

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr 1.

Köln, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

articles from the *NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG*

[History and Information on the Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)

Statement from the editorial board of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* upon the publication of the first issue

Written May 31, 1848

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

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

Editorial Board:

Editor-in-Chief:

[Karl Marx](#)



A sketch of Unter Hutmacher – the Cologne street on which the NRZ editorial offices

Editors:

[Heinrich Burgers](#),

[Ernst Dronke](#),

[Friedrich Engels](#),

[Georg Weerth](#),

Ferdinand Wolff,

[Wilhelm Wolff](#)

were situated.

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 1,
June 1, 1848

THE NEWS ARTICLES

NOTE: Dates provided are of the article's publication, not its writing. An (M) denotes the author as being Marx, an (E) as Engels.

1848

- June 1: [Huser](#) (Marx's first article in NRZ)
- June 1: [The Assembly at Frankfurt](#) (E)
- June 2: [The democratic party](#) (ME)
- June 7: [The programmes of the radical-democratic party and of the left at Frankfurt](#) (ME)
- June 14: [The Berlin debate on the revolution](#) (E)
- June 18: [The Prague uprising](#) (E)
- June 23: [The fall of the Camphausen ministry](#) (M)
- June 25: [A democratic uprising](#) (E)
- June 25: [Patow's commutation memorandum](#) (M)
- June 27: [News from Paris](#) (ME)
- June 29: [The June revolution](#) (M)
- July 1: [The June revolution](#) (The Course of the Paris Uprising) (E)
- July 2: [The June revolution](#) (The Course of the Paris Uprising) (E)
- July 3: [Germany's foreign policy](#) (E)
- July 18: [The debate on Jacoby's motion](#) (E)
- July 22: [The armistice with Denmark](#) (E)
- July 30: [The bill proposing the abolition of feudal obligations](#) (M)
- August 1: [The Kolnische Zeitung on the state of affairs in England](#) (E)
- August 9: [The Frankfurt assembly debates the polish question: Part I](#) (E)



- *August 12:* [The Frankfurt assembly debates the polish question: Part II](#) (*E*)
- *August 20:* [The Frankfurt assembly debates the polish question: Part III](#) (*E*)
- *August 12:* [The Italian liberation struggle and the cause of its present failure](#) (*E*)
- *August 27:* [The Zeitungs-Halle on the Rhine province](#) (*E*)
- *September 1:* [Mediation and intervention. Radetzky and Cavaignac](#) (*E*)
- *September 3:* [The Antwerp death sentences](#) (*E*)
- *September 10:* [The Danish-Prussian armistice](#) (*E*)
- *September 12:* [The crisis and the counter-revolution: Part I](#) (*M*)
- *September 13:* [The crisis and the counter-revolution: Part II](#) (*M*)
- *September 14:* [The crisis and the counter-revolution](#) (*M*)
- *September 14:* [The crisis and the counter-revolution: Part III](#) (*M*)
- *September 16:* [The crisis and the counter-revolution: Part IV](#) (*M*)
- *September 17:* [Freedom of debate in Berlin](#) (*ME*)
- *September 17:* [Freedom of deliberations in Berlin](#) (*ME*)
- *September 20:* [Ratification of the armistice](#) (*E*)
- *September 20:* [The uprising in Frankfurt: Part I](#) (*E*)
- *September 21:* [The uprising in Frankfurt: Part II](#) (*E*)
- *October 12:* [Revolution in Vienna](#) (*M*)
- *October 13:* [The "Cologne Revolution"](#) (*M*)

- *November 3:* [Appeal of the democratic congress to the German nation](#) (M)
- *November 3:* [The Paris *Reforme* on the situation in France](#) (M)
- *November 5:* [The latest news from Vienna, Berlin and Paris](#) (M)
- *November 7:* [The victory of the counter-revolution in Vienna](#) (M)
- *November 9:* [The crisis in Berlin](#) (M)
- *November 12:* [Counter-revolution in Berlin: Part I](#)
- *November 14:* [Counter-revolution in Berlin: Part II](#)
- *November 15:* [New institutions -- Progress in Switzerland](#) (E)
- *November 15:* [The ministry under indictment](#) (M)
- *November 15:* [Appeal of the democratic district committee of the Rhine province](#)
- *November 15:* [Impeachment of the government](#) (M)
- *November 17:* [No tax payments!](#) (M)
- *November 19:* [Appeal](#)
- *November 23:* [The Assembly at Frankfurt](#) (M)
- *November 30:* [The revolutionary movement in Italy](#) (M)
- *December 8:* [The coup d'etat of the counter-revolution](#) (M)
- *December 10:* [The bourgeoisie and the counter-revolution: Part I](#)
- *December 15:* [The bourgeoisie and the counter-revolution: Part II](#)
- *December 16:* [The bourgeoisie and the counter-revolution: Part III](#)
- *December 31:* [The bourgeoisie and the](#)

[counter-revolution: Part IV](#)

1849

- *January 1:* [The revolutionary movement](#) (M)
- *January 5:* [A bourgeois document](#) (M)
- *January 21:* [Montesquieu LVI: Part 1](#) (M)
- *January 22:* [Montesquieu LVI: Part 2](#) (M)
- *February 15:* [Democratic Pan-Slavism](#) (E)
- *February 22:* [The proclamation of a republic in Rome](#) (ME)
- *February 25-27:* [The trial of the Rhenish district committee of Democrats](#)
(transcript of Marx's speech of Feb. 8)
(M)
- *May 10:* [The counter-revolutionary offensive and the successes of the revolution](#) (E)
- *May 10:* [The House of Hohenzollern](#) (M)
- *May 19:* [Hungary](#) (E)
- *May 19:* [To the workers of Cologne](#)
- *May 19:* [Suppression of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*](#) (M)



[Marx / Engels](#)
[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)
[Archives](#)

Encyclopedia of Marxism

Glossary of Periodicals

Ne

Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Organ der Demokratie
(New Rhenish Gazette. Organ of Democracy)

"Those were such revolutionary times, and at such times it is a pleasure to work in the daily press. One sees for oneself the effect of every word, one sees one's articles strike like hand-grenades and explode like fired shells."

Frederick Engels

The Neue Rheinische Zeitung was a daily paper published in Cologne between June 1 1848 and May 19 1849. As implied by its name, it was envisioned to continue the tradition of the [Rheinische Zeitung](#) — which Marx edited in 1842 and 1843.

The Neue Rheinische Zeitung, despite its regional name, considered its audience to be all of Germany — beyond the Rhine Province (which centred on Cologne). During April/May 1848, Marx and Engels raised funds for it by selling shares, while drumming up talented correspondents and establishing contacts with democratic periodicals in other countries.

The paper would ultimately be shut down in 1849 by an act of Prussian censorship. The last issue was printed entirely in red ink, see Karl Marx's last article for the newspaper: [Suppression of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#).

Statement from the editorial board of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung
upon the publication of the first issue (Written May 31, 1848)

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

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

Editorial Board:

Editor-in-Chief: Karl Marx

Editors: Heinrich Burgers, Ernst Dronke, Friedrich Engels, Georg Weerth, Ferdinand Wolff, Wilhelm Wolff

See also: Articles by Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels in the [Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)

New York Daily Tribune

An American newspaper published from 1841 to 1924. Until the middle eighteen fifties it was the organ of the Left wing of the American Whigs, and thereafter the organ of the Republican Party. Karl Marx contributed to the paper from [August 1851 to March 1862](#), and at his request Frederick Engels wrote numerous articles for it.

During the period of reaction that set in Europe, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels used this widely circulated, and at that time progressive, newspaper to publish concrete material exposing the failings of capitalist society.

During the American Civil War Marx's contributions to the newspaper stopped. His break with The New York Daily Tribune was largely due to the growing influence on the editorial board of the advocates of compromise with the slave-owners, and the papers's departure from progressive positions.

[Index of the Letter N](#)

[Glossary of Periodicals](#) | [Encyclopedia of Marxism](#)

Marx/Engels Biographical Archive

Karl Marx:

[Biographical overview \(until 1869\)](#)

by F. Engels (1869)

[Karl Marx](#)

by V.I. Lenin (1914)

[On the love between Jenny and Karl Marx](#)

by Eleanor Marx (his daughter; 1897-98)

[The Death of Karl Marx](#)

by F. Engels, various articles (1883)

Fredrick Engels:

[Biographical Article](#)

by V. I. Lenin (1895)

[Encyclopedia Article](#)

Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften (1892)

[Encyclopedia Article](#)

Brockhaus' Konversations-Lexikon (1893)

Collections:

[Various media Interviews on both Engels and Marx](#)

(1871 - 1893)

[Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels: An Intro](#)

A book by David Riazanov (1927)

[Recollections on Marx and Engels](#)

by Mikhail Bakunin (1871)

Family of Marx and Engels:

[Jenny von Westphalen](#),

(Jenny Marx) -- wife of Karl Marx

[Edgar von Westphalen](#)

Brother of Jenny

[Jenny Marx](#)

Daughter -- Various Articles by her

[Laura Marx](#)

Daughter

[Elenaor Marx](#)

Daughter

[Charles Longuet](#)

Husband of Jenny Marx

[Paul Lafargue](#)

Husband of Laura Marx

[Edward Aveling](#)

Husband of Elanor Marx

[Helene Demuth](#)

Family friend and maid

[Works](#) | [Biography](#) | [Letters](#) | [Images](#) | [Contact](#)

[Marx/Engels Internet Archive](#)

Heinrich Burgers

1820 - 1878

Radical journalist in Cologne. *Rheinische Zeitung* staffer 1842-43. 1848 member of the Cologne chapter of the "League of Communists." Editorial staffer at *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* in 1848-9. In 1850, member of the central authority of the "League of Communists." In 1852, one of principal defendants in the Cologne communists trial and sentenced to six years prison. Later, became a national liberal.

[Biography Index](#)



Ernest Dronke

1822 - 1891

Political writer. Initially follower of "true socialism." Became member of the "League of Communists." An editor with *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* in 1848/9. In 1849, emigrated to Switzerland, then to England. Retired from politics in 1852.

[Biography Index](#)



Georg Weerth

1822 - 1856

German revolutionary writer. Member of the London center of the "League of Communists" (from 1843 in England), then 1845-7 in Brussels. From then on, friendship with Marx, contributor to *Deutsche Brusseler Zeitung*. In 1848-9, was an editor with the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. In 1849, sentenced to three months' imprisonment for his "Schnappahnski." Business trips (which were partly political courier journeys) through Holland, Spain, southern and central America. Died of tropical fever in Cuba.

Weerth was a poet greatly influenced by Heinrich Heine. Engels called Weerth "the first and most important poet of the German proletariat."



[Biography Index](#)

Wilhelm Wolff

June 21 1809 - May 9 1864

Silesian schoolmaster. In 1831, became active as a radical student organization member -- for which he was imprisoned between 1834 and 1838. In 1846, in Brussels, began close friendship with Marx and Engels. Active in the Brussels Communist Correspondence Committee. Member of the League of the Just. Co-founder of the League of Communists -- in 1848 as member of its central authority. As served as an editor of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* in 1848-9. Member of the Frankfurt National Assembly (extreme left). Emigrated to Switzerland in 1849, and to England in 1851. Upon his death, Wolff left a substantial fortune to Marx.



Marx dedicated *Capital* volume I to Wolff:

"To my unforgettable friend, Wilhelm Wolff. Intrepid, faithful, noble protagonist of the proletariat."

See Engels' [Wolff biography](#) from *Die Neue Welt* (1876)

[Biography Index](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Berlin, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

HÖSER

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 1

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, May 31 -- IN MAINZ, Herr H•ser, with the help of old fortress regulations and antediluvian federal laws, has discovered a new method of making Prussians and other Germans even more slaves than they were before May 22, 1815. [On May 22, 1815, the Prussian King issued a decree for the establishment of provisional popular assemblies, with a promise for a constitution. -- Ed.] We advise Herr H•ser to take out a patent on his new invention, which would in any case be very lucrative. According to this method, one sends out two or more drunken soldiers, who naturally start a fight with citizens. The public authority steps in and arrests the soldiers; this becomes sufficient for the commander of any fortress to declare the city to be in a state of siege, so that all arms can be confiscated and the inhabitants exposed to the mercy of the brutal soldiery. This plan is the more profitable in that Germany has more fortresses aimed against the interior than the exterior; it is particularly lucrative because any local commandant who is paid by the peoples -- a H•ser, a Roth von Schreckenstein, or any similar feudal name -- may dare more than a king or a kaiser, since he can suppress freedom of the press, since he can, for example, forbid the people of Mainz, who are not Prussians, to express their antipathies for the King of Prussia and the Prussian political system.

Herr H•ser's project is only a part of reactionary Berlin's great plan,

which strives to disarm all civil guards, especially on the Rhine, as soon as possible, to destroy gradually the whole arming of the people now developing, and to deliver us defenselessly into the hands of an army consisting mostly of foreign elements either easily assembled or already prepared.

This is what has actually happened in Aachen, in Trier, in Mannheim, in Mainz, and it can happen elsewhere.

Neue Rheinische Zeitung	
	
Marx / Engels	Marxist writers'
Archive	Archives

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Acht, Sonntag, 1. Juni

1848.

THE ASSEMBLY AT FRANKFURT

by

FREDERICK ENGELS

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org

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

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

The bold and public proclamation of the sovereignty of the German people should have been the first act of the National Assembly.

Its second act should have been the drafting of a German constitution based on the sovereignty of the people and the elimination from the conditions actually existing in Germany of everything that conflicts with this principle.

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

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

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

The National Assembly realised that it must have rules, for it knew that when two or three Germans get together they must have a set of rules, otherwise chair legs will be used to decide matters. And now some school-master had foreseen this contingency and drawn up special regulations for this high Assembly. A motion was submitted to adopt this scheme provisionally; though most deputies had not read it, the Assembly adopted it without more ado, for what would become of Germany's representatives without regulations? *Fiat reglementum partout et toujours!*

Herr Raveaux of Cologne tables a quite simple motion dealing with conflicts between the assemblies at Frankfurt and at Berlin.³ But the Assembly debates the final regulations, and although Raveaux's motion is urgent, the regulations are still more urgent. *Pereat mundus, fiat reglementum!* However, the elected philistines in their wisdom cannot refrain from making a few remarks concerning Raveaux's motion, and while they are debating whether the regulations or the motion should take precedence, they have already produced up to two dozen amendments to this motion. They ventilate the thing, talk, get stuck, raise a din, waste time and postpone voting from the 19th to the 22nd of May. The matter is brought up again on the 22nd, there is a deluge of new amendments and new digressions, and after longwinded speeches and endless confusion they decide that the question, which was already placed on the agenda, is to be referred back to the sections. Thus the time has happily slipped by and the deputies leave to take their meal.

On May 23 they first wrangle about the minutes, then have innumerable motions read out again, and just when they are about to return to the agenda, that is, to the beloved regulations, Zitz of Mainz mentions the brutalities of the Prussian army and the despotic abuses of the Prussian commandant at Mainz.- This was an indubitable and successful sally on the part of the reaction, an event with which the Assembly was especially competent to deal. It ought to have called to account the presumptuous soldier who dared threaten to shell Mainz almost within sight of the National Assembly, it ought to have protected the unarmed citizens of Mainz in their own houses from the atrocities of a coarse soldiery which had been forced upon them and incited against them. But Herr Bassermann, the waterman of Baden [A pun on the words "Basscrinann" and "Wasscrmann" (waternian). -- Ed.], declares that these are trifles. Mainz must be left to its fate, the whole is more important, the Assembly meets here to consider a set of regulations in the interests of Germany as a whole -- indeed, what is the shelling of Mainz compared with this! *Pereat Moguntia, fiat reglementum!* But the Assembly is soft-hearted, it elects a commission that is to go to Mainz to investigate matters and-it is

again just time to adjourn and dine.

And then, on May 24, we lose the parliamentary thread altogether. The regulations would seem to have been completed or to have got lost, at any rate we hear nothing more about them. Instead we are inundated by a veritable flood of well-intentioned motions in which numerous representatives of the sovereign people obstinately demonstrate the limited understanding of a loyal subject. [5] Then follow applications, petitions, protests, etc., and in the end the national slops find an outlet in innumerable speeches skipping from one subject to another. The fact, however, that four committees have been set up cannot be passed over in silence.

Finally Herr Schloffel asked for the floor. Three German citizens, Esselen, Pelz and L6wenstein, had been ordered to leave Frankfurt that very day, before 4 p.m. The wisc and all-knowing police asserted that these gentlemen had incurred the wrath of the townspeople by their speeches in the Workers' Association and must therefore clear out. And the police dare to do this after German right of citizenship was proclaimed by the Preparliament [6] and even after it was endorsed in the draft constitution of the 17 "trusted men" (*hommes de confiance de la diete*). [7] The matter is urgent. Herr Schloffel asks to be allowed to speak on this point. He is refused permission. He asks for the floor to speak on the urgency of the subject, which he is entitled to do according to the regulations, but on this occasion it was a case of *fiat politia, pereat reglementum!* Naturally, for it was time to go home and eat.

On the 25th, the flood of tabled motions caused the pensive heads of the deputies to droop like ripe ears of corn in a downpour. Two deputies then attempted once more to raise the question of the expulsion, but they too did not get a chance to speak, even about the urgency of the matter. Some of the documents received, especially one sent by Poles, were much more interesting than all the motions of the deputies. Finally the commission that was sent to Mainz was given the floor. It announced that it could not report until the following day; moreover it had, of course, arrived too late: 8,000 Prussian bayonets had restored order by disarming 1,200 men of the Civil Guard. Meantime, there was nothing for it but to pass on to the agenda. This was done promptly, the item on the agenda being Raveaux's motion. Since in Frankfurt this had not yet been settled, whereas in Berlin it had already lost all significance because of Auerswald's decree, the National Assembly decided to defer the question till the next day and to go and dine.

On the 26th innumerable new motions were introduced and after that the Mainz commission delivered its final and very indecisive report.

Herr Hergenbahn, 'ex-people's representative and pro tempore minister, presented the report. He moved an extremely moderate resolution, but after a lengthy debate the Assembly concluded that even this docile proposition was too strong and resolved to leave the citizens of Mainz to the tender mercies of the Prussians commanded by a Herr Hilser, and "in the hope that the government will do its duty" the Assembly passed on to the agenda, that is, the gentlemen left to have a meal.

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

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

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



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Acht, Sonntag, 1. Juni

1848.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

by

KARL MARX and FREDERICK ENGELS

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

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

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

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

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

We demand of the democratic party that it grasp the significance of

its position. This demand springs from the experience of the past months. The democratic party has allowed the elation of its first victory to go to its head. Intoxicated with the joy of being able at last to proclaim its principles openly for all to hear, it imagined that one had merely to proclaim these principles for them to be immediately realised. It did not go beyond this proclamation after its first victory and the concessions which directly followed it. But while the party was lavish with its ideas and treated as a brother everyone who did not immediately dare to challenge it, the others -- those who retained or obtained power -- were active. And their activity is not to be made light of. Keeping their principles to themselves and divulging only those parts that were directed against old conditions already overthrown by the revolution, they carefully held the movement in check, ostensibly in the interests of the evolving legal system or the establishment of formal order. They made would-be concessions to the advocates of the old order to secure their support for their own plans; then they gradually built up the basic elements of their own political system and thus succeeded in occupying an intermediate position between the democratic party and the defenders of absolutism, on the one hand advancing and on the other retarding the movement, being at once progressive -- as regards the absolutists -- and reactionary -- as regards the democrats.

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

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

We must clearly warn against those hypocritical friends who, while declaring that they agree with the principles, doubt whether they are practicable, because, they allege, the world is not yet ready for them, and who have no intention of making it ready, but on the contrary prefer to share the common lot of the wicked in this wicked earthly life. If these are the crypto-republicans whom the privy councillor Gervinus fears so much, then we wholeheartedly agree with him: "Such men are dangerous."



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Cologne, Wednesday, 1. June

1848.

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

by

KARL MARX and FREDERICK ENGELS

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 7

Cologne, June 6. Yesterday we acquainted our readers with the "reasoned manifesto of the Radical-Democratic Party [8] in the constituent National Assembly at Frankfurt am Main". Today they will find the manifesto of the Left under the heading Frankfurt. At first sight the two manifestos appear to be almost identical except in form, as the Radical-Democratic Party has a clumsy editor and the Left a skillful one. On closer scrutiny, however, several substantially different points stand out. The manifesto of the Radicals demands a National Assembly to be set up "by direct voting without any electoral qualifications", that of the Left wants it to be convened by "free universal elections". Free universal elections exclude electoral qualifications, but do not exclude indirect methods. In any case why use this vague and ambiguous term?

We encounter once more this greater latitude and flexibility in the demands of the Left compared with the demands of the Radical Party. The Left wants "an executive central authority elected by the National Assembly for a definite period and responsible to it". It does not say

whether this central authority has to be elected from the ranks of the National Assembly, as the manifesto of the Radicals expressly states.

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

"all political power of the federal state is now concentrated in the Assembly which must immediately bring into operation the various forces and political institutions falling within its jurisdiction, and direct the home and foreign policies of the federal state".

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

The manifesto of the Radicals at least expresses the revolutionary nature of the National Assembly. It demands appropriate revolutionary action. Does not the mere existence of a constituent National Assembly prove that there is no longer any constitution? But if there is no constitution, then there is no government either. And if there is no government the National Assembly must govern. Its first move should have been a decree of seven words: "The Federal Diet [9] is dissolved for ever."

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

Apart from the fact that it was the outcome of indirect elections, the German National Assembly suffers from a specifically German malady. It sits at Frankfurt am Main, and Frankfurt am Main is merely an ideal centre, which corresponded to the hitherto ideal, that is,

merely imaginary, German unity. Frankfurt moreover is not a big city with a numerous revolutionary population that can back the National Assembly, partly defending it, partly spurring it on. It is the first time in human history that the constituent assembly of a big nation holds its sessions in a small town. This is the result of Germany's previous history. While the French and English national assemblies met on volcanic ground -- Paris and London -- the German National Assembly considered itself lucky to find neutral ground, where in the most comfortable peace of mind it could ponder over the best constitution and the best agenda. Yet the present state of affairs in Germany offered the assembly an opportunity to overcome the drawbacks of its unfortunate physical situation. It only had to oppose authoritatively all reactionary encroachments by obsolete governments in order to win such strength of public opinion as would make all bayonets and rifle butts ineffective against it. Instead Mainz, almost within sight of the Assembly, is abandoned to the arbitrary actions of the army, and German citizens from other parts of the country are exposed to the chicanery of the philistines in Frankfurt. [\[See June 1 issue -- Ed\]](#) The Assembly bores the German people instead of inspiring it or being inspired by it. Although there is a public which for the time being still looks with good-natured humor upon the antics performed by the spectre of the resurrected Diet of the Holy Roman Empire, there is no people that can find its own life reflected in the life of the Assembly. Far from being the central organ of the revolutionary movement, the Assembly, up till now, was not even its echo.

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

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

After very careful consideration
I see that we need no emperor at all. [10]

Because it is so difficult to decide "who shall be emperor", and because there are as many good reasons for an elected emperor as there are for a hereditary emperor, even the conservative majority of

the Assembly will be compelled to cut the Gordian knot by electing no emperor at all.

It is quite incomprehensible how the so-called Radical-Democratic Party can advocate, as the ultimate political structure of Germany, a federation of constitutional monarchies, small principalities and tiny republics, i.e., a federal union of such heterogeneous elements, headed by a republican government -- for this is what the central body agreed to by the Left really amounts to.

First of all the German central government elected by the National Assembly must undoubtedly be set up alongside the governments which still actually exist. But its struggle against the separate governments begins as soon as it comes into existence, and in the course of this struggle either the federal government and the unity of Germany are wrecked, or the separate governments with their constitutional princes or petty republics are destroyed.

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

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

Leaving alone the fact that all its constituent parts have a similar structure, the United States of America covers an area equal to that of civilized Europe. Only a European federation would be analogous to it. But in order to federate with other states Germany must first of all become one state. The conflict between centralization and federalism in Germany is a conflict between modern culture and feudalism. Germany fell into a kind of bourgeoisified feudalism at the very moment the great monarchies arose in the West; she was moreover excluded from the world market just when this market was opened up to the countries of Western Europe. Germany became impoverished while the Western countries grew rich; she became countrified while

they became urbanized. Even if Russia did not knock at the gates of Germany, the economic conditions alone would compel the latter to introduce rigorous centralization. Even from a purely bourgeois point of view, the solid unity of Germany is a primary condition for her deliverance from her present wretchedness and for the building up of her national wealth. And how could modern social problems be solved in a territory that is split into 39 small states?

Incidentally, the editor of the democratic programme does not bother about such a minor question as material economic conditions. He relies on the concept of federation in his reasoning. Federation is an alliance of free and equal partners. Hence Germany must be a federal state. But cannot the Germans unite in one great state without offense to the concept of an alliance of free and equal partners?



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Berlin, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

THE BERLIN DEBATE ON THE REVOLUTION

by

KARL MARX

FREDERICK ENGELS

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, June 13. At last the Assembly of conciliation has made its position clear. It has rejected the idea of revolution and accepted the theory of agreements. [11]

The matter the Assembly had to decide was this.

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

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

A well-known "misunderstanding" led to the revolution. There was indeed a misunderstanding. The attack by the soldiers, the 16-hour

fight, and the fact that the troops had to be forced by the people to withdraw are sufficient proof that the people completely misunderstood the concessions of March 18.

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

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

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

The upper middle class was all along anti-revolutionary; through fear of the people, i.e., of the workers and the democratic lower middle class, it concluded a defensive and offensive alliance with the reaction.

The united reactionary parties began their fight against the democratic movement by calling the revolution in question. The victory of the people was denied, the famous list of the "seventeen dead soldiers" was fabricated, and those who had fought on the barricades were slandered in every possible way. But this was not all. The United Provincial Diet [12] convoked before the revolution was now actually convened by the government, in order rather belatedly to fabricate a legal transition from absolutism to the constitution. Thus the government openly repudiated the revolution. It moreover invented the theory of agreement, once more repudiating the revolution and with it the sovereignty of the people.

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

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

The Assembly of conciliation was now to declare whether it

recognized the revolution or not.

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

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

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

Neither has the Left exactly distinguished itself in these debates. Most of its speakers repeat one another; none of them dare tackle the matter head-on and speak their mind in frank revolutionary terms. They are always afraid to give offense, to hurt or to frighten people away. Germany would have been in a sorry plight if the people who fought on March 18 had not shown more energy and passion in battle than the gentlemen of the Left showed in the debate.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr 1.

Köln, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.



THE PRAGUE UPRISING

by

FREDERICK ENGELS

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, June 17. Another massacre similar to that of Poznan [13] is being prepared in Bohemia. The possibility of a peaceful association of Bohemia and Germany has been drowned in the blood of the Czech people shed by the Austrian army.

Prince Windischgratz had cannons mounted on the Wyshehrad and Hradschin [14] and trained on Prague. Troops were massed and a sudden attack on the Slavic Congress [15] and the Czechs was being prepared.

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

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

However the uprising may end, a war of attrition between the Germans and Czechs is now the only possible outcome.

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

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

And so they deserve to be. A nation which throughout its history allowed itself to be used as a tool of oppression against all other nations must first of all prove that it has been really revolutionized. It must prove this not merely by a few indecisive revolutions, as a result

of which the old irresolution, impotence and discord are allowed to continue in a modified form; revolutions which allow a Radetzky to remain in Milan, a Colomb and Steinacker in Poznan, a Windischgratz in Prague, a Hueser in Mainz, as if nothing had changed.

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

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

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

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

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

Are they to be blamed for dissociating themselves from the impotent Austrian government, which is in such a perplexed and helpless state that it seems to exist only in order to register the disintegration of Austria, which it is unable to prevent, or at least to give it an orderly course? A government which is even too weak to save Prague from the guns and soldiers of a Windischgratz?

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

The Germans once again bear the responsibility for the ruin of the Czech people, for the Germans have betrayed them to the Russians.

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)

[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)

[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Acht, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

THE FALL OF THE CAMPHAUSEN MINISTRY

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No.

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, June 22 --

No matter how beautifully the gun may shine,
Sooner or later it must decline. *

And the sun that was dyed in the hot Polish blood of March 30 had also declined. [It was under the Camphausen Ministry, which began on March 30, 1848, that the Polish uprising in Posen was crushed. -- Ed.]

The Camphausen Ministry has shed the liberal-bourgeois garment of the counterrevolution. The counterrevolution feels itself strong enough to throw off the inconvenient mask.

A popular but untenable left-center ministry may possibly follow the Ministry of March 30 for a few days. Its real successor is the Ministry of the Prince of Prussia. Camphausen has the honor of having provided him, the natural chief of the absolutist-feudal party, as a successor to it and to himself.

Why pamper the bourgeois guardians much longer?

Do the Russians not stand on the eastern frontier and the Prussian troops on the western? Are the Poles not won over by shrapnel and lapis infernalis to Russian propaganda?

Have not measures been arranged to repeat the bombardment of Prague in practically all Rhineland cities?

Did the army not have all the time needed, during the Danish and Polish wars and in small conflicts between the military and the people, to train itself into a brutal soldiery?

Is the bourgeoisie not tired of revolution? And does there not rise in the ocean the rock on which the counterrevolution will build its church -- England?

The Camphausen Ministry seeks to snatch a few more pennies' worth of popularity, to arouse public sympathy by the assurance that it left the political stage as a dupe. And certainly it is a trickster tricked. In the service of the big bourgeoisie, it had to cheat the democratic revolution of its fruits; in the struggle with the democracy, it had to ally with the aristocratic party and to become the tool of its lust for counterrevolution. The later is now sufficiently strengthened to be able to throw its protector overboard. Herr Camphausen sowed reaction in the bourgeois sense, he will reap it in the aristocratic and absolutist sense. This was the man's good intention, this was his bad luck. A penny's worth of popularity for the disappointed man.

A penny's worth of popularity!

No matter how beautifully the sun may shine,
Sooner or later it must decline!

But in the East it rises again.

* *"Scheint die Sonne noch so schon, / Einmal muss is untergehn,"* from Ferdinand Raimund, *Das Madchen aus der Feenwelt oder der Bauer als Millionar* [The Girl from the Fairy World or the Peasant as Millionaire], Act II, Scene 6.

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)
[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)
[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Acht, Sonntag, 1. Juni

1848.

A DEMOCRATIC UPRISING

by

FREDERICK ENGELS

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

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

They only saw Count Leo Thun and his aristocrats, and failed to notice the mass of the people of Bohemia -- the numerous industrial workers and peasants. The fact that at one moment the aristocracy tried to use the Czech movement in its own interests and those of the camarilla at Innsbruck, was regarded by them as evidence that the revolutionary proletariat of Prague, who, already in 1844, held full control of Prague for three days, [16] represented the interests of the nobility and reaction in general.

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

The Austrians attacked the people not because they were Czechs, but because they were revolutionaries. The military regarded the storming

of Prague simply as a prelude to the storming and burning down of Vienna.

Thus the Berliner Zeitungs-Halle [17] writes:

"Vienna, June 20. The deputation which the Viennese Citizens' Committee [18] had sent to Prague has returned today. Its sole errand was to arrange for some sort of supervision of telegraphic communications, so that we should not have to wait for information 24 hours, as was often the case during the last few days. The deputation reported back to the Committee. They related dreadful things about the military rule in Prague. Words failed them to describe the horrors of a conquered, shelled and besieged city. At the peril of their lives they drove into the city from the last station before Prague by cart, and at the peril of their lives they passed through the lines of soldiers to the castle of Prague.

"Everywhere the soldiers met them with exclamations of: 'So you're here, too, you Viennese dogs! Now we've got you!' Many wanted to set upon them, even the officers were shockingly rude. Finally the deputies reached the castle. Count Wallmoden took the credentials the Committee had given them, looked at the signature and said: 'Pillersdorf? He has nothing to say here.' Windischgratz treated the plebeian rabble more arrogantly than ever, saying: 'The revolution has been victorious everywhere; here we are the victors and we recognize no civilian authority. While I was in Vienna things were quiet there. But the moment I left everything was upset.' The members of the deputation were disarmed and confined in one of the rooms of the castle. They were not allowed to leave until two days later, and their arms were not returned to them.

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

"But the revolution has gone too far. Windischgratz thinks he is the man who can stem it. The Bohemians are shot down like dogs, and when the time for the venture comes the advance against Vienna will begin. Why did Windischgratz set Leo

Thun free, the same Leo Thun who headed the Provisional Government in Prague and who advocated the separation of Bohemia? Why, we ask, was he freed from Czech hands if his entire activity were not a game prearranged with the aristocracy in order to bring about the explosion?

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



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Acht, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

PATOW'S COMMUTATION MEMORANDUM [Prussia's Feudal Reforms]

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No.

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, June 24 -- IN THE constituent session of the twentieth of this month, that fateful session in which Camphausen's sun set and the ministerial crisis set in, Herr Patow submitted a memorandum on the main principles that were to regulate the elimination of feudalism on the land.

When one reads this memorandum, one cannot understand how a peasant war has not broken out long ago in the Old Prussian provinces. What a confused mass of performances, tributes, and deliverings; what a jumble of medieval names, one crazy one after another! Loan suzerainty, decess, capitation, Elector's metes, blood tithe, patronage money, Walpurgis rent, bees' rent, wax lease, meadow right, tithes. Laudemiums, [in Roman law, 2 percent of the price paid the owner for his consent to sell -- ed.] additional rentals -- all this has remained until now in the "best-administered state in the world," and would have continued unto eternity if the French had not made their revolution in February!

Yes, most of these exactions, and especially the most oppressive

among them, would have continued unto eternity if Herr Patow had had his way. It was precisely Herr Patow who was assigned this department, to spare the bumpkin-Junkers in the Marches, in Pomerania, in Silesia as much as possible, and to cheat the peasants of the fruits of the Revolution as much as possible!

The Berlin Revolution made all these feudal relations forever impossible. The peasants, naturally, immediately did away with them in practice. There was nothing left for the government to do but to put in legal form the actually existing abolition of all feudal burdens by the will of the people.

But before the nobility decided on its Fourth of August, its castles were in flames. [On the night of August 4, 1789, the French National Assembly, under growing peasant pressure, formally abolished a whole series of feudal burdens on the peasantry, which the latter had already done away with in reality. -- Ed.] The government, here represented by an aristocrat, declared for the aristocracy. It put a memorandum before the Assembly demanding that it betray the peasant revolution, which had broken out all over Germany in March, to the aristocracy. The government is responsible for the consequences that the application of Patow's principles would have on the land.

For Herr Patow wants the peasants to pay compensation for all the feudal exactions abolished, even the Laudemiums. The only exactions to be abolished without compensation are those that flow from serfdom, from the old tax system and the patrimonial jurisdiction, or those that are worthless to the feudal lord (how generous!); that is, in general the exactions that are the least part of the whole feudal burden.

On the other hand, all feudal commutations arrived at by agreement or judicial decision are final. That is: the peasants who settled their exactions under the reactionary and pro-aristocratic laws enacted since 1816 and particularly since 1840, and have been swindled of their property by bribed officials in favor of feudal lords, receive no compensation.

Rent banks are to be established, to throw sand into the eyes of the peasants.

If Herr Patow had his way, the feudal exactions would be eliminated under his law as little as they were under the old law of 1807.

The correct title for Herr Patow's essay is: Memorandum on the Maintenance of Feudal Exactions Forever by Means of Their Commutation.

The government is provoking a peasant war. Perhaps Russia will not "shy away" from a "momentary loss of Silesia."

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)

[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)

[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr 1.

Acht, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

NEWS FROM PARIS

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, June 26. The news just received from Paris takes up so much space that we are obliged to omit all articles of critical comment.

Therefore only a few words to our readers. Our latest news from Paris gives this: the resignation of Ledru-Rollin and Lamartine and their ministers; the transfer of Cavaignac's military dictatorship from Algiers to Paris; Marrast the dictator in plain clothes; Paris bathed in blood; the insurrection growing into the greatest revolution that has ever taken place, into a revolution of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. Three days which sufficed for the July revolution and the February revolution are insufficient for the colossal contours of this June revolution, but the victory of the people is more certain than ever. The French bourgeoisie has dared to do what the French kings never dared -- it has itself cast the die. This second act of the French revolution is only the beginning of the European tragedy.

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)

[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)

[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Organ der Demokratie.

Nr 1.

Köln, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.



THE JUNE REVOLUTION

by

KARL MARX

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

The workers of Paris were overwhelmed by superior strength, but they were not subdued. They have been defeated but their enemies are vanquished. The momentary triumph of brute force has been purchased with the destruction of all the delusions and illusions of the February revolution, the dissolution of the entire moderate republican party and the division of the French nation into two nations, the nation of owners and the nation of workers. The tricolor republic now displays only one color, the color of the defeated, the color of blood. It has become a red republic.

None of the big republican figures, whether of the National [19] or of the Reforme, [20] sided with the people. In the absence of leaders and means other than those thrown up by the rebellion itself, the people stood up to the united forces of the bourgeoisie and army longer than any French dynast with the entire military apparatus at its disposal was ever able to stand up to any group of the bourgeoisie allied with the people. To have the people lose its last illusions and break completely with the past, it was necessary that the customary poetic trimmings of French uprisings -- the enthusiastic bourgeois youth, the students of the *ecole polytechnique*, the *tricornes* -- should join the side of the suppressers. The medical students had to deny the wounded plebeians the succor of their science. Science does not exist for the plebeian who has committed the heinous, unutterable crime of fighting this time for his own existence instead of for Louis Philippe or Monsieur Marrast.

The Executive Committee, [21] that last official vestige of the February revolution, vanished like a ghost in the face of these grave events. Lamartine's fireworks have turned into the incendiary shells of Cavaignac.

Fraternite, the brotherhood of antagonistic classes, one of which exploits the other, this fraternity which in February was proclaimed and inscribed in large letters on the facades of Paris, on every prison and every barracks -- this fraternity found its true, unadulterated and prosaic expression in civil war, civil war in its most terrible aspect, the war of labor against capital. This brotherhood blazed in front of the windows of Paris on the evening of June 25, when the Paris of the bourgeoisie held illuminations while the Paris of the proletariat was burning, bleeding, groaning in the throes of death.

This brotherhood lasted only as long as there was a consanguinity of interests between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Pedants sticking to the old revolutionary tradition of 1793; socialist doctrinaires who begged alms for the people from the bourgeoisie and who were allowed to deliver lengthy sermons and compromise themselves so long as the proletarian lion had to be lulled to sleep; republicans who

wanted to keep the old bourgeois order in toto, but without the crowned head; members of the Dynastic Opposition [22] on whom chance imposed the task of bringing about the downfall of a dynasty instead of a change of government; legitimists, [23] who did not want to cast off their livery but merely to change its style -- these were the allies with whom the people had fought their February revolution. What the people instinctively hated in Louis Philip was not Louis Philip himself, but the crowned rule of a class, the capital on the throne. But magnanimous as always, the people thought they had destroyed their enemy when they had overthrown the enemy of their enemies, their common enemy.

The February revolution was the nice revolution, the revolution of universal sympathies, because the contradictions which erupted in it against the monarchy were still undeveloped and peacefully dormant, because the social struggle which formed their background had only achieved an ephemeral existence, an existence in phrases, in words. The June revolution is the ugly revolution, the nasty revolution, because the phrases have given place to the real thing, because the republic has bared the head of the monster by knocking off the crown which shielded and concealed it.

Order! was Guizot's war-cry. Order! shouted Sebastiani, the Guizotist, when Warsaw became Russian. Order! shouts Cavaignac, the brutal echo of the French National Assembly and of the republican bourgeoisie.

Order! thundered his grape-shot as it tore into the body of the proletariat.

None of the numerous revolutions of the French bourgeoisie since 1789 assailed the existing order, for they retained the class rule, the slavery of the workers, the bourgeois system, even though the political form of this rule and this slavery changed frequently. The June uprising did assail this system. Woe to the June uprising!

Under the Provisional Government it was considered good form and, moreover, a necessity to preach to the magnanimous workers -- who, as a thousand official posters proclaimed, "placed three months of misery at the disposal of the Republic" -- it was both good politics and a sign of enthusiasm to preach to the workers that the February revolution had been carried out in their own interests and that the principal issue of the February revolution was the interests of the workers. With the opening of the National Assembly the speeches have become more prosaic. Now it was only a matter of leading labor back to its old conditions, as Minister Trelat said. Thus the workers fought in February in order to be engulfed in an industrial crisis.

It is the business of the National Assembly to undo the work of February, at least as far as the workers are concerned, and to throw them back to their old conditions. But even this was not done, because it is not within the power of any assembly any more than of a king to will a universal industrial crisis -- advance up to this point and no further. In its crude eagerness to put an end to the tiresome February phraseology, the National Assembly did not even take the measures that were possible on the basis of the old conditions. Parisian workers aged 17 to 25 were either pressed into the army or thrown onto the street; those from other parts were ordered out of Paris to the Sologne without even receiving the money that went with such an order; adult Parisians could for the time being secure a pittance in workshops organized on military lines on condition that they did not attend any public meetings, in other words on condition that they ceased to be republicans. Neither the sentimental rhetoric which followed the February events nor the brutal legislation after May 15 [24] achieved their purpose. A real, practical decision had to be taken. For whom did you make the February revolution, you rascals -- for yourselves or for us? The bourgeoisie put this question in such a way that it had to be answered in June with grape-shot and barricades.

The entire National Assembly is nevertheless struck with paralysis, as one deputy [Ducoux. -- Ed.] put it on June 25. Its members are stunned when question and answer make the streets of Paris flow with blood; some are stunned because their illusions are lost in the smoke of gunpowder, others because they cannot understand how the people dare stand up on their own for their own vital interests. Russian money, British money, the Bonapartist eagle, the lily, amulets of all kinds -- this is where they sought an explanation of this strange event. Both parts of the Assembly feel however that a vast gulf separates them from the people. None of them dare stand up for the people.

As soon as the stupor has passed frenzy breaks out. The majority quite rightly greets with catcalls those hapless utopians and hypocrites guilty of the anachronism of still using the term fraternite, brotherhood. The question at issue was precisely that of doing away with this term and with the illusions arising from its ambiguity. When the legitimist Larochejaquelein, the chivalrous dreamer, protested against the infamy of those who cried "Vae victis! Woe to the vanquished!" the majority of the deputies broke into a St. Vitus's dance as if stung by a tarantula. They shouted woe! to the workers in order to hide the fact that they themselves are the "vanquished". Either the Assembly must perish now, or the republic. And that is why it frantically yells -- long live the republic!

Is the deep chasm which has opened at our feet to mislead us, democrats, or cause us to believe that the struggle for a form of polity

is meaningless, illusory and futile?

Only weak, cowardly minds can pose such a question. Collisions proceeding from the very conditions of bourgeois society must be overcome by fighting, they cannot be reasoned out of existence. The best form of polity is that in which the social contradictions are not blurred, not arbitrarily -- that is, merely artificially, and therefore only seemingly -- kept down. The best form of polity is that in which these contradictions reach a stage of open struggle in the course of which they are resolved.

We may be asked, do we not find a tear, a sigh, a word for the victims of the people's wrath, for the National Guard, the mobile guard, [25] the republican guard and the line?

The state will care for their widows and orphans, decrees extolling them will be issued, their remains will be carried to the grave in solemn procession, the official press will declare them immortal, the European reaction in the East and the West will pay homage to them.

But the plebeians are tormented by hunger, abused by the press, forsaken by the physicians, called thieves, incendiaries and galley-slaves by the respectabilities; their wives and children are plunged into still greater misery and the best of those who have survived are sent overseas. It is the right and the privilege of the democratic press to place laurels on their gloomy threatening brow.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Paris, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

THE JUNE REVOLUTION

The Course of the Paris Uprising

by

FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 31

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Gradually we gain a more comprehensive view of the June Revolution; fuller reports arrive, it becomes possible to distinguish facts from either hearsay or lies, and the nature of the uprising stands out with increasing clarity. The more one succeeds in grasping the interconnection of the events of the four days in June, the more is one astonished by the vast magnitude of the uprising, the heroic courage, the rapidly improvised organization and the unanimity of the insurgents.

The workers' plan of action, which Kersausie, a friend of Raspail and a former officer, is said to have drawn up, was as follows:

The insurgents, moving in four columns, advance concentrically towards the town hall.

The first column, whose base were the suburbs of Montmartre, La Chapelle and La Villette, advance southwards from the gates of Poissonniere, Rochechouart, St. Denis and La Villette, occupy the Boulevards and approach the town hall through the streets Montorgueil, St. Denis and St. Martin.

The second column, whose base were the faubourgs du Temple and St. Antoine, which are inhabited almost entirely by workers and protected by the St. Martin canal, advance towards the same centre through the streets du Temple and St. Antoine and along the quais of the northern bank of the Seine as well as through all other streets running in the same direction in this part of the city.

