter to a vote of confidence. The 31 votes for Tessin were, with five or six exceptions, all French Swiss. During the roll-call one heard nothing but “*oui*” and “*nein*”, not one “*non*”, and only five or six “*jas*”. Romance Switzerland was hopelessly overwhelmed by the Germans.



The remaining points in the majority motion, to which the minority (Herr Pioda) also agreed, are just being adopted. The sitting and the post-office close at the same time. More details of this interesting debate tomorrow.<sup>72</sup>

Written by Engels on November 22, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 153 (second edition),  
November 26, 1848

Published in English for the first  
time

[RAVEAUX'S RESIGNATION.—VIOLATION  
OF THE SWISS FRONTIER]

Berne, November 23. Raveaux's resignation from his embassy post<sup>a</sup> is causing quite a sensation here and is unanimously approved. But great indignation has been caused by the German troops' violation of the frontier at Sulgen, and still more by their commander's cavalier apology. What! Thirty-five soldiers enter Swiss territory, weapons in hand, and force their way into a village. They surround a pre-selected house where a pre-selected refugee, Herr Weisshaar, is supposed to be hiding, and make as if to search it. They persist in their purpose despite being told repeatedly that they are on Swiss soil, threaten to use force and finally have to be driven off by peasants wielding cudgels and throwing stones. And despite those incontestable circumstances which prove beyond doubt that the attack was premeditated, the commander maintains that the troops did not know that they were on Swiss soil.

How then can we explain the strange fact that such a large detachment was commanded only by a non-commissioned officer, not at least by a lieutenant, as is otherwise invariably the case, particularly in Germany, which is teeming with lieutenants? How can we explain this, if not by the fact that the presence of an officer, who *would* certainly know that much geography, would have been far too compromising? The Swiss Government will certainly not rest content with an apology flung down so cavalierly after an insult so lightly committed. The Zurich authorities have already instituted an inquiry and the affair will probably end not with an apology from

---

<sup>a</sup> Imperial commissioner in Switzerland.—Ed.

Switzerland to the Barataria's Reich,<sup>73</sup> but with the Barataria's Reich apologising to Switzerland.

Written by Engels on November 23, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the supplement to the  
*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 154,  
November 28, 1848

Published in English for the first  
time

## MANTEUFFEL AND THE CENTRAL AUTHORITY

Cologne, November 24. *The Minister Manteuffel declared yesterday to the imperial commissioners<sup>a</sup> at present in Berlin that the Prussian Government would not submit to the decision of the Frankfurt Assembly to form a popular Ministry<sup>74</sup> because this was an **internal** matter.*

Hence Manteuffel agrees with us that the decision of the Frankfurt Assembly on the **refusal to pay taxes<sup>b</sup>** is also null and void, because it concerns only an **internal** matter.

It is possible, of course, that the Brandenburg-Manteuffel Ministry will help to convert the *Rhine Province into an external matter for Prussia.*

Written on November 24, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 153, November 26, 1848

Published in English for the first time

<sup>a</sup> Simson and Hergenhahn.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 51-52.—*Ed.*

THE GERMAN CENTRAL AUTHORITY  
AND SWITZERLAND

*Cologne*, November 24. In the comedies of last century, notably the French, there never failed to be a servant who amused the public because he was continually being cudgelled, cuffed and, in especially effective scenes, even kicked. The role of this servant is certainly a thankless one, but still it is enviable compared with a role which is being continuously performed at our Frankfurt imperial theatre: compared with the role of the Imperial Minister of Foreign Affairs. The servants in the comedy at least have a means of avenging themselves—they are witty. But the Imperial Minister!

Let us be fair. The year 1848 is no year of roses for any Minister of Foreign Affairs. Up to now Palmerston and Nesselrode have been glad to be left in peace. Eloquent Lamartine, who with his manifestos moved even German old maids and widows to tears, has had to slink away in shame with broken wings and bedraggled feathers. His successor, Bastide, only a year ago in the *National* and the obscure *Revue nationale*, as official trumpeter of war, gave vent to the most virtuous indignation at Guizot's cowardly policy. Now he sheds silent tears every evening on reading his *œuvres complètes de la veille*<sup>a</sup> and at the bitter thought that day by day he is sinking more and more to the level of Guizot of the respectable republic. Nevertheless all these Ministers have one consolation: if things have gone badly for them in big matters, they have been able to take their revenge in small matters, on Danish, Sicilian, Argentinian, Wallachian and other remote questions. Even the Prussian Minister of

---

<sup>a</sup> Collected works of the day before.—*Ed.*

Foreign Affairs, Herr Arnim, when he concluded the unpleasant armistice with Denmark,<sup>75</sup> had the satisfaction not only of being duped, but also of duping someone, and this someone was—the Imperial Minister!

In fact, the Imperial Minister of Foreign Affairs is the only one of them all who played a completely passive role, who received blows, but did not deal a single one. From the first days of his entry into office he has been the predestined scapegoat on whom all his colleagues of neighbouring states vented their spleen, on whom they all took reprisals for the petty sufferings of diplomatic life, a share of which they too had to bear. When he was beaten and tortured, he remained silent, like a lamb being led to the slaughter. Where is there anyone who can say that the Imperial Minister ever harmed a hair of his head? Truly the German nation will never forget Herr Schmerling for having dared with such determination and consistency to resume the traditions of the old Holy Roman Empire.<sup>76</sup>

Need we give further confirmation of Herr von Schmerling's courageous patience with a list of his diplomatic successes? Need we return to the journey of Herr Max Gagern from Frankfurt to Schleswig, that worthy parallel to the old story of *Sophia's Journey from Memel to Saxony*?<sup>77</sup> Need we again rake up the whole edifying history of the Danish armistice? Need we dwell on the unsuccessful offer of mediation in Piedmont and on Herr Heckscher's diplomatic study trip at the expense of the Empire? There is no need to do so. The facts are too recent and too striking for it to be necessary even to mention them.

But there is a limit to everything, and in the end even the most patient man must show his teeth, as the German philistine says. True to this maxim of a class which our worthy statesmen declare to be the great, well-meaning majority in Germany, Herr von Schmerling at last also felt the need to show his teeth. The sacrificial lamb looked for a scapegoat and believed it had finally found one in the shape of Switzerland. Switzerland—with scarcely two and a half million inhabitants, republicans into the bargain, the refuge from which Hecker and Struve invaded Germany<sup>78</sup> and seriously alarmed the new Holy Roman Empire—can one find a better and, at the same time, a less dangerous opportunity of proving that "great Germany" has teeth?

An "energetic" Note was immediately dispatched to the *Vorort Berne* because of the machinations of the refugees. The *Vorort Berne*, however, being conscious of its rights, replied no less energetically to "great Germany" in the name of "little Switzerland". But this did not at all intimidate Herr Schmerling. His capacity to

bite grew with astonishing rapidity, and already on October 23, a new, still "more energetic" Note was drafted and on November 2 handed to the *Vorort*.<sup>79</sup> In it Herr Schmerling now threatened naughty Switzerland with the birch. The *Vorort*, even swifter in its actions than the Imperial Minister, replied two days later with the same calm and determination as before, and therefore Herr Schmerling will now put into effect his "provisions and measures" against Switzerland. He is already most busily engaged in this, as he has stated in the Frankfurt Assembly.<sup>a</sup>

If this threat was the usual imperial farce such as we have seen so many times this year, we would not waste a single word on it. Since, however, one can never sufficiently credit the stupidity of our imperial Don Quixotes, or rather imperial Sanchos, in administering the Foreign Office of their Barataria island,<sup>80</sup> it may easily happen that owing to this Swiss conflict we shall be involved in all kinds of new complications. *Quidquid delirant reges* etc.<sup>b</sup>

Let us then examine somewhat more closely the imperial Note to Switzerland.

It is well known that the Swiss speak German badly and are not much better at writing it. But the Note in reply from the *Vorort* is, as regards style, a perfect masterpiece worthy of Goethe compared with the schoolboyish, clumsy German of the Imperial Ministry, which is always at a loss for the right expressions. The Swiss diplomat (Federal Chancellor Schiess, it is said) seems to have deliberately used a specially pure, limpid and refined language in order in this respect too to form an ironical contrast to the Note of the Imperial Regent,<sup>c</sup> which could certainly not have been written in a worse style by one of Jellachich's red-coats.<sup>81</sup> In the imperial Note there are sentences which are quite incomprehensible, and others which are extremely clumsy, as we shall see later. But are not these sentences written precisely "in the *straightforward language* which the Government of the Imperial Regent will always consider it its duty to use in international intercourse"?

Herr Schmerling does no better in respect of the content. In the first paragraph he recalls

"the fact that in regard to the German Note of June 30 of this year for several weeks before any reply followed, proceedings took place in the Diet<sup>82</sup> in a tone which at that time would have made it impossible for a representative of Germany to stay in Switzerland".

<sup>a</sup> At its sitting on November 18, 1848.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> First words of the line from Horace: "*Quidquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi.*"—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Archduke John of Austria.—*Ed.*

(This is also a sample of the style.)

The *Vorort* is good-natured enough to prove to the "Government of the Imperial Regent" from the minutes of the Diet that these debates "for several weeks" were limited to a single brief session on *one single* day. It is clear, that our Imperial Minister, instead of looking up the documentary records, prefers to trust to his own confused memory. We shall find still further proofs of this.

Incidentally, the Government of the Imperial Regent could regard this obligingness of the *Vorort*, its readiness to come to the assistance of the Government's poor memory, as a proof of the "good-neighbourly attitude" of Switzerland. Indeed, if the Government of the Imperial Regent had taken into its head to speak in a Note in such a fashion about the debates of the English Parliament, the dry arrogance of Palmerston would have dealt with it in quite a different way! The Prussian and Austrian ambassadors in London can tell it what was said in public proceedings about their respective states and Notes, without anyone thinking that their stay in London was thereby rendered impossible. These tyros want to teach Switzerland international law and do not even know that the only thing that concerns them in the proceedings of sovereign assemblies is what is decided, but not what is said! These logicians assert in the same Note, "Switzerland should know that attacks on freedom of the press could not emanate from Germany" (it suffices to print these lines in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* to make them bitterly ironical!)—and they even want to meddle with the freedom of debate of the highest organ of authority in Switzerland at that time!

"There is no conflict here over principles. It is not a question of the right of asylum or of freedom of the press. Switzerland should know that attacks on these rights cannot emanate from Germany. Germany has repeatedly stated that it will not tolerate their abuse, it has recognised that the right of asylum must not become an industry for Switzerland" (what does that mean?), "a state of war for Germany" (the right of asylum a state of war—what German!), "that there must be a difference between shelter for the persecuted and a hiding-place for highway robbers."

"A hiding-place for highway robbers"! Have Rinaldo Rinaldini and all the robber chieftains who made their appearance with Gottfried Basse in Quedlinburg descended with their bands from the Abruzzi Mountains to the Rhine in order at a suitable time to plunder Upper Baden? Is Karl Moor on the march from the Bohemian forests? Has Schinderhannes also left behind a brother's son, who as the "nephew of his uncle"<sup>a</sup> wants to continue the dynasty from Switzerland? Far from it! Struve, now in the Baden

<sup>a</sup> An allusion to Louis Bonaparte.—*Ed.*



prison. Madame Struve, and a few workers who crossed the frontier *unarmed*—these are the “highway robbers” who had their “hiding-place” in Switzerland, or allegedly still have it there. The imperial authority, not satisfied with the prisoners on whom it can take revenge, is so lost to all decency that it hurls abuse across the Rhine at those who were lucky enough to escape.

“Switzerland knows that it is not being asked to persecute the press in any way, that it is not a question of newspapers and leaflets, but of their authors, who at the very frontier day and night wage a base contraband war against Germany by the mass smuggling in of inflammatory writings.”

“Smuggling in”! “Inflammatory writings”! “Base contraband war”! The expressions become ever more elegant, ever more diplomatic—but has not the Government of the Imperial Regent “considered it its duty to use straightforward language”?

And, in fact, its language is remarkably “straightforward”! It does not demand from Switzerland any persecution of the press; it is not speaking about “newspapers and leaflets”, but about “their authors”. The activities of the latter must be put a stop to. But, worthy “Government of the Imperial Regent”, when proceedings are instituted in Germany against a newspaper, e.g. the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, is it a question of the newspaper which is in everyone’s hands and can no longer be withdrawn from circulation, or of the “authors”, who are put in prison and brought before the court? This worthy Government does not demand any persecution of the press, it merely demands persecution of the *authors* of the press. Well-meaning persons! Wonderful “straightforward language”!

These authors “wage a base contraband war against Germany by the mass smuggling in of inflammatory writings”. This crime of the “highway robbers” is truly unpardonable, the more so since it goes on “day and night”, and the fact that Switzerland tolerates it is a flagrant violation of international law.

From Gibraltar whole shiploads of English goods are smuggled into Spain, and the Spanish priests declare that the English “by smuggling in evangelical inflammatory writings”, e.g. the Spanish Bibles published by the Bible Society, wage a base contraband war against the Catholic Church. Barcelona manufacturers also curse the base contraband war waged from Gibraltar against Spanish industry by the smuggling in of English calico. But were the Spanish ambassador to complain about it just once, Palmerston would reply to him: Thou blockhead,<sup>a</sup> that is just what we took Gibraltar for!

<sup>a</sup> Engels wrote these two words in English.—Ed.

Hitherto all other governments have shown too much tact, taste and consideration to complain in Notes about smuggling. But the naive Government of the Imperial Regent speaks in such "straightforward language" that it most artlessly declares that Switzerland has violated international law if the Baden customs officials do not display the appropriate vigilance.

"Switzerland, finally, cannot be unaware also that the right of foreign countries to resist such *iniquity* cannot depend on whether the Swiss authorities lack the strength or desire to prevent it."

The Government of the Imperial Regent seems completely "unaware that the right" of Switzerland to leave in peace everyone who obeys the laws of the land, even if he wages a base contraband war etc. by smuggling in etc., "cannot depend on whether the *German* authorities lack the strength or desire to prevent" this smuggling. The Government of the Imperial Regent should take to heart Heine's reply to the Hamburger who moaned to him about a big fire:

Get yourselves better laws  
And better fire-hoses<sup>a</sup>—

and then it would no longer need to make itself ridiculous by its straightforward language.

"The conflict is only over the facts," it goes on to say, and therefore we shall at last hear about some other significant facts besides the base contraband war. We are eager for them.

"The eminent *Vorort* demands, on the grounds of its lack of information, that it be supplied with definite proof of actions which could confirm the accusations made against the Swiss authorities."

Obviously, a very reasonable demand on the part of the eminent *Vorort*. And will the Government of the Imperial Regent most willingly accede to this just demand?

By no means! Just listen:

"But a controversial procedure between governments on generally known matters is not customary among nations."

That is a rough lesson in international law for arrogant little Switzerland, which believes itself entitled to be as impertinent towards the Government of the Imperial Regent of great Germany as little Denmark was at one time. It should take note of the example of the Danish armistice and be more modest. Otherwise the same thing might happen to it.

<sup>a</sup> Heinrich Heine, *Deutschland. Ein Wintermärchen*, Caput XXI.—Ed.

When the extradition of a common criminal is demanded from a neighbouring state, a controversial procedure is involved, however "generally known" the crime. But the controversial procedure, or rather the mere proof of guilt which Switzerland demands before taking measures—not against common criminals who have crossed the border, nor against refugees, no, against its *own officials*, elected on the basis of a democratic popular vote—such proof "is not customary among nations"! Truly, the "straightforward language" cannot be denied even for a moment. It could not be *more straightforwardly* confessed that there are no proofs to put forward.

There now follows a hail of questions in which all these generally known facts are enumerated.

"Does anyone doubt the activity of the German agitators in Switzerland?"

Of course no one does, just as no one doubts the activity of Herr Schmerling in Frankfurt. It is clear that most of the German refugees in Switzerland pursue some "activity". The only question is *what* their activity is, and obviously Herr Schmerling himself does not know, otherwise he would tell us.

"Has anyone any doubt about the refugee press?"

Of course no one has. Yet Herr Schmerling himself states that attacks on freedom of the press could not emanate from Germany. And if they were to come from there, Switzerland would certainly know how to repulse them. What then does this question mean? If we translate it from "straightforward language" into plain German, it can only mean: Switzerland should abolish freedom of the press for the refugees. *A un autre,<sup>2</sup> Monsieur de Schmerling!*

"Has Germany to give Europe proof of the pilgrimage to Muttenz?"

Of course not, cunning "Government of the Imperial Regent"! But to prove that these pilgrimages were the cause of Struve's invasion or possibly of some other enterprise giving greater grounds for complaint against Switzerland—to prove that would bring no discredit to the Government of the Imperial Regent, but would be all the more difficult.

Once again the *Vorort* is obliging enough to do more than "is customary among nations", and to remind Herr Schmerling that the pilgrimages to Muttenz<sup>2b</sup> directly concerned *Hecker*, that Hecker was *against* the second invasion, that he even went to America in order to dispel all doubts about his intentions, that among the pilgrims there

<sup>2b</sup> Tell that to somebody else.—Ed.

were prominent members of the German National Assembly. The *Vorort* is tactful enough, even in presence of the tactless Note of Herr Schmerling, not to mention the final and most striking reason: namely, that the "pilgrims" after all returned to Germany, where at any moment they could be called to account by the Government of the Imperial Regent for any punishable action, for all their "activity" in Muttenz. That this did not happen is the best proof that the Government of the Imperial Regent possesses no data incriminating the pilgrims, and that therefore it is still less able to reproach the Swiss authorities in this respect.

"Or the meetings in Birsfeld?"

"Straightforward language" is a fine thing. Anyone who, like the Government of the Imperial Regent, "has considered it his duty in international intercourse" to use this language, has merely to prove that meetings in general, or even meetings of refugees, took place in Birsfeld to be able to accuse the Swiss authorities of gross violation of international law. Other mortals, of course, would first of all have had to show what occurred at these meetings that was contrary to international law. But, of course, they are "generally known facts", so generally known that I am prepared to bet that among the readers of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* there are not three to be found who have any idea what meetings Herr Schmerling is talking about.

"Or the warlike preparations of the malefactors, who are able to pursue their activity along the frontier, in Rheinfelden, Zurzach, Gottlieben and Laufen?"

Praise God! At last we learn something more definite about the "activity" of the refugees! We did Herr von Schmerling an injustice in expressing the opinion that he did not know what the refugees were doing. He knows not only *what* they are doing, but also *where* they are doing it. *Where* do they do it? In Rheinfelden, Zurzach, Gottlieben and Laufen along the frontier. *What* do they do? "Pursue their activity"!

"*They pursue their activity*"! Monstrous violation of all international law—their activity! What then does the Government of the Imperial Regent do in order not to violate international law? Is it perhaps "its excesses" <sup>a</sup>?

But Herr von Schmerling speaks of "warlike preparations". And since among the towns where, to the terror of the whole Empire, the refugees pursue their activity there are several that belong to the Aargau canton, the *Vorort* takes it as an example. It again does

<sup>a</sup> A pun: the German *Wesen* here means "activity", *Unwesen* "excesses".— Ed.

something more than is necessary, it once again does more than "is customary among nations", and offers to prove by means of a "controversial procedure" that at that time only 25 refugees were living in the Aargau canton, that of these only ten took part in Struve's second expedition of volunteers,<sup>84</sup> and that even they entered Germany *unarmed*. That is all there was of "warlike preparations". But what does that mean? The other fifteen, who remained behind, were the most dangerous. They obviously only remained behind in order to continue to "pursue their activity" without interruption.

These are the weighty accusations of the "Government of the Imperial Regent" against Switzerland. More than this it is unable to put forward, nor does it need to do so, since it "is not customary among nations" etc. But if Switzerland is so shameless as still not to be shattered by these accusations, the "decisions" and "provisions" of the Government of the Imperial Regent will not fail to have a shattering effect. The world is curious to know what these decisions and provisions will consist of, and is all the more curious because Herr Schmerling is preparing them in the greatest secrecy and does not want to communicate any details even to the Frankfurt Assembly. Meanwhile the Swiss press has already shown that all reprisals Herr Schmerling might take are bound to have a more harmful effect on Germany than on Switzerland and, according to all reports, the Swiss regard the "provisions and decisions" of the Government of the Imperial Regent with the greatest equanimity. Whether the Ministers in Frankfurt will be of the same mind, especially if English and French Notes intervene, remains to be seen. One thing is certain: the affair will end, like the Danish war, in a new disgrace, which on this occasion, however, will fall on *official* Germany alone.

Written by Engels on November 24, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 153, November 26, 1848

Published in English for the first time

DRIGALSKI—LEGISLATOR,  
CITIZEN AND COMMUNIST<sup>85</sup>

Cologne, November 24. Düsseldorf has been declared in a state of siege; the Brandenburg-Wrangel Ministry has found worthy representatives in Herren *Spiegel-Drigalski*. The first of these gentlemen is a simple *Regierungspräsident*, but the second combines various qualities. He is not only a lieutenant-general and commander of a division—as such he figures in the army lists and as “supreme” legislator of the city and entire municipality of Düsseldorf—he is also an author and says of himself that he is at the same time a “citizen” and—a *communist*, and all that with God for King and Fatherland.<sup>a</sup> These two gentlemen, the simple as well as the multicoloured one, have discovered that the state of law in Düsseldorf can only be maintained by *extraordinary* measures; hence they have found themselves “compelled” to declare the entire municipality of Düsseldorf in a state of siege “for the protection of law and order”.<sup>86</sup>

We have known for a long time that the Brandenburg Government can only preserve itself by *extraordinary* means; we know that its existence would have come to an end long ago if the country were not in a state of siege. The state of siege is the *state of law* of the Brandenburg Government.

“A state of siege, gentlemen, means a *state of war*,” declared Prime Minister von *Pfuel* at the agreement sitting<sup>b</sup> of September 29.<sup>87</sup> At that time the matter concerned the city and fortress of Cologne, at

<sup>a</sup> The words “with God for King and Fatherland” are from Frederick William III’s decree of March 17, 1813, on organising the army reserve.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The reference is to the sitting of the Prussian National Assembly held to draw up a Constitution by agreement with the Crown.—*Ed.*

that time it was a question of an uprising, the decisions of the courts could not be carried out, the lawful force—the civic militia—could not ensure tranquillity, barricades had been erected; force could only be opposed by force. Such was the assertion at least of those who defended the state of siege, at least they still made an effort to save external appearances by relying on allegedly established facts. Now, however, the matter is regarded much more lightly; Düsseldorf is not in revolt, the activity of the courts has not been prevented for a single moment, the civic militia has always been ready to execute lawful orders; indeed one cannot appeal even to the obsolete *instructions* of the year 1809, on which the main stress was laid at that time, for Düsseldorf is not a fortress. But Düsseldorf with rare energy has declared itself *in favour of the tax refusal*; that sufficed for the two supporters of Brandenburg to establish the state of law, that is to say, to declare the city *outside the law*.

We shall not go into the accusations which are intended to serve as a pretext for proclaiming the state of siege; we recommend them to the attention of the judicial authorities as being *false accusations*, for nowhere has legal proof been adduced to support them; they are calumnies which come under Articles 367 et seq. of the Penal Code.<sup>88</sup> We desire here merely to set out the illegalities of which Herren *Spiegel* and *Drigalski* have made themselves guilty for the purpose of protecting law and order.

After these two gentlemen had proclaimed the state of siege and “*thereby supreme power passed to the military authorities*”, “*communist and citizen*” *Drigalski* issued the following decrees:

1. The legally existing authorities remain in office and will be given the most energetic support in the measures undertaken by them.

That means that the legally existing authorities, insofar as they have a *legal basis of existence*, are dismissed, but they remain in office in order to support Herr von *Drigalski*.

“I expect,” says *Drigalski* to his “co-citizens”, “that all well-intentioned inhabitants will facilitate *the application of the laws for me*, and that *the authorities will support me in this with complete determination*.”

Herr *Drigalski* not merely makes the laws, he also applies them; the legally existing authorities are his henchmen. And the “independent” judges of the Düsseldorf district court and the Chief Public Prosecutor and his colleagues calmly put up with all that! They see no violation of the law in their being removed from office, they pay homage to the legislator *Drigalski* and rejoice at being allowed at this price to continue to draw their salaries. Fie! Are you not ashamed,

gentlemen, under the rule of the sword, to issue orders for arrests and institute criminal proceedings? Or perhaps the arrest of Herr *Lassalle*, who, trusting unfortunately all too boldly in his good right and the protection of the judicial authorities, did not want to evade the state of siege, is only an act of private revenge on the part of Herr *Drigalski*? Perhaps proceedings against this man and his helpers based on Articles 114, 123 and 124 have already been instituted secretly and are in process?

The *second* law of Herr *Drigalski* states:

"All associations having political and social aims are abolished."

What does Herr *Drigalski* care about the law of April 6, Paragraph 4!<sup>89</sup> If, in accordance with that law, "all Prussians are entitled without previous police permission to unite in societies for purposes which do not contravene the existing laws", that is obviously one of those "achievements" which must be annulled as quickly as possible, that is to say, are incompatible with *Drigalski's* legislation.

*Third* and *fourth* laws. Herr von *Drigalski* controls street traffic and business hours of public houses. As if Düsseldorf had become Paris, he issues a law against *atroupements*.<sup>a</sup> But he is not merely a big figure as a policeman, he betrays also special talent as a night-watchman: he imposes a curfew.

*Fifth* law.

"In view of its impending reorganisation, the civic militia is disbanded and must surrender its arms as from today."

This law is a complex of illegalities. We distinguish the following:

a) The civic militia is *disbanded*. According to the ordinary laws, specifically the Civic Militia Law of October 17,<sup>90</sup> the militia can be disbanded only by a royal Cabinet Order. Has Herr von *Drigalski* perhaps a secret Cabinet Order *in petto*? Well then, why does he not publish it, as he published the statement of the Chief Postmaster, Maurenbrecher?<sup>91</sup> Of course, this statement was at once repudiated as a lie by the Düsseldorf militia. Herr von *Drigalski* has no Cabinet Order, he acts on his own assumption of plenipotentiary powers and assumes royal prerogatives, although he is a *royal-minded* "citizen and communist".

b) The civic militia is not *merely removed from its duties*. Herr von *Drigalski* is not satisfied with merely seizing for himself the official power of the *Regierungspräsident*. As far as illegality is concerned, he

<sup>a</sup> Gatherings.—Ed.



would have already done quite enough by merely removing the militia from its duties. Paragraph 4 of the law of October 17 states:

"If the civic militia of a municipality or district refuses to obey the orders of the authorities or interferes in the activities of municipal, administrative or judicial authorities, then the *administrative head of the governmental area* may provisionally remove it from its duties, provided he gives the grounds for so doing."

Hence removal from duties could be pronounced only by the *Regierungspräsident*, but not by a lieutenant-general or divisional commander, nor by a citizen, nor finally by a communist, even a "royal Prussian communist".

But Herr Drigalski has his own good reasons for at once acting as royalty without regard for the regular instances. If he had dealt with the militia merely as a *Regierungspräsident* he could not have *disarmed* it. But

c) "the civic militia must surrender its arms as from today". Mere removal from duties in no way justifies the taking away of arms. Otherwise officers who have been suspended would also have to give up their swords. But Herr Drigalski is right; if the militia had been allowed to keep its arms, it would probably not have allowed itself to be removed from duties by *him*; it would have fulfilled its function as Paragraph 1 of the law prescribes.

d) Herr von Drigalski orders the arms to be handed over to *him*. Since he feels himself called upon to act as if he were royalty, he is not concerned about the royal order on compliance with the law on the institution of the civic militia. Here Paragraph 3 states:

"The arms supplied by the state to the municipalities remain in the possession of the latter in any case until the time indicated above."

The "city administration and Municipal Council" of Düsseldorf raise no objection to this order. Instead of protesting against this illegality and standing up for the rights of the municipality, they exhort the citizens to adopt a "calm, legal attitude" towards their new dictator.

#### *Sixth law.*

"Anyone found engaging in open and armed resistance to the orders of the legal authorities, or who exposes the troops to danger or disadvantage by treacherous behaviour, shall be brought before a military tribunal."

According to the law safeguarding personal freedom,<sup>92</sup> *no one may be brought before any judge other than the one designated by the law. Special courts and extraordinary commissions are inadmissible. No punishment can be threatened or imposed other than in accordance with the law.* According to the same law, this provision can *never* be suspended for

any time or area, *even in case of war or insurrection*. For even then, according to Paragraph 8, only Paragraphs 1 and 6 can be suspended, but only *by decision and under the responsibility of the Ministry of State*. Yet Herr von Drigalski decrees that civilians are to be tried by a military tribunal. It can no longer be a matter for surprise that he orders arrests to be made and for this purpose violates the sanctity of the home. These provisions can at least still be suspended, although not by Herr von Drigalski. For the rest, it is a matter of indifference whether one believes the assertion of the *Düsseldorfer Zeitung*<sup>a</sup> that Lassalle's arrest was carried out in a wholly irregular manner or the assurance given by the *Kölnische Zeitung* that the arrest occurred by order of the examining magistrate.<sup>b</sup> The *Kölnische Zeitung*, of course, takes the side of the military commandant in order to put the blame on the examining magistrate. In any case, the arrest is illegal; for in an illegal situation no legal actions can be undertaken. In a state of war, civil justice ceases to be operative. If the examining magistrate continues to function, he assumes the position of a member of a *military tribunal*; the *articles of war* become his code of law. The Düsseldorf Public Prosecutor's office is well aware of its new situation; for if it still considered its competence to be that laid down in the Rhenish Penal Code it would have intervened long ago, if only on the basis of Paragraph 9 of the Habeas Corpus Act, which states:

*"No preliminary permission of the authorities is necessary for taking legal action against public officials, civil or military, for violating the above-mentioned provisions by exceeding their official powers."*

In order to become fully acquainted with the power of our Rhenish institutions, the question still remains whether the Prosecutor-General, Herr *Nicolovius*, under whose supervision are all officials of the judicial police, even the examining magistrates, will approve the attitude of the Düsseldorf Public Prosecutor's office. To a deputation which visited him yesterday in order to demand that he should exercise his official powers in relation to the Düsseldorf events, Herr *Nicolovius* is said to have replied that he did not have at his disposal any legal provisions on the basis of which he could intervene. We say only that Herr *Nicolovius* is said to have made that reply, although this utterance was communicated to us in a most trustworthy way. Nevertheless we cannot believe it, for otherwise we

<sup>a</sup> "Düsseldorf, vom 22. November", *Düsseldorfer Zeitung* No. 311, November 24, 1848.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "Neueste Nachrichten. Düsseldorf, 23. November", *Kölnische Zeitung* No. 315, November 24, 1848.—*Ed.*

would have to assume that Herr Nicolovius has completely forgotten the *Code pénal* together with all the laws that have been promulgated since March of this year.

Written by Marx on November 24, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 153, November 26, 1848

Published in English for the first time

[THREE STATE TRIALS  
AGAINST THE NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG]

Cologne, November 24. At this moment three state trials against the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* are impending—we do not include the judicial proceedings against *Engels, Dronke, Wolff* and *Marx* for alleged “unnewspaperlike” political offences.—We are assured from well-informed sources that at least a dozen more inquisitions have been instituted against the “**scurrilous sheet**”—the official expression of the *ci-devant*<sup>a</sup> Public Prosecutor and actual Chief Public Prosecutor *Hecker* (*c'est du Hecker tout pur*<sup>b</sup>).<sup>93</sup>

*First crime.* Violent attack on the maidenly “*delicacy*” of six royal Prussian police officers and of the king of the Cologne Public Prosecutor's office, Herr Chief Public Prosecutor *Zweiffel*<sup>94</sup>—people's representative *in partibus infidelium*<sup>95</sup> who carries out his duties for the time being neither in Berlin nor in Brandenburg, but in *Cologne* on the Rhine. On the Rhine! on the Rhine! there our vines do grow! ‘We, too, prefer the Rhine to the Spree and the Disch Hotel to the Mielentz Hotel.’<sup>96</sup>

*Va pour la délicatesse des gens d'armes!*<sup>d</sup> As far as the “*delicacy*” of Herr *Zweiffel* is concerned, for us it is a “*noli me tangere!*”<sup>e</sup> We were morally incensed at the indelicate vote of non-confidence by which his electors are said to have caused him to beat a retreat. As true guardians of the maidenly “*delicacy*” of Herr *Zweiffel*, we request him to *refute publicly* the statement of Herr *Weinhagen* of Cleve. Herr

<sup>a</sup> Former.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> It's genuine Hecker.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Matthias Claudius, “*Rheinweinlied*”.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> So much for the delicacy of the police!—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> Not to be touched!—*Ed.*

*Weinhagen* stated in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* over his signature that he could communicate facts injurious to the "honour and delicacy" of Herr Zweifel. He could even provide *proof* of these facts, he wrote, but he was compelled to refrain from publishing them as long as Herr Zweifel could take refuge in the article of the *Code pénal*, by which every denunciation, even the most well-founded, is prosecuted as *calumny* unless it can be proved by a judicial verdict or authentic documents. We appeal therefore to the "honour and delicacy" of Herr Zweifel!

*Second crime.* The simple Hecker and the dichotomous Hecker.

*Third crime.* This crime, which took place in 1848, is being prosecuted on the demand of the *Imperial Ministry*. The crime—*Schnapphahnski!* A *feature article as a criminal!*<sup>97</sup>

In its indictment, the Imperial Ministry is said to have described the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* as the worst newspaper of the "bad press". For our part, we declare the imperial authority to be the most comic of all comic authorities.

Written by Marx on November 24, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 153 (second edition), November 26, 1848

Published in English for the first time

## PERSONALITIES OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL

Berne, November 24. It will not be unwelcome to the readers of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* to learn something about the personalities who are now called upon to rule Switzerland under the control of the two Councils,<sup>a</sup> and who have now just begun their work. Five members of the Federal Council accepted their election without reservation, another, Herr Furrer, has accepted provisionally until the spring, and about acceptance by the seventh (Munzinger) there can be no doubt.

The President of the Federal Council, Herr *Furrer*, is a typical *Zuricher*. He has, as the French would say, *l'air éminemment bourgeois*.<sup>b</sup> Clothes, demeanour and features, including his silver-mounted spectacles, reveal at the very first glance the "citizen of the imperial free town", who, as President of the *Vorort* and the Diet<sup>98</sup> respectively, has, it is true, become somewhat civilised, but has yet remained "every inch a provincial".<sup>c</sup> The chief merit of Herr Furrer, one of the most important lawyers of the "Swiss Athens" (as the Zurich philistine likes to call his little town of 10,000 inhabitants), is that by his consistent efforts and moderate liberalism the September regime in Zurich<sup>99</sup> was overthrown and the canton was won back to the party of progress. As President of the Diet he remained true to his principles. Moderate progress in internal affairs and the strictest neutrality in external affairs was the policy he

---

<sup>a</sup> The National Council and the Council of States which made up the Federal Assembly of Switzerland.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> An eminently bourgeois appearance.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> A paraphrase of Lear's words in Shakespeare's tragedy *King Lear*, Act IV, Scene 6.—*Ed.*

pursued. That he has now become President of the Federal Council is more a matter of accident than of design. People would have preferred a man from Berne; but then there was only the choice between Ochsenbein, against whom there was great antipathy, and Neuhaus, who now in 1848 has been just as conservative in his activity as five or six years ago and for that reason was not elected at all to the Federal Council. Owing to this difficulty a Zurichier was chosen, and in that case Furrer was of course the most suitable. Thus Furrer by no means represents quite exactly the majority of the Federal Assembly, but at any rate he is the representative of the majority of German Switzerland.

The Vice-President, *Druey*, is in all respects the opposite of Furrer and the best representative that French Switzerland could send. Whereas Furrer is too moderate for the majority and particularly for the radical minority, Druey on the other hand is far too radical for most. Whereas Furrer is a moderate bourgeois liberal, Druey is a resolute supporter of the red republic. The prominent role played by Druey in the recent revolutionary events in his canton is well known; less well known but all the greater for that are the multifarious services he has rendered his canton (Waadt). Druey, a socialist democrat of the Louis Blanc shade, a first-class authority on constitutional law, and the quickest and most industrious worker in the whole of Switzerland, is an element in the Federal Council which in time is bound to win more and more influence and have the most beneficial effect.

Owing to his antecedents, *Ochsenbein*, leader of the volunteer bands against Lucerne, President of the Diet which decided on the war against the Sonderbund,<sup>100</sup> colonel of the Berne reservists in that campaign, has become well known and popular not only in Switzerland, but throughout Europe. Less well known, however, is his attitude since the February revolution. The partially socialist character of that revolution, the measures of the Provisional Government in France, and the whole movement of the French proletariat, served to no small extent to intimidate him, the *démocrate pur*, whom the French would count as belonging to the party of the *National*.<sup>101</sup> He gradually drew closer to the moderate trend. Especially in external policy, in which he had shown so much energy before and during the war against the Sonderbund, he became more and more inclined to the old system of so-called strict neutrality, which in reality is nothing but the policy of conservatism and connivance with reaction. Thus as President of the *Vorort*, he delayed in recognising the French Republic, and behaved ambiguously, to say the least, in regard to the Italian affair. In addition, the

unrestrained passion which he displayed in presiding over the Diet, and which often caused him to take a biased attitude towards the radicals, made him many enemies among these, and especially among the French Swiss. If any other choice had been possible for the Berne member of the Federal Council than between him and Neuhaus, Ochsenbein would have obtained far fewer votes.

Colonel *Frey-Hérosé* from Aargau is considered one of the most capable of Switzerland's military men. He was Chief of the General Staff during the campaign against the Sonderbund. Like most Swiss staff officers, he too for a fairly long time played a political role in his canton, and in consequence became familiar also with civil administration. In any case, in his new post he will perform excellent work for the Military Department. As regards his political views, he is one of the stauncher liberals of his canton.

State Councillor *Franscini* from Tessin is certainly one of the most respected public figures in the whole of Switzerland. For many years he has worked tirelessly in his canton. It was mainly he who in 1830, already before the July revolution, succeeded in bringing the despised Tessin, which was considered politically backward, to be the first in all Switzerland, and without a revolution, to replace the old oligarchic Constitution by a democratic one. It was he again who headed the 1840 revolution, which for the second time overthrew the surreptitiously restored domination of the priests and oligarchs.<sup>102</sup> Furthermore, it was Franscini who, after that revolution, organised afresh the administration, which had fallen into complete disorder in the hands of the reactionaries, put a stop to the innumerable occurrences of theft, fraud, bribery and squandering and, finally, as far as the means of a poor mountain region allowed, once more organised education in the schools, which had completely gone to ruin under the direction of the monks. He thereby deprived the priests of one of their chief means of influencing the people, and the results<sup>2</sup> become more evident each year by the increasing confidence of the Tessiners in their Government. In addition, Franscini is regarded as the most expert economist in Switzerland and is the author of the best books on Swiss statistics (*Statistica della Svizzera*, Lugano, 1827, *Nuova Statistica della Svizzera*, 1848). He is a staunch radical and in the Federal Council will side with Druey rather than with Ochsenbein and Furrer. The people of Tessin especially value him, the leader of their Government for many years, for his "honourable poverty".

<sup>2</sup> In the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* there is an editorial note: "To be continued in the supplement."—Ed.



Government Councillor *Munzinger* from Solothurn is the most influential man in his canton, which he has represented in the Diet almost continuously since 1830, and which he has actually ruled for several years. As a semi-radical newspaper of French Switzerland, the *Gazette de Lausanne*, puts it, he is said to *cachez sous les apparences de la bonhomie un esprit fin et pénétrant*,<sup>a</sup> which means that concealed beneath the outward appearance of a good-natured fellow he possesses that petty cunning which in the imperial free towns is regarded as diplomatic ability. As for the rest, he is a moderate man of progress à la Furrer and he demands that Switzerland should concern itself with its own affairs and leave the high politics of Europe to God and Lord Palmerston. Hence he speaks extremely unfavourably of the foreign refugees, who so far have always been a source of unpleasantness for Switzerland. Together with the Swiss Athenian, Dr. Escher, he has recently in Tessin again given proofs of his attitude in this respect.<sup>103</sup> In general, Furrer and Munzinger in the Federal Council perfectly represent the prejudices and narrow-mindedness of the "enlightened" German Swiss.

Finally, Herr *Näff* from St. Gallen, about whom I can say very little. He is said to have done much to improve the administration in his canton, and has also distinguished himself in other respects. The canton of St. Gallen, one can read in Swiss newspapers, is in general one containing the richest and most excellent men; but these excellent men suffer from the misfortune that not much is heard about them, and in any case they seem to lack initiative. Nevertheless, in his special capacity as administrator, Herr *Näff* is apparently not without merit. As regards his political views, he stands midway between Furrer and Ochsenbein; he is more resolute than the former, but does not go as far as could perhaps be expected of the latter judging by his antecedents.

In view of this composition of the Federal Council, there is no doubt about the policy Switzerland will pursue in the immediate future. It is the same policy as the old Diet and the *Vorort* Berne pursued under the leadership of Ochsenbein, and later of Funk (who without Ochsenbein is a nonentity). In internal affairs—strict implementation of the new Federal Constitution which still leaves too much scope to the sovereignty of the cantons; in external affairs—strict neutrality, of course stricter or milder according to circumstances, in particular stricter in relation to Austria. The moderate party definitely has the upper hand, and it is probable that Herr Ochsenbein will vote with it on most questions.

<sup>a</sup> Conceal a shrewd, penetrating mind under a kind-hearted appearance.—*Ed.*

But in order to understand how in such circumstances a minority, like Druey and Francini, could agree to be elected and expose themselves to the prospect of being continually outvoted, how such a collegium can rule jointly — to understand this one must either be a Swiss or have seen how Switzerland is governed. Here, where all the executive authorities deliberate jointly, the principle followed is: Just accept the position; true, you are in the minority today, but perhaps you may still be of some use; and who knows whether in a year or two, owing to deaths, resignations etc., you will not find yourself in the majority. That is the natural consequence of the fact that governing collegiums are formed by means of elections. Then, just as in the legislative assemblies, each party tries at least to consolidate its position by securing the entry of one or several candidates to the collegium, and to ensure a minority for itself, as long as it cannot achieve a majority. If its candidates wished to refuse election, as would certainly happen in larger countries, the party would not take it amiss. But the Federal Council is no *commission du pouvoir exécutif*,<sup>104</sup> and Druey's position is infinitely remote from that of Ledru-Rollin.

The Swiss press as a whole asserts that the Federal Council consists of men of first-class talents. I doubt, however, whether a single one of its members apart from Druey and Francini would ever play an outstanding rôle in a larger country, and whether any of the three other members, with the exception of Frey-Hérosé and Ochsenbein, would manage to achieve even an important *secondary* rôle.

Written by Engels on November 24, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 155, November 29, 1848, and in the supplement to No. 155

Published in English for the first time

REPORT OF THE FRANKFURT COMMITTEE  
ON AUSTRIAN AFFAIRS

Cologne, November 27. Some forty years ago there were people who described *Germany in Its Deepest Humiliation*.<sup>105</sup> It is as well that they have already been gathered *ad patres*.<sup>a</sup> They could not now write such a book; they would not know what title to give it, and if they chose the old one they would contradict themselves.

Because for Germany there is always, as the English poet says, "beneath the lowest deep a lower still".<sup>b</sup>

We believed that the conclusion of the Danish armistice<sup>106</sup> signified the utmost depths of shame. It seemed to us that after the activity of the imperial envoy Raumer in Paris, of Heckscher in Italy, and of the Commissioner Stedtman in Schleswig-Holstein, and after the two Notes to Switzerland,<sup>c</sup> the humiliation of Germany could not go farther. The actions of the two imperial commissioners in regard to *Austrian* affairs prove that we were mistaken. How incredibly far the German imperial commissioners go in their disregard for the honour of Germany, what stupid incapacity, cowardice or treachery can be inherent in the men of the old liberalism, is abundantly evident from the recently issued "Report of the Committee for Austrian Affairs etc.,"<sup>107</sup> and especially from the 20 documents it contains.

On October 13, Herren Welcker and Mosle travelled from Frankfurt on the orders of the Central Authority "to mediate in *Vienna* affairs". Persons not conversant with the new central

<sup>a</sup> To their fathers.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> John Milton, *Paradise Lost*. The quotation is in English in the German original.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See this volume, pp. 67-68.—*Ed.*

diplomacy expected news of their arrival in Vienna within a few days. It was not known at the time that imperial commissioners have their own itineraries. The Imperial Regent's<sup>a</sup> Eisele and Beisele<sup>108</sup> took the most direct route to Vienna—via Munich. With the well-known travel map from the *Jobsiade*<sup>109</sup> in their hands, they arrived there in the evening of October 15. Until noon of October 17 they studied the Vienna events in cosy company with the Bavarian Ministers and the Austrian chargé d'affaires. In their first letter to Herr Schmerling they gave an account of their preliminary studies. In Munich the pair had a moment of illumination. They passionately desired the arrival of a "third colleague", if possible a Prussian, "because we would then be better able to cope with our great mission". The Herr "colleague" did not appear. The hope of a trinity was wrecked; the poor couple had to go out into the world alone. What then will become of the "great mission"? The great mission travels in the pockets of Herren Welcker and Mosle to Passau. Before crossing the Austrian Rubicon, the "great mission" sends out a proclamation in advance. It was frightful over there on the other side!<sup>b</sup>

"Here, too," Welcker writes to Schmerling, "on the Austrian frontier the population is by no means free from revolutionary and terrorist symptoms." Indeed, "only by the intervention of a military occupation of the bridge was even the national guard of Krems rendered incapable of depriving their Emperor of it and therefore to some extent of making him a prisoner".

What reader would be so hard-hearted as not to appreciate fully these feelings of the fine soul of a political encyclopaedia [*Staatslexikonseele*]<sup>c</sup> After the two gentlemen had gathered strength in Passau from midday on the 18th to early on the 20th, they betook themselves to Linz.

They had left Frankfurt on October 13; in the evening of the 20th they were already in Linz. Is not this tremendous speed proof enough of the importance of their "great mission"? Were they perhaps spurred on by special instructions to this enormous haste? It suffices to say that after seven full days the gentlemen arrived in Linz. This town, which with its "big factory population already influenced by emissaries from Vienna" had aroused anxious

<sup>a</sup> Archduke John of Austria.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> Paraphrase of a line from Schiller's ballad "Der Taucher": "Da unten aber ist's fürchterlich."—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> An allusion to the *Staats-Lexikon oder Encyklopädie der Staatswissenschaften, in Verbindung mit vielen der angesehensten Publicisten Deutschlands*, hrsg. von Carl von Rotteck und Carl Welcker, Bd. 15, Altona, 1843.—Ed.

forebodings in Herr Welcker during his stay in Passau, showed absolutely no signs of the gallows which he and his Herr colleague had probably envisaged in their imagination. On the contrary:

"The entire national guard with its officers and musicians ... received us in ceremonial formation with the German flag flying, and together with the surrounding people welcomed us with repeated cheers."

Therefore Linz—the revolutionary Sodom—turns out to be a well-disposed town, having sufficient *bonhomie* to welcome our excellent imperial commissioners with due ceremony. All the more dreadful does Vienna appear in the Welcker-Mosle reports to Herr Schmerling as the most godless Gomorrah, as a bottomless pit of anarchy etc.

On the 21st the gentlemen embarked on a steamship and went to Krems. On the way they reported to Frankfurt that they had been met with a guard of honour in Linz, that the main guard had paraded before them under arms, and other equally important matters. At the same time they prepared three letters: to Windischgrätz, to Minister Krauss, and to the Presidium of the Imperial Diet.

Should anyone still not be completely satisfied with the more than eight days activity of our imperial commissioners, let him now accompany them during the night of October 21-22 to the headquarters of Windischgrätz in Stammersdorf. Here the Central Authority in the shape of its commissioners appears before us in all its glory.

"Windischgrätz," say Welcker-Mosle, "rejected every attempt at influence on our part with a *certain harshness*."

In other words, they were received with kicks and had to make themselves scarce. "Indeed, he would not even see our credentials," Welcker complains to his Minister Schmerling. And to fill the cup of bitterness to overflowing: Windischgrätz did not offer a drop of wine to the personifications of the Central Authority confronting him, not even a tot of brandy.

Our commissioners therefore once more seated themselves in their carriage, sadly humming the words "*O du Deutschland etc.*,"<sup>a</sup> and continued their journey to—Vienna? Heaven forbid! To Olmütz, "to the imperial residence". And they did well to do so. Otherwise the whole imperial joke would have lost its point, the last act would

<sup>a</sup> These words are from a German folk song well known in Ernst Moritz Arndt's adaptation under the title "Ausmarsch des Jahrs 1815".—*Ed.*

be missing from the mediation farce. If they were treated like stupid schoolboys by Windischgrätz, they found in Olmütz

"a much more obliging reception on the part of the Emperor and the imperial family" (cf. p. 11 of the report, letter No. 6).

They were invited to a meal and, as they write further to Herr Schmerling, "we had the pleasure of the *most gracious* reception". It is not at all the German lackey character that is expressed here, but the most sincere thankfulness which finds its appropriate expression in the song: "After so much suffering etc."<sup>3</sup>

After all the dining and wining the famous "great mission" still remains to be fulfilled. Our two commissioners address themselves in writing to Minister Baron von *Wessenberg*.

"Your Excellency" (begins the letter of October 25), "we humbly request you to be so good as to fix a time at which it will be convenient for you to receive our thanks for the benevolent reception which has been accorded our mission and ourselves by His Royal Imperial Majesty and Your Excellency, and to inform us of your views and decisions in respect of the following points concerning the fulfilment of our mission."

The "following points" say in a great many words that the commissioners wish to be allowed to go to Vienna for the purpose of mediation.

The whole letter, as also the second one to *Wessenberg*, is drafted in such a complicated last-century government office style, and is so full of excessive politeness and servility that it really does one good to be able to read *Wessenberg's* replies immediately after it. Compared with the Austrian Minister, the two commissioners give the impression in this correspondence of being two loutish peasants confronting a highly cultured nobleman, before whom they bow and scrape in a comical fashion and try to make use of really select expressions.

*Wessenberg* replied to the above-mentioned letter as follows:

"Your Excellencies, I must apologise for being so late in replying to your letter of today.... As regards your well-meant intention to make one more attempt in Vienna to settle the dissension there, it seems to me necessary first of all to acquaint you with the state of affairs there at the present time. It is not a question of negotiating with a party, but solely of suppressing an insurrection etc." (cf. p. 16 of the report).

