

# Revolutionary Refugees

German socialism in Britain, 1840–1860

Christine Lattek

Routledge Studies in Modern British History

 Routledge  
Taylor & Francis Group



**Also available as a printed book**  
see title verso for ISBN details

# Revolutionary Refugees

The substantial German colony in mid-nineteenth century London included not only Karl Marx, but hundreds of less well-known exiles plotting a revolution at home and planning the society of the future. *Revolutionary Refugees* traces the debates of these German socialists, from their initial artisans' clubs, through their impact on the revolutions of 1848, up to their influence on the First International and the emerging Social Democracy.

This book investigates the troubled relationship between early German 'utopian' socialism and groups such as the 'Communist League' which were increasingly dominated by Marx and Engels. The links between the émigrés and their British hosts, especially the Chartists, are examined, along with their connections to other radical groups such as French Blanquists. This study places the developments of exile politics in the overall framework of the flourishing German colony, combining an analysis of this crucial stage in the development of socialist political theory with an examination of the social and cultural environment of the immigrant community.

**Christine Lattek** was educated at the universities of Berlin, Tübingen and Cambridge, where she received her PhD for her thesis on German Socialism in British Exile. She specialises in modern and contemporary German history, and has written on nineteenth-century radicalism, feminist movements and the Holocaust. She has taught British and German history at the University of Cologne and Washington University, St. Louis, and now lives in London as an editor and a translator.

# **Routledge studies in modern British history**

## **1 Violence and Crime in Nineteenth-Century England**

The shadow of our refinement

*J. Carter Wood*

## **2 Revolutionary Refugees**

German socialism in Britain, 1840–1860

*Christine Lattek*

# Revolutionary Refugees

German socialism in Britain, 1840–1860

*Christine Lattek*

 Routledge  
Taylor & Francis Group

LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2006 by Routledge 2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN  
Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada by Routledge 270 Madison Ave, New York,  
NY 10016

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group*

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2006.

“To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or Routledge’s collection of  
thousands of eBooks please go to <http://www.ebookstore.tandf.co.uk/>.”

© 2006 Christine Lattek

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or  
by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including  
photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission  
in writing from the publishers.

The publisher makes no representation, express or implied, with regard to the accuracy of the  
information contained in this book and cannot accept any legal responsibility or liability for any  
errors or omissions that may be made.

*British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data*

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

*Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data*

A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN 0-203-49783-X Master e-book ISBN

ISBN 0-203-60718-X (OEB Format)

ISBN 0-714-65100-1 (Print Edition)

## Meinen Eltern

Der Flüchtling an der Thernse Strand, Empfindet tief für's Vaterland  
Und wenn er hört die Mordgeschichten Von Henkern und von  
Standgerichten, Des theuren Volkes Qual und Noth, Geliebter Freunde  
Märtyr-Tod— Da möcht ihm wohl das Herz zerbrechen Wenn er nicht  
dächte, sie zu rächen.

(Amalie Struve, 'Gedanken eines deutschen Flüchtlings', October, 1849,  
in Amalie Struve, *Erinnerungen aus den badischen Freiheitskämpfen.*  
*Den deutschen Frauen gewidmet*, Hamburg, Hoffmann & Campe, 1850,  
p. 167)

# Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	vii
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	viii
<i>Preface</i>	x
Introduction: socialism and exile in the German colony in mid-nineteenth-century London	1
1 The German colony	8
2 The German Workers' Educational Society, 1840–1849	19
3 Between democrats and Blanquists: the Communist League, 1849–1850	41
4 The 'Chronique Scandaleuse': Ruge, Kinkel and German democracy, 1849–1853	71
5 The Sonderbund, I: the Willich-Schapper League at its zenith, 1850–1851	94
6 The Sonderbund, II: decline and dissolution of the Communist League, 1851–1853	117
7 Apathy and revival: the International Association, 1853–1859	136
8 The New Era, 1858–1860	157
Epilogue: from exile to colony—class and the formation of community	184
<i>Notes</i>	197
<i>Bibliography</i>	284
<i>Index</i>	308

## Acknowledgements

Many have helped to bring this book to the light of day. My first and foremost debt is to Gareth Stedman Jones, who supervised the initial dissertation research upon which this book is based and whose own work has been constantly stimulating. The President and Fellows of New Hall, Cambridge, and particularly Zara Steiner, helped to make post-graduate life both pleasant and exciting. Istvan Hont has been unstintingly kind and incisive over many years. I am grateful to John Breuilly and Jonathan Steinberg, who examined the thesis and provided meticulous criticism. Wolfgang Mommsen and Gerhard Hirschfeld of the German Historical Institute, London, provided essential support, as did the German Academic Exchange Service. Rosemary Ash ton kindly commented on an early draft while she was researching her own book. Walter Schmidt lent his great knowledge of the early German socialist movement. In Cologne, Eberhard Kolb was very kind and generous in providing a congenial environment for teaching and writing, demonstrating much about historical scholarship besides. The late Erich Angermann also helped to make my time in Cologne a stimulating experience. Among the many staff of libraries and archives who helped in my research, I would particularly like to single out for their courtesy and patience Marcel van der Linden, Götz Langkau and Mieke Ijzermans, who helped me find my way through the wealth of material at the IISG, Amsterdam. Hans Pelger and Elisabeth Neu of the Karl-Marx-Haus, Trier, also kindly forwarded much valuable material. The staff of the Potsdam Archive were very forthcoming in difficult times. The British Library (especially the Newspaper Library at Colindale) and the Interlibrary Loan services of Cambridge University Library, the University Library of Cologne, and of Washington University, St Louis, were similarly helpful. I am grateful to the German Academic Exchange Service for their grant. My parents have unfailingly, generously and patiently encouraged and supported all aspects of my education. My greatest debts are to my husband, Greg Claeys, who endured the book's long gestation stoically and shared much enthusiasm and anguish. Anna, Christopher and Daniel, while no doubt an impediment to completion, have added a perspective to scholarship which defies historical analysis.