The third column based on the Faubourg St. Marceau move towards the Ile de la Cite through the Rue St. Victor and the quais of the southern bank of the Seine.

The fourth column, based on the Faubourg St. Jacques and the vicinity of the Medical School, move down the Rue Saint Jacques also to the Cite. There the two columns join, cross to the right bank of the Seine and envelop the town hall from the rear and flank.

Thus the plan, quite correctly, was based on the districts in which only workers lived. These districts form a semicircular belt, which surrounds the entire eastern half of Paris, widening out towards the east. First of all the eastern part of Paris was to be cleared of enemies, and then it was intended to move along both banks of the Seine towards the west and its centres, the Tuileries and the National Assembly.

These columns were to be supported by numerous flying squads which, operating independently alongside and between the columns, were to build barricades, occupy the smaller streets and be responsible for maintaining communication.

The operational bases were strongly fortified and skillfully transformed into formidable fortresses, e.g., the Clos St. Lazare, the Faubourg and Quartier St. Antoine and the Faubourg St. Jacques, in case it should become necessary to retreat.

If there was any flaw in this plan it was that in the beginning of the operations the western part of Paris was completely overlooked. There are several districts eminently suitable for armed action on both sides of the Rue St. Honore near the market halls and the Palais National, which have very narrow, winding streets tenanted mainly by workers. It was important to set up a fifth centre of the insurrection there, thus cutting off the town hall and at the same time holding up a considerable number of troops at this projecting strongpoint. The success of the uprising depended on the insurgents reaching the centre of Paris as quickly as possible and seizing the town hall. We cannot know what prevented Kersausic from organizing insurgent action in this part. But it is a fact that no uprising was ever successful which did not at the outset succeed in seizing the centre of Paris adjoining the Tuileries. Suffice to mention the uprising [The uprising took place in

Paris on June 5-6, 1832. -- Ed.]" which took place during General Lamarque's funeral when the insurgents got as far as the Rue Montorgueil and were then driven back.

The insurgents advanced in accordance with their plan. They immediately began to separate their territory, the Paris of the workers, from the Paris of the bourgeoisie, by two main fortifications -- the barricades at the Porte Saint Denis and those of the Cite. They were dislodged from the former, but were able to hold the latter. June 23, the first day, was merely a prelude. The plan of the insurgents already began to emerge clearly (and the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* grasped it correctly at the outset, see No. 26, special supplement), especially after the first skirmishes between the advanced guards which took place in the morning. The Boulevard St. Martin, which crosses the line of operation of the first column, became the scene of fierce fighting, which, partly due to the nature of the terrain, ended with a victory for the forces of "order".

The approaches to the Cite were blocked on the right by a flying squad, which entrenched itself in the Rue de la Planche-Mibray; on the left by the third and fourth columns, which occupied and fortified the three southern bridges of the Cite. Here too a very fierce battle raged. The forces of "order" succeeded in taking the St. Michel bridge and advancing to the Rue St. Jacques. They felt sure that by the evening the revolt would be suppressed.

The plan of the forces of "order" stood out even more clearly than that of the insurgents. To begin with, their plan was merely to crush the insurrection with all available means. They announced their design to the insurgents with cannon-ball and grape-shot.

But the government believed it was dealing with an uncouth gang of common rioters acting without any plan. After clearing the main streets by the evening, the government declared that the revolt was quelled, and the stationing of troops in the conquered districts was arranged in an exceedingly negligent manner.

The insurgents made excellent use of this negligence by launching the great battle which followed the skirmishes of June 23. It is simply amazing how quickly the workers mastered the plan of campaign, how well-concerted their actions were and how skillfully they used the difficult terrain. This would be quite inexplicable if in the national workshops the workers had not already been to a certain extent organized on military lines and divided into companies, so that they only needed to apply their industrial Organization to their military enterprise in order to create a fully organized army.

On the morning of the 24th they had not only completely regained the

ground they had lost, but even added new strips to it. True, the line of Boulevards up to the Boulevard du Temple remained in the hands of the troops, thus cutting off the first column from the centre, but on the other hand the second column pushed forward from the Quartier St. Antoine until it almost surrounded the town hall. It established its headquarters in the church of St. Gervais, within 300 paces of the town hall. It captured the St. Merri monastery and the adjoining streets and advanced far beyond the town hall so that together with the columns in the Cite it almost completely encircled the town hall. Only one way of approach, the quais of the right bank, remained open. In the south the Faubourg St. Jacques was completely reoccupied, communication with the Cite' was restored, reinforcements were sent there, and preparations were made for crossing to the right bank.

There was no time to be lost. The town hall, the revolutionary centre of Paris, was threatened and was bound to fall unless resolute measures were taken immediately.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Paris, Donnerstag, 1. Juli

1848.

THE JUNE REVOLUTION

The Course of the Paris Uprising

by

FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 32

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cavaignac was appointed dictator by a frightened National Assembly. Accustomed as he was in Algeria to "energetic" action, he did not have to be told what to do.

Ten battalions promptly moved towards the town hall along the wide Quai de l'Ecole. They cut off the insurgents in the Cite' from the right bank, secured the safety of the town hall and made it even possible to attack the barricades surrounding it.

The Rue de la Planche-Mibray and its continuation, Rue Saint Martin, were cleared and kept permanently clear by cavalry. The Notre-Dame bridge, which lies opposite and leads to the Cite, was swept by heavy guns, and then Cavaignac advanced directly on the Cite in order to take "energetic" measures there. The "Belle Jardiniere", the strongpoint of the insurgents, was first destroyed by cannon and then set on fire by rockets. The Rue de la Cite was also seized with the aid of gun-fire; three bridges leading to the left bank were stormed and the insurgents on the left bank were pressed back. Meanwhile, the 14 battalions deployed on the Place de Greve and the quais freed the besieged town hall, and reduced the church of Saint

Gervais from a headquarters to a lost outpost of the insurgents.

The Rue St. Jacques was bombarded not only from the Cite but also in the flank from the left bank. General Damesme broke through along the Luxembourg to the Sorbonne, seized the Quartier Latin and sent his columns against the Pantheon. The Pantheon square had been transformed into a formidable stronghold. The forces of "order" still faced this unassailable bulwark long after they had taken the Rue St. Jacques. Gun-fire and bayonet attacks were of no avail until finally exhaustion, lack of ammunition and the threat of the bourgeois to set the place on fire compelled the 1,500 workers, who were completely hemmed in, to surrender. At about the same time, the Place Maubert fell into the hands of the forces of "order" after a long and courageous resistance, and the insurgents, deprived of their strongest positions, were forced to abandon the entire left bank of the Seine.

Meanwhile the troops and National Guards stationed on the Boulevards of the right bank of the Seine were likewise put into action in two directions. Lamoriciere, who commanded them, had the streets of the faubourgs St. Denis and St. Martin, the Boulevard du Temple and part of the Rue du Temple cleared by heavy artillery and swift infantry attacks. By the evening he could boast of brilliant successes. He had cut off and partly surrounded the first column in the Clos St. Lazare; he had pushed back the second column, and by advancing along the Boulevards had thrust a wedge into it.

How did Cavaignac win these advantages?

First, by the vastly superior force he was able to use against the insurgents. On the 24th he had at his disposal not only the 20,000-strong Paris garrison, the 20,000 to 25,000 men of the Garde mobile and the 60,000 to 80,000 available men of the Garde national, but also the Garde national from the whole vicinity of Paris and from many of the more distant towns (20,000 to 30,000 men) and in addition 20,000 to 30,000 soldiers who were called in with the utmost dispatch from the neighboring garrisons. Even on the morning of the 24th he had well over 100,000 men at his disposal, and by the evening their numbers had increased by half. The insurgents, on the other hand, numbered 40,000 to 50,000 men at most!

Secondly, by the brutal means he used. Until then guns had been fired in the streets of Paris only once, i.e., in Vendemiaire 1795, when Napoleon dispersed the insurgents in the Rue Saint Honore with grape-shot. But no artillery, let alone grenades and incendiary rockets, was ever used against barricades and against houses. The people were unprepared for this, they were defenseless, for the only counteraction they could take was to set fire to houses, but this was

repugnant to their noble sentiments. Up till then the people had no idea that this brand of Algerian warfare could be used right in the centre of Paris. They therefore retreated, and their first retreat spelt their defeat.

On the 25th Cavaignac attacked with even larger forces. The insurgents were confined to a single district, the faubourgs Saint Antoine and du Temple; in addition they still held two outposts, the Clos St. Lazare and a part of the St. Antoine district up to the Damiette bridge.

Cavaignac, who had received further reinforcements of 20,000 to 30,000 men as well as a substantial park of artillery, first attacked the isolated outposts of the insurgents, especially the Clos St. Lazare. The insurgents were entrenched here as in a fortress. After a 12-hour bombardment with shells and grenades, Lamoriciere finally succeeded in dislodging the insurgents and occupying the Clos St. Lazare, but not until he had mounted a flank attack from the Rue Rochechouart and the Rue Poissonniere, and had demolished the barricades by bombarding them with 40 guns on the first day and with an even greater number on the next.

Another part of his column penetrated through the Faubourg Saint Martin into the Faubourg du Temple, but was not very successful. A third section moved along the Boulevards towards the Bastille, but it did not get very far either, because a number of the most formidable barricades there resisted for a long time and only succumbed after a fierce cannonade. The houses here suffered appalling destruction.

Duvivier's column advancing from the town hall pressed the insurgents back still further with the aid of incessant artillery fire. The church of St. Gervais was captured, a long stretch of the Rue St. Antoine well beyond the town hall was cleared, and several columns moving along the quai and streets running parallel to it seized the Damiette bridge, which connected the insurgents of the St. Antoine district with those of the St. Louis and Cite islands. The St. Antoine district was outflanked and the insurgents had no choice but to fall back into the faubourg, which they did in fierce combat with a column advancing along the quais to the mouth of the St. Martin canal and thence along the Boulevard Bourdon skirting the canal. Several insurgents who were cut off were massacred, hardly any were taken prisoner.

The St. Antoine district and the Place de la Bastille were seized in this operation. Lamoriciere's column managed to occupy the whole Boulevard Beaumarchais by the evening and join up with Duvivier's troops on the Place de la Bastille.

The capture of the Damiette bridge enabled Duvivier to dislodge the insurgents from the St. Louis island and the former Louvier island. He did this with a commendable display of Algerian barbarity. Hardly anywhere in the city was heavy artillery used with such devastating effect as in the island of St. Louis. But what did that matter? The insurgents were either driven out or massacred and among the blood-stained ruins "order" triumphed.

One more post remained to be seized on the left bank of the Seine. The Austerlitz bridge, which east of the St. Martin canal links the Faubourg St. Antoine with the left bank of the Seine, was heavily barricaded and had a strong bridgehead on the left bank where it adjoins the Place Valhubert in front of the Botanical Gardens. This bridgehead, which after the fall of the Pantheon and the Place Maubert was the last stronghold of the insurgents on the left bank, was taken after stubborn resistance.

Only their last bulwark, the Faubourg St. Antoine and a part of the Faubourg du Temple, was thus left to the insurgents on the following day, the 26th. Neither of these is quite suitable for street-fighting; the streets there are fairly wide and almost perfectly straight, offering full play for the artillery. Their western side is well protected by the St. Martin canal, but the northern side is completely exposed. Five or six perfectly straight, wide streets run from the north right into the centre of the Faubourg St. Antoine.

The principal fortifications were at the Place de la Bastille and in the Rue du Faubourg St. Antoine, the main street of the whole district. Remarkably strong barricades were set up there, built partly of big flagstones and partly of wooden beams. They were constructed in the form of an angle pointing inward in order partly to weaken the effect of the gun-fire, partly to offer a larger defense front making cross.-fire possible. Openings had been made in the fireproof walls of the houses so that the rows of houses were connected with each other, thus enabling the insurgents to open rifle fire on the troops or withdraw behind the barricades as circumstances demanded. The bridges and quais along the canal as well as the streets running parallel to it were also strongly fortified. In short, the two faubourgs the insurgents still held resembled a veritable fortress, in which the troops had to wage a bloody battle for every inch of ground.

On the morning of the 26th the fighting was to be resumed, but Cavaignac was not keen on sending his troops into this maze of barricades. He threatened to shell them; mortars and howitzers were brought up. A parley was held. Cavaignac meanwhile ordered the nearest houses to be undermined, but this could only be done to a very limited extent, because the time was too short and because the canal

covered one of the lines of attack; he also ordered internal communication to be established between the occupied houses and the adjoining houses through gaps in the fire-proof walls.

The negotiations broke down and fighting was resumed. Cavaignac ordered General Perrot to attack from the Faubourg du Temple and General Lamoriciere from the Place de la Bastille. The barricades were heavily shelled from both directions. Perrot pushed forward fairly rapidly, occupied the remaining section of the Faubourg du Temple and even penetrated into the Faubourg St. Antoine at several points. Lamoriciere's advance was slower. The first barricades withstood his guns, although his grenades set the first houses of the faubourg on fire. He began once more to negotiate. Watch in hand he awaited the moment when he would have the pleasure of shelling and razing to the ground the most thickly populated district of Paris. Some of the insurgents at last capitulated, while others, attacked in the flank, withdrew from the city after a short battle.

That saw the end of the June barricade fighting. Skirmishes still continued outside the city, but they were of no significance. The insurgents who fled were scattered in the neighborhood and were one by one captured by cavalry.

We have given this purely military description of the struggle to show our readers with what heroic courage, unity, discipline and military skill the Paris workers fought. For four days 40,000 of them opposed forces four times their strength, and were within a hairbreadth of victory. They almost succeeded in gaining a footing in the centre of Paris, taking the town hall, forming a provisional government and doubling their number not only by people from the captured parts of the city joining them but also from the ranks of the Garde mobile, who at that time needed but a slight impetus to make them go over to their side.

German newspapers assert that this was the decisive battle between the red and the tricolor republics, between workers and bourgeois. We are convinced that this battle will decide nothing but the disintegration of the victors. Moreover, the whole course of events proves that, even from a purely military standpoint, the workers are bound to triumph within a fairly short space of time. If 40,000 Paris workers could achieve such tremendous things against forces four times their number, what will the whole mass of Paris workers accomplish by concerted and coordinated action.

Kersausie was captured and by now has probably been shot. The bourgeois can kill him, but cannot take from him the fame of having been the first to organize street-fighting,. They can kill him, but no

power on earth can prevent his techniques from being used in all future street-fighting. They can kill him, but they cannot prevent his name from going down in history as the first commander-in-chief of barricade fighting.

<u>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</u>	
	
<u>Marx / Engels</u>	<u>Marxist writers'</u>
<u>Archive</u>	<u>Archives</u>

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Dien, den 3. Juli 1848.

1848.

GERMANY'S FOREIGN POLICY

by

FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 33

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, July 2. All hitherto existing rulers and their diplomats have employed their skill and efforts to set one nation against another and use one nation to suppress another, and in this manner to perpetuate absolute rule. Germany has distinguished herself in this respect. During the last 70 years alone, she had furnished the British, in exchange for English gold, with mercenaries to be used against the North Americans fighting for their independence; when the first French revolution broke out it was the Germans again who, like a rabid pack, allowed themselves to be set upon the French; in a vicious manifesto issued by the Duke Of Brunswick they threatened to raze the whole of Paris to the ground; they conspired with the ,migr, aristocrats against the new order in France and were-paid for this in the form of subsidies received from England. When the Dutch, for the first time in two hundred years, finally hit upon the sensible idea of putting an end to the mad rule of the House of Orange and establishing a republic, [26] it was the Germans again who acted as the hangmen of freedom. The Swiss, too, could tell a tale about their German neighbors, and it will be some time before the Hungarians recover from the harm which Austria, i.e., the German imperial court, inflicted upon them. German mercenary troops were even sent to Greece to prop up the little throne of dear Otto, [27] and German policemen were sent even to Portugal. Then there were the congresses

after 1815, Austria's expeditions to Naples, Turin and the Romagna, the imprisonment of Ypsilanti, the German-imposed war of suppression which France waged against Spain, [28] Dom Miguel [29] and Don Carlos [30] who were supported by Germany; the reaction in Britain had Hannoverian troops at its disposal; German influence led to the dismemberment of Belgium and the establishment of a Thermidorian rule there; in the very heart of Russia Germans are the mainstay of the one autocrat and of the smaller ones, all Europe is flooded with sprigs of the House of Coburg.

Poland was plundered and dismembered and Krakow throttled with the help of German soldiers. [31] German money and blood helped to enslave and impoverish Lombardy and Venice, and directly or indirectly to stifle any movement of liberation throughout Italy by means of bayonets, gallows, prisons and galleys. The list of sins is much longer, let us close it.

The blame for the infamies committed with the aid of Germany in other countries falls not only on the governments but to a large extent also on the German people. But for the delusions of the Germans, their slavish spirit, their flair for acting as mercenaries and "benign" jailers and tools of the masters "by divine right", the German name abroad would not be so detested, cursed and despised, and the nations oppressed by Germany would have long since been able to develop freely. Now that the Germans are throwing off their own yoke, their whole foreign policy must change too. Otherwise the fetters with which we have chained other nations will shackle our own new, barely prescient, freedom. Germany will liberate herself to the extent to which she sets free neighboring nations.

Things are indeed beginning to look up. The lies and misrepresentations which the old government organs have been so busy spreading about Poland and Italy, the attempts to artificially create enmity, the turgid phrases proclaiming that German honor or German power is at stake -- all these magic formulas are no longer effective. The official patriotism is effective only when these patriotic postures conceal material interests, i.e., only among a section of the big bourgeoisie whose business depends on this official patriotism. The reactionary party knows this and makes use of it. But the great mass of the German middle class and the working class understand or feel that the freedom of the neighboring nations is the guarantee of their own freedom. Is Austria's war against Italy's independence or Prussia's war against the restoration of Poland popular, or do these "Patriotic" crusades on the contrary destroy the last illusions? However, neither this understanding nor this feeling is sufficient. If Germany's blood and money is no longer to be squandered, to her own detriment, in suppressing other nations, then we must achieve a really

popular government, and the old edifice must be razed to the ground. Only then can an international policy of democracy take the place of the sanguinary, cowardly policy of the old, revived system. How can a democratic foreign policy be carried through while democracy at home is stifled? Meanwhile, everything possible must be done to prepare the way for the democratic system on this side and the other side of the Alps. The Italians have issued a number of declarations which make their friendly attitude towards Germany perfectly clear. We would mention the Manifesto of the Provisional Government at Milan addressed to the German people [32] and the numerous articles written in the same vein, which are published in the Italian press. We have now received further evidence of this attitude -- a private letter from the administrative committee of the newspaper L'Alba, [33] published in Florence, to the editors of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung. It is dated June 20, and says among other things:

"We thank you sincerely for the esteem in which you hold our poor Italy. Meanwhile we wholeheartedly assure you that all Italians know who really violates and attacks their liberty; they know that their most deadly enemy is not the strong and magnanimous German people, but rather their unjust, despotic, and cruel government; we assure you that every true Italian longs for the moment when he will be free to shake hands with his German brother, who, once his inalienable rights are established, will be able to defend them, to respect them himself and to secure the respect of all his brothers for them. Placing our trust in the principles to whose careful elaboration you have dedicated yourselves, we remain your faithful friends and brothers

(signed) L. Alinari"

The Alba is one of the few papers in Italy which advocate thoroughly democratic principles.

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)

[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)

[Archives](#)



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Dien, den 18. Juli

1848.

THE DEBATE ON JACOBY'S MOTION

by

FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 48

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, July 17. Again a "great debate", to use an expression of Herr Camphausen, has taken place, a debate which lasted two full days.

The substance of the debate is well known -- the reservations the government advanced regarding the immediate validity of the decisions passed by the National Assembly and Jacoby's motion asserting the Assembly's right to pass legally binding decisions requiring no one's consent, and at the same time objecting to the resolution on the central authority. [31]

That a debate on this subject was possible at all may seem incomprehensible to other nations. But we live in a land of oaks and lime-trees where nothing should surprise us.

The people send their representatives to Frankfurt with the mandate that the Assembly assume sovereign power over the whole of Germany and all her governments, and, by virtue of the sovereignty the people have vested in the Assembly, adopt a constitution for Germany.

Instead of immediately proclaiming its sovereignty in respect to the separate states and the Federal Diet, the Assembly timidly avoids any

question relating to this subject and maintains an irresolute and vacillating attitude.

Finally it is confronted with a decisive issue—the appointment of a provisional central authority. Seemingly independent, but in fact guided by the governments with the help of Gagern, the Assembly elects as Vice Regent of the Empire a man whom these governments had in advance designated for this post.

The Federal Diet recognizes the election, pretending, as it were, that only its confirmation makes the election valid.

Reservations are nevertheless made by Hannover and even by Prussia, and it is the Prussian reservation that has caused the debate of the 11th and 12th.

This time, therefore, it is not so much the fault of the Chamber in Berlin that the debates are vague and hazy. The irresolute, weak-kneed, ineffectual Frankfurt National Assembly itself is to blame for the fact that its decisions can only be described as so much twaddle.

Jacoby introduces his motion with a brief speech made with his usual precision. He makes things very difficult for the speakers of the Left, because he says everything that can be said about the motion if one is to avoid enlarging upon the origin of the central authority, whose history is rather discreditable to the National Assembly.

In fact, the deputies of the Left who follow him advance hardly any new arguments, while those of the Right fare much worse -- they lapse either into sheer twaddle or juridical hair-splitting. Both sides endlessly repeat themselves.

The honor of first presenting the case for the Right devolves on Deputy Schneider.

He begins with the grand argument that the motion is self-contradictory. On the one hand, the motion recognizes the sovereignty of the National Assembly, on the other hand, it calls upon the Chamber of conciliation to censure the National Assembly, thus placing itself above it. Any individual could express his disapproval but not the Chamber.

This subtle argument, of which the Right seems to be very proud seeing that it recurs in all the speeches of its deputies, advances an entirely new theory. According to this theory, the Chamber has fewer rights with regard to the National Assembly than an individual.

This first grand argument is followed by a republican one. Germany

consists for the most part of constitutional monarchies, and must therefore be headed by a constitutional, irresponsible authority and not by a republican, responsible one. This argument was rebutted on the second day by Herr Stein, who said that Germany, under her federal constitution, had always been a republic, indeed a very edifying republic.

"We have been given a mandate," says Herr Schneider, "to agree on a constitutional monarchy, and those in Frankfurt have been given a similar mandate, i.e., to agree with the German governments on a constitution for Germany."

The reaction indulges in wishful thinking. When, by order of the so-called Preparliament -- an assembly having no valid mandate -- the trembling Federal Diet convened the German National Assembly, there was no question at the time of any agreement; the National Assembly was then considered to be a sovereign power. But things now have changed. The June events in Paris have revived the hopes of both the big bourgeoisie and the supporters of the overthrown system. Every country bumpkin of a squire hopes to see the old rule of the knout re-established, and a clamor for "an agreed German constitution" is already arising from the imperial court at Innsbruck to the ancestral castle of Henry LXXII. The Frankfurt Assembly has no one but itself to blame for this.

"In electing a constitutional head the National Assembly has therefore acted according to its mandate. But it has also acted in accordance with the will of the people; the great majority want a constitutional monarchy. Indeed, had the National Assembly come to a different decision, I would have regarded it as a misfortune. Not because I am against the republic; in principle I admit that the republic -- and I have quite definitely made up my mind about it -- is the most perfect and lofty form of polity, but in reality we are still very far from it. We cannot have the form unless we have the spirit. We cannot have a republic while we lack republicans, that is to say, noble minds capable, at all times, with a clear conscience and noble selflessness, and not only in a fit of enthusiasm, of sinking their own interests in the common interest."

Can anyone ask for better proof of the virtues represented in the Berlin Chamber than these noble and modest words of Deputy

Schneider? Surely, if any doubt still existed about the fitness of the Germans to set up a republic, it must have completely vanished in face of these examples of true civic virtue, of the noble and most modest self-sacrifice of our Cincinnatus-Schneider. Let Cincinnatus pluck up courage and have faith in himself and the numerous noble citizens of Germany who likewise regard the republic as the most noble political form but consider themselves bad republicans—they are ripe for the republic, they would endure the republic with the same equanimity with which they have endured the absolute monarchy. The republic of worthies would be the happiest republic that ever existed -- a republic without Brutus and Catiline, without Marat and upheavals like those of June, it would be a republic of well-fed virtue and solvent morality. [35]

How mistaken is Cincinnatus-Schneider when he exclaims:

"A republican mentality cannot be formed under absolutism; it is not possible to create a republican spirit offhand, we must first educate our children and grandchildren in this way. At present I would regard a republic as the greatest calamity, for it would be anarchy under the desecrated name of republic, despotism under the cloak of liberty."

On the contrary, as Herr Vogt (from Giessen) said in the National Assembly, the Germans are republicans by nature, and to educate his children in the republican spirit Cincinnatus-Schneider could do no better than bring them up in the old German discipline, tradition of modesty and God-fearing piety, the way he himself grew up. Not anarchy and despotism, but those cozy beer-swilling proceedings, in which Cincinnatus-Schneider excels, would be brought to the highest perfection in the republic of worthies. Far removed from all the atrocities and crimes which defiled the first French republic, unstained by blood, and detesting the red flag, the republic of worthies would make possible something hitherto unattainable: it would enable every respectable burgher to lead a quiet, peaceful life marked by godliness and propriety. The republic of worthies might even revive the guilds together with all the amusing trials of non-guild artisans. This republic of worthies is by no means a fanciful dream; it is a reality existing in Bremen, Hamburg, Lilbeck and Frankfurt, and even in some parts of Switzerland. But its existence is everywhere threatened by the contemporary storms, which bid fair to engulf it everywhere.

Therefore rise up, Cincinnatus-Schneider, leave your plough and turnip field, your beer and conciliation, mount your steed and save the threatened republic, your republic, the republic of worthies!

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)

[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)

[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Düsseldorf, Donnerstag, 1. Juli

1848.

THE ARMISTICE WITH DENMARK

by
FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 52

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, July 21. As our readers know, we have always regarded the Danish war [36] with great equanimity. We have joined neither in the blatant bluster of the nationalists, nor in the well-worn tune of the sea-girt Schleswig-Holstein fraternity with their sham enthusiasm. We knew our country too well, we knew what it means to rely on Germany.

Events have fully borne out our views. The unimpeded capture of Schleswig by the Danes, the recapture of the country and the march to Jutland, the retreat to the Schlei, the repeated capture of the duchy up to Koenigsau-this utterly incomprehensible conduct of the war from first to last has shown the Schleswigers what sort of protection they can expect from the revolutionary, great, strong, united, etc., Germany, from the supposedly sovereign nation of forty-five million. However, in order that they lose all desire to become German, and that "the Danish yoke" appear infinitely more desirable to them than "German liberty", the Prussians, in the name of the German Confederation, negotiated the armistice of which we print today a word-for-word translation.

Hitherto it has been the custom, when signing an armistice, for the two armies to maintain their positions, or as a last resort, a narrow neutral strip was interposed between them. Under this armistice, the

first result of "the prowess of Prussian arms", the victorious Prussians withdraw over 20 miles, from Kolding to this side of Lauenburg, whereas the defeated Danes maintain their positions at Kolding and relinquish only Alsen. Furthermore, in the event of the armistice being called off, the Danes are to advance to the positions they held on June 24, in other words they are to occupy a six to seven miles wide stretch of North Schleswig without firing a shot—a stretch from which they were twice driven out -- whereas the Germans are allowed to advance only to Apenrade and its environs. Thus "the honor of the German arms is preserved" and North Schleswig, already exhausted because it was deluged with troops four times, is promised a possible fifth and sixth invasion.

But that is not all. A part of Schleswig is to be occupied by Danish troops even during the armistice. Under Clause 8, Schleswig is to be occupied by regiments recruited in the duchy, i.e., partly by soldiers from Schleswig who took part in the movement, and partly by soldiers who at that time were stationed in Denmark and fought in the ranks of the Danish army against the Provisional Government. They are commanded by Danish officers and are in every respect Danish troops. That is how the Danish papers, too, size up the situation.

The *Fadrelandet* [37] of July 13 writes:

"The presence in the duchy of loyal troops from Schleswig will undoubtedly substantially harden popular feeling which, now that the country has experienced the misfortunes of war, will forcefully turn against those who are the cause of these misfortunes."

On top of that we have the movement in Schleswig-Holstein. The Danes call it a riot, and the Prussians treat it as a riot. The Provisional Government, which has been recognized by Prussia and the German Confederation, is mercilessly sacrificed; all laws, decrees, etc., issued after Schleswig became independent are abrogated; on the other hand, the repealed Danish laws have again come into force. In short, the reply concerning Wildenbruch's famous Note, [38] a reply which Herr Auerswald refused to give, can be found here in Clause 7 of the proposed armistice. Everything that was revolutionary in the movement is ruthlessly destroyed, and the government created by the revolution is to be replaced by a legitimate administration nominated by three legitimate monarchs. The troops of Holstein and Schleswig are again to be commanded by Danes and thrashed by Danes; the ships of Holstein and Schleswig are to remain "Danish property" as before, despite the latest order of the Provisional Government.

The new government which they intend to set up puts the finishing touch to all this. The Fadrelandet declares:

"Though in the limited electoral district. from which the Danish elected members of the new government are to be chosen we shall probably not find the combination of energy, talent, intelligence, and experience which Prussia will dispose of when making her selection" this is not decisive. "The members of the government must of course be elected from among the population of the duchies, but nothing is to prevent us giving them secretaries and assistants residing and born in other Parts of the country. In selecting these secretaries and administrative advisers one can be guided by considerations of fitness and talent without regard to local considerations, and it is likely that these men will exert a great influence on the spirit and trend of the entire administration. Indeed, it is to be hoped that even high-ranking Danish officials will accept such a post, though its official status may be inferior. Every true Dane will consider such a post an honor under the present circumstances."

This semi-official paper thus promises the duchies that they will be swamped not only with Danish troops but also with Danish civil servants. A partly-Danish government will take up its residence in Rendsburg on the officially recognized territory of the German Confederation.

These are the advantages which the armistice brings Schleswig. The advantages for Germany are just as great. The admission of Schleswig to the German Confederation is not mentioned at all. On the contrary, the decision of the Confederation is flatly repudiated by the composition of the new government. The German Confederation chooses the members for Holstein, and the King of Denmark chooses those for Schleswig. Schleswig is therefore under Danish, and not German, jurisdiction.

Germany would have rendered a real service in this Danish war if she had compelled Denmark to abolish the Sound tax, a form of old feudal robbery. [39] The German seaports, hard hit by the blockade and the seizure of their ships, would have willingly borne the burden even longer if it led to the abolition of the Sound tax. The governments also made it known everywhere that the abolition of this tax must at any rate be brought about. And what came of all this boasting? Britain and Russia want the tax kept, and of course Germany obediently acquiesces.

It goes without saying that in exchange for the return of the ships, the supplies requisitioned in Jutland have to be refunded, on the principle that Germany is rich enough to pay for her glory.

These are the advantages which the Hansemann ministry offers in this draft armistice to the German nation. These are the fruits of a war waged for three months against a small nation of a million and a half. That is the result of all the boasting by our national papers, our formidable Dane-haters!

It is said that the armistice will not be concluded. General Wrangel, encouraged by Beseler, has definitely refused to sign it, despite repeated requests by Count Pourtales, who brought him Auerswald's order to sign it, and despite numerous reminders that it was his duty as a Prussian general to do so. Wrangel stated that he is above all subordinated to the German central authority, and the latter will not approve of the armistice unless the armies maintain their present positions and the Provisional Government remains in office until the peace is concluded.

Thus the Prussian project will probably not be carried out, but it is nevertheless interesting as a demonstration of how Prussia, when she takes over the reins, is capable of defending Germany's honor and interests.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Acht, Sonntag, 1. Juli

1848.

THE BILL PROPOSING THE ABOLITION OF FEUDAL OBLIGATIONS

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 60

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, July 29. If any Rhinelander should have forgotten what he owes to the "foreign rule", to "the yoke of the Corsican tyrant", he ought to read the Bill providing for the abolition without compensation of various services and dues. The Bill has been submitted by Herr Hansemann in this year of grace 1848 for the "consideration" of his conciliators. Liegdom, allodification rent, death dues, heriot, protection money, legal dues and fines, signet money, tithes on live-stock, bees, etc. -- what a strange, what a barbaric ring these absurd terms have for our ears, which have been civilized by the French Revolution's destruction of feudalism and by the Code Napoleon. How incomprehensible to us is this farrago of medieval duties and taxes, this collection of musty junk from an antediluvian age.

Nevertheless, put off thy shoes from off thy feet, German patriot, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground. These barbarities are the last remnants of Christian-German glory, the last links of the historical chain which connects you with your illustrious ancestors all

the way back to the forest of the Cherusci. The musty air, the feudal mire which we find here in their classic unadulterated form are the very own products of our fatherland, and every true German should exclaim with the poet:

'Tis my own native air, and the glow on my cheek
Could bear no other construction;
The very dirt in the highway itself
Is my fatherland's production!' [40]

Reading the Bill, it seems to you at first glance that our Minister of Agriculture Herr Gierke, on the orders of Herr Hansemann, has brought off a terrifically "bold stroke", has done away with the Middle Ages by a stroke of the pen, and of course quite gratuitously.

But when one looks at the Bill's motivation, one discovers that it sets out straight away to prove that no feudal obligations whatever ought to be abolished without compensation, that is to say, it starts with a bold assertion which directly contradicts the "bold stroke".

The minister's practical timidity now maneuvers warily and prudently between these two bold postures. On the left "the general welfare" and "the demands of the spirit of our time"; on the right the "established rights of the lords of the manor"; in the middle the "praiseworthy idea of a freer development of rural relations" represented by Herr Gierke's shamefaced embarrassment -- what a picture!

In short, Herr Gierke fully recognizes that feudal obligations in general ought to be abolished only against compensation. Thus the most onerous, the most widespread, the principal obligations are to continue or, seeing that the peasants have in fact already done away with them, they are to be reimposed.

But, Herr Gierke observes,

"if, nevertheless, particular relations, whose intrinsic justification is insufficient or whose continued existence is incompatible with the demands of the spirit of our time and the general welfare, are abolished without compensation, then the persons affected by this should appreciate that they are making a few sacrifices not only for the good of all but also in their own well-understood interests, in order that relations between those who have claims and those who have duties shall be peaceful and friendly, thereby helping landed property generally to maintain the political status which befits it for the

good of the whole".

The revolution in the countryside consisted in the actual elimination of all feudal obligations. The government of action, which recognizes the revolution, recognizes it in the countryside by destroying it underhandedly. It is quite impossible to restore the old status quo completely; the peasants would promptly kill their feudal lords -- even Herr Gierke realizes that. An impressive list of insignificant feudal obligations existing only in a few places is therefore abolished, but the principal feudal obligation epitomized in the simple term *corvee* is revived.

As a result of all the rights that are to be abolished, the aristocracy will sacrifice less than 50,000 thaler a year, but will thereby save several million. Indeed the minister hopes that they will thus placate the peasants and even gain their votes at future parliamentary elections. This would really be a very good deal, provided Herr Gierke does not miscalculate.

In this way the objections of the peasants would be eliminated, and so would those of the aristocrats, in so far as they correctly understand their position. There remains the Chamber, the scruples of the inflexible legalists and radicals. The distinction between obligations that are to be abolished and those that are to be retained -- which is simply the distinction between practically worthless obligations and very valuable obligations -- must be based as regards the Chamber on some semblance of legal and economic justification. Herr Gierke must prove that the obligations to be abolished 1. have an insufficient inner justification, 2. are incompatible with the general welfare, 3. are incompatible with the demands of the spirit of our time, and 4. that their abolition is fundamentally no infringement of property rights, i.e., no expropriation without compensation.

In order to prove the insufficient justification of these dues and services Herr Gierke delves into the darkest recesses of feudal law. He invokes the entire, "originally very slow development of the Germanic states over a period of a thousand years". But what good will it do? The deeper he digs, the more he rakes up the stagnant mire of feudal law, the more does that feudal law prove that the obligations in question have, not an insufficient justification, but from the feudal point of view, a very solid justification. The hapless minister merely causes general amusement when he tries his hardest to induce feudal law to make cryptic pronouncements in the style of modern civil law, or to let the feudal lord of the twelfth century think and judge like a bourgeois of the nineteenth century.

Herr Gierke fortunately has inherited Herr von Patow's principle that everything emanating from feudal sovereignty and serfdom is to be abolished without payment, but everything else is to be abolished only against payment of compensation. But does Herr Gierke really think that special perspicacity is required in order to show that all and every obligation subject to repeal emanates from feudal sovereignty?

It is hardly necessary to add that for the sake of consistency Herr Gierke constantly insinuates modern legal concepts into feudal legal regulations, and in an extremity he always invokes them. But if Herr Gierke evaluates some of these obligations in terms of the modern ideas of law, then it is incomprehensible why the same should not be done with all obligations. In that case, however, the corvee, faced with the freedom of the individual and of property, would certainly come off badly.

Herr Gierke fares even worse when he advances the argument of public welfare and the demands of the spirit of our time in support of his differentiations. Surely it is self-evident that if these insignificant obligations impede the public welfare and are incompatible with the demands of the spirit of our time, then this applies in still greater measure to such obligations as labor service, the corvee, laudemium, etc. Or does Herr Gierke consider that the right to pluck the peasants' geese (S 1, No. 14) is out of date, but the right to pluck the peasants is not?

Then follows the demonstration that the abolition of those particular obligations does not infringe any property rights. Of course, only spurious arguments can be adduced to prove such a glaring falsehood; it can indeed only be done by reckoning up these rights to show the squires how worthless they are for them, though this, obviously, can be proved only approximately. And so Herr Gierke sedulously reckons up all the 18 sections of Clause 1, and does not notice that, to the extent in which he succeeds in proving the given obligations to be worthless, he also succeeds in proving the proposed legislation to be worthless. Virtuous Herr Gierke! How it pains us to have to destroy his fond delusions and obliterate his Archimedean-feudalist diagrams.

But there is another difficulty. Both in previous commutations of the obligations now to be abolished and in all other commutations, the peasants were flagrantly cheated in favor of the aristocracy by corrupt commissions. The peasants now demand the revision of all commutation agreements concluded under the previous government, and they are quite justified in doing so.

But Herr Gierke will have nothing to do with this, since "formal right and law are opposed" to it; such an attitude is altogether opposed to

any progress, since every new law nullifies some old formal right and law.

"The consequences of this, it can confidently be predicted, will be that, in order to secure advantages to those under obligations by means that run counter to the eternal legal principles" (revolutions, too, run counter to the eternal legal principles), "incalculable damage must be done to a very large section of landed property in the state, and hence" (!) "to the state itself."

Herr Gierke now proves with staggering thoroughness that such a procedure

"would call in question and undermine the entire legal framework of landed property and this together with numerous lawsuits and the great expenditure involved would cause great damage to landed property, which is the principal foundation of the national welfare"; that it "would be an encroachment on the legal principles underlying the validity of contracts, an attack on the most indubitable contractual relations, the consequences of which would shake all confidence in the stability of civil law, thereby constituting a grave menace to the whole of commercial intercourse"!!

Herr Gierke thus sees in this an infringement of the rights of property, which would undermine all legal principles. Why is the abolition of the obligations under discussion without compensation not an infringement? These are not merely indubitable contractual relations, but claims that were invariably met and not contested since time immemorial, whereas the demand for revision concerns contracts that are by no means uncontested, since the bribery and swindling are notorious, and can be proved in many cases.

It cannot be denied that, though the abolished obligations are quite insignificant, Herr Gierke, by abolishing them, secures "advantages to those under obligations by means that run counter to the eternal legal principles" and this is "directly opposed to formal right and law"; he "undermines the entire legal framework of landed property" and attacks the very foundation of the "most indubitable" rights.

Really, Herr Gierke, was it worth while to go to all trouble and commit such a grievous sin in order to achieve such paltry results?

Herr Gierke does indeed attack property -- that is quite indisputable -- but it is feudal property he attacks, not modern, bourgeois property. By destroying feudal property he strengthens bourgeois property which arises on the ruins of feudal property. The only reason he does not want the commutation agreements revised is because by means of these contracts feudal ownership relations were converted into bourgeois ones, and consequently he cannot revise them without at the same time formally infringing bourgeois property. Bourgeois property is, of course, as sacred and inviolable as feudal property is vulnerable and -- depending on the requirements and courage of the ministers -- violable. What in brief is the significance of this lengthy law?

It is the most striking proof that the German revolution of 1848 is merely a parody of the French revolution of 1789.

On August 4, 1789, three weeks after the storming of the Bastille, the French people, in a single day, got the better of the feudal obligations.

On July 11, 1848, four months after the March barricades, the feudal obligations got the better of the German people. Teste Gierke cum Hansemanno.

The French bourgeoisie of 1789 never left its allies, the peasants, in the lurch. It knew that the abolition of feudalism in the countryside and the creation of a free, land-owning peasant class was the basis of its rule.

The German bourgeoisie of 1848 unhesitatingly betrays the peasants, who are its natural allies, flesh of its own flesh and without whom it cannot stand up to the aristocracy.

The perpetuation of feudal rights and their endorsement in the form of the (illusory) commutations -- such is result of the German revolution of 1848. There was much ado about nothing.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Organ der Demokratie.

№ 1.

Köln, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

THE *KOLNISCHE ZEITUNG* ON THE STATE OF AFFAIRS IN ENGLAND

by
FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 62

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, July 31.

"Where is it possible in England to discover any trace of hatred against the class which in France is called the bourgeoisie? This hatred was at one time directed against the aristocracy, which by means of its corn monopoly imposed a heavy and unjust tax on industry. The bourgeois in England enjoys no privileges, he depends on his own diligence; in France under Louis Philippe he depended on monopolies, on privileges."

This great, this scholarly, this veracious proposition can be found in Herr Wolfers' leading article in the always well-informed *Kolnische Zeitung*. [41]

It is indeed strange. England has the most numerous, the most concentrated, the most classic proletariat, a proletariat which every five or six years is decimated by the crushing misery of a commercial crisis, by hunger and typhus; a proletariat which for half its life is

redundant to industry and unemployed. One man in every ten in England is a pauper, and one pauper in every three is an inmate in one of the Poor Law Bastilles. [42] The annual cost of poor-relief in England almost equals the entire expenditure of the Prussian state. Poverty and pauperism have been openly declared in England to be necessary elements of the present industrial system and the national wealth. Yet, despite this, where is it possible in England to discover any trace of hatred against the bourgeoisie?

There is no other country in the world where, simultaneously with the enormous growth of the proletariat, the contradiction between proletariat and bourgeoisie has reached such a high level as in England; no other country presents such glaring contrasts between extreme poverty and immense wealth -- yet where can one find even a trace of hatred against the bourgeoisie?

Obviously, the associations of workers, set up secretly before 1825 and openly after 1825, associations not for just a day against any single manufacturer, but permanent associations directed against entire groups of manufacturers, workers' associations of entire industries, entire towns, finally associations uniting large numbers of workers throughout England, all these associations and their numerous fights against the manufacturers, the strikes, which led to acts of violence, revengeful destructions, arson, armed attacks and assassinations -- all these actions just prove the love of the proletariat for the bourgeoisie.

The entire struggle of the workers against the manufacturers over the last 80 years, a struggle which, beginning with machine wrecking, has developed through associations, through isolated attacks on the person and property of the manufacturers and on the few workers who were loyal to them, through bigger and smaller rebellions, through the insurrections of 1839 and 1842, has become the most advanced class struggle the world has seen. The class war of the Chartists, [43] the organized party of the proletariat, against the organized political power of the bourgeoisie, has not yet led to those terrible bloody clashes which took place during the June uprising in Paris, but it is waged by a far larger number of people with much greater tenacity and on a much larger territory -- this social civil war is of course regarded by the *Kölnische Zeitung* and its Wolfers as nothing but a long demonstration of the love of the English proletariat for its bourgeois employers.

Not so long ago it was fashionable to present England as the classic land of social contradictions and struggles, and to declare that France, compared with England's so-called "unnatural situation", was a happy land with her Citizen King, her bourgeois parliamentary adversaries

and her upright workers, who always fought so bravely for the bourgeoisie. It was not so long ago that the *Kolnische Zeitung* kept harping on this well-worn tune and saw in the English class struggles a reason for warning Germany against protectionism and the "unnatural" hot-house industry to which it gives rise. But the June days have changed everything. The horrors of the June battles have shaken the *Kolnische Zeitung*, and the millions of Chartists in London, Manchester and Glasgow vanish into thin air in face of the forty thousand Paris insurgents.