Together with this reply, he returned them their credentials.

They repeated their request on October 27.

"We must regard it as our urgent duty," they say, "once more *most humbly* to request Your Excellency and through you the Imperial Government to send us as quickly as possible to Vienna under safe escort with lenient and conciliatory instructions and conditions, so that in this terrible crisis we can make use of the assuaging and personal influence embodied in us and our mission."

<sup>3</sup> From Rossini's opera *Tancredi*.—Ed.

We have seen how this "assuaging and personal influence" operated in the fourteen days after they left the gates of Frankfurt.

It exerted such a powerful effect on Wessenberg that in his reply he gave no answer to their request. He gave them some items of news from Vienna, half untrue at that, and remarked ironically:

"Furthermore, that revolts like that of the proletarians in Vienna cannot easily be suppressed without the use of means of coercion has been confirmed recently by the events in Frankfurt!"<sup>116</sup>

It was impossible for Herren Welcker and Mosle to withstand such arguments; hence they desisted from further attempts and waited with their "assuaging and personal influence" for the events that would come about.

On October 28 they again reported to Schmerling about their "great mission". In response to an offer by Wessenberg they handed their message to a courier whom the former was sending to Frankfurt. The courier departed, but not the message, which only arrived in Frankfurt on November 6. If they had not dined at the imperial table, if the imperial family, and especially Archduke Karl, had not spoken to them in such a friendly way—the commissioners must have gone out of their minds at such bad luck.

There now followed two days of silence. The "assuaging influence" was resting on the Sabbath after so much labour.

Then, on October 30, Wessenberg gave them official news of the surrender of Vienna. Their decision was taken. True, on October 28 they still expressed the opinion (p. 14 of the report),

"It seems that he" (Windischgrätz), "like the influential persons here" (in Olmütz), "is *all too greatly* dominated by the idea not only of subjugating Vienna but of inflicting a revengeful punishment for previous wrong-doing."

However, since then Wessenberg has assured them—and how should an imperial commissioner dare to doubt it—that

"the Austrian Government, in making use of this victory, will be guided by principles suitable for ensuring the sympathy of its subjects".

"We can therefore assume," exclaim Welcker-Mosle in a tone of imperial pathos, "that *nevertheless* our proposals have had some influence." Therefore, nevertheless? O certainly! For eight days you have most magnificently amused Wessenberg, Archduke Karl, Sophia & Co. You were an aid to the royal imperial digestion, *Welcker-Mosle!*

"After that assurance of the Minister, we regard our task as having been accomplished and we shall tomorrow" (October 31) "begin our return journey via Prague."

Such is the conclusion of the last message of Herren Weicker-Mosle.

And, in fact, you are right; your "great mission" of conciliation and mediation was fulfilled. Why should you now go to Vienna? Were not those apostles of humanity, Windischgrätz and Jellachich, masters of the city? Have not the red-coats<sup>111</sup> and the royal imperial troops by means of plunder, arson, murder and rape preached the gospel of peace and constitutional liberty in a way comprehensible to all?

How effective your "assuaging influence" has been, how splendidly you have carried out your task — is evident from the death-rattles of the murdered, the desperate cries of the ravished, it is testified by the thousands in the prisons, it is taught us by the blood-stained shade of *Robert Blum*.

Your task was to supplement the trilogy staged by Windischgrätz, Jellachich and Wessenberg by helping to perform a farce in Olmütz. That task has been worthily carried out; with great virtuosity you have played to the end the role of the "*bamboozled uncle*", if not something worse.

Written on November 27, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 154, November 28, 1848

Published in English for the first time



## NEWS

*Cologne*, November 28. In its issue of November 17 the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* stated:

“And as for the *Jews*, who since the emancipation of their sect have everywhere put themselves, at least in the person of their eminent representatives, at the *head of the counter-revolution*—what awaits them? There has been no waiting for victory in order to throw them back into their ghetto.”<sup>3</sup>

At the time, we quoted government decrees from *Bromberg*. Today we have a still more striking fact to report. The big “Three Crowns” masonic lodge in Berlin—it is well known that the *Prince of Prussia* is the supreme head of the Prussian freemasons, just as *Frederick William IV* is the supreme head of the Prussian religion—has put a stop to the activity of the *Minerva* lodge in *Cologne*. Why? *Because it has Jews among its members. Let the Jews take note of this!*

A circular of the Braudenburg Ministry to all administrative bodies, which we came upon by chance, calls upon them to carry out *mass arrests of the leaders of the clubs*.

We are assured from a trustworthy source that *Cologne, Düsseldorf, Aachen etc.* will be given imperial troops, in fact *Austrians*, as a Christmas present from our most gracious sovereign. Probably they will include *Croats, Serezhans, Czechs, Raizes, Serbs etc.*,<sup>112</sup> so that “order and calm” will be established in the Rhine Province as in Vienna. By the way, people say that the Rhine Province borders not on *Russia* but on *France*. *Let the most gracious sovereign take note of this!*

Written on November 28, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 155, November 29, 1848

Published in English for the first time

<sup>3</sup> See this volume, p. 32.—*Ed.*

SITTINGS OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL  
AND THE COUNCIL OF STATES

*Berne*, November 25. Yesterday's sitting of the National Council did not come any nearer to solving the question of the federal capital and, if anything, it made the solution even more remote. It was decided, against the majority, to choose the federal capital not by secret ballot at a joint sitting of the two Councils, but through a law to be deliberated by each Council separately. If this happens a conflict will ensue, as I conjectured earlier\*; the National Council will choose *Berne* and the Council of States will choose *Zurich*. This is admitted by members of both Councils. Unless the Council of States revokes this decision, it is impossible to see how the conflict is to be resolved. In addition, the federal capital that is to be chosen was placed under obligation to procure and furnish the necessary quarters for the legislative federal assemblies and the Central Government and likewise to provide a mint. After that, unlimited credit facilities were granted to the Federal Council by a large majority. Similar credit was simultaneously granted by the Council of States, and therefore has the force of law.

Today there was first a sitting of the Council of States, then of both Councils jointly, and afterwards of the National Council. At the joint sitting *Druey* and *Franscini* were sworn in as Federal Councillors. Since I was prevented from attending the sittings, I shall report any further developments of importance tomorrow.

Written by Engels on November 25, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 155, November 29, 1848

Published in English for the first time

---

\* See this volume, p. 44.— *Ed.*

## [LETTERS OPENED]

*Cologne*, November 28, 11 p.m. Two of the items of correspondence that have reached us this evening, one postmarked *Berne* and the other *Paris*, have clearly been *opened* by an official or semi-official hand. The seal was missing. The wafers with which the letters had been re-sealed *were not yet dry*. *Sedlnitzky*, too, is making propaganda with *Windischgrätz*.

Written by Marx on November 28, 1848

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 155 (special edition), November 29, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

JOINT SITTING OF THE COUNCILS.—  
THE FEDERAL COUNCIL

*Berne*, November 26. Contrary to the intention and declared purpose that the Federal Councillors Druey and Franscini were both to be sworn in at yesterday's joint sitting of the Councils,<sup>a</sup> only the former was sworn in. Franscini had not arrived as heavy snow had held up the stage-coach over the St. Gotthard. The Federal Council was then empowered to swear in those Federal Councillors and Federal Judges who did not arrive until after the eventual adjournment of the two legislative Councils.

A sitting of the Council of States had taken place earlier to discuss the draft Bill adopted two days ago by the National Council on the question of the federal capital. This question, which had already been posed in a complicated manner by the National Council, was here made even more complicated. Fazy of Geneva proposed a motion to keep the seat of government in *Berne* for a provisional period of one year, and in the meantime to work out a more detailed law which would also include the obligations to be imposed on the canton with regard to the security of the federal authorities. The question was being treated much too lightly. The Swiss people should also first be given an opportunity to express its wishes. Briatte of *Waadt*, President of the Council of States, shared this opinion. Other members proposed further amendments: that the seat of the Federal Government should be determined by a vote at a joint sitting; that like the old *Vorort* it should be changed, but only every six years, at least until the federal university is established etc. The debate had to be broken off because the time allocated for the joint

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 95.—*Ed.*

sitting had expired; it will be resumed today. Rüttimann (Zurich) proposed to refer the draft back to the commission together with the amendments.

After the joint sitting, the National Council remained assembled to discuss the draft Bill submitted by the Federal Council on taking over all the Swiss postal establishments by the Confederation as from January 1, 1849, with the individual cantons continuing meanwhile to administer them until the postal system is finally settled, but the federal authorities having full powers to alter the rounds etc., etc. The draft was adopted *séance tenante*<sup>a</sup> with slight changes by Druey and others. Today the National Council is discussing the law proposed by the radical Dr. Emil Frei (Baselland) on responsibility of the executive officials of the Swiss Confederation; and, time permitting, the draft Bill proposed by Ochsenbein on the establishment of a federal university.

The Federal Council, the executive authority, has already sat several times. Provisionally, Furrer has taken over external affairs, Ochsenbein military affairs and Frei-Herose finance. The Federal Council of War has been accordingly thanked for its services and suspended from activity. The Federal Council has further decided to announce to the cantons, to Switzerland's diplomatic agents abroad and to the foreign powers that it has been constituted. It has likewise decided to lodge a complaint with the Imperial Government regarding the territorial violation in the canton of Zurich,<sup>b</sup> and at the same time to make inquiries, in the relevant cantons, as to the behaviour of the refugees and the truth of the facts published by the imperial authorities in the *Oberpostamts-Zeitung*.<sup>113</sup>

Written by Engels on November 26, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 156, November 30, 1848

Published in English for the first time

<sup>a</sup> On the spot.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 63-64.—*Ed.*

THE ORGAN OF MANTEUFFEL AND JOHANN—  
THE RHINE PROVINCE AND THE KING OF PRUSSIA

Cologne. The *Neue Preussische Zeitung* confirms Manteuffel's statement which we have already published<sup>a</sup> concerning the Frankfurt Central Authority and Assembly. Manteuffel's organ says:

**"The proclamation of the Imperial Regent<sup>b</sup> may be very well meant. We Prussians, however, must decisively reject it, the people no less than the Crown."**<sup>c</sup>

Manteuffel's organ has guessed our inmost thoughts.

The same official newspaper instructs us as follows about the validity of the Frankfurt decisions<sup>114</sup>:

*"We Prussians have no other master than our King. And only what he approves in the Frankfurt decisions, only that will be binding for us, because He"* (Prussian style!) *"finds it good and for no other reason."*

We "Prussians"!!! In the great haggling over human beings in Vienna, we *Rhinelanders* had the good fortune to win an "Archduke" of the Lower Rhine, who has not fulfilled the conditions on which he became "Archduke"<sup>115</sup> A "King of Prussia" exists for us only through the Berlin *National Assembly*, and since no Berlin *National Assembly* exists for our "Archduke" of the Lower Rhine, no "King of Prussia" exists for us. We fell to the lot of the Archduke of the Lower Rhine owing to the haggling over nations! As soon as we have got so

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 65.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Archduke John of Austria. The reference is to the "Proklamation des Reichsverwesers an das deutsche Volk, den Konflikt zwischen der Krone und der Nationalversammlung in Preussen betreffend", November 21, 1848.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Neue Preussische Zeitung* No. 129, November 28, 1848.—*Ed.*

far that we no longer recognise the selling of human souls, we shall ask the “Archduke of the Lower Rhine” about his “**title to ownership**”.

Written on November 29, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 156, November 30, 1848

Published in English for the first time

THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT IN ITALY<sup>116</sup>

*Cologne*, November 29. After six months of almost uninterrupted defeats for democracy, after a series of unprecedented triumphs for the counter-revolution, there are at last indications of an approaching victory of the revolutionary party. Italy, the country whose uprising was the prelude to the European uprising of 1848 and whose collapse was the prelude to the fall of Vienna—Italy rises for the second time. Tuscany has succeeded in establishing a democratic government, and Rome has just won a similar government for itself.

London, April 10; Paris, May 15 and June 25; Milan, August 6; Vienna, November 1<sup>117</sup>—these are the four important dates of the European counter-revolution, the four milestones marking the swiftly accomplished stages of its latest triumphal march.

Not only was the revolutionary might of the Chartists *broken in London on April 10*, but the *revolutionary propaganda impact of the February victory* was also for the first time *broken*. Those who correctly assess England and the role she plays in modern history were not surprised that the continental revolutions passed over her without leaving a trace for the time being. England, a country which, through her industry and commerce, dominates all the revolutionary nations of the Continent and nevertheless remains relatively independent of her customers because she dominates the Asian, American and Australian markets; a country in which the contradictions of present-day bourgeois society, the class struggle of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, are most strongly developed and most acute, England more than any other country pursues her own, independent, course of development. The fumbling approach of continental provisional governments to the solution of problems and the



abolition of contradictions is not required in England, for *she* is more competent in dealing with and solving them than any other country. England does not accept revolution from the Continent; when the time comes England will *dictate revolution to the Continent*. That was England's position and the necessary consequence of her position, and hence the victory of "order" on April 10 was quite understandable. But who does not remember how this victory of "order", this first counterblow to the blows of February and March, gave fresh support to the counter-revolution everywhere and raised daring hopes in the hearts of those who were called conservatives! Who does not remember how throughout Germany the action of London's special constables was immediately accepted as a model by the entire civic militia! Who does not remember the impression made by this first proof that the movement which had broken out was not unconquerable!

On May 15, *Paris* promptly provided its counterpart to the victory of the English conservative party. The outermost waves of the revolutionary flood were stemmed on April 10; on May 15 its force was broken at its very source. April 10 demonstrated that the February movement was not irresistible; May 15 demonstrated that the insurrection could be checked in Paris. The revolution defeated at its centre was of course bound to succumb at the periphery as well. And this happened to an increasing extent day by day in Prussia and the smaller German states. But the revolutionary current was still strong enough to ensure two victories of the people in Vienna, the first also on May 15, the second on May 26, while the victory of absolutism in Naples, likewise won on May 15, acted because of its excesses rather as a counterbalance to the victory of order in Paris.<sup>118</sup> Something was still missing, though. Not only had the revolutionary movement to be defeated in Paris, but armed insurrection had to be divested of the spell of invincibility in Paris itself; only then could the counter-revolution feel safe.

And that happened at *Paris* in a battle lasting four days, from June 23 to 26. Four days of gun-fire put an end to the impregnability of the barricades and the invincibility of the armed people. What did Cavaignac demonstrate by his victory if not that the laws of warfare are more or less the same in a street and in a defile, whether faced by a barricade or by an entanglement or bastion? That 40,000 undisciplined armed workers, without guns or howitzers and without deliveries of ammunition, can withstand a well-organised army of 120,000 experienced soldiers and 150,000 men of the national guard supported by the best and most numerous artillery and abundantly supplied with ammunition for no more than four days? Cavaignac's

victory was the sheerest suppression of the smaller force by a force numerically seven times as big; it was the most inglorious victory ever won, the more inglorious for the blood that it cost despite the overwhelmingly superior forces. Nevertheless the world regarded it with amazement as if it were a miracle, for this victory won by superior forces divested the people of Paris and the Paris barricades of the aura of invincibility. By defeating 40,000 workers, Cavaignac's 300,000 men defeated not only the 40,000 workers, but, without realising it, defeated the European revolution. We all know what an impetuous storm of reaction set in from that day. There was nothing now to restrain it; the people of Paris were defeated with shell and grape-shot by conservative forces, and what could be done in Paris could be repeated elsewhere. Nothing remained to democracy after this decisive defeat but to make as honourable a retreat as possible and at least defend foot by foot in the press, at public meetings and in parliaments, the ground which could no longer be held.

The next great blow was the *fall of Milan*.<sup>a</sup> The recapture of Milan by Radetzky was indeed the first European event following the June victory in Paris. The double-headed eagle on the spire of the Milan Cathedral signified not only the fall of Italy as a whole, it signified also the restoration of *Austria*, the restoration of the stronghold of European counter-revolution. Italy crushed and Austria resurrected—what more could the counter-revolution demand! Indeed, with the fall of Milan there was an immediate slackening of revolutionary energy in Italy, Mamiani was overthrown in Rome, the democrats were defeated in Piedmont; and simultaneously the reactionary party raised its head again in Austria and from its centre, Radetzky's headquarters, it began with renewed courage to spread the net of its intrigues over all provinces. Only then did Jellachich assume the offensive, only then was the great alliance of the counter-revolution with the Austrian Slavs completed.

I say nothing of the brief intermezzi in which the counter-revolution gained local victories and conquered separate provinces, of the setback in Frankfurt,<sup>119</sup> and so on. They are of local, perhaps national, but not European significance.

Finally, the work that was begun on the day of Custoza<sup>120</sup> was completed on November 1—just as Radetzky had marched into Milan so did Windischgrätz and Jellachich march into Vienna. Cavaignac's method was employed, and employed successfully,

---

<sup>a</sup> In August 1848.—Ed.

against the largest and most active focus of German revolution. The revolution in Vienna, like that in Paris, was smothered in blood and smoking ruins.

But it almost seems as if the victory of November 1 also marks the moment when the retrogressive movement reaches the turning-point and a crisis sets in. The attempt to repeat the bold exploit of Vienna bit by bit in Prussia has failed. Even if the country should forsake the Constituent Assembly, the most the Crown can expect is merely a partial victory which will decide nothing, and at any rate the first discouraging effect of the Viennese defeat has been nullified by the clumsy attempt to copy it in every detail.

While Northern Europe has either been forced back again into the servitude of 1847 or is laboriously defending the gains won during the first months against the attacks of the counter-revolution, Italy is suddenly rising again. Leghorn, the only Italian city which the fall of Milan spurred on to a victorious revolution, Leghorn has at last imparted its democratic *élan* to the whole of Tuscany and has succeeded in setting up a radically democratic government, more radical than any that ever existed under a monarchy, and more radical than most formed in a republic. This Government responded to the fall of Vienna and the restoration of Austria by proclaiming an Italian Constituent Assembly. The revolutionary fire-brand which this democratic Government has thus hurled into the midst of the Italian people has kindled a fire: in Rome the people, the national guard and the army have risen as *one* man, have overthrown the evasive, counter-revolutionary Government and secured a democratic government, and first among the demands they succeeded in putting through is a government based on the principle of Italian nationality, that is to say, the sending of delegates to the Italian Constituent Assembly as proposed by Guerazzi.<sup>121</sup>

That Piedmont and Sicily will follow suit is beyond doubt. They will follow just as they did last year.

And then? Will this second resurrection of Italy within three years—like the preceding one—herald the dawn of a new upsurge of European democracy? It almost looks as if it will. The measure of the counter-revolution has been filled to overflowing. France is about to throw herself into the arms of an adventurer<sup>a</sup> in order to escape the rule of Cavaignac and Marrast; Germany is more divided than ever; Austria is overwhelmed; Prussia is on the eve of civil war. All the illusions of February and March have been ruthlessly crushed

---

<sup>a</sup> Louis Bonaparte.—Ed.

beneath the swift tread of history. Indeed, the people have nothing more to learn from any further victories of the counter-revolution!

It is up to the people, when the occasion arises, to apply the lessons of the past six months *in good time and fearlessly*.

Written by Marx on November 29, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 156, November 30, 1848

## GERMAN PROFESSORIAL BASENESS

*Cologne*, November 29. The lackey nature of German professors finds its ideal surpassed in the learned gentlemen of Berlin and Halle. Such a servile frame of mind would shame a Russian serf. The pious Buddhist who credulously swallows the excrement of his Dalai Lama hears with astonishment about the Berlin and Halle Buddhists whose prostitution before royalty "by the grace of God" seems to him like a fable. He only believes in its reality when he is shown the addresses of the Berlin and Halle professors to the King of Prussia dated November 24 and 21 respectively, with the original signatures.<sup>a</sup>

"Freedom of discussion was abolished, the lives of the deputies menaced, the dignity of the Assembly and the honour of the nation besmirched, and the most well-intentioned and just proposals for putting an end to this reign of terror were frustrated by the resistance of those whom it was to benefit."

With these and other such brazen lies, and with the most servile assurances of inborn loyalty, 80 Berlin professors—including Hengstenberg, Schönlein, Ehrenberg, Böckh, the two Grimms etc.—have concocted an address to the King in which they bray in chorus their learned applause for the coercive measures of the Brandenburg Ministry.

The address of 19 Halle professors has a similar sound, but they go so far in their comicality as to speak incidentally of the "seriousness of their profession".

<sup>a</sup> "Adresse der Berliner Professoren an den König von Preussen", November 24, 1848; "Erklärung von Prorektor und Senat der Königlichen vereinten Friedrichs-Universität" in Halle, November 21, 1848 (*Preussischer Staats-Anzeiger*, November 25 and 26, 1848).— Ed.

The central feature in both addresses is an indescribable fury at the *refusal to pay taxes*. This is very easy to understand! No more taxes — and privileged erudition goes bankrupt. This money-greedy race of professors needs only the remotest threat to its purse for all science to be engulfed in fire and flames. Their monopoly is rooted in royalty “by the grace of God”. They write addresses to the King expressing their devotion, that is to say, they are devoted until death to their own monopoly. If the people achieves final victory, these gentlemen will quickly, in spite of all the “seriousness of their scientific profession”, manage to put themselves on the side of popular sovereignty, now so greatly condemned by them. The people, however, will cry out to them “too late”<sup>122</sup> and put a speedy end to the whole evil of privileged erudition.

Written on November 29, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 156, November 30, 1848

Published in English for the first time

SITTING OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL.—  
 THE COUNCIL OF STATES.—  
 PROTEST OF THE POPE.— IMPERIAL  
 GRAIN EMBARGO.— THE VALAISAN GREAT COUNCIL

*Berne*, November 26. At yesterday's sitting the National Council dispatched both items on the agenda (Emil Frei's motion on the law of responsibility and Ochsenbein's on the federal university) by referring them to the Federal Council. During the discussion on the university some strange remarks were made. Lusser from Uri saw in the project the ruin of his canton's finances. Hungerbühler from Berne similarly resisted the idea of a university with all his might: he said it was a luxury expenditure and that there were already enough people whose heads had been turned through too much learning. The Alcibiades of the Swiss Athens, Herr Escher from Zurich, also thought it necessary to wait first for the financial means. Alcibiades had good reason to press for an ordinary agenda; he was well aware that the Berne deputies intended to grab the seat of the Federal Government for themselves and let Lucerne be satisfied with the Federal Court and Zurich with the "Federal Higher School". But the ambition of the Athenians of Switzerland goes beyond that, and all but two of them voted, although to no avail, for an ordinary agenda.

In the Council of States the law on the seat of the Federal Government was approved in the draft proposed by the National Council and only one addendum was made, by Rüttimann, concerning the security of the federal authorities. Thus, it has now been decided that the seat of the Federal Government be chosen separately in each Council, and not by ballot, but according to the usual voting procedure. We shall see what comes of this.

A few days ago the canton of *Neuchâtel* witnessed scenes of great confusion. News arrived that all the State Councillors except one (Herr Steck) had tendered their resignations. All the members of the Republic's National Council and Council of States immediately went

home in great consternation. From what we have heard, the dispute resulted from a violent attack on the part of Herr Steck and was settled by a commission of the Great Council appointed specially for the purpose. At the sitting the day before yesterday the State Councillors withdrew their resignations amidst loud cries of *vive la république* from the Great Council.

The Pope<sup>a</sup> has protested against the decisions of the five cantons of the Freiburg diocese, which are relieving Bishop Marilley of his episcopal duties and taking steps to set up a provisional administration of the bishopric.<sup>123</sup> If these measures are not revoked, he is threatening to issue "other decrees to which his conscience commits him towards the Catholic world". The *Schweizerischer Beobachter*, the local reactionary newspaper, consoled itself two nights ago with the hope that since a republic had now been proclaimed in Rome (the worthy paper was made to believe this), the papacy was finished with<sup>124</sup> and the Catholic world had regained its freedom, which meant that the confused situation in Freiburg would also be resolved!

There are conflicting reports from the German frontier as to whether or not a grain embargo has been introduced. It is known for sure that so far it has at the most been introduced at Lake Constance; for on the 24th, the day before yesterday, as many Swabian corn growers as ever before came to the market in Zurich.

The Valaisan Great Council has taken the decision to levy the taxes necessary to pay the Sonderbund war reparations not, as elsewhere, on the enormously rich monasteries, but on the municipalities. The proportion that Valais has to pay amounts to 1,600,000 Swiss francs. So, instead of the monks who were the original instigators of the insurrection, it is the poor people of the canton who will have to pay this tax. In the meantime, the reverend fathers are carting away more and more of their property to Piedmont, just as the *patres* of the Great St. Bernhard have already done. These priestlings, famous in school books and sentimental stories for their dogs and for their alleged selfless devotion to travellers dying in the snow, are in reality tremendously rich and live extremely comfortably. They have taken all their riches, their cattle, their money and their effects to Aosta, where they are also now staying and partaking copiously of Piedmontese wine. When Radetzky marched into Milan,<sup>b</sup> these philanthropists celebrated the happy event with banqueting and cannon-fire, for which they were brought before the Piedmontese

<sup>a</sup> Pius IX.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> On August 6, 1848.—*Ed.*



courts. This *ecclesia pressa*<sup>a</sup> left nothing behind in their wintry monastery but a little bread and bacon, with which a few servants entertain travellers. However, the *Suisse* doubts whether the above decision was actually taken, even though it was printed in the *Journal du Valais*.

Written by Engels on November 26, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the supplement to the  
*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 157,  
December 1, 1848

Published in English for the first  
time

---

<sup>a</sup> Persecuted church.— *Ed.*

## [SITTING OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL]

*Berne*, November 27. At today's sitting of the National Council the question of publishing a bulletin of proceedings was once again taken up, but owing to the small number of members present it was very soon adjourned until tomorrow.

Written by Engels on November 27, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the supplement to the  
*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 157,  
December 1, 1848

Published in English for the first  
time

BERNE DECLARED FEDERAL CAPITAL.—  
FRANSCINI

*Berne*, November 28. At today's sitting of the National Council *Berne* was declared the federal capital by 58 votes to 42. All that is now needed is the ratification of the Council of States, which in the opinion of the *Berne* public is a foregone conclusion. There will be a sitting of the Council of States at 4 o'clock this afternoon, when it will take a decision on this matter. As the post goes at half past four, it will be impossible for me to send a report today on the outcome of this sitting.

At yesterday's sitting the Council of States ratified the National Council's decision on the 'Tessin question'<sup>a</sup> without amending it, which means that it has force of law. In the debate, which was somewhat long drawn out, Federal Councillor Franscini, who arrived the day before, particularly distinguished himself with a speech in support of the Tessiners. Carteret of Geneva also spoke out energetically in support of the Italian refugees and protested against their being referred to as "culprits" in this assembly, whereas they deserved the sympathy of all Swiss people for their aspirations and their struggles. It was indeed by demonstrating such active sympathy that the Tessiners proved that they were genuinely Swiss. In spite of this and several other vigorous protestations, especially against Article 2, which deprives Tessin of the right to grant asylum, the decision of the National Council was, as I have said, ratified in its entirety by a sizeable majority. Here too the German cantons were the decisive factor, even though a few German deputies also supported the Tessiners in the Council of States.

Written by Engels on November 28, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 158, December 2, 1848

Published in English for the first time

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 61-62.—*Ed.*

## [NEWS FROM SWITZERLAND]

*Berne*, November 29. At yesterday's sitting of the Council of States the law centralising the control of the posts in the hands of the federal authorities as from January 1, 1849,<sup>a</sup> was debated and approved without amendments. It had already received the approval of the National Council. The decision on the seat of the Federal Government was on the agenda. However, since the National Council was debating this decision at the same time and had already taken the initiative, the sitting was adjourned until four o'clock. At four o'clock the Council proceeded to the vote. At the first vote Berne received 21 votes, Zurich 13 and Lucerne 3, which gave an absolute majority to Berne. *Berne is therefore definitively the seat of the Swiss federal authorities.*

This morning both Councils came together to swear in Federal Councillor Franscini. Franscini delivered a longish speech in Italian which was applauded by all. Thereupon the Federal Assembly adjourned indefinitely. It was left to the Federal Council to reconvene the Assembly at the appropriate time.

The Federal Council made the following distribution of departments among its members: Furrer, as President, was put in charge of external affairs and general direction of federal policies; Druey, justice and police; Ochsenbein, war; Franscini, internal affairs; Munzinger, finance; Frei-Herose, taxes on commerce and turnpike money (*péages*); Näff, posts and public works.

The two recent elections in Berne for the National Council<sup>b</sup> resulted in victories for the liberals; in Mittelland Weingart was elected and in Emmenthal, governor Karrer.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 98.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 56 and 59.—*Ed.*

It goes without saying that the people of Berne are jubilant at their elevation to citizens of the capital of Switzerland. Last night there were any number of torchlight processions and serenades; in addition, the inevitable roar of cannon; bell-ringing seems to be left to the "imperial authority". There was naturally quite a serenade in front of the Erlacher Hof, where the Federal Council has its seat, and Steiger and Furrer made speeches.

I have just heard that Luvini fought a duel with Colonel Berg because of the latter's provocative remarks during the Tessin debate. It appears that no one was hurt; however, I cannot yet say anything definite on that score.

Written by Engels on November 29, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 159 (second edition), December 3, 1848

Published in English for the first time

## DUEL BETWEEN BERG AND LUVINI

*Berne, November 30.* In the duel yesterday between Herren Berg and Luvini, Herr Berg sustained fairly severe wounds in the arm and in the side. The weapon chosen was the officer's broadsword (*briquet d'ordonnance*). When Herr Berg left yesterday he had to be carried to the carriage.

Written by Engels on November 30, 1848

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 160, December 5, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

THE CLOSING OF THE GERMAN FRONTIER.—  
THE EMPIRE.—THE COUNCIL OF WAR

*Berne*, December 1. Thank God! At last it *appears* that the official news of the closing of the German frontier has reached the Federal Council and we shall now know what the position is. It was high time, considering how long their worships in the Central Authority have been taunting us Swiss and making fools of us. The Federal Council is said to have decided not to put even a single company of Swiss troops in the field against the mighty formation of 50,000 imperial troops. The imperial authorities can judge from this how much Switzerland fears their decisions, precautionary measures, threats and troop formations. Of course, the "Empire" does not have the same military system as Switzerland, which has no standing army at all but within a week can raise 150,000 trained and battle-ready troops—that is twice as many as the classical land of the military parade with its celebrated Scharnhorstian system of military organisation.

Even though the conflicting rumours about the closing of the frontier are threatening to dry up as a source of merriment for the Swiss, we can still rely on the "Empire" for something to laugh at. Yesterday the German and especially the Frankfurt imperial newspapers presented us in all seriousness with yet another fat canard: the recent invasion of Lörrach by refugees—or rather bandits—and the battle in which four real live Badenese dragoons succumbed! There is no need to tell you that the whole ridiculous story, which provoked the greatest hilarity here, is pure mystification. However, I can tell you that the Empire citizens' fear of the couple of volunteers who may still be prowling about on the border makes a hilarious impression on every Swiss. The newly coined

phrase, "Scared as six Empire citizens by one volunteer", has permanently entered the language. The latest article in the *Frankfurter Oberpostamts-Zeitung* about the continuing subversive activities of the refugees along the frontier has greatly helped to keep up the laughter at the expense of the Empire.<sup>a</sup> What important revelations Herr Schmerling's spies have made! Metternich<sup>b</sup> is in Muttenz and has been seen in Birsfeld, where Neff too is residing and writing and receiving many letters. Siegel and Katzenmaier are staying in Emmishofen — and they say the Empire need not tremble! Even more terrifying, the Swiss Government tolerates the presence in Dornach, close to the German frontier, of — "a few canteen-keeper stragglers from Lörrach and the vicinity" !!! In addition to that, "it is generally believed" that fresh "predatory incursions" would have taken place if ... etc., etc. And was there not sniping across the Rhine from Gross-Laufenburg? When, how and by whom the imperial newspaper has of course no idea. In short, if the Empire is in such a bad state that it shakes to its foundations just because Metternich is seen in Birsfeld and a few canteen-keeper stragglers are wasting away in Dornach, Switzerland will certainly have no part in propping up such a rotten building! What is more, these confused reports strung together by Empire *mouchards*<sup>c</sup> contradict themselves in every line: for example, Metternich is said to be the *only* refugee in Muttenz, and yet three lines further on "there are reports from Muttenz that *they* (!! ) are once more *arming* there" !! "They" — means Metternich, all on his own! And it is for this — for making them the laughing-stock of the whole world with such clumsy contradictions — that the imperial authorities pay their *mouchards* in Switzerland! *Trema, Bisanzio*,<sup>d</sup> Metternich has been seen in Birsfeld and "several canteen-keeper stragglers" in Dornach have sworn your destruction!

But let us leave the Empire aside. The Federal Council of War has been dissolved *pro forma*, but immediately reconstituted as a military commission, Herr Ochsenbein, as head of the Federal War Department, taking over as chairman. The *Berner Zeitung* sharply criticises this reconstitution or retention of the most cumbersome and costly item of the old Federal Government. In its opinion, the Military Council has never achieved anything but the appointment of a few aristocratic officers and the birth, after protracted labour

<sup>a</sup> "Die Fortdauer der Überstände an der Schweizergrenze", *Frankfurter Oberpostamts-Zeitung* No. 314 (supplement), November 24, 1848.— *Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Germain Metternich.— *Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Informers.— *Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Tremble, Byzantium! (Donizetti, *Belisario*).— *Ed.*



pains, of federal drill regulations [*Kamaschenreglement*]. These regulations proved so expensive that for the same price the whole army might have been equipped with puttees [*Kamaschen*] and boots. For the rest, the Military Council restricted itself to drawing its daily allowance of sixteen francs per head and because of all the difficulties and hair-splitting has long since given up all hope of ever achieving anything.

Besides the duel between Luvini and Berg, there were prospects of a second one—between Pioda and Michel from Graubünden—as a result of the Tessin debate in the National Council. Colonel Michel had expressed himself in an unbecoming manner and ended up angrily declaring Pioda to be a downright liar. Pioda answered extremely calmly and properly, but afterwards called the old federal war-horse to account. Thereupon Michel made statements that gave complete satisfaction to Pioda and his friends and with that the affair was allowed to rest.

Written by Engels on December 1, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 160, December 5, 1848

Published in English for the first time

THE FEDERAL COUNCIL AND THE FOREIGN  
AMBASSADORS.—  
THE FEDERAL COUNCIL IN TESSIN.—  
CENTRALISATION OF POSTS.—  
GERMAN ARMY COMMANDER'S APOLOGY

*Berne*, December 2. Since announcing the constitution of the new federal authorities and the simultaneous expiry of the 1815 treaty,<sup>125</sup> the Federal Council has already received the assurance from all the foreign ambassadors that they believed they could promise in advance their governments' recognition of the new authorities and the new Constitution. Only the British ambassador, Master<sup>a</sup> Peel, made no mention of recognition, and merely stated tersely that he had communicated the announcement to his Government. As Russia has no representative here, no statement has, of course, come from that power.

The Federal Council has appointed as its representatives in Tessin Colonel Stehlin from Basle and Colonel Briatte from Waadt, both of them members, and the latter President, of the Council of States. The radical Briatte will, it is hoped, act differently from Herr Escher and Herr Munzinger.<sup>126</sup> Incidentally, all Italian refugees of military age have been removed from Tessin into the interior of Switzerland.

Further, the Federal Council has started to apply the law on the centralisation of posts. Herr Laroche-Stehelin from Basle has been appointed acting Postmaster-General of Switzerland, and two commissions have been set up, the first to assess the materials to be taken over from the cantons and private individuals, the second to draft a law on the organisation of the Swiss posts.

The German army commander concerned has made the appropriate apology in a letter to the Federal Council<sup>b</sup>; he declares himself ready to give the satisfaction required, and announces that those concerned have already been handed over for punishment.

Written by Engels on December 2, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 161, December 6, 1848

Published in English for the first time

<sup>a</sup> This word is given in English in the original.— *Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 63 and 98.— *Ed.*

SWISS EVIDENCE  
OF THE AUSTRIAN ARMY'S HEROIC DEEDS  
IN VIENNA

Cologne, December 5. While the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* and other bought newspapers exalt a Windischgrätz and a Jellachich to heaven for restoring law and order, crown the valiant Austrian troops with laurels and never tire of recounting the horrors of the democratic reign of terror, a new source of information has suddenly appeared in the Swiss press to serve the chronicling of the latest Viennese events. This source consists of the Swiss citizens who with difficulty and in mortal danger, and after maltreatment, escaped from the myrmidons of "order", and having returned to their homeland, publish their experiences during the "days of terror" and the "war of order". And indeed not raging "proletarians", but big capitalists, people who owned enormous factories in Vienna, most trustworthy bourgeois of conservative convictions—and a Swiss conservative is well known to be the equivalent of a German "wailer"<sup>127</sup> raised to the second power—and their reports are not appearing in radical scandal sheets but in the most serious conservative newspapers. We have taken the following details from one such description in the *Basler Intelligenzblatt*:

Herr *Specker* of St. Gallen was director of a big machine factory which stood quite isolated on the Tabor, the extreme customs boundary of Vienna. He, like his workers and foremen, all of them Swiss, had neither taken part in the fighting, nor had weapons in the house. Only 15 workers had remained on duty with the factory's fire-pump set up in the yard. At the approach of the military, General *Wyss*, patrician of Berne and chief of the Austrian General Staff, gave Herr *Specker* his word of honour that nothing would happen to his building if he had no weapons and if no shots were fired from the factory. The house was searched by the troops and

nothing was found. In spite of this another detachment of riflemen asserted that shots had been fired from the house (very understandably, as they had permission to loot any house from which shots were fired). The "Swiss dogs", who had trusted the word of their compatriot General Wyss so implicitly that they had even left their wives and children in the factory, were most brutally mishandled by these soldiers, and only saved by the intervention of another officer. The latter took them to the guardroom. A neighbour pointed at one of the workers passing by and said: "He, too, was at the dismantling of the Tabor bridge." Immediately, without being allowed to say a word, the worker was put up against a wall and shot. In the guardroom guns were pointed at the "Swiss dogs" and only a loaded pistol brought out by the officer held the soldiers back. Director Specker was stood up against the wall, three soldiers set on him, one cocked his gun, put the barrel to Specker's mouth and fiddled about with the trigger. One of the officers took out his watch and said: "You have a quarter of an hour, Swiss dog, then you'll be shot, so say your prayers!" Before the time was up, the officer who had previously saved them returned, and took him to General Wyss, who reproached him for "breaking his word"! The general obstinately maintained that shots had been fired from the factory, although Herr Specker proved that this was physically impossible. At last he obtained a pass for himself and his people to Florisdorf. On returning to the factory they found everything in wrack and ruin and looted bare. Herr Specker's family had been chased around the house with rifle-shots; the book-keeper, a Swiss, riddled with bullets, rolled in his death throes in the garden and anyone who approached him was shot at, so that the unfortunate man was left till late at night to lie there and die. His name was *Kunz*. In the end the survivors succeeded in getting away safely to Florisdorf.

The machine manufacturer Bollinger, also a Swiss, who made himself famous by his work on the spire of St. Stephen's, succeeded with the help of fire-pumps in protecting his factory from being burned down. But here too the Austrians broke in under the false pretence that shots had been fired from the factory, and they plundered and demolished the whole building, set fire to it, and stabbed Bollinger's brother to death as he tried to escape from the flames. Another Swiss resident in Vienna, Madame Bodener, had her child shot in her arms by the Croats.

The report holds out prospects of still further information about the heroic deeds of the brave Austrian army as soon as other Swiss citizens return. At the same time, it depicts in most moving terms the assurance and calm of the armed proletarians, and the courteousness

and decency with which the Swiss were treated during the so-called reign of terror of the Vienna proletariat and students.

We repeat: the originators of these reports are not radicals, not proletarians and malcontents, but big capitalists and true full-blooded Swiss aristocrats. Will the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* not let its various correspondents  $\rho$ , MW,  $\ddagger$ ,  $\Delta$ , and others in Vienna collect information as to whether this is not word for word true? We have given names, locality, and all other details as exactly as the paper can wish. But it will of course be wary.

Written by Engels on December 5, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 161, December 6, 1848

Published in English for the first time

[THE FRENCH WORKING CLASS  
AND THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS]<sup>128</sup>

Paris. Raspail or Ledru-Rollin? Socialist or Montagnard? That is the question which is now splitting the party of the red republic into two hostile camps.<sup>129</sup>

What is this dispute really all about?

Ask the journals of the Montagnards, the *Réforme*, the *Révolution*, and they will tell you that they themselves cannot make it out; that the socialists have drawn up the same programme,<sup>a</sup> word for word, as the Mountain,<sup>b</sup> a programme of permanent revolution, of progressive taxes and death duties, and of organisation of labour; that there is no dispute on principles, and that the whole untimely scandal has been instigated by a few jealous and ambitious men who are deceiving the "religion and the good faith" of the people and out of egotism casting suspicion on the men of the people's party.

Ask the journal of the socialists, the *Peuple*, and you will be answered with bitter expletives about the ignorance and empty-headedness of the Montagnards, with endless legal, moral and economic treatises, and finally with the mysterious hint that at bottom it is all about Citizen Proudhon's new panacea, which they say is going to outdo the old socialist phrases of Louis Blanc's school.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> A reference to "Manifeste électoral du Peuple", *Le Peuple* No. 4, November 8-15, 1848.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> A reference to "Déclaration au peuple", *La Réforme* No. 310, November 9, 1848.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> [P.-J. Proudhon,] "Argument à la Montagne", *Le Peuple* No. 5, November 15-21, 1848.—*Ed.*

Finally, ask the socialist workers, and they will answer you shortly: Ce sont des *bourgeois*, les montagnards.<sup>a</sup>

Once again, the only ones who hit the nail on the head are the workers. They will have nothing to do with the Mountain because the Mountain consists only of *bourgeois*.

The socialist-democratic party, even before February, consisted of two different factions; first, of the spokesmen, deputies, writers, lawyers etc., with their not inconsiderable train of petty bourgeois who formed the party of the *Réforme* proper; secondly, of the mass of Paris workers, who were not at all unconditional followers of the former, but, on the contrary, were very distrustful allies, and adhered more closely to them or moved farther away from them, according to whether the *Réforme* people acted with more resolution or with more vacillation. In the last months of the monarchy the *Réforme* acted with great resolution in consequence of its polemic with the *National*, and the relationship between it and the workers was very close.

The *Réforme* people therefore also entered the Provisional Government as representatives of the proletariat.

There is no need to go into details here about how they were in the minority in the Provisional Government and hence, incapable of asserting the workers' interests, only served the pure republicans<sup>130</sup> to put off the workers until the pure republicans had re-organised public power, which was now *their* power over against the workers; how Ledru-Rollin, the leader of the *Réforme* party, was persuaded by Lamartine's phrases of self-sacrifice and by the lure of power to enter the Executive Commission<sup>131</sup>; how he thereby split and weakened the revolutionary party, partially putting it at the disposal of the Government, and so caused the failure of the insurrections of May and June, nay, even fought against them himself. The facts are still too fresh in the memory.

Enough said; after the June insurrection, after the overthrow of the Executive Commission and the rise of the pure republicans to exclusive domination<sup>132</sup> in the person of Cavaignac, the party of the *Réforme*, of the democratic-socialist petty bourgeoisie, lost all illusions about the development of the Republic. It was pushed into opposition, it was free again, acted again as opposition and resumed its old connections with the workers.

As long as no important questions were raised, as long as it was only a question of exposing the cowardly, treacherous and reaction-

<sup>a</sup> They are *bourgeois*, those Montagnards.— Ed.

ary policy of Cavaignac, so long the workers could put up with being represented in the press by the *Réforme* and the *Révolution démocratique et sociale*. The *Vraie République* and the real working-class papers had anyway already been suppressed by the state of siege, by tendentious trials and surety payments. They could equally well put up with being represented in the National Assembly by the Mountain. Raspail, Barbès and Albert were under arrest, Louis Blanc and Caussidière had had to flee. The clubs were in part closed, in part under strict supervision, and the old laws against freedom of speech continued and still continue in operation. Enough examples of how these laws were used against the workers were given in the newspapers every day. The workers, faced with the impossibility of having their own representatives speak, had again to be content with those who had represented them before February, with the radical petty bourgeois and their spokesmen.

Now the question of the Presidency arises. There are three candidates: Cavaignac, Louis Napoleon and Ledru-Rollin. For the workers Cavaignac was out of the question. The man who shot them down in June with grape-shot and incendiary rockets could only count on their hatred. Louis Bonaparte? They could only vote for him out of irony, to raise him by the ballot today and overthrow him again by force of arms tomorrow, and with him the honourable, "pure" bourgeois republic. And finally, Ledru-Rollin, who recommended himself to the workers as the only red, socialist-democratic candidate.

Really, after the experiences of the Provisional Government, of May 15 and June 24, could the workers be expected once again to give a vote of confidence to the radical petty bourgeoisie and Ledru-Rollin? To the same people who on February 25, when the armed proletariat ruled Paris, when they could have obtained everything, had only lofty, reassuring phrases instead of revolutionary action, only promises and vain hopes instead of quick and decisive measures, only the flag, the fine phrases and the styles of 1793, instead of the energy of 1793? To the same people who shouted with Lamartine and Marrast: First and foremost the *bourgeois* must be *reassured*, and who in doing so forgot to carry on the revolution? To the same people who on May 15 were undecided and on June 23 had artillery fetched from Vincennes and battalions from Orléans and Bourges?

And yet, the people might have voted for Ledru-Rollin so as not to split the votes. But then came his speech of November 25 against Cavaignac in which he once again took the side of the victors, reproached Cavaignac for not having acted with sufficient energy



against the revolution, for not having had more battalions in readiness against the workers.

This speech deprived Ledru-Rollin completely of all credit with the workers. Even now, after five months, after having had to suffer all the consequences of the June battle so to speak on his own body, even now he still sides with the victors against the vanquished, he is proud of having demanded more battalions against the insurgents than Cavaignac could supply!

And the man who considers the June fighters were not vanquished quickly enough wants to be the head of the party which has entered upon the heritage of the June martyrs?

After that speech the candidature of Ledru-Rollin was lost for the Paris workers. The opposing candidature of Raspail, already put forward earlier and already having earlier enjoyed the sympathy of the workers, was victorious in Paris. If the ballot papers of Paris had decided, Raspail would now be President of the Republic.

The workers know very well that Ledru-Rollin is not yet played out, that he still can and will render great service to the radical party. But he has forfeited the confidence of the workers. For his weakness, his petty vanity, his dependence on high-sounding phrases, through which even Lamartine mastered him, *they*, the workers, have had to suffer. No service he can render will make them forget that. The workers will always know that when Ledru-Rollin becomes energetic again, his energy will only be that of the armed workers standing behind him and driving him on.

By giving Ledru-Rollin a no-confidence vote, the workers also gave a no-confidence vote to the whole of the radical petty bourgeoisie. The indecision, the dependence on the traditional phrases of *dévoûment*<sup>a</sup> etc., the forgetting of revolutionary action over revolutionary reminiscences, are all qualities which Ledru-Rollin shares with the class he represents.

The radical petty bourgeois are only socialistic because they clearly see before their eyes their ruin, their transition into the proletariat. They are enthusiastic for the organisation of labour and revolution in the relationship between capital and labour not as petty bourgeois, as possessors of a little capital, but as future proletarians. Give them political domination, and they will soon forget the organisation of labour. Political domination gives them, of course, at least in the intoxication of the first moment, the prospect of the acquisition of capital, of salvation from threatening ruin. Only when the armed proletarians stand behind them with bayonets at the ready, only then

<sup>a</sup> Devotedness.—Ed.

will they remember their allies of yesterday. That is how they acted in February and March, and Ledru-Rollin, as their leader, was the first to act like that. If they are now disappointed, does that alter the workers' attitude to them? If they come back in sackcloth and ashes, does that entitle them to demand that the workers now, under quite different circumstances, shall fall into the trap again?

By voting not for Ledru-Rollin but for Raspail, the workers give them to understand that they will not do so, that they know how they stand in relation to the radical petty bourgeoisie.

But Raspail—what services has Raspail rendered the workers? How can *he* be placed in opposition to Ledru-Rollin as a socialist *par excellence*?

The people know full well that Raspail is no official socialist, no system-maker by profession. The people want none of the official socialists and system-makers, they are fed up with them. Otherwise, Citizen Proudhon would be their candidate, and not the hot-blooded Raspail.

But the people have a good memory and are not nearly so ungrateful as it pleases certain unappreciated reactionary celebrities, in their modesty, to maintain. The people still remember very well that Raspail was the first to reproach the Provisional Government for its inactivity, for its preoccupation with mere republican stuff and nonsense. The people have not yet forgotten the *Ami du Peuple, par le citoyen*<sup>a</sup> Raspail, and since Raspail was the first to have the courage—and it did require courage—to speak out in revolutionary fashion against the Provisional Government, and since Raspail represents not any particular socialist *couleur*, but only the social *revolution*, the people of Paris vote for Raspail.

It is not at all a question of a few petty measures solemnly proclaimed in the manifesto of the Mountain as the salvation of the world. It is a question of the social revolution which will give the French people something very different from these incoherent, already stale phrases. It is a question of the energy to carry through this revolution. It is a question whether the petty bourgeoisie will have this energy, after it already once proved powerless. And the proletariat of Paris, by voting for Raspail, replies "No!"

Hence the amazement of the *Réforme* and the *Révolution* that one can accept their phrases and yet not vote for Ledru-Rollin, although he proclaims these phrases. These worthy papers, which think of themselves as working-class papers and yet are now more

---

<sup>a</sup> By Citizen.—Ed.

than ever before papers of the petty bourgeoisie, cannot, of course, realise that the same demand which on the lips of the workers is revolutionary, is on *their* lips a mere phrase. Otherwise they would not have their own illusions.

And Citizen Proudhon and his *Peuple*? More of them tomorrow.

Written by Engels at the beginning  
of December 1848

Printed according to the manu-  
script

First published, in German, in:  
Marx/Engels, *Gesamtausgabe*, Abt. 1, Bd. 7,  
1935

Published in English for the first  
time

## [PROUDHON]

Paris. Yesterday we spoke of the Montagnards and the socialists, of the candidatures of Ledru-Rollin and of Raspail, of the *Réforme* and the *Peuple* of Citizen Proudhon. We promised to return to Proudhon.

Who is Citizen Proudhon?