# Abbreviations

<i>AfS</i>	<i>Archiv für Sozialgeschichte</i>
AGSA	<i>Archiv für die Geschichte des Socialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung</i>
<i>BdK</i>	<i>Der Bund der Kommunisten: Dokumente und Materialien</i> (3 vols, Berlin: Dietz, 1982–1984)
BGLAK	Badisches Generallandesarchiv Karlsruhe
<i>BzG</i>	<i>Beiträge zur Geschichte der (deutschen) Arbeiterbewegung</i>
CABV	Communistischer Arbeiter-Bildungsverein
<i>DLZ</i>	<i>Deutsche Londoner Zeitung</i>
<i>FP</i>	<i>Friend of the People</i>
IISG	International Institute for Social History, Amsterdam
<i>IRSH</i>	<i>International Review of Social History</i>
<i>IWK</i>	<i>Internationale wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung</i>
<i>LDJ</i>	<i>Londoner Deutsches Journal</i>
LDZAA	<i>Londoner Deutsche Zeitung und Allgemeiner Anzeiger</i>
<i>MECW</i>	Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, <i>Collected Works</i> (Lawrence and Wishart, 1975–)
<i>MEGA</i>	Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, <i>Gesamtausgabe (MEGA)</i> (Berlin: Dietz, 1975–1990; ed. Internationale Marx-Engels-Stiftung, Berlin: Dietz, and Amsterdam: IISG, 1991–)
<i>MEW</i>	Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, <i>Werke</i> (Berlin: Dietz, 1956–)
<i>NS</i>	<i>Northern Star</i>
<i>NYCZ</i>	<i>New Yorker Criminal-Zeitung</i>
<i>NYSZ</i>	<i>New Yorker Staats-Zeitung</i>
<i>NZ</i>	<i>Neue Zeit</i> (London)

<i>PP</i>	<i>The People's Paper</i>
<i>RdA</i>	<i>Republik der Arbeiter</i>
Wermuth/Stieber	[Karl Georg Ludwig] Wermuth and [Wilhelm] Stieber, <i>Die Communisten-Verschwörungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts</i> , 2 vols in one (Berlin: A.W.Hahn, 1853–1854; facsimile edn, Berlin: Verlag K.Guhl, 1976)
ZAVK	<i>Zeitung des Arbeiter-Vereines zu Köln</i>
ZfG	<i>Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft</i>

## Preface

In the years after 1848, London became ‘the great city of refuge for exiles of all nations’. Germans were prominent among them. According to the well-known commentator on London life, George Augustus Sala, writing in 1859, they were to be found ‘in the purlieu of Oxford Street, near Leicester Square, or in the centre of that maze of crooked streets between Saint Martin’s Lane and Saint Anne’s Church, Soho’. Sala depicted their manners and way of life in his sketch of ‘Herr Brutus Eselskopf, publican and, in his time, ‘general of brigade’. At first sight, Eselskopf’s pub resembled any other, even though the landlord wore ‘a Turkish cap, with blue tassels, and a beard and moustachios of prodigious magnitude’. But after ‘five minutes of the customers’, the differences became clear enough. ‘Herr Eselskopf’s little back parlour’ was ‘filled morning, noon and night, with foreigners under political clouds of various degrees of density, and in a cloud of uniform thickness and of strong tobacco, emitted in many-shaped fumes from pipes of eccentric design’.

Among the customers by the fire reading the *Allgemeine Zeitung* or *OstDeutsche Post*, and occasionally indulging in muttered invectives against the crowned heads of Europe, Sala picked out ‘that valiant republican Spartacus Bursch, erst PhD. of the University of Heidelberg’. He was ‘then on no pay, but with brevet rank, behind a barricade formed of an omnibus, two water-carts and six paving stones at Frankfort...afterwards of Paris, Red Republican, manufacturer of lucifer matches, affili  of several secret societies, chemical lecturer, contractor for paving roads, usher in a boarding school’ and ‘ultimately...promoter of a patent for extracting vinegar from white lead, keeper of a cigar shop, professor of fencing, calisthenics, and German literature; and latterly out of any trade or occupation’.

Others included ‘enthusiastic young advocates, zealous young sons of good families, patriotic officers, who have thrown up their commissions under despot standards to fight for liberty, freedom-loving literary men, republican journalists, socialist workmen’...‘hunted from frontier to frontier on the Continent like mad dogs’. These refugees, or at least the great majority, were ‘the quiescent ones’. But there were also ‘the incandescent ones, the roaring, raging, rampaging, redhot refugees; the amateurs in vitriol, soda water bottles full of gunpowder, and broken bottles for horses’ hoofs; the throwers of grand pianofortes from first floor-windows on soldiers’ heads, the cutters off of dragoons’ feet, the impalers of artillery men’. These were no longer welcome at Herr Eselskopf’s and met instead at the little *Gasthaus* in Whitechapel, formerly known as the *Schinkenundbrod* and now rechristened ‘the Tyrants’ Entrails’.<sup>1</sup>

The place of the refugee question in Victorian politics was usefully discussed in Bernard Porter’s work of 1979, but it is only very recently that the obscure status and rights of asylum seekers, and the arcane law underpinning them, have been elucidated by the research of Caitlin Anderson.<sup>2</sup> As she shows, until the 1870s, the law governing aliens, although often unintentionally liberal in effect, went back to the unambiguously preliberal legal judgements enunciated by Sir Edward Coke after the union of the English

and Scottish crowns in 1603. Similarly, until the recent work of Ashton, Panayi and others, historians paid little attention to the merchants and diplomats, asylum seekers and spies, music and language teachers, tramping artisans and economic migrants who made up the German inhabitants of Victorian London.<sup>3</sup> But even after these publications, coverage has remained spotty. In particular, there has been little investigation of the political and social divisions within and between exile and immigrant organisations. What has been written has been largely an offshoot from the biographies of prominent leaders or the product of forays into the archives to confirm prior-held assumptions about the development of German working-class politics. Such work has sometimes provided valuable information, but has also led to exaggerated notions of the importance of particular leaders and often to forced readings of particular publications or utterances. Thus most of the discussion of socialist exiles and the *Arbeiterbildungsvereine* in which they were to be found, has remained subordinate in one way or another to ongoing polemics about the significance of Marx.