France has become the classic country as regards hatred of the bourgeoisie and, according to the present assertions of the *Kolnische Zeitung*, this has been the case since 1830. How strange. For the last ten years English agitators, received with acclamation by the entire proletariat, have untiringly preached fervent hatred of the bourgeoisie at meetings and in pamphlets and journals, whereas the French working-class and socialist literature has always advocated reconciliation with the bourgeoisie on the grounds that the class antagonisms in France were far less developed than in England. The men at whose very name the *Kolnische Zeitung* makes the triple sign of the cross, men like Louis Blanc, Cabet, Caussidiere and Ledru-Rollin, have, for many years before and after the February revolution, preached peace with the bourgeoisie, and they generally did it in good faith. Let the *Kolnische Zeitung* look through any of the writings of these people, or through the *Reforme*, [44] the *Populaire*, [45] or even the working-class journals published during the last few years like the *Union*, [46] the *Ruche populaire* [47] and the *Fraternite* [48] -- though it should be sufficient to mention two works which everybody knows, Louis Blanc's entire *Histoire de dix ans*, especially the last part, and his *Histoire de la revolution francaise* in two volumes.

But the *Kolnische Zeitung* is not content with merely asserting that no hatred exists in England against "the class which in France is called the bourgeoisie" (in England too, our well-informed colleague, cf. *The Northern Star* [49] for the last two years) -- it also explains why this must 'be so.

Peel saved the English bourgeoisie from this hatred by repealing the monopolies and establishing Free Trade.

"The bourgeois in England enjoys no privileges, no monopolies; in France he depended on monopolies.... It was Peel's measures that saved England from the most appalling upheavals."

By doing away with the monopoly of the aristocracy, Peel saved the bourgeoisie from the threatening hatred of the proletariat, according to the amazing logic of the *Kolnische Zeitung*.

"The English people, we say; the English people realizes more and more that only from Free Trade can it expect a solution of the vital problems bearing on all its present afflictions and apprehensions, a solution which was recently attempted amid streams of blood.... We must not forget that the first notions of Free Trade came from the English people."

The English people! But the "English people" have been fighting the Free Traders since 1839 at all their meetings and in the press, and compelled them, when the Anti-Corn Law League was at the height of its fame, to hold their meetings in secret and to admit only persons who had a ticket. The people with bitter irony compared the practice of the Free Traders with their fine words, and fully identified the bourgeois with the Free Trader. Sometimes the English people were even forced temporarily to seek the support of the aristocracy, the monopolists, against the bourgeoisie, e.g., in their fight for the ten-hour day. [50] And we are asked to believe that the people who were so well able to drive the Free Traders off the rostrum at public meetings, that it was these "English people" who originally conceived the ideas of Free Trade! The *Kolnische Zeitung*, in its artless simplicity, not only repeats mechanically the illusions of the big capitalists of Manchester and Leeds, but lends a gullible ear to their deliberate lies.

"The bourgeois in England enjoys no privileges, no monopolies." But in France things are different:

"The worker for a long time regarded the bourgeois as the monopolist who imposed a tax of 60 per cent on the poor farmer for the iron of his plough, who made extortionate profits on his coal, who exposed the vine-growers throughout France to death from starvation, who added 20, 40, 50 per cent to the price of everything he sold them...."

The only monopoly which the worthy *Kolnische Zeitung* knows is the customs monopoly, i.e., the monopoly which only appears to affect the workers, but actually falls on the bourgeoisie, on all industrialists,

who do not profit from the tariff- protection. The *Kolnische Zeitung* knows only the local, legally imposed monopoly, the monopoly which was attacked by the Free Traders from Adam Smith to Cobden.

But the monopoly of capital, which comes into being without the aid of legislation and often exists despite it, this monopoly is not recognized by the gentlemen of the *Kolnische Zeitung*. Yet it is this monopoly which directly and ruthlessly weighs upon the workers and causes the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Precisely this monopoly is the specifically modern monopoly, which produces the modern class contradictions, and the solution of just these contradictions is the specific task of the nineteenth century.

But this monopoly of capital becomes more powerful, more comprehensive, and more threatening in proportion as the other small and localized monopolies disappear.

The freer competition becomes as a result of the abolition of all "monopolies", the more rapidly is capital concentrated in the hands of the industrial barons, the more rapidly does the petty bourgeoisie become ruined and the faster does the industry of England, the country of capital's monopoly, subjugate the neighboring countries. If the "monopolies" of the French, German and Italian bourgeoisie were abolished, Germany, France and Italy would be reduced to proletarians compared with the all-absorbing English bourgeoisie. The pressure which the individual English bourgeois exerts on the individual English proletarian would then be matched by the pressure exerted by the English bourgeoisie as a whole on Germany, France and Italy, and it is particularly the petty bourgeoisie of these countries which would suffer most.

These are such commonplace ideas that today can no longer be explained without causing offense -- to anybody but the learned gentlemen of the *Kolnische Zeitung*.

These profound thinkers see in Free Trade the only means by which France can be saved from a devastating war between the workers and the bourgeois.

To reduce the bourgeoisie of a country to the level of the proletariat is indeed a means of solving class contradictions, which is worthy of the *Kolnische Zeitung*.



[Marx / Engels](#)
[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)
[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Köln, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

THE FRANKFURT ASSEMBLY DEBATES THE POLISH QUESTION

by
FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 70

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, August 7. The Frankfurt Assembly, whose debates even during the most exciting moments were conducted in a truly German spirit of geniality, at last pulled itself together when the Poznan question came up. On this question, the ground for which had been prepared by Prussian shrapnel and the docile resolutions of the Federal Diet, the Assembly had to pass a clear-cut resolution. No mediation was possible: it had either to save Germany's honor or to blot it once again. The Assembly acted as we had expected; it sanctioned the seven partitions of Poland, and shifted the disgrace of 1772, 1794 and 1815 from the shoulders of the German princes to its own shoulders.

The Frankfurt Assembly, moreover, declared that the seven partitions of Poland were benefactions wasted on the Poles. Had not the forcible intrusion of the Jewish-German race lifted Poland to a level of culture and a stage of science which that country could never have dreamed of! Deluded, ungrateful Poles! If your country had not been partitioned you would have had to ask this favor yourselves of the Frankfurt Assembly.

Pastor Bonavita Blank of the Paradise monastery near Schaffhausen trained magpies and starlings to fly in and out. He had cut away the lower part of their bill so that they were unable to get their own food and could only receive it from his hands. The philistines who from a distance saw the birds alight on the Reverend's shoulders and seem to be friendly with him, admired his great culture and learning. His biographer says that the birds loved their benefactor.

Yet the fettered, maimed, branded Poles refuse to love their Prussian benefactors.

We could not give a better description of the benefactions which Prussia bestowed on the Poles than that provided by the report which the learned historiographer Herr Stenzel submitted on behalf of the Committee for International Law, a report which forms the basis of the debate.

The report, entirely in the style of the conventional diplomatic documents, first recounts how the Grand Duchy of Poznan was set up in 1815 by "incorporation" and "merging". Then follow the promises which at the same time Frederick William III made to the inhabitants of Poznan, i.e., the safeguarding of their nationality, language and religion, the appointment of a native governor, and participation in the famous Prussian constitution. [51]

The extent to which these promises were kept is well known. The freedom of communication between the three sections of Poland, to which the Congress of Vienna could the more easily agree the less feasible it was, was of course never put into effect.

The make-up of the population is then examined. Herr Stenzel calculates that 790,000 Poles, 420,000 Germans and about 80,000 Jews lived in the Grand Duchy in 1843, making a total of 1,300,000.

Herr Stenzel's statement is challenged by the Poles, notably by Archbishop Przylyski, according to whom there are considerably more than 800,000 Poles, and, if one deducts the Jews, officials and soldiers, hardly 250,000 Germans, living in Poznan.

Let us, however, accept Herr Stenzel's figures. For our purposes it is quite sufficient. To avoid all further discussion, let us concede that there are 420,000 Germans living in Poznan. Who are these Germans, who by the inclusion of the Jews have been brought up to half a million?

The Slavs are a predominantly agricultural people with little aptitude for urban trades in the form in which they were hitherto carried on in the Slav countries. The first crude stage of commerce, when it was still mere hawking, was left to Jewish pedlars. With the growth of

culture and population the need for urban trades and urban concentration made itself felt, and Germans moved into the Slav countries. The Germans, who after all had their heyday in the petty-bourgeois life of the imperial cities of the Middle Ages, in the sluggish inland trade conducted in caravan style, in a restricted maritime trade, and in the handicraft workshops of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries organized on guild lines -- the Germans demonstrated their vocation as the philistines of world history by the very fact that they still to this day form the core of the petty bourgeoisie throughout Eastern and Northern Europe and even in America. Many, often most of the craftsmen, shopkeepers and small middlemen in Petersburg, Moscow, Warsaw and Krakow, in Stockholm and Copenhagen, in Pest, Odessa and Jassy, in New York and Philadelphia are Germans or of German extraction. All these cities have districts where only German is spoken, and some of them, for example Pest, are almost entirely German.

This German immigration, particularly into the Slav countries, went on almost uninterruptedly since the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Moreover, from time to time since the Reformation, as a result of the persecution of various sects large groups of Germans were forced to migrate to Poland, where they received a friendly welcome. In other Slav countries, such as Bohemia, Moravia, the Slav population was decimated by German wars of conquest, whereas the German population increased as a result of invasion.

The position is clearest in Poland. The German philistines living there for centuries never regarded themselves as politically belonging to Germany any more than did the Germans in North America; just as the "French colony" in Berlin and the 15,000 Frenchmen in Montevideo do not regard themselves as belonging to France. As far as that was possible during the days of decentralization in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, they became Poles, German-speaking Poles, who had long since renounced all ties with the mother country.

But the Germans brought to Poland culture, education and science, commerce and trades. -- True, they brought retail trade and guild crafts; by their consumption and the limited intercourse which they established they stimulated production to some extent. Up to 1772 Poland as a whole was not particularly well known for her high standard of education and science, and the same applies to Austrian and Russian Poland since then; of the Prussian part we shall speak later. On the other hand, the Germans prevented the formation of Polish towns with a Polish bourgeoisie. By their distinct language, their separateness from the Polish population, their numerous different privileges and urban codes, they impeded centralization, that most

potent of political means by which a country achieves rapid development. Almost every town had its own law; indeed towns with a mixed population had, and often still have, a different law for Germans, Poles and Jews. The German Poles remained at the lowest stage of industrial development; they did not accumulate large capitals; they were neither able to set up large-scale industry nor control any extensive commercial networks. The Englishman Cockerill had to come to Warsaw for industry to strike root in Poland. The entire activity of the German Poles was restricted to retail trade, the handicrafts and at most the corn trade and manufacture (weaving, etc.) on the smallest scale. In considering the merits of the German Poles it should not be forgotten that -they imported German philistinism and German petty-bourgeois narrow-mindedness into Poland, and that they combined the worst qualities of both nations without acquiring their good ones.

Herr Stenzel seeks to enlist the sympathy of the Germans for the German Poles:

"When the kings ... especially in the seventeenth century, became increasingly powerless and were no longer able to protect the native Polish peasants against the severest oppression by the nobles, the German villages and towns, too, declined, and many of them became the property of the nobility. Only the larger royal cities kept some of their old liberties" (read: privileges).

Does Herr Stenzel perhaps demand that the Poles should have protected the "Germans" (i.e., German Poles, who are moreover also "natives") better than themselves? Surely it is obvious that foreigners who immigrate into any country must expect to share the good and bad with the indigenous inhabitants.

Now passing to the blessings for which the Poles are indebted to the Prussian government in particular.

Frederick II seized the Netze district in 1772, and in the following year the Bromberg canal was built, which made inland navigation between the Oder and Vistula possible.

"The region, which for centuries was an object of dispute between Poland and Pomerania, and which was largely desolate as a result of countless devastations and because of vast swamps, was now brought under cultivation and populated by

numerous colonists."

Thus, the first partition of Poland was no robbery. Frederick II merely seized an area which "for centuries was an object of dispute". But since when has there no longer existed an independent Pomerania which could have disputed this region? For how many centuries were in fact the rights of Poland to this region no longer challenged? And in general, what meaning has this rusted and rotten theory of "disputes" and "claims", which, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, served the purpose of covering up the naked commercial interests and the policy of rounding off one's lands? What meaning can it have in 1848 when the bottom has been knocked out of all historical justice and injustice?

Incidentally, Herr Stenzel ought to bear in mind that according to this junk-heap doctrine the Rhine borders between France and Germany have been "an object of dispute for millennia", and that Poland could assert her claims to suzerainty over the province of Prussia and even over Pomerania.

In short, the Netze district became part of Prussia and hence ceased to be "an object of dispute". Frederick II had it colonized by Germans, and so the "Netze brethren", who received such praise in connection with the Poznan affair, came into being. The state-promoted Germanization began in 1773.

"According to reliable information, the Jews in the Grand Duchy are all Germans and want to be Germans.... The religious toleration which used to prevail in Poland and the possession of certain qualities which were lacking in the Poles, enabled the Jews in the course of centuries to develop activities which penetrated deep into Polish life", namely, into Polish purses. "As a rule they have a thorough command of both languages, although they, and their children from the earliest years, speak German at home."

The unexpected sympathy and recognition which Polish Jews have lately received in Germany has found official expression in this passage. Maligned wherever the influence of the Leipzig fair extends as the very incarnation of haggling, avarice and sordidness, they have suddenly become German brethren; with tears of joy honest Michael presses them to his bosom, and Herr Stenzel lays claim to them on behalf of the German nation as Germans who want to remain Germans.

Indeed, why should not Polish Jews be genuine Germans? Do not "they, and their children from the earliest years, speak German at home"? And what German at that!

Incidentally, we would point out to Herr Stenzel that he might just as well lay claim to the whole of Europe and half America, and even part of Asia. German, as everyone knows, is the universal language of the Jews. In New York and Constantinople, in St. Petersburg and Paris "the Jews, and their children from the earliest years, speak German at home", and some of them even a more classical German than the Poznan Jews, the "kindred" allies of the Netze brethren.

The report goes on to present the national relations in terms that are as vague as possible and as favorable as possible to the alleged half a million Germans consisting of German Poles, Netze brethren, and Jews. It says that German peasants own more land than the Polish peasants (we shall see how this has come to pass), and that since the first partition of Poland enmity between Poles and Germans, especially Prussians, reached its highest degree.

"By the introduction of its exceptionally rigidly regulated political and administrative orders" (what excellent style!) "and their strict enforcement, Prussia in particular seriously disturbed the old customs and traditional institutions of the Poles."

Not only the Poles but also the other Prussians, and especially we from the Rhine, can tell a tale about the "rigidly regulated" and "strictly enforced" measures of the worthy Prussian bureaucracy, measures which "disturbed" not only the old customs and traditional institutions, but also the entire social life, industrial and agricultural production, commerce, mining, in short all social relations without exception. But Herr Stenzel refers here not to the bureaucracy of 1807-48, but to that of 1772-1806, to the officials of genuine, dyed in the wool, Prussianism, whose baseness, corruptibility, cupidity and brutality were clearly evident in the treacherous acts of 1806. These officials are supposed to have protected the Polish peasants against the nobles and received in return nothing but ingratitude; of course the officials ought to have understood "that nothing, not even the good things granted or imposed, can compensate for the loss of national sovereignty".

We too know the way in which quite recently the Prussian officials used "to grant and impose everything". What Rhinelander, who had dealings with newly arrived officials from the old Prussian lands, did not have an opportunity to admire their inimitable, obtrusive

priggishness, their impudent meddlesomeness, their overriding insolence and that combination of narrow-mindedness and infallibility. True, with us, in most cases, these old Prussian gentry soon lost some of their roughness for they had no Netze brethren, no secret inquisition, no Prussian law and no floggings -- deficiency which even brought many of them to an early grave. We do not have to be told what havoc they wrought in Poland, where they could indulge in floggings and secret inquisitions to their heart's content.

In short, the arbitrary Prussian rule won such popularity that "already after the battle of Jena, the hatred of the Poles found vent in a general uprising and the ejection of the Prussian officials". This, for the time being, put an end to the bureaucratic rule.

But in 1815 it returned in a somewhat modified form. The "best", "reformed", "educated", "incorruptible" officialdom tried their hand at dealing with these refractory Poles.

"The founding of the Grand Duchy of Poznan was not conducive to the establishment of cordial relations, since... at that time the King of Prussia could not possibly agree to have any single province set up as an entirely independent unit, thus turning his state, as it were, into a federal state."

Thus according to Herr Stenzel, the King of Prussia could "not possibly agree" to keep his own promises and the treaties of Vienna. [52]

"In 1830, when the sympathies which the Polish nobility showed for the Warsaw uprising caused anxiety, and systematic efforts were made ever since by means of various arrangements" (!) -- "notably by buying up the Polish landed estates, dividing them and handing them over to the Germans-gradually to eliminate the Polish nobility altogether, the latter's resentment against Prussia increased."

"By means of various arrangements"! By prohibiting Poles from buying land brought under the hammer, and similar measures, which Herr Stenzel covers with the cloak of charity.

What would Rhinelanders say if with us, too, the Prussian government were to prohibit Rhinelanders from buying land put up for sale by order of the court. Sufficient pretexts could easily be

found, namely: in order to amalgamate the population of the old and new provinces; in order that the natives of the old provinces could share in the blessings of parcellation and of the Rhenish laws; in order that Rhinelanders be induced to emigrate to the old provinces and implant their industries there as well, and so on. There are enough reasons to bestow Prussian "colonists" on us too. How would we look upon people who bought our land for next to nothing while competition was excluded, and who did it moreover with the support of the government; people who were thrust upon us for the express purpose of accustoming us to the intoxicating motto "With God for King and Country"?

After all we are Germans, we speak the same language as the people in the old provinces. Yet in Poznan those colonists were sent methodically, with unabated persistence, to the demesnes, the forests and the divided estates of the Polish nobility in order to oust the native Poles and their language from their own country and to set up a truly Prussian province, which was to surpass even Pomerania in black and white fanaticism. [53]

In order that the Prussian peasants in Poland should not be left without their natural masters, they were sent the flower of Prussian knighthood, men like Tresckow and Lutichau, who also bought landed estates for a song, and with the aid of government loans. In fact, after the Polish uprising of 1846, [54] a joint-stock company was formed in Berlin, which enjoyed the gracious protection of the highest personages in the land, and whose purpose was to buy up Polish estates for German knights. The poor starvelings from among the Brandenburg and Pomeranian aristocracy foresaw that trials instituted against the Poles would ruin numerous Polish squires, whose estates would shortly be sold off dirt-cheap. This was a real godsend for many a debt-ridden Don Ranudo [55] from the Uckermark. A fine estate for next to nothing, Polish peasants who could be thrashed, and what is more, a good service rendered to King and Country -- what brilliant prospects!

Thus arose the third German immigration into Poland. Prussian peasants and Prussian noblemen settled throughout Poznan with the declared intention, supported by the government, not of Germanizing, but of Pomeranizing Poznan. The German Poles had the excuse of having contributed in some measure to the promotion of commerce, the Netze brethren could boast that they had reclaimed a few bogs, but this last Prussian invasion has no excuse whatever. Even parcellation was not consistently carried through, the Prussian aristocrats following hard on the heels of the Prussian peasants.

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)

[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)

[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Köln, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

THE FRANKFURT ASSEMBLY DEBATES THE POLISH QUESTION

by
FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 73

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, August 11. In the [first article](#) we have examined the "historical foundation" of Stenzel's report in so far as he deals with the situation in Poznan before the revolution. Today we proceed to Herr Stenzel's history of the revolution and counter-revolution in Poznan.

"The German people, who at all times is filled with compassion for all the unfortunate" (so long as this compassion costs nothing), "always deeply felt how greatly its princes wronged the Poles."

Indeed, "deeply felt" within the calm German heart, where the feelings are so "deeply" embedded that they never manifest themselves in action. Indeed, "compassion", expressed by a few alms in 1831 and by dinners and balls in aid of the Poles, lasting just long enough to have a dance and drink champagne for the benefit of the Poles, and to sing "Poland is not yet lost. [56] But when were the Germans prone to do something really decisive, to make a real

sacrifice!

"The Germans honestly and fraternally proffered their hand to expiate the wrongs their princes had perpetrated."

If it were possible to "expiate" anything with sentimental phrases and dull tub-thumping, then the Germans would emerge as the purest people in the world.

"Just at the moment, however, when the Poles shook hands" (that is, took the fraternally proffered hand) "the interests and aims of the two nations already diverged. The Poles' only thought was for the restoration of their old state at least within the boundaries that existed before the first partition of 1772."

Surely, only the unreasoning, confused, haphazard enthusiasm, which from time immemorial has been the principal adornment of the German national character, could have caused the Germans to be surprised by the Polish demands. The Germans wanted to "expiate" the injustice the Poles had suffered. What started this injustice? The earlier treacheries apart, it certainly started with the first partition of Poland in 1772. How could this be "expiated"? Of course, only by restoration of the status quo existing before 1772, or at least by the Germans returning to the Poles what they had robbed them of since 1772. But this was against the interests of the Germans? Well, if we speak of interests, then it can no longer be a question of sentimentalities like "expiation"; here the language of harsh, unfeeling practice should be used, and we should be spared rhetorical flourishes and expressions of magnanimity.

Moreover, firstly, the Poles did not "only think" of the restoration of the Poland of 1772. In any case what the Poles did "think" is hardly our concern. For the time being they demanded only the restoration of the whole of Poznan and mentioned other eventualities only in case of a German-Polish war against Russia.

Secondly, "the interests and aims of the two nations diverged" only in so far as the "interests and aims" of revolutionary Germany in the field of international relations remained exactly the same as those of the old, absolutist Germany. If Germany's "interest and aim" is an alliance with Russia, or at least peace with Russia at any price, then of course everything in Poland must remain as it was hitherto. We shall see later, however, to what extent the real interests of Germany are

identical with those of Poland.

Then follows a lengthy, confused and disconcerted passage, in which Herr Stenzel expatiates on the fact that the German Poles were right when they wanted to do justice to Poland, but at the same time to remain Prussians and Germans. Of course it is of no concern to Herr Stenzel that the "when" excludes the "but" and the "but" the "when".

Next comes an equally lengthy and confused historical recital, in which Herr Stenzel goes into detail in an attempt to prove that, owing to the "diverging interests and aims of the two nations" and the ensuing mutual enmity which was steadily growing, a bloody clash was unavoidable. The Germans adhered to the "national" interests, the Poles merely to the "territorial" interests, in other words, the Germans demanded that the Grand Duchy should be divided according to nationalities, the Poles wanted the whole of their old territory.

This is again not true. The Poles asked for restoration and at the same time stated that they were quite willing to relinquish the frontier districts with a mixed population where the majority are Germans and want to join Germany. The inhabitants, however, should not be declared German or Polish by the Prussian officials at will, but according to their own wishes.

Herr Stenzel goes on to assert that Willisen's mission was of course bound to fail because of the (alleged, but nowhere existing) resistance of the Poles to the cession of the predominantly German districts. Herr Stenzel disposed of the statements of Willisen about the Poles and those of the Poles about Willisen. These published statements prove the opposite. But this happens if "one is a man who", as Herr Stenzel says, "has studied history for many years and deems it his duty never to speak an untruth and never to conceal anything".

With the same truthfulness which never conceals anything, Herr Stenzel easily passes over the cannibalism perpetrated in Poznan, the base and perfidious violation of the Convention of Jaroslawiec, [57] the massacres of Trzemeszno, Miloslaw and Wreschen, the destructive fury of a brutal soldiery worthy of the Thirty Years' War, and does not say a word about it.

Now Herr Stenzel comes to the four partitions of Poland recently effected by the Prussian government. First the Netze district and four other districts were torn away (April 14); to this were added certain parts of other districts. This territory with a total population of 593,390 was incorporated in the German Confederation on April 22. Then the city and fortress of Poznan together with the remainder of the left bank of the Warta were also included, making an additional 273,500 persons and bringing the combined population of these lands

to double the number of Germans living in the whole of Poznan even according to Prussian estimates. This was effected by order in council on April 26, and already on May 2 they were admitted to the German Confederation. Now Herr Stenzel pleads with the Assembly that it is absolutely essential for Poznan to remain in German hands, that Poznan is an important, powerful fortress, with a population of over 20,000 Germans (most of them Polish Jews) who own two-thirds of all the landed property, etc. That Poznan is situated in the midst of a purely Polish territory, that it was forcibly Germanized, and that Polish Jews are not Germans, does not make the slightest difference to men who "never speak an untruth and never suppress a truth", to historians of Herr Stenzel's calibre.

In short, Poznan, for military reasons, should not be relinquished. As though it were not possible to raze the fortress, which, according to Willisen, is one of the greatest strategic blunders, and to fortify Breslau instead. But ten million (incidentally this is again not true -- barely five million) have been invested, and it is of course more advantageous to keep this precious work of art with 20 to 30 square miles of Polish land into the bargain.

With the "city and fortress" of Poznan in one's hands, it will be all the easier to seize still more.

"But to keep the fortress it will be necessary to secure its approaches from Glogau, Kustrin and Thorn as well as a fortified area facing the east" (it need be only 1,000 to 2,000 paces wide, like that of Maestricht facing Belgium and Limburg). "This," continues Herr Stenzel with a smile of satisfaction, "will at the same time ensure undisturbed possession of the Bromberg canal; but numerous areas with a predominantly Polish population will have to be incorporated into the German Confederation."

It was for all these reasons that Pfuel von Hollenstein, 58 the well-known philanthropist, carried through two new partitions of Poland, thus meeting all the desires of Herr Stenzel and incorporating three-fourths of the Grand Duchy into Germany. Herr Stenzel is the more grateful for this procedure, since the revival of Louis XIV's chambers of reunion [59] with augmented powers must evidently have demonstrated to this historian that the Germans have learned to apply the lessons of history.

According to Herr Stenzel, the Poles ought to find consolation in the fact that their share of the land is more fertile than the incorporated

territory, that there is considerably less landed property in their part than in that of the Germans and that "no unbiased person will deny that the lot of the Polish peasant under a German government will be far more tolerable than that of the German peasant under a Polish government"! History provides some curious examples of this.

Finally, Herr Stenzel tells the Poles that even the small part left to them will enable them, by practicing all the civic virtues,

"to befittingly prepare themselves for the moment, which at present is still shrouded in the mists of the future, and which, quite pardonably, they are trying -- perhaps too impatiently -- to precipitate. One of their most judicious fellow-citizens exclaimed very pertinently, 'There is a crown which is also worthy of your ambition, it is the civic crown!' A German would perhaps add: It does not shine, but it is solid!"

"It is solid!" But even more "solid" are the real reasons for the last four partitions of Poland by the Prussian government.

You worthy German -- do you believe that the partitions were undertaken in order to deliver your German brothers from Polish rule; to have the fortress of Poznan serve as a bulwark protecting you from any attack; to safeguard the roads of Kustrin, Glogau and Bromberg, and the Netze canal? What a delusion.

You were shamefully deceived. The sole reason for the recent partitions of Poland was to replenish the Prussian treasury.

The earlier partitions of Poland up to 1815 were annexations of territory by force of arms; the partitions of 1848 are robbery.

And now, worthy German, see how you have been deceived!

After the third partition of Poland the estates of the big Polish feudal lords and those of the Catholic clergy were confiscated by Frederick William 11 in favor of the state. As the Declaration of Appropriation issued on July 28, 1796, says, the estates of the Church in particular "constituted a very considerable part of landed property as a whole". The new demesnes were either managed on the King's account or leased, and they were so extensive that 34 crown-land offices and 21 forestry divisions had to be set up for their administration. Each of these crown-land offices was responsible for a large number of villages; for example, altogether 636 villages came under the ten offices of the Bromberg district, and 127 were administered by the Mogilno crown-land office.

In 1796, moreover, Frederick William 11 confiscated the estates and woodlands of the convent at Owinsk and sold them to the merchant von Tresckow (forefather of the brave Prussian troop leader in the last heroic war [60]). These estates comprised 24 villages with flour mills and 20,000 morgen [An old German land measure, varying in different localities between 0.25 and 1.23 hectares. -- Ed.] of forest land, worth at least 1,000,000 thaler.

Furthermore, the crown-land offices of Krotoschin, Rozdrazewo, Orpiszewo and Adelnau, worth at least two million thaler, were in 1819 made over to the Prince of Thurn und Taxis to compensate him for the post-office privileges in several provinces which had become part of Prussia.

Frederick William 11 took over all these estates on the pretext that he could administer them better. Nevertheless, these estates, the property of the Polish nation, were given away, ceded or sold, and the proceeds flowed into the Prussian treasury.

The crown lands in Gnesen, Skorzencin and Trzemeszno were broken up and sold.

Thus 27 crown-land offices and forestry divisions, to a value of twenty million thaler at the very least, still remain in the hands of the Prussian government. We are prepared to prove, map in hand, that all these demesnes and forests -- with very few exceptions, if any at all -- are located in the incorporated part of Poznan. To prevent this rich treasure from reverting to the Polish nation it had to be absorbed into the German Confederation, and since it could not go to the German Confederation, the German Confederation had to come to it, and three-fourths of Poznan were incorporated.

That is the true reason for the four famous partitions of Poland within two months. Neither the protests of this or that nationality nor alleged strategic reasons were decisive -- the frontier was determined solely, by the position of the demesnes, and the rapacity of the Prussian government.

While German citizens were shedding bitter tears over the invented sufferings of their poor brothers in Poznan, while they were waxing enthusiastic about the safety of the Eastern Marches, and while they allowed themselves to be provoked to anger against the Poles by false reports about Polish barbarities, the Prussian government acted on the quiet, and feathered its nest. This German enthusiasm without rhyme or reason merely served to disguise the dirtiest deed in modern history.

That, my worthy German, is how you are treated by your responsible

ministers!

Actually however you ought to have known this beforehand. Whenever Herr Hansemann has a hand in something, it is never a matter of German nationality, military necessity or suchlike empty phrases, but always a matter of cash payment and of net profit.

<u>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</u>	
	
<u>Marx / Engels</u>	<u>Marxist writers'</u>
<u>Archive</u>	<u>Archives</u>

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Acht, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

THE FRANKFURT ASSEMBLY DEBATES THE POLISH QUESTION

by
FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 81

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org

Cologne, August 19. We have examined in detail Herr Stenzel's report, which forms the basis of the debate. We have shown that he falsifies both the earlier and the more recent history of Poland and of the Germans in Poland, that he confuses the whole issue, and that Stenzel the historian is not only guilty of deliberate falsification but also of gross ignorance.

Before dealing with the debate itself we must take another look at the Polish question.

The problem of Poznan taken by itself is quite meaningless and insoluble. It is a fragment of the Polish problem and can only be solved in connection with and as a part of it. Only when Poland exists again will it be possible to determine the borders between Germany and Poland.

But can and will Poland exist again? This was denied during the debate.

A French historian said: Il y a des peuples necessaires -- there are necessary nations. The Polish nation is undoubtedly one of the necessary nations of the nineteenth century.

But for no one is Poland's national existence a greater necessity than

it is for us Germans.

What is the main support of the reactionary forces in Europe since 1815, and to some extent even since the first French revolution? It is the Russian-Prussian-Austrian Holy Alliance. [61] And what holds the Holy Alliance together? The partition of Poland, by which all the three allies have profited.

The tearing asunder of Poland by the three powers is the tie which links them together; the robbery they jointly committed makes them support each other.

From the moment the first robbery of Polish territory was committed Germany became dependent on Russia, Russia ordered Prussia and Austria to remain absolute monarchies, and Prussia and Austria had to obey. The efforts to secure control -- efforts which were in any case feeble and timid, especially on the part of the Prussian bourgeoisie -- failed entirely because of the impossibility of breaking away from Russia, and because of the support which Russia offered the feedlots-absolutist class in Prussia.

Moreover, as soon as the Allies attempted to introduce the first oppressive measures the Poles not only rose to fight for their independence, but simultaneously came out in revolutionary action against their own internal social conditions.

The partition of Poland was effected through a pact between the big feudal aristocracy of Poland and the three partitioning powers. It was not an advance, as the ex-poet Herr Jordan contends, it was the last means the big aristocracy had to protect itself against a revolution, it was reactionary to the core.

Already the first partition led quite naturally to an alliance of the other classes, i.e., the nobles, the townspeople and to some extent the peasants, both against the oppressors of Poland and against the big Polish aristocracy. The constitution of 1791/62 shows that even then the Poles clearly understood that their independence in foreign affairs was inseparable from the overthrow of the aristocracy and from the agrarian reform within the country.

The big agrarian countries between the Baltic and the Black seas can free themselves from patriarchal feudal barbarism only by an agrarian revolution, which turns the peasants who are enthralled or liable to labor services into free landowners, a revolution which would be similar to the French Revolution of 1789 in the countryside. It is to the credit of the Polish nation that it was the first of all its agricultural neighbors to proclaim this. The first attempted reform was the constitution of 1791; during the uprising of 1830 Lelewel declared the

agrarian revolution to be the only means of saving the country, but the parliament recognized this too late; during the insurrections of 1846 and 1848 the agrarian revolution was openly proclaimed.

From the day of their subjugation the Poles came out with revolutionary demands, thereby committing their oppressors still more strongly to a counter-revolutionary course. They compelled their oppressors to maintain the patriarchal feudal structure not only in Poland but in all their other countries as well. The struggle for the independence of Poland, particularly since the Krakow uprising of 1846, is at the same time a struggle of agrarian democracy--the only form of democracy possible in Eastern Europe -- against patriarchal feudal absolutism.

So long, therefore, as we help to subjugate Poland, so long as we keep a part of Poland tied to Germany, we ourselves remain tied to Russia and to the Russian policy, and shall be unable to eradicate patriarchal feudal absolutism in Germany. The creation of a democratic Poland is a primary condition for the creation of a democratic Germany.

But the restoration of Poland and the settlement of her frontiers with Germany is not only necessary, it is the most easily solvable of all the political problems which have arisen in Eastern Europe since the revolution. The struggle for independence of the diverse nationalities jumbled together south of the Carpathians is much more complicated and will lead to far more bloodshed, confusion and civil wars than the Polish struggle for independence and the establishment of the border line between Germany and Poland.

Needless to say, it is not a question of restoring a seemingly independent Poland, but of restoring the state upon a viable foundation. Poland must have at least the dimensions of 1772, she must comprise not only the territories but also the estuaries of her big rivers and a large seaboard at least on the Baltic.

The Germans could have secured all this for Poland and at the same time protected their own interests and their honor, if after the revolution they had had the courage, for their own sake, arms in hand, to demand that Russia relinquish Poland. Owing to the commingling of Germans and Poles in the border regions and especially along the coast, it goes without saying -- and this would create no difficulties -- that both parties would have had to make some concessions to one another, some Germans becoming Polish and some Poles German.

After the indecisive German revolution, however, the courage for so resolute an action was lacking. It is all very well to make florid speeches about the liberation of Poland and to welcome passing Poles

at railway stations, offering them the most ardent sympathies of the German people (to whom had these sympathies not been offered?); but to start a war with Russia, to endanger the European balance of power and, to cap all, hand over some scraps of the annexed territory -- only one who does not know the Germans could expect that.

And what would a war with Russia have meant? A war with Russia would have meant a complete, open and effective break with the whole of our disgraceful past, the real liberation and unification of Germany, and the establishment of democracy on the ruins of feudalism, on the wreckage of the short-lived bourgeois dream of power. War with Russia would have been the only possible way of vindicating our honor and our interests with regard to our Slav neighbors, notably the Poles.

But we were philistines and have remained philistines. We made several dozen small and big revolutions, of which we ourselves took fright even before they were accomplished. We talked big, but carried nothing through. The revolution narrowed our mental horizon instead of broadening it. All problems were approached from the standpoint of the most timid, most narrow-minded, most illiberal philistinism, to the detriment, of course, of our real interests. From the angle of this petty philistinism, the major issue of Poland's liberation was reduced to the piddling slogan calling for reorganization of a part of the Province of Poznan, while our enthusiasm for the Poles turned into shrapnel and lunar caustic.

War with Russia, we repeat, was the only possible means of upholding Germany's honor and Germany's interests. We shrank from it and the inevitable happened -- the reactionary military, beaten in Berlin, raised their head again in Poznan; under the pretext of saving Germany's honor and national integrity they raised the banner of counter-revolution and crushed our allies, the revolutionary Poles--and for a moment the hoodwinked Germans exultantly cheered their victorious enemies. The new partition of Poland was accomplished, and only the sanction of the German National Assembly was still missing.

The Frankfurt Assembly still had a chance to mend matters: it should have excluded the whole of Poznan from the German Confederation and left the border question open until it could be discussed with a restored Poland *d'egal a egal*.

But that would be asking too much of our professors, lawyers and pastors who sit in the Frankfurt National Assembly. The temptation was too great. These peaceful burghers, who had never fired a rifle, were, by simply rising or remaining seated, to conquer for Germany a

country of 500 square miles and to incorporate 800,000 Netze brethren, German Poles, Jews and Poles, even though this was to be done at the expense of the honor and of the real, lasting interests of Germany -- what a temptation! They succumbed to it, they endorsed the partition of Poland.

What the motives were, we shall see tomorrow.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Acht, Sonntag, 1. Juni

1848.

THE ITALIAN LIBERATION STRUGGLE AND THE CAUSE OF ITS PRESENT FAILURE

by
KARL MARX

FREDERICK ENGELS *Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 73*

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org

With the same celerity with which they were expelled from Lombardy in March, the Austrians have now returned in triumph and have already entered Milan.

The Italian people spared no pains. They were prepared to sacrifice life and property to complete the work they had begun and win national independence.

But this courage, enthusiasm and readiness to make sacrifices were nowhere matched by those who stood at the helm. Overtly or covertly, they did everything to use the means at their disposal, not for the liberation of the country from the harsh Austrian tyranny, but to paralyze the popular forces and, in effect, to restore the old conditions as soon as possible.

The Pope, [Pius IX. -- Ed.] who was worked on more and more every day and won over by the Austrian and jesuitical politicians, put all the obstacles in the way of the Mamiani ministry which he, in conjunction with the "Blacks" and the "Black Yellows", [63] could find. The ministry itself delivered highly patriotic speeches in both chambers,

but did not have the energy to carry out its good intentions.

The government of Tuscany distinguished itself by fine words and even fewer deeds. But the arch-enemy of Italian liberty among the native princes was and remains Karl Albert. The Italians should have repeated and borne in mind every hour of the day the saying: Heaven protect us from our friends and we shall protect ourselves against our enemies. They hardly needed to fear Ferdinand of Bourbon, he was unmasked long ago. Karl Albert, on the other hand, let himself be acclaimed everywhere as "la spada d'Italia" (the sword of Italy) and the hero whose rapier was Italy's best guarantee of freedom and independence.

His emissaries went all over Northern Italy, portraying him as the only man who could and would save the country. To enable him to do this, however, it was necessary to set up a North Italian kingdom. Only this could give him the power required not only to oppose the Austrians but to drive them out of Italy. The ambition which had first made him join forces with the Carbonari, [64] whom he had afterwards betrayed, this ambition became more inflamed than ever and made him dream of a plenitude of power and magnificence before which the splendor of all the other Italian princes would very soon pale. He thought that he could appropriate the entire popular movement of 1848 and use it in the interests of his own miserable self. Filled with hatred and distrust of all truly liberal men, he surrounded himself with people more or less loyal to absolutism and inclined to encourage his royal ambitions. He placed at the head of the army generals whose intellectual superiority and political views he did not have to fear, but who neither enjoyed the confidence of the soldiers nor possessed the talent required to wage a successful war. He pompously called himself the "liberator" of Italy while making it a condition that those who were to be liberated accept his yoke. Seldom was a man so favored by circumstances as he was. His greed, his desire to possess as much as he could led in the end to his losing everything he had gained. So long as there was no firm decision that Lombardy would join Piedmont, so long as the possibility of a republican form of government still existed, he remained in his entrenchments and did not move against the Austrians, although the were relatively weak at the time. He let Radetzky, d'Aspre, Welden, and others seize the towns and fortresses of the Venetian provinces one by one and did not stir a finger. Only when Venice sought the refuge of his crown did he deign to give his help. The same applies to Parma and Modena. Radetzky meanwhile had mustered strength and made all preparations for an attack which, in view of the inability and Blindness of Karl Albert and his generals, led to a decisive victory. The outcome is well known. Henceforth Italians can and will no

longer entrust their liberation to a prince or king. On the contrary, in order to save themselves they must completely discard this useless "spada d'Italia" as quickly as possible. If they had done this earlier, and had superannuated the King with his system and all the hangers-on, and had formed a democratic union, it is likely that by now there would have been no more Austrians in Italy. Instead, the Italians not only bore all the hardships of a war waged with fury and barbarity by their enemies and suffered the heaviest sacrifices in vain, but were left, defenseless, to the tender mercies of the vindictive Metternich-Austrian reactionaries and their soldiery. Anyone reading Radetzky's manifestos to the people of Lombardy and Welden's manifestos to the Roman legations will understand that to the Italians Attila and his Hun hordes would have appeared merciful angels. The reaction and restoration have triumphed. The Duke of Modena, called "il carnefice" (the hangman), who loaned the Austrians 1,200,000 florins for war purposes, has returned as well. The people, in their magnanimity, have so often made a stick for their own back, that it is time they got wiser and learned something from their enemies. Although, during his previous reign, the Duke had imprisoned, hanged and shot thousands of people for their political convictions, the Modenese let him depart unmolested. Now he has returned to discharge his sanguinary princely office with redoubled zeal.

The reaction and restoration have triumphed, but only for a time. The people are so deeply imbued with the revolutionary spirit that they cannot be held in check for long. Milan, Brescia and other towns showed in March what this spirit is capable of. The excessive suffering inflicted upon them will lead to a new rising. By taking into account the bitter experience of the past months, Italy will be able to avoid new delusions and to secure her independence under a single democratic banner.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Rhein, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

THE ZEITUNGS-HALLE ON THE RHINE PROVINCE

by
FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 87

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org

Cologne, August 26. The Berliner Zeitungs-Halle [65] carries the following paragraph:

"We recently had occasion to mention that the time has come when the spirit which for so long has held together the old political entities is gradually vanishing. As regards Austria hardly anyone will call this in question, but in Prussia, too, the signs of the times confirming our observation are becoming daily more manifest, and we cannot turn a blind eye to them. There is at present only one interest capable of tying the various provinces to the Prussian state, namely, that of developing liberal political institutions and jointly establishing and promoting a new and free mode of social relations. Silesia, which is making vigorous advances on the road to political and social progress, will hardly be happy in Prussia unless Prussia as a state is entirely adequate to these aspirations. As regards the Province of Saxony we know only too well that ever since its incorporation into the Prussian state it has resented it at heart. And as to the Rhineland, surely everybody will still remember the threats made by the Rhenish deputies prior to March 18, which helped to precipitate the turn of events. There

is a growing spirit of alienation in this province. New evidence of this is provided in a now rather widely distributed leaflet which contains no mention of the publisher or place of publication."

The leaflet referred to by the Zeitungs-Halle is presumably known to all our readers.

What must please us is the view -- which is at last advanced by at least one Berliner -- that Berlin does not play the role of Paris as far as either Germany or the Rhineland in particular is concerned. Berlin is beginning to realize that it cannot govern us, cannot acquire the authority befitting a capital city. Berlin has amply proved its incompetence during the indecisive March revolution, during the storming of the armory and during the recent disturbances. [66] To the irresolution displayed by the people of Berlin is added a complete lack of talent in all parties. Since February the whole movement has not produced a single man capable of leading his party. The spirit in this "capital of the spirit" is indeed very willing but just as weak as the flesh. The Berliners even had to import their Hansemann, their Camphausen and their Milde from the Rhine or Silesia. Far from being a German Paris, Berlin is not even a Prussian Vienna. It is not a metropolis, it is a "seat of the court".

It is, however, noteworthy, that even in Berlin people are coming to the conclusion, long widespread in the Rhineland, that German unity can come about only as a result of the disintegration of the German so-called great powers. We have never concealed our views on this point. We are not enraptured with either the past or present glory of Germany, with either the wars of - independence or the "glorious victories of German arms" in Lombardy and Schleswig. But if Germany is ever to achieve anything she must unite, she must become one state in deed as well as in word. And to bring this about it is necessary above all that there should be "neither an Austria nor a Prussia". [67] Incidentally, "the spirit" which "for so long held together" us and the old Prussian provinces was a palpable, crude spirit; it was the spirit of 15,000 bayonets and a number of cannon. It was not for nothing that military units of Silesian Poles and Kasubians were stationed here on the Rhine, and that our young men had to serve in guards regiments in Berlin. This was done not in order to reconcile us with the other provinces, but to stir up hatred between the provinces and to exploit the national enmity between the Germans and Slavs, and the regional hatred of every petty German province against all the neighboring provinces, in the interests of patriarchal feudal despotism. Divide et impera!