Citizen Proudhon is a peasant from the Franche-Comté who has done a variety of jobs and engaged in a variety of studies. He first drew public attention to himself by a pamphlet published in 1842: *What Is Property?*<sup>a</sup> The reply was: "Property is theft."

The surprising repartee startled the French. The Government of Louis Philippe, the austere Guizot, who has no sense of humour, was narrow-minded enough to take Proudhon to court. But in vain. In the case of such a piquant paradox any French jury can be relied on for acquittal. And so it came to pass. The Government disgraced itself and Proudhon became a famous man.

As to the book itself, it corresponded throughout to the above résumé. Every chapter was summed up in a curious paradox in a manner which is new to the French.

For the rest, it contained partly legal and moral, partly economic and moral treatises, each of which sought to prove that property amounts to a contradiction. As to the legal points, these can be admitted, inasmuch as nothing is easier than to prove that the whole of jurisprudence amounts to nothing but contradictions. As to the economic treatises, they contain little that is new, and what is new in them is based on wrong calculations. The rule of three is everywhere most disgracefully mishandled.

<sup>a</sup> P.-J. Proudhon, *Qu'est-ce que la propriété?* — Ed.

The French, however, were unable to cope with the book. For the jurists it was too economic, for the economists too legalistic and for both too moralistic. *Après tout, c'est un ouvrage remarquable*,<sup>a</sup> they said finally.

But Proudhon was hankering after greater triumphs. After various long-forgotten minor writings, there appeared at last in 1846 his *Philosophie de la misère*, in two enormous tomes. In this work, which was to establish his fame for ever, Proudhon applied a badly mishandled Hegelian philosophical method to a curiously misunderstood political economy and sought by all kinds of transcendental leaps to found a new socialist system of a free association of workers. This system was so new that in England, under the name of Equitable Labour Exchange Bazaars or Offices,<sup>133</sup> it had already gone bankrupt ten times ten years earlier in ten different towns.

This ponderous, pseudo-learned, bulky work, in which eventually not only all previous economists but all previous socialists too were told the rudest things, made absolutely no impression on the easy-going French. This way of speaking and reasoning was new to them and much less to their taste than the curious paradoxes of Proudhon's earlier work. Similar paradoxes were not lacking here either, it is true (as when Proudhon declared himself quite seriously a "personal enemy of Jehovah"<sup>b</sup>), but they were, so to speak, buried under the allegedly dialectical lumber. The French again said: *C'est un ouvrage remarquable*, and put it aside. In Germany, the work was of course received with great reverence.

Marx at the time issued a pamphlet in reply, which was as witty as it was thorough (*Misère de la philosophie. Réponse à la Philosophie de la misère de M. Proudhon. Par Karl Marx, Bruxelles et Paris, 1847*), and which in thought and language is a thousand times more French than Proudhon's pretentious monstrosity.

As to the real content of Proudhon's two works in criticism of the existing social relationships, one can, after reading them both, say with a clear conscience that it amounts to zero.

As to his proposals for social reforms, they have, as already mentioned, the advantage of having been brilliantly proved in England a long time ago by multiple bankruptcy.

That was Proudhon before the revolution. While he was still engaged in efforts to bring out a daily newspaper, *Le Représentant du Peuple*, without capital but by means of a calculation unequalled in its contempt for the rule of three, the Paris workers be-

<sup>a</sup> After all, it is a remarkable work.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> Heinrich Heine, *Deutschland. Ein Wintermärchen*, Caput XXIII.—Ed.

stirred themselves, chased out Louis Philippe and founded the Republic.

Proudhon first became a "citizen" by virtue of the Republic; afterwards by virtue of the Paris workers' vote, given on the strength of his honest socialist name, he became a representative of the people.

So the revolution flung Citizen Proudhon out of theory into practice, out of his sulking corner into the forum. How did this obstinate, high-handed, self-taught man, who treats all previous authorities — jurists, scholars, economists and socialists — with equal contempt, who declares all previous history to be drivel and introduced himself, so to speak, as the new Messiah; how did he behave now that he himself was to help make history?

We must say to his credit that he began by taking his seat on the extreme Left, among the same socialists, and voting with the same socialists whom he so deeply despised and had so vehemently attacked as ignorant, arrogant dolts.

It is put about, of course, that in the party meetings of the Mountain he renewed his old violent attacks on his former opponents with fresh vehemence, that he declared them one and all to be ignoramuses and phrase-mongers who did not understand the ABC of what they were talking about.

We readily believe it. We even readily believe that the economic paradoxes which Proudhon uttered with all the dry passion and confidence of a doctrinaire caused no small embarrassment to *Messieurs les Montagnards*. Very few among them are theoreticians of economics and they rely more or less on little Louis Blanc; and little Louis Blanc, though a much more significant brain than the infallible Proudhon, is all the same too intuitive a nature to be able to cope with his learned economic pretensions, odd transcendence and seemingly mathematical logic. Moreover, Louis Blanc soon had to flee, and his flock, helpless in the field of economics, remained unprotected, exposed to the merciless claws of the wolf Proudhon.

We need hardly repeat that in spite of all these triumphs Proudhon is still an extremely weak economist. Only his weakness does not happen to lie within the grasp of the mass of French socialists.

Proudhon won the greatest triumph of his life on the rostrum of the National Assembly. On one occasion, I do not remember which, he took the floor and angered the bourgeois of the Assembly for an hour and a half with an endless string of truly Proudhonist paradoxes, each crazier than the other, but all calculated to shock the listeners most rudely in their dearest and most sacred feelings. And

all this was delivered with his dry academic indifference, in a toneless, academic Franche-Comté dialect, in the driest, most imperturbable style in the world—the effect, the St. Vitus's dance of the enraged bourgeois, was not at all bad.<sup>134</sup>

But this was the highlight of Proudhon's public activity. In the meantime he continued to belabour the workers, both through the *Représentant du Peuple*—which, after bitter experiences with the rule of three, had gradually materialised and soon was transformed into the *Peuple* pure and simple—as well as in the clubs, in favour of his theory of happiness for all. He was not without success. *On ne le comprend pas*, the workers said, *mais c'est un homme remarquable.*<sup>a</sup>

Written by Engels at the beginning  
of December 1848

Printed according to the manu-  
script

First published, in German, in:  
Marx/Engels, *Gesamtausgabe*, Abt. 1, Bd. 7,  
1935

Published in English for the first  
time

---

<sup>a</sup> You can't understand him, but he is a remarkable man.—*Ed.*

## HERR RAUMER IS STILL ALIVE

*Cologne*, December 6. Recently we mentioned the addresses of loyalty sent by the Halle and Berlin professors to the King.<sup>a</sup> Today we have to announce that Herr von Raumer, imperial envoy *in partibus*,<sup>b</sup> who at the present time is to be found in the antechambers of Bastide and Cavaignac, has fully joined in the professors' ignominy by stating his agreement with those addresses. As a matter of fact, nothing else was to be expected of an imperial envoy like Herr Raumer. But there seems to be yet another reason for his statement. For months past Herr Raumer has been entirely forgotten in Germany. In his longing to be rescued somehow from that oblivion, he eagerly seized the opportunity offered him by his fellow bonzes in Berlin and promptly published the above-mentioned statement. This production of Raumer's is to be found in the latest issue of the *Preussischer Staats-Anzeiger*.<sup>c</sup>

Written by Marx on December 6, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 162, December 7, 1848

Published in English for the first time

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 106-07.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See Note 95.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Issue No. 215, December 5, 1848.—*Ed.*



## [SECOND STAGE OF THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION]

*Cologne*, December 6. The counter-revolution has reached its second stage. The National Assembly has been dissolved. An imposed Constitution has been proclaimed by the "grace of the All-Highest" without more ado.<sup>135</sup>

All the hypocrisy over the "agreement"<sup>136</sup> which has been going on since May has been stripped of its last mask.

The March revolution is declared null and void and royal power "by the grace of God" celebrates its triumph.

The camarilla, the junkers, the bureaucracy, and the entire reaction, with and without uniform, are jubilant because the stupid people is at last to be driven back into the stall of the "Christian-Germanic" state.

Written by Marx on December 6, 1848

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 162 (special edition),  
December 7, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first  
time

THE COUP D'ÉTAT  
OF THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION <sup>137</sup>

*Cologne, December 7. The National Assembly has been dissolved. The representatives of the people have been dispersed "by the grace of God".*

The reason given by the Government for this act of violence adds bitter contempt to the coup d'état carried through 'with such insolence.'<sup>138</sup>

The National Assembly now reaps the fruits of its chronic weakness and cowardice. For months it allowed the conspiracy against the people to carry on its work unmolested, to grow strong and powerful, and hence has now become its first victim.

The people, too, is now suffering for its sins, committed out of magnanimity, or rather stupidity, in March and again in April and May, and finally through so-called passive resistance. It has now been taught a lesson which it will probably put to profit. Its next victory will put an end to "agreement" and to all other phrases and hypocrisies.

Written by Marx on December 7, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 163, December 8, 1848

## MEASURES CONCERNING THE GERMAN REFUGEES

*Berne*, December 5. The Federal Council has now taken measures to deal with the German refugees, partly in order to deprive the imperial authority of the pretext for hostile measures, partly to show its impartiality towards Tessin and to carry through in practice also in the northern cantons the triumph of the policy of strict neutrality which was won in the Tessin debate.<sup>a</sup> The policy of Furrer-Munzinger-Ochsenbein is being pursued everywhere. A circular of the Federal Council addressed to the border cantons concerned repeats the basic principles expressed by the *Vorort*, and again insists on the internment of all refugees who took part in the Struve campaign<sup>139</sup>; and in order to give weight to this demand the President of the Federal Assembly, Dr. Steiger, already left yesterday as representative of the Confederation to visit the northern cantons.

There can be no objection to the measure in itself. Nobody will blame Switzerland for not wanting to get involved in unpleasantness because of a few volunteer insurgents who are thirsting for adventure and heartily bored in their exile. But why then the previous bold talk against Germany, the positive assurance that the Swiss had done their duty, when it is now indirectly admitted that they did not do it, when they are only now seeking to satisfy themselves how far the cantons have obeyed the orders of the *Vorort*?—It is not to be denied that this decision of the Federal Council, an act of justice towards Tessin, is a complete *démenti* of the last official act of the *Vorort*, and though the Note<sup>b</sup> received unanimous applause, this beginning of disavowal in the Note will cause little joy.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 61-62 and 112.—*Ed*

<sup>b</sup> Sent to the Imperial Government on November 4, 1848. See this volume, pp. 67-68.—*Ed*

Nothing has been heard about the closing of the German frontier, except that the whole of Swabia is protesting against it. Whether it will take place or not is again left to God to decide. In any case, the Federal Council has decided for the present not to range any troops opposite the imperial division.

The Federal Military Council has now concluded its current business and has been definitely disbanded. In its place there will be a War Office which Ochsenein, as head of the Military Department, will organise and direct.

The new Spanish ambassador, Herr Zayas, who arrived here a few days ago with credentials for the *Vorort*, has now presented these to the Vice-President of the Federal Council, Herr Druey, and thereby made immediate contact with the new authorities.

The press is much incensed over the treatment of the Swiss in Vienna, of which I recently gave you some examples.<sup>a</sup> It insists on the Federal Council demanding satisfaction and compensation from Austria. In particular the behaviour of the Bernese General Wyss arouses general indignation here. This general's brother is a master builder here in Berne.

Written by Engels on December 5, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 165, December 10, 1848

Published in English for the first time

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 120-22.— *Ed.*

## THE NATIONAL COUNCIL

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 165, December 10, 1848]

Berne, December 6. Who in this period of European storms is concerned about Switzerland? Certainly almost no one apart from the imperial authority, which suspects there is a volunteer insurgent lying in ambush behind every bush on the left bank of the Rhine from Constance to Basle. And yet Switzerland is an important neighbour for us. Today constitutional Belgium is the official model state,<sup>a</sup> but who in these stormy days will guarantee us that tomorrow a republican Switzerland will not be an official model state? Already I know more than one *farouche*<sup>b</sup> republican who wishes nothing more than to transfer the Swiss political system with its large and small councils—federal, national, council of states, and other councils—across the Rhine, i. e. to transform Germany into a large-scale Switzerland, and then lead a calm and peaceful life in all godliness and honour as a member of the Great Council or a *Landammann*<sup>c</sup> of the Baden, Hesse or Nassau canton.

At any rate, therefore, we Germans should be concerned about Switzerland, and what the Swiss think, say and do may very soon be held up to us as a model. Hence it can do no harm if in advance we acquaint ourselves to some extent with the kind of customs and people the twenty-two cantons of the "Confederation" have produced in their Federative Republic.

It is reasonable for us first of all to consider the cream of Swiss society, the men whom the Swiss people themselves have appointed as their representatives; I am referring to the National Council which meets in the Town Hall in Berne.

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 333-36 and 482-84.—*Ed*

<sup>b</sup> Fierce.—*Ed*

<sup>c</sup> President of a canton.—*Ed*

Anyone who comes to the public gallery of the National Council is bound to be surprised at the variety of figures the Swiss people has sent to Berne to deliberate on matters common to the whole nation. One who has not already seen a good deal of Switzerland will hardly understand how a small country of a few hundred square miles and of less than two and a half million inhabitants can produce such a colourful assembly. But it is not at all surprising. Switzerland is a country in which four different languages are spoken—German, French, Italian (or rather Lombardian) and Romansh—and which combines all stages of culture, from the most advanced machine industry down to the most unadulterated pastoral life. The Swiss National Council combines the cream of all these nationalities and stages of culture and therefore looks anything but national.

There cannot be any question of definite seats, of separate parties in this semi-patriarchal assembly. The radicals have made a feeble attempt to seat themselves on the extreme left, but they do not seem to have been successful. Each member sits where he likes and often changes his place three or four times during one sitting. But most members have certain favourite seats which finally they always occupy, so that after all the assembly is divided into two rather sharply separated parts. On the three front semicircular benches one sees men with sharply defined features, many with beards, with well-kept hair and modern clothes of Parisian cut. Seated here are the representatives of French and Italian Switzerland, or the "Welch" members as they are called here; on these benches it is rare for anything but French to be spoken. But behind the Welch members sits a curiously motley society. True, no peasants in Swiss national costumes are to be seen; on the contrary, these are all people whose clothing bears the stamp of a certain degree of civilisation; here and there one even sees a more or less modern frock-coat, the owner usually possessing decorous features; then half a dozen Swiss officer types in civilian dress, looking very much alike, more solemn than military, their faces and clothing somewhat old-fashioned and to some extent reminiscent of Ajax in *Troilus and Cressida*; lastly the bulk of the assembly, consisting of more or less elderly, old-fashioned gentlemen with features and costumes that defy description, each one different, each one a distinct type and in the main also a type for caricature. All varieties of the petty bourgeois, the *campagnard endimanché*,<sup>b</sup> and the oligarchy of the cantons are here represented, but all equally respectable, all terribly serious, all

---

<sup>a</sup> A drama by Shakespeare.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Peasant in his Sunday best.—*Ed.*

wearing equally heavy silver-rimmed spectacles. These are the representatives of German Switzerland, and this bulk of the assembly is sent by the smaller cantons and outlying areas of the larger ones.

The presidential chair facing this assembly is occupied by the famous Dr. Robert Steiger from Lucerne, who a few years ago was sentenced to death under the Siegwart-Müller administration, and is now the President of the Swiss Federal Assembly. Steiger is a small thickset man with clear-cut features, to which his grey hair, brown moustache, and even the inevitable silver-rimmed spectacles, provide a not unpleasant background. He carries out his duties with great calm and perhaps somewhat excessive restraint.

The discussion corresponds to the physiognomy. Only the Welch members, and not even all of them, speak a fully civilised, rhetorical form of language. The Bernese, who among the German Swiss have most of all adopted Romance customs, most closely resemble them. Some temperamental fire, at least, is still to be found among them. The Zurichers, these sons of the Swiss Athens, speak with the gravity and precision appropriate to someone halfway between a professor and a factory foreman, but always "educatedly". The officers speak with solemn slowness, without much skill or content, but always decisively as though their battalion stood behind them ready for action. Finally, the main body of the assembly provides orators who are more or less well-meaning, cautious and conscientious, and who weigh up the arguments on one side and the other but nevertheless in the end always come down on the side of their cantonal interests; almost all of them speak very clumsily and in some places according to their own rules of grammar. When the discussion turns on a question of cost, it always starts from them, particularly from the representatives of the *Ur*-cantons. In this respect the Uri canton has already a well-deserved reputation in both Councils.

Consequently, on the whole the discussion is dull, calm, mediocre. The National Council has very few talented orators who would be successful also in larger assemblies; so far I know only of two, Luvini and Dufour, and perhaps Eytel. True, I have not yet heard several of the more influential members; but neither their successes in the assembly nor the newspaper reports of their speeches are such as to justify great expectations. Only Neuhaus is said to be a brilliant orator. How indeed could oratorical ability develop in assemblies which represent at most a few hundred thousand people and have to concern themselves with the most petty local interests? At any rate, the defunct Diet<sup>140</sup> was a diplomatic rather than a legislative assembly; in it one could learn how to distort instructions and find a plausible way out of a situation, but not how to rouse an assembly

and dominate it. Hence the speeches of the National Council members are mostly limited to motives for voting, with every speaker setting out the facts which induce him to vote in this way or that, and so without the slightest embarrassment he calmly repeats again what has already been repeated *ad nauseam* by previous speakers. Especially the speeches of the bulk of the representatives display this patriarchal sincerity. And once one of these gentlemen has the floor, as a matter of course he uses the opportunity also to voice his opinion at length on all the incidental points raised in the discussion, although they may have been disposed of long ago. Amidst this friendly chatter of the decent old fellows, a few main speeches laboriously keep the threads of the discussion together, and when the sitting ends one confesses to have seldom heard anything more boring. Philistinism, which lends a certain originality to the *physique*<sup>a</sup> of the assembly because it is rarely seen in this classical form, here too remains *au moral*<sup>b</sup> flat and tedious. There is little passion and no question at all of wit. Luvini is the only one who speaks with rousing, forceful passion, Dufour the only one who impresses by genuinely French clarity and precision. Frey from the Basle canton represents humour, which at times Colonel Bernold also attempts with some success. The French Swiss totally lack French wit. Throughout the existence of the Alps and the Jura not a single tolerable pun has been produced on their slopes, nor any quick, trenchant repartee heard there. The inhabitant of French Switzerland is not merely *sérieux*, he is *grave*.

The discussion which I will describe in some detail here concerns the Tessin affair and the Italian refugees in Tessin.<sup>c</sup> The circumstances are well known: the so-called intrigues of the Italian refugees in Tessin gave Radetzky the pretext for taking unpleasant measures; the *Vorort* Berne sent to Tessin federal representatives with extended powers<sup>d</sup> and also a brigade of troops; the uprising in Veltlin and in Valle Intelvi prompted a number of refugees to return to Lombardy, which they succeeded in doing in spite of the vigilance of the Swiss frontier posts; they crossed the frontier, without arms however, took part in the uprising and after the defeat of the insurgents, again unarmed, returned from Valle Intelvi to the Tessin area, and from there they were deported by the Tessin Government. Meanwhile Radetzky intensified his reprisals in the frontier area and redoubled his protests to the federal representatives.

<sup>a</sup> Outward appearance.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In essence.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See this volume, pp. 59-60, 61-62 and 112.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Escher and Munzinger.—*Ed.*



The latter demanded the deportation of all refugees without distinction; the Tessin Government refused; the *Vorort* confirmed the measure of the representatives; the Tessin Government appealed to the Federal Assembly, which in the meantime had begun its session. The National Council had to decide on this appeal and on the factual assertions put forward by both sides, concerning especially the behaviour of the Tessiners towards the representatives and the Swiss troops.

The majority of the commission appointed on this matter proposed the deportation of *all* the Italian refugees from Tessin, their internment in the interior of Switzerland, a ban on the entry of new refugees into Tessin, and in general that the measures taken by the *Vorort* should be confirmed and adhered to. The report of the commission was given by Herr Kasimir Pfyffer from Lucerne. But long before I had made my way to the public gallery through the crowded audience, Herr Pfyffer ended his rather dry report, and Herr Pioda was given the floor.<sup>a</sup>

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 165, December 10, 1848, second edition]

Herr Pioda, Secretary of State in Tessin, who was the sole representative of the minority in the commission, proposed the deportation of only those refugees who had taken part in the last uprising and against whom, therefore, there were positive grounds for action to be taken. Herr Pioda, a major and battalion commander during the war against the Sonderbund,<sup>141</sup> despite his mild, blonde appearance, displayed great courage at the time at Airolo, and held his ground for a week against more numerous, better-trained and better-armed enemy troops which, in addition, had occupied a more advantageous position. Pioda's speech is as mild and full of feeling as his outward appearance. Since he speaks French perfectly, both as regards accent and fluency, I would at first have taken him for a French Swiss and was astonished to learn that he was an Italian. However, when he came to speak of the reproaches levelled against the Tessiners, when in contrast to these reproaches he described the actions of the Swiss troops, who behaved almost as if they were in enemy country, when he began to get heated, he revealed if not passion, at any rate that lively, thoroughly Italian eloquence which resorts at times to antiquated forms and at others to a certain modern, sometimes exaggerated, magniloquence. To his credit I

---

<sup>a</sup> The newspaper here has an editorial note: "To be continued."—*Ed.*

must say that in this last respect he knew how to keep within bounds, and these passages in his speech had a very good effect. On the whole, however, his speech was too long and too emotional. The German Swiss possess Horace's *aes triplex*,<sup>a</sup> and all the fine phrases, all the noble sentiments of the good Pioda made no impression on their breasts, which are as hard as they are broad.

The next to speak was Herr Doctor Alfred Escher from Zurich. *A la bonne heure*<sup>b</sup>—he is a man *comme il en faut pour la Suisse*.<sup>c</sup> Herr Doctor Escher, federal representative in Tessin, Vice-President of the National Council, the son—if I am not mistaken—of the well-known machine-builder and engineer Escher who canalised the Linth and founded a huge engineering works near Zurich. Herr Doctor Escher is not so much a Zurichier as a “Swiss Athenian”. His frock-coat and waistcoat have been made by the best *marchand tailleur*<sup>d</sup> in Zurich; one sees the praiseworthy and partly successful effort to meet the demands of the Paris fashion magazine; but one sees also the influence of the town's original sin, which compelled the cutter to go back to the age-old, customary, petty-bourgeois lines. Like the frock-coat, so the man. The fair hair is very carefully cut, but in a horribly bourgeois manner, as also the beard—for our Swiss Alcibiades wears a beard, of course, a caprice of the Zurichier from a “good family” that strongly reminds one of the first Alcibiades. When Herr Doctor Escher takes the presidential chair to replace Steiger for a short time, he carries out this manoeuvre with a mixture of dignity and elegant nonchalance of which M. Marrast could be envious. One sees clearly that he is taking advantage of those few moments in the soft upholstery of the arm-chair to rest his back, weary from sitting on a hard bench. In a word, Herr Escher is as elegant as it is only possible to be in the Swiss Athens; moreover, he is wealthy, handsome, strongly built, and not more than 33 years old. The ladies of Berne need to beware of this dangerous Alcibiades of Zurich.

Herr Escher, in addition, speaks very fluently and in such good German as is only possible for a Swiss Athenian: an Attic idiom with a Doric accent, but without grammatical mistakes, and not every member of the National Council from German Switzerland is capable of that; like all the Swiss he speaks with the most terrifying solemnity. If Herr Escher were 70 years of age he could not have

---

<sup>a</sup> “*Illi robur et aes triplex circa pectus erat*”. (Horace, *Carminum*, Ode 3.)—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Excellent.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Such as Switzerland needs — *Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Merchant tailor.—*Ed.*

adopted a more solemn tone than he did the day before yesterday—yet he is one of the youngest members of the assembly. Moreover, he has another quality not typical of the Swiss. The point is that every German Swiss has only a single gesture for all his speeches, in all circumstances and throughout his life. Herr Doctor Kern, for instance, stretches out his right arm to the side at right angles with his body; the various officers have exactly the same gesture, the only difference being that they hold the arm straight out in front of them instead of to the side; Herr Tanner from Aarau makes a bow after every third word; Herr Furrer bows first to the front, then in a half-turn to the right and then to the left; in short, if all the German-speaking members of the National Council were assembled, a fairly complete signalling code would result. Herr Escher's gesture consists in stretching out his arm in front of him and making a movement with it exactly like that of a pump-handle.

As for the content of Herr Doctor Escher's speech, there is no need for me to repeat his list of the complaints of the federal representatives, since almost all these complaints have reached most of the German newspapers through the *Neue Zürcher-Zeitung*. There was absolutely nothing new in the speech.

Zurich solemnity was succeeded by Italian passion: after Herr Dr. Escher came Colonel Luvini. Luvini is an excellent soldier, to whom the Tessin canton owes its whole military organisation; as the military leader he led the 1840 revolution. In August 1841, when the overthrown oligarchs and priests launched an attack from Piedmont and tried to make a counter-revolution, Luvini by his swift and energetic action suppressed the attempt in a single day. During the war against the Sonderbund he was the only one to be taken prisoner solely because the Bündeners left him in the lurch. Luvini very quickly leapt from his seat to defend his fellow countrymen against Escher. The fact that Herr Escher's reproaches were couched in the stilted but outwardly calm language of a schoolteacher did not make them any the less bitter; on the contrary, everyone knows that doctrinaire wisdom is in itself sufficiently intolerable and wounding.

Luvini replied with all the passion of an old soldier and Tessiner, who is Swiss by accident but Italian by nature.

"Are not the people of Tessin here being strongly reproached because of their sympathy with Italian freedom? Yes, it is true that the Tessiners sympathise with Italy, and I am proud of the fact, and I shall not cease to pray to God every morning and evening for the liberation of this country from its oppressors. Yes, despite Herr Escher, the Tessiners are a calm and peaceful people, but if daily and hourly they have to watch the Swiss soldiers fraternise with the Austrians, with the police detachments

of a man whose name I can never pronounce without a bitterness that comes from the depths of my soul, with Radetzky's hirelings—how can they fail to be embittered, they before whose very eyes, as it were, the Croats commit the most shocking atrocities? Yes, the Tessiners are a calm and peaceful people, but when they are sent Swiss soldiers who take sides with the Austrians, and in some places behave like the Croats, then, of course, they cannot be calm and peaceful!" (There follows an enumeration of facts about the behaviour of the Swiss troops in Tessin.) "It is already hard and sad enough to be oppressed and enslaved by foreigners, yet this is tolerated in the hope that the day will come when the foreigners will be driven out; but when my own brothers and members of the Confederation enslave me, when they, as it were, put a rope round my neck, then truly...."

The President's bell interrupted the speaker. Luvini was called to order. He said a few more words and ended his speech rather abruptly and irritably.

The fiery Luvini was followed by Colonel Michel from Graubünden. The Bündeners, with the exception of the Italian-speaking inhabitants of Misox, have always been bad neighbours to the Tessiners, and Herr Michel remained true to the traditions of his homeland. Speaking in the highly solemn tone of a man of worth, he tried to cast suspicion on the statements of the Tessiners, launched into a series of uncalled-for denunciations and slanders against the Tessin people, and was even tactless and ignoble enough to reproach the Tessiners because they (rightly) laid the blame for their defeat at Airolo on Michel's fellow countrymen, on the Bündeners. He concluded his speech by kindly proposing that part of the frontier occupation costs should be imposed on the Tessin Government.

On a motion by Steiger, the debate was then adjourned.

The following morning the first to speak was Herr Colonel Berg from Zurich. I shall not describe his appearance for, as I have pointed out, the German-Swiss officers all look alike. Herr Berg is the commander of the Zurich battalion stationed in Tessin, the insolent behaviour of which was described by Luvini with numerous examples. Herr Berg, of course, had to defend his battalion, but as he soon came to the end of the factual assertions put forward for this purpose, he launched into a series of the most unrestrained personal attacks on Luvini.

"Luvini," he said, "ought to be ashamed to talk about the discipline of the troops and moreover to cast suspicion on the discipline of one of the finest and most orderly battalions. For if what happened to Herr Luvini had happened to me I would long ago have resigned. What happened to Herr Luvini was that in the war against the Sonderbund he was defeated in spite of his army being numerically superior, and on being given the order to advance, replied that it was impossible, as his troops were demoralised etc. Incidentally, I should like to have a word with Herr Luvini on this matter, not here but somewhere else; I like to look my opponent in the eye."

All these and numerous other provocative statements and insults were uttered by Herr Berg in a tone that was in part dignified, in part blustering. He obviously wanted to imitate Luvini's *fougueuse*<sup>a</sup> rhetoric, but his effort was a complete fiasco.

As the story of Airolo has already cropped up twice in my report and has now come up again, I shall briefly recall the main circumstances. Dufour's plan in the war against the Sonderbund was as follows: while the main army attacked Freiburg and Lucerne, the Tessiners were to advance over the St. Gotthard, and the Bündeners over the Oberalp into the Urserental, liberate and arm the liberal-minded population there, and by this diversion cut off Wallis from the *Ur-cantons*<sup>142</sup> and compel the main Lucerne army of the Sonderbund to divide into two. The plan failed, firstly because the men of Uri and Wallis had already occupied the St. Gotthard before hostilities began and secondly because of the half-heartedness of the Bündeners. The latter totally failed to mobilise the Catholic militia, and even the troops that were mobilised let themselves be dissuaded from further advance by the Catholic population at a meeting in the Disentis High Court. Hence Tessin was quite alone, and bearing in mind that the military organisation of this canton was still very immature and that the entire Tessin army numbered only about 3,000, the weakness of Tessin compared with the Sonderbund is easily grasped. Meanwhile the men of Uri, Wallis and Unterwalden had been reinforced by more than 2,000 men with artillery and on November 17, 1847, they descended the St. Gotthard with their entire force and broke into Tessin. The Tessin troops were deployed in echelons up the Leventinatal from Bellinzona to Airolo; their reserves were in Lugano. The Sonderbund troops, concealed by a dense mist, occupied all the heights around Airolo, and when the mist dispersed Luvini saw that his position was lost before a shot had been fired. Nevertheless he assumed the defensive and after a battle lasting many hours, in which the Tessiners fought with the greatest courage, his troops were thrown back by the numerically stronger enemy. At first the retreat was covered by some army units, but the Tessin recruits, attacked on the flanks from the heights and fired on by artillery, were soon in total disorder and could only be brought to a halt at eight hours' distance from Airolo, behind the Moesa. Anyone who knows the St. Gotthard road will understand the huge advantages of an army coming down from above, especially if it has artillery, and the impossibility for an army retreating down the mountain to make a stand anywhere and deploy its forces in the

---

<sup>a</sup> Fiery.—Ed.

narrow valley. Moreover the Tessiners who were actually involved in the battle by no means outnumbered the Sonderbund troops, on the contrary. For this defeat, therefore, which incidentally had no further consequences, it was not Luvini who was to blame but, firstly, his numerically weak and untrained troops, secondly, the unfavourable terrain, thirdly and mainly, the absence of the Bündeners, who allowed themselves to quaff Veltlin wine in Disentis instead of being on the Oberalp, and who at last came to the help of the Tessiners over the St. Bernard, *post festum*, with two battalions. And this victory of the Sonderbund, at the only place where it was superior in numbers, is used to reproach the Tessiners by those who shamefully left them in the lurch or who won cheap laurels at Freiburg and Lucerne, fighting three against one!

As you know, these attacks by Berg against Luvini resulted in a duel in which the Welch man severely disabled the Zuricher.<sup>a</sup>

But let us return to the debate. Herr Dr. Kern from Thurgau rose to support the proposals of the majority. Herr Kern is a typical Swiss, tall, broad-shouldered, with not unpleasant clear-cut features and somewhat theatrical hair, such as perhaps an honest Swiss would imagine Olympian Jupiter; he is dressed somewhat like a man of learning, his look, tone of voice and bearing indicate unshakeable determination. Herr Kern is considered one of the most accomplished and shrewdest lawyers in Switzerland. "With his characteristic logic" and highly declamatory manner of speaking, the President of the Federal Court began to expound on the Tessin question, but soon I was so bored that I preferred to go to the Café italien and drink a glass of Wallis wine.

When I returned, Kern had already been followed by Almeras from Geneva, Homberger, Blanchenay from Waadt and Castoldi from Geneva—more or less important local figures whose fame in the Confederation is only just beginning. Eytel from Waadt was speaking.

In Switzerland, where people are proportionately as large as ordinary cattle, Herr Eytel may be considered delicately built, although in France he would pass for a *jeune homme fort robuste*.<sup>b</sup> He has a handsome, delicate face, fair moustache and fair curly hair, and like the Waadt people in general he reminds one of a Frenchman more than do the other inhabitants of Welch Switzerland. It goes without saying that he is one of the main supporters of the ultra-radical, red-republican trend among the Waadt people.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 114, 115.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Quite robust young man.—*Ed.*

Moreover, he is still young and certainly not older than Escher. Herr Eytel spoke with great vehemence against the federal representatives.

"They behaved in Tessin as though Tessin were not a sovereign state, but a province which they had to administer as pro-Consuls; truly, if these gentlemen had acted in that way in a French canton, they would not have been allowed to remain there long! Yet these gentlemen, instead of thanking God that the Tessiners put up so calmly with their lust for domination and their fantastic ideas, even complain of being badly received!"

Herr Eytel speaks very well but is somewhat too long-winded. Like all the French Swiss, he fails to come to the point.

Old Steiger also said a few words from his presidential chair in favour of the majority proposals and then our Alcibiades Escher took the floor for the second time in order to repeat once more the account he had already given. But this time he attempted a rhetorical conclusion in which his schoolboy's exercise was evident three miles away.

"Either we are neutral or we are not neutral, but whatever we are, that we must wholly be, and old Swiss loyalty demands that we should keep our word, even if given to a despot."

From this new and striking idea, Herr Escher's tireless arm pumped out the broad stream of a solemn peroration, and when he had completed it Alcibiades, obviously pleased with himself, sat down again.

Herr Tanner from Aarau, President of the Supreme Court, was the next speaker. He is a lean, puny man of medium height who speaks very loudly about very uninteresting matters. Basically his speech was nothing but the hundredfold repetition of one and the same grammatical mistake.

He was followed by Herr Maurice Barman from French Wallis. To look at him no one would believe that he fought so bravely at Pont de Trient in 1844, when the men of Upper Wallis led by the Kalbermattens, Riedmattens and other Mattens<sup>a</sup> attempted a counter-revolution in the canton.<sup>143</sup> Herr Barman's outward appearance is that of a tranquil bourgeois but is by no means unpleasant; he speaks thoughtfully and rather disjointedly. He repulsed Berg's personal attacks on Luvini and supported Pioda.

Herr Battaglini from Tessin, who looks rather bourgeois and could remind a malicious observer of Dr. Bartholo in *Figaro*, read out a rather long discourse in French about neutrality in favour of

<sup>a</sup> *Matten* also means "meadows".— *Ed*

his canton, a statement which contained perfectly correct principles but was listened to with only very superficial attention.

Suddenly the conversations and moving about in the assembly ceased. There was complete silence and all eyes turned to a beardless, bald old man with a big aquiline nose, who began to speak in French. This little old man, who in his simple black suit and with his completely civilian appearance was more like a professor than anything else, and who struck one only by his expressive face and lively, penetrating glance, was General *Dufour*, that same Dufour whose far-sighted strategy crushed the Sonderbund almost without bloodshed. What a distance separated him from the German-Swiss officers of that assembly! Those Michels, Zieglers, Berge etc., those narrow-minded fire-eaters, those pedantic martinets, cut a very characteristic figure in comparison with the small unpretentious Dufour. One could see at a glance that it was Dufour who was the brain behind the whole war against the Sonderbund, whereas these Ajaxes full of a sense of their own worth were only the fists he needed for carrying out his decisions. The Diet had truly chosen correctly and found the necessary man.

But when one hears Dufour speak one becomes really astounded. This old officer in the Engineers, who has spent his whole life only organising artillery schools, drawing up regulations and inspecting batteries, who has never taken part in parliamentary proceedings, never spoken in public, spoke with an assurance and with a fluency, elegance, precision and clarity that is admirable and unique in the Swiss National Council. This maiden speech<sup>a</sup> of Dufour's on the Tessin question, as far as its form and content are concerned, would have created the greatest sensation in the French Chamber; in every respect it far surpasses Cavaignac's<sup>b</sup> three-hour speech which made him the leading lawyer in Paris—if one can judge from the text published in the *Moniteur*. As for beauty of language, it is doubly deserving of recognition in someone from Geneva. The national language of Geneva is a Calvinistically reformed French, broad, flat, poor, monotonous and colourless. Dufour, however, did not speak in the language of Geneva, but in real, genuine French. Moreover, the sentiments which he expressed were so noble, so soldierly in the *good* sense of the word, that they made the petty professional jealousies and petty cantonal narrowness of the German-Swiss officers stand out in glaring contrast.

---

<sup>a</sup> The words "maiden speech" are in English in the original.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> This refers to Éléonore Louis Godefroy Cavaignac.—*Ed.*



"I am glad that everyone is talking about neutrality," said Dufour. "But what is neutrality? It consists in our not undertaking or allowing to be undertaken anything by which the state of peace between Switzerland and neighbouring states would be endangered. Nothing less, but also nothing more. We have the right, therefore, to grant asylum to refugees from abroad, it is a right of which we are proud. We regard it as a duty which we owe to misfortune. But on one condition: that the refugee submits to our laws, that he does not undertake anything that could endanger our security at home or abroad. That a patriot driven from his country by tyranny endeavours, from our territory also, to win back the freedom of his homeland, I can understand. I do not reproach him in any way on that account, but then we also have to see what we must do. If, therefore, a refugee takes up his pen or his musket to oppose the neighbouring Government—all right, we shall not deport him for it, that would be unjust, but we shall remove him from the frontier, intern him. That is demanded by our own security and by our regard for neighbouring states; nothing less but also nothing more. If, on the other hand, we take steps not only against the insurgent volunteer who has penetrated into foreign territory, but also against the brother or the father of that volunteer, against one who has remained in peace, then we are doing more than we are obliged to do, then we are no longer neutral, we take the side of a foreign government, the side of despotism against its victims." (General applause.) "And precisely now when Radetzky, a man for whom certainly no one in this assembly has any sympathy, is already demanding from us this unjust removal of *all* refugees from the frontier zone, when he is backing up his demand by threats, indeed, by hostile measures, precisely now it is least of all fitting for us to accede to the unjust demand of a more powerful opponent, because it would look as if we were bowing to superior force, as if we had taken this decision because a stronger opponent demanded it." (Bravo!)

I regret that I cannot give more of this speech and more word-for-word extracts from it. But there are no stenographers here, and I have to write from memory. Suffice it to say that Dufour astonished the entire assembly both by his oratorical skill and by the unpretentiousness of his speech as well as by the weighty arguments he put forward, and that after declaring he would vote for Pioda's proposal, he returned to his seat amid general applause. I have never on any other occasion heard applause during debates in the National Council. Dufour's speech decided the matter; after it there was nothing more to be said, and Pioda's proposal was carried.

However, this did not suit the knights of the small cantons whose consciences had been shaken, and to the call for an end to the debate they replied by casting 48 votes for its continuance. Only 42 voted for ending the debate, which therefore continued: Herr Veillon from Waadt proposed that the whole matter be referred to the Federal Council. Herr Pittet from Waadt, a handsome man with French features, spoke in favour of Pioda, fluently but verbosely and in a doctrinaire tone, and it seemed that the discussion was petering out when, finally, Herr Furrer, President of the Confederation, rose to speak.

Herr Furrer is a man in the prime of life, a counterpart of Alcibiades Escher. If the latter represents the Swiss Athens, Herr Furrer represents Zurich. If Escher tends to look like a professor, Furrer tends to look like a factory foreman. Together they are a complete representation of Zurich.

Herr Furrer, of course, is a man who favours the most absolute neutrality and since he saw his system seriously threatened as a result of Dufour's speech, he had to employ the most extreme measures to ensure himself a majority. It is true that Herr Furrer has only been Federal President for three days, but in spite of that he proved that he understands the politics of no-confidence questions despite Duchâtel and Hansemann. He declared that the Federal Council was extremely eager for the decision of the National Council, because this decision would be a decisive turning-point in the entire policy of Switzerland etc. After a little embellishment of this *captatio benevolentiae*,<sup>a</sup> he gradually proceeded to expound his own opinion and that of the majority of the Federal Council, namely, that the policy of neutrality must remain and that the view of the majority of the commission was also the view of the majority of the Federal Council. He said all this with such solemn dignity and in such an insistent tone that there was a hint of the no-confidence question in every word of his speech. One must bear in mind that in Switzerland the executive power is not an independent power alongside the legislative, as in a constitutional monarchy or in the new French Constitution, but only the derivative and instrument of the legislative power. One must bear in mind that it is not at all the custom for the executive power to resign if its wishes are disregarded by a decision of the legislative assembly; on the contrary, it is accustomed to carry out this decision most obediently and wait for better times. And since the executive power likewise consists of an elected council in which there are also various shades of opinion, it is of no great importance if the minority in the executive council has a majority on some questions in the legislative council. And here at least two members of the Federal Council, Druet and Franscini, were for Pioda and against Furrer. Consequently, from the point of view of Swiss customs and views, Furrer's appeal to the assembly was quite unparliamentary. But what does that matter? The weighty voice of the Federal President gave new courage to the knights of the small cantons, and when he returned to his seat, they even attempted a "bravo" which faded away without any response, and demanded an end to the debate.

---

<sup>a</sup> Attempt to win goodwill.—*Ed.*

But old Steiger was fair enough to give the floor first to Herr Pioda—as the reporter for the minority. Pioda spoke with the same calm and decorum as before. He again refuted all the accusations while briefly summing up the debate. He warmly defended his friend Luvini, whose *fougueuse* eloquence had perhaps somewhat carried him away but who, and this should never be forgotten, on a previous occasion had saved his canton for Switzerland. Finally, he touched upon Airolo and expressed his regret that this word had been mentioned here and, moreover, mentioned by the side from which he least of all expected it.

"It is true that we suffered a defeat at Airolo," he said. "But how did it come about? We stood there alone, our little, sparsely populated canton against the whole weight of the Ur-cantons and Wallis, which hurled themselves upon us and crushed us, although we defended ourselves bravely. It is true, we were defeated. But is it seemly for you" (turning to Michel) "to reproach us for it? You, gentlemen, you are to blame for the fact that we were defeated; you should have been on the Oberalp and have struck the Sonderbund forces in the flank, and it was you who were not there and who left us in the lurch, and that was why we were defeated. Yes, you did arrive, gentlemen, but when it was too late, when it was all over—then at last you arrived!"

Colonel Michel leapt up in a fury and with a face red as a lobster and declared that it was a lie and a slander. Called to order by loud murmurs and the President's bell, he continued somewhat more calmly. He said he knew nothing about having been supposed to be on the Oberalp. All he knew was that after getting the order he came to the aid of the Tessiners and in fact was the first to arrive.

Pioda replied as calmly as before: it had not entered his mind to attack Herr Michel personally, he had merely spoken of the Graubündeners in general, and it was a fact at any rate that they should have supported the Tessiners by descending from the Oberalp. If Herr Michel did not know that, it was easily explained by the fact that at the time he commanded only a battalion, and therefore the general plans of the campaign could very well have remained unknown to him.

With this intermezzo, which further led to private discussions of various kinds between these gentlemen outside the assembly hall and was finally settled by mutually satisfactory statements, the debate came to an end. The voting was by roll-call. The Frenchmen and four or five Germans voted with the Tessiners, the mass of the German Swiss voted against them. Tessin was deprived of the right to afford asylum, Radetzky's demands<sup>144</sup> were agreed to, neutrality at any price was proclaimed, and Herr Furrer could feel satisfied with himself and the National Council.

Such is the Swiss National Council, where the flower of the statesmen of Switzerland meet. I find that they are distinguished from other legislators by only one virtue, greater *patience*.

Written by Engels on December 6, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 165 and in the second edition of No. 165, December 10, 1848

Published in English for the first time

THE BOURGEOISIE  
AND THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION<sup>145</sup>

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 165, December 10, 1848]

Cologne, December 9. We have never concealed the fact that ours is not a *legal basis*, but a *revolutionary basis*. Now the Government for its part has abandoned the false pretence of a legal basis. It has taken its stand on a revolutionary basis, for the *counter-revolutionary* basis, too, is *revolutionary*.<sup>146</sup>

§ 6 of the law of April 6, 1848, lays down:

"The right to approve all *laws* as well as to determine the national budget and the *right to grant taxes* must in any case belong to the future representatives of the people."

§ 13 of the law of April 8, 1848, reads:

"The Assembly convened on the basis of this law is called upon to *establish the future Constitution* by agreement with the Crown and during the period of its existence to exercise the prerogatives of the former imperial estates, in particular regarding the granting of taxes."

The Government sends this Agreement Assembly to the devil, most autocratically imposes a *soi-disant*<sup>a</sup> Constitution<sup>147</sup> upon the country and grants itself the taxes which the representatives of the people had refused it.

The Camphausen epic, a sort of pompous *legal Jobsiade*,<sup>148</sup> has been brought to an abrupt end by the Prussian Government. In retaliation the great *Camphausen*, the author of this epic, continues coolly to deliberate in Frankfurt as envoy of this same Prussian Government, and goes on scheming with the Bassermanns in the interests of this same Prussian Government. This Camphausen, who invented the theory of agreement in order to preserve the legal basis, that is in order first of all to cheat the revolution of the respect that is

<sup>a</sup> Self-styled.— *Ed.*





due to it, at the same time invented the mines which were later to blow up the legal basis together with the theory of agreement.

This man introduced the *indirect* elections that produced an assembly to which, at a moment of sudden revolt, the Government could shout: **Trop tard!**<sup>149</sup> He recalled the Prince of Prussia, the head of the counter-revolution, and did not disdain an official lie to turn the Prince's flight into a study trip.<sup>150</sup> He let the old Prussian laws dealing with political crimes and the old courts continue to function. Under his government the old bureaucracy and the old army gained time to recover from their fright and to reconstitute themselves completely. All the leading personalities of the old regime were left untouched in their positions. Under Camphausen the camarilla carried on a war in Posen,<sup>151</sup> while he himself carried on a war in Denmark. The Danish war was intended as an overflow for the superabundant patriotism of the German youth, against whom also after their return the police took the appropriate measures. This war was intended to give some popularity to General Wrangel and his notorious Guards regiments and to rehabilitate the Prussian soldiery in general. This purpose achieved, the sham war had to be ended at any price by a disgraceful armistice, which was once again agreed on at Frankfurt am Main by the same Camphausen with the German National Assembly. The outcome of the Danish war was the appointment of the "*Commander-in-Chief of the two Marches*"<sup>152</sup> and the return to Berlin of the Guards regiments which had been driven out in March.

And the war which the Potsdam camarilla waged in *Posen* under the auspices of Camphausen!

The war in Posen was more than a war against the Prussian revolution. It was the fall of Vienna, the fall of Italy, the defeat of the heroes of June. It was the first decisive victory gained by the Russian Tsar over the European revolution. And all this was done under the auspices of the great *Camphausen*, the thinking friend of history,<sup>3</sup> the knight of the great debate, the champion of agreement.

Under *Camphausen* and with his help the counter-revolution seized all important positions; it prepared an army ready for action while the Agreement Assembly debated. Under *Hansemann-Pinto*,<sup>153</sup> the Minister of action, the old police force was fitted out with new uniforms, and the bourgeoisie waged a war—as bitter as it was petty—against the people. The conclusion from these premises was

<sup>3</sup> An ironical allusion to *Allgemeine Geschichte vom Anfang der historischen Kenntniss bis auf unsere Zeiten*, by Karl von Rotteck, a well-known work at the time. Its subtitle was: *Für denkende Geschichtsfreunde* (For Thinking Friends of History).—Ed.



drawn under *Brandenburg's* rule. The only things needed for this were a moustache and a sword instead of a head.

When Camphausen resigned we exclaimed:

*He has sown reaction as interpreted by the bourgeoisie, he will reap reaction as interpreted by the aristocracy and absolutism.*<sup>a</sup>

We have no doubt that His Excellency, the Prussian envoy *Camphausen*, at this moment considers that he himself is a feudal lord and will have come to a peaceable agreement with this "misunderstanding".

One should not, however, commit the error of ascribing initiatives of world-historic significance to such mediocrities as a *Camphausen* or a *Hansemann*. They were nothing but the mouthpieces of a class. Their language, their actions, were merely the official echo of the class which brought them to the forefront. They were simply the big bourgeoisie placed in the forefront.

The representatives of this class formed the *liberal opposition* in the blissfully deceased *United Diet*, which *Camphausen* resurrected for a moment.

The gentlemen of this liberal opposition have been reproached with having betrayed their principles after the March revolution. This is a fallacy.

The big landowners and capitalists, who were the only ones represented in the *United Diet*, in short the money-bags, became wealthier and more educated. With the development of bourgeois society in Prussia, in other words, with the development of industry, trade and agriculture, the old estate distinctions had, on the one hand, lost their material basis.

The aristocracy itself was largely bourgeoisified. Instead of dealing in loyalty, love and faith, it now dealt primarily in beetroot, liquor and wool. Its tournaments were held mainly on the wool market. On the other hand, the absolutist state, which in the course of development had lost its old social basis, became a restrictive fetter for the new bourgeois society with its changed mode of production and its changed requirements. The bourgeoisie had to claim its share of political power, if only by reason of its material interests. Only the bourgeoisie itself could secure legal fulfilment of its commercial and industrial requirements. It had to wrest the administration of these, its "most sacred interests", from the hands of an antiquated bureaucracy which was both ignorant and arrogant. It had to demand control over the national wealth, of which it considered itself the creator. Having deprived the bureaucracy of the monopoly

---

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 108.—*Ed.*

of so-called education and conscious of the fact that it possessed a far superior knowledge of the real requirements of bourgeois society, the bourgeoisie had also the ambition to secure for itself a political status in keeping with its social status. To attain this aim it had to be able freely to debate its own interests and views and the actions of the Government. It called this "*freedom of the press*". The bourgeoisie had to be able to *enter freely into associations*. It called this "*freedom of association*". As a necessary consequence of *free competition*, it had likewise to demand *religious liberty* and so on. Before March 1848 the Prussian bourgeoisie was well on the way to realising all its aims.

