

## Karl Marx 1860

### Herr Vogt

**Source:** Book published in 1982 by New Park Publications, 21b Old Town, London SW4 0JT, translation by Robert Archer. Scanned and prepared for the Marxist Internet Archive by Paul Flewers.

### Contents

Foreword.....	3
Chapter I: The Brimstone Gang.....	5
Chapter II: The Bürstenheimers.....	13
Chapter III: Police Matters.....	21
Chapter IV: Techow’s Letter .....	37
Chapter V: Imperial Regent and Count Palatine.....	52
Chapter VI: Vogt and the <i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> .....	53
Chapter VII: The Augsburg Campaign.....	59
Chapter VIII: Da-Da Vogt and His Studies .....	72
Chapter IX: Agency .....	103
Chapter X: Patrons and Accomplices .....	122
Chapter XI: A Trial.....	149
Chapter XII: Appendices .....	170
XIV: Dentu Pamphlets.....	188
XV: Postscript.....	189
XVI: Additional Material by Marx on the Vogt Case.....	190

### Publisher’s Foreword

*Herr Vogt* is Marx’s ‘forgotten’ work. Mentioned in passing — if at all — in biographical studies, and scarcely at all in discussions of his writings, it has remained for over a century largely neglected.

Yet this is the work which Marx took the best part of a year away from the writing of *Capital* to complete. It is an answer to the slanders against himself, Engels and their supporters which appeared in Karl Vogt’s 1859 pamphlet, *Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung*. He knew before its publication that many ‘clever men’ would be ‘completely unable to grasp how I could squander my time on refuting such infantile nonsense’.

What the clever men and their successors over the years could not or would not understand is that for Marx in 1860, as for Marxists today, the defence and security of the revolutionary party was of paramount concern.

The German workers’ movement of the 1830s and 1840s, operating largely in exile, was the first international workers’ movement to come into existence. Out of it, in 1847, Marx, Engels and their supporters formed the Communist League, which adopted the *Communist Manifesto* they drafted for it and inscribed the proletarian revolution on its banner.

In the 1848 revolution which swept Germany and Europe, members of the League quickly took the lead among the working class. When the movement was suppressed, it was the Communist League, gathering again in exile, which drew the lessons of the year of revolution. Marx and Engels insisted

on the necessity to build the revolutionary leadership of the independent workers' movement. Constantly analysing the development of capitalism and of the class struggle, they saw that the industrial crisis of 1847 which had led to the revolutionary upsurge of the following year, had for the moment been overcome. Capitalism was entering into its phase of most rapid expansion. The task of leadership was to prepare the working class for the moment when the forces of production would again come into violent conflict with the mode of production.

But in the wake of 1848, petty-bourgeois factions of all nationalities abounded which rejected this perspective. Louis Kossuth of Hungary, the Italian Giuseppe Mazzini and many others came to London with schemes to form provisional governments and organise the 'liberation' of their native countries. The German petty-bourgeois group around Kinkel proposed a loan raised in America as the main means to revolution. When Willich, Schapper and others within the League proposed to follow the road of petty-bourgeois adventurism, a split took place.

Marx's intransigence against the petty-bourgeois factions was wholly vindicated in the years that followed. The military adventures ended in disaster. European reaction found fertile ground for its agents among the petty-bourgeois factions. At the head of the reaction was Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, the French president. In 1852 he proclaimed himself Emperor Napoleon III and established the Second Empire, which was to last until 1870. He at once set about juggling with the various bourgeois nationalist movements in his bid to gain hegemony in Europe.

Meanwhile, the rapid development in capitalism led to the international economic crisis of 1857–58, giving new impetus to both the working-class struggle and the struggle of the nationalities. The tasks left unsolved by the 1848 revolutions — particularly the national unification of Germany and of Italy — now became burning questions once more. In 1859 the Italian war broke out.

It was a moment of both great opportunity and great danger for the Communists. The revival in working-class activity opened the possibility of rallying new forces; but the instability of the Bonapartist regime made it more desperate to attack its enemies.

It was at this moment that Karl Vogt published his slanderous pamphlet against Marx and his colleagues. Vogt had taken the side of the petty-bourgeois democrats in 1848. Now he reached for the foulest slanders against Communists, not hesitating to use the forged police evidence produced against them in 1852 at the time of the Cologne Communist Trial. He alleged that they engaged in secret and violent conspiracies and that Marx acted among them like a dictator.

In this book Marx answers Vogt line for line and charge for charge. In the first chapters he holds up to ridicule Vogt's assertion that the Communists constituted a secret conspiratorial gang, producing evidence from German émigrés which leaves the slanderer's arguments in tatters. Marx spares neither wit nor invective in demolishing his opponent.

But *Herr Vogt* is more than a fine defensive polemic. Marx goes on to expose who and what Karl Vogt was. He takes Vogt's articles on the European situation (see in particular Chapter VIII), and shows them to be directly in line with Bonapartist propaganda. Carefully compiling the results of his investigations, he traces a whole network of Bonapartist agents and publicists in and around the workers' movement. Vogt stands exposed as a mouthpiece of Napoleon III.

The service this exposure did to the revolutionary movement was revealed ten years later, after the fall of the Second Empire, when Vogt's name was indeed found in the lists of Napoleon's hired agents.

\* \* \*

Since 1975 the International Committee of the Fourth International has been engaged in a major investigation into the circumstances surrounding the death of its founder Leon Trotsky in 1940, the infiltration of his household by agents of the GPU, and the subsequent infiltration of the Trotskyist movement and in particular the American Socialist Workers Party by agents of imperialism. The investigation has already produced irrefutable evidence of such infiltration.

From its inception the inquiry has been ignored or derided by the revisionists and their petty-bourgeois circles. The International Committee has been described as 'paranoic'.

Historically, it is in good company. What *Herr Vogt* reveals is that from the very earliest years the Marxist movement was obliged to pay the greatest attention to its security and to the exposure of

agents in the workers' movement. The self-styled academic 'Marxists' who consider the writing of the book was a diversion from Marx's main task, do not pause to consider what would have happened to the writing of *Capital* had Marx and his party been unable to defend themselves against the Bonapartist agents.

Vogt's pamphlet had at once been seized on by the bourgeois press, not only in Germany but in all Europe, to fuel their anti-Communist diatribes. Marx himself became the immediate object of the smear campaign. But he at once saw that what was at stake was the future of the party itself. To expose Vogt and his slanders became 'of decisive importance for the *historical vindication* of the party and for its future position in Germany' (Letter to Freiligrath, 23 February 1860).

Marx had no hesitation in committing himself to the expense and difficulties of conducting a case in the German courts against the Berlin *National-Zeitung*, which had reproduced the lies from the pamphlet. The Prussian authorities, nervous of the implications, would not even allow him to bring the suit. When it was rejected, he extended the reply he was preparing to Vogt into the present book. In the course of it, he also exposes the bourgeois press — including the London *Daily Telegraph*, then a Liberal paper, to which he devotes a particularly choice passage (Chapter X).

Throughout the book, the struggle against the agents and their 'patrons and accomplices' is closely related to the struggle for an independent, revolutionary working-class leadership, against all petty-bourgeois tendencies and diversions. Without this firm political position, the struggle against Vogt could not have been waged. Marx's opposition to the conspiratorial-adventurist position of the Willich-Schapper faction aided him in decisively refuting Vogt's charges of conspiracy. His analysis of Bonapartism enabled him to see the importance of establishing all the connections of Vogt and his fellow-agents. Engels and he firmly opposed all those who saw the role of Bonapartism as 'progressive' because of its alliances with Italian and German bourgeois nationalists. They insisted against all comers (including the outstanding German socialist leader Lassalle) that such unification must be carried out by *revolutionary* democratic means.

Here too, the International Committee of the Fourth International takes up and continues Marx's struggle. It is only the prolonged struggle against every shade of revisionism in the decades since the Second World War, which enables it today to expose the agents who have taken over and subverted an entire section of the Trotskyist movement — the American Socialist Workers Party — in their bid to disarm, discredit and destroy the Fourth International.

These agents will not now succeed, any more than Vogt and his Bonapartist paymasters succeeded in destroying Marx and the Communist League. In arming the revolutionary party against further such attacks, Marx's *Herr Vogt* remains, after 120 years, a model of the analysis, investigation and exposure of the agents of bourgeois reaction.

**Editorial note:** In this edition the style and emphasis of the original German text has been followed as closely as possible. In the frequent passages where Marx quotes from a language other than German, the original has been retained with an English translation provided in a footnote. Marx's own notes are also given at the foot of the page; for the editors' explanatory notes, the reader is referred to the section beginning on page 317. [Notes here are displayed at the end of each chapter; Marx's own notes are indicated to distinguish them from those of the editors — MIA.]

## Foreword

Under the date 'London, 6 February 1860' I published in the Berlin *Volks-Zeitung*, the Hamburg *Reform* <sup>[1]</sup> and other German newspapers a statement that begins with the following words:

I hereby announce that I have made preparatory steps towards taking legal action for libel against the Berlin *National-Zeitung* <sup>[2]</sup> for its leading articles no 37 and no 41 on Vogt's pamphlet: *Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung*. <sup>[3]</sup> I am reserving a literary answer to Vogt for later.

Why I decided to answer *Karl Vogt* in a literary manner and the *National-Zeitung* in a legal manner can be seen from the present book itself.

In the course of February 1860 I took action for libel against the *National-Zeitung*. After the case had been through four stages of preparatory proceedings, I received, on 23 October of this year, the ruling

of the Prussian Royal Supreme Court denying me the right to prosecute my accusation to the highest stage, and the case was thus dismissed before it could come to public proceedings. If this had taken place, which I had a right to expect, I would have been spared the first third of the present publication. A simple reprint of the shorthand record of the court proceedings would have been sufficient, and I would thus have escaped the highly repugnant labour of answering accusations against my own person, and thus being obliged to talk about myself. I have always avoided this so carefully that Vogt could expect some success from his lying stories. However, *sunt certi denique fines*.<sup>[4]</sup> Vogt's farrago, summarised in its own way by the *National-Zeitung*, accuses me of a series of slanderous actions which now, since I have been finally prevented from refuting them legally and *publicly*, demand a literary refutation. But apart from this consideration, which left me no choice, once I had to go into Vogt's tall stories about myself and my party comrades, I had other motives for dealing more exhaustively with them: on the one hand, the almost unanimous shout of triumph with which the so-called 'liberal' press in Germany greeted his alleged revelations; on the other hand, the opportunity offered by an analysis of this farrago for characterising such an individual, who represents a whole tendency.

The answer to Vogt has forced me to expose here and there a *partie honteuse*<sup>[5]</sup> of the history of the emigration.<sup>[6]</sup> Here I am only making use of the right of self-defence. Besides, with the exception of a few people, the emigration can be accused of nothing worse than illusions, which were more or less justified by the conditions of the times, and follies, which necessarily grew out of the extraordinary circumstances in which they unexpectedly found themselves. I speak here of course only of the first years of the emigration. A comparison of the history of governments and of bourgeois society from, say, 1849 to 1859 with the history of the emigration for the same period, would be the most splendid apology for the latter that could be written.

I know in advance that the same clever men who, when Vogt's farrago appeared, shook their heads solemnly over the seriousness of his 'revelations', will now be completely unable to grasp how I could squander my time on refuting such infantile nonsense, while the 'liberal' hacks who hawked Vogt's stale vulgarities and worthless lies with malicious haste around the German, Swiss, French and American press will find the manner in which I send themselves and their heroes about their business outrageously offensive. But never mind!

The political and legal parts of this book need no separate introduction. I would only like to note one thing in order to avoid possible misunderstandings. The very men who, even before 1848, were in agreement among themselves to support the independence of Poland, Hungary and Italy not only as the *right* of those countries but as the *interest* of Germany and Europe, have laid down diametrically opposed views on the tactics that Germany had to carry out in relation to Louis Napoleon on the occasion of the Italian war of 1859. These contradictory views arose from contradictory judgements of the *factual assumptions*, a decision on which will have to be reserved for a later occasion. For my part I am concerned in this book only with the views of *Vogt* and his clique. Even the views he *claimed* to represent and which he represented in the *imagination* of an injudicious mob fall outside the terms of reference of my criticism. I deal with the views that he *really* represented.

Finally, I would like to express my hearty thanks for the ready help given to me in the writing of this book not only by old friends in the party but also by many members of the emigration in Switzerland, France and England who were not previously close to me and who, in part, were personally unknown to me.

**Karl Marx**

London

17 November 1860

## Notes

**1** *Volks-Zeitung* — democratic daily paper, appeared from 1853 in Berlin. *Reform* — liberal daily paper, appeared between 1848 and 1892 in Hamburg.

**2** *National-Zeitung* — bourgeois daily paper which appeared between 1848 and 1915 in Berlin. In the 1850s it represented a liberal tendency. From 1915 the *8 Uhr Abendblatt/National-Zeitung*.

**3** Karl Vogt, *Mein Prozess Gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung* (Geneva, December 1859). *Allgemeine-Zeitung* — bourgeois daily paper founded in 1798; appeared between 1810 and 1882 in Augsburg. In the 1850s and 1860s it supported plans for the national unification of Germany under the domination of Austria.

**4** There are after all certain limits.

**5** Shameful chapter.

**6** ‘Emigration’ — the German revolutionaries forced to emigrate from Germany after the crushing of the revolution of 1848–49.

## Chapter I: The Brimstone Gang

*Clarín*: Malas pastillas gasta;... hase untado con unguento de azufre — Calderon <sup>[1]</sup>

That ‘rounded character’, as the advocate, *Hermann*, tactfully described his rotund client, the hereditary steward of Nichilberg, <sup>[2]</sup> before the District Court at Augsburg, begins his Horrendous Contortions of History as follows:

Known under the name of the ‘Brimstone Gang’, <sup>[3]</sup> or also under the no less characteristic name of the ‘*Bürstenheimers*’, there were, among the refugees of 1849, a number of people who, at first scattered between Switzerland, France and England, gradually gathered in London and there honoured Herr Marx as their visible chief. The political principle of these fellows was the dictatorship of the proletariat, etc. (Karl Vogt, *Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung* <sup>[4]</sup> (Geneva, December 1859), p 136)

The *Magnum Opus* <sup>[5]</sup> in which this important announcement occurs appeared in December 1859. Eight months previously, however, that ‘rounded character’ had published an article in the *Biel Handels-Courier* <sup>[6]</sup> which must be regarded as the outline of the more far-reaching Contortions of History. <sup>[7]</sup> Let us listen to the original text:

Since the overturn of the revolution in 1849 [crows the *Biel Carpet-Bagger*] a clique of refugees has by and by gathered in London, whose members were known, among the *émigrés in Switzerland*, as the ‘*Bürstenheimers*’ or in its [sic!] day as the ‘*Brimstone Gang*’. Their chief is *Marx*, the former editor of the *Rheinische Zeitung* in Cologne — their password ‘Socialist Republic, Workers’ Dictatorship’ — and their activity is the weaving of plots and conspiracies. (Reprinted in the *Magnum Opus*, Section III, Documents, no 7, pp 31–32)

The clique of refugees who, ‘among the *émigrés in Switzerland*’, were known as the ‘*Brimstone Gang*’, were transformed eight months later and for a larger audience into a mass ‘scattered’ throughout ‘Switzerland, France and England’, and known ‘among the refugees’ in general as the ‘*Brimstone Gang*’. It is the old tale of the buckram of Kendal green as told by Karl Vogt’s prototype, the immortal Sir John Falstaff, who has by no means suffered any *material* loss in his zoological reincarnation. From the *Biel Carpet-Bagger* we learn that the ‘*Brimstone Gang*’ like the ‘*Bürstenheimers*’ were local *Swiss* flora. Let us have a look at their natural history.

Informed by friends that in the year 1849–50 a refugee society under the name ‘*Brimstone Gang*’ had indeed flowered in Geneva, and that Herr *SL Borkheim*, a well-established merchant in the City of London, could give me more detailed information on the origins, growth and decay of this brilliant association, I addressed myself in writing to that gentleman, who at the time was not known to me, in February 1860, and did in fact receive, after a personal encounter, the following sketch, which I print unaltered:

12 February 1860  
18 Union Grove  
Wandsworth Road  
London

**Dear Sir**

Although until three days ago we were not acquainted with one another, despite the fact that we have lived in the same country, and mostly in the same town, for nine years, you were right to presume that I could not deny you, as a fellow exile, the information you desired.

Well then, to the 'Brimstone Gang'.

In 1849, shortly after we rebels had been driven out of Baden at gun-point, there met in Geneva, partly sent there by the Swiss authorities and partly there by choice, several young men who, as students, soldiers and merchants, had either been friends before 1848 in Germany or become acquainted with one another during the revolution.

The mood among the refugees was by no means bright. The so-called political leaders tried to shrug off the blame for the failure on to each other's shoulders, military leaders criticised each other's offensive retreats, flanking manoeuvres and strategic withdrawals; people began to abuse each other as bourgeois republicans, Socialists and Communists; it rained broadsheets, whose effects were far from soothing; spies were suspected everywhere, and besides all this most people's clothes were wearing to rags, and hunger was to be read on many faces. In the midst of all these afflictions, the young people I have already mentioned held together in friendship. They were:

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

*Max Cohnheim* from Fraustadt; he had been a shop assistant and was, at the outbreak of the revolution, a volunteer in the Artillery of the Guard.

*Korn*, chemist and pharmacist from Berlin.

*Becker*, engineer from the Rhineland.

And *I myself* who, after I had taken my matriculation examination at the *Werder Gymnasium* in Berlin, had resided in Breslau, Greifswald and Berlin for the purposes of study, and whom the '48 revolution found in my native town of Glogau as a gunner.

I do not think that any of us were older than 24. We lived close together, in fact for some time we all lived together in the same house in the Grand Pré. Our main occupation was not to permit ourselves to be depressed and demoralised by the general misery of the refugees and the political hangover we suffered in that little country, which offered so few opportunities for earning a living. The climate and natural surroundings were splendid — we remained true to our Prussian antecedents and found the '*Jugend jottvoll*'.<sup>[8]</sup> Whatever one of us possessed belonged also to the others, and when none of us had anything we found kind-hearted publicans or other good people who would take pleasure in lending us something on the strength of our young and vivacious faces. Honestly, we must all have looked really crazy! I must at this point make grateful mention of the café proprietor, Bertin (*Café de l'Europe*), who quite indefatigably gave 'tick' not only to us but also to many other German and French refugees. In 1856, after an absence of six years, I visited Geneva while returning from the Crimea for the sole purpose of paying my debts, with the reverence of a repentant reveller. The good, round, fat Bertin was astonished, and assured me that I was the first to do him this pleasure, but that he by no means regretted, nevertheless, having 10,000 to 20,000 Francs outstanding to him from refugees who had already been scattered all over the world. Quite apart from their debts to him, he enquired with particular warmth about my closer friends. Unfortunately there was very little I could tell him.

After the above digression I now return to the year 1849. We tiddled joyfully and sang merrily. I remember having seen refugees of every political shading, Frenchmen and Italians too, at our table. Happy evenings spent in such *dulci jubilo* <sup>[91]</sup> all seemed to be oases in the otherwise miserable desert of the life of the refugee. Even friends who were, or were to become, members of the Grand Council of Geneva, found their way now and then to our revels for relaxation.

Liebknecht, who is now here and whom I have seen only three or four times in the last nine years, always meeting him by chance in the street, was not infrequently part of our company. Students, doctors, former friends from the *Gymnasium* or the university travelling abroad, often drank their way through many glasses of beer and many a bottle of the good, cheap Mâcon with us. In between times we lay around for days, indeed weeks, on Lake Geneva without ever coming ashore, singing the songs of the troubadours and, guitar in hand, ‘serenading’ the windows of the villas on the Savoy and Swiss shores.

I do not flinch from stating here that our boisterous blood relieved itself from time to time in tricks that broke the law. That dear man, the late *Albert Galeer*, no mean political opponent of Fazy’s in the Geneva corporation, would then preach morals to us in the friendliest tone. ‘You fellows are crazy’, he would say, ‘but it is true that to have such good spirits despite the misery of being refugees you can’t be moral or physical weaklings — you need resilience for that.’ It was hard for that good-hearted man to be any harder on us. He was a Grand Councillor of the Canton of Geneva.

The only duel that took place to my knowledge was with pistols between myself and Herr R—n. The cause was by no means of a political nature. My second was a Genevan artilleryman who spoke only French and the umpire was the young *Oscar Galeer*, brother of the Grand Councillor, who unfortunately later, when a student in Munich, was taken from us by typhus. A second duel, the cause of which was also non-political, was to have taken place between Rosenblum and a refugee, Lieutenant von F—g from Baden, who shortly afterwards returned to his own country and, I believe, went back to the re-formed army of Baden. The quarrel was amicably settled on the morning of the duel without coming to an actual fight, by the mediation of Herr Engels — I assume this is the same man who is now said to live in Manchester. I have not seen him since. This Herr Engels was on his *way through* Geneva and we certainly did not drink any the less wine in his stimulating company. The encounter with him, if I remember correctly, was particularly welcome to us as we could allow his purse to take charge of the proceedings.

We joined neither the so-called blue republicans nor the red, neither the Socialist nor the Communist party leaders. We took the liberty of judging the political activities of Imperial Regents, of members of the Frankfurt Parliament and other talking-shops, of revolutionary generals or corporals, and of the Dalai Lamas of Communism freely and independently — I will not claim always correctly — and for that and for other purposes that amused us we even founded a weekly paper entitled: *RUMMELTIPUFF — Organ of the Rogueaucracy*. <sup>[10]</sup> Only two issues of the paper appeared. When I was later arrested in France to be sent here, my papers and diaries were seized by the French police, and I can no longer remember with accuracy whether our paper was buried by an official ban or by poverty.

‘Philistines’ — from among the so-called bourgeois republicans and also from the ranks of the so-called Communist workers — called us by the name of the ‘*Brimstone Gang*’. Occasionally it seems to me that we gave ourselves this name. In any case, it applied to our society solely in the amiable German sense of the word. I always meet comrades in exile on the friendliest terms, friends of Herr Vogt and others who were, and probably still are, friends of yours. But I am glad that I have never heard anyone, on any side, speak with disrespect of the members of the *Brimstone Gang* I have described, in either a personal or a political connection.

This ‘*Brimstone Gang*’ is the only one whose existence is known to me. It existed between 1849 and 1850 in Geneva. In mid-1850 the few members of this dangerous society, since they belonged to the categories of refugees who were to be expelled, were forced to leave Switzerland with the exception of Korn. Thus the life of the ‘*Brimstone Gang*’ had come to an end. I know nothing of any other ‘*Brimstone Gangs*’ existing anywhere else for any purpose whatsoever.

*Korn* remained, I believe, in Switzerland, and is said to have settled there as a pharmacist. *Cohnheim* and *Rosenblum* went to Holstein before the battle of Idstedt.

<sup>[11]</sup> I think they both took part in it. Later, in 1851, they sailed to America. *Rosenblum* returned to England at the end of the same year and went, in 1852, to Australia, whence I have heard nothing from him since 1855. *Cohnheim* is supposed to have been the editor of the *New Yorker Humorist* for some time. *Becker* went to America in 1850. I cannot unfortunately say with any certainty what has become of him.

I myself spent the winter of 1850–51 in Paris and Strasburg and was, as I already indicated above, forcibly sent to England — in the space of three months I was dragged through 25 prisons and generally wore heavy iron chains during the march. After spending the first year mastering the language, I devoted my life here to business, not without a continuous lively interest in the political events of my homeland, but always free of any refugee clique affairs. I am now doing quite well, or as the English say: very well, sir, thank you. It is your own fault if you want to wade through this long, but in any case not very important story.

I respectfully remain your devoted servant

**Sigismund L Borkheim**

So much for *Herr Borkheim*’s letter. With a premonition of their historical importance, the ‘*Brimstone Gang*’ took the precautionary measure of carving a register of their members in woodcuts in the book of history. The first issue of *Rummeltipuff*, that is to say, is decorated with the likenesses of its founders.

The brilliant gentlemen of the ‘*Brimstone Gang*’ had taken part in *Struve*’s republican putsch of September 1848, then been imprisoned in the gaol at Bruchsal, and finally fought as soldiers in the campaign for the imperial constitution, which had carried them over the Swiss border. <sup>[12]</sup> In the course of 1850, two matadors of that same group, *Cohnheim* and *Rosenblum*, arrived in London, where they ‘gathered round’ *Herr Gustav Struve*. I did not have the honour to be personally acquainted with them. They entered into a political relationship with me by trying to form, under *Struve*’s leadership, a committee in opposition to the London Refugees’ Committee <sup>[13]</sup> led at that time by myself, *Engels*, *Willich* and others. This committee’s *pronunciamento*, which was hostile to us, and which was signed by *Struve*, *Rosenblum*, *Cohnheim*, *Bobzin*, *Grunich* and *Oswald*, appeared in, among other journals, the *Berlin Abend-Post*.

In the heyday of the Holy Alliance the *Charcoal Burners (Carbonari)* <sup>[14]</sup> formed a lucrative mine for police activity and aristocratic fantasy. Did our Imperial Gorgellantua think to exploit the ‘*Brimstone Gang*’ in the same way as the *Charcoal Gang* for the instruction and edification of the Teutonic citizenry? The *Saltpetre Gang* would complete this policeman’s trinity. Perhaps, too, *Karl Vogt* is averse to sulphur because the smell of gunpowder terrifies him. Or does he, like other sick people, hate the specific remedy for his disease? The doctor of occult medicine, *Rademacher*, <sup>[15]</sup> as we know, classifies diseases according to their remedies. Thus under the heading of sulphur disease would come what the advocate, *Hermann*, calls his client’s ‘rounded character’ at the District Court in Augsburg, what *Rademacher* calls a ‘stomach wall distended like a drum’, and what the even greater Doctor *Fischart* calls the ‘vaulted belly from France’. All Falstaffian characters thus suffer from the sulphur disease in more than one sense. Or did *Vogt*’s zoological conscience remind him that sulphur is death to the itch-mite (*sarcoptes scabiei*), completely and utterly odious to those itch-mites who have already frequently changed their skins. For, as recent researches have proved, only those itch-mites that have moulted are capable of reproduction and have thus achieved self-consciousness. What a nice contrast: on the one hand, sulphur and, on the other, the self-conscious itch-mite! But in any case *Vogt* owes it to his ‘Emperor’ and the liberal Teutonic citizens to prove that all the trouble since



the ‘overturn of the revolution in 1849’ comes from the *Brimstone Gang* in Geneva and not the *December Gang* in Paris. He had to elevate me personally to the chief of the Brimstone Gang which he slanders, and which was unknown to me until the appearance of the *Magnum Opus*, as a punishment for my years of sacrilege against the head and members of the ‘Tenth of December Gang’. <sup>[16]</sup> In order to make the justified resentment of the ‘jolly companion’ understandable I quote here some passages from my book *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (New York, 1852), relating to the ‘December Gang’ (see pages 31, 32 and 61, 62).

This gang <sup>[17]</sup> dates from the year 1849. On the pretext of founding a benevolent society, the lumpen-proletariat of Paris had been organised into secret sections, each section being led by Bonapartist agents, with a Bonapartist general at the head of the whole. Alongside decayed roués with dubious means of subsistence and of dubious origin, alongside ruined and adventurous offshoots of the bourgeoisie, were vagabonds, discharged soldiers, discharged jailbirds, escaped galley slaves, swindlers, mountebanks, lazzaroni, pickpockets, smugglers, gamblers, *macquereaus*, <sup>[18]</sup> brothel-keepers, porters, casual labourers, organ-grinders, rag-pickers, knife-grinders, tinkers, beggars — in short, the whole indefinite, disintegrated mass thrown hither and thither, which the French term *la bohème*; from this fraternity Bonaparte formed the core of the Tenth of December Gang. A ‘benevolent society’ — in so far as, like Bonaparte, all its members felt the need of benefitting themselves at the expense of the labouring nation.

This Bonaparte, who constitutes himself chief of the lumpen-proletariat, who here alone rediscovers in the mass the interests which he personally pursues, who recognises in this scum, offal and refuse of all classes the only class upon which he can base himself unconditionally, is the real Bonaparte, the Bonaparte *sans phrase*, unmistakable even when later, being omnipotent, he shrugged off the guilt on to some of his former fellow conspirators by sending them to Cayenne along with the revolutionaries. Crafty old roué, he conceives the historical life of the nations and their state dramas as comedy in the most vulgar sense, as a masquerade where the grand costumes, words and postures merely serve to mask the pettiest knavery. Thus it was on his expedition to Strasbourg, where a trained Swiss vulture had been playing the part of the Napoleonic eagle. For his raid on Boulogne he puts some London lackeys into French uniforms. They represent the army. <sup>[19]</sup> In his Tenth of December Gang, he assembles ten thousand rascally fellows, who are to play the part of the people, as Nick Bottom that of the lion... <sup>[20]</sup>

What the national workshops were for the socialist workers, what the *Gardes mobiles* were for the bourgeois republicans, the Tenth of December Gang was for Bonaparte the party fighting force peculiar to him. On his journeys the detachments of this gang packing the railways had to improvise a public for him, stage public enthusiasm, roar *Vive l'Empereur*, insult and thrash republicans, under the protection, of course, of the police. On his return journeys to Paris they had to form the advance guard, forestall counter-demonstrations or disperse them. The Tenth of December Gang belonged to him, it was *his* work, his very own idea. Whatever else he does, the circumstances do for him or he is content to copy from the deeds of others. But Bonaparte with official phrases about order, religion, family and property in public, before the citizens, and with the secret society of the Schufferles and Spiegelbergs, <sup>[21]</sup> the society of disorder, prostitution and theft, behind him — that is Bonaparte himself as original author, and the history of the Tenth of December Gang is his own history...

Bonaparte would like to appear as the patriarchal benefactor of all classes. But he cannot give to one class without taking from another. Just as at the time of the Fronde <sup>[22]</sup> it was said of the Duke of Guise that he was the most ‘obliging’ man in France because he had turned all his estates into his partisans’ obligations to him, so Bonaparte would like to be the most ‘obliging’ man in France and turn all the property, all the labour of France into a personal obligation to himself. He would like

to *steal* the whole of France in order to be able to *give* her to France, or, rather, in order to be able to *buy* France back with French money, for as the chief of the Tenth of December Gang he must buy what ought to belong to him. And all the state institutions, the Senate, the Council of State, the legislative body, the courts, the Legion of Honour, the soldiers' medals, the washhouses, the public works, the railways, the *état major* <sup>[23]</sup> of the National Guard not including privates, and the confiscated estates of the House of Orleans — all become parts of the institution of purchase. Every place in the army and in the government machine becomes a means of purchase.

But the most important feature of this process, whereby France is robbed so that she can be endowed, are the percentages that find their way into the pockets of the head and the members of the Tenth of December Gang during the turnover. The witticism with which Countess L, the mistress of M de Morny, characterised the confiscation of the Orlean estates: '*C'est le premier vol de l'aigle*' <sup>[24]</sup> is applicable to every flight of this *eagle*, which is more like a *raven*. He himself and his adherents call out to one another daily like that Italian Carthusian admonishing the miser who, with boastful display, counted up the goods on which he could yet live for years to come: '*Tu fai conto sopra i beni, bisogna prima il conto sopra gli anni.*' <sup>[25]</sup> Lest they make a mistake in the years, they count the minutes.

A gang of individuals push their way forward to the court, into the ministries, to the head of the administration and the army, a crowd of the best of whom it must be said that no one knows whence he comes, a noisy, disreputable, rapacious *bohème* that crawls into gold-braided coats with the same grotesque dignity as the high dignitaries of Soulouque. <sup>[26]</sup> One can visualise clearly this upper stratum of the Tenth of December Gang, if one reflects that *Véron-Crevel* is its preacher of morals and *Granier de Cassagnac* its thinker. <sup>[27]</sup> When Guizot, at the time of his ministry, employed this Granier on a hole-and-corner newspaper against the dynastic opposition, he used to boast of him with the quip: '*C'est le roi des drôles.*' — 'He is the king of buffoons.' One would be wrong to recall the Regency <sup>[28]</sup> or Louis XV in connection with Louis Bonaparte's court and tribe. For 'often already, France has experienced a government of mistresses; but never before a government of *hommes entretenus*'. <sup>[29]</sup>

Driven by the contradictory demands of his situation and being at the same time, like a conjurer, under the necessity of keeping the public gaze fixed on himself, as Napoleon's substitute, by springing constant surprises, that is to say, under the necessity of executing a *coup d'état en miniature* every day, Bonaparte throws the entire bourgeois economy into confusion, violates everything that seemed inviolable to the Revolution of 1848, makes some tolerant of revolution, others desirous of revolution, and produces actual anarchy in the name of order, while at the same time stripping its halo from the entire state machine, profanes it and makes it at once loathsome and ridiculous. The cult of the Holy Tunic of Trier <sup>[30]</sup> he duplicates at Paris in the cult of the Napoleonic imperial mantle. But when the imperial mantle finally falls on the shoulders of Louis Bonaparte, the bronze statue of Napoleon will crash from the top of the Vendôme Column.

## Notes

**1** *Clarín*: 'He spreads false words;... he has smeared himself with sulphur ointment.' From Pedro Calderón de la Barca's play *El mágico prodigioso* (*The Mighty Magician*) of 1637.

**2** The word '*vogt*' in German means a steward. Marx often uses the homonym of Vogt's surname (the title of a feudal official — steward or governor) to make fun of him. 'The Hereditary Steward of Nichilburg' or 'Erb-Vogt von Nichilburg' (the castle that does not exist) is a character in Johann Fischart's satirical novel *Geschichtklitterung und Aller*

*Praktik Grossmutter (Contortions of History and the Grandmother of all Practice)*. Fischart's work, which appeared in 1575, is a free translation of François Rabelais' novel *Gargantua and Pantagruel*. Marx quotes below from Fischart's work.

**3** *Brimstone (or Sulphur) Gang (Schwefelbande)* was originally the description of a student association at Jena University in the 1770s, which had a bad reputation because of the scandals caused by its members. The expression 'Schwefelbande' later became a general term for mobs of delinquents.

**4** *My Case Against the Allgemeine Zeitung*.

**5** 'Great Work', 'Hauptbuch'. Marx uses this term to distinguish Vogt's book *Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung* from Vogt's other, smaller publications in the press on the same subject.

**6** *Trade-Messenger*.

**7** Marx refers here to Vogt's article *Zur Warnung (As a Warning)* of 23 May, which appeared in the supplement of no 150 of the *Schweizer Handels-Courier* of 2 June 1859. *Schweizer Handels-Courier* — a bourgeois daily paper. Appeared between 1853 and 1909 in Biel (Switzerland). In the 1850s and 1860s it represented Bonapartist views. Marx from time to time ironically calls this newspaper the Biel *Carpet-Bagger*.

**8** 'Jegend jottvoll' is the Prussian pronunciation of 'Gegend gottvoll' ('we found the area divine').

**9** Sweet pleasure.

**10** "“Rogueaucracy” was the title, if my memory serves me right, given to all the liberal parties in any one of the German pocket parliaments or the Frankfurt Parliament. We wanted to immortalise it." — Note by Borkheim.

**11** Idstedt — a battle in the Schleswig-Holstein campaign of 1850. For more detailed information on this campaign, see Franz Mehring, *Absolutism and Revolution in Germany 1525–1848* (New Park Publications, 1975), pp 198–99, 280n.

**12** The *republican uprising* which broke out in Baden at the end of September 1848 was kindled by a group of German émigrés led by Gustav Struve, who came from Switzerland on 21 September. With the support of armed detachments of Baden democrats and of the local Bürgerwehr (Civic Guard), Struve declared the German Republic. After a few days the uprising was quelled by Baden troops and Struve and a number of the participants were arrested and sentenced to long periods of imprisonment, to serve which they were sent to the town gaol of Bruchsal (Baden). In May 1849, during a new uprising in Baden, Struve and other political prisoners were released by the rebels.

*Imperial Constitution Campaign* — the struggle for the defence of the Imperial Constitution adopted by the Frankfurt National Assembly on 28 March 1849 was the last stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1848–49 in Germany. The governments of almost all the large German states (Prussia, Saxony, Bavaria, Hanover and others) refused to recognise the constitution. In May and June 1849 there were, in the Rhineland, Dresden, Baden and the Palatinate, armed struggles of the popular masses under the leadership of often hesitant and vacillating petty-bourgeois democrats. The rebels received no support from the Frankfurt National Assembly. The rising had a sporadic and spontaneous character and was cruelly suppressed in the middle of July 1849. On the character and course of these struggles, in which Engels took part, see *Die Deutsche Reichsverfassungskampagne* (MEW, Volume 7, pp 109–97) and *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany*.

**13** In September 1849, Marx was elected to the Committee for the Support of German Political Refugees which was formed by the German Workers' Educational Association. In order to defeat the attempt of the petty-bourgeois democratic émigrés to bring the proletarian elements of the London emigration under their influence, the Committee for the Support of German Political Refugees was turned into the Social-Democratic

Refugees' Committee, into the leadership of which Engels entered. In mid-September 1850, Marx and Engels announced their resignation from the Refugees' Committee, as the majority of members had fallen under the influence of the Willich–Schapper faction.

**14** *Carbonari* (charcoal-burners) — a secret political society which existed at the beginning of the nineteenth century in Italy and in the 1820s in France. The Italian Carbonari, who had in their ranks representatives of the urban bourgeoisie, of the bourgeoisified nobility and of the peasantry, fought for the national unity and independence of Italy and for free-thinking state reforms. The French Carbonari, to whom the representatives of various political tendencies belonged, had as their aim the overthrow of the Bourbon monarchy.

**15** Marx calls Johann Gottfried Rademacher a miracle doctor, referring to the title of his book, *Rechtfertigung der von den Gelehrten misskannten, verstandesrechten Erfahrungsheillehre der alten scheidekünstigen Geheimärzte und treue Mittheilung des Ergebnisses einer 25 Jährigen Erprobung dieser Lehre am Krankenbette (Justification of the Rational Doctrine of the Experience of Healing, Misunderstood by the Academics, of the Old Analytical Occult Doctors, and True Report of the Result of 25 Years' Test of this Doctrine at the Sick-Bed)*.

**16** By *Tenth of December Gang* Marx means the participants in the Bonapartist *coup d'état* of 2–4 December 1851, which led to the setting up of the counter-revolutionary regime of the Second Empire in France under Napoleon III. In the preparations for this coup the secret Bonapartist society of the Tenth of December, set up in 1849, played a significant role. It was so called in honour of the election of their protector to the Presidency of the French Republic on 10 December 1848, and Marx proceeds to give its characteristics.

**17** In this extract from *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* Marx everywhere changes the word 'society' into the word 'gang'.

**18** Pimps.

**19** This deals with the attempts undertaken by Louis Bonaparte under the July monarchy to carry out *coups d'état* by means of military putsches. On 30 September 1836, he succeeded in rousing the Strasbourg garrison with the aid of a few pro-Bonapartist officers, but within a few hours the insurgents were disarmed. Louis Bonaparte was arrested and deported to America. Taking advantage of a certain revival of Bonapartist feeling in France, he landed with a handful of conspirators in Boulogne on 6 August 1840 and attempted to instigate a rebellion among the troops of the local garrison. But this attempt proved to be an utter failure. Bonaparte was sentenced to life imprisonment, but in 1846 he escaped to England.

**20** Nick Bottom, a character in Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream*.

**21** Schufterle and Spiegelberg — characters in Schiller's drama *Die Räuber (The Robbers)* who plunder and murder unimpeded by any moral scruple.

**22** Rebel party during the minority of Louis XIV of France.

**23** General staff.

**24** 'Vol' means either flight or theft — note by Marx: 'It is the first flight/theft of the eagle.'

**25** You count your goods. You should first count your years.

**26** Faustin Soulouque (c1782–1867) — President of the Negro Republic of Haiti, in 1849 he proclaimed himself Emperor, assuming the name of Faustin I.

**27** Véron-Crevel — in his novel *Cousin Bette*, Balzac delineates the thoroughly dissolute Parisian philistine in Crevel, a character whom he draws after the model of Dr Véron, the proprietor of the *Constitutionnel*, a French bourgeois daily published in Paris during 1815–70. Adolphe Granier de Cassagnac (1806–1880) — French journalist,

unscrupulous politician, before the revolution of 1848 Orleanist, later Bonapartist. During the Second Empire a member of the legislative Corps.

**28** A reference to Philippe d'Orléans's regency during the minority of Louis XV from 1715 to 1723.

**29** 'Kept men', the words quoted are those of Madame Girardin — note by Marx.

**30** The holy tunic of Trier — a Catholic relic preserved in Trier Cathedral, alleged to be a holy vestment taken from Christ while he was being executed. It became an object of veneration for pilgrims.

## Chapter II: The Bürstenheimers

But, sirrah, there's no room for faith, truth, nor honesty, in this bosom of thine; it is all filled up with guts and midriff. (Shakespeare) <sup>[1]</sup>

'Bürstenheimers' or 'Brimstone Gang', it says in the Original Gospel according to Biel (page 3 of the *Magnum Opus*, Documents). 'Brimstone Gang' or also 'Bürstenheimers', it says in the *Magnum Opus* (p 136).

According to both readings the 'Brimstone Gang' and the 'Bürstenheimers' are one and the same gang. The 'Brimstone Gang', as we have seen, quite died out in the middle of 1850. And the 'Bürstenheimers'? The 'rounded character' is the civiliser attached to the December Gang, and civilisation, as Fourier says, is distinguished from barbarism by the fact that the simple lie is replaced by the compound lie.

Our 'compound' imperial Falstaff tells us (*Magnum Opus*, p 198) that a certain *Abt* is the 'lowest of the low'. With what admirable modesty does Vogt put himself in the positive but his *Abt* in the superlative, in a certain sense promoting him to his Field-Marshal Ney. When Vogt's Original Version of the Gospel appeared in the Biel *Carpet-Bagger* I asked the editorial board of the *Volk* <sup>[2]</sup> to print this Original Mop-Rag without any further commentary. The editorial board, however, added this note to the reprint:

The above fragment originates from a degenerate character by the name of *Abt*, who, eight years ago in Geneva, was unanimously found guilty of various dishonourable activities by a court of honour of German refugees. (*Volk*, no 6, 11 June 1859)

The editorial board of the *Volk* held *Abt* to be the author of Vogt's Original Mop-Rag; they forgot that Switzerland had two Richmonds in the field, <sup>[3]</sup> not only an *Abt* but also a *Vogt*. <sup>[4]</sup>

In the spring of 1851, then, the 'lowest of the low' invented the 'Bürstenheimers', whom Vogt pilfered from his Field Marshal in the autumn of 1859. The sweet habit of plagiarism instinctively pursues him from his hackwork in natural history to his hackwork on police matters. The Geneva Workers' Association was for a period presided over by the brush-maker (*Bürstenmacher*) *Sauernheimer*. *Abt* took the first half of *Sauernheimer*'s trade and the second half of his name, and from the two halves cleverly composed the whole 'Bürstenheimer'. With this title he originally designated, apart from *Sauernheimer*, his closest associates, *Kamm*, from Bonn, a brush-maker by trade, and *Ranickel* from Bingen, a journeyman book-binder. He appointed *Sauernheimer* the General of the 'Bürstenheimers', *Ranickel* their Adjutant, and *Kamm* a 'Bürstenheimer' *sans phrases*. <sup>[5]</sup> Later, when two refugees who belonged to the Geneva Workers' Association, *Imandt* (now a university professor at Dundee) and *Schily* (previously a lawyer in Trier, now in Paris), brought about the ostracism of *Abt* by a court of honour of the Association, *Abt* published an abusive pamphlet in which he elevated the whole of the Geneva Workers' Association to the rank of 'Bürstenheimers'. So you see, there were Bürstenheimers in general and Bürstenheimers in particular. 'Bürstenheimers' in general embraced the Geneva Workers' Association, the same Association from which the cornered Vogt surreptitiously obtained for himself a *testimonium pauperitatis* <sup>[6]</sup> published in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, and before which he crawled on all fours on the occasion of the Schiller celebration and the Robert Blum celebration (1859). <sup>[7]</sup> 'Bürstenheimers' in particular meant, as I have said,

Sauernheimer, who was completely unknown to me and never came to London; Kamm, who was deported from Geneva and travelled to the United States by way in London, where he sought out not me, but Kinkel; and finally Ranickel, or rather *the ranickel*, who, as the adjutant of the Bürstenheimers, stayed in Geneva, where he ‘gathered’ around that ‘rounded character’. In fact he represented, in his own person, the Vogt proletariat. Since I shall return to *the ranickel* later, here are some provisional details on the monster. *Ranickel* belonged to the force of refugees commanded by Willich in Besançon after the failure of Hecker’s campaign. <sup>[9]</sup> He went through the Imperial Constitution campaign with them and later fled with them to Switzerland. Willich was his Communist Mahomet, who was to bring about the millennium with fire and with sword. A vain, loquacious, melodramatic coxcomb, *the ranickel* overbore the tyrant. In Geneva it raged in red fury against the ‘Parliamentarians’ in general, and threatened in particular, like another William Tell, ‘to throttle the Governor (Land-Vogt)’. When, however, it was introduced to Vogt by Wallot, a refugee from the 1830s and Vogt’s boyhood friend, the ranickel’s bloody way of thinking was washed away in the milk of human kindness. ‘The rascal was *the Vogt’s man*’, as Schiller says. <sup>[9]</sup>

The adjutant of the Bürstenheimers became the adjutant of General Vogt, whose military fame has only been eclipsed because Plon-Plon <sup>[10]</sup> thought the Neapolitan Captain *Ulloa* (also a General by courtesy) quite bad enough for the part his ‘*corps de touristes*’ <sup>[11]</sup> had to perform in the Italian campaign, and is holding his Parolles in reserve for the great adventure with ‘the lost drum’ that will take place on the Rhine. <sup>[12]</sup> In 1859, Vogt promoted his *ranickel* from the proletariat to the bourgeoisie, procured him a business (*objets d’art*, bookbinding, stationery) and in addition obtained for him the custom of the Geneva government. The Bürstenheimers’ Adjutant became Vogt’s maid of all work, Cicisbeo, family friend, Leporello, <sup>[13]</sup> tale-bearer and particularly after fat Jack’s <sup>[14]</sup> fall from grace, his listening post and Bonapartist propagandist among the workers. A Swiss newspaper recently announced the discovery of a third species of hedgehog, the rhine-hedgehog (*Ran- or Rhein-Igel*), uniting the characteristics of the hedge-hog and the hedge-pig, and found in a little place on the Arve, the country seat of Humboldt-Vogt. Was this *Ran-Igel* meant for our *ranickel*?

NB, the only refugee in Geneva with whom I was connected, *Dr Ernst Dronke*, a former fellow editor of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* <sup>[15]</sup> and now a merchant in Liverpool, was opposed to ‘Bürstenheimery’.

As a preface to the letters from *Imandt* and *Schily* that follow, I would only like to say that at the outbreak of the revolution Imandt left the university to take part in the war in Schleswig-Holstein as a *Freischärler*. <sup>[16]</sup> In 1849, Schily and Imandt led the attack on the arsenal at Prüm, <sup>[17]</sup> whence, with their men and the weapons they seized, the two fought their way through to the Palatinate in order to join there the ranks of the army of the Imperial Constitution. Thrown out of Switzerland in the early summer of 1852, they came to London.

Dundee

5 February 1860

**Dear Marx**

I do not understand how Vogt can connect you with affairs in Geneva. It was known among the refugees there that the *only* one of us who was connected with you was *Dronke*. The *Brimstone Gang* existed before my time, and the only name I remember in relation to it is *Borkheim*.

The *Bürstenheimers* were the Geneva Workers’ Association. The name owes its origins to *Abt*. The Association was at the time a nursery of the Willich secret society, in which I functioned as chairman. When, on my motion, Abt was declared by the Workers’ Association, to which many refugees belonged, to be an infamous person unworthy of associating with refugees and workers, he published shortly afterwards a lampoon accusing Schily and myself of the most absurd crimes. We thereupon raised the whole matter anew in a different place and in front of entirely different people. Called upon to prove the slanders he had written, he rejected our demand and without Schily or myself needing to say anything in our defence, *Dentzer* put down a motion declaring Abt to be an infamous slanderer. This motion was unanimously passed for a

second time, this time in a meeting of refugees that consisted almost entirely of Parliamentarians. I am sorry that my report is so extremely scanty, but this is the first time I have thought about *that rubbish* in eight years. I would not like to be condemned to writing about it, and *I would be most surprised if you found yourself able to dip your fingers in that stew.*

Adieu

Your **Imandt**

A well-known Russia writer, <sup>[18]</sup> a great friend of Herr Vogt's during his stay in Geneva, wrote to me, in the sense of the closing lines of the above letter:

**My Dear Marx**

I have learnt with the liveliest indignation of the calumnies that have been spread about you, which came to my attention through an article in the *Revue contemporaine* signed Edouard Simon. What particularly astonished me was that Vogt, whom I did not think either stupid or malicious, could have fallen into the moral abasement that his pamphlet reveals. I did not need any evidence to be assured that you were incapable of base and dirty intrigues, and it was all the more painful for me to read of these defamations, since at the very moment they were printed you were giving the world the first part of the fine work which is to renew economic science and place it on a new and firmer basis... My dear Marx, do not concern yourself with all this wretchedness; all serious men, all conscientious men are on your side, but what they expect from you is something other than sterile polemics; they would like to be able as soon as possible to study the continuation of your fine work — your success among thinking men is immense, and if it is agreeable to you to learn of the sensation your doctrines have aroused in Russia I shall tell you that at the beginning of this year Professor — <sup>[19]</sup> gave a public course on political economy in Moscow, the first lecture of which was nothing other than a paraphrase of your recent publication. I am sending you a copy of the *Gazette du Nord* in which you will see how your name is esteemed in my country. Adieu, my dear Marx, stay in good health and work as in the past to enlighten the world without preoccupying yourself with petty stupidity and petty baseness. Please believe the friendship of your devoted...

*Szemere*, the former Hungarian minister, also wrote to me: 'Is it worth *your* while to busy yourself with all this gossip?'

Why, despite this and similar dissuasions, I have, to quote Imandt's powerful language, dipped my fingers in Vogt's stew, you will find briefly indicated in the foreword.

So back to the *Bürstenheimers*. I print the following letter from Schily complete including the parts that do not refer to our 'muttons'. <sup>[20]</sup> I have however abbreviated some of the information on the Brimstone Gang already anticipated in Borkheim's letter, and I have reserved some parts for a *later* place, since I must deal with 'my choice subject' to some extent artistically, and thus cannot reveal all my secrets at once.

Paris

8 February 1860

46 rue Lafayette

**Dear Marx**

I was very pleased to receive, in your letter of the 31st, a direct sign of life from you, and you find me all the readier to give you the information you request on the Geneveriana in question because I wanted to write to you about it *proprio motu*. <sup>[21]</sup> That is to say that the fact that Vogt bundles you together with complete strangers was the first thought, not only of myself, but also of all my acquaintances from Geneva living here when we had occasion to speak of it. Thus I took over the job, as a duty to truth, of giving you all the appropriate information on 'Bürstenheimers', 'Brimstone Gang', etc. So you will understand that I found your two questions: '1: Who were the

Bürstenheimers and what did they do?’ and ‘2: Who were the Brimstone Gang, of what elements did it consist and what did it do?’ very timely. First, however, I must charge you with an infraction of chronological order, for, according to the latter, priority belongs to the *Brimstone Gang*. If Vogt wanted to talk of the Devil to the German philistine, or even heap burning brimstone on his head, and at the same time ‘pull his leg’, then he really should have chosen more diabolical figures as his prototypes than those harmless, jolly, alehouse geniuses whom we elders of the Geneva emigration jokingly and without any unfriendly mental reservations called by the name of the Brimstone Gang, and who accepted the appellation just as guilelessly. They were merry sons of the muses who had taken their *examina* and *exercitia practica* <sup>[22]</sup> in the various South German putsches and finally in the Imperial Constitution campaign, and who were now strengthening themselves after the failure they had suffered under their red examiners and taskmasters in Geneva for a resumption of the business... It goes without saying that someone who never went to Geneva, or only arrived after the gang had been broken up, obviously never belonged to it. That is to say that it was a purely local flower, which only blossomed for a day (so that this sublimate should really be called flowers of sulphur). However, and probably because of the revolutionary whiff of their *Rummeltipuff*, they probably smelled a little too strong for Swiss nerves, for: Druey <sup>[23]</sup> blew, and the flower was scattered to the four winds. It was only some time afterwards that *Abt*, and several years after him *Cherval*, came to Geneva, where each smelled ‘after his own fashion’, but by no means, as Vogt claims, like that bouquet, which had long since been torn up and forgotten, and had lost its perfume.

The Gang’s activities can more or less be summed up in the words: Toiling in the vineyard of the Lord. At the same time they edited *Rummeltipuff* under the motto, ‘Stay in the land and nourish thyself *redly*’, and in it wittily and humorously made fun of God and the world, stigmatised false prophets, scourged parliamentarians (*inde irae*), <sup>[24]</sup> spared neither themselves nor us, their audience, and caricatured one and all, friend and foe alike, with admirable conscientiousness and impartiality.

I do not need to tell you that they had no connection with you and did not wear your *Bundschuh*. <sup>[25]</sup> Nor can I conceal from you the fact that this footwear would not have been to their taste. Soldiers of the revolution, they were for the time being lounging around in the slippers of the cease-fire until the revolution could reactivate them and equip them with her own buskins (the seven-league boots of decisive progress). And anybody who tried to disturb their siesta with Marxist political economy, with workers’ dictatorship, etc, would have been ill received by them. Dear God! The *work they* did demanded a toast-master rather than a chairman, and their economic studies revolved around a pot and its *red* contents. ‘The *right* to work’, Backfisch, an honest blacksmith from the Odenwald, once said, ‘was all very well, but they should leave him be when it came to the *duty* to work...’

Let us then allow the Brimstone Gang’s gravestone, so sacrilegiously raised, to fall back into place. Actually, a Hafiz <sup>[26]</sup> ought to sing a *Requiescat in pace* to prevent any further desecration of the Gang’s tomb. Lacking which, may it receive *pro viatico et epitaphio* <sup>[27]</sup> the obituary: ‘They all had a whiff of gunpowder’, while their sacrilegious historiographer only ever managed to smell brimstone.

By the time the *Bürstenheimers* appeared, the Brimstone Gangsters lived on only in legend, in the registers of Geneva philistines and in the hearts of Geneva belles. The brushmakers and bookbinders Sauernheimer, Kamm, Ranickel, etc, fell out with *Abt*. Taking the part of the former, *Imandt*, myself and others also suffered the enmity of the latter. *Abt* was then summoned to a general assembly composed of the refugees and the Workers’ Association as a *cour de pairs* or rather as a *haute cour de justice*, <sup>[28]</sup> before which he did in fact appear. Not only did he fail to uphold the accusations he had hurled at this and that person, but he declared point blank that he had plucked



them out of thin air as a reprisal against his opponents' accusations that were composed of the same element: '*Tit for tat, reprisals hold the world together*', he said. Then, when he had boldly pleaded his tit-for-tat system and thoroughly persuaded the high peers of its practical value, and thereupon proof had been brought forward concerning the accusations made against him, he admitted that he had committed a malicious slander, was found guilty of the other misdemeanours imputed to him and accordingly ostracised and excommunicated. *En revanche* <sup>[29]</sup> he now named the noble peers, originally only the above-mentioned guild members, '*Bürstenheimers*': as you see a happy combination of the name and the status of the first-named of that guild, whom you therefore have to honour as the founding father of the guild of Bürstenheim without, however, marching alongside or even behind that tribe, whether it embraces the guild or the above-mentioned peerage. For you should know that those among them who occupied themselves with the 'organisation of the revolution' did so, not as your supporters but as your opponents, in that they honoured Willich as their God-the-Father, or at least as their Pope, and reviled you as their Antichrist or Anti-Pope, so that Dronke, who counted as your only supporter and *legatus a latere* <sup>[30]</sup> in the diocese of Geneva, was excluded from all councils except the oenological ones, where he was *primes inter pares*. <sup>[31]</sup> But the Bürstenheimery, like the Brimstone Gang, was purely ephemeral, and blew away like dust before Druey's powerful breath. The fact that a pupil of Agassiz <sup>[32]</sup> could have got hopelessly lost among these fossils of the Geneva emigration, and could dig up from them such fabulous little natural histories as those served up in his pamphlet, is all the more astonishing in relation to the species *Bürstenheimerana* for the fact that he has at his disposal in his zoological cabinet a splendid specimen of that species in the shape of a mastodon of the order of ruminants in the person of the prehistoric Bürstenheimer *Ranickel*. The rumination, therefore, seems not to have proceeded correctly, or not to have been studied correctly by the said pupil...

You now have everything you demanded, *et au delà*. <sup>[33]</sup> And now I would like to ask you for something, that is to say your opinion on the introduction of an inheritance tax *pro patria, vulgo* <sup>[34]</sup> the state, as a chief source of finance, with the removal of the taxes burdening the propertyless classes and directed, of course, only against large inheritances... Apart from this inheritance tax I am also concerning myself with two other German institutions, 'the consolidation of land-holdings' and 'the insurance of mortgages', an understanding of which I would like to introduce in these parts, although it is entirely missing, as the French in general, with a few exceptions, see only sauerkraut and nebulosity on the far bank of the Rhine. There was an exception some time ago in the *Univers*, which, lamenting the undue parcellisation of landed property, correctly added: 'It would be desirable to apply immediately the energetic remedies that have been used with advantage in parts of Germany: the obligatory re-arrangement of property wherever seven-tenths of the proprietors in a community demand this measure. This redistribution will facilitate drainage, irrigation, rational cultivation and the construction of roads on the properties.' Then there comes the *Siècle*, in general anyway somewhat short-sighted and in the consideration of German conditions in particular totally blind, by virtue of its self-satisfied Chauvinism, worn proudly like the ragged clothes of Diogenes, which pulp it warms up daily for its readers as patriotism. This same Chauvin, now, after giving the *Univers*, his *bête noire*, the obligatory matutinal greeting, declaims: 'Rural proprietors, follow this advice. Hurry to demand the obligatory reorganisation of your properties; *rob the poor to profit the rich. O fortunatos nimium agricolos* — too lucky inhabitants of the countryside — *sua si bona* — if only they knew the advantage of the obligatory reorganisation of property.' As if on a vote *by heads* the rich would prevail over the poor.

For the rest I let God's water flow over God's land, render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's, and respectively even 'the Devil's share', and remain thus.

Your old friend

**Schily**

From the material we have seen up until now it follows that, if in Geneva there existed from 1849–50 a 'Brimstone Gang' and from 1851–52 the 'Bürstenheimers', two associations that had nothing to do with one another and nothing in common with me, the existence of the '*Brimstone Gang*' or '*Bürstenheimers*' exposed by our Parliamentary clown, is cloth of his cloth, a *lie* to the power four, 'fat as he that fathered it'. Imagine an historian having the shamelessness to report: 'At the time of the first French revolution a number of people were known under the name of the "*Cercle sociale*"<sup>[35]</sup> or also under the no less characteristic name of the "Jacobins".'

As far as the life and deeds of the 'Brimstone Gang' or 'Bürstenheimers' which he had made up were concerned, our Friar Tuck avoided all expense on production costs. I shall quote a single example:

One of the main activities of the Brimstone Gang [he of the rounded character explains to his astounded audience] was so to compromise people in the home country that they had to resist their attempts at exploitation no longer and pay money [a nice turn of phrase, 'they *had to* resist their attempts at exploitation *no longer*'] so that the gang would keep the fact that they were compromised secret. Not *one* but *hundreds* of letters were written by these men [that is to say, Vogt's *homunculi*] to Germany, containing the unconcealed slogan that a denunciation would be made of participation in this or that act of the revolution if a certain sum of money did not reach a given address by a certain point in time. (*Magnum Opus*, p 139)

Why did Vogt not have *one* of these letters printed? Because the 'Brimstone Gang' wrote '*hundreds*'. If threatening letters were as cheap as blackberries, Vogt would swear that we were not to have one. If he was to be summoned tomorrow before a court of honour of the Grütliverein<sup>[36]</sup> to explain the 'hundreds' of 'threatening letters', he would draw from his belt instead of a letter a bottle of wine, smack his lips, snap his fingers and amidst the belly-shaking laughter of a Silenus cry out with his Abt: 'Tit for tat, reprisals hold the world together.'

## Notes

**1** *Henry IV*, Part I, Act I, Scene II.

**2** *Das Volk* — German-language weekly newspaper which appeared between 7 May and 20 August 1859 in London. It was founded as the official organ of the German Workers' Educational Association in London under the editorship of the German publicist and petty-bourgeois democrat Elard Biscamp. From the second issue Marx collaborated unofficially with the newspaper, gave constant advice and help, wrote articles, organised financial support, etc. From the sixth issue, 11 June 1859, the paper's editorial board officially announced the collaboration of Marx, Engels, Freiligrath, Wilhelm Wolff and Heinrich Heise. From this time onwards Marx was effectively the editor of the newspaper, which thenceforth became an organ of the proletarian revolutionaries. At the beginning of July, Marx took over the whole running of the paper. The *Volk* defended the revolutionary theories and the tactics of the proletarian struggle worked out by Marx, discussed the class struggles of the proletariat and fought irreconcilably against the representatives of the petty-bourgeois ideology. The paper analysed the events of the Austro-Franco-Italian war of 1859 and the questions of German and Italian reunification from the standpoint of proletarian internationalism, exposed the reactionary foreign policy of the great European powers, and conducted a consistent struggle against Bonapartism and its open and concealed supporters. In the *Volk* there appeared Marx's Foreword to his book *Critique of Political Economy* and five of his articles, including the uncompleted series of articles 'Quid pro Quo'; nine articles by Engels and his review of Marx's book *Critique of Political Economy*; the marginal notes on the contents of the

newspaper *Hermann* published by the German petty-bourgeois democrats in London, composed by Marx with Biscamp's participation and published as *Gatherings from the Press*. Apart from these, a whole number of further articles and the *Politische Rundschau* (*Political Review*) bear clear signs of having been worked over by Marx. In all 16 issues of the paper appeared. On 20 August 1859, the paper ceased publication because of lack of money.

**3** 'Two Richmonds' — see Shakespeare, *Richard III*, Act V, Scene IV. The phrase indicates the presence of a second, unexpected, enemy.

**4** Not only an Abbot but also a Steward.

**5** Pure and simple.

**6** Certificate of bankruptcy.

**7** See Chapter III; Robert Blum (1807–1848) — petty-bourgeois democrat, by profession a journalist. Leader of the left at the Frankfurt National Assembly. Sent to represent the Assembly in Vienna, where he was executed by drumhead court martial following the defeat of the insurrection in October 1848.

**8** 'Hecker's campaign' — in April 1849 a republican insurrection broke out in Baden. Frederick Hecker was one of the leaders. His detachment was, like other insurrectionary groups, beaten by government troops. The insurrection was defeated. Some of the participants later joined the troop of German refugees organised in November 1848 in Besançon, France, by Willich. The members of this troop were materially supported by the French government, but at the beginning of 1849 this support ceased. This troop later joined the Free Corps which participated, under the command of Willich, in the actions of the Baden–Palatinate insurrectionary army in May–June 1849.

**9** 'The rascal was *the Vogt's man*.' — Schiller, *Wilhelm Tell*, Act I, Scene IV.

**10** Prince 'Plon-Plon' was Napoléon Joseph Charles Paul Bonaparte (1822–1891), cousin of Napoleon III. It was through Plon-Plon that Vogt received his subsidies from Napoleon III: see DB Riazanov, *Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels* (Monthly Review Press, London and New York, 1973), p 118.

**11** Party of tourists.

**12** 'The adventure of the lost drum' — Marx's ironical name for the efforts of Napoleon III and Bonapartist groups, supported in the press by Vogt, to seize the left bank of the Rhine. Marx compares these Bonapartist plans with the episode in Shakespeare's *All's Well That Ends Well* (Act III, Scenes V and VI; Act IV Scenes I and III) in which Captain Parolles goes in search of the missing drum and is finally unmasked as a cowardly, boastful and corrupt person by his former companions.

**13** Leporello — valet to Don Giovanni in Mozart's opera.

**14** Fat Jack — Falstaff.

**15** *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, 'Organ der Demokratie' — daily newspaper edited by Karl Marx and published in Cologne from 1 June 1848 to 19 May 1849. The editorial board included Frederick Engels, Wilhelm Wolff, Georg Weerth, Ferdinand Wolff, Ernst Dronke, Ferdinand Freiligrath and Heinrich Bürgers. As the organ of the proletarian wing of the democracy, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* became the educator of the popular masses in the struggle against the counter-revolution. The guiding lead-articles on the most important questions involving the German and European revolutions were as a rule written by Marx and Engels. The determined and irreconcilable attitude of the *New Rheinische Zeitung*, its militant internationalism and its political revelations called forth a hue and cry from the side of the feudal-monarchist and the bourgeois-liberal press even in the first months of its publication, as well as persecution by the Prussian government, which became stronger after the counter-revolutionary coup in Prussia in November–December 1849. Disregarding all the persecution and the political disciplinary measures,

the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* boldly defended the interests of the revolutionary democracy and thus of the working class. In May 1849, when the counter-revolution in general was going over to the offensive, the Prussian government, which had already refused Marx's citizenship, decreed his expulsion from Prussia. His expulsion and the reprisals against the other editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* forced the editorial board to cease publication of the paper. The last issue of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* (no 301, 19 May 1849) appeared in red ink. In their farewell appeal to the workers of Cologne the editors declared: 'Its last word will everywhere and always be: *Emancipation of the working class!*' The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was the 'best, unsurpassed organ of the revolutionary proletariat' — Lenin.

**16** A member of the revolutionary 'Freishchar' or 'Freikorps' (volunteer corps).

**17** The storming of the arsenal at Prüm on 17–18 May 1849 was undertaken by democrats with the support of the workers of Trier and the surrounding district. The attackers' aim was to seize arms in order to unleash an uprising in support of the Imperial Constitution. Although the arsenal was for a time occupied by insurgents, the movement was quickly crushed by government troops.

**18** Ivan Kondratievich Babst.

**19** Nicolai Ivanovich Sasanov.

**20** This letter was originally written in French.

**21** Of my own volition.

**22** *Examina* — examinations; *exercitia practica* — practical exercises.

**23** Henri Druet (1799–1855) — Swiss radical statesman, member of the Bundesrat 1848–55, from 1848 director of the Department of Police and Justice. In 1850, President of the Swiss Confederation.

**24** Hence this wrath.

**25** Bundschuh — a peasant's laced boot, symbol and name of a revolutionary peasant organisation in the period leading up to the peasant revolt of 1525.

**26** Hafiz — a Moslem priest.

**27** As extreme unction and epitaph.

**28** As a court of peers or rather as a high court of justice.

**29** In revenge.

**30** Papal Legate.

**31** First among equals.

**32** Louis-Jean-Rudolphe Agassiz (1807–1873) — Swiss naturalist who adopted an extremely reactionary position in his scientific views. Opponent of Darwinism.

**33** And more.

**34** For the fatherland, in common parlance.

**35** Cercle sociale — an organisation founded by representatives of the democratic intelligentsia which emerged during the first years of the French bourgeois revolution in Paris at the end of the eighteenth century. In the history of Communist ideas the place of the cercle sociale is determined by the fact that its ideologist, Claude Fouchet, posed the demand for the equal division of land, for limitations on the size of property and for the labour of all citizens capable of working. Claude Fouchet's critique of the formal equality proclaimed by the French revolution cleared the ground for the much bolder stance adopted by Jacques Roux, a leader of the 'enragés' on this question. The largest part of the bourgeois-revolutionary Jacobins rejected the ideas of egalitarian socialism represented by the members of the cercle social and particularly by the 'enragés'.

**36** A Swiss petty-bourgeois reformist organisation set up in 1838 for the enlightenment of workers and tradesmen. In 1901, it affiliated to the Swiss Social Democratic Party, with which it fused completely in 1925. The term ‘Grütli’ underlines the Swiss national character of the association. According to the Swiss legend the representatives of the three mountain cantons, Schwyz, Uri and Unterwalden, pledge themselves to the common struggle against the rule of the Habsburgs in 1307 during the nocturnal meeting at the ‘Grütli’, a mountain meadow. Marx exploits this circumstance to aim an ironical comment at Vogt.

## Chapter III: Police Matters

What new infamy has the Vogt thought up? — Schiller

I say quite frankly [says Vogt, and strikes an attitude of the most earnest buffoonery], I say quite frankly: Everyone who lets himself become involved in any way with the political activities of Marx and his comrades falls sooner or later into the hands of the police. These activities are betrayed to the secret police from the very start, known to them and hatched out by them as soon as the time seems right. [The activities, it seems, are eggs, and the police the broody hen that hatches them out.] The instigators, Marx and Co, sit of course well out of the way in London. [While the police sit on the eggs.] *I am in no perplexity as far as producing proof of this claim is concerned.*

Vogt is in no ‘perplexity’. Falstaff was never in ‘perplexity’: ‘perjury’, as much as you like, but ‘perplexity’? Your ‘proof’, Jack, your ‘proof’.

### I: Self Confession

Marx himself says in his pamphlet *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne*, published in 1853, page 107: ‘After 1849 just as before 1848, only one path was open to the proletarian party — that of *secret association*. And so after 1849 a whole series of clandestine proletarian societies sprang up on the continent, were discovered by the police, condemned by the courts, broken up by the gaols and invariably resuscitated by the force of circumstances.’ Euphemistically [says Vogt] Marx here calls himself a ‘circumstance’. (*Magnum Opus*, p 167)

So Marx says that the police have uncovered since 1849 a whole series of secret societies that circumstances have recreated. Vogt says that it was Marx, and not ‘circumstances’, that ‘recreated the secret societies’. This is how Vogt proves that, as often as Badinguet’s <sup>[1]</sup> police uncovered the Marianne, <sup>[2]</sup> Marx wove it together again in agreement with Pietri.

‘Marx himself says!’ I will now quote in context what Marx himself says:

With the suppression of the revolution of 1848–49 the party of the proletariat on the continent lost every right it had enjoyed for once in a way during that short interval: *a press, freedom of speech and the right to associate*, that is, *the legal instruments* of party organisation. The social status of the classes they represented enabled both the bourgeois liberal and the petit-bourgeois democratic parties to remain united in one form or another and to function more or less effectively despite the reaction. After 1849 just as before 1848, only *one* path was open to *the proletarian party* — that of *secret association*. And so after 1849 a whole series of clandestine proletarian societies sprang up on the continent, were discovered by the police, condemned by the courts, broken up by the gaols and invariably resuscitated by the force of circumstances. Some of these secret societies had as their goal the direct overthrow of the existing power of the state. This was fully justified in *France*... Others aimed at

organising the proletariat into a party, without concerning themselves with the existing governments. This was necessary in countries like *Germany*... There is no doubt that here too the members of the proletarian party would take part once again in a revolution against the *status quo*, but it was no part of their task to prepare for this revolution, to agitate, conspire or to plot for it...

*The 'Communist League', therefore, was no conspiratorial society... (Revelations, pp 107, 108, etc)*

The cruel Land-Vogt makes even mere 'propaganda' a crime, except, of course, the propaganda carried out by Pietri and Laity. <sup>[3]</sup> 'Agitation, conspiracy and plotting' the Land-Vogt does allow, but only when its central seat is the Palais Royal, <sup>[4]</sup> the home of Hal Good-heart and Heliogabalus Plon-Plon. But 'propaganda' among the proletarians! For shame!

In the *Revelations* I continue as follows after the passage quoted above, so cleverly mutilated by Examining Magistrate Vogt:

It is self-evident that a secret society [such as the Communist League] could have but few attractions for individuals who on the one hand concealed their personal insignificance by strutting around in the theatrical cloak of the conspirator, and on the other wished to satisfy their stupid ambition on the day of the next revolution, and who wished above all to seem important at the moment, to snatch their share of the fruits of demagogy and to find a welcome among the quacks and charlatans of democracy. Thus a splinter broke off from the Communist League, or rather it was broken off, a group that demanded, if not real conspiracies, at any rate the *appearance* of conspiracies, and accordingly favoured an alliance with the democratic heroes of the hour; this was the Willich-Schapper party. It is typical of them that Willich was, together with Kinkel, one of the entrepreneurs in the German-American revolutionary loan. <sup>[5]</sup>

And how does Vogt translate this passage in his 'euphemistic' police gibberish? Listen:

As long as *both* [parties] worked together, their work consisted, *as Marx himself indeed says*, in instigating secret societies and *compromising associations and individuals* on the continent. (*Magnum Opus*, p 171)

Only the fat rascal forgets to quote the page of the *Revelations* where Marx '*himself indeed says*' this. 'Egli è bugiardo e padre di menzogna.' <sup>[6]</sup>

## II: The Revolutionary Congress of Murten

'Charles the Bold', 'bold Karl', *vulgo* Karl Vogt now presents the defeat at Murten:

Workers and refugees in great numbers were so wheedled and worked on [that is to say by *Liebknecht*] that finally... a revolutionary congress at Murten was announced. The delegates of the branch associations were supposed to proceed there *secretly*, where *the final organisation of the League* and the *definitive date of the uprising* were to be discussed. All the preparations were kept *strictly secret*, the calling of the conference was taken care of entirely by people in Herr Liebknecht's confidence or by his correspondents. The delegates came together *from all sides* in Murten, *on foot, by boat and by coach*, and were immediately received by gendarmes who knew in advance what, whence and in *what manner*. The whole group apprehended *in this way* was locked up for a time in the Augustinian monastery of Freiburg and then transported to England and America. Herr Liebknecht was treated with quite *special* consideration. (*Magnum Opus*, p 168)

'Herr Liebknecht' had taken part in Struve's putsch of September 1848, was then in gaol in Baden until mid-May 1849, was freed as a result of the Baden military insurrection, entered the Baden Peoples' Artillery as a gunner, was thrown into the dungeons of Rastatt as a rebel by Vogt's friend Brentano, was released once more and, during the Imperial Constitution campaign, joined the detachment of troops commanded by Johann Philipp Becker, and finally, with Struve, Cohnheim, Korn and Rosenblum, crossed the borders of France, whence he proceeded to Switzerland.

‘Herr Liebknecht’ and his Swiss ‘revolutionary congresses’ were at that time even more unknown to me than the tap-room congresses at Benz’s tavern in the Kesslerstrasse in Berne, where the Round Table of Parliamentarians took great pleasure in chewing over anew the speeches they themselves had made in the Paulskirche, <sup>[7]</sup> distributed the future imperial offices among themselves by number, and had the long night of their exile lightened by the lies, tall stories, dirty jokes and bombast of Charles the Bold, who at that time, not without a trace of humour, and alluding to an old German legend, invested himself by his own hand with letters patent as the ‘Imperial Wine-Swiller’.

The ‘legend’ begins with the words:

All the drinking I have seen  
Child’s play it sure has been:  
I have seen such a boozier  
That clearly he was the master.  
Mugs for him were far too small  
He thought jugs no good at all;  
He drank from buckets broad and tall.  
Of any man that’s living  
His was the noblest swilling.  
By bison and by elks  
Never such draughts were swallowed. <sup>[8]</sup>

But back to the ‘revolutionary congress’ of Murten. ‘Revolutionary congress’! ‘Final organisation of the League’! ‘Date of the uprising’! ‘Preparations kept *strictly secret*’! ‘Meeting in complete *secrecy* from all sides, arriving on foot, by boat and by coach’! ‘Bold Charles’ has obviously studied with profit the methods of Stieber exposed in my *Communist Trial*.

The facts are simply these: Liebknecht was — at the beginning of 1850 — chairman of the Geneva Workers’ Association. He proposed an alliance of all the then quite unconnected German Workers’ Associations in Switzerland. The motion was passed. It was thereupon decided to issue a circular to 24 different Workers’ Associations, inviting them to Murten in order to discuss there the proposed organisation and the foundation of a common press organ. The debates in the Geneva Workers’ Association, the circular, the discussion in relation to it in the 24 other Workers’ Associations — all this was dealt with *publicly* and the arrangements for the Murten congress were *public*. If the Swiss authorities wanted to ban it, they could have done so four weeks before it was held. But the liberal Herr Druey, who was looking for somebody to devour in order to pacify the Holy Alliance, which was becoming threatening, planned a police *coup de théâtre*. <sup>[9]</sup> Liebknecht, who had, as chairman of the Workers’ Association, signed the invitation to the congress, enjoyed all the honours due to the chief ringleader. Separated from the other delegates, he received a free lodging in the highest turret of Freiburg Tower, enjoyed an extensive view and even had the privilege of strolling an hour daily on the battlements of the tower. The only thing that was original about his treatment was his solitary confinement. His repeated request to be locked up with the others was repeatedly rejected. Vogt, however, knows that the police do not put their ‘*moutons*’ in solitary confinement, but much prefer to mix them up as jolly ‘companions’ with the mass.

Two months later Liebknecht was sent by the Freiburg police chief along with a certain Gebert to Besançon, where he and his comrade received a one-way French passport to London, with the warning that if they deviated from the route laid down they would be transported to Algiers. As a result of this unforeseen journey Liebknecht lost the greater part of his effects, which were in Geneva. Moreover, we owe it to Herren Castella, Schaller and the other members of the Freiburg government at the time to comment that Liebknecht, no less than the other Murten prisoners, was treated completely humanely. Those gentlemen remembered that they themselves had been prisoners or fugitives only a few years previously and publicly declared their aversion to the turnkey duties imposed on them by the Coptic Grand Master Druey. <sup>[10]</sup> The imprisoned refugees were *not* treated in the way that the émigré ‘parliamentarians’ had expected. A certain fellow called H, who is still to be found in Switzerland and who is a comrade of the parliamentarians, felt himself therefore obliged to publish a pamphlet in which he denounced the prisoners in general and the imprisoned Liebknecht in particular for their ‘revolutionary’ ideas that exceeded the bounds of parliamentary good sense. And

‘Charles the Bold’ still seems inconsolable over the ‘quite special consideration’ with which Liebknecht was treated.

Plagiarism characterises all our ‘bold’ hero’s hackwork. It is the same here. The Swiss liberals, that is to say, have the fixed habit of ‘liberalising’ their brutal expulsion orders by slandering their victims as ‘*mouchards*’. <sup>[11]</sup> After *Fazy* had expelled *Struve* he publicly denounced him as a ‘Russian Spy’. *Druey* similarly accused *Bichot* of being a French ‘*mouchard*’. *Tourte* acted in the same way against *Schily*, after he had had the latter suddenly seized on the street in Geneva and sent to the prison tower in Berne. ‘The Federal Mayor-Commissioner, Monsieur Kern, demands your expulsion’, the high and mighty *Tourte* replied to *Schily*’s enquiry as to the cause of the brutality inflicted on him. *Schily*: ‘Then take me to Monsieur Kern.’ *Tourte*: ‘No, we do not wish Monsieur le commissaire fédéral to do the work of the police in Geneva.’ The logic of this answer was quite worthy of the subtlety with which that very same *Tourte*, as Swiss ambassador to Turin at the time that the secession of Nice and Savoy was already *fait accompli*, wrote to his federal president that Cavour was working with all his might to prevent the Secession. But then it may be that certain diplomatic relations concerning railways at that time interrupted his normal measure of subtlety. Scarcely had *Schily* been put into the strictest solitary confinement in Berne when *Tourte* began to ‘liberalise’ his police brutality by whispering in the ears of German refugees, for example Dr Fink: ‘That *Schily* had been secretly in contact with Kern, had denounced refugees in Geneva to him [etc].’ The Geneva *Indépendant* <sup>[12]</sup> listed the ‘systematic slandering of refugees, raised to the level of a maxim of state’ among the most notorious crimes of the Geneva government (see Appendix I).

As soon as the German police made their first protests, the Swiss liberals broke the right of asylum — and they had only granted the right of asylum on the condition that the remnant of the revolutionary army did not fight a last battle on the soil of Baden — by throwing out the so-called ‘leaders’. Later it was the turn of the ‘mised’. Thousands of soldiers from Baden obtained passports home on the basis of false promises, and were immediately received by gendarmes who knew in advance ‘what, whence and in what manner’. Then came the threats from the Holy Alliance and with them the police farce at Murten. However, the ‘liberal’ Federal Council <sup>[13]</sup> did not dare go so far as ‘bold Charles’. Nothing about a ‘revolutionary congress’, ‘final organisation of the League’, ‘definitive date of the uprising’. The enquiry that had had to be instituted for the sake of decency simply petered out.

‘Threats of war’ from abroad and ‘politico-propagandistic tendencies’ was all the ‘perplexed’ Federal Council could splutter in its own defence in an official statement (see Appendix II). The police exploits of ‘Swiss Liberalism’ were by no means at an end with the ‘revolutionary congress of Murten’. On 25 January 1851, my friend Wilhelm Wolff (‘Parliament Wolff’ as the ‘Parliament-sheep’ baptised him) wrote to me from Zurich:

By the measures it has carried out until now the Federal Council has cut the number of refugees from 11,000 to 500, and it will not rest until all those who have neither impressive fortunes or special connections have been completely driven out.

The refugees who had acted in favour of the revolution stood in the most natural opposition to those of the Paulskirche who had talked it to death. The latter did not hesitate to betray their opponents to the Swiss police.

Vogt’s faithful follower, the monster *Ranickel*, himself wrote to *Schily*, after the latter’s arrival in London:

Do try to keep a few columns free in a Belgian journal for statements, and do not fail to make life in America miserable for the *rotten German dogs* [parliamentarians], *who have sold themselves as tools to that goitrous diplomat* [Druey].

One can now understand what ‘Charles the Bold’ means by the phrase:

I worked *with all my strength* to cut down revolutionary vagabondage and to provide the refugees with *a place to go*, be it on the continent, be it *overseas*.

As early as No 257 of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* one could read under the following dateline:

*Heidelberg*, 23 March 1849: Our friend *Vogt*, ‘champion’ of the left, Imperial Humorist of the present, Imperial Barrot <sup>[14]</sup> of the future, the ‘true warner’ against the revolution, has united with — some comrades? indeed not! — with some reactionaries



of the first water... and for what purpose? In order to send to America, or rather to *deport*, some of the 'figures' who are staying in Strasbourg, Besançon and other places on the German border... What Cavaignac's <sup>[15]</sup> regime of the sabre imposes as a punishment, these gentlemen wish to do in the name of Christian love... The amnesty is dead, long live *deportation*! Of course in the process there can be no lack of the *pia fraus* <sup>[16]</sup> that the refugees themselves expressed the desire to emigrate, etc. Now, however, people are writing from Strasbourg to the *Seeblättern* that this lusting after deportation has aroused a veritable storm of protest among *all* the refugees... They all hope soon to return to Germany, even at the danger (as Herr Vogt so touchingly remarks) of having to join a 'foodhardy venture'.

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

### III: Cherval

The virtue of this jest will be the incomprehensible lies that this same fat rogue will tell us. — Shakespeare, *Henry IV*, Part I, Act I, Scene 2.

In my *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne* a chapter is reserved for the Cherval plot. <sup>[17]</sup> In it, I demonstrate how Stieber, with Cherval (pseudonym for Crämer) as his instrument and Carlier, Greif and Fleury as midwives, brought the so-called Franco–German September Plot into the world in Paris in order to get over the lack of 'hard fact' that the 'Cologne Prosecution Council' censured in the prosecution against the Cologne prisoners.

So striking were the proofs that I provided for the defence during the Cologne trial on the absolute lack of any connection between Cherval on the one hand and myself and the Cologne defendants on the other, that the very Stieber who had conjured up his Cherval against us on 18 October 1852 was already abjuring him by 23 October 1852. Driven into a corner, he gave up his attempt to identify Cherval and his plot with us. Stieber was Stieber, but Stieber was no Vogt.

I do not think it would serve any purpose to repeat here disclosures I made in the *Revelations* over the so-called September plot. At the beginning of May 1852, Cherval returned to London, whence he had removed to Paris for business reasons in the early summer of 1850. The Paris police set him free a few months after he had been sentenced in February 1852. In London he was at first greeted as a political martyr by the German Workers' Educational Association, <sup>[18]</sup> which I and my friends had already left *in mid-September 1850*. This deception, however, did not last long. His Parisian exploits soon became known, and in the course of that very month of May he was expelled in infamy from the Association at a public meeting. The defendants in the Cologne trial, in gaol from the beginning of May 1851, were still imprisoned on remand awaiting trial. From a notice sent from Paris to his organ, the *Kölnische Zeitung*, by the spy *Beckmann*, I saw that the Prussian police were trying retrospectively to forge a connection between Cherval, his plot and the Cologne defendants. I therefore looked around for information on Cherval. It turned out that the latter had, in July 1852, offered his services as an agent for the Orleanists to Monsieur de R, a former minister under Louis Philippe and a well-known eclectic philosopher. Monsieur de R's links with the Prefecture of Police in Paris enabled him to receive from there extracts from Cherval's dossier. In the French police reports Cherval is described as Cherval alias Frank, whose real name is Crämer. He was said to have functioned for a long time as the agent of Prince Hatzfeldt, the Prussian Ambassador to Paris, to have been the betrayer of the Franco–German plot and now simultaneously a French spy, etc. During the proceedings of the Cologne trial I provided one of the defendants, the advocate *Schneider II*, with this information, and empowered him, if necessary, to name my source. When, in the hearing of 18 October, Stieber swore that the Irishman Cherval, of whom he himself said that he served time in Aachen for forgery in 1845, was still under arrest in Paris, I informed Herr Schneider II by the next post that the Rhenish Prussian Crämer was 'still' resident in London under the pseudonym Cherval, that he was in daily communication with the Prussian Police Lieutenant Greif, and that, as a condemned Prussian criminal, he would have to be extradited immediately from England on the application of the Prussian government. His transportation to Cologne as a witness would immediately have wrecked the whole Stieber system.

Hard pressed by Schneider II, Stieber finally said on 23 October that he believed that he had heard that Cherval had fled from Paris, but he denied by all that was holy any knowledge of the Irishman's present whereabouts and of his alliance with the Prussian police. In fact Cherval was at that time attached to Greif in London with a fixed weekly wage. The debate in the Cologne Assize Court, occasioned by my information, on the 'Cherval mystery', drove the latter from London. I heard that he had gone to Jersey on a police mission. I had long lost him from sight when I accidentally saw, in a letter from Geneva in the *Republik der Arbeiter* <sup>[19]</sup> which appears in New York, that Cherval had turned up in Geneva in March 1853 under the name of *Nugent*, and that he had disappeared thence in the summer of 1854. Thus he appeared where Vogt was living in Geneva a few weeks after the material in my *Revelations* compromising him was brought out by Schabelitz in Basle.

Let us now return to the Falstaffian contortions of history.