Christine Lattek's *Revolutionary Refugees* is the first major study to get outside the terms of this debate. Her book breaks new ground in at least three ways. First, it charts the development of artisan exile politics, both before and after 1848, and is therefore able to trace both the rise and decline of Marx's impact upon the Communist League. It is also able to take proper account of the equal or sometimes greater impact made by others whose importance has subsequently been downplayed or ignored. Figures barely glimpsed through the fumes of vituperation which enlivened and evened the Marx-Engels correspondence—Willich, Schapper, Heinzen, Kinkel, Scherzer, Blind, Edgar Bauer and others—here for the first time appear in their own right. Second, *Revolutionary Refugees* is the first study to have made systematic use of state archives and intelligence reports held in Potsdam. It is therefore able to provide a more rounded portrait than previous accounts of exile politics, particularly in the decade after 1848. Third, this book pays as much attention to the history of ideas circulating among members of the Communist Workers' Association as it does to its organisational history. It therefore offers a far richer picture of the competing republican, democratic and socialist positions circulating around the mid-nineteenth century. This is doubly valuable in a German context since free political debate in the German Confederation was effectively repressed from around 1849–1850 until the 'New Era' and the Prussian amnesty at the beginning of the 1860s. It was therefore primarily in London that the growing tensions between liberals, republicans, democrats and socialists can best be explored.

The portrait of mid-nineteenth-century German socialism which emerges from this book is in many ways unfamiliar. In the first place, it suggests that there was never a moment at which the London *Arbeiter-Bildungsverein* or the Communist League simply fell under the sway of Marx and Engels. What occurred was more a convergence of positions. As Christine Lattek reveals, it was not only Marx and Engels, whose political and theoretical positions had evolved and developed during the 1840s, the same was true of the League itself; and both sides contributed to the new shared position of 1847–1848. Even the *Communist Manifesto*, usually seen as exclusively an expression of the ideas of Marx and Engels, reveals traces of the input of other members of the League, notably Karl Schapper.

But this convergence of positions was also temporary and precarious. In 1848, Marx offered critical support to the Liberals in the hope that they would act as putative bearers of a bourgeois revolution. For this reason, in Cologne, he opposed the raising of separate proletarian demands. But at the same time, he seems to have had little but contempt for the democratic leaders—in his view, the confused and unreliable mouthpiece of the petit-bourgeoisie. Other members of the League, even the most radical, did not share this contempt. Personally, they admired these leaders for their courage and military competence. Politically, the line between communists and revolutionary democrats remained far more fluid than the post-1848 Marxian emphasis upon an independent proletarian party would suggest.

Marx's own bargaining position after 1850 was not strong. The revolutionary wing of the German exiles did not easily forgive his disbanding of the Communist League. It confirmed their suspicion of the 'arrogance' of university-educated intellectuals. Similarly, even when they adopted the Marxian terminology of the *Manifesto*, they generally remained closer to the ideas of Weitling or later Lassalle.

From Christine Lattek's account, they seem never to have accepted the social-economic perspective put forward by Marx. They continued to think in terms of oppression and tyranny, even when employing a language of exploitation and class struggle. On the other hand, around 1849–1850, ideas about the need for a transitional dictatorship were widely shared, as much among democrats like Heinzen as among revolutionary republicans and socialists like Willich, Schapper, Marx and the Blanquists. But in most versions of this belief among the German exiles, the idea of transitional dictatorship remained strongly linked to what would later be called a *Volksstaat*. The state in this vision would become the state of the 'Arbeiterstand', but its legitimacy would be based upon the conviction that the working class would rule in the interests of all. Thus Wilhelm Liebknecht, one of Marx's 'party' in the 1850s, back in Germany in the 1860s, was happy to endorse the 'Volksstaat' idea, both within the Saxon Volkspartei and in the Eisenach Social Democratic Labour Party.

In the eyes of the public and of the exiles themselves, the 'red 48ers' were not Marx and Engels, but activists and military heroes like Willich and Schapper. By focusing on ideas as much as on organisations and occupations, Christine Lattek is able to demonstrate which ideas from the *Manifesto* were shared, and which ignored or not understood. The effect of rifts between radicals—whether democrat or socialist—and moderates was to highlight differences on social and economic questions. But the first aim, shared alike by revolutionary democrats, republicans and socialists—and until 1849, by the group around Marx—was not to resolve 'the social question', but to overthrow the princes.

Christine Lattek is right to argue that the years of exile in Britain did much to crystallise the differences between liberal, democrats and socialists. While democrats and socialists could agree upon demands for manhood suffrage, the ending of princely rule and people's militias to replace standing armies, socialists in the Communist League and its aftermath envisaged a *Volksstaat*, or a socialised commonwealth which would resolve 'the social question' either by opening a road back to self-employment or through industry-wide organisations which would control production. These positions were enunciated in different ways in the *Manifesto*, in the arguments of Willich and Schapper's

*Sonderbund*, and later in more moderate and parliamentary form in Lassalle's polemic against Schulze-Delitzsch.