It is indeed time to put an end to the fictitious role assigned to the Berliners by "the provinces", i.e., by the junkerdom of the Uckermark and Further Pomerania, in their panic-stricken declarations, a role which the Berliners promptly accepted. Berlin is not and will never become the seat of the revolution, the capital of democracy. Only the imagination of the knights of Brandenburg, terrified at the prospect of bankruptcy, the debtor's prison and the lamppost, could ascribe to Berlin such a role, and only the coquettish vanity of the Berliners could believe that it represented the provinces. We acknowledge the March revolution, but only for what it really was. Its greatest shortcoming is that it has not revolutionized the Berliners.

The Zeitungs-Halle believes that the disintegrating Prussian state can be cemented by means of liberal institutions. On the contrary. The more liberal the institutions are, the freer will it be for the heterogeneous elements to separate, and the clearer will become the necessity of dissociation and the incompetence of the politicians of all parties in Berlin.

We repeat, the Rhineland by no means objects to remaining together with the old Prussian provinces within Germany, but trying to compel it to remain for ever within Prussia, whether it be an absolutist, a constitutional or a democratic Prussia, is tantamount to making Germany's unity impossible, tantamount even to losing for Germany -- we express the general attitude of the people -- a large and beautiful territory by attempting to keep it for Prussia.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Acht, Sonntag, 1. Sept.

1848.

MEDIATION AND INTERVENTION. RADEZKY AND CAVAIGNAC

by
FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 91

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org

The armistices concluded as the result of Karl Albert's treachery will expire in about three weeks (on September 21). France and Britain have offered to act as mediators. The *Spectateur republicain*, Cavaignac's paper, writes that Austria has not yet stated whether she will accept or decline the offer. France's dictator is getting annoyed over the discourtesy of the Austrians and threatens armed intervention if by a given date the Viennese cabinet does not reply, or rejects mediation. Will Austria allow a Cavaignac to prescribe the peace terms to her, especially now after the victory over democracy in Vienna and over the Italian "rebels"? Austria understands perfectly well that the French bourgeoisie wants "peace at any price", that the freedom or bondage of the Italians is altogether a matter of complete indifference to the bourgeoisie and that it will agree to anything so long as it is not openly humiliated and thus reluctantly compelled to draw the sword. It is said that Radetzky will pay a short visit to Vienna in order to say the decisive word about mediation. He does not have to travel to Vienna to do that. His policy has now prevailed, and his opinion will be none the less weighty for his remaining in Milan. If Austria were to accept the basis for peace proposed by England and France, she would do so not because she is afraid of Cavaignac's intervention but for much more pressing and compelling reasons.

The Italians were just as much deluded by the March events as the Germans. The former believed that foreign rule at any rate was now done with; the latter thought that the old system was buried for good and all. However, the foreign rule in Italy is worse than ever, and in Germany the old system has recovered from the few blows it sustained in March and it acts with greater ferocity and vindictiveness than ever before.

The Italians are now making the mistake of expecting salvation from the present government of France. Only the fall of this government could save them. The Italians are further mistaken when they regard the liberation of their country as feasible while democracy in France, Germany and other countries continues to lose ground. Reaction, to whose blows Italy has succumbed, is not merely an Italian phenomenon, it is a European phenomenon. Italy alone cannot possibly free herself from the grip of this reaction, least of all by appealing to the French bourgeoisie, which is a true pillar of reaction in Europe as a whole.

Before reaction can be destroyed in Italy and Germany, it must be routed in France. A democratic social republic must first be proclaimed in France and the French proletariat must first subjugate its bourgeoisie, before a lasting democratic victory is conceivable in Italy, Germany, Poland, Hungary and other countries.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Acht, Donnerstag, 1. Sept.

1848.

THE ANTWERP DEATH SENTENCES

by
FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 93

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org

Cologne, September 2. Belgium, the model constitutional state, has produced further brilliant proof of the excellence of her institutions. Seventeen death sentences resulting from the ridiculous Risquons-Tout affair! Seventeen death sentences to avenge the humiliation inflicted upon the prudish Belgian nation by a few imprudent men, a few hopeful fools, who attempted to raise a small corner of the constitutional cloak! Seventeen death sentences -- what savagery!

The Risquons-Tout incident is well known. Belgian workers in Paris joined forces to attempt a republican invasion of their country. Belgian democrats came from Brussels to support the venture. Ledru-Rollin assisted as much as he could. Lamartine, the "noble-minded" traitor, who was not sparing of fine words and ignoble deeds as far as both the foreign and French democrats were concerned -- Lamartine, who prides himself on having conspired with the anarchists, like a lightning conductor with the lightning -- Lamartine at first supported the Belgian Legion the better to be able later to betray it. The Legion set out. Delescluze, Prefect of the Department du Nord, sold the first column to Belgian railway officials; the train which carried them was treacherously hauled into Belgian territory right into the midst of the Belgian bayonets. The second column was led by three Belgian spies (we were told this by a

member of the Paris Provisional Government, and the course of events confirms it), and these treacherous leaders brought it into a forest on Belgian territory, where an ambush of loaded guns was waiting for it. The column was shot down and most of its members were captured.

This tiny episode of the 1848 revolution -- an episode which assumed a farcical aspect as a result of the many betrayals and the magnitude ascribed to it in Belgium -- served the Brussels prosecutor as a canvas on which to embroider the most colossal plot that was ever devised. Old General Mellinet, the liberator of Antwerp, Tedesco and Ballin, in short the most resolute and most active democrats of Brussels, Liege and Ghent were implicated. Mr. Bavay would even have Mr. Jottrand of Brussels dragged into it, had not the latter known things and possessed documents whose publication would greatly compromise the entire Belgian government, the wise Leopold included.

Why were these democrats arrested, why were these monstrous proceedings started against men who knew as much about the whole thing as the jurymen who faced them? It was meant to scare the Belgian bourgeoisie and, under cover of this scare, to collect the excessive taxes and forced loans, which are the cement of the glorious Belgian political edifice, and the payments on which were rather behindhand.

In short, the accused were arraigned before the Antwerp jury, the elite of the Flemish faro-playing fraternity, who lack both the elan of French political dedication and the cool assurance of grandiose English materialism, i.e., before those dried-cod merchants who spend their whole life vegetating in philistine utilitarianism, in the most short-sighted and timid profiteering. The great Bavay knew his men and appealed to their fear.

Indeed, had anyone ever seen a republican in Antwerp? Now thirty-two of the monsters faced the terrified men of Antwerp, and the trembling jury in concert with the wise bench consigned seventeen of the accused to the tender mercies of Article 86 and others of the Code penal, i.e., the death sentence.

Mock trials were also held during the Reign of Terror in 1793, and convictions based on other facts than those officially stated did occur, but even the fanatical Fouquier-Tinville did not conduct a trial so distinguished by clumsy barefaced lies and blind partisan hatred. Moreover, is Belgium in the grip of a civil war and are the armies of half Europe assembled at her frontiers conspiring with the rebels, as was the case in France in 1793? Is the country in danger? Has a crack appeared in the crown? On the contrary, no one intends to subjugate

Belgium, and the wise Leopold still drives every day without an escort from Laeken to Brussels and from Brussels to Laeken.

What has the 81-year-old Mellinet done to be sentenced to death by jury and judges? The old soldier of the French republic saved the last spark of Belgian honor in 1831. He liberated Antwerp and in return Antwerp condemns him to death! His only sin is that he defended his old friend Becker against the insinuations of the Belgian official press and did not change his friendly attitude towards Becker even when the latter was plotting in Paris. Mellinet was in no way connected with the plot. And because of this he is without further ado sentenced to death.

As to Ballin, he was a friend of Mellinet's, often visited him, and was seen in the company of Tedesco in a coffeehouse. Reason enough to sentence him to death.

And finally Tedesco. Had he not visited the German Workers' Association, did he not associate with people on whom the Belgian police had planted stage daggers? Had he not been seen with Ballin in a coffee-house? The case was established -- Tedesco had provoked the great battle of Risquons-Tout -- off to the scaffold with him!

And so with the others.

We are proud of being able to call many of these "conspirators", sentenced to death only because they are democrats, our friends. If the venal Belgian press slings mud at them, then we, at least, want to vindicate their honor before the face of German democracy; if their country disowns them, we want to acclaim them.

When the president of the court pronounced the sentence of death, they passionately exclaimed: "Long live the republic!" Throughout the whole procedure and the reading of the sentence they behaved with truly revolutionary steadfastness.

As against this we read in the wretched Belgian press:

"The verdict," writes the Journal d'Anvers, "has caused no more of a sensation in the city than the entire trial, which aroused hardly any interest. Only among the working classes" (read: the proletarian rabble) "can one find sentiments hostile to the paladins of the republic; the rest of the population hardly took any notice of it. The attempt to bring about a revolution does not cease to appear absurd even after the death sentence, which, in any case, no one believes will be executed."

To be sure, if an interesting spectacle were to be staged allowing the citizens of Antwerp to watch the guillotining of seventeen republicans headed by old Mellinet, their liberator, then they would certainly have taken notice of the trial.

The savagery of the Belgian government, the Belgian jury and law courts lies precisely in the fact that they play with death sentences.

The Liberal Liegeois says: "The government wanted to show its strength, but it has merely demonstrated its savagery."

But then that has always been the lot of the Flemish nation.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Acht, Donnerstag, 1. Sept.

1848.

THE DANISH-PRUSSIAN ARMISTICE

by
FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 99

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org

Cologne, September 9. Again we revert to the Danish armistice -- we are given time to do this owing to the thoroughness of the National Assembly, which, instead of taking prompt and energetic decisions and getting new ministers appointed, allows the committees to deliberate in the most leisurely manner and leaves the solution of the government crisis to God -- a thoroughness which barely conceals "our dear friends' lack of courage". [69]

The war in Italy was always unpopular with the democratic party, and has for a long time been unpopular even with the democrats of Vienna. The storm of public indignation over the war of extermination in Poznan could be staved off only for a few weeks by means of falsifications and lies on the part of the Prussian government. The streetfighting in Prague, despite all the efforts of the national press, excited sympathy among the people towards the defeated, but not towards the victors. The war in Schleswig-Holstein, however, from the outset was popular also among the people. What is the reason?

Whereas in Italy, Poznan and Prague the Germans were fighting the revolution, in Schleswig-Holstein they were supporting it. The Danish war is the first revolutionary war waged by Germany. We therefore advocated a resolute conduct of the Danish war, from the very beginning, but this does not in any way denote kinship with the

sea-girt bourgeois beer-garden enthusiasm.

A sad thing for Germany that her first revolutionary war is the most ridiculous war ever waged.

But come to the point. The Danish nation is in commercial, industrial, political and literary matters completely dependent on Germany. It is well known that the real capital of Denmark is not Copenhagen but Hamburg; that for a whole year the Danish government copied all the United Provincial Diet experiments conducted by the Prussian government, which passed away on the barricades; that Denmark obtains all her literary as well as material fare via Germany, and that apart from Holberg, Danish literature is a poor imitation of that of Germany.

Impotent though Germany has been from time immemorial, she has the satisfaction of knowing that the Scandinavian nations, and especially Denmark, have fallen under her sway, and that compared with them she is even revolutionary and progressive.

Do you require proofs? Then read the polemics carried on by the Scandinavian nations against each other ever since the concept of Scandinavianism arose. Scandinavianism is enthusiasm for the brutal, sordid, piratical, Old Norse national traits, for that profound inner life which is unable to express its exuberant ideas and sentiments in words, but can express them only in deeds, namely, in rudeness towards women, perpetual drunkenness and the wild frenzy of the Berserker alternating with tearful sentimentality.

Scandinavianism and the theory of kinship with sea-girt Schleswig-Holstein appeared simultaneously in the states of the King of Denmark. The two concepts are correlated; they evoked each other and were in conflict with each other, thereby asserting their existence.

Scandinavianism was the pattern of the Danes' appeals for Swedish and Norwegian support. But as always happens with the Christian-Teutonic nation, a dispute immediately arose as to who was the genuine Christian-Teuton, the true Scandinavian. The Swede contended that the Dane had become "Germanized" and had degenerated, the Norwegian said the same of the Swede and the Dane, and the Icelander of all three. Obviously, the more primitive a nation is, the more closely its customs and way of life resemble those of the Old Norse people, the more "Scandinavian" it must be.

The Christiania *Morgenbladet* [70] for November 18, 1846, is lying in front of us. This charming sheet contains the following amusing passages in an article on Scandinavianism.

After stating that the whole concept of Scandinavianism is nothing

but an attempt by the Danes to create a movement in their own interest, the paper says:

"What have these gay vivacious people in common with the ancient, gloomy and melancholy world of warriors (med den gamle, alvorlige og vemodsfulte Kjampeverden)? How can this nation, which -- as even a Danish writer admits -- has a docile and gentle disposition, believe itself to be spiritually related to the tough, lusty and vigorous men of a past age? And how can these people with their soft southern accent imagine that they speak a northern tongue? Although the main trait of our nation and the Swedes, like that of the ancient Northerners, is that our feelings are kept hidden in the innermost part of the soul, and not given outward expression, nevertheless these sentimental and affectionate people, who can so easily be astonished, moved and swayed and who wear their hearts upon their sleeves, nevertheless these people believe that they are of a northern cast and that they are related to the two other Scandinavian nations!"

The *Morgenbladet* attributes the degeneration of the Danes to their association with Germany and the spread of German traits in Denmark. The Germans have indeed

"lost their most sacred asset, their national character; but feeble and insipid though the German nation is, there is another nation still more feeble and insipid, namely, the Danes. While the German language is being ousted in Alsace, Vaud and on the Slav border" (!the services of the Netze brethren remained unnoticed at the time) "it has made enormous progress along the Danish border."

The Danes, we are told, now had to oppose their nationality to the Germans and for this purpose they invented Scandinavianism. The Danes were unable to resist,

"for the Danish nation, as we have said before, was essentially Germanized, although it did not adopt the German language. The writer of these lines has seen it admitted in a Danish paper that the Danish nation does not differ essentially from the German nation."

Thus the *Morgenbladet*.

Of course, it cannot be denied that the Danes are a more or less civilized nation. Poor Danes!

By the same right under which France took Flanders, Lorraine and Alsace, and will sooner or later take Belgium -- by that same right Germany takes over Schleswig; it is the right of civilization as against barbarism, of progress as against static stability. Even if the agreements were in Denmark's favor -- which is very doubtful--this right carries more weight than all the agreements, for it is the right of historical evolution.

So long as the Schleswig-Holstein movement remained a purely legal philistine agitation of a civic and peaceful nature it merely filled well-meaning petty bourgeois with enthusiasm. When, before the outbreak of the February revolution, the present King of Denmark at his accession promised a liberal constitution for all his states, envisaging the same number of deputies for the duchies as for Denmark, and the duchies were opposed to this, the petty-bourgeois parochial nature of the Schleswig-Holstein movement became distastefully conspicuous. The issue, at that time, was not so much union with Germany -- did a Germany exist at that time? -- as separation from Denmark and establishment of a small independent parochial state.

But then came the revolution, which imparted to the movement a different character. The Schleswig- Holstein party was forced either to attempt a revolution or to perish. It quite correctly chose the revolution. The Danish promises, which were very favorable before the revolution, were quite inadequate after the revolution; union with Germany -- formerly an empty phrase -- now acquired meaning. Germany made a revolution and as usual Denmark copied it on a small provincial scale.

The Schleswig-Holstein revolution and the Provisional Government to which it gave rise behaved at first still in a rather philistine way, but the war soon compelled them to adopt a democratic course. This government, whose members are all moderate liberal worthies, formerly kindred spirits of Welcker, Gagern and Camphausen, has given Schleswig-Holstein laws which are more democratic than those of any other German state. The Kiel Provincial Assembly is the only German assembly based on universal suffrage and direct elections. The draft constitution which the government submitted to it was the most democratic constitution ever drawn up in the German language. As a result of the revolutionary war, Schleswig-Holstein, which had

always trailed behind Germany in political matters, suddenly acquired more progressive institutions than the rest of Germany.

The war we are waging in Schleswig-Holstein is therefore a truly revolutionary war.

And who, from the outset, supported Denmark? The three most counter-revolutionary powers in Europe -- Russia, England and the Prussian government. As long as it was possible the Prussian government merely pretended to be waging a war -- this is evidenced by Wildenbruch's Note, by the alacrity with which the Prussian government, on the representations of England and Russia, ordered the withdrawal from Jutland, and finally by the two armistice agreements. Prussia, England and Russia are the three powers which have greater reason than anyone else to fear the German revolution and its first result -- German unity: Prussia because she would thereby cease to exist, England because it would deprive her of the possibility of exploiting the German market, and Russia because, it would spell the advance of democracy not only to the Vistula but even as far as the Dvina and the Dnieper. Prussia, England and Russia have conspired against Schleswig-Holstein, against Germany and against the revolution.

The war that may now arise from the decisions taken at Frankfurt would be a war waged by Germany against Prussia, England and Russia. This is just the kind of war that the flagging German movement needs -- a war against the three great counter-revolutionary powers, a war which would really cause Prussia to merge into Germany, which would make an alliance with Poland an indispensable necessity and would lead to the immediate liberation of Italy; a war which would be directed against Germany's old counterrevolutionary allies of 1792-1815, a war which would "imperial the fatherland" and for that very reason save it by making the victory of Germany dependent on the victory of democracy.

The bourgeois and titled landowners at Frankfurt should not deceive themselves -- if they decide to reject the armistice they will be setting the seal to their own downfall, just as the Girondins did during the first revolution when they took part in the events of August 10 and voted for the death of the ex-King, thereby preparing their own downfall on May 31. If, on the other hand, they accept the armistice, they will still be sealing their own downfall: they will be placing themselves under the jurisdiction of Prussia and cease to have any say in things. It is up to them to choose.

The news of Hansemann's downfall probably reached Frankfurt before the vote was taken. This may influence the vote significantly,

especially since it is expected that a government of Waldeck and Rodbertus will follow who, as we know, recognize the sovereignty of the National Assembly.

The future will show. But we repeat -- Germany's honor is in bad hands.

<u>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</u>	
	
<u>Marx / Engels</u>	<u>Marxist writers'</u>
<u>Archive</u>	<u>Archives</u>

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr 1.

Berlin, Donnerstag, 1. Sept.

1848.

THE CRISIS AND THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 100

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org

Cologne, September 11. Anyone reading the reports from Berlin printed below can judge for himself whether we predicted the course of the government crisis correctly. The ministers resigned and it seems that the camarilla did not approve of the government's plan to dissolve the Assembly of conciliation and to use martial law and guns in order to remain in office. The titled landowners from the Brandenburg backwoods are thirsting for a conflict with the people and a repetition of the Parisian June scenes in the streets of Berlin, but they will never fight for the Hansemann government, they will fight for a government of the Prince of Prussia. The choice will fall on Radowitz, Vincke and similar reliable men who are strangers to the Berlin Assembly and are in no way committed to it. The government of the Prince of Prussia which is to be bestowed on us will comprise the cream of the Prussian and Westphalian knights associated for form's sake with a few bourgeois worthies from the extreme Right, such as Beckerath and his like, to whom will be assigned the conduct of the prosaic commercial side of the business of state. Meanwhile hundreds of rumors are being spread, Waldeck or Rodbertus is perhaps summoned, and public opinion is misled, while at the same time military preparations are being made to come out openly at the appropriate moment.

We are facing a decisive struggle. The concurrent crises at Frankfurt and Berlin and the latest decisions of the two Assemblies compel the counter-revolution to give its last battle. If the people in Berlin dare to spurn the constitutional principle of majority rule, if they confront the 219 members of the majority with twice as many guns, if they dare to defy the majority not only in Berlin but also in Frankfurt by presenting to them a government which is quite unacceptable to either of the two Assemblies -- if they thus provoke a civil war between Prussia and Germany, then the democrats know what they have to do.

<u>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</u>	
	
<u>Marx / Engels</u>	<u>Marxist writers'</u>
<u>Archive</u>	<u>Archives</u>

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr 1.

Berlin, Donnerstag, 1. Sept.

1848.

THE CRISIS AND THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 101

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org

Cologne, September 12. Although already by midday we may receive news of the definite formation of an imperial government as described by us yesterday and confirmed from other quarters, the government crisis in Berlin continues. There are only two solutions to this crisis:

Either a Waldeck government, recognition of the authority of the German National Assembly and recognition of popular sovereignty;

Or a Radowitz-Vincke government, dissolution of the Berlin Assembly, abolition of the revolutionary gains, a sham constitutionalism or even the United Provincial Diet.

Don't let us shut our eyes to the fact that the conflict which has broken out in Berlin is a conflict not between the conciliators and the ministers, but between the Assembly, which for the first time steps forth as a constituent assembly, and the Crown.

The point is whether or not it will have the courage to dissolve the Assembly.

But has the Crown the right to dissolve the Assembly?

True, in constitutional states the Crown in case of disputes has the

right to dissolve the legislative chambers convened on the basis of the constitution and to appeal to the people by means of new elections.

Is the Berlin Assembly a constitutional, legislative chamber?

It is not. It has been convened "to come to an agreement with the Crown on the Prussian constitution", it has been convened not on the basis of a constitution, but on that of a revolution. It received its mandate by no means from the Crown or from the ministers answerable to the Crown, but from those who elected it and from the Assembly itself. The Assembly was sovereign as the legitimate expression of the revolution, and the mandate which Herr Camphausen jointly with the United Provincial Diet prepared for it in the shape of the electoral law of April 8 was nothing but a pious wish, and it was up to the Assembly to decide about it.

At first the Assembly more or less accepted the theory of agreement. It realized that in doing so it had been cheated by the ministers and the camarilla. At last it performed a sovereign act, stepping forth for a moment as a constituent assembly and no longer as an assembly of conciliators.

Being the sovereign Assembly of Prussia, it had a perfect right to do this.

A sovereign assembly, however, cannot be dissolved by anybody, and cannot be given orders by anybody.

Even as a mere assembly of conciliation, even according to Herr Camphausen's own theory, it has equal status with the Crown. Both parties conclude a political treaty, both parties have an equal share of sovereignty -- that is the theory of April 8, the Camphausen-Hanseemann theory, the official theory recognized by the Crown itself.

If the Assembly and the Crown have equal rights, then the Crown has no right to dissolve the Assembly.

Otherwise, to be consistent, the Assembly would also have the right to depose the King.

The dissolution of the Assembly would therefore be a coup d'etat. And how people reply to a coup d'etat was demonstrated on July 29, 1830, and February 24, 1848. [72]

One may say the Crown could again appeal to the same voters. But who does not know that today the voters would elect an entirely different assembly, an assembly which would treat the Crown with much less ceremony?

Everyone knows that after the dissolution of this Assembly it will only be possible to appeal to voters of an entirely different kind from those of April 8, that the only elections possible will be elections carried through under the tyranny of the sword.

Let us have no illusions --

If the Assembly wins and succeeds in setting up a Left ministry, then the power of the Crown existing alongside the Assembly is broken, then the King is merely a paid servant of the people and we return again to the morning of March 19 -- provided the Waldeck ministry does not betray us, as did many a ministry before it.

If the Crown wins and succeeds in setting up a government of the Prince of Prussia, then the Assembly will be dissolved, the right of association abolished, the press muzzled, an electoral law based on property qualifications introduced, and, as we have already mentioned, even the United Provincial Diet may be reinvoked -- and all this will be done under cover of a military dictatorship, guns and bayonets.

Which of the two sides will win depends on the attitude of the people, especially that of the democratic party. It is up to the democrats to choose.

We have again the situation of July 25. Will they dare to issue the decrees being devised in Potsdam? Will the people be provoked to make the leap from July 26 to February 24 in a single day?

The will to do it is certainly there, but what about the courage!



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Berlin, Donnerstag, 1. Sept.

1848.

THE CRISIS AND THE COUNTERREVOLUTION

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No.

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

September 13 -- THE CRISIS in Berlin has advanced one more step: The conflict with the monarchy, which until yesterday could still be considered avoidable, has now really begun....

Every provisional government after a revolution necessitates a dictatorship, and an energetic dictatorship at that. From the very beginning we have reproached Camphausen for not acting dictatorially and for not immediately destroying and removing the remnants of the old institutions. While Herr Camphausen rocked himself in the cradle of constitutional dreams, the defeated party strengthened its position in the bureaucracy and in the army, and indeed, here and there ventured ' into open battle. The Assembly, convened to arrange a constitution, made its appearance by the side of the monarchy as its equal. Two equal powers in one provisional government! Herr Camphausen's attempt to share authority "in order to save freedom" was precisely what led to collisions in the provisional government. Behind the monarchy lurked the counterrevolutionary camarilla of the aristocracy, the military, and the bureaucracy. Behind the majority of the Assembly stood the bourgeoisie. The ministry tried to mediate. Too weak to represent effectively the interests of the bourgeoisie and the peasantry, and to

destroy the power of the nobility, the bureaucracy, and the army leaders in one blow, too inept to avoid hurting the financial arrangements of the bourgeoisie everywhere -- its efforts came to nothing more than making itself unpopular with all parties and bringing about the very collision it wished to avoid.

In every nonconstitutional state, what is decisive is not this or that principle, but only the salut public, the public weal. The ministry could have avoided the collision between the Assembly and the crown only if it alone had claimed to represent the principle of the public welfare, even if it had to do so at the risk of itself coming into collision with the crown. But the ministry preferred to make itself "acceptable" in Potsdam. It never hesitated to take dictatorial measures against the democracy in the name of public safety....

But against the counterrevolution the ministry was very careful not to take action -- in the name of public safety! ...

To sum up: The unavoidable collision between two equal authorities in one provisional government has now begun. The ministry did not know how to run the government energetically; it neglected to take the necessary measures for the public safety. The Assembly only carried out its obligation when it demanded that the ministry do its duty. The ministry regards this as an injury to the crown, which it compromises at the moment of its abdication. Monarchy and Assembly confront each other. The policy of "unity" has led to separation and to conflict. Perhaps only arms will decide.

Whoever has the most courage and consistency will win.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Berlin, Donnerstag, 1. Sept.

1848.

THE CRISIS AND THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 102

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org

Cologne, September 13. The crisis in Berlin has advanced a step further. The conflict with the Crown, which yesterday could still be described as inevitable, has actually taken place.

Our readers will find below the King's reply to the resignation of the ministers. [73] By this letter the Crown itself comes to the fore, sides with the ministers and opposes the Assembly.

It goes even further -- it forms a cabinet outside the Assembly, it nominates Beckerath, who represents the extreme Right at Frankfurt and who, as everyone knows, will never be able to count on the support of the majority in Berlin.

The King's message is counter-signed by Herr Auerswald. Let Herr Auerswald, if he can, justify the fact that he thus uses the Crown to cover up his ignominious retreat, that at one and the same time he tries to hide behind the constitutional principle as far as the Chamber is concerned and tramples the constitutional principle by compromising the Crown and invoking the republic.

Constitutional principle! shout the ministers. Constitutional principle! shouts the Right. Constitutional principle! faintly echoes the Kolnische Zeitung.

"Constitutional principle!" Are these gentlemen really so foolish as to believe that it is possible to extricate the German people from the storms of 1848, and from the imminent threat of collapse of all traditional institutions, by means of the Montesquieu-Delolme worm-eaten theory of division of powers, by means of worn-out phrases and long exploded fictions.

"Constitutional principle!" But the very gentlemen who are out to save the constitutional principle at any price should realize first of all that at a provisional stage it can only be saved by energetic action.

"Constitutional principle!" But the vote of the Berlin Assembly, the clashes between Potsdam and Frankfurt, the disturbances, the reactionary attempts, the provocations of the military -- has all this not shown long ago that despite all the empty talk we are still on revolutionary ground, and the pretense that we have already reached the stage of an established, a complete constitutional monarchy only leads to collisions, which have already brought the "constitutional principle" to the brink of the abyss?

Every provisional political set-up following a revolution calls for dictatorship, and an energetic dictatorship at that. From the very beginning we blamed Camphausen for not having acted in a dictatorial manner, for not having immediately smashed up and removed the remains of the old institutions. While thus Herr Camphausen indulged in constitutional fancies, the defeated party strengthened its positions within the bureaucracy and in the army, and occasionally even risked an open fight. The Assembly was convened for the purpose of agreeing on the terms of the constitution. It existed as an equal party alongside the Crown. Two equal powers under a provisional arrangement! It was this division of powers with the aid of which Herr Camphausen sought "to save freedom" -- it was this very division of powers under provisional arrangement that was bound to lead to conflicts. The Crown served as a cover for the counter-revolutionary aristocratic, military and bureaucratic camarilla. The bourgeoisie stood behind the majority of the Assembly. The cabinet tried to mediate. Too weak to stand up for the bourgeoisie and the peasants and overthrow the power of the nobility, the bureaucracy and the army chiefs at one blow, too unskilled to avoid always damaging the interests of the bourgeoisie by its financial measures, the cabinet merely succeeded in compromising itself in the eyes of all the parties and bringing about the very clash it sought to avoid.

The one important factor in any unconstituted state of affairs is the salut public, the public welfare, and not this or that principle. There is only one way in which the government could avoid a conflict between the Assembly and the Crown and that is by recognizing the public

welfare as the sole principle, even at the risk of the government itself coming into conflict with the Crown. But it preferred "not to compromise" itself in Potsdam. It never hesitated to employ public welfare measures (*mesures de salut public*), dictatorial measures, against the democratic forces. What else was the application of the old laws to political crimes, even after Herr Marker had recognized that these articles of the Civil Code ought to be repealed? What else were the wholesale arrests in all parts of the kingdom?

But the cabinet carefully refrained from intervening against the counter-revolution in the name of public welfare.

It was this half-heartedness of the government in face of the counter-revolution, which became more menacing with every day, that compelled the Assembly itself to prescribe measures of public welfare. If the Crown represented by the ministers was too weak, then the Assembly itself had to intervene. It did so by passing the resolution of August 9. [74] It did so in a still rather mild form, by merely warning the ministers. The ministers simply took no notice of it.

Indeed, how could they have agreed to it? The resolution of August 9 flouted the constitutional principle, it is an encroachment made by the legislative power on the executive power, it undermines the division of powers and the mutual control, which are essential in the interests of freedom, it turns the Assembly of conciliation into a National Convention.

There follows a running fire of threats, a vociferous appeal to the fears of the petty bourgeois and the prospect of a reign of terror with guillotines, progressive taxes, confiscations and the red flag.

To compare the Berlin Assembly with the Convention. What irony!

But these gentlemen were not altogether wrong. If the government goes on the way it has been doing, we shall have a Convention before long -- not merely for Prussia, but for Germany as a whole -- a Convention which will have to use all means to cope with the civil war in our twenty Vendees and with the inevitable war with Russia. At present, however, we merely have a parody of the Constituent Assembly.

But how have the ministers who invoke the constitutional principle upheld this principle?

On August 9, they calmly allowed the Assembly to break up in the belief that the ministers would carry out the resolution. They had no intention of making known to the Assembly their refusal to do so, and still less of resigning their office.

They ruminated on the matter for a whole month and finally, when threatened with parliamentary questions, they curtly informed the Assembly that it was self-evident that they would not put the resolution into effect.

When the Assembly thereupon instructs the ministers, nevertheless, to put the resolution into effect, they take refuge behind the Crown, and cause a rupture between the Crown and the Assembly, thus pushing matters towards a republic.

And these gentlemen still talk about the constitutional principle!

To sum up:

The inevitable conflict between two powers having equal rights in a provisional arrangement has broken out. The cabinet was unable to govern with sufficient energy; it has failed to take the necessary measures of public welfare. The Assembly has merely performed its duty in demanding that the cabinet do its duty. The cabinet declares this to be an encroachment upon the rights of the Crown and discredits the Crown at the very moment of its resignation. The Crown and the Assembly confront each other. The "agreement" has led to disagreement, to conflict. It is possible that arms will decide the issue.

The side that has the greater courage and consistency will win.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Dien, Besatzung, 1. Juni

1848.

THE CRISIS AND THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 104

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org

Cologne, September 15. The government crisis has once again entered a new phase, due, not to the arrival and vain efforts of the impossible Herr Beckerath, but to the army revolt in Potsdam and Nauen. The conflict between democracy and aristocracy has broken out even within the guard regiments. The soldiers consider that the resolution carried by the Assembly on the 7th liberates them from the tyranny of their officers; they send letters of greeting and thanks to the Assembly.

This has wrenched the sword from the hands of the counter-revolutionaries. They will not dare now to dissolve the Assembly, and since this cannot be attempted, they will have to give in, carry out the resolution of the Assembly and form a Waldeck cabinet.

It is quite possible that the soldiers in revolt at Potsdam will save us a revolution.

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1840/neue-rz/nrz21d.htm)



[Marx / Engels](#)
[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)
[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr 1.

Berlin, Donnerstag, 1. Sept.

1848.

FREEDOM OF DEBATE IN BERLIN

by
KARL MARX and FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 105

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org

Cologne, September 16. Ever since the beginning of the crisis the counter-revolutionary press keeps alleging that the deliberations of the Berlin Assembly are not free from interference. In particular, the well-known correspondent "G" of the *Kolnische Zeitung*, [75] who also discharges his duties only "temporarily pending the appointment of a successor", [76] refers with obvious fear to the "8,000 to 10,000 strong fellows" in the *Kastanienwaldchen* who "morally" support their friends of the Left. The *Vossische*, [77] *Spenersche* [78] and other newspapers have set up a similar wail, and on the 7th of this month Herr Reichensperger has even tabled a motion frankly demanding that the Assembly be removed from Berlin (to Charlottenburg perhaps?).

The *Berliner Zeitungs-Halle* [79] publishes a long article in which it tries to refute these accusations. It declares that the large majority obtained by the Left was by no means inconsistent with the former irresolute attitude of the Assembly. It can be shown

"that the voting of the 7th could have taken place without conflicting with the former attitude even of those members who previously voted always for the cabinet, that it was indeed from their point of view in perfect harmony with their former position...." The members who came over from the centre

parties "had labored under a delusion; they imagined that the ministers carried out the will of the people; they had taken the endeavors of the ministers to restore law and order for an expression of their own will, i.e., that of the majority of deputies, and had not realized that the ministers could accede to the popular will only when it did not run counter to the will of the Crown, and not when it was opposed to it".

The Zeitungs-Halle thus "explains" the striking phenomenon of the sudden change in the attitude of so many deputies by ascribing it to the notions and delusions of these deputies. The thing could not be presented in a more innocent way.

The paper admits, however, that intimidations did occur. But it says,

"if outside influences did have any effect, it was only that they partially counterbalanced the ministerial misrepresentations and artful temptation, thus enabling the many weak and irresolute deputies to follow their natural vital instinct...."

The reasons which induced the Zeitungs-Halle thus morally to justify the vacillating members of the centre parties in the eyes of the public are obvious. The article is written for these gentlemen of the centre parties rather than for the general public. For us, however, these reasons do not exist, since we are privileged to speak plainly, and since we support the representatives of a party only as long and in so far as they act in a revolutionary manner.

Why should we not say it? The centre parties certainly were intimidated by the masses on September 7; we leave it open whether their fear was well founded or not.

The right of the democratic popular masses, by their presence, to exert a moral influence on the attitude of constituent assemblies is an old revolutionary right of the people which could not be dispensed with in all stormy periods ever since the English and French revolutions. History owes to this right almost all the energetic steps taken by such assemblies. The only reason why people dwell on the "legal basis" and why the timorous and philistine friends of the "freedom of debate" lament about it is that they do not want any energetic decisions at all.

"Freedom of debate" -- there is no emptier phrase than this. The "freedom of debate" is, on the one hand, impaired by the freedom of

the press, by the freedom of assembly and of speech, and by the right of the people to take up arms. It is impaired by the existing state power vested in the Crown and its ministers -- the army, the police and the so-called independent judges, who depend, however, on every promotion and every political change.

The freedom of debate is always a phrase denoting simply independence of all influences that are not recognized in law. It is only the recognized influences, such as bribery, promotion, private interests and fear of a dissolution of the Assembly, that make the debates really "free". In times of revolution, however, this phrase becomes entirely meaningless. When two forces, two parties in arms confront each other, when a fight may start any moment, the deputies have only this choice:

Either they place themselves under the protection of the people, in which case they will put up occasionally with a small lecture;

Or they place themselves under the protection of the Crown, move to some small town, deliberate under the protection of bayonets and guns or even a state of siege, in which case they will raise no objections when the Crown and the bayonets dictate their decisions to them.

Intimidation by the unarmed people or intimidation by an armed soldiery -- that is the choice before the Assembly.

The French Constituent Assembly transferred its sessions from Versailles to Paris. It would be quite in character with the German revolution if the Assembly of conciliation were to move from Berlin to Charlottenburg.

Neue Rheinische Zeitung	
	
Marx / Engels	Marxist writers'
Archive	Archives

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Berlin, Donnerstag, 1. Sept.

1848.

FREEDOM OF DELIBERATIONS IN BERLIN

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No.

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org

Cologne, September 16 -- SINCE THE BEGINNING of the crisis, it has been constantly asserted in the counterrevolutionary press that the Berlin Assembly does not deliberate freely. Specifically, Correspondent G. of the *Kolnische Zeitung*, who continues in his job in "the interim until a successor is named," has pointed with unmistakable anxiety to "8,000 to 10,000 boxing-club members" who "morally" support their leftist friends in the little chestnut glade. [The National Assembly met in the Singing Academy, in a small chestnut glade in Berlin.] The *Vossische*, *Spenersche*, and other newspapers have raised similar complaints, and on the seventh of this month Herr Reichensperger even proposed removing the Assembly from Berlin (perhaps to Charlottenburg?).

The *Berliner Zeitungs-Halle* publishes a long article in which it tries to refute these charges. It explains that the great leftist majority was by no means inconsistent with the former wavering position of the Assembly. It can be proven "that the vote of the seventh, even on the part of those who had formerly voted with the ministry, could occur without contradiction to the previous attitude; yes, viewed from the standpoint of those members, it was fully in accord with it..." Those who moved over from the center "had lived in a delusion; they had imagined that the ministers were the executors of the people's will; in

the efforts of the ministers to restore law and order, they thought they saw the expression of the will of the majority and did not perceive that the ministers could admit the will of the people only when it was not contrary to the will of the crown, not where it opposed it."

Thus the *Zeitungs-Halle* "explains" the striking phenomenon of the sudden revulsion in the minds of so many members against their previous notions and delusions. The matter could not have been stated more innocently.

Nevertheless, the paper admits that there have been intimidations. But it believes that "if outside influences have had any effect, it was that of keeping the clever ministerial shams and deceptions somewhat in balance, and thus enabling many weak and dependent members to follow... their natural instinct for survival."

The reasons that caused the *Zeitungs-Halle* morally to defend before the public the wavering members of the center in this way were evident: the article was written more for these gentlemen of the center than for the public at large. For us, who have the privilege of speaking out frankly and who support representatives of a party only so long and so far as they act as revolutionaries -- for us these reasons do not exist.

Why should we not say it? On the seventh of this month the centrists indeed let themselves be intimidated by the popular masses; whether their fear was justified or not remains to be seen.

The right of the democratic popular masses to exert a moral effect on the attitude of constituent assemblies by their presence is an old revolutionary right of the people which, since the English and French revolutions, cannot be dispensed with in stormy times. To this right history is indebted for practically all the energetic steps taken by such assemblies. If, therefore, the occupiers of the ground of legality" and the scared and philistinish friends of "freedom of deliberations" yammer against it, they do so for no other reason than that they do not want any energetic decisions to be taken.

"Freedom of deliberations"! There is no more hollow phrase than this. On the one side "freedom of deliberations" is injured by freedom of the press, by freedom of assembly and of speech, by freedom of the people to arm. It is injured on the other by the existing public authority, which rests in the hands of the crown and its ministers: by the army, the police, and the so-called independent judges, who are in reality dependent on promotion and political change.

At all times freedom of deliberations is a phrase which means nothing more than independence of every influence not recognized by law.

These recognized influences -- bribery, promotion, private interests, fear of a dissolution of the chamber, etc. -- are what actually make the deliberations "free." But in revolutionary times this phrase is completely meaningless. Where two powers and two parties confront each other prepared for battle, and where the battle may break out at any moment, the deputies have only one choice: Either they place themselves under the protection of the people and put up with a small scolding from time to time, or they place themselves under the protection of the crown, move to some small town, deliberate under the protection of bayonets and cannon or even under a state of siege -- and then they cannot complain when the crown and the bayonets prescribe their decisions for them.

Intimidation by the unarmed people or intimidation by the armed soldiery -- the Assembly must choose.

The French Constituent Assembly [Of 1789] moved from Versailles to Paris. It is properly indicative of the whole character of the German Revolution that its Confederate Assembly moves from Berlin to Charlottenburg.

Neue Rheinische Zeitung	
	
Marx / Engels	Marxist writers'
Archive	Archives

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Berlin, Donnerstag, 1. Sept.

1848.

RATIFICATION OF THE ARMISTICE

by
FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 107

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org

Cologne, September 19. The German National Assembly has ratified the armistice. [We were not mistaken](#): "Germany's honor has fallen into bad hands."

The vote was taken amidst uproar and complete darkness, when the benches of the deputies were thronged with strangers, diplomats, etc. A majority of two forced the Assembly to vote simultaneously on two entirely different questions. The armistice was carried, Schleswig-Holstein sacrificed, "Germany's honor" trampled under foot and the merging of Germany in Prussia decided by a majority of 21 votes.

On no other issue has there been such a clear expression of public opinion. On no other issue have the gentlemen of the Right so openly admitted that they uphold a cause which is indefensible. In no other issue were Germany's interests so unequivocal and so obvious as in this. The National Assembly has made its decision-it has pronounced the death sentence upon itself and upon the so-called central authority created by it. If Germany had a Cromwell it would not be long before he would say: "You are no Parliament.... Depart, I say.... in the name of God, -- go!" [80]

There is talk of the impending withdrawal of the Left. If it had courage, this poor derided Left, which has been fisted by the majority and called to order on top of it by the noble Gagern. Never has a

minority been so insolently and consistently maltreated as has been the Frankfurt Left by the noble Gagern and his 250 champions of the majority. If only it had courage!

Lack of courage is ruining the entire German movement.

The counter-revolution as well as the revolutionary party lack the courage for the decisive blows. All Germans, whether on the right or on the left, know now that the present movement must lead to terrible clashes, to bloody battles, fought either to suppress it or to carry it through. But instead of courageously facing these unavoidable battles and fighting them out with a few rapid and decisive blows, the two parties -- the party of the counter-revolution and that of movement -- have virtually come to an agreement to put them off as long as possible. It is due to this constant resort to petty expedients, to trivial concessions and palliatives, to these attempts at mediation, that the unbearable and uncertain political situation has led everywhere to numerous isolated uprisings, which can only be liquidated by way of bloodshed and the curtailment of rights already won. It is this fear of struggle that gives rise to thousands of minor clashes making the year 1848 exceptionally sanguinary and so complicating the position of the contending parties that in the end the struggle will be the more violent and destructive. But "our dear friends' lack of courage"!

The crucial struggle for Germany's centralization and democratic organization cannot possibly be avoided. Every day brings it nearer despite all attempts to play it down and compromise. The complex situation in Vienna, Berlin and Frankfurt demands a decision, and if everything should fail because of German timidity and indecision, we shall be saved by France. The consequences of the June victory are now taking shape in Paris -- the royalists are getting the better of Cavaignac and his "pure republicans" in the National Assembly, in the press and in the clubs; a general uprising is threatening to break out in the legitimist South; Cavaignac has to resort' to Ledru-Rollin's revolutionary remedies, i.e., to departmental commissioners invested with extraordinary powers; it was with the greatest difficulty that he managed to defend himself and his government in Parliament last Saturday. Another such division, and Thiers, Barrot and company, the men in whose interests the June victory was won, will possess a majority, Cavaignac will be thrown into the arms of the red republic, and the struggle for the republic's existence will start.

If Germany's irresoluteness should persist, the new phase of the French revolution will also be a signal for a fresh outbreak of open struggle in Germany, a struggle which we hope will take us a little further and will at least free Germany from the traditional fetters of her past.

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)
[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)
[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Stuttg., Donnerstag, 1. Sept.

1848.

THE ASSEMBLY AT FRANKFURT

by

FREDERICK ENGELS

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org

Cologne, September 19, 7 p.m. The German-Danish armistice has raised a storm. A sanguinary revolt has begun in Frankfurt. The workers of Frankfurt, Offenbach and Hanau, and the peasants of the surrounding districts, have staked their life to defend Germany's honor betrayed by the National Assembly to a Prussian government which has ignominiously resigned.