Vogt has his Cherval arrive in Geneva *immediately* after his pretended flight from Paris, just as he has him 'sent' from London to Paris 'a few months' before the discovery of the September plot by the Communist secret league (*Magnum Opus*, p 172). If the intervening period between May 1852 and March 1853 thus disappears entirely, the intervening period between June 1850 and September 1851 shrinks to a 'few months'. What would Stieber not have given for a Vogt who would have sworn, at the Cologne Assizes, that the 'Communist secret league in London' had sent Cherval to Paris in June 1850, and what would I not have given to see Vogt next to Stieber sweating in the witness-box! A nice gathering, Stieber swearing his head off with his creature Greif, his Wermuth, his little Goldheim and his — *beadle (Bettelvogt)*! Vogt's Cherval brought to Geneva '*Letters of recommendation to all the acquaintances of Marx and Co, from whom Herr Nugent was soon inseparable*' (p 173). He takes up 'residence with the family of a correspondent of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*' and, probably as a result of my letter of recommendation (in the *Revelations*), obtains access to Vogt, who employs him as a lithographer (p 174) and to a certain extent, as he had previously with Archduke Johann and as he did later with Plon-Plon, enters into 'scientific relations' with him. Busy one day in the cabinet <sup>[20]</sup> of the Imperial Regency, 'Nugent' is recognised as Cherval by an 'acquaintance' who hints that he is an '*agent provocateur*'. Indeed, Nugent is employed in Geneva not only by Vogt but also in the 'instigation of a secret society'.

'Cherval-Nugent was the Chairman, kept the minutes and kept up the correspondence with London.' (p 175) He had '*drawn a few rather gullible but otherwise honest workers into his confidence*' (p 175), but '*among the members there was also an affiliate of the Marxist clique, whom everybody described as a suspect envoy of the German police*' (p 175).

'All' Marx's 'acquaintances', from whom Cherval-Nugent 'was inseparable', are suddenly transformed into '*an affiliate*', which *one* affiliate for his part once more divides into '*the Marxist affiliates who had stayed behind in Geneva*' (p 176), with whom Nugent not only later 'continued to correspond from Paris', but whom he also 'attracted to himself' in Paris like a magnet.

So we once more have the beloved 'change of form' of the buckram 'material' of Kendal green!

What Cherval-Nugent intended with his society was the mass manufacture of counterfeit banknotes and treasury notes, 'by issuing which the depositors' credit was to be undermined and their finances ruined' (p 175).

Cherval, it seems, emulated the noble Pitt, who is known, during the war against the Jacobins, to have set up a factory for the production of counterfeit French assignats not far from London.

*Already* various lithographic and copper plates had been engraved by Nugent himself for this purpose, *already* the gullible members of the secret society had been chosen who were to go, with packets of these [lithographic and copper plates? — no] *counterfeit* banknotes [the banknotes were of course packed before they were manufactured] to France, Switzerland and Germany. (p 175)

But *already* Cicero-Vogt was on the track of Cherval-Catalina, <sup>[21]</sup> with drawn sword. Falstaffian characters all have the feature that their actions are as inflated as their bellies. Just see how our guzzler, who has already cut down the 'revolutionary vagabondage' in Switzerland and provided whole ship-loads of refugees with an *escape overseas*, how he sets his scene, how he melodramatises

himself, how he immortalises the adventure of Stieber's fisticuffs in Paris with Cherval! (See *Revelations*.) Thus:

'The plan of this whole *conspiracy was plotted in the most fearful way.*' (p 176) 'That is to say that all the Workers' Associations were to be implicated in Cherval's plan.' *Already* 'confidential enquiries' had 'been made on the part of foreign embassies'; *already* the attempt was being made 'to compromise Switzerland, particularly the Canton of Geneva'.

But the Land-Vogt was vigilant. He accomplished his first salvation of Switzerland, an experiment which he later repeated several times with constantly increasing success.

I do not deny [cries this weighty man], *I do not deny that I contributed my essentials to thwart this devilry; I do not deny that I had recourse to the police of the Republic of Geneva for this purpose; I regret to this day [disconsolate Cicero] that the zeal of some of those who had been deceived served as a warning to the cunning instigator, so that he was able to make himself scarce before he was arrested.*

At all events, however, Cicero-Vogt had 'thwarted' the Cataline conspiracy, saved Switzerland, and 'contributed' his *essentials*, wherever he wears them. A few weeks later, as he explains, Cherval reappeared in Paris, 'where he did not conceal himself at all, but lived as *openly* as any *citizen*' (p 176). We know how *openly* the Parisian citizens (*citoyens*) of the counterfeit empire are accustomed to *living*.

While Cherval goes about so 'openly' in Paris, poor Vogt has to hide himself every time he visits Paris under Plon-Plon's table at the Palais Royal!

I really regret that I now have to place after Vogt's mighty Zachariade <sup>[22]</sup> the following letter of *Johann Philipp Becker*. The revolutionary activities of Joh Philipp Becker, the veteran of the German emigration, from the Hambach <sup>[23]</sup> festival to the Imperial Constitution campaign, in which he fought as head of the fifth army division (a voice that is surely not partisan, that of the Berlin *Militär-Wohenschrift*, contains a testimony to his military achievements), are too generally known for me to need to say anything here about the author of the letter. I shall therefore merely remark that the letter was addressed to my friend, the German merchant R in London, that JP Becker is personally unknown to me and has never had any political relations with me, and finally that I have left out the opening part of the letter, which contains business matters, as well as most of the material on the 'Brimstone Gang' and the 'Bürstenheimers', which is already known from information previously given. (The original of the letter is in Berlin with the documents of my trial.)

Paris

20 March 1860

... In the last few days Vogt's pamphlet *contra* Marx has come to my attention. This book depressed me all the more for the fact that I see the history of the so-called 'Brimstone Gang' and the infamous Cherval, of which I have quite precise knowledge as a result of my stay in Geneva at the time, completely distorted and totally unjustly connected with the political activities of the activities of the economist Marx. I neither know this Herr Marx personally, nor have I ever had any form of contact with him, but I have on the other hand known Herr Vogt and his family for more than 20 years, and am therefore far closer to the latter in friendly relations. I must bitterly protest at and most decisively reject the rashness and unscrupulousness with which Vogt enters this fight. It is unworthy of a man to use distorted or even completely invented facts as arguments. I am really sorry to see how in his quasi-suicidal thoughtlessness he ruins a much better activity and compromises his position and his reputation and exposes them to ridicule, even if he is completely innocent of the charge of being in the service of Napoleon. How gladly, on the contrary, would I have granted him all honourable means to free himself brilliantly of such serious accusations. With respect to what he has already done in this unedifying affair I feel literally forced to tell you all about this so-called Brimstone Gang and our fine Herr Cherval, so that you can judge for yourself how far Marx can be made at all responsible for their existence and their activity.

A word therefore about the birth and demise of the Brimstone Gang, about which there is scarcely anybody better able to provide information than myself. It was not only that, during my stay in Geneva at the time, I had from the start through my position every opportunity to observe the deeds and omissions of the émigrés, but also that, keeping the general cause in mind, I had as an older man the special interest of following attentively all their movements, in order to anticipate, avoid and prevent any silly enterprises, so pardonable given a state of mind so exacerbated and so often made desperate by misfortune. After all, I knew from 30 years of experience how well endowed every emigration is with illusions.

(What follows here is, in its essence, anticipated in the letters of Borkheim and Schily.)

... This society, which was essentially a drinking club, was humorously and contemptuously called the Brimstone Gang. It was an impromptu association of fellows who had been thrown together without a chairman, a programme, statutes or dogma. There was no thought of anything to do with a secret society or the systematic pursuit of any political or any other kind of goal. All they did was to strive for effect openly and indeed, with extravagant openness and open-heartedness to excess. Even less did they have any connection with Marx, who for his part could quite certainly have no knowledge of their existence, and from whom moreover they diverged widely in their socio-political views. At that time also these lads exhibited a marked drive for independence that amounted to an over-estimation of themselves, so that they would scarcely have subordinated themselves to any authority either in theory or in practice. They would have laughed as much at Vogt's patriarchal admonitions as at any factional directions from Marx. I was all the more exactly informed of everything that happened in their circle for the fact that my eldest son kept up daily traffic with the chiefs of the same... Altogether the whole frivolity of this unbridled gang scarcely survived the winter of 1849–50. The force of circumstance scattered our heroes to all four winds.

Who could have guessed that the Brimstone Gang, long since fallen into oblivion, would be resurrected by Herr Professor Vogt after ten years of slumber, in order to spread against supposed attackers an evil odour which smug newspaper-writers then spread further like some kind of electro-magnetic sympathetic conductor. The liberal *par excellence*, Herr von Vincke, himself talked about the Brimstone Gang on the occasion of the Italian question and used it to enlighten the modest Prussian parliament. And did not the citizenry of Breslau, otherwise in such good odour, in *sancta simplicitas* <sup>[24]</sup> stage a Shrovetide farce in honour of the Brimstone Gang, and, as a symbol of their virtuous convictions, fumigate the town with sulphur candles?

Poor innocent Brimstone Gang! Did you have to, after your late demise, grow willy nilly into a true Vulcan, a bogeyman to scare timid subjects into the arms of the police, to vulcanise all the world's dunderheads, to carbonise every burnt-out brain to the very stump — just as Vogt, it seems to me, has burnt his fingers for good on this.

So now to *Cramer, vulgo Cherval*. This rogue in both the socio-political and in the common meaning, came to Geneva in 1853, and that as an Englishman under the name of Nugent. That was the family name of his alleged wife, who accompanied him and really is an Englishwoman. He spoke fluent English and French, and avoided speaking German for a long time, as it seemed very important for him to be taken for a typical Englishman. As a skilled colour lithographer, it was he, as he boasted, who introduced that art in Geneva. He is skilful in social intercourse, knows how to make an effect and show himself to advantage. He soon found sufficient employment with professors of the academy, drawing objects of antiquity and from natural history. He lived a very retired life at first, and later sought the company almost exclusively of circles of French and Italian refugees. I founded at that time a *bureau de renseignements* <sup>[25]</sup> and a daily paper, *Le Messager du Léman*, and had as an assistant a refugee from Baden by the name of *Stecher*, formerly headmaster of a *Realschule*. <sup>[26]</sup> The latter had a

particular talent at drawing, and intended to improve his prospects by learning colour lithography. He found a teacher in the Englishman Nugent. Stecher often told me the nicest things about this skilled, friendly and generous Englishman and the pleasantly gracious Englishwoman. Now Stecher was also a singing teacher in the Workers' Educational Association, and occasionally took his teacher Nugent there, where I first had the pleasure of his acquaintance, and where he condescended to speak German, and that so fluently in the lower Rhenish dialect that I said to him: '*But you are never an Englishman — not on your life.*' However, he insisted that he was, explaining that his parents had sent him in early youth to an educational establishment in Bonn, where he had stayed until his eighteenth year and had become accustomed to the local dialect. Stecher, who was delighted with the 'nice' man until the very last minute, helped him to sustain his pretence of being an Englishman. But this event made me very suspicious of this alleged son of Albion, and I advised caution within the Association. Later I met the Englishman in the company of French refugees, just at a time when he was boasting about his heroic exploits in the Paris uprisings. That was the first time that I saw that he was also involved in politics. This made me even more suspicious of him. I made fun of the 'lion-like courage' with which he claimed to have fought, in order to give him an opportunity to display it against me also in front of the Frenchmen. But since he simply took my biting mockery with dog-like humility, he became contemptible to me also.

From now on he avoided me entirely wherever he could. Meanwhile, with Stecher's help he staged dances for the German Workers' Association, for which they attracted a few unpaid musicians, an Italian, a Swiss and a Frenchman. At these balls I once more met the Englishman as a true master of the revels and entirely in his element. For he was much better at having a gay good time and pleasing the ladies than he was at lion-like courage. In the Workers' Association, however, he took no part in politics, but only hopped and leapt, laughed, drank and sang. Meanwhile, however, I learned from the goldsmith, Fritz from Württemberg, that the 'thoroughly revolutionary Englishman' had formed a league, which consisted of him (Fritz), another German, and several Frenchmen and Italians, altogether about seven members. I urged Fritz not to get involved in anything serious with this political tightrope-walker, to leave the league immediately and to make the others do the same. Some time later my bookseller sent me a pamphlet by *Marx* on the Communist trials in Cologne, in which Cherval was sharply delineated as Crämer, and sharply taken up as a rogue and a traitor. I immediately suspected now that Nugent could be this Cherval, especially as, according to this book, he was from the Rhine, which was in accordance with his dialect, and that he lived with an Englishwoman, which also fitted. I immediately communicated this suspicion to Stecher, Fritz and the others, and for this purpose had the pamphlet circulated among them. Suspicion of Nugent grew rapidly; *Marx's book had its effect*. Fritz thereupon came to me and declared that he had left the 'little league' and that the others would follow his example. He also revealed to me its secret purpose. The 'Englishman' is supposed to have wanted to destroy the credit of various states by reproducing state notes, and with the money thus gained to set the European revolution into motion, etc. At the same time, a Monsieur Laya, a French refugee, previously an advocate in Paris, was giving lectures on socialism. Nugent was present at them. Laya, who had been his defence lawyer at his trial in Paris, recognised him as Cherval, which he told him to his face. Nugent implored him not to betray him. I learned of this situation from a French refugee who was a friend of Laya, and immediately spread the news around. Nugent had the nerve to appear again in the Workers' Association, where he was unmasked as the German Crämer and the Frenchman Cherval and thrown out. Ranickel from Bingen is supposed to have attacked him the most violently in this affair. To cap it all, the Geneva police was now after him because of the little league, but the manufacturer of state notes had disappeared without trace.

In Paris, the latter occupied himself with the decoration of porcelain, and since I was also engaged here in that trade, we encountered one another in way of business. I always found him, however, still the same reckless, incorrigible windbag.

But what I really cannot understand is how Vogt could have dared to draw a connection between this rascal in his activities in Geneva and the efforts of a *Marx*, and characterise him as his comrade or tool, especially as this was meant to be at a time when Marx was attacking this fellow so decisively in the book I have mentioned. *It was precisely Marx who unmasked him and chased him out of Geneva, where according to Vogt he was supposed to have been working for Marx.*

When I consider how it was possible for the scientist Vogt to get on to such a wrong track, my brain reels. Is it not regrettable to see the noble influence that Vogt had united in his person through the accidental coincidence of circumstances so fruitlessly and prodigally brought to naught? Would it be surprising if, hearing of this, everybody regarded with mistrust and suspicion Vogt's scientific researches, as if his scientific conclusions were based on the same recklessness, the same lack of conscientiousness, and on false conceptions instead of on positive, thoroughly-researched facts?

There is more to being a statesman and a scholar than ambition, otherwise even Cr amer would be both. *Unfortunately, through his Brimstone Gang and his Cherval, Vogt himself has sunk to the level of a sort of Cherval. And in fact the two have an inner similarity in their strongly-marked need for a comfortable life, for bodily security, social gaiety and frivolous facetiousness in serious affairs...* Anticipating speedy and friendly news from you, I am, in hearty devotion.

Your

**J Ph Becker**

PS: I have just taken a further look at Vogt's book, and see to my further amazement that the B urstenheimers are also done full honour. You should now know briefly how matters stood with this gang...

I further see, also in the same book, that he claims that Nugent-Cherval-Cramer *came to Geneva on Marx's behalf*. I must therefore also add that the former, who laid claim to the part of an Englishman until the very end of his stay in Geneva, *never gave the slightest sign that he had ever been in contact with German refugees anywhere*, which would not have suited his incognito anyway. Even here and now, when it could well be less important to him than there at that time, he does not want to pass as one, and denies all acquaintance with Germans from former times.

Previously I still believed that Vogt had frivolously allowed himself to be misled by others, but now his behaviour appears to me more and more to be wicked malice. I am also less sorry for him now, and I only pity his good, honest old father, who will surely suffer many a bitter hour as a result of this affair.

I do not merely allow you, but ask you, in the interest of truth and of the good cause, to make use of this information in the circle of your acquaintances.

Heartily yours

**J Philipp B**

(See Appendix III)

## IV: The Cologne Communist Trial

From the Imperial Regent's 'closet' in Geneva to the Royal Prussian Assize court in Cologne.

'In the Cologne trial *Marx* played an outstanding role.' Undoubtedly.

'In Cologne *his comrades* were tried.' Admittedly.

The Cologne defendants were kept on remand pending investigations for 1½ years.

The Prussian Police and Embassy, Hinckeldy <sup>[27]</sup> and all his tribe, the Post Office and the magistracy, the Ministries of the Interior and of Justice, all of these made the most tremendous efforts during these 1½ years to give birth to a *corpus delicti*. <sup>[28]</sup>

Here, therefore, in his investigation into my ‘activities’, Vogt has, to a certain extent, at his disposal the resources of the Prussian state and even possessed authentic material in my *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne* (Basle, 1853), a copy of which he borrowed from the Geneva Workers’ Association and ‘studied’. This time, therefore, the Boy Karl will not forbear to make me tremble. But no! This time Vogt becomes ‘perplexed’, lets off a few of his natural steam and stink bombs and stutters, seeking to retreat: ‘*The Cologne trial has no especial importance for us.*’ (*Magnum Opus*, p 172)

In the *Revelations* I could not avoid attacking, among others, Herr *A Willich*. In the *New Yorker Criminal-Zeitung* <sup>[29]</sup> of 28 October 1853, Willich starts his self-defence by characterising my book as ‘a masterly critique of the ghastly conduct of the central police of the German League’. J Schabelitz junior, the book’s publisher, wrote to me, after receiving my manuscript, dated *Basle*, 11 December 1852:

Your exposure of the infamy of the police is unsurpassable. You have erected a lasting monument to the present regime in Prussia.

He added that his opinion was shared by experts, and at the head of these experts stands a man who is at present a friend in Geneva of Herr Karl Vogt.

Seven years after its publication the same book gave rise to the following declaration by Herr Eichhoff in Berlin, who was completely unknown to me — as is known, Herr Eichhoff was on trial accused of libel against Stieber:

That he had made an exhaustive study of the Communist trial in Cologne, and that he had not only to sustain his previous claim that Stieber had perjured himself, but to extend it to say that the whole of Stieber’s testimony at that trial was false... that the verdict against the Cologne defendants had been reached solely on the basis of Stieber’s testimony... that Stieber’s whole testimony was perjury consistently carried out. (First supplement to the Berlin *Vossische Zeitung*, 9 May 1860)

Vogt himself admits:

He [Marx] made every imaginable effort to give the defence lawyers material and instructions for the conduct of the trial...

There (in Cologne), as is known, ‘false documents they themselves had forged’ were ‘put forward by the agents’ Stieber, Fleury, etc, ‘as “evidence” and in general such depths of depravity were uncovered among this police rabble as arouse a shudder’ (*Magnum Opus*, pp 169–70).

If Vogt can prove his hatred of *coups d’état* by carrying out propaganda for Bonapartism, why should I not prove my ‘agreement’ with the secret police by *uncovering* their bottomless depravity? If the police possessed real evidence, why did they forge false evidence?

However, lectures Professor Vogt: ‘The blow nevertheless struck *only* the members of the Marxist League in Cologne, only the party of Marx.’

Indeed, Polonius! Had the blow previously not struck another party in Paris, and did it not afterwards strike another party in Berlin (the Ladendorf trial), and yet another in Bremen (the League of the Dead) and so on and so forth?

As far as the *verdict of guilty* on the Cologne defendants is concerned, I shall quote a passage on it from my *Revelations*:

The miracles performed by the police were originally necessary to make the public forget that it was really political opinions that were on trial. The revelations you are about to witness, Gentlemen of the Jury, said Saedt when opening for the prosecution, will prove to you that it is not political opinions that are to be put on trial. But now [at the end of the proceedings] he emphasises the importance of these opinions so as to ensure that the police revelations are forgotten. After the 1½ year preliminary investigation the jury needed objective evidence in order to justify itself before public

opinion. After the five-week-long police comedy they needed ‘opinions *pure and simple*’ to extricate themselves from the sheer mess. Saedt therefore did not only confine himself to the material that had led the Prosecution Council to the conclusion that ‘there was no evidence of an indictable offence’. He went even further. He attempted to prove that the law against conspiracy does not in fact require any conspiracy to take place but only that it be advocated so that in effect the word ‘plot’ is only a pretext which enables the law to burn political heretics. The success of his attempt promised to be all the greater because of the decision to apply the new Prussian Penal Code that had been promulgated after the accused had been arrested. On the pretext that this code contained milder provisions, the servile court brought itself to permit its application to be retroactive. But if people were on trial because of their political opinions, then why a preliminary investigation lasting 1½ years? Because of yet other opinions. (p 114)

With the unmasking of the Minute-Book, forged and planted by the Prussian police themselves, the case had advanced to a new stage. The jury was no longer free merely to find the defendants guilty or not guilty; they must either find the defendants guilty — or else the government. To acquit the accused would mean condemning the government. (pp 112–13)

That the Prussian government of the day had a similar view of the situation is proved by a letter that Hinckeldy wrote during the Cologne proceedings to the Prussian Embassy in London, where it said that ‘the whole existence of the political police was dependent on the outcome of this trial’. He therefore asked for a person to represent before the court the witness H, who had absconded, for which performance he would receive a reward of 1000 Tlr. The person had in fact already been found when a further letter arrived from Hinckeldy: ‘The State Prosecutor hoped, *given the fortunate composition of the jury*, to obtain a verdict of guilty without any further exceptional measures, and he [Hinckeldy] therefore begged them not to make any further efforts.’ — see Appendix IV.

It was in fact this *fortunate composition of the jury in Cologne* that inaugurated the Hinckeldy–Stieber regime in Prussia. The police rabble attached to the Prussian Embassy in London knew as early as October 1852 that ‘a blow would fall in Berlin if the Cologne defendants were found guilty’, although the police bomb in Berlin (Ladendorf conspiracy) did not go off until the end of March 1853 — see Appendix IV.

The liberal outcry after a period of reaction is always in proportion to the enormity of the liberal cowardice that for years left the field clear for reaction. Thus, at the time of the Cologne trial, all my attempts to expose Stieber’s system of deception in the liberal Prussian press failed. They had inscribed in broad characters on their banner: Safety is the citizen’s first duty, and under this sign you will — live.

## **V: Central Festival of the German Workers’ Education Associations at Lausanne (26–27 June 1859)**

Our hero flees with ever-renewed pleasure back to — Arcadia. We find him once more in an ‘out-of-the-way corner of Switzerland’, in Lausanne, at the ‘Central Festival’ of a number of German Workers’ Educational Associations which was celebrated at the end of June in Lausanne. Here Karl Vogt achieved the salvation of Switzerland for the second time. While Catalina sits in London, that Cicero in a pied jacket thunders in Lausanne:

Jam, jam intelligis me acrius vigilare ad salutem quam te ad perniciem reipublicae. <sup>[30]</sup>

By coincidence there exists an authentic report on the said ‘Central Festival’ and the heroic deed done by the ‘rounded character’. The title of the report written with Vogt’s collaboration by Herr G Lommel reads *Das Centralfest der deutschen Arbeiterbildungsvereine in der Wetschweiz (Lausanne 1859)* (Markus Vaney, rue de la Croix d’or, Geneva, 1859). Let us compare the authentic report with the *Magnum Opus* that appeared five months later. The report contains the speech that Cicero-Vogt



'*himself made*', at the outset of which he reveals the secret of his appearance at this event. He appears among the workers, he harangues them, because:

... serious charges have recently been raised against him which, if they were true, *would be bound* to destroy confidence in him *and completely undermine his political effectiveness*. I come [he continues], I come for *that reason*, to say an open word about the [above-mentioned] secret underhand dealing. (pp 6–7 of the report)

He is accused of Bonapartist activities, he has to save his political effectiveness, and as is his custom he defends his skin with his tongue. After threshing about idly for an hour and a half he bethinks himself of Demosthenes' admonition that 'action, action and once more action is the soul of rhetoric'.

But what is action? In America there is a little creature called the skunk which, at times of extreme danger, possesses only one defence, its offensive odour. When attacked it sprays from a certain portion of its anatomy a material whose moisture condemns your clothes to death by fire, without reprieve, and which, should it so much as touch your skin, excludes you for a certain time from the company of all human beings. So horribly offensive is the smell that, as soon as their hounds accidentally surprise a skunk, hunters immediately take to their heels more precipitately and more fearfully than if they had a tiger or a wolf after them. Powder and lead can defend one against wolves and tigers, but there is no remedy against the *a posteriori* of the skunk.

That is action, this naturalised citizen of the 'Animal Kingdom' said to himself, and after the manner of the skunk, the orator sprayed the following over his presumed persecutors:

I warn you most urgently against one thing, however, and that is the activities of a small handful of desperate men, whose whole aim and intention amounts to distracting the worker from his profession, involving him in conspiracies and Communist activities and finally, after living off his sweat, dashing him coldly [after, that is to say, he has sweated himself out] to his ruin. And even *now once more* this handful is trying by every possible means [as generally as possible] to draw the Workers' Association once more into its treacherous net. Whatever they may say [on Vogt's Bonapartist activities], be sure that they only intend to use the worker for their own selfish purposes and finally to leave him to his fate. (p 18 of the report)

The skunk's shamelessness in making myself and my friends, who have always represented the interests of the working class *gratis*, sacrificing our own personal interests, 'live off the sweat of the workers' is not even original. Not only did the Decembrist '*mouchards*' scream similar slanders after Louis Blanc, Blanqui, Raspail, etc, but every time, everywhere, the sycophants of the ruling class have constantly slandered the literary and political champions of the oppressed classes in this infamous manner (see Appendix V).

After this action, moreover, our 'rounded character' is not even able to keep a straight face. The buffoon now compares his 'persecutors' who are at liberty, with the 'Russian *prisoners* at Zorndorf' and himself with — guess whom! — *Frederick the Great*. Falstaff-Vogt remembered that, at the first battle he took part in, Frederick the Great ran away. How much greater then is not *he*, who ran away without taking part in a battle.

So much for the adventure of the Central Festival at Lausanne according to the authentic report. And 'now just look' (to quote Fischart) 'at the sticky, sponging, boorish swill-cook and pastry-rag' and what an Eulenspiegel-like police-brew he serves up five months later for the German philistines:

The intention was *at any price to bring about complications in Switzerland*: the policy of neutrality... was at all events to suffer a setback. *I was informed* that the Central Festival of Workers' Educational Associations was to be used to direct the workers into paths which they had absolutely refused to tread. It was hoped to be able to use the beautiful festival to form a *secret committee* which was to enter into contact with like-minded people in Germany and take God knows [Vogt, *although informed*, does not know] what *kind of measures*. Vague rumours and secret messages circulated about active intervention in German politics at home. *I immediately decided to oppose this activity*, in order to bring home to the workers once more that they should not lend their ear *to any proposals of this kind*. I expressed the warning openly at the above-mentioned end of my speech [etc]. (*Magnum Opus*, p 18)

Cicero-Vogt forgets that he openly babbled out at the start of his speech what really drove him to the Central Festival — not the neutrality of Switzerland, but the salvation of his own skin. There is not a syllable in his speech about the intended attentat on Switzerland, the conspiratorial longings at the Central Festival, the secret committee, the workers' active intervention in German politics, about proposals of *'this'* or any other *'kind'*. There is nothing about any of these Stieberisms. His final warning was merely the warning of that man of honour Sykes, who warned the jury at the Old Bailey not to listen to the *'depraved'* detectives who had discovered his theft.

*'The immediately subsequent events'*, says Falstaff-Vogt (*Magnum Opus*, p 181) *'confirmed my suspicions.'* What, *suspicions!* But Falstaff forgets again that a few lines previously he had not *'suspected'*, but had been *'informed'*, *informed* of the plans of the conspirators, and *informed* in complete *detail!* And what, thou suspicious angel, were the immediately subsequent *events?*

*'An article in the Allgemeine Zeitung imputed tendencies to the festival and the life of the workers about which they [that is to say the festival and the life] were not even thinking in the slightest.'* (Just as Vogt imputes them to the Murten Congress and the workers' organisations in general.) *'On the basis of this article and a reprint of it in the Frankfurter Journal there followed a confidential enquiry from the Ambassador of a South German state in which that significance was ascribed to the festival' — which the article in the Allgemeine Zeitung and the reprint in the Frankfurter Journal 'imputed' to it — upon my soul no! — 'which it was supposed to have had according to the thwarted intentions of the Brimstone Gang.'*

Yes indeed! *Was supposed to have had!*

Although the most superficial comparison of the *Magnum Opus* with the authentic report on the Central Festival is sufficient to expose the secret of Cicero-Vogt's second salvation of Switzerland, I nonetheless wished to make sure whether or not some fact or other — however distorted — had provided him with the material for his display of energy. I therefore applied in writing to the editor of the authentic report, Herr *G Lommel* of Geneva. Herr Lommel must have been on friendly terms with Vogt, as he not only wrote the report on the Lausanne Central Festival with his assistance, but also, in a later pamphlet on the Schiller and Robert Blum Festival in Geneva, drew a veil over the blunder that Vogt made there. Herr Lommel, who is not personally known to me, stated in a letter to me of 13 April 1860:

*Vogt's* account that he had thwarted a dangerous plot in Lausanne is *the purest myth* or lie; in Lausanne he was only looking for a place to be able to speak and have this speech printed afterwards. In this 1½ hour speech he defended himself against the accusation that he was in the pay of Bonaparte. The manuscript is safe in my hands.

A Frenchman living in Geneva, asked about this same conspiracy of Vogt's, answered briefly: *'Il faut connaître cet individu, surtout le faiseur, l'homme important, toujours hors de la nature et de la vérité.'* (*'One has to know this individual [that is to say, Vogt] above all the charlatan, with his self-importance, always unnatural and untruthful.'*)

Vogt himself says on page 99 of his so-called *Studies* that he *'had never boasted of possessing prophetic qualities'*. But we know from the Old Testament that the ass saw what the prophet had not seen.

And thus is explained how Vogt *saw* the conspiracy which in November 1859 he suspected he had *'frustrated'* in June 1859.

## VI: Various

*If my memory does not deceive me* [says the Parliament clown], the circular [that is to say, an alleged circular from London to the proletarians dated 1850] was at all events written by a member of Marx's party, the so-called Parliament-Wolf, and was passed to the Hanoverian police — *this channel crops up* once again in the story of the circular *'der Vaterlandsfreunde an die Gothaer'*. (*Magnum Opus*, p 144)

*A channel crops up! A prolapses ani* perhaps, you jesting natural historian?

As far as ‘Parliament-Wolf’ is concerned — and we will hear later why Parliament-Wolf weighs down like an incubus on the memory of the Parliament-clown — he published the following statement in the Berlin *Volks-Zeitung*, the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and the Hamburg *Reform*:

**Statement:** Manchester, 6 February 1860. From a friend’s letter I learn that the *National-Zeitung* (no 41 of this year) carried the following passage in a leading article based on Vogt’s pamphlet: ‘In 1850, as Vogt seems to remember, another *circular letter* from London was written by Parliament-Wolf, alias Battlement-Wolf, sent to *the proletarians* in Germany, and simultaneously passed to the Hanoverian police.’ I have not seen either that issue of the *National-Zeitung* or Vogt’s pamphlet, and therefore answer solely with regard to the passage quoted.

1: In 1850 I lived in *Zurich* and not in London, whither I did not move until summer 1851.

2: In my whole life I have never written a circular letter, either to ‘proletarians’ or anyone else.

3: As far as the insinuation regarding the Hanoverian police is concerned, *I fling this shamelessly invented accusation contemptuously back into the originator’s teeth*. If the rest of Vogt’s pamphlet is as stinking a lie as the part that refers to me, it is worthy to stand beside the *hack-work* of *Chenu, de la Hodde* and company.

### **W Wolff**

One can see that, just as *Cuvier* <sup>[31]</sup> correctly reconstructs the whole structure of an animal from a single bone, so *Wolff* has correctly reconstructed Vogt’s hack-work from a scrap of a quotation. Alongside *Chenu* and *de la Hodde*, *Karl Vogt* does indeed appear as *primus inter pares*.

The ‘unperplexed’ Vogt’s final proof of my *entente cordiale* with the secret police in general and ‘my relations with the *Kreuz-Zeitung* party <sup>[32]</sup> in particular’, consists of the fact that my wife is the sister of the retired Prussian minister Herr von Westphalen (*Magnum Opus*, p 194). How now to parry Falstaff’s dastardly wiles? Perhaps the clown will forgive my wife her cognate Prussian minister if he learns that one of her Scottish agnates was beheaded as a rebel in the Edinburgh market place in the fight for freedom against James II. As is well known, it is only by an oversight that Vogt still carried his own head around with him. That is to say, that at the Robert Blum celebration of the German Workers’ Educational Association in Geneva (13 November 1859) he reported, ‘how the left of the Frankfurt Parliament had long been undecided whom they should send to Vienna, whether Blum or himself. In the end it was fate, the drawing of a straw, that decided in favour of, or rather against, Blum.’ (*Die Schillerfeier zu Genf: Text der Gesänge und Declamationen* (Geneva, 1859), pp 28–29)

On 13 October, Robert Blum travelled from Frankfurt to Vienna. On 23 or 24 October, a deputation of the Frankfurt extreme left, on its way to the Congress of Democrats in Berlin, arrived in Cologne. I saw these gentlemen, among whom there were several parliamentarians closely affiliated with the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. These people, the first of whom was summarily shot during the Imperial Constitution campaign, the second of whom died in exile, and the third of whom is still alive, whispered a strange, uncanny story into my ear concerning Vogt’s activities in relation to Robert Blum’s mission to Vienna.

However:

Ask me not to talk, ask me to keep my peace,  
For sealed lips are my duty.

*Heiß mich nicht reden, heiß mich schweigen,  
Denn das Geheimnis ist mir Pflicht!* <sup>[33]</sup>

The Robert Blum celebration (November 1859) mentioned above was an unpleasant experience for the ‘rounded character’. As he entered the hall, Silenus-like, subserviently waddling around his patron James Fazy, a worker called out: ‘There goes Hal, and behind him Falstaff.’ When he announced himself, according to his pleasant anecdotes, to be Robert Blum’s *alter ego*, it was only by great efforts possible to prevent some enraged workers from storming the platform. When, finally, forgetting how only in June he had thwarted the revolution, he himself now called ‘once more on to the barricades’ (*Schillerfeier*, p 29), a mocking echo repeated: ‘Barricades — bullshit!’ So accurately,

however, is Vogt's revolutionary bluster gauged abroad that this time we were spared the otherwise unavoidable 'confidential inquiry by a South German Ambassador', and *no* article appeared in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*.

Vogt's collected Stieberisms from the 'Brimstone Gang' to the 'retired Minister' betray in him the kind of master-singer of whom Dante said:

*Ed egli avea fatto del cul trombetta.*

(And he made his arse a trumpet.)

## Notes

- 1** A nickname for Napoleon Bonaparte.
- 2** Marianne was the name of a secret republican group founded in France in 1850.
- 3** Pietri — a French Bonapartist politician and police prefect of Paris; Laity — a French politician and senator who took part in the Strasburg putsch with Louis Napoleon.
- 4** The Palais Royal had been the royal residence in Paris. Under the Second Empire it was the residence of Napoleon I's younger brother, Jérôme Bonaparte and his son, Prince Napoleon, nicknamed Plon-Plon.
- 5** A loan which Kinkel and other leaders of the petty-bourgeois emigration tried to raise in 1851–52 to get money for the immediate unleashing of a revolution in Germany.
- 6** He is a liar and the father of lies (Dante's *Inferno*).
- 7** The Frankfurt National Assembly sat in St Paul's Church in Frankfurt-am-Main from May 1848 to May 1849.
- 8** Verses from a medieval German satirical poem.
- 9** A sudden dramatic act.
- 10** The title Coptic Grand Master refers to the eighteenth-century adventurer Cagliostro, who set up a masonic society called the 'Egyptian Freemasons' under an omnipotent and omniscient head, the Great Copt.
- 11** Police spies.
- 12** *L'Indépendant* — A bourgeois-democratic weekly founded in London in 1840. Marx and Engels were active in it in 1847 and 1849–50 but left in 1850 because it lined up with the minority in the Communist League in the fight against adventurism led by Marx and Engels. Marx and Engels later were again active in it.
- 13** Governing body of the Swiss Confederation.
- 14** Barrot — leader of the French liberal opposition under the July monarchy, Prime Minister from 1848–49 relying on the counter-revolutionary monarchists.
- 15** Cavaignac — French General and politician made War Minister in May 1848. Given dictatorial powers by the National Assembly, he put down the June rising of the Paris proletariat with great cruelty. Prime Minister from June to December 1848.
- 16** Pious fraud.
- 17** Cherval plot — In September 1851 members of the community of the Communist League were arrested. With the help of Cherval, who was head of the community in Paris, the French and Prussian police were able to invent the 'Franco-German conspiracy'. Cherval, who had acted as provocateur, was allowed to escape from prison. The attempts of the Prussian police to implicate Marx and Engels in the conspiracy failed completely.
- 18** The German Workers' Educational Association was founded in London in 1840. Marx and Engels were active in it in 1847 and again in 1849–50, when they left it because the Association had sided against them in the Central Committee of the

Communist League. At the end of the 1850s Marx and Engels once more collaborated with the Association.

**19** *The Workers' Republic* — published in New York in the early 1850s; represented the views of the egalitarian Communists.

**20** Vogt was one of the five members of the Imperial Regency set up by the rump parliament of the Frankfurt Assembly. In June, the Assembly moved to Stuttgart since, having been deserted by the conservative deputies and a good number of the liberals, it feared it would be dispersed. It was dispersed by troops a few days later.

**21** Catalina — Roman politician and patrician (108–62 BC), organiser of a conspiracy against the aristocratic Republic of Rome.

**22** Zacharias — Old Testament prophet.

**23** A demonstration of South German liberals and radical supporters in 1832 demanding freedom for citizens and the unity of Germany.

**24** Sainly simplicity.

**25** Information bureau.

**26** Non-classical secondary school.

**27** Hinckeldy — Police President of Berlin and Chief of the Prussian Police.

**28** The sum or aggregate of the ingredients which make a given fact a breach of law.

**29** *New Yorker Criminal-Zeitung* — published in New York in the 1850s.

**30** Now, now you see that I am sharper in looking to the safety of the republic than you to harming it.

**31** Georges Cuvier (1769–1832) — French zoologist and palaeontologist who founded the science of comparative anatomy.

**32** The *Neue Preussische Zeitung*, which appeared in Berlin after 1848, was the organ of the Prussian Junkers. It was known as the *Kreuz-Zeitung* because it had an Iron Cross (Kreuz) in its heading.

**33** Quotation from Goethe's novel *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*.

## Chapter IV: Techow's Letter

What else does the '*rounded character*' now pull out of the '*tristo sacco che merda fa di quel, che si trangugia*' — Dante <sup>[1]</sup>

A letter from Techow dated London, 26 August 1850:

*To characterise those activities* [that is to say of the Brimstone Gang] I can do no better than to impart here the letter of a man that everybody who ever knew him will recognise as a man of honour and that [the man of honour or the letter?] I may permit myself to publish because it was explicitly intended for the purpose of information [for whom?] and those considerations [on whose part?] that previously spoke *against publication* are no longer in force. (*Magnum Opus*, p 141)

Techow came to London from Switzerland at the end of August 1850. His letter is addressed to the former Prussian Lieutenant, *Schimmelpfennig* (at that time in Berne) 'for the information of our friends', that is to say the members of the '*Centralisation*', a secret society that was set up by German

refugees in Switzerland, died almost a decade ago, was highly variegated in its composition and was to a large degree animated by parliamentary elements. Techow belonged to this society, unlike Vogt and his friends. How, therefore, does Vogt come into possession of Techow's letter and who gave him permission to publish it ?

*Techow* himself wrote to me from Australia, dated 17 April 1860, 'I in any case have *never* had the opportunity to give Herr *Karl Vogt* any authorisation at all in this matter.'

Of Techow's 'friends' to whom the letter was to be imparted there are now only two in Switzerland. Let both speak for themselves:

**E to Schily**, 19 April 1860, Upper Engandine, Canton Graubünden:

Upon the appearance of Vogt's pamphlet *My Case Against the Allgemeine Zeitung*, in which a letter from Techow to his friends in Switzerland dated 26 August 1850 is printed, we decided, those of Techow's friends who are still in Switzerland, to express our disapproval of the *unauthorised* publication of this letter in a letter to Vogt. Techow's letter was addressed to Schimmelpfennig in Berne, and copies of it were to be sent to friends... I am glad to say that we were right to the extent that no one among Techow's friends, no one who has a right to his letter of 26 August, has put it to the same use as its accidental possessor. On 22 January, a letter was written to Vogt disapproving of the *unauthorised* publication of Techow's letter, protesting against *any further misuse* of the same and demanding the letter back. On 27 January of this year, Vogt replied: 'That Techow's letter had been intended for the information of his friends, that the friend who had placed the same in his hands had given it to him for the explicit purpose of publication... and that he would only give the letter back to the person from whom *he* had received it.'

**B to Schily**, Zurich, 1 May 1860:

The letter to Vogt was written by me by prior agreement with E—. R was not one of the 'friends' for whose information Techow's letter was intended; from the content of the letter, however, *Vogt* knew that it was addressed to me, but took good care not to obtain my agreement to its publication.

To solve the riddle I have held back a part of the letter from Schily given above. It reads:

I must speak here of this *Ranickel*, because *Techow's letter must have got into Vogt's hands through him*, a point in your inquiry that I almost overlooked. That is to say that the letter was addressed by Techow to the friends with whom he had lived in Zürich, Schimmelpfennig, B and E. I then also received the letter later, as a friend of these friends and of Techow. When I was summarily and brutally expelled from Switzerland (that is to say that, without previous notice of expulsion, I was seized in the streets of Geneva and immediately carried off) I was not even granted the favour of entering my apartment one last time to sort out my things. I therefore wrote from prison in Berne to a reliable man in Geneva, the master cobbler Thum, asking him to have one or the other of my friends who were still there (for I did not know which of them might perhaps have been ordered out at the same time) pack my things and send the best of them on to me in Berne, but to take the rest *for the time being into his care*, recommending a careful inspection of my papers so that nothing should be added to the consignment sent to me that could not stand the journey through France. So it happened, and Techow's letter was not added. Among those papers there were several documents relating to the mutiny of parliamentarians then going on against the Geneva local committee for distributing money for the refugees (the committee consisted of three citizens of Geneva, among them Thum, and two refugees, Becker and myself), documents which *Ranickel* knew perfectly as a result of his participation on behalf of the committee against the parliamentarians. So, then, I had asked Thum, as treasurer and archivist of the committee, to have *Ranickel* search those pieces out of my papers for him. It may be that *Ranickel*, thus legitimated to be present at the inspection of my papers, was handed Techow's letter in one way or another, perhaps being informed of it by one of the inspectors. I by no means impugn the *transfer of possession from me* to

him, but I most decidedly claim to distinguish it from a transfer of *ownership*. *I then soon wrote to Ranickel from London that he should send me the letter. But he did not do so*: from then on, therefore, dates his *culpa manifesta*, in the beginning, it is true, only *levis*, but increasing according to the degree of his complicity in the unauthorised publication of the letter to *magna* or *maxima culpa*, or even to *doles*.<sup>[2]</sup> That this publication was *unauthorised*, that it was not permitted by any of the addressees, I do not doubt for an instant, and I shall anyway write on that score to E to make sure. That *Ranickel* lent a hand in the publication there can also be no doubt, given his notorious intimacy with Vogt, and although I do not have the slightest intention of criticising this intimacy as such, I cannot help drawing attention here to the way it contrasts with what went before. *Ranickel*, that is to say, was not only one of the biggest parliamentarian-baiters in general, but also expressed in relation to the Imperial Regent in particular the most bloodthirsty intentions. ‘I must murder the fellow’, he would cry, ‘even if I have to go to Berne to do it’, and we would have to put him in a straitjacket, so to speak, to keep him from these regicidal intentions. Now, however, that the scales seem to have fallen from his eyes, and Saul has turned into Paul, I am curious to see how he will turn out in another respect, that is to say as the *avenger of Europe*. ‘I have fought a hard struggle’, he said in those days, when he was vacillating between Europe and America, ‘but now, happily, it is over. I shall stay — *and avenge myself!*’ Shudder ye Byzantines.

So much for *Schily*’s letter.

The *Ranickel*, therefore, Stieberated Techow’s letter from the papers of the refugee Schily. Despite Schily’s demand from London, it retained the letter. ‘Friend’ *Ranickel* handed over the letter that was *thus fraudulently intercepted* to ‘friend’ Vogt, and ‘friend’ Vogt, with that tenderness of conscience peculiarly his own, declared himself justified in publishing the letter since Vogt and *Ranickel* are ‘friends’. Thus whoever wrote the letter for the ‘information’ of ‘friends’ wrote it necessarily for the ‘friends’ *Vogt* and *Ranickel* — *arcades ambo*.<sup>[3]</sup>

I regret that this peculiar concept of justice takes me back to stories that are half-forgotten and have long since been lost from sight: but *Ranickel* has started and I must follow.

The ‘*Communist League*’ was set up in Paris in 1836, originally under a different name. The way that the organisation gradually took shape was this. A certain number of members would form a ‘community’, the various communities in the town would form a ‘circle’ and a greater or lesser number of circles would group themselves around a ‘leading circle’; at the head of the whole stood the ‘central authority’ which, elected at a congress of the delegates of all the circles, nevertheless had the right to co-opt members and in urgent cases to appoint its successors. The central authority was based first in Paris, and from 1840 to the beginning of 1848 in London. The leaders of the communities and the circles, like the central authority itself, were all appointed by election. This democratic constitution, completely at variance with the purposes of a conspiratorial secret society, was at least not dissonant with the tasks of a propaganda society. The ‘League’s’ activities consisted first of all in setting up public German Workers’ Educational Associations, and most of the associations of this kind that still exist in Switzerland, England, Belgium and the United States were either founded directly by the ‘League’ or brought to life by former members of it. For that reason the constitution of these Associations is the same everywhere. One day in the week was set aside for discussion, and another for social entertainment (singing, recitations, etc). Association libraries were set up everywhere, and wherever possible, classes for the education of the workers in elementary knowledge. The ‘League’ that stood behind the public Workers’ Associations and directed them, not only found in them the most convenient field for public propaganda, but also filled out and extended itself from their most useful members. Given the migrant life of the German craftsman, it was only in rare cases that the central authority needed to send special emissaries.

As far as the secret doctrine of the ‘League’ itself is concerned, it underwent all the transformations of French and English socialism, as well as their German varieties (for example, Weitling’s fantasies). From 1839, as is already obvious from the Bluntschli report,<sup>[4]</sup> the religious question played, next to the social question, the most important role. The various phases that German philosophy underwent

between 1839 and 1846 were followed with eager partisanship in the bosom of the workers' societies. The secret form of the society owed its origin to Paris. The League's main purpose — propaganda among the workers in Germany — dictated the later retention of this form. During my first stay in Paris I cultivated personal relations with the leader of the 'League' there, as I did with the leaders of most of the French secret workers' societies, without however joining any of these. In Brussels, where Guizot banished me, I set up, together with Engels, W Wolff and others, the German Workers' Educational Association, <sup>[5]</sup> which still exists. At the same time we published a series of pamphlets, partly printed and partly lithographed, in which the medley of Anglo-French Socialism or Communism and German philosophy which at that time formed the secret doctrine of the 'League' was subjected to merciless criticism, the scientific insight into the economic structure of bourgeois society was established in its place as the only tenable theoretical foundation, and finally the fact that what was at issue was not the introduction of some utopian system or other, but conscious participation in a revolutionary social process taking place before our eyes, was explained in popular form. As a result of this activity, the London central authority entered into correspondence with us and, at the end of 1846, sent one of its members, the clockmaker *Joseph Moll*, who later as a soldier of the revolution fell on the battlefield in Baden, to Brussels, in order to call on us to join the 'League'. Moll countered the reservations that spoke against this intention by revealing that the central authority proposed to convene a congress in London where the critical views we had asserted were to be set forth as the League's doctrine in a public manifesto, that, however, our personal collaboration was indispensable in the face of the outdated and resisting elements, but that that collaboration was tied to joining the 'League'. We therefore joined. The congress, at which the League's members in Switzerland, France, Belgium, Germany and England were represented, took place, and after a passionate debate that lasted several weeks the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* that Engels and I had written was accepted, appearing in print at the beginning of 1848, and later appearing in English, French, Danish and Italian translations. On the outbreak of the February revolution, the London central authority transferred the supreme command over the 'League' to me. During the period of the revolution in Germany, its activities died out of their own accord, as more effective ways for the assertion of its aims now stood open. When, after being expelled from France for a second time, I arrived in London in the late summer of 1849, I found the ruins of the central authority reconstituted and communications with the reconstructed circles in Germany restored. *Willich* arrived in London a few months later, and on my proposal was accepted onto the central authority. He was recommended to me by *Engels*, who had served as his adjutant in the Imperial Constitution Campaign. To complete the history of the League, I must also comment that on 15 September 1850 a split took place in the central authority. The majority, with Engels and myself, transferred the seat of the central authority to *Cologne*, where the 'leading circle' for Central and Southern Germany had been for a long time, and where the most significant centre of intellectual forces outside London was to be found.

At the same time, we withdrew from the London *Workers' Educational Association*. The minority of the central authority, on the other hand, with *Willich* and *Schapper*, set up a separate League, which not only kept up the link with the Workers' Educational Association but also resumed communications with France and Switzerland, interrupted after 1848. On 12 November 1852, the Cologne accused were found guilty. A few days later the League, on my proposal, was declared dissolved. I have included among the legal documents of my action against the *National-Zeitung* a document relating to this dissolution, dated November 1852. Mentioned there as the reason for the dissolution is the fact that since the arrests in Germany, that is to say as early as the spring of 1851, *all* contact with the continent has ceased, and that anyway such a propaganda society was no longer timely. A few months later, at the beginning of 1853, the separate *Willich-Schapper League* also passed away.

One can find the principled reasons for the split touched on above in my *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial*, where an extract from the minutes of the meeting of the central authority on 15 September 1850 is printed. The immediate practical occasion was *Willich's* exertions to involve the 'League' in the revolutionary games of the German democratic emigration. Completely opposing conceptions of the political situation sharpened the conflict still further. I would like to quote only *one* example. *Willich* deluded himself that the rivalry between Prussia and Austria, on the question of



Electoral Hesse and the Confederation, <sup>[6]</sup> would lead to serious conflicts and offered an opportunity for the practical intervention of the revolutionary party. On 10 November 1850, shortly after the split in the 'League', he also published a proclamation in the same terms 'Aux démocrates de toutes les nations' <sup>[7]</sup> signed by the central authority of the 'separate League' and also by French, Hungarian and Polish refugees. Engels and I, on the other hand, as can be read on pages 174–75 of the *Revue der Neuen Rheinischen Zeitung* (double issue of May to October 1850, Hamburg), <sup>[8]</sup> claimed the opposite; '*all this noise will lead to nothing...* without a drop of blood being spilled, the two sides' — Austria and Prussia — 'will find a way to one another on the benches of the Federal Diet', <sup>[9]</sup> in Frankfurt, 'without either their mutual jealousies, or their dispute with their subjects or their chagrin at the Russian supremacy being in the slightest diminished.'

Whether *Willich's* personality — and his abilities, by the way, should not be denied — and his memories of Besançon, which at that time (1850) were still fresh, qualified him of all people to conceive 'impersonally' conflicts that were rendered inevitable by contradictory views and were renewed daily, can be judged from the following document:

The German Column at Nancy to Citizen Joh Philipp Becker in Biel, President of the German Association of Arms 'Hilf Dir!'

### **Citizen!**

We hereby announce to you, as the elected representative of all German republican refugees, that a column of German refugees has formed in Nancy bearing the name 'German Column in Nancy'. The refugees forming the column here are partly those that previously formed the Vesoul column and partly, the refugees here, a component of the Besançon column. Their withdrawal from Besançon is based on purely democratic reasons. Namely that, in everything that he did, Willich asked the column for advice very rarely; thus the rules of the Besançon column were not generally discussed and decided upon, but given *a priori* by Willich and put into execution without the agreement of the column.

Further, Willich also gave us *a posteriori* proof of his despotic character in a series of orders that were worthy of a Jellačić or a Windischgrätz, but not of a republican. Willich gave orders that a member leaving the column, named Schörr, should have the new shoes that had been procured for him out of the column's savings taken from his feet, not thinking that Schörr, too, had a share in these savings, in that these savings came for the most part from the 10 sous per man that are paid daily as a subsidy by France... He wanted to take his shoes with him, but Willich had them taken off him.

Willich sent several sound members of the column away from Besançon on account of trifles, such as absence during roll-call or drill, coming back too late (at night) and petty bickerings, *without consulting the column*, with the comment that they could go to Africa, for they could no longer remain in France; and if they did not go to Africa he would have them handed over — to Germany, moreover, for he had complete power to do so from the French government, which afterwards, following an inquiry at the Besançon Prefecture, was declared to be untrue. Almost every day Willich stated at roll-call that anybody who did not like it could go away whenever he wanted, the sooner the better, they could go to Africa, etc; further, he once shouted the general threat that anybody who opposed his orders could either go to Africa or he would have them handed over to Germany, which had as a result the inquiry at the Prefecture mentioned above. As a result of these threats many people became thoroughly fed up with life in Besançon where, as it was said, they had everything thrown in their faces every day. 'If we want to be slaves', they said, 'we can go to Russia, or need not have started anything in Germany.' Enough; they declared that they could not hold out in Besançon any longer at any price without coming into bitter conflict with Willich; for that reason they went away, but since at that time there was not a column anywhere else that could accept them, and they could not live on ten sous alone, there was nothing left for them to do but to enlist for Africa, which they did. Thus Willich

brought 30 fine citizens to desperation, and he is to blame for the fact that these forces were lost to the Fatherland for ever.

What is more, Willich was unwise enough always to praise his old people at roll-call and to disparage the new, which caused constant strife. Indeed, Willich even declared one day at roll-call that Prussians were far superior to South Germans in head, heart and body, or, as he expressed himself, in physical, moral and intellectual powers. On the other hand, the South Germans were, he said, good-natured. He meant to say stupid, but he did not have the courage. In this way, Willich made all the South Germans, by far the most, fearfully angry. The coarsest comes last.

When, 14 days ago, the Seventh Company allowed a member named Baroggio, whom Willich had arbitrarily expelled from the barracks, to stay quartered in the room for one night, and kept him in their room despite Willich's ban and defended it against Willich's supporters, fanatical tailors, Willich ordered them to bring ropes and tie up the rebels. And the ropes were actually brought. But although Willich's intentions were quite strong enough to have the order carried out, his authority was not... These are the reasons for their withdrawal.

We have not written this in order to complain against Willich, for Willich's character and intentions are good, and many of us respect him. But the manner in which he seeks to achieve his aims and the means that he applies did not please all of us. Willich means well, but he thinks that he is wisdom and the *ultima ratio*, <sup>[10]</sup> and thinks that everybody who contradicts him, be it even in small things, is either an idiot or a traitor. In short, Willich recognises no opinion other than his own. He is a mental aristocrat and despot. If he approves of something, he will not stop at any means to achieve it. But enough of this; we know Willich now. We know his strengths and his weaknesses, and that is why we are no longer in Besançon. Moreover, in leaving Besançon, we all declared that we were separating from Willich but not resigning from the German Association of Arms, 'Hilf Dir'.

And the same with the people from Vesoul...

With assurances of our highest esteem, fraternal greetings and a handclasp from the Nancy column.

Adopted at the General Meeting of 13 November 1848.

Nancy, 14 November 1848, for and on behalf of the column, B— (Secretary).

Now back to *Techow's* letter. As with the other reptile, this letter's poison is in the tail, that is to say in the postscript of 3 September [1850]. It deals with a duel between my friend *Konrad Schramm*, who died all too young, and Herr *Willich*. In this duel, which took place early in September 1850 in Antwerp, *Techow* and the Frenchman *Barthélemy* figured as Willich's seconds. *Techow* wrote to Schimmelpfennig 'for the information of friends': 'The former [that is to say, Marx and his supporters] unleashed their champion *Schramm* against Willich, who attacked him with the most vulgar invective and finally challenged him to a duel.' [Techow means: whom he attacked with the most vulgar invective and finally challenged to a duel.] (*Magnum Opus*, pp 156, 157)

My refutation of this childish gossip has been available in printed form for the last seven years in the pamphlet quoted earlier, *The Knight of the Noble Consciousness* (New York, 1853).

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

Willich's second, Barthélemy, had not yet been hanged; Schramm's second, the worthy Polish officer Miskowsky, had not yet been burnt, and Herr Techow could not yet have forgotten his circular 'for the information of friends'.

In the said pamphlet is to be found a letter from my friend *Friedrich Engels*, dated *Manchester*, 23 November 1853, which says at the end:

*At the meeting of the central authority which gave rise to a challenge between Schramm and Willich, I [Engels] am supposed [according to Willich] to have committed the crime of 'leaving the room' with Schramm shortly before the scene was enacted, and thus of having prepared the whole scene. Previously it was Marx who*

[according to Willich] is supposed to have ‘incited’ Schramm, now for a change *I* am the one. A duel between an old Prussian Lieutenant experienced with pistols and a merchant who had probably never had a pistol in his hand was truly a marvellous way of getting rid of the Lieutenant. Nevertheless, friend Willich narrated everywhere, orally and in writing, that we wanted to have him shot... Schramm was simply enraged by Willich’s shameless conduct, and we were all greatly surprised when he forced him to a duel. Schramm himself did not suspect, a few minutes previously, that it would come to that. Never was there a more spontaneous action... Schramm only left [the meeting room] when personally urged to do so by Marx, who wished to avoid further scandal. (Fr Engels, *The Knight*, p 7)

How far I for my part was from suspecting that *Techow* would lend himself as a vehicle for this childish gossip can be seen from the following passage in the same pamphlet:

Originally, *as Techow himself told me and Engels upon his return to London*, Willich was firmly convinced that I intended to do away with His Lordship through the intermediary of Schramm, and he wrote this idea to anybody and everybody. Upon closer consideration, however, he found that such a diabolical tactician as myself could not possibly hit upon the idea of getting rid of him by means of a duel with Schramm. (*The Knight*, p 9)

The gossip *Techow* retailed to Herr Schimmelpfennig ‘for the information of friends’ was repeated from hearsay. *Karl Schapper*, who took Willich’s part in the subsequent split in the League and was a witness of the challenge scene, writes to me on this:

5 Percy Street  
Bedford Square  
27 September 1860

**Dear Marx**

The following with reference to the scandal between Schramm and Willich:

This occurred in a meeting of the central authority and as a result of a violent dispute that developed *coincidentally* between the two during the discussion. I can still recall very clearly that you did *everything* to calm things down and to settle the matter, and that you seemed as surprised at this sudden explosion as I myself and the other members present.

Greetings

Your **Karl Schapper**

I will finally just mention that a few weeks *after* the duel, Schramm himself, in a letter of *31 December 1850*, accused me of *partiality towards Willich*. The disapproval that Engels and I had openly expressed to him about the duel, both before and after it, had for the moment put him in a temper. This letter of his and other papers concerning the duel that have come to me from him and Miskowsky are available for inspection by his relatives. They do not belong in the public eye.

When Konrad Schramm next visited me in London in mid-July 1857, after his return from the United States, this bold, tall figure of a youth was broken by incurable consumption, which, however, had only transfigured that handsome head, which was so full of character. With his own peculiar sense of humour, which never deserted him for a moment, the first thing that he laughingly told me about was his own obituary, which an indiscreet friend had already published in a German paper in New York on the basis of a rumour. On medical advice Schramm went to St Hélier in Jersey, where Engels and I saw him for the last time. Schramm died on 16 January 1858. At the funeral, which was followed by the whole liberal population of St Hélier and all the émigrés who had settled there, the funeral oration was pronounced by *G Julian Harney*, one of the best popular orators in England, who had earlier been known as a Chartist leader, and who had befriended Schramm during his stay in London. Schramm’s fiery, impetuous, bold and energetic character, which never allowed itself to be tied down by humdrum interests, was permeated with critical intelligence, original power of thought, ironical humour and naive good nature. He was our party’s Percy Hotspur.

Back to *Herr Techow's* letter. A few days after his arrival in London, he had a lengthy rendezvous late at night with us in a wine-house where Engels, Schramm and I treated him. He describes this rendezvous in his letter to Schimmelpfennig of 26 August 1850 'for the information of friends'. I had never seen him previously, and afterwards saw him perhaps a couple of times, but only in passing. Nevertheless he immediately saw through my head, heart and kidneys and those of my friends, and hurried to send a psychological warrant for our arrest to Switzerland, the secret duplication and distribution of which he most carefully recommended to 'friends'.

Techow busied himself greatly with my heart. I shall be generous enough not to follow him into this area. 'Ne parlons pas morale', <sup>[11]</sup> as the Parisian grisette said when her friend talked politics.

Let us spend some time on the addressee of the letter of 26 August, the former Prussian Lieutenant *Schimmelpfennig*. I do not know this gentleman personally and have never met him. I can draw his character from two letters. The first letter, which I shall give in the form of extracts, was addressed to me by my friend *W Steffen*, former Prussian lieutenant and teacher at the Divisional School, dated *Chester, 23 November 1853*. It reads:

Willich had once sent over [to Cologne] an adjutant called *Schimmelpfennig*. The latter did me the honour of summoning me, and was very firmly convinced that he could judge all circumstances in advance better than anybody who had had the facts in view day by day. He therefore formed a very poor opinion of me when I informed him that the officers of the Prussian army would not count themselves lucky to fight under his and Willich's banner, and were not at all inclined to proclaim the Willichian Republic citissime. <sup>[12]</sup> He became even more angry when not a single person was senseless enough to want to duplicate his appeal to the officers, which he brought with him ready-written, to proclaim themselves immediately in favour of what he called 'democracy'.

He left '*a Cologne enslaved by Marx*', as he wrote to me, in a rage, and obtained the duplication of his nonsense elsewhere and sent it to a number of officers, and so it came about that the chaste secret of this clever method of turning Prussian officers into republicans was prostituted by 'Spectator' of the *Kreuzzeitung*.

At the time of this adventure, Steffen, who did not come to England until 1853, was completely unknown to me. *Schimmelpfennig* characterises himself even more strikingly in the following letter to the same *Hörfel* who was later unmasked as a French police agent, the soul of the revolutionary committee set up in Paris at the end of 1850 by Schimmelpfennig, Schurz, Häfner and *Kinkel's* other friends in Paris at the time, and who was also the most intimate friend of the two matadors Schurz and Schimmelpfennig.

**Schimmelpfennig to Hörfel** (in Paris 1851):

Here [in London] the following has now happened... we have written to all our influential supporters there [in America] to prepare for the loan [the Kinkel loan] by *first of all speaking for a while personally and in the press of the power of conspiracy*, and to point out what powerful forces, *neither* from the German, French *nor* Italian side, will *never* desert the field of battle. [*Hasn't history got no facts?*] <sup>[13]</sup> ... *Our work has now got off to a good start*. As soon as over-obstinate people are dropped, they come back afterwards and gladly accept the conditions that are set. Tomorrow, as soon as the *work* is firm and has been secured, I shall get in with Ruge and Haug... *My social position is, like yours, very oppressive. Our business must pull its socks up soon*. [That is to say Kinkel's revolutionary loan business.]

Your

**Schimmelpfennig**

This letter is to be found in the 'Revelations' published by *A Ruge* in the *Herold des Westens*, Louisville, 11 September 1853. Schimmelpfennig, who was already in the United States at the time of publication, has never protested against the authenticity of the letter. Ruge's 'Revelations' are the reprint of a document *From the Files of the Berlin Police Presidium*. The document consists of Hinckeldy's marginal comments and papers that were either seized from Schimmelpfennig and Hörfel

in Paris by the French police or Stieberated from Pastor Dulon in Bremen, or, finally, entrusted to the German-American press during the War of the Frogs and the Mice <sup>[14]</sup> between Ruge's Agitational Association and Kinkel's Émigrés Association by the warring brothers themselves. Characteristic is the irony with which Hinckeldy says of Schimmelpfennig that he broke short his Kinkel-revolutionary-loan mission through Prussia because 'he had the *delusion* that he was being followed by the police'! In the same 'Revelations' there is to be found a letter from *Karl Schurz*, 'the London representative of the Paris Committee' (that is to say of Hörfel, Häfner, Schimmelpfennig, etc), which says:

It was decided yesterday by the members of the emigration present here to include Bucher, Dr Frank, Redz from Vienna, and *Techow*, who will soon be here, in our discussions. NB: *Provisionally Techow should not be informed of this decision either orally or in writing until he is here.* (K Schurz to the 'dear people' in Paris, London, 16 April 1851)

It is to one of these 'dear people', Herr *Schimmelpfennig*, that *Techow* addresses his letter of 26 August 1850 for 'the information of friends'. First of all, he informs the 'dear man' of theories which I had held quite secret but which he immediately got out of me at our one meeting by means of the proverb '*in vino veritas*'.

I [Herr *Techow* explains to Herr *Schimmelpfennig* 'for the information of friends'] finally declared 'that I had always imagined them' [Marx, Engels, etc] '*to be above the nonsense of a Communist abode of bliss à la Cabet etc*'. (*Magnum Opus*, p 150)

Imagined! So *Techow* did not even *know* the ABC of our views, but was, however, generous and condescending enough to *imagine* that they were not exactly nonsense.

Not to mention scientific works, if he had only read *The Manifesto of the Communist Party*, which he later characterised as my 'proletarian catechism', he would have found in it a detailed section under the title 'Socialist and Communist Literature' and at the end of this section a paragraph:

The significance of Critical-Utopian Socialism and Communism bears an inverse relation to historical development. In proportion as the modern class struggle develops and takes definite shape, this fantastic standing apart from the contest, these fantastic attacks on it, lose all practical value and all theoretical justification. Therefore, although the originators of these systems were, in many respects, revolutionary, their disciples have, in every case, formed mere reactionary sects. They hold fast by the original views of their masters, in opposition to the progressive historical development of the proletariat. They therefore endeavour, and that consistently, to deaden the class struggle and to reconcile the class antagonisms. They still dream of experimental realisation of their social Utopias, of founding isolated 'phalansteries', <sup>[15]</sup> of establishing 'Home Colonies', of setting up a 'Little Icaria' — pocket editions of the New Jerusalem — and to realise all these castles in the air, they are compelled to appeal to the feelings and purses of the bourgeois.

In the closing words *Cabet's Icarie* or, as *Techow* calls it, 'abode of bliss', is explicitly described as 'a pocket edition of the New Jerusalem'.

His admitted complete ignorance of the views that Engels and I had made known in print years before our meeting with him is a circumstance that fully explains his misunderstanding. A few examples of *his* own character:

He [Marx] laughed at the fools who prayed his proletarian catechism after him, as well as at the Communists *à la* Willich and at the bourgeois. The only people whom he respects are the *aristocrats*, the pure ones who are conscious of it. *In order to drive them from domination*, he needs a power which he can find only in the proletariat, *and that is why he has tailored his system to suit them.* (*Magnum Opus*, p 152)

Thus *Techow* 'imagines' that I have composed a 'proletarian catechism'. He means the *Manifesto*, in which socialist and critical utopianism of every sort is criticised and, if *Techow* insists, 'laughed at'. Only this 'laughter' was not as simple as he 'imagines', but demanded a good piece of hard work, as he could see from my book against Proudhon, *Misère de la Philosophie* (1847). *Techow* further

‘imagines’ that I have ‘tailored’ a ‘system’ while on the contrary, even in the *Manifesto*, which was intended directly for workers, I rejected *all* systems, and in their place put ‘the critical insight into the conditions, the course, and the general results of real social movement’. Such an ‘insight’, however, can be neither conjured up nor ‘tailored’ to order.

The way of conceiving of the relationship between the aristocracy, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat as Techow ‘imagines’ (*vorstellt*) it and imputes (*unterstellt*) it to me, is of rare naïveté.

I ‘respect’ the aristocracy, ‘laugh’ at the bourgeoisie and ‘tailor a system’ to suit the proletariat in order through it to ‘drive’ the aristocracy ‘from domination’. In the first section of the *Manifesto* entitled ‘Bourgeois and Proletarians’, the point is exhaustively developed that the economic, and therefore also in one form or the other, *the political domination of the bourgeoisie* is the fundamental condition not only for the existence of the modern proletariat but also for the creation of the ‘material conditions for its liberation’. The ‘development of the modern proletariat’ (see *Revue der Neuen Rheinischen Zeitung*, January 1850, p 15):

... is in general determined by the development of the industrial bourgeoisie. Only *under its domination* does it win an extended national existence which can raise its revolution to the level of a national revolution, and does it itself create the modern means of production which become so many means for its own revolutionary liberation. Only *its domination* tears out the roots of feudal society and prepares the ground *on which alone a proletarian revolution is possible*. <sup>[16]</sup>

I therefore declare in the same *Revue* that every proletarian movement in which England does not participate is a ‘storm in a tea-cup’. As early as 1845, Engels had already developed the same view in his *Condition of the English Working Class*. In countries therefore where the aristocracy in the continental sense — and that was how Techow understood ‘the Aristocracy’ — still has to be ‘driven from domination’, the first precondition of a proletarian revolution, that is to say an *industrial proletariat* on a national scale, is in my opinion missing.

Techow found my view of the position German workers specifically took up in relation to the bourgeois movement very definitely expressed in the *Manifesto*:

In Germany the Communist Party fights with the bourgeoisie whenever it acts in a revolutionary way against the absolute monarchy, the feudal squirearchy and the petty bourgeoisie.

But they never cease, for a single instant, to instil into the working class the clearest possible recognition of the hostile antagonism between bourgeoisie and proletariat [etc].

When I stood before a bourgeois jury in Cologne accused of ‘rebellion’, I also declared in the same sense:

In modern bourgeois society there are still classes but there are no longer estates. Its development consists in the struggle of these classes, though the latter are united in confronting the estates and their God-anointed monarchy.

What else did the liberal bourgeoisie do in its appeals to the proletariat from 1688 to 1849 if it did not ‘tailor systems and phrases’ to force the aristocracy from domination through *its* strength? So when we get down to what Herr Techow really extracted from my secret theory, it was only the *most ordinary bourgeois liberalism!* Tant de bruit pour une omelette! <sup>[17]</sup> But since Techow, on the other hand, knew that ‘Marx’ was no bourgeois liberal, there was nothing left for him to do save ‘go away with the impression that *his* personal dominion is the purpose of all this activity’. ‘All my activity’, what a modest expression for my one single conversation with Herr Techow!

Techow further vouchsafed to his Schimmelpfennig ‘for the information of friends’ the fact that I had expressed the following monstrous opinion:

That in the end it was anyway all one whether this pitiful Europe collapsed, which would have to happen *in the near future* without the social revolution, and whether then America exploited the old system at the expense of Europe. (*Magnum Opus*, p 148)

My conversation with Techow took place at the end of August 1850. In the February 1850 issue of the *Revue der Neuen Rheinischen Zeitung*, that is to say eight months *before* Herr Techow got this secret out of me, I betrayed the following to the German public:

We come now to *America*. The most important fact that has occurred here, one more important than the February revolution, is the discovery of the Californian gold mines. Even now, after scarcely 18 months, it can be predicted that this discovery will have even greater results than the discovery of America... For the second time world trade has been given a new direction... Then the Pacific Ocean will play the same role as the Atlantic now and the Mediterranean Sea in antiquity and the Middle Ages — the role of the great waterway of world trade; and the Atlantic will be diminished to the role of an inland lake, such as is now played by the Mediterranean. The only chance that the civilised European countries will not *then* fall into the same industrial, commercial and political dependence in which Italy, Spain and Portugal now find themselves lies in a social revolution [etc]. (*Revue*, Heft 2, February 1850, pp 76–77)

The ‘collapse in the near *future*’ of old Europe and the accession of America to the throne the next morning belongs only to Herr Techow. How clear I was at that time about America’s immediate future one sees from the following passage from the same *Revue*:

*Superspeculation* will very soon develop and even if English capital... enters... massively, *New York* nevertheless remains the centre of the whole swindle this time, and, as in 1836, will be the first to experience its collapse. (*Revue*, double issue, May–October 1850, p 149)

This forecast that I made for America in 1850 was to be fulfilled literally in the great trade crisis of 1857. Of ‘old Europe’, I say:

In view of this general prosperity, in which the productive forces of the bourgeoisie are developing so exuberantly... there can be no talk of a real revolution... The various squabbles in which the representatives of the individual factions of the Continental Party of Order are now indulging and compromising one another are remote from providing an opportunity for a new revolution. On the contrary, they are possible only because the basis of conditions *for the time being* is so secure and — what the reaction does not know — *so bourgeois*. All the attempts of the reaction to hold up bourgeois development will recoil from it as certainly as *all the moral indignation and all the enthusiastic proclamations of the democrats*. A new revolution is only possible as a result of a new crisis. (*Revue*, double issue, May–October 1850, p 153)

In fact, European history did not assume an acute, and, if you will, revolutionary character again until after the crisis of 1857–58. In fact, precisely during the period of reaction of 1849 to 1859 industry and trade developed on the continent on a previously unimagined scale and with them the material foundations for the political rule of the bourgeoisie. In fact, in that period ‘all the moral indignation and all the enthusiastic proclamations of the democrats’ recoiled from the economic conditions.

If *Techow* took the serious part of our interview so light-heartedly, he took the light-hearted part all the more seriously. With a solemnly straight face he lectures his *Schimmelpfennig* ‘for the information of friends’:

Marx further said: The officers are always the most dangerous in revolutions, a chain of traitors and treachery from Lafayette to Napoleon. One must always *have poison and the dagger* to hand for them. (*Magnum Opus*, p 153)

Even *Techow* will surely not wish to bestow the commonplace about the treachery of the ‘military gentlemen’ on us as an original thought. What is original is the ‘poison and the dagger’ to be kept constantly to hand. Did Techow not know even then that really revolutionary governments, like the Committee of Public Safety, kept at hand for the ‘military gentlemen’ measures which, if they were very drastic, were all the same less melodramatic? At the most, poison and daggers suit the affairs of a Venetian oligarchy. If Techow studies his own letter anew, he will belatedly see the irony in it. *Vogt*’s fellow vagabond, the notorious Bonapartist mouchard Edouard Simon, translated the last piece from Techow’s letter in the *Revue contemporaine* with the marginal comment:

*Marx* does not much like seeing officers in *his gang*. Officers are too dangerous in revolutions.

*Poison and the poignard must always be kept ready for them!*

Techow, who is an officer, does not need telling twice; he re-embarks and returns to Switzerland. ('Le procès de M Vogt', *Revue contemporain*, XIII, Paris, 1860, p 528)

*Edouard Simon* makes poor Techow so mightily terrified by the 'poison and the dagger' I kept at hand for him that he immediately bolts, takes ship and returns to Switzerland. The Reichs-Vogt prints the passage about 'poison and the dagger' in bold type to scare the German philistine. The same merry person, however, writes in his so-called *Studies*:

The *Spaniard's poison and dagger shine today with a transfigured radiance* — what was at stake, indeed, was the independence of the nation. (*Studien zur gegenwärtigen Lage Europas*, p 79)

Note, quite coincidentally: Spanish and English historical sources for the period from 1807 to 1814 have long since refuted the myth about poison invented by the French. But of course for political hot air it continues undisturbed.

I come finally to the 'gossip' in Techow's letter, and shall give a few examples to show his historical impartiality:

At first the talk was about the competition between them and us, Switzerland and London... *They had had to defend the rights of the old League* which, for the sake of its definite party position, could not tolerate in friendship another alongside it in the *same field* [proletariat]. (*Magnum Opus*, p 143)

The rival company in Switzerland that Techow is speaking of here, and as the representative of which he to some extent approached us, was the '*Revolutionäre Zentralisation*' we have already mentioned. Its central authority was based in Switzerland and led by a President, an advocate and former Vice-President of the pocket parliaments of 1848 who had been a member of one of the German provisional governments of 1849. In *July 1850*, *Dronke* arrived in Zurich, where, as a member of the London 'League', he was presented with a kind of notarised contract from the advocate for my 'information'. In it, it said word for word:

In consideration of the necessity of a unification of all the truly revolutionary elements, and since all the members of the revolutionary central authority have recognised the character of the next revolution as proletarian, even if they were not all able to adopt unconditionally the programme drawn up in London [*Manifesto* of 1848], the following points are agreed between the Communist League and the Revolutionary Centralisation:

1: Both parties are agreed to continue their work side by side — the Revolutionary Centralisation by trying to prepare for the next revolution through the unification of *all* revolutionary elements, the London society by trying to prepare the rule of the proletariat through the organisation *chiefly of the proletarian elements*.

2: To this end, the Revolutionary Centralisation instructs its agents and emissaries that, in setting up sections in Germany, the attention of the members who seem to be suitable for entry into the Communist League should be drawn to the existence of an organisation set up chiefly in the proletarian interest.

3 and 4: That the leadership for Switzerland should be entrusted only to *real supporters* of the London *Manifesto*, and that there should be a mutual exchange of reports.

One can see from this document, which is still in my possession, that this is not a matter of two secret societies 'in the same field' (proletariat), but of an alliance of two societies in *different fields* and with *different tendencies*. One can further see that, besides pursuing its own aims, the 'Revolutionary Centralisation' declares itself ready to form a kind of branch office for the 'Communist League'.

The proposal was rejected as to accept it was inconsistent with the 'principled' character of the 'League'.



*Now it was Kinkel's turn...* To that they answered that... they had never striven for cheap popularity, on the contrary! ... As far as Kinkel was concerned they would gladly have granted him his cheap popularity if he had stayed quiet. But after he had published that Rastatt speech in the Berlin *Abend-Post*, peace had no longer been possible. That they had known that everybody would raise a cry; that they had predicted that in this they were staking the existence of their present paper [the *Revue der Rheinischen Zeitung*]. That their fears had also come true. That they had been ruined by the affair, had lost all their subscribers in the Rhenish Province, and now had to let their paper close down. But that that did not worry them. (*Magnum Opus*, pp 146–48)

First of all a factual report: the *Revue* did not close down then, for three months later a double issue of the same appeared, nor had we lost *a single subscriber* in the Rhenish Province, as my old friend the former Prussian artillery Lieutenant *J Weydemeyer*, at that time editor of the *Neue Deutsche Zeitung* in Frankfurt, who was so kind as to collect the subscriptions for us, can testify. Besides, Techow must have known of Engels' and my own literary activity only from hearsay, but he must at least have read the critique, which he himself criticised, of Kinkel's speech. What was the purpose then of the confidential information for the 'dear people' in Switzerland? Why 'reveal' to them what we ourselves had already revealed to the public five months earlier? In the critique mentioned it says word for word:

We know in advance that we will evoke the general indignation of the sentimental swindlers and the democratic declaimers by denouncing this speech of the 'imprisoned' Kinkel to our party. That is a matter of complete indifference to us. Our task is ruthless criticism... And in defending this position of ours, *we gladly forgo cheap democratic popularity*. We have in no way endangered Herr Kinkel's position by our attack. *We denounced him for the amnesty*, confirming his admission that he is not the man that people claimed to think he was, and stating that he was worthy not only of being amnestied but even of entering the Prussian state service. Moreover his speech has been published. (*Revue der Neuen Rheinischen Zeitung*, April 1850, pp 70–71)

Techow speaks of our 'compromising' of the *petits grands hommes* <sup>[18]</sup> of the Revolution. He does not, however, understand this 'compromising' in the *police* sense that Herr Vogt does. He means the reverse, the operation by which we stripped sheep who had disguised themselves in revolutionary wolves' clothing of their offensive raiment and thus preserved them from the fate of the famous Provençal troubadour who was torn apart by the hounds because they believed in the wolfskin which he wore to go hunting.

As an example of the offensive nature of our attacks, Techow particularly marks the occasional notes on General *Sigel* in Engels' description of the 'Imperial Constitution Campaign' (see *Revue*, March 1850, pp 70–78).

Now compare Engels' well-documented criticism with the following malicious, insipid gossip that the London 'Emigration Association' run by Techow, Kinkel, Willich, Schimmelpfennig, Schurz, HB Oppenheim, Eduard Meyen, etc, had printed against the same General *Sigel* about a year after our meeting with Techow. And they did so for the simple reason that Sigel supported Ruge's 'Agitation Association' instead of Kinkel's 'Emigration Association'.

On 3 December 1851, that is to say, under the title '*The Agitation Association in London*', the *Baltimore Correspondent*, at that time a sort of *Kinkel Moniteur*, <sup>[19]</sup> carried the following characterisation of *Sigel*:

Let us look a little deeper into who these sterling men are to whom all others appear as '*immature politicians*'. *Generalissimo Sigel*. If the muse of history is ever asked how this pale nonentity achieved the rank of *Generalissimo*, it will embarrass her more than the mooncalf Napoleon. The latter is at least 'his uncle's nephew', but Sigel is only 'his brother's brother'. His brother became a popular officer through derogatory remarks against the government caused by repeated arrest that he had to suffer for *disorderly conduct*. Sigel minor thought this *sufficient reason* to proclaim himself

Generalissimo and Minister of War in the initial confusion of the revolutionary uprising. The Baden artillery, which has often proved its excellence, had enough senior and sterling officers, before whom *the young, schoolboy-like Lieutenant Sigel* would have to withdraw, and who were not a little outraged to obey *an insignificant young man who was as inexperienced as he was untalented*. But then there was a Brentano who was weak-headed and treacherous enough to let everything happen that would ruin the revolution. Indeed, it is a ridiculous fact, but it is a fact, that *Sigel made himself Generalissimo* and that Brentano recognised him subsequently... One remarkable characteristic, at least, is that Sigel left the bravest soldiers of the republican army in the lurch in a desperate, hopeless fight at Rastatt in the Black Forest, without sending the reinforcements promised while he himself drove around Zürich in the epaulettes and cabriolet of the Prince of Fürstenburg and paraded himself as an interesting, unlucky Generalissimo. That is the known greatness of the mature politician who, remembering his earlier heroic deeds with 'justified self-esteem', imposes himself once more as Generalissimo, this time upon the Agitation Association. That is the *famous* great man, 'his brother's brother'.

Impartiality demands that we should also listen for a moment to Ruge's 'Agitation Association' in the person of its spokesman *Tausenau*. In an open letter dated London, *14 November 1851* 'To Grizen Seidensticker', Tausenau remarks in relation to the 'Emigration Association' led by Kinkel, Techow, etc, amongst other things:

They express the conviction that a unification of all in the interest of the revolution is an urgent patriotic duty. The German Agitation Association shares this conviction, as its members have shown in practice in long-drawn-out attempts at unification with Kinkel and his supporters. Any basis for political cooperation disappeared, however, as soon as it appeared to have been gained, and new deceptions succeeded the old ones. Arbitrary action in breach of previous agreements, separate interests under the mask of reconciliation, the systematic gerrymandering of majorities, the emergence of unknown Great Men as organising chiefs of the Party, attempts to impose a secret finance committee and all the other hole-in-the-corner moves with which immature politicians always try to guide their country's destiny from abroad. The very first white heat of the revolution, meanwhile, evaporates such vanities to an empty haze... We were publicly and officially denounced by Kinkel's supporters; the **reactionary German press, to which we had no access**, teemed with correspondence hostile to us and favourable to Kinkel, and in the end Kinkel travelled to the United States in order to dictate to us through the so-called German loan undertaken there a unification or rather a subordination and dependence that *is the intention of every author of financial party mergers*. Kinkel's departure was kept so secret that we only learnt about it from the report of his arrival in New York in American newspapers... This and yet more were compelling reasons for revolutionaries, who do not overestimate themselves but can say with self-assurance in the *consciousness of previous achievements* that at least *clearly defined sections of the people stand behind them*, to enter an association which, in its way, tries to advance the interests of the revolution.

The accusation is further made against Kinkel that the funds collected by him were to serve 'a clique', as 'his whole behaviour here' (London) 'and in America shows', and similarly 'the majority of the guarantors appointed by Kinkel himself'.

It finishes by saying:

*We promise our friends no interest and no repayment of their patriotic donations, but we know that we will justify their confidence by positive [fair dealing?] achievements and conscientious accountancy, and that the gratitude of the fatherland awaits them one day with the publication of their names on our part. (Baltimore Wecker, 29 November 1851)*

That was the kind of literary activity developed over three years in the German-American press by the democratic heroes of the 'Agitation Association' and the 'Emigration Association', to which the 'Revolutionary League of the Two Worlds' set up by Goegg was later added (see Appendix VI).

The refugee scandal in the American press was, moreover, opened by a paper tournament between the parliamentarians Zitz and Roesler von Oels.

Here is yet another fact that is characteristic of Techow's 'dear people'.

Schimmelpfennig, to whom Techow's letter 'for the information of our friends' was addressed, had (as has already been mentioned above) set up a so-called Revolutionary Committee in Paris at the end of 1850 together with Hörfel, Häfner, Goegg and others (K Schurz joined them later).

Several years ago, a letter by a former member of this committee to a political refugee here was made over to me for whatever use I might like to put it to. The document is still in my possession.

It says, among other things:

Schurz and Schimmelpfennig constituted the whole of the committee. Whoever they added in the way of members were only figureheads. At that time, these two gentlemen believed that they would soon be able to place their Kinkel, whom they had regularly expropriated to themselves, at the head of affairs in Germany. Ruge's sarcasms, like Marx's criticism and daemonic impulses, were particularly hateful to them. At a meeting of these gentlemen with their members they gave us a really interesting portrait of Marx and instilled into us an exaggerated opinion of his pandaemonic dangerousness... Schurz-Schimmelpfennig introduced a motion *to annihilate* Marx. *Insinuation and intrigue*, the most impudent slanders, were *recommended* as means. A vote in favour and a decision, if you want to call it that, took place. The first step towards carrying it out was the characterisation of Marx by *L Häfner*, based on the abovementioned portrait by Schurz and Schimmelpfennig, published in *the feuilleton* of the *Hamburger Anzeiger* at the beginning of 1851.

At any event, there is the most striking elective affinity between Häfner's *feuilleton* and Techow's letter, although neither the one nor the other can compare with *Vogt's 'Lousiad'*. The 'Lousiads' must not be confused with Camoens' 'Lusiads'. The original 'Lousiad' was rather a mock-heroic epic by *Peter Pindar*.<sup>[20]</sup>

## Notes

- 1 Wretched sack, which turns to dung all that goes in it.
- 2 *Culpa manifesta* — manifest guilt; *levis* — slight; *magna* — great; *doles* — extreme.
- 3 One is as good/bad as the other.
- 4 Bluntschli, a Swiss lawyer and reactionary politician, who was a member of the investigating committee examining the activities of German emigrants, wrote a report on Communists in Switzerland.
- 5 Founded by Marx and Engels in Brussels in August 1847 with the aim of educating the German workers in Belgium and of familiarising them with the ideas of scientific Communism. Shortly after the February Revolution of 1848 in France, the Belgians arrested and expelled the members of the Association.
- 6 The German Confederation, set up in 1815 by the Congress of Vienna, comprised 28 principalities and four free cities. It lasted till 1866. It preserved the feudal fragmentation of Germany and delayed the setting up of a central government. After the failure of the 1848 revolution, Prussia and Austria were rivals for supremacy in Germany. In 1850, revolutionary events in Hesse gave them both an excuse to intervene in the affairs of that state. Both despatched troops but, under pressure from the Russian Tsar, Prussia withdrew.
- 7 To democrats of all nations.

**8** The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung (Politisch-Oekonomisch Revue)* was founded by Marx and Engels in December 1849 as the paper of the Communist League to continue the work of the previous *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* (see Chapter II, note 15). Six issues appeared before it closed because of lack of funds and repression in Germany. Edited in London and printed in Hamburg, the material published included Marx's *Class Struggles in France from 1848 to 1850* and *The Peasant War* by Engels.