The Prussian state was in financial difficulties. Its borrowing power was exhausted. This was the secret behind the convocation of the United Diet. Although the Government struggled against its fate and ungraciously dissolved the United Diet, lack of money and of credit facilities would inevitably have driven it gradually into the arms of the bourgeoisie. Those who are kings by the grace of God have always bartered their privileges for hard cash, as did the feudal barons. The first great act of this world-historic deal in all the Christian-Germanic states was the emancipation of the serfs; the second great act was the constitutional monarchy. "*L'argent n'a pas de maître*",<sup>a</sup> but the *maîtres* cease to be *maîtres* as soon as they are demonetised.

And so the liberal opposition in the United Diet was nothing else than the opposition of the bourgeoisie to a political form that no longer corresponded to its interests and needs. In order to oppose the Court, the bourgeoisie had to court the people.

It may have really imagined that its opposition was *for* the people.

Obviously, the rights and liberties which the bourgeoisie sought *for itself* could be demanded from the Government only under the slogan: *popular rights* and *popular liberties*.

This opposition, as we have said, was well on the way to its goal when the *February storm* broke.

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 169, December 15, 1848]

Cologne, December 11. When the March deluge—a Biblical deluge in miniature—subsided, it left on the surface of Berlin no prodigies, no revolutionary giants, but traditional creatures, thickset bourgeois figures—the liberals of the United Diet, the representatives of the

<sup>a</sup> "Money has no master."—*Ed.*

conscious Prussian bourgeoisie. The main contingents for the new Ministries were supplied by the *Rhine Province* and *Silesia*, the provinces with the most advanced bourgeoisie. Behind them came a whole train of Rhenish lawyers. To the same extent that the bourgeoisie was pushed into the background by the feudal aristocracy, the *Rhine Province* and *Silesia* were replaced in the Ministries by the old Prussian provinces. The only link of the *Brandenburg Ministry* with the *Rhine Province* now is through a single *Elberfeld Tory*. *Hansemann* and *von der Heydt!* These two names represent for the Prussian bourgeoisie the whole difference between *March* and *December 1848!*

The Prussian bourgeoisie reached the highest positions in the state, not, however, by means of a *peaceful deal with the Crown*, as it had desired, but as the result of a *revolution*. It was supposed to defend, not its own interests, but *those of the people*—for a *popular movement* had prepared the way for the bourgeoisie—against the Crown, in other words, against *itself*. For the bourgeoisie regarded the Crown simply as a cloak provided by the grace of God, a cloak that was to conceal its own profane interests. The inviolability of its own interests and of the political forms corresponding to these interests, when translated into constitutional language, was supposed to read: *inviolability of the Crown*. Hence the enthusiasm of the German bourgeoisie and in particular of the Prussian bourgeoisie for the *constitutional monarchy*. Therefore, although the Prussian bourgeoisie welcomed the February revolution together with its repercussions in Germany because it had placed the helm of state in their hands, it also upset their plans, because their rule was thus bound by conditions which they neither wanted nor were able to fulfil.

The bourgeoisie did not raise a finger; they simply allowed the people to fight for them. Hence the rule that was transferred to them was not the rule of a general who has defeated his adversary, but the rule of a committee of public safety to which the victorious people entrusts the protection of its interests.

*Camphausen* was still clearly aware of this embarrassing situation, and the weakness of his Ministry was entirely due to this feeling and the circumstances that gave rise to it. Even the most shameless actions of his Government are therefore tinted by a sort of shamefaced blush. Open *shamelessness* and *insolence* were *Hansemann's* privilege. The red colouring is all that distinguishes these two painters one from the other.

The *March revolution in Prussia* should not be confused either with the *English* revolution of 1648 or with the *French* one of 1789.

refugees, a centralisation which cannot be harmed and which is therefore in a position to perform its functions. The deputy from Biel<sup>a</sup> himself was of this opinion and spoke against transferring the duties of the Central Association to the Executive of the military association. But all are, of course, free to join the military association; they are only asked not to join it as *associations*, so that the association can never be harmed as such, but only individual persons, if perchance new persecutions should take place.

Having thus replied to each of the points mentioned in your letter, we refer you to the enclosed minutes for the further decisions of the Congress and ask you on behalf of the Congress to join the Union of German Associations founded hereby and to advise us as soon as possible of your having done so.

We appeal to you again: give way in secondary matters as others have given way and will give way in future, so as to save the main object; join the nucleus of the Union which has already been founded by several associations with much sacrifice in money and time, and which can only succeed if we all stand together, forget the past and no longer allow ourselves to be divided by minor differences of opinion!

Greetings and fraternal good wishes.

On behalf of the Congress,  
***The Central Commission***

Berne, about December 25, 1848

Address: Herr N. Berger,  
Käfichgässlein No. 109, Bern

Written by Engels

First published in *Beiträge zur Geschichte  
der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung*, Heft 4.  
1960

Printed according to the manu-  
script

Published in English for the first  
time

---

<sup>a</sup> Julius Standau.—*Ed.*

## REFUTATION

The *literary lumpenproletariat* of Herr Dumont, which accepts with the most touching passive resistance all the kicks bestowed on it by the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, is trying to revenge itself by denouncing the editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* to the police on account of articles which they have *not* written. Thus, according to the *Kölnische Zeitung* of December 25, *Freiligrath* is alleged to be the author of a report from Cologne in the *Deutsche Schnellpost*, published in New York, and *for that reason* is said to have participated in the cat's concert dedicated to the patrons of the *Kölnische Zeitung* on November 3. It seems that the laurels won by "*Maltheser*"<sup>a</sup> prevent the editors of the *Kölnische Zeitung* from sleeping.

Written on December 26, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 179, December 27, 1848

Published in English for the first time

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 191.—*Ed.*

## THE NEW "HOLY ALLIANCE"

*Cologne*, December 30. It is already generally known that some months ago a new "Holy Alliance" was concluded between Prussia, Austria and Russia.<sup>200</sup> The treaty itself will very shortly be brought into the light of day and it will be possible for it to be made public. The soul of this alliance of the rulers "by the grace of God and the knout" is Russia. On the other hand, the whole of Russian policy and diplomacy, with few exceptions, is borne on the shoulders of Germans or German Russians. Indeed, wherever absolutism and counter-revolution are actively at work, Germans are always to be found, but nowhere more so than at the focal point of the permanent counter-revolution, Russian diplomacy. There, in the first place, is Count Nesselrode, a German Jew; then come Baron von Meyendorff, ambassador in Berlin, from Estonia, and his assistant, adjutant of the Tsar, Colonel Count Benkendorff, also from Estonia. Working in Austria is Count Medem, a Courlander, with several assistants, including a Herr von Fonton, all of them Germans. Baron von Brunnow, Russian ambassador in London, also a Courlander, acts as an intermediate and mediating link between—Metternich and Palmerston. Finally, in Frankfurt, Baron von Budberg, a Livonian, acts as Russian chargé d'affaires. These are a few examples. We could cite several dozen more, without mentioning the creatures of the Petersburg Tsar<sup>a</sup> who occupy high and highest posts in Germany and at the same time are in high Russian pay.

The role played by the Austrian Archduchess Sophia, now the Dowager Empress, in the cause of the Holy Alliance and the enemies of the people, is so notorious as to need no description. Sophia

<sup>a</sup> Nicholas I.—Ed.

herself, however, is in turn powerfully influenced by Grand Duchess Helena, wife of Grand Duke Michael and daughter of Prince Paul von Württemberg. Helena serves as the most intimate link between Nicholas and Sophia and the notorious Archduke Ludwig.

Moreover, already some months ago these persons agreed on the plan according to which the Austrian martial-law Emperor<sup>a</sup> will marry the surviving daughter<sup>b</sup> of the Grand-ducal married couple in order that the new "Holy Alliance" will be indissolubly welded together and Russia brought ever closer to its goal, the establishment in Germany of the most complete rule of the knout.

Written on December 30, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 183, December 31, 1848

Published in English for the first time

---

<sup>a</sup> Franz Joseph.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Catherine.—*Ed.*

THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT<sup>201</sup>

*Cologne, December 31.* Never was a revolutionary movement opened with such an edifying overture as the revolutionary movement of 1848. The Pope gave it the blessing of the Church,<sup>202</sup> and Lamartine's aeolian harp vibrated with tender philanthropic tunes to the text of *fraternité*, the brotherhood of members of society and nations.

Welcome all ye myriad creatures!  
Brethren, take the kiss of love!<sup>a</sup>

Driven out of Rome, the Pope is at present staying at Gaeta under the protection of the tigerish idiot Ferdinand; Italy's "*iniciatore*"<sup>203</sup> conspires against Italy with Austria, Italy's traditional mortal enemy, whom in happier days he threatened to excommunicate. The recent French presidential elections have given statistical proof of the unpopularity of Lamartine, the traitor. There has been no event more philanthropic, humane, and weak than the February and March revolutions, nothing more brutal than the inevitable consequences of this *humanity of weakness*. The proofs are Italy, Poland, Germany, and, above all, those who were defeated in June.

But the defeat of the French workers in June was the defeat of the June victors themselves. Ledru-Rollin and the other men of the Mountain were ousted by the party of the *National*, the party of the bourgeois republicans; the party of the *National* was ousted by Thiers-Barrot, the dynastic opposition; these in turn would have had to make way for the legitimists<sup>204</sup> if the cycle of the three restorations had not come to an end, and if Louis Napoleon were something

<sup>a</sup> Schiller. "An die Freude".—Ed.



more than an empty ballot-box by means of which the French peasants announced their entry into the revolutionary social movement, and the French workers their condemnation of all leaders of the preceding periods—Thiers-Barrot, Lamartine and Cavaignac-Marrast. But let us note the fact that the inevitable consequence of the defeat of the revolutionary French working class was the defeat of the republican French bourgeoisie, to which it had just succumbed.

The defeat of the working class in France, the victory of the French bourgeoisie was at the same time the renewed fettering of the nationalities who had responded to the crowing of the Gallic cock with heroic attempts to liberate themselves. Prussian, Austrian and English *Sbirri*<sup>205</sup> once more plundered, ravished and murdered in Poland, Italy and Ireland. The defeat of the working class in France, the victory of the French bourgeoisie was at the same time the defeat of the middle classes in all European countries where the middle classes, united for the moment with the people, had responded to the crowing of the Gallic cock with sanguinary insurrections against feudalism. Naples, Vienna, Berlin! The defeat of the working class in France, the victory of the French bourgeoisie was at the same time a victory of East over West, the defeat of civilisation by barbarism. The suppression of the Rumanians by the Russians and their tools, the Turks, began in Wallachia<sup>205</sup>; Croats, Pandours, Czechs, Serezhans<sup>206</sup> and similar rabble throttled German liberty in Vienna, and the Tsar is now omnipresent in Europe. The overthrow of the bourgeoisie in France, the triumph of the French working class, the emancipation of the working class in general, is therefore the rallying-cry of European liberation.

But *England*, the country that turns whole nations into its proletarians, that takes the whole world within its immense embrace, that has already once defrayed the cost of a European Restoration, the country in which class contradictions have reached their most acute and shameless form—*England* seems to be the rock against which the revolutionary waves break, the country where the new society is stifled even in the womb. England dominates the world market. A revolution of the economic relations in any country of the European continent, in the whole European continent without England, is a storm in a teacup. Industrial and commercial relations within each nation are governed by its intercourse with other nations, and depend on its relations with the world market. But the

---

<sup>a</sup> Policemen.—*Ed.*

world market is dominated by England, and England is dominated by the bourgeoisie.

The liberation of Europe, whether brought about by the struggle of the oppressed nationalities for their independence or by overthrowing feudal absolutism, depends therefore on the successful uprising of the French working class. Every social upheaval in France, however, is bound to be thwarted by the English bourgeoisie, by Great Britain's industrial and commercial domination of the world. Every partial social reform in France or on the European continent as a whole, if designed to be lasting, is merely a pious wish. And only a *world war* can overthrow the old England, as only this can provide the Chartists, the party of the organised English workers, with the conditions for a successful rising against their gigantic oppressors. Only when the Chartists head the English Government will the social revolution pass from the sphere of utopia to that of reality. But any *European war* in which England is involved is a world war, waged in Canada as in Italy, in East Indies as in Prussia, in Africa as on the Danube. A European war will be the first result of a successful workers' revolution in France. England will head the counter-revolutionary armies, just as it did during the Napoleonic period, but through the war itself it will be thrown to the head of the revolutionary movement and it will repay the debt it owes in regard to the revolution of the eighteenth century.

The table of contents for 1849 reads: **Revolutionary rising of the French working class, world war.**

Written by Marx on December 31, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 184, January 1, 1849

## SWISS-ITALIAN AFFAIRS

*Berne*, December 28. The Swiss troops have hardly been withdrawn from the Lombardy border and Radetzky's chicaneries are already beginning again. He has written to the federal representatives in Tessin saying there is a disturbing trade in weapons on the frontier, and the federal representatives have talked the Tessin Government into authorising several house searches in Mendrisio. A few muskets have been found and confiscated. It cannot be foreseen on what grounds this violation of the privacy of the home and seizure of foreign property will be justified. It is only surprising that the Tessin Government has lent itself to such practices.

The Neapolitan recruiting in Lucerne and the *Ur-cantons*<sup>a</sup> appears however to be leading nowhere. It is not as if they had not found a sufficient number of stalwart Alpine lads who would give their skins for ready money and be happy to do Croat services in Ferdinand's army; on the contrary! But the whole business is foundering on the impossibility of getting from Switzerland to Naples.

According to the enlistment agreements,<sup>207</sup> the recruits must be transported via Genoa, and the Turin Government refuses transit. It is now said that the recruits are to be brought to Trieste and embarked there. This news has caused great alarm among the recruits. They do not want to go to Austria. They are afraid of being put among real Croats and led against the Magyars, and they are now petitioning the Lucerne Government Council to insist on the Genoese route. Strange. As if it were not a matter of indifference to these henchmen of the counter-revolution whether they massacre Magyars or Messinese! But of course there is a big difference between Austrian paper money and Neapolitan full-weight gold ducats!

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 183.—*Ed.*

Incidentally, the Lucerne Government seems to imitate the Bernese Government in wanting to suspend the enlistment agreements till the Swiss merchants in Naples and Messina are indemnified.<sup>208</sup> At least, it has inquired of the Federal Council about the arrangements for compensation. So that leaves only the *Ur*-cantons, and these will not suffer any encroachment upon the right of every citizen to sell himself as long as the Federal Constitution allows it, i.e. as long as the present enlistment agreements have still to run. This right of self-sale is one of the finest and oldest privileges of the free *Ur*-Swiss, and if these brave "first-born sons of freedom" tried to defend their "five-hundred-year-old rights" against the new Federal Constitution, it was above all on account of this special right which the new Constitution has annulled. The military enlistment agreements are really a vital matter for the *Ur*-cantons. For five hundred years they have been the drainage channel for the superfluous population, and hence the best guarantee for the existing barbarous state of things. Annul the enlistment agreements, and you will unleash a real revolution in these so-called *clean*, i.e. in fact extremely unclean, democracies.

The younger sons of peasants, now setting off for Naples and Rome, will have to stay at home; they will find no occupation either in their own cantons or in the rest of Switzerland, which is already suffering enough from "over-population"; they will form a new class of peasant proletarians, who by their very existence must bring all the old relations of property, property acquirement and law of these pastoral races, established for a thousand years, into the utmost confusion. Where would these sterile mountain lands get the means to feed the paupers deposited there from all sides on the frontier by expulsion orders? The core of such a class of paupers already exists and threatens in an exceedingly disagreeable way this traditional patriarchalism. And even if—which is not to be expected—in the next few years the European revolution observes the same respect as hitherto towards Swiss neutrality, the article of the new Federal Constitution forbidding enlistments is preparing a revolutionary ferment which will eventually completely uproot the oldest and most firmly entrenched seat of reactionary barbarism in Europe. Like the monarchies, the reactionary republics are going under, dying of pecuniary consumption, of the "pale melancholy of financial need".

Written by Engels on December 28, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the supplement to the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 185, January 3, 1849

Published in English for the first time

A BOURGEOIS DOCUMENT<sup>209</sup>

*Cologne*, January 4. In England, where the rule of the bourgeoisie has reached the greatest development, public charity too, as we know, has assumed the most noble and magnanimous forms. In English workhouses<sup>a</sup>—public institutions in which the surplus labour population is allowed to vegetate at the expense of bourgeois society—charity is cunningly combined with the *revenge* which the bourgeoisie wreaks on the wretches who are compelled to appeal to its charity. Not only do the poor devils receive the most wretched and meagre means of subsistence, hardly sufficient for the propagation of the species, their activity, too, is restricted to revolting, unproductive, meaningless drudgery, such as work at the treadmill, which deadens both mind and body. These unfortunate people have committed the crime of having ceased to be an object of exploitation yielding a profit to the bourgeoisie—as is the case in ordinary life—and having become instead an object of expenditure for those born to derive benefit from them; like so many barrels of liquor which, left unsold in the warehouse, become an object of expenditure to the wine merchant. To bring home to them the full magnitude of their crime, they are deprived of everything that is granted to the lowest criminal—association with their wives and children, recreation, talk—everything. Even this “*cruel charity*” of the English bourgeoisie is due not to sentimental but to thoroughly practical and rational reasons. On the one hand, if all the paupers in Great Britain were suddenly thrown into the street, bourgeois order and commercial activity would suffer to an alarming extent. On the

<sup>a</sup> Here and below this word is given in English in the original.—*Ed.*

other hand, British industry has alternate periods of feverish over-production, when the demand for hands can hardly be satisfied, and the hands are nevertheless to be obtained as cheaply as possible, followed by periods of slack business, when production is far larger than consumption and it is difficult to find useful employment even at half pay for half the labour army. Is there a more ingenious device than the workhouse for maintaining a reserve army in readiness for favourable periods while converting them in these pious institutions during unfavourable commercial periods into machines devoid of will, resistance, claims and requirements?

The Prussian bourgeoisie differs favourably from the English bourgeoisie, since in contrast to British political arrogance reminiscent of pagan Rome it displays Christian humility and meekness in the most servile reverence before throne, altar, army, bureaucracy and feudalism; instead of displaying the commercial energy which conquers whole continents, it engages in domestic retail trade of a Chinese type, and tries to confound the impetuous titanic spirit of inventiveness in industry by clinging staunchly and virtuously to the traditional semi-guild routine. But the Prussian bourgeoisie approaches its British ideal in one respect—in its *shameless maltreatment of the working class*. That, as a body, it in general lags behind the British bourgeoisie, is due simply to the fact that, on the whole, as a *national class*, it has never achieved anything of importance and never will, because of its lack of courage, intelligence and energy. It does not exist on a national scale, it exists only in *provincial, municipal, local, private* forms, and in *these* forms it confronts the working class even more ruthlessly than the English bourgeoisie. Why is it that since the Restoration the peoples longed for Napoleon, whom they had just before chained to a lonely rock in the Mediterranean?<sup>3</sup> Because it is easier to endure the tyranny of a genius than that of an idiot. Thus the English worker can feel a certain national pride in face of the German worker, because the master who enslaves him enslaves the whole world, whereas the master of the German worker, the German bourgeois, is himself *everybody's servant*, and nothing is more galling and humiliating than to be the *servant of a servant*.

We publish here without any alterations the "*Worker's Card*", which proletarians engaged on municipal works have to sign in the good city of Cologne; this historical document shows the cynical attitude of our bourgeoisie towards the working class.

---

<sup>3</sup> An allusion to Elba, the island to which Napoleon I was exiled during the Bourbon restoration in 1814.—Ed.

## WORKER'S CARD

§1. Every worker must *strictly obey* the instructions and orders of *all municipal supervisors*, who have been sworn in as *police officers*. *Disobedience and insubordination will entail immediate dismissal.*

§2. No worker is allowed to move from one section to another or to leave the building-site *without the special permission of the supervisor.*

§3. Workers purloining wheelbarrows, carts or other equipment from another section in order to use them in their work will be dismissed.

§4. Drunkenness, disturbance of the peace, and starting up squabbles, quarrels and fights entail immediate dismissal.—In *appropriate cases* moreover legal proceedings will be taken against the culprits.

§5. A worker arriving *ten minutes late* at his place of work will be given no work on that *particular half day*; if this should occur three times he *may* be dismissed altogether.

§6. If workers are dismissed at their own request or by way of punishment, they will receive their wages at the next regular pay-day in accordance with the work done.

§7. A worker's dismissal is noted in the Worker's Card.—Should the dismissal be by way of punishment, the worker, *according to the circumstances*, is barred from re-employment either at the same place of work or at all municipal works.

§8. The *police* are always to be informed when workers are dismissed by way of punishment and of the reasons for their dismissal.

§9. Should workers have any *complaints* to make *against the building-site supervisor*, these are to be lodged with the *town clerk of works* through an elected delegation of three workers. This officer will examine the cause of the complaint on the spot and *give his decision.*

§10. The working hours are from six thirty in the morning to twelve noon and from one o'clock in the afternoon till evening darkness sets in. (Wonderful style!)

§11. The worker is employed on these conditions.

§12. Payment is made on the building-site on Saturday afternoon.

The sworn building-site supervisor, for the present [...] whose instructions have to be obeyed.

Cologne Signature } or sign }	of the worker	{	Assigned to section of ... and has etc. Signature of the building-site super- visor
-------------------------------------	---------------	---	--

Could the *Russian* edicts of the Autocrat of All the Russias to his subjects be couched in more Asiatic terms?

The municipal, and even "*all municipal supervisors*, who have been sworn in as *police officers*", must be "*strictly obeyed*". "*Disobedience and insubordination will entail immediate dismissal.*" First of all, therefore, *passive obedience*. Then, according to §9, the workers have the right to complain to "*the town clerk of works*". The decisions of this pasha are irrevocable and directed, of course, *against the workers*, if only in the interests of the hierarchy. And once this decision has been taken and the municipal interdict laid upon the workers, woe to them, for they will then be placed under *police surveillance*. The last semblance of their civic freedom disappears,

for, according to §8, "the *police* are always to be informed when workers are dismissed by way of punishment and of the reasons for their dismissal".

But gentlemen, if you dismiss a worker, if you terminate a contract by which he gives *his labour* for *your wages*, what on earth has the *police* to do with this termination of a *civil agreement*? Is the municipal worker a convict? Have you *denounced* him to the *police* because he did not pay due deference to you, his hereditary, most wise and noble-minded masters? Would you not deride the citizen who *denounced* you to the *police* for having broken some delivery contract, or failed to pay a bill when it was due, or drunk too much on New Year's eve? Of course you would! But as regards the worker you are bound by no civil agreement, you lord it over him with the caprice of the *lords by the grace of God!* The police must, on your behalf, keep a record of his conduct.

Under §5, a worker arriving *ten minutes* late is punished with the loss of *half a day's labour*. What a punishment in comparison with the offence! You are *centuries* late, but the worker is not allowed to arrive *ten minutes* after half past six without losing *half a working day*.

Finally, in order that this patriarchal arbitrariness should not be in any way restricted and the worker be entirely dependent on your whim, you have left the mode of punishment, as far as possible, to the discretion of your uniformed servants. Dismissal and denunciation to the police is, according to §4, to be followed in "*appropriate cases*", that is in cases which you will be pleased to regard as appropriate, by "legal proceedings against the culprits". Under §5, the worker who arrives late for the third time, i.e. ten minutes after half past six, "*may*" be dismissed altogether. In case of dismissal by way of punishment, §7 states, "the worker, *according to the circumstances*, is barred from re-employment either at the *same place of work* or at *all municipal works*", and so on and so forth.

What scope for the whims of the annoyed bourgeois is given in this criminal code of our municipal Catos, these great men who grovel before Berlin!

This model law shows *what sort of Charter our bourgeoisie*, if it stood at the helm of state, *would impose on the people*.

Written by Marx on January 4, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 187, January 5, 1849



## A NEW-YEAR GREETING

Cologne, January 8. That priests and precentors, vergers and organ-blowers, barbers and night-watchmen, field guards, grave-diggers etc. send us New-Year greetings, is a custom that is as old as it is ever recurrent, and one which leaves us cold.

The year 1849, however, is not content with the traditional. Its arrival has been marked by something unprecedented, a New-Year greeting from the King of Prussia.<sup>a</sup>

It is a New-Year wish addressed not to the Prussian people, nor "To my dear Berliners", but "To my army".<sup>210</sup>

This royal New-Year message looks on the army "with pride" because it remained loyal

*"when" (in March) "revolt disturbed the peaceful development of liberal institutions towards which I wished cautiously to lead My people".*

Previously people spoke of the March events, of "misunderstandings", and so forth. Now there is no longer need for disguise: the March "misunderstandings" are cast in our face as "*revolt*".

The royal New-Year greeting breathes on us the same spirit as that which emanates from the columns of the "Dame of the Cross".<sup>b</sup> Just as the former speaks of "*revolt*", so the latter speaks of inglorious "March criminals", of the criminal rabble which upset the tranquillity of Court life in Berlin.

If we ask why the March "*revolt*" should be so particularly revolting, we are told in reply: "because it disturbed the peaceful development of liberal (!) institutions etc."

<sup>a</sup> Frederick William IV.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> That is *Kreuz-Zeitung (Neue Preussische Zeitung)*.—Ed.

If you were not peacefully at rest in Friedrichshain,<sup>211</sup> you March rebels, you would now have to be rewarded with "powder and shot" or penal servitude for life. By your wickedness did you not indeed disturb "the peaceful development of liberal institutions"? Does one need to be reminded of that royal Prussian development of "liberal institutions", of the most liberal development in the squandering of money, of the "peaceful" expansion of bigotry and royal Prussian jesuitry, of the peaceful development of police and barrack rule, of spying, deception, hypocrisy, arrogance, and finally the most disgusting brutalisation of the people alongside of the most shameful corruption among the so-called upper classes? There is all the less need for such a reminder because we have only to look around, to stretch out our hands, in order to see that "disturbed development" again in full bloom and to refresh ourselves with a double edition of the above-mentioned "liberal institutions".

"My army," the royal message of greetings goes on to say, "has kept its old glory and won new glory."

Indeed it has! It has won so much glory that at most the Croats could lay claim to greater.

But where and how has it won it? In the first place:

"It adorned its banners with new laurels when Germany required our weapons in Schleswig."

The Prussian Note sent by Major Wildenbruch to the Danish Government<sup>212</sup> is the basis on which the new Prussian glory has been erected. The entire conduct of the war conformed excellently to that Note, which assured the Danish Herr cousin<sup>a</sup> that the Prussian Government was not at all in earnest, it was merely throwing out a bait to the republicans and throwing sand in the eyes of other people in order to gain time. And to gain time is to gain everything. Later agreement would be reached in the jolliest of ways.

Herr Wrangel, about whom public opinion was led astray for rather a long time, Herr Wrangel left Schleswig-Holstein secretly like a thief in the night. He travelled in civilian clothes in order not to be recognised. In Hamburg all the innkeepers declared that they could not give him shelter. They considered their houses, and the windows and doors in them, to be dearer to them than the laurels of the Prussian army, which were despised by the people although embodied in this illustrious gentleman. We should not forget either that the only success in this campaign of useless and senseless

<sup>a</sup> Frederick VII.—Ed.

movements hither and thither, which was wholly reminiscent of the procedure of the old imperial courts of justice (see our issues at the time<sup>a</sup>), was a strategic mistake.

The only surprising thing about this campaign is the inexpressible cheek of the *Danes*, who mischievously hoaxed the Prussian army and completely cut off Prussia from the world market.

To complete the Prussian glory in this connection, one must include also the peace negotiations with Denmark and the Malmö armistice which resulted from them.<sup>213</sup>

If the Roman Emperor,<sup>b</sup> on sniffing a coin in the receipts from the public conveniences, could say: "*Non olet*" (it does not smell), the Prussian laurels won in Schleswig-Holstein, on the other hand, are marked in ineradicable characters: "*Olet!*" (it stinks!).

Secondly, "My army victoriously overcame hardships and dangers when it was necessary to combat insurrection in the Grand Duchy of Posen".

As far as the "victoriously overcome hardships" are concerned, they are as follows: Prussia, firstly, exploited the magnanimous illusion, fostered by smooth words from Berlin, of the Poles, who regarded the "*Pomeranians*" as German comrades-in-arms against *Russia*, and therefore calmly disbanded their army, let the Pomeranians march in, and only reassembled their scattered military cadres when the Prussians most vilely maltreated them when they were defenceless. And as for the Prussian feats of heroism! The heroic deeds of the "glorious" Prussian army were accomplished not *during* the war, but *after* the war. When Mieroslawski was presented to the June victor, Cavaignac's first question was how the Prussians had managed to be defeated at *Miloslaw*. (We can prove this by eyewitnesses.) 3,000 Poles, hardly armed with scythes and pikes, struck twice and twice forced 20,000 Prussians to retreat, although the latter were well organised and liberally equipped with weapons.<sup>214</sup> In its wild flight the Prussian cavalry itself threw the Prussian infantry into confusion. The Polish insurrection kept its hold on *Miloslaw*, after twice driving the counter-revolutionaries out of the city. Still more shameful than the Prussians' defeat at *Miloslaw* was their final *victory at Wreschen*, prepared for by a defeat.<sup>215</sup> If an unarmed but Herculean opponent confronts a coward armed with pistols, the coward flees and fires his pistols from a respectable distance. That is how the Prussians behaved at *Wreschen*. They fled to

<sup>a</sup> A reference to Engels' articles "The War Comedy" and "The Armistice with Denmark" (see present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 42-44 and 266-69).—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> *Vespasian*.—Ed.

In 1648 the bourgeoisie was allied with the modern aristocracy against the monarchy, the feudal aristocracy and the established church.

In 1789 the bourgeoisie was allied with the people against the monarchy, the aristocracy and the established church.

The revolution of 1789 (at least in Europe) had as its prototype only the revolution of 1648; the revolution of 1648 only the revolt of the Netherlands against Spain.<sup>154</sup> Both revolutions were a century in advance of their prototypes not only in time but also in content.

In both revolutions the bourgeoisie was the class that *really* headed the movement. The *proletariat* and the *non-bourgeois strata of the middle class* had either not yet any interests separate from those of the bourgeoisie or they did not yet constitute independent classes or class sub-divisions. Therefore, where they opposed the bourgeoisie, as they did in France in 1793 and 1794, they fought only for the attainment of the aims of the bourgeoisie, even if not *in the manner* of the bourgeoisie. *All French terrorism* was nothing but a *plebeian way* of dealing with the *enemies of the bourgeoisie*, absolutism, feudalism and philistinism.

The revolutions of 1648 and 1789 were not *English* and *French* revolutions, they were revolutions of a *European* type. They did not represent the victory of a *particular* class of society over the *old political order*; they *proclaimed the political order of the new European society*. The bourgeoisie was victorious in these revolutions, but the *victory of the bourgeoisie* was at that time *the victory of a new social order*, the victory of bourgeois ownership over feudal ownership, of nationality over provincialism, of competition over the guild, of the division of land over primogeniture, of the rule of the landowner over the domination of the owner by the land, of enlightenment over superstition, of the family over the family name, of industry over heroic idleness, of bourgeois law over medieval privileges. The revolution of 1648 was the victory<sup>a</sup> of the seventeenth century over the sixteenth century; the revolution of 1789 was the victory of the eighteenth century over the seventeenth. These revolutions reflected the needs of the world at that time rather than the needs of those parts of the world where they occurred, that is England and France.

There has been nothing of all this in the *Prussian March revolution*.

The February revolution actually *abolished* the constitutional monarchy and nominally *abolished* the rule of the bourgeoisie. The Prussian March revolution was intended to *establish* nominally a

---

<sup>a</sup> In the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*: "the revolution".—Ed.

constitutional monarchy and to *establish* actually the rule of the bourgeoisie. Far from being a *European revolution* it was merely a stunted after-effect of a European revolution in a backward country. Instead of being ahead of its century, it was over half a century behind its time. From the very outset it was a *secondary* phenomenon, and it is well known that secondary diseases are harder to cure and at the same time cause more harm than the primary diseases do. It was not a question of establishing a new society, but of resurrecting in Berlin a society that had expired in Paris. The Prussian March revolution was not even a *national, German* revolution; from the outset it was a *provincial Prussian* revolution. All sorts of provincial uprisings—in Vienna, Cassel, Munich etc.—took place alongside it and contested its lead.

Whereas 1648 and 1789 gained boundless self-confidence from being at the apex of creation, it was the ambition of the Berlin revolution of 1848 to constitute an anachronism. Its light was like that of the stars which reaches us, the inhabitants of the Earth, only after the bodies from which it emanated have been extinct for a hundred thousand years. The March revolution in Prussia was, on a small scale—just as it was on a small scale in everything—such a star for Europe. Its light was that of the corpse of a society which had long ago decayed.

The German bourgeoisie developed so sluggishly, timidly and slowly that at the moment when it menacingly confronted feudalism and absolutism, it saw menacingly confronting it the proletariat and all sections of the middle class whose interests and ideas were related to those of the proletariat. The German bourgeoisie found not just one class *behind* it, but all Europe hostilely *facing* it. Unlike the French bourgeoisie of 1789, the Prussian bourgeoisie, when it confronted the monarchy and aristocracy, the representatives of the old society, was not a class speaking for the *whole* of modern society. It had sunk to the level of a kind of *social estate* as clearly distinct from the Crown as it was from the people, with a strong bent to oppose both adversaries and irresolute towards each of them individually because it always saw both of them either in front of it or behind it. From the first it was inclined to betray the people and to compromise with the crowned representative of the old society, for it itself already belonged to the old society; it did not represent the interests of a new society against an old one, but renewed interests within an obsolete society. It stood at the helm of the revolution not because it had the people behind it but because the people drove it before them; it stood at the head not because it represented the initiative of a new social era but only because it represented the

rancour of an old one. A stratum of the old state that had failed to break through and was thrown up on the surface of the new state by the force of an earthquake; without faith in itself, without faith in the people, grumbling at those above, trembling before those below, egoistic towards both sides and aware of its egoism; revolutionary in relation to the conservatives and conservative in relation to the revolutionaries. It did not trust its own slogans, used phrases instead of ideas, it was intimidated by the world storm and exploited it for its own ends; it displayed no energy in any respect, but resorted to plagiarism in every respect, it was vulgar because unoriginal, and original in its vulgarity; haggling over its own desires, without initiative, without faith in itself, without faith in the people, without a world-historic mission, an abominable dotard finding himself condemned to lead and to mislead the first youthful impulses of a virile people so as to make them serve his own senile interests—sans eyes, sans ears, sans teeth, sans everything\*—such was the *Prussian bourgeoisie* which found itself at the helm of the Prussian state after the March revolution.

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 170, December 16, 1848]

Cologne, December 15. The *theory of agreement*, which the bourgeoisie, on attaining governmental power in the shape of the *Camphausen* Ministry, immediately declared the "broadest" basis of the Prussian *contrat social*, was by no means an empty theory; on the contrary, it grew on the tree of "golden" life.

The sovereign by the grace of God was by no means subjected to the sovereignty of the people as a result of the March revolution. The Crown, the absolutist state, was merely compelled to come to an understanding with the bourgeoisie, to *come to an agreement* with its old rival.

The Crown is ready to sacrifice the aristocracy to the bourgeoisie, the bourgeoisie is ready to sacrifice the people to the Crown. Under these circumstances the monarchy becomes bourgeois and the bourgeoisie monarchial.

Only these two powers still exist since the March revolution. They use each other as a sort of lightning-conductor against the revolution. Always, of course, on the "*broadest democratic basis*".

Therein lay the *secret of the theory of agreement*.

The oil and wool merchants<sup>155</sup> who formed the first Ministry after the March revolution took pleasure in their role of protecting the

\* Cf. Shakespeare. *As You Like It*. Act II, Scene 7.—Ed.

exposed Crown with their plebeian wings. They were highly delighted at having gained access to the Court and reluctantly driven by pure magnanimity to abandon their austere Roman pose, i.e. the Roman pose of the United Diet, to use the corpse of their former popularity to fill the chasm that threatened to engulf the throne. Minister *Camphausen* plumed himself on being the *midwife* of the constitutional throne. The worthy man was evidently deeply moved by himself, his own magnanimity. The Crown and its hangers-on reluctantly suffered this humiliating protection and made *bonne mine à mauvais jeu*,<sup>a</sup> hoping for better days to come.

The *bourgeois gentilhomme*<sup>b</sup> was easily taken in by a few honeyed words and curtsies from the partly disintegrated army, the bureaucracy that trembled for its positions and salaries, and the humiliated feudals, whose leader<sup>c</sup> was engaged in a constitutional educational journey.

The Prussian bourgeoisie was *nominally* the ruler and did not for a moment doubt that the powers of the old state had placed themselves unreservedly at its disposal and had become devoted adjuncts of its own omnipotence.

Not only in the Ministry but throughout the monarchy the bourgeoisie was intoxicated with this delusion.

Did not the army, the bureaucracy and even the feudal lords act as willing and obedient accomplices in the only heroic deeds the Prussian bourgeoisie performed after the March revolution, namely, the often sanguinary machinations of the civic militia against the unarmed proletariat? Did not the subdued *Regierungspräsidenten* and penitent divisional generals listen with admiration to the stern patriarchal admonitions which the *local councillors* addressed to the people—the only efforts, the only heroic deeds of which these local councillors, the local representatives of the bourgeoisie (whose obtrusive servile vulgarity the Windischgrätzes, Jellachiches and Weldens afterwards repaid with kicks), were capable after the March revolution? Could the Prussian bourgeoisie have doubted after this that the former ill will of the army, bureaucracy and feudal aristocracy had been transformed into respectful loyalty to the bourgeoisie, the magnanimous victor who had put a curb both upon itself and upon anarchy?

<sup>a</sup> A good face on a bad game.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> An ironical allusion to the German liberal leaders whom Marx compares with Jourdain, hero of Molière's comedy *Le bourgeois gentilhomme*.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The reference is to the Prince of Prussia.—*Ed.*

Clearly the Prussian bourgeoisie now had only one task — to settle itself comfortably in the saddle, get rid of the troublesome anarchists, restore “law and order” and retrieve the profit lost during the March storm. It was now merely a question of reducing to a minimum the *costs* of its rule and of the March revolution which had brought it about. The weapons which, in its struggle against the feudal society and the Crown, the Prussian bourgeoisie had been compelled to demand in the name of the people, such as the right of association and freedom of the press, were they not bound to be broken in the hands of a deluded people who no longer needed to use them to fight *for* the bourgeoisie and who revealed an alarming inclination to use them *against* the bourgeoisie?

The bourgeoisie was convinced that evidently only one obstacle stood in the way of its *agreement* with the Crown, in the way of a deal with the old state, which was resigned to its fate, and that obstacle was the people — *puer robustus sed malitiosus*,<sup>2</sup> as Hobbes says. The *people* and the *revolution*!

The *revolution* was the *legal title of the people*; the vehement claims of the people were based on the revolution. The revolution was the bill of exchange drawn by the people on the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie came to power through the revolution. The day it came to power was also the day this bill became due. The bourgeoisie had to *protest* the bill.

*Revolution* on the lips of the people meant: you, the bourgeois, are the *Comité du salut public*, the Committee of Public Safety, to whom we have entrusted the government not in order that you should *come to an agreement* with the Crown regarding your own interests but in order that you should implement our interests, the interests of the people, *in face of* the Crown.

*Revolution* was the people's protest against the agreement between the bourgeoisie and the Crown. The bourgeoisie that was making an agreement with the Crown *had therefore to protest* against the *revolution*.

And that was done under the great *Camphausen*. The *March revolution* was not recognised. The representative National Assembly at Berlin set itself up as the *representative of the Prussian bourgeoisie*, as the *Agreement Assembly*, by *rejecting* the motion recognising the March revolution.<sup>156</sup>

The Assembly sought to undo what had been done. It vociferously declared to the Prussian people that the people did not come to an agreement with the bourgeoisie in order to make a revolution against

<sup>2</sup> A robust but malicious fellow (Thomas Hobbes, *De cive*, Preface).—Ed.



the Crown, but that it was making a revolution in order that the Crown would come to an agreement with the bourgeoisie against the people! Thus was the *legal title* of the revolutionary people annulled and the *legal basis* secured for the conservative bourgeoisie.

*The legal basis!*

Brüggemann, and through him the *Kölnische Zeitung*, have prated, fabled and moaned so much about the "legal basis", have so often lost and recovered, punctured and mended that "legal basis", tossed it from Berlin to Frankfurt and from Frankfurt to Berlin, narrowed and widened it, turned the simple basis into an inlaid floor and the inlaid floor into a false bottom (which, as we know, is a principal device of performing conjurers), and the false bottom into a bottomless trapdoor, so that in the end the legal basis has rightly turned for our readers into the basis of the *Kölnische Zeitung*; thus, they could confuse the shibboleth of the Prussian bourgeoisie with the private shibboleth of Herr Joseph Dumont, a necessary invention of Prussian world history with the arbitrary hobby-horse of the *Kölnische Zeitung*, and regard the legal basis simply as the basis on which the *Kölnische Zeitung* thrives.

The *legal basis*, namely, the *Prussian legal basis!*

The *legal basis* on which Camphausen, the knight of the great debate, the resurrected phantom of the United Diet and the Agreement Assembly, acted *after* the March revolution—is it the constitutional law of 1815 or the law of 1820 regarding the Provincial Diet, or the edict of 1847, or the electoral and agreement law of April 8, 1848<sup>157</sup>?

*It is none of these.*

"Legal basis" simply meant that the revolution had gained no ground and the old society had not lost its ground; that the March revolution was only an "occurrence" that gave the "impulse" for an "agreement" between the throne and the bourgeoisie, preparations for which had long been made within the old Prussian state, and the need for which the Crown itself had already announced in earlier royal decrees, but had not, prior to March, considered as "*urgent*". In short, the "*legal basis*" meant that *after* the March revolution the bourgeoisie wanted to negotiate with the Crown on the same footing as *before* the March events, as though no revolution had taken place and the United Diet had achieved its goal without a revolution. The "legal basis" meant that the legal title of the people, *revolution*, did not exist in the *contrat social* between the Government and the bourgeoisie. *The bourgeoisie deduced its claims from the old Prussian legislation, in order that the people should not deduce any claims from the new Prussian revolution.*

Naturally, the *ideological cretins* of the bourgeoisie, its journalists, and suchlike, had to pass off this embellishment of the bourgeois interests as the real interests of the bourgeoisie, and persuade themselves and others to believe this. The phrase about the legal basis acquired real substance in the mind of a *Brüggemann*.

The *Camphausen* Government fulfilled its task, the task of being an *intermediate link* and a *transitional stage*. It was the *intermediate link* between the bourgeoisie which had risen on the shoulders of the people and the bourgeoisie which no longer required the shoulders of the people; between the bourgeoisie which apparently represented the people in face of the Crown and the bourgeoisie which really represented the Crown in face of the people; between the bourgeoisie coming away from the revolution and the bourgeoisie which had come out as the core of the revolution.<sup>3</sup>

In keeping with its role, the *Camphausen* Government coyly and bashfully confined itself to *passive resistance* against the revolution.

Although it rejected the revolution in theory, in practice it *resisted* only its claims and *tolerated* only the re-establishment of the old political authorities.

The bourgeoisie in the meantime believed that it had reached the point where *passive resistance* had to turn into *active offensive*. The *Camphausen* Ministry resigned not because it had committed some blunder or other, but simply because it was the *first* Ministry following the March revolution, because it was the *Ministry of the March revolution* and by virtue of its origin it had to conceal that it represented the bourgeoisie under the guise of a dictatorship of the people. Its dubious origin and its ambiguous character still imposed on it certain conventions, restraints and considerations with regard to the sovereign people which were irksome to the bourgeoisie, and which a second Ministry originating directly from the Agreement Assembly would no longer have to reckon with.

Its resignation therefore puzzled the saloon-bar politicians. It was followed by the *Hansemann* Government, the *Government of Action*, as the bourgeoisie intended to proceed from the period when it *passively* betrayed the people to the Crown to the period of *active* subjugation of the people to its own rule exercised in agreement with the Crown. The *Government of Action* was the *second* Government after the March revolution; that was its whole secret.

---

<sup>3</sup> This is evidently a misprint: it should read "the core of the counter-revolution".—*Ed.*

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 183, December 31, 1848]

Cologne, December 29.

"Gentlemen, business is business!"<sup>a</sup>

In these few words Hansemann epitomised the whole liberalism of the United Diet. This man was the required head of a government based on the Agreement Assembly, a government which was to turn *passive resistance* to the people into an *active offensive* on the people, the *Government of Action*.

No Prussian Government contained so many *bourgeois* names! Hansemann, Milde, Märker, Köhlwetter, Gierke! Even *von Auerswald*, the sort of label acceptable at Court, belonged to the liberal aristocracy of the Königsberg opposition which paid homage to the bourgeoisie. *Roth von Schreckenstein* alone represented the old bureaucratic Prussian feudal nobility among this rabble. *Roth von Schreckenstein*! The surviving title of a vanished novel about robbers and knights by the late *Hildebrandt*.<sup>b</sup> But *Roth von Schreckenstein* was merely the feudal setting for the bourgeois jewel. *Roth von Schreckenstein* in a bourgeois government meant this, spelled out in capital letters: the Prussian feudalists, the army and bureaucracy are guided by the newly arisen star, the Prussian bourgeoisie. These powerful figures have placed themselves at its disposal, and the bourgeoisie has set them up in front of its throne, just as bears were placed in front of the rulers of the people on old heraldic emblems. *Roth von Schreckenstein* is merely intended to be the bear of the bourgeois Government.

On *June 26* the Hansemann Government presented itself to the National Assembly. Its effective existence began only in *July*. The *June revolution* was the background of the Government of Action, just as the *February revolution* formed the background of the Government of Mediation.

The bloody victory of the Paris bourgeoisie over the proletarians of Paris was exploited against the people by the Prussian bourgeoisie, just as the bloody victory of the Croats at Vienna was exploited against the bourgeoisie by the Prussian Crown. The suffering of the Prussian bourgeoisie after the Austrian November was *retribution* for the suffering of the Prussian people after the French June. In their short-sighted narrow-mindedness the German philistines mistook

<sup>a</sup> A quotation from Hansemann's speech in the first United Diet on June 8, 1847.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The reference is to Hildebrandt's novel *Kuno von Schreckenstein oder die weissagende Traumgestalt*.—*Ed.*

themselves for the French bourgeoisie. They had overturned no throne, they had not abolished feudal society, still less its last vestiges, they did not have to uphold a society they themselves had created. After June, as after February, they believed, as they had since the beginning of the sixteenth century and during the eighteenth century, that they would be able in their traditional crafty money-making manner to pocket three-quarters of the profit produced by someone else's labour. They had no inkling that behind the French June lurked the Austrian November and behind the Austrian November, the Prussian December. They did not suspect that whereas in France the throne-shattering bourgeoisie was confronted by only one enemy, the proletariat, the Prussian bourgeoisie, grappling with the Crown, possessed only one ally—the people. Not as if these two groups had no hostile and contradictory interests, but because they were still welded together by *the same* interests in face of a third power which oppressed them both equally.

The Hanseemann Government regarded itself as a *government of the June revolution*. In contrast to the "red robbers", the philistines in every Prussian town turned into "respectable republicans", without ceasing to be worthy royalists, and occasionally overlooking the fact that their "reds" wore *white-and-black*<sup>a</sup> cockades.

In his speech from the throne on June 26, Hanseemann gave short shrift to Camphausen's mysteriously nebulous "monarchy on the broadest democratic basis".

"Constitutional monarchy based on the two-chamber system and the joint exercise of legislative power by the two Chambers and the Crown"—that was the dry formula to which he reduced the portentous motto of his enthusiastic predecessor.

"Modification of the most essential relationships that are incompatible with the new constitution, liberation of property from the fetters that hamper its most *advantageous utilisation* in a large part of the monarchy, reorganisation of the administration of justice, reform of fiscal legislation and particularly *annulment of tax exemptions* etc." and above all "*strengthening of the power of the state* which is necessary for safeguarding the *freedom* which has been won" (by the citizens) "against reaction" (i.e. using the freedom in the interests of the feudal aristocracy) "and anarchy" (i.e. using the freedom in the interests of the people) "and for *restoring the shaken trust*"

—such was the Government's programme, the programme of the Prussian bourgeoisie in office, whose classical representative is *Hanseemann*.

In the United Diet Hanseemann was the most bitter and the most cynical adversary of trust, for—"Gentlemen, *business is business!*" Hanseemann in office proclaimed the "*restoration of the shaken trust!*" a

<sup>a</sup> Black and white were the Prussian colours.—Ed.

foremost necessity, for—this time he addressed the *people* as previously he had addressed the *throne*—for

*"Gentlemen, business is business!"*

Previously it was a question of the trust that *gives* money, this time of the trust that *makes* money; then it was a matter of *feudal* trust, the sincere trust in God, King and Fatherland, now it was *bourgeois* trust, trust in trade and commerce, in interest-bearing capital, in the solvency of one's commercial friends, that is, commercial trust; it is not a matter of faith, charity or hope, but of *credit*.

Hansemann's words, "*restoration of the shaken trust*", expressed the fixed idea of the Prussian bourgeoisie.

*Credit* depends on the confidence that the exploitation of wage labour by capital, of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie, of the petty bourgeois by the big bourgeois, will continue in the traditional manner. Hence any political stirring in the proletariat, whatever its nature, even if it takes place under the direct command of the bourgeoisie, shakes this trust, impairs credit. "*Restoration of the shaken trust*" when uttered by Hansemann signifies:

*Suppression of every political stirring in the proletariat* and in all social strata whose interests do not completely coincide with the interests of the class which believes itself to be standing at the helm of state.

Hansemann accordingly placed the "*strengthening of the power of the state*" side by side with the "*restoration of the shaken trust*". But he was mistaken as to the character of this "*power of the state*". He sought to strengthen the state power which served credit and bourgeois trust, but he strengthened the state power which demands trust and if necessary extorts this trust with the help of grape-shot, because it has no credit. He wanted to economise on the costs of bourgeois rule but instead burdened the bourgeoisie with the exorbitant millions which the restoration of Prussian feudal rule cost.

He told the workers very curtly that he had an excellent remedy for them. But before he could produce it the "*shaken trust*" must first of all be restored. To restore this trust the working class had to give up all political activity and interference in matters of state and revert to its former habits. If it followed his advice and trust were restored, this mysterious potent remedy would prove effective, if only because it would no longer be required or applicable, since in this case the malady itself—the subversion of the bourgeois law and order—would have been eliminated. And what need is there of medicine when there is no malady? But if the people obstinately stuck to their purpose, very well, then he would "*strengthen the power of the state*", the police, the army, the courts, the bureaucracy, and

would set his bears on them, for "trust" had become a "money matter", and:

"Gentlemen, business is business!"