The second reason for the eventual separations of Social Democrats from liberals and radicals concerned internationalism. From the perspective of the political history of social democracy, Marx's importance derived less from his temporary ascendancy in the Communist League around 1848 than from his direction of the First International in the 1860s. It was Bebel and Liebknecht's decision to affiliate with the First International which led to their break with the Saxon Volkspartei and the foundation of the Social Democratic Labour Party at Eisenach in 1868. Yet here again, German exile politics in London had played a vital role. Between the founding of the First International and the prior formation in the 1840s of the Fraternal Democrats, who had allied the German Workers' Educational Association with French 'Red Republicans' and Chartists, German and other exiles in the 1850s had been prominent in forming The International Association. The prior existence of this generally neglected organisation—Mazzinian rather than Marxian in spirit—both helps to explain the ideological battles fought by Marx in the later International, but also why the idea of internationalism already possessed a resonance in the 1860s when Marx became Secretary of the First International.

*Revolutionary Refugees* does more than add a detailed chapter to the prehistory of German Social Democracy, it invites us to think again about what German historians call the mid-century *Trennung*' between liberalism and socialism and how that affected the subsequent history of each.<sup>4</sup>

Gareth Stedman Jones

# Introduction

## Socialism and exile in the German colony in mid-nineteenth-century London

During the 1840s, but especially after large numbers of German democrats were forced into exile after 1848, much of the development of early German socialism and social democracy occurred in communities of German emigrants abroad. The most important of these groups was in London, where thousands of Germans congregated in the middle years of the nineteenth century. Exile was a bleak existence; not for nothing is the German word for 'misery', *Elend*, derived etymologically from the term for 'alien' or 'abroad', being expelled into the *Ausland*.<sup>1</sup> Their condition was mitigated in part by a fervent sense of political rectitude. But this also tended to sharpen considerably the exiles' political disagreements, and such discussions indeed became for many the chief focus of interest in an otherwise often depressing environment.

This book examines the political activities, organisations and debates of the German exiles in mid-nineteenth-century London. German democratic politics in exile have not hitherto been carefully scrutinised. While the lives and thought of the best-known German exiles, Marx and Engels, have of course been meticulously analysed, the activities, plans and ideas of the lesser figures of the emigration, however, have been much less adequately examined. Consequently not merely an imprecise but also a skewed portrait of exile politics has predominated, in which the crucial evolution of internal émigré politics, so central to the shaping of German socialism in this period, has been largely ignored. It is necessary to ascertain why this has been the case and to set forth some of the central problems studied, before providing a brief sketch of the social background to the debates and organisations discussed in the following chapters.

### Historiography

Emigration generally has long been regarded as a 'lost subject', ignored because historians 'dislike lost causes'.<sup>2</sup> Nonetheless various writers have deplored the absence of a history of the German emigration after 1848.<sup>3</sup> In the last few years, consequently, historians have begun to rediscover at least the more colourful side of foreigners whose interrupted careers resulted in sometimes bizarre destinies. Interest in foreign communities in Britain generally has also been stimulated by post-1945 demographic and social trends.<sup>4</sup> Studies of groups such as the much-neglected Irish and the East End Jews have also prompted enquiries into other communities. American sociological work on ethnicity has stimulated new thinking among British historians of migration, and a journal now specialises in immigration and minorities.<sup>5</sup> Studies have also appeared of individual groups of nineteenth-century newcomers, both of economic migrants like the

Irish and of political refugees, such as the Russians.<sup>6</sup> Bernard Porter's persuasive work on government policy and public opinion has emphasised the importance of the conditions of asylum and of British attitudes towards aliens.<sup>7</sup> Most recently, Tom Stoppard's trilogy, 'The Coast of Utopia', performed to great success at the National Theatre in 2002, brought the lives of these exiles to a much wider audience.

Studies of German emigration in particular have focused on twentieth-century problems.<sup>8</sup> By comparison the nineteenth century has been neglected, partly in reaction to patriotic contemporaries and later National Socialist writers extolling ethnic communities abroad (*Auslandsdeutschtum*). The activities of the Forty-eighters in the United States have of course long been praised by writers tracing the German democratic tradition, but recent studies have turned more to social aspects of migration, community life and processes of assimilation, with less attention paid to political refugees,<sup>9</sup> while the German exiles in nineteenth-century Switzerland and France have been carefully treated.<sup>10</sup>

German emigration to London has frequently been detailed in studies of individual refugees. Biographies tend to treat the London exile period of their subject as a largely irrelevant prelude or postscript to future or past fame. In studies of Carl Schurz, Lothar Bucher, Wilhelm Liebknecht, Arnold Ruge and Gustav Struve, for example, exile often figures as an almost negligible phase not worth serious research.<sup>11</sup> Comments on émigré politics are usually limited to a few cursory remarks regularly repeated. Moreover, these have often been drawn from biographies of Marx and Engels, who had considerable prejudices about their fellow exiles.<sup>12</sup>

The fragmentary character of this historiography has not been amended in books whose titles promise general accounts of German exile life.<sup>13</sup> The most influential previous study, by Rosemary Ashton, usefully describes the social and cultural activities of German refugees in England while paying little heed to their politics.<sup>14</sup> Her study narrates the private lives and gradual integration into British society of the more prominent exiles, and is especially valuable on their relation to English literary circles and on the hardship endured by many of the emigrant women. The social background of the German community, however, and the development of political organisations and debates remain unexplored. Ashton consequently misconstrues the activities and thinking of the socialists, most notably of August Willich and Wilhelm Weitling.<sup>15</sup> By contrast, a recent book by Panikos Panayi offers much information on the composition of the German colony and on British attitudes to Germans in general and those in their midst in particular.<sup>16</sup> But it, too, pays virtually no attention to the political refugees and their debates, which are the focus of the present book. Sabine Sundermann concentrates on internal émigré politics in the nationalist organisations developing in the 1860s, and both her theme, liberal nationalism, and her timeframe thus complement the present undertaking.<sup>17</sup>