**9** The Federal Diet or Bundestag was the central organ of the German Confederation; it met in Frankfurt under the chairmanship of Austria. It consisted of representatives of the German states and was an instrument for the reactionary policies of the German governments.

**10** Last word.

**11** Let's not talk about morality.

**12** Most quickly.

**13** A reference to a remark by a reactionary member of the Frankfurt National Assembly: 'There isn't no fact on which to base an historical right.'

**14** *War of the Frogs and the Mice (Batrachomyomachia)* — an ancient Greek parody of Homer's *Iliad*.

**15** Phalanstery was the name given to the socialist colonies founded by Fourier. Owen called his model Communist colonies 'home-colonies'. Cabet, the French utopian Communist, called his Utopia Icaria — a name he later gave to his Communist colony in America.

**16** A quotation from Marx's *Class Struggles in France*.

**17** So much noise over an omelette!

**18** Little big men.

**19** Marx ironically compares Kinkel's paper with the French government paper *Moniteur*.

**20** Marx calls Vogt's book a *Lousiad*, after the satirical poem of that name by the English eighteenth-century poet, Peter Pindar. The title 'Lousiad' is itself a parody of the name of the epic poem by the great Portuguese poet Camoens, who in 1572 wrote the 'Lusiads' celebrating Portuguese explorers.

## Chapter V: Imperial Regent and Count Palatine

Vidi un col capo sì di merda lordo,  
Che non pareva s'era laico o cherco,  
Quei mi sgridò: Perchè se'tu sì ingordo  
Di riguardar più me che gli altri brutti? — Dante <sup>[1]</sup>

The *Vogt* feels a mighty need to prove why it was precisely he who, as a 'bête noir', attracted the gaze of the 'Brimstone Gang'. *Cherval* and the 'thwarted conspiracy' at the Central Festival at Lausanne are therefore supplemented by an adventure, which has no less substantial basis in reality, with the 'runaway Imperial Regent'. *Vogt*, that is to say — and do not forget it — was in his day governor of the parliamentary island of Barataria. <sup>[2]</sup> He recounts:

At the beginning of 1850 there appeared Kolatschek's *Deutsche Monatsschrift*... Immediately after the appearance of the first issue the *Brimstone Gang*, through one of its members who immediately departed for America, issued a pamphlet under the title *The Runaway Imperial Regent Vogt with His Followers and Adolph Kolatschek's 'Deutsche Monatsschrift'*, which was also mentioned by the *Allgemeine Zeitung*... The whole system of the Brimstone Gang reveals itself anew in this pamphlet. (*Magnum Opus*, p 161)

There follows a long-winded explanation of how, in the said pamphlet, an anonymous article on *Gagern*, written by Professor *Hagen*, is ‘ascribed’ to the runaway Imperial Regent, Vogt, and precisely because ‘the Brimstone Gang knew’ that Hagen ‘was living in Germany at the time, was being persecuted by the police and could not at that time be named without being exposed to the most painful vexations’ (*Magnum Opus*, p 163).

*Schily* wrote to me in his letter dated Paris, 6 February:

That *Greiner*, who to my knowledge was never in Geneva, became entangled with the Brimstone Gang is due to his obituary on the ‘Runaway Regent’. In parliamentary circles its author was thought to be *d’Ester*, and he was as such ostracised until I enlightened a friend and colleague of Vogt’s by letter on this point.

*Greiner* was a member of the provisional government of the Palatinate. Greiner’s rule was ‘total misery’ (see *Vogt’s Studien*, p 28), that is, for my friend *Engels*, whom he had arrested on false charges at Kirchheim. Engels himself has related the whole tragi-comic episode in detail in the *Revue der Neuen Rheinischen Zeitung*, February 1850, pp 53–55. And that is all that is known to me about Herr *Greiner*. The fact that the runaway regent lyingly involves me in his conflict with the Count Palatine reveals ‘anew’ the ‘whole system’ by which this inventive man has composed the life and deeds of ‘The Brimstone Gang’.

What reconciles me, however, is the Falstaffian humour with which he has the Count Palatine depart ‘immediately’ for America. After the Count Palatine has loosed the pamphlet like a Parthian shot at the ‘Runaway Regent’, Greiner is gripped by terror. Away he flees from Switzerland to France, from France to England. Even the channel does not seem sufficient protection to him, and on he flees to Liverpool and on to a Cunard Steamer, where he calls breathlessly to the Captain: ‘Away over the Atlantic.’ And the ‘stern mariner’ replies:

Wohl aus des *Vogt* Gewalt errett’ ich Euch!  
Aus Sturmes Nöten muß ein andrer helfen. <sup>[31]</sup>

## Notes

**1** I saw one with a head so heavy with dung, / I knew not be he layman or cleric. / He shrieked at me: ‘What makes you so curious, / To stare at me more than the other wretches?’

**2** Vogt’s apparent powers as regent are ironically compared to those of Don Quixote’s servant, Sancho Panza, as governor of the imaginary island of Barataria.

**3** Though I shall save you from the Vogt’s power / From the tempest’s perils another must protect you. — Schiller, *Wilhelm Tell*, Act I, Scene 1.

## Chapter VI: Vogt and the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*

Sin kumber was manecvalt. — First collection of German fables, 1461. <sup>[1]</sup>

*Vogt* himself says that he is ‘concerned’ in the *Magnum Opus*, page 162, with ‘the development of his personal position towards this clique’ (Marx and Company). Strangely enough, he only recounts conflicts that he never experienced and he only experiences conflicts that he has never recounted. I must therefore counterpose to his fisherman’s tales a piece of real history. If one leafs through the volume of *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* (1 June 1848 to 19 May 1849) one will find that during the whole of 1848, with one single exception, Vogt’s name figures neither in the lead articles nor in the correspondence of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. It is to be found only in the daily reports on the parliamentary debates, and the Frankfurt reporter never fails, to Herr Vogt’s great satisfaction, to register conscientiously each time the ‘applause’ earned by the ‘speeches he himself made’. We have seen that, while the right wing at Frankfurt had at its disposal the combined forces of a Harlequin like *Lichnowski* and of a clown like *von Vincke*, the left had nothing but the isolated pranks of the single *Vogt*. We grasped the fact that he needed encouragement — ‘that *important fellow* the children’s

wonder — Signor Punchinello’ — and therefore quietly let the Frankfurt reporter have his own way. A change in the colouration of the reports occurs after the middle of September 1848.

Vogt, who, in the debates at the Malmö armistice <sup>[2]</sup> had tried to provoke an uprising by revolutionary Rhodomontades, did everything in his power at the moment of decision to thwart the acceptance of the resolutions passed at the popular meeting on the Pfingstweide and endorsed by part of the extreme left. After the fight on the barricades had been beaten down, Frankfurt had been transformed into an open army camp and the State of Emergency had been proclaimed, the same Vogt declared himself to be in favour of the *urgency* of Zachariä’s motion approving the measures adopted up to that time by the Imperial Ministry and expressing gratitude to the imperial troops. Before *Vogt* mounted the rostrum, *Venedey* himself had opposed the ‘urgency’ of those motions and declared such a discussion at such a moment to be against the dignity of the assembly. But *Vogt* was *lower than Venedey*. As a punishment, in the parliamentary report, after the word ‘Vogt’ I put the word ‘chatterer’, a laconic hint to the Frankfurt reporter.

The following October, Vogt not only neglected to carry out his office and wave his cap of bells over the heads of the majority, who were at that time over-bold and rabidly reactionary. He did not even dare to sign the protest that *Zimmermann* from Spandau introduced on 10 October on behalf of about 40 Deputies, against the law for the defence of the National Assembly. <sup>[3]</sup> This law, as *Zimmermann* correctly emphasised, was the most shameless infringement of the popular rights won by the March Revolution — the right of assembly and the freedom of speech and of the press. Even *Eisenmann* handed in a similar protest. But *Vogt* was *lower than Eisenmann*. When later he poked his nose into the foundation of the ‘Central March Association’, <sup>[4]</sup> his name at last appears in an article in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* (issue of 29 December 1848) in which the ‘March Association’ is described as ‘an unconscious tool of the counter-revolution’, its programme is critically dissected, and *Vogt* is presented as one half of a double figure whose other half is *Vincke*. More than a decade later both ‘Ministers of the future’ have recognised their affinity and chosen the *partition of Germany* as the motto for their unification.

That we had understood the ‘March Association’ correctly was not only proved by its subsequent ‘development’. The Heidelberg ‘People’s League’, the Breslau ‘Democratic Association’, the Jena ‘Democratic Association’, etc, all rejected its loving overtures with scorn, and those members of the extreme left that had joined it confirmed our criticism of 29 December 1848 in their declaration of resignation of 20 April 1849. *Vogt*, however, sublimely unmoved, piled burning coals upon our heads, as can be seen from the following quotation:

*Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, no 243, Cologne, 10 March 1849. The so-called ‘Frankfurt March Association’ of the so-called ‘Imperial Assembly’ has had the impudence to send us the following lithographed letter: ‘The March Association has decided that all lists of *all newspapers* that have opened their columns to us should be drawn up and communicated to all the associations with whom we are in correspondence so that the association in question can work towards providing the newspapers mentioned preferentially with, as it were, appropriate *advertisements*. In hereby communicating to you the list drawn up, *we do not think it necessary* to draw your attention to the *importance of paid advertisements to a newspaper* as its main source of nourishment... Frankfurt, end of February 1849, the Committee of the Central March Association.’

Also to be found *on* the enclosed *list* of those newspapers that have opened their columns to the March Association, and are to be provided preferentially with ‘appropriate advertisements’ by the supporters of the March Association, is the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, which, to boot, is *especially honoured by the presence of an asterisk*. We hereby declare... that the columns of our newspaper have never been opened to the so-called March Association... If, therefore, in its lithographed report and in the newspapers whose columns really are open to it, the March Association described our newspaper as one of its organs, then this is nothing but a simple libel on the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* and tasteless boasting on the part of the March Association. We have, of course, no answer to the filthy remark of the patriots, rabid

for profit and beset by competition, about the importance of a newspaper's paid advertisements as the *main source of nourishment for the whole enterprise*. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* has always distinguished itself from the patriots in this, as in everything else, that it has never regarded the political movement as a branch of the swindling industry or as a source of nourishment.

Shortly after this abrupt rejection of the source of nourishment offered by Vogt and Company, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was tearfully mentioned at a meeting of the Central Commercial Association as a model of 'authentic German disunity'. At the end of our reply to this Jeremiad (no 248 of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*), Vogt is characterised as 'a small-time university beer blusterer and *failed Imperial Barrot*'. At that time (15 March), he had, moreover, not yet eaten the garlic of the question of the Emperor. But we were clear about Herr Vogt for once and for all, and could therefore treat as a deed already consummated the future treachery that was not yet clear even to him.

From then on, anyway, we left Vogt and Company in the hands of young Schlöffel, as intelligent as he was bold, who had arrived in Frankfurt from Hungary at the beginning of March and who subsequently reported to us about the storms in the Imperial frog-pond.

Vogt, meanwhile, had fallen so far — he himself, of course, had contributed more to this fall than the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* — that even *Bassermann* could dare to brand him as an '*apostate and renegade*' in the session of 25 April 1849.

As a result of his participation in the Elberfeld insurrection, one of the editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, *F Engels*, had to flee. I myself was shortly afterwards driven out of Prussia after repeated attempts to silence me by court action had failed because of the juries and the organ of the *coup d'état* ministry, <sup>[5]</sup> the *Neue Preussische Zeitung*, had repeatedly denounced the '*Chimborazo* <sup>[6]</sup> impudence of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, in comparison with which the *Moniteur* of 1793 appears pale'. Such '*Chimborazo impudence*' was not out of place in a Prussian fortress town and at a time when the victorious counter-revolution was trying to intimidate people by shameless brutality.

On 19 May 1849, there appeared the last issue of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* (the Red Issue). As long as the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* existed, Vogt kept patiently silent. If a parliamentarian did protest at all, it was always modestly, more or less as follows:

Sir, I esteem your paper's *sharp criticism* no less highly for the fact that it *watches over all parties and all individuals equally strictly*. (See no 219, 11 February 1849, *Wesendonck's* protest.)

A week after the fall of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* Vogt thought that he was at last able, under the shield of parliamentary immunity, to grasp by the scruff of the neck the opportunity for which he had so long been waiting, and to develop into 'energy' the 'matter' that had long been accumulated in the depth of his heart. That is to say that an editor of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, *Wilhelm Wolff*, had entered the Frankfurt Assembly, which was in 'a state of progressive dissolution', as a replacement for a waning Silesian parliamentarian.

In order to understand the following scene from the parliamentary session of 26 May 1849, one must remember that at the time the Dresden uprising and the partial movement in the Rhine Province had already been beaten down, the imperial intervention in Baden and the Palatinate was coming, the main Russian army was marching on Hungary, and, finally, the Imperial Ministry had simply annulled the resolutions passed by the Assembly. On the agenda were two 'Proclamations to the German People', the first written by Uhland and coming from the majority, the other from the members of a Committee of Thirty, who belonged to the Centre. <sup>[7]</sup> The President was *Reh* <sup>[8]</sup> from Darmstadt, who later became a hare, and also 'absolved' himself from the 'rapidly dissolving' Assembly. I quote from the official shorthand report no 229 of session no 228 in the Paulskirche:

**Wolff from Breslau:** Gentlemen, I have put my name down against the Proclamation to the People, against the Proclamation written by the majority and read out here, because I think it is inadequate for present conditions, and because I find it much too weak. It is fit only to appear as an article in the daily papers of the party from which it comes, but not as a proclamation to the German people. As a second one has now been read out, I shall just comment incidentally that I am even more opposed to it, for

reasons that I do not need to go into here. [*A voice from the Centre: 'Why not?'*] I am speaking only of the majority proclamation. It is, to be sure, so moderate that even Herr Buss could not say much against it, and that is certainly the worst recommendation for any proclamation. No, gentlemen; if you want to retain any influence upon the people at all, then you cannot speak to them in the way that the proclamation does. You cannot speak there of legality, legal basis and so on, but of illegality, in the same way as the government, the *Russians*, and by Russians I mean the Prussians, the Austrians, Bavarians, Hanoverians. [*Disturbances and laughter.*] These are all embraced by the common name *Russians*. [*Great hilarity.*] Indeed, gentlemen, the *Russians* are represented in this Assembly too. You must tell them: 'Just as you adopt the legal standpoint, so we too adopt it.' It is the standpoint of force, and you must in parenthesis explain legality in this sense, that you oppose the Russians' cannon with force, with well-organised storm columns. *If* a proclamation is to be issued *at all*, then issue one in which you start by *declaring the principal traitor to the people, the Imperial Administrator, an outlaw.* [*Interjection: 'Order!' — Lively applause from the galleries.*] *And similarly all the ministers.* [*Renewed disorder.*] Oh, I shall not let you interrupt me; *he is the principal traitor to the people.*

**President:** I think that Herr Wolff overstepped the bounds and violated all respect. He cannot call the *Archduke-Imperial Administrator* a *traitor to the people* in front of this House, and I must therefore call him to order. At the same time I give the galleries a final warning not to intervene in the debates in the way that has happened.

**Wolff:** For my part I accept the call to order and declare that I *wanted* to overstep the bounds, *that he and his ministers are traitors.* [*Interjection from all sides of the House: 'Order, that is vulgar.'*]

**President:** I must ask you to stop speaking.

**Wolff:** Good, *I protest*; I tried to speak on behalf of the people here and to say what the *people think*. I protest against any proclamation written in this sense. [*Great excitement.*]

**President:** Gentlemen, please let me speak for a moment. I can say that the *incident* that has just occurred is *the first since Parliament has met here.* [It was in fact the first and *only incident* in this debating club.] No speaker has yet declared here that he wanted to violate *order*, the *foundation* of this House. [When similarly called to order in the session of 25 April, Schlöffel had said: 'I accept the call to order, and do so all the more gladly for the fact that I hope *that the time will soon come when this Assembly will be called to order from a different quarter.*']

Gentlemen, it is a matter of deep sorrow to me that Herr Wolff, who has only just become a member of the House, has *made his début in this way.* [Reh considers the matter from the standpoint of the theatre.] Gentlemen, I called him to order because of the *severe infringement* he permitted himself *in regard to the respect and consideration* that we owe to the person of the Imperial Administrator.

The session proceeds on its way. Hagen and Zachariä make long speeches, one for and one against the majority proclamation.

At last there rises to his feet:

**Vogt from Giessen:** Gentlemen, permit me to say a few words. I do not wish to tire you. It is completely correct, gentlemen, that Parliament no longer is *as it assembled* last year, and we *thank Heaven* [the blindly faithful Herr Vogt thanks Heaven!] that it *will have become so* [yes indeed, *will have become so!*] and that those who despaired of the people and who betrayed the cause of the people at the decisive moment have separated themselves from the Assembly. Gentlemen, *I have asked for the floor* [so the foregoing prayer of thanksgiving was merely humbug] to defend the crystal-clear stream [defend a stream] that has flowed from a poetic soul [Vogt becomes soulful] into this proclamation against the *unworthy filth* that has been thrown into the same *or flung* against the same, to defend it against the *dung* that has been piled up in this



latest movement and threatens to inundate and contaminate everything there. Indeed, gentlemen, it [that is to say the dung] is dung *and* is filthy [dung is filth!] which is thrown *in this way* [in what way?] *at everything you can think of that is pure*, and I express my *deepest indignation* [Vogt in deepest indignation, *que tableau!*] <sup>[9]</sup> that *such a thing* [what?] could happen.

And what he says is — dung.

*Wolff* had not said a syllable about *the way Uhland* wrote the proclamation. As the President repeatedly stated, he had been called to order and had raised the whole storm because he had declared *the Imperial Administrator and all his ministers to be traitors to the people*, and had called on the Parliament to declare them *traitors to the people*. But the ‘Archduke-Imperial Administrator’, that ‘worn-out Habsburger’ (*Vogt’s Studien*, p 28) and ‘*all his ministers*’ are ‘*everything you can think of that is pure*’ for *Vogt*. Like *Walter von der Vogelweide*, he sang:

Des fürsten milte ûz Österrîche  
fröit dem süezen regen gelîche  
beidiu liute und ouch daz lant.

The Prince of Austria’s kindness,  
like the sweet rain, delights  
Both the land and also the people.

Did *Vogt* at that time already entertain the ‘scientific relations’ he later admitted to having with *Archduke Johann*? (See *Magnum Opus*, p 25, Document.)

Ten years later the same *Vogt* declared in his *Studien*, pages 27–28:

This much at least is certain, that the National Assembly in France and its leaders at the time underestimated *Louis Napoleon’s* abilities just as much as the leaders of the Frankfurt National Assembly did *those of Archduke Johann*, and that each of the two sly foxes in his own sphere made those, that had underestimated him pay dearly for their mistake. In this we are very far from placing them both on an equal footing. The fearful ruthlessness [etc, etc, of *Louis Bonaparte*] — all this makes him appear by far superior to the already old and worn-out *Habsburger*.

At that very same session *Wolff* challenged *Vogt* to a duel with pistols through *Würth*, the member from *Sigmaringen*, and, when the said *Vogt* decided to preserve his skin for the Empire, threatened him with corporal punishment. But when *Wolff*, leaving the *Paulskirche*, found *Charles the Bold* flanked by two ladies, he broke into loud laughter and left him to his fate. Although a wolf with the teeth and heart of a wolf, *Wolff* is nevertheless a lamb where the fair sex is concerned. The only, very harmless, revenge he took was an article entitled ‘Supplement on the Empire’, in the *Revue der Neuen Rheinischen Zeitung*, April 1850, p 73, which reads, on the question of the ex-Imperial Regent:

In these critical days the Central Marchmen were most industrious. Before the retreat from Frankfurt they had already called to the March Associations and the German people in an appeal: ‘Fellow citizens! The eleventh hour has struck!’ From Stuttgart they now issued a new proclamation ‘To the German People’ for the creation of a people’s army, and lo, the hands of the Central March Clock still stood at the same spot, or the figure 12 had broken off, like the clock on Freiburg cathedral. Be that as it may, the proclamation again read: ‘Fellow citizens! The eleventh hour has struck!’ Oh, if only it had struck on, and at the same time through your heads earlier, or at least when the Central March hero *Karl Vogt* in Nuremberg was pacifying the Franconian revolution to his own satisfaction and that of the loudmouths fêting him... <sup>[10]</sup> The regency opened its offices in the Freiburg government building. The Regent *Karl Vogt*, simultaneously Foreign Minister and occupant of many other ministries, took here too the good of the German people most earnestly to heart. After burning the midnight oil for a long time, he brought about a most timely invention, ‘Imperial Regency Passports’. The passports were simple, beautifully lithographed, and obtainable free in any quantity the heart desired. They only had one small shortcoming: they were valid and respected only in *Vogt’s* Chancellery. Perhaps one

day one or the other example of them will find its way into some Englishman's collection of curiosities.

Wolff did not follow Greiner's example. Instead of 'departing for America immediately after the appearance' of the *Revue*, he awaited the Land-Vogt's revenge for a further year in Switzerland.

## Notes

**1** His cares were manifold.

**2** The armistice between Denmark and Prussia, which had taken part only formally in the war in Schleswig-Holstein, was signed in August 1848 at Malmö in Sweden. The effect of the armistice, which placed Schleswig-Holstein under a provisional Danish-Prussian government, was to destroy the gains of the revolutionary and democratic forces there. Yet the Frankfurt National Assembly accepted the armistice in September. This immediately led to mass demonstrations in Frankfurt demanding that the deputies who had agreed to it be arraigned for high treason and that the Left should leave the Assembly. While part of the extreme Left accepted these demands, Vogt opposed them. A couple of days later there was street fighting in Frankfurt against Prussian and Austrian troops.

**3** A reference to the law passed by the Frankfurt National Assembly for 'the protection of the constituent imperial assembly and the officials of the central power' according to which an insult to a deputy to the Assembly or to a representative of central power was punishable by imprisonment. This law was one of the methods of reprisal used after the September rising in Frankfurt.

**4** The March Associations were founded at the end of November 1848 by deputies of the Left from the Frankfurt National Assembly for the defence of the gains of the German revolution of March 1848. Their leadership was made up of petty-bourgeois democrats, whose policies Marx and Engels attacked in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* as favouring the counter-revolution.

**5** A reference to the *coup d'état* in Prussia at the beginning of December 1848 which completed the victory of the counter-revolution.

**6** Chimborazo — one of the highest peaks in South America.

**7** The proclamation to the German people by the German National Assembly, drawn up on behalf of the moderate democrats by the poet Uhland, was based on their attempt to find common ground with the liberal bourgeoisie. It contained no concrete programme, merely a helpless appeal to the German people to support the introduction of an Imperial Constitution. The second appeal was drawn up by the Committee of Thirty. This Committee was set up by the National Assembly in April 1849 to clear up the situation with the Prussian King, Frederick William IV, who had refused the imperial crown, and to enforce the Constitution. This appeal was equally useless; it called on the troops of those states which did not recognise the National Assembly or its decisions to take an oath on the Constitution.

**8** Literally, 'deer'.

**9** What a picture!

**10** In May 1849, as a result of the refusal of the Bavarian Government to recognise the Imperial Constitution, the masses in Nuremberg became restless. A demonstration of some 50,000 people was advised by Vogt not to take decisive action against the government — this, together with the indecision of the democrats, who led the movement, brought about the defeat of the mass movement.

## Chapter VII: The Augsburg Campaign

Shortly after the citizen of the Canton of Thurgau <sup>[1]</sup> had finished his Italian war, the citizen of the Canton of Berne opened his Augsburg campaign.

It had *long since been the Marx clique* there [in London] that had provided the major part of the correspondence [of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*] and *had been in contact with the 'Allgemeine Zeitung' uninterruptedly since 1849.* (*Magnum Opus*, p 194)

Although Marx himself has only lived in London since the end of 1849, that is to say since he was expelled from France for the second time, the 'Marx clique' seems to have lived in London 'long since', and although the Marx clique has '*long since provided the major part of the correspondence of the Allgemeine Zeitung*', it has been '*uninterruptedly in contact*' with the *Allgemeine Zeitung* only 'since 1849'. Be that as it may, Vogt's chronology breaks down — and that is hardly surprising, since the man 'had not thought of concerning himself with politics' before 1848 (*Magnum Opus*, p 225) into two great periods, that is to say the period from 'long since' to 1849 and the period from 1849 to 'this' year.

From 1842 to 1843 I edited the old *Rheinische Zeitung* <sup>[2]</sup> which waged a war to the death against the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. Between 1848 and 1849, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* reopened the polemic. What therefore remains for the period from 'long since' to '1849' except the fact that Marx has '*long since*' been fighting the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, while Vogt was its 'constant collaborator' from 1844 to 1847? (See *Magnum Opus*, p 225.)

Now for the second period of Vogt's world history.

From London I was 'uninterruptedly in contact with the *Allgemeine Zeitung*', '*uninterrupted since 1849*', because 'from 1852' a certain Ohly was chief London correspondent of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. Now Ohly never had any contact with me, either before or after 1852. I have *never* in my life seen him. To the extent that he figured at all in London refugee circles it was as a member of Kinkel's *Emigration Association*. But this does not alter anything in the matter, since:

The earlier oracle of the English-speaking Old Bavarian Altenhöfer was my *more immediate countryman, the blond Ohly*, who on the basis of Communism *tried to attain higher poetical standpoints in politics and literature*, and was the chief correspondent of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* at first in Zurich and from 1852 in London, until he finally ended up in a madhouse. (*Magnum Opus*, p 195)

Mouchard Edouard Simon frenchifies the Vogtiad in the following way:

En voici d'abord un qui de son point de départ communiste, avait cherché à s'élever aux plus hautes conceptions de la politique. <sup>[3]</sup> ['Higher poetical standpoints in politics' exceeds the powers even of an Edouard Simon.] A en croire M Vogt, cet adepte fut l'oracle de la *Gazette d'Augsbourg* jusqu'en 1852, époque où il mourut dans une maison de fous. (*Revue contemporaine* (Paris), Volume 13, 1860, p 529) <sup>[4]</sup>

'Operam et oleum perdidi', Vogt can cry about his *Magnum Opus* and his Ohly. <sup>[5]</sup> While he himself has his 'more immediate countryman' correspond with the *Allgemeine Zeitung* from London *from 1852 onwards* 'until he finally ends up in a madhouse', Edouard Simon says, 'if we are to believe Vogt, Ohly was the oracle of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* until 1852, at which epoch he' — who, incidentally, is still alive — '*died* in a madhouse'. But Edouard Simon knows his Karl Vogt. Edouard knows that once you make up your mind to 'believe' your Karl it is totally and utterly immaterial *what you believe*, what he says, or the opposite of what he says.

'*Herr Liebknecht*', says Karl Vogt, 'replaced him', that is to say Ohly, as correspondent on the *Allgemeine Zeitung*.' 'Liebknecht was only accepted as a correspondent by the *Allgemeine Zeitung* after he had been openly proclaimed to be a member of the Marxist party.' (*Magnum Opus*, p 169)

That proclamation took place during the Cologne Communist trial, that is to say, at the *end* of 1852.

In fact, in the spring of 1851 Liebknecht became a contributor to the *Morgenblatt*,<sup>[6]</sup> in which he reported on the London industrial exhibition. Through the *Morgenblatt* he obtained in September 1855 the post of correspondent on the *Allgemeine Zeitung*.

His [Marx's] comrades did not write a single line of which he had not previously been made aware. (*Magnum Opus*, p 194)

The proof is simple: 'He' — Marx — 'commands his people absolutely' (*Magnum Opus*, p 195), while Vogt obeys his Fazy and Company implicitly. Here we come across a peculiarity of the way in which Vogtian myths are formed. Everywhere we have the dwarfish scale of Giessen or Geneva, the small-town framework and the smell of the Swiss tavern. Naïvely translating the hole-in-the-corner conviviality of his clique system from Geneva to the metropolis of London, he does not permit Liebknecht in the West End to write a single line of which I, four miles away in Hampstead, 'had not previously been made aware'. And I perform the same La Guéronnière duties daily for a horde of other 'comrades' scattered around London and corresponding all over the world. What a stimulating profession in life — and how lucrative!

Vogt's mentor, Edouard Simon, who is at least conversant with Parisian if not with London conditions, shows the unmistakable tact of the artist in giving a metropolitan verve to the clumsy sketch of his 'country friend':

Marx, comme chef de la société, ne tient pas lui-même la plume, mais ses fidèles n'écrivent pas une ligne sans l'avoir consulté: la *Gazette d'Augsbourg* sera d'autant mieux servie. (*Magnum Opus*, p 529)

So:

Marx, as head of the society, *does not write himself*, but his followers do not write a line without consulting him first. The *Augsburger Zeitung* is all the better served.

Does Vogt sense the whole finesse of this correction?

I had as much to do with Liebknecht's reports to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* from London as I did with Vogt's reports to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* from Paris. Moreover, Liebknecht's reports were thoroughly praiseworthy — critical descriptions of *British* politics, which he portrayed in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* in exactly the same way as he did in reports written at the same time for radical German-American newspapers. Vogt himself, who has scrupulously ferreted through whole volumes of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* in the search for something subversive in Liebknecht's letters, confines his criticism of their contents to the fact that Liebknecht's journalistic signature is 'two thin oblique strokes' (*Magnum Opus*, p 196).

The fact that the strokes were oblique proved, of course, that all was not well with the reports. And then there was the 'thinness'! If only Liebknecht had used two big round blobs for his journalistic coat of arms! But even if no worse blemish than 'two thin oblique strokes' sullies the reports, the fact that they appeared in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* at all still arouses scruples. And why not in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*? It is well known to all that the *Allgemeine Zeitung* allows the most varied points of view to be expressed, at least in neutral areas like British politics, and is accepted moreover abroad as the only German newspaper that has a more than local importance. Liebknecht could confidently write his London letters for the same paper for which Heine wrote his 'Parisian' and Fallmerayer his 'Oriental Letters'.<sup>[7]</sup> Vogt reports that nasty people also write for the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. As we know, he himself was its correspondent from 1844 to 1847.

As far as I myself and *Frederick Engels* are concerned — I mention Engels because we both work to a common plan and by prior arrangement — to a certain extent, it must be admitted, we entered 'into relations' with the *Allgemeine Zeitung* in 1859. That is to say that in January, February and March 1859 I published a series of leading articles in the *New York Tribune*<sup>[8]</sup> in which, among other things, the 'Central European Great Power Theory' of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, and its claim that the continuation of Austrian domination was in Germany's interest, were subjected to very exhaustive criticism. Shortly before the outbreak of the war, and in agreement with me, Engels published *Po and Rhine* (Berlin, 1859), a pamphlet which is specifically aimed against the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and which, in Engels' own words (page 4 of his pamphlet *Savoy, Nice and the Rhine* (Berlin, 1860)) proved from the standpoint of military science 'that Germany does not need any part of Italy for her

defence and that, on purely military grounds, France has a much stronger claim to the Rhine than Germany to the Mincio'. With us, however, this polemic against the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and its theory of the necessity of Austrian despotism in Italy went hand in hand with the polemic against *Bonapartist* propaganda. For example, I proved exhaustively in the *Tribune* (see for example, February 1859) that the financial and domestic situation of the 'bas empire' had reached a critical point where only a foreign war could prolong the rule of the *coup d'état* government in France and thus of the counter-revolution in Europe. I showed that the *Bonapartist* liberation of Italy was only a pretext to keep France subjugated, subject Italy to the rule of the *coup d'état* government, extend France's 'natural frontiers' to Germany, transform Austria into a tool of Russia, and force Europe into a war between the legitimate and the illegitimate counter-revolution. All this happened before the Ex-Reichs-Vogt blew his trumpet blast from Geneva.

Since Wolff's article in the *Revue der Neuen Rheinischen Zeitung*, I had completely forgotten the 'rounded character'. I was once more reminded of the merry fellow in the spring of 1859 one April evening, when Freiligrath gave me a letter from Vogt to read, together with the enclosed political *Programme*.<sup>[9]</sup> That was no indiscretion, for Vogt's circular had been sent 'for the information' of the friends, not of Vogt, but of the addressee.

When asked what I found in the *Programme* I replied: 'Hot air.' I immediately recognised the old joker in his entreaty to Freiligrath to solicit the service of Herr *Bucher* as political correspondent of the propaganda paper planned in Geneva. Vogt's letter was dated 1 April 1859. It was well known that Bucher had, in his reports from London to the *Berlin National-Zeitung* since January 1859, advocated views diametrically opposed to Vogt's programme. But to the man of 'critical directness' all cats seemed grey.

After this event, which I thought too unimportant to talk to a soul about, I received Vogt's *Studien zur gegenwärtigen Lage Europas (Studies on the Current Situation in Europe)*, a wretched publication that left me in no doubt as to his connection with *Bonapartist* propaganda.

The evening of 9 May 1859 found me on the platform of a public meeting held by David Urquhart on the occasion of the Italian war. Even before the meeting started an earnest figure stepped weightily up to me. From the Hamlet-like expression on its physiognomy I immediately recognised that there was 'something rotten in the state of Denmark'. This was the *homme d'état*<sup>[10]</sup> Karl Blind. After a few preliminary phrases he got round to talking about Vogt's 'intrigues'. Shaking his head for emphasis, he assured me that Vogt was receiving *Bonapartist* subsidies for his propaganda. He told me that a South German writer whom he could not, 'unfortunately', name had been offered a 30,000 guilder bribe by Vogt — I could not rightly see what South German writer was worth 30,000 guilders — and that attempted bribery had occurred in London. He said that the Italian war had been discussed as early as 1858 at a meeting between Plon-Plon, Fazy and Company in Geneva, and that the Russian Grand Prince Constantine had been named as the future King of Hungary. He said that Vogt had also called upon him (Blind) to contribute to his propaganda, and that he had *proofs* of Vogt's treasonable intrigues. Blind betook himself back to his seat by his friend, J Fröbel, at the far end of the platform; the meeting began and, speaking in great detail, D Urquhart sought to portray the Italian war as the fruit of Franco-Russian intrigue.<sup>[11]</sup>

Towards the end of the meeting *Dr Faucher*, foreign editor of the *Morning Star*<sup>[12]</sup> (organ of the Manchester school),<sup>[13]</sup> came up to me and told me that a new London-German weekly, *Das Volk*, had just appeared. He said that *Die Neue Zeit*,<sup>[14]</sup> the workers' paper published by Herr *A Scherzer* and edited by *Edgar Bauer*, had collapsed as the result of an intrigue on the part of *Kinkel*, the publisher of the *Hermann*.<sup>[15]</sup> Hearing of this, he said, *Biscamp*, a former correspondent of the *Neue Zeit*, had given up his teaching post in the south of England to set up *Das Volk* in London in opposition to the *Hermann*. He said that the German Workers' Educational Association and some other London Associations were supporting the paper, which of course, like all similar workers' papers, was being written and edited gratis. He said that although he himself, Faucher, was, as a free trader, alien to the *Volk's* policies, he would not tolerate a monopoly in the German press in London, and that he had therefore set up a finance committee to support the paper together with some other acquaintances in London. *Biscamp*, he said, had already written to *Liebknecht*, whom he had not

previously known, asking for literary contributions, and so forth. Finally Faucher invited me to contribute to the *Volk*.

Although Biscamp had been living in England since 1852, we had not previously become acquainted. A day after the Urquhart meeting, Liebknecht brought him to my house. Because of lack of time, I could not immediately comply with the invitation to write for the *Volk*, but I promised to ask my German friends in England for subscriptions, money donations and literary contributions. In the course of the conversation we came to talk about the Urquhart meeting, which led to Vogt, whose *Studien* Biscamp already knew and correctly evaluated. I informed him and Liebknecht of the contents of the Vogt 'Programme' and of Blind's revelations, but remarked in relation to the latter that South Germans had the habit of painting things in strong colours. To my amazement the second issue of the *Volk* (14 May) carried an article entitled 'Der Reichsregent als Reichsverräter' ('The Imperial Regent as Imperial Traitor', see *Magnum Opus*, Documents, pp 17, 18), in which Biscamp mentions two of the facts quoted by Blind — the 30,000 guilders, which he reduced, however, to 4000, and the Bonapartist origins of the Vogtian operating capital. For the rest, his article consisted of jokes after the manner of the *Hornisse* (*Hornet*),<sup>[16]</sup> which he edited in Kassel in 1848–49 together with *Heise*. Meanwhile, as I learnt long after the appearance of the *Magnum Opus* (see Appendix VIII), the London Workers' Educational Association had commissioned one of its leaders, Herr Scherzer, to request the Workers' Educational Associations in Switzerland, Belgium and the United States to support the *Volk* and to combat Bonapartist propaganda. Biscamp himself sent the above-mentioned article from the *Volk* of 14 May 1859 by post to Vogt, who at the same time received Herr A Scherzer's circular through his own Ranickel.

With his famous 'critical directness' Vogt immediately dreamed up a romance in which I was the demiurge of this web of hostility towards him. Without any further ado, therefore, he published the *Grundriss*<sup>[17]</sup> of his later contortions of history in the often-quoted *Extraordinary Supplement to Issue 50 of the Schweizer Handels-Courier*. This Original Version of the Gospel, in which the mysteries of the Brimstone Gang, the Bürstenheimers, Cherval, etc, were first revealed under the dateline Berne, 23 May 1859 (more recently therefore than the Books of Mormon),<sup>[18]</sup> was entitled *Zur Warnung (As a Warning)* and amounted, as far as the contents went, to a translation of part of a pamphlet by the notorious E About.<sup>[19]</sup>

Vogt's Original Version of the Gospel *Zur Warnung* was, as has already been said, printed at my request in the *Volk*.

At the beginning of June I left London to visit Engels in Manchester, where a subscription of about £25 had been raised for the *Volk*. Fr Engels, W Wolff, I myself and finally three German doctors who had settled in Manchester and whose names are in a legal document sent by me to Berlin, provided this subsidy whose 'character' caused the 'inquisitive' Vogt to cast 'a glance over the Channel' to Augsburg and Vienna (*Magnum Opus*, p 212). Herr Vogt can enquire about the original finance committee's London collections from Dr Faucher.

Vogt tells us on page 225 of the *Magnum Opus*:

It has long since been a trick of reaction to demand of the democrats that they should do everything *for free*, while *they themselves* [the reaction, that is to say, not the democrats] *claim* the privilege of having themselves paid and of being paid.

What a *reactionary* trick, then, on the part of the *Volk*, not only to be written and edited free, but over and above that *to make its contributors pay!* If that is not proof of the connection between the *Volk* and reaction, then Karl Vogt is a Dutchman.

During my stay in Manchester an event of decisive importance took place in London. Liebknecht found in the composing room of Hollinger (the printer of the *Volk*) the galley of the anonymous leaflet *Zur Warnung (As a Warning)* directed against Vogt, skimmed through it, immediately recognised Blind's revelations and, to cap it all, discovered from the compositor, *A Vögele*, that *Blind* had given the manuscript in his own handwriting to Hollinger to be printed. What is more, the corrections on the galley were also in *Blind's* handwriting. Two days later Liebknecht received from Hollinger the corrected galley, which he sent in to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. The type that had been set for the leaflet was left standing and later served to reprint it in issue 7 of the *Volk* (of 18 June 1859).

The Ex-Reichs-Vogt's Augsburg campaign opened with the publication of the *As a Warning* by the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. He prosecuted the *Allgemeine Zeitung* for publishing the leaflet.

In the *Magnum Opus*, pages 227–28, Vogt parodies Müllner's <sup>[20]</sup> 'I am, I am, I am the robber Jaromir'. But he translates it from 'I am' to 'I have'...

*I have prosecuted*, because I knew beforehand that all the hollowness, emptiness and wretchedness of that editorial board that has the presumption to claim to be 'the representative of High German culture' would have to stand revealed, *I have prosecuted* because I knew beforehand that the connection between that worthy editorial board and the pro-Austrian policy it elevates to the heavens with the Brimstone Gang and the dregs of the revolution would have become public knowledge...

... followed by four more 'I have prosecuteds'. Having prosecuted, Vogt becomes exalted, unless Longin is right in his view that there is nothing drier in the world than a person with dropsy.

'Personal considerations', cries the 'rounded character', 'were the least motive for my decision to prosecute.'

In reality, however, it was not quite like that. No calf could have been more fearful of the slaughterhouse than Karl Vogt was of the courthouse. While his 'more immediate' friends, the Ranickel, Reinach (earlier the walking *chronique scandaleuse* <sup>[21]</sup> about Vogt) and the loquacious rump parliamentarian Mayer, from Esslingen, confirmed him in his fear of the courthouse, he received urgent warnings from Zurich to proceed with the 'prosecution'. At the workers' festival in Lausanne the furrier Roos told him in front of witnesses that he would no longer be able to respect him unless he went to court. But Vogt became obstinate. He said that the Brimstone Gang in Augsburg and London could go to the devil, he would remain silent. Suddenly, however, he spoke. Various newspapers carried notice of his court case, and the Ranickel said:

*The people in Stuttgart had not left him [Vogt] in peace.* He [Ranickel] had not agreed to it.

Moreover, since he of the 'rounded character' was in a corner, a complaint against the *Allgemeine Zeitung* seemed undeniably the most promising manoeuvre. Vogt's self-defence against an attack by J Venedey, <sup>[22]</sup> who had accused him of Bonapartist intrigues, saw the light of day in the *Biel Handels-Courier* of 16 June 1859, and therefore did not arrive in London until *after* the appearance of the anonymous leaflet, which ended with the warning:

It is scarcely likely that *Vogt* will dare to deny this, but should he try to do so, this revelation will be followed by No 2.

Now Vogt had denied it, and what did not follow was revelation No 2. Secure on this flank, therefore, he could only be threatened with disaster by his dear friends, whom he knew well enough to count on their cowardly consideration. The more he laid himself open publicly by prosecuting, the more he could bank on their discretion, for to a certain extent the whole of the rump parliament was in the pillory in the person of the 'Runaway Regent'.

In his *Pro domo und Pro patria gegen Karl Vogt* (Hanover, 1860), pages 27–28, the parliamentarian *Jacob Venedey* talks out of school in the following way:

Besides the letters communicated in Vogt's description of his trial, I have read another letter from Vogt which shows far more clearly than the one to Dr Loening Vogt's position as a helper of those who were at great pains to localise the war in Italy. To convince myself, I copied a few passages out of this letter, which I cannot unfortunately publish here because the person to whom the letter was addressed communicated it to me under the condition that it was not to be published. *The attempt has been made to cover up Vogt's activities in this matter in a way that does not seem to me to do justice either to the party or to a man's duty towards the Fatherland. This reticence in many quarters is the reason why Vogt still has the cheek to appear as head of a German party. But it seems to me that for this very reason the party that Vogt supported became half-way responsible for his activities.* <sup>[23]</sup>

So if the risk involved in prosecuting the *Allgemeine Zeitung* was not exactly excessive, an offensive in this direction on the other hand offered General Vogt the most favourable basis of operations. In decrying the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, Vogt really decried Austria, and Austria in league with the Communists! Thus the Reichs-Vogt appeared as the interesting victim of a monstrous coalition between the enemies of bourgeois liberalism. And the Little German press, <sup>[24]</sup> already well disposed towards Vogt because he is a diminisher of the Empire, <sup>[25]</sup> would raise him rejoicing on its shield!

At the beginning of July 1859, shortly after my return from Manchester, Blind visited me as the result of an occurrence that is unimportant here. He was accompanied by Fidelio Hollinger and Liebknecht. In this company I expressed my conviction that he was the author of the pamphlet *Zur Warnung*. He swore that it was not the case. I repeated point by point what he had said on 9 May, which in fact formed the whole content of the leaflet. He conceded all that, but said that he was nevertheless not the author of the leaflet.

About a month later, in August 1859, Liebknecht showed me a letter from the editorial board of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* urgently asking him for evidence for the accusations made in the leaflet *Zur Warnung*. At his request, I decided to accompany him to Blind's home in St John's Wood, for, if he was not the *author* of the leaflet, he had in any case known at the beginning of May what the leaflet had not revealed to the world until the beginning of June, and he could, moreover, 'prove' what he knew. Blind was absent. He was to be found at a seaside resort. Liebknecht therefore informed him in writing of the purpose of our visit. No reply. Liebknecht wrote a second letter. Finally, the following statesmanlike document appeared:

St Leonard's

8 September

**Dear Herr Liebknecht**

Both your letters, which were wrongly addressed, arrived almost simultaneously. You will understand that I have not the slightest desire to become involved in the affairs of a newspaper with which I have no connection at all. This is all the more true in *the case in question, in which, as I have already mentioned, I had no part at all.* Concerning the remarks made in private conversation which you quote, it is obvious that they were completely misunderstood, and that an error exists on this about which I shall come to speak orally when the occasion arises. Regretting that you and Marx made the trip to visit me in vain.

I remain

Yours respectfully

**K Blind**

This diplomatically cool note, according to which *Blind* 'had no part at all' in the denunciations against Vogt, reminded me of an article that appeared anonymously on 27 May 1859 in the *London Free Press* and which reads as follows:

**The Grand Duke Constantine to be King of Hungary**

A Correspondent, who encloses his card, writes as follows:

Sir: Having been present at the last meeting in the Music Hall, <sup>[26]</sup> I heard the statement made concerning the Grand Duke Constantine. I am able to give you another fact:

So far back as last summer, Prince Jérôme-Napoléon detailed to some of his confidants at Geneva a plan of attack against Austria, and prospective rearrangement of the map of Europe. I know the name of a Swiss senator to whom he broached the subject. Prince Jérôme, at that time, declared that, according to the plan made, *Grand Duke Constantine was to become King of Hungary.*

I know further of attempts made, in the beginning of the present year, to win over to the Russo-Napoleonic scheme some of the exiled German Democrats, as well as some influential liberals in Germany. Large pecuniary advantages were held out to them as a bribe. I am glad to say that these offers were rejected with indignation.



This article, in which Vogt was admittedly not named, but described unmistakably for the London émigrés, does indeed give the essence of the leaflet *Zur Warnung* that appeared later. The author of the ‘Future King of Hungary’, driven by patriotic zeal to denounce Vogt anonymously, would of course have to grasp eagerly the golden opportunity that dropped into his lap with the Augsburg trial, the opportunity to unmask this treason legally before the eyes of all Europe. And who was the author of the ‘Future King of Hungary’? *Citizen Karl Blind*. The form and the contents of the article had already betrayed that to me in May, and that was now *officially confirmed* by the editor of the *Free Press*, Mr Collet, as soon as I explained the importance of the unresolved dispute and informed him of Blind’s diplomatic note.

On 17 September 1859, the compositor Herr *A Vögele* gave me a written statement (printed in the *Magnum Opus*, Documents nos 30, 31) in which he testifies, not indeed that *Blind* was the *author* of the leaflet *Zur Warnung*, but that he himself (A Vögele) and his employer *Fidelio Hollinger* set the leaflet in *Hollinger’s print shop*, that *the manuscript was written in Blind’s handwriting*, and that *Blind had at some time or another been described to him by Hollinger as the author of the leaflet*.

Basing himself on Vögele’s statement and on the ‘Future King of Hungary’, *Liebknecht* wrote one more time to *Blind* for ‘proof’ of the facts that statesman had denounced in the *Free Press*, at the same time giving notice that there was now evidence of *his* participation in the publication of the leaflet *Zur Warnung*. Instead of an answer to *Liebknecht*, *Blind* sent Mr Collet to me. Mr Collet was to ask me on *Blind’s* behalf not to make any public use of my knowledge of the authorship of the article in question in the *Free Press*. I replied that I could not give any undertaking, and that my discretion would keep pace with *Blind’s* courage.

Meanwhile the date of the opening of the trial in Augsburg was approaching. *Blind* was silent. In his various public announcements, *Vogt* had tried to implicate me as the secret instigator of the leaflet and of the *evidence* for the statements in the leaflet. To parry this manoeuvre, to vindicate *Liebknecht* and to defend the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, which, in my opinion, had done a good job in denouncing *Vogt*, I let the editors of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* know through *Liebknecht* that I would be prepared to hand over to them a document relating to the origins of the leaflet *Zur Warnung* if they asked for it in writing. In this way came to pass the ‘*lively correspondence that precisely Marx is now carrying on with Herr Kolb*’, as *Vogt* relates on page 194 of the *Magnum Opus*. This ‘*lively correspondence*’ of mine ‘*with Herr Kolb*’ consisted in fact of two letters to me from Herr *Orges*, both of the same date, in which he asks me for the promised document, which was then sent to him with a *few lines* on my part.

Both letters from Herr *Orges*, actually only a double issue of the same letter, arrived in London on 18 October 1859, while the legal proceedings in Augsburg were already due to take place on 24 October. I therefore wrote immediately to Herr Vögele to fix an appointment with him for the following day at the Marlborough Street Police Court building, where he was to give his statement on the leaflet *Zur Warnung* the legal form of an *affidavit*. My letter did not reach him in time. On 19 October, therefore, contrary to my previous intention, I had to send the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, instead of an affidavit, the written statement of 17 September mentioned above.

The court proceedings in Augsburg degenerated, as is known, into a true comedy of errors. The *corpus delicti* was the leaflet *Zur Warnung* printed by the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and sent to it by Herr *W Liebknecht*. But the publisher and the author of the leaflet were playing blind man’s buff. *Liebknecht* could not subpoena his witnesses in London to appear in the stand at a court in Augsburg, the editors of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, in their juridical embarrassment, perorated politically tasteless gibberish, Dr Hermann made great play with the ‘rounded character’s’ tall stories about the Brimstone Gang, the Festival at Lausanne, etc, and finally the court rejected *Vogt’s* complaint because the plaintiff had mistaken the court’s competence. The confusion reached its climax when the trial in Augsburg was closed and the report on it arrived with the *Allgemeine Zeitung* in London. *Blind*, who until then had maintained his diplomatic silence inviolate, now leapt into the public arena, flushed out by the compositor Vögele’s testimony that I had produced. Vögele had *not* stated that *Blind* was the *author* of the leaflet, but only that he had been described to him as such by *Fidelio Hollinger*. On the other hand, Vögele stated categorically that *the manuscript of the leaflet was written in Blind’s handwriting, which he knew, and set and printed in Hollinger’s print-shop*. *Blind* could still have been the *author*

of the leaflet, even if it had been neither written in Blind's handwriting nor set in Hollinger's print-shop. Conversely, the leaflet could have been *written out by Blind* and printed by Hollinger, even though Blind was *not* the author.

In no 313 of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, dated London, 3 November (see *Magnum Opus*, Documents, pp 37–38) the citizen and statesman Blind states that he was *not* the *author* of the leaflet, and 'publishes' as *evidence* the '**following document**':

a) I hereby declare that the claim by the compositor Vögele contained in no 300 of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, according to which the leaflet *Zur Warnung* was printed in my *print-shop* or originated from Herr *Karl Blind* is a malicious invention.

**Fidelio Hollinger**

3 Litchfield Street

Soho

London

2 November 1859

b) The undersigned, who has been *living and working* at no 3 Litchfield Street for 11 months, *testifies* for his part to the *correctness of Herr Hollinger's statement*.

**JF Wiehe**

Compositor

London

2 November 1859

Nowhere had Vögele *claimed* that *Blind* was the *author* of the leaflet. Fidelio Hollinger therefore first invented Vögele's claim in order then to declare it to be a 'malicious invention'. On the other hand, *if* the leaflet was *not* printed in Hollinger's print-shop, how did that same Fidelio Hollinger know that *Karl Blind* was *not* the author?

And how, too, can the circumstance that he '*had lived and worked*' in Hollinger's house '*for 11 months*' (counting backwards from 2 November 1859) qualify the *compositor Wiehe* to testify to the '*correctness of Fidelio Hollinger's statement*'?

My reply to this statement by *Blind* — no 325 of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* (see *Magnum Opus*, Documents, pp 39–40) — closed with the words: 'The whole mystère <sup>[27]</sup> *Blind-Vogt* would be cleared up *if the trial were transferred from Augsburg to London*.'

Blind returns to the attack with all the moral indignation of the injured sentimentalist in the 'Supplement' to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of 11 December 1859:

Referring repeatedly [remember this] to the documents signed *by the print-shop proprietor Herr Hollinger and the compositor Wiehe*, I state one last time that the *imputation*, which emerges now only as an insinuation, that I am the author of the often mentioned leaflet is a *downright lie*. In the other statements about me are to be found the *crudest distortions*.

In a postscript to this statement, the editors of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* note that 'this discussion no longer interests the wider public' and therefore begs the 'gentlemen in question whom it may concern to forego any further reply'. The 'rounded character' makes the following comment on this at the end of his *Magnum Opus*:

In other words, the editors of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* are begging Messrs *Marx, Biscamp and Liebknecht*, who have been set down as downright liars, not to get themselves and the *Allgemeine Zeitung* into any more hot water. <sup>[28]</sup>

This was how the Augsburg campaign for the time being ended.

Falling back into the tone of his *Lousiad*, Vogt has the 'compositor Vögele' give 'false testimony' to myself and *Liebknecht* (*Magnum Opus*, p 195). But he explains the origins of the leaflet from the fact that *Blind* 'may have hatched suspicious thoughts and gossiped about them. *Out of that* the Brimstone Gang then forged the leaflet and other articles which they brought down on the head of the cornered *Blind*.' (*Magnum Opus*, p 218)

The Reichs-Vogt did not reopen his indecisive campaign, as he was challenged to do, in London, partly because London is 'a corner' and partly because the parties in question are 'accusing each other of lying' (*Magnum Opus*, p 229).

'Critical directness' in this man means thinking that the involvement of the court is only suitable if the parties *do not dispute* the truth.

\* \* \*

I shall now jump three months to pick up the threads of my story once more at the beginning of February 1860. Vogt's *Magnum Opus* had not yet reached London, but the *gleanings of the Berlin National-Zeitung* had, which said, among other things:

Now it was very easy for the *Marx Party* to throw the blame for writing the leaflet on to *Blind* precisely because and after the latter had expressed himself in a similar way in conversation with *Marx* and in the article in the *Free Press*. Using *Blind*'s statements and turns of phrase the leaflet could be *forged* so that it looked like his work.

Just as Falstaff held discretion to be the better part of valour, so *Blind* held silence to be the whole art of diplomacy. He once more fell silent. In order to loosen his tongue I published an English circular over my own signature dated London, 4 February 1860 (see Appendix XI).

The circular, addressed to the editor of the *Free Press*, said among other things:

Now, before taking any further steps, I want to show up the fellows who evidently have played into the hands of Vogt. I therefore publicly declare that the statement of *Blind*, *Wiehe* and *Hollinger*, according to which the anonymous pamphlet was not printed in *Hollinger*'s office, 3 Litchfield Street, Soho, is a *deliberate lie*.

After laying down my evidence, I finish with the words:

Consequently I again declare the above-said *Charles Blind* to be a *deliberate liar*. If I am in the wrong he can easily refute me by appealing to an English court.

On 6 February 1860, a London daily paper (the *Daily Telegraph*) <sup>[29]</sup> — to which I shall return later — published the gleanings of the *National-Zeitung* under the title '*The Journalistic Auxiliaries of Austria*'. I, however, started proceedings for libel against the *National-Zeitung*, gave the *Telegraph* notice of a similar plaint, and began to obtain the necessary legal material.

The compositor *Vögele* swore an affidavit before the Bow Street Police Court dated 11 February 1860. It repeats the essential contents of his statement of 17 September 1859, that is to say that the manuscript of the leaflet was *written in Blind's handwriting* and *set in Hollinger's print-shop*, partly by *Vögele* himself and partly by *F Hollinger* (see Appendix XII).

Incomparably more important was the affidavit of the compositor *Wiehe* to whose testimony *Blind* had *repeatedly* referred with constantly increasing self-confidence in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. Besides the original (see Appendix XIII) there therefore follows here a literal translation:

One of the first days of November last — I do not recollect the exact date — in the evening between nine and ten o'clock I was taken out of bed by *Mr F Hollinger*, in whose house I then lived, and by whom I was employed as compositor. He presented to me a paper to the effect that, during the preceding 11 months I had been *continuously* employed by him, and that during all that time a certain German flysheet, *Zur Warnung (As a Warning)* had not been composed and printed in *Mr Hollinger's* Office, 3 Litchfield Street, Soho. In my perplexed state, and not aware of the importance of the transaction, I complied with his wish, and copied and signed the document. *Mr Hollinger* promised me *money*, but I never received anything. *During that transaction Mr Charles Blind*, as my wife informed me at the time, *was waiting in Mr Hollinger's room*. A few days later, *Mrs Hollinger* called me down from dinner and led me into her husband's room, *where I found Mr Charles Blind alone*. *He presented me the same paper* which *Mr Hollinger* had presented me before, *and entreated me to write, and sign a second copy, as he wanted two, the one for himself,*

and the other for publication in the press. He added that he would show himself grateful to me. I copied and signed again the paper.

I herewith declare the truth of the above statement and that:

1: During the 11 months mentioned in the document I was for *six* weeks *not* employed by Mr Hollinger, but by a Mr Ermani.

2: I did *not* work in Mr Hollinger's Office just at that time when the flysheet *Zur Warnung (As a Warning)* was published.

3: I heard at the time from Mr Vögele, who then worked for Mr Hollinger, that he, Vögele, had, **together with Mr Hollinger** himself, *composed* the flysheet in question, and that the manuscript was in Mr *Blind's* handwriting.

4: The types of the pamphlet were still standing when I returned to Mr Hollinger's service. I myself broke them into columns for the reprint of the flysheet (or pamphlet) *Zur Warnung (As a Warning)* in the German paper *Das Volk*, published at London by Mr Fidelio Hollinger, 3 Litchfield Street, Soho. The flysheet appeared in no 7, dated 18 June 1859, of *Das Volk (The People)*.

5: I saw Mr Hollinger give to Mr William Liebknecht of 14 Church Street, Soho, London, the proof-sheet of the pamphlet *Zur Warnung*, on which proof-sheet **Mr Charles Blind with his own hand had corrected four or five mistakes**. Mr Hollinger hesitated at first giving the proof-sheet to Mr Liebknecht, and when Mr *Liebknecht* had withdrawn, he, F Hollinger, expressed to me and my fellow workman Vögele his regret for having given the proof-sheet out of his hands.

Declared and signed by the said Johann Friedrich Wiehe at the Police Court, Bow Street, this eighth day of February 1860, before me *Th Henry*, Magistrate of the said court.

**Johann Friedrich Wiehe**

\* \* \*

It was proved by the two *affidavits* of the composers Vögele and Wiehe that *the manuscript of the leaflet was written in Blind's handwriting and set in Hollinger's print-shop, and that the proofs were corrected by Blind himself.*

And that *homme d'état* wrote to Julius Fröbel, dated London, 4 July 1859:

A serious accusation of bribery has been raised here against Vogt, *by whom I do not know*. In it various facts are alleged *of which we had heard nothing previously.*

And the same *homme d'état* wrote to Liebknecht on 8 September 1859 that:

***He had no part at all in the case in question.***

Not content with these achievements, the citizen and statesman *Blind* had into the bargain *forged a false statement*, for which he had *fraudulently obtained the signature of the compositor Wiehe* by offering him pecuniary advantages on the part of *Fidelio Hollinger* and gratitude for the future on his own part.

Not only did he send this product of his own ingenuity with the fraudulently obtained signature together with *Fidelio Hollinger's* false testimony to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, but he '*refers repeatedly*' to these '*documents*' and, in relation to these '*documents*', hurls accusations of '*downright lying*' at my head in the greatest moral indignation.

I had both affidavits by Vögele and Wiehe copied and circulated in various quarters, whereupon a meeting took place at *Blind's* home between *Blind*, *Fidelio Hollinger* and *Blind's* family friend, Herr *Karl Schaible*, MD, a good, quiet man who to a certain extent plays in *Blind's* statesmanlike operations the role of the tame elephant.

In the issue of the *Daily Telegraph* for 15 February 1860, there then appeared a paragraph which was later reprinted in German newspapers and which reads as follows:

The Vogt-Pamphlet: To the publishers of the *Daily Telegraph*

**Sir**

In consequence of erroneous statements which have been current, I feel I owe it to Mr Blind, as well as to Mr Marx, formally to declare that neither of them is the *author* of the pamphlet directed some time ago against Professor Vogt, at Geneva. That pamphlet originates from me; and on me the responsibility rests. I am sorry both with regard to Mr Marx and Mr Blind, that circumstances beyond my control should have prevented me from making this declaration earlier.

**Charles Schaible, MD**

London

14 February 1860

Herr *Schaible* sent me this statement, I immediately returned the compliment by sending him the affidavits of the composers Vögele and Wiehe and at the same time writing to him that his (Schaible's) statement changed nothing either as regarded the false testimonies which *Blind* had sent to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* or as regarded *Blind's conspiracy with Hollinger* to obtain fraudulently Wiehe's signature for the *forged, false document*.

*Blind* sensed that he was now no longer on the safe ground of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* but within the more alarming jurisdiction of the British courts. If he wanted to refute the *affidavits* and the 'crude insults' in my circular which were based upon them, then he and Hollinger would have to swear *counter-affidavits*. But felony is no joking matter.

Tweedledum Blind is not the author of the leaflet, for Tweedledee Schaible publicly states himself to be the author. Blind has only *written* the manuscript of the leaflet, has only *had it printed* by Hollinger, has only corrected the proof-sheets with his own hands, and only *forged* with Hollinger and sent to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* false testimony to refute these facts. But he is nevertheless all injured innocence because he is not the *author* or the *originator* of the leaflet. He only functions as *Tweedledee Schaible's secretary*. That is why he did not know on 4 July 1859 'by whom' the leaflet had been put abroad, and why, on 8 September 1859, he had 'no part at all in the case in question'. Let us therefore calm his fears: *Tweedledee Schaible* is the *author* of the leaflet in the literary sense, but *Tweedledum Blind* is the *author* within the technical meaning of the British law and the *responsible publisher* within the meaning of all civilised legislation. Habeat sibi! <sup>[30]</sup>

One last word to Herr Tweedledee Schaible.

The lampoon against me dated Berne, 23 May 1859, and published by *Vogt* in the Biel *Handels-Courier* was entitled *Zur Warnung*. The leaflet composed by Schaible at the beginning of June 1859 and written out and published by his secretary, Blind, in which *Vogt* is denounced in quite precise detail as a 'bribing' and 'bribed' agent of Louis Bonaparte, is also entitled *Zur Warnung*. Furthermore it is signed: X. Although in algebra X denotes an unknown magnitude, it also coincidentally forms the last letter of my name. Was the purpose of the title and signature of the leaflet perhaps to make it appear that Schaible's 'warning' was *my* reply to *Vogt's* 'warning'? Schaible had promised a revelation No 2 as soon as *Vogt* dared to deny revelation No 1. Not only did *Vogt* deny it, he answered Schaible's 'warning' with a libel action. And Schaible's No 2 is missing to this day. At the head of his leaflet Schaible printed the words: 'Circulate at your pleasure.' And since *Liebknecht* had now done him the 'pleasure' of 'circulating' it through the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, Herr Schaible's tongue was tied from June 1859 until September 1860 by 'circumstances beyond his control', and it was only loosened by the affidavits at Bow Street Police Court.

Be that as it may, Schaible, who had originally denounced *Vogt*, has now publicly assumed responsibility for the statements in the leaflet. Instead, therefore, of closing with the victory of the defendant *Vogt*, the Augsburg Campaign closed with the appearance of the accuser Schaible on the battlefield at last.

## Notes

**1** Ironic reference to Louis Bonaparte, who was offered honorary citizenship by the Swiss canton of Thurgau, where he grew up.

**2** *Rheinische Zeitung* — Appeared in Cologne from January 1842 to March 1843. Founded by members of the bourgeoisie of the Rhineland, who were opposed to Prussian absolutism, it had the collaboration of some Young Hegelians. Marx started working for it in April 1842 and became editor in October of that year. The paper also published articles by Engels. Under Marx's editorship it became increasingly revolutionary and democratic in tone; this led to its banning in April 1843 by the Prussian Government.

**3** Here, to begin with, is someone who starting out from Communism had tried to rise to the loftiest ideas of politics.

**4** If we are to believe M Vogt, this disciple was the oracle of the *Augsburg Gazette* until 1852, when he died in a madhouse.

**5** I have lost labour and oil. Quotation from the Roman writer of comedies, Plautus, put in the mouth of a prostitute who has completed her toilet in vain. There is a pun on 'oleum' (oil) and Ohly.

**6** *Morgenblatt* — A literary daily which in 1840–41 published various articles by Engels on art and literature.

**7** Heine — German lyric poet and essayist living in exile in Paris. Fallmerayer — German orientalist.

**8** *The New York Daily Tribune* appeared from 1841 to 1924. Founded by the American politician and journalist Horace Greely, it was the organ of the left wing of the American Whigs until the mid-1850s and then organ of the Republican Party. In the 1840s and 1850s it took a progressive stance and opposed slavery. One of its editors at this period was Charles Dana, the Utopian socialist writer. Marx contributed to the paper from 1851 to 1862. A large number of the articles were written by Engels at Marx's request; they dealt with important questions concerning the international labour movement, politics, foreign politics, economic developments in Europe, questions of colonial expansion, etc. The editorship of the paper in many cases shortened the articles arbitrarily or used them without acknowledgement as leading articles, at which Marx often protested. Marx finally broke off relationships with the paper when it abandoned its progressive position, especially on the question of slavery.

**9** In 1859, Vogt circulated to Freiligrath and others a political programme in which he made Bonapartist propaganda in favour of the neutrality of the German Confederation in the imminent war between France and Austria.

**10** Statesman.

**11** Vogt naturally derives the Marx clique's attacks on Lord Palmerston from my opposition to his own self-important person and its 'friends' (*Magnum Opus*, p 212). It therefore seems appropriate to call to mind here briefly my relationship with D Urquhart and his party. Urquhart's writings on Russia and against Palmerston interested me but did not convince me. In order to reach a definitive view I subjected Hansard's 'Parliamentary Debates' and the diplomatic *Blue Books* of 1807 to 1850 to a painstaking analysis. The first fruit of these studies was a series of lead articles in the *New York Tribune* (end of 1853) in which I demonstrated Palmerston's connection with the Russian cabinet from his transactions with Poland, Turkey, Circassia, etc. Shortly afterwards I had these articles reprinted in the Chartist organ *People's Paper* edited by Ernest Jones, adding new sections on Palmerston's activities. Meanwhile the *Glasgow Sentinel* had also reprinted one of these articles ('Palmerston and Poland'), which attracted the attention of Mr D Urquhart. As a result of the meeting I had with him, he commissioned Mr Tucker in London to publish a part of that article in pamphlet form. This Palmerston pamphlet was later sold in various editions of from 15,000 to 20,000 copies. As a result of my analysis of the *Blue Book* on the fall of Kars — it appeared in the London Chartist paper (April 1856) — the Sheffield Foreign Affairs Committee sent me a letter of appreciation (see Appendix). While researching into the diplomatic manuscripts in the British Museum I discovered a series of English documents stretching

back from the end of the eighteenth century to the period of Peter the Great, which reveal the constant secret collaboration between the cabinets of London and St Petersburg and make it appear that this collaboration was born in the age of Peter the Great. Of a detailed work on this subject I have as yet only had the introduction printed, under the title 'Revelations of the Diplomatic History of the Eighteenth Century'. It appeared first in the Sheffield and later in the London *Free Press*, both Urquhartite organs. The latter has contained occasional contributions by myself ever since it was founded. My preoccupation with Palmerston and Anglo-Russian diplomacy in general therefore occurred, as one can see, without the slightest suspicion that behind Lord Palmerston there stands Herr Karl Vogt. [Marx's note]

**12** *Morning Star* — Daily which appeared from 1856 to 1869 in London, organ of the Free Trade movement.

**13** The Manchester School consisted of English bourgeois ideologists in the first half of the nineteenth century. They defended free trade, the non-interference of the state in economic affairs, and the uncontrolled exploitation of the workers. Manchester was their chief centre of activity. Their leaders were two textile manufacturers, Cobden and Bright, who in 1838 founded the Anti-Corn-Law League. In the 1840s and 1850s they formed the left wing of the Liberal Party.

**14** *Die Neue Zeit* — Weekly German periodical of the petty-bourgeois German emigrants in London.

**15** *Hermann* — Organ of the German emigration, appeared in London in 1858–59

**16** *Hornisse (Hornet)* — Organ of petty-bourgeois democrats published in Kassel 1848–50.

**17** *Outline or Foundations* — Marx himself produced in 1857–58 a series of notebooks known as the *Grundrisse — Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*.

**18** Basic text — claimed to be divinely inspired — of the Mormon Brotherhood, a religious sect founded in America in 1830.

**19** A word about the Biel *Carpet-Bagger*, the 'Runaway Regent's' own hole-in-the corner *Moniteur*. Publisher and editor of the Biel *Handels-Courier* is a certain Ernst Shüler, a political refugee of 1838, post-master, wine merchant, and bankrupt, who is, meanwhile, in pocket once more, to the extent that his paper, subsidised by the Anglo-French-Swiss advertising business during the Crimean War, now has a circulation of 1200. [Marx's note]

**20** Müllner — minor dramatist. The quotation is actually from a play by the Austrian dramatist Grillparzer.

**21** Scandal sheet.

**22** Venedey had published a letter in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* revealing Vogt's connections with Napoleon Bonaparte.

**23** See also page 4 of the pamphlet quoted, where it says:

This 'settlement of accounts' out of party motives, the want of moral principle that there is in admitting in private that Vogt has played a shabby game with the fatherland... and then allowing this Vogt to accuse openly of slander those who have only said what they know and what they can readily prove, this makes me sick [etc]. [Marx's note]

**24** That portion of the press which was against the union of Germany under Prussian domination.

**25** In the Middle Ages, the German Emperor was called the 'Increaser of the Empire'.

**26** This was the meeting mentioned above, held by D Urquhart on 9 May. [Marx's note]

**27** Mystery.

**28** Biscamp wrote a letter dated London, 20 October, on the Vogt affair to the editors of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, in which he finally offered himself as a correspondent. I only became acquainted with this letter through the *Allgemeine Zeitung* itself. Vogt invents a moral theory according to which support for a paper that has failed makes me responsible for the subsequent private letters of the editor. How much more would Vogt be responsible for Kolatschek's *Stimmen der Zeit* since he was a paid contributor to Kolatschek's *Monatschrift*. As long as Biscamp published the *Volk* he showed the greatest self-sacrifice, giving up a position he had held for years to take over the editorship, editing the paper gratis under the very oppressing circumstances and finally putting his position of correspondent for German papers such as the *Kölnische Zeitung* at risk in order to be able to work in accordance with his convictions. Nothing else was or is any concern of mine. [Marx's note].

**29** *Daily Telegraph* — Originally a Liberal paper; became a conservative organ in the 1880s.

**30** So be it!

## Chapter VIII: Da-Da Vogt and His Studies

'*Sine studio*' <sup>[1]</sup>

Approximately a month before the outbreak of the Italian War there appeared Vogt's so-called *Studien zur gegenwärtigen Lage Europas* (*Studies on the Current Situation in Europe*, Geneva, 1859). Cui bono? <sup>[2]</sup>

Vogt knew that:

*Britain will remain neutral in the forthcoming war.* (*Studien*, p 4)

He knew that Russia 'in agreement with France, will use all means short of open hostilities to damage Austria' (*Studien*, p 13).

He knew that *Prussia* — but let us allow him to say for himself what he knows about Prussia:

It must now have become clear even to the most short-sighted person *that an understanding exists between the Prussian government and the French Imperial government*; that Prussia will not take up the sword to defend Austria's non-German provinces, that she will agree to all measures affecting the defence of the territory of the Confederation, but that otherwise *she will prevent any participation by the Confederation or individual members of the Confederation on Austria's behalf, in order then, in later peace negotiations, to receive her reward for these efforts on the North German plain.* (*Studien*, p 19)

Nett total: In Bonaparte's forthcoming crusade against Austria, Britain will *remain neutral*, Russia will act *hostilely* towards Austria, Prussia will keep whatever hotheads there are among the Confederation members quiet, and Europe will localise the war. Louis Bonaparte will wage the Italian War, as earlier the Russian War, with the permission of higher authority, to a certain extent as the secret general of a European coalition. Since Vogt knows that Britain, Russia and Prussia are acting against Austria, what makes him write *for* Bonaparte? But it appears that, besides the old anti-French feeling 'led by Father Arendt, who has become childish, and the ghost of that old wretch Kahn' (*Studien*, p 121), a kind of national movement was agitating 'the German people' and finding an echo in all sorts of 'chambers and newspapers', 'while the governments are only hesitantly and unwillingly entering the prevailing current' (*Studien*, p 114). It seems that 'the belief in a threat of danger' was causing a 'cry for joint measures' to echo from the German 'people'. The French *Moniteur* (see, among others, issue of 15 March 1859) saw this German movement with 'grief and amazement'.

A kind of crusade against France [it cries] is being preached in the chambers and in the press of some of the states of the German Confederation. She is accused of nourishing ambitious plans that she has denied, of preparing conquests she does not need [etc].



Against these ‘slanders’ the *Moniteur* shows that ‘the Emperor’s’ intervention in the Italian question should ‘on the contrary inspire the greatest confidence in German spirits’, that German unity and her nationality are to a certain extent the hobby-horses of Decembrist France, etc. The *Moniteur* admits, it is true (see 10 April 1859), that certain German apprehensions may seem to be ‘provoked’ by certain Parisian pamphlets — pamphlets in which Louis Bonaparte urgently begs himself to give his people the ‘long-awaited opportunity’ ‘pour s’étendre majestueusement des Alpes au Rhin’ (to stretch majestically from the Alps to the Rhine). ‘But’, the *Moniteur* says:

Germany forgets that France stands under the aegis of legislation that permits no preventive control on the part of the government.

This and similar statements by the *Moniteur* achieved, as was reported to the Earl of Malmsbury (see *Blue Book: On the Affairs of Italy, January to May 1859*), the exact opposite of the intended effect. Perhaps *Karl Vogt* could do what the *Moniteur* could not. His *Studien* are nothing but a *compilation*, translated into German, of *Moniteur*-articles, *Dentu*-Pamphlets <sup>[3]</sup> and Decembrist maps of the future.

Vogt’s hot air about *Britain* is interesting for one reason only — it illustrates the method of his *Studien*. True to his original French sources, he transforms the British Admiral *Sir Charles Napier* into a ‘*Lord Napier*’ (*Studien*, p 4). The literary Zouaves attached to Decembrism know from the Theatre of the Porte St Martin that every English gentleman is at least a Lord.

Britain [*Vogt* tells us] has never been able to remain in harmony with Austria for long. If a *momentary* community of interest brought them together *for a time*, political necessity always separated them again *immediately*. With Prussia, on the other hand, Britain entered again and again into a closer connection [etc]. (*Studien*, p 2)

Indeed! The common struggle of Britain and Austria against Louis XIV lasted, with slight interruptions, from 1689 until 1713, that is to say almost a quarter of a century. In the War of the Austrian Succession, Britain fought for about six years with Austria against Prussia and France. It was not until the Seven Years’ War that Britain allied with Prussia against Austria and France, but by 1762 Lord Bute was already leaving Frederick the Great in the lurch to make proposals for the ‘partition of Prussia’ alternately to the Russian minister Golitsyn and the Austrian minister Kaunitz. In 1790, Britain concluded a treaty with Prussia against Russia and Austria which, however, came to nothing in the very same year. During the anti-Jacobin war, Prussia, despite Pitt’s subsidies, withdrew from the European Coalition through the Treaty of Basle. Austria, on the other hand, incited by Britain, fought on with slight interruptions from 1793 until 1809. Scarcely had Napoleon been defeated when Britain (during the Congress of Vienna itself) immediately concluded a secret treaty (of 3 January 1815) with Austria and France against Russia and Prussia. In 1821, in Hanover, Metternich and Castlereagh reached a new agreement against Russia. So while the British themselves, their historians and parliamentary speakers, choose to speak of Austria as of Britain’s ‘*ancient ally*’, *Vogt* discovers in the French pamphlets published by *Dentu* that serve as his originals that, discounting ‘momentary community of interest’, Britain and Austria were always drawing apart, but that Britain and Prussia, on the other hand, were always in alliance. This could well be the reason why, during the Russian War, Lord *Lyndhurst* cried out to the House of Lords in relation to Prussia: ‘*Quem tu, Romane, caveto!*’ <sup>[4]</sup> Protestant Britain feels antipathy towards Catholic Austria; liberal Britain feels antipathy towards conservative Austria; free-trade Britain feels antipathy towards protectionist Austria; and solvent Britain feels antipathy towards bankrupt Austria. But the element of feeling was always foreign to British history. During his 30-year rule of Britain, Lord *Palmerston*, it is true, occasionally glossed over the fact that he was a vassal of Russia by reference to his feeling of antipathy towards Austria. For example, it was out of ‘antipathy’ towards Austria that, in 1848, he refused British mediation in Italy, which was acceptable to Piedmont and France. According to this, Austria would withdraw to the Adige Line and Verona; Lombardy, if she wanted, could be incorporated into Piedmont; Parma and Modena fell to Lombardy; and Venice formed an independent Italian state under an Austrian Archduke and gave herself a constitution. (See *Blue Book on the Affairs of Italy*, Part II, July 1849, nos 377, 478.) These conditions were in any case more favourable than those of the peace of Villafranca. <sup>[5]</sup> After Radetzky had beaten the Italians at all points, Palmerston proposed the conditions that he himself had rejected. As soon as Russia’s interests demanded the opposite procedure, during the Hungarian War of Independence, he refused to give the

assistance asked for by the Hungarians on the basis of the treaty of 1711, for all his ‘antipathy’ towards Austria. He even refused to make any protest against the Russian intervention because:

The political independence and liberties of Europe are bound up with the maintenance and integrity of Austria as a great European power. (House of Commons, 21 July 1849)

Vogt further tells us:

The interests of the United Kingdom... are *everywhere opposed to them* [the interests of Austria]. (*Studien*, p 2)

‘Everywhere’ is immediately transformed into the Mediterranean:

Britain wishes at all costs to maintain her influence in the Mediterranean and the countries on its coast. Naples and Sicily, Malta and the Ionian islands, Syria and Egypt are the fulcrums of her policy directed towards the East Indies; Austria has *everywhere* created the *liveliest* obstacles for her at all these points. (*Studien*, p 2)

What will *Vogt* not believe from his original sources, the Decembrist pamphlets published by Dentu in Paris! The British have always imagined that they fought for possession of Malta and the Ionian islands alternately with the Russians and the French, but never with Austria; that France, and not Austria, sent an expedition to Egypt and was at this moment establishing herself on the Suez isthmus; that France, and not Austria, made conquests on the north coast of Africa and, allied to Spain, tried to wrest Gibraltar from the British; that Britain concluded the treaty of July 1840 in relation to Egypt and Syria against France but with Austria; that in her ‘*policy directed towards the East Indies*’ Britain had everywhere met the ‘liveliest obstacles’ on the part, not of Austria, but of Russia; that in the only serious dispute between Britain and Sicily — the sulphur question of 1840 <sup>[6]</sup> — it was a *French* and not an Austrian company whose monopoly of the Sicilian sulphur trade had served as a pretext for the friction; and that, finally, on the far side of the channel, there is occasionally talk of the Mediterranean being transformed into a ‘*lac français*’, but never of its being transformed into a ‘*lac autrichienne*’. <sup>[7]</sup> But here an important circumstance must be considered.

That is that in the course of 1858, a map of Europe appeared in London entitled *L’Europe en 1860* (*Europe in 1860*). This map, which was published by the French Embassy and contains many prophetic hints for 1858 — Lombardy-Venice annexed to Piedmont, and Morocco to Spain — redraws the political geography of Europe with the single exception of France, who seems to remain within her old frontiers. With sly irony the territories intended for her are presented to impossible possessors. Thus Egypt falls to Austria, and the note printed on the margin of the map reads: ‘François Joseph I, l’Empereur d’Autriche et d’Egypte’ (Franz Joseph I, Emperor of Austria and Egypt).

Vogt had the map *L’Europe en 1860* in front of him as a kind of Decembrist compass. Hence his conflict between Britain and Austria over *Egypt* and *Syria*. Vogt prophesies that this conflict would ‘end in the destruction of the conflicting powers’, *if*, as he opportunely remembers, ‘*if* Austria possessed *sea power*’ (*Studien*, p 2). But the climax of the historical learning peculiar to his *Studien* is reached in the following quotation:

When Napoleon I *once* tried to break *the English Bank*, the latter had recourse, *for a day*, to counting sums and not weighing them, as had been the custom previously; the Austrian treasury is in the same, indeed far worse, position, 356 days in the year. (*Studien*, p 43)

As we know, the Bank of England (‘the English Bank’ is also a phantom of Vogt’s brain) suspended cash payments from February 1797 to 1821, and for these 24 years British banknotes were not exchangeable for any metal at all, weighed or counted. When the suspension started, there was, as yet, no Napoleon I in France (although there was a General Bonaparte waging his first Italian campaign), and when cash payments were resumed in Threadneedle Street, Napoleon I had ceased to exist in Europe. Such *Studien* even beat La Guéronnière’s conquest of the Tyrol by the ‘Emperor’ of Austria.

Frau von Krüdener, <sup>[8]</sup> the mother of the Holy Alliance, used to distinguish between the principle of Good, the ‘*white angel of the North*’ (Alexander I) and the principle of Evil, the ‘*black angel of the South*’ (Napoleon I). Vogt, the adoptive father of the new Holy Alliance, transforms both, Tsar and

Caesar, Alexander II and Napoleon III, into ‘white angels’. Both are the predestined liberators of Europe.

Piedmont, says Vogt, ‘has *even* earned the respect of Russia’ (*Studien*, p 71).

What more can you say about a state, *than that it has even earned the respect of Russia!* Particularly after Piedmont had ceded the military harbour of Villafranca to Russia, and as the same *Vogt* warns in relation to the purchase of the Jadebusen <sup>[91]</sup> by Prussia:

A military harbour in foreign territory without organic links with the country to which it belongs is such ridiculous nonsense that its existence can only have any meaning if it is regarded to a certain extent as the aim of future endeavours, as a marker set up towards which to lay aim. (*Studien*, p 15)

As we know, Catherine II was already trying to win military harbours in the Mediterranean for Russia.

Tender considerateness towards the ‘white angel’ of the North misleads *Vogt* into a piece of gross exaggeration that infringes the ‘modesty of nature’ as vouchsafed by his original sources from Dentu. In *La vraie question. France–Italie–Autriche* (Paris, 1859, published by Dentu) <sup>[10]</sup> we read on page 20:

In any case, by what right could the Austrian government invoke the inviolability of the treaties of 1815, when she herself violated them by *confiscating Cracow*, whose independence was guaranteed by these treaties? <sup>[11]</sup>

He translates this French original of his into German in the following way:

It is strange to hear such language in the mouth of the *one* government that has up until *now impudently broken the treaties...* by stretching out a sacrilegious hand in peacetime, without any reason, against the *Republic of Cracow*, which was guaranteed by the treaties, and incorporating the same *without any further ado* into the imperial state. (*Studien*, p 58)

Of course, Nicholas annihilated the constitution and the independence of the Kingdom of Poland, guaranteed by the treaties of 1815, out of ‘respect’ for the treaties of 1815. Russia did not respect the integrity of Cracow any the less for the fact that she occupied that free city with Muscovite troops in 1831. In 1836, Cracow was once more occupied by Russians, Austrians and Prussians, was dealt with completely like a conquered country, and was, in 1840, still vainly appealing to Britain and France on the basis of the treaties of 1815. <sup>[12]</sup> Finally, on 22 February 1846, Russians, Austrians and Prussians occupied Cracow once more in order to incorporate it into Austria. The breach of the treaties was committed by the *three northern powers*, and the Austrian confiscation of 1846 was only the final word of the Russian invasion of 1831. Out of delicacy towards the ‘white angel of the North’, *Vogt* forgets the confiscation of Poland and falsifies the history of the confiscation of Cracow. <sup>[13]</sup>

The circumstance that *Russia* is ‘altogether hostile towards Austria and sympathetic towards France’ leaves *Vogt* in no doubt as to Louis Bonaparte’s national-liberationist tendencies, just as the circumstance that ‘his’ (Louis Bonaparte’s) ‘policies are *today most closely* bound up with those of Russia’ permits him no doubt as to the national-liberationist tendencies of Alexander II.

Holy Russia, therefore, must be considered as much ‘a friend of all strivings for freedom’ and of ‘popular and national development’ in the East as Decembrist France is in the West. This watchword was passed out to all the agents of 2 December. ‘Russia’, *Vogt* read in the book *La foi des traités, les puissances signataires et l’empereur Napoleon III*, <sup>[14]</sup> published by Dentu (Paris, 1859):

Russia belongs to the family of the Slavs, a chosen race... There has been surprise at the chivalrous agreement that has suddenly sprung up between France and Russia. There is nothing more natural: *Harmony of principles, agreement on aims*, subordination to the *law of the holy alliance of governments and the peoples*, not to lay traps and coerce, but to guide and support the divine march of the nations. From this most perfect cordiality [between Louis Philippe and Britain there was only the *entente cordiale*, but between Louis Napoleon and Russia *la cordialité la plus parfaite* reigns]

the happiest results have emerged: railways, *the emancipation of the serfs*, trading posts on the Mediterranean, etc. <sup>[15]</sup>

Vogt immediately picks up the ‘emancipation of the serfs’ and hints that ‘the impetus now given... could well make Russia into a friend of aspirations for freedom rather than an enemy of the same’ (*La foi des traités*, p 10).

He, like his Dentu original, derives the impetus for the so-called emancipation of the Russian serfs back to Louis Bonaparte, and for this purpose transforms the Anglo–Turkish Franco–Russian war that gave the impetus into a ‘*French war*’ (*La foi des traités*, p 9).

As we know, the call for the emancipation of the serfs first rang out loud and long under Alexander I. Tsar Nicholas occupied himself with the emancipation of the serfs all his life, created a special Ministry of the Domains for this purpose, had the Ministry carry out preparatory steps in 1843, and even decreed, in 1847, laws on the sale of nobles’ lands that were favourable to the peasants. He was only driven to repeal these in 1848 by fear of the revolution. Thus if the question of the emancipation of the serfs has taken on mightier dimensions under the ‘benevolent Tsar’ as Vogt cordially describes Alexander II, this seems to be due to a development of economic conditions that not even a Tsar can order back.

Moreover, the emancipation of the serfs in the *way intended by the Russian government* would increase Russia’s aggressive power one hundredfold. Its purpose is simply to perfect the autocracy by tearing down the many barriers offered to the great autocrat by the many petty autocrats of the Russian nobility resting on serfdom, as well as by the self-governing peasant communities whose material basis, common ownership, is to be destroyed by the so-called emancipation.