The outcome of the struggle is still uncertain. Until yesterday evening the soldiers apparently made little progress. In Frankfurt, apart from the Zeil and perhaps a few other streets and squares, artillery is of little use, and cavalry of hardly any use. In this respect the people are in 'an advantageous position. Citizens of Hanau, armed with weapons from the arsenal they had stormed, have come to their assistance, as have also peasants from numerous villages in the vicinity. Yesterday evening the military probably numbered about 10,000 men and very little artillery. Large reinforcements of peasants must have arrived during the night, and considerably smaller ones of soldiers, the immediate vicinity being denuded of troops. The revolutionary temper of the peasants in the Odenwald, Nassau and the Electorate of Hesse precluded further withdrawals; it is likely that communications have been interrupted. If today the insurgents are still holding out, then the whole of the Odenwald, Nassau, the Electorate of Hesse and Rhenish Hesse will take up arms, the entire population between Fulda, Koblenz, Mannheim and Aschaffenburg will be in arms, and there are insufficient troops available to crush the uprising. And who will

answer for Mainz, Mannheim, Marburg, Cassel and Wiesbaden -- towns in which hatred of the army has reached its highest pitch as a result of the bloody excesses of the so-called Federal troops? Who will answer for the peasants on the Rhine, who can easily prevent troop movements along the river?

We admit, nevertheless, that we have little hope of the courageous insurgents being able to win the day. Frankfurt is too small a town, the number of troops is disproportionately large, and the well-known counter-revolutionary sentiments of the local petty bourgeoisie are too great to allow us to be very hopeful.

But even if the insurgents are defeated, this will settle nothing. The counter-revolution will become arrogant, it will enslave us for a time by introducing martial law, by suppressing freedom of the press, and banning the clubs and public meetings; but before long the crowing of the Gaelic cock [81] will announce the hour of liberation, the hour of revenge.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No 1.

Main, Samstag, 1. Sept.

1848.

THE UPRISING IN FRANKFURT

by
FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 108

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org

Cologne, September 20. The news from Frankfurt is beginning to confirm our fears of yesterday. It seems certain that the insurgents have been ejected from Frankfurt, and that now they are holding only Sachsenhausen, where they are said to be strongly entrenched. A state of siege has been declared in Frankfurt; anyone caught carrying weapons or resisting the "Federal Authority" is to be court-martialed.

Thus the gentlemen in the Paulskirche are now on an equal footing with their colleagues in Paris. They can now at their leisure and under the rule of martial law reduce the fundamental rights of the German people to a "minimum"

The railway line to Mainz is torn up in many places, and the post arrives either late or not at all.

It appears that artillery decided the outcome of the fight in the wide streets and enabled the army to attack the fighters on the barricades from the rear. Additional factors were the zeal with which the petty bourgeois of Frankfurt opened their houses to the soldiers, thus giving them every advantage in the street-fighting, and the superior strength of the troops, swiftly brought up by rail, over the peasant contingents, who arrived slowly on foot.

But even if the fight has not been renewed in Frankfurt itself, it certainly does not mean that the rising has been crushed. The angry

peasants are not likely to put their weapons down forthwith. Though they may not be able to break up the National Assembly, they still have enough at home that has to be cleared away. The storm that was repelled outside the Paulskirche can spread to six or eight petty residences and to hundreds of manor-houses. The peasant war begun this spring will not come to an end until its goal, the liberation of the peasants from feudalism, has been achieved.

What is the reason for the persistent victory of "order" throughout Europe and for the series of recurrent defeats of the revolutionary party from Naples, Prague and Paris to Milan, Vienna and Frankfurt?

All parties know that the struggle impending in all civilized countries is quite different from, infinitely more significant than, all previous revolutions; in Vienna and Paris, in Berlin and Frankfurt, in London and Milan the point at issue is the overthrow of the political rule of the bourgeoisie, an upheaval whose immediate consequences horrify all portly, stockjobbing bourgeois.

Is there a revolutionary centre anywhere in the world where the red flag, the emblem of the militant, united proletariat of Europe, has not been found flying on the barricades during the last five months?

The fight in Frankfurt against the Parliament of the combined landowners and the bourgeoisie was likewise waged under the red flag.

The reason for all these defeats is that every uprising that now takes place is a direct threat to the political existence of the bourgeoisie, and an indirect threat to its social existence. The people, largely unarmed, have to fight not only the well-armed bourgeoisie but also the organized power of the bureaucratic and military state which the bourgeoisie has taken over. The people, who are unorganized and poorly armed, are confronted by all the other social classes, who are well organized and fully armed. That is the reason why up to now the people have been defeated and will continue to be defeated until their opponents are weakened either through dissension, or because the army is engaged in war-or until some important event impels the people to begin a desperate fight and demoralizes their opponents.

Such an event is impending in France.

Hence we need not give up hope, even though during the last four months the barricades everywhere have been defeated by grape-shot. On the contrary, every victory of our opponents was at the same time a defeat for them, for it divided them and, ultimately, gave control not to the conservative party that was victorious in February and March, but in each case to the party that had been overthrown in February and

March. Only for a short time did the victory won in Paris in June establish the rule of the petty bourgeoisie, the pure republicans; hardly three months have passed and the big bourgeoisie, the constitutional party, is threatening to overthrow Cavaignac and drive the "pure ones" into the arms of the "reds". This will happen in Frankfurt too -- the victory will benefit, not the respectable gentlemen from the centre parties, but those of the Right. The bourgeoisie will have to give pride of place to the gentlemen representing the military, bureaucratic and aristocratic state and will very soon taste the bitter fruit of victory.

May it do them good! Meanwhile we shall await the moment when the hour of liberation for Europe will have struck in Paris.

Neue Rheinische Zeitung	
	
Marx / Engels	Marxist writers'
Archive	Archives

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Acht, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

REVOLUTION IN VIENNA

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 114

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org

Cologne, October 11. In its First issue (for June 1) the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* wrote of a revolution (on May 25) in Vienna. Today, when we resume publication for the first time after the break caused by the declaration of martial law in Cologne, we bring news of the much more important Viennese revolution of October 6 and 7. Detailed reports on the events in Vienna compel us today to omit all analytical articles. Only a few words of comment, therefore, on the revolution in Vienna. Our readers will see from the reports of our Vienna correspondent [Muller-Telling. -- Ed.] that the bourgeoisie's distrust of the working class threatens, if not to wreck the revolution, at least to hamper its development. However that may be, the repercussions of this revolution in Hungary, Italy and Germany completely upset the plan of campaign devised by the counter-revolution. The flight from Vienna of the Emperor and of the Czech deputies [82] compels the Viennese bourgeoisie to continue the fight unless it is prepared to surrender unconditionally. The dreams of the Frankfurt Assembly, which is just now engaged in presenting us Germans with

a national jail and a common whip, [83]

have been rudely interrupted by the events in Vienna, and the government at Berlin is beginning to doubt the efficacy of martial law

as a panacea. Martial law, like the revolution, is making a round-the-world tour. A large-scale experiment has just been made to impose martial law on a whole country, Hungary. This attempt has called forth a revolution in Vienna instead of a counter-revolution in Hungary. Martial law will not recover from this setback. Its reputation has been permanently ruined. By an irony of fate, simultaneously with Jellachich, Cavaignac, the hero of martial law, in the West, has been singled out for attack by all the factions who were saved in June by his grapeshot. Only by resolutely going over to the revolution will he be able to hold out for some time.

Following the latest news from Vienna, we publish several reports sent on October 5, because they reflect the hopes and fears current in Vienna about the fate of Hungary.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Köln, Donnerstag, 1. Dez.

1848.

THE "COLOGNE REVOLUTION"

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No.

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, October 12 -- THE "Cologne Revolution" of September 25 was a carnival, the *Kölnische Zeitung* tells us, and the *Kölnische Zeitung* is right. The "Cologne military command" introduced Cavaignac on September 26. And the *Kölnische Zeitung* admires the wisdom and moderation of the "Cologne military command." But who is the most comical—the workers who built the barricades on September 25, or Cavaignac, who on September 26 most solemnly pronounced a state of siege, suspended journals, disarmed the civil guard, and prohibited association?

Poor *Kölnische Zeitung*! The Cavaignac of the "Cologne Revolution" is not one cubit bigger than the "Cologne Revolution" itself. Poor *Kölnische Zeitung*! It must take the "Revolution" jokingly and the "Cavaignac" of this gay revolution seriously. Vexatious, thankless, disagreeable theme!

We do not waste words on the rights of the military command. D'Ester has exhausted this subject. [On September 29, 1848, Dr. d'Ester, a communist deputy in the Prussian National Assembly, demanded the suspension of the state of siege in Cologne.] For the rest, we consider the military command as a subordinate tool. The actual authors of this strange tragedy were the "right-minded

citizens," the Dumonts & Co. Hence it is no wonder that Herr Dumont was instrumental in peddling the Address against d'Ester, Borchardt, and Kyll. What they had to defend, these "right-minded" ones, was not the action of the military command but their own action.

The Cologne event wandered through the Sahara Desert of the German press in the form given it by the Cologne Journal des Debats. Sufficient ground to return to this.

Moll, one of the most beloved leaders of the Workers' Association, was to be arrested. [The Workers' Association was founded by communists in Cologne on April 13, 1848. -- ed.] Schapper and Becker were already arrested. To carry out these arrests, they chose a Monday, a day when everyone knows most of the workers are free. Hence the authorities must have known that the arrests would stir up a great ferment among the workers and could even be the cause of violent resistance. Strange coincidence, that these arrests occurred precisely on a Monday! The excitement was the more easily to be foreseen as, on the occasion of Stein's motion against the army order, [on August 9, Deputy Stein made a motion protesting against an attack by Prussian troops in Schweidnitz which killed fourteen men -- ed.] and after Wrangel's Proclamation [On September 17, 1848, General Wrangel issued a proclamation in Berlin in defense of "public order." -- ed.] and Pfuel's appointment as Prime Minister, a decisive counterrevolutionary blow, hence a revolution, was expected in Berlin. The workers therefore had to view the arrests, not as legal but as political measures. In the procurator they saw only a counterrevolutionary authority. They believed they were being robbed of their leaders on the eve of important events. They were determined at all costs to keep Moll from being arrested. And they left the field of battle only after they achieved their aim. The barricades were built only when the workers assembled on the Old Market Place discovered that the military was moving to an attack from all directions. The workers were not attacked; hence they did not have to defend themselves. Furthermore, it became known to them that no important news had arrived from Berlin. Thus they withdrew, after having vainly waited for the enemy throughout most of the night.

Hence nothing is more ridiculous than the reproach of cowardice that has been made against the Cologne workers.

But other reproaches have been made against them, in order to justify the state of siege and to trim down the Cologne event to a small June Revolution. Their actual plan was supposed to have been the plundering of the good city of Cologne. The charge derives from the alleged plundering of one clothing shop. As if every city did not have its contingent of thieves, who naturally take advantage of days of

public excitement. Or does one understand by plundering the plundering of arms stores? If so, one should send the Cologne parquet [law court] to Berlin to help prepare the case against the March Revolution. Without the plundered arms stores, perhaps we would never have had the satisfaction of seeing Herr Hansemann transformed into a bank director and Herr Muller into a state secretary.

Enough of the Cologne workers. Let us come to the so-called democrats. What do the Kolnische Zeitung, the Deutsche Zeitung, the Augsburgische Allgemeine Zeitung, and whatever the names of the other "right-minded" papers are, reproach them with?

The heroic Bruggemanns, the Bassermanns, etc., called for blood, and the soft-hearted democrats, out of cowardice, did not agree to bloodshed.

The fact, however, is this: The democrats declared in the Kranz (on the Old Market Place), in the Eiser Hall, and on the workers' barricades that under no circumstances did they want any Putsch. But at that point, when there was no important question to drive the whole population to battle and hence every rising was bound to fail, this was the more senseless in that it disabled men for battle on the eve of decision, at a time when tremendous events could occur in a few days. When the ministry in Berlin hazarded a counterrevolution, that was the day for the people to hazard a revolution. The judicial investigation will confirm our assertion. The gentlemen of the Kolnische Zeitung would have done better if, instead of standing in front of the barricades "in the darkness of the night" with "folded arms and dark looks" and "reflecting on the future of the nation," they had stood on the barricades themselves and harangued the blinded masses with their words of wisdom. Of what use is wisdom post festum?

Worst was the treatment of the Civil Guard in the good Cologne press during the events in the city. Let us make a distinction. That the Civil Guard refused to sink to the level of a will-less servant of the police -- that was its duty. That it voluntarily surrendered its arms--can be excused on one ground: the liberal portion of the guard knew that its illiberal portion joyfully seized the opportunity of ridding itself of its weapons. A partial resistance would have been useless.

The "Cologne Revolution" had one good result. It revealed the existence of a phalanx of more than 2,000 saints whose "satiated virtue and solvent morality" [From Heinrich Heine, "Anno 1829." -- ed.] demonstrate a "free life" only during a state of siege. Perhaps there will some day be an occasion for writing an Acta Sanctorum -- the biographies of these saints. Our readers will then learn how the

"treasures" that neither moth nor rust doth corrupt [Matthew VI:19: "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt..." -- ed.] are acquired, and in what way the economic background of "good intention" is conquered.

<u>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</u>	
	
<u>Marx / Engels</u>	<u>Marxist writers'</u>
<u>Archive</u>	<u>Archives</u>

Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Berlin, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

APPEAL OF THE DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS TO THE GERMAN NATION

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No.

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, November 2 -- We reproduce below the Appeal of the "Democratic Congress" [the Second Democratic Congress met in Berlin from October 26 to 30, 1848, and passed a series of resolutions without preparing any means for their enforcement. -- ed.]:

"To the German Nation!

"For long disgraceful years the German nation sighed under the yoke of autocracy. The bloody deeds in Vienna and Berlin had given us reason to hope that the nation's freedom and unity would be realized in a single blow. The devilish artifices of a cursed reaction thwarted this development, cheating a heroic people of the fruits of its magnificent uprising. Vienna, a main bulwark of German freedom, stands momentarily in greatest peril. Sacrificed by the plots of a still powerful camarilla, it is to be delivered anew to the chains of despotism. But its noble population has risen as one man and confronts the armed hordes of its oppressors with deadly courage. The cause of Vienna is the cause of Germany, the cause of freedom. With the fall of

Vienna, arbitrary government would raise its banner higher than ever- with Vienna's victory, it would be destroyed. It is up to us, German brothers, not to permit the destruction of Vienna's freedom or see it handed over to the armed barbaric hordes. It is the most sacred duty of all German governments to rush to the aid of the hard-pressed sister city with all their influence; but it is at the same time also the most sacred duty of the German people, in the interest of their own freedom, in the interest of self-preservation, to make every sacrifice to save Vienna. Never must they tolerate the disgrace of apathetic indifference where the utmost is at stake. Therefore we appeal to you, brothers, that each of you, according to his means, contribute to save Vienna from destruction. What we do for Vienna, we do for Germany. Help yourselves! The men you sent to Frankfurt to establish freedom have rejected, with mocking laughter, the appeal to save Vienna. Now it is up to you to act! Demand, with strong and inflexible will, that your governments submit to your majority and save the cause of Germany and the cause of freedom in Vienna. Hurry! You are the power, your will is law! Arise! Ye men of freedom, arise in all the lands and wherever the idea of liberty and humanity glows in noble hearts! Arise, before it is too late! Save Vienna's freedom, save Germany's freedom. The present will admire you, the future will reward you with immortal glory!

"October 29, 1848

"THE DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS IN BERLIN"

This Appeal replaces the lack of revolutionary energy with preacher-like blubbing pathos, behind which is hidden the utmost poverty of ideas and passion.

A few examples!

The Appeal expected from the March revolutions in Vienna and Berlin the realization of the "freedom and unity" of the German nation "in a single blow." In other words: the Appeal dreamed of "a single blow" that would make the German people's "development" toward "freedom and unity" superfluous.

Immediately after this, the fantastic "single blow," which replaces development becomes a "development" "thwarted" by the reactionaries. A phrase, a self-dissolving phrase!

We overlook the monotonous repetition of the main theme: Vienna is

in peril, and with Vienna, Germany's freedom; help Vienna and thereby you help yourselves! These ideas are not endowed with flesh and blood. The one phrase is wound around itself so often that it becomes a piece of rhetoric. We only remark that artificial, untrue pathos always degenerates into this kind of dun rhetoric.

"It is up to us, German brothers, not to permit the destruction of Vienna's freedom or to see it handed over the armed barbaric hordes."

And how do we begin to do this?

Chiefly by an appeal to the sense of duty of the "German governments." C'est incroyable! [It is incredible!]

"It is the most sacred duty of all German governments to rush to the aid of the hard-pressed sister city with all their influence."

Is the Prussian Government to send Wrangel or Colomb or the Prince of Prussia against Auersperg, Jellachich, and Windischgratz?

Did the "Democratic" Congress venture even for a moment, such a childish and conservative position toward the German governments? Did it, even for a moment, venture to separate the cause of the "most sacred interests" of the German governments from the cause and interests of "Croatian order and freedom?" The governments will smile smugly at this maidenly reverie.

And the people?

The people in general are called upon "to make every sacrifice to save Vienna." Good! But the "people" expect specific demands from the Democratic Congress. He who demands everything demands nothing and receives nothing. The specific demand here is: "Demand, with strong and inflexible will, that your governments submit to your majority and save the cause of Germany and the cause of freedom in Vienna. Hurry! You are the power, your will is law! Arise!"

Assuming that magnificent people's demonstrations succeeded in moving the governments to take official steps to save Vienna, we would be blessed with a second edition of the Stein military order. To want to utilize the present "German governments" as "saviors of freedom"! As if in their "imperial buying and selling" they did not fulfill their true vocation, their "most sacred duties" as the Gabriels of "constitutional freedom"! The "Democratic Congress" should have kept silent about the German governments, or it should have unsparingly revealed their conspiracy with Olmutz and Petersburg.

Although the Appeal recommends "hurry" -- and in truth there is no time to be lost -- the humanistic phraseology pulls it beyond the

frontiers of Germany, beyond all geographic frontiers, into the cosmopolitan never-never land of "noble hearts" in general!

"Hurry!" "Arise! Ye men of freedom, arise in all the lands and wherever the idea of liberty and humanity glows in noble hearts!"

We do not doubt that there are such "noble hearts" even in Lapland.

In Germany and where else? In wasting itself on this purely aimless phrase, the "Appeal" presented an authentic expression.

It is unforgivable that the "Democratic Congress" should have signed such a document. "The present" will not "admire" it for this, nor will "the future" reward it with "immortal glory."

Let us hope that despite the "Appeal of the Democratic Congress," the people will awake from their lethargy and bring to the Viennese the only kind of help that can still be brought at this moment -- defeating the counterrevolution in its own house.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Acht, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

THE PARIS *REFORME* ON THE SITUATION IN FRANCE

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 133

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org

Cologne, November 2. Even before the June uprising we repeatedly exposed the illusions of the republicans who cling to the traditions of 1793, the republicans of the *Reforme* (of Paris). Under the impact of the June revolution and the movement to which it gave rise the utopian republicans gradually had their eyes opened.

A leading article in the *Reforme* for October 29 reflects the conflict between the old delusions of the party and the new facts.

The *Reforme* says:

"In our country the fights waged to seize the reins of government have long been class wars, struggles of the bourgeoisie and the people against the nobility when the first republic came into being; the sacrifices of the armed people without, and rule of the bourgeoisie within during the empire; the attempt to restore feudalism under the older branch of the Bourbons; finally, in 1830, the triumph and rule of the bourgeoisie -- that is our history."

The *Reforme* adds with a sigh:

"We certainly regret that we have to speak of classes, of ungodly and hateful divergences, but these divergences exist and we cannot overlook this fact."

That is to say: up to now the *Reforme* in its republican optimism saw only "citoyens" but it has been so hard pressed by history that the splitting up of the "citoyens" into "bourgeois" and "proletaires" can no longer be dismissed by any effort of imagination.

The *Reforme* continues:

"The despotism of the bourgeoisie was broken in February. What did the people demand? justice for all and equality. That was its primary slogan, its primary desire. The wishes of the bourgeoisie, whose eyes had been opened by the flash of lightning, were at first the same as those of the people."

The paper's views on the February revolution are still based on the speeches of that time. The despotism of the bourgeoisie, far from having been broken during the February revolution, was completed by it. The Crown, the last feudal aureole, which concealed the rule of the bourgeoisie, was cast aside. The rule of capital emerged unadulterated. Bourgeoisie and proletariat fought against a common enemy during the February revolution. As soon as the common enemy was eliminated, the two hostile classes held the field of battle alone and the decisive struggle between them was bound to begin. People may ask, why did the bourgeoisie fall back into royalism, if the February revolution brought bourgeois rule to its completion? The explanation is a simple one. The bourgeoisie would have liked to return to the period when it ruled without being responsible for its rule; when a puppet authority standing between the bourgeoisie and the people had to act for it and to serve it as a cloak. A period when it had, as it were, a crowned scapegoat, which the proletariat hit whenever it aimed at the bourgeoisie, and against which the bourgeoisie could join forces with the proletariat whenever that scapegoat became troublesome and attempted to establish itself as an authority in its own right. The bourgeoisie could use the King as a kind of lightning-conductor protecting it from the people, and the people as a lightning-conductor protecting it from the King.

Since the illusions, some of them hypocritical, some honest, which

became widespread immediately after the defeat of Louis Philippe, are mistakenly accepted by the *Reforme* as facts, the developments following those days in February appear to it as a series of errors, awkward accidents, that a great man adequate to the needs of the moment could have avoided. As though Lamartine, the jack-o'lantern, had not been the true man of the moment.

The *Reforme* bemoans the fact that the true man, the great man, has not yet appeared, and the situation gets worse every day.

"On the one hand the industrial and commercial crisis grows; on the other hand hatred grows and all strive towards contradictory goals. Those who were oppressed before February 24 seek their ideal of happiness and freedom in the conception of an entirely new society. The only concern of those who governed under the monarchy is to regain their realm in order to exploit it with redoubled harshness."

Now what is the attitude of the *Reforme* towards these sharply antagonistic classes? Does it realize even vaguely that class contradictions and class struggle will disappear only with the disappearance of classes?

No. Just now it admitted that class contradictions exist. But class contradictions are based on economic foundations, on the existing mode of material production and the conditions of commerce resulting from it. The *Reforme* knows no better way of changing and abolishing these contradictions than to disregard their real basis, that is, these very material conditions, and to withdraw into the hazy blue heaven of republican ideology, in other words, into the poetic February period, from which it was violently ejected by the June events. It writes:

"The saddest aspect of these internal dissensions is the obliteration, the loss of the patriotic, national sentiments', i.e., of just that patriotic and national enthusiasm which enabled both classes' to veil their distinct interests, their conditions of life. When they did that in 1789, their real contradictions were not yet developed. What at that time was an adequate expression of the real position, is today merely an escape from the existing situation. What had substance then, is today just a relic.

"France," concludes the *Reforme*, "evidently suffers from a

deep-seated Malady, but it is curable. It is caused by a confusion of ideas and morals, by a neglect of justice and equality in social relations, and by depravity resulting from egoistical teaching. The means for reorganization must be sought in this sphere. Instead people have recourse to material means."

The *Reforme* presents the whole case as a matter of conscience", and moral twaddle is then used as a means to solve everything. The antithesis of bourgeoisie and proletariat accordingly derives from the ideas of these two classes. And where do these ideas derive from? From the social relations. And where do these relations derive from? From the material, economic conditions of life of the hostile classes. According to the *Reforme*, if the two classes are no longer conscious of their real position and their real contradictions, and become intoxicated with the opium of the "patriotic" sentiments and phrases of 1793, then their difficulties will be solved. What an admission of helplessness!



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Dienstag, den 5. Nov. 1848.

1848.

THE LATEST NEWS FROM VIENNA, BERLIN AND PARIS

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 135

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org

Cologne, November 4. The outlook brightens.

There is no direct news yet from Vienna. But even according to the official Prussian papers, it is clear that Vienna has not surrendered and that Windischgratz deliberately or as a result of a misunderstanding had given to the world a false telegram. The "good" press, like an orthodox, multilingual echo, has willingly repeated the message although it has tried hard to mask its malicious glee behind a woebegone countenance. Stripped of all their fantastic and self-contradictory trash, the reports from Silesia and Berlin bring out the following facts. By October 29 the imperial bandits had obtained control only of a few suburbs. The reports received up till now do not show that they have gained a foothold in Vienna itself. The whole story of Vienna's surrender boils down to a few treasonable proclamations of the Vienna town council. The advanced guard of the Hungarian army attacked Windischgratz on October 30, and was said to have been driven back. On October 31 Windischgratz resumed the shelling of Vienna -- without result. His army is now between the Viennese and the over 80,000-strong Hungarian army. Windischgratz's infamous manifestos called forth uprisings or at least very threatening movements in all provinces. Even the Czech fanatics in Prague, the neophytes of Slovanska Lipa, [84] have awakened from

their wild dreams and declared for Vienna against the imperial Schinderhannes. [85] Never before has the counter-revolution dared to proclaim its plans with such fatuous brazenness. Even at Olmutz, that Austrian Koblenz, [86] the crowned idiot can feel the ground shaking beneath his feet. The fact that the troops are led by the world-famed Sipehsalar [Commander-in-Chief. -- Ed] Jellachich -- whose name is so great that "at the flash of his sabre the frightened moon hides behind the clouds" and "the roar of cannon" always "points the way" in which he must hurriedly decamp -- leaves no doubt that the people of Hungary and Vienna

Horsewhip that scum into the Danube River,
 Go castigate that overweening rabble,
 Those starveling beggars, all so tired of living,
 That horde of miscreants, rogues and vagabonds,
 Croatian riff-raff, abject peasant hirelings,
 That vomit, spewed up by a gluttoned homeland
 For desperate ventures and for certain doom.

Later reports will give appalling details of the crimes perpetrated by Croats and other knights "of law and order and constitutional freedom". The European bourgeoisie ensconced in stock exchanges and other convenient observation posts will loudly acclaim the gory spectacle; the same wretched bourgeoisie that broke into screams of moral indignation because of a few harsh acts of popular justice and with a thousand voices unanimously anathemized the "murderers" of honest Latour and noble Lichnowski.

The Poles, avenging the Galician murders, are once more advancing at the head of the liberators of Vienna, just as they march at the head of the Italian people and everywhere act as high-minded generals of the revolution. Three cheers for the Poles!

The Berlin camarilla, intoxicated with the blood of Vienna, blinded by the pillars of smoke rising from the burning suburbs, stunned by the Croats' and Hungarians' shouts of victory, has dropped its cloak. "Peace has been restored in Berlin." We shall see.

Finally, from Paris come the first subterranean rumbles announcing the earthquake that will bury the genteel republic under its own ruins.

The outlook brightens.

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)

[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)

[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Acht, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

THE VICTORY OF THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN VIENNA

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 136

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, November 6. Croatian freedom and order has won the day, and this victory was celebrated with arson, rape, looting and other atrocities. Vienna is in the hands of Windischgratz, Jellachich and Auersperg. Hecatombs of victims are sacrificed on the grave of the aged traitor Latour.

The gloomy forecasts of our Vienna correspondent [Muller-Telling. See *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 127, October 27, 1848. -- Ed.] have come true, and by now he himself may have become a victim of the butchery.

For a while we hoped Vienna could be liberated by Hungarian reinforcements, and we are still in the dark regarding the movements of the Hungarian army.

Treachery of every kind prepared the way for Vienna's fall. The entire performance of the Imperial Diet and the town council since October 6 is a tale of continuous treachery. Who are the people represented in the Imperial Diet and the town council?

The bourgeoisie.

A part of the Viennese National Guard openly sided with the camarilla from the very beginning of the October revolution. Towards the end of the October revolution another part of the National Guard in collusion with the imperial bandits fought against the proletariat and the Academic Legion. To which strata do these groups of the National Guard belong?

To the bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie in France, however, headed the counterrevolution only after it had broken down all obstacles to the rule of its own class. The bourgeoisie in Germany meekly joins the retinue of the absolute monarchy and of feudalism before securing even the first conditions of existence necessary for its own civic freedom and its rule. In France it played the part of a tyrant and made its own counter-revolution. In Germany it acts like a slave and carries out the counter-revolution for its own tyrants. The bourgeoisie in France won its victory in order to humble the people. In Germany it humbled itself to prevent the victory of the people. History presents no example of greater wretchedness than that of the German bourgeoisie.

Who fled from Vienna in large numbers leaving their wealth to be watched over by the magnanimous people, the people whom, in reward for their watchman's duties, they maligned while away and whose massacre they witnessed on their return?

The bourgeoisie.

Whose innermost secrets were revealed by the thermometer which dropped whenever the people of Vienna showed signs of life, and rose whenever the people were in the throes of death? Who used the runic script of the stock exchange quotations?

The bourgeoisie.

The "German National Assembly" and its "central authority" have betrayed Vienna. Whom do they represent?

Mainly the bourgeoisie.

The victory of "Croatian order and freedom" at Vienna depended on the victory of the "genteel" republic in Paris. Who won the day in June?

The bourgeoisie.

European counter-revolution began its debaucheries with its victory in Paris.

In February and March armed force was beaten everywhere. Why?

Because it represented only the government. After June it was everywhere victorious because the bourgeoisie everywhere had come to a secret understanding with it, while retaining official leadership of the revolutionary movement and introducing all those half measures which by the very nature of things were bound to miscarry.

The national fanaticism of the Czechs was the most powerful instrument the Viennese camarilla possessed. The allies are already at loggerheads. In this issue our readers will find the protest of the Prague delegation against the insolent rudeness with which it was greeted in Olmutz.

This is the first symptom of the struggle which is going to break out between the Slav party and its hero Jellachich on the one hand, and the party of the plain camarilla, which stands above all nationality, and its hero Windischgratz on the other. Moreover the German peasants in Austria are not yet pacified. Their voice will be loudly heard above the caterwauling of the Austrian nationalities. And from a third quarter the voice of the Tsar, the friend of the people, reaches as far as Pest; his henchmen are waiting for the word of command in the Danubian principalities.

Finally, the last decision of the German National Assembly at Frankfurt, which incorporates German Austria into the German empire, should lead to a gigantic conflict, unless the German central authority and the German National Assembly see it as their task to enter the arena in order to be hissed off the boards by European public. For all their pious resignation the struggle in Austria will assume gigantic dimensions such as world history has never yet witnessed.

The second act of the drama has just been performed in Vienna, its first act having been staged in Paris under the title of The June Days. In Paris the Garde mobile, in Vienna "Croats" -- in both cases lazzaroni, lumpenproletariat hired and armed -- were used against the working and thinking proletarians. We shall soon see the third act performed in Berlin.

Assuming that arms will enable the counter-revolution to establish itself in the whole of Europe, money would then kill it in the whole of Europe. European bankruptcy, national bankruptcy would be the fate nullifying the victory. Bayonets crumble like tinder when they come into contact with the salient "economic" facts.

But developments will not wait for the bills of exchange drawn by the European states on European society to expire. The crushing counter-blow of the June revolution will be struck in Paris. With the victory of the "red republic" in Paris, armies will be rushed from the

interior of their countries to the frontiers and across them, and the real strength of the fighting parties will become evident. We shall then remember this June and this October and we too shall exclaim:

Vae victis!

The purposeless massacres perpetrated since the June and October events, the tedious offering of sacrifices since February and March, the very cannibalism of the counterrevolution will convince the nations that there is only one way in which the murderous death agonies of the old society and the bloody birth throes of the new society can be shortened, simplified and concentrated, and that way is revolutionary terror.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Berlin, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

THE CRISIS IN BERLIN

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 138

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, November 8. The situation looks very complicated, but it is very simple. [87]

The King, as the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* [88] correctly notes, stands "on the broad foundation" of his "hereditary divine" rights.

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

Two sovereign powers.

The connecting link between the two is Camphausen, and the theory of agreement.

When these two sovereign powers are no longer able to agree or do not want to agree, they become two inimical 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. Power 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 a constitutional but a-constituent assembly. 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.

The King's demand that a Brandenburg cabinet be appointed at his pleasure in defiance of the majority of the Chamber, is the demand of an absolute monarch.

The Chamber's presumption to send a deputation straight to the King forbidding the formation of a Brandenburg cabinet, is the presumption of an absolute Chamber.

The King and the Assembly have sinned against constitutional convention.

The King and the Chamber 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 cabinet would be the cipher in which plus and minus neutralize each other.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Berlin, Donnerstag, 1. Dez.

1848.

COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN BERLIN

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 141

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

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

Brandenburg in the Assembly and the Assembly in Brandenburg.
[95]

Thus runs the epitaph of the House of Brandenburg. [96] The Emperor Charles V was admired because he had had himself buried while still alive. [97] To have a bad joke engraved on one's tombstone is to go one better than Charles V and his criminal code. [98]

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. [99]

Brandenburg in the Assembly and the Assembly in Brandenburg is an ambiguous expression, which is equivocal and portentous.

As we know, it is much easier for nations to get the better of kings than of 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 of Cromwell dissolved the Long Parliament, and the French people in the person of Bonaparte dissolved the legislative body. But the Long Parliament had long ago become a Rump, and the legislative body a corpse.

Have the kings been more fortunate in their revolts against legislative assemblies than the people?

Charles I, James II, Louis XVI, and Charles X are hardly promising progenitors.

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, apart from the Poles, went over to the imperial camp with flying colors. [100]

The struggle of the camarilla in Vienna against the 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 slaves, and slaves do not constitute a party; at best they are camp-followers of a party. The members of the Right [101] who left the Berlin Assembly have not strengthened the enemy camp, they have infected it with a fatal malady called treason.

The Slav party carried the day in Austria together with the camarilla. It will now fight the camarilla over the spoils. If the Berlin camarilla wins 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 right when it confronts the Assembly as an absolute Crown. But the Assembly is wrong because it does not confront the Crown as an absolute assembly. To begin with it should have arrested the ministers 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 characterizing the actions of the National Assembly in Berlin may become a source of civic strength in the provinces.

The bourgeoisie would have liked to transform the feudal monarchy into a bourgeois monarchy by peaceful means. 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 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 had 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 alien artificial soil which bears it only under the condition that it withers away.

The bourgeoisie turns the intoxicating "divine right" into a sober legal title, the rule of blood into the rule of paper, the royal sun into a plebeian gas 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. Its cry: Brandenburg in the Assembly and the Assembly in Brandenburg drove the bourgeoisie once more into the arms of the revolution, into the arms of the people.

While admitting that we do not expect the bourgeoisie to answer in a manner befitting the occasion, we must say, 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 give him the order for his coup d'etat. 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 the Frankfurt (Assembly) to give him this order. It denies its sovereignty at the very moment when it wants to establish it. Herr Bassermann of course jumped at the opportunity to play the servant as master. But he has the satisfaction of seeing the master in his turn play the servant.

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

We may have to go through a hard school, but it is a preparatory school for a full-fledged revolution.

<u>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</u>	
	
<u>Marx / Engels</u>	<u>Marxist writers'</u>
<u>Archive</u>	<u>Archives</u>

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Berlin, Donnerstag, 1. Dez.

1848.

COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN BERLIN

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 141 (second edition)

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, November 11. European revolution is taking a circular course. It started in Italy and assumed a European character in Paris; the first repercussion of the February revolution followed in Vienna; the repercussion of the Viennese revolution took place in Berlin. European counterrevolution struck its first blow in Italy, at 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.

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

In Naples the lazzaroni 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 flock 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; discord within the Civil Guard itself; finally, attacks by the people supplying a pretext for the attacks 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 moustaches [The term "Schnurrbart" (moustache) in 18 c. student slang stood also for policeman. -- Ed.] -- such is the antithesis of the querulous, self-opinionated, irresolute National Assembly.

Will-power -- be it even that of an ass, an ox, a policeman -- 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-power as the National Assembly, seeks out the two most stupid men in the monarchy and tells these lions: represent will-power. 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," [102]

exclaims the perplexed National Assembly.

These Wrangels and Brandenburgs, these blockheads who can want because they have no will of their own, because they only 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, have discredited themselves because they did not get down to skull-breaking, the only job these battering-rams are good for.

Wrangel does not go beyond confessing that he recognizes only a National Assembly that obeys orders. Brandenburg is given a lesson in parliamentary behavior, and after having shocked the Chamber with his crude, repulsive jargon appropriate to a drill-sergeant, he allows the National Assembly "to tyrannize the tyrant" and carries out its orders by humbly begging for permission to speak, though he had just attempted to usurp this right.

I had rather be a tick in a sheep
Than such a valiant ignorance. [103]

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 use its power to proscribe? 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 turn over the leaves of the Moniteur, [104] 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 [105] -- 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 for securing the defeat of the monarchy, and that is to do it before the advent of the anti-June revolution, which will take place in Paris in December. [106]

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

Defeat it therefore in a bourgeois manner.

How can one defeat the monarchy in a bourgeois manner?

By starving it into surrender.

And how can one starve it into surrender?

By refusing to pay taxes.

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

Neue Rheinische Zeitung	
	
Marx / Engels	Marxist writers'
Archive	Archives

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Berlin, Donnerstag, 1. Dez.

1848.

NEW INSTITUTIONS -- PROGRESS IN SWITZERLAND

by
FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 143

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Berne, November 9. The new legislative Federal Assembly, consisting of the Swiss National Council and the Council of States, has been meeting here since the day before yesterday. The city of Berne has gone out of its way to give them brilliant and fascinating reception. 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), the great 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 demicanton, on the whole resembles the last Diet as regards composition and character. The old cantons have once again returned several true separatists, [89] 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 [90] and invalidating half votes, the Council of States has been turned into a rejuvenated version of the Diet and has been pushed into the background by the creation of the National Council. It plays the thankless role of a senate or a chamber of peers, the role of heir to the mature wisdom and sober judgment of the forefathers, acting as a drag on the National Council which is assumed to be excessively fond of innovation. 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 did make itself talked about it would be still worse for it.

Although the National Council is supposed to represent the entire Swiss "nation", it has already at its first session given proof of typically Swiss discord and hair-splitting, even 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 all three of them from Berne. The three gentlemen in question were Ochsenbein, Funk and Neuhaus; the first two represent the moderate radical party of Berne, the third the moderate liberal, semi-conservative party. In the end Ochsenbein was elected by 50 votes out of 93, that is, with a very narrow majority. One can understand the Zurich and other Moderados [91] preferring the wise and very experienced Herr Neuhaus to Herr Ochsenbein, but the fact that Herr Funk, who represents exactly the same political coloring as Herr Ochsenbein, should have been put forward as a competing candidate and received support in two votings, shows how unorganized 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 obtains in the two Chambers and that they will soon move in different directions 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 many of them are involved, and interesting for people abroad because this debate will reveal most clearly to what extent the old parochial patriotism, the petty cantonal narrow-mindedness has been finished with. 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 rising 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, the sedate Council of States for the 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 [local] authorities 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, groups 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; 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 got 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 return 46 councilors, elected almost exclusively reactionaries. The *Revue de Geneve* [92] is still arguing with the bourgeois papers as to whether all 46

are reactionary or half a dozen of them will vote for the Radical government. We shall soon know. Still greater confusion may reign in Geneva; for if the government, which is here elected directly by the people, is forced to resign, then a situation similar to that obtaining during the second elections to the National Council might easily result, and a Radical government would be confronted by a reactionary majority in the Great Council. It is moreover certain that the workers of Geneva are only waiting for an opportunity to secure the threatened gains of 1847/93 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 this 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 democratized, 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-ever since then the Swiss workers have been drawn more and more into the political and socialist movements, have fraternized with foreign workers, especially German workers, and have abandoned their "free Swiss attitude". In the French part of Switzerland and in many of her 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 Organization of German Democratic Associations which has partially been set up. Whereas the extreme Radicals of official Switzerland dream at best of the one and indivisible Helvetian republic, Swiss workers often express the view that the whole of little Switzerland's independence will go to the dogs 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 Fribourg, [94] -- but Vienna is 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 Wilhelm Tell, that Switzerland belonged again to Austria. Hundreds of rumors were bruited about, dilated upon, 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 Windischgratz's superior strength and barbarity was definitely confirmed, the effect on these Swiss workers was as great 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 great advance.

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)
[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)
[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

№ 1.

Berlin, Donnerstag, 1. Dez.

1848.

THE MINISTRY UNDER INDICTMENT

by
KARL MARX

Special edition -- *Neue Rheinische Zeitung No.*

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

THE CITY OF BRANDENBURG [Berlin] WANTS TO HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH THE MINISTRY OF BRANDENBURG AND IS SENDING AN ADDRESS OF THANKS TO THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY.

THE WHOLE COUNTRY, IN ITS ADDRESSES, RECOGNIZES ONLY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY.

THE MINISTRY COMMITS HIGH TREASON ANEW WHEN, IN OPPOSITION TO THE HABEAS CORPUS ACT AND WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY, IT DECLARES A STATE OF SIEGE AND DRIVES THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ITSELF FROM THE SCHUTZENHAUS WITH BAYONETS.

THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY HAS ITS SEAT AMONG THE PEOPLE, AND NOT IN THIS OR THAT PILE OF STONES. DRIVEN FROM BERLIN, IT CAN SIT IN ANY OTHER PLACE, IN BRESLAU, COLOGNE, OR WHEREVER IT PLEASURES. THIS IS THE DECISION IT MADE ON THE THIRTEENTH.

THE BERLINERS MOCK THE STATE OF SIEGE AND IN NO WAY LET THEMSELVES BE CURBED BY IT.

FROM MANY PARTS OF THE COUNTRY, ARMED MEN ARE RUSHING TO DEFEND THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY.

THE GUARDS ARE REFUSING OBEDIENCE. THE SOLDIERS ARE FRATERNIZING WITH THE PEOPLE.

SILESIA AND THURINGIA ARE IN FULL REVOLT.

But, citizens, we appeal to you: Send money to the Democratic Central Committee in Berlin. And in return pay no taxes to the counterrevolutionary government. The National Assembly has stated that the refusal to pay taxes is legally sound. It has not yet decreed it out of consideration for officialdom. A hunger cure would teach these officials the power of the citizens and make them good citizens themselves.

Starve the enemy and refuse to pay taxes! Nothing is more foolish than to provide a high-treason government with the means for a fight against the nation, and the means of all means is -- money.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Rhein, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

APPEAL OF THE DEMOCRATIC DISTRICT COMMITTEE OF THE RHINE PROVINCE [110]

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 143

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

PROCLAMATION

Cologne, November 14. The Rhenish District Committee of Democrats calls upon all democratic associations in the Rhine Province immediately to convene their associations and organize everywhere popular meetings in order to encourage the entire population of the Rhine Province to refuse to pay taxes, since this is the most effective measure of protest against the arbitrary acts committed by the government against the assembly of Prussian elected 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 Eiser's Hall, Komodienstrasse, Cologne).

For the District Committee

Karl Marx
Schneider II

<u>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</u>	
	
<u>Marx / Engels</u>	<u>Marxist writers'</u>
<u>Archive</u>	<u>Archives</u>

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No 1.

Berlin, Donnerstag, 1. Dez.

1848.

IMPEACHMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 143 (special edition)

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

The town of Brandenburg refuses to have anything to do with the Brandenburg cabinet and has sent a letter of thanks to the National Assembly.

Statements issued throughout the country recognize only the government of the National Assembly.

The cabinet has again committed high treason by defying the Habeas Corpus Act [111] and proclaiming a state of siege without the assent of the National Assembly and by expelling the National Assembly from the shooting-gallery at the point of the bayonet.

The seat of the National Assembly is the people and not 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 resolution it passed on the 13th.

The Berliners scoff at the state of siege and are in no way intimidated 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 Guard regiments have refused to obey orders. More and more soldiers are fraternizing with the people.

Silesia and Thuringia are in 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 declared that refusal to pay taxes is justified in law. It has not yet passed a resolution on this out of consideration for the civil servants. A starvation diet will make these officials realize the power of the citizenry and will make good citizens of them.

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.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Berlin, Donnerstag, 1. Dez.

1848.

NO TAX PAYMENTS!

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 145 (special supplement)

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, November 16. All the Berlin newspapers, with the exception of the Preussische Staats-Anzeiger, [112] Vossische Zeitung, [113] and Neue Preussische Zeitung, [114] have failed to arrive.

The Civil Guard in the wealthy south-western district of Berlin has been disarmed, but only there. It is the same battalion that dastardly murdered the engineering workers on October 31. [115] The disarming of this battalion strengthens the popular cause.

The National Assembly was again driven out of the Kolnische Rathaus [116] by force of arms. It assembled then in the Mielenz Hotel, where finally it unanimously (by 226 votes) passed the following resolution on the non-payment of taxes:

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

"This decree 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!