The second chief historiographic strand relevant here is ignored in all the major studies of German emigrants in London, and concerns early German socialism. This literature has of course been dominated by an overwhelming interest in Marx, and some of the clearest analyses of debates among London exiles have been offered by his biographers, from Franz Mehring to David McLellan, particularly concerning the Communist League.<sup>18</sup> Historians of political thought interested in German socialism have also concentrated on Marx, although Hunt's and Draper's studies, for example, have also shed much light on his socialist rivals.<sup>19</sup> Elsewhere, however, much of the English-



language literature is often content to identify early German socialism with Weitling alone.<sup>20</sup> The preoccupation with Marx in discussions of early socialism was of course most pronounced in East German historiography, where, despite orthodox fetters, intensive research had unearthed much material on exile groups in contact with—and at odds with—Marx and Engels.<sup>21</sup> The collapse of the German Democratic Republic has allowed access to still more source material, in particular on Marx's rivals, which are here extensively used for the first time. In what was the former West Germany, the early socialism of artisans' groups abroad has not been treated comprehensively since Wolfgang Schieder's influential 1963 study (which stops at 1842, in any case), but research on the early workers' movement has flourished.<sup>22</sup> Many studies have concentrated on the social and regional history of the workers' movement, striving to integrate its social history.<sup>23</sup> At the same time, interest in the history of ideas and of organisations has declined, although clubs and associations have received attention as part of the culture of the working class and the workers' movement.<sup>24</sup> Debates about the theoretical development of early German socialism have concentrated on the philosophy of the 'true' socialists, especially Moses Hess, and on 'workers' socialism'.<sup>25</sup> Analysts of the latter have moreover largely concentrated on Weitling, primarily on the 'Utopian' character of his views.<sup>26</sup> Research on the formation of theories in the movement generally has above all stressed the 'autonomy' of the 'workers' communism' until 1847, and its independence both of 'bourgeois' radical intellectuals and of Marx.<sup>27</sup>

My task is to weave together these thematic strands in treating the evolution of German socialism and its relation to revolutionary democracy within the framework of the London community.<sup>28</sup> While the relevance of the political views of individual German emigrants—chiefly but not only Marx—has been acknowledged elsewhere, the social and intellectual context of these ideas has remained unexplored, and detailed debates about social theory, revolution and the future constitution of Germany have been ignored. This is thus the first attempt to deal with the ideas as well as the organisations and structures of exile politics, necessitating a use of sources much wider than the memoirs and letters previous studies have relied on. In particular, political debates which were recorded in a dozen or so German-language periodicals which appeared in London are analysed here for the first time, as are reports from those German-American and Chartist papers open to the emigrants. Published and unpublished proposals, manifestoes, discussion minutes and statutes of the London Germans also help to reveal their development in these two decades, while the use of census returns corrects frequently repeated errors about the composition of the German colony.

Several aspects of exile politics receive particular prominence here. Given recent work on the cultural integration of the emigrants, no attempt is made here to outline their assimilation process, or to trace the impact of those who returned to Germany after 1861. My focus instead is upon the politics in exile of early German socialism. Its organisational centre was the German Workers' Educational Association (known usually by its later name, the Communistischer Arbeiter-Bildungsverein or CABV) in London. This was one of the most influential organisations in early German socialism; the fact that its development has never yet been fully traced has recently been deplored as an 'inexcusable desideratum'.<sup>29</sup> I show here that those early forms of socialism which developed in the CABV in the mid-forties did not succumb to the onslaught of Marx in 1847–1848, as most authors have stated, following Engels's account.<sup>30</sup> Early German

socialism should therefore not be seen as merely ‘pre-Marxian’ or ‘utopian’, but as continuing to evolve parallel to and frequently in competition with Marx’s ideas and activities. The leading protagonists of my account are the socialists around Marx, notably the workers in the CABV. Karl Schapper, August Willich, Andreas Scherzer and others emerge here as local leaders with more sway over the German emigrants’ politics (and German socialists outside England as well) than Marx. In particular the wing of the Communist League which competed with that of Marx is shown to have had a much wider impact than has previously been acknowledged, and German participation in socialist activities during the fifties belies the assumption that the movement was dead until Marx resumed political activities in the ‘New Era’. Much of the socialist movement in mid-century in fact developed separately from Marx. Thus G.D.H.Cole’s statement that Marxism drove the other forms of socialism ‘before it as chaff before the wind’, which echoes the ‘official’ historiography perpetrated by the consolidated Social Democrats after the 1870s, misreads the character of the movement in the 1840s and 1850s.<sup>31</sup> It can even be shown that to some degree the relationship between Marx and the exile socialists was inverted: while his impact on their thinking was much smaller than has been assumed, their activities had considerable impact on Marx, and much of his writing between 1846 and 1860, from the *Circular against Kriege* to *Herr Vogt*, can only be explained by the context of daily politics and the social and political environment in which Marx lived and wrote.

Some of these writings mirror the fact that—unlike Marx—many socialists continued after 1848 to be engrossed in their relations with the democratic movement. While this was not a major issue prior to the 1848 revolution, the large influx of non- or anti-socialist émigrés after 1848 turned the question of alliances into a key problem. As an important aspect of the lessons to be drawn from the events of 1848–1849, proposals for joint forces to achieve at least the overthrow of the existing system in Germany continued to occupy socialists active in Willich’s League, the International Association, and the CABV. For most of the two decades examined here London was virtually the only place where German political theories could be developed freely and politics acted out unhampered. In the long run, German parties formed along the lines first drawn here in exile, and the deep divide evolving between democrats, increasingly absorbed with the problem of national unification, and the socialists were to become major features of the revival of political life in Germany.<sup>32</sup> In this sense, exile functioned as a kind of hothouse or experimental laboratory for political options and theories, which could be played out without the constraints of realpolitik.<sup>33</sup> Consequently exile was far from the futile and repetitious turning in circles decried by the Russian emigrant Alexander Herzen and reiterated by many modern scholars.<sup>34</sup>