Incidentally, the Russian serfs understand emancipation in quite a different way from the government, and the Russian nobility understand it in yet another different way. The ‘benevolent Tsar’ therefore discovered that real emancipation of the serfs was incompatible with his autocracy, just as the benevolent Pope Pius IX discovered that the emancipation of Italy was incompatible with the conditions for the existence of the papacy. The ‘benevolent Tsar’ therefore saw the only means to postpone an internal revolution in a war of conquest and the continuation of Russia’s traditional foreign policy, which, as the Russian historian Karamsin notes, is ‘immutable’. The lying myth about the dawning of the millennium under Alexander II, diligently spread all over Europe since 1856 by the paid hacks of Russia, loudly proclaimed in 1859 by the Decembrists and pattered out by Vogt in his *Studien*, has been critically annihilated by Prince Dolgorukov in his book *La vérité sur la Russie* (1860). <sup>[16]</sup>

Even before the outbreak of the Italian war, according to Vogt, the alliance between the ‘white Tsar’ and the ‘man of December’, set up for the sole purpose of liberating the nationalities, had proved its worth in the Danube principalities, where the unity and independence of the Romanian nation was sealed by the election of Colonel Cuza <sup>[17]</sup> as Prince of Moldavia and Wallachia:

Austria protests hand and foot, *France and Russia applaud*. (*La foi des traités*, p 65)

In a memorandum (printed in the *Preussisches Wochenblatt*, 1855) <sup>[18]</sup> drafted by the Russian cabinet in 1837 for the then Tsar, we read:

Russia does not like to absorb states with alien elements *immediately*... in any case, it seems more appropriate to allow states whose acquisition has been *decided* to exist for some time under special but quite dependent rulers, as we have done for example in Moldavia and Wallachia [etc].

Before Russia absorbed the Crimea, she proclaimed its *independence*.

A Russian proclamation of 11 December 1814, says, among other things:

Tsar Alexander, your protector, appeals to you Poles. Arm yourselves for the defence of your fatherland and the maintenance of your *political independence*.

And now even the Danube principalities! Russia has worked for their ‘*independence*’ since Peter the Great’s invasion of the Danube principalities. The Empress Anne demanded the independence of the Danube principalities under a Russian protectorate from the Sultan at the Congress of Niemirow (1737). Catherine II insisted on the independence of the provinces under a *European protectorate* at

the Congress of Fokshani (1772). Alexander I continued these efforts and set the seal on them by the transformation of Bessarabia into a Russian province (Treaty of Bucharest, 1812). Nicholas even blessed the Romanians, through Kisselev, with the still-valid *Règlement organique*,<sup>[19]</sup> which organised the most infamous serfdom amidst the cheers of the whole of Europe at this Code of Freedom. In semi-unifying the Danube principalities under Cuza, Nicholas II was only taking the policies of his predecessors over the previous century and a half one step further. *Vogt* discovers that, as a result of this unification under a Russian vassal, ‘the principalities would be a dam to Russian penetration to the South’ (*La foi des traités*, p 61).

Since Russia applauded Cuza’s election (*La foi des traités*, p 65), it is as clear as daylight that the benevolent Tsar is using all his strength to ‘block the route to the South’, even though ‘Constantinople remains a permanent aim of Russian policy’ (*La foi des traités*, p 9).

The twist of decrying Russia as the protector of liberalism and national aspirations is not new. Catherine II was honoured by a whole host of enlightened Frenchmen and Germans as the standard-bearer of progress. The ‘noble’ Alexander I (*Le Grec du Bas Empire*,<sup>[20]</sup> as Napoleon ignobly called him) played in his day the hero of liberalism all over Europe. Did he not bestow upon Finland all the blessings of Russian civilisation? Did he not in his generosity give France not only a constitution but also a *Russian* prime minister? Was he not the secret head of the ‘Hetairie’,<sup>[21]</sup> while at the same time at the Congress of Verona he bribed Chateaubriand to drive Louis XVIII to war against the Spanish rebels? Did he not egg on Ferdinand VII, through his confessor, to send an expedition against the insurgent Latin American colonies, while at the same time he assured the President of the United States of North America of his support against any intervention whatsoever by European powers on the American continent? Did he not send Ypsilanti<sup>[22]</sup> to Wallachia as the head of the ‘holy horde of Greeks’, and did he not betray the horde through that same Ypsilanti and have Vladimiresco, the leader of the Wallachian rebels, treacherously murdered? Nicholas too was, before 1830, greeted in every language, rhymed and unrhymed, as the heroic liberator of the nationalities. When, in 1828–29, he undertook the war against Machmut II for the liberation of the *Greeks*, after, that is to say, Machmut had refused to let a Russian army march in to suppress the Greek rebellion, Palmerston declared to the British parliament that the enemies of the Russian liberators were necessarily the ‘friends’ of the greatest monsters in the world, Dom Miguel,<sup>[23]</sup> Austria and the Sultan. Did not Nicholas, in paternal solicitude, give the Greeks a Russian general, Count Capo d’Istria, as president? Only the Greeks were no Frenchmen, and they murdered the noble Capo d’Istria. Although, from the outbreak of the July revolution of 1830, the main role that Nicholas played was that of patron of reaction, he still did not cease for a moment to labour for the ‘liberation of the nationalities’. A few examples will suffice. The constitutional revolution of September 1843 in *Greece* was led by Katakasi, the Russian minister in Athens, earlier the Inspector General with responsibility over Admiral Heyden during the catastrophe of Navarino.<sup>[24]</sup> The centre of the *Bulgarian* revolution was the Russian consulate in Bucharest. There, in the spring of 1842, the Russian general Duhamel received a Bulgarian delegation and laid before it the plan for a general insurrection. Serbia was to act as the reserve of the revolution, and the position of Hospodar<sup>[25]</sup> of Wallachia was to be conferred upon the Russian general Kisselev. During the Serbian insurrection (1843) Russia, through her embassy in Constantinople, drove Turkey to violent measures against Serbia in order to use this pretext to appeal to the sympathy and fanaticism of Europe against the Turks. Italy, too, was by no means excluded from the liberation plans of Tsar Nicholas: *La Jeune Italie*,<sup>[26]</sup> for a time the Paris organ of Mazzini’s party, explains in an issue of November 1843:

The recent disturbances in Romagna and the movement in Greece are more or less connected... The Italian movement failed because the really democratic party refused to join in it. The *republicans did not* want to *support* a movement set going by *Russia*. Everything in Italy had been prepared for general insurrection. The movement was to start in Naples, where it was expected that part of the army would lead it or immediately make common cause with the patriots. After the outbreak of this revolution, Lombardy, Piedmont and the Romagna were to rise, and an *Italian Empire* was to be founded under the Duke of Leuchtenberg, son of Eugène Beauharnais and son-in-law of the Tsar. *Young Italy foiled the plan*.

*The Times* of 20 November 1843 noted on this information in *Jeune Italie*:

If that great end — the establishment of a new Italian Empire the head of which would be a Russian Prince — could be attained, so much the better; but there was another — an immediate, though perhaps not quite so important advantage to be gained by any outbreak in Italy — the causing of alarm to Austria and the withdrawal of her attention from the fearful projects of Russia *on the Danube*.

After unsuccessfully trying ‘Young Italy’ in 1843, Nicholas sent Herr von Butenev to Rome in March 1844. On behalf of the Tsar, Butenev disclosed to the Pope that Russian Poland was to be ceded to Austria in exchange for Lombardy, which was to form a North Italian kingdom under Leuchtenberg. The *Tablet* of April 1844, at that time the British organ of the Roman Curia, noted on this proposal:

The bait for the Roman Curia contained in this beautiful plan lay in the fact that Poland would fall into Catholic hands, while Lombardy would remain in the possession of a Catholic dynasty as before. But the diplomatic veterans of Rome perceived that while Austria can barely maintain its hold on its own possessions and in all human probability will be forced sooner or later to relinquish its Slav provinces, the cession of Poland to Austria, even if this part of the proposal were seriously intended, would be nothing more than a loan to be repaid at a later date. Whereas North Italy with the Duke of Leuchtenberg would in fact fall under Russian protection and before long would infallibly come beneath the Russian sceptre. The warmly recommended plan was consequently put aside for the present.

So much for the *Tablet* of 1844.

The sole circumstance that has justified Austria’s existence as a state since the middle of the eighteenth century, its resistance to Russian progress in the East — a helpless, inconsistent, cowardly but tough resistance — causes *Vogt* to make the discovery that ‘Austria is the source of all discord in the East’ (*La foi des traités*, p 56). With ‘a certain childishness’ that goes so well with his fat nature, he explains the alliance between Russia and France against Austria, besides the liberationist tendencies of the ‘benevolent Tsar’, from the *ingratitude* of Austria for services rendered by Nicholas during the Hungarian revolution:

In the Crimean War itself Austria went to the last extremes of armed hostile neutrality. It goes without saying that this stance, which moreover bore the stamp of *falseness and fraud*, had to embitter the Russian government to a huge extent towards Austria and thus force it towards France. (*La foi des traités*, pp 10–11)

According to *Vogt*, Russia pursued a sentimental policy. The gratitude showed to the Tsar at Germany’s expense by Austria during the Warsaw Congress and through the march on Schleswig-Holstein <sup>[271]</sup> does not nearly satisfy the grateful *Vogt*.

In his famous dispatch dated Paris, October 1825, the Russian diplomat *Pozzo di Borgo*, says, after first enumerating Austria’s intrigues against Russia’s plans to intervene in the East:

Our policy therefore directs us to show ourselves to this state [Austria] in an intimidating way, and to convince it through our preparations that, if it dares to move against it, the wildest storm it has ever experienced will break about its head.

After *Pozzo* has threatened war from outside and revolution from within, described Austria’s intervention in the ‘provinces’ of Turkey ‘agreeable’ to her as a possible peaceful solution, and depicted Prussia simply as a subordinate ally of Russia, he continues:

*If the Vienna court had given way to our good aims and intentions*, the imperial cabinet’s plan would long have been fulfilled — a plan that extends not only to the seizure of the Danube principalities and Constantinople, but to driving the Turks out of Europe itself.

In 1830, as we know, a secret treaty was concluded between Nicholas and Charles X. It stipulated that France would allow Russia to take possession of Constantinople and would receive the Rhenish Provinces and Belgium in compensation; that Prussia would be compensated by Hanover and Saxony, and that Austria would receive part of the Turkish provinces on the Danube. Under Louis-Philippe, the same plan was, at Russia’s instigation, once more put before the Petersburg cabinet by Molé. Soon

afterwards Brunnov took the document with him to London where he informed the British government of it as proof of France's treachery and used it to form the anti-French coalition of 1840.

Let us now see how Russia, in agreement with France, *was supposed* to exploit the Italian War in the view, inspired by his original Parisian sources, of *Vogt*. Russia's 'national' composition, and in particular the '*Polish nationality*', would seem to create some difficulties for a man whose 'Pole Star' is 'the principle of nationality'. But:

We hold the principle of nationality high; the principle of free self-determination even higher. (*La foi des traités*, p 121)

When Russia annexed by far the greater part of what was actually *Poland* through the treaties of 1815, she obtained such an advanced position to the West, drove such a wedge, not only between Austria and Prussia, but also between East Prussia and Silesia, that even then Prussian officers (for example, Gneisenau) were drawing attention to the intolerable nature of such frontiers shared with an over-powerful neighbour. But it was not until the subjugation of Poland in 1831 placed this area completely at the mercy of the Russians that the true meaning of the wedge emerged. The suppression of Poland only served as a pretext for the fortifications laid out in the grand style at Warsaw, Modlin and Ivangorod. Their real purpose was the complete strategic domination of the Vistula area, the creation of a basis for attacks to the North, South and West. Even Haxthausen, who is rapturous about the orthodox Tsar and everything Russian, sees a quite decisive danger and threat to Germany here. The Russians' fortified position on the Vistula is a greater threat to Germany than all of France's fortresses put together, particularly when Poland's national resistance ceases and Russia is able to use Poland's military strength as her own aggressive force. *Vogt* therefore reassures Germany that *Poland* is *Russian* by free self-determination:

There is no doubt [he says], there is no doubt that, as a result of the strenuous efforts of the Russian People's Party, *the abyss that yawned between Poland and Russia is becoming significantly narrower*, and perhaps it will only require a *slight impulse to bridge it completely*. (*La foi des traités*, p 12)

This slight impulse was to be supplied by the Italian war. (Alexander II, however, convinced himself during this war that Poland had not yet achieved the same level as *Vogt*.) *Poland*, absorbed into Russia by 'free self-determination', would exert a gravitational attraction as a central body upon all the former parts of the dissolved Polish Empire languishing under foreign rule. In order to facilitate this process of attraction, *Vogt* advises Prussia to seize the opportunity to get rid of the 'Slav appendage' (*La foi des traités*, p 17), that is to say Posen (*La foi des traités*, p 97) and probably *West Prussia* too, since only East Prussia is recognised as 'truly German territory'. The parts split off from Prussia would fall back into the central body absorbed by Russia, and the 'truly German territory' of East Prussia would be transformed into a Russian enclave. On the other hand, as regards *Galicja*, which is also incorporated into Russia in the map *L'Europe en 1860*, its separation from Austria was anyway a direct part of the war aims of liberating Germany from Austria's non-German possessions. *Vogt* remembers that:

... before 1848... the portrait of the Russian Tsar was to be seen more frequently in Galicja than that of the Austrian Emperor [and]... given the uncommon skill that Russia possesses in weaving such intrigues, significant grounds would exist here for fears on Austria's part. (*La foi des traités*, p 12)

However, it goes quite without saying that, in order to get rid of this 'internal enemy', Germany must calmly allow the Russians 'to push troops up to the frontier' who support these intrigues. While Prussia herself gives up her Polish provinces, Russia is to use the Italian War to separate Galicja from Austria in the same way, indeed, that, as early as 1809, Alexander I received part of Galicja in payment for his purely theatrical support of Napoleon I. We know that Russia successfully demanded back, partly from Napoleon I and partly from the Congress of Vienna, a portion of the fragments of Poland that had originally fallen to Austria and Prussia. By 1859 the moment had come, according to *Vogt*, to unite the *whole* of Poland with Russia. Instead of the *liberation of the Polish nationality* from Russians, Austrians and Prussians, *Vogt* demands that the *whole of the former Polish Empire should merge and disappear into Russia*. Finis Poloniae!

This ‘Russian’ idea of the ‘restoration of Poland’, which spread all over Europe immediately after the death of Tsar Nicholas, was denounced as early as March 1855 by *David Urquhart* in his pamphlet *The New Hope of Poland*.<sup>[28]</sup>

But Vogt has still not done enough for Russia.

The extraordinarily polite way [says this ‘courteous and sociable fellow’], indeed, the almost fraternal way in which the Russians treated the *Hungarian* revolutionaries contrasted so sharply with the way Austrians proceeded that it could not fail to have full effect. Russia, it is true, overthrew the party [NB: according to *Vogt*, Russia overthrew not *Hungary*, but the *party*] but, in treating it with consideration and courtesy, she laid the basis for a new outlook which could more or less be expressed by saying that one has to choose the lesser of two evils, and *that, in the present case, Russia is not the greater of the two*.<sup>[29]</sup>

How ‘extraordinarily politely, considerately and courteously’ indeed almost ‘fraternally’, does Plon-Plon’s Falstaff conduct the Russians to Hungary and make himself a ‘channel’ for the illusions which brought failure to the Hungarian revolution of 1849. It was *Görgey’s*<sup>[30]</sup> party which at that time spread belief in the idea of a Russian prince as future King of Hungary, and through this belief broke the power to resist of the Hungarian revolution.

Without any particular attachment to any race, the Habsburgs *before* 1848 naturally based their rule on the ruling nationality — the *Magyars*. Let it be said, incidentally, that in general Metternich was the greatest upholder of independent nationalities. He misused them to fight one another, but he needed them in order to misuse them. Therefore he upheld them. Just compare Posen and Galicia. After the revolution of 1848–49, the Habsburg dynasty, which had used the Slavs to beat the Germans and Magyars, attempted in imitation of Joseph II to put the German element in control in Hungary by force. The Habsburgs did not dare to fall into the arms of their saviours, the Slavs, for fear of Russia. Their whole state reaction in Hungary was directed much more against their saviours, the Slavs, than it was against the Magyars they had defeated. In fighting against its own saviours, therefore, the Austrian reaction drove the Slavs back under the banner of the Magyars, as *Szemere*<sup>[31]</sup> has shown in his pamphlet *Hungary, 1848–1860* (London, 1860). Austrian rule *over* Hungary and Magyar rule *within* Hungary therefore coincided *before* and *after* 1848. It is quite different with Russia, whether it rules directly or indirectly in Hungary. Taking the elements related to her ethnically and by religion together, Russia would immediately have at her disposal the *non-Magyar majority of the population*. The Magyar race would immediately succumb to the Slavs, related to the Russians ethnically, and the Wallachians related to them by religion. Russian rule in Hungary is therefore synonymous with the *ruin of the Hungarian nationality*, that is to say of a Hungary historically tied to the rule of the Magyars.<sup>[32]</sup>

*Vogt*, who has the *Poles* absorbed into *Russia* by ‘free self-determination’, has Hungary disappear into *Slavism* under Russian rule.<sup>[33]</sup>

But *Vogt* has still not done enough for Russia.

Among the ‘extra-German provinces’ of Austria, for which the German Confederation is *not* supposed to ‘take up the sword’ against France, and Russia, ‘which sides completely with France’, are to be found not only Galicia, Hungary and Italy, but also and particularly *Bohemia and Moravia*.

‘Russia’, says *Vogt*, ‘offers the fixed point around which the Slavic nationalities are more and more striving to rally.’ (*La foi des traités*, pp 9–10)

Bohemia and Moravia are among the ‘Slavic nationalities’. Just as Muscovy developed into Russia, so Russia must develop into Panslavonia. ‘With the *Czechs*... at our sides we will *succumb* to every *enemy*.’ (*La foi des traités*, p 134) We, that is, Germany, must attempt to get rid of the *Czechs*, that is, Bohemia and Moravia. ‘No guarantee for extra-German possessions of the rulers.’ (*La foi des traités*, p 133) ‘*No more extra-German provinces in the Confederation*’ (*La foi des traités*, p 133) — but only German provinces in France! Not only must ‘the present French Empire’ therefore ‘*be allowed to have its own way*... as long as it does *not infringe on the territory* of the German Confederation’ (*La foi des traités*, p 9, Foreword), but **Russia** too must be ‘allowed to have its own way’ as long as it only infringes on the ‘extra-German provinces in the Confederation’. Russia will help Germany to develop



her 'unity' and 'nationality' by moving troops up on Austria's 'Slavic appendages' that are subject to her intrigues. While Austria is kept busy in Italy by Louis Bonaparte and Prussia sheathes the sword of the German Confederation, the 'benevolent Tsar' will 'know how to support' revolutions in *Bohemia and Moravia* 'secretly with money, weapons and ammunition' (*La foi des traités*, p 13).

And 'with the Czechs at our sides we must succumb to every enemy'!

How generous, then, of the 'benevolent Tsar' to liberate us from Bohemia and Moravia and their Czechs, who, as 'Slavic nationalities', must naturally 'rally round Russia'.

Let us see how our Imperial Vogt defends the Eastern frontier of Germany by incorporating Bohemia and Moravia into Russia. Bohemia Russian! But Bohemia lies in the middle of Germany, separated by Silesia from Russian Poland and by a Moravia Russianised by Vogt from a Galicia and a Hungary Russianised by Vogt. In this way Russia receives a part of the territory of the German Confederation 50 German miles long by 25 to 30 German miles wide. It pushes her Western frontier a full 65 German miles to the West. Since the distance from Eger to Lauterburg in Alsace is only 45 German miles as the crow flies, North Germany would be completely separated from South Germany by the French wedge on the one side and even more by the Russian wedge on the other side, and the *division of Germany would be complete*. The direct route from Vienna to Berlin would pass through Russia, as indeed would the direct route from Munich to Berlin. Dresden, Nuremberg, Regensburg and Linz would be our frontier towns against Russia. Our position in relation to the Slavs in the South would, to say the least, be the same as *before* Charlemagne (while in the West Vogt does not even allow us to go back to Louis XV), and we could cross out a thousand years of our history.

The same purpose that Poland served can be even better served by Bohemia. Prague transformed into a fortified camp with supporting fortresses at the confluences of the Moldau and the Eger with the Elbe — and the Russian army in Bohemia can calmly await the approach of a German army divided from the outset between Bavaria, Austria and Brandenburg. It could allow the strong forces to run up against the fortifications and mop up the weak piecemeal.

Just look at the linguistic map of central Europe — let us take for example a Slav authority, the 'slovanský zeměvid' <sup>[341]</sup> of Šafařík. Here the frontier of the Slav language runs from the coast of Pomerania near Stolp (Słupsk) via Zastrow (Jastrowie) southwards to Chodziehen (Chodzież) on the Netze (Noteć), and then westwards as far as Meseritz (Międzyrzecz). From here, however, it suddenly turns to the south-east. Here the massive wedge of Silesia drives deeply in between Poland and Bohemia. In Bohemia and Moravia, the Slav language then jumps far to the West once more — although it is, admittedly, eroded on all sides by the advance of German elements and studded with German towns and German-speaking enclaves, just as in the North the whole Lower-Vistula area and the better part of East and West Prussia are German and thrust forwards uncomfortably against Poland. Between the most westerly point reached by the Polish and the most northerly point reached by the Bohemian languages, there lies the Lusatian-Wendish language enclave in the middle of the German language area, but in such a way that it almost cuts off Silesia.

For the Russian Panslavist *Vogt*, who has Bohemia at his disposal, there can be no doubt here where the natural frontier of the Slav empire lies. From Meseritz it runs directly to Lieberose and Lübben, and from there to the point where the Elbe breaks through the mountains on the Bohemian border, and then it goes on to follow the southern and western frontiers of Bohemia and Moravia. Everything to the East is Slav; the few German enclaves and other intruders can no longer stand in the way of the development of the great Slav whole; anyhow, they have no right to be where they are. Once this 'pan Slav condition' has been created, then it follows naturally that a similar rectification of frontiers is necessary in the South. Here too a German wedge has unwarrantably obtruded between northern and southern Slavs, occupying the Danube valley and the Styrian Alps. *Vogt* cannot tolerate this wedge, and so, logically, he annexes Austria, Salzburg, Styria and the German parts of Carinthia to Russia. *Vogt* has already unfolded, in defiance of Austria, the fact that, in this creation of the Slavo-Russian empire, according to the tried and tested tenets of the 'nationality principle', the handful of Magyars and Romanians will also fall to Russia, along with various Turks, as a punishment for intruding between the northern and southern Slavs.

In this operation we Germans lose — nothing more than East and West Prussia, Silesia, parts of Brandenburg and Saxony, the whole of Bohemia, Moravia and the rest of Austria apart from the Tyrol

(a part of which falls to the share of the Italian ‘nationality principle’) — and our national existence into the bargain!

But let us stay with the immediate proposals to make Galicia, Bohemia and Moravia *Russian!*

Under such conditions, German Austria, South-West Germany and North Germany could never act together except — and it would necessarily come to this — *under Russian leadership.*

Vogt has us Germans sing what his Parisians sang in 1815:

Vive *Alexandre*,  
Vive *le roi des rois*,  
Sans rien *prétendre*,  
Il nous donne *des lois*. <sup>[35]</sup>

The *Vogtian* ‘nationality principle’, which he hoped in 1859 to realise by the alliance of the ‘white angel of the North’ with the ‘white angel of the South’, is supposed therefore in his *own* view to show its worth first of all in the annexation of the Polish nationality, the annihilation of the Magyar nationality and the deterioration of the German nationality all in the interests of — *Russia.*

I have not mentioned his original *Dentu* pamphlets this time because I was holding in reserve a *single* striking example to prove that in everything that he half hints at and half lets slip a watchword passed out by the Tuileries is being obeyed. In the issue of *Pensiero ed Azione* <sup>[36]</sup> for 2–16 May 1859, in which he predicts events which were later to take place, Mazzini notes, among other things, that in the coalition between Alexander II and Louis Bonaparte the first stipulation read: ‘*abbandono assoluto della Polonia*’ (absolute abandonment of Poland on the part of France, which *Vogt* translates into ‘the complete bridging of the abyss that yawns between Poland and Russia’).

Che la guerra si prolunghi e assuma... proporzioni europee, l’insurrezione delle provincie oggi turche preparata di lunga mano e quelle dell’*Ungheria*, daranno campo all’Alleanza di rivelarsi... Principi russi governerebbo le provincie che surgerebbo *sulle rovine* dell’Impero Turco e dell’*Austria*... *Constantino di Russia* è già proposto ai malcontenti ungheresi. (See *Pensiero ed Azione*, 2–16 May 1859)

But should the war be prolonged and assume European proportions, then the insurrection in the present Turkish provinces and Hungary, which has long been prepared, will give the Alliance an opportunity to reveal itself... Russian princes will rule the states that will arise on the ruins of Turkey and Austria... Constantine of Russia has already been proposed to the Hungarian malcontents.

\* \* \*

*Vogt’s Russianism* is, however, only secondary. In it, he is only following a watchword passed out from the Tuileries, only seeking to prepare Germany for manoeuvres that were agreed upon between Louis Bonaparte and Alexander II for certain eventualities in the war against Austria, and in fact only slavishly echoing the pan-Slav phrases of original Parisian pamphlets. His real business is to sing the *Song of Ludwig* <sup>[37]</sup> (Louis):

I know of a king yclept Sir Ludovic  
Who gladly God [that is, the nationalities] serves.

We heard earlier how *Vogt* praises Sardinia by the assertion that ‘*she has even earned the respect of Russia*’. Now the parallel.

There is no mention [he says] of Austria in the statements [by Prussia]... the language would be no different in the case of an approaching war between North America and Cochin China. But Prussia’s German vocation, German obligations, old Prussia, that is emphasised with relish. *France* [according to his statement on page 27 on France: ‘France is now summed up... solely in the person of her ruler.’] *consequently hands out praise through the Moniteur and the rest of the press* — Austria rages.

The fact that Prussia has a correct conception of her ‘German vocation’ flows from *the praise handed out* to her by Louis Bonaparte in the *Moniteur* and the rest of the December press. (*Studien*, p 18)

What cool impertinence! It will be remembered how, out of tenderness towards the ‘white angel of the North’, Vogt has Austria *alone* break the treaties of 1815 and alone confiscate Cracow. He now performs the same labour of love for the ‘white angel of the South’:

This ecclesiastical state on whose republic [the republic of the ecclesiastical state] *Cavaignac*, the representative of the doctrinaire republican party... and the military counterpart of Gagern <sup>[38]</sup> [that too is a parallel!] committed foul *genocide* [commit genocide on the republic of a state!], which did not, however, help him to ascend the presidential chair. (*Studien*, p 69)

So it was *Cavaignac* and not *Louis Bonaparte* who committed ‘*foul genocide*’ on the Roman Republic! Indeed, in November 1848 *Cavaignac* sent a fleet to Civitavecchia for the personal defence of the Pope. But it was not until the following year, not until months after *Cavaignac* had been removed from the presidential chair, not until 9 February 1849 that the secular rule of the Pope was abolished and *the Republic proclaimed in Rome*, and so *Cavaignac* could not at all have murdered a republic that did not yet exist when he was in power. On 22 April 1849, *Louis Bonaparte* sent General Oudinot to Civitavecchia with 14,000 men, after fraudulently obtaining the funds required for the expedition against Rome from the National Assembly by the solemnly-repeated assurance that he only intended to resist an intended Austrian attack on the Roman States. As we know, the Paris catastrophe of 13 June 1849 arose from the decision of Ledru-Rollin and the Mountain <sup>[39]</sup> — to take vengeance for the ‘foul genocide of the Roman Republic’, which was at the same time ‘a foul breach of the French constitution’ and a ‘foul infringement of the decision of the National Assembly’, on the person of the author of all these foul deeds, *Louis Bonaparte*, by putting him on trial. One can see how ‘foully’ the vile sycophant of the *coup d’état*, how impertinently *Vogt falsifies* history in order to place Sir ‘Ludovic’s’ vocation of liberating the nationalities in general and Italy in particular beyond the shadow of a doubt. He now sets this right in the following way:

The present Empire has no party among the educated, no party... in the French bourgeoisie. To it *belong* only two masses, the army and the rural proletariat *that cannot read or write*. But that constitutes nine-tenths of the population and embraces the mighty organised instrument with which resistance can be smashed and the *herd of mortgage-helots* who possess nothing but *a vote in the ballot-box*. (*Studien*, p 25)

The non-urban population of France, including the army, amounts to scarcely two-thirds of the entire population. *Vogt* transforms less than two-thirds into nine-tenths. The whole French population outside of the towns, one-fifth of which approximately consists of prosperous landowners, and another one-fifth of which consists of people without land or property, he transforms one and all into small peasants, ‘mortgage helots’. Finally, he abolishes all reading and writing in France outside of the towns. Here he falsifies statistics, as he did earlier history, in order to give his hero a bigger pedestal. The hero himself is now placed on this pedestal:

France is now in fact summed up solely in the person of her ruler, of whom Masson <sup>[40]</sup> [also an authority] said ‘he possesses great qualities as a statesman and a sovereign, an unshakable will, a sure tact, powerful resolve, a strong heart, a high, bold spirit and complete ruthlessness’. (*Studien*, p 27)

wie saeleclîche stât im an  
allez daz, daz êr begât!  
wie gâr sîn lîp ze wunsche stât!  
wie gênt îm so gelîche inein  
die finen keiserlîchen bein. (*Tristan*) <sup>[41]</sup>

*Vogt* seizes the censer from Masson in order to swing it himself. To Masson’s catalogue of virtues he adds ‘cold calculation’, ‘powerful scheming’, ‘the cunning of the serpent’ and ‘tough patience’ (*Studien*, p 28), and then, like a Tacitus of the ante-chamber, he stammers: ‘The *origin* of this reign was a *horror*’, which is itself — a nonsense. Above all he has to melodramatise the grotesque figure of his hero into a great man, and so ‘Napoleon the Small’ <sup>[42]</sup> becomes this ‘*man of destiny*’ (*Studien*, p 36).

Should *present conditions* [cries *Vogt*] lead to a *change* [what a modest expression, a *change*] in his [the man of destiny’s] government, it will certainly not lack our *ardent*

*congratulations*, even if we *may not*, for the time being, conceive any prospect of it.  
(*Studien*, p 29)

How seriously this ardent admirer took his congratulations *in petto* <sup>[43]</sup> can be seen from the following:

If peace persists, however, *conditions at home* will become more and more untenable as each day passes, because the French army has a far more intimate connection with the party of the educated than is the case, for example, in German states, in Prussia and Austria — because these parties find an echo, particularly among the officers, and so one fine day the *only active power base* the Emperor has may slip from his fingers.  
(*Studien*, pp 26–27)

So '*conditions at home*' became '*more and more untenable*' if 'peace persisted'. Therefore *Vogt* had to try to make Louis Bonaparte's *breach of the peace* easier. The army, 'the only active base' of his 'power', threatens to 'slip out of his fingers'. That is why *Vogt* proved that Europe had the task of binding the French 'army' once more firmly to Louis Bonaparte through a war 'localised' in Italy. Indeed, at the end of 1858, it looked as if the role played by *Badinguet*, as the Parisians disrespectfully call 'his uncle's nephew', was going to come to a dreadful end. The general trade crisis of 1857–58 had paralysed French industry. The government's manoeuvres aimed at preventing an acute outbreak of crisis made the disease chronic, so that the slump in French trade dragged on until the outbreak of the Italian war. On the other hand, corn prices fell so low between 1857 and 1859 that the complaint loudly resounded at various *Congrès agricoles* <sup>[44]</sup> that, with the low prices and the heavy burdens weighing down upon it, French agriculture was becoming impossible. Louis Bonaparte's ridiculous attempt to raise corn prices artificially by a Ukase that was supposed to order all the bakers in France to lay in stocks of grain merely betrayed his government's helpless embarrassment.

The *coup d'état*'s foreign policy only produced a series of unsuccessful attempts to play the Napoleon — nothing but forays, always crowned by official withdrawals. Thus there were his intrigues against the United States, the manoeuvres to revive the slave trade and his melodramatic threats to Britain. The liberties that Louis Napoleon at that time permitted himself to take in relation to Switzerland, Sardinia, Portugal and Belgium — although in Belgium he was not even able to frustrate the fortification of Antwerp — merely threw his fiascos in relation to the great states into sharper relief. 'Napoléon le petit' had become a standing joke in the British parliament, and in its closing articles in 1858 *The Times* made fun of the 'man of iron' as a 'man of gutta-percha'. Meanwhile *Orsini's* <sup>[45]</sup> hand-grenades had flashed their warning over the internal situation in France. It became clear that Louis Bonaparte's regime was still as unstable as it had been in the first days of the coup. The *Lois de Sûreté publique* <sup>[46]</sup> betrayed his complete isolation. He had to abdicate in favour of his own generals. France was divided, according to the Spanish custom, into five Captaincy-Generals, an unheard-of event. <sup>[47]</sup> Through the introduction of the regency, *Pélissier* was in fact recognised as the highest authority in France. In any case, the renewal of the terror did not intimidate anybody. The Dutch nephew of the Battle of Austerlitz <sup>[48]</sup> appeared merely grotesque instead of terrible. *Montalembert* <sup>[49]</sup> could play the *Hampden* in Paris, *Berryer* and *Dufaure* could in their speeches for the defence betray the aspirations of the bourgeoisie, and *Proudhon*, <sup>[50]</sup> in Brussels, could proclaim Louis Philippism with an *acte additional*, while Louis Bonaparte himself betrayed to the whole of Europe the growing power of the Marianne. During the *Châlons* uprising, <sup>[51]</sup> when the officers heard the news that the republic had been proclaimed in Paris, they first of all carefully inquired at the Prefecture whether the republic really had been proclaimed, instead of falling upon the insurgents. Here was striking proof that even the army regarded the restoration empire as a pantomime whose final scene was approaching. The arrogant officers' scandalous duels in Paris, at the same time as scandalous killings on the Bourse in which the most prominent chiefs of the Tenth of December gang were compromised; the fall of *Palmerston's* ministry in Britain because of his alliance with Louis Bonaparte; <sup>[52]</sup> and finally a treasury that could only be refilled on this extraordinary pretext — such was the position of the bas empire at the end of 1858. Either the *Brummagem* empire fell, or the farce of a Napoleonic empire *within* the frontiers of the treaties of 1815 had come to an end. But what was needed for that was a *localised war*. The mere prospect of a war with Europe would at that point have

been sufficient to set off the explosion in France. Any child could grasp what *Horsman* said in the British parliament:

We know that France will support the emperor as long as our hesitation allows his foreign policy to be successful, but we have reason to believe that she will desert him as soon as we offer him decisive opposition.

Everything depended on *localising* the war, that is, conducting it with the permission of higher authority in Europe. France herself had to be prepared for the war by a series of peace negotiations and their repeated failure. Louis Bonaparte nearly came unstuck here. Lord Cowley, the British ambassador, had travelled to Vienna with proposals drafted by Louis Bonaparte and endorsed by the British cabinet (Derby). Under pressure from Britain the proposals were unexpectedly adopted there (see the *Blue Book* quoted above). Cowley had just returned to London with the news of the ‘peaceful settlement’, when the report also arrived there suddenly that Louis Bonaparte had given up his own proposals and had joined a conference proposed by Russia to discuss measures to be taken against Austria. The war only became possible through the intervention of Russia. Had Russia not needed Louis Bonaparte at that time for the execution of her plans — either to *impose them with French help* or to *transform Austria and Prussia into her helpless tools through blows from France* — then Louis Bonaparte would at that time have fallen. But despite Russia’s secret support, despite the promises of Palmerston, who at Compiègne had endorsed the conspiracy of Plombières, <sup>[53]</sup> everything still depended on the attitude of Germany, since, on the one hand, the Tory cabinet was still at the helm in Britain and, on the other, the silent rebellion of the day in France would have been driven into the open by the prospect of a European war.

Vogt himself lets slip the fact that he sang his *Song of Ludwig* neither out of a lively sympathy for Italy, nor out of fear of the timorous, conservative despotism of Austria, which is as clumsy as it is brutal. He believed rather that, if Austria, who, it must be noted, was *forced* to declare war, was herself victorious in Italy, ‘the revolution would in any case break out in France, the empire would fall, and quite a different future would be brought about’. He believed that ‘the Austrian army would not be capable, in the last analysis, of withstanding the popular forces that would be released in France’, and that ‘the victorious arms of Austria would create in the revolution in France, Italy and Hungary the opponent that would have to destroy them’ (*Studien*, p 131).

For him, however, it was a matter, not of liberating Italy from Austria, but of enslaving France to Louis Bonaparte.

Is there any proof needed that *Vogt* is merely one of the countless mouthpieces through which the grotesque ventriloquist of the Tuileries made himself heard in foreign tongues?

It will be remembered that, at the time when Louis Bonaparte first discovered his vocation of liberating the nationalities in general and Italy in particular, France offered a spectacle unparalleled in her history. The whole of Europe marvelled at the obstinacy with which she rejected ‘les idées napoléoniennes’. <sup>[54]</sup> The enthusiasm with which even the ‘*chiens savants*’ of the Corps législatif cheered Morny’s peace assurances; <sup>[55]</sup> the peevish notes in which the *Moniteur* lectured the nation now on its lapse into material interests, now on its lack of patriotic vigour and its doubts as to Badinguet’s skill as a general and his political wisdom, the soothing official messages to all France’s chambers of commerce; the Emperor’s assurances that ‘étudier une question n’est pas la créer’ <sup>[56]</sup> — all this still lives in the memory of the public. At the time the British press, amazed at this spectacle, abounded in well-meaning twaddle about the transformation into peace-lovers that had taken place in the character of the French, the Bourse treated ‘war’ and ‘no war’ as a ‘duel’ between Louis Napoleon, who wanted war, and the nation, which did not, and bets were laid over who would win, the nation or ‘his uncle’s nephew’. In order to depict the situation at the time, I wish only to quote a few passages from the London *Economist* which, as the organ of the City, as the spokesman of the Italian war, and as the property of Wilson (the Chancellor of India and tool of Palmerston who died recently), possessed great importance:

Alarmed at the colossal uproar which has been created, the French Government is now trying the soothing system. (*The Economist*, 15 January 1859)

In its issue of 22 January 1859, in an article entitled ‘The Practical Limits of the Imperial Power in France’, *The Economist* says:

... whether the Emperor's designs for a war in Italy are or are not carried out to their completion, *one* fact at least has become conspicuous enough — that his plans have received a very severe and probably unexpected check in the chilling attitude assumed by popular feeling in France and the complete absence of any sympathy with the Emperor's scheme... He proposes a war... and the French people show nothing but alarm and discontent — the government securities are depreciated, the fear of the tax-gatherer subdues every gleam of political or martial enthusiasm, the commercial portion of the nation is simply panic-struck, the rural districts are dumb and dissatisfied, fearing fresh conscriptions and fresh imposts — the political circles which have supported the Imperial regime most strongly, as a *pis alley* against anarchy, discourage war for exactly the same reason for which they support that regime... it is certain that Louis Napoleon has found an extent and depth of opposition throughout all classes in France to a war, even in Italy, which he did not anticipate.

It was at this popular sentiment in France that *that* part of the Dentu original pamphlet was aimed which 'in the name of the people' ordered the 'Emperor' to help France 'finally to stretch majestically from the Alps to the Rhine', and to cease his resistance to the 'war lust' and 'urge of the nation to liberate the nationalities'. *Vogt* blows the same horn as the prostitutes of December. At the very moment that Europe was marvelling at France's obstinate desire for peace, *Vogt* was discovering that 'today this fickle people' — the French — '*appears to be filled with war-like lusts*' (*Studien*, pp 29–30), while Sir Ludovic was only following the 'predominant trend of the day' which strives precisely for 'the liberation of the nationalities' (*Studien*, p 31). He believed, of course, not a syllable of what he wrote.<sup>1571</sup> In his *Programme* calling on the democrats to collaborate with his Bonapartist propaganda, he explains very precisely that the Italian war is *unpopular* in France:

I do not believe in any immediate threat to the Rhine, but it could *emerge subsequently*, a war *there* or against Britain would almost make Louis Napoleon popular, the war in *Italy does not have this popular side*. (*Magnum Opus*, Documents, p 34)

If then one part of the Dentu original pamphlet sought to kick the French nation out of its 'peaceful lethargy' and put Louis Bonaparte's private desires into the nation's mouth, the other part, with the *Moniteur* at the head, had the task of convincing above all Germany of the Emperor's aversion to territorial gains and of his ideal vocation as the Messiah of the liberation of the nationalities. The proofs of the unselfishness of his policies on the one hand and of his nationality-liberating proclivities on the other are easily learned by heart, as they are constantly repeated and revolve around only two axes. Proof of the unselfishness of Decembrist policies — *the Crimean War*. Proof of the nationality-liberating proclivities — *Colonel Cuza and the Romanian nationality*. In this it was the *Moniteur* that set the tone. See the *Moniteur* of 15 March 1859 on *the Crimean War*. The *Moniteur* of 10 April 1859 says on the *Romanian nationality*:

In Germany, as in Italy, she [France] wants the nationalities recognised by the treaties to maintain and even strengthen themselves. In the Danubian principalities he [the Emperor] has taken pains to help the legitimate wishes of these principalities to triumph, to satisfy in this part of Europe too the order based on national interests.

See too the pamphlet published at the beginning of 1859 by *Dentu: Napoléon III et la question roumaine*.<sup>1581</sup> With reference to *the Crimean War*:

Finally, what compensation has France demanded for the blood she has spilt and the millions she has spent on the Orient in an exclusively European interest? (*La vraie Question* (Dentu, Paris, 1859), p 13)

*Vogt* germanises this theme, played in endless variations in Paris, so correctly that *E About*, the talkative magpie of Bonapartism, seems to have retranslated *Vogt's* German translation back into French. See *La Prusse en 1860*. Here too we are pursued by the *Crimean War* and the *Romanian nationality under Colonel Cuza*:

But this much at least we do know [*Vogt* echoes the *Moniteur* and the original Dentu pamphlets] that France did not win a foot of ground [in the Crimea] and that the *uncle*,

after *the victorious campaign*, would not have been satisfied with the slender results of conclusive superiority in the art of war. (*Studien*, p 33)

Here, after all, an *essential* dissimilarity with the old Napoleonic policy becomes evident. (*Studien*, p 34)

As if Vogt had to prove to us that '*Napoléon le Petit*' is not the real Napoleon! <sup>[59]</sup> Vogt could, with equal justice, have prophesied in 1851 that the nephew, who had nothing to compare with the first Italian campaign and the expedition to Egypt except the adventure at Strasburg, the expedition to Boulogne and the sausage review at Satory, <sup>[60]</sup> would never imitate 18 Brumaire and still less ever mount the Imperial throne. There was, after all, 'an essential dissimilarity with the old Napoleonic policy'. There is also a dissimilarity between waging a war against a European coalition and waging a war with the permission of a European coalition.

The 'glorious Crimean campaign', in which Britain, France, Turkey and Sardinia together, after two years, managed to 'conquer' one half of one Russian fortress, and in return lost a whole Turkish fortress (Kars) to Russia, and at the conclusion of peace at the Congress of Paris <sup>[61]</sup> had humbly to 'beg the permission' of the enemy to ship their troops home without interference — was indeed anything but 'Napoleonic', and glorious at all only in *Bazancourt's* novel. <sup>[62]</sup> But the Crimean War proved all sorts of things. Louis Bonaparte *betrayed* the supposed ally (Turkey) in order to obtain an alliance with her supposed enemy. The first fruit of the Treaty of Paris was the sacrifice of the 'Circassian nationality' and the Russian annihilation of the Crimean Tartars, and no less the dashing of the national hopes that the Poles and Swedes had linked to a Western European crusade against Russia. Another moral of the Crimean War was that Louis Napoleon could *not* wage a *second* Crimean War. He could not lose an old army and gain a new national debt in exchange for the consciousness that France was rich enough 'de payer sa propre gloire'; <sup>[63]</sup> that the name of Louis Napoleon figures on a European treaty; that 'the conservative and dynastic press of Europe' — so highly does Vogt rate him (*Studien*, p 32) — unanimously recognises 'the virtues as a ruler, the wisdom and the moderation of the Emperor'; and that all Europe at the time did him all the *honneurs* due to a real Napoleon on the express condition that, following the example of Louis-Philippe, he stayed well within the 'bounds of practical reason', that is, the Treaties of 1815, and did not for a moment forget the thin line that separates the buffoon from the hero that he represents. The political permutations, the rulers and the social conditions which made it possible for the chief of the December gang to play the Napoleon at all, first of all in France and then outside of French territory, belong in fact to *his* epoch, not to the annals of the great French Revolution:

The fact remains at least that present French policy in the East did justice to the striving of one nationality [the *Rumanian*] for unification. (*Studien*, pp 34–35)

As has already been mentioned, Cuza is keeping the position open either for a Russian governor or for a Russian vassal. On the map *L'Europe en 1860* a Grand-Duke of Mecklenburg figures as the vassal. Russia of course allowed Louis Bonaparte all the *honneurs* of *this* Rumanian emancipation, while she herself pocketed all the advantages. The path towards her further benevolent intentions was blocked by Austria. What the Italian war had to do, therefore, was *to transform Austria from being an obstacle into being a tool*.

As early as 1858, the ventriloquist of the Tuileries was playing the 'Rumanian nationality' on his countless mouthpieces. One of Vogt's authorities, *Mr Kossuth*, could therefore reply, as early as 20 November 1858, at a lecture in Glasgow:

Wallachia and Moldavia receive a constitution hatched out in the cave of secret diplomacy... it is in reality no more and no less than a charter granted to Russia for the purpose of disposing of the Principalities.

The 'principle of nationality' was therefore misused by Louis Bonaparte in the Danubian principalities in exactly the same way that the *Austrian government* misused the 'principle of nationality' in 1848–49 to strangle the Magyar and German revolution through Serbs, Slavonians, Croats, Wallachs, etc.

The *Rumanian people* — and this is taken in hand simultaneously by the Russian Consul in Bucharest and the interests of the Boyar scum of Moldavia-Wallachia, the majority of whom are not even

Rumanians but a colourful mosaic of foreign adventurers, a kind of oriental December gang — the Rumanian people still languish as they did before under the most terrible feudal bondage, such as could *only* be organised by *Russians* under a *réglement organique* and only be maintained by an oriental demi-monde.

In order to refurbish the wisdom he had drawn from his original Dentu source with his own eloquence, *Vogt* says:

Austria already had quite enough with one Piedmont in the South; she does not need a second in the East. (*Studien*, p 64)

Piedmont annexes *Italian* territories. So do the Danubian principalities, the most unwarlike area of Turkey, annex Rumanian territories? Conquer Bessarabia from Russia, Transylvania, the Banat of Temesvár and the Bukovina from Austria? *Vogt* not only forgets the ‘benevolent Tsar’, he also forgets that in 1848–49 *Hungary* did not appear at all inclined to let these more or less Romanian territories be separated from her, and answered their ‘cry of pain’ with a drawn sword, and that it was much more *Austria* who unleashed such ‘propaganda of the nationality principle’ *against Hungary*.

But *Vogt’s Studies* shine once more in the fullest brilliance of their historical erudition when, quoting some half-remembered occasional pamphlet he has leafed through, he quite calmly ‘*derives* the miserable condition of the principalities... from the disruptive poison of the *Greeks* and *Fanariotes*’ (*Studien*, p 63).

He does not suspect that the *Fanariotes* (so named after a quarter of Constantinople) are those very same identical Greeks who, since the beginning of the eighteenth century, have lived in the Danube principalities under Russian protection. It is in part the descendants of these *Limondji* (lemonade-sellers) of Constantinople who are now playing ‘Rumanian nationality’ once more in the service of Russia.

\* \* \*

So, then, the white angel of the North proceeds from the East and annihilates the nationalities in honour of the Slav race, while the white angel of the South proceeds from the opposite direction as the standard-bearer of the nationalities and ‘one must *wait* until the liberation of the nationalities by this man of destiny has ensued’ (*Studien*, p 36).

During this operation schemed up ‘in the closest collaboration’ between the two angels and ‘two greatest external enemies of German unity’ (*Studien*, Second Edition, Afterword, p 154) — what role does the Reichs-Vogt, who is, however, no ‘Extender of the Reich’, ascribe to *Germany*?

It *must* now have become clear even to the most short-sighted person that an understanding exists between the Prussian government and the Imperial French government; that Prussia will not take up the sword to defend Austria’s non-German provinces [including, of course, Bohemia and Moravia]; that she will agree to all measures affecting the defence of the territory of the Confederation [excluding its extra-German provinces]; but that otherwise she will prevent any participation by the Confederation or any individual members on Austria’s behalf, in order then, in later peace negotiations, *to receive her reward for these efforts on the North German plain*. (*Studien*, First Edition, pp 18–19)

By trumpeting abroad, even before the actual outbreak of the war against Austria, the secret entrusted to him by the Tuileries, that Prussia was acting in a ‘secret *understanding*’ with ‘Germany’s external enemy’, who would pay her ‘her reward on the North German plain’, *Vogt* of course rendered Prussia the best help in achieving her alleged aims. He aroused the suspicions of the other German governments not only towards her efforts to secure neutrality but also towards her claim to the supreme command in the course of the war.

Whatever the path may be [says *Vogt*] that Germany has to take in the present crisis, there is no question that she has to take a definite path energetically, while the unhappy *Bundestag* now... [etc] (*Studien*, p 96)

The dissemination of the view that Prussia’s path lies arm in arm with the ‘external enemy’ and that it leads to the swallowing up of the Northern plain could well create the unity lacking in the *Bundestag*.



The attention of *Saxony* in particular is drawn to the fact that Prussia has already once inflicted on her 'the loss of some of her fairest provinces' (*Studien*, p 93). The 'purchase of the *Jadebusen*' is denounced (*Studien*, p 15).

*Holstein* was to form the price of Prussia's collaboration [in the Turkish War] when the notorious theft of the despatches gave the negotiations a different turn... Mecklenburg, Hanover, Oldenburg, Holstein and whatever else there is more or less around there... these German sister states formed the bait at which Prussia ['at every opportunity', moreover] greedily snaps. (*Studien*, pp 14–15)

And with which, as Vogt lets slip, she is hooked on this occasion by Louis Bonaparte. On the one hand, Prussia 'will and must reach the coast of the North Sea and the Baltic at the expense of her German sisters' (*Studien*, p 14) and by a secret 'understanding' with Louis Bonaparte. On the other hand: 'Prussia will not have a *natural frontier* until the *watershed* of the Erz and Fichtel Mountains is continued *through* the white Main and the line of the Main as far as Mainz.' (*Studien*, p 93)

Natural frontiers in the middle of Germany! And formed, what is more, by a *watershed* that *runs through a river!* Discoveries like this in the field of physical geography — and the 'channel' that 'crops up' (see *Magnum Opus*) is one of them — place the 'rounded character' on the same level as A von Humboldt. At the same time as he instilled in the German Confederation such confidence in the leadership of Prussia, Vogt, not satisfied with the 'old rivalry between Prussia and Austria on German territory', etc, invented a rivalry between the two 'which has so often emerged on territory *outside Europe*' (*Studien*, p 20). It must be supposed that this territory *outside Europe* is on the moon.

In fact Vogt merely translates into words the map *L'Europe en 1860* published by the *French* government in 1858. On this map Hanover, Mecklenburg, Brunswick, Holstein and Electoral Hesse, along with the various Waldecks, Anhalts, Lippes, etc, are annexed to Prussia, while 'L'Empereur des Français conserve ses [!] limites actuelles', the Emperor of the French keeps his (!) present frontiers. 'Prussia as far as the Main' is at the same time a catchphrase of Russian diplomacy. (See for example, the Memorandum of 1837 that has already been mentioned.) A Prussian North Germany would come face to face with an Austrian South Germany separated by natural frontiers, tradition, religion, dialect and ethnic differences, the *division* of Germany into *two* would be accomplished by the simplification of her internal contradictions, and the Thirty Years' War would be declared in permanence.

Such then, according to the first edition of the *Studien*, is the '*reward*' that Prussia is to receive for her '*efforts*' to keep the sword of the Confederation sheathed during the war. That is to say that in Vogt's *Studien* as in the map *L'Europe en 1860* it is *not Louis Bonaparte, but Prussia* who seeks and finds territorial gains and natural frontiers through the *French* war against Austria.

It was, however, not until the Afterword of the second edition of his *Studien*, which appeared during the Franco-Austrian War, that Vogt revealed Prussia's true task. She was to start a *civil war* (see second edition, p 152) in order to set up a 'unified central authority' (*Studien*, p 153), in order to incorporate Germany into the Prussian monarchy. While Russia proceeds from the East and Austria is held in check by Louis Bonaparte in Italy, Prussia is to open a *dynastic 'civil war'* in Germany. Vogt guarantees the Prince Regent that the 'war now unleashed' in Italy will take up 'at least 1859, while the unification of Germany, carried out with rapid decision, will not cost *as many weeks* as the Italian campaign will months' (*Studien*, p 155).

The civil war in Germany would only cost weeks! Apart from the Austrian troops who would immediately march against Prussia, Italian War or no Italian War, Prussia would, as *Vogt* himself relates, meet with resistance from '*Bavaria... which is completely subordinated to Austrian influence*' (*Studien*, First Edition, p 90), *Saxony*, who would be under immediate threat and would have no reason to do violence to her 'sympathy for Austria' (*Studien*, p 93), Württemberg, Hesse-Darmstadt and Hanover (*Studien*, p 94), in brief, from '*nine-tenths*' (*Studien*, p 16) of the 'German governments'. And as *Vogt* goes on to prove, these governments would not by any means have remained undecided in such a *dynastic 'civil war'* started by of all people Prussia at a time when Germany was threatened by her 'two biggest external enemies'.

The court (in Baden) [says Vogt] follows Prussia, but there can be no doubt that the people do not join the ruling family in these sympathies. The Breisgau, even, is much more firmly linked than one would think after such a long separation to the Emperor

and the Imperial state, as is Upper Swabia, by the bonds of sympathy and religion and by old memories of Upper Austria, to which it once belonged. (*Studien*, pp 93–94)

With the exception of Mecklenburg [and ‘perhaps’ Electoral Hesse], distrust of the absorption theory and unwilling submission to Prussia reigns in *North Germany*. The instinctive *feeling of aversion, indeed of hatred*, that *South Germany* harbours towards Prussia... all the resounding howls of the Imperial party have not been able to extirpate this feeling or declaim it away. It exists in a living way in the people, and no government, not even that of Baden, can resist it for long. *Prussia therefore does not have true sympathy anywhere in the German people or in the governments of the German Confederation*. (*Studien*, p 21)

Thus spoke Vogt. And for that very reason, according to the same Vogt, a dynastic ‘civil war’ undertaken by Prussia in ‘secret understanding’ with ‘Germany’s two biggest external enemies’ would only have cost ‘weeks’. But this is still not enough:

Old Prussia follows the governments — *Rhineland-Westphalia* follows Catholic Austria. If the popular movement there does not succeed in forcing the government to side with Austria, the *immediate result will be a renewed opening of the abyss between the two parts of the monarchy*. (*Studien*, p 20)

So if, according to Vogt, a simple refusal by Prussia to support Austria would reopen the abyss between Rhineland-Westphalia and Old Prussia once more, then of course a ‘civil war’ undertaken by Prussia in order to exclude Austria from Germany would, according to the same Vogt, have to tear Rhineland-Westphalia entirely free from Prussia. But ‘what do these whelps of Rome care about Germany?’ (*Studien*, p 119), or, as he really means, what does Germany care about these whelps of Rome? *Rhineland-Westphalia* is an ultra-montane, ‘*Roman-Catholic*’ and not ‘*truly German*’ province. So it too must be separated off from the territory of the Confederation, no less than Bohemia and Moravia. And the *dynastic ‘civil war’* recommended to Prussia by Vogt is intended to accelerate this process of separation. In fact, just as the *French* government, in the map *L’Europe en 1860* which it published in 1858 and which served Vogt as a compass for his *Studien*, annexes Egypt to Austria, so too it annexes the Rhenish Provinces to *Belgium* as countries of ‘*Catholic nationality*’ — an ironic formula for the annexation of Belgium and the Rhenish Provinces to France. The fact that Vogt goes further than the French government’s map and gives up Westphalia into the bargain is explained by the runaway Regent’s ‘scientific relations’ with Plon-Plon, son of the ex-King of Westphalia.

To sum up then: on the one hand, Louis Bonaparte will allow Russia to stretch her arms from Posen into Bohemia and via Hungary out towards Turkey; on the other, he himself will set up a united and independent Italy by force of arms on France’s frontiers, and all — ‘pour le roi de Prusse’; <sup>[64]</sup> all so that Prussia can have the opportunity to bring Germany under her control through a civil war and to secure the Rhenish Provinces for ever’ against France (*Studien*, p 121).

But, it is said, the territory of the Confederation is menaced, the hereditary foe threatens; his real goal is the Rhine. So defend it, and defend the territory of the Confederation. (*Studien*, p 105)

And defend the territory of the Confederation, what is more, by abdicating Bohemia and Moravia to Russia; defend the Rhine by starting a German ‘civil war’ intended, among other things, to tear Rhineland-Westphalia loose from Prussia:

But it is said that Louis Napoleon wants to slake the Napoleonic thirst for land by some means or other! We do not believe so, we have the example of the Crimean campaign before us! (*Studien*, p 129)

Beside his disbelief in the Napoleonic thirst for land and his belief in the Crimean campaign, Vogt has another argument *in petto*. <sup>[65]</sup> The Austrians and the French in Italy will continue biting each other until, after the example of the Kilkenny cats, nothing is left of either of them but the tails:

It will become a fearfully bloody, obstinate, perhaps indecisive war... Only by harnessing her strength to the utmost will France, with Piedmont, achieve victory, and she will need decades to recover from these exhausting efforts. (*Studien*, pp 127–29)

This prospect of the duration of the Italian War strikes home at its opponents. The method by which *Vogt* now prolongs Austria's resistance to French arms in Italy and paralyzes France's aggressive power is indeed original enough. On the one hand, the French have *carte blanche* in Italy; on the other hand, the 'benevolent Tsar' is allowed, by his manoeuvres in Galicia, Hungary, Moravia and Bohemia, by revolutionary intrigues internally and military demonstrations on the borders 'to keep a significant part of the Austrian armed forces in those parts of the monarchy that are exposed to a Russian attack or accessible to Russian intrigues' (*Studien*, p 11).

And finally Austria is forced, by a dynastic 'civil war' opened simultaneously in Germany by Prussia, to withdraw her main forces from Italy to defend her German possessions. Under such conditions Franz Joseph and Louis Bonaparte will, of course, not sign a Treaty of Campoformio, <sup>[66]</sup> but — 'bleed each other to death in Italy'.

Austria will neither make the 'benevolent Tsar' concessions in the East, accepting the compensation long since offered in Serbia and Bosnia, nor will she guarantee the Rhenish Provinces to France and, in league with Russia and France, fall upon Prussia. 'Pon my soul, no!' She will insist on 'bleeding to death in Italy'. In any case, *Vogt's* man of destiny would reject such compensation on the Rhine in moral indignation. He knows that: 'The foreign policy of the present Empire knows only one principle, that of self-preservation.' (*Studien*, p 31)

He knows that Louis Bonaparte 'is pursuing only one single idea, that of maintaining himself in that rule' (over France) (*Studien*, p 29).

He knows that the 'Italian War does not make him popular in France', while the acquisition of the Rhenish Provinces would make would make him and his dynasty 'popular'. He says:

The Rhenish Provinces are a favourite desire of the French Chauvin, and perhaps, if one gets down to it, one would only find a small minority of the nation that does not carry this wish in its heart. (*Studien*, p 121)

On the other hand, 'those in the know in France', and thus presumably *Vogt's* 'man of destiny with the cunning of the serpent' too, know:

... that there is only hope of realising it [that is to say, the French acquisition of the natural frontier on the Rhine] so long as Germany has 34 different governments... Let a real Germany exist with united interests and firm organisation — and the Rhine frontier is secure for ever. (*Studien*, p 121)

For that very reason Louis Bonaparte, who at Villafranca offered Lombardy to the Emperor of Austria in exchange for the guarantee of the Rhenish Provinces (see Kinglake's <sup>[67]</sup> statement in the House of Commons, 12 July 1860), would have rejected Austria's offer of the Rhenish Provinces for French help against Prussia in indignation.

*Vogt's Dentu* original sources too did not only indulge in feelings of enthusiasm for Germany's unification under Prussia. <sup>[68]</sup> In particular they rejected with virtuous emphasis any allusion to desire for the Rhenish Provinces:

The Rhine! ... What is the Rhine — a frontier. Frontiers will soon be anachronisms. (*La foi des traités*, p 36) <sup>[69]</sup>

Who, in the Thousand Year Empire to be set up by Badinguet on the basis of the principle of nationality, will speak of frontiers along the Rhine, or anywhere for that matter?

Does France stipulate compensation for the sacrifices she is prepared to make for a purpose that is equitable, of just influence and in the interests of European equilibrium? Does she demand the left bank of the Rhine? Does she even raise any claim to Savoy and the County of Nice? (*La vraie question* (Paris, 1859), p 13) <sup>[70]</sup>

France's renunciation of Savoy and Nice as proof that France will renounce the Rhine! *Vogt* did not translate that into German.

Before the war started, it was of decisive importance for Louis Bonaparte to make the German Confederation believe that he had enticed Prussia into an understanding even if he did not manage to entice her. *Vogt* seeks to spread this belief in the first edition of his *Studien*. During the war it became even more important for Louis Bonaparte to draw Prussia into moves that would supply Austria with

proof, or apparent proof, of such an understanding. In the second edition of the *Studien*, which appeared during the war, *Vogt* therefore calls on Prussia, in his own afterword, to conquer Germany and to start a dynastic ‘civil war’ which he proves, in the text of the book, will be ‘bloody, obstinate and perhaps indecisive’, and will cost at least Rhineland-Westphalia, and which he solemnly swears in the afterword of the same book ‘will only cost weeks’. Now *Vogt*’s voice is indeed no siren’s song. Louis Napoleon, supported in his imposture by bottle-holder Palmerston, had therefore to present *Prussian proposals* to Franz Joseph at Villafranca *that he himself had forged*.<sup>[71]</sup> Austria had to make Prussia’s modest claim to the military leadership of Germany the pretext for a treaty that Louis Bonaparte had to excuse to France by saying that the Italian War threatened to turn into a general war ‘which would have realised German unity and thus accomplished a work which ever since the time of Francis I it has been the object of French policy to prevent’.<sup>[72]</sup>

After France had obtained Savoy and Nice through the Italian War, and with them a position that was more valuable than an army in the event of a war on the Rhine, ‘German unity under Prussian hegemony’ and ‘secession of the left bank of the Rhine to France’ became convertible magnitudes in the probability calculations of 2 December. The map *L’Europe en 1860* published in 1858 is reinterpreted by the map *L’Europe pacifiée* (Europe put to sleep?) published in 1860, in which Egypt no longer falls to Austria and the Rhenish Provinces are annexed to France as a replacement for the ‘*Nordic plain*’ handed over to Prussia.<sup>[73]</sup>

Finally, at Etienne, *Persigny*<sup>[74]</sup> officially stated that, if only in the interests of European ‘equilibrium’, every further move to centralise Germany would entail the advance of France to the Rhine. But neither before nor after the Italian War has the grotesque ventriloquist of the Tuileries spoken more shamelessly than he did through the mouthpiece of the runaway regent.

\* \* \*

‘The New Swiss, citizen of the Canton of Berne and member of the Geneva *Ständerat*’,<sup>[75]</sup> (*Studien*, Foreword), opens the Swiss section of his *Studien* with a prologue (*Studien*, pp 37–39) which calls on the Swiss to *burst with joy* at the replacement of Louis Philippe by Louis Bonaparte. Admittedly, Louis Bonaparte demands ‘press measures’ from the *Bundesrat*, but ‘the Napoleonides seem to have an extraordinarily thin skin in this respect’ (*Studien*, p 36). A mere skin disease that has taken such a firm hold of the family that it is transmitted not merely in the blood but also — witness Louis Bonaparte — through the bare family name. Admittedly:

The persecution of innocent people in Geneva, carried out by the *Bundesrat* on orders from the Emperor against poor devils whose only crime was to be Italian; the setting up of Consultates; the harassment of the press; the senseless police measures of every kind; and finally the negotiations over the secession of the Dappe valley, have contributed greatly to blurring the memories in Switzerland of the *services the Emperor really rendered in the Neuchâtel deal*, particularly for that party that has now turned against him most violently. (*Studien*, pp 37–38)

Generous Emperor, and ungrateful party! What the Emperor wanted in the Neuchâtel deal<sup>[76]</sup> was not at all a precedent for breaking the treaties of 1815, humiliating Prussia and establishing a protectorate over Switzerland. For him it was a question of ‘*rendering real services*’ to Switzerland in his quality as ‘New Swiss, citizen of the Canton of Thurgau and Artillery Captain of Oberstrasse’. Another servant of the Emperor, M de *Thouvenel*,<sup>[77]</sup> accused the whole of Switzerland in June 1860 of the ingratitude with which *Vogt* had reproached the anti-Bonapartist party in Switzerland in March 1859. In *The Times* of 30 June 1860, one reads:

A few days ago a meeting took place between Dr Kern and M de Thouvenel in the Foreign Ministry in Paris in the presence of Lord Cowley. Thouvenel informed the honourable representative of Switzerland that the doubts and protestations of the Federal Government were insulting inasmuch as they seemed to imply a want of faith in the government of His Imperial Majesty. Such treatment was base ingratitude in view of the *services* which the Emperor Napoleon had *rendered* the Confederation on many occasions, and in particular the *Neuchâtel affair*. However that may be, since

Switzerland had been so *blind* as to mistrust her benefactor, she must herself bear the consequences.

And yet *Vogt* had already tried to open the eyes of the *blind* anti-Bonapartist party in Switzerland in March 1859. On the one hand, he points to ‘the real services’ that ‘the Emperor has rendered’. On the other hand, ‘imperial harassment’ disappears completely when compared with the royal harassment under Louis-Philippe (*Studien*, p 39). Whereas, for example, the *Bundesrat* in 1858 ‘on the orders from the Emperor’ expelled ‘poor devils whose only crime was to be Italians’ (*Studien*, p 37), it refused, in 1838, despite Louis-Philippe’s threats, to expel Louis Bonaparte, whose only crime was to conspire from Switzerland against Louis-Philippe’s throne. In 1846, Switzerland risked the *Sonderbund* <sup>[78]</sup> war despite Louis-Philippe’s ‘military show’, for towards the peacemaker-King the watchword was: don’t be intimidated. In 1858, she reacted with less than virginal modesty when Louis Napoleon tried to lay hands on the Dappe valley. <sup>[79]</sup>

Louis-Philippe [*Vogt* himself says] had dragged out a poor existence in Europe, treated with contempt on all sides, even by the smaller legitimate princes, because he had not dared to pursue a strong foreign policy. (*Studien*, p 31)

But:

*The policy of the Emperor towards Switzerland* is without doubt that of a powerful neighbour who knows that he can impose anything that he wants. (*Studien*, p 37)

And so *Vogt* concludes, with logic worthy of a Grandguillot, <sup>[80]</sup> ‘that from the purely Swiss point of view one can only be delighted in the highest degree’ (*Studien*, p 39) at the change that gave Switzerland a ‘powerful neighbour who knows he can do anything he wants to her’ instead of a ‘Louis-Philippe treated with contempt on all sides’.

This prologue, which creates the necessary mood, is followed by a German translation of the *Bundestag* note of 14 March 1859. Oddly enough, *Vogt* praises this note in which the *Bundestag* appeals to the treaties of 1815, <sup>[81]</sup> appeal to which the same *Vogt* declares to be ‘hypocrisy’. ‘Be off with you and your hypocrisy!’ (*Studien*, p 112) <sup>[82]</sup>

*Vogt* now goes on to investigate ‘from which side the first attack on the neutrality of Switzerland will come’ (*Studien*, p 84) and superfluously proves that the French army, which did not have to conquer Piedmont this time, would march neither over the Simplon pass nor over the Great St Bernard. At the same time he invents the non-existent route ‘over the Mont Cénis via Fenestrella through the Stura valley’ (*Studien*, p 84). Its proper name is the Dora valley. So no danger threatens Switzerland from France:

One cannot expect with the same assurance that the neutrality of Switzerland will be respected on the part of Austria, and various phenomena even indicate that the intention is to infringe it should the occasion arise... The concentration of a corps of troops at Bregenz and Feldkirch could well be significant in this respect. (*Studien*, pp 85–86)

Here the red thread becomes visible that runs through all the *Studien* and leads straight from Geneva to Paris.

That is to say that the *Blue Book* published by the Derby cabinet entitled *The Affairs of Italy: January to May 1859* relates that ‘the concentration of an Austrian corps near Bregenz and Feldkirch’ was a rumour intentionally spread by Bonapartist agents in Switzerland which lacked any basis in fact (N174 of the *Blue Book* quoted, letter of Captain Harris to Lord Malmsbury, dated Berne, 24 March 1859). On this occasion too, Humboldt-*Vogt* discovers that in Bregenz and Feldkirch one...

... is in the immediate vicinity of the Rhine valley, into which three great Alpine passes with passable roads open, that is to say the Via Mala, the Splügen and the St Bernard, the latter leading to the Ticino, the two former to Lake Como. (*Studien*, p 86)

In reality the Via Mala leads first over the Splügen, secondly over the St Bernard and thirdly nowhere else.

After all this Polonius-chatter intended to divert Swiss suspicion from her western to her eastern frontier, the ‘rounded character’ finally gets round to his true task.

Switzerland [says Vogt] is completely *in the right* if she *decidedly* rejects her obligation not to allow troop trains over this railway [from Culoz to Aix and Chambéry] and confines herself, should the matter arise, to claiming only as much of the neutral zone as is necessary for the defence of her own territory. (*Studien*, p 89)

And he assures the *Bundesrat* that ‘the whole of Switzerland will, as one man, stand by’ this ‘*policy indicated in its note of 14 March*’.

Vogt published his *Studien* at the end of March. Louis Bonaparte did not use the said railway for troop trains until 24 April, and he declared war even later. Initiated into all the details of Bonaparte’s war plans, Vogt knew exactly ‘*from which side the first attack on the neutrality of Switzerland*’ would come. His express mission was to lure her into tolerating a first infringement of neutrality whose logical consequence would be the annexation of the neutral area of Savoy to the December empire. Tapping the *Bundesrat* on the shoulder, he attributes to its note of 14 March a meaning that it *was supposed to have* from the Bonapartist point of view. In its note, the *Bundesrat* says that it will ‘fulfil’ its ‘mission’ of neutrality as laid down in the treaties ‘equally and loyally towards all’. It goes on to quote an article of the treaties according to which ‘*no troops of any power whatsoever may be stationed or pass through there*’ (the neutral zone of Savoy). There is *not a single word* to say that it will allow the French to use the railway that runs through the neutral zone. It conditionally reserves for the Swiss Confederation ‘the military occupation’ of the neutral zone as ‘a measure for the security and defence of her territory’. The fact that *Vogt* is here *lying*, consciously and under orders from above, about the *Bundestag* note, is proved not only by its text, but also by the statement by *Lord Malmsbury* — at that time British Foreign Secretary — in the House of Lords on 23 April 1860:

When the French troops [more than a month after the *Bundesrat* Note of 14 March] were about to march through Savoy into Sardinia, the Swiss government, true to the neutrality upon which depends its independence, at first objected that those troops had no right to pass through the neutralised territory.

And by what objections did Louis Bonaparte and the Swiss party allied to him overcome the *Bundesrat*’s scruples? Vogt, who already knew at the end of March 1859 that French troops would violate the neutral zone at the end of April 1859, could also, of course, anticipate at the end of March the phrases with which Louis Bonaparte at the end of April embellished his act of violence. The scruple he raises is whether the ‘upper end of the line from Culoz to Aix and Chambéry falls within the purlieu of the neutral zone’ (*Studien*, p 89) and demonstrates that ‘the specification of the neutral zone by no means had the purpose of cancelling communication between France and Chambéry’, so that morally the said railway line avoids the neutral zone. <sup>[83]</sup>

Let us listen, on the other hand, to *Lord Malmsbury*:

Subsequently, there being some question as to whether the line of railway did not avoid the neutralised portion of Savoy, the Swiss government withdrew their objection, and allowed the troops of France to pass. I think that they were wrong in doing so. We thought the maintenance of the neutrality of such European consequence... that we protested at the French Court against the passage of those troops to Sardinia on 28 April 1859.

Because of this protest, Palmerston accused Malmsbury of ‘Austrian’ sympathies, and said that he ‘had uselessly offended the French government’, just as *Vogt* in his *Magnum Opus* accuses the *Volk*:  
<sup>[84]</sup>

... it made every effort [to oblige Austria, of course] to embarrass Switzerland... one only has to read the articles it carried on the question of neutrality and the march of the French troops through Savoy to be able to see as clear as daylight the tendencies it shares completely with the *Allgemeine Zeitung*.

One will now be able to ‘see as clear as daylight’ that the whole section of *Vogt*’s *Studien* relating to Switzerland has no other purpose than to preface *the first violation of the Swiss neutral zone* by his ‘man of destiny’. It was the first step towards the annexation of Savoy and therefore of French Switzerland. The fate of Switzerland depended on the energy with which she opposed this step and maintained her rights by making use of them at the decisive moment, raising them into a European question at a time when the support of the British government was certain and Louis Bonaparte, who

was just starting his localised war, could not dare to throw down the gauntlet to her. <sup>[85]</sup> Once officially involved, the British government could no longer back down. Hence the mighty exertions of the ‘New Swiss, citizen of the Canton of Berne and member of the Geneva *Ständerat*’ to raise clouds of dust and to depict the granting of *permission* for French troops to march through the neutral zone as a *right* that Switzerland had to assert as a bold demonstration against Austria. Had he not, after all, saved Switzerland from Cataline-Cherval!

While Vogt echoes and amplifies the denial, in his *Dentu* original pamphlets, of any lusting towards a Rhine frontier, he avoids *any* reference, even the slightest, to the renunciation of Savoy and Nice contained in *the same pamphlet*. The very names Savoy and Nice are missing from his ‘Studies’. But as early as February 1859, Deputies from Savoy were protesting in Turin against the Italian War because the annexation of Savoy into the December empire formed the purchase price of the French Alliance. The protest never reached Vogt’s ears. Nor did the stipulations, agreed between Louis Bonaparte and Cavour at Plombières in *August 1858*, which were well known to other émigrés (published in one of the first issues of the *Volk*). In the issue of *Pensiero ed Azione* already mentioned (2–16 May 1859), *Mazzini* had literally predicted:

But should Austria be defeated at the very beginning of the war, and repeat the proposals that she made to the British government for a period in 1848, the abandonment of Lombardy on the condition of retaining Venice, peace... would be accepted. Only the conditions relating to the enlargement of the Sardinian monarchy and the *secession of Nice and Savoy to France* would be put into operation.

Mazzini published his forecast in mid-May 1859, Vogt the second edition of his *Studien* in mid-June 1859, but there is not a mortal word about Savoy and Nice. Even before Mazzini, and even before the Savoy Deputies, as early as *October 1858*, a month and a half after the conspiracy of Plombières, the President of the Swiss Confederation informed the British Foreign Office in a personal despatch, ‘he had reason to believe that some conditional agreement had been come to between the Emperor of the French and Count Cavour in respect to Savoy’. <sup>[86]</sup>

At the beginning of June 1859, the Swiss President once more informed the British *chargé d’affaires* in Berne of his fears concerning the coming annexation of Savoy and Nice. <sup>[87]</sup> Vogt, an expert where the salvation of Switzerland is concerned, heard not a word about either the protest by the Savoy deputies, or Mazzini’s revelations or about the continuous fears of the Swiss government between October 1858 and June 1859. Indeed, as we shall see later, *even in March 1860*, when the secret of Plombières was public in every street in Europe, Herr Vogt avoided ever coming across it. It is probably with reference to this dumbness on the threat of annexation that the *Studien* bear the motto: ‘Silence is the virtue of the slave.’ They do, however, contain *one* hint:

But just supposing [says Vogt], just supposing that the *unlikely* happens, and the price of victory is paid in Italian territory, be it in the North or in the South... *truly, from the narrowest German point of view... one would most earnestly wish* the French wolf to get an *Italian bone* between its teeth. (*Studien*, pp 129–30)

Italian territory in the North means, of course, Nice and Savoy. After the New Swiss, citizen of the canton of Berne and member of the Geneva *Ständerat* has, ‘*from the purely Swiss point of view*’ (*Studien*, p 39) called on Switzerland ‘*to be delighted in the highest degree*’ at possessing Louis Bonaparte as a neighbour, it suddenly occurs to the runaway Regent how, ‘*from the narrowest German point of view* he truly would most earnestly wish’ the French wolf to ‘get the bone’ of Nice and Savoy, *and thus French Switzerland*, ‘between its teeth’. <sup>[88]</sup>

\* \* \*

Some time ago there appeared in Paris a pamphlet entitled *Napoléon III*, not *Napoléon III et l’Italie*, or *Napoléon III et la question Roumaine*, or *Napoléon III et la Prusse*, but plain *Napoléon III*, just Napoleon III. It is a panegyric written on Napoleon III in hyperbole about Napoleon III. This pamphlet has been translated by an *Arab* called *Da-Da* into his native language. In the ‘Afterword’ the intoxicated Da-Da is no longer able to contain his enthusiasm, and he breaks into glowing rhyme. In the ‘Foreword’, however, Da-Da is still sober enough to confess that his book is published by order

of the local authorities in Algiers and is intended for distribution among the native Arab tribes outside the frontiers of Algeria so that ‘the idea of unity and nationality under one common chief can take hold of their imagination’. This common chief which is to bring about the ‘unity of the Arab nation’ is, as Da-Da lets slip, no less a person than ‘the Sun of Beneficence, the Glory of the Firmament — the Emperor Napoleon III’. Vogt, although his writing has neither rhyme nor reason, is no less a person than *the German Da-Da*.

To dignify with the title of *Studies* his German paraphrase of the *Moniteur articles*, *Dentu pamphlets* and revised maps of Europe that have radiated from ‘the Sun of Beneficence, the Glory of the Firmament’ is the best jest that *Da-Da Vogt* has let fall in his entire merry career, even better than the Imperial Regency and the Imperial Wine-Swiller and the passports for foreign travel that he himself invented. In Vogt’s *Studien* Austria wrestles with Britain for possession of *Egypt*, Austria and Prussia quarrel over territory *outside Europe*, Napoleon I forces the Bank of England to weigh its gold out instead of counting it out, Greeks and Fanariotes are different races and a road runs from Mont Cenis via Fenestrella through the Stura Valley. For a ‘cultured’ German bourgeois to think that such *Studien* are *bona fide* studies only goes to show the enormous pressure with which ten years of reaction have weighed down on his liberal skull.

Oddly enough, the very same liberal German sluggard who applauded *Vogt’s* grossly excessive *German translation of the original Decembrist pamphlets* leapt up from his armchair in fury as soon as *Edmond About* translated Da-Da’s compilation *back*, with wise moderation, into French in his *La Prusse en 1860* (originally *Napoleon III et la Prusse*). This talkative magpie of Bonapartism is, incidentally, rather a wag himself. As proof of Bonaparte’s sympathy for Germany, *About* quotes, for example, the fact that the December empire lumps *Da-Da Vogt* together with *Humboldt* just as much as it does *Lazarillo Hackländer* with *Goethe*. At least this *Vogt–Hackländer* combination shows more profound study on *About’s* part than could ever be found in the *Studien* of the German Da-Da.

## Notes

- 1 Without malice — an ironical reference by Marx to the malice which Vogt shows in his *Studies of the Present Situation in Europe*.
- 2 Who benefits?
- 3 Dentu — a Bonapartist publisher.
- 4 Beware of him, Roman!
- 5 The peace of Villafranca ended the war between France and the Kingdom of Sardinia on the one side, and Austria on the other. The peace was concluded by Louis Napoleon behind the back of his ally, the King of Sardinia. It gave Savoy and Nice to France, united Lombardy to Sardinia, but left Venice in Austrian hands.
- 6 England and the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies made an agreement in 1816 that the latter would not grant any power trading rights which might damage English interests. In 1838, the King of the Two Sicilies granted a French company monopoly rights for sulphur-mining in Sicily. England protested sharply and blockaded Naples from the sea. The monopoly rights were withdrawn.
- 7 Lac français — French lake; lac autrichienne — Austrian lake.
- 8 Baroness von Krüdener — a devoutly Catholic writer who was mistakenly credited with originating the idea of the Holy Alliance of the reactionary powers of Europe.
- 9 In 1853, Prussia purchased from the Duchy of Oldenburg a strip of coast and built a naval dockyard there — Wilhelmshaven.
- 10 *The Real Issue: France–Italy–Austria*.
- 11 The original reads:  
‘De quel droit, d’ailleurs, le gouvernement autrichien viendrait-il invoquer l’inviolabilité de ceux (traités) de 1815, lui qui les a violés en confisquant Cracovie, dont ces traités garantissaient l’indépendance?’



**12** In 1836, there was an attempted rising in Poland which was successful only in Cracow. A national government was set up and feudal burdens revoked. The rising was put down by Austrian, Prussian and Russian troops; Cracow was handed over to Austria.

**13** Palmerston, who fooled the whole of Europe with his ridiculous protest, had collaborated untiringly in the intrigue against Cracow ever since 1831. See my pamphlet *Palmerston and Poland* (London, 1853). [Marx's note]

**14** *The Treaties, the Signatory Powers and Emperor Napoleon III.*

**15** The original reads:

‘La Russie est de la famille des Slaves, race d’élite... On s’est étonné de l’accord chevaleresque survenu soudainement entre la France et la Russie. Rien de plus naturel: accord des principes, unanimité du but... *soumission à la loi de l’alliance sainte des gouvernements et des peuples*, non pour leurrer et contraindre, mais pour guider et aider la marche divine des nations. De la cordialité la plus parfaite sont sortis les plus heureux effets: chemins de fer, *affranchissement des serfs*, stations commerciales dans la Méditerranée [etc].’ — *La foi des traités* (Paris, 1859), p 33.

**16** *The Truth About Russia*; Prince Dolgorukov — a Russian writer, historian and liberal who emigrated in 1859 and collaborated with Herzen, the liberal publicist and editor of *The Bell*.

**17** Colonel Cuza — Romanian politician who ruled briefly over the Danube provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia as John I. He was overthrown by a reactionary conspiracy and fled the country.

**18** *Preussisches Wochenblatt* — a reactionary Prussian paper.

**19** Règlement organique — the first constitution of the Danube principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia proposed by Kisselev, head of the administration under the Russian occupation of the territories. The constitution confirmed the powers of the feudal landowners but granted certain bourgeois reforms such as freedom of trade. It was cancelled during the 1848 revolution.

**20** The Greek from Byzantium.

**21** Hetairie — a Greek secret society aiming at armed revolt against the Turks. It was secretly supported by the Tsarist government.

**22** Alexander Ypsilanti (1792–1828) — leader of the Greek freedom movement against the Turks. After the defeat of the rising in Moldavia, he fled to Austria where he was imprisoned.

**23** Dom Miguel — King of Portugal during 1828–34, leader of the clerical and absolutist forces in Portugal.

**24** The sea battle at Navarino (Pylos) in Greece saw the destruction of the Turkish and Egyptian fleets by English, French and Russian squadrons (the latter under Admiral Heyden).

**25** Ruler.

**26** *La Jeune Italie (Young Italy)* — organ of the secret Italian organisation of that name founded by Mazzini. During 1831–48 it fought for the unity of Italy and the setting up of a bourgeois republic in Italy.

**27** Austria sent an army corps to Schleswig-Holstein in 1850 with the support of Russia, which was opposed both to the rise of Prussia and to the end of the division of Germany into a number of feudal states.

**28** David Urquhart (1805–1877) — Tory MP and supporter of Turkey; attacked the foreign policy of Palmerston and the Whigs.

**29** The Polish Colonel Lapinski, who fought against the Russians until the surrender of Komorn in the Hungarian revolutionary army, and later in Circassia, says:

‘It was the misfortune of the Hungarians that they did not know the Russians... The Vienna cabinet was completely in the hands of the Russians... the chiefs were murdered on their advice... while the Russians used every means to win sympathy, *Austria was ordered by them* to make herself even more hated than she ever had been.’ — Theophil Lapinski, *Feldzug der Ungarischen Hauptarmee im Jahre 1849 (Campaign of the Main Hungarian Army in 1849)*, Hamburg, 1850), pp 188–89, 216. [Marx’s note]

**30** Arthur Görgey (1818–1916) — commander of the Hungarian army during the revolution of 1848–49; he was supported by the reactionary elements among the officers and sabotaged the revolutionary war.

**31** Bertolan Szmere (1812–1869) — Hungarian politician, Minister of the Interior in the revolutionary government in 1848; later in exile.

**32** General *Moritz Perczel*, famous for his part in the Hungarian revolutionary war, withdrew while the Italian Campaign was still under way from the Hungarian officers who had gathered around Kossuth and explained the reasons for his withdrawal in a public statement — on the one hand, Kossuth, who was only serving as a Bonapartist scarecrow, and, on the other, the perspective of Hungary’s *Russian* future. In a reply (dated St Helier, 19 April 1860) to a letter in which I asked him for further information about his statement, he said, among other things: ‘Never shall I allow myself to be used as a tool in saving Hungary from the claws of the twin eagle merely in order to deliver her over to the deadly embrace of the northern bear.’ [Marx’s note]

**33** Herr *Kossuth* has never been under any illusion as to the correctness of the view developed in the text. He knew that *Austria* can maltreat Hungary but never destroy her. ‘The Emperor Joseph II [he writes to the Grand Vizier Reshid Pasha from Kutayah, 15 February 1851], the only man of genius produced by the Habsburg family, exhausted the extraordinary resources of his rare intellect and of the then still common notions of the power of his House, in the attempt to Germanise Hungary, and integrate it within the state as a whole. But Hungary emerged from the struggle with renewed vigour... In the last revolution, Austria only raised itself from the dust in order to collapse once again at the feet of the Tsar, its master, who never *gives* his aid but only *sells* it. And Austria had to pay for this aid dearly.’ — *Correspondence of Kossuth*, p 33.

On the other hand, he says in the same letter that only Hungary and Turkey united could break the *Panslavist intrigues* of Russia. He writes to *David Urquhart*, dated Kutayah, 17 January 1851:

‘*We must crush Russia*, my dear Sir! And, headed by you, we will! I have not only the resolution of will, but also that of hope! And this is no vain word, my dear Sir! No sanguine fascination; it is the word of a man, who is wont duly to calculate every chance; of a man though very weak in faculties, not to be shaken in perseverance and resolution [etc].’ — *Correspondence of Kossuth*, p 39. [Marx’s note]

**34** A map of the Slav lands in a book by the Czech scholar, Pavel Safarik.

**35** Long live Alexander / Long live the king of kings / Asking nothing in return / He gives us laws.

**36** Literally *Thought and Action* — title of the organ of the Italian bourgeois democrats; edited by Mazzini, it appeared in London and Lugano. Marx translated Mazzini’s manifesto into English and published it in the New York *Daily Tribune*.

**37** The *Song of Ludwig* — reference to the ninth-century Old High German epic of that name.

**38** Heinrich Gagern (1799–1880) — right-wing Liberal politician and member of the Frankfurt National Assembly.

**39** In June 1849, Ledru-Rollin, leader of the petty-bourgeois democrats, moved in the legislative assembly that the President, Louis Bonaparte, should be tried for bombarding Rome in order to destroy the Roman Republic and restore the temporal power of the

Pope. The motion was defeated by the conservative majority. On 13 June, under popular pressure, the democrats organised a mass demonstration which was dispersed by troops. Politicians belonging to the 'Mountain' — the petty-bourgeois party in the assembly — were deprived of their seats; many went into exile.