Hansemann's programme, even though he may smile at this, was an *honest* programme, a well-intentioned programme.

He wanted to strengthen the power of the state not only against anarchy, that is against the people, he wanted to strengthen it also against reaction, that is against the Crown and feudal interests insofar as they attempted to assert themselves against the purse and the "*most essential*", that is the most modest, political claims of the bourgeoisie.

The very composition of the Government of Action was a protest against this "reaction".

It differed from all previous Prussian Ministries in that its real *Prime Minister* was the *Minister of Finance*. For centuries the Prussian state had carefully concealed the fact that the departments of war, internal and foreign affairs, church and school matters and even the royal household as well as faith, charity and hope depended on profane *financial* matters. The Government of Action placed this tiresome bourgeois truth uppermost by placing Herr Hansemann at its head, a man whose ministerial programme like his opposition programme was summarised in the words:

"Gentlemen, business is business!"

The monarchy in Prussia became a "money matter".

Now let us pass from the programme of the Government of Action to its actions.

It really carried out its threat of "*strengthening the power of the state*" against "*anarchy*", that is against the working class and all sections of the middle class who did not stick to the programme of Herr Hansemann. It can even be said that, apart from increasing the tax on beet-sugar and spirits, this *reaction* against so-called *anarchy*, i.e. against the revolutionary movement, was the only serious action of this Government of Action.

Numerous lawsuits against the press based on Prussian Law or, where it did not exist, on the *Code pénal*, numerous arrests on the same "sufficient grounds" (Auerswald's formula), introduction of a system of constables in Berlin<sup>158</sup> at the rate of one constable per every two houses, police interference with the freedom of association, the use of soldiers against unruly citizens and of the civic militia against unruly proletarians, and the introduction, by way of deterrent, of a state of siege—all these events of Hansemann's

Olympiad are still vividly remembered. There is no need to give details.

This aspect of the efforts of the Government of Action was summarised by *Kühlwetter* in the following words:

"A state that wants to be really free must have a really large police force as its executive arm",

to which Hansemann himself muttered one of his usual remarks:

"This will also greatly help to restore trust and revive the rather slack commercial activity."<sup>2</sup>

The Government of Action accordingly "*strengthened*" the old Prussian police force, the judiciary, the bureaucracy and the army, who, since they receive their *pay* from the bourgeoisie, also *serve* the bourgeoisie, as Hansemann thought. At any rate, they were "*strengthened*".

On the other hand, the mood of the proletariat and bourgeois democrats was expressed by *one* event. Because a few reactionaries maltreated some democrats in Charlottenburg, the people stormed the residence of the Prime Minister in Berlin.<sup>159</sup> This shows how popular the Government of Action had become. The next day Hansemann tabled a law against riotous gatherings and public meetings. This shows how cunningly he intrigued against reaction.

Thus the actual, tangible, popular activity of the Government of Action was of a purely *police* character. In the eyes of the proletariat and the *urban* democrats this Ministry and the Agreement Assembly, whose majority was represented in the Ministry, and the Prussian bourgeoisie, the majority of whom constituted the majority in the Agreement Assembly, represented the *old*, refurbished *police and bureaucratic state*. To this was added resentment against the bourgeoisie, because it governed and in the *civic militia* had become an integral part of the police.

The "achievement of the March events", as the people saw it, was that the liberal gentlemen of the bourgeoisie, too, took *police* duties upon themselves. There was thus a double police force.

Not the actions of the Government of Action, but the drafts of its organic laws show clearly that it "*strengthened*" the "*police*"—the ultimate expression of the old state—and spurred it into action only in the interest of the bourgeoisie.

In the Bills relating to *local government*, *juries*, and the *civic militia*, introduced by the Hansemann Ministry, *property* in one form or

<sup>2</sup> Quotations from the speeches made by *Kühlwetter* and Hansemann in the Prussian National Assembly on August 9, 1848.—*Ed.*

another always forms the demarcation line between the *lawful* and the *unlawful*. All these Bills contain the most servile concessions to royal power, for the bourgeois Ministry believed that royalty had become harmless to it and was its ally; but to compensate for that the ascendancy of capital over labour is all the more ruthlessly emphasised.

The civic militia law approved by the Agreement Assembly was directed against the bourgeoisie itself and had to provide a legal pretext for disarming it. According to the fancy of the bourgeoisie, however, it was to become valid only after the enactment of the local government regulation and the promulgation of the Constitution, that is after the consolidation of the rule of the bourgeoisie. The experience which the Prussian bourgeoisie has gained in connection with the civic militia law may contribute to its enlightenment and show it that for the time being all its actions that are meant to be directed against the people are only directed against itself.

As far as the people are concerned, the Hansemann Ministry is in *practice* epitomised by the old-Prussian police and in *theory* by the offensive *Belgian* differentiation between bourgeois and non-bourgeois.<sup>160</sup>

Now let us pass on to another section of the ministerial programme, to *anarchy against reaction*.

In this respect the Ministry has more pious wishes to show than real deeds.

Among the pious *bourgeois* wishes are the partition and sale of domains to private owners, the abandonment of banking to free competition, the conversion of the *Seehandlung*<sup>161</sup> into a private institution etc.

It was unfortunate for the Government of Action that all its economic attacks against the feudal party took place under the aegis of a *compulsory loan*, and that in general its attempts at reformation were seen by the people merely as financial expedients devised to replenish the treasury of the strengthened "power of the state". Hansemann thus won the hatred of one party without winning the approval of the other. And it has to be admitted that he only ventured to attack feudal privileges in earnest when "*money matters*" closest to the Minister of Finance, when *money matters as understood by the Ministry of Finance*, became pressing. In this narrow sense he told the feudal lords:

"Gentlemen, business is business!"

Thus even his positively bourgeois efforts directed against the feudalists reveal the same police taint as his negative measures



designed to “*revive commercial activity*”. For in the language of political economy the *police* is called *exchequer*. The increase in the beet-sugar and liquor duties which Hansemann passed through the National Assembly roused the indignation of the money-bags, standing with God for King and Fatherland, in Silesia, the Marches, Saxony, East and West Prussia etc. But while this measure angered the industrial landowners in the old Prussian provinces, it caused no less displeasure among the bourgeois distillers in the Rhine Province, who perceived that their conditions of competition compared with those of the old Prussian provinces had been made even more unfavourable. And to crown all, it angered the working class in the old provinces, for whom it only meant, and could only mean, a *rise in the price of a prime necessity*. This measure therefore merely amounted to replenishing the treasury of the “*strengthened power of the state*”. This example suffices, since it is the only action against the feudalists *actually* taken by the Government of Action, the only Bill of this nature which really became law.

Hansemann’s “Bills” abrogating all *exemptions* from graduated and *land taxes*,<sup>162</sup> and his projected income tax caused the landowning votaries of “God, King and Fatherland” to respond as if bitten by a tarantula. They denounced him as a *communist* and even today the Prussian Dame of the Cross<sup>a</sup> crosses herself three times at the mention of Hansemann’s name. That name sounds to it like *Fra Diavolo*.<sup>b</sup> The repeal of all exemptions from the land tax, the only important measure to be introduced by a Prussian Minister during the glorious reign of the Agreement Assembly, failed because of the *narrow-mindedness of the Left concerning principles*. Hansemann himself had justified this narrow-mindedness. Was the Left to provide new financial resources for the Ministry of the “*strengthened power of the state*” before the Constitution had been completed and sworn to?

The bourgeois Ministry *par excellence* was so unlucky that its most radical measure had to be frustrated by the radical members of the Agreement Assembly. It was so barren that its whole crusade against feudalism merely resulted in a *tax increase*, which was equally odious to all classes, and the abortive outcome of its entire financial acumen was a *compulsory loan*: two measures, which ultimately only provided *subsidies for the campaign of the counter-revolution against the bourgeoisie*. But the *feudal lords* were convinced of the “*nefarious*” intentions of

<sup>a</sup> An allusion to the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* also known as the *Kreuz-Zeitung*.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> *Fra Diavolo*—a sobriquet of Michele Pezza, an Italian bandit; the title character of an opera by Auber.—Ed.

the *bourgeois* Ministry. Thus even the financial struggle of the Prussian bourgeoisie against feudalism merely proved that owing to its unpopularity and impotence it was only able to collect *money against itself* and—*Gentlemen, business is business!*

Just as the bourgeois Ministry succeeded in equally offending the urban proletariat, the bourgeois democrats and the feudal lords, so did it manage to alienate and antagonise even the *peasantry* oppressed by feudalism, and in this it was eagerly supported by the *Agreement Assembly*. It should not be forgotten that during half of its existence this Assembly was appropriately represented by the Hansemann Ministry and that the bourgeois martyrs of today were yesterday the train-bearers of Hansemann.

During Hansemann's rule Patow introduced a Bill abolishing feudal obligations (see the criticism of it we published earlier<sup>3</sup>). It was a most wretched botchwork, the product of the helpless bourgeois desire to abolish feudal privileges, those "conditions that are incompatible with the new constitution", and of bourgeois fear of revolutionarily attacking any kind of property whatever. Wretched, timid and narrow-minded egoism blinded the Prussian bourgeoisie to such an extent that it repulsed the *peasantry*, its *essential ally*.

On June 3 deputy Hanow moved

"that all pending proceedings which concern the settlement of landowner-peasant relations and the commutation of services be immediately discontinued at the request of one of the sides until the promulgation of a new law based on just principles".

Not until the *end of September*, that is four months later, under the Pfuël Government, did the Agreement Assembly pass a Bill designed to discontinue pending proceedings between landowners and peasants, after rejecting all liberal amendments and retaining the "reservation about the provisional establishment of current obligations" and the "collection of disputed dues and arrears".<sup>163</sup>

In *August*, if we are not mistaken, the Agreement Assembly declared that *Nenstiel's* motion that "*labour services be abolished immediately*" was *not urgent*.<sup>164</sup> Could the peasants be expected to consider it an urgent matter for them to take up the cudgels for this Agreement Assembly which had thrown them back into conditions inferior to those they had actually won after the March events?

The French bourgeoisie began by emancipating the peasants. Together with the peasants it conquered Europe. The Prussian bourgeoisie was so preoccupied with its *most narrow*, immediate

<sup>3</sup> See present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 117-18, 290-95 and 327-32.—*Ed.*

interests that it foolishly threw away even this ally and turned it into a tool of the feudal counter-revolutionaries.

The official history of the dissolution of the bourgeois Ministry is well known.

Under its aegis, the "power of the state" was "strengthened" to such an extent and the popular energy so weakened that already on July 15 the Dioscuri Kühlwetter and Hansemann were obliged to issue a warning against reactionary machinations of civil servants, and especially *Landräte*, to all *Regierungspräsidenten* in the monarchy; that later an "assembly of the nobility and big landowners for the protection" of their privileges<sup>165</sup> met in Berlin alongside the Agreement Assembly; and that finally, in opposition to the so-called Berlin National Assembly, a "diet of local communities for the protection of the threatened property rights of landowners", a body originating in the Middle Ages, was convoked in Upper Lusatia on September 4.

The energy expended by the Government and the so-called National Assembly against these increasingly menacing counter-revolutionary symptoms found adequate expression in paper admonitions. The bourgeois Ministry reserved bayonets, bullets, prisons and constables exclusively for the people "so as to restore the shaken trust and revive commercial activity".

The incidents at *Schweidnitz*, where the soldiery in fact murdered the bourgeoisie in the person of the civic militia, finally roused the National Assembly from its apathy. On August 9 it braced itself for a heroic deed, that of the Stein-Schultze army order, whose most drastic measure of coercion was an appeal to the *tact* of the Prussian officers.<sup>166</sup> A measure of coercion indeed! Did not royalist honour forbid the officers to follow the dictates of bourgeois honour?

On *September 7*, a month after the Agreement Assembly had passed the Stein-Schultze army order, it once more decided that its decision was a real decision and should be carried out by the Ministers. Hansemann refused to do this and resigned on September 11, after appointing himself a bank director at a yearly salary of 6,000 talers, for—*Gentlemen, business is business!*

Finally, on *September 25*, the Agreement Assembly gratefully agreed to *Pfuel's* thoroughly watered-down formula of acceptance of the Stein-Schultze army order, which by that time Wrangel's parallel army order and the large number of troops concentrated around Berlin had turned into a *bad joke*.

A mere glance at these dates and the history of the Stein-Schultze army order suffices to show that the army order was not the *real*

reason for Hansemann's resignation. Is it likely that Hansemann, who did not shy at recognising the revolution, should have shied at this paper proclamation? Are we to believe that Hansemann, who, whenever the portfolio slipped from his fingers, always picked it up again, has this time, in a fit of virtuous exasperation, left it on the ministerial benches to be hawked about? No, our Hansemann is no fanatic. Hansemann was simply duped, just as in general he was the representative of the duped bourgeoisie. He was allowed to believe that on no account would he be dropped by the Crown. He was made to lose his last semblance of popularity in order that the Crown should at last be able to sacrifice him to the rancour of the country junkers and get rid of this bourgeois tutelage. Moreover, the plan of campaign agreed upon with Russia and Austria required that the Ministry should be headed by a general appointed by the camarilla from outside the Agreement Assembly. The old "power of the state" had been sufficiently "strengthened" under the bourgeois Ministry to venture on this coup.

Pfuehl was a disappointment. The victory of the Croats at Vienna made even a Brandenburg a useful tool.

Under the Brandenburg Ministry the Agreement Assembly was ignominiously dispersed, fooled, derided, humiliated and persecuted, and the *people*, at the decisive moment, remained *indifferent*. The *defeat* of the Assembly was the *defeat of the Prussian bourgeoisie*, of the *constitutionalists*, hence a *victory for the democratic party*, however dear it had to pay for that victory.

And the *imposed* Constitution?

It had once been said that never would a "scrap of paper" be allowed to come between the King and *his* people.<sup>167</sup> Now it is said: there shall be *only a scrap of paper* between the King and *his* people. The *real* Constitution of Prussia is the *state of siege*. The imposed French Constitution had only one article—the 14th, which invalidated it.<sup>168</sup> Every article of the imposed Prussian Constitution is an Article 14.

By means of this Constitution the Crown grants new privileges—that is upon *itself*.

It permits itself to dissolve the Chambers indefinitely. It permits Ministers in the interim to issue any desired law (even those affecting property and so forth). It permits deputies to impeach Ministers for such actions, but at the risk, under the state of siege, of being classed as "internal enemies". Finally, it permits itself, should the stock of the counter-revolution go up in the spring, to replace this nebulous "scrap of paper" by a Christian-Germanic Magna Charta<sup>169</sup> *organically* growing out of the distinctions of the medieval social estates, or

to drop the constitutional game altogether. Even in the latter case the conservative bourgeois would fold their hands and pray:

*"The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord!"<sup>a</sup>*

The history of the Prussian bourgeois class, like that of the German bourgeois class in general between March and December, shows that a purely *bourgeois revolution* and the establishment of *bourgeois rule* in the form of a *constitutional monarchy* is impossible in Germany, and that only a feudal absolutist counter-revolution or a *social republican revolution* is possible.

But that the viable section of the bourgeoisie is bound to awake again from its apathy is guaranteed above all by the *staggering bill* which the counter-revolution will present it with in the spring and, as our Hansemann so sensibly says:

*"Gentlemen, business is business!"*

Written by Marx on December 9, 11, 15  
and 29, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische  
Zeitung* Nos. 165, 169, 170 and 183,  
December 10, 15, 16 and 31, 1848

---

<sup>a</sup> Job 1:21.--Ed.

## A NEW ALLY OF THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION

*Cologne*, December 11. The counter-revolution has acquired a new ally: the Swiss Federal Government.

Already five days ago we learned from a thoroughly trustworthy source that the recent rumours of an intended incursion of the German refugees into Baden, of arming at the frontier, and of a mythical battle near Lörrach between volunteer insurgents and imperial troops—that all these peculiar rumours were “agreed upon” between the ruling party of Furrer-Ochsenbein-Munzinger in the Swiss Federal Council and the German imperial authority in order to give the said party an excuse for taking measures against the refugees and thereby helping to establish a good agreement with the imperial power.<sup>a</sup>

We did not immediately communicate this news to our readers, because we could not unreservedly believe in such an intrigue. We waited for confirmation, and confirmation was not long in coming.

It was already noticeable that these rumours were not published by Baden newspapers which, being on the spot, should be the best and earliest informed, but by Frankfurt newspapers.

It was furthermore noticeable that the *Frankfurter Journal* was already informed from Berne on December 1 that the Federal Council had issued a circular on the question of the refugees and sent a commissioner, whereas the Berne newspapers, several of which (*Verfassungs-Freund* and *Suisse*) are in direct contact with members of the Federal Council, did not publish the news until December 3.

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 116-17 and 141-42.—*Ed.*

Now at last we have the circular to the cantonal authorities before us in the *Suisse*,<sup>a</sup> and if previously we could still doubt the adhesion of Switzerland to the new Holy Alliance,<sup>170</sup> now all doubts have been removed.

The circular begins with *rumours* of new armings of the political refugees and of an intended new incursion into the Baden area. These rumours, which all Switzerland and all Baden know to be false, serve as the *grounds* for the new extraordinary measures against the refugees. The decisions of the Federal Assembly about Tessin are mentioned only to justify the competence of the Federal Council to adopt these measures but not its obligation to do so; on the contrary the essential difference between the situation in Tessin and in the northern cantons is *expressly recognised*.

Then come the following instructions:

1) All refugees who took part in Struve's expedition,<sup>171</sup> or who otherwise offer no personal guarantees of tranquil behaviour, are to be removed from the frontier cantons;

2) all refugees without distinction are to be kept under close supervision;

3) a list of all refugees coming under 1) is to be sent to the Federal Council and to all frontier cantons, and

4) possible exceptions to internment are to be left to the decision of the representative of the Confederation, Dr. Steiger, whose instructions in general are to be followed.

Then follows the demand for the "*strict*" fulfilment of these instructions, since otherwise, if it becomes necessary to call out troops, the costs will have to be borne by the frontier canton concerned.

The whole circular is drafted in harsh language, highly insulting to the refugees, and concludes with the words:

"Switzerland must not become an assembly area for foreign parties which so greatly misconceive their situation on neutral soil and so often trample under foot the interests of the country that hospitably receives them."

Now compare this bitter language with that of the Note of November 4<sup>b</sup>; bear in mind that the rumours on which the circular is based are *notoriously false*; that, as we have been informed from the frontier today, the representative of the Confederation, Dr. Steiger, has *already completed* his inspection in the Aargau canton, against which the imperial authority put forward most complaints, and has

<sup>a</sup> *La Suisse* No. 291, December 6, 1848.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Note of the *Vorort* Berne to the Imperial Government (see this volume, pp. 67-68 and 136).—*Ed.*

found that the refugees concerned were interned long ago and that he has no more to do there (he is already in Liestal); that the Note of November 4 already asserts and the Swiss press (e.g. *Schweizer Bote*, *Basellandschaftliches Volksblatt*, *National-Zeitung* etc.) long ago proved that all the frontier cantons fulfilled their duties long ago; bear in mind, finally, that after long uncertainty, after the most contradictory reports about the closing of the frontier, now for the last two or three days all our Swiss newspapers and letters have been unanimous in saying that *absolutely no* measures of coercion are being applied against Switzerland, and indeed that the order given to certain frontier posts for stricter supervision of the movement of people was revoked already 24 hours later; bear all this in mind and say whether the circumstances do not confirm in the minutest detail the report given by us above.

At any rate, it is well known that Herren Furrer, Ochsenbein, Munzinger etc. have long cherished a burning desire to put an end once for all to the "excesses of the refugees".

We congratulate Herr Schmerling on his new friends. We only wish that, if *he* too were to enter Switzerland as a refugee—which could very well happen before the three years' official duration of the present Federal Council expires—these friends of his will not consider him as one of those refugees who "offer no personal guarantees".

Written on December 11, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 166, December 12, 1848

Published in English for the first time



THE CALUMNIES  
OF THE NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG

Cologne, December 13. The article of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* of July 4,<sup>a</sup> on account of which the responsible publisher, *Korff*, the editor-in-chief, *Marx*, and the editor of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, *Engels*, are to appear before the assizes on the 20th inst., concludes with the following words:

“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.*”

Facts have proved to what extent the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* has **calumniated** the Prussian Government and its henchmen.

Written by Marx on December 13, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 168, December 14, 1848

Published in English for the first time

<sup>a</sup> “Arrests” (see present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 177-79) quoted below.—Ed.

URSULINE CONVENT.—  
 RECRUITING FOR THE GRAPE-SHOT KING.—  
 THE "BURGHERS' COMMUNE".—  
 COMMISSION ON A GENERAL CUSTOMS TARIFF

*Berne*, December 9. The last convent in the Berne canton, that of the Ursulines in Pruntrut in the Jura, is approaching its end. The Government Council [*Regierungsrat*]<sup>a</sup> has decided to propose to the Great Council the dissolution of this convent in fulfilment of the Diet's decision banning from Switzerland all orders affiliated to the Jesuits (to which the Ursulines belong).

After Radetzky had again allowed the Neapolitan-Swiss recruits through Lombardy, King Ferdinand likewise immediately suggested that recruiting should again be allowed in Switzerland. Lucerne and the *Ur*-cantons naturally hastened to permit recruitment; the Berne Government, for whom the enlistment agreements<sup>172</sup> are anyway a thorn in the flesh, luckily found an excuse to continue prohibiting recruitment for the present. It states in particular that according to the enlistment agreement (which is a relic inherited from the revered regime of Herr Neuhaus), the recruits would be obliged to go via Genoa, a route which is still barred to them; and further, the Neapolitan Government would first have to indemnify the Swiss in Naples for the damage by looting etc., done on May 15.<sup>173</sup> The god-fearing *Beobachter*<sup>b</sup> is of course fearfully shocked by this violation of inviolable Swiss loyalty, which moreover prevents a great number of fine young canton citizens from making a glorious career (!), jeopardises the future of the Berne soldiers in Naples, causes recruiting sergeants present in Berne to starve, and reduces the income of the publicans on whose premises the military bounty would be drunk away. These are the kind of arguments with which the reactionary Swiss press wages its war.

<sup>a</sup> i.e. the Government of the canton.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Schweizerischer Beobachter*.—*Ed.*

The local conservative patricians have suffered a hard blow. For there is a so-called burghers' commune within the commune itself. This commune, the core of which is the patriciate, made sure, in spite of all the revolutions, that the former monastery estates and other state and town domains to which it is entitled as the former holder of sovereignty, should not be transferred with sovereignty to the state or the town respectively, but be kept by it in collective ownership. Only a small part of these highly valuable estates, on which the patricians still wax fat today, is to go to the town, but the "burghers" always refused to give it up. Now at last, through the choice of Berne as the federal capital and the consequent heavy city expenses, the burghers' commune has been forced to surrender its share to the town commune, the so-called residents' commune,<sup>174</sup> and moreover to pledge a "substantial" contribution to the costs of the federal capital. The patricians declare Zion to be in danger, and they have good reason, for the federal capital threatens their purses very seriously.

The Federal Council has formed under the presidency of the head of the Trade and Customs Department, Herr Näff, a commission which is to prepare the abolition of canton duty and the creation of a Swiss customs tariff, and propose the necessary measures. Switzerland will also get protective tariffs now, which will not, it is true, be high but will completely achieve their purpose owing to the advanced development of most branches of Swiss industry and to the low wages. England, Paris, Mühlhausen and Lyons will suffer most from these measures.

Written by Engels on December 9, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 168, December 14, 1848

Published in English for the first time

ADDRESS OF THE CENTRAL COMMISSION  
OF THE WORKERS' ASSOCIATIONS OF SWITZERLAND  
TO THE EXECUTIVE OF THE MARCH ASSOCIATION  
IN FRANKFURT AM MAIN<sup>175</sup>

*To the Executive of the March Association  
in Frankfurt am Main*

Citizens,

The German associations of Switzerland held a Congress here in Berne on the 9th, 10th and 11th of this month; they have joined together in a permanent union and appointed the Berne Association as the District Union.<sup>176</sup>

The undersigned Central Commission herewith informs you of the founding of the Union.

It also informs you that the Congress has decided to enter into correspondence with the March Association. A closer union with the latter is excluded by Article I of our common Rules, in which the Swiss associations explicitly declare themselves for a democratic social republic.<sup>177</sup>

The Congress has also instructed us to make known to you its decided disapproval of the measures taken by the German imperial authority against Switzerland. These measures, as unjust as they are ridiculous, not only serve to compromise Germany in the eyes of all Europe; for us German workers in Switzerland they have the particular disadvantage that they jeopardise our position materially and put us German democrats in a false position in relation to our friends, the democrats of Switzerland.

We hope that one of the delegates of the March Association will take the earliest opportunity to inform the so-called National Assembly<sup>2</sup> of this official expression of opinion of the German workers in Switzerland.

---

<sup>2</sup> The German National Assembly in Frankfurt.—*Ed.*

In the meantime we look forward to your communications and letters.

Greetings and fraternal good wishes.

*The Central Commission  
of the German Workers' Associations  
of Switzerland*

Berne, December 1848<sup>a</sup>

Written by Engels in mid-December 1848

Printed according to the manuscript

First published in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung*, Heft 4, 1960

Published in English for the first time

---

<sup>a</sup> The back of the document bears the address: "To Herr Trützschler, deputy at Frankfurt am Main."—*Ed.*

## [DISMISSAL OF DRIGALSKI]

Cologne, December 17. The "citizen and communist" Drigalski,<sup>a</sup> who introduced the censorship, abolished it again, and then threatened to **suspend** the local newspaper,<sup>b</sup> has, we have just heard, been **suspended** himself. A pity, a great pity!

*Postscript.* Misfortune travels fast! Herr Spiegel, *Regierungspräsident*, also bids us farewell. According to reports current all over the town, he has been **dismissed**.

Written by Marx on December 17, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the supplement to the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 172, December 19, 1848

Published in English for the first time

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 75-80.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*.—*Ed.*

## THE TRIAL OF GOTTSCHALK AND HIS COMRADES

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 175, December 22, 1848]

Cologne, December 21. This morning the trial of *Gottschalk, Anneke* and *Esser* began at the extraordinary assizes here.

The accused were escorted like the lowest criminals *in fetters* from the new remand prison to the court building, where a not inconsiderable armed force was present.

Our readers are aware that we regard the jury system as at present organised as anything but a guarantee. The register qualification gives a definite class the privilege of choosing the jury from its midst. The method of compiling the lists of jury members gives the Government the monopoly of selecting from the privileged class those individuals who suit it. For the Herr *Regierungspräsident* draws up a list of a certain number of individuals which he selects from the lists of jury members of the entire administrative area; the *judicial* representatives of the Government prune this list down to 36, if our memory does not deceive us. Finally, at the time of the actual formation of the jury, the Public Prosecutor's office has the right to prune for a third time the last list, the outcome of class privilege and a double governmental distillation, and to reduce it to the final requisite dozen.

It would be a real miracle if such a constitution of the jury did not place accused persons who have openly opposed the privileged class and the existing state authority directly in the absolute power of their most ruthless enemies.

But the *conscience* of the jurymen, we shall be told in reply, their *conscience*; could one demand a greater guarantee than that? But,

*mon Dieu*, a man's conscience depends on his knowledge<sup>a</sup> and his way of life.

The conscience of a republican is different from that of a royalist, that of a property owner is different from that of one who owns no property, that of a thinking person is different from that of one incapable of thought. One who has no vocation for being a jurymen other than that of the register qualification has the conscience of the register qualification.

The "conscience" of the privileged is precisely a privileged conscience.

Although, therefore, the jury as at present constituted appears to us to be an institution for asserting the privileges of a few and by no means an institution for safeguarding the rights of all; although, in the present case especially, the Public Prosecutor's office has made the most extensive use of its powers in order to eradicate from the last list the last dozen names displeasing to it—nevertheless we have not a moment's doubt of the *acquittal* of the accused. Our guarantee is the *bill of indictment*. Reading it, one could believe it an ironically phrased defence document of Gottschalk and his comrades.

Let us summarise this *indictment*, the only analogy to which is the indictment against Mellinet and Co. (the Risquons-Tout trial in Antwerp<sup>178</sup>).

In Cologne there is a Workers' Association.<sup>179</sup> Gottschalk was president of it, and Anneke and Esser members of its Executive Committee. The Workers' Association, the indictment informs us,

"had a special organ, the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, edited by Gottschalk, and anyone who did not have the opportunity of attending in person the meetings of the Association could learn from this newspaper the dangerous *tendencies* of the Association to flatter the proletariat and work for communism and the overthrow of the existing order".<sup>b</sup>

Therefore, one could acquaint oneself with *tendencies* but not with *illegal acts*. *The proof is*: Until the arrest of Gottschalk and the others, the prosecuting magistrates did not bring forward any charge against the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, and *after* Gottschalk's arrest it was only once condemned—in the monster trial instituted by the prosecuting magistrates here, on the charge of insulting these magistrates.<sup>180</sup>

"But the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* itself," the indictment admits, "does not seem to have taken the trouble to conceal anything in its reports on the subject" (the proceedings of

<sup>a</sup> In the original there is a pun on the words *Gewissen* (conscience) and *Wissen* (knowledge).—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> Here and below the indictment is quoted from M. F. Anneke's book *Der Politische Tendenz-Prozess gegen Gottschalk, Anneke und Esser*, which is named later in this article.—Ed.



the Workers' Association, of the meetings of its Executive Committee and of its branches).

If, therefore, the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* could not be prosecuted on account of its "reports" of the proceedings of the Workers' Association, then this Association itself could not be prosecuted on account of its proceedings.

The only accusation levelled against the Workers' Association is the same as that against the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, viz the *objectionable tendency of this Association*. Do the March achievements include also *trials based on tendency*, trials against tendencies that have remained mere tendencies? Up to now our *September Laws*<sup>181</sup> have not yet been promulgated. Gottschalk and his comrades were by no means arrested and accused because of illegal reports of the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* or illegal proceedings of the Workers' Association. The indictment makes no secret of this. It was not the previous activity of the Workers' Association that set the wheels of justice in motion, but—listen to this:

"From June 14 to 17 of this year a Congress was held in Frankfurt of delegates from a multitude of democratic associations that have arisen in Germany. Gottschalk and Anneke were delegates representing the Cologne Workers' Association. As is known, this Congress expressed itself *openly in favour of a democratic republic*, and the authorities here *expected a repercussion of the movement there*, when on Sunday, June 25, once more a general meeting of the Workers' Association was announced to be held in the Gürzenich Hall."

*The authorities here expected a repercussion of the Frankfurt movement.* But what movement had taken place in Frankfurt? The *Democratic Congress* had expressed itself *openly in favour of the objectionable tendency of a democratic republic*. A "*repercussion*", therefore, of this "*tendency*" was expected and it was intended to engage in a struggle against this *echo*.

As is known, the *Democratic Congress* in Frankfurt and the *Central Committee* in Berlin, appointed to carry out its decisions, held their sessions without any opposition from the authorities.<sup>182</sup>

The German governments therefore, in spite of the *objectionable tendency*, had to recognise the lawfulness of the Frankfurt Congress and of the organisation of the democratic party decided upon by the Congress.

But the Cologne authorities "*expected nevertheless*" a *repercussion* of the Frankfurt movement. They expected to have an opportunity of catching Gottschalk and his comrades on illegal ground. In order to create this opportunity, on June 25 the police authorities sent "police inspectors *Lutter* and *Hünnemann*" to attend the general

meeting of the Workers' Association in the Gürzenich Hall and "specially instructed them to observe what took place there". At the same general meeting there happened to be present "the book-binder Johann *Maltheser*", who, as the indictment states regretfully, "*would be a chief witness, if he were not in the pay of the police authorities*", that is to say, in other words, if he were not a *paid police spy*. Finally, there was present there, probably out of pure patriotic fanaticism, the "*candidate assessor von Groot*", who gives Anneke's speech at the general meeting "in more detail than anyone else, *since he wrote it down during the sitting itself*".

It is clear that the Cologne authorities *were expecting a crime to be committed* on June 25 by *Gottschalk* and his comrades. All arrangements were made by the police to confirm the occurrence of this possible crime. And once the authorities "*expect*", they do not want to *expect* in vain.

"The reports" of the police inspectors and other minor assistants officially sent to confirm an *expected* crime

"gave occasion for the state authorities on July 2 to demand a judicial investigation against *Gottschalk* and *Anneke* on account of their inflammatory speeches delivered" (it should say *expected*) "at that public meeting. Their arrest and the seizure of their papers took place on July 3.

"On July 5, after a number of witnesses had been heard and more detailed information had become available, the investigation was extended to the whole previous activity of the leaders of the Workers' Association and thereby to several members of the latter, especially to the cooper *Esser* etc. The results of the investigation of the accused relate in part to their speeches in the Workers' Association, in part to their papers and the printed material spread by them".

The *real result of the investigation—we shall prove it tomorrow from the text of the indictment itself*—is that the movement expected on June 25 was confined to a movement of the authorities—this echo of the Frankfurt movement; that *Gottschalk and his comrades have had to atone for the deceived expectation of the authorities on June 25 by undergoing six months' close confinement during examination. Nothing is more dangerous than to deceive the state authority's expectations of earning a medal for saving the fatherland. No one likes to be disappointed in his expectations, least of all the state authority.*

If the whole way in which the crime of June 25 was staged shows us the state authority as the sole creator of this crime drama, the text of the indictment enables us to admire the astute versatility by which it spun out the prologue over six months.

We quote word for word from *Der Politische Tendenzprozess gegen Gottschalk und Konsorten*, published by M. F. Anneke, Publishing House of the *Neue Kölnische Zeitung*.

"After the investigation had gone on for about five to six weeks, it was declared closed by the Examining Magistrate Leuthaus, who had replaced Herr Geiger, the latter having been promoted to the post of Police Superintendent. Public Prosecutor Hecker, however, after looking through the dossiers, put forward new demands to which the examining magistrate agreed. After about 14 days, the preliminary investigation was closed for the second time. After Herr Hecker had made a fresh study of the dossiers at his leisure, *he once more put forward a number of new demands*. The examining magistrate did not want to accept them, nor did the Council Chamber. Herr Hecker appealed to the board of prosecuting magistrates and this instance laid down that some of the demands should be allowed, but others rejected. Among the latter, for example, was the demand that *on the basis merely of a list of names of persons from all parts of Germany which was found in Anneke's portfolio, all these persons, some 30 or 40 in number, should be subjected to judicial investigation*.

"After the investigation had been successfully spun out so far, and could not reasonably be still further extended, the Council Chamber on September 28 ordered the dossiers to be handed over to the board of prosecuting magistrates. The latter confirmed the indictment on October 10, and on October 28 the Prosecutor-General signed the bill of indictment.

*"It was therefore luckily too late for this trial to come before the regular quarterly assizes, which had begun on October 9.*

"After November 27 an extraordinary session of the assizes was fixed. *It was intended that if possible this session also should be missed*. The dossiers of the preliminary examination were sent to the Ministry of Justice with the request that the trial should be referred to another court of assizes. However, the Ministry of Justice found no sufficient grounds for this and towards the end of November the accused *Gottschalk, Anneke and Esser* were finally referred to the extraordinary assizes here on December 21."

During this long prologue, the *first examining magistrate, Geiger, was promoted to acting Police Superintendent, and Public Prosecutor Hecker to Chief Public Prosecutor*. Since Herr Hecker in this last capacity was moved from *Cologne to Elberfeld shortly before the beginning* of the extraordinary assizes, he will not appear before the jury at the same time as the accused.

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 176, December 23, 1848]

*Cologne, December 22*. On what day did the Gürzenich general meeting, which was convened to confirm an "expected" crime, take place? It was on *June 25*. This was the day of the definitive defeat of the *June insurgents* in Paris. On what day did the state authorities begin proceedings against Gottschalk and his comrades? It was on *July 2*, i.e. at the moment when the Prussian bourgeoisie and the Government allied with it at that time, carried away by their thirst for revenge, believed that the time had come to finish off their political opponents. On *July 3*, Gottschalk and his associates were arrested. On *July 4*, the *present counter-revolutionary* Ministry in the person of *Ladenberg* joined the *Hansemann* Ministry. On the same day, the *Right wing* in the Berlin Agreement Assembly ventured on a *coup*

*d'état* by unceremoniously rejecting in *the same sitting*, after part of the Left wing had dispersed,<sup>188</sup> a decision regarding *Poland* which had been adopted by a majority.

These facts are eloquent. We could prove by the testimony of witnesses that on July 3 a "certain" person declared: "The arrest of Gottschalk and his associates has made a favourable impression on the public." It suffices, however, to point to the issues of the *Kölnische*, the *Deutsche*, and the *Karlsruher Zeitung* of the dates mentioned to convince oneself that during those days it was not the "echo" of the imaginary "*Frankfurt movement*", but rather the "echo" of "*Cavaignac's movement*" which resounded a thousandfold in Germany and, among other places, also in *Cologne*.

Our readers will recall: On June 25 the Cologne authorities "expected" a repercussion of the "*Frankfurt movement*" on the occasion of the general meeting of the Workers' Association in the Gürzenich Hall. They will recall further that the starting point for the judicial investigation against Gottschalk and his comrades was not any actual crime committed by Gottschalk etc. *prior to* June 25, but solely the *expectation* of the authorities that on June 25 at last some palpable crime *would be* committed.

The expectation in regard to June 25 was disappointed and suddenly June 25, 1848, is transformed into the year 1848. The accused are made *responsible for the movement of the year 1848*. Gottschalk, Anneke and Esser are charged with

"having in the course of the year 1848" (note the elasticity of this expression) "made a *conspiracy* in Cologne with the aim of changing and overthrowing the Government concerned and of fomenting a civil war by misleading the citizens into taking up arms against one another, *or at any rate*" (take note!), "*or at any rate* by speeches at public meetings, by printed material and posters, having incited to attempts at assassination and *suchlike aims*".

That is to say, therefore, they are charged with having made a *conspiracy*, "*or at any rate*" with not having "made" **any** conspiracy. But then at any rate "to attempts at assassination and *suchlike aims*". That is to say, to attempts at assassination or something of the sort! How magnificent the juridical style is!

So it is stated in the board of prosecuting magistrates' decision for committal to trial.

In the conclusion of the indictment itself, mention of *conspiracy* is *dropped* and "in accordance with it" Gottschalk, Anneke and Esser are charged with

"having in the course of the year 1848, by speeches at public meetings as well as by printed material, *directly* incited their fellow citizens to alteration of the Constitution by force, to armed rebellion against the royal power and to the arming of one part of the

citizens against another, without, however, these incitements having been successful—a crime envisaged in Article 102, in combination with Articles 87 and 91 of the Penal Code”.

And why did the authorities *in the course of the year 1848* not intervene before July 2?

Incidentally, for the gentlemen to be able to speak of an “*alteration of the Constitution by force*”, they would *in the first place* have had to furnish proof that a *Constitution existed*. The Crown has *proved* the contrary by sending to the devil the Agreement Assembly. If the agreeers had been more powerful than the Crown, they would perhaps have conducted the proof in the *reverse direction*.

As regards the incitement “to *armed* rebellion against the royal power and to the *arming* of one part of the citizens against another”, the indictment tries to prove it:

1. by speeches of the accused in the course of the year 1848;
2. by unprinted;
3. by printed documents.

*Ad. 1.* The *speeches* provide the indictment with the following *corpus delicti*<sup>3</sup>:

At the sitting of May 29, Esser finds that a “*republic*” is the “*remedy for the suffering of the workers*”. An *incitement to armed rebellion against the royal power!* Gottschalk declares that “*the reactionaries will bring about the republic*”. Some workers complain that they do not have enough “to keep body and soul together”. Gottschalk replies to them: “You should learn to *unite*, to distinguish your friends from your disguised enemies, to make yourselves capable of *looking after your own affairs*.”

An obvious *incitement to armed rebellion against the royal power and to the arming of one part of the citizens against another!*

The indictment sums up its proofs in the following words:

“The witnesses who have been examined concerning these earlier meetings, both members and non-members, on the whole speak only in praise of Gottschalk and Anneke, especially the former. He is said to have always warned against excesses, and to have tried to calm rather than incite the masses. In doing so he indeed indicated the republic as the final goal of his efforts, which, however, was to be achieved not by a street riot but only by the majority of the people being won over to the view that there was no salvation except in a republic. As is clearly seen, by thus setting out to undermine gradually the foundations of the existing order, he was understandably often hard put to it to restrain the impatience of the vulgar crowd.”

It is precisely because the accused *calmed* the masses instead of *inciting* them that they showed *clearly* their nefarious tendency

<sup>3</sup> Body of the crime.—Ed.

*gradually to undermine the foundations of the existing order, that is, in a legal way to make a use, objectionable to the authorities, of freedom of the press and the right of association. And that is what the indictment calls: "Incitement to armed rebellion against the royal power and to the arming of one part of the citizens against another" !!!*

Finally comes the general meeting of June 25, which was "expected" by the authorities. In regard to it, the indictment says: "*detailed testimonies are available*". And what results from these detailed testimonies?—That Gottschalk made a report on the Frankfurt events; that the union of the three democratic associations in Cologne was discussed,<sup>184</sup> and that Gottschalk delivered a "concluding speech", which especially attracted the attention of **Maltheser** and the **candidate assessor von Groote**, and ended with the "point": "To go on waiting requires more courage than to strike at random. One must wait until the reaction takes a step which results in pressure for the proclamation of a republic." *Obvious incitement to armed rebellion against the royal power and to the arming of one part of the citizens against another!!!*

As far as *Anneke* is concerned, according to the indictment

*"there is nothing more against him than that, in the debate on the union of the three associations" (the three democratic associations of Cologne), "he spoke very vigorously for this union, addressing the meeting also as republican citizens".*

A speech in favour of the "union" of the three democratic associations of Cologne is obviously "*incitement to the arming of one part of the citizens against another*"!

And the mode of address as "*republican citizens*"! Herren **Maltheser** and **von Groote** might have felt themselves insulted by this mode of address. But does not General *von Drigalski* address himself and the citizens of Düsseldorf as "*communist citizens*"?

Looking at this net product of the "expected" general meeting of June 25, one can understand that the state authority had to take refuge in the *course of the year 1848*, and that is what it did by acquiring information about the movement in this year through the seizure of letters and printed documents; for example, it confiscated three issues of the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* which could be bought for four pfennigs a copy in any street.

From the letters, however, it became convinced of the "*political fanaticism*" prevailing in Germany in the year 1848. A letter of Professor *Karl Henkel* from Marburg to Gottschalk seemed to it particularly "fanatical". To punish him it denounced this letter to the Hesse Government and had the satisfaction that a judicial investigation would be instituted against him.

But the final result derived from the letters and printed documents is that in 1848 fanaticism of all kinds was at work in people's minds and on paper, and in general events took place which resembled as closely as one egg does another "*armed rebellion against the royal power and the arming of one part of the citizens against another*".

Gottschalk and his comrades, however, were busily occupied with all this, whereas the state authority only became aware of the "*repercussion*" of this astonishing movement through confiscating the printed documents and letters of the accused!<sup>185</sup>

Written by Marx on December 21 and 22,  
1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* Nos. 175 and 176, December 22 and 23, 1848

Published in English for the first  
time

THE PRUSSIAN COUNTER-REVOLUTION  
AND THE PRUSSIAN JUDICIARY<sup>186</sup>

*Cologne.* The chief result of the revolutionary movement of 1848 is not what the peoples won, but what they lost—the *loss of their illusions*.

*June, November and December* of 1848 are gigantic milestones on the path to the disenchantment and disintoxication of the minds of the European peoples.

High in the list of the last illusions which keep the German people in chains is its *superstitious faith* in the *judiciary*.

The prosaic north wind of the Prussian counter-revolution has blighted also this flower of the people's imagination, whose true Motherland is Italy—eternal Rome.

The actions and statements of the *Rhenish Court of Appeal*, of the *Supreme Court of Berlin*, and of the *Courts of Appeal of Münster, Bromberg and Ratibor*, against *Esser, Waldeck, Temme, Kirchmann* and *Gierke* prove once again that the *French Convention* is and remains the beacon for all revolutionary epochs. It inaugurated the revolution by means of a decree *dismissing all officials*. Judges, too, are nothing but officials, as the above-mentioned courts have testified before the whole of Europe. Turkish *hadis* and Chinese collegiums of mandarins can countersign without qualms the most recent decrees of those "*high*" courts against their colleagues.

Our readers already know the decrees of the Berlin Supreme Court and of the Ratibor Court of Appeal. Today we are concerned with the *Münster Court of Appeal*.<sup>187</sup>



First of all, however, a few words more about the *Rhenish Court of Appeal*, the *summus pontifex*<sup>a</sup> of Rhenish jurisprudence, which has its seat in Berlin.

As is well known, the Rhenish jurists (with a few honourable exceptions) found nothing more urgent to do in the Prussian Agreement Assembly than to cure the Prussian Government of its old prejudice and old resentment. They proved to that Government in fact that their previous opposition merely signified as much as the opposition of the French parliament before 1789<sup>188</sup>—the obstinate and would-be liberal assertion of *guild interests*. Like the liberal members of the French National Assembly of 1789, so the liberal Rhenish jurists in the Prussian National Assembly of 1848 were the *worthiest of the worthy* in the army of servility. The Rhenish-Prussian prosecuting magistrates outdid the old-Prussian inquisitorial judges in “political fanaticism”. The Rhenish jurists had, of course, to maintain their reputation also *after* the dissolution of the Agreement Assembly. Thought of the laurels of the old-Prussian Supreme Court prevented the Rhenish-Prussian Court of Appeal from sleeping. Its chief presiding judge *Sethe* sent to judge of the Supreme Court of Appeal *Esser* (not to be confused with the “well-meaning” Cologne “Essers”<sup>b</sup>) a letter similar to that of the presiding judge of the Supreme Court *Mühler* to judge of the Secret Supreme Court *Waldeck*<sup>189</sup> But the Rhenish-Prussian court was able to go one better than the old-Prussian court. The presiding judge of the Rhenish Court of Appeal<sup>c</sup> played a trump card against his competitors by committing the treacherous *rudeness* of informing the Berlin public of the letter to Herr Esser in the *Deutsche Reform*,<sup>d</sup> before he had communicated it to Herr Esser himself. We are convinced that the *entire Rhine Province* will reply to Herr Sethe’s letter *by a monster address to our worthy veteran countryman, Herr Esser*.

Not something is rotten in the “state of Denmark”,<sup>e</sup> but *everything*. Now for *Münster*!

Our readers have already heard of the protest of the Court of Appeal in Münster against the reappointment of its director *Temme*.

The matter can be summarised as follows:

The Ministry of the counter-revolution had, directly or indirectly, insinuated to the Secret Supreme Court, the Rhenish Court of

<sup>a</sup> The supreme pontiff.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Esser I and Esser II.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Sethe.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> No. 56, December 21, 1848 (morning edition).—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, Act I, Scene 4.—*Ed.*

Appeal, and the Courts of Appeal in Bromberg, Ratibor and Münster, that the King<sup>a</sup> would view with extreme disfavour the return of Waldeck, Esser, Gierke, Kirchmann and Temme to their high judicial posts, because they had continued to attend the Assembly in Berlin and had participated in the decision to refuse to pay taxes. So would those courts protest against it.

All the high courts (at the outset the Rhenish Court of Appeal vacillated; great artists achieve their successes not by being the first but by being the last to perform) accepted this suggestion and sent protests from and to Berlin. The *Münster Court of Appeal* was stupid enough to address *directly to the King* (the so-called *constitutional King*) a protest against *Temme*, which states word for word

"that by participation in the illegal sittings of a faction of the adjourned National Assembly he had put himself in open rebellion against His Majesty's Government and by taking part in voting in favour of the motion on refusing to pay taxes he had taken the path of revolution and tried to hurl the fire-brand of anarchy into the fatherland",

and which then continues:

"It is contrary to our sense of justice, to the demands of the public for integrity on the part of the director of a provincial collegium of magistrates, and to the responsibilities of the latter concerning the training of young law officers and his position in relation to the junior officials of courts, that after such events the aforesaid *Temme* should retain his official position in the collegium here. Therefore, Your Majesty, we feel compelled by our consciences most humbly to express the urgent desire to see ourselves freed from official relation to director *Temme*."<sup>b</sup>

The address is signed by the whole collegium except for one member, a brother-in-law of *Minister of Justice Rintelen*.

On December 18, this Minister of Justice sent Herr *Temme* in Münster a copy of this address "*for his decision*", after *Temme* had already resumed his post here *without opposition from the cowards*.

During the morning of December 19, as the *Düsseldorfer Zeitung* reports, *Temme* appeared for the first time in a plenary sitting of the provincial Court of Appeal and took his seat as director beside deputy chief presiding judge von *Olfers*. As soon as the sitting began, he asked to speak and in brief said approximately the following:

"He had received a rescript from the Minister of Justice with a copied enclosure. This enclosure contained a petition of the 'high collegium', to which he now had the honour to belong, protesting against his reinstatement in his post. The Minister of Justice had sent him this petition for his information and for him to take a

<sup>a</sup> Frederick William IV.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Quoted from the *Preussischer Staats-Anzeiger* No. 229, December 19, 1848,—*Ed.*

decision accordingly'. The protest of the 'high collegium' was obviously based on his political activity; but of this as in general of his political views, he did not intend to speak here, for he did not have to defend them before the 'high collegium'. Further, as far as his 'decision' was concerned, he had already given effect to it by taking his seat here as director, and he could assure the 'high collegium' that he would not vacate it until judgment and law compelled him to do so. Moreover, he was not of the opinion that the collegial relationship should be upset by the diversity of political views; for his part at least that would be avoided as far as possible."<sup>a</sup>

The worthiest of the worthy were thunderstruck. They sat there dumb, motionless, like stone figures, as if a Medusa's head had been hurled into the collegium of mandarins.

The worthy Court of Appeal in Münster! In its professional zeal it has caused numerous people to be questioned and arrested because they wanted the decision of the National Assembly on the refusal to pay taxes to be carried out. By its statement about Herr Temme, which had even been addressed directly to the throne, the worthy provincial Court of Appeal has formed itself into—a party and pronounced a *prejudiced opinion*, and therefore it is impossible for it any longer to play the role of judge in relation to another party.