These wider repercussions establish the importance of these émigrés to nineteenth-century German politics. Within London, however, exile also required developing relations with other communities, including the English and émigrés from other countries. The social and intellectual relations between the different groups play a major role in this study, especially contacts with the Chartists. Nationalism and internationalism thus form the third main issue considered here. Various forms of socialist internationalism were being developed in London in the 1840s, and continued throughout the 1850s until the foundation of the First International. While the Germans exhibited varying degrees of theoretical sophistication in arguing for internationalism as a concept,

they were virtually always involved in its practical organisations. The idea of international co-operation forced itself upon the exiles in the form of daily contacts, but the forms such endeavours took were by no means predestined. Alternative concepts were experimented with, ranging from ‘proletarian internationalism’ to republican cosmopolitanism, often of a Mazzinian colour.<sup>35</sup> Nonetheless exile for many also had the effect of creating a heightened sense of ethnic or national identity, assisted by daily comparisons between home and the host country. This fostered sentiments ranging from homesick patriotism to national chauvinism, and, parallel to the movement for unification within Germany, from the forties to the seventies attempts to unite all the Germans in London grew. The emigrants frequently remarked that ‘abroad, the German becomes a patriot’, even the Reuss-Greiz-Schleitzer (an archetypal subject of a tiny principality) trading his nostalgia for his minute state for German identity when in Whitechapel.<sup>36</sup> This tendency found many different cultural expressions; above all thousands of emigrants participated in special celebrations such as the 1859 anniversary of Schiller’s birthday or the *Sängerfest* in 1868. This patriotism posed a permanent and growing challenge to the London socialists. Having just shed their origins in the nationalist ‘Young Germany’ movement, they nonetheless supported the progressive movement for German unity as well, but increasingly saw the movement for unification and patriotic fervour identified with non-socialist revolutionaries. Nationalism and internationalism became increasingly mutually exclusive, one being linked to the democrats and the other to the socialists.

### Outline

Chapter 1 of this book examines the background to these debates provided by the German colony, outlining the social stratification of its members, from Prince Albert to governesses, tailors and penniless street musicians. It argues that their wide distribution over the capital, and their fragmentation according to regional origins and religious and social differences accounted for a variety of ethnic organisations but also for the absence of a ‘Little Germany’ as a recognisable community until the latter part of the century.

Chapter 2 looks at the organisational centre of much German socialist exile life, the Soho club known as the German Workers’ Educational Association. From its foundation in 1840 to its demise during the First World War, it embraced virtually every facet of German socialism, from the early brand of the secret artisan societies through Marxism, Lassalleanism and anarchism to mainstream social democracy, flirting with Blanquism and liberal democracy on the way, sometimes deeply divided in its preferences. Although most works on the German emigration begin with the influx of defeated revolutionaries of 1848, it is useful to emphasise the continuity in socialist discussions from the pre-revolutionary (*Vormärz*) period. Not only did most of the same protagonists reappear, but new refugees also benefited from the organisational and theoretical experiences of the first phase of German socialist exile in London. This chapter, then, traces the early development of the society’s politics. Within German artisanal socialism, the CABV became the single most important centre of ideological debate, and when it moved from adherence to the ‘Utopian’ Weitling’s doctrines to formulate its own criticisms, and later to adopt and then abandon Marx’s views, this was decisive for early German socialism in its entirety. Exile politics here were not at the fringe but at the very centre of the

movement. Second, the GABV was prominently involved in the 'invention' of socialist internationalism, and founded from its contacts with English socialists and Chartists and with other foreign revolutionary exiles the beginnings of a long theoretical and institutional tradition. The impact of this internationalism on the development of early German socialism will also be discussed as will, third, the role played by the exiles on their return to Germany at the time of the revolution of 1848–1849.

Chapter 3 clarifies the problems the refugees faced immediately upon returning to London after the failure of the continental revolutions. Besides practical considerations, these above all resulted from the splitting of the refugees into mutually hostile groups of socialists and non-socialist democrats. Repeated attempts at reconciliation having failed, some socialists instead became attracted to the uncompromising revolutionism of the Blanquists. These were opposed by a smaller group of socialists around Marx, with the result that the main organisation of the socialists, the Communist League, split.

The largest exile factions were made up of democratic refugees, and since their behaviour strongly influenced the politics of the socialists after the revolution and dominated the public image of exile politics in those years to an extent unknown before 1848, these groups are analysed in detail in chapter 4. The distance between the democratic and socialist exiles has been reflected in subsequent historical studies, which regularly focus on only one side. But it is shown here that without reference to the socialists, debates among the democrats cannot be properly understood. Divisions which soon emerged within the democratic camp were partly provoked by their rivalry with the socialists, and disagreements between the followers of the immensely popular exile Gottfried Kinkel and those of his rival Arnold Ruge were largely defined by their respective attitudes to socialist demands. A republican internationalism distinguished the anti-socialist Ruge from the group around Kinkel, whose reluctant cooperation with the communists soon gave way to increasing emphasis on national unity. Internationalist and nationalist groups among the democrats were moreover also divided by regional attachments to south and north Germany.