**40** Masson — a French author.

**41** How fortunate he is / in all he undertakes! / How perfect his body is! / How smoothly those imperial legs even / Move together.

**42** Napoleon the Small — nickname for Louis Napoleon invented by Victor Hugo.

**43** Privately.

**44** Agricultural congresses.

**45** Felice Orsini (1819–1858) — Italian revolutionary republican who made an attempt on the life of Louis Napoleon and was executed.

**46** These laws dealing with 'public safety' gave the Emperor and his government the power to imprison persons suspected of a hostile attitude towards the Second Empire, to banish them within French territories or to send them into exile.

**47** A decree dated January 1858 divided France up into military regions, on the lines of Spain, with a field marshal in charge of each of the five regions.

**48** Napoleon III (Louis Napoleon), whose father had been made King of Holland by his brother, Napoleon I, carried out his *coup d'état* on the anniversary of the battle of Austerlitz, where Napoleon I defeated the Russian and Austrian armies.

**49** In 1858, the French writer Montalembert was sentenced for writing an article condemning the regime of Louis Napoleon. When the Emperor wished to grant him a pardon, Montalembert refused it and demanded rehabilitation. Marx compares him ironically to John Hampden, who refused to pay ship money to Charles I in 1636; his trial hastened the English Civil War.

**50** Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809–1865) — French sociologist and economist and one of the founders of the anarchist movement. In a pamphlet published in Brussels he compared the record of the Napoleonic dynasty with that of the Orleans dynasty and gave preference to the latter, with the proviso that they had not carried out certain democratic reforms.

**51** In 1858, there was an unsuccessful republican uprising by members of the army at Châlons-sur-Saône.

**52** In 1858, Palmerston introduced a Bill which made any person, whether British or foreign, who took part in conspiracies against any person in England or elsewhere answerable under English law. Widespread protests led to the defeat of the Bill and to Palmerston's resignation.

**53** In July 1858, a secret agreement was reached between Napoleon III and Cavour, Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Sardinia. Napoleon promised to help to free Lombardy and Venice from Austria in return for Savoy and Nice. In the autumn of 1858, Palmerston, then leader of the Whig opposition, was invited to Compiègne to state his position on the imminent war between France and Austria; he did not object to the expulsion of Austria from Italy.

**54** A reference to Louis Napoleon's book *Des idées napoléoniennes*, which champions Bonapartism as the doctrine of freedom through the exercise of power.

**55** Duc de Morny (1811–1865) — Bonapartist politician. One of the organisers of the *coup d'état* of 1851, Minister of the Interior and chairman of the legislative assembly. The 'tame dogs' (*chiens savants*) were the members of the legislature.

**56** To study a question is not to create it.

**57** Lord Chelsea, who deputised for Lord Cowley in Paris during his absence, writes:

The official disavowal [in the *Moniteur* of 5 March 1859] of all warlike intentions on the part of the Emperor, this Imperial message of peace, has been received by *all classes of Paris* with feelings of what may be called exultation. — No 88 of the *Blue Book: On the Affairs of Italy, January to May 1859*. [Marx's note]

**58** NB: In his *Studies* he repeats, with the *Moniteur* and the original Dentu pamphlet, 'that it is a peculiar whim of fate that forces this man [Louis Bonaparte] to push himself forward as a *liberator of the nationalities*' (*Studien*, p 35), and that one 'must grant *one's support* to this policy as long as it remains within the bounds of the liberation of the nationalities', and that *one must wait* 'until the liberation of the nationalities by this man of destiny has ensued' (*Studien*, p 36). In his *Programme* for Messrs the democrats, on the other hand, it says: 'We can and *should warn against such assistance.*' — *Magnum Opus*, p 34, Documents). [Marx's note]

**59** Moreover, 'Napoléon le Petit' has also borrowed the national-liberation phraseology of the real Napoleon. In *May 1809*, for example, Napoleon issued from Schönbrunn a Proclamation to the *Hungarians* which said, among other things: 'Hungary! The moment to regain your *independence* has come... I demand nothing of you. I only wish to see you as a free and *independent nation*. Your connection with Austria was your curse [etc].' On 16 May 1797, Bonaparte concluded a treaty with the Republic of Venice, whose last article read: 'In future peace and good accord are to reign between France and the Venetian Republic.' He revealed his aims in signing this treaty three days later in a secret despatch to the Directory, which begins with the words: 'You receive herewith the Treaty I have concluded with the Republic of Venice, by virtue of which General Baraguay d'Hilliers has occupied the towns with between 5000 and 6000 men. I had various aims in view in signing this treaty.' As his last aim he recounts: 'To mute everything that may be said in Europe, since it will now appear that our occupation of Venice is only a temporary operation which the Venetians themselves have eagerly demanded.' Three days after that, on 26 May, Bonaparte wrote to the municipality of Venice:

'The Treaty concluded in Milan may meanwhile be signed by the Municipality — the secret articles by three of its members. I shall always do everything in my power to give you proof of my desire to confirm *your liberties* and to see *unhappy Italy* at last occupy that place it is destined to occupy in the world theatre, free and *independent of all foreigners.*'

A few days later, he writes to General Baraguay d'Hilliers:

'On receiving this report go to the Provisional Government of Venice and tell them that, in harmony with the principles that now unite the Republics of France and Venice, and given the immediate protection that the French Republic affords the Venetian, it is essential that the sea power of the Republic should be placed on a footing capable of commanding respect. *On this pretext*, you will take possession of everything, bearing in mind the necessity of living on good terms with the Venetians, and enlist all the Republic's sailors into our service — *at all times speaking in the name of Venice*. In brief, you must so manage it that you transport all the naval supplies and ships in the harbour of Venice to Toulon. By virtue of a secret article in the treaty the Venetians are obliged to supply the French Republic with naval supplies to the value of three millions for the navy in Toulon, but *it is my intention* to take possession of *all Venetian ships and all their naval supplies* for the benefit of Toulon.' — *Correspondance secrète et confidentielle de Napoléon* (seven volumes, Paris, 1817).

This order was carried out to the letter; and as soon as Venice had been plundered of *all* naval and military resources, Napoleon handed over his new ally, the *liberated Republic of Venice*, which he had solemnly sworn to defend against every danger, without the slightest hesitation *to the despotic yoke of Austria*. [Marx's note]

**60** In 1840, Louis Napoleon, who had been exiled to America, landed in Boulogne and attempted to start a revolt there. The 'sausage review' was a parade of troops near

Versailles in 1850 at which Louis Napoleon attempted to win over officers and men by providing them with sausage, venison, champagne and cigars.

**61** The Peace of Paris arranged the conditions of peace after Russia's defeat by England, France and Turkey in the Crimean War.

**62** Bazancourt — a Bonapartist novelist.

**63** To pay for its own glory.

**64** For the King of Prussia, that is, for nothing.

**65** Literally, in the breast; that is, held in reserve and not revealed publicly.

**66** The Peace of Campoformio in 1797 ended the war between France and Austria.

**67** William Kinglake — a Liberal MP and historian.

**68** It reads:

'Prussia is Germany's only hope... the German spirit is centred on Berlin... the German spirit seeks the *unity* of its body, the truth of the Confederation. This is the force that is raising Prussia... How is it that, while Italy demands integrity, national unity, which is what Germany wants, the latter favours Austria, the living negation of all nationality? ... It is because Prussia is not yet at her head; because the head is Austria, weighing down on political Germany.' — *La foi des traités*, p 34. [Marx's note]

**69** The original reads:

'Le Rhin! ... Qu'est-ce que le Rhin? Une frontière. Les frontières seront bientôt des anachronismes.' — *Studien*, p 36. [Marx's note]

**70** The original reads:

'La France stipule-t-elle des dédommagements pour les sacrifices qu'elle est prête à faire dans un but d'équité, de juste influence, et dans l'intérêt de l'équilibre européen? Demande-t-elle la rive gauche du Rhin? Elève-t-elle même des prétentions sur la Savoie et sur le Comté de Nice?' — *La foi des traités*, p 13. [Marx's note]

**71** A few days after the conclusion of the Treaty of Villafranca, the *Prager Zeitung* carried the following official announcement:

'This claim [Prussia's claim to assume the supreme command of the arms of the Confederation under the control of the Confederation] provides clear proof that Prussia is striving for hegemony over Germany, and therefore for the exclusion of Austria from Germany. Since disloyal Lombardy was worth infinitely less than *the maintenance of our position in Germany*, we gave it up in order to obtain a peace which had become an imperious necessity *through the attitude of Prussia*.' [Marx's note]

**72** The Parisian *Galvani's Messenger*, which only carries lead articles by way of exception and on specific official instructions, says in its issue of 22 July 1859:

'To give another province to the King of Piedmont, it would not only have been necessary to support a war against two-thirds of Europe, but *German unity would have been realised*, and a work thus accomplished, which ever since the time of Frances I it has been the object of French policy to prevent.' [Marx's note]

**73** Plon-Plon's own private paper, the *Opinion nationale*, says in an article of 5 July 1860:

'The day of demanding with violence is past. The Emperor is endowed with too fine a tact, with too correct a feeling for the trends of public opinion for that... But is *Prussia* bound by oath never to think of *German unity*? Can she guarantee that she will never cast a lustful eye on Hanover, Saxony, Brunswick, Hesse, Oldenburg and Mecklenburg? Today the Princes embrace one another, and certainly they are very sincere. But who knows what the people will demand of them in a few years? And if Germany, under the pressure of public opinion, *centralises herself*, would it be just, would it be reasonable, for France not to be allowed *to extend her territory at the expense of her neighbour*? ...

Should the Germans see fit to change their old political constitution and replace the impotent Confederation with a strong, centralised government, then we cannot guarantee *that France will not see fit to demand compensation and assurances from Germany.*'  
[Marx's note]

**74** The Imperial Pecksniff outdoes himself in the Dentu pamphlet *La Politique anglaise* (Paris, 1860). According to this, a couple of million Germans and Belgians have to be stolen in order to improve the moral constitution of France, whose southern element requires large admixtures of Nordic solidity. After explaining that for political and military reasons France needs the frontiers *that nature herself gave her*, it goes on to say: 'A second reason makes such an annexation [of the Rhenish Provinces and Belgium] necessary. France loves and demands rational liberty [une sage liberté] and the southern element forms a large element of its public bodies. This element has wonderful qualities... but it lacks firmness and persistence. It needs the patient steadfastness, the cold and unbending resolution of our northern brothers. The frontiers determined by providence are therefore no less necessary for our freedom than for our independence.'  
[Marx's note]

**75** The Ständerat — one of the two chambers of the Swiss Federal Parliament.

**76** Neuchâtel — a Swiss canton which was also a vassal state of the Prussian monarchy. After the revolution of 1848 it was proclaimed independent of Prussia. This led to a long quarrel between Prussia and Switzerland which lasted until 1857 when, under pressure from other powers including France, Prussia was persuaded to surrender her claims.

**77** Thouvenel — Bonapartist politician and diplomat; Foreign Minister 1860–62.

**78** *Sonderbund* — a separate league set up in 1843 by seven economically backward Swiss cantons to counter progressive bourgeois developments and to defend the privileges of the Roman Catholic Church and the Jesuits. The resolution of the Swiss Federal Parliament in July 1847 to dissolve the league served as an excuse for it to attack the other cantons. A few weeks later the troops of the league were defeated.

**79** The Dappe valley lies on the frontiers between France and Switzerland. Recognised as Swiss territory at the Congress of Vienna, it was for many years a bone of contention with France. In 1862, Switzerland ceded part of the valley to France in return for compensation.

**80** Grandguillot — a Bonapartist journalist and editor.

**81** The Congress of Vienna which had guaranteed Switzerland's 'eternal neutrality' declared the province of Northern Savoy neutral territory and gave the Swiss the right to occupy it in the case of war between neighbouring countries. This Switzerland threatened to do in March 1859.

**82** It had not in fact been the 'treaties' that had defended the neutrality of Switzerland but the mutually paralysing interests of the various powers on her borders. 'The Swiss feel', Captain Harris, the British chargé d'affaires in Berne, writes to Lord John Russell after an interview with the Federal President Frey-Hérosé, 'that... the events in recent times have essentially changed the relative weights of the powers on her frontiers, in that Prussia, since the Neuchâtel deal, is indifferent, Austria checked and France incomparably more powerful than before.' [Marx's note]

**83** The fact that the railway falls *inside* the neutral territory is expressly admitted in a note addressed to Captain Harris on 18 November 1859 by Federal President Stämpfli and Chancellor Schiess. It said:

'Another point concerning the neutrality of Savoy could also come into question... we mean the railway recently constructed from Culoz to Chambéry, with regard to which it can well be asked whether it should *continue to form part of the neutral territory.*'  
[Marx's note]

**84** Vogt particularly reproaches the *Volk* with having attempted ‘to bring the Swiss Confederation into conflict with the greater neighbouring powers’. When the annexation of Savoy actually took place, the *Eidgenössische Zeitung*, a Bonapartist paper, accused the official *Bund*, that: ‘Its views on Savoy and France were a pale remnant of the policy which has been trying to involve Switzerland in European conflicts since as early as 1848.’ (See the *Bund*, Berne, 12 March 1860.) One can see that the phrases of the Bonapartist scribblers are tailored to order. [Marx’s note]

**85** ‘Had these provinces [Chablais and Faucigny] been occupied by the Federal Troops... there can be little doubt they would have remained in them to this moment.’ — L Oliphant, *Universal Suffrage and Napoleon III* (London, 1869), p 20. [Marx’s note]

**86** In his speech mentioned above Lord *Malmsbury* says:

‘There is a despatch now in the Foreign Office, dated as long back as October 1858... from the President of the Swiss Republic, stating that he had reason to believe that some conditional agreement had been come to between the Emperor of the French and Count Cavour with respect to Savoy.’ [Marx’s note]

**87** See no 1 of the first *Blue Book: On the Proposed Annexation of Savoy* [etc]. [Marx’s note]

**88** Vogt’s desire to throw an Italian ‘bone’ into the jaws of the ‘French wolf’ from ‘the narrowest German standpoint’, so that the wolf will suffer from indigestion, will undeniably be fulfilled to a constantly increasing degree. In the semi-official *Revue contemporaine* of 15 October 1860 — and, may it incidentally be said, *Vogt’s particular patroness* — there is to be found a report dated 8 October from Turin, which says, among other things:

‘*Genoa and Sardinia* would be the legitimate price of a new French war for Italian unity. I add that possession of Genoa would be the necessary instrument of our influence on the peninsula and the only effective way of preventing the naval power to whose formation we have contributed, from one day escaping our alliance in order to enter some new one. *Only with our knee in its throat can we secure the loyalty of Italy. Austria, a good judge in this matter, knows that very well. We shall not press so brutally as Austria, but better — that is the only difference.*’ [Marx’s note]

## Chapter IX: Agency

So muosens alle strîten  
in vîl angestlichen zîten  
wart gescheiden doch her dan  
... der *Vogt* da von Bërne. — Klage <sup>[1]</sup>

In a programme which he wittily dates *April Fool’s Day*, that is to say 1 April 1859, *Da-Da Vogt* called on all democrats of different shades to contribute to a newspaper that was to appear in Geneva and was to spread the Russo-Decembrist views of his *Studien*. Carefully drawn up as the programme had, of course, to be, the cloven hoof still occasionally shows through its blotting-paper cover. However, let us not waste any time on that.

At the end of the programme, Vogt begs his addressees to send him details of ‘like-minded people’ who ‘would be prepared to work in the same sense for papers and journals started by him’. At the Central Festival in Lausanne, he stated that he had drafted a programme with an invitation to:

... *those that* wanted to follow the same, to work for an appropriate honorarium in the organs of the press at his disposal. (*Centralfest*, p 17)

Finally, it says in a letter to *Dr Loening*:

Can you put me in touch with people who can, based on Frankfurt, work in this sense on newspapers and journals? I am willing to pay them a decent honorarium for works, an offprint of which is sent to me. (*Magnum Opus*, Documents, p 36)

The ‘like-minded people’ of the programme become ‘*those that*’ at the Central Festival in Lausanne, and ‘those that’ in relation to Dr Loening, are transformed into ‘*people*’, people *sans phrase*.<sup>[2]</sup> Vogt, the General Treasurer and General Auditor of the German press, has ‘funds placed at his disposal’ (*Magnum Opus*, p 36) in order to pay not only for articles ‘in newspapers and journals’ but also ‘pamphlets’. It will be grasped that an agency on this scale requires quite considerable ‘funds’.

— er sante nach allen den hêrren  
 die in diusken rîchen wâren;  
 er klagete in allen sîn nôt,  
 unde bôt in ouch sîn golt rôt. (*Kaiserchronik*)<sup>[3]</sup>

— he sent to all the Lords  
 that lived in Germany;  
 He told them of his needs  
 And offered them his red gold.

But for what purpose were newspapers, journals and pamphlets to be ‘worked on’ by *those who*, when they ‘sent them in’ to Vogt would be paid a ‘decent honorarium’ by him? ‘For the safe of Italy’, nothing more; for in order to parry the threat to the Rhine it ‘seems’ to Herr Vogt ‘to be advantageous to let Louis Bonaparte bleed to death in Italy’ (*Magnum Opus*, programme, p 34). No, ‘it is not for the sake of Italy’ (Letter to Dr Loening, *Magnum Opus*, p 36). ‘It is for the sake of Hungary.’ (Letter to Herr H— in N—, *Magnum Opus*, p 36). No, it is not for the sake of Hungary. ‘It is for the sake of... things about which I cannot tell you.’ (*Magnum Opus*, Documents, p 36)

Just as contradictory as the thing for whose sake it is, is the source from which the decent ‘funds’ flow. It is ‘a distant corner of French Switzerland’ (*Magnum Opus*, p 210). No, ‘it is Hungarian women from the West’ (Letter to Karl Blind, supplement no 44 of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, 13 February 1860). Conversely, it is men ‘in the domain of the German, and particularly of the Austrian Police’ (*Centralfest*, p 17). The quantity of his funds is no less chameleon-like than their purpose and their source. It is ‘a few francs’ (*Magnum Opus*, p 210). They are ‘small funds’ (*Centralfest*, p 17). They are sufficient funds to give everybody a decent honorarium who can work in a Vogtian way in the German press and in pamphlets. Finally, the manner in which the funds were raised is also two-fold. Vogt ‘scraped them together with great difficulty’ (*Magnum Opus*, p 210). No, they ‘were placed at his disposal’ (*Magnum Opus*, Documents, p 36).

If I am not mistaken [says the ‘rounded character’] then *bribery* is equivalent to using money and other advantages to move somebody to do and say things that are against his convictions. (*Magnum Opus*, p 217)

So nobody whose convictions permit him to *sell* himself can be *bribed*. When, for example, the foreign press section of the Paris ministry offers to Swiss newspapers the Parisian *Lithographierte Correspondenz*, which appears daily and costs 250 francs, for a half or a quarter of the price, or even free, and draws the attention of ‘well disposed’ editors to the fact that they can count on monthly subsidies of 50, 100 and 150 francs, increasing ‘in proportion to their success’, then ‘pon my soul that is not bribery. Editors whose convictions are opposed to the daily *Correspondenz* and the monthly subsidy are not forced to accept either. And is Granier de Cassagnac ‘bribed’, or La Guéronnière, or About, or Grandguillot, or Bullier, or Jourdan of the *Siècle*<sup>[4]</sup> or Martin and Boniface of the *Constitutionnel*<sup>[5]</sup> or Rochaid Da-Da Albert? Has any act or utterance, backed by hard cash, ever in the lives of these gentlemen managed to contradict their convictions? Or did Vogt, for example, bribe the agent of a certain Swiss newspaper which had previously been hostile to him when he placed at his disposal gratis several hundred copies of his *Studien*? A peculiar invitation this, in any case, an invitation from Vogt to publicists to work in accordance with their own convictions in the organs at their disposal, and for this work to receive an honorarium through the organ of Herr Karl Vogt in Geneva. The fact that Vogt mixes up the honorarium paid by a newspaper to its own contributors with secret subsidies offered from an anonymous source by a third party to the correspondents of newspapers totally unconnected with him — this *quid pro quo* simply goes to show how far the German Da-Da has ‘assimilated’ the morals of 2 December.

‘An der Quelle Saß der Knabe.’<sup>[6]</sup> But by what source?



Instead of the weekly *Die neue Schweiz* that Vogt had intended, there later appeared in Geneva the *Neue Schweizer Zeitung* set up by Vogt's friend of many years' standing, Herr A Brass. <sup>[7]</sup> One cool November morning Herr Brass announced, to the amazement of the whole of Geneva, that he had 'written a letter to Vogt rejecting the *French feeding trough* that Vogt has wished to place before him'.

At the same time he announced that he was prepared to back up his denunciation should the occasion arise (*Neue Schweizer Zeitung*, 12 November 1859). And the cock, or rather the capon who had hitherto crowed so lustily fell silent as soon as he was tumbled on his own dung-heap. The 'New Swiss, citizen of the Canton of Berne and member of the Geneva *Ständerat*' had now been publicly accused in the middle of Geneva by one of his 'notorious' friends of *attempted bribery with French money*. And the member of the Geneva *Ständerat* fell silent.

Do not think that Vogt could simply ignore the *Neue Schweizer Zeitung* with dignity. The denunciation against him appeared, as has been said, in the issue of 12 November 1859. Shortly afterwards, the same paper carried a piquant description of Plon-Plon, and the *Revue de Genève*, <sup>[8]</sup> the organ of the dictator of Geneva, James Fazy, immediately protested in a four-column lead-article (*Revue de Genève*, 6 December 1859). It protested 'au nom du radicalisme genevois', in the name of Geneva radicalism. Such is the weight that Fazy himself ascribed to the *Neue Schweizer Zeitung*. The four-column lead-article in the *Revue de Genève* unmistakably shows Vogt's helping hand. Brass himself is excused to a certain extent. He himself is said not to be the author of the attack on Plon-Plon, but only to have been led astray. In true Vogtian fashion the *corpus delicti* is shifted onto the same L Häfner on to whom Vogt in the *Magnum Opus* (p 188) casts suspicion of writing 'disgusting, personal and scandalous stories about the Emperor and Prince Napoleon'. There is also the allusion, inevitable with Vogt, to the 'infamous ex-lieutenant Clossmann of Baden' as Berne correspondent of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* (see *Magnum Opus*, p 198). Let us spend a moment on the protest published by the master and the servant, James Fazy <sup>[9]</sup> and Karl Vogt, 'in the name of Geneva radicalism' and to save the honour of Plon-Plon on 6 December 1859 in the *Revue de Genève*.

Brass is accused of trying to 'strengthen his German opinion of France by insulting a Prince of the House of Bonaparte'. It is said that, as has already been known in Geneva for a long time, *Plon-Plon* is a liberal of the purest water who, while in exile, was noble enough to refuse 'to play a role in the court of Stuttgart, or even of St Petersburg'; that nothing could be more ridiculous than ascribing to him the idea of forming a little principality somewhere, a Kingdom of Etruria perhaps, as the offending article in the *Neue Schweizer Zeitung* does:

Prince Napoleon, strongly conscious of his own *genius* and *talent*, values himself too highly for these miserable little thrones.

He much prefers to play the Marquis of Posa to his sublime cousin 'as a Citizen Prince' (*prince-citoyen*) in France, 'the centre of higher civilisation and general incentive'. 'His cousin respects and loves him, whatever people may say about it.' The Prince is not only Bonaparte's Marquis of Posa, he is the 'disinterested friend' of Italy, of Switzerland and in brief of all the nationalities:

Prince Napoleon is, like the Emperor, a great economist... Surely, if ever the good principles of political economy are victorious in France, Prince Napoleon will have contributed a great deal towards it.

He was and is a 'partisan of the most unlimited freedom of the press', opponent of all preventive police measures, proponent of the 'idea of freedom in the broadest sense of the word, in its theory as in its practice'. If he finds the Emperor's ear blocked to his Egeria <sup>[10]</sup> voice by his evil entourage, he withdraws with dignity but 'without sulking'. It is none other 'than *his merit* that has exposed him to the slanders of Europe':

The enemies of France fear him because he bases himself on the revolutionary support of the peoples of Europe in order to restore to them their nationality and their freedom.

A misunderstood genius, therefore, a Marquis of Posa, an Egeria, an economist, protector of the subjugated nationalities, democrat of the purest water — and — can it be possible? — Plon-Plon <sup>[11]</sup> is '*habile comme général et brave comme tout officier français*' — 'skilled as a general and brave, like every French officer'. 'He proved that in the Eastern campaign during and after the Battle of

Alma.’ And in the Italian campaign ‘he organised his army corps of 50,000 men [the famous Corps de touristes, I am tempted to say Corps de ballet] very well and, in a short space of time, carried out a difficult march through mountainous country without his troops lacking for anything’.

French soldiers in the Crimea are known to have christened cold feet under fire *la maladie Plon-Plonienne*, and it is probable that Plon-Plon only left the peninsula because of the growing lack of food.

‘We’, the *Revue de Genève* triumphantly concludes, ‘we have shown him’ — that is to say Plon-Plon — ‘as he is.’

Hurrah for General Plon-Plon!

No wonder *Vogt* says, then, that he has received his war-chest from ‘democratic hands’. Plon-Plon, the *Prince Rouge*,<sup>[12]</sup> is *Vogt*’s ideal as he is *Fazy*’s, to a certain extent the bewitched Prince of European democracy. *Vogt* could not receive his money from purer democratic hands than Plon-Plon’s. Even if part of the money handed over directly by Plon-Plon’s illustrious cousin to Mr Kossuth finds its way through Hungarian hands into *Vogt*’s hands, ‘its origins’ remain ‘a horror’, but from Plon-Plon’s hands! Even the money *Vogt* received at the time of the Neuchâtel deal from Klapka’s<sup>[13]</sup> friend, Countess C—, may have come from more delicate hands, but certainly not from purer or more democratic ones. ‘Plon-Plon est voluptueux comme Héliogabale,<sup>[14]</sup> lâche comme Ivan III et faux comme un vrai Bonaparte’, says a well-known French writer.<sup>[15]</sup> The worst thing Plon-Plon did was to make his cousin an *homme sérieux*.<sup>[16]</sup> Victor Hugo could still say of Louis Bonaparte: n’est pas monstre qui veut,<sup>[17]</sup> but since Louis Bonaparte invented Plon-Plon the business aspect of the Imperial Janus face is concentrated on the man in the Tuileries and the grotesque aspect is concentrated on the man in the Palais Royal. The false Bonaparte, who is his uncle’s nephew without being his father’s son,<sup>[18]</sup> appears real alongside this real Bonaparte, so that the French still say: l’autre est plus sûr.<sup>[19]</sup> Plon-Plon is at the same time the Don Quixote and the Hudibras<sup>[20]</sup> of the Bas Empire.<sup>[21]</sup> Hamlet brooded over the fact that Alexander’s ashes were perhaps fated to stop the bung-hole of a barrel. What would Hamlet say if he caught sight of the severed head of Napoleon on Plon-Plon’s shoulders!

Although *Vogt* mainly funded his war chest ‘from the French feeding-trough’, he may well also have staged ostensible collections of ‘a few francs’ among his more or less democratic friends in order to mask the feeding trough. In this way, the contradictions in the source and quantity of the funds and the way in which they were raised are easily resolved.

*Vogt*’s agency was not confined to *Studien*, a ‘Programme’ and a recruiting office. At the *Lausanne Central Festival* he proclaimed Louis Bonaparte’s mission of liberating the nationalities to the German workers in Switzerland, although he did so, of course, from a much more radical point of view than that of the *Studien* intended for liberal philistines. There he had, by a profound penetration of the relationship between ‘matter and energy’, reached the conviction that there could be no thought ‘of the destruction and dissolution of the existing governments in Germany’ (*Studien*, Foreword, p vii), and he particularly appealed to the ‘German bourgeois’ (*Studien*, p 128) to ‘take to heart’ the fact that the Bonapartist ‘liberation’ of Italy would prevent a ‘revolution’ in Germany. Conversely, he informs the German workers that ‘Austria is the *sole bulwark* for their [the German Princes’] continued existence’ (*Centralfest*, p 11).

I have just told you [he says] that, as far as people abroad are concerned, Germany does not exist, that it first of all has to be created, and that it is my conviction that it can only be created in the form of a *confederation of republics* similar to that of the Swiss Confederation. (*Centralfest*, p 10)

He said this on 26 June 1859, while as recently as 6 June, in the Afterword to the second edition of the *Studien*, he had begged the Prince Regent of Prussia to subjugate Germany to the House of Hohenzollern by force of arms and by a dynastic civil war. Monarchist centralisation by force of arms is, of course, the shortest path to a federal republic ‘similar to that of the Swiss Confederation’.

He further developed the theory of the ‘*external enemy*’ — France — with whom Germany would have to ally herself against the ‘*internal enemy*’ — Austria.

If I am given the choice [he cried] between the devil (Habsburg) and his grandmother (Louis Bonaparte), *I shall choose the latter*; for she is an old woman, and she will die.

However, this direct appeal to Germany to throw herself into the arms of Decembrist France on the pretext of hatred for Austria seemed to him to be too compromising for the reading public, so that in the *printed* speech he altered it in the following way:

And if the question does arise of taking sides in the struggle between the devil and his grandmother, we think it best *if they both beat each other to death and eat each other up*, thus saving us the trouble. (*Centrafest*, p 13)

And finally, while in the *Studien* he appoints Louis Bonaparte Emperor of the peasants and soldiers, he declares this time, in front of an audience of workers, that ‘*particularly the great majority of the workers in Paris* have been won at the present moment for Louis Bonaparte’:

Louis Bonaparte is [in the opinion of French workers] doing everything the Republic ought to have done *by giving the workers work and ruining the bourgeoisie* [etc]. (*Centrafest*, p 9)

So Louis Bonaparte is a *proletarian dictator*, and as a proletarian dictator he is praised to the German workers in Switzerland by that very same *Vogt* who, in the *Magnum Opus*, starts foaming with bourgeois indignation at the very mention of the words ‘proletarian dictatorship’!

The Paris programme that dictated to the Decembrist agents in Switzerland their organisational plan in relation to the annexation of Savoy consisted of three points: 1: to ignore rumours of impending danger completely for as long as possible and, if necessary, dismiss them as an Austrian invention; 2: at an advanced stage to spread the view that Louis Bonaparte wants to incorporate the neutral zone into Switzerland; and finally 3: after the annexation has been completed, to make use of it as a pretext for an *alliance between France and Switzerland*, that is, the complete subordination of Switzerland to a Bonapartist protectorate. We shall now see how loyally the master and the servant, *James Fazy* and *Karl Vogt*, the Dictator of Geneva and his appointee in the Geneva Ständerat, followed this programme.

We already know that in his *Studien* Vogt avoided the slightest allusion to the idea for which his man of destiny went to war. There is the same reticence at the Central Festival at Lausanne, at the National Council, at the Schiller and Robert Blum celebrations, in the Biel *Carpet-Bagger* and finally in the *Magnum Opus*. And nevertheless the idea dated back even before the conspiracy of *Plombières*. As early as *December 1851*, a few days after the *coup d'état*, one could read in the *Patriote savoisien*:

Posts in Savoy... are already being shared out in the antechambers of the Elysée. Its newspapers even joke about it pleasantly. <sup>[22]</sup>

On 6 December 1851, Herr Fazy could already see Geneva falling victim to the December empire.

On 1 July 1859, *Stämpfli*, the Federal President, had an interview with Captain Harris, British chargé d'affaires in Berne. He repeated his fears that the annexation of Savoy to France had been decided upon in the event of an extension of Sardinian rule in Italy, and emphasised that the annexation, particularly of North Savoy, would completely expose one flank of Switzerland and would soon entail the loss of Geneva. (See the first *Blue Book: On the Proposed Annexation of Savoy and Nice*, no 1.) Harris reported to Malmsbury, who for his part commissioned Lord Cowley in Paris to demand particulars from Walewski concerning the Emperor's intentions. Walewski did not at all deny that:

Peut être le citoyen Thurgovien que nous avons si bien défendu contre les menaces de Louis Philippe, nous fera-t-il la grâce de vouloir bien se constituer comme mediateur *et reprendre de nous Genève*.

Perhaps the citizen of Thurgau whom we protected so well against the threats of Louis-Philippe will show us the favour of being kind enough to play the mediator, *and take Geneva back from us*. (*Revue de Genève*, 6 December 1851)

Walewski's reply is dated from 4 July 1859, so that it preceded the Treaty of Villafranca. In August 1859, Petétin's pamphlet, which prepared Europe for the annexation of Savoy, appeared in Paris. *That same August*, after the summer session of the Swiss National Assembly, Herr Vogt crawled to Paris in order to fetch instructions from Plon-Plon there. To cover his tracks he had his fellow rascals spread the rumour that he had gone to a health resort on Lake Lucerne.

ze Pâris lëbt er mangel tac,  
vil kleiner wîsheit er enpflic  
sîn zerung was unmâzen grôz...;  
ist ër ein esel und ein gouch,  
daz sëlbb ist ër zuo Pâris ouch.  
He lived in Paris many a day,  
Became no wiser in any way,  
He ate beyond all moderation...;  
if he an ass or idiot is  
He'll still be one in Paris.

In September 1859, the Swiss *Bundesrat* saw the danger of annexation looming (*Blue Book: On the Proposed Annexation of Savoy and Nice*, no VI); on 12 November it decided to address a memorandum in this sense to the Great Powers; and on 18 November President Stämpfli and Chancellor Schiess handed over an official note to the British chargé d'affaires in Berne (*Blue Book: On the Proposed Annexation of Savoy and Nice*, no IX). James Fazy, who had returned in October from his unsuccessful journey to Tuscany, where he had worked for Plon-Plon's Etruscan kingdom, now opposed the rumours of annexation in his usual affectedly irascible, noisily quarrelsome way. Nobody in France or Sardinia would dream of annexation. The larger the danger loomed, the greater grew the confidence of the *Revue de Genève*, whose cult of the Napoleonic reached Chorybantic<sup>[23]</sup> proportions in November and December 1859. (See for example, the Plon-Plon article quoted above.)

The year of 1860 brings us to the second phase of the annexation deal.

It was no longer in the interests of the Decembrists to ignore or deny anything. The thing was now much rather to lure Switzerland into the annexation and to trick her into a false position. The second point of the Tuileries programme had to be carried out, that is to say that the catchword of the intended gift of the neutral zone to Switzerland had to be rung out as loud as possible. The Swiss Decembrists were, of course, supported by simultaneous manoeuvres in Paris. Thus *Baroche*, the Minister of the Interior, announced at the beginning of January 1860 to the Swiss Ambassador, *Dr Kern*, that:

... should any change in the ownership of Savoy occur hereafter it should only be made with due regard to those provisions of the Treaties of 1815 which stipulated that a portion of it sufficient to ensure a good line of defence should be at the same time ceded to Switzerland. (See the *Blue Book: On the Proposed Annexation of Savoy and Nice*, no XIII.)

As early as 2 February 1860, on the very same day that *Thouvenel* notified the British Ambassador, Lord Cowley, that the annexation of Savoy and Nice was 'a possibility', he also informed him:

... indeed, in the opinion of the French government, it would be well if in these circumstances the districts of Chablais and Faucigny should be united *permanently* to Switzerland. (*Blue Book: On the Proposed Annexation of Savoy and Nice*, no XXVII)

Spreading this illusion was intended not only to lure Switzerland into accepting the annexation of Savoy into the December empire, but also to blunt the edge of any subsequent protest on her part against the annexation and to compromise her in front of Europe as the accomplice, although duped, of *Decembrism*. *Frey-Herosé*, Federal President from 1860, did not fall into the trap, but on the contrary told Captain Harris his fears concerning the alleged advantages of incorporating the neutral area into Switzerland. For his part, *Harris* warned the Federal government against the Bonapartist intrigue, lest 'Switzerland, too, should appear to be a power cherishing annexationist desires and striving for territorial expansion'.

On the other hand, *Sir James Hudson*, British Ambassador in Turin, wrote, after a long interview with *Cavour*, to Lord John Russell:

I have good ground for believing that Switzerland also is anxious to annex to herself a portion of Savoy. Consequently, it ought to be clearly understood that when France is blamed for seeking this cession, Switzerland is no less to blame... This question,

therefore, becoming more complicated by this double attack, renders the position of Sardinia more defensible. (*Blue Book: On the Proposed Annexation of Savoy and Nice*, no XXXIV)

Finally, as soon as Louis Bonaparte threw away the mask, Thouvenel too quite unconcernedly let slip the secret of the catchword of the Swiss annexation of the neutral zone. In a despatch to the representative of the French legation in Berne, he openly mocks the Swiss protest against the annexation of Savoy by France, and with what? With the 'plan for the partition of Savoy' imposed on Switzerland by Paris (see Thouvenel's despatch of 17 March 1860).

And how, meanwhile, had the agents of December in Switzerland contributed to this tissue of defeat? *James Fazy* is the first, in January 1860, to present the annexation of Chablais and Faucigny by Switzerland to the British chargé d'affaires in Berne, not as a promise on the part of Louis Bonaparte, but as the actual wish of the Swiss and of the inhabitants of the neutral districts (*Blue Book: On the Proposed Annexation of Savoy and Nice*, no XXIII). *Vogt*, who had hitherto never suspected the possibility of the annexation of Savoy and Nice by France, is now suddenly filled with the spirit of prophecy, and *The Times*, which has not mentioned *Vogt's* name once since its foundation, suddenly reports in an item dated 30 January:

The Swiss Professor *Vogt* pretends to know that France will procure for Switzerland Faucigny, Chablais and the Genevese, the neutral provinces of Savoy, if the Grand Council of the Republic will let her have the free use of the Simplon. (*The Times*, 3 February 1860)

Yet more! At the end of January 1860, *James Fazy* assures the British chargé d'affaires in Berne that *Cavour*, with whom he had held a long interview scarcely two weeks previously in Geneva, was up in arms against any secessions to France. (See the *Blue Book: On the Proposed Annexation of Savoy and Nice*, no XXXIII.) While *Fazy* thus vouches to Britain for *Cavour*, *Cavour* uses the same *Fazy's* annexationist lusts to excuse himself to Britain (*Blue Book: On the Proposed Annexation of Savoy and Nice*, no XXXIII). And finally *Tourte*, the Swiss Ambassador in Turin, runs all by himself to the British Ambassador *Hudson* on 9 February 1860 to assure him that:

... no engagement subsists between Sardinia and France for the cession of Savoy to France, and that Sardinia is not in the least disposed to cede or exchange Savoy to France. (*Blue Book: On the Proposed Annexation of Savoy and Nice*, no XXXIII)

The moment of decision loomed closer. The Parisian *Patrie* of 25 January 1860 prepared the ground for the annexation of Savoy in an article entitled 'les vœux de la Savoie'.<sup>[24]</sup> In a further article of 27 January, 'le Comté de Nice',<sup>[25]</sup> it foreshadowed, December-style, the annexation of Nice. On 2 February 1860, Thouvenel notified the British Ambassador, *Cowley*, of the annexation of Savoy and Nice as a 'possibility' that had already been agreed before the war by France and Sardinia. An official note on France's *real* decision to annex Savoy and Nice was not, however, conveyed to Lord *Cowley* until 5 February (see Lord *Cowley's* speech to the House of Lords of 23 April) and to Dr *Kern* until 6 February — with the specific statement to both Ambassadors, British and Swiss, that the neutral zone was to be incorporated into Switzerland. Before these official revelations, *James Fazy* was informed from the Tuileries that Sardinia had *already* ceded Savoy and Nice to France by a secret treaty, and that the treaty *did not contain a clause in favour of Switzerland*. Before Thouvenel's official statement to Lord *Cowley* and Dr *Kern*, *Fazy* was supposed to sugar the imperial pill and administer it to his subjects in Geneva. On 3 February therefore he had his blindly devoted tool *John Perrier* call a popular meeting at the premises of the Club Populaire, at which he appeared as if by accident under the pretext:

... that he had just heard [je viens d'entendre] that the subject under discussion was any secret treaties that France and Sardinia may have concluded on the secession of Savoy. Unfortunately such a treaty was signed on 27 January by the Sardinian government; but from this *positive fact* we cannot yet conclude that our security is really threatened... The treaty does not, it is true, contain any written reservation in favour of our rights in the neutral territory of Sardinia, but we do not know whether such a reservation exists in the minds of the contracting parties... so it may have been the subject of an unspoken agreement [sous-entendu comme allant de soi]... we must

not show premature spirit of distrust... we must appeal to sympathy [with the *coup d'état* empire]... and avoid any hostile word.

(See Fazy's 'confidential' speech, in its way a masterpiece of demagogy, in the *Revue de Genève* of 3 February 1860.)

The British chargé d'affaires in Berne found Fazy's prophetic gift remarkable enough to inform Lord John Russell of it in a special dispatch.

The *official* treaty on the secession of Savoy and Nice to France was to be signed on 24 March 1860, so there was no time to lose. The Swiss patriotism of the Geneva Decembrists had to be officially recognised before the annexation of Savoy was officially proclaimed. Signor *Vogt* therefore travelled, in company with General *Klapka*, who was probably acting in good faith, at the beginning of March to Paris, in order to bring his influence to bear on the Egeria of the Palais Royal, the misunderstood genius, Plon-Plon, and, before the eyes of the whole of Switzerland, throw *his personal weight* into the scales in favour of the annexation of the neutral zone to Switzerland. From Plon-Plon's Lucullan board — for as we know, in gastronomical matters Plon-Plon vies with Lucullus and Cambacérés, so that if Brillat-Savarin himself were to rise from the dead he would marvel at Plon-Plon's *genius, national economy, liberal ideas, generalship and personal bravery* in this field — from Plon-Plon's Lucullan board which, as a 'pleasant companion', he boldly attacked, Falstaff-Vogt now called on the Swiss to be bold. (See his letter from Paris to the Biel *Carpet-Bagger* of 8 March 1860, Supplement.) Switzerland was to show that 'her militia was not simply there for parading and playing at soldiers'. The 'secession of the neutral zone to Switzerland' was an illusion.

Relinquishing Chablais and Faucigny to France is a first step which would be followed by others.... *The twin stilts of nationality and natural frontiers* will carry one from Lake Geneva to the Aar and finally to Lake Constance and the Rhine — if the legs are strong enough.

But — and this is the point — Falstaff-Vogt *still does not believe* what Thouvenel himself, the French Foreign Minister, had officially admitted a month previously, and what all of Europe already knew — that the secession of Savoy and Nice had been negotiated as the price of French intervention against Austria as early as *August 1858 at Plombières*. On the contrary, his 'man of destiny' has only just been driven into the arms of chauvinism against his will by the priests, and forced into the confiscation of the neutral zone.

Obviously [stutters the embarrassed apologist], obviously leading circles have *sought* a counter-weight to the *constantly growing clerical movement*, and now believe that they have found it in so-called chauvinism — in that most short-sighted national feeling that knows no better than the acquisition of *a scrap* [!] of land.

After making such a bold to-do, intoxicated by the fumes of Plon-Plon's cook-house, in the Biel *Carpet-Bagger*, Vogt used the same mouthpiece shortly after his return from France to tell fables about the absolutely pro-French feelings of the inhabitants of Nice. He thus fell into an unpleasant conflict with *Vegazzi-Ruscalla*, a member of the central executive of the Italian National Association and author of the pamphlet *La Nazionalità di Nizza*.<sup>[26]</sup> And when that same hero who had played the Winkelried<sup>[27]</sup> from Plon-Plon's dining table now took the floor at the National Council in Berne, his martial trumpet call was transformed into the diplomatic piping of a flute recommending the calm continuation of negotiations with *the Emperor, who had always been a friend of the Swiss*, and warning with particular emphasis against an *alliance with the East*. Frey-Hérosé, the Federal President, cast a few peculiar aspersions on *Vogt*, who did, on the other hand, have the pleasure of seeing his speech praised in the *Nouvelliste Vaudois*. The *Nouvelliste Vaudois* is the organ of Messrs Blanche-nay, Delarageaz and the other state magnates of the Vaud, in a word of the Swiss Western Railway, just as the *Neue Züricher Zeitung* is the organ of Zurich Bonapartism and the Northern Railway. To characterise the patrons of the *Nouvelliste Vaudois* it is sufficient to note that, on the occasion of the famous Oron Railway struggle, five members of the Vaud Government Council were repeatedly and without punishment accused in the enemy press of receiving 10,000 francs each in stock (20 shares) as a present from the Paris *Crédit Mobilier*<sup>[28]</sup> — the main shareholder in the Swiss Western Railway.

A few days after *Vogt*, accompanied by *Klapka*, had set off to see the Egeria of the Palais Royal, *James Fazy*, accompanied by *John Perrier*,<sup>[29]</sup> went to see the Sphinx of the Tuileries. As we know, Louis Bonaparte enjoys playing the role of the Sphinx, and hires his own Oedipuses just as earlier kings of France used to hire their own court jesters. At the Tuileries *Fazy* threw himself between Switzerland and the Sphinx. As has been said, his companion on the journey was *John Perrier*. This John is his James' shadow, does everything that he wants him to do, nothing that he does not want, lives through him and for him, became a Grand Councillor of Geneva through him, prepares all his feasts and toasts, his Leporello and his Fialin.<sup>[30]</sup> Both returned to Geneva with nothing achieved as far as the position of Switzerland was concerned, but with amazing success as regards *Fazy's* own threatened position. *Fazy* publicly thundered that the scales had fallen from his eyes, and that from now on he would hate Louis Bonaparte as much as he had once loved him. A peculiar love this, nourished for nine years by the republican *Fazy* for the murderer of two republics! *Fazy* played the disappointed patriot with such virtuosity that the whole of Geneva was swamped with enthusiasm for him, and the loss of *Fazy's* illusions was felt almost more keenly than the loss of the neutral provinces. Even Theodore de Saussure,<sup>[31]</sup> his opponent of many years and the chief of the aristocratic opposition party, conceded that it was no longer possible to doubt *James Fazy's* Swiss patriotism.

Having received such a well-deserved popular ovation, the tyrant of Geneva rushed off to the National Council in Berne. Shortly after his departure his faithful servant, his companion on the journey to Paris, in short his own *John Perrier*, undertook an Argosy<sup>[32]</sup> of quite a different sort. A gang of Genevan drunkards (or so, at least, they were described in the *London Times*), selected from the Society of '*Fruitiers*', *Fazy's* democratic bodyguard, sailed under *Perrier's* command unarmed to *Thonon* to hold an anti-French demonstration in that part of the neutral zone. What this demonstration consisted of or was supposed to consist of, whether the Argonauts had a golden fleece to conquer, or whether they were taking on to their own skins the responsibility for someone else, to this day no one can say, for no Orpheus accompanied *Perrier's* Argosy and no Appolonius<sup>[33]</sup> sang of it. What it was, it appears, was a kind of symbolic occupation of the neutral zone by *John Perrier* and his gang as representatives of Switzerland. The real Switzerland, however, soon had her hands so full, what with diplomatic excuses and declarations of loyalty and expressions of indignation on account of *John Perrier's* symbolic occupation, that in fact it appeared very moderate on the part of Louis Bonaparte to confine himself merely to the real occupation of *Thonon* and the rest of the neutral zone.

*John Perrier*, in whose pockets several thousand francs were found, was arrested in Geneva. *M Ducommun*, the Vice-Chancellor of State and editor of the *Revue de Genève*, a young man without any personal wealth and dependent in both the qualities mentioned above on the President of the Council of State and owner of the *Revue*, *James Fazy*, was also arrested on *Perrier's* evidence. He admitted that he had given *Perrier* the money and that it had been taken from a fund that had been set up to finance a Free Corps — a fund whose existence had until then been unknown to the Geneva radicals. The legal investigation ended with the release first of *Ducommun* then of *Perrier*.

On 24 March, Nice and Savoy, together with the neutral zone, were officially ceded to Bonaparte by Victor Emmanuel. On 29–30 March, *John Perrier*, who had returned to Geneva from Paris with *Fazy*, undertook his *Argosy*, a burlesque demonstration which frustrated any serious demonstration at the decisive moment. In Berne, *James Fazy* assured everyone that 'he knew nothing about the incident'.<sup>[34]</sup> In the former neutral zone *Laity* boasted that if the Swiss really had attacked there the Emperor would immediately have marched three divisions into Geneva. Last of all, the secret of the *Argosy* was totally and utterly unknown to *Vogt*, for, a few days before it took place, he as a preventive measure denounced to the Geneva police a collision of the Savoy frontier originating in Geneva. But it was a red herring. I have a letter before me on this subject written by a refugee living in Geneva, a former friend of *Vogt*, to a refugee living in London. It says, among other things:

*Vogt* spread about that I was continually roaming around the West of Switzerland and Savoy in order to plot a revolution against the interests of Switzerland and in favour of powers hostile to her. This was only a few days before *Perrier's* attentat, about which *Vogt* certainly knew, but I knew as little as you. Obviously he tried to divert the trail to me and to ruin me. Fortunately *he also denounced me to the Director of Police*,

*Duy*, who summoned me and was not a little surprised when, at the very first question, I interrupted him and said, smiling: ‘Aha! The well-known Vogtian intrigue!’ He now asked for more information about my relationship with *Vogt*. My testimony was at the same time confirmed by a government secretary, a member of the Helvetia, who the other day travelled to a central meeting in Berne and there made unfriendly remarks about Karl’s behaviour to *Vogt*’s brother, whereupon Gustav laconically remarked that he had long since seen from his letters what his politics were like.

At first silence and denials and sermons preaching trust in Louis Bonaparte had diverted Swiss attention away from the danger. Later the outcry over the intended incorporation of Faucigny, Chablais and the Genevois into Switzerland had popularised the annexation of Savoy to France. Finally, the burlesque at Thonon was intended to break any serious resistance. And now the annexation, which had actually taken place, and the danger, which had become undeniable, had, according to the Paris programme, to serve as motives for Switzerland to lay down her arms voluntarily, *that is, make an alliance with the December empire.*

This task was so delicate that only *James Fazy* himself could start on its solution. His servant *Vogt* could warn against an *alliance with the East*, but only Fazy himself could advocate an *alliance with the West*. He hinted at its necessity first of all in the *Revue de Genève*. On 18 April 1860, there circulated in Geneva an extract from a letter from London, which said among other things:

Recommend to our influential fellow-citizens that they should be on their guard against any advice *James Fazy* may give to Switzerland to *give up her neutrality*. It is very probable that this advice originates from the *French government* itself, whose faithful agent *James Fazy* has been up until today... He now adopts the attitude of a good Swiss who is working against the intentions of France, but a usually well-informed person assures me that this is a trap. As soon as Switzerland declares that she is no longer willing or able to remain neutral, the French government will act upon it and force her into an alliance as she did at the time of the first empire.

*Fazy* had the following reply to this printed in the *Revue de Genève*:

The day that Savoy and France are united, the neutrality of Switzerland will cease by itself, and such advice on *Fazy*’s part would thus be superfluous.

Three months later, on 10 July, *James Fazy* made a speech at the Swiss National Council in which:

Cursing and roaring, shaking a fist at the Bonapartist moneymen and Barons of the Confederation — he denounced them as *le gouvernement souterrain* — he marched into the Bonapartist camp.

The officially pro-French party of Zurich and the Vaud therefore calmly let him bluster, although apparently it came under the crudest attack:

Europe, *particularly Germany*, has abandoned Switzerland. *Thus neutrality has become impossible; Switzerland must seek alliances, but where?*

Then the old demagogue mutters something:

... about France, our neighbour and our kin, who will one day see the injustice she has done and make it good, and could perhaps even become a republic, etc. But the money men and the Barons of the Confederation, who have outlived their time, must not inaugurate *this new policy*; Helvetia, the people, must do it. Just wait, the next election will teach you your manners. The federal troops are extremely welcome in Geneva. But should their presence cast the slightest doubt on the present government of Geneva, then off with them. Geneva will help and defend herself.

Thus on 10 July, *James Fazy* carried out in the National Council what he had hinted at in the *Revue de Genève* of 18 April — ‘*the new policy*’, *alliance between Switzerland and France*, that is, annexation of Switzerland by December. Well-informed people in Switzerland thought that this dropping of the anti-Bonapartist mask that *Fazy* had worn since his return from the Tuileries was premature. *Fazy*, however, possesses a virtuosity in the art of the calculated indiscretion almost reminiscent of Palmerston.



The most notorious representatives of the 'gouvernement souterrain', as we know, moved a motion of censure against *Stämpfli* in the National Council because, as Federal President, he had grasped the situation and for a moment had taken the correct decision to secure the neutral zone against French infringement with Federal troops. The motion of censure was rejected by an enormous majority of the votes, but *Vogt's* vote was missing.

It is very characteristic of *Karl Vogt* [somebody wrote to me at the time from Switzerland] that at the time of the discussion in the Swiss *Ständerat* concerning the vote of censure against the Federal President, *Stämpfli*, he was missing. As a representative of the Canton of Geneva, which was threatened by Bonaparte, *Vogt* had, of necessity, to vote for its energetic defender. Moreover, he is his personal friend and owes him a debt of gratitude. *Vogt's* father and two brothers earn their bread as employees of the Canton of Berne. Not long ago *Stämpfli* helped a third brother to obtain a well-paid post as Senior Federal Statistician. Consequently it was not really possible for him to come out against his friend, benefactor and countryman in a division where every vote would be called out. On the other hand, it was no more possible for *Vogt*, the Plon-Plonist, to approve a policy that fought Bonapartist aggression to the death. Hence he ran away and hid his head, but in the process his broad backside remained visible and received some knocks, the usual stratagem and the destiny of the modern Falstaff here below.

The catchphrase of 'Austrianism' passed out by the Tuileries and bandied about so loudly by *James Fazy* in the *Revue de Genève* and by his servant *Vogt* in the *Biel Carpet-Bagger*, the *Studien*, the *Magnum Opus*, etc, now rebounded upon Switzerland herself. About the middle of April a placard appeared on the walls of Milan: 'Conflict between Napoleon and Switzerland.' It says:

Savoy seems to Switzerland to be an appetising morsel, and she is hurrying, spurred on by *Austria*, to get in the way of Napoleon III's plans in a matter that only concerns Italy and France... Britain and the northern great powers, excluding *Austria*, do not oppose the annexation of Savoy in the slightest. Only *Switzerland*, egged on by *Austria*, who strives to stir up disorder and tumult in all the states allied to Sardinia, has used her veto... *Switzerland* is an abnormal state, which cannot for long withstand the pressure of the great principle of nationality. Germans, Frenchmen and Italians are not capable of submitting to the same laws. If *Switzerland* knows this, then let her not forget that in the Canton of Ticino the language of Foscolo and Giusti is spoken, and let her not forget that a great part of the population belongs to the great and magnanimous nation called *French*.

*Switzerland*, it appears, is nothing but an *Austrian* invention.

While *Vogt* himself was making such zealous efforts to save *Switzerland* from the claws of *Austria*, he entrusted to one of his most trusty accomplices, the Swabian chatterbox *Karl Mayer from Esslingen*, self-important, rump-parliamentarian, and presently proprietor of a trinket factory, the salvation of *Germany*. At the consecration of the colours of the Neuchâtel German Workers' Association, celebrated in the Crown at St Blaise, the main speaker, rump-parliamentarian and trinket-maker *Karl Mayer from Esslingen* called on *Germany* 'just to let the French over the Rhine, for otherwise things in *Germany* would never get better'.

Two deputies of the Geneva Workers' Association, returning from the ceremony after the New Year (of 1860) reported this incident. After the report had been confirmed by the delegates of several other West-Swiss Associations, the Geneva headquarters issued a circular as a general warning against Bonapartist intrigues among German workers in *Switzerland*.

It recalled [I am quoting from a memorandum I have in front of me] the first empire, when individual Germans also tried to encourage Napoleon's world domination, thinking that the colossus would not survive the fall of him that bore it, and that there would emerge from the dissolution of the provinces of the Frankish Empire a *Germany* at least united, which would then find it all the easier to win her freedom. It said that it was political charlatanism to bleed a living body dry in the hope that, by a miracle, healthy blood would grow in its place. Moreover, it criticised the idea of

denying outright that a great people had the strength to defend themselves and the right to self-determination. Finally, it noted that the expected Messiah of Germany had, after all, just shown in Italy what *he* meant by national liberation, etc. The circular was aimed, as it said, only at those Germans who had chosen the wrong means to a good end, but it refused to have anything to do with *venal publicists* or ambitious *ci-devants*.

At the same time, the *Aargauer Nachrichten*, the organ of the Helvetia, <sup>[35]</sup> scourged the:

... logic according to which you have to let the hedgehog into the mole-hole so that you can more easily lay hold of it and pull it out. According to this fine logic, one would also have to let the Ephialteses do as they wish so that there can be Leonidases. <sup>[36]</sup> *A certain Professor* is said to be an upside-down version of Duke Ulrich of Württemberg, <sup>[37]</sup> who tried to return home from exile by way of the ‘Bundschuh’ after the cavalier’s boot had shown itself to be no longer interested in him. *That same Professor*, however, has fallen out with the shoe and is therefore trying on the boot [etc].

The importance of this denunciation against *Herr Professor Vogt* lay in the fact that it appeared in the organ of the Helvetia. But in return he was all the better received by the *Espérance*, <sup>[38]</sup> a journal set up in 1859 in Geneva in a large format and at great expense to the French Treasury. The task of the *Espérance* was to preach the annexation of Savoy and the Rhineland in particular and Louis Bonaparte’s messianic vocation of national liberation in general. It is well known all over *Geneva* that *Vogt* is an habitué of the *Espérance* editorial offices and one of its most active contributors. Details have come into my possession which *place* the fact *beyond all question*. What *Vogt* hints at in the *Studien*, what he had openly announced in Neuchâtel by his fellow-rascal, the Swabian chatterbox, rump-parliamentarian and trinket-maker *Karl Mayer* from *Esslingen*, finds its further development in the *Espérance*. Thus for example it says in the issue of 26 March 1860:

If the only hope of German patriots is based on a war with France, what reason can they have to wish to weaken that country’s government and prevent it from forming its *natural frontiers*? Or can it be that the people in Germany are far from sharing this hatred of France? Be that as it may, *there are very upright German patriots, particularly among the most advanced German democrats [particularly the Reichs-Vogt, the Ranickel, Karl Mayer from Esslingen, and tutti quanti] who see no great misfortune in the loss of the left bank of the Rhine, and who are, on the other hand, convinced that the political life of Germany, of a Germany reborn, based on the alliance and merging into the civilisation of the European West, will only begin after this loss.* <sup>[39]</sup>

Accurately informed as it was by *Vogt* about the views of the most advanced German democrats, the *Espérance* declared in a leading article of 30 May, ‘a plebiscite on the left bank of the Rhine would soon show that everybody there is sympathetic to France’.

The *Postheiri*, a humorous Swiss paper, now pours out bad jokes on the *Espérance*, calling it a ‘jaded nag’ who, besides Bacchus Plon-Plon’s laurels, which were light enough, now had to carry ‘the heavy paunch’ of his Silenus upon its crop as well.

The precision with which the Decembrist press-manoeuvres are carried out can be seen from the following. On 30 May, the *Espérance* in Geneva had the left bank of the Rhine fall to France by plebiscite. On 31 May, Louis Jourdan in the *Siècle* in Paris started advancing Rhine-annexation earthworks, and at the beginning of June the *Propagateur du Nord et du Pas-de-Calais* unlimbered its heavy artillery against Belgium. Shortly before the Geneva mouthpiece *Edmond About* had declared in the *Opinion Nationale* that the expansion of Sardinia had forced the Emperor ‘de prendre la Savoie... c-à-d nous fermons notre porte’, <sup>[40]</sup> and, he continues, should the aspirations towards union in Germany lead to similar expansion by Prussia, ‘alors nous aurions à veiller à notre sûreté, à prendre la rive gauche du Rhin, c-à-d nous fermerions notre porte’. <sup>[41]</sup> Hot on the heels of this light-minded door-shutter comes that heavy-footed ox AA, the foreign affairs correspondent of the *Indépendance Belge*, <sup>[42]</sup> a kind of Joseph Prudhomme and personal oracle of the ‘providence’ that has settled in the Tuileries. The *Espérance* meanwhile took its peculiar enthusiasm for *German unity*

and its indignant denunciation of the German anti-Decembrists as victims of *Austria* to such dizzy heights that *James Fazy*, who has to take account of some diplomatic considerations and who, moreover, was in the process of transforming the *Revue de Genève* into the *Nation Suisse*, deigned to declare with magnanimous condescension in the *Revue* that one could oppose Bonapartism without being an Austrian.

*Karl Vogt*, German Da-Da, proprietor of a Decembrist recruiting office for the German press, Fazy's sub-agent, 'pleasant companion' in the Palais Royal, Plon-Plon's Falstaff, Ranickel's 'friend', prompter to the Biel *Carpet-Bagger*, contributor to the *Espérance*, protégé of Edmond About, singer of the 'Lousiad' — still had one step lower to sink. He was to appear in Paris, in full sight of everybody, in the *Revue contemporaine* arm in arm with **Monsieur Edouard Simon**.<sup>[43]</sup> Let us just look for a moment at what the *Revue contemporaine* is and who *Monsieur Edouard Simon* is.

The *Revue contemporaine* was originally the official Decembrist review, in sharp contrast to the *Revue des deux Mondes*,<sup>[44]</sup> for which the elegant pens wrote, the people from the *Journal des Débats*,<sup>[45]</sup> Orleanists, fusionists<sup>[46]</sup> and particularly, too, professors at the Collège de France and Members of the Institute.<sup>[47]</sup> Since one could not simply order the latter official personnel to transfer directly to the *Revue contemporaine*, the attempt was made to order them to leave the *Revue des deux Mondes* and thus to press-gang them into working for the Decembrist *Revue* in a roundabout way. But the coup was not really successful. The proprietors of the *Revue contemporaine* even found it impracticable to do business with the editorial board imposed on it on M *La Guéronnière's* orders. But since the ventriloquist of the Tuileries needs a variety of dummies, the *Revue contemporaine* was transformed into the *semi-official* review, while the *Revue européenne* on the other hand was installed as *official* review with the editorial board imposed by *La Guéronnière*.

Now for *Monsieur Edouard Simon*, by nature a Rhenish-Prussian Jew named *Eduard Simon* who pulls the most comical faces in order to pass as a Frenchman by profession, except that at every moment his style betrays the Rhenish-Prussian Jew translated into French.

Shortly after the Schiller Celebration (November 1859), I met at the home of an acquaintance in London a highly respectable merchant who had resided in Paris for many years and who reported in detail on the Paris Schiller celebration, Schiller Societies, etc. I interrupted him to ask how German societies and meetings got on with the Decembrist police. He answered with an amused grin:

Of course, there is no meeting without a *mouchard* and no association without a *mouchard*. So to avoid any complications we follow for once and for all the simple tactic — *probatum est*<sup>[48]</sup> — of bringing a *known mouchard* and electing him on to the committee straight away. And there we always have, just the job for such cases, our **Edouard Simon**. You know that *La Guéronnière*, former lackey of Lamartine and purveyor of padding to Emile de Girardin, is now the Emperor's favourite, his secret stylist, and at the same time chief censor of the French press. Now *Edouard Simon* is *La Guéronnière's* lapdog and (he added, wrinkling his nose in a peculiar way) a stinking cur at that. *Edouard Simon*, and you will surely not hold this against him, did not want to work *pour le roi de Prusse*, but thought that by joining the Decembrist system he was doing himself and civilisation an incalculable service. He is a fellow without much wit and with a mean character, but he is not bad in a certain sphere of subordinate intrigue. *La Guéronnière* has ordered his *Edouard Simon* to the *Patrie* as one of its lead-article writers. That proved the secret stylist's tact. The proprietor of the *Patrie*, that is to say, the banker *Delamarre*, is an arrogant, cross-grained, grumpy parvenu who will tolerate nobody in his office apart from creatures of decidedly servile pliancy. So our *Edouard Simon*, who despite his rat-poison is as pliant as an angora cat, was in just the right place. As you know, at the time of the republic, the *Patrie* was one of the most shameless organs of the *Rue de Poitiers*.<sup>[49]</sup> Since December it has fought with the *Pays* and the *Constitutionnel* for the honour of being semi-official organ of the Tuileries, and since the signal has been given, has outdone all in annexation fever. You know, do you not, the beggars who pretend to have epilepsy on the street to swindle a few sous off the passers-by? In fact the *Patrie* had the honour of being able to be the first to announce the impending annexation of

Savoy and Nice. Scarcely had the annexation taken place, when it enlarged its format, for, as M Delamarre naively declared: ‘La Savoie et le Comté de Nice ayant été annexés à la France, la conséquence naturelle est *l’agrandissement de la Patrie*.’<sup>[50]</sup> Who, on hearing that, does not remember the quip of the Parisian cynic who, to the question ‘Qu’est-ce que la patrie?’,<sup>[51]</sup> simply replied: ‘*Journal du soir*.’<sup>[52]</sup> And if the Rhenish Provinces are annexed too, what an increase that would mean in the *Patrie* and its format and in *Edouard Simon’s* wages. As regards economics, the *Patrie* sees the salvation of France in the abolition of the Tourniquet de la Bourse, which would allow dealings on the Stock Exchange and thus throughout the country to be swindled up to the desired level once more. *Edouard Simon* too is enthusiastic about the abolition of the Tourniquet de la Bourse. Our *Edouard Simon* is not only lead-article writer of the *Patrie* and La Guéronnière’s lap-dog. He is also the most devoted friend and informer of the new *Jerusalem*, alias the Prefecture of Police, particularly of M *Palestrina*. In brief, gentlemen (the narrator concluded) a committee with M Edouard Simon in its bosom is, for that reason alone, in the most completely favourable *odour with the police*.

And Herr— burst out in peculiarly shrill laughter, as if the *odeur du mauvais lieu*<sup>[53]</sup> and *Monsieur Edouard Simon* had some further, unmentionably secret, connection.

Mr *Kinglake* has drawn the attention of the House of Commons to the pleasant confusion of foreign policy, police and the press that characterises the agents of December (House of Commons, 12 July 1860). ***Monsieur Edouard Simon*** — Vogt’s notorious *Eduard* is, of course, not to be confused with Vogt’s gentle *Cunégonde*, alias *Ludwig Simon of Trier*<sup>[54]</sup> — ***Monsieur Edouard Simon***, La Guéronnière’s lap-dog, Delamarre’s poodle, Palestrina’s nark and everybody’s cur, obviously belongs, if not to the cream, at least to the Limburg cheese of 10 December, to the second circle, where:

S’annida  
 Ipocrisia, lusinghe e chi affatura,  
 Falsità, ladroneccio e *simonia*,  
 Ruffiani, baratti e simile lordura.  
 Nest  
 hypocrisy, deceit and affectation,  
 falsehood, pilfering and *simony*,  
 pimps, ruffians and suchlike trash.<sup>[55]</sup>

*Karl Vogt* had entrusted his *Edouard Simon* with reviewing his *Magnum Opus* in the French press many weeks before it appeared. *Edouard Simon* was in favour of *double emploi*. First of all, he translated the *Magnum Opus* privately for M La Guéronnière and was then on this occasion ordered by his patron to join the *Revue contemporaine*. In vain the editorial board of the *Revue contemporaine* humbly begged that, if *Edouard Simon* had to appear in their columns, he should at least do so anonymously. La Guéronnière was inexorable. *Edouard Simon* made his debut in the *Revue contemporaine* on 15 February 1860 with a notice on his friend *Vogt* under the title ‘Un tableau de moeurs politiques d’Allemagne. Le procès de M Vogt avec la *Gazette d’Augsburg*’ (‘A Picture of the Political Customs of Germany: Herr Vogt’s Case Against the *Augsburger Zeitung*’) signed — ***Edouard Simon***.

The ‘Latin’ *Edouard Simon* does not think that, ‘in order to be a good Frenchman, he has to hurl invective against the noble German race’ (*Revue contemporaine*, 15 February 1860, p 531), but as a ‘good Frenchman’ and ‘born Latin’ he must at least evince a certain native ignorance about Germany. Thus, among other things, he says about his *Karl Vogt*: ‘He was one of the *three Regents* of the ephemeral empire.’<sup>[56]</sup> Of course, *Monsieur Edouard Simon* does not suspect that the Empire *in partibus* groaned under a *pentarchy*, but rather imagines, ‘as a Frenchman’, that the Three Wise Men of Cologne<sup>[57]</sup> corresponded, for simple reasons of symmetry, to three Parliamentary Imperial Regents in Stuttgart. ‘Friend’ *Vogt’s* jokes in the *Magnum Opus* ‘often’ go ‘too far for French taste’.<sup>[58]</sup> The Frenchman Edouard will give him a hand and ‘make an effort to choose’.<sup>[59]</sup> ‘Friend’ *Vogt* has a native love of ‘glaring colours’, and ‘is not exactly a gourmet in the matter of language’.<sup>[60]</sup>

But of course! ‘Friend’ Vogt is only an annexed German in the same way that Da-Da is an annexed Arab, while *Edouard Simon* is a ‘good Frenchman’ by birth and a ‘Latin’ by race. Did Herr Orges and Herr Dietzel ever go so far in their slanders on the ‘Latin race’?

Monsieur Edouard Simon amuses his superiors by exhibiting one of the ‘Three’ Holy German Rump Wise Men, and what is more by arrangement and in agreement with that Holy German Three Rump Wise Man, to the Parisian public as a voluntary prisoner behind the triumphal chariot of the imperial Quasimodo. One can see, says Edouard Simon, from a quotation from *Vogt’s Magnum Opus*:

One can see that Herr Vogt was not fussy about where the help for German unity came from, just as long as it came. *The French Empire, even, seemed to him to be particularly suited to hastening the outcome he desired. Perhaps in that Herr Vogt was trading in cheaply on his antecedents, and it must have appeared strange to his old colleagues who sat with him on the extreme left of the Frankfurt Parliament to see this ardent opponent of any concentration of power, this fervent zealot of anarchy, show such lively sympathy for the sovereign who has defeated it in France.* <sup>[61]</sup>

Edouard transfers the ‘Runaway Regent’ from the un-‘decided’ Left at the Frankfurt Parliament to the extreme Left. The man who voted for ‘the hereditary Emperor’ is turned into ‘an ardent opponent of any concentration of power’, and the member of the Central March Association who preached ‘order’ at any price to the colourful mixture of drinking parties in Frankfurt becomes a ‘fervent zealot of anarchy’. All this in order to throw into proper relief what a catch 10 December has made in the ‘Runaway Regent’. All the dearer then are those ‘*such lively sympathies*’ that Vogt ‘cherishes for the man who has defeated anarchy in France’, all the more valuable does his present recognition become ‘*that the French Empire is particularly suited to bringing about German unity*’, and all the more understandable is ‘friend’ *Simon*’s broad hint that ‘friend’ *Vogt* ‘perhaps sold his antecedents *cheaply*’ (de bon marché), and that in any case the man of December did not obtain them ‘*at too high a price*’. In order to leave not the slightest doubt in high places that ‘friend’ *Vogt* is now just as reliable as ‘friend’ *Simon*, Monsieur Edouard Simon recounts, smirking and rubbing his hands and winking with his left eye, that in his longing for order *Vogt* ‘even, if I understood Herr Vogt correctly, attracted the attention of the authorities in Geneva to revolutionary activities’ <sup>[62]</sup> in just the same way that Monsieur Edouard Simon attracts the attention’ of Messieurs Palestrina and La Guéronnière.

It is generally known that About and Jourdan and Granier de Cassagnac and Boniface and Dr Hoffmann, that the monks of the *Espérance*, the knights of the *Nationalités*, the wind-bags of the *Opinion Nationale*, the penny-a-liners of the *Indépendance*, the *Morning Chronicle*, <sup>[63]</sup> the *Nouvelliste Vaudois*, etc, the La Guéronnières and the Simons, stylists, civilisationists, Decembrists, Dentuists and dentists all, together and severally, draw their inspiration from one and the same sublime — **cash box**. Now we do not find Da-Da *Vogt* as an isolated partisan fighting off his own bat, but subsidised, indoctrinated, regimented, rascalised, associated with *Simon* and appropriated by Plon-Plon, bound up with them and strung up with them. The question remains: is *Karl Vogt paid* to be an agent?

If I am not mistaken, bribery is equivalent to using money and other advantages to move somebody to do and say things that are against his *convictions*. (*Magnum Opus*, p 217)

And *Vogt* is a convinced Plon-Plonist. So even if he is *paid* in cash he is in no way *bribed*. But there must be more ways of paying people than there are of minting coins.

Who knows whether Plon-Plon has not promised his Falstaff the post of Commander of the Mouse Tower <sup>[64]</sup> in the Rhine at Bingen? Or his nomination as corresponding member of the *Institut*, since About in his *La Prusse en 1860* already has French naturalists fighting for the honour of corresponding *simultaneously* with the living *Vogt* and the dead *Dieffenbach*. Or is there a prospect of his restoration as Imperial Regent?

In any case, rumour has it, I know that there is a more prosaic explanation of things. Thus ‘with the turn in the situation since 1859’ there is said to have been a turn in the conditions of the ‘jolly companion’ (who had, a short time previously, been joint chief of a joint stock company in great difficulties and involved in criminal investigations), which anxious friends tried to explain away by saying that an Italian mining company had presented *Vogt* with quite a large number of shares in

recognition of his ‘mineralogical’ merits, and that he turned them into cash during his first visit to Paris. Experts who are completely unknown to one another have written to me almost simultaneously from Switzerland and France that the ‘jolly companion’ was responsible, and paid a certain income, for the supervision of the estate of ‘La Bergerie’ near Nyon (in the Vaud), the dower house bought by Plon-Plon for the Iphigenia <sup>[65]</sup> of Turin. Indeed, I know of a letter in which a ‘New Swiss’ who was in Vogt’s confidence long after the ‘turn of 1859’ at the beginning of 1860 specifies to a Mr PBB of 78 Fenchurch Street, London, a *very large sum* which his ex-friend is supposed to have received from the central cash-box in Paris, not as a *bribe*, but as an *advance payment*.

Such things and worse have reached our ears in London, but for my part I do not give a straw for them. I would much rather believe *Vogt*’s word when he says:

That where I [*Vogt*] get my means from is nobody’s business. *I shall also in future continue to attempt to obtain the means that are necessary to achieve my political aims, and I shall continue to take them, conscious of my good cause, from wherever I can get them.* (*Magnum Opus*, p 226)

That is to say, from the central cash box in Paris.

*Political aims!*

Nugaris, cum tibi, Calve  
Pinguis aqualiculus propenso sesquipede extet.  
You trifle, Calvus,  
Your fat belly out a foot and a half.

*Good cause!* This must be the German idealist expression for what the crude materialist Englishman calls ‘the good things of this world’.

Whatever *Dr Schaible* thinks of it, why should we not take *Vogt* at his word when he says in that very same *Magnum Opus*, at the end of the *tall stories* about the Brimstone Gang, etc, with just as much ceremony:

Herewith closes this section of a part of contemporary history. *These are no empty dreams that I present here; they are pure facts!* (*Magnum Opus*, p 182)

Why should not his agency be just as pure as the facts he recounts in the *Magnum Opus*?

For my part, I am firmly convinced that, unlike all the other scribbling, agitating, politicking, plotting, propagandising, boasting, plon-plonising, conspiring and self-compromising members of the December Gang, only *Vogt*, he exclusively and alone, conceives of his Emperor as ‘l’homme qu’on aime pour lui-même’. <sup>[66]</sup>

‘Swerc nicht geloubt, der sündet’, as Wolfram von Eschenbach says, or ‘if you don’t believe it, you are mistaken’, as it goes in the modern song.

## Notes

**1** ‘So must they all squabble / In such times of fear / had to depart from here /... the *Vogt* of Berne.’

In his *Iwein*, *Hartmann* has the *Vogt*, no doubt in reference to his difference of opinion with the burghers of Berne, say on the contrary: ‘Von Bêrn mac wol heizen ich, wand ich dâ niht ze schaffen hân.’ (‘I can say I come from Berne, / Although I have no business there.’)

Do not confuse this *Hartmann* however with *Vogt*’s friend, the lyrical parliamentary mollusc of the same name. [Marx’s note]

The motto for this chapter Marx took from *Die Klage* (*The Complaint*), an anonymous twelfth-century poem.

**2** Without qualification.

**3** *Kaiserchronik* — a twelfth-century poem which deals with the history — in a more or less legendary form — of the Roman and German Emperors from the time of Caesar up to the twelfth century.

- 4** *Le Siècle* — a Paris newspaper which appeared during 1836–39; represented a moderate republican line.
- 5** *Le Constitutionnel* — in 1848 represented the views of the counter-revolutionary royalist bourgeoisie; later became a Bonapartist paper. The names — Granier de Cassaignac, etc — refer to journalists working for these two papers. See Chapter I, note 27.
- 6** ‘The boy sat by the spring’ (or source) — from a poem by Schiller.
- 7** August Brass — a journalist who took part in the German revolution of 1848–49; emigrated to Switzerland where he became editor of the *Neue Schweizer Zeitung*; later became a supporter of Bismarck.
- 8** *Revue de Genève* — originally the organ of the radical party, it became a Bonapartist paper.
- 9** James Fazy — a Swiss statesman and radical, Prime Minister of the Canton of Geneva; pursued a pro-Bonapartist policy.
- 10** Egeria — in Roman legend, the name of a wood-nymph who advised a ruler of Rome, hence the wise adviser of a prince.
- 11** Prince Napoleon (Plon-Plon) commanded a division of French troops in the Crimea. He disapproved of the expedition, had little military skill, was unpopular with the Army, pretended to be ill and returned to Paris on his own initiative.
- 12** The Red Prince.
- 13** György Klapka — an Hungarian general who commanded an Hungarian Army during the revolution of 1848; emigrated and became connected with Bonapartist circles.
- 14** As he relates, as early as 1852 Vogt was supposed to enter into a voyage of exploration (Bacchanals?) with Plon-Plon, whom a ‘Proudhonist’ had enthusiastically recommended to him for his ‘mais do que promettia a forza humana’ (‘astounding researches into natural history’). [Marx’s note]
- 15** Plon-Plon is as sensual as Heliogabalus (a Roman Emperor), as cowardly as Ivan III, and as false as a true Bonaparte.
- 16** A man to be taken seriously.
- 17** Wanting to be a monster doesn’t make you one.
- 18** A reference to rumours about Napoleon III’s illegitimate birth, his father being officially the King of Holland, Napoleon’s brother, Louis Bonaparte.
- 19** The other one is more genuine.
- 20** Hudibras — a pedantic figure and main character of a satirical epic poem directed against the Puritans by Samuel Butler (1618–1680).
- 21** Bas empire — the Byzantine Empire and hence any empire in a state of decline.
- 22** The original reads: ‘On se partage déjà les places... de la Savoie dans les antichambres de l’Elysée. Ses journaux plaisaient même assez agréablement là-dessus.’
- 23** Corybantes — priests of the goddess Cybele, who worshipped her in a wild state of excitement.
- 24** The vows of Savoy.
- 25** The county of Nice.
- 26** *The Nationality of Nice*.
- 27** Winkelried — a legendary popular hero of the war of liberation fought by the Swiss against the Hapsburgs in the fourteenth century.

**28** Crédit Mobilier — a great French bank which had close links with the government of Napoleon III; took a large part in building railways in France, Austria, Hungary, Switzerland, Spain and Russia; went bankrupt in 1867 and went into liquidation in 1871.

**29** John Perrier — a Swiss radical politician.

**30** Don Giovanni's man-servant. Fialin, Duc de Persigny, organised the *coup d'état* of December 1851.

**31** Theodore de Saussure — a Swiss statesmen, writer and artist, leader of the aristocratic opposition.

**32** Jason, the Greek legendary hero, sailed in search of the golden fleece on the Argo; his journey was called the Argosy and his companions Argonauts.

**33** Appolonius — a Greek poet.

**34** The consciousness that since the annexation of North Savoy Geneva has become an enclave surrounded by France, and also the French occupation of the harbour of Thonon, have, as we know, inflamed the anti-Decembrist mood of the old republic to the highest degree in recent times. The genuine outbreaks of this popular mood, however, are accompanied by fake ones, carried out on the orders of Paris and in part by French police themselves. Thus we read in the *Saturday Review*, September 1860:

‘A party of self-styled Swiss were giving vent to gross insults against the Empire at Thonon, when a blundering gendarme, in an excess of official zeal, seized them, and insisted on looking at their passports. They turned out to be Frenchmen, with papers perfectly *en règle*... The gravest fact relating to these artificial collisions is that in one of the earliest and the worst of them, *a close adherent of Mr Fazy* [friend Perrier] *was prominently implicated.*’

**35** Helvetia — a Swiss student union which opposed Bonaparte's plans to annex Savoy to France.

**36** Leonidas, King of Sparta, was the hero of the defence of the pass of Thermopylae against the invading Persian army of Xerxes in 480 BC.

**37** Ulrich, Duke of Wüttemberg attempted to use the peasant movement of 1525, which had a shoe (Bundschuh) as its badge, in order to return to power after banishment.

**38** *Espérance* — a Bonapartist paper published in Geneva.

**39** The original reads:

‘Si la seule expérience des patriotes allemands est fondée sur une guerre avec la France, quelle raison peuvent-ils avoir de chercher à affaiblir le gouvernement de ce pays et l'empêcher de former ses frontières naturelles? Serait-il que le peuple en Allemagne est loin de partager cette haine de la France? Quoi qu'il en soit, il y a des patriotes allemands très sincères, et notamment entre les démocrates les plus avancés, qui ne voient pas grand malheur dans la perte de la rive gauche du Rhin, qui sont, au contraire, convaincus que c'est après cette perte seulement que commencera la vie politique d'une Allemagne régénérée, appuyée sur l'alliance et se confondant avec la civilisation de l'Occident européen.’ — *Espérance*, 25 March 1860.

**40** To take Savoy... that is, *we shut the door behind us.*

**41** Then we should have to attend to our security, *take the left bank of the Rhine, that is, shut the door behind us.*

**42** *Indépendance Belge* — a Belgian liberal paper.

**43** Edouard Simon — a French journalist born in Berlin who was a Bonapartist spy.

**44** *La Revue des Deux Mondes*, which still appears, is a French literary and political journal.



- 45** Short title for *Journal des débats politiques et littéraires* founded in Paris in 1789. In the 1848 revolution it represented the views of the reactionary ‘party of order’; after Bonaparte’s *coup d’état* of 1851 it represented the moderate Orleanist opposition.
- 46** The fusionists wished to achieve an alliance between the Legitimists, who supported the elder branch of the French dynasty, the Bourbons, with the Orleanists, who supported the younger branch.
- 47** The Collège de France, founded in Paris in 1530, is one of the oldest scientific institutions. The French Institute is the highest scientific and artistic institution in France; the Académie Française forms part of it.
- 48** It’s well proved.
- 49** *The Club in the Rue de Poitiers* was the leading organ of the ‘party of order’, a coalition of the two monarchist factions; from 1849 to December 1851 and the *coup d’état* it played a leading role in the legislative assembly of the Second Republic.
- 50** Savoy and the County of Nice having been annexed to France, the natural consequence is the *aggrandisement of the Fatherland*.
- 51** What is the Fatherland?
- 52** *Journal du soir* — an evening paper.
- 53** The smell of a place of ill-repute.
- 54** Through the intervention of the gentle Cunégonde, some Vogt material was helped into a hole-in-the corner rag in my home town of Trier. Here, among other things, there is talk of my ‘carnal involvement’ with the *Allgemeine*. What an association of ideas for the chaste Cunégonde! Very shocking, indeed! [Marx’s note]
- 55** Dante, *Divina Commedia*: Inferno Canto XI.
- 56** ‘Il fut un des trois régents de l’empire éphémère.’ — *Revue contemporaine*, 15 February 1860, p 518.
- 57** The relics of the Three Wise Men are supposed to be preserved in the Chapel of the Three Kings in Cologne Cathedral.
- 58** ‘Il dépasserait le but au goût des Français.’ — *Revue contemporaine*, 15 February 1860, p 519.
- 59** ‘Nous efforcerons de choisir.’ — *Revue contemporaine*, 15 February 1860, p 519.
- 60** ‘M Vogt aime les couleurs tranchantes, et il n’est pas précisément un gourmet en matière de langage.’ — *Revue contemporaine*, 15 February 1860, p 530.
- 61** The original reads:  
‘On le voit, M Vogt se souciait peu d’où vint le secours en faveur de l’unité allemande, pourvu qu’il vînt; l’empire français lui semblait même singulièrement propre à hâter le dénouement qu’il désire. Peut-être en cela M Vogt faisait-il bon marché de ses antécédents, et il dut paraître étrange, à ses anciens collègues qui siégeaient avec lui à l’extrême gauche dans le Parlement de Francfort, de voir ce fougueux antagoniste de tout pouvoir unique, ce fervent zélateur de l’anarchie manifester de si vives sympathies envers le souverain qui l’a vaincue en France.’ — *Revue contemporaine*, 15 February 1860, p 518.
- 62** ‘Si nous aeons bien ces menées.’ — *Revue contemporaine*, 15 February 1860, p 529.
- 63** A London bourgeois newspaper which appeared from 1769 to 1862.
- 64** Stands on a rock in the Rhine at Bingen; so called because Bishop Hatto of Mainz (tenth century) is supposed to have hidden himself there after causing starving people to be burned and to have been eaten by the mice.

**65** Iphigenia, a Greek princess, daughter of Agamemnon, who was to be sacrificed to appease the wrath of the gods. Here a reference to Clotilde, daughter of the King of Sardinia, Victor Emmanuel, and wife of Prince Napoleon.

**66** The man who is loved for himself.

###

## Chapter X: Patrons and Accomplices

Principibus placuisse viris non ultima laus est. <sup>[1]</sup>

Bail for the ex-Reichsvogt's good behaviour is stood by:

Kossuth, [and] those two other men, Fazy, the regenerator of Geneva, and Klapka, the defender of Komorn, 'whom he' proudly calls his friends. (*Magnum Opus*, p 213)

I call them his *patrons*.

After the battle of Komorn (2 July 1849), Görgey usurped the supreme command of the Hungarian army against the orders of the Hungarian government, which had deposed him.

Had the government been headed by an energetic man [says Colonel *Lapinski*, who was still, in his book, a supporter of *Kossuth*] then even at that time an end could have been put to all Görgey's intrigues. Kossuth only needed to come into the camp and say 20 words to the Army, and all of Görgey's popularity could not have prevented his overthrow... But *Kossuth* did not come, he did not have the strength to come out openly against Görgey, *and while in secret he intrigued against the General, he tried to justify his activities to the world.* (Th *Lapinski, Feldzug der ungarischen Hauptarmee*, pp 125–26)

Görgey's intended treachery was, by his own admission, formally denounced to Kossuth some time later by General *Guyon*. (See David Urquhart, *Visit to the Hungarian Exiles at Kutayah*.)