It will be recalled that the alleged coercion of the Prussian National Assembly by the Berlin mob was used as the pretext for the first coup d'état of the Brandenburg Ministry.<sup>190</sup> In order not to exercise any coercion against the deputies, the Ministry continued the "wild chase"<sup>191</sup> begun against them in Berlin, even *after* the deputies had returned to their homes!

Minister of Justice Rintelen states in his decree, which we reprint further below:

"The illusion deliberately fostered by many persons, that the hitherto existing criminal laws, particularly those concerned with crimes against the state, are no longer valid since March of this year, has greatly contributed to increase anarchy and has perhaps also had a dangerous influence on individual courts."

Most of the actions of Herr Rintelen and of the courts *under his jurisdiction* provide further proof that since the forcible dissolution of the National Assembly only *one* law continues to be valid in Prussia, *the arbitrary will of the Berlin camarilla*.

On March 29, 1844, the Prussian Government promulgated the notorious disciplinary law against the judges,<sup>b</sup> by which, through a mere decision of the Ministry, they could be deprived of their posts,

<sup>a</sup> Quoted from the report "Münster, vom 20. Dez." published in the *Düsseldorfer Zeitung* No. 336, December 23, 1848.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "Gesetz, betreffend das gerichtliche und Disziplinar-Strafverfahren gegen Beamten."—*Ed.*

moved or pensioned off. The last *United Diet*<sup>192</sup> abolished this law and restored the validity of the fundamental principle that judges could be dismissed, moved or pensioned off only by a lawfully delivered judgment.<sup>3</sup> The imposed Constitution confirms this principle. Are not these laws being trampled under foot by the courts which, in accordance with the prescription of the Minister of Justice, Rintelen, want by *moral compulsion* to drive their politically compromised colleagues into giving up their posts? Are not these courts turning themselves into an officer corps which casts out any member whose political views do not suit its royal Prussian "honour"?

And is there not also a law on the *non-liability* and *inviolability* of the *people's representatives*?

Hot air and empty sound!

If the *Prussian Constitution* had not annulled itself already by its own articles and the manner of its origin, it would be annulled owing to the simple fact that its ultimate guarantor is the *Supreme Court of Berlin*. The Constitution is guaranteed by the *responsibility of the Ministers*, and the *non-liability of the Ministers* is guaranteed by the court that has been granted to them, which is no other than the *Supreme Court in Berlin*, the classical representative of which is Herr *Mühler*.

The most recent rescripts of the Supreme Court, therefore, are neither more nor less than the obvious *cassation of the imposed Constitution*.

In *Austria*, owing to the Government's direct *threats to plunder the bank*,<sup>193</sup> which the Viennese people left *untouched* at the time of its greatest and most justified resentment against financial feudalism, the *bourgeoisie* realises that its betrayal of the proletariat surrendered precisely what this betrayal was intended to safeguard—*bourgeois property*. In *Prussia*, the *bourgeoisie* sees that, owing to its cowardly trust in the Government and its treacherous distrust of the people, the indispensable *guarantee of bourgeois property—bourgeois administration of justice—is threatened*.

With the dependent state of the judiciary, the bourgeois administration of justice itself becomes dependent on the Government; that is to say, bourgeois law itself is replaced by the arbitrary action of officials. *La bourgeoisie sera punie, par où elle a péché*—the bourgeoisie will be punished by that in which it has sinned—by the *Government*. That the servile statements of the highest Prussian courts are only the first symptoms of the approaching absolutist

<sup>3</sup> The reference is to the "Verordnung über einige Grundlagen der künftigen Preussischen Verfassung".—Ed.

transformation of the courts, is borne out by the following recent decree of the Ministry of Justice:

"By the general ordinance of October 8 of this year, my predecessor in office has already called attention to the fact that it is the prime task of the judicial authorities to maintain respect for the law and its effective action, that they can best serve their country by fulfilling this task, because true freedom can flourish only on the basis of law. Since then, unfortunately, in many places there have occurred very serious outbreaks of an anarchist activity which mocks at law and order; in some parts of the country even violent revolts against the authorities have taken place and have not everywhere been energetically countered. In view of such a regrettable state of affairs, I now, after His Majesty's Government has taken a decisive step to save the state, which has been brought to the brink of the abyss, I now address myself anew to the judicial authorities and the Public Prosecutors of the whole country, to request them to do their duty everywhere and without regard for persons. Whoever the guilty person may be, he must not escape the legal punishment that has to be brought to bear in the speediest possible way.

"With especially deep regret I have been compelled to note, both from individual reports of the provincial authorities and from official newspapers, that some judicial officials also, unmindful of their special professional duties, have in part let themselves be carried away into committing obviously illegal actions, and in part have not shown the courage and fearlessness through which alone terrorism could be successfully countered. I expect steps to be taken in regard to them also, with establishment of the facts and if necessary the institution of a judicial investigation, without lenience and with the utmost expedition, for officials responsible for the administration of justice, who are entrusted with preserving the prestige of the laws, have by their own violation of the law been doubly at fault; and it is especially necessary to expedite the proceedings against them because the operation of the law must not be allowed to remain in the hands of such officials. If among those guilty there are officials in respect of whom, on the basis of existing regulations, a formal investigation cannot be made, or on whom suspension from office, which must always be considered as a duty in cases of this kind, cannot be imposed without higher authorisation, then steps must be taken to establish the facts in order to justify the investigation without a special instruction, and after that the requisite permission obtained as speedily as possible. With regard to candidate assessors and junior lawyers attending the courts, it must be borne in mind that there are special rules governing their dismissal from state service.

"The illusion deliberately fostered by many persons: that the hitherto existing criminal laws, particularly those concerned with crimes against the state, are no longer valid since March of this year, has greatly contributed to increase anarchy and has perhaps also had a dangerous influence on individual courts. In view of the excellent state of mind of the Prussian judicial officials, which on the whole they still display, it suffices to point to the well-known juridical principle that laws remain in force until annulled or modified through legislation, as well as to the express provision of Article 108 of the constitutional document of the 5th of this month, in order to be assured that the honourable Prussian judicial officials, in their whole-hearted interest for true moral and political freedom, will put above everything the prestige of law and order.

"Guided by these principles and scorning all personal dangers, we shall go forward confident of victory over crime, over anarchy. Precisely thereby we shall most essentially contribute to ensure that the Prussian state, previously so brilliant, will once again display its moral strength and will no longer tolerate—to use the words of a

brave Frankfurt deputy—that wickedness and gross violence should continue to exist among us.

“The presiding judges of the courts, and also the Prosecutor-General in Cologne, should accordingly instruct the officials of their departments to do what is necessary, and keep me informed in respect of which officials, and for what offences, suspensions are being pronounced and judicial investigations instituted.

Berlin, December 8, 1848

Minister of Justice *Rintelen*”

If one day the revolution in Prussia is victorious, it will not find it necessary, like the February revolution, to abolish the irremovability of the older class of judges by a special decree. It will find this caste has given documentary evidence of the renunciation of its privilege in the authentic declarations of the *Rhenish Court of Appeal*, the *Supreme Court in Berlin*, and the *Courts of Appeal in Bromberg, Ratibor and Münster*.

Written by Marx about December 23,  
1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische  
Zeitung* No. 177, December 24, 1848

Published in English for the first  
time

MEASURES AGAINST GERMAN REFUGEES.—  
 RETURN OF TROOPS FROM TESSIN.—  
 THE PATRICIANS' COMMUNE

Berne, December 24. The new measures of the Federal Council, which are so gratefully recognised by the Empire, do not merely consist of the circular and Steiger's journey of inspection<sup>a</sup>; they consist in particular of the expulsion from Switzerland of three absolutely non-dangerous refugees who published an absolutely blameless, merely informative pamphlet about the latest rising in Baden,<sup>b</sup> and furthermore of the steps taken against the newspaper *Die Revolution* and against the so-called *Hilf Dir* military association.<sup>194</sup>

The volunteer commander, J. Ph. Becker of Biel, who has been a citizen of the Berne canton for the past year, was the head of a military organisation of the above name, which is said to have had the aim of organising all the German volunteers living in Switzerland into a German Legion. It seems a dangerous business but was not really so at all. The Legion only existed on paper; there was no question of weapons, still less of drilling; its only object was to hinder more over-hasty and unplanned volunteer campaigns, and since *all* these are necessarily over-hasty and unplanned—as is proved by the two of Lucerne, the two of Baden, and the one of Val d'Intelvi<sup>195</sup>—the military association would inevitably have led to the prevention of such volunteer campaigns *altogether*. For that reason neither the Baden nor the Swiss Government had anything to do with it, and as the leaders of the organisation owing to all sorts of beloved memories of all secret societies as well as to more or less

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 180-81.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> T. W. Löwenfels, F. Neff und G. Thielemann, *Die zweite republikanische Aufstand in Baden*, Basel, 1848.—*Ed.*

bragging behaviour gave the Government a pretext for intervening; and as, moreover, the whole plan came under the Berne law on volunteer insurgents, there was the best possible opportunity to see here a far-reaching conspiracy and preparations for a new attack on Baden in the near future. Added to this was Becker's indiscretion in announcing, on the title page, his weekly *Revolution* as the "organ of the democratic military association '*Hilf Dir*'". That was enough: Herr Ochsenbein, who by chance or intentionally came to Biel, brought about the intervention of the public authorities. The specimen issue of the *Revolution* was seized, one of the editors, Michel, banished from the canton, and Becker's house searched. After that there were second thoughts. The attack on the freedom of the press was too provocative. The distraint was again lifted, and the *Revolution* will continue to appear<sup>a</sup>; but a judicial investigation against Becker has begun, and it will probably be the end of the military association "*Hilf Dir*". The German imperial philistine can once more sleep in peace.

In Tessin, all the troops have been discharged. The extent to which the Tessiners were slandered by the East Swiss is shown by the excellent understanding between the Bernese battalion sent there and the population. It is true, of course, that this battalion began by behaving quite differently from the men of Zurich and Appenzell. At one of the banquets given to the officer corps, Colonel Seiler of Berne declared that neutrality was a necessary evil, and that he looked forward to the time when the Swiss, free from these fetters, would fight for liberty in the ranks of the other peoples. The battalion collected a day's pay as a contribution for the refugees from Italy. If the gentlemen from Zurich and Appenzell had acted in the same way instead of taking pleasure in fulfilling odious gendarme functions and fraternising with Austrian officers, the Tessiners would have given them a very different reception.

Some days ago there was a highly amusing meeting of philistines in Berne. The residents' commune met to decide whether they wanted to take over the burden of being the seat of the Federal Government. The patricians, beaten in the last burghers' commune meeting,<sup>b</sup> and seeing with their own eyes that the property dispute between the burghers and the residents was really beginning, wanted to have their revenge here. With the actual handing over of the property of the residents' commune the town was made independent of the patriciate, they lost a large number of lucrative posts and the main

<sup>a</sup> Subsequently it appeared as *Die Evolution*.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 183-84.—Ed.



props of their overwhelming influence in the Commune Council, not to mention the direct heavy financial loss. So they launched into all their intrigues in order—to remove again the seat of the Federal Government from Berne! They declared that the costs of the seat of the Federal Government had been stated so uncertainly that there was a risk of being shamefully cheated by the Federal Council. Further, the state and not the town should bear the bulk of the costs; and under these pretexts they proposed to grant a miserable 300,000 francs, but no more. The law concerning the seat of the Federal Government demands however unreserved acceptance of the conditions within a month, and the month expires on December 28. The acceptance of the proposals made by the patricians was thus equivalent to a refusal to make Berne the seat of the Federal Government. The patricians' plausible proposals for economy and safeguards met with tremendous approval from the Berne philistines, so that the radicals who wanted *à tout prix* to keep the federal capital there almost despaired of succeeding in their object. It was debated all day, and not till evening did the radicals collect 419 votes against 314 for the unconditional acceptance of the obligations proposed by the Federal Assembly. There you have an example of the petty parochialism which dares to try to lay down the law, even in the capital city of Switzerland!

Written by Engels on December 24, 1848

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the supplement to the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 180, December 28, 1848

Published in English for the first time

LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMISSION  
OF THE WORKERS' ASSOCIATIONS IN SWITZERLAND  
TO THE ASSOCIATION IN VIVIS

TO THE ASSOCIATION IN VIVIS

Friends, Brothers,

We, the Central Commission set up by the Congress, have before us for reply your letter of December 7.<sup>196</sup> Since the Congress has now established the foundations for the unification of the various associations, we shall not deal with your reproaches to the Zurich Association<sup>197</sup> but go straight on to answer the different points of your letter which concern the proposed centralisation.

You demand, first, that at the Congress the votes of associations given only by letter should be included in the count, justifying this by reference to the democratic principle. The Congress discussed this matter and also the reasons you give, but it believed that it could not accept them. It took the view that in that case no congress would be necessary and the associations would only need to send letters to the Central Commission, which could then add up the votes and proclaim the result. This is more or less the manner in which the associations have been in communication up to now and which yielded no results, while the Congress was easily able to put matters to rights in a few days. And this was because more can be achieved, and understanding can more easily be reached, in a few hours of oral consultation than by years of correspondence. Associations which send no delegates cannot, of course, take part in the *debates* of the Congress, they cannot hear what reasons for and against are being put forward, and since in the end these reasons decide the voting, they cannot, of course, vote either. Otherwise it would not be possible ever to reach a majority decision. If you think this is not democratic, we take the view that no democratic state in the world has ever accepted your opinion in this respect, but invariably taken ours: in America, in Switzerland, in France, as in all former

democracies, the principle has always held good that those who send no delegates cannot vote either. Incidentally, the Congress has seen to it that in future every association can be represented by the Congress taking over the entire costs of the delegates. At this Congress, too, you could perhaps have been represented; Lausanne, which lacked the means to send a delegate, arranged for a citizen in Berne<sup>a</sup> to represent them and sent him his instructions.<sup>198</sup>

It is certainly to be regretted that up to now there has been so little unity among the associations in Switzerland, and also that so many contradictory proposals for the Central Association were put forward. For this very reason it was an excellent idea of the Zurich Association to suggest a Congress. The provisional regulations which it drafted were, of course, only a suggestion on which the Congress had to vote, and which it altered considerably, as you will see from the enclosed printed copy of the minutes. But now, when a beginning at least has been made through the debates of the delegates of ten different associations, it is most desirable that the unrepresented associations should adhere to the centralisation which has at last been started and that they should yield in the same way that almost every other represented association has yielded on one point or another of its opinion and submitted to the decisions of the majority. Without mutual concessions we can never achieve anything.

Your suggestion that the Executive of the "*Hilf Dir*" military association be proclaimed the Central Association was very seriously considered, but was rejected. The *Hilf Dir* military association is a banned association under the local laws (the law on volunteers) and thus all *associations* joining it as *associations* would likewise be in danger of being dissolved and deprived of their funds. Moreover, the military association will only take over the military organisation, but does not see it as its task to represent the associations also with respect to social-democratic propaganda and correspondence with Germany. The Berlin Central Committee and the Workers' Committee in Leipzig<sup>199</sup> would not be able to risk entering into correspondence with the military association, even on innocent matters, without exposing themselves to dissolution and arrest; and the other way round, the military association would likewise not be able to conduct a regular correspondence with these committees without exposing itself to the most persistent persecution by the Swiss authorities. Above all, however, we want a centralisation which does not give the governments any pretext for new persecutions of

<sup>a</sup> Frederick Engels.—*Ed.*

a distance at which they could fire grape-shot, grenades containing 150 bullets, and shrapnel against pikes and scythes which, as is well known, cannot be effective at a distance. Previously shrapnel had only been fired by Englishmen against semi-savages in the East Indies. Only the stalwart Prussians, in fanatical fear of Polish courage and conscious of their own weakness, used shrapnel against their so-called fellow citizens. They had, of course, to look for a method of killing masses of Poles at a distance. Close to, the Poles were too terrible. Such was the *glorious victory at Wreschen*. But, as already stated, the heroic deeds of the Prussian army begin only *after* the war, just as the heroic deeds of the prison warder begin *after* sentence has been pronounced.

That *this* glory of the Prussian army will go down in history is guaranteed by the thousands of Poles killed with shrapnel, pointed bullets etc. as a result of Prussian treachery and black-and-white trickery, and by those later branded with lunar caustic.<sup>216</sup>

Adequate testimony to this second laurel wreath of the counter-revolutionary army has been provided by the villages and towns burnt by the Prussian heroes, by the Polish inhabitants beaten up and massacred in their homes with rifle-butts and bayonets, and by the acts of plunder and violence of all kinds committed by the Prussians.

Immortal glory for these Prussian warriors in Posen, who paved the way trodden shortly afterwards by the Neapolitan executioner,<sup>a</sup> who battered with shot and shell his loyal capital city and allowed the soldiery to plunder it for 24 hours.<sup>217</sup> Honour and glory to the Prussian army for the Posen campaign! For it served as a shining example for the Croats, Serezhans, Ottochans<sup>218</sup> and other hordes of Windischgrätz and Co., who, as Prague (in June), Vienna, Pressburg etc. have proved, were inspired to be its most worthy imitators.

And, lastly, even *this* courage of the Prussians against the Poles occurred only owing to fear of the Russians.

"All good things come in threes."<sup>b</sup> Hence "My army" also had to win a triple glory. The occasion for it was not lacking. For "its participation in the maintenance of order (!) in South Germany won fresh recognition for the name of Prussia".

Only malice or an attempt at belittlement could make one deny that "My army" performed the most effective services as jailor and policeman for the Federal Diet, which modernised itself on being rebaptised and had itself called the Central Authority.<sup>219</sup> It is equally undeniable that the Prussian name gained full recognition in

<sup>a</sup> Ferdinand II.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Lessing, *Minna von Barnhelm*, Act I, Scene 2.—*Ed.*

guzzling South-German wine, meat, cider etc. The starving Brandenburgers, Pomeranians etc. grew patriotic paunches, the thirsty ones refreshed themselves, and in general succeeded in polishing off everything that the South Germans who provided them with billets set before them with such heroic courage that the Prussian name has gained the most noisy recognition there. It is a pity that the billet money has not yet been paid; the recognition would be still noisier.

The glory of "My army" is really inexhaustible; nevertheless, one must not omit to mention that

"whenever I called, it stood ready, in complete loyalty and in *complete discipline*", nor omit to communicate to posterity the equally remarkable statement that

"My army countered abominable calumnies by its excellent spirit and *noble self-control*."

How flattering for "My army" is this greeting, evoking as it does the pleasant recollection of its "complete discipline" and "noble self-control", and at the same time once more its heroic deeds in the Grand Duchy,<sup>a</sup> and furthermore the laurels it won in Mainz, Schweidnitz, Trier, Erfurt, Berlin, Cologne, Düsseldorf, Aachen, Coblenz, Münster, Minden etc. We others, however, who do not belong to "My army", can in this way widen our limited conceptions as humble subjects. To shoot down old men and pregnant women, to rob (officially documented in the neighbourhood of *Ostrowo*), to maltreat peaceful citizens with rifle-butts and sabres, to destroy houses, to make attacks in the night on unarmed people with weapons hidden under cloaks, waylaying (recall what happened at Neuwied)—these and similar heroic deeds are termed in Christian-German language "*complete discipline*" and "*noble self-control*"! Long live self-control and discipline, since those murdered under this watchword are in fact dead.

The few passages of this royal Prussian New-Year greeting which we have touched upon here show us that this document in its significance and spirit is on the same level as the manifesto of the Duke of Brunswick<sup>b</sup> about 1792.<sup>220</sup>

Written by Marx on January 8, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 190, January 9, 1849

Published in English for the first time

<sup>a</sup> Posen.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Karl Wilhelm Ferdinand.—*Ed.*

THE MAGYAR STRUGGLE <sup>221</sup>

*Cologne, January.* While in Italy the first counterblow is already being struck against the counter-revolution of last summer and autumn, in the plains of Hungary the last stage of the struggle to suppress the movement which arose directly out of the February revolution is being completed. The new Italian movement is the prologue of the movement of 1849, the war against the Magyars is the epilogue to the movement of 1848. Probably this epilogue will yet pass into the new drama that is being prepared in secret.

Like the first scenes of the revolutionary tragedy of 1848, which rapidly succeeded one another, and like the fall of Paris and Vienna, this epilogue too is heroic, and pleasantly heroic after the partly colourless and partly petty episodes of the period between June and October. The last act of 1848 passes through *terrorism* into the first act of 1849.

For the first time in the revolutionary movement of 1848, for the first time since 1793, a nation surrounded by superior counter-revolutionary forces dares to counter the cowardly counter-revolutionary fury by revolutionary passion, the *terreur blanche* by the *terreur rouge*.<sup>a</sup> For the first time after a long period we meet with a truly revolutionary figure, a man who in the name of his people dares to accept the challenge of a desperate struggle, who for his nation is Danton and Carnot in one person—*Lajos Kossuth*.

The superiority of forces is frightful. The whole of Austria, 16 million fanaticised Slavs in the forefront, against 4 million Magyars.

Mass uprising, national manufacture of arms, issue of banknotes, short shrift for anyone hindering the revolutionary movement, revolution in permanence—in short, all the main features of the

<sup>a</sup> The white terror by the red terror.—*Ed.*

glorious year 1793 are found again in the Hungary which Kossuth has armed, organised and inspired with enthusiasm. This revolutionary organisation, which on pain of utter ruin had to be completed, so to speak, in 24 hours, was lacking in Vienna, otherwise Windischgrätz would never have been able to enter it. We shall see whether he will succeed in entering Hungary in spite of this revolutionary organisation.

Let us take a closer look at the struggle and the combatant parties.

The Austrian monarchy arose out of the attempt to unite Germany in a single monarchy just as the French kings up to Louis XI did in France. The attempt failed because of the pitiful provincial narrow-mindedness of both the Germans and the Austrians, and because of the corresponding petty commercial spirit of the Habsburg dynasty. Instead of the whole of Germany, the Habsburgs obtained only those South-German lands which were in direct conflict with the isolated Slav tribes, or in which a German feudal nobility and German burghers ruled jointly over enslaved Slav tribes. In both cases the Germans of each province required support from outside. This support they received through the association against the Slavs, and this association came into being through the union of the provinces in question under the sceptre of the Habsburgs.

That is how German Austria originated. It suffices to read in any textbook how the Austrian monarchy came into being, how it split up and arose again, all in the course of struggle against the Slavs, to see how correct this description is.

Adjacent to German Austria is Hungary. In Hungary the Magyars waged the same struggle as the Germans in German Austria. A German wedge driven between the Slav barbarians in the Archduchy of Austria and Styria went hand in hand with the Magyar wedge driven in the same way between the Slav barbarians on the Leitha. Just as in the south and north, in Bohemia, Moravia, Carinthia and Kraina the German nobility ruled over Slav tribes, Germanised them and so drew them into the European movement, the Magyar nobility likewise ruled over Slav tribes in the south and north, in Croatia, Slavonia and the Carpathian territories. The interests of both were the same; opponents of both were natural allies. The alliance of the Magyars and the Austrian Germans was a necessity. All that was still lacking was some great event, a heavy attack on both of them, in order to make this alliance indissoluble. Such an event came with the Turks' conquest of the Byzantine Empire. The Turks threatened Hungary and, secondly, Vienna, and for centuries Hungary came indissolubly under the Habsburg dynasty.

But the common opponents of both became gradually weak. The Turkish Empire became powerless, and the Slavs lost the strength to revolt against the Magyars and Germans. Indeed, a part of the German and Magyar nobility ruling in Slav lands adopted Slav nationality and thereby the Slav nationalities themselves became interested in preserving the monarchy, which had more and more to defend the nobility against the developing German and Magyar bourgeoisie. The national contradictions were disappearing and the Habsburg dynasty adopted a different policy. The same Habsburg dynasty which had climbed to the German imperial throne on the shoulders of the German burghers became more decisively than any other dynasty the champion of the feudal nobility against the burghers.

In the same spirit Austria participated in the partition of Poland.<sup>222</sup> The important Galician elders and army commanders, the Potockis, Lubomirskis and Czartoryskis, betrayed Poland to Austria and became the most loyal supports of the Habsburg dynasty, which in return guaranteed them their possessions against attacks from the lower nobility and burghers.

But the burghers in the towns continually grew in wealth and influence and the progress of agriculture alongside that of industry changed the position of the peasants in relation to the landowners. The movement of the burghers and peasants against the nobility became more and more menacing. And since the movement of the peasants, who everywhere are the embodiment of national and local narrow-mindedness, necessarily assumes a local and national character, it was accompanied by a resurgence of the old national struggles.

In this state of affairs, Metternich achieved his master stroke. With the exception of the most powerful feudal barons, he deprived the nobility of all influence on state administration. He sapped the strength of the bourgeoisie by winning to his side the most powerful financial barons—he had to do this, the state of the finances made it compulsory for him. Supported in this way by the top feudal and financial aristocracy, as well as by the bureaucracy and the army, he far more than all his rivals attained the ideal of an absolute monarchy. He kept the burghers and the peasantry of each nation under control by means of the aristocracy of that nation and the peasantry of every other nation, and he kept the aristocracy of each nation under control by its fear of that nation's burghers and peasantry. The different class interests, the national features of narrow-mindedness, and local prejudices, despite their complexity, were completely held in check by their mutual counteraction and



allowed the old scoundrel Metternich the utmost freedom to manoeuvre. How far he succeeded in this setting of one nation against another is proved by the Galician scenes of slaughter when the democratic Polish movement which began in the interests of the peasantry was crushed by Metternich by means of the Ruthenian peasants themselves who were animated by religious and national fanaticism.<sup>225</sup>

The year 1848 first of all brought with it the most terrible chaos for Austria by setting free for a short time all these different nationalities which, owing to Metternich, had hitherto been enslaving one another. The Germans, Magyars, Czechs, Poles, Moravians, Slovaks, Croats, Ruthenians, Rumanians, Illyrians and Serbs came into conflict with one another, while within each of these nationalities a struggle went on also between the different classes. But soon order came out of this chaos. The combatants divided into two large camps: the Germans, Poles and Magyars took the side of revolution; the remainder, all the Slavs, except for the Poles, the Rumanians and Transylvanian Saxons, took the side of counter-revolution.

How did this division of the nations come about, what was its basis?

The division is in accordance with all the previous history of the nationalities in question. It is the beginning of the decision on the life or death of all these nations, large and small.

All the earlier history of Austria up to the present day is proof of this and 1848 confirmed it. Among all the large and small nations of Austria, only three standard-bearers of progress took an active part in history, and still retain their vitality—the *Germans*, the *Poles* and the *Magyars*. Hence they are now revolutionary.

All the other large and small nationalities and peoples are destined to perish before long in the revolutionary world storm. For that reason they are now counter-revolutionary.

As for the *Poles*, we refer the reader to our article about the debates on the Polish question in Frankfurt.<sup>a</sup> In order to curb their revolutionary spirit, Metternich had appealed to the Ruthenians, a nationality differing from the Poles by its somewhat different dialect and especially by its Greek orthodox religion. The Ruthenians had belonged to Poland for a long time and learned only from Metternich that the Poles were their oppressors. As though in the old Poland the Poles themselves were not oppressed just as much as the Ruthenians, as though under Austrian domination Metternich was not their common oppressor!

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 337-81.—*Ed.*

So much for the Poles and Ruthenians who, moreover, because of their history and geographical position, are so sharply separated from Austria proper that we have had to get them out of the way first of all in order to reach clarity in regard to the chaos of the other peoples.

Let us, however, also remark at the outset that the Poles have revealed great political understanding and a true revolutionary spirit by now entering into an alliance with their old enemies, the Germans and Magyars, against the pan-Slav counter-revolution. A Slav people for whom freedom is dearer than Slavism proves its vitality by this fact alone, and thereby already assures a future for itself.

We pass now to Austria proper.

Situated to the south of the Sudetic and Carpathian mountains, in the upper valley of the Elbe and in the region of the Middle Danube, Austria in the early Middle Ages was a country populated exclusively by Slavs. By language and customs these Slavs belong to the same stock as the Slavs of Turkey, the Serbs, Bosnians, Bulgarians, and the Slavs of Thrace and Macedonia; these, in contrast to the Poles and Russians, are called Southern Slavs. Apart from these related Slav nationalities, the vast region from the Black Sea to the Bohemian forests and Tyrolean Alps was inhabited only by a few Greeks in the south of the Balkans, and in the Lower Danube region by scattered Rumanian-speaking Wallachians.

Into this compact Slav mass a wedge was driven by Germans from the west and the Magyars from the east. The German element conquered the western part of Bohemia and pushed forward on both sides of the Danube as far as the other side of the Leitha. The Archduchy of Austria, part of Moravia, and the greater part of Styria were Germanised and thus separated the Czechs and Moravians from the inhabitants of Carinthia and Kraina. In the same way Transylvania and Central Hungary up to the German frontier was completely cleared of Slavs and occupied by Magyars, who here separated the Slovaks and a few Ruthenian localities (in the north) from the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, and subjected all these peoples to their rule. Finally, the Turks, following the example of the Byzantines, subjugated the Slavs south of the Danube and the Sava, and the historical role of the Southern Slavs was ended for ever.<sup>224</sup>

The last attempt of the Southern Slavs to play an independent part in history was the Hussite war,<sup>225</sup> a national peasant war of the Czechs under the flag of religion against the German nobility and the supremacy of the German Emperor. The attempt failed, and

ever since then the Czechs have remained fettered under the yoke of the German Empire.

On the other hand, their conquerors—the Germans and Magyars—took over the historical initiative in the Danube regions. Without the aid of the Germans and particularly of the Magyars, the Southern Slavs would have become Turkish, as actually happened to part of them, indeed Mohammedan, as the Slavs of Bosnia still are today. And for the Southern Slavs of Austria this is a service which is not too dear even at the price of exchanging their nationality for German or Magyar.

The Turkish invasion of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was a second edition of the Arab invasion of the eighth century. Charles Martel's victory was repeatedly won at the walls of Vienna and on the Hungarian plain. As then at Poitiers, and later at Wahlstatt, during the invasion of the Mongols,<sup>226</sup> there was here once more a threat to the whole of European development. And where it was a matter of saving this, how could it be achieved by a few nationalities, like the Austrian Slavs, which had long ago disintegrated and become impotent and which, moreover, themselves needed to be saved?

The situation internally was like that externally. The class that was the driving force and standard-bearer of the movement, the bourgeoisie, was everywhere German or Magyar. The Slavs could only with difficulty give rise to a national bourgeoisie, and the Southern Slavs only in quite isolated cases. And with the bourgeoisie, industrial power and capital were in the hands of Germans or Magyars, German culture developed, and intellectually too the Slavs became subordinate to the Germans, even as far as Croatia. The same thing happened—only later and therefore to a lesser extent—in Hungary, where the Magyars together with the Germans took the lead in intellectual and commercial affairs. But the Hungarian Germans, although they retained the German language, became genuine Hungarians in disposition, character and customs. Only the newly introduced peasant colonists, the Jews and the Saxons in Transylvania, are an exception and stubbornly retain an absurd nationality in the midst of a foreign land.

And if the Magyars were a little behind the German Austrians in civilisation, they have recently brilliantly overtaken them by their political activity. Between 1830 and 1848 there was more political life in Hungary alone than in the whole of Germany, and the feudal forms of the old Hungarian Constitution were better exploited in the interests of democracy than the modern forms of South-German constitutions. And who was at the head of the movement here? The

Magyars. Who supported Austrian reaction? The Croats and Slovenes.

Against the Magyar movement, as also against the reawakening political movement in Germany, the Austrian Slavs founded a Sonderbund<sup>227</sup>—*pan-Slavism*.

Pan-Slavism did not originate in Russia or Poland, but in Prague and in Agram.<sup>228</sup> Pan-Slavism means the union of all the small Slav nations and nationalities of Austria, and secondarily of Turkey, for struggle against the Austrian Germans, the Magyars and, eventually, against the Turks. The Turks are only incidentally included here and, as a nation which is also in a state of complete decline, can be entirely disregarded. In its basic tendency, pan-Slavism is aimed against the revolutionary elements of Austria and is therefore reactionary from the outset.

Pan-Slavism immediately gave proof of this reactionary tendency by a double betrayal: it sacrificed to its petty national narrow-mindedness the only Slav nation which up to then had acted in a revolutionary manner, the *Poles*; it *sold* both itself and Poland to the *Russian Tsar*.

The direct aim of pan-Slavism is the creation of a Slav state under Russian domination, extending from the Erzgebirge and the Carpathians to the Black, Aegean and Adriatic seas—a state which would include, besides the German, Italian, Magyar, Wallachian, Turkish, Greek and Albanian languages, also approximately a dozen Slav languages and basic dialects. All this would be held together not by the elements which have hitherto held Austria together and ensured its development, but by the abstract quality of Slavism and the so-called Slav language, which is at any rate common to the majority of the inhabitants. But where does this Slavism exist except in the minds of a few ideologists, where is the “Slav language” except in the imagination of Herren Palacký, Gaj and Co., and, to some extent, in the old Slav litany of the Russian church, which no Slav any longer understands? In reality, all these peoples are at the most diverse stages of civilisation, ranging from the fairly highly developed (thanks to the *Germans*) modern industry and culture of Bohemia down to the almost nomadic barbarism of the Croats and Bulgarians; in reality, therefore, all these nations have most antagonistic interests. In reality, the Slav language of these ten or twelve nations consists of an equal number of dialects, mostly incomprehensible to one another, which can be reduced to different main stems (Czech, Illyrian, Serbian, Bulgarian) and which, owing to the total neglect of all literature and the lack of culture of the majority of these peoples, have become a sheer patois, and with few

exceptions have always had above them an *alien*, non-Slav language as the written language. Thus, pan-Slav unity is either pure fantasy or—the *Russian knout*.

And what nations are supposed to head this great Slav state? Precisely those nations which for a thousand years have been scattered and split up, those nations whose elements capable of life and development were *forcibly* imposed on them by other, non-Slav peoples, those nations which were saved from downfall in Turkish barbarism by the victorious arms of non-Slav peoples, small, powerless nationalities, everywhere separated from one another and deprived of their national strength, numbering from a few thousand up to less than two million people! They have become so weak that, for example, the race which in the Middle Ages was the strongest and most terrible, the Bulgarians, are now in Turkey known only for their mildness and soft-heartedness and set great store on being called *dobre chrisztian*, good Christians! Is there a single one of these races, not excluding the Czechs and Serbs, that possesses a national historical tradition which is kept alive among the people and stands above the pettiest local struggles?

Pan-Slavism was at its height in the eighth and ninth centuries, when the Southern Slavs still held the whole of Hungary and Austria and were threatening Byzantium. If at that time they were unable to resist the German and Magyar invasion, if they were unable to achieve independence and form a stable state even when both their enemies, the Magyars and Germans, were tearing each other to pieces, how will they be able to achieve it today, after a thousand years of subjection and loss of their national character?

There is no country in Europe which does not have in some corner or other one or several ruined fragments of peoples, the remnant of a former population that was suppressed and held in bondage by the nation which later became the main vehicle of historical development. These relics of a nation mercilessly trampled under foot in the course of history, as Hegel says,<sup>2</sup> these *residual fragments of peoples* always become fanatical standard-bearers of counter-revolution and remain so until their complete extirpation or loss of their national character, just as their whole existence in general is itself a protest against a great historical revolution.

Such, in Scotland, are the Gaels, the supporters of the Stuarts from 1640 to 1745.

Such, in France, are the Bretons, the supporters of the Bourbons from 1792 to 1800.

<sup>2</sup> See G. W. F. Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte. Einleitung.*—Ed.

Such, in Spain, are the Basques, the supporters of Don Carlos.

Such, in Austria, are the pan-Slavist *Southern Slavs*, who are nothing but the *residual fragment of peoples*, resulting from an extremely confused *thousand years of development*. That this residual fragment, which is likewise extremely confused, sees its salvation only in a reversal of the whole European movement, which in its view ought to go not from west to east, but from east to west, and that for it the instrument of liberation and the bond of unity is the *Russian knout*—that is the most natural thing in the world.

Already before 1848, therefore, the Southern Slavs had clearly shown their reactionary character. The year 1848 brought it fully into the light of day.

When the February storm broke, who made the Austrian revolution? Vienna or Prague? Budapest or Agram? The Germans and Magyars, or the Slavs?

It is true that among the more educated Southern Slavs there was a small democratic party which, although not wanting to renounce its nationality, nevertheless desired to put it at the disposal of the struggle for freedom. This illusion, which succeeded in arousing sympathy also among West-European democrats, sympathy that was fully justified as long as the Slav democrats took part in the struggle against the common enemy—this illusion was shattered by the bombardment of Prague. After that event all the South-Slav races, following the example of the Croats, put themselves at the disposal of Austrian reaction. Those leaders of the South-Slav movement who continue to talk drivel about the equality of nations, about democratic Austria, and so on, are either stupid dreamers, such as, for example, many journalists, or they are scoundrels like Jellachich. Their democratic assurances have no more significance than the democratic assurances of official Austrian counter-revolution. It suffices to say that in practice the restoration of the South-Slav nationality begins with the most savage outbursts of fury against the Austrian and Magyar revolution, with a first great good turn rendered to the Russian Tsar.

Apart from the higher nobility, the bureaucracy and the military, the Austrian camarilla found support only among the Slavs. The Slavs played the decisive part in the fall of Italy, the Slavs stormed Vienna, and it is the Slavs who are now attacking the Magyars from all sides. At their head as spokesmen are the Czechs under Palacký, as leaders of armed forces the Croats under Jellachich.

That is the gratitude shown for the fact that the German democratic press in June everywhere sympathised with the Czech

democrats when they were shot down by Windischgrätz, the same Windischgrätz who is now their hero.

To sum up:

In Austria, apart from Poland and Italy, it is the Germans and Magyars in 1848, as during the past thousand years already, who have assumed the historical initiative. They represent the *revolution*.

The Southern Slavs, who for a thousand years have been taken in tow by the Germans and the Magyars, only rose up in 1848 to achieve their national independence in order thereby at the same time to suppress the German-Magyar revolution. They represent the *counter-revolution*. They were joined by two nations, which had likewise long ago degenerated and were devoid of all historical power of action: the Saxons and the Rumanians of Transylvania.

The Habsburg dynasty, whose power was based on the union of Germans and Magyars in the struggle against the Southern Slavs, is now prolonging the last moments of its existence through the union of the Southern Slavs in the struggle against the Germans and Magyars.

That is the political aspect of the question. Now for the military aspect.

The region inhabited exclusively by Magyars does not form even one-third of the whole of Hungary and Transylvania. In the area from Pressburg, northwards from the Danube and Theiss up to the rear of the Carpathians there live several million Slovaks and a few Ruthenians. In the south, between the Sava, Danube and Drava, there live Croats and Slovenes; farther to the east, along the Danube is a Serb colony of more than half a million people. These two Slav stretches are linked by the Wallachians and the Saxons of Transylvania.

On three sides, therefore, the Magyars are surrounded by natural enemies. If the Slovaks, occupying the mountain passes, were of a less lukewarm disposition, they would be dangerous opponents, in view of their region being excellently adapted for guerilla warfare.

As things are, however, the Magyars have only to withstand from the north attacks of invading armies from Galicia and Moravia. In the east, on the other hand, the Rumanians and Saxons rose up in a mass and joined the Austrian army corps there. Their situation is an excellent one, partly because of the mountainous nature of the country and partly because they occupy most of the towns and fortresses.

Finally, in the south are the Banat Serbs, supported by the German colonists, the Wallachians and also an Austrian corps, protected by the vast Alibunar morass and almost impregnable.

The Croats are protected by the Drava and the Danube, and since they have at their disposal a strong Austrian army with all its auxiliary resources, they advanced into the Magyar region already before October and now have little difficulty in holding their line of defence on the Lower Drava.

Finally, from the fourth side, from Austria, the serried columns of Windischgrätz and Jellachich are now advancing. The Magyars are encircled on all sides, and encircled by an enemy of vastly superior power.

The fighting is reminiscent of that against France in 1793, hut with the difference that the sparsely populated and only half-civilised country of the Magyars is far from having at its disposal the resources which the French Republic then had.

The weapons and munitions manufactured in Hungary are bound to be of very poor quality; in particular, it is impossible for the manufacture of artillery to go ahead rapidly. The country is far smaller than France and every inch of territory lost is therefore a much greater loss. All that is left to the Magyars is their revolutionary enthusiasm, their courage and the energetic, speedy organisation that Kossuth was able to give them.

But for all that, Austria has not yet won.

"If we fail to beat the imperial troops on the Leitha, we shall beat them on the Rabnitz; if not on the Rabnitz, we shall beat them at Pest; if not at Pest, then on the Theiss, but in any case we shall beat them."<sup>a</sup>

So said Kossuth, and he is doing his utmost to keep his word.

Even with the fall of Budapest, the Magyars still have the great Lower Hungarian steppe, a terrain as it were specially created for cavalry guerilla warfare and offering numerous almost unassailable points between the swamps where the Magyars can dig themselves in. And the Magyars, who are almost all horsemen, possess all the qualities needed to wage such a war. If the imperial army dares to enter this desert region, where it will have to obtain all its provisions from Galicia or Austria, for it will find nothing, absolutely nothing on the spot, it is impossible to see how it will be able to hold out. It will achieve nothing in a closed formation; and if it splits up into flying detachments it is lost. Its clumsiness would deliver it irretrievably into the hands of the swift Magyar cavalry detachments, without any possibility of pursuit even if it should be victorious, and every isolated soldier of the imperial army would find a mortal

---

<sup>a</sup> From Kossuth's speech in the Hungarian parliament on November 9, 1848 (*Közlöny*, November 11, 1848).—*Ed.*



enemy in every peasant, in every herdsman. War in these steppes is like war in Algeria, and the clumsy Austrian army would require years to end it. And the Magyars will be saved if they hold out for only a few months.

The Magyar cause is not in such a bad way as mercenary black-and-yellow<sup>a</sup> enthusiasm would have us believe. The Magyars are not yet defeated. But if they fall, they will fall gloriously, as the last heroes of the 1848 revolution, and only for a short time. Then for a time the Slav counter-revolution will sweep down on the Austrian monarchy with all its barbarity, and the camarilla will see what sort of allies it has. But at the first victorious uprising of the French proletariat, which Louis Napoleon is striving with all his might to conjure up, the Austrian Germans and Magyars will be set free and wreak a bloody revenge on the Slav barbarians. The general war which will then break out will smash this Slav Sonderbund and wipe out all these petty hidebound nations, down to their very names.

The next world war will result in the disappearance from the face of the earth not only of reactionary classes and dynasties, but also of entire reactionary peoples. And that, too, is a step forward.

Written by Engels about January 8, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 194, January 13, 1849

---

<sup>a</sup> The colours of the Austrian flag.—*Ed.*

HERR MÜLLER.—  
 RADETZKY'S CHICANERY TOWARDS TESSIN.—  
 THE FEDERAL COUNCIL.—LOHBAUER

*Berne*, January 8. The Neapolitan Government, which is getting more and more worried about the non-arrival of Swiss recruits, has now sent one of its Swiss staff officers, Herr Tobias Müller, here to confer with the Federal Council about the change of the route of the recruits, as the stipulated port of embarkation, Genoa, is closed to them. This Herr Müller is eminently suitable for such a mission. Not only has he fought in Italy against freedom for many years; he had already in 1831 taken up arms in his home town (Freiburg) against the revolution. Radetzky, who knows his men, received him with distinction, embraced him in front of his General Staff, and praised him and the Swiss in Naples in general in glowing terms for their "loyalty to their King" (!) and their bravery in the service of their "King". However, Herr Müller will very likely come up against difficulties: even the liberalism which prevails in the Federal Council is no friend to the enlistment agreements,<sup>229</sup> any more than are the liberal governments of Berne and Lucerne.

While Radetzky fraternises with the Swiss in Naples, his chicaneries against Tessin are beginning all over again. He has informed the Government there that Mazzini is still hiding in the canton and has even revealed to it his hiding-place. He further complains that weapons are continuing to be smuggled into Lombardy. The Government has decided to investigate the first point and, if Mazzini is really again in the canton, to expel him; as to the second point, the Government let it lie on the table, since it was not its business to serve the Austrians as frontier guard. Radetzky has incidentally threatened to enforce the closing of the frontier again if smuggling of arms does not cease.

The Federal Council is busy with the draft laws to be put before the next Federal Assembly. Among these are the Customs Law, organisation of postal services, proposals for military organisation, and so on. It must be admitted that while the highly esteemed Frankfurt Assembly in its extravagant helplessness and helpless extravagance has not up to now produced anything but its own *misère*, the Swiss federal authorities are quietly carrying through one bourgeois centralisation step after another. A number of centralising laws will be put before the Councils in March, will be debated and adopted in May and June, and will come into force in June. For such small, detailed reforms the present ruling liberal generation of Swiss politicians (one cannot say statesmen) have an incontestable talent. In a few years the centralisation of Switzerland will be completed as far as the Constitution allows, and then the Constitution itself will become a fetter on the further development of the country, and the one and indivisible republic will become a necessity. All this on the—impossible—supposition that the European storm which is building up will leave Switzerland as neutral as did the year 1848.

But really, what kind of a nation is this, which in a time of revolution like the present is striving for no more than the abolition of cantonal customs, cantonal posts and other cantonal institutions which for many many years past have been heavily oppressive! Which in the midst of the birthpangs of a new historical epoch sees as its highest goal an improved edition of the historically outdated Federal Republic and the *first beginnings*, already necessitated by the Sonderbund war,<sup>230</sup> of bourgeois centralisation! What small beer in the ferment of the glorious European movement!

The Federal Council has moreover taken an extremely strange step. It has again appointed the well-known Herr *Lohbauer* of Berlin as Professor of Military Science. Herr Lohbauer, refugee of 1830, radical, later renegade, was, as is well known, summoned through the Eichhorn clique in the forties to Berlin, where he worked on the *Staats-Zeitung*,<sup>a</sup> on the *Janus* and on other ultra-reactionary and pietist organs of the press. Herr Lohbauer is, if we are not much mistaken, the author of that lackey's kick in the shape of an article in the *Staats-Zeitung* with which Herwegh was thrown out of the royal states after his letter to His Majesty. Herr Lohbauer was never a soldier, and yet he is to lecture here on military science.<sup>231</sup> Only Herr Ochsenbein, who appointed him, can know the meaning of that.

---

<sup>a</sup> *Allgemeine Preussische Staats-Zeitung*.—Ed.

In most of the cantons the Great Councils are now in agreement, and fighting against the pettiest local interests. The Zurich Great Council has elected our friend Dr. Alcibiades Escher as Burgomaster (*id est* chief of the Executive). The Berne Great Council will meet on the 15th.

Written by Engels on January 8, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 194, January 13, 1849

Published in English for the first time

## THE LAST VOLUNTEER INSURGENTS

*Berne*, January 8. The second instance of the Court of Appeal here has sentenced Herr J. Ph. Becker and Herr H. Hattemer in Biel, the first to one year, the second to six months' exile from the canton, for founding the military association "*Hilf Dir*".<sup>252</sup> The other accused were acquitted. This brings to an end the famous story of the much-talked-of third volunteer insurgents' campaign, and the Central Authority can now once more devote its entire valuable time to the question of the German monarch and the German fleet. God bless their sour efforts for the well-being of the "whole fatherland".

Written by Engels on January 8, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 195, January 14, 1849

Published in English for the first time

## BUDGET

*Berne*, January 9. The Cantonal Budget has now been so far discussed in the Government Council that it can be presented to the Great Council which is to assemble shortly. It conforms with other European budgets in also having a deficit, of 43,000 francs out of a total of about 5 million francs. Of these 5 million, about 800,000 francs are covered by revenue from state property, 1,800,000 by indirect taxes, the rest by tolls. Thus the population pays per head almost exactly 4 Swiss francs (1 taler 18 sgr.) in direct taxes, and about 3½ francs in indirect taxes. If all the reductions proposed by Finance Director Stämpfli (leader of the local radicals) had gone through, the result would have been a surplus of 80,000 francs instead of a deficit. But this did not suit the liberal majority of the Government Council, who calmly leave it to the aristocrats to make the eternal complaint of the "disastrous financial situation" in order to lay the blame for this on the radical Stämpfli. In reality, the canton's finances were brought into complete disorder and squandered by the notorious Neuhaus Government, and if order has been restored now, we have only Herr Stämpfli to thank for this.

Written by Engels on January 9, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 195, January 14, 1849

Published in English for the first time

## PRIESTS' REBELLION

Neuchâtel, January 9. We now have a priests' rebellion here. The *vénérable compagnie des pasteurs*,<sup>a</sup> who had led a splendid life among the pious regiment of God's grace—every pastor was the Eichhorn of his parish—have suffered a hard blow through the Republic. That is, the reverend gentlemen must be elected in future by the parishes themselves, and only for a *limited period*. Imagine the alarm! God's word no longer granted by one of God's ordained authorities, but hired out by the hour for ready cash just like a donkey or a day-labourer! The decision is taken, not by God-given will of the Royal Government, but by profane free competition, the pastor sinks to the position of an ordinary hired worker, the flock becomes a profane "employer" and can dismiss its worker if he does not carry out his task to its satisfaction. The indignation of the venerable company exceeds all bounds. They immediately issued a proclamation in which, in the most pitiful and lamentable way, they bleated against the desecration of the most holy. Naturally this only aroused universal derision. But in secret, these gentlemen, the old friends of the Jesuits and the Sonderbund, are intriguing against the Republic and conspiring to restore Frederick William, by the grace of God. The Government is magnanimous enough to allow these impotent machinations to go on for the time being. The patriotic associations will be adequate to counterbalance the ambitions of the priests. These patriotic associations are now forming everywhere. Starting from the mountains, from La Chaux-de-Fonds, Locle and the Traverstal, the home of our revolution,<sup>233</sup> they are spreading all over

---

<sup>a</sup> The venerable company of pastors.—*Ed.*

the canton. Even the royalist village of Les Ponts has got its own association. This organisation of democracy through the people itself will be the best means of thwarting the plots of all the *bédouins*<sup>a</sup> and priests.

Written by Engels on January 9, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 195, January 14, 1849

Published in English for the first time

---

<sup>a</sup> The local nickname of royalist candidates for election to the Swiss National Council (see this volume, p. 7).—*Ed.*



## THE SWISS PRESS

*Berna*, January 11. Year by year the political press in Switzerland becomes increasingly active. Besides some twenty literary magazines, there are now 98 political newspapers in the 22 cantons. But one should not imagine that among them there are any large-size newspapers like the German or even the French. Except for a few newspapers in the Waadt canton, they are all only half a printed sheet and in quarto, and scarcely a dozen of them are published daily; a small number appear five times, most of them three times and some only once a week. With few exceptions they are all wretchedly managed and written. And, of course, on the restricted basis of cantonal conditions in this country, and in the extremely petty polemics which is the only possible kind here, how can any considerable journalistic talent develop and what really talented journalist would consent to be restricted to these meagre conditions and to the space of a quarto sheet that appears three times a week!