Chapters 5 and 6 then turn to the further development of the larger section of the Communist League, who under August Willich sought every opportunity to promote a revolutionary revival at home and hence approached the democrats around Kinkel for joint ventures. This majority of German socialists has been woefully neglected in historiography. They were a diverse group, ranging from supporters of Weitling who had survived the ideological onslaught of the *Communist Manifesto* to chiliasts, and from the philosophical brand of Moses Hess's 'true' socialism to the 'communist Islam' of Willich himself, whose preoccupation with the military progress of a revolution eclipsed his interest in socialist theory. United by their antipathy to Marx, these socialists collected in a common organisation almost all the German communist groups in Europe and America, and were thus for some brief years the single most important German socialist body. In London exile politics, moreover, they dominated the Germans' relations to both the Chartists and French exile groups, but in their hope for renewed activity on the Continent also co-operated closely with non-socialists. The movement thus was much broader and more tolerant towards other groups than the previous scholarly concentration on Marx's politics alone would suggest. Moreover, the break of socialist with *bürgerlicher* democracy must thus be seen as a drawn-out and complex development by no means simply completed at will by Marx, and in exile anticipated events which took place in

Germany in the sixties and seventies (e.g. as described in Gustav Mayer's famous analysis).<sup>37</sup>

The mid-fifties have traditionally been regarded as a period of decline in socialist development. A closer look at the exile community in chapter 7, however, suggests that at least abroad the Germans continued to be involved in propaganda and organisation. Socialists soon began to join a new international association, but, again, the German exiles in it were not Marxists, but ranged from Weitlingian communists to those straddling socialism and democracy without belonging exclusively to either camp. Chapter 8 analyses the renewal of conflict between the socialists and democrats at the end of the 1850s, which focused intensely for the first time on the issue of national unification. My account concludes with a look at the further development of the German colony after its highpoint of the Schiller festival of 1859, and after an amnesty allowed the return to Germany of most incriminated Forty-Eighters, adding an outline of the CABV's history up to the First World War.

# 1

## The German colony

### Exiles and emigrants

The historiography of the German community in London has often been marred by the ideological presuppositions of German nationalist authors. Frequently the history of the exile colony and that of the Germany colony have been blurred, with the highly visible refugees being regarded as representative of the life of all Germans in London.<sup>1</sup> There are some good reasons for this confusion. Common parlance is often inaccurate, and we know much more about the experiences of articulate and politically active refugees, for example, than those of the Hessian broom-girls of London. The borderline between émigré and emigrant—the first being abroad for political reasons—is also not always clearly discernible, and people moved from one category into the other (for example Gottfried Kinkel, who remained in Britain after the Prussian amnesty of 1861). But we must distinguish between these groups in order to analyse the politics and the theoretical discussions of the exiles. Clearly the psychological strain of forced residence abroad was far more intense among exiles (a number actually went insane).<sup>2</sup> Their means were usually far more slender than those of emigrants, most of whom had chosen London for economic motives, and a preoccupation with speedily returning home rarely improved an exile's financial situation. But above all a propensity towards intense political involvement was much more pronounced among exiles, who were correspondingly less concerned with integrating into British society and more oriented towards political renewal at home. Most political, but also much social, activity among Germans in London was thus initiated by refugees, who organised meetings, edited newspapers, sent emissaries to Germany, and launched charitable and social organisations.

Nonetheless the refugees also relied heavily on the German colony as a whole. Initial financial aid for destitute new arrivals came from long-established merchants and artisans, who also became the first audience of the refugees' political efforts. Later, the refugees were to create a previously unknown sense of identity and solidarity among the colony, but initially they benefited from an established infrastructure of organisations which provided them with a first foothold.

This colony had existed for some time. London Germans in the nineteenth century were fond of pointing back to the twelfth-century trade privileges and the Hansa's settlement in the 'Steelyard'.<sup>3</sup> Reformation and Counter-Reformation on the Continent brought many Protestants.<sup>4</sup> Migrating artisans such as miners, cutlers, goldsmiths and weavers followed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Colonists on their way to America sometimes got stranded, although rarely as many as the four thousand from the Palatinate who arrived in London in 1709 and eventually settled in Ireland.<sup>5</sup> Under the Hanoverians the colony in London—probably numbering 80 per cent of the total of those in Britain at this time—increased to about 6,000, and included the Rothschilds, the

painter Angelika Kaufmann, and the composer Handel. In 1840 Queen Victoria married Prince Albert of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, and in his footsteps, to the horror of republicans, there followed not only advisors such as Freiherr von Stockmar but assorted minor aristocrats and courtiers as well. Caricatures, for example The Royal Coburg Apparatus for Hatching Paupers', played on fears of a flood of German paupers.<sup>6</sup> By then the Germans were by far the largest foreign community in the metropolis (the Irish not being classified as foreigners), almost twice the size of the next largest group, the French. This pattern continued until the massive immigration of Polish and Russian Jews towards the end of the century, while emigration from Germany slowed down after the foundation of the empire. With the First World War, finally, the German community in London came to an end, although Nazi Germany sent a new wave of refugees, while the student leader Rudi Dutschke unsuccessfully attempted to retreat to north London in 1970–1971.

It is notoriously difficult to estimate the size of either the German colony as a whole or the number of refugees in it. The émigré press assumed that some 80–150,000 Germans lived in London by 1859, or more moderately, perhaps 50,000. This stunningly contradicts the census figures of 1851, which counted 9,566 Germans in London, a figure which rose to 12,448 by 1861.<sup>7</sup> This discrepancy can be explained partly by the fact that the census counted both children born in Britain and naturalised persons as British (although, as an English commentator conceded later, 'privately, we never consider either of these classes as really English'<sup>8</sup>). By contrast the Germans' rather generous definition of their own ethnicity went well beyond mere citizenship or place of birth and included everybody whose mother-tongue was German; Austrians and Prussians were regarded as part of the colony.<sup>9</sup> This brought the overall size of the colony to 16,701 or about 40 per cent of the entire foreign population of London. Similarly, German-speaking Swiss participated in the colony's life. The definition of ethnicity, moreover, went even further to include those Germans born in Prague or Paris, for instance, with examples provided by the popular founder of the German Hospital, Dr Freund from Prague, or Marx's daughter Laura, born in Brussels. The German Hospital, set up in 1845 to care for this community and hence in need of realistic statistics, assumed some 30,000 German-speakers in the capital.<sup>10</sup> At least 10,000 and perhaps even 20,000 Germans attended Schiller's anniversary celebrations in the Crystal Palace in 1859.<sup>11</sup> Figures, however, rose dramatically under any form of calculation, and the 1871 census gave 19,773 individuals born in Germany (with an additional 809 Austrians whom by then only a few diehard *grossdeutsche* politicians counted as Germans.)<sup>12</sup> We may thus fairly assume some 20,000 members of the German colony in the 1840s, and more than 30,000 in the following decade.