It is true that Kossuth said in a fine speech at Szagedin that if he knew of a traitor he would murder him with his own hands, and in saying so he was probably thinking of Görgey. But not only did he fail to carry out this somewhat theatrical threat, he did not even name the man he suspected to any of his ministers; and while he *concocted wretched plans against Görgey* with a few people, *he... always spoke of him with the greatest respect, and indeed wrote him the most affectionate letters.* Let him who can understand, for I cannot, how, having seen the only salvation of one's fatherland in the overthrow of a dangerous man, one can try half-heartedly to bring him down and at the same time support him and afford him respect and a following by showing confidence in him, thus putting all power in his hands. While Kossuth worked now against Görgey and now for him *in this deplorable way...* *Görgey*, firmer and more consistent than the other, carried out his black plan. (*Lapinski, Feldzug der ungarischen Hauptarmee*, pp 163–64)

On 11 August 1849, Kossuth issued, on Görgey's *orders* and allegedly from the Fortress of Arad, a public manifesto of abdication, in which he invested Görgey 'with supreme civil and military government authority' and declared:

After the unlucky struggles which *God* in recent days has *visited* upon the nation, *there is no longer any hope that we can continue the struggle for self-defence any further against the two great powers... with any prospect of success.*

Having started the Manifesto by declaring that the Hungarian cause is *irretrievably* lost, and moreover as a result of a *visitation of God*, *Kossuth* goes on to make Görgey 'responsible *before God* for the fact that he will use' the power entrusted to him by Kossuth 'for the salvation' of Hungary. He trusts Görgey enough to yield all of Hungary to him, but too little to yield his own person to him. His

personal distrust of Görgey was so great that he skilfully caused the arrival of his person on Turkish soil to coincide with that of his act of abdication in Görgey's hands. That is also why the Manifesto closes with the words: 'If my death can be of any use at all to the Fatherland, I shall gladly sacrifice my life.'

What he had sacrificed to Görgey on the altar of the Fatherland was the *government*, the *title* to which, however, he immediately usurped once more under Turkish protection.

At Kutayah HE the Governor *in partibus* <sup>[2]</sup> received the first *Blue Book* on the Hungarian catastrophe that Palmerston placed before the British parliament. The study of these diplomatic documents, he wrote to David Urquhart, convinced him that '*Russia possesses a spy, indeed, an agent in every cabinet*' and that *Palmerston had betrayed dear Hungary in the interests of Russia*. And the first public words that he let fall after landing on British soil in Southampton were: 'Palmerston, the dear friend of my bosom!' <sup>[3]</sup>

When his internment in Turkey had been lifted, Kossuth sailed to Britain. En route in Marseilles, where he could not, however, land, he issued a manifesto in the sense and in the phraseology of the French social democracy. On British soil he immediately denied:

... that *novel doctrine*, social democracy, which rightly or wrongly is held to be incompatible with social order and the security of property. Hungary neither has nor wishes to have anything to do with these doctrines, if only for the extremely simple reason that in Hungary there is no opportunity nor even the slightest inducement for them to be introduced. [Compare with this the letter from Marseilles.]

During the first 14 days of his stay in Britain he changed his creed as often as he changed his audience — all things to all men. Count *Kasimir Batthyany* explained the reasons for his open breach at that time with Kossuth: <sup>[4]</sup>

It is not just the *bévues* <sup>[5]</sup> that Kossuth has committed in the first two weeks since his release that have induced me to take this step, but all my experience of him, everything I have seen, suffered, allowed, endured, and, as you will recall, disguised and concealed, at first in Hungary and then in exile — in short it is a matter of the opinion I have formed about the man... Permit me to remark that whatever Mr Kossuth has said or may say in Southampton, Wisbech or London, in England, in short, cannot undo what he said in Marseilles. In the land of the 'young giant' (America) he will again sing a different tune, for just as he is unscrupulous in other matters and bends like a reed beneath any gust of wind, so too does he gainsay his own words *sans gene*, <sup>[6]</sup> and does not hesitate to hide behind the great names of men now dead whom he has ruined, such as my poor cousin, Louis Batthyany... I do not hesitate to declare that before Kossuth leaves England you will have good reason to regret the honours you have squandered on a most undeserving heart. (Letter of Count Batthyany to Mr Urquhart, Paris, 29 October 1851, *Correspondence of Kossuth*)

Kossuth's guest appearance in the United States, where he came out *against* slavery in the North and *in favour* of it in the South, left nothing behind but gigantic disappointment and the corpses of 300 speeches. Quickly passing over this peculiar episode, I should only like to observe that he glowingly recommended to the *Germans* in the *United States*, and particularly to the *German exiles*, an alliance between Germany, Italy and Hungary to the *exclusion of France* (not just of the *coup d'état* government, but of France, even of the French exiles and the parties they represented in France). Immediately after his return he tried, from London, *to forge an alliance with Louis Bonaparte* through a certain dubious subject, Count Szirmay, and Colonel Kiss in Paris. (See my letter to the *New York Tribune* of 28 September 1859, and my statement in the same of 16 November 1852.)

During the Mazzinist mutiny in Milan in 1853 <sup>[7]</sup> there appeared on the walls of that town a proclamation to the Hungarian troops stationed there calling on them to join up with the Italian insurgents. It was signed: *Louis Kossuth*. Scarcely had the news of the defeat of the insurrection reached London when Kossuth in great haste declared in the pages of *The Times* and other British papers that the proclamation was a forgery, and thus gave a public dementi to his friend Mazzini. Nevertheless the proclamation was *genuine*. Mazzini received it from Kossuth, possessed the

manuscript of the same in Kossuth's writing, and acted with Kossuth's agreement. Convinced that the overthrow of the Austrian despotism in Italy demanded joint action by Italy and Hungary, Mazzini first of all tried to replace Kossuth with a more reliable Hungarian leader, but, when this failed because of the splits among the Hungarian exiles, he forgave his uncertain ally and generously spared him the exposure that would have destroyed him in Britain.

As we know, the opening of the Russian–Turkish War fell in the same year of 1853. On 17 December 1850, Kossuth had written to David Urquhart from Kutayah:

Take away the Turkish supremacy from Turkey and it will cease to be. And after all, as matters stand, *Turkey is indispensably necessary to the freedom of the world.*

His enthusiasm for Turkey was intensified in a letter of 15 February 1851 to the Grand Visier *Reschid-Pasha*. In flowery language he offered his services to the Turkish government. During his tour of the United States, on 22 January 1852, he wrote to *David Urquhart*:

Would you feel inclined, knowing how much the interests of Hungary and Turkey were identical, to plead my cause at Constantinople? The Porte did not know who I am when I was there. My reception in England and America, and the position in which the chances of fortune, and I may say Providence, have placed me, could show the Porte that I am a true friend, and perhaps a not uninfluential one, of Turkey and her future.

On 5 November 1853, he offered Mr *Crawshay* (Urquhartite) in writing to go to Constantinople as an ally of Turkey, 'but not with empty hands' and he therefore begged Mr Crawshay to get hold of some money '... by private applications addressed confidentially to such liberal men as might well afford the assistance he required'.

In this letter he says: 'I hate and despise the artifice of making revolutions.' While he thus flowed over with hatred of revolutions and love of Turkey as far as the Urquhartites were concerned, he issued, together with Mazzini, manifestos proclaiming that the Turks should be driven out of Europe and that Turkey should be transformed into 'the Switzerland of the East', and equally signed the appeals for revolution in general of the so-called Central Committee of European Democracy. <sup>[8]</sup>

Since Kossuth had already, by the end of 1853, squandered to no purpose the money he had drummed up in 1852 in the United States, and since, on the other hand, Mr Crawshay turned a deaf ear to his entreaties, he forwent his intended knight-errantry in Constantinople and sent instead his agent, Colonel *Johann Bangya*, with the warmest recommendations. <sup>[9]</sup>

On 20 January 1858, a court-martial sitting at Aderbi, in Circassia, unanimously sentenced '*Mehemed Bey*, formerly *Johann Bangya d'Illofalva*, found guilty on his own admission and evidence of high treason and secret correspondence with the enemy' (the Russian General Philippon) to death, which has not, however, prevented him from living on happily in Constantinople to this moment. In his written confession handed in to the court-martial *Bangya* says, among other things:

My political activity was completely and utterly on the instructions of the chief of my country, *Louis Kossuth*... Provided with letters of introduction from my political chief, I reached Constantinople on 22 December 1853.

He then became, as he goes on to say, a Moslem, and entered the Turkish service with the rank of Colonel:

My instructions [from Kossuth] urgently recommended me to attach myself by one means or another to such troop units as were charged with operations on the Circassian coast.

There he was to attempt to prevent any participation by the Circassians in the war against Russia. He carried his task out successfully, and at the end of the war he sent from Constantinople a 'detailed report on the position in Circassia to Kossuth'. Before his second expedition to Circassia, undertaken in conjunction with the Poles, he received orders from Kossuth to work with certain specified Hungarians, among others General Stein (Ferhad Pasha).

*Captain Frankini* [he says], *the Russian Envoy's military secretary*, was present at various of our conferences. The purpose was to win Circassia for Russian interests in a peaceful, slow but sure manner. Before the expedition left Constantinople [mid-

February 1857], I received letters and instructions from Kossuth approving of my plan of operation.

In Circassia, Bangya's treachery was discovered by the capture of a letter to the Russian general Philippon.

*According to my instructions* [says Bangya], I had to enter into communications with the Russian General. For a long time I could not make up my mind to take this step, but in the end I received *such explicit orders* that I could hesitate no longer.

The proceedings at the court-martial in Aderbi, and especially *Bangya's confession*, aroused a great sensation in Constantinople, London and New York. Kossuth was repeatedly and urgently, and also on the part of Hungarians, called upon to make a statement, but in vain. To this day he has maintained a fearful silence on Bangya's mission in Circassia.

In the autumn of 1858, Kossuth went round England and Scotland hawking low-priced lectures against the Austrian concordat <sup>[10]</sup> and Louis Bonaparte. The passionate fanaticism with which he at that time warned the British against the treacherous intentions of Louis Bonaparte, whom he described as a secret ally of Russia, can be seen, for example, in the *Glasgow Sentinel*, 20 November 1858. When, at the beginning of 1859, Louis Bonaparte revealed his plans for Italy, Kossuth denounced him in *Mazzini's Pensiero ed Azione*, and warned 'all true republicans', Italians, Hungarians, even Germans, not to let themselves be used as the catspaws of the imperialist Quasimodo. In February 1859, Kossuth ascertained that Colonel Kiss, Count Teleki and General Klapka, who had already long belonged to the red camarilla of the Palais Royal, were, with Plon-Plon, hatching plans for a conspiracy to raise a revolt in Hungary. Kossuth now threatened a public polemic in the British press if they would not allow him in to the 'secret society'. Plon-Plon was more than ready to open the doors of the conclave to him. With a British passport under the name of Mr Brown, Kossuth travelled to Paris at the beginning of May, rushed to the Palais Royal and set forth his plans for raising a revolt at great length to Plon-Plon. On the evening of 3 May, the Prince Rouge accompanied the ex-Governor in a coach to the Tuileries in order to present him there to the Saviour of Society. During this meeting with Louis Bonaparte, his tongue, usually so eloquent, failed him, so that Plon-Plon had to play the spokesman and as it were fetch Kossuth's programme to his cousin like a gun-dog. Kossuth was afterwards full of praise for the literal accuracy of Plon-Plon's translation. After listening carefully to his cousin's exposition, Louis Bonaparte declared that there was only one obstacle in the way of accepting Kossuth's proposals, and that was Kossuth's republican principles and his republican connections. The ex-Governor thereupon most ceremoniously abjured the republican faith with the assurance that he was neither a republican now, nor had he ever been one, that political necessity alone, and a peculiar concatenation of circumstances had forced him into alliance with the republican party among the European exiles. As proof of his anti-republicanism he offered Plon-Plon the Hungarian crown on behalf of his country. The question of this crown had not yet been settled at that time. Nor did Kossuth possess the power of attorney to auction it, but whoever has followed his performance abroad with any attention will also know that he has long since been accustomed to talk of his 'dear Hungary' in the same way that a Prussian cabbage-Junker speaks of his country estate.

I believe that his denial of republicanism was sincere. The civil list of 300,000 florins to which he laid claim in Pest to maintain the lustre of the Executive; the patronage of the hospitals which an Austrian Arch-Duchess transferred to his sister; the attempt to christen a regiment 'Kossuth'; his efforts to form a camarilla; the persistence with which he clung on while abroad to the title of Governor which he had renounced in the hour of danger; his whole performance later, which was much more that of a President than that of a refugee — all that points to tendencies that are alien to republicanism.

After the clearing-of-suspicion-of-republicanism scene, three million francs were, according to contract, placed at Mr Kossuth's disposal. There was nothing objectionable in this stipulation in and of itself, for the military organisation of the Hungarian exiles required financial means. And why should the Governor not receive subsidies from his new allies by the same right that every despotic power in Europe received subsidies from Britain for the whole duration of the Anti-Jacobin War? Kossuth immediately received an advance payment of 50,000 francs and in addition negotiated himself certain pecuniary advantages, as it were, an insurance premium against a premature ending of the war. An eye for finance and melodramatic sensibility are by no means mutually exclusive... Did

Kossuth not, after all, as his ex-Minister of Finance Dušek must know, take the elementary precaution even during the Hungarian revolution of having his salary paid, not in Kossuth notes, but in silver or Austrian banknotes?

Before Kossuth left the Tuileries it was agreed that he was to neutralise the allegedly 'pro-Austrian tendencies' of the Derby ministry by opening a neutrality campaign in Britain. We already know how the ready support of the Whigs and the Manchester School enabled him to fulfil this preliminary part of the contract with the greatest success. A lecture tour from the Mansion House to the Free Trade Hall in Manchester formed the antithesis of the Anglo-Scottish tour of 1858, when he had hawked his hatred of Bonaparte and Cherbourg, 'the standing menace to England', at a shilling a head.

The greater part of the Hungarian exiles had drawn back from Kossuth after the end of 1852. The prospect of an invasion of the Adriatic coast with French help brought the majority back under his flag. His dealings with the military portion of these newly-won supporters were not without their Bonapartist flavour. So as to be able to allot them a larger amount of French money, he promoted them to higher military ranks — Lieutenants, for example, to the rank of Major. First of all, everyone received his travelling expenses to Turin, then an opulent uniform (the price of a Major's uniform came to £150 sterling), and finally six months' pay in advance and the promise of a pension for one year following the conclusion of peace. In other respects, the pay was not excessive, 10,000 francs for the Senior General (Klapka), 5000 for the Brigadiers, 4000 for Lieutenant-Colonels, 3000 for Majors, etc. The Hungarian military forces gathered in Turin consisted almost exclusively of officers without private soldiers, and I have heard many bitter complaints on this score from the 'lower orders' among the Hungarian exiles.

As we have already said, *General Moritz Perczel* made a public statement and withdrew as soon as he had seen through the diplomatic game. *Klapka* insisted, despite Louis Bonaparte's orders to the contrary, on a landing near Fiume, but *Kossuth* kept the Hungarian refugee corps within the scenic boundaries prescribed by the theatre director.

Scarcely had the rumour of the conclusion of the Treaty of Villafranca reached Turin, when Kossuth, fearful of being handed over to Austria, ran away head over heels to Geneva, secretly, behind the backs of the military forces at his disposal. No name, neither Francis Joseph nor Louis Bonaparte, had a more unpleasant sound in the Hungarian camp in Turin at the time than the name of Louis Kossuth, except that the comedy of his latest escapade to a certain extent silenced criticism. After his return, Kossuth published in London a letter to his tame elephant, a certain MacAdam in Glasgow, declaring himself to be disappointed but not beaten and closing with the moving flourish that he had nowhere to lay down his head, for which reason all letters to him were to be addressed to the residence of his friend F Pulszki, who had offered asylum to the refugee. The less than Anglo-Saxon courtesy with which the London press told Kossuth that he should at least have the goodness to rent his own house in London with the Bonapartist subsidies convinced him that for the time being his role in Britain had been played out.

Beside his talent as an orator, Kossuth possesses the great talent of falling silent when his audience shows decided disfavour or when he does not actually know what to say for himself. Like the sun, he is an expert at eclipses. The fact that he has been able to act consistently at least once in his life was proved by his recent letter to Garibaldi warning him against an attack on Rome so as not to annoy 'the sole support of the oppressed nationalities', the Emperor of the French.

Just as Alberoni, in the first half of the eighteenth century, was called the colossal Cardinal, so Kossuth can be called a colossal *Langenschwarz*.<sup>[11]</sup> He is essentially the improviser who receives his impressions from his audience at any given time, not the author who imprints his original ideas upon the world. Just as Blondin balances on his tightrope, so Kossuth balances on his tongue. Separated from the atmosphere of his people, he had to degenerate into mere virtuosity and all the vices of virtuosity. The instability of thought characteristic of the improviser is necessarily reflected in the ambiguity of his actions. If Kossuth was once the Aeolian harp through which the popular hurricane roared, he is now the ear of Dionysius amplifying to a murmur the whispering in the secret chambers of the Palais Royal.

It would be absolutely unjust to put Vogt's second patron, *General Klapka*, on the same level as Kossuth. Klapka was one of the best Generals of the Hungarian revolution. Like most of the officers

who, in 1859, gathered in Turin, he regards Louis Bonaparte in more or less the same way that Ferencz Rákóczi <sup>[12]</sup> regarded Louis XIV. <sup>[13]</sup> To them, Louis Bonaparte represents the military might of France, which can serve Hungary but which, for geographical if for no other reasons, can never endanger her. But why does Vogt refer to Klapka? Klapka has never denied that he belongs to Plon-Plon's red camarilla. So that 'friend' Klapka can vouch for 'friend' Vogt? Klapka does not show any special talent for choosing friends. One of his most favoured friends in Komorn was Colonel *Assermann*. Let us hear what Colonel *Lapinski*, who served under Klapka until the surrender of Komorn and who later distinguished himself in Circassia by his fight against the Russians, has to say about this Colonel Assermann.

The treachery at Világos [says Lapinski] <sup>[14]</sup> aroused the greatest terror among the numerous and unoccupied staff-officers to be found in Komorn... The perfumed gentlemen with gold collars, many of whom knew neither how to use a rifle nor even how to command three men, milled about in fear and confusion and considered ways of getting away in one piece at any price. They who had successfully used all kinds of excuses to be detached from the main body of the army and withdraw into the snug security of the impregnable fortress, and whose only occupation was to write a receipt once a month to draw their full wages, were terrified at the thought of a stand to the last... It was these wretches that lyingly described to the General phantoms of internal dissention, mutiny, etc, simply in order to persuade him to surrender the fortress as quickly as possible... if only they could save themselves and their property. This latter was particularly close to their hearts; for all their aspirations throughout the revolution amounted to making themselves rich, which many succeeded in doing. This self-enrichment was easy for various individuals as six months often passed before money received was accounted for. Since this favoured disloyalty and fraud, many people may well have reached deeper into the cash-box than they could properly answer for... A cease-fire was concluded. How was it now used? Unnecessarily large rations were taken out to the villages from the supplies in the fortress, *which were sufficient for a year*, while, on the other hand, no provisions were brought in from the surrounding countryside. Even the hay and oats of the peasants in the nearby villages, which they asked to be bought off them, was left there, and a few weeks later the Cossack horses were eating the peasants' property while we in the fortress were complaining of shortages. The fat stock kept there was, for the most part, sold outside the town on the pretext that there was not enough forage available. *Colonel Assermann* probably did not know that meat can be salted. A large part of the corn there was similarly sold on the excuse that it was going mouldy. This was happening in public and to an even greater extent in secret. With a man like *Assermann* at his side and a few such individuals in his entourage, *Klapka* obviously had to drop any good ideas that occurred to him very quickly; these gentlemen took care of that... (Lapinski, *Feldzug der ungarischen Hauptarmee*, pp 202–06)

Görgey's and Klapka's political memoirs speak out equally loudly on Klapka's lack of character and of political insight. All the mistakes that he committed during the defence of Komorn stemmed from this lack:

If only Klapka has possessed, for all his knowledge and patriotism, a *firm will of his own*, and if only he had acted according to opinions he formed himself and not those *taught* him by blockheads and cowards, the defence of Komorn would have shone in history like a meteor. (Lapinski, *Feldzug der ungarischen Hauptarmee*, p 209.)

On 3 August, Klapka had won a brilliant victory near Komorn against the Austrian corps encircling him, had broken through it and rendered it unfit to fight for a long time. He thereupon took Raab, and could even have taken Vienna without difficulty, but he lingered indecisively and idly in Raab for eight days and then returned to Komorn, where he found news of Görgey's capitulation and a letter from him. The enemy asked for a cease-fire so as to be able to concentrate the Austrians' shattered encircling corps and the Russians advancing from Rima Szombat near Komorn and to surround the fortress at leisure. Instead of attacking the enemy detachments, which were only just starting to draw

together, individually one after the other, Klapka once more vacillated to and fro indecisively, refusing however to grant a ceasefire to the Austrian and Russian emissaries. Then, Lapinski relates:

... one of Emperor Nicholas' Adjutants came to Komorn on 22 August... But, said the Russian Mephisto in honey-sweet tones: *You will surely grant us a cease-fire, sir. His Most Gracious Majesty the Emperor asks you for it personally!* That worked like a quick-acting poison. What the efforts of the Austrian and the persuasion of the Russian emissaries had been unable to achieve, this cunning Russian achieved in a few words. *Klapka* could not resist the fine compliment and signed a cease-fire for 14 days. From here dates the fall of Komorn.

The use to which *Klapka* himself put the cease-fire was, as has already been mentioned, to have his Colonel Assermann clear the fortress *in two weeks of sufficient supplies for a whole year*. At the end of the cease-fire, Grabbe surrounded Komorn on the Waag side while the Austrians, who were gradually increasing their strength to 40,000 men, camped on the right bank of the Danube. The garrison of Komorn was demoralised by being cooped up behind its walls and fortifications. *Klapka* did not even make a sortie against the Russian corps surrounding him, which had not yet been in battle and was only 19,000 strong. The enemy went undisturbed about his work of preparing the siege. All *Klapka's* preparations in fact after accepting the cease-fire were not for defence but for capitulation. The only energy he was able to develop was of a political nature, that is to say directed against those brave officers who opposed capitulation. 'In the end', says Lapinski, 'it became dangerous to say anything about the Austrians unless one wanted to be arrested'.

Finally, on 27 September, the capitulation was signed.

When compared [says Lapinski] with the power, with the desperate position of the country, which had put its last hope in Komorn, when compared with the position of relations in Europe and the powerlessness of Austria, who would have suffered grave losses because of Komorn, *the conditions of surrender were as wretched as they possibly could be*.

They 'just about served to get one hurriedly over the frontier from Komorn', but did not stipulate the slightest guarantee either for the Hungarians or for the revolutionary generals in Austrian hands. And in addition they were worded in such precipitate haste and so unclearly and ambiguously that it was later easy for Haynau to infringe them.

So much for *Klapka*. If Vogt does not possess any 'character', then *Klapka* is the last person to have any of that commodity to spare for him.

His third patron is 'James Fazy, the regenerator of Geneva', as his court jester, Vogt, calls him. The following letters from *Johann Philipp Becker*,<sup>[15]</sup> sent to the recipient of his letter printed above, contain a characterisation of Fazy that is too telling to be spoilt by additions. So I shall note only one thing beforehand. The most nauseating trait of Vogt's so-called *Studien* is the simulation of Lutheran, nay Calvinist horror of the 'Ultramontane Party'.<sup>[16]</sup> Thus, for example, he poses Germany with the absurd alternative of giving Louis Napoleon a free hand or falling under the domination of the Austrian concordat, and 'truly, we would prefer to go through a second period of national humiliation' (*Studien*, p 52). In the most puritan of nasal tones he raises a hue and cry against the 'Ultramontane party, that hereditary enemy that gnaws at the innermost marrow of the whole of mankind, that horror' (*Studien*, p 120).

He has, of course, never heard what even Dupin the elder let slip in the Decembrist Senate, that is to say that:

... under Louis Bonaparte's regime the congregations, associations and foundations of every kind directly controlled by the Jesuit order have grown to a greater extent than under the *ancien régime*,<sup>[17]</sup> and that all the state obstacles that even before 1798 limited Ultramontane propaganda have been systematically torn down by the Decembrist legislature and administration.

But what Vogt does know is that the power of his local Bonaparte, *Mr James Fazy*, rests on a coalition of many years' standing between the so-called radical party and the Ultramontane party. When the Congress of Vienna incorporated Geneva, the old seat of Calvinism, into the Swiss



Confederation, it added to its territory several districts of Savoy with a Catholic rural population and the cream of the Ultramontane priesthood. It is the alliance with this 'hereditary enemy of mankind, this horror' that has made *Fazy* the *dictator* of Geneva and *Vogt* a *member of Fazy's Ständerat*. So much for the preliminary comment.

Paris

2 July 1860

**My friend R—**

In the end I must after all comply with your wish and write you my opinion of Mr James Fazy...

Just as the scientific study of the state is useless without the art of applying it to life, so statecraft is sterile if it is not based on science and philosophical thought. With science alone a so-called statesman has no appeal, and he will soon show his lack of ability clearly. A man of one-sided statecraft, on the other hand, can more easily hide his lack of knowledge and intellectual productivity, pass as a practical statesman and have the great market of mediocrity to himself. Whether a people progress in the cultural-historical sense through the management of such a man, and whether guarantees are created for further undisturbed development, lies beyond the powers of judgement of a blindly admiring throng. As long as it has the appearance of making good progress, and everything happens in the name of freedom and civilisation!

I shall now submit in our *Mr James Fazy* a splendid example of the species states-craftsman. This skilful man does not really only pursue one statescraft, but a wide variety of statescrafts, performs tricks and tours de force as often as the 'public good' demands it, but protects himself with his usual cunning from involvement in any really dangerous acts. Clever at weaving roles behind the scenes, skilled as a director and prompter, he is the *Non plus ultra* <sup>[18]</sup> of the Gallic actor. His 'spiritual strength', which will not flinch at any means to achieve his ends, would be highly estimable if it did not proceed from the filth of his ends. When one knows this man's lack of character and principles, one is less inclined to admire the subtlety with which he chooses his means and the skill with which he applies them. Everything good that happens or is generated in the life of the people he governs is impudently conjured by this states-craftsman into his own lap and then presented to the great multitude in his name, so that they think that it was all done by 'Papa Fazy', or that it only happened through him. He is just as skilful at shifting responsibility for what is bad and unpopular from his own shoulders and pinning it on others. In his governing councils he will not tolerate any independent character. His colleagues must all let him disclaim them as and when he sees fit and stand godfather to his failures. Enjoying his domineering brutality *à discrétion*, they must always be prepared to act as scapegoats and whipping-boys for the good of the people and the reputation of the President. Just as a crowned head, at every political step, however much in the popular interest it may be, must ask himself, before His Majesty 'deigns', whether or not it will harm the dynasty, so Papa Fazy asks himself in everything he does or does not do: 'Does it not undermine my presidency?' Our hero therefore always directs his policies according to circumstances and lives from hand to mouth. Today he acts a ghost scene in the Government Council, tomorrow he does a juggling act in the Grand Council and the day after he produces some dramatic sound effects at a popular meeting. And the great crowd, which he skilfully wheedles, is for its part glad to have a God it can see and hear, honour and revere, and becomes credulous and believes that black is white and white black. I do not at all mean to say that the people of Geneva are underdeveloped or unintelligent; on the contrary, I believe that scarcely anywhere is a more active public life and more powerful intellectual efforts to develop free civic conditions to be found than on the banks of Lake Geneva. I shall return later to how Mr Fazy has nevertheless repeatedly been able to secure himself a majority.

He credits his regime, or has his lackeys and admirers credit it, with everything that has brought about a lively generation in Geneva in the last 15 years. The levelling of the fortifications and the expansion and embellishment of the cantonal capital, for example, are supposed to be his work. And yet any administration, even Mr Fazy's, would have been mercilessly thrust aside if it had at all opposed the mighty urge of the population to pull down the useless fortifications and expand the town, which was becoming more and more insanitary as a result of the pressure of masses of people. The question was thus a matter of life and death for Fazy and — to his credit — he took it in hand energetically and helped to achieve many things to the general satisfaction. But the individual cannot, without arrogant presumption, push himself forward as the author and creator of something created by the mighty requirements of the hour with the powerful collaboration of a generation. Only the whole of society, and that only relatively, produces a whole, to which each member contributes a greater or a smaller fraction according to his strength and his position. Blind belief in authority is a superstition like any other and a hindrance to healthy development.

I know very well that our Mr Fazy is like every other son of man, that he only does what he cannot omit, and he only omits what he cannot do; that under the pressure of the absolute stamp of his individuality he — like everything else in the animal world — strives to satisfy his needs. One could no more expect him to be any different than one could demand of a cat to enter water voluntarily, or of a horse to climb trees. Otherwise he would not, after all, be James Fazy, and if he were not Fazy, then perhaps he would be Louis Bonaparte or something of the sort. If to possess authority and to keep the people in leading reins, dazzling them with conjuring tricks without impressing intellectual and moral culture with the stamps of intensive progress, and only marking the traces of an existence by the corruption of society, is greatness, then Fazy too is great, and can with good reason be envied by more powerful tyrants.

Our man understands as well as any other how to navigate with contradictions, and the compass by which he steers his little ship is magically shaped of them. At one point radicalism supplies the crew and Ultramontanism the cargo, at another vice-versa, just as it suits the helmsman. Thus the state machine is constantly in motion, always going to and fro like the action of a watch. Happy outcome! The radicals swear that things are going forwards and the Ultramontanists believe they are going backwards. Both are correct, both are happy in their belief, and Fazy remains Lord God at the helm.

Now, dear friend, make do with these lines for the while.

Hearty greetings meanwhile.

Your **Joh Philipp Becker**

Paris

20 July 1860

**Dear R—**

So you think I may have laid the colours on too thick in the portrait of Fazy. Not at all, my dear friend! Anyway, a man cannot think about and judge things and people as he wishes, but as he logically must according to his perceptions and inner experience. Whoever says other than what he thinks in these matters, and acts differently from what he says, is untrue to himself and a scoundrel.

Fazy, who received his first education at a Moravian institute in Neuwied and speaks good German, seems even today, a 65-year-old man, to judge Germany and her people according to the impressions of that model institution. Nothing German, be it only from German Switzerland, is to his taste, and only finds favour with him in rare exceptions. As a born Genevan and through his long stay in the free states of North America, he became intimately acquainted with republican institutions, methods of agitation and particularly his own natural bent for the artifices of intrigue. He is more of a demagogue than a republican, and his main maxim of state and device, *laissez*

*aller et laissez faire*, would not be so bad if he could stop himself from sticking his nose in everywhere in society where the attempt is being made to bring something into being without the blessing of the state, in order either to add credit to his reputation or, if this cannot be, to undermine the enterprise, as was the case with the Banque de Crédit et d'Echange planned by Herr Mayer and others and the setting up of a trades hall. In the Geneva revolution of 1846, Mr James Fazy followed the proposition that the only old soldiers are the ones who never saw the firing line, and he gave more consideration to ways of getting away from it than he did to ways of winning. He was just poised to leave Geneva secretly when Albert Galeer, the heart and soul of the whole movement, won the indecisive struggle with one last effort, and reported complete victory to him. Galeer, for whom the cause was everything and personal fame nothing, and who then at least still believed in Fazy's sincere love of the people, was not at all put out to see the hero whom he had saved just in time from precipitate flight give himself out to be the victor at a popular meeting held immediately after the victory. It was anyway impossible for Galeer to think at that time of occupying a position in government circles after the revolution since he was a citizen, not of Geneva, but of Berne, and therefore could neither vote nor be elected according to the state of the Federal law of the day. Citizenship was, it is true, soon granted to him, and he was then elected to the Grand Council as well as obtaining the post of translator of state documents. As the centre of the active youth of Geneva he became a firm pillar of the radical regime. Through him Fazy became more and more the popular man of the great crowd. Fazy agitated in the press and on the rostrum with the phraseology of French radicalism, which he had absorbed while a correspondent of the *Nation* in Paris at the time of Louis Philippe, and with it masked his real thoughts and intentions to his heart's content. Despite his demagogic arts, however, he was seriously accused in various circles before the year was out of having secret relations with leading Ultramontanists and soon afterwards of being a supporter of the French. In German Switzerland, where matters are looked at more coolly and judged more calmly, his intrigues seem to have been seen through early on. Towards the end of 1847, directly after the end of the 'Sonderbund' war, Mr James Fazy came to the offices of the War Department to visit General Ochsenbein. I was alone, as Ochsenbein and the other officers were visiting the wounded in the hospitals. When I reported to Ochsenbein on his return that Mr Fazy had visited him while he was away, he let slip the words, with an expression of contempt: 'Oh, the false hypocrite!' Perhaps General Ochsenbein, the former Federal President and President of Berne, who has for several years been enjoying an imperial French pension in Switzerland, now cherishes milder feelings towards his colleague in office, who is certainly his social equal. One thing that is striking is that Mr Fazy has never yet been elected from the National Assembly to the Bundesrat, although he and his friends have made great efforts to that end and despite the fact that the Assembly has the tendency almost to the point of narrow-mindedness to rotate representation in the central government between the more important cantons. He always showed himself refractory towards the central authority, where he himself was unable to exercise any authority and which limits the sovereignty of the local cantons which is so convenient for him, and he made difficulties for it wherever he could.

When, at the beginning of 1849, the Federal Police found it politically expedient to persecute me because I was organising a Sicilian Legion, I went to Geneva where Fazy told me I could organise as much as I wanted and did not need to worry about the Federal Police. I know that Mr Fazy is quite prepared to sacrifice anybody as soon as he is hard-pressed, even when the law is on his side, as I experienced in a later case that would take up too much space for a letter and about which the Federal Commissioners Dr Kern and Mr Trog could tell a tale.

Although in refugee matters he was recalcitrant towards the central authorities' measures under the pretext of humanity, he persecuted the refugees he personally

disliked with arbitrary heartlessness. Prominent people close to Galeer, in whom he suspected a future rival, were in particular subjected to ruthless persecution. Mazzini had to be more on his guard against him than against the Federal Police. Lofty Heinzen was anathema to him and had to leave the canton forthwith. 'He acts as if he owns the place', was Fazy's only, naive, reason. Struve was arrested, without any initiative from the Bundesrat, while taking a walk with his wife, and taken over the frontier to the canton of Vaud as a *Russian* spy. Galeer hurried off in time to see Fazy and make him remedy his mistake. The discussion became heated, as Fazy thinks he is all the more credible the louder he shouts and the more he adopts the pose of indignation. Struve had to remain a Russian spy. If my memory serves me right this scene took place at the Hotel des Bergues, at the home of the Russian exile, Mr Herzen, where the President of Geneva liked to dine. In any case, that gentleman had no part in the allegation against Struve. It is certain that Fazy is a greater Russophile than Struve, for I once heard him say in a speech at a festival: 'The works of Jean-Jacques Rousseau are read more and understood better in Russia than they are in Germany.' Admittedly, his main intention in saying that was to strike at Galeer's German friends and Germans in general.

Galeer, who previously had gone with Fazy through thick and thin in political questions, and with whom I spoke immediately after his collision with Fazy about Struve, told me with a heavy heart: 'It is all over with Fazy. I cannot honourably associate with him any longer. The man is a real political monster, he is a pure animal in his greed; if I stay with him any longer it would mean helping to destroy the cause of the people from the inside. He is only forced to raise the flag of radicalism to save his own position when a decisively free-thinking opposition party is put up against him. As long as he only has the old aristocracy against him, the cause will become more and more rotten, as he has long been making eyes at the Ultramontanists, and he can do exactly as he likes. In any case, he is not Swiss in his outlook, and looks to Paris rather than to Berne. I have long had reason enough to turn away from him, but the habit I have had for a long time of regarding him as a sound man prevented me from doing so. Now repeated internal conflicts and today's open collision have prevailed upon me to settle accounts with him.'

Around Galeer there rallied all the men of more independent character and particularly the people of the new school of political economy, and the resolute radical and socialist elements 'united' in this way were soon called the democratic party. Radicalism only continued, apart from a few exceptions, in conscious or unconscious servility towards Fazy, who had now found the main support for his majority in the Catholic areas of Savoy united with Geneva since 1815. The Ultramontane priests who are all-powerful there entered into the alliance with Fazy's rump 'radicalism'. Galeer was placed under suspicion, persecuted and dismissed from his post in the basest way. The young democratic party, standing now between the aristocratic party and the united old radical and Ultramontane parties, could not yet put up an independent list in the forthcoming elections. And although Mr James Fazy refused to accept any democratic names in his own list, Galeer and his friends nevertheless decided to spurn all offers from the aristocratic party and to continue to vote for Fazy's list, expecting the future to give them their victory. So if Fazy was sincere about progress and radical bourgeois development, he did not need to hang on to the wretched coat-tails of the Ultramontanists, who are always backward-looking. In order to continue persecuting Galeer and casting suspicion on him with more success, a special scandal sheet was set up by His Excellency the 'radical' President's satellites, so that their clever lord and master did not need to sully his *Moniteur*, the *Revue de Genève*, with his invective, with which his whipping-boy's rag, all knowledge of which he could deny at will, was all the more richly adorned. Galeer, who was in poor health, succumbed to this insidious persecution and died during that same year (1852) aged 33. How often did I hear it said in Geneva: '*Our good, noble Galeer has fallen victim to the implacable*

*revenge of our jesuitical tyrant.*' In the subsequent elections to the government, Galeer's friends were all the more eager to enter the connection offered to them by the aristocratic party for the fact that the latter were content with the overthrow of Fazy and a very modest share in the administration. The principled Galeer would probably have rejected this connection too, but all the people in his party said: 'Why did Mr Fazy give us the good example of his alliance with the Ultramontanists? Why should we be ashamed of the respectable coat-tails of the aristocracy when Mr Fazy is not ashamed of the disreputable ones of the Ultramontanists? Why should we not be able to make as much progress with the educated aristocracy as Mr Fazy claims to make with ignorant Ultramontanism?'

So in the elections (I believe it was in November 1853), in which many more radicals, even colleagues of Fazy's in the government, went over to the democrats, the hero of 1846 was ejected from the presidency by a large majority. And now the ex-president, burdened with debts, was in extreme embarrassment. Before I go into this I must say something very characteristic about his life.

Even before his accession as head of government, Mr James Fazy had squandered a fair inheritance on pleasure and delight. Up to his ears in debt and pursued by his creditors, he tried, once he had attained the presidency, to bring about the abolition of the imprisonment of debtors, 'in the interests of personal freedom', of course. Thus a citizen of Geneva who was plagued by debts could tell me in 1856: 'It is a good thing after all to have had as President a debtor who, if he did not abolish the debts, at least abolished the debtor's prison.'

At the beginning of the 1850s, however, Mr Fazy came under very heavy material pressure, so that the 'grateful people' had to present him with a big piece of building land on the area gained by levelling the fortifications. And why not? Did he not help to liberate this land from the fortifications, and why should he not have part of it 'annexed', as even greater potentates make no bones about doing? Mr Fazy could now sell many big house-sites and build himself a fine big house. Unfortunately, however, he immediately got deep into debt once more, and was unable to pay the building workers. Early in 1855, he had to let a master carpenter to whom he owed several thousand francs shout after him in the street: 'Pay me, you rascal, so that I can buy bread for my children.'

It was under these conditions that this hard-pressed man became ex-President and, to fill his cup to overflowing, he was overtaken by an even more painful embarrassment. The Caisse d'Escompte, namely, a radical credit institution, had to suspend its payments. Fazy's friends in this institution, groaning under a similar burden of debts, had granted him and themselves credits far beyond their means and in contravention of the statutes. The manager of the bank, who is still in prison today, had — bad examples ruin good habits — provided himself with even more immoderate credits. Thus the Caisse d'Escompte was on the eve of a serious event — bankruptcy. The savings of a hundred provident workers' families were in danger. Now good advice and saving deeds were needed if bankrupt Fazyism was not to be scattered like spray in the wind. There was, of course, no money to be had directly for the Caisse d'Escompte under such circumstances. But just at that time another credit institution was labouring through its birth-pangs in Geneva, the Banque Générale Suisse. Considerable funds had to be obtained for this bank so that in return it could save the Caisse d'Escompte from the shortage of money and Fazy from the surfeit of debts. Fazy had to play the saviour in order to be saved himself. Should the move succeed, he was assured of a worthwhile provision of so many per cent and the Caisse d'Escompte was assured of the necessary capital aid. For this purpose therefore Mr Fazy went *pro domo* and for the Banque Générale Suisse to *Paris*, where he succeeded, after a stay of several weeks and — as the saying used to go — *with the gracious assistance of the 'Almighty'* in raising a saving broadside of many millions of francs from the Crédit Mobilier. Just at that time (November 1855) preparations for fresh government

elections were taking place, and the Saviour therefore wrote even before his arrival in Geneva that he would very shortly be bringing this million-strong salvo along himself. That was balm to the aching hearts of the Caisse d'Escompte shareholders and a miraculous torch for the Ultramontane-radical voters. A caricature of the day shows a good likeness of him in the form of a giant swan loaded with money-bags sailing on the lake into Geneva harbour. One wit told me at the time that at the beer people were telling him that Fazy had brought back 50 million francs, at the wine 100 million and at the absinthe 200 million. The reputation of Papa Fazy's miraculous powers was completely restored among his children. Deluded into thinking that their victory with the voters was assured, the democrats made no special efforts. The society of powerful young men — *les fruitiers* — that had already been formed some time previously, now acted entirely as Fazy's bodyguard, terrorising the elections in the most brutal manner — and their idol ascended the presidential throne once more.

This time, however, it soon became absolutely clear that the Ultramontanists had not delivered their massive quota of votes for nothing, but that they too wanted to enjoy the fruits of victory. The Bishop of Freiburg, Mr de Marilley, an eternal maker and fomentor of trouble, who had been expelled from Switzerland as a result of the *Sonderbund* war, returned to Geneva from France one fine day with the high official authorisation of Mr Fazy, and began to conduct 'holy' masses. A cry of indignation swept around the town and was immediately echoed all over Switzerland. This sort of thing was too much, even for the blindest radical, the most devoted fruiterer. A popular meeting was immediately held, and the President was presented with a vote of no confidence. His colleague, Government Councillor Tourte, although he was a protégé and pupil of Fazy, felt a considerable urge towards independence, and thundered away ruthlessly at his lord and master. But Mr Fazy had already gone away before the Bishop's arrival, as he always did when he had cooked his colleagues a sauce they had to drink on their own. Mr de Marilley had to leave the city and the country immediately, of course. But Papa Fazy wrote from Berne, taking his unruly children to task for the time being, saying that he had been misunderstood, that the government had not done its job well, and that he had only acted 'in the interests of religious freedom', merely allowing the Bishop to come on a visit. When the first storm died down, Papa Fazy returned, deeply offended. It was now all the easier for him to restore his injured authority and belief in his pure love of country and freedom with a few oracular sayings that apply to everything and always appear true, since his colleagues were so good as to shoulder the main blame themselves. But in this way Fazy had achieved the fine aim of showing his friends the Ultramontanists that he was *always prepared to do for them — anything in his power*. In the last few years Mr James Fazy has been a very rich man. Not only is the Banque Générale Suisse supposed to have assured him a certain percentage for life, but as President he has also not neglected his own interests in his canton's railway undertakings, etc. In his fine big house (Hôtel Fazy on the Quai du Mont Blanc) elegant society revolves around the Cercle des Etrangers. And since Piedmont has found the 'gambling hells' of the Savoyan spas to be incompatible with her state morals, the sympathetic President of the Republic of Geneva has been moved to house such a hell as a refugee in his own spacious halls. Long live freedom! *Laissez aller et laissez faire! Allez chez moi et faites votre jeu!* <sup>[19]</sup>

My dear man, what more can you want?

Your **Johann Philipp Becker**

From *Vogt's* patrons I descend to his *accomplices*.

Peace and goodwill to this fair meeting,  
I come not with hostility but with greeting.

At the head of the procession, of which I shall name only a few of the more prominent figures, we are met by the *Berlin National-Zeitung*, commanded by Herr F Zabel's swagger-stick. A comparison of

the notice of the *Magnum Opus*, prompted by Vogt himself, by Mr Edouard Simon in the *Revue contemporaine* with the corresponding articles in the *National-Zeitung*, *Breslauer Zeitung*, etc, would almost lead us to believe that the ‘rounded character’ issued two programmes, one to prepare the ground for the Italian campaign and one to prepare the ground for the Augsburg campaign. What in the world possessed Herr *F Zabel* of the *National-Zeitung*, otherwise such a careful and boring tip-toer and wool-gatherer, to kick over the traces so violently and turn Vogt’s street-corner ballads into lead articles?

The first detailed consideration of the *National-Zeitung* is to be found in no 205 of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* on 26 January 1849, in a leading article beginning with the words ‘*Signpost to Schilda*’. The arms of the signpost are, however, too long to be reprinted here. In a lead article in no 224 of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* on 17 February 1849, one reads:

The *Berlin National-Zeitung* is the weighty expression of triviality. A few new samples. The question discussed is the Prussian circular note... Moreover and but! Can and may and seem! Find and wish that the Prussian government may like! Every phrase carries a ball and chain around its leg like a convict, and so weighs a hundredweight. Every ‘if’, every ‘moreover’, every ‘but’ is a veritable Doctor of Roman and Common Law. And when all this Christian-Teutonic padding, all the cotton rags with which the *National-Zeitung* carefully wraps up its wisdom, are just as carefully unwrapped, what remains? ... *Hot air*, black on white, as a full-dress Berlin lead article... The *National-Zeitung* is obviously written for the *thinking reader*, like Rotteck’s *World History*. The French have a splendid formula for this kind of thinking, whose whole movement is purely verbal. ‘*Je n’aime pas les épinards et j’en suis bien aisé; car si je les aimais, j’en mangerais beaucoup, et je ne peux pas les souffrir.*’ — ‘I do not like eating spinach, and that is a very good thing for if I did like eating it, I would never be able to eat enough of it, and I cannot stand it.’ ... The *National-Zeitung* wants what is best for Prussia, and therefore — a different cabinet. But what it wants at all events is — a *cabinet*. That, too, is the only thing about which the patrons of the *National-Zeitung* are clear among themselves, and on which they enjoy positive self-assurance.

In no 296 of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* one reads under the dateline:

**Berlin, 9 May 1849.**... It is interesting to observe the attitude of the Berlin press towards the Saxon revolution. *The National-Zeitung feels only one thing — fear of being banned.*

But fear is an elixir of life, as the *National-Zeitung* has demonstrated during the Manteuffel decade.

The *National-Zeitung* has proved the truth of Pope’s words:

Still her old Empire to restore she tries,  
For born a Goddess Dullness never dies. <sup>[20]</sup>

Save that Pope’s Empire of Dullness is distinguished from the Empire of the *National-Zeitung* by the fact that there ‘now Dunce the second reigns as Dunce the first used to’, whereas here the old Dunce still reigns, *Dunce the first*.

Hot on the heels of the *National-Zeitung* follows the *Breslauer Zeitung*, which is now as rapturous about the Hohenzollern cabinet as it previously was about the Manteuffel cabinet. At the beginning of 1860 I received the following letter:

Breslau  
27 February 1860  
**Dear Marx**

I read your address and your statement against the *National-Zeitung* in the *Volks-Zeitung*. The *Breslauer Zeitung* also carried an article similar to that in the *National-Zeitung*, from the pen of its *daily* correspondent Dr Stein. This is the same Dr Stein who sat on the extreme left of the Berlin National Assembly with D’Ester, and moved the famous resolution against the officers of the Prussian army. This great Stein of the small body was suspended from his post as teacher. Since the new cabinet came in, he

has set himself the task of agitating for it, not only last year during the elections, but even now, in order to unify the Silesian democrats with the constitutionalists. Nevertheless, his plea to be granted a dispensation to teach privately was rejected by the present cabinet, not once but several times. The retiring cabinet had closed an eye to his doing so, but the present one has forbidden him to do it as being illegal. He then travelled to Berlin to obtain a dispensation, but unsuccessfully, as you can read in greater detail in the issue of the *Volks-Zeitung* that carries your statement. Now *Dr Stein* has also had the Brimstone Gang acted out in the Carnival Parade for the *Breslauer Ressourcen-Gesellschaft*. But nevertheless *Dr Stein, Schlehan, Semrau* and their accomplices have had to take one humiliation after the other from the constitutionalists. But that sort will never stray from their patriotism. What do you think of this fine company?

What can I say about my colleague Stein, for Stein was indeed my colleague? That is to say, I was, for a whole six months (1855), correspondent for the *Neue Oder Zeitung*,<sup>[221]</sup> and that is the only German newspaper for which I have written during my stay abroad. Obviously Stein (*Stone*) is a man with a heart of stone, which is not even softened by the refusal of a dispensation to teach privately. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* had carved away at this stone a good deal in order to make a bust out of it. Take, for example, no 225:

**Cologne, 16 February 1849...** As concerns Herr Stein specifically, we remember a time when he came out as a fanatical constitutionalist against the republicans, and, *in the Schlesische Zeitung*,<sup>[221]</sup> *absolutely denounced the representatives of the working class*, and *had them denounced* by a like-minded schoolmaster, at present a member of the 'Association for Law and Order'. Just as wretched as the Assembly of Conciliators<sup>[231]</sup> was the so-called democratic faction of that Assembly. It was to be anticipated that, in order to be re-elected, these gentlemen would now recognise the *constitution* that had been *imposed* on them. It is even more characteristic of their position that they *afterwards* deny in the democratic clubs what they had affirmed *before* the elections at election meetings. Such sly liberal petty cunning was never the diplomacy of revolutionary characters.

The stone himself proved that the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* had not sculpted it in vain as soon as Manteuffel<sup>[241]</sup> once more deposed the chamber he had just imposed, for Dr Julius Stein now cried in the 'Main Democratic Association in Breslau':

We [the Berlin extreme left] gave the German question up as lost from the very start... one must *now* be convinced *that no German unity is possible as long as there are German princes*. (No 290 of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*)

Is it not indeed heartrending, enough to melt a heart of stone, that that same Stein, although no longer a bone, or rather a stone, of contention, continues to be the stone that the builder in Schwerin — rejected.

I do not know whether my readers have seen *Punch* at first hand, I mean the London *Kladderadatsch*. On the title page sits Punch, and opposite him stands his dog Toby, staring morosely and with a pen behind his ear, both signs that he is a born penny-a-liner. If one may compare something small with something great, then one could, perhaps, compare Vogt with Punch, particularly since the latter has lost the point of his joke, a misfortune which overtook him in 1846 with the abolition of the Corn Laws.<sup>[251]</sup> But his companion, the dog Toby, can only be compared with himself or with — **Eduard Meyen**. Indeed Eduard Meyen, should he ever actually die, will not require any Pythagorean transmigration of his soul. Toby has taken care of that even during his lifetime. I do not exactly mean to claim that Eduard Meyen sat as a model for the artist who drew the vignette, but in any case I have never in my whole life seen such a great similarity between a man and a dog. No wonder, however, for Eduard Meyen is by nature a penny-a-liner, and the penny-a-liner is by nature a Toby. Eduard Meyen has always loved to devote his importunately bustling quill-drivings to ready-made Institutions for the Undertaking of Writing for Party Organisations. A programme imposed from above saves the bother of thinking for oneself, the sense of being connected to a more or less organised mass deadens one's feelings of one's own inadequacy, and one's consciousness of the presence of a war-chest



overcomes for a moment even Toby's professional peevishness. Thus we find Eduard Meyen in his day tacked on to the unhappy democratic Central Committee, that hollow nut that sprang in 1848 from the German Democratic Assembly <sup>[26]</sup> at Frankfurt-am-Main. In exile in London, he was attached busily to turning out the lithographed leaflets by means of which Kinkel's Loan Funds for the Fabrication of Revolution were in part hawked, which did not, of course, prevent that same Eduard Meyen from deserting bag and baggage to the camp of the Prince Regent in order to howl amnesty and in fact beg permission to inflict on us, from Wandsbek, his ideas on foreign politics in the Hamburg *Freischütz*. Vogt, who was recruiting 'those that', people who were prepared to 'follow his policy' and fetch him articles, and, what is more, dangled a well-lined war-chest before their eyes, came along at a wonderfully opportune moment for our Eduard Meyen, who was running around temporarily masterless, and whose dog-licence nobody wanted to pay for in those hard times. And like a mad thing Toby barked out the rumour that I was trying to cheat Vogt's Institution for the Undertaking of Party Writing of its credit and its quill-driving pug-dogs of their fees! *Quelle horreur!* Vogt had instructions on the obligatory adaptation of the *Magnum Opus* sent to his Eduard Meyen that were just as detailed as those sent to his Edouard Simon, and Eduard Meyen did indeed garnish five issues of the *Freischütz* (nos 17 to 21, 1860) with crumbs from his *Magnum Opus*. But what a difference! While Edouard Simon corrects the original, Eduard Meyen mutilates it. The simplest aptitude for grasping any given material objectively is shown, after all, in the ability to *copy out* printed matter, but our Eduard Meyen is absolutely incapable of copying a single line correctly. Toby's mind lacks even the strength needed for copying. Just listen.

*Freischütz*, no 17:

The newspaper [*Allgemeine Zeitung*]... now stands condemned... of also enlisting the aid of a revolutionary party that Vogt brands as the *Brimstone Gang of German Republicans*.

Where and when does Vogt spin yarns about the Brimstone Gang of German Republicans?

*Freischütz*, no 18:

It is Liebknecht who has to raise the accusation against Vogt in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* by repeating there the charges forged by Biscamp in the London *Volk*. But they did not attain their full weight until Marx sent to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* a leaflet that appeared in London, the authorship of which he ascribed to Blind.

Vogt may have told a good many lies, but Hermann, his lawyer, alone would have prevented him from saying that Biscamp's article, which was *not* printed in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, had been 'repeated' there by Liebknecht. Nor does it even occur to Vogt to say that I sent the *Allgemeine Zeitung* the leaflet *As a Warning*. On the contrary, he expressly says: 'It is... Herr Liebknecht who sent the slanderous leaflet to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*.' (*Magnum Opus*, p 167)

*Freischütz*, no 19:

Blind has positively denied authorship of the leaflet and the printer has testified that it was not *handed* to him by Blind for printing. But it is established that the defamatory text was immediately transferred, in the same type, to the *Volk*, that Marx caused it to be published in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* [etc].

In the *Magnum Opus* Vogt prints, on the one hand, Fidelio Hollinger's statement in which Fidelio testifies that the leaflet had *not* been *set* in his print-shop, and, on the other hand, my counter-statement that the original type of the defamatory text was *still* standing in Hollinger's shop when it was reprinted in the *Volk* and what confusion the unhappy Toby makes of all this!

*Freischütz*, no 19:

As far as they personally are concerned [Engels and I are supposed to say in Techow's letter] they are purely men of reason, who know no nationality.

No *sentimentality*, my good Toby, no sentimentality is what Techow writes according to Vogt.

*Freischütz*, no 20:

Marx... had the two duellists betake themselves to *Ostend* to shoot each other there. Techow served as Willich's second [etc]. After this incident Techow broke with Marx and his league.

Eduard Meyen is not content merely to write *Ostend* instead of *Antwerp*. In London he probably heard the Frenchman in the West End complaining that the English write London and pronounce it Constantinople. Eduard Meyen has Techow, who had seen me just once in his life, and who, moreover, explicitly writes that he at first intended to *join* me and my league, *break* with me and my league, to which he never belonged.

*Freischütz*, no 21:

This incident [the Central Workers' Festival in Lausanne] explains the violent attack on Vogt published in the *Volk* in London.

Vogt himself informs us in the *Magnum Opus* of the date of the 'violent attack' on him that appeared in the *Volk* — 14 May 1859. (The leaflet appeared in the *Volk* of 18 June 1859.) The Lausanne Central Festival, on the other hand, took place on 26 and 27 June 1859, that is to say long *after* the 'violent attack' it provoked, according to Meyen.

But enough of these gems from Toby. No wonder Toby, who read everything that was not there in Vogt's book, also read into it that: 'Vogt's book will take its place among the boldest, wittiest and most useful polemics in our literature.' (*Freischütz*, no 17)

And now just picture the unfortunate Toby, incapable as he is of copying even two lines accurately from a printed book, picture him condemned to decipher the book of world history daily from Wandsbek, to copy out hourly the events of the day fleetingly hinted in the obscurest of initial letters, and to photograph life-size for the *Freischütz* the dissolving views of the moment! Unhappy herald of Wandsbek! Happy Hamburg readers of the *Freischütz*!

A few days ago the *London Times* carried a curious paragraph which went through all the English press and was entitled 'A Man Shot by a Dog'. So it seems that Toby knows how to shoot, and it is not surprising that Eduard Meyen sings in the *Freischütz*: <sup>[27]</sup> 'Ein Schütz bin ich in des Regenten Sold.' <sup>[28]</sup>

The *Kölnische Zeitung* confined itself to a few malicious paragraphs and sly insinuations on Vogt's behalf. Eight days after the publication of the *Magnum Opus* it spread in its columns the legend that the book was already out of print, presumably in order to avoid having to print anything about it itself. Anyway, how funny the way of the world is!

Could I only somehow have guessed in 1848–49, at the time of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, when we broke a lance almost daily with our neighbour in Cologne on behalf of the Poles, Hungarians and Italians, that the same *Kölnische Zeitung* would in 1859 arise as a knight of the nationality principle, and that the simple *Herr Jusepp Dumont* would be metamorphosed into a Signor Giuseppe Del Monte! But at that time, of course, Louis Bonaparte had not yet lent the nationalities the sanctity of the higher morality, and the *Kölnische Zeitung* will never forget of Louis Bonaparte that he was the saviour of society. Let the red fury with which the paper at that time used to attack *Austria* be shown by *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, no 144:

**Cologne, 15 November 1848:** At a moment when the whole of Germany starts up with a cry of indignation at the fact that the blood-stained servant of the Austrian bandit, that a Windischgrätz could dare to have the Deputy *Robert Blum* shot like a dog — at such a moment it is timely to return to two German papers, one of which attempts with rare perfidy to besmirch the last days of the departed, while the other pursues him to the grave with its stale cretinism. We speak of the *Kölnische Zeitung* and the *Rheinische Volks-Halle* (vulgo *Fools-Halla*)... In issue no 292, the *Kölnische Zeitung* reports: 'On the 22nd [of October] the *enthusiastic leaders* of the Democratic Party... removed themselves from Vienna; similarly... *Robert Blum*.' The *Kölnische Zeitung* carried this information without any further addition, but set the denunciation against Blum in Garamond type so as to impress it all the more easily on the memories of the readers. The *Kölnische Zeitung* made good its omissions in later issues. It did not even flinch at carrying in its columns articles from the Camarilla's deepest black-

yellow paper, items from Grand Duchess Sophie's organ... the most infamous of all Austrian newspapers... [There then follows the quotation of, among other things:] 'Robert Blum reaped no laurels in Vienna... he spoke, that is to say, at the Aula about the inner enemy of irresolution, lack of courage and persistence; he said that should there, however, be *other* inner enemies *too*, apart from this one — and he hoped there were none — or should there still exist in the city people who preferred the victory of the military to the victory of freedom, then the war to the knife against the hosts outside the city would have to be turned against them too... In Herr Blum's speech there is the madness of a Septembrist... If **Herr Blum** spoke these words then, we say it frankly, he has — **dishonoured himself.**' So much for the *Kölnische Zeitung*.

By means of an artificial system of hidden piping all the lavatories of London empty their physical filth into the Thames. In the same way the world capital daily spews all its social filth through a system of goose-quills into one big central paper sewer — the *Daily Telegraph*. Liebig correctly criticises the senseless waste that robs the waters of the Thames of their purity and the soil of Britain of its manure. But Levy, the proprietor of the central paper sewer, is an expert not only at chemistry but also at alchemy. After transforming all the social filth of London into newspaper articles, he transforms the newspaper articles into copper and finally the copper into gold. On the gate that leads to the central paper sewer are inscribed *di colore oscuro* <sup>[29]</sup> the words: 'Hic... quisquam faxit oletum!' Or, as Byron has already beautifully translated it in verse: 'Stop, traveller, and — piss!'

Levy, like Habbakuk, is *capable de tout*. <sup>[30]</sup> He is quite capable of writing a lead article three columns long on a single rape-case. At the beginning of this year he treated his numerous audience of connoisseurs to an asafetida-ragout skilfully brewed from the details of a certain legal case that were so sordidly nauseating that they had obliged the judge to order the court to be cleared of women and children. Unfortunately, Levy spiced the ragout with the name of an innocent person. The libel case that ensued ended with his conviction and the public condemnation of his organ from the bench. As we know, libel cases are, like all trials, exorbitantly expensive in Britain, and are, to a certain extent, the privilege of the *coffre fort*. <sup>[31]</sup> A number of unemployed lawyers in the city, however, soon discovered that Levy was easy game. They got together and offered their services *gratis* on spec to anybody who wants to prosecute Levy for libel. Levy himself has therefore loudly complained in his organ that a new variety of extortion is going around prosecuting Levy for libel. Since then, prosecuting Levy has become something that is not to be undertaken lightly. One lays oneself open to improper gossip, for just as the notices on every wall in London read 'Commit no nuisance', those on the gates of British Law-courts read 'Commit Levy'.

Politicians call the *Daily Telegraph* 'Palmerston's Mobpaper', but in general Levy's sewage-barge only takes politics on as ballast. The *Saturday Review*, on the other hand, aptly characterised his penny paper as 'cheap and nasty'.

It is a fatal symptom [it says, among other things] that it should have given such a definite preference for dirt to cleanliness. In every case it will exclude the most important report in order to leave space for a disreputable article.

Levy, however, also has his own prudery. Thus he finds fault with the immorality of the theatre and, a second Cato censor, persecutes the garments of the ballerinas, which start too late and finish too soon. Through such attacks of virtue Levy falls out of the frying pan into the fire. O consistency! cries a London theatre journal, *The Players*, O consistency, where is thy blush? How the rogue must have laughed in his beard! ... The *Daily Telegraph* preach about the propriety of female attire on the stage! Holy Jupiter, what next? Earthquakes and fiery comets are the very least that is now to be expected. Propriety! 'I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me that word.' <sup>[32]</sup> And, as Hamlet does Ophelia, *The Players* advises Levy to get him to a monastery, or rather a nunnery. 'Get thee to a nunnery, Levy!' Levy in a nunnery! Perhaps the 'nunnery' is only a misprint for 'Nonaria', so that it should read: 'Get thee to Nonaria, Levy', in which case everybody will be:

multum gaudere paratus,  
Si Cynico [the cynic, Levy] barbam petulans Nonaria vellat.  
Prepared to rejoice greatly  
If Nonaria ruffles the cynic's beard.

The *Weekly Mail* claimed that although Levy does not pull the wool over the public's eyes, he does give them a 'Y' in place of an 'I', and indeed, among the 22,000 Levis counted by Moses during the march through the wilderness, there was not a single Levi who spelled his name with a 'Y'. Just as Edouard Simon absolutely insists on belonging to the Latin race, Levy positively insists on belonging to the Anglo-Saxon race. At least once a month, therefore, he attacks the un-British policies of Mr Disraeli, for Disraeli, 'the Asiatic mystery', unlike the *Daily Telegraph*, does not originate from the Anglo-Saxon race. But what use is it Levy attacking Mr D'Israeli and taking a 'Y' instead of an 'I' when mother nature has written his lineage in the middle of his face in the most extravagant black-letter script. The nose of Slavkenbergius' mysterious stranger (see *Tristram Shandy*), <sup>[331]</sup> who fetched himself the finest nose from the promontory of noses, was only the talk of Strasbourg for a week, while Levy's nose is the talk of the City of London all year round. A Greek epigrammatist describes the nose of a certain Castor, which served him as everything, as shovel, trumpet, sickle, anchor, etc. He closes the description with the following words:

Οὕτως εὐχρήστου σχεύους Κάστωρ τετύχηκε  
 Πῖνα φέρων πάσης ἀρμενον ἐργασίας

And thus Castor possesses a tool for every occasion  
 Holding his nose at the ready for whatever work may arise.

But even Castor could not guess what Levy uses his nose for. The English poet comes closer with the lines:

And 'tis a miracle we may suppose,  
 No nastiness offends his skilful nose.

The great art of Levy's nose in fact consists in courting the smell of putrescence, sniffing it out a hundred miles away and fetching it. Thus Levy's nose serves the *Daily Telegraph* as elephant's trunk, feeler, light-house and telegraph. Hence one can say without exaggeration that Levy writes his newspaper with his nose.

This fine *Daily Telegraph* was of course the *only* English newspaper in which Vogt's *Lousiad* appeared, in which it could not fail to appear. On 6 February 1860, an article two and a half columns long appeared in Levy's organ with the title 'The Journalistic Auxiliaries of Austria', in fact a mere translation into malodorous English of the two lead articles in the Berlin *National-Zeitung*. In order to mislead, the article bore the by-line: 'From an occasional correspondent, Frankfort on the Main, 2 February.' I knew, of course, that the *Telegraph's* only correspondent lived in Berlin, where Levy's nose had discovered him with its usual virtuosity. I therefore wrote immediately to a friend in Berlin to ask whether he could not tell me the name of the correspondent of Levy's organ. My friend, a man whose erudition even A von Humboldt has recognised, was nevertheless obstinate enough to claim that there was no *Daily Telegraph* in London and consequently no correspondent of the same in Berlin. Under these conditions I turned to another acquaintance in the city on the Spree. Answer: the Berlin correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* exists and is called — *Abel*. In this I saw wicked mystification. Abel was obviously a simple abbreviation of Zabel. The fact that Zabel cannot write English did not worry me in the least. If Abel, as Zabel, could edit the *National-Zeitung* without knowing how to write German, then why should not Zabel, as Abel, be correspondent of the *Telegraph* without knowing how to write English? So Zabel, Abel, Abel, Zabel? How find a way out of this Babel? I compared the Berlin organ of wisdom one more time with Levy's organ, and discovered on this occasion in issue 41 of the *National-Zeitung* the following text:

Liebknecht fügt wunderbar hinzu: 'Wir wollten von deco *Magistrat* [?] unsere  
 Unterschrift beglaubigen lassen.'

Liebknecht adds surprisingly: 'We wanted to have our signatures attested by the *City Council* [?].'

This part about the *Magistrat* (City Council) with Zabel's astonished question mark is reminiscent of that Swabian who 'no sooner had he got off the ship in Asia when he asked: "Ain't any of my mates from Bebbingen 'ere?'" Not only is this whole piece missing in Levy's organ, but the question mark too, from which it follows as clear as daylight that Levy's correspondent does not share the view of F Zabel, according to whom the London police court Justices, or Magistrates, are the Berlin *Magistrat*.

So Zabel was not Abel and Abel was not Zabel. Meanwhile, other acquaintances in Berlin had heard of my efforts. One of them wrote: ‘Among the 22,000 Levis in the Fourth Book of Moses there is also to be found an Abel, but he spelled his name Abigail.’ Another wrote: ‘So this time Abel has killed Cain and not Cain Abel’. And so I got deeper and deeper into the ‘Labyrinth’ until the editor of a London newspaper assured me with dry English solemnity that Abel was not a joke but a Jewish literary man in Berlin whose full name was *Dr Karl Abel*, which dear boy had served some considerable time under Stahl and Gerlach as a zealous drudge on the *Kreuz-Zeitung* but, with the change of government, had changed if not his skin then at least his colour. Now the importunate zeal of the renegade would, admittedly, explain why Levy’s Berlin correspondent thinks that the British freedom of the press was invented for the sole purpose of permitting him to hawk his epileptic awe of the Hohenzollern government in public. Hypothetically therefore it may be assumed that besides a Levy in London there is also an Abel in Berlin — *par nobile fratrum*.<sup>[34]</sup>

Abel keeps his Levy supplied from all imaginable places simultaneously — from Berlin, Vienna, Frankfurt am Main, Stockholm, Petersburg, Hong Kong, etc, which is a much greater trick than de Maistre’s *Voyage autour de ma chambre*.<sup>[35]</sup> But under whatever dateline Abel writes to his Levy, he always writes under the sign of Cancer. In contrast to the Echternacht procession,<sup>[36]</sup> which takes two steps forward and one step back, Abel’s articles go one step forward and two steps back.

No crab more active in the dirty dance,  
Downward to climb and backward to advance. (Pope)

Abel possesses an undeniable skill at making the state secrets of the continent accessible to his Levy. The *Kölnische Zeitung*, for example, carries some article or other, let us say on Russian finances, borrowed perhaps from the *Baltische Monatsschrift*. Abel lets a month pass by and then suddenly writes the article in the *Kölnische Zeitung* from Petersburg to London, not forgetting to hint in the process that, if not exactly the Tsar himself, and perhaps not even the Russian Finance Minister, then at least one of the directors of the state bank whispered the statistical secret to him *entre deux cigares*.<sup>[37]</sup> And so he cries out triumphantly: ‘I am in a position to state [etc].’ Or the official *Preussische Zeitung* puts out a ministerial feeler and hints maybe at Herr von Schleinitz’s unauthoritative views on the question of Electoral Hesse. This time Abel does not wait an instant, but writes to Levy that very day, and openly from Berlin what is more, on the question of Electoral Hesse. A week later he reports that the *Preussische Zeitung*, the government organ, is carrying the following article on the question of Electoral Hesse, and ‘I owe it to myself to point out that a week ago I already’, etc. Or he translates an article from the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and dates it, say, from Stockholm. Then there inevitably follows the phrase ‘I must warn your readers’ not against the article that he has copied, but against some other article in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. But as soon as Abel comes to talk about the *Kreuz-Zeitung* he crosses himself in order to make himself unrecognisable.

As far as Abel’s style is concerned, one can only describe it metaphorically as a copy of the genres Stern Gescheidt,<sup>[38]</sup> Isidor Berlinerblau and Jacob Wiesenriesler.

With Abel’s permission, a small digression. The original Stern Gescheidt is another accomplice of Vogt’s, a certain *Ludwig Bamberger*, in 1848 the editor of a hole-in-the-corner paper in Mainz and at present a ‘full pay’ *loup-garou*<sup>[39]</sup> by marriage in Paris and *Decembrist democrat* ‘in the simplest sense of the word’. In order to understand this ‘simple’ sense, one has to know the Romany language of the Paris stock exchange synagogue. Stern Gescheidt’s ‘simple’ democracy is what Isaac Péreire calls ‘*la démocratisation du crédit*’, which consists in transforming not individual circles in a nation but the whole nation into a gambling hell so as to be able to swindle it *en masse*. Whereas the oligarchic stock exchange wolf under Louis Philippe was so narrow-minded as to hunt the national wealth concentrated in the hands of the upper bourgeoisie, under the aegis of Louis Bonaparte, all is fish for the democratic stock exchange wolf who, like the Roman Emperor, cries *non olet*,<sup>[40]</sup> and, with Stern Gescheidt Bamberger, adds: ‘*The masses must do it.*’ That is Stern Gescheidt’s democracy at its most ‘simple’. Stern Gescheidt Bamberger has recently become known under the name ‘*Hurrah, we’re off to Italy*’. During the Imperial Constitution campaign, on the other hand, he answered the call: ‘*Oy Vey, we’re off from Kirchheimboland!*’ Having decamped from Kirchheimboland and led the Rhineland-Palatinate free corps a dance, Stern Gescheidt Bamberger, about whose heroic exploits a delicious manuscript has been entrusted to my care, was much too clever not to sniff out the fact that

there was gold for the clever treasure-hunter in the bloated, blood-permeated night-soil of December. He therefore betook himself to Paris where, as his friend Isidor Berlinerblau, alias *HB Oppenheim*, so prettily put it: 'Where one feels freer than one knows.' Stern Gescheidt, whose 'circulation' began to 'falter' in 1858 (see the document of the Banque de France on circulation in 1858–59), was as pleased as punch when the night-soil of December suddenly began to shimmer with the bright colours of grandiose ideas. Stern Gescheidt, who is as clever as he is tinsel-democratic, realised that a flood in Paris would wash away the *Pro* in his ledger along with the soil of December, leaving only the *Contra*. As we know, Stern Gescheidt Bamberger has increased the nine Hellenic muses by one Hebrew muse, the 'muse of Time', as he calls the stock-exchange price-list.

Back to Abel. Abel's style is permeated with the *odor specificus* indispensable to the *Daily Telegraph*, the great paper sewer of the world capital. When Levy is really moved by the perfume of Abel's despatches, Abel's erudition and the industrious devotion with which Abel writes from 20 different degrees of longitude simultaneously, in such moments of profound emotion Levy calls Abel caressingly, lovingly, his — 'industrious bug'.

Poetic justice alone demands that the 'rounded character' should not end the comedy stuck, with Abel, in the manure of London. But who is to pull him out of the manure? Who is to be his saviour? The fink must be his saviour, that is to say *Baron von Vincke*, Junker of the red earth, knight of the joyful countenance, *chevalier sans peur et sans reproche*.<sup>[41]</sup>

As has been said earlier, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* had already betrayed the unity of the opposites Vogt and Vincke in 1848, and Vogt himself suspected it in 1859, when he wrote in his *Studien*, 'Herr von Vincke as the apostle of new state freedom... that really verges on the territory of the ridiculous' (*Studien*, p 21), on Vogt territory, that is to say. Vincke, however, openly pronounced words of reconciliation when he, as Joh Philipp Becker says, 'illuminated the modest Prussian chamber with the *Brimstone Gang*'. Scarcely a year beforehand he recommended to the same house the pamphlet *Po and Rhine*<sup>[42]</sup> whose sulphurous origins, lacking Levy's nose, he did not, of course, suspect. With Vincke now, just like Vogt, playing the Italian, with Vincke, like Vogt, insulting the Poles, and Vincke, like Vogt, proclaiming the partition of Germany, the hostile brothers fell for ever into each other's arms.

It is known that equal poles irresistibly repel each other. And so for a long time Vogt and Vincke found each other mutually repulsive. Both suffer from excessive verbal salivation, and hence each of the two fears that the other will not let him get a word in edgeways.

Vogt, as Ranickel testifies, is a great zoologist, and so is Vincke, as his pig-breeding at Ickern proves.

In Spanish drama there are always two buffoons for every hero. Even St Cyprian, the Spanish Faust, is provided by Calderon with Moscon and Clarin. In the same way, the reactionary general von Radowitz possessed in the Frankfurt parliament two comic adjutants, his Harlequin Lichnowsky and his clown Vincke. Vogt, however, the liberal anti-clown, had to do everything on his own, which obviously soured him towards Vincke, since Jacobus Venedey could only do the sob-stuff in his role of Pantaloon. Vincke loved to wear the jester's cap from time to time. Thus he declared in the parliamentary session of 21 June 1848: 'That from time to time he was more inclined to believe he was in a theatre than in such an assembly.'

And at a festive gathering of the Tories in the Frankfurt parliament, he performed as the *Prince of Fools*, sat on a barrel and sang:

I am the prince of fools,  
Until I die I'll booze.

That too annoyed his counterpart. Besides, neither Vogt nor Vincke could scare the other, and so they thought it wisest to attack one another. Falstaff Vogt knew with whom he was dealing in the knight without fear and without reproach, and vice versa. In his day the Westphalian Bayard had studied law at German universities, not so much the Roman *corpus juris* for, as he said, his ancestors of the red earth had not defeated Varus in vain. All the more zealously did he apply himself to Teutonic law, that is to say, to the *Students' Code*, whose foundations he measured in all dimensions and afterwards made famous under the name *legal basis*. As a result of this casuistically profound study of the *Students' Code*, he always hit, in the event of a duel, upon some Scotist<sup>[43]</sup> hair that was laid with as

much hair-splitting sharpness between the knight and bloodshed as the naked sword between the Princess and the *locum tenens*. This hair-splitting always got in the way with the regularity of a periodic fever, from the adventure with Supreme Court Assessor Benda at the time of the United *Landtag* <sup>[44]</sup> until the no less notorious adventure with the Prussian War Minister in the House of Deputies in 1860. So one can see how wrong people were to accuse the Junker recently of having lost his legal basis. It is not his fault if his legal basis consists entirely of loopholes. Much rather, since the *Students' Code* only serves for the higher levels of legal debate, the ingenious Junker replaces it in day-to-day parliamentary practice with the — *Code of Sharp Practice*.

In the Frankfurt frog-pond Vincke once bitterly abused his counterpart Vogt as '*future minister*'. As soon as he learned, at Ickern, that Vogt, remembering the saying 'Take a little office on, and be called master all year round', had not only become Imperial Regent, but even Minister for Foreign Affairs *in partibus*, <sup>[45]</sup> it quite overcame him, and he was angrily resentful about the neglected claims of seniority. For even in the United *Landtag* of 1847 Vincke had been in the opposition as a Frondeur and a noble representative of the bourgeois opposition. At the outbreak of the March revolution, therefore, he saw himself as called upon before all others to save the crown. His rivals, however, all became actual ministers, while he retained his position of 'future minister', a post he has occupied to this day with uninterrupted success.

To take his revenge, he shook the dust of Berlin from his feet and betook himself to Frankfurt, to the extreme right in the *Paulskirche*, to operate here as clown, claqueur and bully of General Radowitz.

The fink was a fanatically good Austrian as long as that earned the applause of the authorities. He raved like a man possessed against the *nationalities*:

The left is in raptures about every imaginable nationality in turn, Italians, Poles, and now even Magyars. (Session of 23 October 1848)

The three knights Vincke, Uchnowski and Arnim sang the musical trio, 'The ox gives a roar, the cow gives a f—, the donkey follows the bass part', with such virtuosity against the speakers who were in support of Poland (Session of 5 June 1848), that even the President's bell ran out of breath, and when Radowitz went so far as to claim the Mincio for the German Empire on military-natural grounds (session of 12 August 1848), Vincke, to the delight of the gallery and to Vogt's secret admiration, stood on his head and telegraphed applause with his legs. Claqueur in chief of the decisions by which the Frankfurt frog-pond placed the stamp of the approval of the will of the German people on the dynastic subjugation of Poland, Hungary and Italy, the Junker of the red earth raised an incomparably merrier outcry as soon as it came to sacrificing the claims of the German nation in the shameful Malmö armistice. In order to secure a majority for the ratification of the armistice, diplomatic and other visitors had crept from the gallery to the benches of the right. The deception was discovered and Raveaux insisted on a fresh vote. The fink inveighed against him, saying it did not matter who voted, but what was voted for (session of 16 September 1848). During the September insurrection in Frankfurt, called forth by the decision on the Malmö armistice, the Westphalian Bayard disappeared without trace, only to revenge himself, after the proclamation of martial law, with rabidly reactionary somersaults for the terror for which nobody could compensate him.

Not satisfied with lashing out with his tongue at Poles, Italians and Hungarians, he proposed Arch-Duke Johann of Austria as President of the provisional central power (session of 21 June 1848), with the most obedient reservation, however, that the Habsburg executive of the German parliament did not have either to execute or to proclaim its plebeian decisions, or even concern itself with them at all. He sprang up in fury when his own colleagues of the majority, for the sake of variety, voted that the Imperial Vicar should graciously deign to reach an agreement with parliament before declaring war or peace or signing treaties with foreign powers (session of 27 June 1848). And the great oratorical fire with which the fink tried to bully out of the German parliament a vote of confidence in the imperial minister Schmerling and company as recompense for their and the Imperial Vicar's complicity in the bloody and infamous treachery of Vienna <sup>[46]</sup> victoriously refutes Fischart's <sup>[47]</sup> slander:

O, Westphalian mugs  
Are like chilled mugs!

Thus Vincke was a good neighbour to the Habsburgs until suddenly over the parliamentary Sahara there appeared the *fata morgana* <sup>[48]</sup> of Little Germany, in which the Junker thought to see a life-sized

minister's portfolio with a fink under its arm. Since the walls of the *Paulskirche* had unusually long ears, he could flatter himself that the clamour in Frankfurt of his outbreaks of loyalty towards the Hohenzollern dynasty would make a favourable impression in Berlin. Had he not declared in the middle of the *Paulskirche* on 21 June 1848:

I was sent here by my voters to represent the rights not only of the people but also of the princes. I still comfort myself with the words of the Great Elector, who once called the people of the Mark his most loyal and obedient subjects. And we in the Mark are proud of that.

And the Bayard of the Mark went from words to deeds in that famous platform battle that he owed to his knightly spurs (session of 7 and 8 August 1848). When Brentano, namely, on the occasion of the demand for an amnesty for Friedrich Hecker, <sup>[49]</sup> let fall from the rostrum an ambiguous allusion to a Hohenzollern prince, the fink was overcome by a veritable rabies-attack of loyalty. Rushing from his seat up to Herr Brentano, he tried to pull him down from the rostrum with the words: 'Down, you cur!' Brentano kept his place. Later the Junker once more rushed at him and cast down the gauntlet for a chivalrous duel, without prejudice, of course, to the possibility of later considerations concerning the legal basis. Brentano accepted the challenge with the words:

Outside the church you can say what you like to me. Here you will let me go immediately or I will slap your face.

The Junker now reached into his verbal quiver and from it flung a variety of insults at the left, until Reichardt shouted at him: 'Von Vincke, you really are a s—t.' (session of 7 August 1848) The fink tried to prevent the debate on the conflict between the Brandenburg government and the agreementist Assembly by moving next business.

Since Wrangel's victorious entry into Berlin [he said] there had been calm, shares had risen... the Berlin Assembly had no right to issue proclamations to the people [etc].

Scarcely had the agreementists been dispersed when the Knight without fear and without reproach fell on them all the more furiously.

We lack the political education for a republic [he howled during the session of 12 December 1848]. The representatives of the former Berlin Assembly proved that by passing resolutions that proceeded from base personal ambition.

He tried to pacify the storm that broke out at that with the statement:

That he was ready to defend his views *chivalrously* against any person, [but the careful knight added] he did not mean any member of this Assembly, but the members of the dispersed Berlin Assembly.

So defiantly did the challenge of the Bayard of the Mark ring out against the whole army of dispersed agreementists. One of those dispersed heard the challenge, rallied himself, and in fact achieved the unheard-of feat of bringing the Junker of the Red Earth to battle at Eisenach. Bloodshed seemed to have become inevitable when, at the decisive moment, Bayard smelled a Scotist rat. His opponent was called Georg Jung, and although the rules of honour commanded the knight without fear and without reproach to fight the dragon, they did not under any circumstances allow him to fight a namesake of the knight of the dragon. The fink would not let himself be talked out of this *idée fixe*. <sup>[50]</sup> Rather, he swore by all that was holy, rather slit his own belly open like a Japanese Daimyo <sup>[51]</sup> than harm a hair on the head of a man called George, who was, moreover, still too *jung* to be of age for duelling. All the more recklessly did this resolute expert at duelling rage in the *Paulskirche* against Temme and other opponents of the government who were safely under lock and key in gaol in Münster (session of 9 January 1849). If he scorned such minor details to make a favourable impression in high places, he outdid himself in loyal zeal in his gigantic efforts for the creation of a Little Germany and a great Prussian crown. Warwick the Kingmaker was a child compared with Vincke, the maker of Emperors.

The Bayard of the Mark thought that he had heaped enough fiery coals on the head of the ingratitude of March 1848. When the 'government of action' <sup>[52]</sup> collapsed, Vincke disappeared from the *Paulskirche* for a period and held himself in readiness. Ditto when the von Pful government fell. But since the mountain would not come to Mahomet, Mahomet decided to go to the mountain. Elected for some rotten borough or other, the knight of the red earth suddenly turned up in Berlin as a member of



the imposed chamber, full of the great urge for the requital of the reward that awaited his deeds in Frankfurt. In addition, the knight felt infinitely at ease in the state of emergency, which would not fail him in any unparliamentary liberty. He sucked in greedily with both ears the hissing and shouts of contempt with which he was greeted by the people of Berlin while waiting with the deputies of the imposed chamber before the *Schloss* to be received in the White Room, particularly since Manteuffel had delicately hinted that, in order to find a ministerial portfolio vacant for certain merits, a certain person in high places was inclined to accept the imperial crown from the hands of the Emperor-maker of Frankfurt. In the sweet illusion of these expectations the fink tried for the time being to make himself useful as the dirty boy of the cabinet. He composed the draft of the address to the crown according to the instructions of the *Kreuz-Zeitung*, thundered against an amnesty, accepted even the imposed constitution only with the explicit reservation that it should be revised and expurgated by a 'strong state power', insulted the deputies of the left suffering under the state of emergency, etc, and awaited his triumph.

The catastrophe approached, the Emperor deputation had arrived in Berlin from Frankfurt, and Vincke had, on 2 April 1849, tabled an amendment proposing an Emperor, for which Manteuffel had, in all innocence, voted. Immediately after the session Vincke leapt madly goat-like into a neighbouring second-hand shop to buy a portfolio there with his own hands, a portfolio of black pasteboard lined with red satin and edged with gold. Glad at heart and smirking, faun-like in triumph the knight of the happy countenance sat next morning in his place in the centre of the chamber, but — 'Never, never, never' it rang out, Manteuffel's lips twitched, dripping honey, and the fearless knight, white about the gills and quivering with inner excitement like an electric eel, snapped wildly to his friends: 'Hold me back, I shall do something unfortunate.' In order to hold him back the *Kreuz-Zeitung*, according to whose instructions Vincke had been living for months, and for whose draft address of the chamber he had been Godfather, published an article the next day under the headline 'The Fatherland is in Danger', saying, among other things:

*The government remains*, and the King replies to Herr von Vincke and Comrades that they should not meddle in matters that do not concern them.

And the cheated knight *sans peur* and *sans reproche* trotted off from Berlin to Ickern with a longer nose than Levy ever wore, and such as could only be pinned onto — *a future minister!*

After vegetating for long sad years of practical zoology in Ickern, the Cincinnatus <sup>[53]</sup> of the red earth awoke one fine morning as the official leader of the opposition in the Prussian House of Deputies. Since he had fared so badly with his right-wing speeches in Frankfurt, he now held *gauche* speeches in Berlin. Whether he represented the opposition of confidence or the confidence of the opposition was not to be ascertained exactly. However, he overplayed his role once more. He had soon made himself so irreplaceable to the cabinet on the opposition benches that he was forbidden ever to leave them again. And so the Junker of the Red Earth remained — *a future minister*.

Under those circumstances the fink grew tired of the matter and concluded the famous treaty of Ickern. *Vogt* gave it him in black and white: as soon as Plon-Plon conquers the first Island of Baratania on the continent of Europe, peoples it with dips-Oppenheimers and installs his Falstaff as regent, *Vogt* will appoint the Westphalian Bayard his Prime Minister, invest him with final authority in all duels, raise him, further, to the rank of real Privy General Supreme Master Road-Builder, <sup>[54]</sup> elevate him in addition to the rank of prince with the title Prince of Thoren and finally have struck in the tin, which will in any case circulate instead of money in this insular *Vogtary*, a pair of Siamese twins. *Vogt* on the right as Plon-Plon's regent, *Vincke* on the left as *Vogt's* minister, and draped around the capacious double figure the vine-wreathed inscription:

Mouth to mouth with thee  
I defy my century.

## Notes

- 1 To have pleased Princes is not the highest praise.
- 2 That is, 'in partibus infidelium' — among the infidel non-believers.