The best quality of the Swiss press is its brazenness. People say such things to one another publicly in the newspapers, make unblushingly such insolent personal attacks, that a Rhenish Public Prosecutor for whom Article 370<sup>a</sup> of the *Code pénal*<sup>234</sup> is sacrosanct would not be able to stand it for three days in such a country.

But that is all. If one leaves out of account this recklessness which, incidentally, is quite without wit or humour, almost nothing is left but the most servile bowing and scraping to the repellent narrow-mindedness of a small nation, which in addition to its smallness is split and immeasurably puffed up—a nation of antediluvian Alpine

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 317.—*Ed.*

herdsmen, hidebound peasants and disgusting philistines. That in large countries a newspaper takes the lead from its party and never undertakes anything against the interests of the party is quite understandable, and does little harm to freedom of discussion, because every trend, even the most progressive, has its press organs. But in the parochial conditions of Switzerland, the parties themselves are parochial, and the press is just as parochial as the parties. Hence the narrow-minded viewpoints from which everything is looked at; hence the absence of any press organs for trends which are indeed progressive, but which even in Germany have long been current. Hence the fear of even the most radical newspapers to diverge one iota from the narrow-minded programme of their party calculated only on the most immediate future, their fear to attack even the most extreme features of Swiss national narrow-mindedness. Anyone who violated sacred national feeling would immediately be punished by patriarchal lynch justice. What else does the honest Swiss need his fists for?

Such is the average level of the Swiss press. Above this level are the best newspapers of Romance Switzerland and Berne; below this level is the great mass of newspapers of East Switzerland.

Let us begin with the press of the Swiss capital. In Berne a certain centralisation of the Swiss press is already taking place. The press of the canton is already concentrated there and is beginning to a certain extent to gain the influence befitting a capital city.

The chief organ of the reactionary, or as it is called here the aristocratic, party is the *Schweizerischer Beobachter*, which the *Berner-Zeitung* rightly calls the *Moniteur* of Swiss officers in the service of foreign states. This prim little newspaper (issued three times a week) praises the heroic deeds of the Swiss Croats in Italy, attacks the radicals with the dirtiest weapons, defends the enlistment agreements,<sup>235</sup> fulsomely praises the aristocrats, extols Radetzky and Windischgrätz, defends the murder of Robert Blum, slanders the revolution in all countries and denounces refugees to the Government. This noble sheet has really no editor; it is compiled from all kinds of dispatches and items from idle sons of patricians, and from place-seekers of the Municipal Council. A worthy companion to it is the *Intelligenzblatt*, an organ which has on the front page only announcements, while the back page is filled with articles praising the pietism and profit-making of the patrician landowners. *Die Biene* is intended to act as the *Charivari* of this party. But since nowadays the patrician gentlemen on the whole have more to weep over than to laugh at, the humour of this *Biene* is of a terribly dull and lame variety.

The moderate or liberal party, the party of Ochsenbein, has the *Berner Verfassungs-Freund* as its main organ. This newspaper, the editor of which is Dr., formerly Professor, Karl Herzog, is regarded as the semi-official organ of Ochsenbein. Edited by a fairly experienced hand, but without a trace of talent, the newspaper limits itself to defending the actions of the Government and Federal Council, insofar as these actions emanate from the Ochsenbein party. In regard to the eastern cantons, especially the *Ur-cantons*,<sup>256</sup> it is of course fearfully liberal, and even in matters of foreign policy it sometimes issues a resounding trumpet-call in order, behind the warlike tone, to smuggle in the most non-committal neutrality. A more or less obscure newspaper, the *Bundeszeitung*, steers approximately the same course, as does also the French newspaper, *La Suisse*, edited in bad French by the Piedmontese Bassi. While not so directly linked with the Government as the *Verfassungs-Freund*, it is no less zealous in flattering the ruling liberal majority, and with great persistence but little success it attacks the revolutionary press of French Switzerland, in particular the *Nouvelliste Vaudois*. It behaves more decently in regard to the Italian question in which its editor takes a direct part.—These three newspapers appear daily.

The radical party has the largest number of newspapers. At their head is the *Berner-Zeitung*, of which the editor-in-chief is the barrister Niggeler, Vice-President of the Great Council and member of the Council of States. This newspaper is the organ of the markedly radical party of the German part of the canton, represented in the Government Council by Finance Director Stämpfli. Implementation of democracy in the legislation and administration of the canton, from which much ancient rubbish has still to be removed, the greatest possible centralisation throughout Switzerland, abandonment of the policy of neutrality at the first opportunity—these are the main principles in the editing of this newspaper.

The most eminent representatives of Berne radicalism participate in this work, and it is therefore not surprising that the *Berner-Zeitung* is the best edited newspaper not only in the canton, but in the whole of German Switzerland. If the editors and contributors could write quite freely the newspaper would be much better still, the one and indivisible Helvetican republic<sup>257</sup> would come into prominence, with a very red coloration at that; but that cannot be done just now; the party would not yet tolerate it. Appearing alongside the *Berner-Zeitung* from January 1, and also daily, is *L'Helvétie fédérale*, the successor of the newspaper *Helvétie*, formerly published in Pruntrut<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> The French name is Porrentruy.—*Ed.*

in the Jura, organ of the Jura radicals and their leader, Colonel Stockmar, a member of the Government Council. The old *Helvétie* was definitely red; the new one is equally so, indeed in an even more marked degree.

The *Schweizer Zeitung* (previously *Der Freie Schweizer*) is likewise a representative of radicalism, but exclusively of the bourgeois variety, and therefore restricts itself wholly to demanding economic reforms which are advantageous to the ruling, propertied class. For the rest, however, this newspaper too goes beyond the usual Swiss cantonal narrow-mindedness (neutrality, sovereignty of the cantons etc.). Besides these three dailies, the Berne radicals have also a humorous newspaper, and in fact the only good one in Switzerland—the *Gukkasten* of Jenni. The *Gukkasten* (a weekly) restricts itself purely to Swiss and, particularly, Berne canton interests, but precisely for this reason it has succeeded in becoming a power in the land, so that it played an important part in the fall of the Neuhaus Government and is now trying to ensure that the Ochsenbein party does not remain at the helm too long. The merciless wit by which Jenni seeks to strip the halo of popularity from every one of the governing personalities, including Ochsenbein himself, has brought him innumerable court cases and vexations under the Neuhaus Government, and subsequently threatening letters and savage attacks. But all in vain, and the highly placed gentlemen of Berne still await the appearance of each fresh Saturday issue of the *Gukkasten* with considerable trepidation. When Blum was shot, the *Gukkasten's* weekly cartoon depicted an executioner's block and axe, surrounded by a mass of broken crowns, with the caption: "The only remedy." When the sedate bourgeois of Berne waxed indignant over this, it was followed by a cartoon in the next issue showing a lamp-post with a crown dangling from it, and with the caption: "*Suaviter in modo, fortiter in re*<sup>a</sup>—in memory of Messenhauser!"

Until the New Year, the *Seeländer Anzeiger*, published by J. A. Weingart, a member of the National Council and the Great Council, was the sole representative of socialism. The *Seeländer Anzeiger* preaches a curious mixture of tearfully sentimental and philanthropic socialism with red revolution. It keeps the former for the Berne canton, but speaks of the latter as soon as it deals with foreign countries. As regards literary form, this weekly is one of the worst edited periodicals of the canton. For the rest, in spite of the Christian soft-hearted outpourings of his soul, Herr Weingart in politics supports the most outspoken radicalism. Since the New Year, the

<sup>a</sup> Mild in manner, radical in substance.—Ed.

*Seeländer Anzeiger* has had a rival in the shape of another weekly, *Der Unabhängige*, which it is true has set itself a rather thankless task: in the conditions of the Berne canton and Switzerland in general to find starting points for propaganda of the fundamentals of socialism and to propose measures for getting rid of at least the most blatant evils. At any rate, this little newspaper is the only one in the whole of Switzerland which has adopted the right course to gain support for its ideas in this country, and if its chances of success are in proportion to the fury it has already aroused among the high and highest authorities, then its prospects are by no means bad.

Of the newspapers published outside the city, I shall mention only one: the *Evolution*, as Becker, the leader of the volunteer insurgents, has now renamed his *Revolution*.<sup>a</sup> This most outspoken of all the newspapers published in Switzerland alone calls for a new European revolution, for which it tries to win supporters among its entourage. By way of thanks, the peaceful burghers detest it, and it finds few readers, apart from the German refugees in Switzerland, Besançon and Alsace.

In a forthcoming article I shall examine in more detail the newspapers published outside Berne.<sup>258</sup>

Written by Engels on January 11, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 197, January 17, 1849

Published in English for the first time

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 205.—Ed.

PROTECTIONIST AGITATION.—  
RECRUITING INTO THE NEAPOLITAN ARMY

*Berne*, January 12. The protective tariff agitation in Switzerland is growing more and more lively, and so, in the same proportion, is the movement in the interest of preserving the free trade system which has existed up to now. The arguments of both sides are equally excellent and it is very hard to see how Switzerland will extricate itself from the dilemma. The protectionist party points to the yearly increasing pressure of foreign competition on home industry and the proportionately vanishing prospects for providing work for the growing unemployed population. As against this the free traders stress the price increases of industrial products, affecting the agricultural majority of the people, and the impossibility for a nation of two million people to protect a border as extended, and as suitable for smuggling, as the Swiss border, without ruinous expense. Both parties are perfectly right; without protective tariffs one branch of Swiss industry after another is ruined; with protective tariffs the federal finances are ruined. To unite both, the *Berner Verfassungs-Freund* proposes a *juste-milieu* tariff which would ruin both together. In March the Federal Councils will have to break their teeth on the impossible solution of this problem.

In Geneva for some time past, Neapolitan recruiting officers were seen going around trying to raise recruits for the service of His Bombarding Majesty.<sup>239</sup> Ferdinand must need the sturdy Swiss very badly if he even allows recruiting in cantons with which he has no enlistment agreement. But the Geneva Government soon put an end to these activities. It declared all engagements already entered into as null and void, forbade all recruiting, and threatened the recruiting officers with harsh punishment. The mercenaries of the Neapolitan hyena thereupon withdrew in all haste from the Geneva area.

Written by Engels on January 12, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 197, January 17, 1849

Published in English for the first time

MÜLLER.—THE FREIBURG GOVERNMENT.—  
OCHSENBEIN

*Berne*, January 13. The great Herr Tobias Müller has at last arrived in the canton of Uri and is demanding from the Government that the depot of Neapolitan recruits, which was previously in Genoa, now be moved to Altorf, from whence he will send them by one route or another to Naples. It is not known whether the Government will agree to his demands; even if it does, it is still questionable whether the other governments bound by the enlistment agreement will be satisfied with the proposed move.—A troop of Lucerne recruits are, it is said, to be forwarded via Trieste to Naples, to the scandal of the whole civilised world.

The Freiburg Government, which in general is guilty of strangely arbitrary actions, has again, despite the new Federal Constitution, had a Schwyz canton citizen deported. Already earlier it had just as unceremoniously thrown out Herr Sieber of Zurich, editor of the *Wächter* of Murten, and present co-editor of the *Berner-Zeitung*. Both cases will come before the Federal Assembly, and it is hoped it will see that the Constitution is respected.

A wonder has come to pass: the press organ of the neutral Herr Ochsenbein, the *Verfassungs-Freund*, recognises repentantly that the Tessiniers were not so much in the wrong in their quarrels with Radetzky and the East-Swiss troops.<sup>a</sup> He stammers his *pater, peccavi*<sup>b</sup> and tries to cover the matter up with an *Iliacos intra peccatur muros et extra*.<sup>c</sup> And yet the Tessin government councillors are the most confirmed anti-neutralists among the supporters of what Ochsen-

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 136.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Father, I have sinned.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Sins are committed inside and outside the walls of Ilion.—*Ed.*

bein, in a malicious appeal to Swiss narrow-mindedness, calls "foreign policy". But the Tessiners have become very popular in Berne as a result of the reports of the Berne soldiers, and Herr Ochsenbein has got to remain popular in Berne; and finally, this is the bottom of the business, the Federal Council, without any cause, has just *made* the canton of Tessin again *responsible* for all further complications with Radetzky. But whenever Herr Ochsenbein perpetrates in the Federal Council a practical dirty trick, the *Verfassungs-Freund* must, in theory, clothe it in magnanimous and noble language. That's how they rule the stupid peasants in this country. Oh, democracy!

Written by Engels on January 13, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 197, January 17, 1849

Published in English for the first time



MONTESQUIEU LVI<sup>240</sup>

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 201, January 21, 1849]

Cologne, January 20. The "honourable" *Joseph Dumont* allows an anonymous writer, who is not paid by him but pays him and who in the feature section seeks to influence the *primary electors*, to address the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* in the following way<sup>a</sup>:

"The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, the *Organ of Democracy*, has been pleased to take notice of the articles published in this paper under the title 'To the Primary Electors', and to state that they were taken from the *Neue Preussische Zeitung*.<sup>241</sup>

"In face of this *lie*, we simply declare that these articles are paid for as *advertisements*, and that, with the exception of the first one, taken from the *Parlaments-Korrespondenz*, they were written in Cologne and their author has up to now not even seen, let alone read, the *Neue Preussische Zeitung*."

We understand how important it is for Montesquieu LVI to authenticate his *property*. We also understand how important for Herr Dumont is the statement that he is "*paid*" even for the leaflets and advertisements which he sets up, prints and distributes in the interest of his class, the *bourgeoisie*.

As for the anonymous writer, he is aware of the French saying: "Les beaux esprits se rencontrent."<sup>b</sup> It is not his fault that his own intellectual products and those of the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* and of the "Prussian associations"<sup>242</sup> are as alike as two peas.

We *have never read* his advertisements in the *Kölnische Zeitung*, but the leaflets produced by Dumont's printing-house and sent to us from various quarters, we deemed worthy of a casual glance. Now,

<sup>a</sup> Here follows the statement by the *Kölnische Zeitung* editors published in their paper on January 20, 1849 (issue No. 17), following the address "To the Primary Electors".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Great minds think alike.—*Ed.*

however, comparison has shown us that the same stuff plays the simultaneous role of advertisement and leaflet.

In order to atone for the injustice we have done to the anonymous Montesquieu LVI we have imposed upon ourselves the harsh penance of reading all his advertisements in the *Kölnische Zeitung* and making his intellectual private property available to the German public as "common property".<sup>243</sup>

*Here is wisdom!*

Montesquieu LVI is chiefly concerned with the *social question*. He has found the "easiest and simplest way" to solve it, and he extols his Morison pill<sup>244</sup> with the most unctuous, naively shameless pathos of a quack.

"The easiest and simplest way, however, to achieve this" (that is the solution of the social question) "is to accept the Constitution imposed on December 5 last year, revise it, then make everyone swear allegiance to it, and thus to establish it. *This is our only way to salvation. Consequently, any man who has a sympathetic heart for the misery of his poor brothers, who wants to feed the hungry and clothe the naked ... anyone, in short, who wants to solve the social question*" ... *should not vote for anyone who is opposed to the Constitution*" (Montesquieu LVI).

Vote for Brandenburg-Manteuffel-Ladenberg, and the *social question* will be solved in the "simplest" and "easiest way"! Vote for Dumont, Camphausen, Wittgenstein or else for *dii minorum gentium*<sup>b</sup> such as Compes and Mevissen—and the *social question* will be solved! The "social question" for a vote! He who "wants to feed the hungry and clothe the naked" should vote for Hansemann and Stupp! One social question less for each vote! Acceptance of the imposed Constitution—*voilà la solution du problème social!*<sup>c</sup>

We do not for a moment doubt that neither Montesquieu LVI nor his patrons in the citizens' associations will wait for the imposed Constitution to be accepted, revised, sworn, and promulgated before "feeding the hungry and clothing the naked".<sup>245</sup> Measures have already been taken to this end.

During the last few weeks circulars have been distributed here in which capitalists inform craftsmen, shopkeepers etc. that, in view of the present state of affairs and the revival of credit, the rate of interest, for philanthropical reasons, has been raised from 4 to 5 per cent. First solution of the social question!

The Municipal Council here has in the same spirit drawn up a "*Worker's Card*" for the unfortunate people who must either starve

<sup>a</sup> In the *Kölnische Zeitung*: "social questions".—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> The gods of minor nations.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> There is the solution of the social problem!—Ed.

or sell their hands to the city (cf. No. 187 of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*<sup>a</sup>). It will be remembered that under this Charter imposed on the workers, the worker who has lost his job is bound by contract to place himself under *police surveillance*. Second solution of the social question!

Shortly after the March events, the Municipal Council established an eating-house in Cologne at cost prices, beautifully furnished, with fine rooms that could be heated etc. After the granting of the Constitution other premises were substituted for this, premises managed by the poor-law administration, where there is no heating, no crockery, where food may not be consumed on the spot and where a quart of indescribable gruel costs eight pfennigs. Third solution of the social question!

While they ruled Vienna the workers guarded the Bank, the houses and the wealth of the bourgeois who had fled. These same bourgeois, on their return, denounced these workers to Windischgrätz as "robbers" who ought to be *hanged*. The unemployed who applied to the Municipal Council were put into the army to fight Hungary. Fourth solution of the social question!

In Breslau the wretched people who were obliged to seek refuge in the poor-house were calmly exposed to cholera by the Municipal Council and the Government, which deprived them of the most essential physical necessities of life, and took notice of the victims of their cruel charity only when they themselves were attacked by the disease. Fifth solution of the social question!

In the Berlin Association "with God for King and Fatherland",<sup>246</sup> a supporter of the imposed Constitution declared that it was distressing that in order to further one's interests and plans one still had to pay compliments to the "*proletariat*".

That is the solution of the "solution of the social question"!

"The Prussian spies are so dangerous because they are never paid but are always hoping to be paid," says our friend Heine. And the Prussian bourgeois are so dangerous because they never pay but always promise to pay.

During an election the English and French bourgeois spend quite a lot of money. Their corrupt practices are well known. The Prussian bourgeois "are the most shrewd"! They are much too virtuous and upright to dip into their pocket; they pay with the "*solution of the social question*". And that costs nothing. Montesquieu LVI, however, as Dumont officially assures us, pays at least for the advertisements

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 218-21.—Ed.

in the *Kölnische Zeitung* and adds—gratis—the solution of the “social questions”.

The practical part of our Montesquieu's *petites œuvres* thus boils down to the following: Vote for Brandenburg-Manteuffel-Ladenberg! Elect Camphausen-Hansemann! Send us to Berlin, just let our people establish themselves there. That is the *solution of the social question!*

The immortal *Hansemann* has solved these questions. First, the establishment of law and order to revive credit. Then, the solution of the “social question” with powder and shot, as in 1844, when “my dear Silesian weavers ought to be helped”<sup>1247</sup>

Vote therefore for the friends of the imposed Constitution!

But Montesquieu LVI accepts the imposed Constitution only to be able afterwards to “revise” and “swear allegiance to it”!

My dear Montesquieu! Once you have accepted the Constitution you can revise it only on its own basis, that is insofar as it suits the King and the Second Chamber consisting of country squires, financial magnates, high-ranking officials and clerics. This only possible revision has been judiciously indicated already in the imposed Constitution itself. It consists in abandoning the constitutional system and restoring the former Christian-Germanic *system of estates*.

After the acceptance of the imposed Constitution this is the only possible and only permitted revision, which cannot have escaped the shrewd Montesquieu.

Thus the *petites œuvres* of Montesquieu LVI, in their practical part, amount to this: Vote for Hansemann-Camphausen! Vote for Dumont-Stupp! Vote for Brandenburg-Manteuffel! Accept the imposed Constitution! Elect delegates who accept the imposed Constitution—and all this under the pretext of solving “the social question”.

What the hell does the pretext matter to us, when it is a question of the imposed Constitution.

But our Montesquieu of course prefaces his practical instructions for the solution of “the social question”, the quintessence of his monumental work, with a theoretical part. Let us examine this theoretical part.

The profound thinker explains first *what the “social questions” are*.

“What then, in effect, is the social question?

“Man must and wants to live.

“To live he needs dwellings, clothes and food.

“Dwellings and clothes are not produced by nature at all, and only a scanty and by no means sufficient amount of food grows naturally.

"Hence man himself must procure everything to satisfy these needs.

"This he does by labour.

"Labour, therefore, is the first condition of our life; without labour we cannot live.

"Among primitive peoples everybody built his own hut, made his own clothes from animal skins and gathered fruit for his meals. That was the primitive state.

"But if man needs nothing beyond shelter, clothes and food, if he satisfies merely his *physical* wants, then he remains at the same level as the animals, for animals can do this too.

"But man is a higher being than an animal, he needs more, he needs joy, he must raise himself to moral values. But he can do that only if he lives in society.

"But once men began to live in societies entirely new conditions arose. They soon perceived that work was much easier when each individual performed only one particular job. Thus, one made clothes, another built houses, a third provided food, and the first gave the second what he lacked. The various social estates of men thus developed automatically, one becoming a hunter, another a craftsman, and a third a cultivator. But men did not stop at this, for humanity must go forward. People began to invent. They invented spinning and weaving, they learned to forge iron and tan hides. The more inventions were made the more diverse did the crafts become, and the easier did farming become with the aid of the plough and spade which the handicrafts gave it. One thing helped another and everything was interconnected. Then intercourse started with neighbouring peoples; one people had what the other needed, and the latter possessed things the former lacked. These were exchanged. Thus *trading* arose, that is a new branch of human activity. Thus culture advanced step by step; from the first clumsy inventions through the centuries down to the inventions of our day.

"Thus, the sciences and the arts arose among men and life became ever richer and more varied. The physician treated the sick, the clergyman preached, the merchant traded, the farmer tilled the land, the gardener grew flowers, the mason built houses, for which the carpenter made the furniture, the miller ground flour from which the baker baked bread. Everything was interconnected, no one could live in isolation, nobody could satisfy all his needs himself.

"These are the social relations.

"They have arisen quite naturally of their own accord. And if today you make a revolution which destroys the very foundations of these relations, and if tomorrow you start life anew, *then relations exactly the same as the present ones will arise again*. This has been so for thousands of years among all the nations on earth. And if anyone draws a distinction between the workers and the bourgeoisie this is a *big lie*. *We all work*, each in his own way, each according to his strength and abilities. The physician works when he visits the sick, the musician when he plays a dance tune, the merchant when he writes his letters. Everyone works, each at his job."

*Here is wisdom! He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.<sup>2</sup>*

*What, then, in effect is the situation with the physiological question?*

Every corporeal being presupposes a certain weight, density etc. Every organic body consists of various component parts, each of which performs its own special function, and reciprocal interaction takes place between the organs.

"*These are physiological relations.*"

<sup>2</sup> Matthew 11: 15.—Ed.

Montesquieu LVI cannot be denied an original talent for simplifying science. He ought to be granted a patent (without government guarantee).

The products of labour cannot be produced without labour. One cannot reap without sowing, one cannot have yarn without weaving etc.

Europe will bend in admiration before the great genius who here, in Cologne, without any aid from the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* has himself brought these truths to light.

In their work men enter into certain relations with one another. There takes place a *division of labour* which may be more or less diversified. One person bakes, another forges iron, one person agitates [*wührt*], another wails [*heult*],<sup>248</sup> Montesquieu LVI writes and Dumont prints. *Adam Smith*, acknowledge thy master!

These discoveries, that *labour* and the *division of labour* are essential conditions of life of every human society, enable Montesquieu LVI to draw the conclusion that the existence of the "*various social estates*" is quite natural, that the distinction between "bourgeoisie and proletariat" is a "*big lie*", that even if a "*revolution*" were completely to destroy the existing "social relations" today, "*relations exactly the same as the present ones will arise again*", and finally that for anyone who has "a sympathetic heart for the misery of his poor brothers" and who wishes to gain the respect of Montesquieu LVI, it is absolutely necessary to elect delegates in keeping with the ideas of Manteuffel and the imposed Constitution.

"*This has been so for thousands of years among all the nations on earth*"!!! In Egypt there was labour and division of labour—and *castes*; in Greece and Rome labour and division of labour—and *free men and slaves*; in the Middle Ages labour and division of labour—and *feudal lords and serfs, guilds, social estates* etc. In our day there is labour and division of labour—and *classes*, one of which owns all means of production and all means of subsistence, while the other lives only so long as it sells its labour,<sup>249</sup> and it sells its labour only so long as the employing class enriches itself by purchasing this labour.

Is it not obvious, therefore, that "*for thousands of years it has been the same among all the nations on earth*" as it is in Prussia today, since *labour and division of labour* have always existed in one form or another? Or is it, on the contrary, evident that the social relations, the property relations, were always overthrown by the constantly changing method of labour and division of labour?

In 1789 the bourgeois did not tell feudal society that an aristocrat should remain an aristocrat, a serf a serf and a guildsman a guildsman—because there is no society without labour and division

of labour. There is no life without breathing of air. Hence, argues Montesquieu LVI, breathe the stuffy air and do not open any window.

One must possess the naively clumsy insolence of a German imperial philistine grown grey in crass ignorance to contribute oracular pronouncements upon problems on which our century is breaking its teeth, after having rammed the first elements of political economy—labour and division of labour—in a superficial and distorted manner into his inert head.

“There is no society without labour and division of labour.

*Therefore*

“Elect friends of the imposed Prussian Constitution, and only friends of the imposed Constitution, as delegates.”

This epitaph some day will be inscribed in large letters on the walls of the magnificent marble mausoleum which a grateful posterity will feel obliged to erect for Montesquieu LVI (not to be confused with Henry CCLXXXIV of Reuss-Schleiz-Greiz-Lobenstein-Eberswalde<sup>a</sup>) who solved the social question.

Montesquieu LVI does not conceal from us “*where the difficulty lies*” and what he intends to do as soon as he is proclaimed a lawgiver.

“*The state,*” he teaches us, “*must see to it that everybody receives sufficient education to be able to learn something useful in this world.*”

Montesquieu LVI has never heard that under existing conditions the division of labour replaces complex labour by simple labour, the labour of adults by that of children, the labour of men by that of women, the labour of the independent workers by automations; that, in proportion as modern industry develops, the education of workers becomes unnecessary and impossible. We refer the Montesquieu of Cologne neither to *Saint-Simon* nor to *Fourier* but to *Malthus* and *Ricardo*. This worthy should first acquaint himself with the rudiments of present-day conditions before trying to improve them and making oracular utterances.

“*The community must take care of people who have been reduced to poverty as a result of illness or old age.*”

And if the community itself is reduced to poverty which will be the inevitable result of the 100-million tax imposed simultaneously with the new Constitution and the epidemically recurring states of siege—what then, Montesquieu?

<sup>a</sup> An allusion to Henry LXXII, Prince of Reuss-Lobenstein-Ebersdorf.—Ed.

"When new inventions or commercial crises destroy entire industries the state must come to their assistance and find remedies."

Little versed as he may be in the things of this world, it can hardly have escaped the Montesquieu of Cologne that "new inventions" and commercial crises are features just as permanent as the Prussian ministerial decrees and legal basis. New inventions, especially in Germany, are only introduced when competition with other nations makes it vital to introduce them; and should the newly arising branches of industry be expected to ruin themselves in order to render assistance to the declining ones? The new industries that come into being as a result of inventions come into being precisely because they can produce more cheaply than the declining industries. What the deuce would be the advantage if they had to feed the declining industries? But it is well known that the state, the Government, only seems to give. It has to be given something first in order to give. But who should give to it, Montesquieu LVI? The declining industry, so that it declines even faster? Or the rising industry, so that it withers even as it rises? Or those industries that have not been affected by the new inventions, so that they go bankrupt because of the invention of a new tax? Think it over carefully, Montesquieu LVI!

And what about the commercial crises, my dear man? When a European commercial crisis occurs the Prussian state is above all anxious to extract the last drops, by means of distraint etc., from the usual sources of revenue. Poor Prussian state! In order to neutralise the effect of commercial crises, the Prussian state would have to possess, in addition to national labour, a third source of income in Cloud-Cuckoo-Land. If royal New-Year greetings,<sup>a</sup> Wrangel's army orders or Manteuffel's ministerial decrees could indeed conjure up money, then the "refusal to pay taxes" would not have caused such panic among the Prussian "well-beloved loyal subjects", and the social question, too, would have been solved without an imposed Constitution.

It will be remembered that the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* called our Hansemann a communist because he intended to do away with exemption from taxation. In Cologne our Montesquieu, who has never read the *Neue Preussische Zeitung*, has all by himself conceived the idea of calling everyone a "communist" and "red republican" who endangers the imposed Constitution. Therefore, vote for Manteuffel, or you are not only personal enemies of labour and the division of labour, but also communists and red republicans.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 222-26.—Ed.



Acknowledge Brüggemann's latest "legal basis" or renounce the *Code civil*.<sup>250</sup>

*Figaro, tu n'aurais pas trouvé ça!*<sup>3</sup>

More about Montesquieu LVI tomorrow.

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 202, January 22, 1849]

Cologne, January 21. With the sly petty cunning of an experienced horse-dealer, *Montesquieu LVI* seeks to sell the "gift horse", the imposed Constitution, to the primary electors. He is the Montesquieu of the horse-fair.

Anyone not wanting the imposed Constitution wants a republic, and not just a republic, but a red republic! Unfortunately, the issue in our elections is least of all a republic, or a red republic; it is simply this:

Do you want the old *absolutism* together with a refurbished *system of social estates*, or do you want a bourgeois *system of representation*? Do you want a political constitution in keeping with the "existing social relations" of past centuries, or do you want a political constitution in keeping with the "existing social relations" of your century?

In this case, therefore, it is least of all a question of fighting against bourgeois property relations similar to the struggle that is taking place in France and is being prepared in England; rather it is a question of a struggle against a political constitution which endangers "*bourgeois* property relations" by surrendering the helm of state to the representatives of "*feudal* property relations", to the King by the grace of God, the army, the bureaucracy, the country squires, and a few financial magnates and philistines who are allied with them.

Beyond a doubt, the imposed Constitution has solved the social question in keeping with the views of these gentlemen.

What is the "*social question*" as understood by the *government official*? It is the maintenance of his salary and his present position, which is superior to the people.

What is the "*social question*" as understood by the nobility and its big landowners? It is the maintenance of the hitherto existing feudal rights of the landowners, seizure of the most lucrative posts in the army and civil service by the families of the landed nobility, and

<sup>3</sup> Figaro, you would not have found that out! An allusion to "*Ah, Figaro, pends-toi; tu n'as pas deviné celui-là!*" (Figaro, hang yourself; you didn't find that one!) from Beaumarchais' comedy *La folle journée, ou le mariage de Figaro*, Act V, Scene 8.—Ed.

finally direct aims from the public purse. Apart from these palpable *material* and therefore “*most sacred*” interests of the gentlemen “with God for King and Fatherland”<sup>a</sup> it is for them, of course, also a question of preserving those social privileges which distinguish their race from the inferior race of the bourgeois, peasants and plebeians. The old National Assembly was dispersed precisely because it dared to lay hands on these “most sacred interests”. As we have already indicated, these gentlemen, by “revision” of the imposed Constitution, understand simply the introduction of a *system of social estates*, that is to say, a form of political constitution representing the “social” interests of the feudal aristocracy, the bureaucracy and the monarchy by the grace of God.

We repeat, there is not the slightest doubt that the imposed Constitution solves the “social question” in keeping with the views of the aristocracy and the bureaucracy, in other words, it presents these gentlemen with a form of government which ensures the exploitation of the people by these demigods.

But has the imposed Constitution solved the “social question” from the standpoint of the *bourgeoisie*? In other words, does the bourgeoisie receive a political system enabling it freely to administer the affairs of its class as a whole, i.e. the interests of commerce, industry and agriculture, to make the most productive use of public funds, to manage the state budget as cheaply as possible, to protect national labour effectively from without, and within the country to open up all sources of national wealth silted by feudal mud?

Does history provide a single example showing that under a king imposed by the grace of God, the bourgeoisie ever succeeded in achieving a political system in keeping with its material interests?

In order to establish a constitutional monarchy it was twice compelled to get rid of the Stuarts in Britain, and the hereditary Bourbons in France, and to expel William of Orange from Belgium.<sup>251</sup>

What is the reason for this?

A hereditary king by the grace of God is not a particular individual but the physical representative of the old society within the new society. State power in the hands of a king by the grace of God is state power in the hands of the old society existing now merely as a ruin; it is state power in the hands of the feudal social estates, whose interests are profoundly antagonistic to those of the bourgeoisie.

<sup>a</sup> A quotation from Frederick William III's decree of March 17, 1813, on organising the army reserve.—*Ed.*

But it is precisely the "King by the grace of God" who forms the basis of the imposed Constitution.

Just as the feudal strata of society regard the monarchy by the grace of God as their *political apex*, so does the monarchy by the grace of God regard the feudal estates as its *social foundation*, the well-known "*monarchical wall*".<sup>252</sup>

Therefore, whenever the interests of the feudal lords and of the army and bureaucracy controlled by them clash with the interests of the bourgeoisie, the monarchy by the grace of God will invariably be impelled to a coup d'état and a revolutionary or counter-revolutionary crisis will arise.

Why was the National Assembly dispersed? Only because it upheld the interests of the bourgeoisie against the interests of feudalism; because it wanted to abolish the feudal relations hampering agriculture, to subordinate the army and bureaucracy to trade and industry, to stop the squandering of public funds and abolish aristocratic and bureaucratic titles.

All these were questions *chiefly* and *directly* affecting the *interests of the bourgeoisie*.

Thus, *coups d'état* and *counter-revolutionary crises* are vital conditions for the monarchy by the grace of God, which the March and similar events compelled to humiliate itself and reluctantly to accept the semblance of a bourgeois monarchy.

Can *credit* ever revive again under a political system which inevitably culminates in coups d'état, counter-revolutionary crises and states of siege?

What a delusion!

Bourgeois industry *must* burst the fetters of absolutism and feudalism. A revolution against both only demonstrates that bourgeois industry has reached a level when it must either win an appropriate political system or perish.

The system of bureaucratic tutelage guaranteed by the imposed Constitution spells *death* for industry. It is sufficient to look at the Prussian administration of mines, the factory regulations etc. When an English manufacturer compares his costs of production with those of a Prussian manufacturer, he will always first of all note the time losses which the Prussian manufacturer incurs because he has to observe bureaucratic rules.

What sugar-refiner does not remember the Prussian trade agreement with the Netherlands in 1839?<sup>253</sup> What Prussian factory owner does not blush at the memory of 1846, when the Prussian Government in deference to the Austrian Government banned exports to *Galicia* for a whole province, and when one bankruptcy

after another occurred in Breslau the Prussian Government declared with astonishment that it had had no idea that there were such important exports to Galicia etc.!

Men of the same race are placed at the helm of state by the imposed Constitution, and this "gift" itself comes from the same men. Consequently, examine it twice.

The Galicia adventure draws our attention to another point.

At that time the counter-revolutionary Prussian Government in league with Austria and Russia sacrificed Silesian industry and Silesian trade.<sup>254</sup> This manoeuvre will be constantly repeated. The banker of the Prussian-Austrian-Russian counter-revolution, from which the monarchy by the grace of God with its monarchical walls will always have to seek *outside* support, is *England*. The same *England* is German industry's most dangerous opponent. These two facts, we believe, speak for themselves.

At home, an industry fettered by bureaucracy and an agriculture fettered by feudal privileges; abroad, a trade sold by the counter-revolution to England—such is the fate of Prussia's national wealth under the aegis of the imposed Constitution.

The report of the "Financial Commission" of the dispersed National Assembly has thrown sufficient light on the management of national wealth by the grace of God.

The report however mentions only by way of example the sums taken from the treasury to support the tottering monarchical walls and gild foreign pretenders to the absolute monarchy (Don Carlos). But these monies, purloined from the pockets of the rest of the citizens to enable the aristocracy to live in appropriate style and to keep the "huttresses" of the feudal monarchy in good condition, are only of secondary importance compared with the state budget imposed simultaneously with Manteuffel's Constitution. The main features of the imposed state budget are, first of all, a *strong army* to enable the minority to rule the majority; as large an army as possible of officials so that as many of them as possible, by virtue of their private interests, are alienated from the common interest; unproductive employment of public monies in order that wealth, as the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* says, should not make the *subjects* overbold; immobilisation wherever possible of public monies instead of employing them in industry in order that at easily predictable moments of crisis the Government by the grace of God should independently confront the people. The basic principle of the imposed Prussian Constitution is to use the taxes for maintaining the state power as an oppressive, independent and sacred force contraposed to industry, commerce and agri-

culture, instead of *degrading* it into a profane *tool* of bourgeois society.

The gift is worthy of the donor. The Constitution is of a piece with the present Prussian Government that presented it. To characterise *this Government's hostility towards the bourgeoisie* it is sufficient to point to its proposed *trade regulations*. On the pretext of *advancing towards association* the Government attempts to *return to the guild system*. Competition compels the manufacturer to produce more and more cheaply and therefore on a constantly increasing scale, i.e. with *more capital*, with a continuously *expanding division of labour* and constantly *increasing use of machinery*. Every new division of labour depreciates the traditional skill of the craftsmen, every new machine ousts hundreds of workers, production on a larger scale, that is with more capital, ruins small trade and petty-bourgeois enterprise. The Government promises to protect the handicrafts against the factories, acquired skills against division of labour, and small capital against big capital, by means of *feudal guild institutions*. Thus, the German nation, particularly the Prussian, which only with the utmost difficulty and effort resists complete defeat by English competition, is to become its defenceless prey, forced to accept a form of trade organisation that is incompatible with modern means of production and is already burst wide open by modern industry.

We are certainly the last people to desire the rule of the bourgeoisie. We were the first in Germany to raise our voice against the bourgeoisie when today's "men of action" were spending their time complacently in petty squabbles.

But we say to the workers and the petty bourgeois: it is better to suffer in modern bourgeois society, which by its industry creates the material means for the foundation of a new society that will liberate you all, than to revert to a bygone form of society, which, on the pretext of saving your classes, thrusts the entire nation back into medieval barbarism.

But medieval social estates and conditions are, as we have seen, the *social foundation* of the Government by the grace of God. This Government is unsuitable for modern bourgeois society. It necessarily tries to create a society in its own image. It is *entirely consistent* when it attempts to replace free competition by the guild system, mechanical spinning by the spinning-wheel and the steam plough by the hoe.

Why is it then that, under these circumstances, the Prussian bourgeoisie, in complete contrast to its French, English and Belgian predecessors, proclaims as its shibboleth the imposed Constitution

(and with it the monarchy by the grace of God, the bureaucracy and the junkers)?

The commercial and industrial sections of the bourgeoisie throw themselves into the arms of the counter-revolution for fear of the revolution. As though counter-revolution were not the overture to revolution.

There is moreover a section of the *bourgeoisie* that, quite indifferent to the interests of its class as a whole, pursues its own particular interests, which may even be inimical to those of its class.

These are financial magnates, big creditors of the state, bankers, and rentiers, whose wealth increases proportionately to the poverty of the people, and finally men whose business depends on the old political structure, e.g. *Dumont* and his literary lumpenproletariat. These are ambitious professors, lawyers and similar persons, who can only hope to obtain respectable posts in a state where betrayal of the people's interests to the Government is a lucrative business.

These are individual manufacturers who do well out of their transactions with the Government; contractors whose considerable profits depend on the general exploitation of the people; philistines who lose their importance in political life on a large scale; local councillors who under cover of the old institutions arrange their private shady affairs at the expense of the public; oil merchants who by betrayal of the revolution have become Excellencies and Knights of the Eagle<sup>a</sup>; bankrupt cloth merchants and speculators in railway shares who have become royal bank directors<sup>b</sup> etc., etc.

"It is they who are the friends of the imposed Constitution." If the bourgeoisie has a *sympathetic heart for these poor brothers* and if it wants to be worthy of the respect of Montesquieu LVI, then it should elect *delegates in keeping with the imposed Constitution*.

Written by Marx on January 20-21, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* Nos. 201 and 202, January 21 and 22, 1849

<sup>a</sup> Probably an allusion to the supporters of the Prussian royal house, whose coat of arms featured an eagle.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> An allusion to Camphausen and Hansemann.—*Ed.*

[ANSWER FROM COLONEL ENGELS]<sup>255</sup>

*Cologne.* We have received from Colonel Engels the following answer to our question of two days ago.

"To the insertion in No. 203 of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* the answer is No.

"Only private persons have permitted themselves to express the opinion, unlawful in my view, that not enough by a long chalk has been done to these houses by the soldiers.

*Cologne*, January 24, 1849

Engels, Colonel,  
2nd Commandant

"To the esteemed editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*."

We will very likely have new questions to put to Herr Engels in the next few days, and particularly about the elections.

Written by Engels on January 25, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the supplement to the  
*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 205, January  
26, 1849

Published in English for the first  
time

THE PRUSSIAN WARRANT FOR THE ARREST  
OF KOSSUTH

Cologne, January 21. We have just received the following edifying document published in the *Oppelner Kreisblatt*:

"*Warrant of Arrest.* According to a statement of the royal imperial Austrian governmental commission in Cracow, measures have been taken in Hungary to enable Kossuth under a false name to reach Hamburg via Breslau. It is supposed that he will take the route through Myslowitz, Gleiwitz and Kosel.

"On the basis of instructions from the Herr *Oberpräsident* of the province of Silesia, I order all police authorities, local courts and gendarmerie to keep a sharp look-out for Kossuth, whose description is given below, and in the event of his appearance on their territory to arrest him and to deliver him to me safely for further steps."

(Here follows, as already stated, Kossuth's description.) This edifying document is signed:

"Oppeln, January 17, 1849

Royal *Landrat Hoffmann*"

What have our readers to say to that? The Manteuffels of Upper Silesia by the grace of God would be quite pleased to arrest the great agitator Kossuth if he were defeated and succeeded in crossing the frontier, and to deliver him to his executioners for the speediest pardon with gunpowder and shot. If Kossuth is in actual fact handed over, this will be *the most foul betrayal, the most infamous violation of international law* that history has ever known.

Under the old legislation of the German Confederation,<sup>256</sup> of course, Prussia was obliged to hand over to German Austria, on the demand of the latter, political refugees charged with actions carried out on the *territory of the German Confederation*. The revolution overthrew the old legislation of the German Confederation, and *even under the Pfiel Government refugees from Vienna* were safe in Berlin.



But Prussia has no such obligations in relation to *Hungary*. Hungary is an independent state and if Prussia hands over Hungarian refugees who can be charged only with actions carried out on Hungarian territory, it commits the same *disgraceful and infamous* deed as if it handed over Russian or Polish refugees to Russia.

Even under the Bodenschwingh regime the authorities did not dare to hand over to Austria the refugees from Galicia and Cracow who had crossed the border into Prussia.<sup>257</sup> But, on the other hand, of course, at that time we were under an absolute monarchy, and today we are a constitutional state!

Moreover, if Kossuth crosses into Prussian territory he will not be a political refugee but a *belligerent party that has crossed into neutral territory*.

German Austria, an independent union of states, is waging war against Hungary, an independent state; the reason for it is no concern of Prussia's. Even in 1831 the authorities did not dare to hand over to Russia the Poles who had crossed the border into Prussia<sup>258</sup>; but at that time, too, we were under an absolute monarchy, and today we are a constitutional state!

We draw the attention of public opinion to the benevolent intentions of the Prussian Government in regard to Kossuth. We are convinced that this will suffice to arouse such a storm of sympathy for the greatest man of the year 1848, and such a storm of indignation against the Government, that even a Manteuffel will not dare to oppose it.

But, of course, for the time being Kossuth still rules in Debreczin, with the enthusiastic support of the entire Magyar people; his valiant hussars still gallop over the Hungarian plains,<sup>259</sup> Windischgrätz still stands in perplexity facing the swamps of the Theiss, and your warrants of arrest are ridiculous rather than frightening!

Written by Engels on January 21, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 207, January 28, 1849

Published in English for the first time

THE BERLIN NATIONAL-ZEITUNG  
TO THE PRIMARY ELECTORS

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 205, January 26, 1849]

Cologne, January 25. Although rarely, it does happen from time to time that one has the pleasure of seeing a signpost of the good old pre-March times rising out of the alluvial deposit which the double deluge of revolution and counter-revolution has left behind. Mountains have been shifted, valleys have been filled up, and forests levelled to the ground, but the signpost still stands in its old place, painted in the old colours, and still bearing the old inscription: "To Schilda!"<sup>260</sup>

Just such a signpost stretches its wooden arm towards us from No. 21 of the *Berlin National-Zeitung* with the inscription: "*To the primary electors. To Schilda!*"

The well-meant advice of the *National-Zeitung* to the primary electors states first of all:

"The hour has come when the Prussian people is about to exercise for the second time its hard-won universal suffrage" (as if the so-called universal suffrage, granted from above, with its different interpretation in each village, were the same suffrage as that of April 8!<sup>261</sup>), "from which are to come the men who for the second time have to declare what is the spirit (!), the opinion (!! ) and the will (!!!) not of separate social estates and classes, but of the whole people."

We shall not speak of the turgidly clumsy style of this sentence which advances slowly and long-windedly from one word to the next. Universal suffrage, it says, should reveal to us the will not of separate social estates and classes, but of the whole people.

Fine! But what does "the whole people" consist of?

Of "separate social estates and classes".

And what does "the will of the whole people" consist of?

Of the separate contradictory "wills" of the "separate social estates and classes", hence precisely of the will which the *National-*

*Zeitung* describes as the direct opposite of the "will of the whole people".

What a great logician the *National-Zeitung* is!

For the *National-Zeitung*, however, there exists a *single* will of the whole people, which is not the sum of contradictory wills, but a united, definite will. How can that be?

It is—the will of the majority.

And what is the will of the majority?

It is the will which derives from the interests, the situation in life, and the living conditions of the majority.

Consequently, in order to have one and the same will, the members of the majority must have the same interests, the same situation in life, and the same living conditions, or for the time being they must be linked with one another by their interests, their situation in life, and their living conditions.

In plain language: the will of the people, the will of the majority, is the will not of separate social estates and classes, but of a *single class* and of those other classes and sections of classes which are subordinated to this one ruling class socially, i.e. industrially and commercially.

"But what are we to say to that?" That the will of the whole people is the will of a ruling class?

Of course, and it is precisely universal suffrage that acts as the compass needle which, even if only after various fluctuations, nevertheless finally points to this class which is called upon to rule.

And this good *National-Zeitung* still continues, as in 1847, to chatter about an imaginary "will of the whole people"!

Let us proceed. After this elevating exordium the *National-Zeitung* astounds us with the following significant remark:

"In January 1849 the state of affairs is different from the May days of 1848 so rich in hope and elation" (why not also in piety?).

All was then adorned with blossom,  
And the sun's rays shone with laughter,  
And the birds sang so full of hope,  
And the people hoped and thought—  
They were deep in thought.<sup>3</sup>

"At that time there seemed to be complete unanimity that the great reforms, which should have been undertaken in Prussia already long ago if on the foundations laid in 1807-14 there had been further construction in the spirit of that time and in accord with the higher level of culture and understanding since achieved, would now have to be carried out completely and without delay."

<sup>3</sup> Heinrich Heine, *Deutschland. Ein Wintermärchen*, Caput VIII.—Ed.

"At that time there seemed to be complete unanimity"! Grand, delightful naivety of the *National-Zeitung*! At that time, when the Guards, gnashing their teeth in fury, were retreating from Berlin, when the Prince of Prussia had to flee in haste from Berlin in a postilion's jacket, when the upper ranks of the nobility and bourgeoisie had to suppress their anger at the ignominy which the King was made to suffer in the palace-yard when the people forced him to remove his hat before the dead bodies of those killed during the March days—"at that time there seemed to be complete unanimity"!

Heaven knows, it is already overdoing it to have imagined anything of the sort. But now, after one has had to admit to having been cheated, to proclaim one's cheated gullibility from the house-tops—truly, *c'est par trop bonhomme!*<sup>a</sup>

And on what did there "seem to be complete unanimity"?

On "that the great reforms, which *should have been* undertaken ... if ... *there had been* further construction ... would now *have to be* carried out".

On that there was—no, there *seemed to be*—complete unanimity.

The great March achievement, expressed in worthy language!

And what "reforms" were these?

Development of the "foundations laid in 1807-14 in the spirit of that time and in accord with the higher level of culture and understanding since achieved".

That is to say in the spirit of 1807-14, and at the same time in quite a different spirit.

The "*spirit of that time*" consisted quite simply in the extremely *material* pressure of the French of that time on the Prussian junker monarchy of that time, as well as in the likewise unfavourable financial deficit of the Prussian kingdom at that time. In order to make the bourgeois and the peasant capable of paying taxes, in order to introduce at least in appearance among the royal Prussian subjects some of the reforms which the French had lavished on the conquered parts of Germany—in short, in order in some degree to patch up the decayed monarchy of the Hohenzollerns that was splitting at every seam, *for the sake of that* a few niggardly so-called urban by-laws, redemption orders, army institutions etc. were introduced. The only distinction of these reforms was that they were a whole century behind the French revolution of 1789, and indeed even behind the English revolution of 1640. And that is supposed to be the foundations for Prussia that has been revolutionised?

<sup>a</sup> That is too simple-minded!—*Ed.*

But old-Prussian conceit always sees Prussia in the centre of world history, whereas in reality world history has always dragged the "state of reason"<sup>a</sup> after it, through the mire. This old-Prussian conceit has, of course, to ignore the fact that as long as Prussia was not kicked by the French, it calmly remained on the undeveloped foundations of 1807-14 and never stirred at all. It has to ignore the fact that these foundations were long ago forgotten when the glorious bureaucratic-junker royal Prussian monarchy in February last year received a new and so powerful push from the French that it most gloriously toppled over from its "foundations of 1807-14". It has to ignore the fact that for the royal Prussian monarchy it was in no way a question of these foundations, but merely one of warding off the further consequences of the push received from France. But Prussian conceit ignores all that, and when it suddenly receives the push, it cries out, like a child crying for its nurse, for the decayed foundations of 1807-14.

As if the Prussia of 1848, as regards territory, industry, trade, means of communication, culture and class relations, were not a totally different country from the Prussia of the "foundations of 1807-14"!