<u>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</u>	
	
<u>Marx / Engels</u>	<u>Marxist writers'</u>
<u>Archive</u>	<u>Archives</u>

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Rhein, Donnerstag, 1. Dez.

1848.

APPEAL

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 147 (second edition)

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

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 through:

1. Since the Prussian National Assembly itself has ruled that taxes are not to be paid, their forcible collection must be resisted everywhere and in every way.
2. In order to repulse the enemy the local militia must be organized 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 recognize 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 re-elected by a universal vote.

For the Rhenish District Committee of Democrats

Karl Marx
Karl Schapper
Schneider II

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)

[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)

[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Berlin, Donnerstag, 1. Dez.

1848.

THE ASSEMBLY AT FRANKFURT

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 150

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, November 22. The resolution of the Berlin Assembly regarding the refusal to pay taxes has been declared unlawful and void by the Frankfurt Parliament. It has thus 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 Brandenburg's Prussian Parliament. Prussia was to have 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. Who cared a hang about a Schmerling after the setting up of the Brandenburg -- Manteuffel ministry! 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 Windischgratz! The gentlemen who were so greatly concerned about the cultural history of Germany left the practical application 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 resolution passed the day before yesterday has destroyed the Frankfurt Parliament. The resolution has driven it into the arms of the traitor Brandenburg. The Parliament at Frankfurt is guilty of high treason, it must be brought to trial. If a whole people rises to protest against an arbitrary act of a king, 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 unlawful, 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 resolution to resign from this "deceased Federal Diet". It is the duty of all democrats to elect these resigned "Prussians" to the German National Assembly at 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 constitutes a quorum. But the Brandenburg Assembly at Frankfurt will become a "fragment", for the inevitable resignation of the 150 deputies will surely be followed by 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 honor; 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.

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)

[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)

[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr 1.

Acht, Donnerstag, 1. Dez.

1848.

THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT IN ITALY

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 156

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, November 29. After six months of democracy's almost uninterrupted defeats, 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 [118] -- these are the four important dates of the European counter-revolution, the four milestones marking the stages of its latest triumphal march.

Not only was the revolutionary power of the Chartists broken in London on April 10, but the revolutionary Propaganda impact of the February victory was for the first time broken. Those who correctly assess the position of 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 those

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 are most acute, England more than any other country follows 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 the revolution of the Continent; when the time comes England will prescribe the revolution to the Continent. That is 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 that 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 known as conservatives. Who does not remember that everywhere throughout Germany the action of London's special constables was immediately accepted as a model by the entire Civil Guard. 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 party that wants to maintain the status quo. 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 in Prussia and the smaller German states. But the revolutionary current was still strong enough to secure 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. 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 its invincibility in Paris itself; only then could the counterrevolution 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, when 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-organized 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 most brutal 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 it was regarded with amazement as if it were a wonder, 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 realizing it, defeated the European revolution. We all know that from that day an impetuous storm of reaction set in. 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 honorable a retreat as possible and defend its positions foot by foot in the press, at public meetings and in parliaments -- positions which could no longer be held.

The next great blow was the fall of Milan. 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 also signified 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 a slackening of revolutionary energy in Italy for a time, 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 counterrevolution gained local victories and conquered separate provinces, of the setback in Frankfurt, and so on. They are of local, perhaps national, but not European significance.

Finally, the work that was begun on the day of Custoza [119] was completed on November 1 -- just as Radetzky had marched into Milan

so did Windischgratz and Jellachich march into Vienna. Cavaignac's method was employed, and employed successfully, 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 I also marks the moment when the retrogressive movement reaches the turning point and a crisis occurs. The attempt step by step to repeat the bold exploit of Vienna 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 mitigated by the crude attempt to copy it in every detail.

While Northern Europe has either been forced back again into the servitude of 1847 or is struggling to make safe 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 elan to the whole of Tuscany and has succeeded in setting up a radically democratic cabinet, more radical than any that ever existed under a monarchy, and more radical even than many a government 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 to a man, have overthrown the evasive, counter-revolutionary cabinet and secured a democratic cabinet, and first among the demands they succeeded in putting through is a government based on the principle of Italian nationality, namely, the sending of delegates to the Italian Constituent Assembly as proposed by Guerazzi.

Piedmont and Sicily will undoubtedly follow suit. 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. For the time of counter-revolution has expired. France is about to throw herself into the arms of an adventurer 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 beneath the swift tread of history. Indeed, the people have nothing more to learn from any further victories of the counterrevolution!

It is up to the people, when the occasion arises, to apply the lessons of the past six months at the right moment and fearlessly.

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)

[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)

[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Cologne, December 8, 1848.

1848.

THE COUP D'ETAT OF THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 163

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

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'etat carried through with such insolence.
[120]

The National Assembly now reaps the fruits of its perennial weakness and cowardice. For months it allowed the conspiracy against the people to do its work unmolested, to grow strong and powerful, and hence it 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 even in April and May, and finally for its so-called "passive resistance". It is now to be hoped that it has learned its lesson. Its next victory will put an end to the policy of "agreement" and to all other phrases and hypocrisies.

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)

[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)

[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Köln, Donnerstag, 1. Dez.

1848.

THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 165

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, December 9. We have never concealed the fact that we do not proceed from a legal basis, but from a revolutionary basis. Now the government has for its part abandoned the false pretense of a legal basis. It has taken its stand on a revolutionary basis, for the counter-revolutionary basis, too, is revolutionary.

S 6 of the law of April 6, 1848, ordains:

"The right to approve all laws as well as to determine the national budget and to pass taxes must in any case belong to the future representatives of the people."

S 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 its lifetime to exercise the prerogatives of the

former Imperial Diet, in particular regarding the passing of taxes."

The government sends this Assembly of conciliators to the devil, imposes a so-called constitution [121] upon the country and levies taxes which the representatives of the people had refused to grant it.

The Camphausen epic, a sort of pompous legal Jobsiad, [122] was 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 that 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 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 provided for indirect elections, which produced an assembly to which, at a moment of sudden revolt, the government could shout: Trop tard! He recalled the Prince of Prussia, the head of the counter-revolution, and even resorted to an official lie to transform Prince's flight into an educational journey. [123] He abolished neither the old Prussian laws dealing with political crimes nor the old courts. Under his government the old bureaucracy and the old army gained time to recover from their fright and to reorganize their whole structure. All the leading personalities of the old regime were left untouched in their positions. Under Camphausen the camarilla carried on a war in Poznan, while he himself carried on a war in Denmark. The Danish war was intended as a channel to draw off the superabundant patriotism [124] of the German youth, on whom after their return the police inflicted fitting disciplinary punishment. This war was to give some popularity to General Wrangle and his infamous regiments of the Guards and in general to rehabilitate the Prussian army. This purpose achieved, the sham war had to be ended at any price by a disgraceful armistice, which was once again negotiated at Frankfurt between the same Camphausen and the German National Assembly. The outcome of the Danish war was the appointment of the "Commander-in-Chief of the two Brandenburgs" [125] and the return to Berlin of the regiments of the Guards which had been driven out in March.

And the war which the Potsdam camarilla waged in Poznan under the auspices of Camphausen!

The war in Poznan 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, [126] the knight of the great debate, the champion of negotiation.

Under Camphausen and with his help the counter-revolution seized all important positions; it prepared an army ready for action while the Assembly of conciliators debated.

Under Hansemann-Pinto, [127] 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 drawn under Brandenburg's rule. The only things needed for this were a moustache and 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.

We have no doubt that His Excellency, the Prussian envoy Camphausen, at this moment regards himself a feudal lord and has come to a peaceable agreement with his "misunderstanding".

One should not, however, commit the error of ascribing initiatives of world historical significance to such mediocrities as a Camphausen and a Hansemann. They were nothing but the instruments 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 members of this class formed the liberal opposition in the late United Provincial Diet of blessed memory, which Camphausen resurrected for a moment.

The gentlemen of this liberal opposition have been reproached with having deserted their principles after the March revolution. This is a fallacy.

The big landowners and capitalists -- and they were the only ones to be represented in the United Provincial 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 class 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 on the wool market. On the other hand, the absolutist state, which in the course of development 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 legally assert 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, whose creator it considered itself. Having deprived the bureaucracy of the monopoly of so-called education and conscious of the fact that it possesses 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 the "right of free association". As the necessary consequence of free competition, it had likewise to demand religious liberty and so on. Before March 1848 the Prussian bourgeoisie was rapidly moving towards the realization of all its aims.

The Prussian state was in financial difficulties. Its borrowing power was exhausted. This was the secret reason for the convocation of the United Provincial Diet. Although the government struggled against its fate and ungraciously dissolved the United Provincial 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 historic deal in all Christian Germanic states was the emancipation of the serfs; the second act was the constitutional monarchy. "L'argent n'a pas de maitre", but the maitres cease to be maitres as soon as they are demonetized.

And so the liberal opposition in the United Provincial Diet was simply the bourgeoisie in opposition to a political form that was no longer appropriate 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 rapidly moving towards its goal when the February storm broke.

<u>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</u>	
	
<u>Marx / Engels</u>	<u>Marxist writers'</u>
<u>Archive</u>	<u>Archives</u>

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Rhein, Donnerstag, 1. Dez.

1848.

THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 169

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, December 11. When the March flood -- a flood 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 Provincial Diet, the representatives of the conscious Prussian bourgeoisie. The main contingents for the new ministries were supplied by the Rhineland and Silesia, the provinces with the most advanced bourgeoisie. They were followed by a whole train of Rhenish lawyers. As the bourgeoisie was pushed into the background by the feudal aristocracy, the Rhineland and Silesia were replaced in the cabinets by the old Prussian provinces. The only link of the Brandenburg cabinet with the Rhineland is through a single Elberfeld Tory. Hansemann and von der Heydt! These two names exemplify the whole difference between March and December 1848 for the Prussian bourgeoisie.

The Prussian bourgeoisie reached the political summit, not by means of a peaceful deal with the Crown, as it had desired, but as the result of a revolution. It was 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 appropriate to these interests, expressed in constitutional language, is inviolability of the Crown. Hence the enthusiasm of the German bourgeoisie and in particular of the Prussian bourgeoisie for the constitutional monarchy. Although the February revolution together with its repercussions in Germany was welcomed by the Prussian bourgeoisie, because the revolution had placed the helm of state into its hands, it also upset the plans of the bourgeoisie, because its rule was thus bound by conditions which it neither wanted nor was able to fulfill.

The bourgeoisie did not raise a finger; it simply allowed the people to fight for it. Hence the rule it was called upon to exercise was not the rule of a commander who has defeated his adversary, but the rule of a committee of public safety which has been entrusted by the victorious people with the protection of its interests.

Camphausen was still clearly aware of this embarrassing position, and the weakness of his cabinet was entirely due to this feeling and the circumstances that gave rise to it. Even the most shameless actions of his government are therefore tinged by a sort of shamefaced blush. Open shamelessness and insolence were Hansemann's privileges. The red complexion is all that distinguishes these two artists from one another.

The March revolution in Prussia should not be confused either with the English revolution of 1648 or with the French one of 1789.

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 model for the revolution of 1789 (at least in Europe) was only the revolution of 1648; that for the revolution of 1648 only the revolt of the Netherlands against Spain. [128] Both revolutions were a century ahead of their model not only in time but also in substance.

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 evolved interests which were different from those of the bourgeoisie or they did not yet constitute independent classes or class 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, albeit in a non-bourgeois manner. The entire French terrorism was just 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 in the European fashion. They did not represent the victory of a particular social class over the old political system; they proclaimed the political system 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 partitioning (of the 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 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 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 ought to have nominally established a constitutional -monarchy and actually established the rule of the bourgeoisie. Far from being a European revolution it was merely a weak repercussion 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 are liable to 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 very start it was a Provincial Prussian revolution. In Vienna, Cassel, Munich and various other towns provincial uprisings took place alongside it and competed with it.

Whereas 1648 and 1789 gained boundless self-confidence from the knowledge that they were leading the universe, it was the ambition of the Berlin (revolution) of 1848 to constitute an anachronism. Its light is like that of the stars which reaches us, the inhabitants of the Earth,

only after the bodies from which it had emanated have been extinct for a hundred thousand years. The March revolution in Prussia was, on a small scale -- just as it did everything on a small scale -- such a star for Europe. Its light was that of a social body which had long since disintegrated.

The German bourgeoisie developed so sluggishly, timidly and slowly that at the moment when it menacingly confronted feudalism and absolutism, it saw menacingly pitted against itself 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 monarchy and aristocracy, the representatives of the old society, was not a class speaking for the whole of modern society. It had been reduced to a kind of estate as clearly distinct from the Crown as it was from the people, with a strong bend 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 representatives of the old society, for it already belonged itself to the old society; it did not advance the interests of a new society against an old one, but represented refurbished 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 forward; it stood at the head because it merely represented the spleen of an old social era and not the initiatives of a new 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, frightened of those below, egoistical towards both and aware of its egoism; revolutionary with regard to the conservatives and conservative with regard 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 anywhere, but resorted to plagiarism everywhere, it was vulgar because unoriginal, and original in its vulgarity; haggling over its own demands, without initiative, without faith in itself, without faith in the people, without a 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 -- this was the Prussian bourgeoisie which found itself at the helm of the Prussian state after the March revolution.

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)

[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)

[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Cologne, December 16, 1848.

1848.

THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 170

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, December 15. The theory of agreement, which the bourgeoisie, on attaining power in the person of the Camphausen cabinet, immediately publicized as the "broadest" basis of the Prussian contract 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 vanquished by the sovereignty of the people as a result of the March revolution. The Crown, the absolute state, was merely compelled to come to an agreement with the bourgeoisie, its old rival.

The Crown offers the aristocracy as a sacrifice to the bourgeoisie, the bourgeoisie offers the people as a sacrifice to the Crown. Under these circumstances the monarchy becomes bourgeois and the bourgeoisie monarchical.

Only these two powers 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".

Herein lay the secret of the theory of agreement.

The oil and wool merchants [129] who formed the first cabinet after the March revolution took pleasure in protecting the 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 Provincial Diet, to use the corpse of their former popularity to fill the chasm that threatened to engulf the throne. Camphausen plumed himself on being the midwife of the constitutional throne. The worthy man was evidently deeply moved by his own action, his own magnanimity. The Crown and its followers reluctantly suffered this humiliating protection and made *bonne mine d mauvais jeu*, hoping for better days to come.

The bourgeois gentilhomme 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 was engaged in a constitutional educational journey.

The Prussian bourgeoisie was nominally in control and did not for a moment doubt that the powers of the old state had placed themselves unreservedly at its disposal and had become offshoots of its own omnipotence.

Not only in the cabinet 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 Civil Guard against the unarmed proletariat? Did not the subdued district governors and penitent major-generals listen with admiration to the stern patriarchal admonitions which the local councilors addressed to the people—the only efforts, the only heroic deeds of which these local councilors, the local representatives of the bourgeoisie (whose obtrusive servile vulgarity the Windischgratzes, 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?

Clearly the Prussian bourgeoisie now had only one duty -- to settle itself comfortably in power, get rid of the troublesome anarchists, restore "law and order" and retrieve the profit lost during the storms of March. 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*, [130] 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 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 in the mouth of the people meant: you, the bourgeois, are the *Comite du salut public*, the Committee of Public Safety, to whom we have entrusted the government in order that you should defend our interests, the interests of the people, in face of the Crown, but not in order that you should come to an agreement with the Crown regarding your own interests.

Revolution was the people's protest against an arrangement between the bourgeoisie and the Crown. The bourgeoisie that was making arrangements with the Crown had therefore to protest against the revolution.

And that was done under the great Camphausen. The March revolution was not recognized. The National Representatives at Berlin set themselves up as representatives of the Prussian bourgeoisie, as the Assembly of conciliators, by rejecting the motion recognizing the March revolution.

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 the Crown, but that the purpose of the revolution was to achieve an agreement between the Crown and the bourgeoisie against the people! Thus was the legal title of the revolutionary people annulled and a legal basis secured for the conservative bourgeoisie.

The legal basis!

Bruggemann, and through him the *Kolnische 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 the principal device of performing conjurers), and the false bottom into a bottomless trapdoor, so that in the end the legal basis has turned for our readers into the basis of the *Kolnische Zeitung*; thus, they could confuse the shibboleth of the Prussian bourgeoisie with the private shibboleth of Herr Joseph Dumont, a necessary invention of the Prussian world history with the arbitrary hobby-horse of the *Kolnische Zeitung*, and regard the legal basis simply as the basis on which the *Kolnische Zeitung* arises.

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 Provincial Diet and the Assembly of conciliators, moved after the March revolution -- is it the constitutional law of 1815 [131] or the law of 1820 regarding the Provincial Diet, [132] or the edict of 1847, [133] or the electoral and agreement law of April 8, 1848. [134]

It is none of these.

"Legal basis" simply meant that the revolution failed to gain firm ground and the old society did not lose its ground; that the March revolution was an "occurrence" that acted merely as a "stimulus" towards 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 expressed in its 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 Provincial Diet had achieved its goal without a revolution. The "legal basis" meant that the revolution, the legal title of the people, was to be ignored 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 such like, had to pass off this palliative 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 Bruggemann.

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 emerging from the revolution and the bourgeoisie which had emerged as the core of the revolution.

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 encroachments 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 open attack. The Camphausen cabinet resigned not because it had committed some blunder or other, but simply because it was the first cabinet following the March revolution, because it was the cabinet 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 beginnings 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 cabinet originating directly from the Assembly of conciliators would no longer have to reckon with.

Its resignation therefore puzzled the arm-chair 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 in agreement with the Crown. The government of action was the second government after the March revolution; that was its whole secret.

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)
[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)
[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Köln, Donnerstag, 1. Dez.

1848.

THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 183

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, December 29.

"Gentlemen, business is business!" [135]

In these few words Hansemann epitomized the whole liberalism of the United Provincial Diet. This man was bound to become the head of a government based on the Assembly of conciliators, a government which was to turn passive resistance to the people into an active attack on the people, the government of action.

No Prussian government contained so many middle-class names. Hansemann, Milde, Murker, Kuhlwetter, Gierke! Even von Auerswald, the label presentable 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. [136] But Roth von

Schreckenstein was merely the feudal setting for the bourgeois jewel. Roth von Schreckenstein in a middle-class government meant this, spelled out in capital letters: the Prussian feudalists, the army and bureaucracy are guided by the newly arisen star, the Prussian middle class. These powerful figures have placed themselves at its disposal, and the middle class 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 middle-class government.

On June 26 the Hansemann government presented itself to the National Assembly. Its actual existence began 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 used against the people by the Prussian bourgeoisie, just as the bloody victory of the Croats at Vienna was used 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 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 the June events, as after those of 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 labor. They had no inkling of the fact 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 because these two groups have no hostile and contradictory interests, but because they are still welded together by the same interests in face of a third power which oppresses them both equally.

The Hansemann 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 the "reds" wore white-and-black cockades. [137]

In his speech from the throne on June 26, Hansemann 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 conditions that are incompatible with the new constitution, liberation of property from the fetters that hamper its most advantageous utilization in a large part of the monarchy, reorganization of the administration of justice, reform of fiscal legislation and particularly annulment of tax exemptions, etc." and above all "strengthening 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 Hansemann.

In the United Provincial Diet Hansemann was the most bitter and the most cynical adversary of trust, for-"gentlemen, business is business!" Hansemann in office proclaimed the "restoration of the shaken trust" a 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 it was of the trust that makes money; then it was a matter of feudal trust, the sincere trust in God, King and Country, 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, love 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 labor 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 move of the proletariat, whatever its nature, unless 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 move of the proletariat and of 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 state" side by side with the "restoration of the shaken trust". But he mistook the character of this "state". He sought to strengthen the state which served credit and bourgeois trust, but he strengthened the state which demands trust and if necessary extorts this trust with the help of grape-shot, because it has no credit. He wanted to economize on the costs of bourgeois rule but has instead burdened the bourgeoisie with the exorbitant millions which the restoration of Prussian feudal rule costs.

He told the workers quite laconically 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 the business 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 upset of bourgeois law and order-would have been eliminated. And what need is there of a medicine when there is no malady? But if the people obstinately stuck to their purpose, very well, then he would "strengthen the state", the police, the army, the courts, the bureaucracy, and would set his bears on them, for "trust" had become a "business question", and:

"Gentlemen, business is business!"

Hansemann's programme, even though he may smile about it, 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 in case they attempted to assert themselves against the bourgeoisie's purse and their "most essential", that is, their most modest, political claims.

The very composition of the government of action expressed a protest

against this "reaction".

It differed from all previous Prussian cabinets 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 educational matters and even the treasury of the royal household as well as faith, hope and charity 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 may be summarized in the words:

"Gentlemen, business is business!"

The monarchy in Prussia became a "money affair".

Now let us pass on from the programme of the government of action to its actions.

It really carried out its threat of "strengthening 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 penal, [138] numerous arrests on the same "sufficient grounds" (Auerswald's formula), introduction of a system of constables in Berlin [139] 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 Civil Guard against unruly workers, and the introduction, by way of deterrent, of martial law -- all these events of Hansemann's Olympiad are still vividly remembered. No details need be mentioned.

This aspect of the efforts of the government of action was summarized by Kuhlwetter 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 muttered one of his usual remarks:

"This would also greatly help to restore trust and revive the rather slack commercial activity."

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 temper of the proletariat and bourgeois democrats is expressed by one event. Because a few reactionaries maltreated a few democrats in Charlottenburg, the people stormed the residence of the Prime Minister in Berlin. So popular had the government of action 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 purely policemantic in character. In the eyes of the proletariat and the urban democrats this cabinet and the Assembly of conciliators, whose majority was represented in the cabinet, and the Prussian bourgeoisie, the majority of whom constituted the majority in the Assembly of conciliation, represented the old, refurbished police and bureaucratic state. To this was added resentment against the bourgeoisie, because it governed and had set up the Civil Guard as 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 twin 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, jury, and Civil Guard, introduced by the Hansemann cabinet, property in one form or another always forms the demarcation line between lawful and unlawful territory. All these bills contain the most servile concessions to royal power, for the bourgeois cabinet believed that the wings of royalty had been clipped and that it had become its ally; but as a consolation the ascendancy of capital over labor is all the more ruthlessly emphasized.

The Civil Guard Law approved by the Assembly of conciliation was turned against the bourgeoisie and had to provide a legal pretext for disarming it. According to the fancy of its authors, however, it was to become valid only after the promulgation of the Law on Local Government and of the constitution, that is, after the consolidation of the rule of the bourgeoisie. The experience which the Prussian bourgeoisie gained in connection with the Civil Guard 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 epitomized by the old Prussian policeman, and in theory by the offensive Belgian differentiation [140] between bourgeois and non-bourgeois.

Now let us pass on to another section of the ministerial programme, to anarchy against reaction.

In this respect the ministry can boast more pious wishes than real deeds.

Among the pious bourgeois wishes are the partition and sale of demesnes to private owners, the abandonment of banking to free competition, the conversion of the Seehandlung [141] 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 forced 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 "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 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 positive middle-class 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 Country in Silesia, Brandenburg, 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 middle-class distillers in the Rhine Province, who perceived that their conditions of competition compared with those of the old Prussian provinces had become even more unfavorable. And to crown all, it angered the workers in the old provinces, for whom it simply 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 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, [142] and his projected income-tax caused the landowning votaries of "God, King and Country" to rave as if stung by the tarantula. They denounced him as a communist and even today the Prussian Knight of the Cross [An allusion to the Kreuz-Zeitung. -- Ed.] crosses itself three times at the mention of Hansemann's name. That name sounds like Fra Diavolo [143] to it. 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 Assembly of conciliators, failed because of the principled narrow-mindedness of the Left. Hansemann himself had justified this narrow-mindedness. Was the Left to provide new financial resources for the cabinet of the "strengthened state" before the completion and promulgation of the constitution?

The bourgeois cabinet par excellence was so unlucky that its most radical measure had to be frustrated by the radical members of the Assembly of conciliators. It was so barren that its whole crusade against feudalism merely resulted in a tax increase, which was equally odious to all classes, and its entire financial acumen brought forth a forced loan: two measures, which ultimately only provided subsidies for the campaign of the counter-revolution against the bourgeoisie. But the feudal aristocrats were convinced of the "nefarious" intentions of the bourgeois cabinet. Thus even the financial struggle of the Prussian bourgeoisie against feudalism merely proved that owing to its unpopularity and impotence it was softly able to collect money against itself and-gentlemen, business is business!

Just as the bourgeois cabinet succeeded in equally offending the urban proletariat, the middle-class democrats and the feudal nobility, so did it manage to alienate and antagonize even the peasants oppressed by feudalism, and in this it was eagerly supported by the Assembly of conciliators. It has to be remembered after all that during

half of its existence the Assembly was appropriately represented by the Hansemann cabinet and that the bourgeois martyrs of today were yesterday the train-bearers of Hansemann.

During Hansemann's rule Patio introduced a bill abolishing feudal obligations (see the criticism of it we published earlier). It was a most wretched concoction of the helpless bourgeois desire to abolish feudal privileges, those "conditions that are incompatible with the new constitution", and of bourgeois fear of revolutionarily infringing on 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 most needed ally.

On June 3 deputy Hanow moved

"that all pending proceedings which concern 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 Pfuel cabinet, did the Assembly of conciliation 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 dues and arrears in dispute".

In August, if we are not mistaken, the Assembly of conciliators declared that Nenstiel's motion that "labor services be abolished immediately" was not urgent. Could the peasants be expected to consider it an urgent matter for them to take up the cudgels for this Assembly of conciliators, which had thrown them back into conditions worse than 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 interests that it foolishly lost even this ally and turned it into a tool of the feudal counter-revolutionaries.

The official history of the dissolution of the middle-class cabinet is well known.

Under its protective arm, the "state" was "strengthened" to such an extent and the popular energy so weakened that even on July 15 the

Dioscuri Kuhlwetter and Hansemann were obliged to send a warning against reactionary machinations of civil servants, and especially chiefs of rural districts, to all district governors in the monarchy; that later an "Assembly of the nobility and big landowners for the protection" of their privileges [144] met in Berlin alongside the Assembly of conciliators; 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 landlords", 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 cabinet 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, [145] where the troops in fact murdered the bourgeoisie in the person of the Civil Guard, 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, [146] whose most drastic measure of coercion was an appeal to the tact of the Prussian officers. A measure of coercion indeed! Did not royalist honor forbid the officers to follow the dictates of bourgeois honor?

On September 7, a month after the Assembly of conciliators had passed the Stein-Schultze army order, it once more decided that its resolution was a real resolution and should be carried out by the ministers. Hansemann refused to do this and resigned on September 11, after having appointed himself a bank director at a yearly salary of 6,000 thaler, for -- gentlemen, business is business!

Finally, on September 25, the Assembly of conciliators 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 [147] 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 recognizing 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 deceived, just as in general he was the representative of the deceived bourgeoisie. He was given to understand 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 malice of the country squires and get rid of this middle-class tutelage. Moreover, the plan of campaign agreed upon with Russia and Austria required that the cabinet should be headed by a general appointed by the camarilla from outside the Assembly of conciliators. The old "state" had been sufficiently "strengthened" under the bourgeois cabinet to venture on this coup.

Pfuel was a mistake. The victory of the Croats at Vienna made even a Brandenburg a useful tool.

Under the Brandenburg cabinet the Assembly of conciliators was ignominiously dispersed, fooled, derided, humiliated and hunted, 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 "piece of paper" be allowed to come between the King and his people. [148] Now it is said, there shall only be a piece 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. [149] Every article of the imposed Prussian constitution is an article 14.

By means of this constitution the Crown imposes 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 martial law, 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 "piece of paper" by a Christian-Germanic Magna Charta organically growing out of the distinctions of the medieval estates, or to drop the constitutional game altogether. Even in this 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!"

The history of the Prussian middle class, and that of the German middle class in general between March and December shows that a purely middle-class revolution and the establishment of bourgeois rule in the form of a constitutional monarchy is impossible in Germany, and that the only alternatives are either a feudal absolutist counter-revolution or a social republican revolution.

The viable section of the bourgeoisie is bound to awake again from its apathy -- this is guaranteed above all by the staggering bill which the counter-revolution will present it with in the spring and, as our Hansemann so thoughtfully says:

Gentlemen, business is business!

Neue Rheinische Zeitung	
	
Marx / Engels	Marxist writers'
Archive	Archives

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Köln, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 184

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

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, and Lamartine's aeolian harp vibrated with tender philanthropical tunes on the words of fraternity, the brotherhood of members of society and nations.

Welcome all ye myriad creatures!
Brethren, take the kiss of love! [150]

Driven out of Rome, the Pope at present is staying at Gaeta under the protection of the tigerish idiot Ferdinand; Italy's "iniciatore" [151] 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 [152] 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 if the cycle of the three restorations had not come to an end, and if Louis Napoleon was something 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 and the victory of the French bourgeoisie at the same time signified the renewed suppression of the nationalities, who had responded to the crowing of the Gallic cock with heroic attempts to liberate themselves. Prussian, Austrian and English Sbirri once more plundered, ravished and murdered in Poland, Italy and Ireland. The defeat of the working class in France and 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, responded to the crowing of the Gallic cock with sanguinary insurrections against feudalism. Naples, Vienna, Berlin. The defeat of the working class in France and the victory of the French bourgeoisie was at the same time a victory of East over West, the defeat of civilization by barbarism. The suppression of the Romanians by the Russians and their tools, the Turks, began in Wallachia; Croats, pandours, Czechs, serezhans [Mounted troops in the Austrian army who were notorious for their cruelty. -- Ed.] 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, and the liberation of the working class in general is therefore the rallying-cry of European liberation.

But England, the country that turns whole nations into her proletarians, that spans the whole world with her enormous arms, 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 which breaks the revolutionary waves, the country where the new society is stifled before it is born. England dominates the world market. Any upheaval in 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 world market is dominated by England and England is dominated by the bourgeoisie.

Thus, the liberation of Europe, whether brought about by the struggle of the oppressed nationalities for their independence or by overthrowing feudal absolutism, depends 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. Only a world war can break old England, as only this can provide the Chartists, the party of the organized English workers, with the conditions for a successful rising against their powerful 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 and Italy, in the East Indies and Prussia, in Africa and 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 she did during the Napoleonic period, but the war itself will place her at the head of the revolutionary movement and she will repay the debt she owes to the revolution of the eighteenth century.

The table of contents for 1849 reads: Revolutionary rising of the French working class, world war.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

N^o 1.

Cologne, Thursday, 1. Jan.

1848.

A BOURGEOIS DOCUMENT

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 187

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, January 4. In England, where the rule of the bourgeoisie has reached the highest stage of development, public charity too, as we know, has assumed the most noble and magnanimous forms. In England's workhouses- those public institutions where the redundant labor 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 bare and most meagre means of subsistence, hardly sufficient for physical reproduction, their activity, too, is restricted to a form of 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 alcohol which, left unsold in the warehouse, become an object of expenditure to the dealer. 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" is due not to enthusiasm 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 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 labor army. Is there a more ingenious device than the workhouse for maintaining a reserve army in readiness for the favorable periods while converting them in these pious institutions during unfavorable commercial periods into unresisting machines without will, without

aspirations and requirements?

The Prussian bourgeoisie differs favorably from the English bourgeoisie, since it opposes British political arrogance reminiscent of pagan Rome with Christian humility and meekness and cringes in worshipful reverence before throne, altar, army, bureaucracy and feudalism; instead of displaying the commercial energy which conquers whole continents, it engages in Chinese pedantry appropriate to imperial citizens, 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 people longed for Napoleon, whom they had just before that chained to a lonely rock in the Mediterranean? 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 impudence with which our bourgeoisie treats the working class.

WORKER'S CARD

S 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.

S 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.

S 3. Workers purloining wheelbarrows, carts or other equipment from another section in order to use them in their work will be dismissed.

S 4. Drunkenness, disturbance of the peace, and the starting of squabbles, quarrels and fights entail immediate dismissal. -- In appropriate cases moreover legal proceedings will be taken against the culprits.

S 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 debarred from work.

S 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.

S 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.

S 8. The police are always to be informed when workers are dismissed by way of punishment and of the reasons for their dismissal.

S 9. Should workers have any complaints to make against the building site supervisor, these are to be lodged with the town surveyor through an elected delegation of three workers. This officer will examine the cause of the complaint on the spot and give his decision.

S 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!)

S 11. The worker is employed on these conditions.

S 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	}	
	}	of the worker
or sign	}	
		Assigned to section of...
		and has, etc.
		Signature of the building-site supervisor

Could the Russian edicts of the Autocrat of all the Russias 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." That is first of all passive obedience. Then, according to S 9, the workers have the right to complain to "the town surveyor". The decisions of this pasha are irrevocable and directed, of course, against the workers, if only for

hierarchical reasons. 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 bourgeois freedom disappears, for, according to S 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 labor for your wages, what on earth has the police to do with this cancellation 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! You make the police, on your behalf, keep a record of his conduct.

Under S 5, a worker arriving ten minutes late is punished with the loss of half a day's labor. What a punishment in comparison with the offense! 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 S 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 S 5, the worker who arrives late for the third time, i.e., ten minutes after half past six, "may" be debarred altogether. In case of dismissal by way of punishment, S 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.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

№ 1.

Köln, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

MONTESQUIEU LVI

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 201

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, January 20. The "honorable" Joseph Dumont allows an anonymous writer, who is not paid by him but pays him and who in the feuilleton seeks to work upon the Primary voters, to address the Neue Rheinische Zeitung in the following way:

"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 Voters", and to state that they were borrowed from the Neue Preussische Zeitung.

"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 borrowed from the Parlements-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." It is not his fault that his own intellectual products and those of the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* and of the "Prussian Associations" [113] are as alike as two peas. We have never read his advertisements in the *Kolnische 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, 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 *Kolnische Zeitung* and making his intellectual private property available to the German public as "common property". 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 Morrison pill with the unctuous, naively shameless pathos of a quack.

"The easiest and simplest way to achieve this however" (that is, the solution of the social question) "is to accept the constitution imposed on December 5, 1848, 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 minor gods 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 -- that is the solution of the social problem!

We do not for a moment doubt that neither Montesquieu LVI nor his patrons in the Citizens' Associations [154] will wait for the imposed constitution to be accepted, revised, [155] sworn, and promulgated before "feeding the hungry and clothing the naked". Appropriate

measures have already been taken.

During the last few weeks circulars have been distributed in which capitalists inform craftsmen, shopkeepers, and others that, considering 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 of Cologne has in the same spirit drawn up a "Worker's Card" for the unfortunate people who must either starve or sell their hands to the city (cf. [No. 187](#) of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung). 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 imposition 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 banks, the houses and the wealth of the bourgeois, who had fled. These same bourgeois, on their return, denounced these workers to Windischgratz as "robbers" who ought to be hanged. 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 who 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 Country", 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.

An election costs the English and French bourgeois quite a lot of money. Their corrupt practices are well known. The Prussian bourgeoisie are very 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 in the *Kolnische Zeitung* and appends -- gratis -- the solution of the "social question".

The practical part of our Montesquieu's *petites oeuvres* thus boils down to the following: vote for Brandenburg, Manteuffel, Ladenberg! Elect Camphausen and Hansemann! Send us to Berlin, let our people establish themselves there. That is the solution of the social question.

The immortal Hansemann has solved these problems. 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".

Hence, vote for the advocates of the imposed constitution!

But Montesquieu LVI accepts the imposed constitution only to be able afterwards to "revise" and "swear allegiance to it"! Montesquieu, my good man! Once you have accepted the constitution you can revise it only on its own basis, that is, in so far as it suits the King and the second Chamber consisting of country squires, financial magnates, high-ranking officials and clerics. The only possible revision has been judiciously indicated 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 essays of Montesquieu LVI, in their practical part, amount to this: vote for Hansemann and Camphausen! Vote for Dumont and Stupp! Vote for Brandenburg and 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.

"And so, what, in effect, is the social question?"

"Human beings must and want to live.

"To live they need 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 labor.

"Labor, therefore, is the first condition of our life; without labor 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 when 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 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. All helped each other and co-operated. Then intercourse started with neighboring peoples; one people had

what the other needed, and the latter possessed things which 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, science and art arose among men and life became 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 was 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.

What, then, in effect is the physiological question? Every material 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."

Montesquieu LVI cannot be denied an original talent for simplifying science. He ought to be granted a patent (without government guarantee).

The products of labor cannot be produced without labor. 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 labor which may be more or less diversified. One person bakes, another forges one person agitates, another howls, [156] Montesquieu writes and Dumont prints. Adam Smith, acknowledge thy master!

The discoveries that labor and the division of labor are essential conditions of every human society enable Montesquieu LVI to draw the conclusion that the existence of "various 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 was so for thousands of years among all the nations on earth"!! In Egypt there was labor and division of labor -- and castes; in Greece and Rome labor and division of labor--and free men and slaves; in the Middle Ages labor and division of labor -- and feudal lords and serfs, guilds, estates, etc. In our day there is labor and division of labor -- 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 labor, and it sells its labor only so long as the employing class enriches itself by purchasing this labor.

Is it not obvious, therefore, that "for thousands of years the same conditions existed among all the nations on earth" as in Prussia today, since labor and division of labor always existed in one form or another? Or is it, on the contrary, not evident that it is the continuously changing method of labor and division of labor which is constantly transforming social relations and property relations?

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 labor and division of labor. 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 -- labor and division of labor -- in a superficial and distorted manner his

inert head.

"There is no society without labor and the division of labor.

"Hence

"Elect advocates of the imposed Prussian constitution, and only advocates of the imposed constitution, as delegates."

This epitaph will be inscribed in large letters on 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 [An allusion to Henry LXXII, Prince of Reuss-Lobenstein-Ebersdorf. -- Ed.]) 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, "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 labor replaces complex labor by simple labor, the labor of adults by that of children, the labor of men by that of women, the labor of the independent workers by automatons; that, with the development of modern industry, 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 and the recurrent imposition of martial law together with the new constitution?

"When new inventions or commercial crises destroy entire industries the state must come to their assistance and find

remedies."

Though he may be little versed 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 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 first in order to give. But who should do the giving, Montesquieu LVI? The declining industry, so that it decline even faster? Or the rising industry, so that it wither on the stem? 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 neutralize the effect of commercial crises, the Prussian state would have to possess, in addition to national labor, a third source of income in Cloud- Cuckoo-Land. If royal New-Year's greetings, 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 "trustworthy and well-beloved 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 labor and the division of labor, but also communists and red republicans. Acknowledge Bruggemann's latest "legal basis" or renounce the Code Civil. [157] Figaro, tu n'aurais pas trouve ca! More about Montesquieu LVI tomorrow.

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)

[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)

[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Acht, Sonntag, 1. Juni

1848.

MONTESQUIEU LVI

by
KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 202

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

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 voters. 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 matter of fighting against bourgeois property relations similar to the struggle that is taking place in France and is in the offing 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 civil servant? 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 finally direct alms from the public purse. Apart from these palpable material and therefore "most sacred" interests of the gentlemen "with God for King and Country", it is for them, of course, also a question of preserving those social privileges which distinguish their species from the inferior species of the bourgeois, peasants and plebeians. The old National Assembly was dispersed because it dared to touch these c 4 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" according to the ideas of the aristocracy and 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 form enabling it freely to run matters concerning 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 apparatus as cheaply as possible, to protect national labor effectively abroad, and within the country to open up all springs 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 attaining a form of government 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.
[158]

What is the reason?

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. Political power in the hands of a king by the grace of God is political power in the hands of the old society existing now merely as a ruin; it is political power in the hands of the feudal estates, whose interests are profoundly antagonistic to those of the bourgeoisie.

But it is 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 divine right as their political apex, so does the monarchy by divine right regard the feudal estates as its social foundation, the well-known "monarchical wall".

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 divine right will invariably be impelled to a coup d'etat and a revolutionary or counter-revolutionary crisis will arise.

Why was the National Assembly ejected? Only because it upheld the interests of the bourgeoisie as against the interests of feudalism; because it wanted to abolish feudal relations, which impede 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 matters chiefly and directly affected the interests of the bourgeoisie.

Thus, coup d'etats and counter-revolutionary crises are vital to the existence of the monarchy by the grace of God, which the March and similar events compelled to eat humble pie and reluctantly to accept a pseudo-bourgeois monarchy.

Can credit ever revive again under a form of government whose inevitable climax are coup d'etats, counter-revolutionary crises and states of siege?

What a delusion!

Bourgeois industry must burst the chains of absolutism and feudalism. A revolution against both only demonstrates that bourgeois industry has reached a level when it must either secure an appropriate political form or perish.

The system of bureaucratic tutelage consolidated 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? [159] 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 so important an export trade was carried with Galicia, etc.!

Men of the same type 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. This maneuver 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 divine management of national wealth.

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 this money, purloined from the pockets of the rest of the citizens to enable the aristocracy to live in appropriate style and to keep the "pillars" of the feudal monarchy well buttressed, is 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 funds in order that wealth, as the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* says, should not make the subjects presumptuous; immobilization wherever possible of public funds instead of employing them in industry in order that at predictable moments of crisis the government by divine right independently confront the people. The basic principle of the imposed Prussian constitution is to use the taxes for maintaining the state as an oppressive, independent and sacred force contraposed to industry, commerce and agriculture, instead of degrading it by turning 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 get an idea of 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 as cheaply as possible and therefore on a constantly increasing scale, i.e., with more capital, with a continuously expanding division of labor and constantly increasing use of machinery. Every new division of labor 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 labor, and small capital against big capital, by means of feudal guild practices. Thus, the German nation, particularly the Prussian, which is barely able to withstand English competition, is to become its defenseless prey, forced to accept a form of trade organization 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 the contemporary bourgeois society, whose industry creates the means for the foundation of a new society that will liberate you all, than to revert to a bygone society, which, on the pretext of saving your classes, thrusts the entire nation back into medieval barbarism.

But medieval 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 contrast to its French, English and Belgian predecessors, proclaims as its shibboleth the imposed constitution (and with it the monarchy by divine right, the bureaucracy and the landowning nobility)?

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 also 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 certain 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 would lose their importance if political life were conducted on a larger scale; local councilors who under cover of the old institutions arrange their private shady affairs at the expense of the public; oil-merchants who at the price of their betrayal of the revolution have become Excellencies and Knights of the Eagle; bankrupt cloth-merchants and speculators in railway-shares who have become royal bank directors, [160] etc., etc.

"It is they who are the advocates 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.



[Marx / Engels](#)
[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)
[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Dienstag, den 14. Febr.

1848.

DEMOCRATIC PAN-SLAVISM

by
FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 222

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, February 14, 1849 - We have often enough pointed out that the romantic dreams which came into being after the revolutions of February and March, such as ardent fantasies about the universal fraternal union of people, a European federative republic, and eternal world peace, were basically nothing but screens hiding the immeasurable perplexity and inactivity of the leading spokesmen of that time. People did not see, or did not want to see, what had to be done to safeguard the revolution; they were unable or unwilling to carry out any really revolutionary measures; the narrow-mindedness of some and the counter-revolutionary intrigues of others resulted in the people getting only sentimental phrases instead of revolutionary deeds. The scoundrel Lamartine with his high-flown declarations was the classical hero of this epoch of betrayal of the people disguised by poetic floridity and rhetorical tinsel.

The peoples who have been through the revolution know how dearly they have had to pay because in their simplicity at the time they believed the loud talk and bombastic assurances. Instead of safeguards for the revolution - everywhere reactionary Chambers which undermined the revolution; instead of fulfillment of the promises given at the barricades - counter-revolution in Naples, Paris, Vienna,

Berlin, the fall of Milan, and the war against Hungary; instead of the fraternal union of peoples - renewal of the Holy Alliance on the broadest basis under the patronage of England and Russia. And the very same persons who in April and May responded jubilantly to the high-flown phrases of the epoch, now only blush with shame at the thought of how at that time they allowed themselves to be deceived by idiots and rogues.

People have learned by bitter experience that the "European fraternal union of peoples" cannot be achieved by mere phrases and pious wishes, but only by profound revolutions and bloody struggles; they have learned that the question is not that of a fraternal union of all European peoples under a single republican flag, but of an alliance of the revolutionary peoples against the counter-revolutionary peoples, an alliance which comes into being not on *paper*, but only on the *battlefield*.

Throughout Western Europe these bitter but necessary experiences have completely discredited Lamartine's phrase-mongering. In the east, on the other hand, there are still sections, ostensibly democratic, revolutionary sections, which are not tired of echoing these phrases and sentimental ideas and preaching the gospel of the European fraternal union of peoples.

These actions - we leave out of account some ignorant German-speaking dreamers such as Herr A. Ruge, etc. - are the *democratic pan-Slavists* of the various Slav peoples.