**3** At that time Kossuth could not grasp how Palmerston's mock hostility towards Russia 'could' deceive anybody with any common sense. 'How could a man of any intellect for a single moment believe that the minister who allowed Russia's intervention in Hungary, would give the word for an attack against her?' — Letter dated Kutayah, 17 December 1850, *Correspondence of Kossuth*. [Marx's note]

**4** The fact that such things reach the light of day appears less astonishing when one considers that at least two very talkative parties were involved here. Moreover, the facts were published in the English papers during Kossuth's presence in London (in the late summer of 1859). [Marx's note]

**5** Gaffes or blunders.

**6** With no embarrassment.

**7** The rising aimed at the overthrow of Austrian rule in Italy but was conspiratorial in its methods, did not appreciate the situation properly, and was quickly put down.

**8** The Central Committee of European Democracy was founded in London in 1851 on the initiative of Mazzini, the Italian republican. It contained bourgeois and petty-bourgeois emigrants from a number of countries. It was dissolved in 1852 because of conflicts between French and Italian exiles.

**9** I myself had become acquainted with *Bangya* and his then friend, the present *General Türr*, in 1850 in London. He overcame the suspicion that his chicanery with every possible party, Orleanist, Bonapartist, etc, and his traffic with policemen of every 'nationality' aroused in me simply by producing letters patent made out in *Kossuth's* own hand, in which he, who had earlier already been the Police President in Komorn under Klapka, is installed as Police President *in partibus*. As secret police chief in the service of the revolution, he naturally had to keep his contacts with the police in the service of the governments 'open'. In the course of the summer of 1852, I discovered that he had misappropriated a manuscript that I had entrusted to him to supply a bookseller in Berlin and arranged for it to fall into the hands of a German government. After I had written about this incident and other peculiarities of the man which had long since impressed themselves upon my attention, to a Hungarian in Paris, and the *Bangya* mystery had been completely solved by the intervention of a third person with precise information, I sent an official denunciation signed in my own name at the beginning of 1853 to the New-Yorker *Criminal Zeitung*. In an apology which I still have in my possession, *Bangya* underlined the fact that I was the last person to think him a spy since (and this was correct) he had always avoided discussing the affairs of my own party with me. Although Kossuth and his supporters did not drop him at that point, my revelations in the *Criminal-Zeitung* made further operations in London difficult for him, and he was all the more eager to seize the opportunity offered by the confusion in the Orient for the realisation of his talents on a new stage. Soon after the Treaty of Paris had been signed (1856), I saw in a Paris newspaper that a certain *Mehemed Bei*, a Colonel in the Turkish service, previously known as a Christian under the name of John *Bangya*, had sailed with a number of Polish refugees to Circassia, where he figured as the chief of staff to *Sefer-Pasha* and to a certain extent as the 'Simon Bolivar' of the Circassian. I referred to the *Liberator's* past in the London *Free Press*, many copies of which go to Constantinople. On 20 January 1858, *Bangya*, as mentioned in the text, was condemned to death by a court-martial of the Polish Legion under the command of Colonel *Th Lapinski* in *Aderbi* for the intended betrayal of Circassia. Since *Bangya* was a Turkish Colonel, *Sefer-Pasha* held execution of the sentence to be incompatible with the consideration due to the Sublime Porte, and therefore shipped the condemned man to *Trebizond*, whence he soon appeared, a free man, in Constantinople. Meanwhile, the Hungarian exiles in Constantinople had passionately taken *Bangya's* side against the Poles. Secured against the Divan by the Russian Embassy, which to cap it all had to feed him, as a 'Colonel', together with his harem, and against the Poles by the prejudices of his own compatriots, *Bangya* with the greatest coolness published a self-apology in the *Journal de*

*Constantinople*. The arrival shortly afterwards of a delegation from Circassia soon put an end to the farce, however. The Hungarian exiles officially dropped their protégé, although *de très mauvais grâce*. All the documents of the court-martial in Aderbi, including Bangya's confession, together with the documents that had later been exchanged in Constantinople, were sent by the Polish exiles there to London, where an extract appeared in the *Free Press* (May 1858). These documents were published in greater detail by me in the *New York (Daily) Tribune*, 16 June 1858. [Marx's note]

**10** By the Concordat of 1855 between the Papacy and Austria, the Catholic Church in Austria obtained autonomy, the right to a direct relationship with Rome, the right to acquire property, powers of censorship and a strong influence over the schools.

**11** Langenschwarz — an early nineteenth-century poet and improviser who tried to base improvisation on a scientific theory.

**12** Ferencz Rákóczi — the leader of the Hungarian movement for independence from Austria at the beginning of the eighteenth century.

**13** Although I can understand such an attitude on Klapka's part, it is distasteful to me to find something approaching it in the book by Szemere mentioned above, and I have often communicated to him my views in this respect. Even less can I understand his latest statement on the Austrian concession. I know that in public affairs Szemere does not allow himself to be led by private motives, and that he had very important reasons for his statement: that with what has been given in Vienna the Hungarians can take anything they want in Pest; that every Hungarian insurrection from abroad, and particularly with French support, would necessarily entail a Russian intervention in Hungary, for or against Austria; and finally that the autonomy granted to Transylvania, Slovenia and Croatia, as well as Vojvodina, would secure those 'nationalities' for the Vienna cabinet against the Magyars in just the same way as 1848–49. All that is correct, but it could have been said without giving the appearance of recognising the version of the Hungarian Constitution mutilated 'in usum Delphini' in Vienna. [Marx's note]

**14** The revolutionary Hungarian army capitulated to Russian troops at Világos in August 1849. Although the army still had the resources to continue the struggle, its commander, Görgey, surrendered in line with the interests of the counter-revolutionary elements in the Hungarian nobility.

**15** Johann Philip Becker (1819–1886) took part in the democratic movements of the 1830s and 1840s in Germany and Switzerland. In the emigration he became an important leader of the International Workers Association and a close friend and collaborator with Marx and Engels.

**16** The Ultramontane party was an extreme reactionary Catholic party.

**17** The 'old regime', that is, the monarchy before the French Revolution.

**18** Unsurpassed example.

**19** Come to my place, and place your bets!

**20** It is impossible to translate 'Dullness' into German. It is more than boredom, it is ennui elevated to a principle, somnolent lifelessness, blunted torpidity. As a quality of style, Dullness is what the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* calls 'the weighty expression of emptiness'. [Marx's note]

A quotation from *The Dunciad* (1728) by Alexander Pope; a satirical attack on Pope's literary enemies, it deals with one of the most important themes of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment: the struggle between reason and ignorance.

**21** Marx was the London correspondent of this bourgeois-democratic newspaper.

**22** The *Schlesische Zeitung* appeared from 1742 to 1945. During the 1848 revolution it represented the views of the constitutional monarchists.

**23** The name given by Marx and Engels to the Prussian National Assembly, which in May 1848 was called upon to work out a constitution ‘in conjunction with the crown’. It was dispersed by the *coup d’état* of December 1848. The ‘imposed’ constitution was put into force as soon as the Assembly had been broken up; it provided for two chambers whose members had to meet certain property qualifications.

**24** Otto, Freiherr von Manteuffel (1805–1882) — Prussian statesman, representative of the reactionary nobility, was at various times Minister for the Interior, Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Prussia.

**25** The Corn Laws had been introduced in 1815 to regulate the import of wheat in the interests of the great landowners. In 1846, they were repealed under pressure from the English industrialists who fought under the banner of Free Trade.

**26** The first German democratic congress met for four days in June 1848. On the initiative of the worker-delegates it declared a democratic republic to be the only tolerable constitution for Germany. The congress was extremely divided and disorganised owing to the weakness of the petty-bourgeois leadership of the democratic movement. The Jacobins were called Septembrists by their enemies who accused them of perpetrating the massacres of September 1792.

**27** Marksman.

**28** I am a marksman in the Regent’s pay.

**29** In dark lettering.

**30** Capable of anything.

**31** Strong-box.

**32** A quotation from Portia’s speech in *The Merchant of Venice*.

**33** *Tristram Shandy* — a novel by Lawrence Sterne, published 1760–67.

**34** Noble pair of brothers.

**35** Journey around my bedchamber.

**36** A procession held every Whitsun in Echternach in Luxemburg as a thanksgiving for the end of an epidemic of St Vitus dance which raged there in 1374. Those taking part move backwards and forwards during the procession.

**37** Between two cigars.

**38** Gescheidt — a pseudonym of Ludwig Bamberger, who took part in the risings of 1849 in Germany, emigrated to France and later became a National Liberal deputy in the Reichstag.

**39** Werewolf.

**40** It doesn’t smell.

**41** A knight without fear and without reproach. Marx ironically calls Vincke ‘knight of the joyful countenance’ on the lines of Cervante’s name for Don Quixote, ‘the knight of the doleful countenance’. The ‘knight without fear or stain’ was the French knight Bayard.

**42** *Po and Rhine* — an anonymous pamphlet by Engels.

**43** Duns Scotus — a medieval philosopher whose followers after the Reformation attacked the ‘new learning’ and were famous for their sophistical arguments.

**44** An assembly of provincial Landtags called in Berlin by Frederick William IV in April 1847; he hoped they would rescue him from his financial difficulties by a guarantee on a foreign loan. Because he refused the slightest reforms the assembly refused the guarantee, whereupon the king dissolved the Assembly — an act which hastened the revolution in Germany.

- 45** Literally, in the parts; usually referring to parts of a domain no longer under the control of the authorities.
- 46** A reference to the counter-revolutionary attitude of the German and Austrian bourgeoisie to the rising in Vienna in October 1848. Under the banner of mediation, the majority in the Frankfurt National Assembly sabotaged aid to the revolution in Austria. Vincke warmly supported this line.
- 47** Johann Fischart — a German satirical poet.
- 48** A very distorted image of a distant object.
- 49** Friedrich Hecker — a radical republican, one of the leaders of the rising in Baden in April 1848, emigrated to Switzerland and then to the United States where he fought as an officer in the Army of the North during the Civil War.
- 50** Set idea.
- 51** Daimyo — a Japanese nobleman.
- 52** The ‘government of action’ was the name given to the government which ruled from June to September 1848.
- 53** Cincinnatus — a Roman patrician of the fifth century BC, who is said to have lived a simple life and cultivated his own farm.
- 54** See the little publication, *Another Description of the Liberal Deputy von Vinke and the Edifying Tale of the Building of the Sprochhövel–Elberfeld Road (Auch eine Charakteristik des liberalen Abgeordneten von Vinke und erbauliche Geschichte des Sprochhövel–Elberfelder Wegbaues*, Hagen, 1849). [Marx’s note]

## Chapter XI: A Trial

At the end of January 1860, two issues of the *Berlin National-Zeitung* reached London with two lead articles, the first entitled ‘Karl Vogt and the *Allgemeine Zeitung*’ (no 37 of the *National-Zeitung*), and the second ‘How to Make Radical Leaflets’. Under these various titles **Frederick Zabel**<sup>[1]</sup> carried a version of Vogt’s *Magnum Opus* reworked in *usum delphim*.<sup>[2]</sup> The latter did not arrive in London until much later. I immediately decided to institute proceedings for libel against **Frederick Zabel** in Berlin.

Masses of abuse against me have piled up in the German and the German-American press in the last ten years, but I have only taken it into account in the literary sense in those very rare exceptions, such as the occasion of the Cologne Communist trial, when the interests of the Party were involved. In my view, the press possesses *the right to insult* writers, politicians, actors and other public figures. If I thought it worthwhile to take cognisance of the attack, then I followed in such cases the motto: *à corsaire, corsaire et demi*.<sup>[3]</sup>

Here matters were different. *Zabel* accused me of a series of *criminal* and *slandorous* actions in front of an audience, moreover, which was inclined, out of party prejudices, to believe the greatest monstrosities and which, on the other hand, given my 11-year absence from Germany, lacked the slightest firm basis for a personal judgement of me. Apart from all political considerations, therefore, I owed it to my family, my wife and my children to subject *Zabel*’s *slandorous* accusations to a legal examination.

The way in which I made my complaint excluded from the very start any legal comedy of errors such as Vogt’s trial against the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. Even if I had cherished the incredible intention of appealing against Vogt to the same court of Fazy’s that had already turned down a criminal investigation, then there were points of decisive importance that could only be settled in Prussia, and not in Geneva, while, on the other hand, the only statement by *Zabel* for which he may have wished to seek proof from Vogt is based on alleged documents that *Zabel* could just as easily produce in Berlin as his friend Vogt in Geneva. My ‘complaint’ against *Zabel* contained the following points.

I: Zabel says in no 37 of the *National-Zeitung*, 22 January 1860, in the article entitled ‘Karl Vogt and the *Allgemeine Zeitung*’:

Vogt reports on pages 136 *et seq.*: Known under the name of *Brimstone Gang* or also of *Bürstenheimers*, there were, among the refugees of 1849, a number of people who, at first scattered between Switzerland, France and England, gradually gathered in London *and there honoured Herr Marx as their visible chief*. The political principle of *these fellows* was the ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’, and with this mirage they deluded at first not only many of the best among the refugees but also the workers from the free bands of Willich’s corps. *They continued among the refugees the work of the Rheinische Zeitung*, which in 1849 had warned against any participation in the movement, just as it constantly attacked all members of parliament, because the movement after all only had the imperial constitution as its content. *The Brimstone Gang exercised a fearful discipline over its supporters*. Any of those who tried to achieve bourgeois prosperity for himself was, for the very reason that he tried to make himself independent, in and of itself a traitor to the revolution, a renewed outbreak of which was expected at any moment, and which, therefore, had to mobilise its soldiers to send them into the field. Discord, fights and duels were created among this carefully maintained class of idlers by widespread rumours and correspondence, etc. One cast suspicion upon the other as a spy and a reactionary. Distrust existed among all against all. *One of the main occupations of the Brimstone Gang was so to compromise people in the fatherland that they had to pay money so that the gang would keep their secrets without compromising them. Not one but hundreds of letters were written to Germany saying that a denunciation would be made of participation in this or that act of the revolution if certain sum of money did not reach a given address by a certain point in time.* According to the principle that ‘those who are not absolutely for us are against us’, everybody that opposed this activity was ‘ruined’, not only among the refugees, but also by means of the press. *The ‘proletarians’ filled the columns of the reactionary press in Germany with their tale-bearing against those democrats who did not pay homage to them, they became the allies of the secret police in France and Germany.* For a *further* characterisation Vogt gives us among other things a letter of 26 August 1850 from the former Lieutenant Techow, in which the principles, activities, enmities and warring secret societies of the ‘proletarians’ are depicted and one sees how Marx, in his Napoleonic arrogance at his mental superiority, *brandishes his whip among the Brimstone Gang*.

For a better understanding of what is to follow, let me note straight away that *Zabel*, having allegedly allowed *Vogt* to ‘report’ in the passage printed above, now describes in his own name blow by blow, in the interests of a better description of the *Brimstone Gang*, the Cherval trial in Paris, the Communist trial in Cologne, the book I published about it, *Liebknecht’s* revolutionary congress in Murten and his relationship, through my mediation, with the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, Ohly, ‘also a channel of the *Brimstone Gang*’, and finally *Biscamp’s* letter to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of 20 October 1859, and then closes with the words:

Eight days after *Biscamp*, *Marx* too wrote to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and offered a legal document as proof against *Vogt*, about which we shall perhaps speak another time. *These are the correspondents of the Allgemeine Zeitung*.

Out of the whole of this lead article no 1, I made only the passage printed under point I the subject of my complaint, and of that only the following sentences contained in it:

One of the main activities of the *Brimstone Gang* was so to compromise people that they had to pay money so that the gang would keep their secrets without compromising them. Not one but hundreds of letters were written to Germany saying that a denunciation would be made of participation in this or that act of the revolution if a certain sum of money did not reach a given address by a certain point in time.

Here, of course, I demanded of *Zabel* *proof that his statements were true*. In my first instructions to my lawyer, *Justizrat Weber* in Berlin, I wrote that I did not demand of *Zabel* ‘hundreds of threatening

letters', or even one letter, but one single line in which any one of my notorious party comrades made himself guilty of the alleged infamy. Zabel only needed, after all, to turn to Vogt, who would send him dozens of 'threatening letters' by return of post. And if by any chance Vogt was unable to show one line from the hundreds of threatening letters, then at all events he could name several hundred 'people in the fatherland' who had been held to ransom in the manner stated. Since the people are to be found 'in Germany', they were in any case more accessible to a court in Berlin than to a court in Geneva.

My complaint against Zabel's lead article no 1 was therefore confined to one single point — *the political compromising of people in Germany in order to blackmail them for money*. In order to refute at the same time the other statements in his lead article no 1, I adduced a series of facts. Here I did not demand *proof that his statements were true*, but *produced proof that they were false*.

Johann Philipp Becker's letter was sufficiently clear about the *Brimstone Gang* or also *Bürstenheimers*. As far as *the character of the Communist League* and the nature of my participation in it were concerned, then among others *H Bürgers*, one of those sentenced in the Cologne Communist trial, could be summoned as a witness from Cologne to Berlin and examined under oath during the proceedings. Further, *F Engels* had found among his papers a letter dated November 1852 and *authenticated* by London and Manchester postmarks in which I informed him of the dissolution of the League which took place on my proposal and also of the motives that had led to this decision to dissolve: the fact that since the arrest of the Cologne defendants all contact with the continent had been broken off, and that such a propaganda society was not all appropriate any longer. As far as Zabel's shameless assertion about my connection 'with the secret police in Germany and in France' was concerned, it was supposed to be proved partly by the Cologne Communist trial and partly by the Cherval trial in Paris. I shall return to the latter. In relation to the former, I sent my lawyer my *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne* published in 1853 and drew his attention to the fact that the lawyer Schneider II could be summoned to Berlin from Cologne and examined under oath about my share in the exposure of the infamies of the police. Zabel's claim that I and my party comrades had 'filled the columns of the reactionary press in Germany with tale-bearing against those democrats' who did not 'do homage' to us I countered with the fact that I had *never*, directly or indirectly, written from abroad in a German newspaper, with the single exception of the *Neue Oder-Zeitung*. My contributions printed in this paper and if necessary the testimony of one of its editors, Dr Elsner, would prove that I did not think it worth the effort the mention even the *name* of a 'democrat'. As far as Liebknecht's correspondence in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* was concerned, it began in the spring of 1855, three years after the dissolution of the 'League', and *moreover without my prior knowledge*, and for the rest contained reports on British politics in keeping with his party standpoint, but not a mortal word about 'democrats', as the volumes of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* show. If, in my absence from London, Liebknecht sent the *Allgemeine Zeitung* a leaflet published in London against the 'democrat' Vogt, he had a complete right to do so, for he knew that the leaflet had as its publisher a 'democrat' whom the 'democrat' Vogt had himself called upon to collaborate in his 'democratic' propaganda, and whom he thus had recognised as a 'democrat' of the same rank as himself. Zabel's nonsense about naming me myself as a 'correspondent of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*' was strikingly refuted by a letter (Appendix X) written to me by *Herr Orges* a few days before the opening of the Augsburg trial in which, among other things, he tries to correct my presumed 'liberal' prejudices against the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. Finally Zabel's lie that 'eight days *after* Biscamp Marx too wrote to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* collapsed under its own weight, since Biscamp's letter is dated 20 October 1859, and the small covering note with which I sent Herr Orges the 'document' he required was before the district court in Augsburg on 24 October 1859, and thus could not have been written in London on 29 October 1859.

With an eye to the court, it seemed appropriate to add to the evidence already quoted some few documents that cast the grotesquely infamous light the 'democrat' Zabel had tried to throw on my position among the exiles and my 'activities' abroad back at the author of the slanders.

I first lived in Paris from the end of 1843 until the beginning of 1845, when Guizot expelled me. To characterise my attitude to the French party of the revolution during my stay in Paris, I sent my lawyer a letter from *Flocon* <sup>[4]</sup> revoking Guizot's expulsion order on behalf of the provisional government of 1848 and inviting me to return to France from Belgium (Appendix XIV). I lived in Brussels from the

beginning of 1845 until the end of February 1848, when Rogier expelled me from Belgium. The municipality of Brussels later removed from office the police inspector who had arrested my wife and myself on the occasion of that expulsion. There was in Brussels an international democratic society <sup>[5]</sup> whose honorary president was the aged General *Mellinet*, the saviour of Antwerp against the Dutch. The president was the lawyer *Jottrand*, formerly a member of the Belgian provisional government. The Vice-President for the Poles was *Lelewel*, a former member of the Polish provisional government, the Vice-President for the French was *Imbert*, governor of the Tuileries after the February revolution of 1848, and I functioned as Vice-President for the Germans, elected by a public meeting consisting of the German Workers' Association and all the German exiles in Brussels. A letter from Jottrand to me at the time of the foundation of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* (Jottrand belongs to the so-called American school of republicans, that is to say a tendency alien to me) and a couple of lines that are otherwise of no interest from my friend Lelewel are sufficient to show my position in the democratic party in Brussels. I therefore added them to the defence documents (Appendix XIV).

After I was thrown out of Prussia in the spring of 1849 and out of France in the late summer of 1849 I went to London where, since the dissolution of the League (1852) and since most of my friends have left London, I have kept my distance from any public or secret societies, or indeed any society at all, although from time to time, with the permission of the 'democrat' Zabel, I hold free lectures on political economy for a selected circle of workers. *The London German Workers' Educational Association*, from which I resigned on 15 March 1850, held on 6 February 1860 a celebration to mark the twentieth anniversary of its foundation, to which I was invited and at which a unanimous resolution was passed 'to brand as slander' Vogt's assertion that I have 'exploited' the German workers in general and the London workers in particular. The then President of the Workers' Association, Herr Müller, had this decision authenticated on 1 March 1860, in front of the Police Court at Bow Street. Besides this document I also sent my lawyer a letter from the English lawyer and leader of the Chartist Party, Ernest Jones (Appendix XIV), in which he expresses his indignation at the 'infamous articles' in the *National-Zeitung* (Ernest Jones, born and brought up in Berlin, understands German better than Zabel) and remembers among other things my years of unpaid collaboration on the London organs of the Chartist Party. I may also mention here that when a British workers' parliament <sup>[6]</sup> met in Manchester at the end of 1853, Louis Blanc and myself alone among the European exiles in London received an invitation to be honorary members.

Finally, since the Honorary Vogt has me 'living from the sweat of the workers', from whom I have never received or demanded a centime, and the 'democrat' Zabel has me 'so compromising people in the Fatherland that they had to pay money so that the gang would keep their secret without compromising them', I asked *Mr Charles A Dana*, the managing editor of the *New York Tribune*, the first English-American newspaper, whose readership is 200,000, and which therefore almost rivals the *Biel Carpet-Bagger* and Zabel's *Organ of Democracy* in circulation, for a written statement on my nine years of paid work for the *Tribune*, the *Cyclopaedia Americana*, etc. His letter (Appendix XIV), which does me great honour, is the final document with which I thought it necessary to provide my lawyer in defence against Vogt-Zabel's stink-ball number I.

II: In Zabel's lead article no II, 'How to Make Radical Leaflets' (no 41 of the *National-Zeitung*, 25 January 1860) it says:

*Where the money came from* for this generously distributed newspaper [that is to say the *Volk*] God only knows. Men only know that *Marx* and *Biscamp* have no money to spare.

Considered in isolation, this passage could be taken as an impartial exclamation of astonishment, as if I, for example, were to say:

How a certain layabout, whom I knew at university as a mentally and materially degenerate dunce — he was proprietor of a child-minding establishment, and his literary achievements before 1848 were confined to a few furtive articles in a hole-in-a-corner literary paper — how the said layabout dunce set about becoming editor in chief of the *National-Zeitung*, a shareholder in it and a 'democrat with money to



spare', God only knows. Men who have studied a certain novel by Balzac and the Manteuffel period can guess.

Zabel's remark receives a completely different malicious meaning from the fact that it follows his allegations about my connections with the secret police in France and Germany and my political-conspiratorial blackmailing letters, and is immediately followed by the 'mass production of forged banknotes' to be mentioned under III. The obvious aim is to imply that I obtained funds for the *Volk* by dishonest means.

An affidavit of 3 March 1860 in Manchester, according to which all the money I made over to the *Volk*, with the exception of an aliquot part that I myself paid, came, not as Vogt claimed 'over the Channel', but from Manchester, and moreover from the pockets of my friends, served as a legal refutation of Zabel. (See the Augsburg Campaign.)

III: 'To characterise the tactics' of the 'party of the "proletarians" *under Marx*', Frederick Zabel relates, among other things, in his leading article no II:

In this way a conspiracy of the most scandalous kind, *involving the mass production of counterfeit banknotes*, read *Vogt for the details*, was in 1852 devised against the Swiss Workers' Associations [etc].

This is how Zabel elaborates Vogt's statements about the Cherval adventure and makes me moral author of and criminal participant in 'the mass production of counterfeit banknotes'. My evidence in refutation of these allegations by the 'democrat' Zabel extends over the whole period from Cherval's entry into the 'Communist League' until his flight from Geneva in 1854. An affidavit sworn by *Karl Schapper* before the Bow Street Police Court on 1 March 1860 proved that Cherval's entry into the League in London took place *before* my entry into the League, that from Paris, where he lived from the summer of 1850 until the spring of 1852, he entered into relations not with me but with the hostile counter-league under Schapper and Willich, and that after his pretended escape from St Pélagie prison and his return to London (spring 1852) he entered the local *German Workers' Educational Association*, to which I had not belonged since September 1850, until he was finally unmasked, declared to be an infamous person and expelled. Further, the lawyer Schneider II in Cologne could be examined under oath as to the fact that the revelations about Cherval and his relations with the German police in London, etc, came from me. My *Revelations* published in 1853 proved that I had publicly denounced him *after* the closure of the trial. Finally, Johann Philipp Becker's letter gave information about Cherval's Geneva period.

IV: After drivelling with truly dunce-like logic in lead article no II about the leaflet *As a Warning* directed against Vogt, and casting as much suspicion as possible on Vögele's testimony which I sent to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and which relates *to the origins* of the same, the 'democrat' Frederick Zabel concludes as follows:

He [Blind] is obviously not a member of the *more immediate Marx party*. It seems to us that it was not too difficult for the latter to make a scapegoat out of him, and if the accusation against Vogt was to have any weight, then it would necessarily have to be attributed to a specific person who would have to answer for it. Now the *Marx party* could shrug off responsibility for the authorship of the leaflet on to Blind very easily precisely because and since the latter had expressed himself in a similar sense *in conversation with Marx* and in the article in the *Free Press*; *the leaflet could be forged using the same expressions and turns of phrase as Blind so that it looked like his work...* Anybody can now hold *Marx* or Blind to be the author as he sees fit [etc].

Zabel here accuses me of having forged a document, the leaflet *As a Warning*, in Blind's name, and of having later stated that he was the author of the *leaflet I had forged* in a false testimony sent by me to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. The legal refutation of these assertions by the 'democrat' Zabel was as striking as it was simple. It consisted of Blind's letter to Liebknecht quoted earlier, Blind's article in the *Free Press*, the two affidavits of Wiehe and Vögele (Appendices XII and XIII) and the printed statement by MD Schaible.

Vogt, who, as we know, pours scorn on the Bavarian government in his *Studien*, laid a complaint against the *Allgemeine Zeitung* at the end of August 1859. By the following September, the *Allgemeine Zeitung* already had to apply for a postponement of the public court hearing, and despite

the granting of this postponement the hearing actually took place on *24 October 1859*. If such a thing could happen in the *darkest state of Bavaria*, what was not to be expected of the *enlightened state of Prussia*, quite apart from the fact that there are proverbially ‘judges in Berlin’.

My lawyer, *Herr Justizrat Weber*, formulated my complaint in the following way:

The editor of the *National-Zeitung*, Dr Zabel, libelled me repeatedly and publicly in the lead articles contained in nos 37 and 41 of this year of that newspaper and in particular accused me of 1) obtaining and having obtained money by dishonest and criminal means; 2) having forged the anonymous leaflet *As a Warning* and having not only given out to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, against my better knowledge, that the author was a certain Blind, but also having attempted to prove it by means of a document the incorrectness of whose contents must have been manifest to me.

Herr Justizrat Weber chose first of all the *criminal law procedure*, that is, he denounced Zabel’s libels to the public prosecutor so that official action could now be taken against Zabel. On 18 April 1860, there then ensued the following ‘*ordinance*’:

Returned to Herr Dr Karl Marx in the hands of Herr *Justizrat Weber*, with notification that *no public interest* is involved which might give me occasion to intervene (Article XVI of the Introductory Law to the Penal Code of 14 April 1851) Berlin, 18 April.

Signed **Lippe**, Public Prosecutor at the Royal City Court.

My lawyer appealed to the attorney general and, on 26 April 1860, received a second ‘*ordinance*’ reading:

*To königl Justizrat Weber* as attorney here for Herr Dr Karl Marx in London. I return the documents handed in here with the complaint of 20 April inst, in the matter of the denunciation against Dr Zabel with the remark that the only consideration by which the public prosecutor can permit himself to be guided in the discretion granted to him by Article XVI of the Introductory Law to the Penal Code is indeed the question whether prosecution furthers any recognisable public interest. In the present case, I must agree with the public prosecutor and answer this question in the negative, and therefore reject your complaint.

Berlin, 26 April 1860, signed **Schwarck**, Attorney General at the Royal Supreme Court.

I found these two refusals by the public prosecutor, *Lippe*, and the attorney general, *Schwarck*, entirely justified. In every state in the world, and therefore presumably in the Prussian state too, what is understood by public interest are the *interests of the government*. No ‘*recognisable public interest*’ in *prosecuting* the ‘democrat’ Zabel for libel against my person existed or could exist on the part of the Prussian government. Rather, its interests lay in the opposite direction. Moreover, the public prosecutor does not possess the judicial authority to reach a verdict; he has to follow the instructions of his superiors, in the last instance of the *Minister of Justice*, blindly, even against his own convictions or views. In fact, therefore, I am in complete agreement with the decisions of Herren Lippe and Schwarck, although I harbour a legal scruple about Lippe’s reference to Article XVI of the penal code of 14 April 1851. The department of public prosecutions is not bound to give reasons why it makes *no* use of its powers to intervene by any provision of the Prussian penal code. Nor does Article XVI, which Lippe quotes, contain a syllable in this respect. So why quote it?

My lawyer now adopted the *civil law procedure*, and I heaved a sigh of relief. If the Prussian government had no public interest in prosecuting Frederick Zabel, then my private interest of self-defence was all the livelier. And I now appeared in my own name. How the *verdict* fell was a matter of indifference to me, as long as I succeeded in bringing Frederick Zabel to the bar of a public court. Now imagine my amazement! It was not yet, I learned, a question of starting legal proceedings on my complaint, but of starting legal proceedings to establish whether I had the *right to prosecute* Frederick Zabel.

In the Prussian legal system, I learned to my horror, before the judge introduces the complaint, that is, has preparations made for the actual verdict, every plaintiff must present the case to the same judge in such a way that the latter can see whether the *right to prosecute* exists. In this preliminary

examination of the material, the judge may demand new evidence or suppress part of the old evidence, or find that no *right to prosecute* exists at all. If it pleases him to grant the plaintiff the right to prosecute, the judge introduces the complaint, the case is argued before the court and the matter is decided by a verdict. If the judge refuses the right to prosecute, he simply rejects the plaintiff *per decretum*,<sup>[7]</sup> by an *ordinance*. This procedure is peculiar not only to cases of defamation but to civil cases in general. Thus a prosecution for defamation, like any other civil prosecution, can be rejected in a court of any level by such an *ordinance*, and consequently never be settled.

It will be admitted that legislation that does not recognise the right to prosecute of a private person in his own private affairs has not yet grasped the simplest of all the basic laws of bourgeois society. From being the manifest right of an independent private person, the right to prosecute becomes a privilege bestowed by the state through its judicial employees. In every legal quarrel the state pushes in between the private person and the doors of the court, which are its *private property*, and which it opens and shuts as it sees fit. The judge first of all *ordains* as an employee of the state in order later to *reach a verdict* as a judge. The same judge who, without examining the defendant or hearing both sides of the case argued out, *prejudges* whether the right to prosecute exists, who may take the side of the plaintiff, and thus decide to a certain extent *in favour* of the justice of the complaint and thus to a certain extent against the defendant, that very same judge, then, is later supposed to reach an *impartial* verdict between the plaintiff and the defendant, that is to say pass judgement on his own pre-judgement. B boxes A's ears. A cannot prosecute the ear-boxer until he has respectfully obtained a licence to do so from the judicial employee of the state. A denies B the use of a piece of land. B needs a provisional concession in order to validate his claim to possession in court. He may or may not obtain it. B libels A in the public press, and a judicial employee of the state may 'ordain' in secret that A cannot prosecute B. One can grasp what enormities such a procedure can engender in the actual civil trial itself. But in a libel action between political parties in the public press! In every country, even in Prussia, judges are known to be men like any others. Did not one of the Vice-Presidents of the Royal Prussian High Court of Appeal, Herr *Dr Götze* declare in the Prussian House of Lords that Prussian jurisprudence had got into difficulty as a result of the confusion of the years 1848, 1849 and 1850, and that it had taken some time to orient itself? Who will guarantee that *Dr Götze* did not miscalculate the time needed for orientation? The fact that in Prussia the right to prosecute, for example, a slanderer depends on the *provisional 'ordinance'* of a state employee whom, to cap it all, the government can punish for so-called 'dereliction of duty in office' with a reprimand, a fine, a forced transfer to another position and even dishonourable discharge from the legal service (see the provisional regulation of 10 July 1849 and the disciplinary law of 7 May 1851) — how am I to start to make that not just clear but credible to the English?

I propose, that is, to publish an English pamphlet on my case against Frederick Zabel. And what would Edmond About, while he was writing *La Prusse en 1860*, not have given for the knowledge that, throughout the whole extent of the Prussian monarchy, the *right to prosecute* exists nowhere except in the Rhenish province 'blessed' with the Code Napoléon?<sup>[8]</sup> People have to *suffer* under the courts everywhere, but only in a few countries are they forbidden to *complain*.

It will be grasped that under these conditions *my case* against *Zabel* before a *Prussian court* had to be transformed in my hand into *my case against the Prussian courts* about *Zabel*. Let us then turn our gaze from the theoretical beauty of legislation to the practical charms of its application.

On 8 June 1860, the Royal *City Court* of Berlin decreed the following '*ordinance*':

Ordinance on the complaint of 5 June 1860, in the matter of defamation Marx vs Zabel  
M 38 de 1860.

1: The complaint is dismissed because of *lack of evidence* because the two articles in the *National-Zeitung* of this city forming the basis of the charge have *solely the political position of the Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung* and the *history of the anonymous leaflet As a Warning* as their subject of discussion and the remarks and assertions, insofar as they are made by the author himself and **do not consist of mere quotations from other persons**, do not overstep the bounds of permitted criticism and therefore cannot be considered culpable under the provisions of paragraph 154 of the

penal code, *since no intention to insult* emerges either from *the form in which these remarks were made* or from *the circumstances* under which they ensued.

Berlin, 8 June 1860 Royal City Court, Department Of Criminal Matters, Commission I for Matters of Defamation (LS).

So the *City Court* forbids me to *prosecute Frederick Zabel* and relieves *Zabel* of the bother of answering for his public slanders! And why? '*Because of lack of evidence.*' The Department of Public Prosecutions refused to take steps against *Zabel* for me *because no public interest at all was involved.* The *City Court* forbids me to take steps in my own person against *Zabel* because *no evidence* exists. And why is there no evidence?

Firstly: 'Because the two articles in the *National-Zeitung* are concerned solely with the political position of the *Allgemeine Zeitung.*' Because provisionally *Zabel* lyingly transforms me into a 'correspondent of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*', *Zabel* has the right to make me the whipping boy in his squabble with the *Allgemeine Zeitung* over circulation, and I do not even have the right to complain about this 'ordinance' of the mighty *Zabel*! The Brimstone Gang, the Bürstenheimers, the Franco-German plot, the revolutionary congress at Murten, the Cologne Communist trial, the counterfeit banknotes of Geneva, the '*work of the Rheinische Zeitung*', etc, etc — all that is 'solely concerned with the political position of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*'.

Secondly: Frederick *Zabel* had 'no intention to insult'. Pon my soul, no! The good fellow merely intended to slander me to death politically and morally.

If the 'democrat' Frederick *Zabel* claims in the *National-Zeitung* that I counterfeited masses of banknotes, forged documents in the names of third parties and compromised people politically in the fatherland in order to extort money out of them under the threat of denunciation, etc, then legally speaking *Zabel* can only have intended one thing or the other by these assertions, to slander me or to denounce me. In the first case *Zabel* is legally culpable, in the second case he has to supply legal proof of the truth of his assertions. What concern of mine are any other private intentions 'democrat' *Zabel* has?

*Zabel* slanders, but without 'the intention to insult'. He cuts off my honour in the same way that the Turk cut off the Greek's head, without intending to hurt him.

If it is a question of 'insulting' and 'intention to insult', then with the kind of infamies 'democrat' *Zabel* makes up about me, *Zabel*'s specific '*intention*' to '*insult*' me, the *good Zabel*'s very wicked intention breathes out of every pore of his lead articles I and II.

Vogt's *Magnum Opus*, including Appendices, numbers no fewer than 278 pages. And Frederick *Zabel*, accustomed 'to draw out the thread of his verbosity finer than the staple of his argument', the bombastic Frederick *Zabel*, dunce *Zabel*, manages to compress these 278 pages into about five newspaper columns without losing *a single one* of Vogt's slanders against myself and my party. Frederick *Zabel* gives a choice bouquet of the dirtiest passages and a table of contents of the less drastic ones. Frederick *Zabel*, accustomed to drawing two molecules of thought out into 278 pages, condenses 278 pages into two lead-articles without dropping a single atom of malice in the process. *Ira facit poetam.* <sup>[9]</sup> How intense then the malice must have been that could magically transform *Zabel*'s water on the brain into a hydraulic press of such compressive power!

On the other hand, his malice obscures his vision so completely that he ascribes miraculous powers, literally miraculous powers to me just so that he can insinuate one more piece of baseness.

After starting the first article with a description of the Brimstone Gang under my command and happily making myself and my party comrades '*allies of the secret police in France and Germany*', after relating, among other things, that 'those people' hated Vogt because he was constantly saving Switzerland from them, he continues:

When, then, Vogt last year raised his complaint against the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, another London accomplice, *Biscamp*, reported to the paper in writing... In the most shameless manner the writer offered his pen as a second correspondent beside Herr Liebknecht. *Eight days after Biscamp*, Marx also wrote to the *Allgemeine-Zeitung* offering a '*legal document*' as proof against Vogt, of which [document, proof or Vogt?] we shall perhaps speak on another occasion.

Zabel makes the latter promise on 22 January and he had already made it good by 25 January, in no 41 of the *National-Zeitung*, which reads:

So Blind denies that he is the author of the leaflet; he is described as such for the first time... in Biscamp's letter to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of 24 October... Marx writes to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* on 29 October in order further to plead Blind's authorship.

So not once but twice, first of all on 22 January and then again on 25 January, after he had had three days to consider, Zabel credits me with the miraculous power of writing, on 29 October 1859 in London a letter that was before the District Court in Augsburg on 24 October 1859, and both times he credits me with this miraculous power in order to make a connection between the 'document' I sent to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and Biscamp's offending letter to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, in order to make it appear that my letter was the *pedissequis* <sup>[10]</sup> of Biscamp's letter. And was it not malice, perverse malice, that made this Frederick Zabel so utterly stupid, far beyond his usual degree of stupidity, that he believes in miracles?

But, the *City Court* goes on to 'plead', Zabel's lead article II has 'solely the history of the anonymous leaflet *As a Warning*' as 'its subject of discussion'. As its *subject*? That should read: as its *pretext*.

*Tweedledum and Tweedledee*, concealed this time under the name of 'Friends of the Fatherland', <sup>[11]</sup> had, it appears, sent an 'open letter' in November 1859 to the *Nationalverein* <sup>[12]</sup> which was reprinted in the reactionary *Neue Hannoversche Zeitung*. The 'open letter' exceeded the measure of Zabel's 'democracy', which balances its lion-like courage towards the Habsburg dynasty with its crawling before the Hohenzollern dynasty. From the 'open letter' the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* made the admittedly not very original discovery that once democracy starts it does not necessarily end in — Frederick Zabel and his 'Organ of Democracy'. Zabel grew angry and wrote lead article II: '*How to Make Radical Leaflets*'.

In inviting [says the weighty Zabel] the *Kreuz-Zeitung* to go through the history of the leaflet *As a Warning* with us on the basis of the documents and *explanations* imparted to us by Vogt, we expect them in the end to concede that we were right to say eight days ago that the 'open letter' to the *Nationalverein* was something for them and not for us, that it was written for their columns and not for ours.

So the 'democrat' Zabel, initiated *radicaliter* into all the mysteries of radicalism, wants for his part to lecture the *Kreuz-Zeitung* on the mystery of 'How to Make Radical Leaflets', or, as the *City Court* puts it, *has solely the history of the leaflet As a Warning as its subject of discussion*'. And how does Frederick Zabel start?

He begins with the 'tactics' of the 'party of the "proletarians" under Marx'. He relates first of all how the "proletarians" under Marx' behind the back of but in the name of a Workers' Association, carried on correspondence from London with foreign Workers' Associations 'the compromising of which is intended', set 'intrigues', the organisation of a secret society, etc, into motion, and finally had 'documents' written which 'inevitably attract the attention of the police' to the associations 'the compromising of which is intended'. So in order to teach the *Kreuz-Zeitung* 'how to make radical leaflets' Zabel first of all teaches how the 'party of the "proletarians" under Marx' makes political 'correspondence' and 'documents', which are not 'leaflets'. In order to explain 'how to make radical leaflets', he goes on to explain how, in 1852 in Geneva, the "proletarians" under Marx' made 'masses of counterfeit banknotes', which once more are not 'radical leaflets'. In order to explain 'how to make radical leaflets' he reports how, at the central festival at Lausanne in 1859, the "proletarians" under Marx' carried out anti-Swiss 'manoeuvres' intended to compromise the Workers' Associations, which again are not 'radical leaflets'; how 'Biscamp and Marx', with financial sources known only to 'God', brought out the *Volk*, which once again was not a 'radical leaflet' but a weekly paper, and after all this he puts in a good word for the spotless purity of Vogt's recruiting office, which was not a 'radical leaflet' either. This is how he fills two of the three and a half columns of the article '*How to Make Radical Leaflets*'. The *history* of the anonymous leaflet therefore only serves as a pretext for these two-thirds of the article in order to repeat those of Vogt's infamies that 'friend' and accomplice Frederick Zabel had not yet peddled under the heading of '*political position of the Allgemeine Zeitung*'. Finally, at long last, Dunce I comes to the art of 'making radical leaflets', that is to say to 'the history' of the leaflet *As a Warning*:

Blind insists he is not the author of the leaflet. He is impudently described as such, and for the first time, in Biscamp's letter to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of 20 October... In order to plead further the case for Blind's authorship, Marx writes to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*: 'I have obtained the enclosed document because Blind refuses to answer for remarks he has made to me and to others.'

Zabel now casts suspicion on this document too particularly because Liebknecht... 'surprisingly' adds: 'We wanted to have our signatures validated by the Magistrate (?)' (this question mark is in Zabel's text), and because Zabel is determined once and for all not to recognise any other magistrate apart from the Berlin *Magistrat*.

Zabel further informs us of the contents of Vögele's declaration, as a result of which Blind sent the *Allgemeine Zeitung* the testimonies of Hollinger and Wiehe as proof that *the leaflet had not been set in Hollinger's print-shop* and therefore had not been written by Blind, and then continues: 'Always quick to answer, Marx replies in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* on 15 November.'

Zabel enumerates the various points in my reply. Marx says this... Marx says that... 'moreover Marx refers'. And so, since I *moreover* say nothing, does that mean that Zabel has informed his readers of *all* the points in my reply? You know your Zabel! He conceals, pilfers away, *suppresses* the main point of my reply. In my statement of 15 November I adduce various points which are, moreover, numbered. Like this:

1... 2... and finally 3..., incidentally the reprint [of the leaflet] in the *Volk* is run off the type set for the leaflet, which was still standing in Hollinger's print-shop. Thus *legal proof could be furnished that the leaflet originated from F Hollinger's print-shop* by a simple comparison between it and the reprint in the *Volk* without taking any testimony.

That decides the matter, Zabel says to himself. My readers must not know that. And he conjures away the main point of my reply in order to burden my conscience with a suspicious quickness to reply. That is how Zabel tells the 'history of the leaflet', by falsifying history twice, once in relation to the chronology and the other time in relation to the content of my statement of 15 November. His *double falsification* smooths the path to his conclusion that I 'forged' the leaflet, and moreover in such a way that it 'looked like' Blind's 'work', in other words that in Vögele's testimony I sent false testimony to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, and did so *knowingly*. According to the view of the Berlin *City Court*, the accusation of forging documents with the intention of attributing them to a third party 'does not overstep the bounds of permitted criticism', even less does it involve 'the intention to insult'.

At the end of his recipe 'How to Make Radical Leaflets', it suddenly occurs to Zabel that there is still *one* of Vogt's shameless inventions that has not yet been peddled, and immediately after his lead article II he hastily throws in the note:

In 1850 another circular [as Vogt seems to remember] written by Parliament-Wolf alias *Dungeon-Wolf*, was sent to the 'proletarians' in Germany and *at the same time* passed to the Hanoverian police.

With this nice police anecdote about a former editor of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, the layabout and democrat Zabel takes his smirking departure from his readership. The words 'alias *Dungeon-Wolf*' are not Vogt's, but Frederick Zabel's. He intended his Silesian readers to know quite exactly that the person they were dealing with was their compatriot *W Wolff*, a former co-editor of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. Such is the supreme care with which the good Zabel is concerned to establish in the smallest detail the link between the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* and the police in France and Germany! His Silesians could, perhaps, have believed that they were dealing with Zabel's own *B Wolff*, Zabel's natural superior, who as we know, in a 'secret society' with those notorious fabricators of lying dispatches *Reuter* in London and *Havas* in Paris, rearranges world history by telegraph to suit his purposes. *Sigmund Engländer*, the notorious secret police agent, is however the soul of *Reuter's* agency, and therefore the animating unity of the trinity *B Wolff-Reuter-Havas*.

Despite all this and despite democrat Zabel's intention not to insult, the Berlin *City Court* declares that there are, admittedly, 'contained' in Zabel's two lead articles, 'remarks and assertions' which 'overstep the bounds of permitted criticism', and are therefore 'culpable' and thus also at any event *liable to prosecution*. So where is Zabel? Hand Zabel over to me so that he can wriggle in front of the

court! Halt! cries the *City Court*. The ‘remarks and assertions’, says the *City Court*, ‘insofar as they are made by the author himself **and do not consist of mere quotations from other persons**’, do not overstep ‘the bounds of permitted criticism’, are not ‘culpable’, and thus Zabel is not only not culpable, but not even liable to prosecution, and the ‘documents are to be returned to the account of the plaintiff. So the slanderous part of Zabel’s ‘remarks and assertions’ are ‘mere quotations’. Voyons!

From the beginning of this section it will be remembered that my complaint of libel rests on four passages in Zabel’s two lead articles. In the passage on sources of finance (under point II of the heads of complaint quoted above) *Zabel himself* does not *pretend* to be quoting, and is in fact not quoting, for:

**Zabel:** *National-Zeitung*, no 41: ‘Where the money came from for this generously distributed newspaper [*Volk*], God only knows. Men only know that Marx and Biscamp have no money to spare.’

**Vogt:** *Magnum Opus*, p 212: ‘The constant correspondent of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* works for this paper (*Volk*), which was founded with unknown funds, since neither Biscamp nor Marx possess the necessary means *for this purpose*. [That is to say for founding a newspaper with *unknown funds*?]

In the second of the passages forming the basis of the charge (see under IV above), in which I am accused of forging a document in Blind’s name, Zabel even states that he is speaking in *his own* name as Zabel, and not in Vogt’s name:

It seems to *us* [as ruler in the Empire of Dullness Zabel, of course, uses the royal *we*] it seems to us that it was not too difficult for the latter [the Marx Party] to make a scapegoat of him [Blind]... the leaflet could be forged using the same expressions and turns of phrase as Blind so that it looked like his [Blind’s] work. (*National-Zeitung*, no 41)

The third passage forming the basis of my charge (under III above) I must once more ‘quote’ in full:

In this way a conspiracy of the most scandalous kind, involving the mass production of counterfeit banknotes (*read Vogt for the details*) was in 1852 devised against the Swiss Workers’ Associations, and it would have created the most extreme unpleasantness for the Swiss authorities had it not been discovered in time.

Is this ‘**mere quotation**’ as the *City Court* claims, or is it quotation at all? It is in part plagiarised from Vogt, but in *no sense is it quotation*.

First of all, *Zabel himself* claims that he is not quoting but speaking in his own name by telling the reader in parentheses ‘read Vogt for the details’. And now just look at the passage! In Geneva it was known that *Cherval* did not come to Geneva until the *spring of 1853*, that his ‘conspiracy’ and flight took place in the *spring of 1854*. Vogt in Geneva, therefore, did not dare to say that the ‘conspiracy’ had been devised in ‘1852’. He leaves this lie to the good Zabel in Berlin. Further: Vogt says:

*Already* various lithographic and copper plates had been *engraved* by Nugent himself for this purpose [the manufacture of counterfeit banknotes, etc]. (*Magnum Opus*, p 175)

So various lithographic and copper plates had *already* been engraved for the counterfeiting, the banknotes and treasury notes had not *yet* been manufactured. According to *Zabel*, on the other hand, ‘the production of counterfeit banknotes’, and ‘*mass production*’ at that, had already taken place. Vogt says that the statutory ‘purpose’ of *Cherval*’s conspiracy had been:

To combat despotism by its own methods, and moreover by the mass fabrication of counterfeit banknotes and treasury notes. (*Magnum Opus*, p 175)

Zabel deletes the combating of despotism and holds on to the ‘mass production of counterfeit banknotes’. So what we have according to Zabel is a common bourgeois crime not even justified to the members of the ‘secret society’ by the false pretext of political ends. And *this* is how Zabel ‘**quotes**’ the *Magnum Opus* altogether. *Vogt* had to turn his tall stories into a ‘book’. He therefore adds details, spins things out, splotches, blots, colours, manipulates, complicates, motivates, invents, *fa del cul trombetta*, <sup>[13]</sup> and thus his Falstaffian soul appears through all the alleged facts that he

unconsciously dissolves anew into their original nothingness through his own narration. Zabel, however, who had to compress the book into two lead articles without losing a single piece of malice, suppresses everything except the *Caput mortuum* <sup>[14]</sup> of every alleged fact, lines these dried bones of slander up one after the other and then counts the beads of this rosary with all the zeal of the Pharisee.

Take, for example, the case at hand. Vogt links his inventions to the fact, which I was the first to expose, that Cherval is a secret police agent provocateur in the pay of various embassies. The story then goes, among other things, that:

*Already* various lithographic and copper plates had been engraved by Nugent [Cherval] himself for this purpose [counterfeiting], *already* the gullible members of the secret society had been decided who were to go with packets of these [not yet manufactured] counterfeit banknotes to France, Switzerland and Germany; but *already* the denunciations to the police too had ensued, and for the while the Workers' Associations had been involved in them in a scandalous manner [etc]. (*Magnum Opus*, p 175)

So *Vogt* has Cherval *already* denounce his own operation to the police when he has, *as yet, only* engraved copper plates and lithographic stones for his intended counterfeiting, and before the purpose of his conspiracy has been achieved, before there is a *corpus delicti*, or anyone else compromised beyond himself. But *Vogt's* Cherval is impelled by the urge to involve 'the Workers' Associations in a scandalous manner' in his 'conspiracy'. The *foreign embassies* using Cherval are just as stupid as Cherval and are just as over-precipitate to draw the 'attention of the Federal Police to the fact that political intrigues were taking place in the Workers' Associations, etc, through confidential enquiries'.

At the same time, these simpletons of ambassadors, who do not have the patience to allow the conspiracy hatched on their behalf by Cherval to ripen, and who in their childish impatience uselessly expose their own agent, draw up Gendarmes on 'the frontiers' so that, 'should the matter go so far' as they would not let it go, 'they would arrest' Cherval's emissaries 'with the counterfeit banknotes' whose production they thwarted, 'and use the whole affair for a general witch-hunt in which masses of innocent people would have to suffer for the intrigues of a few vile men'.

If *Vogt* now goes on to say that 'the plan of this whole conspiracy was plotted in *the most horrible way*', then anybody would concede that it was plotted in the *most horribly stupid way*, and when he concludes with the boast 'I do not deny that I contributed my essentials to thwart this devilry', everybody will see the point and split their sides laughing at the merry devil. But now compare it with the monkish chronicle of Zabel's version!

In this way a conspiracy of the most scandalous kind, involving the mass production of counterfeit banknotes (read *Vogt* for the details) was in 1852 devised against the Swiss Workers' Associations, and it would have created the most extreme unpleasantness for the Swiss authorities had it not been discovered in time.

Here is a whole bundle of facts that are as dry as they are scandalous rolled up into a single short sentence. 'A conspiracy of the most scandalous kind' dated 1852. 'The mass production of counterfeit banknotes.' That is to say, a common bourgeois crime. 'Intentional compromising of the Swiss Workers' Associations.' That is to say, treachery to one's own party. The possibility of creating 'the most extreme unpleasantness' for the 'Swiss authorities'. That is to say, an agent provocateur in the interests of the continental despots against the Swiss republic. Finally, 'the timely discovery of the conspiracy'. Here the critic has none of the points of reference offered to him by *Vogt's* account; they have been conjured quite away. One simply has to believe or not believe. And this is how Zabel revises the whole of the *Magnum Opus* insofar as it deals with myself and my party comrades. *Heine* rightly says that there is nobody as dangerous as an ass in a rage.

Admittedly, *Zabel* introduces the fourth of the passages forming the basis of my charge (under point I above), with which his lead article I opens its revelations on the 'Brimstone Gang', with the words: '*Vogt reports on page 136 et seq.*' Zabel offers no opinion as to whether he himself is giving a resume or quoting. He avoids using quotation marks. In fact *he is not quoting*. That was out of the question from the start, since Zabel compresses pages 136, 137, 138, 139, 140 and 141 of the *Magnum Opus* in 51 lines of 48 letters each, indicates no gaps, but rather packs the sentences in as tightly as Dutch herrings, and finally still finds room in the 51 lines for material of his own. Where he encounters a



particularly slimy sentence, he takes it up more or less unchanged into his bundle. For the rest he mixes all the extracts up, not according to the sequence of the pages in the *Magnum Opus*, but as he sees fit. He provides the head of one of Vogt's sentences with the tail of another. There again, he makes up *one* sentence from the catchwords of a dozen of Vogt's sentences. Where in Vogt some stylistic rubbish or other blocks the limelight from falling directly on the slander, Zabel clears the rubbish away. For example, *Vogt* says: 'So to compromise people in the fatherland that *they had to resist their attempts at exploitation no longer and pay money.*'

But *Zabel* says: 'So to compromise people that they had to pay money.'

At other points, *Zabel* *changes* what seems to him to be ambiguous in Vogt's lack of style. Thus *Vogt* says: '... and pay money so that the gang would keep the fact that they were compromised secret.'

Whereas *Zabel* says: '... so that the gang would keep their secrets without compromising them.'

Finally, *Zabel* interpolates whole *sentences* of his *own* fabrication, such as: 'The Brimstone Gang exercised a fearful discipline over its members', and 'they' — that is to say *the fellows who continued among the refugees the work of the Rheinische Zeitung* — 'they became the allies of the secret police in France and Germany'.

Thus of the four passages forming the basis of my charge, three *are Zabel's own work according to Zabel himself*, while the fourth, the alleged 'quotation', *is not a quotation*, although it has an admixture of quotations, and still less is it a '*mere quotation*' as the *City Court* claims. Least of all is it a quotation '*from other persons*' the plural, as the same *City Court* claims. Vice versa, there is, on the other hand, in all the '*remarks and assertions*' *Zabel* makes about me, not *a single line* containing 'criticism and evaluation' ('permitted' or 'not permitted').

But even assuming that *the City Court's factual postulates* were as true as they are false; even assuming that *Zabel* was only quoting his slanders against me, would this circumstance *legally justify* the *City Court* in *forbidding* me to *prosecute* Frederick Zabel? In an 'ordinance' that is to be quoted shortly the Royal Prussian Supreme Court declares on the contrary that:

... whether the facts adduced in the article in question are represented as *the author's own assertions* or as **quotations** from third persons would *alter* nothing in the substance of paragraph 156 of the criminal law.

So, quotation or no quotation, 'democrat' Zabel remains answerable for his 'assertions'. The *City Court* has already *stated* that Zabel had made assertions about me that were 'culpable', *only* they were quoted and **therefore** bulletproof. Away with this pretext, which is *legally false*, cries the **Supreme Court**. So at last I shall get a grip on Zabel, the doors of the court will open, *Italiam, Italiam!* <sup>[15]</sup>

From the *City Court* my lawyer appealed to the *Supreme Court*, and received on 11 July 1860 the following 'ordinance':

No libel of the plaintiff, Dr Karl Marx of London, can be found in the lead articles published under the titles 'Karl Vogt and the *Allgemeine Zeitung*' and 'How to Make Radical Leaflets' in numbers 37 and 41 of the *National-Zeitung* of 22 and 25 January of this year. Whether or not the facts adduced in the article in question are represented as the author's own assertions or as quotations from third parties indeed alters nothing in the substance of paragraph 156. However, the press cannot be prevented from subjecting the activities of the parties and their literary disputes to discussion and criticism insofar as no *intention to insult emerges* from the form of the polemic, *which cannot be assumed* in the present case.

In the articles in question, light is cast pre-eminently on the conflict that has raged between the views of Dr Karl Vogt on the one hand and the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* on the other over support for the interests of the Italians and the interests of Austria occasioned by the recent war, and thereby on the participation of the so-called *German emigration* in London in favour of the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* against Vogt and also occasionally on the *divisions* and machinations of these refugees among and between themselves!

If in the course of these remarks the relationship of the *plaintiff* to those parties and his partial participation in their aspirations, and particularly his efforts to come to the

assistance of the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* with evidence, is drawn into the ambit of the discussion, then the remarks made in the two articles in relation to this find *rather their confirmation than the intended refutation* in the facts brought forward *by the plaintiff himself in his complaint*. If, on the other hand, he goes on to claim that he was *identified*, in a manner *detrimental to his honour*, with those party activities, which are, admittedly, sharply condemned in those articles as *eccentric*, or rather *lacking in character* and *dishonourable*, then this claim cannot be recognised as being justified. For, if the first article *quotes* from Vogt's account 'that the refugees of 1849 gradually gathered in London and there honoured the person Marx as their visible chief', and talks about a letter by Techow 'in which one sees how Marx, in his Napoleonic arrogance at his mental superiority, brandishes his whip among the Brimstone Gang', then what is essentially contained in this is a characterisation of the 'Brimstone Gang', so-called by Vogt, and not invective against Marx, who is much rather portrayed as the superior bridling the others. Least of all is his person connected with those people who are accused of extortion and tale-bearing. Similarly, nowhere in the second article is it said that the plaintiff ascribed authorship of the leaflet *As a Warning against his better knowledge* to the person Blind, or that he *knowingly* forwarded the untrue testimony of third parties to this effect to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. The plaintiff himself, however, admits in his complaint that the testimony of the compositor Vögele is contested by referring to the contrary assurances of the printer Hollinger and the compositor Wiehe. Besides, according to his own deposition, a certain Schaible has since made himself known as the author of the leaflet, and moreover *after* the two articles in the *National-Zeitung* had appeared.

The complaint against the ordinance of rejection of the Royal City Court of the 8th of last month raised on the 21st of the same month has had, therefore, to be regarded as being groundless and is hereby rejected. Costs of 25 silver groats for the rejection of a groundless complaint are to be paid to the City Court Salary Office of this town immediately on threat of distraint.

Berlin, 11 July 1860, Criminal Senate of the Royal Supreme Court Second Department, *Guthschmidt, Schulze*.

To Dr Karl Marx, In the hands of Herr Justizrat Weber of this town.

When I received this 'ordinance' from my lawyer I skimmed through the beginning and the end at the first reading and, unacquainted as I am with Prussian law, I thought that what I had in front of me was the copy of a *defence document* handed into the Supreme Court by the 'democrat' Frederick Zabel. What Zabel has written, I said to myself, about 'the views' (see Appendix XV) 'of Dr Karl Vogt and the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*', about 'the interests of the Italians and the interests of the Austrians', must have wandered by accident from a lead article intended for the *National-Zeitung* into his defence plea.

In any case, in the four columns dealing with me in the two articles, which are scarcely six columns long, Zabel does not mention those views and these interests in *a single syllable*. Zabel says in his defence plea that I had 'come to the assistance of the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* with evidence in its *polemic* against Vogt'. He calls *Vogt's trial against the Allgemeine Zeitung the Allgemeine Zeitung's polemic against Vogt*. If trials and polemics were the same thing, why would I need the permission of the Attorney General, the City Court, the Supreme Court, etc, for my 'polemic' against Zabel? And now there is Zabel's assurance that the 'remarks in relation' to my relationship with the *Allgemeine Zeitung* in his two lead articles found *rather their confirmation than the intended refutation* in the 'facts' I myself 'brought forward'. Rather — than! Either or, says the law. And what were Zabel's remarks?

Zabel's 'remarks in relation' to my relationship with the *Allgemeine Zeitung* in lead article I were:

I: That Liebknecht had become a correspondent of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* as a result of a testimonial publicly given to him by me. I threw the lie in Zabel's teeth in my complaint, but thought it superfluous to adduce other 'facts' about this nonsense.

II: Zabel has me send the *Allgemeine Zeitung* a ‘legal document’ from London on 29 October which was before the district court in Augsburg on 24 October, and he found the confirmation of this ‘remark’ in the ‘facts’ that I brought forward! Zabel realised, it is true, from the facts brought forward in my complaint, that, quite apart from any political motives, it became necessary for me to send documents relating to the origins of the *Warning* once Vogt, even before the trial started, had publicly attempted to pin responsibility for the authorship of the leaflet on to me.

III: I refuted Zabel’s ‘remark’ that I was one of the correspondents of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* with authentic documents. The only ‘remark in relation’ to my relationship with the *Allgemeine Zeitung* that Zabel’s lead article no II contained was, as was shown earlier, that I myself had forged the *Warning*, foisted it upon Blind, and attempted to prove that it was his hack-work by means of Vögele’s false testimony. Did these ‘remarks find rather their confirmation in the facts brought forward “in my complaint” than the refutation I had thereby intended’? Zabel himself admits the contrary.

Could Zabel have known that Schaible was the author of the leaflet *As a Warning*? Did Zabel have to believe that the testimony of the compositor Vögele, in my own deposition ‘contested’, was correct? But where in the world have I implied that Zabel had that knowledge or that belief? My complaint relates rather to Zabel’s ‘remarks in relation’ to the claim that I ‘forged the leaflet so that it looked like his’ — Blind’s — ‘work’ and that I later attempted to prove that it was Blind’s hack-work by means of Vögele’s testimony.

Finally, I encountered a defensive position of Zabel’s which at least seemed interesting.

If [he says] he [the plaintiff Marx] on the other hand goes on to claim that he was *identified*, in a manner *detrimental to his honour*, with those party activities, which are, admittedly, sharply condemned in those articles [Zabel’s lead articles] as *eccentric*, or rather *lacking in character* and *dishonourable*, then this claim cannot be recognised as being justified... *Least of all is his person connected with those people who are accused of extortion and tale-bearing.*

Obviously Zabel is not one of those Romans of whom it was said ‘*Memoriam quoque cum voce perdidissimus*’<sup>[16]</sup> — he has lost his memory but not his tongue. Zabel transforms not only sulphur but the Brimstone Gang from the crystal into the fluid state and from the fluid into the vaporous state in order to throw dust into my eyes with the red vapour. The Brimstone Gang, he claims, is a ‘party’ with whose ‘activities’ he has never ‘*identified*’ me, and with whose ‘extortions and tale-bearing’ he has never even linked the people ‘connected’ with me. It will be necessary to transform the sulphur vapour into flowers of sulphur.

In lead article I (*National-Zeitung*, no 37, 1860) Zabel opens his ‘remarks in relation to’ the *Brimstone Gang* by calling ‘Marx’ its ‘visible chief’. The second member of the Brimstone Gang, whom he does not, it is true, name, but whom he describes ‘for the further characterisation’ of the same, is Frederick Engels. That is to say that he refers to the letter in which Techow reports his meeting with Frederick Engels, Konrad Schramm and myself. Frederick Zabel refers to the latter two as illustrations of the ‘Brimstone Gang’. Immediately afterwards he mentions *Cherval* as an emissary from London. Then it is the turn of Liebknecht:

This Liebknecht, in nomine omen,<sup>[17]</sup> one of *Marx*’s most servile supporters...  
Liebknecht took service with Marx immediately after his arrival and earned the complete satisfaction of his master.

Close behind Liebknecht marched ‘*Ohly, also* a channel of the Brimstone Gang’. Finally ‘another London *accomplice, Biscamp*’. All these details follow each other blow by blow in lead article I, but in lead article II yet another member of the Brimstone Gang is belatedly named, *Wilhelm Wolff* — ‘Parliament-Wolf, alias Dungeon-Wolf’, who is entrusted with the important business of ‘issuing circulars’. So according to Zabel’s ‘remarks’ the Brimstone Gang consists of Marx, chief of the Brimstone Gang; Frederick Engels, illustration of the Brimstone Gang; Cherval, London emissary of the Brimstone Gang; Liebknecht, ‘one of the Marx’s most servile supporters’; Ohly, ‘*also* a channel of the Brimstone Gang’; Biscamp, ‘*another*’ London ‘accomplice’; and finally, Wolff, circular-writer of the Brimstone Gang.

In the first 51 lines Zabel already has the Brimstone Gang, thrown together in this way, figure alternately under the various names: 'Brimstone Gang or also Bürstenheimers', 'fellows who continued among the refugees the *work of the Rheinische Zeitung*', 'the proletarians' or, as it says in lead article II, the 'party of the "proletarians" under Marx'.

So much for the personal composition and the names of the Brimstone Gang. Zabel portrays its *organisation* briefly and strikingly in his 'remarks'. 'Marx' is the '*chief*'. The 'Brimstone Gang' itself forms the circle of his '*more immediate*' supporters, or, as Zabel says in the second lead article, 'the more immediate Marx party'. Zabel even gives a hallmark by which one can recognise the '*more immediate Marx party*'. The member of the more immediate Marx party, that is to say, must have seen Biscamp at least once in his life.

'He' (Blind), says Zabel in lead article II, 'states that he has never seen Biscamp in his life, he is *obviously not a member* of the more immediate Marx party.'

The 'more immediate Marx party', or the actual Brimstone Gang, is therefore the peerage of the gang, and is to be distinguished from the third category, the plebeians of the '*supporters*' or 'this carefully maintained *class of idlers*'. So first we have the chief, Marx, then the actual 'Brimstone Gang' or 'more immediate Marx Party', and finally the plebeians of the '*supporters*' or '*class of idlers*'. The Brimstone Gang, divided into these three categories, rejoices in a truly Spartan discipline. 'The *Brimstone Gang*', says Zabel, 'exercised a fearful discipline over its *supporters*', while on the other hand '*Marx... brandishes his whip among the Brimstone Gang*'. It goes without saying that, in such a well-organised 'Gang', the characteristic 'activity' of the gang, its 'main occupation', the deeds that the gang carried out *qua* gang, take place on the orders of its chief, and are explicitly described by Zabel as the deeds of this whip-brandishing chief. And what was the so to speak official occupation of the gang?

One of the main occupations of the Brimstone Gang was so to compromise people in the fatherland that they had to pay money so that the gang would keep their secrets without compromising them. Not one but hundreds of letters were written to Germany saying that a denunciation would be made of participation in this or that act of the revolution if a certain sum of money did not reach a given address by a certain point in time... Everybody that opposed *this* activity was ruined, not only among the refugees, but also by means of the press. The 'proletarians' filled the columns of the reactionary press in Germany with *their tale-bearing* against those democrats who did not pay homage to them, they became the *allies* of the secret police in France and Germany [etc]. (*National-Zeitung*, no 37)

After opening his 'remarks in relation to' the Brimstone Gang with the observation that I was its 'visible chief, and then enumerating the 'main occupations' of the Brimstone Gang, that is to say, the extortion of money, tale-bearing, etc, he closes his general description of the Brimstone Gang with the words:

*... they became the allies of the secret police in France and Germany.* For a further characterisation Vogt gives us among other things a letter of 26 August 1850 from the former Lieutenant Techow... in which one sees how *Marx, in his Napoleonic arrogance at his mental superiority, brandishes his whip among the Brimstone Gang.*

Having made the Brimstone Gang 'honour' me as its 'visible chief' at the beginning of his description of it, Zabel is now seized by fear that the reader could believe that there was another, invisible, chief standing behind the visible one, or that, like the Dalai Lama, I was satisfied merely to be 'honoured'. At the end of his description, therefore, he transforms me (in *his*, and not in *Vogt's* words) from the merely 'visible' chief into the whip-brandishing chief, from the Dalai Lama into the Napoleon of the 'Brimstone Gang'. And it is precisely this that he quotes in his speech for the defence as proof that, in his article, he did *not* 'identify' me 'with the party activities' of the Brimstone Gang, 'which are sharply condemned as *eccentric*, or rather *lacking in character* and *dishonourable*'. But no! Not quite! He did 'identify' me, but *not* in a manner '*detrimental to my honour*'. 'Much rather', indeed, he did me the honour of naming me the Napoleon of extortionists, writers of threatening letters, mouchards, agent provocateurs, counterfeiters, etc. Obviously Zabel draws his concepts of honour from the dictionary of the *December Gang*. Hence the epithet 'Napoleonic'. But it is precisely because of this

honour he has done me that I am prosecuting him! I have *proved* by the facts brought forward in my complaint, proved so strikingly that Zabel is unwilling to follow me into any public court at all, *proved* that all his 'remarks in relation to' the Brimstone Gang are Vogtian inventions and lies which Zabel only quotes so that he can 'honour' me as the Napoleon of this 'Brimstone Gang'. But does he not portray me as the 'superior bridling the others'? Does he not make me exercise *discipline* in the Gang? He himself explains what the bridling, the superiority, the *discipline* consisted of:

The Brimstone Gang exercised a *fearful discipline* over its supporters. Any of those who tried to achieve bourgeois prosperity for himself was, for the very reason that he tried to make himself independent, in and of itself a traitor to the revolution... Discord, fights and duels were created among this carefully-maintained class of idlers by widespread rumours and correspondence [etc].

But Zabel is not content with this *general depiction* of the party activities of the Brimstone Gang, with which he honourably 'identified' me.

*Liebknecht*, a 'notorious member of the Marx party', 'one of Marx's most servile supporters, who earned the complete satisfaction of his master', intentionally compromised the workers in Switzerland through the 'revolutionary congress at Murten' where, brimming with joy, he 'led them into the arms' of the waiting 'Gendarmes'. 'In the Cologne trial the authorship of the fake minutes book was ascribed to this Liebknecht.' (Zabel, of course, forgets to say that this lie of Stieber's was publicly *proved* to be a lie of Stieber's during the proceedings themselves.) *Wolff*, a former co-editor of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, sends from London a 'circular to the proletarians' which 'he at the same time passes to the Hanoverian police'.

While presenting people who are so 'notoriously' connected with me as agents of the secret police, Zabel on the other hand links me with a 'notorious' secret police agent, agent provocateur and counterfeiter, that is to say with Cherval. Immediately after his general depiction of the Brimstone Gang, he has 'several people', including *Cherval*, go from London to Paris 'in the dual role of revolutionary seducers of the workers and allies of the secret police' and there instigate the 'so-called Communist trial', etc. In lead article II he goes on to relate:

In this way a conspiracy of the most scandalous kind, involving the mass production of counterfeit banknotes (*read Vogt for the details*) was in 1852 devised against the Swiss Workers' Associations [etc].

If the reader of the *National-Zeitung* obeys Zabel's imperious summons and *reads Vogt for the details*, what does he find? That Cherval was sent by me to Geneva, set 'the scandalous conspiracy with the counterfeit banknotes' into motion under my direct supervision, etc. The reader, directed to Vogt by Zabel, further finds:

However, Marx's personal attitude in relation to this is completely irrelevant, for, as has already been said, *whether Marx himself does something or whether he has it done by a member of his gang is a matter of complete indifference; he rules his people unconditionally.*

But Zabel had still not done enough for himself. He felt the urge to whisper a last word into the reader's ear at the end of his two lead articles. He says:

He [Blind] states at the same time that he has never seen Biscamp in his life. He is obviously not a member of the *more immediate Marx party*. *It seems to us* that it was not difficult for the latter [the more immediate Marx party] to make a scapegoat of him [Blind]... The *Marx party* could shrug off responsibility for the authorship of the leaflet on to Blind very easily precisely because the latter had expressed himself in a similar sense in conversation with *Marx* and in the article in the *Free Press*; the leaflet could *be forged* using the same expressions and turns of phrase as Blind so that it looked like *his* [Blind's] work.

So 'the Marx party' or the 'more immediate Marx party', alias the Brimstone Gang, 'forged' the leaflet so that it looked like Blind's work? Having developed this hypothesis, Zabel summarises its meaning dryly in the following words: 'Anyone can now **hold Marx or Blind to be the author**, as he sees fit.'

Not, therefore, the Marx Party or Blind, nor yet Blind or the more immediate Marx Harty, vulgo the Brimstone Gang, but Blind or Marx, *Marx sans phrases*. The Marx party, the more immediate Marx party, the Brimstone Gang, etc, were therefore only pantheistic names for *Marx*, the person Marx. Zabel does not only ‘identify’ Marx with the ‘party’ of the Brimstone Gang, *he personifies* the Brimstone Gang in Marx. And the same Zabel dares to claim before the court that, in his lead articles he did not ‘identify’ ‘the plaintiff’ Marx with this Brimstone Gang ‘in a manner detrimental to his honour’. He beats his breast and swears that ‘*least of all*’ had he ‘connected’ my ‘person with those people’ whom he had ‘accused of extortion and tale-bearing’! What a figure, I thought to myself, what a figure Zabel will cut in the public session of the court! With this consoling cry I reached once more for the document my lawyer had sent me, read it through once more, thought to discover something like the names Müller and Schultze at the end, but soon discovered my mistake. What I had in my hand was not Zabel’s defence, but an ‘*ordinance*’ of the *Supreme Court* signed *Guthschmidt and Schultze*, an ordinance that deprived me of the *right to prosecute* Zabel and on top of that ordered me, as a punishment for my ‘complaint’, to pay 25 silver groats immediately to the Berlin City Court Salary office on threat of distraint. I was indeed *attonitus*.<sup>[18]</sup> However, my astonishment was allayed by a further mature reading of the ‘*ordinance*’.

**Example I:** Zabel prints in the lead article of the *National-Zeitung*, no 37, 1860:

Vogt reports on page 13 *et seq*: Known under the name of Brimstone gang or also of Bürstenheimers, there were, among the refugees of 1849, a number of people who, at first scattered between Switzerland, France and England, gradually gathered in London and there honoured Herr Marx as their visible chief.

Herren Guthschmidt and Schultze read in the lead article of the *National-Zeitung*, no 37, 1860:

For, if the first article quotes from Vogt’s account ‘that the refugees of 1849 gradually gathered in London and there honoured the person Marx as their visible chief’.

Zabel says: *a number of people, etc, among the refugees of 1849 known under the name of the Brimstone Gang or also the Bürstenheimers* gradually gathered in London and there honoured me as their visible chief. Herren Guthschmidt and Schultze, on the other hand, have Zabel say: *the refugees of 1849 gradually gathered in London* (which is not even correct, since a large part of the refugees gathered in Paris, New York, Jersey, etc) and honoured me as their visible chief, an honour that was neither done to me nor, by Zabel and Vogt, imputed to me. Herren Guthschmidt and Schultze are not even summarising, but *quote in quotation marks* a sentence *cited* ‘from Vogt’s depiction’ in Zabel’s first lead article which Zabel *nowhere* prints. What Herren Guthschmidt and Schultze had in front of them therefore was a *secret edition* of no 37 of the *National-Zeitung* equally unknown to me and the public. That explains every misunderstanding.

The *secret edition* of no 37 of the *National-Zeitung* is not distinguished from the popular edition of the same number merely by the phrasing of individual sentences. The *whole context* of the first lead article in the *popular edition* has nothing at all in common with its context in the *secret edition apart from a few words*.

**Example II:** Zabel prints in no 37 of the *National-Zeitung* after appointing me Chief of the Brimstone Gang:

These fellows [the Brimstone Gang]... continued among the refugees the work of the *Rheinische Zeitung*... One of the main occupations of the Brimstone Gang was so to compromise people in the fatherland that they had to pay money... The ‘proletarians’ filled the columns of the reactionary press in Germany with their tale-bearing... they became the allies of the secret police in France and Germany. For a further characterisation [of this ‘Brimstone Gang’ or these ‘proletarians’] Vogt gives us a letter from... Techow, in which the principles, *activities*, etc, of the ‘proletarians’ are depicted and one sees how Marx, in his Napoleonic arrogance at his mental superiority, brandishes his whip among the Brimstone Gang.

Herren Guthschmidt and Schultze read in no 37 of the *National-Zeitung*, after Zabel has appointed me *Chief of the refugees of 1849*:

And if it [the first article in the *National-Zeitung*] goes on to speak of a letter by Techow: 'in which one sees how Marx, in his Napoleonic arrogance at his mental superiority, brandishes his whip among the Brimstone Gang.'

If judges do possess the authority to allow or deny a private person the right to prosecute, then Herren Guthschmidt and Schultze were not only justified in denying me the right to prosecute Zabel, they were actually obliged to do so. For the context of the lead article in no 37 of the *National-Zeitung*, imparted to them *in nuce* <sup>[19]</sup> in the *secret edition*, positively excludes any *corpus delicti*. Indeed, what does Zabel express in this *secret edition*? First of all, he does me the undeserved honour of having me 'honoured' as the 'visible chief' of the refugees gathered in London in 1849. Am I supposed to 'prosecute' him for that? And secondly, he does me the no less undeserved honour of having me 'brandish my whip' over a certain 'Brimstone Gang' which in other respects he does not link with me in any way, more or less in the same way that I brandished my whip over Zabel & Co in 1848–49. Am I supposed to 'prosecute' Zabel for that?

One can see what confusion is caused when legislation allows judicial state employees to 'ordain', and to 'ordain' in secret, whether or not one person has the right to prosecute another, for example, for libel in the *National-Zeitung*. The plaintiff lodges his complaint on the basis of a popular edition of no 37 of the *National-Zeitung* available to the public in an edition of perhaps 10,000 copies, and the judge ordains on the basis of a secret edition of the same issue prepared for him alone. How uncertain even the bare identity of the *corpus delicti* is in this procedure.

By making the right of a private person to prosecute subject in every individual case to a judicial concession, Prussian legislation proceeds from the view that the state must, as a paternal power, regulate the civil life of its children and hold it in tutelage. But even from the point of view of Prussian legislation the *Supreme Court's* 'ordinance' seems odd. Obviously, Prussian legislation wants to exclude frivolous prosecutions and therefore gives the judge, if I understand its spirit correctly and am right to assume that it does not intend a systematic denial of justice, and therefore gives the judge the right to reject a complaint, but only if *the complaint is prima facie unfounded*, and therefore, *prima facie* frivolous. Is this true in this case? The *City Court* admits that Zabel's lead articles *in fact* contain remarks that are 'detrimental to my honour' and therefore 'culpable'. It only places *Frederick Zabel* out of reach of my legal revenge because *Frederick Zabel* 'merely quoted' his slanders. The *Supreme Court* declared that, quoted or not quoted, remarks detrimental to one's honour remain equally legally culpable, but, for its part, it now *denies* that Zabel's lead articles contain any remarks at all — quoted or not quoted — detrimental to my honour. The *City Court* and the *Supreme Court* therefore have views on the *facts of the case itself* that are not merely *different* but directly contradictory. The one finds remarks detrimental to the honour of my person where the other finds none. This *contradiction* between the views of the different judges on *the facts of the case itself* proves strikingly that, *prima facie*, the complaint is *well founded*. If *Papinian* and *Ulpian* say, 'This printed remark is detrimental to his honour', while *Mucius Scaevola* and *Manilius Brutus* on the other hand maintain on the contrary, 'This printed remark is not detrimental to his honour', what will the people of the *Quirites* think? Why should the people not think, with *Papinian* and *Ulpian*, that Zabel has printed remarks detrimental to my honour in nos 37 and 41 of the *National-Zeitung*? If I assure the people of the *Quirites* that *Mucius Scaevola* and *Manilius Brutus* have issued me a secret testimonial according to which Zabel's remarks and assertions 'detrimental to my honour' in no way affect my person, the people of the *Quirites* will shrug their shoulders and say: 'A d'autres.' <sup>[20]</sup>

Since the *Supreme Court* has to reach a decision in the final resort about the *facts of the case*, and thus had, in the final resort, to decide whether *in fact* my honour was impugned and the intention to insult me existed in Zabel's two lead articles, and since the *Supreme Court* denied that these were *the facts of the case*, recourse to the **High Court of Appeal** only left open the question of whether the *factual judgement* of the *Supreme Court* rested on a *legal error*. The *Supreme Court itself* had found, in the *factual judgement* in its 'ordinance' that Zabel had alleged 'activities lacking in character and dishonourable', 'tale-bearing and extortion' on the part of the *Brimstone Gang*, the same *Brimstone Gang* that the same Zabel in the same lead article explicitly characterises as '*the Marx party*' or '*the more immediate Marx party*' with 'Marx' as its visible and whip-brandishing 'chief'. Did the *Supreme Court* possess the *legal* authority not to find in this an impugnement of the honour of my

person? My lawyer, Herr Justizrat *Weber*, comments on this in his written complaint to the *High Court of Appeal*, among other things:

Admittedly, nowhere is it directly said [by Zabel] that Marx extorted money and committed tale-bearing and forgery. But does it need to be stated any more clearly than to say that Marx was the chief of a party that pursued the criminal and immoral aims alleged? Nobody of sound and unprejudiced judgement can deny that the chief of an association whose aims and whose principle activity are dedicated to the commission of crimes not only countenances the same but himself organises and leads it and enjoys the fruits; and this chief is therefore unquestionably doubly responsible, not only as a participant, but also as the intellectual author, even if not a single act of direct participation in the commission of a specific crime can be proved against him. *The views expressed in the disputed ordinance* [of the Supreme Court] *would lead to the good name of any man being abandoned without any defence to him who wants to ruin him. Instead of claiming falsely of A that he has committed murder, the slanderer only needs to say that there exists somewhere a gang that carries on the business of murder and that A is the chief this gang. The Supreme Court's view assures the slanderer of complete immunity.* According to the correct view, however, the punishment for slander would strike the slanderer just as much whether he unvarnishedly branded a third party as a robber or as a robber chief.

From the point of view of *common sense* a slander does indeed exist. Does it exist *within the meaning of Prussian legislation*? The Supreme Court says no, my lawyer says yes. If the Supreme Court has decided against the City Court that the *quotation form* does not make the slanderer *immune to prosecution*, why should the High Court of Appeal not decide, against the Supreme Court, that the slanderer's *tape-worm form* does not make him immune either? It was on this *legal point*, on this *legal error*, committed by the Supreme Court in its judgement of the facts of the case, that my lawyer appealed to the **High Court of Appeal**, that is to say to a certain extent to the *Areopaga*. The *High Court of Appeal* 'ordained':

I: Your complaint of 23 August of this year concerning the ordinance of the Criminal Senate of the Royal Supreme Court in the matter of defamation of Dr Karl Marx vs the editor of the *National-Zeitung* Dr Zabel of 11 July of this year is, after a study of the documents, herewith rejected as unfounded.

II: For the Royal Supreme Court has neither found an objective impugment of the plaintiff's honour in the two leading articles in question in the *National-Zeitung* nor assumed the existence of the intention of insulting the latter, and therefore the institution of the requested prosecution for defamation was rightly rejected. But whether an impugment of the plaintiff's honour objectively exists, and whether the intention to insult him actually existed, are essentially factual judgements which can only be disputed by a complaint to the Royal High Court of Appeal if the assumption of the Appeal Judge in this respect is based on a legal error.

III: Such does not, however, emerge in the case in hand.

IV: You have to pay the costs of this ordinance at 25 silver groats at the Salary Office of the Royal City Court of this city within eight days.

**Berlin**, 5 October 1860, Royal High Court of Appeal, **von Schlickmann**.

To Herr Justizrat **Weber** of this City

To have an easier overall view, I have numbered the different parts of the *High Court of Appeal's* 'ordinance'.

Under I, Herr *von Schlickmann* explains that the complaint against the Supreme Court is 'rejected'. Under II, he lectures us on the relative competence of the Supreme Court and of the High Court of Appeal — obviously a didactic digression not germane to the issue. Under IV, Herr Weber is ordered to pay the sum of 25 silver groats to the Berlin City Court Salary Office, a *result* of the 'ordinance' but surely not its *cause*.



So where is the *reason* for the *ordinance* ‘of rejection’? Where is the answer to my lawyer’s very detailed written complaint? That is to say:

Under III: ‘Such [a legal error] does **not**, however, *emerge* in the present case.’

If the little word *not* is crossed out in this sentence under III, the motivation would read: ‘Such [a legal error] *does*, however, *emerge* in the present case.’ With this, the Supreme Court’s ordinance would have been set aside. So it is only upheld by the little word *not* put in as an afterthought, with which Herr von *Schlickmann*, in the name of the High Court of Appeal, ‘rejects’ Herr Justizrat Weber’s written complaint.

*Not!* Herr von *Schlickmann* does *not* refute the legal considerations unfolded by my lawyer, he does *not* discuss them, he does *not* even *mention* them. Herr von *Schlickmann* naturally had sufficient reasons for his ‘ordinance’, but he keeps them silent. *Not!* This little word’s validity as proof lies exclusively in the authority, the hierarchical position, of the person in whose mouth it is used. In and of itself not proves nothing. *Not!* Αὐτότατος ἔφη. <sup>[21]</sup>

And so the *High Court of Appeal* **also forbade me to prosecute the ‘democrat’ Frederick Zabel.**

And so ended *my case against the Prussian courts.*

## Notes

- 1 Frederick Zabel — a liberal journalist and editor of the Berlin *National-Zeitung*.
- 2 According to the oracle.
- 3 Fight fire with fire.
- 4 Ferdinand Flocon — a French politician, editor of *La Réforme*, and member of the provisional government in 1848.
- 5 The Association Démocratique was founded in Brussels in the autumn of 1847. It contained German proletarian revolutionaries and bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democrats. Marx and Engels were active in founding the association, Marx being elected Vice-President. During the bourgeois February revolution in France, the proletarian wing of the association attempted to arm the Belgian workers and to begin the struggle for a democratic republic. After Marx was expelled from Brussels in March 1848 and the Belgian authorities had dealt with the revolutionary elements in the association, its activities became increasingly restricted. It ceased to function in 1849.
- 6 The parliament met in Manchester during 6–18 March 1854. It was called together on the initiative of a Chartist group led by Ernest Jones with the aim of creating a broad working-class organisation to coordinate strikes throughout England. Marx, who was invited to be an honorary delegate, wrote a paper for the parliament which was read out on 10 March; in it he proclaimed the need to create an independent political mass party of the working class. The mass movement at which the parliament aimed failed because of the refusal of support by the majority of trade-union leaders. The parliament did not meet again.
- 7 By decree.
- 8 The code of French civil law was revised in 1807 as the Code Napoléon. It was introduced into the conquered area of West and Southern Germany by the French; even after the union with Prussia it still had force in the Rhine province. The code was based on the gains of the French Revolution and took its stand on the base of formal bourgeois equality.
- 9 Anger makes the poet.
- 10 Footman or attendant.
- 11 The Friends of the Fatherland was a republican society of German emigrants in London in the 1850s and 1860s.