As if since that time two quite new classes—the industrial proletariat and the class of free peasants—had not intervened in its history; as if the Prussian bourgeoisie of 1848 were not quite different from the timid, docile and grateful petty bourgeoisie of the time of the "foundations"!

But all that is of no avail. A loyal Prussian must not know anything but his "foundations of 1807-14". Those are the foundations on which further construction will take place—and that is the end of the matter.

The beginning of one of the most colossal historical revolutions is shrunken into nothing more than the ending of one of the pettiest pseudo-reform swindles—that is how revolution is understood in old Prussia!

And in this self-complacent narrow-minded fantasy from the country's history "there seemed to be complete unanimity"—of course, only in Berlin, thank God!

Let us proceed.

"Those social estates and classes which had to renounce privileges and special rights ... which were destined in the future to stand only on an equal footing with all

---

<sup>a</sup> Marx uses ironically the expression *Staat der Intelligenz* by which Hegel designates the Prussian state (see G. W. F. Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie. Vorrede, gesprächen zu Heidelberg den 29-ten Oktober 1816* (Note).—Ed.

their fellow citizens ... seemed prepared for that renunciation—inspired by the conviction that the old state of things had become untenable, that it was in their own well-understood interest....”

Look at this meek and mild, sincerely humble bourgeois—how once again he conjures away the revolution! The nobility, the priests, the bureaucrats, the officers, “seemed prepared” to renounce their privileges, not because the armed people forced them to do so, not because in the first moments of terror at the European revolution, the demoralisation and disorganisation irresistibly spreading in their own ranks made them incapable of resistance—no! The peaceful, benevolent “agreements” (to use Herr Camphausen’s language) of February 24 and March 18,<sup>3</sup> which were advantageous to both sides, “inspired” them with the “conviction” that this “was in their own well-understood interest”!

That the March revolution, and above all February 24, was in the well-understood interest of the Herren cabbage-junkers, members of church councils, *Regierungsräte*, and Guards lieutenants—that is indeed a truly monumental idea!

But, unfortunately!

“Today it is no longer like that. The beneficiaries and adherents of the old state of affairs, far from themselves helping, *as is their duty* (!), to see that the old rubbish is cleared away and the new house built, want only to prop up the old ruins beneath which the ground shook so dangerously and to embellish them with some forms in appearance appropriate to the new period.”

“Today it is no longer like that”—as it *appeared* to be in May, i.e. it is no longer what it was not in May, or it is precisely the same as it was in May.

That is the sort of language in which the Berlin *National-Zeitung* is written and, what is more, its writers are proud of it.

In a word: May 1848 and January 1849 differ from one another only *in appearance*. Previously the counter-revolutionaries *seemed* to understand their duty—today they actually and openly do not, and the peaceful bourgeois moans about it. After all, it is the *duty* of the counter-revolutionaries to renounce their interests for the sake of their own well-understood interest! It is their *duty* themselves to cut their vital arteries—yet, they do not do so—thus moans the exponent of well-understood interest!

And why do your enemies not do now what, as you say, is nevertheless their duty?

---

<sup>3</sup> On February 24, 1848, Louis Philippe was overthrown in France; March 18, 1848—the beginning of the revolution in Prussia.—*Ed.*

Because in the spring you yourselves did not do *your* "duty", because at that time, when you were strong, you behaved like cowards and quaked before the revolution that was to make you great and powerful; because you yourselves let the old rubbish remain and complacently admired yourselves in the mirror wearing the aureole of a half success! And now, when the counter-revolution has become strong overnight and sets its foot on your neck, when under *your* feet the ground shakes dangerously—now you demand that the counter-revolution should become your servant, should clear away the rubbish that you were too weak and cowardly to clear away, that it, grown mighty, should sacrifice itself for you who are weak?

What childish fools you are! But wait a little and the people will rise up and with a single mighty push will throw you to the ground together with the counter-revolution against which you are now so impotently yapping!

[*Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 207, January 28, 1849, second edition]

Cologne, January 27. In our first article we did not take into account one circumstance which could, at any rate apparently, serve to excuse the *National-Zeitung*; the *National-Zeitung* is not free in what it writes—it is under *martial law*. And under martial law it has, of course, to sing:

Bid me not speak, bid me be silent,  
To keep my secret is for me a duty;  
I would for you my inmost soul lay bare,  
'Tis only fate that will not let me do so!!!<sup>a</sup>

Even under martial law, however, newspapers are not published in order to say the opposite of what they think; moreover, martial law has nothing to do with the first half, which we considered previously, of the article in question.

Martial law is not to blame for the inflated, nebulous style of the *National-Zeitung*.

Martial law is not to blame for the fact that after March the *National-Zeitung* created for itself all sorts of naive illusions.

Martial law does not at all compel the *National-Zeitung* to make the 1848 revolution the train-bearer of the reforms of 1807-14.

<sup>a</sup> Goethe, "Mignon". From the novel *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*, Book V, Chapter 16.—Ed

In short, martial law in no way compels the *National-Zeitung* to entertain such absurd notions about the course of development of the revolution and counter-revolution in 1848 as we proved it to hold two days ago. Martial law affects not the past but the present.

Therefore, in our criticism of the *first* half of the article in question, we did not take martial law into account, and precisely for this reason we shall take it into account today.

After ending its historical introduction, the *National-Zeitung* addresses the primary electors in the following way:

"It is a matter of safeguarding the progress initiated, of consolidating the achievements."

What "progress"? What "achievements"? The "progress" expressed in the fact that "today it is no longer like that", as it "appeared" to be in May? The "achievement" that "the beneficiaries of the old state of affairs are far from themselves helping, as is their duty, to see that the old rubbish is cleared away"? Or the granted "achievements" which "prop up the old ruins and embellish them with some forms in appearance appropriate to the new period"?

Martial law, gentlemen of the *National-Zeitung*, is no excuse for absence of thought and confusion.

The "progress" which just now has been most successfully "initiated" is regression to the old system, and we are daily advancing farther along this path of progress.

The sole "achievement" left to us—and it is not a specifically Prussian, not a "March" achievement, but the result of the 1848 European revolution—is the most general, most determined, most blood-thirsty and most violent counter-revolution, which is itself only a phase of the European revolution, and hence only the generator of a new, universal and victorious revolutionary counterblow.

But perhaps the *National-Zeitung* knows that just as well as we do, and only dare not say it because of martial law? Listen to this:

"We do not want a *continuance of the revolution*; we are enemies of all *anarchy*, all *acts of violence and arbitrariness*; we want *law, tranquillity and order*."

Martial law, gentlemen, compels you at most to be *silent*, never to *speak*. Therefore we put on record the sentence just quoted: if it is *you* who are speaking through its words, so much the better; if it is martial law that is speaking, there is no need for you to make yourselves its organ. Either you are revolutionary, or you are not. If you are not, then we are opponents from the outset; if you are, you should have been *silent*.



But you speak with such conviction, you have such an honest past, that we can safely assume that martial law has absolutely nothing to do with this asseveration.

"We do not want a continuance of the revolution." That means: we want the continuance of the counter-revolution. For it is a historical fact that either one does not put an end to violent counter-revolution at all, or one does so only through revolution.

"We do not want a continuance of the revolution", that means: we recognise that the revolution is ended, that it has reached its goal. And the goal which the revolution had reached on January 21, 1849, when the above-mentioned article was written, this goal was precisely—counter-revolution.

"We are enemies of all anarchy, all acts of violence and arbitrariness."

That means enemies also of the "anarchy" which occurs after every revolution until the new conditions have been consolidated, enemies of the "acts of violence" of February 24 and March 18, enemies of the "arbitrariness" which ruthlessly shatters a decayed system and its decrepit legal supports!

"We want law, tranquillity and order"!

Indeed, the time has been well chosen to bow down before "law, tranquillity and order", to protest against the revolution, and to concur in the cheap outcry against anarchy, acts of violence and arbitrariness! It has been well chosen, at the very moment when under the protection of bayonets and cannons the revolution is officially branded as a *crime*, when "anarchy, acts of violence and arbitrariness" are openly put into practice through ordinances countersigned by the King, when the "law", imposed on us by the camarilla, is always used *against* us and never *for* us, when "tranquillity and order" consist in leaving the counter-revolution in "peace", so that it can re-establish *its* old-Prussian "order" of things.

No, gentlemen, it is not martial law that speaks through you—it is most unadulterated *Odilon Barrot*, translated into Berlin language, with all his narrow-mindedness, all his impotence, all his pious wishes.

There is no revolutionary who is so tactless, so childish, so cowardly, as to deny the revolution at the very moment when counter-revolution is celebrating its most glittering triumphs. If he cannot speak, he acts, and if he cannot act, he prefers to remain perfectly silent.

But is it not possible, perhaps, that the gentlemen of the *National-Zeitung* are pursuing a cunning policy? Are they perhaps

speaking so tamely in order on the eve of the elections to win over to the opposition yet another section of the so-called moderates?

From the very first day that the counter-revolution swooped down on us, we said that from now on there are only two parties: "revolutionaries" and "counter-revolutionaries"; only two slogans: "the democratic republic" or "the absolute monarchy".<sup>a</sup> Everything in between is no longer a party but only a faction. The counter-revolution has done everything to make our statement come true. The elections are the most brilliant confirmation of that.

And at such a time, when the parties confront one another so sharply, when the struggle is being conducted with the greatest ferocity, when only the overwhelming superiority of organised soldiery prevents the struggle from being fought out arms in hand—at such a time all conciliation policy ceases. One needs to be Odilon Barrot himself to play the role of Odilon Barrot at such a time.

But our Berlin Barrots have their reservations, their conditions, their interpretations. They are wailers, but by no means simply wailers; they are wailers with a reservation: "that is to say", wailers from the quiet opposition:

"We, however, want *new laws*, such as are required by the awakened free spirit of the people and the principle of equality; we want a *genuinely democratic-constitutional order*" (i.e. a genuine absurdity); "we want tranquillity which rests on *more than bayonets and martial laws*, which is a politically and morally (!) based pacification of mind arising from the conviction, guaranteed by deeds and institutions, that every class of the people has its rights etc., etc."

We can spare ourselves the labour of completing this sentence, written in conformity with martial law. It suffices to say that these gentlemen "want" not revolution, but only a small nosegay from the *results* of revolution; a little democracy, but also a little constitutionalism; a few new laws, abolition of feudal institutions, bourgeois equality etc., etc.

In other words, the gentlemen of the *National-Zeitung* and those from the Berlin ex-Lefts, whose organ it is, want to obtain from the counter-revolution precisely that for which the counter-revolution dispersed them.

Nothing learnt and nothing forgotten!<sup>262</sup>

These gentlemen "want" the very things they will never obtain except by a new revolution. But they do not want a new revolution.

A new revolution would bring them also quite other things than are contained in the above-quoted modest bourgeois demands. And

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 178.—*Ed.*

for that reason these gentlemen are quite right in not wanting any revolution.

Fortunately, however, historical development is little concerned about what the Barrots "want" or "do not want". The Parisian prototype Barrot also "wanted" on February 24 only to achieve quite modest reforms, in particular a ministerial portfolio for himself; and he had hardly laid hands on both of these when the waves broke over him and he disappeared with all his virtuous petty-bourgeois retinue in the revolutionary deluge. Now, too, when at last he has once more obtained a ministerial post, he again "wants" various things; but nothing of what he wants is coming about. Such has ever been the fate of the Barrots. And the same thing will happen to the Berlin Barrots as well.

Under martial law or without it, they will continue to bore the public with their pious wishes. At most they will secure the adoption on paper of a few of these wishes, and finally they will be put on the shelf either by the Crown or by the people. In any case they will be put on the shelf.

Written by Marx between January 25 and 27, 1849

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 205 and No. 207 (second edition), January 26 and 28, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

## THE SITUATION IN PARIS

Paris, January 28. The danger of a popular uprising has been removed for the time being by the vote of the Chamber *against* dealing with the prohibition of the clubs as a matter of urgency, i.e. against prohibition of the clubs in general.<sup>263</sup> But a new danger is emerging: *the danger of a coup d'état.*

Read today's issue of the *National* and say whether fear of a coup d'état is not visible in *every line.*

"Today's vote is a fatal blow for the Cabinet, and we now challenge Messrs. Odilon Barrot, Faucher and *tutti quanti* to hold their portfolios any longer...."

So far the *National* seems to be of good cheer. But listen to the end of the sentence:

"...without entering into open revolt against the spirit and letter of the Constitution!"

And what would Messrs. Odilon Barrot, Faucher and *tutti quanti* care about entering into open revolt against the Constitution? Since when have Barrot and Faucher been enthusiastic about the Constitution of 1848!

The *National* no longer *threatens* the Ministers; it shows them that they must resign, it shows the President<sup>a</sup> that he must dismiss them. And that in a country where for the last thirty years the resignation of the Ministers after such a vote has been a matter of course!

It is to be hoped, says the *National*, that the President of the Republic will realise that the majority and the Cabinet are in

<sup>a</sup> Louis Bonaparte.—Ed.

complete disagreement, that by dismissing the Cabinet, he will strengthen the ties between him and the majority, and that there is only one obstacle to a good understanding between him and the majority: the Cabinet.

Yes, the *National* is trying to ensure the Ministry an honourable retreat: it would like the charge against the Ministers to be dropped. The vote is punishment enough. This extreme measure could be avoided until the Ministers have really violated the Constitution by an accomplished act.

Yes, the newspaper finally exclaims, *everything* makes it the *duty* of the Cabinet to resign; its own words are binding upon it to such an extent that we hesitate to believe it will dare to remain in power. Monsieur Barrot stated this evening that if the urgency motion is rejected, the *Assembly itself* will bear the responsibility for events. Very well, when responsibility ceases, power too must cease. If the Cabinet does not want to be responsible for events, then it must not direct them. By rejecting responsibility, Monsieur Barrot has tendered his resignation.

In short, the *National* does not believe in the voluntary retirement of the Ministry any more than in its dismissal by the President.

But if the Ministry wants to defy the vote of the Assembly, then there is nothing left for it except—a *coup d'état*.

Dissolution of the National Assembly and preparation for the restoration of the monarchy by military force, that is what lurks behind the fear of the *National* of the Ministry continuing in office.

Therefore the *National* and the red newspapers ask the people only to remain calm and to give no pretext for intervention, since any revolt can only support the Cabinet which is falling, can only be of service to the royalist counter-revolution.

That a *coup d'état* is becoming ever more imminent, is proved by the incidents involving Changarnier and the officers of the mobile guard.<sup>264</sup> The *bouchers de Cavaignac*<sup>3</sup> have no desire to let themselves be used for a royalist coup; that is why they are to be dissolved; they murmur and Changarnier threatens to have them cut to pieces, and he puts their officers under arrest.

The situation seems to become more complicated; in fact, however, it is becoming very simple, as simple as it always is on the eve of a revolution.

The conflict between the Assembly and the President together with his Ministers has reached breaking point. France can no longer exist in the state of impotence which has reigned in it for the last ten

<sup>3</sup> Cavaignac's butchers.—Ed.

months; the deficit, the depressed state of industry and commerce, the pressure of taxation, which ruins agriculture, become daily more intolerable; large-scale, trenchant measures become more and more urgent, and each new Government is more impotent and inactive than the one before; until finally Odilon Barrot has carried inactivity to the extreme and for six weeks has done absolutely nothing at all.

In that way, however, he has greatly simplified the situation. After him, there can no longer be any Ministry of the decent republic. The mixed governments (the Provisional Government and the Executive Commission<sup>265</sup>), the Government of the *National*, the Government of the old Lefts—that has all been gone through, it is all worn out, used up. Now it is the turn of Thiers, and Thiers is the undisguised restoration of the monarchy.

*Restoration of the monarchy* or — a *red republic*, this is now the only alternative in France. The crisis may still be delayed for a few weeks, but it is bound to break out. Changarnier-Monk<sup>266</sup> with his three hundred thousand, who are entirely at his disposal for 24 hours, seems reluctant to wait any longer.

Hence the anxiety of the *National*. It recognises its inability to master the situation; it knows that any forcible change of government will bring its strongest enemies into power, that it is equally lost with a monarchy and a red republic. Hence its sighing for a peaceful deal, its politeness to the Ministers.

We shall very soon see whether it is necessary for the final victory of the red republic that France should go through the monarchical phase for a while. It is possible, but not probable.

But one thing is certain: the decent republic is falling to pieces, and after it—even if there are first of all some small intermezzi—the only possibility is the *red republic*.

Written on January 28, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 209, January 31, 1849

Published in English for the first time

## [THE SITUATION IN PARIS]

Cologne, January 30. When yesterday morning we announced in a special edition the imminent outbreak of a storm in Paris, wailers<sup>267</sup> among the primary electors to the First Chamber wrote under our fly-sheet: *It's a lie! It's no use intimidating us!* and other such philistine strong expressions.

These miserable people regarded our special edition as a mere electoral manoeuvre, as if the First Chamber and the Second Chamber too, and the entire Prussian movement into the bargain, could induce us to falsify the history of the European revolution!

*Stupp* is an elector to the First Chamber! The rentier von *Wittgenstein* is an elector to the First Chamber! Chancellor von *Groote* is an elector to the First Chamber! And yet the revolutionary monster in Paris is capable of roaring afresh! *Quelle horreur!*

In our issue today, we said, *inter alia*, on the Paris situation:

"The danger of a popular uprising has been removed for the time being by the vote of the Chamber *against* dealing with the prohibition of the clubs as a matter of urgency, i.e. against prohibition of the clubs in general. But a new danger is emerging: *the danger of a coup d'état*.... If the Ministry wants to defy the vote of the Assembly, then there is nothing left for it except—a *coup d'état*. Dissolution of the National Assembly and preparation for the restoration of the monarchy by military force, that is what lurks behind the fear of the *National* of the Ministry continuing in office.... That a coup d'état is becoming ever more imminent, is proved by the incidents involving Changarnier and the officers of the mobile guard.... The situation seems to become more complicated; in fact, however, it is becoming very simple, as simple as it always is on the eve of a revolution. The

conflict between the Assembly and the President together with his Ministers has reached breaking point.... *Restoration of the monarchy* or—a *red republic*, this is now the only alternative in France.... The decent republic is falling to pieces, and after it—even if there are first of all some small intermezzi—the only possibility is the *red republic*.”<sup>a</sup>

In the special edition we announced the crisis for the 29th.

The reports of the 29th from Paris printed below will show our readers how accurate our reports were and the striking correctness of our description today of the French situation.<sup>268</sup>

Written on January 30, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the special supplement  
to the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 209,  
January 31, 1849

Published in English for the first  
time

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 281-83.—*Ed.*



THE KÖLNISCHE ZEITUNG ON THE ELECTIONS<sup>269</sup>

Cologne, January 30. The *Kölnische Zeitung* has at last also obtained reports on the elections, and they are indeed reports which to some extent pour oil on its wounds.

"The democratic reports on the elections," exclaims the worthy Brüggemann, intoxicated with joy, "the democratic reports on the elections" (i.e. the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*) "have grossly exaggerated. Protests are now reaching us from all sides."<sup>2</sup>

From all sides! The *Kölnische Zeitung* intends to crush us with the weight of its "protests". Will two pages of compressed election bulletins, each one a "gross exaggeration" of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, each one proving a victory of the constitutionalists, produce a deep-red blush of shame on our cheeks?

On the contrary.

"Protests are now reaching us from all sides."

The worthy Brüggemann does not "exaggerate". He actually got *summa summarum* four whole protests: from the west (Trier), north (Hamm), south (Siegburg) and east (Arnsberg)! Are those not "protests from all sides" against the "gross exaggeration of the democratic reports on the elections"?

For the time being, let us leave to the *Kölnische Zeitung* the pleasure of believing that the constitutionalists were victorious in these four decisive localities. At any rate this pleasure is soured by pain because all the same in many places the constitutionalists were defeated owing to the "masses' susceptibility to being seduced".

---

<sup>2</sup> Quoted from the article "Die Wahlen", *Kölnische Zeitung* No. 25, January 30, 1849.—Ed.

Naive confession of the constitutionalists that *for them* the "masses" are not "susceptible to being seduced"!

One consolation, however, remains for the *Kölnische Zeitung*. And what is this consolation? It is that the Coblenz correspondent of the *Deutsche Zeitung* is a comrade in misfortune, that in this unfortunate state of affairs he uttered appropriate words, worthy of figuring in the first columns of the *Kölnische Zeitung*:

"Note that the *political question* in this point also, as everywhere, becomes a small one compared with the social question, that it *becomes entirely merged in the latter.*"

Until a few days ago the *Kölnische Zeitung* did not want to hear about the social question. On this subject belonging to the other world it never had occasion to speak, or at most it did so with a certain frivolity (insofar as it is possible for the *Kölnische Zeitung* to be frivolous). It adopted an atheistic, disbelieving, free-thinking attitude towards it. Then suddenly it underwent the same experience as the fisherman in *A Thousand and One Nights*. Just as, before the fisherman, the genie arose gigantically out of the bottle he had fished up from the sea-bed and unsealed, so before the trembling *Kölnische Zeitung* there suddenly arises out of the election urn the menacing gigantic spectre of the "social question". Terrified, the worthy Brüggemann sinks to his knees; his last hope vanishes, the spectre at a gulp swallows his entire "political question", which for years he had tenderly cherished, together with its legal basis and accessories.

Clever policy of the *Kölnische Zeitung*. It tries to put a good face on its *political* defeat by means of its *social* defeat.

This discovery that it has been defeated not only in the political field, but in the social field as well, is the greatest experience it has gained from the primary elections!

Or was perhaps the *Kölnische Zeitung* enthusiastic even earlier over the "social question"?

In point of fact, Montesquieu LVI had stated in the *Kölnische Zeitung* that the social question was infinitely important and that recognition of the imposed Constitution was the solution of the social question.<sup>a</sup>

But recognition of the imposed Constitution—that is pre-eminently what the *Kölnische Zeitung* calls the "*political question*".

Prior to the elections, therefore, the social question became merged in the *political* question, *after* the elections the political question becomes merged in the *social* question. That, therefore, is

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 255.—Ed.

the difference, that is the experience from the primary elections, namely, that what is correct *after* the elections is exactly the opposite of what was gospel truth *prior* to the elections.

"The political question becomes merged in the social question"!

Let us leave out of account that already before the elections we explained as clearly as possible that there could be no talk of a "social question" as such, that each class has its *own* social question, and that this social question of a definite class involves at the same time a definite political question for this class.<sup>a</sup> Let us leave out of account all these light-hearted marginal notes when confronting the serious, solid *Kölnerin*, and let us analyse as far as possible the line of thought and mode of speech of this strong-charactered and profound newspaper.

By the social question, the *Kölnische Zeitung* understands the question: how are the petty bourgeoisie, the peasants and the proletariat to be helped?

And now, since at the primary elections the petty bourgeoisie, peasants and proletarians emancipated themselves from the big bourgeoisie, the upper nobility and the higher bureaucracy, now the *Kölnische Zeitung* exclaims: "The political question becomes merged in the social question"!

A fine consolation for the *Kölnische Zeitung*! Therefore the fact that the workers, peasants and petty bourgeoisie routed by striking majorities the big bourgeois and other highly respected constitutional candidates of the *Kölnische Zeitung* is no defeat of the "constitutionalists", but merely a victory of the "social question"! The fact that the constitutionalists were defeated does not prove that the democrats were victorious, but that politics has no part to play in the face of material questions.

Profound thoroughness on the part of our neighbouring journalist<sup>b</sup>! These petty bourgeois, hovering on the brink of ruin, are they enthusiastic about the imposed Constitution? These peasants, oppressed by mortgages and usurers, and crushed under feudal burdens, are they enthusiastic about the finance and feudal barons who are their exploiters, and for whose direct benefit the imposed Constitution was invented? And, finally, these proletarians, who suffer simultaneously from the administrative passion of our bureaucrats and from the lust for profit of our bourgeoisie, have they any reason to rejoice that the imposed Constitution provides a new tie linking these two classes that suck the blood of the people?

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 262-63.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> That is of Brüggemann.—*Ed.*

Are not all these three classes interested above all in the abolition of the First Chamber, which represents not them, but their direct opponents and oppressors?

In point of fact, the *Kölnische Zeitung* is right: the social question swallows up the political question. In the interest of the "social question" the classes that have newly joined the political movement will vote against their own political interests and for the imposed Constitution!

Can the petty bourgeois and peasants, and, the more so, the proletarians, find a better political form for representing their interests than the democratic republic? Are not precisely these classes the most radical, the most democratic, of society as a whole? Is it not precisely the proletariat that is the specifically *red* class?—That does not matter, exclaims the *Kölnische Zeitung*, the social question swallows up the political question.

According to the *Kölnische Zeitung*, the victory of the social question is at the same time the victory of the imposed Constitution.

But the "social question" of the *Kölnische Zeitung* has also a very special feature. Read the report of the *Kölnische Zeitung* on the elections to the First Chamber<sup>270</sup> and their "fortunate outcome", which consists in the fact that Herr Joseph Dumont has become an elector. That at any rate solves the real social question for the *Kölnische Zeitung*, and compared with it all the subordinate "social questions" which could perhaps crop up in connection with elections to a plebeian Second Chamber disappear.

May the storm of the world-historic "political question", which at the present time is menacingly rising in Paris, not mercilessly break to pieces the *Kölnische Zeitung's* delicate "social question"!

Written by Marx on January 30, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 210, February 1, 1849

Published in English for the first time

THE STRUGGLE IN HUNGARY<sup>271</sup>

Cologne, February 2. The war in Hungary is nearing its end. "*Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.*"<sup>a</sup>

Thus spoke the *Kölnische Zeitung* a few days ago.<sup>b</sup> It had been fooled by Welden into thinking that the Assembly in Debreczin had dissolved both itself and the army, and that Kossuth was about to flee to Grosswardein with the rest of his following.

The mountain in labour this time was none other than the *Kölnische Zeitung* itself.

The 17th Army Bulletin,<sup>c</sup> to which Welden imputed the above lie, reports two new operations of the imperial troops: firstly, the departure of a corps from Pest via Gyöngyös to Miskolcz, and secondly, Schlick's plan to operate in two columns against Tokaj, one via Kaschau, the other via Janosfalva and Baranya. Both are concentric movements against the Theiss, behind which the Magyars have taken up positions.

From the border of Transylvania to Szegedin the Theiss describes a semicircle the centre of which is Grosswardein: this semicircle forms the Magyar defence line. On the Upper Theiss it is covered by the fortresses of Sziget and Munkács; on the Middle Theiss by impassable swamps which begin a few miles from Munkács, accompany the Theiss on both sides to its mouth and render an

<sup>a</sup> "The mountains are in labour and a ridiculous mouse will be born" (Horace, *De Arte Poetica*, 139).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "Ungarn (Vom Kriegs-Schauplatz)", *Kölnische Zeitung* No. 25 (supplement), January 30, 1849.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> "17. Armee-Bulletin", *Wiener Zeitung* No. 19, January 23, 1849.—*Ed.*

attack from north and west very difficult. In the south the Körös and its tributaries offer a line of defence which is likewise covered by uninterrupted swamps and moreover by the advanced fortress of Temesvár. So, defended on three sides by swamps and rivers, the Debreczin Heath stretches away to the Transylvanian hills and offers the Magyars an excellent point for concentrating their armies, all the better since Bem has freed their rear by the conquest of Transylvania.

So long as the Magyars hold their ground on the Drava and in the Banat, Debreczin, the centre of their operations, can only be attacked from the north (Schlick) and west (Windischgrätz), and both the above movements are said to be preludes to this attack.

Miskolcz and Tokaj, the two towns to which the imperial troops are now marching, are barely six miles<sup>a</sup> from each other. Tokaj is one of the most advantageous crossing points over the Theiss; Miskolcz lies close enough to enable the troops sent there, depending on circumstances, to join Schlick's corps at Tokaj or to cross the Theiss by themselves a little lower down and if successful to advance on Debreczin.

This plan of the imperial army, which the 17th Bulletin trumpets around the world with such pomp, is, however, not so easy to carry out. From Pest to Miskolcz is more than 30 miles, across desolate heath land, inhabited either by hardly anybody or else by enemies. From Eperies to Tokaj it is also 30 miles, also through decidedly hostile and poor country. The provisioning alone of the two advancing corps would greatly delay their march; the bad roads, which with the present thaw are becoming completely impassable, make it quite impossible for them to reach their destination in less than a fortnight. And once arrived they will find themselves facing the Magyar army, at the crossings of the Theiss, entrenched between swamps, in positions with covered flanks, where the imperial troops cannot deploy their superior strength, where, on the contrary, a few regiments can hold up a whole army. Nay, even were they to succeed in forcing the crossings over the Theiss, the Austrian artillery and heavy cavalry would be utterly lost between the swamps, in marshy ground, in which they will constantly be bogged.

What grandiose successes these two columns have had so far can already be seen from the fact that the 18th Army Bulletin, which we reported yesterday,<sup>b</sup> is completely *silent* about them. Where they are,

<sup>a</sup> One German mile is equal to 4.7 English miles.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 211, February 2, 1849 (a report from Vienna with a reprint of the 18th Army Bulletin from the *Wiener Zeitung* No. 24, published on January 28, 1849).—*Ed.*

how far they have advanced, what successes they have had—of that Welden tells us *not one syllable*, and for good reasons.

But, says Welden,

“according to the news received from Hungary, our troops enjoy *brilliant success* everywhere”

—and the *Kölnische Zeitung* believes Herr Welden.

Let us look a little more closely at these “brilliant successes”.

Four “successes” are reported. Of these three are in areas where there is no decisive fighting, but where the Magyars are merely striving to keep the imperial troops busy at points of secondary importance and thus to divide them. Only the fourth “success” has been won on the Theiss, where Hungary’s fate is being decided.

In the north-west, between the Waag and the Gran, in the south-west, between the Drava and the Danube, and in the south, in the Banat, three Hungarian corps are so far keeping a considerable part of the imperial forces busy, thereby preventing Windischgrätz from pushing forward to the Theiss with any considerable numbers. Against these three corps the imperial forces, so they say, have had “brilliant successes”. *Voyons!*<sup>a</sup>

*First success.* In the north-east, where “Slovakia”<sup>272</sup> is now placed, Baron Csorich has beaten General Görgey at Schemnitz and has taken Schemnitz. When one considers that Görgey’s corps is simply a lost outpost which has to stand its ground in the rear of the imperial army as long as possible; and when one considers that Görgey is operating not on Magyar but on purely Slovak ground, one sees that this success is not very “brilliant”.

Moreover, Csorich was to be supported by Götz and Sossay’s columns. But Sossay was urgently called to Neutra “there to assist in the pacification of the part of the country *already occupied*” (a *purely Slav comitat*<sup>b</sup>), and Götz had his hands full “maintaining his position at Mossocz and *protecting* the Turócz comitat from the insurgents whom Lieutenant-Field Marshal Csorich had *beaten* and *scattered*(!!)”.

“The *at-last-to-be-hoped-for*” (hence still a long way off) “capture of Leopoldstadt and the occupation of Neuhäusel ... *should* suffice to strengthen the good spirit which is *beginning* (!) to develop everywhere in the Trentschin comitat and to *contribute* to the restoration of law and order.”

What brilliant successes! The at-last-to-be-hoped-for capture of a not-yet-captured fortress offers the hope that the much-hoped-for

<sup>a</sup> Let us see!—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> A comitat is a Hungarian county.—*Ed.*

good spirit of a long since occupied region will not, one hopes, always remain a pious wish, and the hope that law and order may at least partially approach realisation!

An uncaptured fortress, a beaten army which nevertheless threatens an entire comitat and keeps several army corps in check, a much-hoped-for good spirit here, an only too real bad spirit there, risings threatened everywhere, and all this on Slovak, not Magyar territory—that is the first “brilliant success”!

*Second “brilliant success”.* A second doomed outpost of the Magyars is in the south-west, between the Danube and the Drava, under the partisan leader Damjanich. Here the brilliant success consists in Count Nugent having ordered the occupation of Kaposvár so as to reach the enemy’s flank. What brilliant success there is in that is not yet clear. The occupation of Eszék by imperial troops is, it is true, reported by several papers, but the 18th Bulletin does not yet know of it and does not even expect it.

*Third “brilliant success”.* General Todorovich has captured Werschetz in the Banat and is “energetically pursuing” the Magyars to Moravicza.

From Werschetz to Moravicza is exactly *three miles* and the position at Moravicza between the Alibunar swamp and the mountains is far more favourable than that at Werschetz.

At any rate it is well known that the Banat is so far from the centre of operations and that the attacks against the Magyars have been so sporadic that even the most brilliant successes of the imperials would here be of no importance whatsoever.

*Fourth “brilliant success”.* Hitherto we have seen the imperial troops, it is true, operating on not very decisive terrain, but at least we saw them operating with some semblance of success. Now at last we come to a decisive terrain, and here the success consists in a *defeat* of the imperial troops.

General Ottinger had advanced from Pest as far as the Theiss, to Szolnok. The road was fairly good; from Pest to Szolnok there is a railway, and all that was needed was to follow the rails. The imperial advanced guard had already occupied the bridge at Szolnok. The crossing of the Theiss appeared to be secured for the right wing of the imperial troops. The left wing under Schlick, operating from Tokaj, the centre from Miskolcz, the right wing under Ottinger from Szolnok, were to force the Theiss crossings and march concentrically on Debreczin. But the imperial gentlemen had reckoned without their host. The Magyars crossed the frozen river, drove Ottinger back four miles all the way to Czegléd, and only gave up the pursuit when Ottinger had received reinforcements near Czegléd and taken



up a strong position. According to the Bulletin, it is true, the Magyars are supposed to have gone back across the Theiss, but at all events they now control the crossing and Herr Ottinger, having so hastily retreated, will hardly force it so soon.

These are the "brilliant successes" of the imperial troops against the disbanded, demoralised, scattered army of Kossuth's rebels. A glance at the map shows that the Magyars have lost nothing since they decided to retreat behind the Theiss. As the latest Austrian *unofficial* reports announce, they are at Miskolcz and await the attacks of Schlick and Windischgrätz. They will not accept battle there either, but will withdraw behind the Theiss. The decisive battle will be fought at the crossings of this river, or, if these are forced, in the Debreczin Heath. And even if the Magyars are routed here, guerilla warfare will begin in the heaths and swamps of Lower Hungary and in the Transylvanian mountains in the same way as it has already begun in the "parts of the country already occupied", to the great regret of the 18th Bulletin. What such warfare can achieve in a sparsely populated country and on a suitable terrain has been proved by the Carlist bands in Spain, and is now being proved again by Cabrera.<sup>273</sup>

But Kossuth has not come to that yet. Although the *Kölnische Zeitung* in its childlike naivety had him taken prisoner yesterday, he is still free and has a considerable army at his disposal. For him it is no longer a question of standing his ground for months on end; he only needs to offer resistance for three or four more weeks. In three to four weeks at most the tables will be turned in Paris: either the Restoration wins there for the moment, and then Hungary may fall, too, so that the counter-revolution may be altogether triumphant; or the revolution will win, and then the Austrian gentlemen will march in haste to the Rhine and to Italy, to be chased back to Hungary by the Red Pantaloons.<sup>2</sup>

In conclusion, let us note the most brilliant of all the imperial troops' successes: Herr Welden's bulletins have at last found a believer who swears by them — and this One is the *Kölnische Zeitung*.

Written by Engels on February 2, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 212, February 3, 1849

Published in English for the first time

<sup>2</sup> The French army.—Ed.

## CAMPHAUSEN

*Cologne, February 3.* We learn from an entirely reliable source that the Brandenburg Ministry will resign before the Chambers open, and that Herr Camphausen will be presented to the Chambers at their opening as the new Prime Minister.

We were sure that something of the kind was being prepared when, a few days ago, the shrewd statesman's friends here spread a rumour that he was tired of political activity:

Oh! the bustle makes me weary;  
What use all the joy and pain?  
Sweet peace come, and  
In my heart begin your reign!<sup>a</sup>

and for that reason wanted to withdraw into peaceful domestic life and restrict his reflections to the less agitating field of speculation in dairy produce.

It should be clear to every intelligent person: Herr Camphausen felt the need to get himself invited once again to save the Crown and, "touched by his own magnanimity", to play a second time the role of "midwife of the constitutional throne" with his well-known aplomb.

The hourgeois opposition in the Chamber will rejoice at this parliamentary "victory". The Germans are forgetful and easily forgive. Those same Lefts who last year opposed Herr Camphausen will gratefully welcome his new accession to office as a great concession on the part of the Crown.

---

<sup>a</sup> Goethe, "Wandrer's Nachtlied".—*Ed.*

But in order that the people should not allow itself to be deceived a second time, we shall briefly recall the most outstanding deeds of this thinking statesman.

Herr Camphausen resurrected the *United Diet* that was buried on March 18 and reached agreement with it on some of the basic principles of the future Constitution.<sup>274</sup>

Herr Camphausen thereby reached agreement on the *legal basis*, i.e. indirect denial of the revolution.

Herr Camphausen furthermore conferred on us the blessing of *indirect elections*.<sup>275</sup>

Herr Camphausen once again denied the revolution as regards one of its chief results, by transforming the Prince of Prussia's flight into a study trip and recalling him from London.<sup>276</sup>

Herr Camphausen organised the civic militia in such a way that from the outset it was transformed from being the arming of the people into the arming of a class, so that the people and the militia confronted each other as enemies.

At the same time Herr Camphausen allowed the old-Prussian bureaucracy and army to be reconstituted and to become daily more capable of preparing counter-revolutionary coups d'état.

Herr Camphausen was responsible for the memorable shrapnel slaughter of practically unarmed Polish peasants.<sup>277</sup>

Herr Camphausen began the war against Denmark to provide an outlet for superabundant patriotism and to restore the popularity of the Prussian Guards. Having achieved this aim, he made every effort to help secure the adoption in Frankfurt of the disgraceful Malmö armistice,<sup>278</sup> which was essential for Wrangel's march on Berlin.

Herr Camphausen confined himself to abolishing a few reactionary old-Prussian laws in the Rhine Province, but left the whole police-state civil-code legislation in existence in all the old provinces.

Herr Camphausen was the first to intrigue against the unity—at that time still definitely revolutionary—of Germany, first of all by convening alongside the Frankfurt National Assembly his Berlin agreement parliament and subsequently by acting in every way against the decisions and influence of the Frankfurt Assembly.

Herr Camphausen demanded of his Assembly that it should restrict its constitutional mandate merely to "reaching agreement".

Herr Camphausen further demanded of it that it should issue an address to the Crown in which it acknowledged this—as if it were a constitutional chamber which could be adjourned or dissolved at will.

Herr Camphausen further demanded of it that it should deny the revolution and even made this a question of confidence in the Cabinet.

Herr Camphausen laid before his Assembly a draft Constitution, which is on much the same lines as the imposed Constitution<sup>a</sup> and aroused a universal storm of indignation at the time.

Herr Camphausen boasted of having been the Minister of mediation, but this mediation was nothing but mediation between the Crown and the bourgeoisie for joint betrayal of the people.

Herr Camphausen at last resigned when this betrayal had been fully negotiated and was sufficiently mature to be put into practice by the Government of Action and its constables.<sup>279</sup>

Herr Camphausen became the ambassador to the so-called Central Authority and continued to be so under all the Ministries. He remained ambassador at the time when in Vienna the Croatian, Ruthenian and Wallachian troops violated German territory, fired on Germany's leading city and set it ablaze and treated it more outrageously than any Tilly treated Magdeburg.<sup>280</sup> He remained ambassador and did not lift a finger.

Herr Camphausen remained ambassador under Brandenburg, thereby taking his share in the Prussian counter-revolution, and subscribed his name to the recent Prussian Circular Note which openly and without disguise demanded the restoration of the old Federal Diet.<sup>281</sup>

Herr Camphausen now at last takes over the Ministry in order to cover the retreat of the counter-revolutionaries and to safeguard the November and December achievements for us for a long time to come.

These are some of the great deeds of Herr Camphausen. If he now becomes Minister he will hasten to add to the list. For our part, we shall keep the most precise possible account of them.

Written by Marx on February 3, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 213, February 4, 1849

Published in English for the first time

<sup>a</sup> "Entwurf eines Verfassungs-Gesetzes für den preussischen Staat", May 20, 1848.—Ed.

## FROM THE BANAT

*From the Banat.* Hardly have the Serbs, Austrians, Banat Germans, Croats, Gipsies and Turkish Serbs succeeded in pushing the Magyars back a little when the bitterest quarrels are breaking out in the newly-manufactured Banat-Serbian nation. Stratimirovich stood on his own initiative as candidate for the dignity of voivode and thereby incurred such enmity from Patriarch Rajachich that the latter issued an order to arrest and deliver the most popular Serbian leader wherever he might be found.

Up to now the Turkish Serbs have supplied 20,000 auxiliary troops to the Banat Serbs. How many Russians are among them it is difficult to say. As recently as on January 19, 700 Serbs and 400 armed Gipsies crossed the Danube at Boljevcze and Pancsova to help the Banatians. That is how the Austrian united monarchy [*Gesamtmonarchie*] is keeping alive!

The power of the Hungarian insurrection is by no means destroyed, but at present is still very considerable, for numerous volunteers flock to the Magyar detachments from all parts of the country. The Magyars still have four strong army corps in the field: in Upper Hungary under Görgey, on the Theiss under Kossuth, in the Banat against the Serbs and in Transylvania under Bem; these can still fight for several months if they carefully avoid any major blow. The fighting has already lasted six whole weeks, and yet the number of Hungarian fighters has increased rather than decreased.

If they succeed, as is their intention, in prolonging hostilities until war breaks out in Upper Italy, the cause is by no means lost. Even in

the Ödenburg comitat right on the Austrian border, one finds the liveliest sympathy for Kossuth among the country people; quite recently in a village, after a black-and-yellow<sup>3</sup> sermon, the peasants cheered the dictator,<sup>282</sup> whereupon a detachment of troops came, arrested the seven most respected persons in the place and marched them off; to this hour nobody knows what has become of them.

Written by Engels on February 3, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the second supplement  
to the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 213,  
February 4, 1849

Published in English for the first  
time

---

<sup>3</sup> Colours of the Austrian flag.—Ed.

THE 19th ARMY BULLETIN  
AND COMMENTARIES ON IT

The 19th Army Bulletin has been published.<sup>a</sup> Even assuming we give credence to this document, the recent advantages gained by the imperial troops are hardly worthy of mention.

We are told nothing of the army corps in the Slovak (north-west) comitats. Obviously, therefore, this corps still has its hands full with "pacifying the parts of the country already occupied".

We are also told nothing of the troops sent from Pest to Miskolcz, who were to establish contact between Windischgrätz and Schlick, and who, as will no doubt be remembered, we prophesied would have rather a long journey.<sup>b</sup> Of these troops, whose advanced posts, according to supposed letters from Schlick's camp, are said to be already at Miskolcz, we also hear nothing. Proof that they have not got very far.

We likewise hear nothing of the Banat Gipsy bands.

And, lastly, we are told nothing whatsoever of the troops sent out against Bem. In general, for some time now not only the official bulletins but also the otherwise so boastful unofficial fabrications have maintained a total silence with respect to Bem. Sufficient proof that the imperial troops have not won any laurels fighting against him either. Thus, with no news whatsoever of Bem, we ought not to be at all surprised if very soon he suddenly appears at Schlick's rear, or on his flanks, and manages to upset the whole imperial plan.

---

<sup>a</sup> "19. Armee-Bulletin", *Wiener Zeitung* No. 27, February 1, 1849.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, p. 291.—*Ed.*

We hardly need mention that the Bulletin does not say a word either about the storming of Leopoldstadt, a lie which has been spread six times by the martial-law newspapers, and six times believed by Mama Dumont.<sup>a</sup> We must assume therefore that there is still "hope" that this fortress will be captured.

All this, then, is *not* said in the Bulletin. What does it actually say?

It has knowledge of the situation in three places: on the Slavonian border, at Szolnok, and on the Upper Theiss. Of course, from these three places it once more reports "brilliant successes".

*First:*

"Master of the Ordnance Count Nugent, who set out on January 25 from Kanizsa to march to Fünfkirchen in order to disperse the rebels who had banded together there, transferred his headquarters to Fünfkirchen on January 29. The rebels, numbering 4,000 men with 10 cannon, left that town on January 26 and may have taken the direction of Esseg to assemble there, sheltered by the fortress which is occupied by the rebels. They will not, however, succeed in doing this as that fortress is encircled by the brigade of Colonel van der Nüll of the Gradiskan border regiment, and Master of the Ordnance Count Nugent also will follow them in that direction. The appearance of the royal imperial army in the Baranya and Tolna comitats has completely annihilated the elements hostile to the Government."

Let us first note that according to this the Esseg fortress on the Drava has not been taken, as the rumours circulating since the establishment of martial law maintained, but has so far only been "encircled", an encirclement which is all the more likely to be broken by the "4,000 men with 10 cannon" as it is *absolutely impossible* to maintain an encirclement on the left bank of the Drava because of the extensive swamps.

The further success is that Nugent has advanced as far as Fünfkirchen. As, according to the 18th Bulletin, Kaposvár had been occupied by the imperial troops, all that has been gained is that the army has advanced its position by some ten miles parallel to the Drava. The result of this is nothing but more difficulty in provisioning, which will grow worse in the same measure as the army approaches the heart of Hungary. Incidentally the Magyars appear to be pursuing the same tactics here as Görgey did in the Slovak region: they hold the towns as long as possible and then begin to fight a guerilla war in the countryside. What is said about the pacification of the Baranya and Tolna comitats reminds one entirely of the way Slovakia was pacified. We shall soon be hearing that the army has been unable to advance here either because it has first to restore peace and order in the comitats that have already been conquered.

<sup>a</sup> i. e. the *Kölnische Zeitung*.—Ed.



*Second:*

"As was already reported in the 18th Bulletin, the Ottinger cavalry brigade, reinforced by three battalions of infantry and two batteries of foot-artillery, has taken up position at Czegléd. On receiving the news that the rebels intended to attack that position, Field Marshal Prince Windischgrätz felt decided to march against them with all available troops, hoping that the rebels would accept battle. However, they did not dare to risk a decisive engagement this time either, and seeing the reinforcements approaching, they hastily withdrew across the Theiss, with the Grammont brigade in pursuit."

Well then! The fact that Windischgrätz himself went to Czegléd "with all available troops" proves that Herr Ottinger must have suffered a severe set-back there. Even the "three battalions and two batteries" received as reinforcements were of no avail! All the gains amount to is that the Austrians are at Szolnok, that is once more on the Theiss.

It is odd that Windischgrätz should be annoyed that the rebels have yet again refused to accept *battle*. As though it had not been the plan from the very outset where possible for the time being to avoid all decisive battles, to lure the imperial troops as far into Hungary as possible and to organise peasant war and guerillas in their rear! When the time is ripe they will "risk a decisive engagement".

*Third:*

"Having already successfully cleaned up the Zips, Lieutenant-Field Marshal Count Schlick has by now achieved the same with respect to the rebels in the Zemplin comitat, and has then set out for Tokaj where Kossuth's supporters have gathered from various points. On January 19 he advanced guard of Lieutenant-Field Marshal Schlick, under the command of Major Piattoli, encountered the enemy at Szanto and drove him back towards Tokaj. On January 21 reconnaissance showed that the enemy had retreated and taken up a rather favourable position at Tokaj, Tarczal and Keresztúr. On January 22 Lieutenant-Field Marshal Count Schlick opened the general assault on that position. Major Herczmanovsky led his gallant Stephan battalion along with a squadron of imperial light cavalry and four cannon in the attack on Keresztúr, while Lieutenant-Field Marshal Count Schlick advanced on Tarczal via Tallya and Mad with the main column. The battle ended in victory for the imperial troops. The enemy suffered considerable losses, particularly in dead among the Polish legion."<sup>3</sup>

This advantage comes as a complete surprise. Schlick drove the Hungarians' advanced posts back a few miles and met them in battle at Tallya and Keresztúr. "The battle ended in victory for the royal imperial troops," says the laconic report of success. Not a word about whether Tallya and Keresztúr have been taken, or whether the Magyars have withdrawn across the Theiss. The same will probably

<sup>3</sup> This legion was nearly 3,000 men strong and fought against the imperial troops from December 1848.—*Ed.*

happen with this battle, which was such a great victory and so singularly lacking in success, as happened with Ottinger's last victory, which in the end turned out to be a defeat. No skill is required to "clean up the Zips" since the Zips is inhabited mainly by Germans. The Zeimplin comitat is inhabited by Ruthenians,<sup>283</sup> who for the time being are still friendly towards the imperial troops, and here, too, it sounds odd to hear talk of "cleaning up".

The main conclusion to be drawn from the Bulletin is that the imperial troops are occupying two positions on the Theiss at a great distance from each other. The two corps have no contact with each other. Kossuth will probably quite soon attempt the decisive blow: he will either throw all his forces into separate attacks on the two corps, or break through between them, march on Pest, and attack the Austrians from the rear.

And while this state of affairs persists, while the imperial troops, despite their superior strength, advance only with extreme hesitation and caution, all their columns operating individually without thinking of concentrating their forces, while the Magyars stand armed on the other side of the Theiss, the martial-law press reports that Kossuth has been taken prisoner near Stry in Galicia. And German newspapers reprint that.

Written by Engels on February 5, 1849

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 214, February 6, 1849

Published in English for the first time

THE FIRST TRIAL  
OF THE *NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG*<sup>284</sup>

[SPEECH BY KARL MARX]

Gentlemen of the jury! The proceedings today have a certain importance because Articles 222 and 367 of the *Code pénal*<sup>285</sup> invoked in the indictment against the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* are the only ones from Rhenish legislation available to the state authorities, unless there is direct incitement to revolt.

You are all aware of the very special predilection of the prosecuting magistrates for taking legal action against the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. In spite of all their diligence, however, up to now they have not succeeded in accusing us of any other offences than those envisaged in Articles 222 and 367. In the interests of the press, therefore, I consider it necessary to make a closer examination of these articles.

But before I enter into a legal analysis, allow me to make a personal observation. The Public Prosecutor has described as a *vilification* the passage in the incriminated article which states: "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?"<sup>a</sup> Gentlemen, it is quite possible for someone to be a very good Chief Public Prosecutor and at the same time a bad people's representative. He is perhaps a good Chief Public Prosecutor only because he is a bad people's representative. The prosecution seems to be little versed in parliamentary history. What underlies the question of incompatibility, which takes up so much space in the proceedings of the constitutional Chambers? The distrust of executive officials, the

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 7, p. 179.—*Ed.*