The programme of democratic pan-Slavism lies before us in the shape of a pamphlet: *Aufruf an die Slaven*. Von einem russischen Patrioten, Michael Bakunin, Mitgleid des Slavencongresses in Prag. Koethen, 1848.

Bakunin is our friend. That will not deter us from criticizing his pamphlet.

Hear how Bakunin at the very beginning of his Appeal adheres to the illusions of last March and April:

"The very first sign of life of the revolution was a cry of hate against the old [policy of] oppression, a cry of sympathy and love for all oppressed nationalities. The peoples... felt at last the disgrace with which the old diplomacy had burdened mankind, and they realized that the well-being of the nations will never be ensured as long as there is a single nation anywhere in Europe living under oppression.... Away with the oppressors! was the

unanimous cry; all hail to the oppressed, the Poles, the Italians and all of the others! No more wars of conquest, but only the one last war fought out to the end, the good fight of the revolution for the final liberation of all peoples! Down with the artificial barriers which have been forcibly erected by congresses of despots [meaning Vienna Congresses of 1814-15] in accordance with so-called historical, geographical, commercial and strategical necessities! There should be no other frontiers than those natural boundaries drawn in accordance with justice and democracy and established by the sovereign will of the peoples themselves on the basis of their national characteristics. Such is the call issued by all the people." pp. 6, 7.

In this passage we already find reproduced all the rapturous enthusiasm of the first months after the revolution. There is not a word about the actually existing obstacles to such a universal liberation, or about the very diverse political needs of the individual peoples. The word "freedom" replaces all that. There is not one word about the actual state of things, or, insofar as it does receive attention, it is described as absolutely reprehensible, arbitrarily established by "congresses of despots" and "diplomats". To this bad reality is counterposed the alleged will of the people with its categorical imperative, with the absolute demand simply for "freedom".

We have seen who proved to be the stronger. The alleged will of the people was so disgracefully deceived precisely because it trusted in such fantastic abstraction from the conditions actually prevailing.

"By its plenipotentiary power the revolution declared the despotic states dissolved; dissolved the Prussian state... Austria... the Turkish Empire... and, finally, the last hope of the despots... the Russian Empire... and as the final goal of all - the universal federation of the European republics." p. 8.

As a matter of fact, here in the West it must strike us as peculiar that after all of these beautiful plans have come to grief at the *first* attempt to fulfill them they can still be regarded as something meritorious and great. Certainly, the unfortunate thing was precisely that although the revolution "by its own plenipotentiary power the revolution declared the despotic states dissolved", at the same time "by its own plenipotentiary power" it did not lift a finger to carry out its decree.

At that same time the Slav Congress was convened. The Slav Congress adopted completely the standpoint of these illusions. Listen

to this:

"With a lively sense of the common ties of history (?) and blood, we swore not to allow our fates to separate us again from one another. Pronouncing a curse on the policy of which we have so long been the victims, *we ourselves asserted* our right to complete *independence* and *vowed* that henceforth this should be *common to all the Slave peoples*. We recognized the independence of Bohemia and Moravia... we held out our fraternal hand to the German people, to democratic Germany. In the name of those of us who live in Hungary, we offered the Magyars, the furious enemies of our race... a fraternal alliance. Nor did we forget in our alliance for liberation those of our brothers who groan under the Turkish yoke. We solemnly condemned the treacherous policy which three times cut Poland into pieces.... All that we proclaimed, and together with the democrats of all peoples (?) we demanded freedom, equality and the brotherhood of all nations." p. 10.

Democratic pan-Slavism still puts forward these demands:

"At that time we felt confident of our cause... justice and humanity were wholly on our side, and nothing but illegality and barbarity on the side of our enemies. The ideas to which we devoted ourselves were *no empty figments of a dream*, they were the ideas of the *sole true and necessary policy*, the policy of *revolution*."

"Justice", "humanity", "freedom", "equality", "fraternity", "independence" - so far we have found nothing in the pan-Slavist manifesto but these more or less ethical categories, which sound very fine, it is true, but *prove absolutely nothing* in historical and political questions. "Justice", "humanity", "freedom", etc., may demand this or that a thousand times over; but if the thing is impossible it does not take place and in spite of everything remains an "empty figment of a dream". The pan-Slavists' illusions ought to have understood that all pious wishes and beautiful dreams are of no avail against the iron reality, and that their policy at any time was no more the "policy of revolution" than was that of the French Republic. Nevertheless, today, in January 1849, they still come to us with the same old phrases, in the content of which Western Europe has been disillusioned by the bloodiest counter-revolution!

Just a word about "universal fraternal union of peoples" and the

drawing of "boundaries established by the sovereign will of the peoples themselves on the basis of their national characteristics". The United States and Mexico are two republics, in both of which the people is sovereign.

How did it happen that over Texas a war broke out between these two republics, which, according to the *moral theory*, ought to have been "fraternally united" and "federated", and that, owing to "geographical, commercial and strategical necessities", the "sovereign will" of the American people, supported by the bravery of the American volunteers, shifted the boundaries drawn by nature some hundreds of miles further south? And will Bakunin accuse the Americans of a "war of conquest", which, although it deals with a severe blow to his theory based on "justice and humanity", was nevertheless waged wholly and solely in the interest of civilization? Or is it perhaps unfortunate that splendid California has been taken away from the lazy Mexicans, who could not do anything with it? That the energetic Yankees by rapid exploitation of the California gold mines will increase the means of circulation, in a few years will concentrate a dense population and extensive trade at the most suitable places on the coast of the Pacific Ocean, create large cities, open up communications by steamship, construct a railway from New York to San Francisco, for the first time really open the Pacific Ocean to civilization, and for the third time in history give the world trade a new direction? The "independence" of a few Spanish Californians and Texans may suffer because of it, in some places "justice" and other moral principles may be violated; but what does that matter to such facts of world-historic significance?

We would point out, incidentally, that this theory of universal fraternal union of peoples, which calls indiscriminately for fraternal union regardless of the historical situation and the stage of social development of the individual peoples, was combated by the editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* already long before the revolution, and in fact in opposition to their best friends, the English and French democrats. Proof of this is to be found in the English, French and Belgian democratic newspapers of that period.

As far as pan-Slavism in particular is concerned, in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No.194 we showed that, part from the well-meaning self-deceptions of the democratic pan-Slavists, it has in reality no other aim than to give the Austrian Slavs, who are split up and historically, literally, politically, commercially and industrially dependent on the Germans and Magyars, a basis of support, in Russia on the one hand, and on the other hand in the Austrian united monarchy, which is dominated by the Slav majority and dependent on Russia. We have shown how such little nations, which for centuries

have been taken in tow by history against their will, must necessarily be counter-revolutionary, and that their whole position in the revolution in 1848 was actually counter-revolutionary. In view of the democratic pan-Slavist manifesto, which demands the independence of all Slavs without distinction, we must return to this matter.

Let us note first of all that there is much excuse for the political romanticism and sentimentality of the democrats at the Slav Congress. With the exception of the Poles - the Poles are not pan-Slavists for very obvious reasons - they all belong to peoples which are either, like the Southern Slavs, necessarily counter-revolutionary owing to the whole of their historical position, or, like the Russians, are still a long way from revolution and therefore, at least for the time being, are still counter-revolutionary. These sections, democratic owing to their education acquired abroad, seek to bring their democratic views into harmony with their national feeling, which is known to be very pronounced among the Slavs; and since the real world, the actual state of things in their country, affords no basis, or only a fictitious basis for such reconciliation, there remains for them nothing but the other-worldly "airy kingdom of dreams" [quoting Heinrich Heine] the realm of pious wishes, the policy of fantasy. How splendid it would be if the Croats, Pandours and Cossacks formed the vanguard of European democracy, if the ambassador of a republic of Siberia were to present his credentials in Paris! Certainly, such prospects would be very delightful; but, after all, even the most enthusiastic pan-Slavist will not demand that European democracy should wait for their realization - and at present it is precisely those nations from whom the manifesto specially demands independence that are the special enemies of democracy.

We repeat: apart from the Poles, the Russians, and at most the Turkish Slavs, no Slav people has a future, for the simple reason that all the other Slavs lack the primary historical, geographical, political and industrial conditions for independence and viability.

Peoples which have never had a history of their own, which from the time when they achieved the first, most elementary stage of civilization already came under foreign sway, or which were *forced* to attain the first stage of civilization only by means of a foreign yoke, are not viable and will never be able to achieve any kind of independence.

And that has been the fate of the Austrian Slavs. The Czechs, among whom we would include the Moravians and Slovaks, although they differ in respect of language and history, have never had a history of their own. Bohemia has been chained to Germany since the time of Charles the Great. The Czech nation freed itself momentarily and

formed the Great-Moravian state, only immediately to come under subjugation again and for 500 years to be a bill thrown from one to another by Germany, Hungary and Poland. Following that, Bohemia and Moravia passed definitely to Germany and the Slovak regions remained with Hungary. And this historically absolutely non-existent "nation" puts forward claims to independence?

The same thing holds for the Southern Slavs proper. Where is the history of the Illyrian Solvenes, the Dalmatians, Croats and Shokazians? Since the 11th century they have lost the last semblance of political independence and have been partly under German, partly under Venetian, and partly under Magyar rule. And it is desired to put together a vigorous, independent, viable nation out of these tattered remnants?

More than that. If the Austrian Slavs were a compact mass like the Poles, the Magyars and the Italians, if they were in a position to come together to form a state of 12-20 million people, then their claims would surely be more serious. But the position is just the opposite. The Germans and Magyars have pushed themselves in between them like a broad wedge to the farthest extremities of the Carpathians, almost to the Black Sea, and have separated the Czechs, Moravians and Slovaks from the Southern Slavs by a broad band 60-80 miles [German mile equals 4.7 English miles] wide. To the north of this band are 5.5 million Slavs, to the south 5.5 million Slavs, separated by a compact mass of 10-11 million Germans and Magyars, made allies by history and necessity.

But why should not the 5.5 million Czechs, Moravians and Slovaks form one state, and the 5.5 million Southern Slavs together with the Turkish Slavs form another state?

Take a look at any good linguistic map of the distribution of the Czechs and their neighbors akin to them in language. They have thrust themselves into Germany like a wedge but on both sides they have been eaten into and pressed back by the German element. One-third of Bohemia speaks German; for every 34 Czechs in Bohemia there are 17 Germans. Yet it is precisely the Czechs in Bohemia who are supposed to form the core of the intended Slav state; for the Moravians, too, are considerably interspersed with Germans, and the Slovaks with Germans and Magyars end furthermore completely demoralized in a national respect. And what a Slav state that would be, in which in the final analysis the *German urban bourgeoisie would hold sway!*

The same thing applies to the Southern Slavs. The Slovenes and Croats cut off Germany and Hungary from the Adriatic Sea; but

Germany and Hungary *cannot* allow themselves to be cut off from the Adriatic Sea on account of "geographical and commercial necessities", which, it is true, are no obstacle to Bakunin's fantasy, but which nevertheless do exist and are just as much a vital question for Germany and Hungary as, for example, the Baltic Sea coast from Danzig to Riga is for Poland. And where it is a question of the existence, of the free development of all the resources of big nations, such sentimental considerations as concern for a few scattered Germans or Slavs will not decide anything! This apart from the fact that these Southern Slavs are likewise everywhere mingled with German, Magyar, and Italian elements, there here too a mere glance at a linguistic map shows the planned South-Slav state would be delivered into the hands of the *Italian* bourgeoisie of Trieste, Fiume and Zara, and the *German* bourgeoisie of Agram, Laibach, Karlstadt, Semlin, Pancsova, and Weisskirchen!

But could not the Austrian Southern Slavs unite with the Serbs, Bosnians, Morlaks, and Bulgarians? Certainly they could if, besides the difficulties mentioned above, there did not exist also the age-old hatred of the Austrian frontier dwellers for the Turkish Slavs on the other side of the Sava and Unna; but these people, who for centuries have considered one another as rascals and bandits, despite all their racial kinship hate one another infinitely more than do the Slavs and Magyars.

In point of fact, the position of the Germans and Magyars would be extremely pleasant if the Austrian Slavs were assisted to get their so-called rights! An independent Bohemian-Moravian state would be wedged between Silesia and Austria; Austria and Styria would be cut off by the "South-Slav republic" from their natural debouche [outlet] - the Adriatic Sea and the Mediterranean; and the eastern part of Germany would be torn to pieces like a loaf of bread that has been gnawed by rats! And all that by way of thanks for the Germans having given themselves the trouble of civilizing the stubborn Czechs and Slovenes, and introducing among them trade, industry, a tolerable degree of agriculture, and culture!

But it is precisely this yoke imposed on the Slavs under the pretext of civilization that is said to constitute one of the greatest crimes of the Germans and Magyars! Just listen to this:

"Rightly do you rage, rightly do you breathe vengeance against the *damnable German policy*, which has thought of nothing but your ruin, which *has enslaved you for centuries....*" p.5

"... The Magyars, the *bitter enemies* of our race, who number hardly four millions, have presumed to seek to impose their yoke on eight million Slavs...." p.9

"I know all that the Magyars have done to our Slav brothers, what crimes they have committed against our nationality, and how they have trampled underfoot our language and independence." p.30

What then are the great, dreadful crimes committed by the Germans and Magyars against the Slav nationality? We are not speaking here of the partition of Poland, which is not at issue here, we are speaking of the "centuries of injustice" supposed to have been inflicted on the Slavs.

In the north, the Germans have reconquered from the Slavs the formerly German and subsequently Slav region from the Elbe to the Warthe; a conquest which as determined by the "geographical and strategical necessities" resulting from the partition of the Carolingian kingdom. These Slavs areas have been fully Germanized; the thing has been done and cannot be undone, unless the pan-Slavists were to resurrect the lost Sorbian, Wendish, and Obodritian languages and impose them on the inhabitants of Leipzig, Berlin and Stettin. But up to now it has never been disputed that this conquest was to the advantage of civilization.

In the south, the Germans found the Slav races already split up. That had been seen to by the non-Slav Avars, who occupied the region later inhabited by the Magyars. The Germans exacted tribute from these Slavs and waged many wars against them. They fought also against the Avars and Magyars, from whom they took the whole territory from the Ems to the Leitha. Whereas they carried out Germanization here by force, the Germanization of the Slav territories proceeded much more on a peaceful basis, by immigration and by the influence of the more developed nation on the undeveloped. German industry, German trade, and German culture by themselves served to introduce the German language into the country. As far as "oppression" is concerned, the Slavs were not more oppressed by the Germans than the mass of the German population itself.

As regards the Magyars, there are certainly also a large number of Germans in Hungary, but the Magyars, although numbering "hardly four millions", have never had the occasion to complain of the "damnable German policy"! And if during *eight centuries* the "eight million Slavs" have had to suffer the yoke imposed on them by the four million Magyars, that alone sufficiently proves which was the more viable and vigorous, the many Slavs or the few Magyars!

But, of course, the greatest "crime" of the Germans and Magyars is that they prevented these 12 million Slavs from becoming *Turkish*! What would have become of these scattered small nationalities, which have played such a pitiful role in history, if the Magyars and Germans had not kept them together and led them against the armies of Mohammed and Suleiman, and if their so-called oppressors had not decided the outcome of the battles which were fought for the defense of these weak nationalities! The fate of the "12 million Slavs, Wallachians, and Greeks" who have been "trampled underfoot by 700,000 Osmons" (p.8), right up to the present day, does not that speak eloquently enough?

And finally, what a "crime" it is, what a "damnable policy" that at a time when, in Europe in general, big monarchies had become a "historical necessity", the Germans and Magyars untied all these small, stunted and impotent little nations into a single big state and thereby enabled them to take part in a historical development from which, left to themselves, they would have remained completely aloof! Of course, matters of this kind cannot be accomplished without many a tender national blossom being forcibly broken. But in history nothing is achieved without violence and implacable ruthlessness, and if Alexander, Caesar, and Napoleon had been capable of being moved by the same sort of appeal as that which pan-Slavism now makes on behalf of its ruined clients, what would have become of history! And are the Persians, Celts, and Christian Germans of less value than the Czechs, Ogulians, and Serezhans?

Now, however, as a result of the powerful progress of industry, trade and communications, political centralization has become a much more urgent need than it was then, in the 15th and 16th centuries. What still has to be centralized is being centralized. And *now* the pan-Slavists come forward and demand that we should "set free" these half-Germanized Slavs, and that we should abolish a centralization which is being forced on these Slavs by all their material interests!

In short, it turns out these "crimes" of the Germans and Magyars against the said Slavs are among the best and most praiseworthy deeds which our and the Magyar people can boast in their history.

Moreover, as far as the Magyars are concerned, it should be specially pointed out here that, particularly since the revolution, they have acted too much submissively and weakly against the puffed-up Croats. It is notorious that Kossuth made all possible concessions to them, excepting only that their deputies were not allowed to speak the Croatian in the Diet. And thus submissiveness to a nation that is counter-revolutionary by nature is the only thing with which the Magyars can be reproached.

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)
[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)
[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Aachen, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

THE PROCLAMATION OF A REPUBLIC IN ROME [164]

by
FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 228

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

The Italian Constituent Assembly is quite unlike the Frankfurt National Assembly. The Italians know that the unity of a country split into feudal principalities can only be established by abolishing dynastic rule. The Italians led the dance in 1848, and they are leading again in 1849. But what progress! Italy no longer has Pius IX nor France her Lamartine. The fantastic period of the European revolution, the period of enthusiasm, goodwill and florid orations, was fittingly concluded with fire-balls, massacres on a grand scale and deportations. Austrian Notes, Prussian Notes and Russian Notes were the most relevant replies to Lamartine's proclamations.

From their Pythian tripod of thoroughness and perseverance the Germans are in ' the habit of looking down with haughty disdain on the superficiality of the Italians. A comparison between the Italian 1848 and the German 1848 would provide the most striking answer. In drawing this comparison one would have to take into account that revolutionary Italy was kept in check by Germany and France, whereas revolutionary Germany was not restricted in her movements.

The republic in Rome is the beginning of the revolutionary drama of 1849.

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)
[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)
[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Köln, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

THE TRIAL OF THE RHENISH DISTRICT COMMITTEE OF DEMOCRATS

by
KARL MARX

FREDERICK ENGELS *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 231 and 232

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

(Karl Marx's Speech Delivered on February 8, 1849) [161]
Published also in a separate pamphlet entitled *Zwei politische Prozesse*, Köln, 1849, Verlag der Expedition der Neuen Rheinischen Zeitung

Gentlemen of the jury, if this action had been brought before December 5, I could have understood the charge made by the public prosecutor. Now, after the 5th of December, I do not understand how he dares to invoke against us laws which the Crown itself has trampled in the dirt.

On what does the public prosecutor base his criticism of the National Assembly and the resolution not to pay taxes? On the laws of April 6 and 8, 1848. And what did the government do on December 5, when it arbitrarily imposed a constitution and a new electoral law on the country? It tore up the laws of April 6 and 8, 1848. These laws are no longer valid for the supporters of the government, so why should they still be valid for the opponents of the government? On December 5 the

government took its stand on a revolutionary basis, namely, on a counter-revolutionary basis. It is now confronted only by revolutionaries or accomplices. Even the mass of citizens who act on the basis of the existing law, who uphold the existing law in face of infringements of that law, have been turned into rebels by this government. Before December 5 opinion concerning the removal of the National Assembly, its dispersal and the introduction of a state of siege in Berlin could have been divided. After December 5 ' it is a well-established fact that these measures were intended to usher in the counterrevolution and that therefore every means could be used against a group that itself no longer recognized the conditions under which it governed and consequently could no longer be recognized as a government by the country. Gentlemen, the Crown could have preserved at least the semblance of legality, but it has not deigned to do so. It could have dispersed the National Assembly and then let the cabinet come forward and tell the country: "We have dared to carry out a coup d'etat -- circumstances have forced us to do it. We have disregarded the convention of the law, but there are moments of crisis when the very existence of the state is at stake. At such moments there is only one inviolable law-the existence of the state. There was no valid constitution when we dispersed the Assembly. Therefore no constitution could be infringed. But there existed two organic laws -- those of April 6 and 8, 1848. Actually there is only one organic law, the electoral law. We ask the country to carry through elections in accordance with this law. We, the responsible government, will then appear before the Assembly that has emerged from these primary elections. This Assembly, we trust, will recognize that the coup d'etat was an act of deliverance necessitated by circumstances. It will subsequently sanction the coup d'etat. It will declare that we infringed a legal form in order to save the country. Let it pass judgment on us.

If the cabinet had done this, it would have had a semblance of right to arraign us. The Crown would have kept a semblance of legality, but it could not or would not do it.

The March revolution, as seen by the Crown, was a harsh fact. One harsh fact can be erased only by another harsh fact. By rejecting new elections on the basis of the law of April 1848, the cabinet renounced its own responsibilities, thereby repudiating also the bar towards which it was responsible. At the very outset it turned the appeal of the National Assembly to the people into a mere pretense, a fiction, a deception. By inventing a first Chamber based on the property qualification as an integral part of the Legislative Assembly, the cabinet tore up the organic laws, departed from the legal basis, falsified the elections and prevented the people from passing any judgment on the "act of deliverance" of the Crown.

And so, gentlemen, the fact cannot be denied, and no future historian will deny it -- the Crown has made a revolution, it has overthrown the existing legal system, it cannot appeal to the laws it has itself so scandalously annulled. After successfully carrying out a revolution one can hang one's opponents, but one cannot convict them. Defeated enemies can be put out of the way, but they cannot be arraigned as criminals. After a revolution or counter-revolution has been consummated the invalidated laws cannot be used against the defenders of these laws. This would be a cowardly pretense of legality which you, gentlemen, will not sanctify by your verdict.

I have already told you, gentlemen, that the government has falsified the sentence which the people passed on the "act of deliverance of the Crown". The people nevertheless has already decided against the Crown and for the National Assembly. The elections to the second Chamber are the only lawful elections because they alone were based on the law of April 8, 1848. Practically all the deputies who were for the refusal to pay taxes were re-elected to the second Chamber, many of them even two or three times. Schneider 11, my codefendant, is himself deputy for Cologne. Thus, the question of the National Assembly's right to vote for the refusal to pay taxes has virtually been decided already by the people.

But quite irrespective of this most authoritative judgment, you will agree with me, gentlemen, that in the present case no crime in the ordinary sense of the word has been committed, in this case no infringement of the law falling within your jurisdiction has occurred at all. Under ordinary conditions the existing laws are enforced by the public authorities; whoever infringes these laws or prevents the public authorities from enforcing them is a criminal. In the present case one public authority has infringed the law, another public authority, it makes no difference which, has upheld it. The struggle between these two political powers lies neither within the sphere of civil law, nor within the sphere of criminal law. The question of who was in the right, the Crown or the National Assembly, is a matter for history. All the juries, all the courts of Prussia cannot decide it. Only one power can supply the answer -- history. I do not understand, therefore, how, on the basis of the Code penal, we could be placed in the dock.

That this was a struggle between two powers, and only power can decide between two powers -- that, gentlemen, has been declared by both the revolutionary and the counterrevolutionary press. This was proclaimed even by the organ of the government a short time before the struggle was decided. The *Neue Preussische Zeitung*, the organ of the present government, clearly realized this. A few days before the crisis it said approximately the following: It is no longer a question of right but of power, and the old monarchy by the grace of God will

show that it still has this power. The *Neue Preussische Zeitung* correctly understood the situation. Power against power. Victory would decide for one or the other. The counter-revolution carried the day but we have seen only the first act of the drama. The struggle in England lasted over twenty years. Charles I came out on top several times and ended up on the scaffold. Who, gentlemen, can guarantee to you that the present cabinet and the officials who acted and continue to act as its tools will not be convicted of high treason by this Chamber or its successors?

Gentlemen, the public prosecutor has tried to base his accusation on the laws of April 6 and 8. I have been compelled here to demonstrate to you that it is these laws which acquit us. But I make no secret of the fact that I have never recognized these laws and never will. They never had any validity for the deputies elected by the people, still less could they prescribe the course of the March revolution.

How did the laws of April 6 and 8 come into being? By agreement between the government and the United Provincial Diet. It was an attempt to maintain continuity with the old legal system and to play down the revolution which had done away with that system. Men like Camphausen thought it important to preserve a semblance of legal continuity. And how did they preserve this semblance? By a series of obvious and absurd contradictions. Let us for a moment adopt the old legal point of view. Was not the very existence of Minister Camphausen, a responsible minister, a minister who had not climbed the bureaucratic ladder, unlawful? The position of Camphausen, the responsible Prime Minister, was unlawful. This officer, who does not exist in law, convenes the United Provincial Diet to have it pass laws it was not legally competent to pass. This inconsistent and self-contradictory playing with formalities was called legal advance, or maintenance of the legal basis!

But let us leave aside the form, gentlemen. What was the United Provincial Diet? It represented old decaying social relations. It was against these relations that the revolution was directed. And the representatives of the vanquished society are asked to endorse organic laws designed to recognize, guide and organize the revolution against this old society. What an absurd contradiction! The Diet was overthrown together with the old monarchy.

On this occasion we are confronted by the so-called legal basis. It is the more necessary for me to deal with this point since we are justly regarded as opponents of the legal basis, and since the laws of April 6 and 8 owe their existence to the formal recognition of the legal basis.

The Diet represented primarily big landed property. Big landed

property was indeed the foundation of medieval, feudal society. Modern bourgeois society, our own society, is however based on industry and commerce. Landed property itself has lost all its former conditions of existence, it has become dependent on commerce and industry. Agriculture, therefore, is carried on nowadays on industrial lines, and the old feudal lords have now become producers of cattle, wool, corn, Beatrice, spirits, etc., i.e., people who trade in industrial products just as any other merchant. However much they may cling to their old prejudices, they are in fact being turned into bourgeois, who manufacture as much as possible and as cheaply as possible, who buy where they can get goods at the lowest price and sell where they can obtain the highest price. The mode of living, production and income of these gentlemen therefore gives the lie to their traditional pompous notions. Landed property, as the predominant social factor, presupposes a medieval mode of production and commerce. The United Provincial Diet represented this medieval mode of production and commerce which had long since ceased to exist, and whose protagonists, though they clung to the old privileges, likewise enjoyed and exploited the advantages of the new society. The new bourgeois society, grounded on an entirely different foundation, on a changed mode of production, was bound to seize also political power, which had to be wrenched from the hands of those who represented the interests of a declining society, a political power, whose whole structure had been built up on the soil of entirely different material conditions of society. Hence the revolution. The revolution was consequently directed as much against the absolute monarchy, the supreme political expression of the old society, as against the representatives of the estates, who stood for a social system that had been long ago destroyed by modern industry or, at most, for the presumptuous ruins of the dissolved estates which bourgeois society was overtaking and pushing into the background more and more every day. How then was the idea conceived to allow the United Provincial Diet, the representative of the old society, to dictate laws to the new society which asserted its rights through the revolution?

Allegedly in order to maintain the legal basis. But what do you understand by maintaining the legal basis? To maintain laws belonging to a bygone social era and framed by representatives of vanished or vanishing social interests, who consequently give the force of law only to these interests, which run counter to the public needs. Society is not founded upon the law; this is a legal fiction. On the contrary, the law must be founded upon society, it must express the common interests and needs of society -- as distinct from the caprice of the individuals -- which arise from the material mode of production prevailing at the given time. This Code Napoleon, which I am holding in my hand, has not created modern bourgeois society. On

the contrary, bourgeois society, which emerged in the eighteenth century and developed further in the nineteenth, merely finds its legal expression in this Code. As soon as it ceases to fit the social conditions, it becomes simply a bundle of paper. You cannot make the old laws the foundation of the new social development, any more than these old laws created the old social conditions.

They were engendered by the old conditions of society and must perish with them. They are bound to change with the changing conditions of life. To maintain the old laws in face of the new needs and demands of social development is essentially the same as hypocritically upholding the out-of-date particular interests of a minority in face of the up-to-date interests of the community. This maintenance of the legal basis aims at asserting minority interests as if they were the predominant interests, when they are no longer dominant; it aims at imposing on society laws which have been condemned by the conditions of life in this society, by the way the members of this society earn their living, by their commerce and their material production; it aims at retaining legislators who are concerned only with their particular interests; it seeks to misuse political power in order forcibly to place the interests of a minority above the interests of the majority. The maintenance of the legal basis is therefore in constant conflict with the existing needs, it hampers commerce and industry, it prepares the way for social crises, which erupt in political revolutions.

That is what adherence to the legal basis and the maintenance of the legal basis really mean. Relying on these phrases about the legal basis, which arise either from conscious deceit or unconscious self-deception, the United Provincial Diet was convoked, and this Diet was made to frame organic laws for the National Assembly the need for which was created by the revolution and which owed its existence to the revolution. And on the strength of these laws the National Assembly is to be judged!

The National Assembly represented modern bourgeois society as against feudal society, which is represented in the United Provincial Diet. It was elected by the people for the purpose of independently enacting a constitution to fit the conditions of life, which had come into conflict with the old political organization and laws. It was thus from the very beginning a sovereign, constituent assembly. The fact that it nevertheless condescended to the views of the conciliators, was mere formal courtesy towards the Crown, mere ceremony. I need not here go into the question whether the Assembly -- as far as the people are concerned -- had the right to take a stand for conciliation. It considered that a collision with the Crown should be averted by a display of goodwill on both sides.

One thing is certain, however -- that the laws of April 6 and 8, which were agreed with the United Provincial Diet, were formally invalid. The only material significance they have is that they state and lay down the conditions under which the National Assembly could really express the sovereign will of the people. The laws passed by the United Provincial Diet were merely a formula by which the Crown was saved the humiliation of having to proclaim: I have been defeated!

Now, gentlemen of the jury, I shall examine more closely the speech of the public prosecutor.

He says:

"The Crown ceded part of the power which had been wholly in its hands. Even in the ordinary course of things a deed of renunciation does not go beyond what is clearly stated in the words of renunciation. The law of April 8, 1848, neither grants the National Assembly the right to refuse to vote taxes, nor stipulates that Berlin must necessarily be the seat of the National Assembly."

Gentlemen, power lay broken in the hands of the Crown, and the Crown gave up power in order to save the fragments. You will remember that immediately after his accession to the throne, the King formally pledged his word of honor at Königsberg and Berlin not to concede constitutional government. You will remember that when opening the United Provincial Diet in 1847 the King solemnly swore that he would not allow a piece of paper to come between him and his people. After the March events of 1848, and even in the imposed constitution, the King proclaimed himself a constitutional monarch. He has put this paper, this piece of abstract, outlandish flummery, between himself and his people. Will the public prosecutor dare to assert that in conceding the agreement or the constitution, the King voluntarily contradicted in so manifest a way his own solemn declarations, that in the eyes of the whole of Europe he voluntarily committed so glaring an inconsistency! The King made the concessions which the revolution compelled him to make. Neither more nor less.

The popular analogy which the public prosecutor has made unfortunately proves nothing. It is true, that if I renounce anything, I renounce only what I have expressly renounced. If I made you a gift, it would indeed be impudent if, on the basis of the deed of gift, you tried to compel me to undertake further obligations. But after the

March events it was the people that made the gift and the Crown which received it. Obviously, the nature of the gift must be interpreted in accordance with the intentions of the giver and not those of the receiver, i.e., in accordance with the intentions of the people and not those of the Crown.

The absolute power of the Crown was shattered. The people had won the day. The two sides concluded a truce and the people was cheated. The public prosecutor himself has taken pains to demonstrate at some length that the people was deceived. To challenge the right of the National Assembly to refuse to vote taxes, the public prosecutor has explained to you in detail that if there was something of this kind in the law of April 6, 1848, it was certainly no longer to be found in the law of April 8, 1848. The interval of two days was thus used to deprive the representatives of the people of the rights which had been conceded to them two days earlier. Could the public prosecutor have more strikingly compromised the honesty of the Crown, could he have more irrefutably proved the intention to deceive the people?

The public prosecutor says further:

"The right to adjourn and prorogue the National Assembly is a prerogative of the executive power recognized in all constitutional countries."

As to the right of the executive to transfer the meeting place of the legislative chambers, I would like to ask the public prosecutor to cite even a single law or example in support of his claim. In England, for instance, under an old historical privilege, the King could convoke Parliament anywhere he pleased. There is no law stating that London is the legal seat of Parliament. As you know, gentlemen, in England the most important political liberties are generally sanctioned not by Statute Law but by Common Law; such, for instance, is the case with the freedom of the press. But should an English ministry take it into its head to transfer Parliament from London to Windsor or Richmond, it is sufficient to put the idea into words to realize how impossible it is.

True, in countries that have a constitutional government, the Crown has the right. to prorogue Parliament. But it must not be forgotten that on the other hand all constitutions specify for how long the chambers can be prorogued and when they have to be summoned again. -- Prussia has no constitution, one still has to be drafted; no legal time-limit for summoning a prorogued chamber exists, consequently no prorogation right of the Crown exists. -- Otherwise the Crown

could prorogue the Chamber for ten days, for ten years, or for ever. How could one be sure that the chambers would ever be summoned or allowed to meet for any length of time? The existence of the chambers juxtaposed with the Crown would be left to the discretion of the Crown, the legislative power -- if one could speak of legislative power in this context -- would have become a sham.

Gentlemen, this example shows where any attempt to compare the conflict between the Prussian Crown and the Prussian National Assembly with the conditions obtaining in constitutional countries leads to. It leads to the maintenance of the absolute monarchy. On the one hand, the rights of a constitutional executive power are conferred upon the Crown, on the other, there is no law, no tradition, no organic institutions able to impose on it the restrictions proper to a constitutional executive power. The representatives of the people are expected to play the role of a constitutional chamber in relation to an absolute monarchy!

Is there any need to explain that in the case under consideration it was not a matter of an executive power vis-a-vis a legislative power, that the constitutional division of powers cannot be applied to the Prussian National Assembly and the Prussian Crown? Let us disregard the revolution and consider only the official theory of agreement. Even according to this theory two sovereign powers confronted each other. That is beyond any doubt. One of these two powers was bound to break the other. Two sovereign powers cannot function simultaneously, side by side, in one state. This is an absurdity, like the squaring of the circle. Material force had to decide the issue between the two sovereign powers. But it is not our task here to go into the question of whether agreement was possible or impossible. It is sufficient that two powers entered into relations with each other in order to conclude an agreement. Camphausen himself admitted that agreement might not be achieved. From the rostrum he spoke to the advocates of agreement of the danger that faced the country if they did not come to terms. The danger was implied in the initial relationship between the conciliatory National Assembly and the Crown, and afterwards an attempt is made to hold the National Assembly responsible for this danger by denying this initial relationship and by turning the Assembly into a constitutional chamber! It is an attempt to overcome a difficulty by abstracting from it.

Gentlemen, I think I have shown you that the Crown had no right either to adjourn or to prorogue the Assembly of conciliators.

But the public prosecutor did not confine himself to examining whether the Crown had the right to adjourn the National Assembly; he has tried to prove that this adjournment was expedient. "Would it not

have been expedient," he exclaims, "if the National Assembly had obeyed the Crown and moved to Brandenburg?" According to the public prosecutor, the expediency of such an act was due to the position of the Chamber itself. The Chamber was not free in Berlin, and so forth.

But is it not obvious what purpose the Crown pursued in ordering this removal? Had not the Crown itself divested all officially advanced reasons for the removal of any semblance of veracity? It was not a question of freedom of deliberation, but of whether the Assembly be dissolved and a constitution imposed, or whether a spurious Assembly be created by summoning more docile representatives. When, - unexpectedly, a sufficient number of deputies arrived in Brandenburg to form a quorum, the pretense was abandoned and the National Assembly was dissolved.

Incidentally, it goes without saying that the Crown had no right to declare the National Assembly either free or unfree. No one but the National Assembly itself could decide whether it had the necessary freedom of deliberation or not.

It would be most convenient for the Crown if it could declare that the National Assembly was not free, that it was irresponsible and to ban it, whenever the Assembly passed resolutions the Crown disliked.

The public prosecutor has also spoken about the government's duty to protect the dignity of the National Assembly against the terrorism of the Berlin populace.

This argument sounds like a satire on the government. I will not speak here of its treatment of individuals, of men who, after all, were the elected representatives of the people. It sought to humiliate them in every possible way, they were prosecuted in a most infamous way and a sort of wild chase was organized against them. But let us leave aside individuals. How was the dignity of the National Assembly and of its work maintained? -Its archives were given over to the military who used the documents comprised in the various departments, the royal messages, draft laws and preliminary studies, as spills to light pipes with, burned them in stoves, and trampled on them.

Not even the formalities of a legal warrant were observed; the archives were seized without even an inventory being drawn up.

It was part of a plan to destroy this work so dear to the people, in order to make it easier to vilify the National Assembly and to quash the planned reforms which were abhorrent to the government and aristocracy. Is it not simply ridiculous to assert after all this that the government transferred the National Assembly from Berlin to

Brandenburg out of tender concern for its dignity?

Now I come to the statement of the public prosecutor regarding the formal validity of the resolution to refuse payment of taxes.

The public prosecutor says that in order to make the resolution on the tax refusal formally valid, the Assembly should have submitted it to the Crown for sanctioning.

But, gentlemen, the Crown itself did not face the Assembly, it was represented by the Brandenburg cabinet. Consequently, according to the absurd claim of the public prosecutor, the Assembly should have reached an agreement with the Brandenburg cabinet to proclaim that cabinet guilty of high treason and to prevent it from collecting taxes. What meaning can this demand have other than that the National Assembly should submit unconditionally to every request of the Brandenburg cabinet?

Another reason why the tax refusal resolution was formally invalid, says the public prosecutor, was that a motion can become law only after the second reading.

On the one hand, when dealing with the National Assembly they ignored important forms of procedure which ought to have been binding and, on the other, they expected the National Assembly to observe even the most unimportant formalities. As simple as that! A bill objectionable to the Crown is passed in the first reading, after which the second reading is prevented by force of arms, and the Bill remains invalid because there was no second reading. The public prosecutor does not take into consideration the exceptional state of affairs that obtained when, threatened with bayonets in their meeting hall, the deputies passed this resolution. The government commits one arbitrary act after another. It flagrantly violates the principal laws, the Habeas Corpus Act, and the Civil Guard Law. [162] It arbitrarily establishes an unlimited military despotism under the guise of martial law. It sends the deputies to the devil, and while on the one hand impudently infringing all laws, it, on the other hand, demands the most punctilious observation of even the rules of procedure.

Gentlemen, I do not know whether it is deliberate misrepresentation -- I am far from assuming this on the part of the public prosecutor -- or merely ignorance when he says: "The National Assembly did not want any negotiations" and it "did not seek any negotiations".

If the people blame the Berlin National Assembly for anything, it is for its desire for negotiations. If the deputies themselves regret anything, it is their desire for reconciliation. It was this desire for reconciliation which gradually alienated the Assembly from the

people, caused it to lose all its positions, and finally, when it was not backed by the nation, exposed it to the attacks of the Crown. When at last it wanted to make a stand it found itself alone and powerless, precisely because it had not made that stand and asserted itself at the right time. It first manifested this desire for reconciliation when it renounced the revolution and sanctioned the theory of agreement, when it degraded itself by turning from a revolutionary National Assembly into a dubious society of conciliators. It carried the weakness for negotiation to extremes when it accepted Pfuel's pseudo-recognition of Stein's army order as valid. The publication of this army order was itself a farce, since it could only be regarded as a comical echo of Wrangel's army order. Nevertheless, instead of going beyond it, the Assembly snatched at the attenuated interpretation of the Pfuel cabinet, which made the order meaningless. To avoid any serious conflict with the Crown, the Assembly accepted the feeble semblance of a demonstration against the old reactionary army as a real demonstration. It seriously pretended to regard what was not even a pseudo-solution of the conflict as the real solution of the conflict. So little did the Assembly want to fight, so keen was it on negotiations -- and the public prosecutor describes it as pugnacious and quarrelsome.

Need I mention another symptom showing the conciliatory nature of this Chamber? You will remember the agreement between the National Assembly and Pfuel about the law suspending commutations. If the Assembly was unable to destroy the enemy in the army, then it was above all necessary to win a friend in the peasantry. But it refrained from attempting even this. To negotiate, to avoid a conflict with the Crown, to avoid it at any cost--that was the Assembly's chief concern, which it placed above even its own self-preservation. And this Assembly is blamed for not wanting to negotiate, not attempting to negotiate!

It tried to negotiate even when the conflict had broken out. You know the pamphlet by Unruh, [163] a man of the Centre. You will have seen from it that every attempt was made to avoid a clash; that deputations were sent to the Crown and were turned away; that some deputies tried to argue with the ministers and were superciliously and arrogantly rebuffed; that the Assembly offered to make concessions and that these were derided. Even at the time when it could only be a matter of Preparing for war, the Assembly still wanted to make peace. And the public prosecutor accuses this Assembly of not wanting to negotiate and not attempting to negotiate!

The Berlin National Assembly clearly nursed extravagant illusions and did not understand its own position and its conditions of existence, when before the conflict and even during the conflict it believed that an amicable arrangement and reconciliation with the

Crown was still possible and worked towards it.

The Crown did not want and could not want reconciliation. Gentlemen of the jury, let us not deceive ourselves concerning the nature of the struggle which began in March and was later waged between the National Assembly and the Crown. It was not an ordinary conflict between a cabinet and a parliamentary opposition, it was not a conflict between men who were ministers and men who wanted to become ministers, it was not a struggle between two political parties in a legislative chamber. It is quite possible that members of the National Assembly belonging to the minority or the majority believed that this was so. The decisive factor, however, is not the opinion of the deputies, but the real historical position of the National Assembly as it emerged both from the European revolution and the March revolution it engendered. What took place here was not a political conflict between two parties within the framework of one society, but a conflict between two societies, a social conflict, which assumed a political form; it was the struggle of the old feudal bureaucratic society with modern bourgeois society, a struggle between the society of free competition and the society of the guilds, between the society of landownership and the industrial society, between a religious society and a scientific society. The political expression corresponding to the old society was the Crown by the grace of God, the bullying bureaucracy and the independent army. The social foundation corresponding to this old political power consisted of privileged aristocratic landownership with its enthralled or partially enthralled peasants, the small patriarchal or guild industries, the strictly separated estates, the sharp contradiction between town and country and, above all, the domination of the countryside over the town. The old political power -- the Crown by the grace of God, the bullying bureaucracy, the independent army -- realized that its essential material basis would disappear from under its feet, as soon as any change was made in the basis of the old society, privileged aristocratic landownership, the aristocracy itself, the domination of the countryside over the town, the dependent position of the rural population and the laws corresponding to these conditions of life, such as the parish regulations, the criminal law. The National Assembly made such an attempt. On the other hand that old society realized that political power would be wrenched from its hands, as soon as the Crown, the bureaucracy and the army lost their feudal privileges. The National Assembly wanted to abolish these privileges. It is not surprising, therefore, that the army, the bureaucracy and the nobility joined forces in urging the Crown to effect a coup de main, and it is not surprising that the Crown, knowing that its own interests were closely interlinked with those of the old feudal bureaucratic society, allowed itself to be impelled to a coup d'etat. For the Crown

represented feudal aristocratic society, just as the national Assembly represented modern bourgeois society. The conditions of existence in modern bourgeois society require that the bureaucracy and the army, which controlled commerce and industry, should become their tools, be reduced to mere organs of bourgeois intercourse. This society cannot tolerate that restrictions are placed on agriculture by feudal privileges and on industry by bureaucratic tutelage. This is contrary to free competition, the vital principle of this society. It cannot tolerate that foreign trade relations should be determined by considerations of the palace's international policies instead of by the interests of national production. It must subordinate fiscal policy to the needs of production, whereas the old state has to subordinate production to the needs of the Crown by the grace of God and the patching up of the monarchical walls, the social pillars of this Crown. Just as modern industry is indeed a leveller, so modern society must break down all legal and political barriers between town and country. Modern society still has classes, but no longer estates. Its development lies in the struggle between these classes, but the latter stand united against the estates and their monarchy by the grace of God.

The monarchy by the grace of God, the supreme political expression, the supreme political representative of the old feudal bureaucratic society, is consequently unable to make any sincere concessions to modern bourgeois society. Its own instinct of self-preservation, and the society which backs it and on which it leans will constantly impel it to retract the concessions it has made, to maintain its feudal character and to risk a counter-revolution. Counter-revolution is a constantly recurrent condition of existence for the Crown after every revolution.

On the other hand, modern society, too, cannot rest until it has shattered and abolished the political power, the traditional official power, by which the old society is forcibly preserved. For the rule of the Crown by the grace of God is the rule of antiquated social strata.