**12** The *Nationalverein* (National Club) was an association of German liberals who aimed at the unity of Germany as a strong, centralised state under a monarchist Prussia. It was founded at a congress in Frankfurt in 1859. The real core of the *Nationalverein* consisted of the pro-Prussian Gotha Party, founded in 1849 by representatives of the counter-revolutionary big bourgeoisie and the right-wing liberals, who had left the National Assembly when the King of Prussia refused to accept the crown from the Assembly.

**13** Makes his arse a trumpet (Dante).

**14** Literally, dead head; useless residue.

**15** To Italy, to Italy! — a quotation from Virgil's *Aeneid*.

**16** We have lost our memory and our voices too.

**17** As the name suggests, 'Liebknecht' means 'dear servant' in German.

**18** Astonished.

**19** In a nut-shell.

**20** It's up to others.

**21** He said it himself.

## Chapter XII: Appendices

### I: Schily's Expulsion from Switzerland

Because of lack of space I can, unfortunately, only give extracts of a letter from Schily on his expulsion from Switzerland in which the treatment of non-parliamentarian refugees is illustrated by an example. The letter starts by relating that two German refugees, B and I, friends of Schily's, had left Geneva, had been arrested on their tour through Switzerland, been set free by Druet, and had returned to *Geneva*.

On their behalf [Schily continues] I went to Fazy to see whether they were wanted men, and received from him the assurance that, as far as the Canton was concerned, he did not want to disturb their incognito, and that no federal warrant had been received. For the rest, he said, I would do well to contact the *chef du département de justice et de police*, M Girard, mentioning his name and what he had said, which I then did with about the same result, leaving my address in case a federal warrant should arrive. A few weeks later a police officer comes to me and demands the addresses of B and I. I refuse to give them, run off to the said Girard and, when he threatens to have me deported if I do not give him the addresses, explain to him that, according to our earlier agreement, my assistance could be demanded as an *intermédiaire*, but not as a *dénonciateur*. He thereupon: Vous avez l'air de vouloir vous interposer comme ambassadeur entre moi et ces réfugiés, pour traiter de puissance à puissance?

I: *Je n'ai pas l'ambition d'être accrédité ambassadeur près de vous.* <sup>[1]</sup>

I was, in fact, henceforth dismissed without any ambassadorial ceremony. On the way home I learned that the two, B and I, had just been found, arrested and carried off, and thus I could consider the above threat as closed. But I had reckoned without 1 April, for on that ominous date in 1852 I was requested by a police officer on the street to accompany him to the Hôtel de Ville, where they wanted to ask me something. Here Herr Staatrat Tourte, the Geneva Commissar for the Expulsion of Refugees *ad latus* <sup>[2]</sup> to the Federal ditto at that time present there, Trog, announced: that I was expelled and that I would therefore have to direct my steps to Berne, all to his deepest regret, in that there was nothing against me as far as the Canton was concerned, but that the

Federal Commissar insisted on my expulsion. At my demand to be taken to the latter, he replied: Non, nous ne voulons pas que le commissaire fédéral fasse la police ici. <sup>[3]</sup> With this, he contradicted what he had just said, and altogether fell out of his role as Geneva Staatsrat, which consisted in resisting the federal government's unreasonable demands for expulsion with liberal prudery and only giving way to force, but also ceding with pleasure or with resignation to gentle pressure. Another characteristic of this role consisted in saying behind the back of the person expelled that he was a spy, and that he had had to be put out in the interests of the 'good cause'... Thus Tourte afterwards told the refugees he had had to put me out because I was hand in glove with the Federal Commissar and had, with him, thwarted *his* (Tourte's) measures for the protection of refugees, that is to say with the same Commissar who, to *his* deep regret, had had me expelled. *Quelles tartines!* What lies and contradictions! All for a little *aura popularis!* <sup>[4]</sup> Admittedly, wind is the only means that gentleman has of keeping his balloon in the air. A Grand Councillor and Councillor of State in Geneva, Swiss *Standerat* or National Councillor, born councillor of confusion, it is only in the Federal Council that he is not present to assure peaceful days for Switzerland, for it is written: *Providentia Dei et confusione hominum Helvetia salva fuit.* <sup>[5]</sup>

A protest against Tourte's slander, which Schily, on his arrival in London, sent to the Geneva *Indépendant*, at that time under the influence of *Raisin*, whom we shall mention later, which a short time previously had sharply censured the donkey-like kicks of slander with which 'the liberal faiseurs drove the refugees out of Switzerland', was not printed.

From the Hôtel de Ville in Geneva [Schily continues], my path now led to prison, and the next day accompanied by the police by post to Berne, where Herr Druey held me for 14 days under close arrest in the so-called old Tower...

In his correspondence with the imprisoned Schily, which we shall mention later, *Druey* placed all the blame on the Canton of Geneva, while Tourte for his part had assured him that all the blame lay on the Federal authorities, and that *as far as the Canton of Geneva was concerned there were no complaints against him*. The Geneva examining magistrate *Raisin* had given him a similar assurance a short time previously. On the latter gentleman Schily writes, among other things:

On the occasion of the Federal Rifle-Shooting held in Geneva in the summer of 1851 *Raisin* had taken over the editorship of the *Journal du tir fédéral* printed in German and French and engaged me to work for him on the promise of an honorarium of 300 Francs. Among other things I also had to note down *in flagrante delicto* <sup>[6]</sup> the speeches of welcome and farewell made in German by the Committee President, Tourte, which, may I say in gratitude to Tourte, was rendered very much easier by the fact that, on each occasion, he addressed to the various deputations of marksmen very much the same enthusiastic words, with slight variation according to whether he had to compliment Muts from Berne or Stier from Uri or other members of the Confederation. The result was that, particularly at the refrain 'should, however, the hour of danger strike, then we shall', etc, I could happily put down my pen and, to *Raisin's* question *why*, reply: *C'est le refrain du danger, je le sais par Coeur.* <sup>[7]</sup> Instead of my hard-earned honorarium of 300 Francs, however, I received 100 from *Raisin* with great difficulty but with the expectation of further work, that is to say for a political review he wished to set up in Geneva. It was intended, independently of all the existing political parties, to attack on all fronts, particularly against the 'liberal' government of Fazy–Tourte, however much he himself belonged to it. He was exactly the right man for such an undertaking, capable, as he used to boast, 'd'arracher la peau à qui que ce soit...'. <sup>[8]</sup> Accordingly he gave me the commission of making contacts for that undertaking on a trip round Switzerland which I started after my exertions in connection with the Tir federal, which I then did and about which I gave him a written report on my return. In the meantime, however, quite a different wind had blown, and it had driven him under full sail from that pirate expedition to the safe haven of the existing government. *J'en étais donc pour mes frais et honoraires,* <sup>[9]</sup> with demands

for which I importuned him in vain, and do so to this hour, although he has become a rich man... Shortly before my arrest he was still swearing that there was no question of my being expelled, as his friend Tourte himself had assured him, that I did not need to take any preventive steps on account of Girard's threats, etc... In answer to a letter that I sent him *de profundis* of my old prison tower asking him for a small part payment of the money owed me and for an explanation of what had happened (my arrest), he was obstinately silent, however much he assured the person who took the letter that he wanted to fulfil my demands...

K, a reliable and unprejudiced man, wrote to me some months later that the fugitive parliamentarians had brought about my expulsion, and this was confirmed *mordicus* by a few lines enclosed by *Ranickel*. The same view was also confirmed many times over by experts on the subject from whom I later had the opportunity to enquire orally about the occurrence... I was, nevertheless, not actually such an ogre towards the parliamentarians as the hyena *Reinach*, who daily dragged the late Imperial Regent Vogt from the imperial tomb to the luncheon board in Berne where he, Reinach, himself sat, a reincarnated 'Prometheus Bound', and *entre poire et fromage* <sup>[10]</sup> cruelly consumed him to the general horror, mummy, reincarnation and all. Now it is true that I was not an admirer of the deeds of the parliament. On the contrary! But did the gentlemen wish to take their revenge on me for that by imposing the Imperial Ban on me, reckoning Switzerland to be part of the Empire because the Imperial Constitution is buried there along with the last decisions of the Imperial Diet? I rather think that the suspicion that they were persecuting me is based on the parliamentary mutiny, mentioned in an earlier letter, against the Geneva Refugees' Committee formed by myself, Becker and some citizens of Geneva... The gentlemen were not even agreed among themselves why they wanted to usurp the distribution of money to the refugees. Some, among them Dentzel of the Baden Chamber, wanted to depart from *our* practice, which was to give a hand particularly to penniless workers, and *by preference* dry the tears of professional mealy-mouths, heroes of the revolution and sons of the fatherland who had seen better days... *Is fecit cui prodest*, <sup>[11]</sup> as we say in the profession, and since my activities had made these gentlemen uncomfortable, suspicion grew that they had used their influence in authoritative circles to have me removed. Was it not known that they had the *aurem principis*, <sup>[12]</sup> or at least stood close enough to that ear to blow into it something about my *unruliness*, and that princeps Tourte in particular had on several occasions gathered them around himself...

After recounting his dispatch from the old tower in Berne to Basle and over the French frontier, Schily notes:

In connection with the expense attached to the expulsion of refugees, I cherish the hope that these costs will not be met at all by the Swiss Federal Exchequer, but by that of the Holy Alliance. One day, that is to say, sometime after our entry into Switzerland, *Princess Olga* sat at luncheon at an inn in Berne with the *Russian* chargé d'affaires there. *Entre poire et fromage* (*sans comparaison* with the terrible *Reinach*), her Ladyship said to her companion at table: 'Eh bien, Monsieur le Baron, avez-vous encore beaucoup de réfugiés ici?' 'Pas mal, Princesse', said the other, 'bien que nous en ayons déjà beaucoup renvoyé. M Druey fait de son mieux à cet égard, *et si de nouveaux fonds arrivent*, nous en renverrons bien encore.' <sup>[13]</sup> Such was heard and related to me by the waiter serving them, a former member of the Free Corps in the Imperial Campaign under my high command.

When Schily was dispatched his travelling effects disappeared mysteriously and irretrievably:

It remains inexplicable to this day how it could come about they could suddenly disappear in Le Havre out of the chaos of the parcels of a train of German emigrants (into which we had been incorporated by the emigration agent *Klenk*, to whom the Swiss Federal authorities had entrusted us for transport as far as Le Havre, under conditions, moreover, where all the baggage of the emigrants and the refugees had

become mixed up) *other than with the assistance* of a list of the refugees and their parcels. Perhaps the merchant *Wanner*, Consul of the Swiss Confederation in Le Havre, to whom we were directed for forwarding, knows more. He promised us full compensation. Druey later confirmed this promise in a letter to me, which I sent to the *Lawyer Vogt* in Berne to pursue my claim in the *Bundesrat*. I have not, however, received it back to this hour, nor could I obtain a reply to all the letters I have addressed to him. On the other hand, in the summer of 1856 my claim was rejected by the *Bundesrat*, who told me to shut up, without any reason for the decision being given...

All this and all the expulsions in general, however much they involved troopers, handcuffs, etc, are mere details compared with the deportations to country of origin, practiced in a peculiarly friendly atmosphere of good-neighbourly agreement, of the so-called less seriously implicated refugees from Baden, with travel documents specially prepared for the purpose and the instruction to report to the local authorities when they returned home. They were not then allowed, as they thought, to follow their trade, but had to undergo all sorts of unexpected penances. The silent sufferings of the people thus extradited (and extradited is the right word) still await their historian and avenger.

It is praise indeed for a man 'if one can tell all one's mistakes without ceasing to be great', the Swiss Tacitus says of Switzerland. Well, there is no lack of material for that kind of praise. It will never hurt her to give it... *qui aime bien chatie bien*.<sup>[14]</sup> And for my part I have an indestructible inclination for Switzerland taken by and large. I like the country and the people well. Keeping his gun with the household utensils and always ready and skilled to use it for the preservation of historical traditions of good repute and modern achievements of his own sound home manufacture, the Swiss is, for me, a thoroughly respectable phenomenon. He has a claim on sympathy abroad because he himself harbours it for strivings for better conditions abroad. 'I would rather our dear Lord had lost his best pair of angels', a Swiss farmer said in his vexation at the failure of the South German uprising. Perhaps he would not have risked one of his *own* draught teams for it, but he would have risked his skin, and his gun with it. Thus, at the bottom of his heart, the Swiss is not neutral, even if he is neutral on the basis of and for the protection of inherited possessions. Anyway, this old crust of neutrality which surrounds his better kernel will soon burst from all the foreign trampling on it — and that is in fact the essence of neutrality — and then there will be fireworks, and that will clear the air.

So much for Schily's letter. In the tower of the Berne prison, he could not manage a personal meeting with Druey, but he did correspond with that gentleman. To a letter in which Schily asks him about the motive for his imprisonment and requests permission for a legal consultation with the lawyer Wyss in Berne, Druey replies in a letter dated 9 April 1852:

... L'autorité genevoise a ordonné votre renvoi du Canton, vous a fait arrêter et conduire à Berne à la disposition de mon département, parce que vous vous êtes montré un des réfugiés les plus remuants et que vous avez cherché à cacher I et B, que vous vous étiez engagé à représenter à l'autorité. Pour ce motif et parce que votre séjour ultérieur en Suisse nuirait *aux relations internationales de la Confederation*, le Conseil fédéral a ordonné votre renvoi du territoire suisse, etc... Comme votre arrestation n'a pas pour but un proces criminel ou correctionnel, mais *une mesure de haute police*... il n'est pas nécessaire que vous consultiez l'avocat. *D'ailleurs, avant de... autoriser l'entrevue que vous me demandez avec M l'avocat Wyss je desire savoir le but de cette entrevue.*

... The Genevan authorities have ordered that you be sent back from the Canton, have had you arrested and taken to Berne in charge of my department, because you have shown yourself to be one of the most active of the refugees and you have tried to hide I and B, whom you had undertaken to bring before the authorities. For this reason and

because your further staying in Switzerland would damage *the Confederation's international relations* the Federal Council has ordered your removal from Swiss territory, etc... As your arrest does not have the objective of a criminal or civil trial, but a *strong police measure*... it is not necessary for you to consult a lawyer. *Moreover, before authorising the interview you request with the lawyer Mr Wyss, I wish to know the aim of this interview.*

The letters that Schily was allowed to write to his friends in Geneva after several requests all had to be given to Herr Druey for inspection beforehand. In one of these letters Schily used the expression: 'Vae Victis.' <sup>[15]</sup> On this, Druey writes to him, dated *19 April 1852*:

Dans le billet que vous avez adressé à MJ se trouvent les mots: *vae victis*... Cela veut-il dire que les autorités fédérales vous traitent en vaincu? S'il en était ainsi, ce serait *une accusation mensongère*, contre laquelle je devrais protester.

In the note you sent to MJ are the words: *vae victis*... Does this mean that the federal authorities are treating you as vanquished? If this were the case, it would be a *lying accusation*, which I would have to protest against.

Schily answered with a letter to Druey, dated *21 April 1852*, among other things:

Je ne pense pas, M le conseiller fédéral, que cette manière de caractériser les mesures prises à mon égard, puisse me valoir le reproche d'une *accusation mensongère*; du moins un pareil reproche ne serait pas de nature à me faire revenir de l'idée que je suis traité avec dureté: au contraire, adressé à un *prisonnier, par celui qui le tient en prison*, une telle réponse me paraîtrait une dureté de plus.

I do not think, Federal Councillor, that this way of describing the measures taken in relation to me could bring me the reproach of a *lying accusation*; at least such a reproach would not make me likely to abandon the idea that I am harshly treated: on the contrary, addressed *to a prisoner from the man who is holding him in prison*, such a reply would seem to me a further hardship.

Towards the end of *March 1852*, shortly before Schily's arrest and the administrative removal of other *non-parliamentary* refugees, the reactionary *Journal de Genève* had chattered all kinds of mixed-up rubbish about Communist plots among the German refugees in Geneva, saying that Herr Trog was busy stamping out a nest of German Communists with a brood of 84 Communist dragons, etc. Besides this reactionary Geneva paper, a scribbler in Berne belonging to the parliamentary gang — one must assume that it was *Karl Vogt*, since he repeatedly claims in the *Magnum Opus* that he saved Switzerland from the Communist refugees — was in the *Frankfurter Journal*, under the correspondent's mark SS, spreading similar reports, saying for example that the Geneva committee for the support of German refugees, consisting of Communists, had been brought down because of the unlawful distribution of money and replaced by sound men (parliamentarians) who would soon put an end to the mischief, and further that the dictator of Geneva was now appearing after all to give way to the orders of the Federal Commissars, in that recently two German refugees belonging to the Communist faction had been brought under arrest from Geneva to Berne, etc. In its issue no 70 of *25 March 1852* the *Schweizerische National-Zeitung*, published in Basle, carried a reply which said, among other things:

Every impartial observer knows that, just as Switzerland is solely concerned with the strengthening and constitutional development of her political achievements, so too the small remnant of German refugees here devote themselves only to earning their daily bread and completely harmless occupations, and that the fairy stories about Communism are only hatched out in the fantasy of the petty-bourgeois haunted by apparitions and by informers with a political or personal interest.

After denouncing the Berne political correspondent of the *Frankfurter Journal* as an *informer*, the article concludes:

Refugees here think that there are among them several so-called 'sound men' in the pattern of the former 'Imperial Bieder- and Bassermanns' who, driven by nostalgia for the flesh-pots of their native land, seek to smooth their path back into the favour of the

rulers of their country with such reactionary exhortations; one wishes them good luck and a speedy departure, so that they will not long continue to compromise the refugees and the government that gives them asylum.

Schily was known by these *fugitive parliamentarians* to be the author of this article. The latter appeared in the Basle *National-Zeitung* on 25 March, and on 1 April Schily's completely unmotivated arrest took place. 'Tantaene animis celestibus irae?' <sup>[16]</sup>

## II: Revolutionary Congress at Murten

After the Murten scandal the body of German refugees in Geneva, with the exclusion of the fugitive *parliamentarians*, issued a protest, 'To a High Department of Justice and Police of the Confederation'. I shall only print one passage from it:

The monarchies were not satisfied with their previous diplomatic achievements. They rattled their war-sabres around Switzerland, threatening military occupation to clear out the refugees. At least, in an official document the Bundesrat has expressed its concern about this danger. And lo! what follows are these expulsions, motivated this time by the well-known Murten meeting and the assertion that, as a result of the procedures thereupon instituted, traces of politico-propagandistic tendencies had been found. In relation to the facts, this assertion must be vigorously contested... In relation to the law, however, it can be maintained that, wherever conditions of legality prevail, *only the legal punishment for offences anticipated by the law* can be inflicted, which also applies to deportation, unless it is to be characterised as arbitrary police despotism. Or do they wish to commend *diplomacy* to us here, perhaps, saying that, *in consideration of foreign powers*, in order to maintain international relations, they had to act in this way? Very well then, if that is the case let the *Swiss cross* hide itself before the *Turkish crescent*, which, when the refugee-hunter knocks at the Porte, shows its horns and does not bend its knee, so let us be given our passports to *Turkey*, and, when the gates have been shut behind us, let the keys of the Swiss bastion of liberty be handed as a *feudum oblatum* <sup>[17]</sup> to the *Holy Alliance*, so that henceforth they can be born in the latter's service as the insignia of its gentleman of the bedchamber, with the motto: *Finis Helvetiae!* <sup>[18]</sup>

## III: Cherval

I realised from JP Becker's letter that the 'affiliate of Marx' or 'affiliates of Cherval' mentioned by the Imperial Vogt could be none other than Herr *Stecher* who lives in London. Until then I had not had the honour of a personal acquaintance with him, although I had heard much in praise of his great and all-sided artistic talent. We met as a result of Becker's letter. The result is a letter written to me by my 'affiliate'.

17 Sussex Street

London WC

14 October 1860

**Dear Herr Marx**

I shall be glad to give you an explanation of the article on *Nugent* (Cherval-Cramer) in Vogt's pamphlet, an extract of which you were good enough to send me. In March 1852, I arrived in Geneva from a journey in Italy. Nugent came to Geneva at about the same time, and I made his acquaintance in a lithographic establishment. I had just started lithographic work, and since Nugent possesses a comprehensive knowledge of it and has an extremely obliging and active, not to say industrious, nature, I accepted his offer of working together with him in a studio. What Vogt says about Nugent's activities in Geneva is more or less what I heard about it at the time, if you take away the usual exaggeration of the feuilletonist or pamphleteer. His success was extremely small. I only knew one member of the society, a good humoured and industrious but otherwise imprudently rash young man; and since he was one of the leading figures, it

is easy to conclude that N was everything in the society and the others only inquisitive spectators. I am convinced that neither copper nor lithographic plates were engraved, although I heard N talk of such things. My acquaintances were mostly Geneva people and Italians. I know that I was later regarded as a spy by Vogt and other German refugees whom I did not know, but I did not let that worry me — the truth will always out. I did not hold it against them, it was so easy to arouse suspicion, since there was no lack of spies and it was not always easy to find them out. I am almost certain that Nugent did not correspond with anybody in Geneva after he had been expelled from there. I later received two letters from him in which he invited me to come to Paris to take over the completion of a work on medieval architecture, which I did. In Paris, I found Nugent cut off from all politics and correspondence. From the above it can, admittedly, be explained how I could be regarded as '*Marx's affiliate*', for I saw and heard of *no one else whom Nugent had attracted to Paris*. Of course, Herr Vogt could not know that I never, either directly or indirectly, came into contact with you, and would probably not have done so had I not taken up residence in London, where by a coincidence I had the pleasure of becoming acquainted with you and your family.

With hearty greetings to you and your wife

**HC Stecher**

#### **IV: Cologne Communist Trial.**

The information I give, in this section, on the Prussian embassy in London and its correspondence with the Prussian authorities on the continent during the proceedings in Cologne is based on the confessions of Hirsch published by *A Willich* in the *New Yorker Criminal-Zeitung* in April 1853 under the title '*The Victims of Moucharderie, an Article in Justification by Wilhelm Hirsch*'. Hirsch, now in prison in Hamburg, was the chief tool of Police Lieutenant Greif and his agent Fleury, and also forged the *fake* minutes book produced by Stieber during the trial on their instructions and under their guidance. I give here some extracts from Hirsch's memoirs. During the Great Exhibition:

... the German associations were kept under joint surveillance by a police triumvirate of Polizeirat Stieber for Prussia, a Herr Kubesch for Austria and Polizeidirektor Hüntel from Bremen.

Hirsch describes the first meeting that he had with *Alberts*, the Secretary of the Prussian embassy, as a result of his offer to act as a mouchard, in the following way:

The rendezvous the Prussian embassy in London gives to its secret agents takes place in an appropriate spot. 'The Cock' tavern, Fleet Street, Temple Bar, is so unobtrusive that, were it not for the sign of a golden cock indicating its entrance, the casual passer-by would hardly see it. A narrow entrance led me into the interior of this old-English tavern, and upon my enquiring after Mr Charles, there presented himself to me under that title a corpulent personage with as friendly a smile as if we two were already old acquaintances. This agent of the embassy, for such he was, seemed to be in a very merry mood, and his humour took sustenance in brandy and water to such an extent that for a whole length of time he seemed to forget the purpose of our meeting. Mr Charles, or, as he immediately called himself by his correct name, *Embassy Secretary Alberts*, informed me first of all that he did not actually have anything to do with police matters, but that he was nevertheless prepared to assume the role of mediator... A second rendezvous took place at his apartment at the time, 39 Brewer Street, Golden Square. Here I became acquainted for the first time with Police Lieutenant Greif, a figure cut in the true police manner, of medium height with dark hair and a beard of the same colour trimmed in regulation style, so that his moustache met his whiskers, leaving his chin free. His eyes, which betrayed anything but intelligence, seemed to have become accustomed to a bulging stare as a result of frequent association with thieves and rogues. Herr Greif wrapped himself in the same mantle of pseudonymity as had at first Herr Alberts, and called himself Mr Charles. The new Mr Charles was at least of a more serious humour. He thought that the first thing he had to do was to test



me... Our first meeting closed with his instructing me to report to him in detail on all the activities of the revolutionary refugees... On the next occasion, Herr Greif introduced me to 'his right hand' as he called him, 'that is to say one of my agents', he added. The person so named was a tall, elegantly dressed young man, who once more introduced himself to me as Mr Charles; the whole political police seem to have adopted this name as a pseudonym, and I now had three Charleses to deal with. The latest arrival, however, seemed to be the most remarkable. 'He too', as he told me, 'had been a revolutionary, but that all things were possible, all I had to do was go with him.'

Greif left London for some time and took his departure from Hirsch, with the expressive remark 'that the new Mr Charles always acted on his behalf, and that I should not have any reservations about trusting him. Even if there were many things that seemed strange to me, I should not be put off by that.' In order to make that clearer to me he added: 'The ministry requires this or that object from time to time; *documents are the main thing. If they are unobtainable, a way round has to be found!*' Hirsch goes on to say that:

... the latest Charles was *Fleury*, previously engaged in the despatch of the *Dresdener Zeitung* edited by *L Wittig*. In Baden, on the basis of recommendations he had brought from Saxony, he was sent by the provisional government to the Palatinate to take in hand the organisation of the local militia, etc. When the Prussians entered Karlsruhe, he was taken prisoner, etc. He suddenly reappeared in London at the end of 1850 or the beginning of 1851. Here he has gone by the name of de Fleury from the very beginning, and as such is to be found among the refugees in an at least apparently a bad situation, moves with them into the refugee barracks set up by the refugee committee, and enjoys their support. Early in the summer of 1851, his situation suddenly improves, he moves into a decent flat and marries at the end of the year the daughter of an English engineer. We see him later as a police agent in Paris... His real name is *Krause*, and moreover he is the son of the cobbler Krause who, together with Backhof and Beseler, was executed some 15 to 18 years ago in Dresden for the murder there of Countess Schonberg and her chambermaid... Fleury-Krause has often told me that he has worked for the government since he was 14.

This was the Fleury-Krause whom Stieber admitted in open court in Cologne to be a Prussian police spy serving directly under Greif. I say of Fleury in my *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial*: 'So Fleury is not indeed the Fleur de Marie of the police prostitutes, but he is a flower and he will bear blossom, albeit only the *fleur de lys*.' <sup>[19]</sup> To a certain extent this has been fulfilled. A few months after the Communist Trial, Fleury was sentenced in England to several years in the hulks for forgery.

'As Police Lieutenant Greif's right hand', says Hirsch, 'Fleury communicated directly with the Prussian embassy in his absence.'

Fleury was in contact with Max Reuter, who carried out the theft of the letters from Oswald Dietz, archivist of the Willich-Schapper league.

Stieber [writes Hirsch] was informed by the agent of the Prussian Ambassador in Paris, that notorious *Cherval*, of the letters that the latter had himself written to London. He merely had Reuter inform him of where they were kept, whereupon Fleury carried out the theft on Stieber's behalf with Reuter's assistance. Those are the stolen letters which Stieber was brazen enough to depose 'to be such' openly in front of the jury in Cologne... Fleury had been in Paris together with Greif and Stieber in the autumn of 1851, after the latter had already formed an association there, through the mediation of Count Hatzfeld, with that *Cherval*, or more correctly, *Joseph Cramer*, with whose help he hoped to bring the plot into existence. To that end Herren Stieber, Greif, Fleury, two additional police agents, Beckmann and Sommer, conferred in Paris together with the famous French spy, *Lucien de la Hodde* (under the name of Duprez) and issued to Cherval their instructions according to which he had to tailor his correspondence. Fleury has often had a laugh with me about that fight staged between

Stieber and Cherval. And that Schmidt who introduced himself into the association set up by Cherval *on police instructions* as the secretary of a revolutionary league of Strasburg and Cologne, that Schmidt was none other than Herr de Fleury... Fleury was undoubtedly the sole agent of the Prussian secret police in London, and all the offers and proposals made to the embassy went through his hands... Herren Greif and Stieber trusted his judgement in many cases.

Fleury revealed to Hirsch:

Herr Greif has told you how we must act... The Central Police in Frankfurt are themselves of the view that what is at stake above all *is to secure the existence of the secret police*, and that what means we use to achieve this is a matter of indifference; *one step has already been taken* with the September plot in Paris.

Greif returns to London and expresses his satisfaction with Hirsch's work, but demands more, particularly reports on '*the secret league meetings of the Marx Party*'.

A *tout prix*, concluded the Police Lieutenant, we must report on the League meetings. Do it as you wish, as long as you never exceed the bounds of probability. I myself am too *busy*. Herr Fleury will work with you on my behalf.

Greif's business at the time consisted, as Hirsch says, in correspondence with Maupas through de la Hodde-Duprez on the mock escape of Cherval and Gipperich to be arranged from the St Pelagie prison. On Hirsch's assurance that:

Marx had not set up a new central association of the league in London... Greif arranged with Fleury that under the circumstances we should, for the time being, prepare reports on league meetings ourselves; he, Greif, would take responsibility for and represent their authenticity, and whatever he submitted would be accepted anyway.

So Fleury and Hirsch set to work. The 'content' of their reports on the secret league held together by me 'was filled up', says Hirsch:

... by saying that discussions had been held from time to time, members accepted into the league, a new community set up in some corner of Germany, some reorganisation had taken place, Marx's imprisoned friends in Cologne had some prospect or no prospect of release, that letters had arrived from this or that person, etc. As far as the latter was concerned, Fleury usually mentioned people in Germany who were already under suspicion as a result of political investigations or who had developed political activity in some way or another. Very often, however, we had to rely on our imagination, and then a member of the league would probably occur whose name did not exist anywhere in the world. Herr Greif, however, thought that the reports were good, and that anyway some had to be created *a tout prix*. In part, Fleury alone took over their composition, but in the main I had to help him in this, as it was impossible for him to find the right style down to the smallest detail. This is how the reports came into being, and Herr Greif guaranteed their veracity without any reservations.

Hirsch now goes on to relate how he and Fleury visit Arnold Ruge in Brighton and Eduard Meyen (of Tobyite memory) and steal letters and lithographed correspondence from them. And that is not enough. Greif-Fleury rent a lithographic press in the Stanbury print-shop in Fetter Lane and, together with Hirsch, now make 'radical leaflets' themselves. There is a lesson for 'democrat' Frederick Zabel here. Let him listen:

The first leaflet I [Hirsch] made was, in accordance with Fleury's instructions, entitled *To the Rural Proletariat*, and we succeeded in running off a few good copies of it. Herr Greif sent these in as if they originated from the *Marx Party*, and, to add plausibility, included a few words about the distribution of such a leaflet in the reports of the so-called league meetings which were fabricated in the manner described. A similar fabrication also occurred under the title *To the Children of the People*. I do not know under what signature Herr Greif sent it in this time. Later this trick was dropped, chiefly because so much money was wasted doing it.

Cherval now arrives in London after his mock escape from Paris, and is provisionally attached to Greif with a wage of £1 10s per week, 'in return for which he was required to report on contacts between the German and French refugees'.

Publicly exposed in the Workers' Association and expelled as a *mouchard*:

Cherval, for easily explicable reasons, represented the German emigrants and their organs as being as insignificant as possible, since, after all, it was completely impossible for him to supply anything whatsoever from this quarter. He therefore drafted for Greif a report on the non-German revolutionary party which outdid Munchhausen.

Hirsch now returns to the Cologne trial:

Herr Greif had already been questioned on several occasions on the contents of his reports on the League manufactured by Fleury at his behest... Specific orders, too, would arrive on the subject. On one occasion Marx was supposed to be corresponding with *Lassalle* by way of an ale-house, and the Public Prosecutor wished to see investigations instituted in this matter... Even more naive was a request from the Public Prosecutor asking to receive more detailed information on the financial support Lassalle was said to be sending to Roser imprisoned in Cologne. The money, that is, was thought to be really coming from England.

It has already been mentioned in Chapter III, Section IV how, on Hinckeldy's instructions, Fleury was supposed to dig somebody up in London to represent before the Cologne assize the runaway witness H, etc. After describing this incident in detail, Hirsch continues:

Herr Stieber had meanwhile insistently demanded that Greif should if possible supply original minutes of the league meetings he had reported. Fleury thought that, if only we had a few people available, he would be able to produce some original minutes, but that, in particular, *the handwriting of some of Marx's friends was needed*. I used this last remark to reject the idea. Fleury only came to speak of this matter once more, and then he was silent about it. At this time Herr Stieber suddenly emerged in Cologne with a minutes-book of the central association of the league meeting in London... I was even more astonished when I recognised in the extracts from the minutes published in the journals an almost exact copy of the reports forged by Fleury at Greif's behest. Herr Greif or Herr Stieber themselves had therefore managed after all by some means to produce a *copy, for the minutes in this alleged original bore signatures, while those that Fleury had handed in were not provided with them*. All that I learned from Fleury himself about this miraculous phenomenon was 'that nothing was beyond Stieber, the affair would raise a storm'!!

As soon as Fleury learned that 'Marx' had had the genuine handwriting of the alleged signatories of the minutes (Liebknecht, Rings, Ulmer, etc) witnessed before a London Police Court, he composed the following letter:

To the Royal Police Presidium in Berlin. London. With the aim of representing the signatures of the signatories of the League minutes to be false, Marx and his friends intend to have signatures witnessed here which will then be submitted to the assizes as the genuine signatures. Everybody who knows the English law also knows that in this respect it allows itself to be twisted and turned, and that he who vouches the authenticity of a thing at bottom does not really guarantee anything at all. The supplier of this information is not afraid to sign his name in a matter in which the truth is at stake. **Becker**, 4 Litchfield Street.

Fleury knew the address of Becker, a German refugee who lived in the same house as *Willich*, so that afterwards suspicion of being the author could all the more easily fall on the latter as an opponent of Marx... Fleury was delighted in advance with the scandal it would cause. Of course, the letter would be read out so late, he thought, that any doubts about its authenticity could only be sorted out after the trial... The letter signed Becker was addressed to the *Police Presidium in Berlin*, but went, not to Berlin, but to 'Police Officer Goldheim, Frankfurter Hof in Cologne', and an *envelope for the letter* went to the Police Presidium in Berlin with the covering note: '**Herr Stieber in Cologne will give you**

*more precise information on its purpose.* ... Herr Stieber made no use of the letter. He made no use of it because he was forced to drop the whole *minutes-book*.

In relation to the latter, Hirsch says:

Herr Stieber declares [before the court] he had had it in his hands 14 days previously and considered the matter before making use of it. He further stated that it had come to him by courier in the person of Greif... Greif had consequently brought over his own work — but how does this fit in with a letter from Herr *Goldheim*? Herr Goldheim writes to the embassy ‘that the minutes-book had only been brought so late so as to avoid the success of any questions as to its authenticity’...

Herr Goldheim arrived in London on Friday, 29 October.

Herr Stieber, that is, was faced with the impossibility of maintaining the authenticity of the minutes-book. He therefore sent a deputy to negotiate with Fleury on the spot. The question was whether proof could not be obtained in one way or another. His discussions remained fruitless and he went back empty-handed, leaving Fleury in a state of desperation. Stieber, that is, was determined to expose him in case the police chiefs were compromised. I did not learn that this was the cause of Fleury’s anxiety until I saw the statement by Herr Stieber that followed shortly afterwards. In dismay Fleury now tried his last resource. He brought me a specimen of handwriting in which I was to copy out a statement and sign it with the name ‘Liebknecht’. I was then to swear to it before the Lord Mayor of London, declaring that I was Liebknecht... Fleury said that the handwriting was that of the man who had written the minutes-book, and *that Herr Goldheim had brought it* [from Cologne]. But, if Herr Stieber had just received the minutes-book from London by the courier Greif, how could Herr Goldheim bring a sample of the handwriting of the person who had allegedly written it from Cologne at a time when Greif had only just returned to London? ... All that Fleury gave me was a few words and the signature... I [Hirsch] copied the handwriting as exactly as possible and wrote in it a statement that the undersigned, that is Liebknecht, declared the legalisation of their signatures by Marx and Co was false and that this, his signature, was the only authentic one. When I had finished my work and had in my hands the specimen [that is the specimen given to him by Fleury for copying] which I fortunately still possess, I expressed my doubts to Fleury, which surprised him not a little, and roundly turned down his request. Disconsolate at first, he then told me that he would swear the oath himself... for safety’s sake, however, he told me he would *have the sample countersigned by the Prussian Consul*, and he went straight off to the latter’s office. I waited for him in a tavern. When he returned he had obtained the counter-signature and he thereupon betook himself to the Lord Mayor, intending to swear the oath. But things did not go smoothly; the Lord Mayor demanded further guarantees which Fleury could not furnish, and the swearing of the oath did not take place... Late at night I saw Herr de Fleury once more for the last time. That very day he had had the nasty surprise of reading Herr Stieber’s statement concerning him in the *Kolnische-Zeitung*! ‘*But I know there was nothing else for Stieber to do*’, Herr Fleury very rightly consoled himself, ‘otherwise he would have had to compromise himself.’ ... ‘*A blow would fall in Berlin if the Cologne defendants were found guilty*’, Herr Fleury told me on one of the last days that I saw him.

Fleury’s last meeting with Hirsch took place at the *end of October 1852*; Hirsch’s confessions are dated the *end of November 1852*; and at the *end of March 1853* the ‘*blow in Berlin*’ (the Ladendorf conspiracy) fell.

## V: Slanders

After the conclusion of the Cologne Communist trial, Vogt-like slanders about my ‘exploitation’ of the workers were busily peddled about, particularly in the German-American press. A few of my friends living in America — Herr Joseph Weydemeyer, Dr A Jacobi (medical practitioner in New York, one of the accused in the Cologne Communist trial) and A Cluss (an official at the United

States Navy Yard in Washington) — published a detailed refutation of this nonsense dated New York, 7 November 1853, with the comment that I had the right to *keep silent* about my private affairs as far as the *favour* of the petty bourgeois was concerned. ‘But *in the face of* the mob, the petty bourgeois and the degenerate idler it does in our view harm the cause, and *we shall break the silence.*’

## VI: The War of the Frogs and the Mice

In my pamphlet quoted earlier, *The Knight*, one can read on page 5:

The ‘Agitation Association’ was founded on 20 July 1851, and the German ‘Emigration Club’ on 27 July 1851. From that day on... dated the struggle waged on both sides of the ocean between ‘Emigration’ and ‘Agitation’, the great war of the frogs and the mice began.

Where find the words, o how am I to write,  
And these mighty deeds with justice full to tell?  
For prouder struggles waged with bitterer spite  
Since the world’s creation never yet befell;  
All other battles, however hard the fight  
Were mere beds of roses, and my poetic spell  
Forsakes me here, where bravery and glory  
With equal honour shine through this great battle’s story.

(After Boiardo, *Orlando Inamorato*, Canto 27)

Now it is by no means my intention to go into any greater detail here on ‘this great battle’s story’, nor yet the ‘Preliminaries to a *Treaty of Union*’ (published in full under that title in the whole German-American press) agreed between *Gottfried Kinkel* on behalf of the Emigration Association and *A Goegg* on behalf of the ‘Revolutionary League of the Two Worlds’. I will only remark that the entire body of *parliamentary* refugees, with few exceptions (at that time every party avoided names like *K Vogt* out of a simple sense of decency) took part in the masquerade on one side or the other.

At the end of his shadow-boxing excursion around the United States, *Gottfried Kinkel*, the passion flower of German Philistinism, expressed in the *Memorandum on the German National Loan for the Advancement of the Revolution*, dated Elmira in the State of New York, 22 February 1852, views which at least possess the virtue of extreme simplicity. *Gottfried* thinks that making revolutions is the same as making railways. Once the money is there, the railway will make itself in the one case and the revolution in the other. While the nation carries the urge towards revolution in its bosom, the revolution-makers must carry cash in their pockets, and therefore everything depends on ‘a small, well-equipped troop, *richly* provided with money’. One can see into what mental aberrations the mercantile wind from England blows even melodramatic brains. Since here everything, even ‘public opinion’, is created with the help of stocks and shares, why not have a joint-stock company ‘for the advancement of the revolution’?

At a public encounter with *Kossuth*, who at that time was also indulging in revolutionary shadow-boxing in the United States, *Gottfried* gave vent to the most aesthetic utterance:

Even from your pure hand, Governor, freedom granted would be a hard morsel of bread for me, which I would bathe *with the tears of my shame.*

Having looked this gift horse so abruptly in the mouth, *Gottfried* assured the Governor that if the latter handed him ‘the Revolution in the East’ with his right hand, he, *Gottfried*, would hand him ‘the Revolution in the West’ with his right hand. Seven years later that very same *Gottfried*, in the ‘*Hermann*’ that he himself set up, assured us that he was a man of rare consistency. Having called, before the Court Martial at Rastatt, for the Prince Regent to be Emperor of Germany, he said, he had always held fast to that slogan.

One of the original three Imperial Regents was Count Oskar Reichenbach, who was also treasurer of the Revolutionary Loan. Dated *London, 8 October 1852*, he published a statement of accounts together with a declaration severing his association with the undertaking. At the same time, however, he said: ‘In any case I cannot and shall not hand over the money to *Citizens Kinkel* [etc].’ On the

contrary, he called on the shareholders to cash in the provisional loan certificates against the cash still in hand. He said that he had been forced to resign the treasurer's position:

... for political and legal reasons... the prerequisites on which the idea of the loan was based have not been met. The loan was only to have been proceeded with after the sum of \$20,000 had been realised, and this had not been reached... No support has been forthcoming for the proposal to set up a periodical to carry out intellectual agitation. To say that it is possible to carry on with the loan now and to guarantee in an active revolutionary way that is equally fair to all parties, that is to say impersonal, at this moment, is only political charlatanism or revolutionary monomania.

However, Gottfried's faith in the revolution was not so easily shaken. For that purpose he obtained a 'resolution' that allowed him to carry on the business under another name.

Reichenbach's statement of accounts contains interesting data.

The guarantors cannot be held responsible [he said], for any contributions paid later by the committees *to anybody other than myself*. I ask the committees to take this into account in accepting certificates back and settling them.

According to his statement of accounts *receipts* totalled £1587 6s 4d, to which London had contributed £2 5s and 'Germany' £9. *Payments* amounted to £584 18s 5d, and were made up as follows: *Kinkel's* and *Hillgartner's travelling expenses*: £220; *other travellers*: £54; lithographic press: £11; production of the provisional loan certificates: £14; *lithographic correspondence, postage, etc*: £106 1s 6d. *On the instructions of Kinkel, etc*: £100.

The revolutionary loan ended up as £1000 which Gottfried Kinkel is keeping in the Westminster Bank ready as earnest money for the first German provisional government. And despite that is there still no provisional government! Perhaps Germany thinks she has enough on her hands with 36 definitive governments.

Individual American loan funds which were not incorporated into the central fund in London did at least find a patriotic application here and there, such as, for example, the £100 that Gottfried Kinkel handed over to Herr Karl Blind early in 1858 to be turned into 'radical leaflets', etc.

## VII: The Palmerston Polemic

Council Hall  
Sheffield  
6 May 1856  
Dr Karl Marx

### Doctor

The Sheffield Foreign Affairs Committee instruct me to convey to you an expression of their warm thanks for the great public service you have rendered by your admirable *exposé* of the Kars-papers published in the *People's Paper*.

I have the honour, etc

**Wm Cycles**

Secretary

## VIII: Statement by Herr A Schemer

Herr *A Scherzer*, who has played a notable part in the workers' movement since the 1830s, writes to me, dated London, 22 April 1860:

**Dear Citizen**

I must protest against a passage that concerns me personally in the tissue of lies and infamous slanders in Vogt's pamphlet. In document no 7, the reprint from the *Schweizer Handels-Courier*, no 150 of 2 June, supplement, it says: 'We know that at present renewed efforts are being made from London. From there, letters signed A

Sch... are being sent to associations and individuals, etc.' No doubt it is those 'letters' that cause Vogt to write, in another part of his book: 'At the beginning of this year (1859), however, new soil for political agitation seemed to offer itself. The opportunity was immediately seized in order, if possible, to regain some influence. In this respect tactics have not changed in years. A committee, about which "nobody knows nothing", as it says in the old song, sends out letters through a president or correspondence secretary who is also completely unknown, etc, etc. When the ground has been sounded out in this way, some "travelling brethren" drop in to the country and immediately busy themselves with setting up a secret society. The association itself which it is intended to compromise learns nothing of these intrigues, which remain the activity of a separate little group of individuals. In the main, even the correspondence which is carried out in the association's name is completely unknown to the latter. But the letters always say 'our association', etc, and the complaints by the police that later invariably follow, and are based on seized documents, always affect the whole association, etc.'

Why has Herr K not printed the whole letter that he hints at in document no 7? Why does he not 'sound out' the source from which it emanated? He could easily have learned that the public London German Workers' Educational Association appointed, at a public meeting, a correspondence committee to which I had the honour to be elected. If Herr Vogt speaks of unknown correspondents and all that, I am delighted to be unknown to him but I am also glad to say that I am known to thousands of German workers who have all partaken of the knowledge of men after which he thirsts. Times have changed. The days of the secret societies are over. It is absurd to talk of secret societies and the activities of separate little groups when the cause can be discussed openly in a workers' association where strangers take part in every meeting as visitors. The letters I signed were composed in a way that could not harm a hair on anybody's head. All that we German workers in London were concerned to do was to find out the mood of workers on the continent and to set up a newspaper that would represent the interests of the working class and take the field against writers in foreign pay. Naturally, it never occurred to any German workers to act in the interests of a Bonaparte; only a Vogt or his ilk is capable of that. We certainly abhor the despotism of Austria more earnestly than does Herr Vogt, but we do not seek its overthrow through the victory of a foreign despot. Every people must free itself. Is it not remarkable that Herr Vogt claims for himself the right to use methods which, when we turned them against his activities, he said made us criminals? Herr Vogt asserts that he is not paid by Bonaparte, but has only received money for setting up a newspaper from democratic hands, and thinks that that has washed him clean. How then can he be so block-headed, despite all his learning, to accuse and cast suspicion upon workers who are concerned for the good of their fatherland and are carrying out propaganda for setting up a newspaper?

Yours faithfully

**A Scherzer**

## **IX: Letters from Herr Orges**

Augsburg 16–10

**Dear Sir**

I received news from Herr Liebknecht today that you will be so good as to place at our disposal a legal document *concerning the origins* of the leaflet against Vogt. I urgently ask you to send me the same as quickly as is at all possible, so that we can produce it. Please send the document by registered post and charge any expenses to us. For the rest, dear sir, the liberal press from time to time misjudges the *Allgemeine Zeitung*: we (the editorial board) have survived all the trials by fire and by water as to the firmness of our political convictions. Do not consider our work piece by piece, the individual

article, but as a whole, and then you must conclude that no German paper strives as we do, without haste but also without rest, for unity and freedom, power and education, mental and material progress, and to raise the level of national feeling and morality in the German people. You must judge our deeds by their effect.

Once more most urgently pressing that you will be so good as to grant my request, I am most respectfully,

Your faithful servant

**Hermann Orges**

The second letter, of the *same* date, was simply an *extract* of the first, 'also sent', as Herr Orges writes, 'for the sake of greater safety'. It similarly demands 'that the documents which, as Herr Liebknecht writes, you have been so good as to place at our disposal *on the origins* of the leaflet against Vogt should be sent to us as quickly as possible'.

## **X: Circular Against Karl Blind**

I shall only print here the conclusion of my English circular against Blind dated 4 February 1860:

Now, before taking any further steps, I want to show up the fellows who evidently have played into the hands of Vogt. I, therefore, publicly declare that the statement of Blind, Wiehe and Hollinger, according to which the anonymous pamphlet was *not* printed in Hollinger's office, 3 Litchfield Street, Soho, is a *deliberate lie*. First Mr Vögele, one of the compositors formerly employed by Hollinger, will declare upon oath that the said pamphlet *was* printed in Hollinger's office, was written in the handwriting of *Mr Blind*, and partly composed by Hollinger himself. Secondly, it can be judicially proved that the pamphlet and the article in the *Das Volk* have been taken off the same type. Thirdly, it will be shown that Wiehe was *not* employed by Hollinger for 11 consecutive months, and, especially, was *not* employed by him at the time of the pamphlet's publication. Lastly, witnesses may be summoned in whose presence Wiehe himself confessed having been persuaded to sign the *wilfully false declaration in the Augsburg Gazette*. Consequently I again declare the above said *Charles Blind* to be a *deliberate liar*.

**Karl Marx**

From the London *Times*, 3 February: Vienna, 30 January — The Swiss Professor Vogt pretends to know that France will procure for Switzerland Faucigny, Chablais and the Genovese, the neutral provinces of Savoy, if the Grand Council of the Republic will let her have the free use of the Simplon.

## **XI: Vögele's Affidavit**

I declare herewith: That the German flysheet *Zur Warnung (As a Warning)* which was afterwards reprinted in no 7 (dated 18 June 1859) of *Das Volk* (a German newspaper which was then published in London) and which was again reprinted in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of Augsburg (the *Augsburg Gazette*) — that this flysheet was composed partly by Mr Fidelio Hollinger of 3 Litchfield Street, Soho, London, partly by myself who was then employed by Mr Fidelio Hollinger, and that the flysheet was published in Mr Hollinger's Printing Office, 3 Litchfield Street, Soho, London; that the manuscript of the said flysheet was in the handwriting of Mr Charles Blind; that I saw Mr Hollinger give to Mr William Liebknecht of 14 Church Street, Soho, London, the proof-sheet of the flysheet *Zur Warnung*; that Mr Hollinger hesitated at first giving the proof-sheet to Mr W Liebknecht, and that, when Mr Liebknecht had withdrawn, he, Mr F Hollinger, expressed to me and to my fellow workman JF Wiehe, his regret for having given the proof-sheet out of his hands.

Declared at the Police Court, Bow Street, in the County of Middlesex, the eleventh day of February 1860, before me, *Th Henry*, one of the Police Magistrates of the Metropolis.



**A Vögele**

## **XII: Wiehe's Affidavit**

One of the first days of November last — I do not recollect the exact date — in the evening between nine and ten o'clock I was taken out of bed by Mr F Hollinger, in whose house I then lived, and by whom I was employed as compositor. He presented to me a paper to the effect that, during the previous 11 months I had been continuously employed by him, and that during all that time a certain German flysheet *Zur Warnung (As a Warning)* had not been composed and printed in Mr Hollinger's Office, 3 Litchfield Street, Soho. In my perplexed state, and not aware of the importance of the transaction, I complied with his wish and copied and signed the document. Mr Hollinger promised me money, but I never received anything. During that transaction Mr Charles Blind, as my wife informed me at the time, was waiting in Mr Hollinger's room. A few days later, Mrs Hollinger called me down from dinner and led me into her husband's room, where I found Mr Charles Blind alone. He presented me the same paper which Mr Hollinger had presented me before, and entreated me to write, and sign a second copy, as he wanted two, the one for himself and the other for publication in the press. He added that he would show himself grateful to me. I copied and signed again the paper.

I herewith declare the truth of the above statements and that:

1: During the 11 months mentioned in the document I was for *six* weeks *not* employed by Mr Hollinger but by a Mr Ermani. 2: I did not work in Mr Hollinger's office just at that time when the flysheet *Zur Warnung (As a Warning)* was published. 3: I heard at the time from Mr Vögele, who then worked for Mr Hollinger, that he, Vögele, had, together with Mr Hollinger himself, composed the flysheet in question, and that the manuscript was in Mr Blind's handwriting. 4: The types of the pamphlet were still standing when I returned to Mr Hollinger's service. I myself broke them into columns for the reprint of the flysheet (or pamphlet) *Zur Warnung (As a Warning)* in the German paper *Das Volk (The People)* published at London, by Mr Fidelio Hollinger, 3 Litchfield Street, Soho. The flysheet appeared in no 7, dd 18 June 1859, of *Das Volk (The People)*. 5: I saw Mr Hollinger give to Mr William Liebknecht of 14 Church Street, Soho, London, the proof-sheet of the pamphlet *Zur Warnung*, on which proof-sheet Mr Charles Blind with his own hand had corrected four or five mistakes. Mr Hollinger hesitated at first giving the proof-sheet to Mr Liebknecht, and when Mr Liebknecht had withdrawn, he, F Hollinger, expressed to me and my fellow workman Vögele his regret for having given the proof-sheet out of his hands.

Declared and signed by the said Johann Friedrich Wiehe at the Police Court, Bow Street, this 8th day of February 1860, before me *Th Henry* Magistrate of the said court.

LS

**Johann Friedrich Wiehe**

## **XIII: From the Trial Documents.**

Provisional Government

French Republic

Liberty, Equality, Fraternity

In the Name of the French People

Paris

1 March 1848

**Good and loyal Marx**

The soil of the French Republic is a place of asylum for all the friends of liberty. Tyranny banned you, free France reopens her gates to you, to you and to all those who fight for the holy cause, the fraternal cause of all the peoples. Every agent of the French government has to interpret his duty in this sense.

With fraternal greetings.

**Ferdinand Flocon**

Member of the Provisional Government

\* \* \*

Brussels

16 May 1848

**My dear Mr Marx**

It is with great pleasure that I learn from our friend Weerth that you are going to bring out in Cologne a *New Rhenish Gazette*, the prospectus for which he has sent me. It is certainly necessary to have this newspaper to keep us in Belgium up to date with the affairs of the German democrats, as it is impossible to learn anything about them from the *Cologne Gazette*, the *General Gazette* of Augsburg and the other aristocratic German newspapers we receive in Brussels, any more than we can through our own *Indépendance Belge*, all of whose special reports are written from the point of view of the interests of our Belgian aristocracy. Mr Weerth tells me that his aim is to join you in Cologne to contribute to the undertaking of the *New Rhenish Gazette*; on your behalf he has also promised to send me the paper in exchange for the *Debat Social* which I, for my part, shall send to you. I could ask no better than to keep up in this way correspondence between us on the common affairs of our two countries. It is essential, in the interests of the two countries, that Belgians and Germans should not remain strangers to each other, for events are being prepared in France which will bring into play questions which affect the two countries jointly. I have just returned from Paris, where I spent ten days which I used to the best of my ability to study the situation in the great capital. At the end of my stay I found myself just in the middle of the events of 15 May. I was even present at the session of the National Assembly where the people burst in... What I have understood by seeing the attitude of the people of Paris and hearing the people who are at the moment prominent in the affairs of the French republic is that a strong reaction by the bourgeois spirit is expected against the events of February last; no doubt the events of 15 May will precipitate this reaction. Well, this will undoubtedly lead in a very short time to a new rising of the people... Soon France will have to have recourse to a war. It is against this eventuality that we will have to discuss, here and in your country, what we shall have to do together. If the war is directed primarily against Italy, we shall have a reprieve... but if it is directed immediately against this country, I am not really sure what we shall have to do, and then we shall need the advice of Germans... Meanwhile I shall announce the forthcoming publication of your paper in Sunday's *Debat Social*...<sup>[20]</sup> I expect to go to London towards the end of the coming month of June. Should you have occasion to write to any of your friends in London, please be so kind as to ask them to receive me there.

Cordially yours,

**L Jottrand**

Advocate

\* \* \*

Brussels

10 February 1860

**My dear Marx**

Having had no news of you for a very long time, I received your last letter with the liveliest satisfaction. You complain about the slow pace of things, and the lack of urgency on my part to reply to the question you asked me. What am I to do: old age slows my pen; I hope, nevertheless, that you will find my opinions and my sentiments unchanged. I see that your last letter was written to your dictation by the hand of your private secretary, your adorable better half; well, Mrs Marx has never

forgotten the old hermit of Brussels. I hope she will graciously deign to accept my respectful greetings.

Keep me, dear colleague, always in your friendship.

Fraternal greetings

**Lelewel**

\* \* \*

5 Cambridge Place

Kensington

London

11 February 1860

**My dear Marx**

I have read a series of infamous slanders against you in the *National-Zeitung* and am utterly astonished at the falsehood and malignity of the writer. I really feel it duty that every one who is acquainted with you should, however unnecessary such a testimony must be, pay a tribute to the worth, honour and disinterestedness of your character. It becomes doubly incumbent on me to do so, when I recollect how many little articles you contributed to my little magazine, the *Notes to the People* and subsequently to the *People's Paper* <sup>[21]</sup> for a series of years, utterly gratuitously; articles which were of such high value to the people's cause, and of such great benefit to the paper. Permit me to hope that you will severely punish your dastardly and unmanly libeller.

Believe me, my dear Marx, most sincerely, yours

**Ernest Jones**

\* \* \*

*Tribune* Office

New York

8 March 1860

Dr Charles Marx

**My dear Sir**

In reply to your request I am very happy to state the facts of your connection with various publications in the United States concerning which I have had a personal knowledge. Nearly nine years ago I engaged you to write for the *New York Tribune*, and the engagement has been continued ever since. You have written for us constantly, without a single week's interruption, that I can remember, and you are not only one of the most highly valued, but one of the best paid contributors attached to the journal. The only fault I have to find with you has been that you have occasionally exhibited too German a tone of feeling for an American newspaper. This has been the case with reference both to Russia and France. In questions relating to both, Czarism and Bonapartism, I have sometimes thought that you manifested too much interest and too great anxiety for the unity and independence of Germany. This was more striking perhaps in connection with the late Italian war than on any other occasion. In that I agreed perfectly with you: *sympathy with the Italian people*, I had as little confidence as you in the sincerity of the French Emperor, and believed as little as you that *Italian liberty* was to be expected from him; but I did not think that Germany had any such ground for alarm as you, in common with other patriotic Germans, thought she had.

I must add that in all your writings that have passed through my hands, you have always manifested the most cordial interest in the welfare and progress of the labouring classes; and that you have written much with direct reference to that end.

I have also at various times within the past five or six years been the medium through which contributions of yours have been furnished to *Putnam's Monthly*, a literary magazine of high

character; and also to the *New American Cyclopaedia*, of which I am also an editor, and for which you have furnished some very important articles.

If any other explanations are needed, I shall be happy to furnish them. Meanwhile I remain, yours very faithfully.

**Charles A Dana**

Managing Editor of the *NY Tribune*

#### XIV: Dentu Pamphlets

I have shown that the Dentu pamphlets are the source from which the German Da-Da has drawn his wisdom on world history in general and ‘*Napoleon’s beneficial policies*’ in particular. The ‘*beneficial policies of Napoleon*’ is a phrase from a recent lead article by the ‘democrat’ *F Zabel*. What the *French* themselves think of and know about these pamphlets can be seen from the following extract from the Paris weekly *Courier du Dimanche*, no 42, 14 October 1860.

As far as the present moment is concerned, take any ten pamphlets, and you will see that at least nine have been thought up, worked out and written... by whom? By professional novelists, song-writers, vaudeville artists, sacristans!

Is there talk in the newspapers of mysterious interviews between the powers of the North, of the resuscitation of the Holy Alliance? Then along comes an agreeable maker of couplets that are literary enough and (once) even passably liberal. He runs off to the inevitable *M Dentu* and brings him, under the high falutin’ title, *The Coalition*, a long and insipid paraphrase of the articles of M Grandguillot. Does the English Alliance sometimes seem to displease M Limayrac? Along comes a M Chatelet, a knight of the order of Gregory the Great, who, to go by his style, is a sacristan somewhere, and he publishes or republished a long and ridiculous history: *The Crimes and Misdemeanors of England Against France*. Already the author of *Grandpa Guillery* (Edmond About) has thought it in order to enlighten us on the political secrets of the Prussian monarchy and, from the heights of his theatrical diarrhoea, to advise caution to the Berlin chambers. It is announced that M Clairville is shortly going to elucidate the question of the Panama Isthmus which M Belly so mixed up; and no doubt a few days after the royal conference of 21 October we will see appear in the windows of all our bookshops a splendid pink pamphlet bearing the title: *Memoir on the Warsaw Interview by the Corps de Ballet of the Opera*.

*This apparently inexplicable invasion of political questions by the dii minores* of literature has a number of causes. We shall only quote one single one here, but it is the most immediate and the most incontestable.

In the almost universal decay of the spirit and the heart, these gentlemen who follow the sad calling of amusers of the public no longer know how to shake their readers awake. The old joys of their refrains and their anecdotes constantly haunt them. They themselves feel as mournful, sad and bored as those they undertake to amuse. That is why, running out of resources and in despair, some of them have started to write biographies of prostitutes and others diplomatic pamphlets.

And then one fine morning a literary adventurer who has never sacrificed a single hour of serious study to politics, and does not even have the shadow of a conviction of any sort in his breast, gets up and says: ‘I must strike a great blow! What shall I do to attract public attention to myself, since it instinctively flees from me? Shall I write a little opus on the leotard question or the Eastern question? Shall I reveal to an astonished world the secrets of boudoirs I have never entered, or those of Russian politics, which I know even less about? Should I wax tender in Voltairean prose on *fallen women* or in evangelical prose on the unfortunate Maronite peoples persecuted, plundered and massacred by fanatical Mahomedans? Should I launch an apologia for Mademoiselle Rigolboche or a plea in favour of temporal power? I shall definitely choose politics. I shall entertain my audience much more with kings and emperors

than with grisettes.’ Having said this, our bohemian literary supernumerary devours the *Moniteur*, haunts the colonnades of the Bourse for a few days, visits a few officials, and ends up knowing which way the wind of public interest is blowing and which way that of court favour. He then chooses a title that this wind can inflate sufficiently, and rests content upon his laurels. He has already done everything necessary, for all that counts where pamphlets are concerned nowadays is the title and the author’s relations with ‘highly placed personages’.

Is it necessary to say, after that, what the pamphlets that are inundating us are worth? Take your courage in both hands one day and try to read one of them through to the end. You will be horrified by the unheard-of ignorance and the intolerable insouciance, not to say loss of moral sense they reveal in their authors. I am not speaking of the worst ones here... And each year bows us further down, each year sees a new sign of intellectual decadence appear, each year adds a new literary shame to those that we already have to blush for, so that even the most optimistic sometimes start to worry about the morrow, and ask in anguish: Where will it all end?

Above, I quoted the phrase ‘*the beneficial policies of Napoleon*’ from the *National-Zeitung*. Oddly enough, the Paris correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* — whose usually accurate reporting is recognised all over England — relates the following curious fact dated Paris, 8 November... ‘Louis Napoleon spends his gold in vain supporting such newspapers as the *National-Zeitung*.’ (*Manchester Guardian* 12 November 1860)

However, I believe that the correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, who is usually well informed, has made a mistake this time. F Zabel, that is, is supposed to have deserted to the Bonapartist camp to prove that he has not been *bought by Austria*. At least, that is what was reported to me from Berlin, and it fits — *the Dunciad*.

## XV: Postscript

a) **K Vogt and ‘La Cimentaire’**: While this last section was going through the press, the *October* [1860] issue of *Stimmen der Zeit* accidentally fell into my hands. *A Kolatschek*, previously the publisher of the *Deutsche Monats-schrift*, the organ of the runaway parliamentarians, who is thus to a certain extent the ‘Runaway Regent’s’ superior, relates the following about his *friend Karl Vogt* on page 37:

The Geneva joint-stock company ‘La Cimentaire’, which had as one of its directors none other than Herr *Karl Vogt* himself, was set up in 1857. By 1858 the shareholders did not have a penny left, and the public prosecutor immediately locked up one of the directors on a charge of fraud. At the time the director was arrested, Herr Vogt was in Berne. He hurriedly returned, the arrested man was released and the trial was suppressed ‘to avoid a scandal’. The shareholders, however, lost everything. Faced with such an example, one could hardly claim that the protection of property is very sound in Geneva. Herr *Karl Vogt’s* error in this respect is all the stranger in that he was, as has been said, *one of the directors of the said company*. In such cases, even in France, the guilty parties are sought among the directors, they are imprisoned and their property is used to cover the civil claims of the shareholders.

Compare this with what JP Becker said in his letter (Chapter X) about the banking events that drove Mr *James Fazy* into the arms of December. Details of this kind contribute a great deal to solve the riddle of how ‘Napoleon le Petit’ became the greatest man of his age. As we know, ‘Napoleon le Petit’ himself had to choose between a *coup d’état* and — Clichy. <sup>[22]</sup>

b) **Kossuth**: The following extract from a memorandum of a conversation with *Kossuth* is striking proof of how precisely Kossuth knows that *Russia* is Hungary’s main danger. The memorandum comes from one of the most famous radical members of the present House of Commons.

Memorandum of a conversation with M Kossuth on the evening of 30 May 1854, at...

A return to strict legality in Hungary [said he, viz Kossuth] might renew the union of Hungary and Austria, and would prevent *Russia* from finding any partisan in Hungary.

He [Kossuth] would not offer any opposition to a return to legality. He would advise his countrymen to accept with good faith such a restoration, if it could be obtained, and would pledge himself not in any way to be an obstacle to such an arrangement. He would not himself return to Hungary. He would not himself put forward such a course of Austria as he had no belief in Austria's return to legality, except under pressure of dire necessity. He gave me authority to say, such were his sentiments, and if appealed to, he should avow them, though he could not commit himself to any proposal, as he should not expect Austria to abandon her traditional scheme of centralisation till forced to do so... He would have consented in 1848 to Hungarian troops being sent to resist attacks of the Piedmontese [in 1848, Herr Kossuth went much further, forcing through the despatch of Hungarian troops against the Italian 'rebels' with an impassioned speech in the Pest parliament], but he would not employ them to coerce Austrian Italy, as he would not consent to foreign troops in Hungary.

The ability of the popular imagination to create myths has manifested itself in every epoch in the invention of 'Great Men'. The most striking example of this kind is unquestionably *Simon Bolivar*. As far as *Kossuth* is concerned, he is celebrated, for example, as the man who abolished feudalism in Hungary. Nevertheless, he is totally innocent of the three great measures — universal taxation, abolition of the feudal impositions on the peasants, and removal of the tithe without compensation. The motion in favour of *universal taxation* (the nobility had previously been exempt) was tabled by *Szemere*, the motion for the abolition of socage, etc, by *Bonis*, the deputy for Szabolcz, and it was the clergy itself, in the person of the deputy and canon Jekelfalusy, who voluntarily renounced the tithe.

c) **Edmond About's *La Prusse en 1860***: At the end of Chapter VIII, I express the view that *E About's pamphlet La Prusse en 1860* or, as it was originally called, *Napoleon III et la Prusse*, is a retranslation back into French of extracts from Da-Da Vogt's German version of a compilation of Dentu pamphlets. The only consideration that spoke against this view was that failed playwright E About's total ignorance of the German language. However, why should *Compere Guillery* not have found a *Commere allemande* in Paris? Who this commere was remained a matter of conjecture for the critic. *La Prusse en 1860* was, as we know, written as a vademecum for Louis Bonaparte's journey to Baden-Baden. <sup>[23]</sup> It was supposed to improve his standing with the Crown Prince and make it clear to Prussia that, as the closing words of the pamphlet say, Prussia possesses in 2 December an 'allié très utile, qui est peut-être appelé à lui rendre de grands services, pourvu qu'elle s'y prête un peu'. <sup>[24]</sup> In German that 'pourvu qu'elle s'y prête un peu' means: 'provided Prussia sells the Rhine Provinces to France', as E About had already let slip in French in the *Opinion Nationale* in the spring of 1860 (see above Chapter IX, Agency). Under these aggravating circumstances, I am unwilling to name anybody by name as the German prompter of the failed playwright and Dentu-pamphleteer E About on the basis of mere supposition. Now, however, I can state with authority that compere Guillery's German commere is none other than Vogt's sweet Cunegonde — *Herr Ludwig Simon of Trier*. The German refugee in London who wrote the famous reply to About's pamphlet can scarcely have suspected that!

## XVI: Additional Material by Marx on the Vogt Case

**Karl Marx, Letter to the Editor of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* (*Allgemeine Zeitung*, no 300, 27 October 1859)**

19 October 1859  
9 Grafton Terrace  
Maitland Park  
Haverstock Hill  
London  
**Sir**

As long as I had a hand in the German press I attacked the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and the *Allgemeine Zeitung* attacked me. That of course does not prevent me from giving what assistance I can to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* in a case where, in my opinion, it has fulfilled the *first* duty of the press, that of denouncing humbug. The enclosed document would be a *legal* document here in London. I do not know whether it is so in *Augsburg*. I obtained the said document because Blind refused to answer for the remarks he made to me and others and which I repeated to Liebknecht, remarks that could have left him in no doubt about the denunciation contained in the anonymous leaflet.

Yours faithfully

**Dr K Marx**

\* \* \*

**On Karl Vogt's Action Against the *Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung* (*Die Reform*, no 139, 19 November 1859, Supplement)**

London

7 November 1859

I see from no 132 of the *Freischütz* sent to me by a friend in Hamburg that Eduard Meyen felt himself obliged to put his decisive weight in the scales in the Vogt affair. The horsepower, or should I say the donkey-power of his logic is concentrated on the great proposition: because he was friendly with Blind and Blind sent him a copy of the anonymous leaflet, the original document sent to the *Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung* is necessarily a forgery. Of course, in his petty cunning he avoids saying this directly; he says it indirectly.

Incidentally, I wish Herr Eduard Meyen would show some proof that my time is so worthless anyway that I can waste it dealing with German vulgar democracy.

From the end of 1850 I broke off all connections with the German emigration in London, which began to decompose in all earnest when I pulled the one point they held in common, their opposition to me, out from under their feet. The process of its dissolution was particularly hastened by the industrious activity of such agents as Meyen, who, for example, openly agitated for the Kinkel faction against the Ruge faction. In the nine years that have passed since then, I have been a constant contributor to the *New York Tribune*, a paper with 200,000 readers, a circulation which will approximate to that of the *Freischütz*. Have I ever even named the name of a vulgar German democrat, have I honoured with a single word, the filthy attacks that these worthies have heaped on me in the last three years in the German and particularly the German American press?

Admittedly, I have in this time attacked 'great' democrats whom Herr Eduard Meyen dutifully admires, although I have not slandered them. The great Lord Palmerston is an example. My offence was all the more unpardonable because not only did English papers of the most varied party tendencies from the *People's Paper*, the Chartist newspaper, to the *Free Press*, Mr Urquhart's organ — reprint my 'slanders', but at least 15,000 copies of those same 'slanders' were reproduced in pamphlet form without my stirring a finger in London, Sheffield and Glasgow. During the same period, what is more, I have denounced the great democrat Louis Bonaparte, first in a German book (*The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon*) which was confiscated everywhere on the German frontier, but which was widely circulated in the United States and appeared in extract in the then London organ of Chartism. I have continued to this very day these slanders of the 'great democrat' Bonaparte in the *Tribune*, analysing his financial system, his diplomacy, his military skill and his 'idées napoléoniennes'. Louis Bonaparte has sent the *New York Times* a public statement for its opposition to those 'slanders'. Seven years ago I even denounced the 'great democrat' Stieber in the *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial*, which was pulped on the Swiss-Bavarian border. Surely Herr Meyen will hold that to my credit. Today this slander is democratic, since it takes place 'with the permission of higher authority'. How often I have erred in my judgement of time is proved not only by the organ of Herr Eduard Meyen, but also by that of Herr Joseph Dumont in Cologne. When I took the liberty, in 1848 and 1849, of coming out in favour of the Hungarian, Polish and Italian nationalities in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, who scolded more, who howled more than the organ of Mr Joseph Dumont of Cologne? But admittedly, at that time no Louis-Napoleon Bonaparte

had yet invested the nationalities with the odour of 'liberal' sanctity. That the former editors of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* have remained true to their views, even the former Herr Joseph Dumont, at present Guiseppe Delmonte, knows from the pamphlet published by Frederick Engels at the beginning of the war entitled *Po and Rhine*. As far, now, as Eduard Meyen's democracy 'in the more immediate sense' is concerned, after ignoring the same for nine years I have only broken my silence twice, and that in the very recent past, once against Kossuth and on the other occasion against Gottfried Kinkel. In fact, I made a few marginal comments in the *Volk*, from the purely grammatical point of view, on Kinkel's aesthetic effusions in the *Herrmann*. That was all that I wrote for the *Volk* apart for an article on the peace of Villafranca entitled 'Quid Pro Quo'. In the imagination of Eduard Meyen, however, a 'good democrat' probably has just as much right to infringe the 'despotic' rules of syntax as he has to desert from the republican camp to the royalist one.

At the end of this letter I now find myself in exactly the opposite difficulty to the one Hegel was in at the beginning of his *Logic*. He wants to pass from being to nothing, I from nothing to being, that is to say from Eduard Meyen to an affair, the Vogt affair. To cut it short I shall ask Karl Blind the following questions:

- 1: Did Blind on 9 May, on the platform of the Urquhartite public meeting, give me information on Vogt that completely coincided with the leaflet *As a Warning*?
- 2: Did Blind in the London *Free Press* of 27 May publish an anonymous article with the headline 'The Grand-Duke Constantine to be King of Hungary', which, leaving out the name Vogt, reproduces the essence of the content of the leaflet *As a Warning*?
- 3: Did Blind have the said leaflet printed at his expense in London by Herr F Hollinger, Litchfield Street, Soho?

Despite all the attempts of the Meyen democracy to distort the matter, and even in spite of the great unknown, Herr Joseph Dumont's 'foremost legal expert', everything revolves around the question: who had the leaflet *As a Warning* printed? It is only because it reprinted this leaflet that the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* was prosecuted. It is only of the accusations in this leaflet that Vogt feels he has publicly to clear himself. The publisher of the leaflet has, as Robert Peel would have said, three courses open to himself. Either he has knowingly told a lie. I do not believe that of Karl Blind. Or he later became convinced that the information that justified him in printing the leaflet was false. Then he is all the more obliged to make a statement. Or, finally, he has the evidence in his hand, but wishes to whitewash the whole business for personal reasons, and bears with great resignation the rotten eggs that are thrown not at him but at me. But should not all personal reasons be dropped in so important a matter as throwing light on the relationship between German Imperial Regent *in partibus* and the *de facto* Emperor of the French?

\* \* \*

**Karl Marx, Statement** (*Allgemeine Zeitung*, no 3259, 21 November 1859, Supplement)

9 Grafton Terrace

Maitland Park

Haverstock Hill

London

15 November 1859

Vogt, who knows his Pappenheimers, manoeuvred very cleverly when he transferred the origin of the accusation against him from the so-called democratic camp into the socialist. For my part, I have no interest at all in giving aid and comfort to this *quid pro quo*. I cannot therefore leave Blind's statement in no 313 of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* unanswered.

On 9 May, on the platform of an Urquhartite meeting, Blind informed me of all the accusations raised against Vogt in the leaflet *As a Warning*. He mentioned the same details to others, for example Freiligrath. Given the complete identity of form and language between his oral account and the printed leaflet, he naturally counts *de prime abord* as its author.



In the London *Free Press* of 27 May, there appeared an anonymous article by Blind with the headline ‘The Grand-Duke Constantine to be King of Hungary’, which anticipated, in its essentials, the leaflet *As a Warning*. In this article Blind stated that he knew liberals in Germany and democrats in London to whom ‘large bribes’ had been offered for Bonapartist propaganda. While the Vogt trial was still pending, Mr D Collet, the responsible editor of the *Free Press*, visited me in order to beg me, on *Blind’s behalf*, to make *no use* of my knowledge of the authorship of the said article. I answered Mr Collet, who found this quite pertinent, that I could not enter into any obligations and that my discretion depended rather on how Blind behaved.

Fidelio Hollinger’s statement is simply laughable. Fidelio Hollinger knows that he formally infringed the English law by publishing the leaflet *without stating where it was printed*. He therefore issued himself in a most high-handed manner with a testimonial that he had not committed that peccadillo. Incidentally, the reprint in the *Volk* was taken off the same types as the leaflet, which were still standing in Hollinger’s print shop. Thus legal proof can be supplied that the leaflet ‘proceeded from the print-shop of F Hollinger’ without taking any evidence from witnesses, simply by comparing it with the reprint in the *Volk*. The transfer of the trial from Augsburg to London would clear up the whole Blind–Vogt mystery.

\* \* \*

**Karl Marx, To the Editor of *The Free Press***

9 Grafton Terrace

Maitland Park

Haverstock Hill

London

4 February 1860

Sir

You will remember that the *Free Press* of 27 May 1859 published an article headed ‘The Grand Duke Constantine to be King of Hungary’. In that article *Mr Vogt*, of Geneva, although not named, was pointed at, in a manner intelligible to the German refugees, as a Bonapartist agent, who, on the outset of the Italian war, had offered ‘*large bribes*’ to Liberals in Germany, and German Democrats in London. The writer gave vent to his intense delight at the indignant repulse those attempts at bribery had met with. *Mr Charles Blind* I assert to be the author of that notice. You can correct me if I am in error. Some time later, there circulated in London an anonymous *German* pamphlet, entitled *Zur Warnung (As a Warning)*, which, in point of fact, may be considered a reproduction of the article of the *Free Press*, only that it gave fuller details and Vogt’s name. Having been reprinted in a German London paper, entitled *Das Volk (The People)*, thence the anonymous pamphlet found its way to the columns of the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung (The Augsburg Gazette)*, which, consequently, was sued by Mr Vogt for libel. Meanwhile I had obtained from Mr Vögele, a compositor then employed by Mr Hollinger, the publisher of *Das Volk*, a written declaration to the effect that the pamphlet was printed in Hollinger’s office, and drawn up by *Mr Charles Blind*. This declaration, as I told you at the time, was sent over to the *Augsburg Gazette*. The Augsburg tribunal having declined to decide the case, *Mr Blind* at last came out in the *Augsburg Gazette*. Not content with a point-blank denial of his authorship of the anonymous pamphlet, he, in terms most positive, *declared the pamphlet not to have issued from Hollinger’s printing office*. In proof of this latter statement, he laid before the public a declaration signed by Hollinger himself, and one Wiehe, a compositor, who, as he said, had for 11 months been continuously employed by Hollinger. To this joint declaration of Blind, Hollinger and Wiehe I replied in the *Augsburg Gazette*; but *Blind*, in his turn, repeated his denial, and again referred to the testimony of Hollinger and Wiehe. *Vogt*, who, from the beginning, and for purposes of his own, had designated *me* as the secret author of the pamphlet, then published a *brochure* full of the most infamous calumnies against myself.

Now, before taking any further step, I want to show up the fellows who evidently have played into the hands of Vogt. I, therefore, publicly declare that the statement of Blind, Wiehe and Hollinger, according to which the anonymous pamphlet was *not* printed in Hollinger’s office, 3 Litchfield Street,

Soho, is a *deliberate lie*. First, Mr Vögele, one of the composers, formerly employed by Hollinger, will declare upon oath that the said pamphlet *was* printed in Hollinger's office, was written in the handwriting of *Mr Blind*, and partly composed by Hollinger himself. Secondly, it can be judicially proved that the pamphlet and the article in *Das Volk* have been taken off the same types. Thirdly, it will be shown that Wiehe was *not* employed by Hollinger for 11 consecutive months, and, especially, was *not* employed by him at the time of the pamphlet's publication. Lastly, witnesses may be summoned in whose presence Wiehe himself confessed having been persuaded by Hollinger to sign the *wilfully false declaration in the Augsburg Gazette*. Consequently, I again declare the above said *Charles Blind* to be a *deliberate liar*.

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

**Karl Marx**

\* \* \*

**Open Letter on the Matter of Vogt and the Berlin *National-Zeitung* (*Volks-Zeitung*, no 35, 10 February 1860)**

9 Grafton Terrace

Maitland Park

Haverstock Hill

London

6 February 1860

To the Editorial Board of the *Volks-Zeitung*

**Statement:** I hereby announce that I have made preparatory steps towards taking legal action for libel against the Berlin *National-Zeitung* for its leading articles no 37 and no 41 on Vogt's pamphlet *Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung*. I am reserving a literary answer to Vogt for later, since that requires enquiries to people who live outside Europe.

For the moment therefore I should just like to say.

1: To judge by the choice selection in the *National-Zeitung* — the book itself has not yet proved to obtainable through the usual channels in London, either through booksellers or from acquaintances to whom Herr Vogt previously sent his so-called *Studies* — Vogt's hack-work is merely a dressed-up version of a sketch which he published nine months ago in his private *Moniteur* — the Biel *Handels Courier*. At that time I had his lampoon printed without comment in London. Such a simple procedure was quite sufficient to characterise the Herr Professor here, where conditions and personalities are known.

2: The *pretext* on which Herr Vogt opens his campaign against me is, like the pretext for the Italian campaign, an 'idea'. I am supposed, that is, to be the author of the anonymous pamphlet *As a Warning*. From the English circular I published, and which I enclose, you will see that I have taken steps to force Herr Blind and Co either to confess the falsity of that pretext by their silence or let themselves be found guilty of the same before an English court.

**Karl Marx**

\* \* \*

**Letter to the Editorial Board of the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung***

6 Thorncliffe Grove

Oxford Road

Manchester

21 February 1860

To the Editorial Board of the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*, Private.

One of the two letters dated 16 October 1859, which I received from the Editorial Board of the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* said literally: ‘Please rest assured of our *particular gratitude* should we, dear sir, ever have the opportunity to express our *thanks* to you.’

That I neither wish nor expect the ‘thanks’ or ‘particular gratitude’ of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* is shown sufficiently clearly by my answer dated 19 October. What I did, however, expect in the *particular* case was the common fairness that no English paper, of whatever colour, would dare to withhold.

The ‘particular gratitude’ and the ‘thanks’ proved to consist of the following:

1: My first statement was *not* printed. Blind’s impudent statement was printed instead, with two false testimonies obtained by conspiracy. The *Reform* in Hamburg printed the statement immediately.

2: It took *douce violence* to get my counter-statement against Blind printed. For all that, it did not appear where I had justly asked for it to appear, in the same place as Blind’s statement, that is to say in the main pages of the paper.

3: The Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* prints a second statement by Blind in which he has the impudence to talk of barefaced lies and to refer to two testimonies by Wiehe and Hollinger that are open to criminal prosecution. It thereupon states that the correspondence is closed and thus denies me the right to reply.

4: On 6 February I send the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* my latest statement together with the English circular. The honourable editorial board pushes it aside and prints instead the statement by Blind which *only arose as a result of my circular*. Naturally, it was careful not to print the *billet doux* enclosed by that great diplomat. Further, it printed Biscamp’s statement, dated three days later, as my own. Finally, having become convinced that my statement had long since been printed in the *Kölnische Zeitung*, the *Volks-Zeitung*, etc, it decides to send it to press, but takes the amiable liberty of *censuring* me and undertaking arbitrary alterations. In 1842–43 I endured a double Royal Prussian censorship, but I never suspected that I would fall under the censorship of Herr Kolb and Co in 1860.

I think it is quite unnecessary to characterise such a procedure in any greater detail.

**Karl Marx**

\* \* \*

**Statement to the Editorial Boards of the Newspapers *Freischutz* and *Reform*** (*Die Reform*, no 29, 7 March 1860) <sup>[25]</sup>

Manchester

28 February 1860

Correspondence: On the effusions of Herr *Eduard Meyen* in nos 17 to 21 of the *Freischütz*, I should merely like to say:

The action for libel which I am pursuing against the Berlin *National-Zeitung* will be completely sufficient for the *legal* elucidation of Vogt’s pamphlet. His affiliate, Eduard Meyen, cannot lay claim to a similar honour. All I can do for Eduard Meyen is to give him a niche that corresponds to his stature in the pamphlet which is to appear when the case has been heard.

**Karl Marx**

\* \* \*

**Karl Marx: Statement** (*Allgemeine Zeitung*, no 336, 1 December 1860)

The Editorial Board of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* was so kind as to print at the beginning of February 1860 a statement by me which began with the following words:

I hereby announce that I have made preparatory steps towards taking legal action for libel against the Berlin *National-Zeitung* for its leading articles no 37 and no 41 on Vogt’s pamphlet *Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung*. I am reserving a literary answer to Vogt for later.

In the course of February 1860, I took action for libel against F Zabel, editor-in-chief of the *National-Zeitung*. My lawyer, Herr Justizrat Weber, chose first of all the *criminal law procedure*. By an ordinance of 18 April 1860, the public prosecutor refused to ‘proceed’ against F Zabel, since *no public interest* gave him reason to do so. On 26 April 1860, his refusal was confirmed by the attorney general.

My lawyer now adopted the *civil law procedure*. By an ordinance of 8 June 1860, the Royal *City Court* forbade me to proceed with the *complaint* because those ‘remarks and assertions’ of F Zabel’s that really were detrimental to my honour consist of *mere quotations*, and the ‘intention of insulting’ did not exist. For its part, the Royal *Supreme Court* declared in an ordinance of 11 July 1860 that the allegation that the article was in the form of a quotation had no effect on its culpability, but that the passages in it detrimental to my honour did *not* refer to my ‘person’. Moreover, the intention to insult could ‘not be assumed in the present case’. The Royal Supreme Court therefore confirmed the ordinance of the City Court rejecting my complaint. The Royal *High Court of Appeal*, in an ordinance of 5 October which reached me on 23 October of this year, found that ‘in the present case’ no ‘legal error’ on the part of the Royal Supreme Court ‘emerged’. I was therefore left with the *prohibition against prosecuting F Zabel* and never obtained a *public hearing in court*.

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

**Karl Marx**

London

24 November 1860

## Notes

- 1 Girard: You seem to want to place yourself as ambassador between myself and these refugees, to deal as between one power and another?
- I: I have no ambition to be appointed ambassador to you.
- 2 Carried forth.
- 3 No, we don’t want the Federal Commissar acting the policeman here.
- 4 Literally, popular breeze; popularity.
- 5 Switzerland was saved by the Providence of God and the confusion of men.
- 6 Literally, in a blazing wrong; caught in the act.
- 7 It is the sound of danger, I know it by heart.
- 8 Of skinning anyone.
- 9 I was therefore short of my expenses and honorarium.
- 10 Between the fruit and the cheese.
- 11 The one who benefited from it did it.
- 12 The ear of the prince.
- 13 ‘Well, Baron, have you still many refugees here?’ ‘Quite a lot, Princess’, said the other, ‘although we have already sent many of them back. M Druey does his best in this respect, *and if more funds arrive* we will send back more.’
- 14 Those who love, chastise.
- 15 Woe to the conquered!
- 16 Such anger in the spirits of heaven?
- 17 Feudal possession.
- 18 The end of Switzerland.
- 19 The fleur de lys was the name given to the letters branded on those condemned to forced labour: TF — travaux forcés.

**20** A Belgian radical weekly.

**21** The *People's Paper*, the Chartist weekly, appeared from 1851 to 1852 under the editorship of Ernest Jones; Marx and Engels supported and wrote for it.

**22** The Paris debtors' prison.

**23** Bonaparte went to Baden-Baden in 1860 to meet the Prussian Prince Regent, William.

**24** Very useful ally, who may be called on to render great services, providing she makes an effort to.

**25** This statement was also sent to the *Volkszeitung* and the *Allgemeine Zeitung* but not published by them. The editor of *Die Reform* wrote that 'Dr K Marx should not be denied the right to throw new light' on the subject of Vogt's case against the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of Augsburg.