Hence no peace is possible between these two societies. Their material interests and needs bring them into mortal combat. One side must win, the other must lose. That is the only possible reconciliation between them. Neither can there be peace between the supreme political representatives of these two societies, between the Crown and the representatives of the people. Thus, the National Assembly had only the choice of either yielding to the old society or standing up to the Crown as an independent force.

Gentlemen, the public prosecutor has described the refusal to Pay taxes as a measure "which shakes the foundations of society". The refusal to pay taxes has nothing to do with the foundations of society.

Generally speaking, why do taxes, the granting or the refusal of taxes, play such an important role in the history of constitutionalism? The reason is very simple. just as serfs purchased privileges from the feudal lords with ready money, so did entire nations purchase privileges from feudal monarchs with ready money. Monarchs needed money for their wars with foreign nations and especially for their struggle against the feudal lords. The more trade and industry developed the greater grew their need for money. But the third estate, the middle classes, grew to the same extent and disposed of increasing financial resources; and in the same degree they purchased liberties from the monarchs by means of taxes. To make sure of these liberties they retained the right at definite intervals to renew the monetary obligations, i.e., the right to vote or to refuse to vote taxes. You can trace the details of this development especially well in English history.

In medieval society, therefore, taxes were the only bond between the emerging bourgeois society and the ruling feudal state, a bond which compelled the state to make concessions to bourgeois society, to meet its needs and adjust itself to its growth. In modern states this right to grant and refuse taxes has been turned by bourgeois society into a means of controlling the government, the body administering its common interests.

You will find therefore that partial tax refusal is an integral part of every constitutional mechanism. This type of tax refusal operates whenever a budget is rejected. The current budget is voted only for a definite period; moreover after being prorogued the chambers must be reconvened after a very short interval. It is thus impossible for the Crown to make itself independent. Rejection of a budget means a definite tax refusal if the cabinet does not win a majority in the new chamber or if the Crown does not nominate a cabinet in accordance with the wishes of the new chamber. The rejection of a budget is therefore the parliamentary form of a refusal to pay taxes. This form could not be employed in the conflict under consideration because a constitution did not yet exist, but had first to be produced.

But a refusal to pay taxes as it occurred here, a refusal which not only rejects a new budget but prohibits even the payment of current taxes, is by no means exceptional. It happened very frequently in the Middle Ages. Even the old German Imperial Diet and the old feudal Diets of Brandenburg passed resolutions refusing to pay taxes. Nor is there any lack of examples in modern constitutional states. The refusal to pay taxes led in Britain in 1832 to the downfall of Wellington's cabinet. And in Britain it was not Parliament which decided to refuse taxes, but the people which proclaimed and carried out this decision on its

own authority. Britain, however, is the historic land of constitutionalism.

Far be it from me to deny that the English revolution, which brought Charles I to the scaffold, began with a refusal to pay taxes or that the North American revolution, which ended with the Declaration of Independence from Britain, started with a refusal to pay taxes. The refusal to pay taxes can be the harbinger of unpleasant events in Prussia too. It was not John Hampden, however, who brought Charles I to the scaffold, but only the latter's own obstinacy, his dependence on the feudal estates, and his presumptuous attempt to use force to suppress the urgent demands of the emerging society. The refusal to pay taxes is merely a sign of the dissidence that exists between the Crown and the people, merely evidence that the conflict between the government and the people has reached a menacing degree of tensity. It is not the cause of the discord or the conflict, it is merely an expression of this fact. At the worst, it leads to the overthrow of the existing government, the existing political system. The foundations of society are not affected by this. In the present case, moreover, the refusal to pay taxes was a means of society's self-defense against a government which threatened its foundations.

Finally, the public prosecutor accuses us of having gone further in the incriminating document than the National Assembly itself. He says, "For one thing, the National Assembly did not publish its resolution." Gentlemen, am I to give a serious reply to the accusation that the decision not to pay taxes was not even published in the Statute Book?

Furthermore, unlike us, the National Assembly did not incite to the use of force and in general did not take a revolutionary stand, but wanted to remain on the basis of the law.

The public prosecutor previously described the National Assembly as unlawful, now he considers it lawful -- in each case to present us as criminals. But if the collection of taxes is declared unlawful, am I not obliged to resist by force the exercise by force of this unlawful action? Even from this standpoint, therefore, we were entitled to repel force by force. Incidentally, it is quite correct that the National Assembly wanted to act on a purely legal basis, by resorting to passive resistance. Two roads were open to it, the revolutionary road -- it did not take it, those gentlemen did not want to risk their necks -- or the refusal to pay taxes which did not go beyond passive resistance. It took the second road. But to give effect to its refusal to pay taxes the people would have had to take a revolutionary stand. The conduct of the National Assembly could by no means serve as a criterion for the people. The National Assembly, as such, has no rights; the people has merely entrusted it with the defense of its own rights. If the Assembly

does not act in accordance with the mandate it has received, then this mandate lapses. The people then takes the stage itself and acts on its own authority. If, for example, a national assembly were to sell itself to a treacherous government, the people would have to kick them out, both the government and the assembly. If the Crown makes a counter-revolution, the people has the right to reply with a revolution. It does not require the sanction of a national assembly to do this. The fact that the Prussian government is attempting a treasonable assault has been stated by the National Assembly itself.

Gentlemen of the jury, to sum up briefly, the public prosecutor cannot charge us under the laws of April 6 and 8, 1848, when these laws have been torn up by the Crown. These laws by themselves are not decisive, as they were arbitrarily concocted by the United Provincial Diet. The resolution of the National Assembly regarding the refusal to pay taxes had the force of law both formally and materially. We went further than the National Assembly in our appeal. This was our right and our duty.

In conclusion, I repeat that we have seen only the first act of the drama. The struggle between the two societies, the medieval and the bourgeois society, will again be waged in political forms. As soon as the Assembly meets, the same conflicts will arise again. The Neue Preussische Zeitung, the organ of the government, already prophesies -- the same people have voted again, that means the Assembly will have to be dispersed a second time.

Whatever new path the new National Assembly may choose, the inevitable result will be -- either complete victory of the counter-revolution or a new successful revolution. It may be that the victory of the revolution is possible only after the counter-revolution is consummated.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Düsseldorf, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

[THE COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY OFFENSIVE AND THE SUCCESSES OF THE REVOLUTION]

by
FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 294 (special supplement)

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, May 9. The counter-revolution is advancing with swift strides, but the revolution advances still faster.

While the counter-revolution has gained advantages in Dresden, [165] which make its victory probable, and has managed to introduce a state of siege, censorship and martial law by provoking a putsch in Breslau at the right moment, the revolution can point to quite different victories.

We do not speak of the quickly mounting open rebellion of the reserve army (Landwehr) in Rhenish Prussia involving the most "Prussian" districts, nor of the South German movement, [166] which is being betrayed everywhere by the governments, the bourgeoisie and the Frankfurt National Assembly; we speak only of those great events which, coming from outside, may give strong support and unity to the small, separate and helpless German movements -- we speak of the Magyar and the French revolutions.

While the Magyar revolution is gaining one victory after another, and

after the next decisive battle (which was to have taken place on May 5 or 6 at Pressburg) will move straight on Vienna and liberate the city, France suddenly enters a stage when the movement is developing again openly and in broad daylight. The underground development of the past months comes to a close; the defeat of the French army at Rome [167] has exposed and discredited the entire policy of the present government. The people reappears upon the scene -- the people, the ultimate, supreme judge. Whether it happens at the elections or in the course of an open revolution, the French people will shortly give an impetus to the movement, which all Europe will feel.

The European dynasties will soon see that the chosen people of the revolution has not changed; the French revolution of 1849 will speak to them, not in Lamartinian phrases, but in the language of guns.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Organ der Demokratie.

No. 1.

Köln, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

by

KARL MARX and FREDERICK ENGELS

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

THE HOUSE OF HOHENZOLLERN

by

KARL MARX

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No.

Cologne, May 9 -- IN THE LAST DAYS of its and the Prussian state's existence, the government of Herr von Hohenzollern seems again to verify fully the old reputation of the Prussian and Hohenzollern name.

Who does not know their character from Heine's poem:

A child with a big pumpkin head,
with long sideburns and gray pigtails,
with spidery-long but strong little arms,
with a gigantic gizzard but short entrails,

A monster

Who does not know the breaches of faith, the perfidies, the legacy buntings by which this family of corporals bearing the name of Hohenzollern became great?

We know how the so-called Great Elector (as if an elector could be great!) committed his first treachery against Poland in that he, Poland's ally against Sweden, suddenly went over to the Swedes, the better to plunder Poland in the Peace of Oliva. [*At the Peace of Oliva, concluded between Sweden on the one side and Poland, Austria, and Brandenburg on the other, on May 3, 1660, Poland finally relinquished sovereignty over East Prussia. -- ed.*]

We know the tasteless figure of Frederick 1, the brutal coarseness of Frederick William I.

We know how Frederick II, the founder of patriarchal despotism, the friend of the Enlightenment via flogging, auctioned off his country to the highest-bidding French entrepreneurs. We know how he allied with Russia and Austria to rape Poland, [*In 1772 Poland was first partitioned between Prussia, Austria, and Russia. -- ed.*] an act which even now, after the Revolution of 1848, continues to be an unremoved stain on German history.

We know how Frederick William II helped to complete the rape of Poland, when he squandered the usurped Polish national and church estates on his courtiers.

We know how, in 1792, he formed a coalition with Austria and England to suppress the glorious French Revolution and to invade France; we also know how his "splendid army," covered with insult and shame, was driven out of France.

We know how he then left his allies in the lurch and hastened to make peace with the French Republic. [*In 1795 Prussia and France concluded a separate peace at Basel. -- ed.*]

We know how he, who used to pretend to enthusiasm for the King of France and Navarre, bought cheaply from the French Republic this same King's crown diamonds, and thus profited from the misfortune of his "Beloved Brother."

We know how he, whose whole life has been a real Hohenzollernish mixture of luxury and mysticism, of senile lasciviousness and childish superstition, trampled on freedom of speech in the Bischoffwerder Edicts. [*In the edict on religion, of July 9, 1788, and on censorship, of December 19 1788, issued at the suggestion of Frederick William II's favorite, Johann Rudolf von Bischoffwerder, religious and press*

freedom were restricted. -- ed.]

We know how his successor, Frederick William III, the "Just," betrayed his allies to Napoleon, having been tossed Hanover as bait.

We know how he thereupon immediately betrayed Napoleon to these quondam allies when he, in the pay of England and Russia, attacked the French Revolution embodied in the person of Napoleon.

We know what success that attack had: the unheard-of defeat of the "splendid army" at Jena; the sudden outbreak of a moral lice disease throughout the Prussian body politic; a series of betrayals, vilenesses, and cringings on the part of Prussian officials, from whom Napoleon and his generals turned away in disgust.

We know how, in 1813, Frederick William III, by means of fine words and splendid promises, brought the Prussian people to the point that they came to believe in a "war of liberty" against the French, although what was really involved was a suppression of the French Revolution and a restoration of the old order by the grace of God.

We know how the fine promises were forgotten as soon as the Holy Alliance marched into Paris on March 30, 1814.

We know how, by the time of Napoleon's return from Elba, the enthusiasm of the people was already so cooled that the Hohenzollern had to revive their extinguished zeal with the promise of a constitution (Edict of May 22, 1815) four weeks before the battle of Waterloo.

We recall the promises of the German Federal Acts and of the Vienna Curtain Acts: freedom of the press, a constitution, etc. *[These Acts were passed by the Congress of Vienna, in June 1815, confirming German federal constitutions. -- ed.]*

We know how the "Just" Hohenzollern kept his word: the Holy Alliance and congresses for the suppression of nations, Carlsbad Decrees, *[the decrees passed by the ministers of the German federal states in August 1819, establishing rigid censorship and surveillance of students and universities. -- ed.]* censorship, police despotism, rule by aristocracy, bureaucratic arbitrariness, justice by cabinets, demagogic persecutions, mass condemnations, financial waste -- and no constitution.

We know how in 1820 the nation was assured of no increase in taxes and no rise in the national debt, and how the Hohenzollern kept his word: expansion of the Maritime Commerce Association into a secret state credit bank.

We know how the Hohenzollern replied to the appeal of the French

people in the July Revolution: massing troops on the frontier, keeping down his own people, suppressing the movement in the smaller German states, and finally enslaving these states under the knout of the Holy Alliance.

We know how this same Hohenzollern violated neutrality in the Russo-Polish War, letting the Russians pass through his territory and thereby get at the back of the Poles, putting the Prussian arsenals and magazines at the disposal of the Russians, offering a secure haven in Prussia to every defeated Russian army corps. *On January 31, 1831, Czar Nicholas I began a war against Poland, which ended on September 7, 1831, with the Russian occupation of Warsaw. -- ed.]*

We know that the whole effort of the Hohenzollern Underlord, in accord with the objectives of the Holy Alliance, was directed at strengthening the aristocracy, the bureaucracy, and the military in their rule, and suppressing with brutal force all freedom of expression and all influence of the "limited intelligence of the subjects" on the government, not only in Prussia but also in the rest of Germany.

We know that there has rarely been a period when such laudable intentions have been carried out in a more brutal way than in the period of Frederick William III, especially between 1815 and 1840. Nowhere have so many people ever been condemned and sentenced, nowhere have the fortresses ever been so full of political prisoners, as under the "just" ruler. And having achieved this, one comes to realize what innocent blockheads these demagogues were.

Shall we revert also to the Hohenzollern who, according to the Monk of Lehnin, *[in the so-called Vaticinium Lehninense [Lehnin Prophecy], a monk named Hermann, living in Lehnin, a cloister near Potsdam, prophesied in the year 1300 the decline of the House of Hohenzollern in the eleventh generation. -- ed.]* "would be the last of his race"? Shall we speak of the rebirth of Christian-Germanic grandeur and the resurrection of pallid financial distress, of the Order of the Swan, *[In 1843 Frederick William IV vainly tried to restore the knightly Order of the Swan, established in 1443 -- ed.]* of the Chief Censorship Court, of the United Diet, *[The first United Diet sat from April 11 to June 26, 1847; it was dissolved after it would not vote a loan demanded by the King. The second United Diet, meeting on April 7, 1848, was dissolved on April 10, 1848, after it voted a loan of 25,000,000 taler. -- ed.]* of the General Synod, of the "piece of paper," *[in a speech at the opening of the Diet, on April 11, 1847, Frederick William IV referred to a constitution as a "piece of paper." -- ed.]* of the vain efforts to borrow money, and all the rest of the achievements of the glorious epoch of 1840-48? Shall we prove from Hegel that it takes a comedian to see the end of the Hohenzollern line?

It will not be necessary. The above-mentioned data fully suffices to characterize the Hohenzollern-Prussian name. It is true that the luster of this name was dimmed for a moment, but since the Pleiades of Manteuffel & Co. have surrounded the crown, the ancient grandeur has returned again. Once more, Prussia is, as of yore, a vice-kingdom under the Russian suzerainty; once more the Hohenzollern is the underlord of the Autocrat of all the Russians and the overlord of all the little boyars of Saxony, Bavaria, Hesse-Homburg, Waldeck, etc.; once more the limited understanding of the subjects is restored to its old right of obeying orders. "My splendid army," so long as the Pravoslavny [Orthodox] Czar does not use it himself, is to restore, in Saxony, Baden, Hesse, and the Palatinate, the kind of order that has prevailed in Warsaw for eighteen years, and to glue together, in its own country and in Austria, the cracked crown with the blood of the subjects. The word spoken in anxiety and in the distress of the heart concerns us as little as our forefathers resting with God; and as soon as we are finished at home we will move, with martial music and flying flags, against France, conquer the country which grows champagne, and destroy the great Babel, the mother of all sins!

These are the plans of our exalted rulers; this is the haven to which the noble Hohenzollern is steering us. Hence the piled-up edicts and strokes of violence; hence the repeated kicks at the cowardly Frankfurt Assembly; hence the states of siege, the arrests and the persecutions; hence the invasion of Dresden and South Germany by Prussian soldiery.

But there is still one power, which of course gets little attention from the gentlemen in Sans Souci, but which nevertheless will speak with the voice of thunder. The PEOPLE -- the people who, in Paris as well as on the Rhine, in Silesia as well as in Austria, with teeth gnashing in anger, are awaiting the moment of revolt, and who knows how soon all the Hohenzollerns and all underlords and overlords will get what they deserve.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Dien, den 19. Mai

1848.

[HUNGARY]

by
FREDERICK ENGELS

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 301

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, May 18. At a moment when the actual entry of Russian troops turns the Magyar war into a European war, we are compelled to discontinue our reports on its further development. We can only once more present for our readers the course of this grand East European revolutionary war in a brief survey.

It will be remembered that in the autumn of 1847, even before the February revolution, the Diet at Pressburg, under the leadership of Kossuth, adopted a number of revolutionary decisions, such as those providing for the salability of landed property, the peasants' right to choose their own domicile, the commutation of feudal services, the emancipation of the Jews and equal taxation of all classes. On the very day the February revolution began in Paris (February 22) the Diet permitted Croats and Slavonians when dealing with their internal affairs to use their own language for official purposes and finally, by demanding a separate responsible ministry for Hungary, it made the first step towards a separate Hungary.

The February revolution broke out, and with it collapsed the resistance of the Viennese government to the demands of the Hungarians. On March 16, one day after the Viennese revolution,

consent was given for the formation of an independent Hungarian government thereby reducing the association between Hungary and Austria to a mere personal union.

The now independent Magyar revolution made rapid progress. It abolished all political privileges, introduced universal suffrage, did away with all feudal dues, labor services and tithes -- compensations being payable by the State -- brought about the union with Transylvania and succeeded in securing the appointment of Kossuth as Minister of Finance and the dismissal of the rebellious Ban Jellachich.

Meanwhile the Austrian government recovered from the blow. While the pseudo-responsible ministry at Vienna remained powerless, the camarilla at the Innsbruck Court grew steadily more powerful. It relied on the imperial army in Italy, on the national appetite of the Czechs, Croats and Serbs and on the stubborn narrow-mindedness of the Ruthenian peasants.

The Serbian insurrection, instigated with the help of money and emissaries from the Court, started in the Banat and Bacska on June 17. On the 20th Jellachich had an audience with the Emperor at Innsbruck and was reappointed Ban. Jellachich returned to Croatia, renounced allegiance to the Hungarian ministry and on August 25 declared war against it.

The treachery of the Hapsburg camarilla was plainly evident. The Hungarians tried once more to persuade the Emperor to return to constitutional methods. They sent a deputation of 200 members of the Imperial Diet to Vienna; the Emperor was evasive. Feeling ran high. The people demanded guarantees and brought about changes in the government. Traitors, who sat in the Pest ministry too, were removed, and on September 20 Kossuth was appointed Prime Minister. But only four days later the Palatine Archduke Stephan, the representative of the Emperor, escaped to Vienna and on the 26th the Emperor issued the well-known manifesto to the Hungarians in which he declared that the government was rebellious and dismissed it, appointing the Magyarophobe Jellachich governor of Hungary and encroaching on the most important revolutionary gains of Hungary.

The manifesto, not having been countersigned by an Hungarian minister, was declared null and void by Kossuth.

Meanwhile Jellachich, taking advantage of the disorganization and treachery prevalent among the nominally Hungarian, but in reality old imperial, officers and general staff, advanced to Stuhlweissenburg. There he was defeated by the Hungarian army, despite its treacherous leaders, and driven back into Austrian territory to the very walls of

Vienna. The Emperor and the old traitor Latour then decided to send reinforcements to Jellachich and to reconquer Hungary with the aid of German and Slav troops. But the revolution broke out in Vienna on October 6, and for the time being put an end to the royal and imperial schemes.

Kossuth immediately marched with a Magyar corps to the assistance of the Viennese people. At the Leitha he was prevented from moving immediately on Vienna by the indecision of the Viennese Diet, the treachery of his own officers and the bad organization of his army, which consisted for the most part of local militia. He was finally obliged to arrest more than a hundred officers, send them to Pest and have a number of them shot. Only after this did he dare to attack. But it was too late-Vienna had already fallen, and his undisciplined local militia was thrown back at Schwechat by the regular Austrian troops.

The truce between the imperial troops and the Magyars lasted six weeks. While both armies did their utmost to strengthen their forces, the Olmiltz camarilla carried out a coup which it had been preparing for a long time. It forced the idiot Ferdinand-who had compromised himself by concessions to the revolution and was now useless-to abdicate, and placed on the throne Sophia's son, the boy Francis. Joseph, whom it intended to use as its tool. On the basis of the Hungarian constitution the Pest Diet rejected this change of sovereigns.

Finally in the middle of December the war started. Hungary by then was practically surrounded by the imperial army. The offensive was launched from all sides.

From Austria three army corps, no less than 90,000 strong, under the supreme command of Field- Marshal Windischgratz advanced southward from the Danube. Nugent with about 20,000 men marched from Styria along the left bank of the Drave. Dahlen with 10,000 men marched from Croatia along the right bank of the Drave to the Banat. Several frontier regiments, the garrison of Temesvir, the Serbian militia -and the Serbian auxiliary corps of Knica-nin, totaling 30,000 to 40,000 men commanded by Todorovich and Rukavina, fought in the Banat itself. Puchner with 20,000-25,000 men was in Transylvania as was also Malkowski with 10,000-15,000 men, who had invaded it from Bukovina. Finally Schlick with a corps of 20,000-25,000 men moved from Galicia towards the upper Theiss.

The imperial army thus numbered at least 200,000 regular, battle-hardened troops, not counting the Slav, Romance and Saxon local militia and National Guards who took part in the fighting in the south and in Transylvania.

Against this colossal fighting force Hungary could pit an army of perhaps 80,000-90,000 trained soldiers, including 24,000 men who had formerly served in the imperial army, and in addition 50,000 to 60,000 poorly organized Honveds and local militia. This army was commanded largely by traitors similar to the officers Kossuth had had arrested at the Leitha.

But whereas Austria, a country kept down by force, financially ruined and almost moneyless, could not yield another recruit for the time being, the Magyars still had great resources at their disposal. The Magyars' enthusiasm for liberty, reinforced by their national pride, waxed stronger every day, providing Kossuth with eager fighters in numbers unheard-of for such a small nation of 5 million. The Hungarian printing press placed inexhaustible financial resources in the form of banknotes at Kossuth's disposal and every Magyar accepted these national assignats as if they were hard silver coin. Rifle and gun production was in full swing. All the army lacked was weapons, experience and good leaders, and all this could be procured in a few months. It was only necessary to win time, to entice the imperial troops into the heart of the country where they would be worn down by unceasing guerrilla warfare and weakened by having to leave behind strong garrisons and other detachments.

Hence the plan of the Hungarians to withdraw slowly into the interior, to train the recruits in continuous skirmishes and as a last resort to place between themselves and their enemies the Theiss line with its impassable swamps, which form a natural moat around the Magyar lands.

According to all calculations, the Hungarians should have been able to hold the area between Pressburg and Pest for two to three months even against the superior strength of the Austrians. But severe frosts suddenly set in covering all rivers and swamps with a thick layer of ice capable of bearing the weight even of heavy guns. This deprived the terrain of all features favoring defense, and made all fortifications built by the Magyar army useless and liable to be outflanked. And so it happened that before twenty days had passed the Hungarian army was thrown back from Odenburg and Pressburg to Raab, from Raab to Mor, from Mor to Pest, and even had to leave Pest and withdraw beyond the Theiss at the very beginning of the campaign.

The other corps fared no better than the main army. In the south Nugent and Dahlen continued their advance towards Esseg, which was occupied by the Magyars, and the Serbs gradually approached the Maros line; in Transylvania Puchner joined Malkowski at Maros-Vasarhely; in the north Schlick descended from the Carpathians to the Theiss and made junction with Windischgratz at

Miskolcz.

The Austrians seemed to have practically finished with the Magyar revolution. They had two-thirds of Hungary and three-fourths of Transylvania in their rear, the Hungarians were attacked in front, on both flanks and in the rear. A further advance of a few miles would have enabled all the corps of the Emperor to make junction and draw the ring tighter until Hungary was crushed in it as in the coils of a boa constrictor.

The thing now -- while the Theiss on the front still formed an insuperable barrier to the enemy -- was to gain some breathing space.

This was done at two points: in Transylvania by Bem, and in Slovakia by Gorgey. Both carried out operations which show that they are the most gifted commanders of our time.

On December 29, Bem arrived at Klausenburg, the only town in Transylvania still held by the Magyars. Here he quickly concentrated the reinforcements he had brought and the remnants of the defeated Magyar and Szekler troops, [169] and marched to Maros-Vasarhely, beat the Austrians and drove Malkowski first across the Carpathians into Bukovina and from there into Galicia, where he pushed on towards Stanislav. Then, swiftly turning back into Transylvania he pursued Puchner to within a few miles of Hermannstadt. After several skirmishes and a few swift drives in various directions, the whole of Transylvania was in his hands apart from two towns, Hermannstadt and Kronstadt, and these too would have been taken if the Russians had not been called in. The 10,000-strong Russian auxiliary troops tipped the scales and forced Bem to fall back on Szeklerland. There he organized an uprising of the Szeklers, and with this achieved, he had the Szekler militia engage Puchner, who had reached Schassburg, while he bypassed Puchner's positions, moved straight on Hermannstadt and drove the Russians out, then defeated Puchner who had followed him, marched on Kronstadt and entered it without firing a shot.

Transylvania was thus won and the rear of the Magyar army cleared. The natural defense line formed by the Theiss now found its continuation in the Carpathian mountain range and the Transylvanian Alps, from the Zips to the borders of the Banat.

Gorgey at the same time made a similar triumphal march in North-Western Hungary. He set out with a corps from Pest to Slovakia, for two months kept in check the corps of Generals Gotz, Csorich and Simunich operating against him from three directions, and finally, when his position became untenable against their superior forces, fought his way through the Carpathians to Eperies and

Kaschau. There he appeared in the rear of Schlick and forced him hurriedly to abandon his position and his whole operational base and retreat to Windischgratz's main army, while he himself was already marching down the Hernad to the Theiss to join the main body of the Magyar army.

This army, which was now commanded by Dembinski, had likewise crossed the Theiss and had repulsed the enemy all along the line. It had reached Hatvan, six miles from Pest, when a stronger concentration of enemy forces compelled it to retreat again. After offering vigorous resistance at Kapolna, Maklar and Poroszlo it recrossed the Theiss just at the moment when Gorgey reached the Theiss at Tokaj. The meeting of the two corps was the signal for a new magnificent advance of the Hungarians. Newly trained recruits arriving from the interior strengthened the Hungarian army in the field. Polish and German Legions were formed, capable leaders had been trained or enlisted, and in place of the leaderless, unorganized mass of December, the imperial troops were suddenly faced by a concentrated, brave, and numerous army which was well organized and excellently led.

The Magyars crossed the Theiss in three columns. The right wing (Gorgey) moved northwards, outflanked the Ramberg division, which had been following it, at Eperies and quickly drove it through Rimaszombat towards the main imperial army. The latter was defeated by Dembinski at Erlau, Gyongyos, Godollo and Hatvan, and hastily retreated to Pest. Finally the left wing (Vetter) dislodged Jellachich from Kecskemet, Szolnok and Czegled, defeated him at Jaszbereny and compelled him, too, to retreat to the walls of Pest. There the imperial forces stood along the Danube from Pest to Waitzen, surrounded in a wide semicircle by the Magyars.

To avoid exposing Pest to bombardment from Ofen, the Hungarians had recourse to their well-trying tactics of dislodging the Austrians from their positions by maneuvers rather than by open frontal attacks. Gorgey captured Waitzen and forced the Austrians to fall back beyond the Gran and Danube; he defeated Wohlgemuth between the Gran and Neutra, thereby relieving Komorn, which was besieged by imperial troops. Since its line of retreat was threatened, the imperial army had to decide on a hurried withdrawal. Welden, the new commander-in-chief, retreated in the direction of Raab and Pressburg, and Jellachich was obliged, in order to pacify his extremely refractory Croats, to hastily retreat with them down the Danube into Slavonia.

During their retreat, which rather resembled a stampede, Welden (and especially his rearguard commanded by Schlick) and Jellachich suffered further considerable reverses. While the latter's hard-pressed

corps was slowly fighting its way through the Tolna and Baranya districts, Welden was able at Pressburg to concentrate the remnants of his army which were by no means capable of offering any serious resistance.

Simultaneously with these astonishing victories of the Magyars over the main Austrian army, Moritz Perczel pressed forward from Szegedin and Tolna towards Peterwardein, relieved it, occupied Bacska and moved into the Banat, in order to link up there with Bem who was advancing from Transylvania. Bem had already taken Arad and besieged Temesvar; Perczel stood at Werschetz close to the Turkish frontier; the Banat was thus conquered in a few days. The fortified Transylvanian mountain passes were at the same time held by the Szeklers, the passes in upper Hungary by the local militia, and Gorgey with a considerable army stood at the Jablunka Pass on the Moravian-Galician frontier.

In short, in a few more days the victorious Magyar army, driving the remnants of the mighty Austrian Legions before it, would have entered Vienna in triumph and put an end to the Austrian monarchy for all time.

Hungary's separation from Austria had been decided in Debrecen on April 14; the alliance with Poland, openly proclaimed since the middle of January, was turned into reality by the 20,000-30,000 Poles who joined the Hungarian army. The alliance with the German Austrians, which had existed since the Viennese revolution of October 6 and the battle at Schwechat, was similarly preserved and sustained by the German Legions within the Hungarian army, as well as by the fact that the Magyars were faced with the strategic and political necessity of occupying Vienna and revolutionizing Austria so as to secure recognition of their declaration of independence.

Thus, the Magyar war very soon lost the national character it had had in the beginning, and assumed a clearly European character, precisely as a result of what would seem to be a purely national act, as a result of the declaration of independence. Only when Hungary proclaimed her separation from Austria, and thereby the dissolution of the Austrian monarchy, did the alliance with the Poles for the liberation of both countries, and the alliance with the Germans for the revolutionization of Eastern Germany acquire a definite character and a solid basis. If Hungary were independent, Poland restored, German Austria turned into the revolutionary focus of Germany, with Lombardy and Italy winning independence -- these plans, if carried out, would wreck the entire East European political system: Austria would disappear, Prussia would disintegrate and Russia would be forced back to the borders of Asia.

The Holy Alliance, therefore, had to make every effort to stem the impending revolution in Eastern Europe -- the Russian armies rolled towards the Transylvanian and Galician frontiers; Prussia occupied the Bohemian-Silesian frontier and allowed the Russians to pass through her territory towards Prerau, and within a few days the first Russian army corps stood on Moravian soil.

The Magyars, who clearly understood that in a few weeks they would have to deal with numerous fresh troops, did not advance on Vienna as quickly as one expected at the beginning. They could not take Vienna, as they could not take Pest, by a frontal attack without shelling the city, and this they were not prepared to do. Again, as at Pest, they were compelled to resort to outflanking maneuvers, and this required time and the assurance that their own flanks and rear were secure. But it was here that the Russians menaced their rear, while if Vienna were seriously endangered strong detachments of Radetzky's army could be immediately expected from the other direction.

The Hungarians therefore acted very wisely when, instead of advancing swiftly on Vienna, they confined themselves to steadily forcing the imperial armies out of Hungary, enveloping them in a wide arc from the foothills of the Carpathians to the spurs of the Styrian Alps, dispatching a strong corps towards Jablunka, fortifying and covering the Galician mountain passes, attacking Ofen and rapidly proceeding with the recruitment of 250,000 men, especially from the reconquered western districts. In this way they secured their flanks and rear and assembled an army which need no more fear the Russian contingents than the once colossal imperial army. 200,000 soldiers of this glorious Austrian army had invaded Hungary and barely 50,000 of them had returned; the rest were either killed, wounded, sick, taken prisoner or had changed sides.

True, the Russians threaten to send even more gigantic armies. Some speak of 120,000 soldiers, others of 170,000. According to the Triester Freihafen, the mobile army in the field is expected considerably to surpass 500,000 men. But the Russian love of exaggeration is well known: of the figures they give only half are on the nominal rolls, and of the numbers on the nominal roll again less than half are really there. If, after deducting the number of troops required for the occupation of Poland, the effective Russian aid amounts to from 60,000 to 70,000 men, the Austrians can be glad. And the Magyars will be able to deal with that number.

The Magyar war of 1849 has strong points of resemblance with the Polish war of 1830-31. But the great difference is that the factors which were against the Poles at that time now act in favor of the Magyars. Lelewel, as we know, unsuccessfully urged, first, that the

mass of the population be bound to the revolution by emancipating the peasants and the Jews, and secondly, that all three partitioning powers be involved in the war and this war turned into a European war, by raising an insurrection throughout the old Polish territories. The Magyars started at the point which the Poles only achieved when it was too late. The Hungarians first of all carried through a social revolution in their country, they abolished feudalism; their second measure was to involve Poland and Germany in the war, thus turning it into a European war. It started with the entry of the first Russian corps into German territory, and will take a decisive turn when the first French battalion steps onto German territory.

By becoming a European war, the Hungarian war is brought into reciprocal interaction with all other factors of the European movement. Its course affects not only Germany, but also France and England. The English bourgeoisie cannot be expected to let Austria become a Russian province and it is certain that the French people will not calmly contemplate the increasing attacks of the counter-revolution on it. Whatever the outcome of the French elections, the army at any rate has declared for the revolution. And the army today is the decisive force. If the army wants war -- and it does want it -- then war it will be.

War will come. Paris is on the threshold of revolution, whether as a result of the elections or of the army's fraternization with the revolutionary party at the ballot-box. While in Southern Germany the core of a revolutionary army is being formed, which prevents Prussia from taking an active part in the Hungarian campaign, France is on the point of having an active role in the struggle. A few weeks, perhaps even a few days, will decide everything, and the French, the Magyar-Polish, and the German revolutionary armies will celebrate their fraternization on the battle-field before the walls of Berlin.



Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr 1.

Acht, Sonntag, 1. Mai

1848.

TO THE WORKERS OF COLOGNE

by
The Editorial Board

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 301

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Finally we warn you against any putsch in Cologne. In the military situation obtaining in Cologne you would be irretrievably lost. You have seen in Elberfeld that the bourgeoisie sends the workers into the fire and betrays them afterwards in the most infamous way. A state of siege in Cologne would demoralize the entire Rhine Province, and a state of siege would be the inevitable consequence of any rising on your part at this moment. The Prussians will be frustrated by your calmness.

In bidding you farewell the editors of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung thank you for the sympathy you have shown them. Their last word everywhere and always will be: emancipation of the working class!

[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)

[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)

[Archives](#)

Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

Organ der Demokratie.

Nr. 1.

Cöln, Donnerstag, 1. Juni

1848.

[SUPPRESSION OF THE NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG]

Neue Rheinische Zeitung No. 301

Translated by the Marx-Engels Institute

Transcribed for the Internet by director@marx.org, 1994

Cologne, May 18. Some time ago Berlin demanded that the local authorities reintroduce a state of siege in Cologne. They intended to use martial law to suppress the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, but met with unexpected resistance. The municipal authorities of Cologne then turned to the judiciary here in order to achieve the same purpose by arbitrary arrests. But this failed on account of the legal scruples of the judiciary, just as it had failed twice before on account of the common sense of the Rhenish juries. [168] There was nothing for it but to resort to a Police ruse, and this, for the time being, has achieved its purpose. The "*Neue Rheinische Zeitung*" ceases publication for the present. On May 16, its Editor-in-Chief Karl Marx received the following official note:

"The tendency of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* to provoke in its readers contempt for the present government, and incite them to violent revolutions and the setting up of a social republic has become stronger in its latest pieces" (!). "The right of hospitality" (!) "which he so disgracefully abused, is therefore to be withdrawn from its Editor-in-Chief, Dr. Karl Marx, and since he has not obtained permission to prolong his stay in these states he is ordered to leave them within 24 hours. If he should not comply with this demand, he is to be conveyed across the border. Cologne, May 11, 1849.

Royal Government
Moeller

"(Addressed to) Herr Geiger, Royal Police Director, here."

Why these absurd phrases, these official lies?

The trend and tone of the latest pieces of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung do not differ a whit from its first "trial piece". In that "first piece" we wrote among other things:

"Herr Huser's idea (in Mainz) is but part of the larger plan of the Berlin reactionaries, who would like... to deliver us defenseless... into the hands of the army."

Well, gentlemen, what do you say now?

As to our tendency, did not the government know it? Have we not declared before the jury that it was now "the duty of the press to undermine the whole basis of the existing order"? Regarding the Hohenzollern princeling one can read the following in the issue of October 19, 1848:

"The King is consistent. He would always have been consistent, had not the March days unfortunately interposed that portentous piece of paper between His Majesty and the people. At present His Majesty apparently believes again, as he did prior to the March days, that Slavism has 'feet of iron'; perhaps the people of Vienna is the magician who will turn the iron into clay."

Is that clear, gentlemen?

And the "social republic"? Have we proclaimed it only in the "latest pieces" of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung?

Did we not speak plainly and clearly enough for those dullards who failed to see the "red" thread running through all our comments and reports on the European movement?

The November 7 issue of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung says, "Assuming that arms will enable the counter-revolution to establish itself in the whole of Europe, money would then kill it in the whole of Europe. European bankruptcy, national bankruptcy would be the fate nullifying the victory. Bayonets crumble like tinder when they come into contact with the salient 'economic' facts. But developments will

not wait for the bills of exchange drawn by the European states on the new European society to expire.

"The crushing counter-blow of the June revolution will be struck in Paris. With the victory of the 'red' republic in Paris, armies will be rushed from the interior of their countries to the frontiers and across them, and the real strength of the fighting parties will become evident. We shall then remember this June and this October and we too shall exclaim:

"Vae victis!

"The purposeless massacres perpetrated since the June and October events, the tedious offering of sacrifices since February and March, the very cannibalism of the counterrevolution will convince the nations that there is only one way in which the murderous death agonies of the old society and the bloody birth throes of the new society can be shortened, simplified and concentrated, and that way is revolutionary terror."

Is that clear, gentlemen?

From the very beginning we did not consider it necessary to conceal our views. During a polemic with the judiciary here, we told you:

"The real opposition of the 'Neue Rheinische Zeitung' will begin only in the tricolor republic."

And at that time we were speaking with the judiciary. We summed up the old year, 1848, in the following words (cf. the issue of December 31, 1848):

"The history of the Prussian middle class, and that of the German middle class in general between March and December shows that a purely middle-class revolution and the establishment of bourgeois rule in the form of a constitutional monarchy is impossible in Germany, and that the only alternatives are either a feudal absolutist counterrevolution or a social republican revolution."

Did we therefore have to advance our social republican tendency only

in the "last pieces" of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung? Did you not read our articles about the June revolution, and was not the essence of the June revolution the essence of our Paper?

Why then your hypocritical phrases, your attempt to find an impossible pretext?

We have no compassion and we ask no compassion from you. When our turn comes, we shall not make excuses for the terror. But the royal terrorists, the terrorists by the grace of God and the law, are in practice brutal, disdainful, and mean, in theory cowardly, secretive, and deceitful, and in both respects disreputable.

The Prussian official piece of paper goes even to the absurd length of speaking about the "right of hospitality which was disgracefully abused" by Karl Marx, the Editor-in-Chief of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

The right of hospitality which the insolent intruders, the anterior Russians (Borussians), forced upon us, inhabitants of the Rhineland, on our own land-this hospitality was indeed "disgracefully" abused by the Neue Rheinische Zeitung. We believe that we have thereby rendered a service to the Rhine Province. We have saved the revolutionary honor of our homeland. From now on the Neue Preussische Zeitung alone will enjoy the full right of citizenship in the Rhine Province.

In parting we should like to remind our readers of the words printed in the first issue we published in January:

"The table of contents for 1849 reads: Revolutionary rising of the French working class, world war."

And in the East, a revolutionary army made up of fighters of all nationalities already confronts the alliance of the old Europe represented by the Russian army, while from Paris comes the threat of a "red republic".


[Neue Rheinische Zeitung](#)



[Marx / Engels](#)
[Archive](#)



[Marxist writers'](#)
[Archives](#)



THE KARL MARX AND
FREDRICK ENGELS
INTERNET ARCHIVE

WORKS
BIOGRAPHY
LETTERS
IMAGES

CONTACT US

[Text Index](#) | [MIA Index](#)

MARXIST WRITERS

PEOPLE WHO WERE IN PRACTICE COMMUNISTS
& IN THEORY DIALECTICAL MATERIALISTS

Large Collections:

[Marx & Engels](#)

Socialism: Utopian and Scientific
Capital
The German Ideology
[over 200 other works]

[Lenin](#)

What is to be Done?
State and Revolution
Left-Wing Communism
[over 200 other works]

[Trotsky](#)

History of the Russian Revolution
My Life
The Revolution Betrayed
[over 75 other works]

[Subject Index](#)

On Women
On Political Economy
Student's Section
[etc.]

[Connolly](#)

The Future of Labour (Socialism made
easy)
Workshop Talks
Street Fighting- a Summary
[over 100 other works]

[DeLeon](#)

Reform or Revolution
The Burning Question of Trades
Unionism
Socialist Reconstruction of Society
[over 40 other works]

[Luxemburg](#)

On Mass Action
The Socialisation of Society
The Russian Revolution
[13 other works]

[Maclean](#)

The Foundation of the British Socialist
Party
The Irish Tragedy: Scotland's Disgrace..
A Scottish Communist Party
[12 other works]

Small Collections:

[Cannon](#)

Speech at the First Workers Party
Convention
Against Expulsion from the Communist
Party
Decision to join the Trotskyst camp
[1 other work]

[Draper](#)

The ABC of National Liberation
Movements
Toward a New Beginning
A Fourth of July Oration
[4 other works]

[Dunayevskaya](#)

Mao Perverts Lenin [abstract]
Philosophy & Revolution [abstract]

[Elkonin](#)

Toward the Problem of Stages in the
Mental Development of Children

[Guevara](#)

Revolutionary Medicine
Man & Socialism in Cuba
Message to the Tricontinental
[3 other works]

[Ilyenkov](#)

Dialectics of the Abstract & Concrete
Dialectical Logic
Leninist Dialectics & Metaphysics of
Positivism [abstract]

[CLR James](#)

Notes on Dialectics [abstract]
Articles on Socialism & Black
Power[abstracts]

[Kautsky](#)

The Intellectuals and the Workers

[Luria](#)

Cognitive Development: Its Social and
Cultural Foundations
The Making of Mind: A Personal Account
of Soviet Psychology

[Mariategui](#)

History of the World Crisis 1924
Anti-Imperialist Viewpoint
The Exile of Trotsky
[2 other works]

[Mészáros](#)

Marx's Theory of Alienation

[Mikhailov](#)

The Riddle of the Self

[Morris](#)

How We Live and How We Might Live
Art and Socialism
Socialism and Anarchism
[1 other work]

[Novack](#)

Introduction to the Logic Of Marxism
[abstract]
Empiricism and Its Evolution — A
Marxist View [abstract]

[Pablo](#)

The 4th International...
The Arab Revolution
Self-management in the struggle...
[1 other work]

[Pannekoek](#)

Marx and Darwin

[Pilling](#)

Ethics and the Materialist Conception of
History
The Social Revolution
[4 other works]

[Kollontai](#)

Internatioanl Women's Day
Red Love
Workers' Opposition

[Labriola](#)

On Socialism and Philosophy
Historical Materialism

[Lafargue](#)

The Right To Be Lazy
The Bankruptcy of Capitalism
The Rights of the Horse and the Rights of
Man
[4 other works]

[Leontev](#)

Activity, Consciousness and Personality

[Lukacs](#)

History & Class Consciousness [abstract]
The Young Hegel [abstract]
1967 [abstract]

[Lunacharsky](#)

Potraits on Lenin, Trotsky, etc

Marx's Capital, Philosophy and Political
Economy [abstract]

[Plekhanov](#)

For the 60th Anniversary of Hegel's Death
[abstract]

The Materialist conception of History
[abstract]

[Pouliopoulos](#)

On Trotsky

[Reed](#)

The Traders' War
Soviets in Action

[Riazanov](#)

On Engels' The Peasants' war in Germany
Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels

[Shachtman](#)

Genesis of Trotskyism
The Struggle for the New Course
The Fight for Socialism
[14 other works]

[Vygotsky](#)

The Crisis in Psychology[abstract]
Thinking & Speaking[abstract]
The Psychology of Art

[Non-English Archive:](#)

[Dansk](#)

[Chinese](#)

[Deutsch](#)

[Espanol](#)

[Bahasa Indonesia](#)

[Euskara](#)

[Italiano](#)

[Norsk](#)

[Nederlands](#)

[Français](#)

[Ellinika](#)

[Türkçe](#)

[Português](#)

[Nihon go](#)

[Suomi](#)

[Svenska](#)

[Russkij](#)

[Marxists Internet Archive](#)