The number of refugees within this colony is even more difficult to gauge, as are figures for those participating in the political life of the colony. Before the revolution, the total count of refugees in the strict sense of the word, actually escaping political persecution in Germany, probably remained fewer than one hundred. The first group to arrive were some sixty members of 'Young Germany', expelled from Switzerland in 1836.<sup>13</sup> They were followed by a steady trickle of democrats, liberal patriots and socialists fleeing Germany for political reasons or, like Karl Schapper, ejected from France for unwelcome political involvement. Only a few were legally expelled from Germany or forced by the authorities to emigrate to America, like Wilhelm Weitling, whose agreement with the Saxon and Prussian governments included payment for his

transportation to America and specifically allowed him to decide whether or not to stay in London on his way there.<sup>14</sup> Warrants had been taken out on only a few people in London.<sup>15</sup> But more became involved in political activity abroad when they travelled as part of their traditional journeyman's *Wanderung*. While in the early *Vormärz* period the governments harassed mainly writers and journalists such as the poet Ferdinand Freiligrath, they now increasingly kept under surveillance workers and artisans active in the opposition clubs abroad. A focal point for such observation was the German Workers' Educational Society (CABV) in London, which had up to 700 members (but at least as many again joined it annually for a short period before returning to the Continent).

After the revolution of 1848 a veritable flood of refugees left Germany. Well over 10,000 participants in the uprising crossed over the nearest border into Switzerland. Over the next few years, the more liberal countries on the Continent came under pressure to conform to repressive policies, and eventually even Switzerland and Belgium, the other traditional countries of asylum, expelled many refugees. By 1851 most therefore thought that their only safe refuge was England, unless they fled as far as to the United States or Australia, which some 3–4,000 Forty-eighters did, frequently passing through London on their way. London thus became the assembly point for most of the prominent Forty-eighters. Numbers here fluctuated considerably between 1849 and 1853, however. The Metropolitan Police estimated that there were 1,300 German refugees in London in 1852.<sup>16</sup> The British government in 1853 counted 400 in the capital (of whom 260 were left by January 1859) and 300 dispersed throughout the country as far as Manchester, Liverpool, Bradford, Hull and Edinburgh.<sup>17</sup> Following the first large wave of autumn 1849, refugee committees in London aided at least 700 fugitives, while meetings were attended by 600 to 800 exiles.<sup>18</sup> We can thus assume that about 1,500 German refugees spent some time in London, with more merely passing through. But many soon dispersed, particularly overseas, with a stock of perhaps 500 or more remaining in London after December 1851. It must be added, though, that there was constant fluctuation, with some refugees still arriving as late as 1855 and 1856. About 5–10 per cent of the German community can therefore be described as active politically.

### **Social stratification of the colony**

Both the refugees and the wider colony represented a broad spectrum of social positions and occupations. At the pinnacle of the social hierarchy sat Prince Albert, who, while little involved with the German community as such, was the pride of the monarchist and loyal section.<sup>19</sup> His presence also created some demand for certain German skills and products, with German language and music becoming fashionable for a time, to the advantage of teachers and governesses. The refugees also included some aristocrats. Toppled by a popular revolt in 1830, the Duke of Brunswick fled to London and there devised schemes for regaining his throne which led him into contact with unlikely bedfellows such as the communist refugees around Marx. Even Prince Metternich, the head and symbol of Restoration Europe, sought refuge from revolution in England in 1848, and in classic exile fashion launched a newspaper, the conservative *Spectateur de Londres*, to expedite his return.<sup>20</sup> Among the democratic Forty-eighters, the Silesian landowner Count Oskar von Reichenbach played a prominent role, as did the wealthy



Baroness von Bruiningk and a number of impoverished minor aristocrats such as the governess Malwida von Meysenbug and a group of former Prussian officers around August von Willich and Alexander Schimmelpfennig von der Oye. In addition, several German states kept embassies in London, but only the Prussian envoy between 1842 and 1854, Freiherr Christian von Bunsen, became prominently involved with the German community through his interests in religion and in the German Hospital.<sup>21</sup>

Far more Germans, of course, lived at the opposite end of the social scale. The bottom rung of the social ladder was made up of unskilled itinerants, and the German charities were obsessed by the large numbers of German ‘professional beggars and swindlers’.<sup>22</sup> Groups of wayfaring ‘broom-girls’ from Hesse-Darmstadt, for instance, were observed as specifically German, and English caricatures show German women accordingly with brooms and kerchiefs (their menfolk typically with beards and long pipes).<sup>23</sup> Germans also had a reputation as musicians, from Charles Hallé to street bands. Almost 400 Germans registered as musicians or music-masters in 1861, and John Ruskin’s family, for example, hired a German band on a festive occasion in 1848.<sup>24</sup> Brass bands were particularly popular in Whitechapel—with the patriotic anthem of *Die Wacht am Rhein* a special favourite—and considerably undercut English prices. An English musician thus complained in 1850 that ‘brass bands is all the go when they’ve Germans to play them. The Germans will work at 2s. a day at any fair, when an Englishman will expect 6s.... The Germans pull the bells and knock at the doors for money, which an Englishman has hardly the face for.’<sup>25</sup>

An important part of the audience for German bands were ‘sugar bakers’, who formed one of the main subsections of the entire colony. North German sugar refiners had established factories in the seventeenth century to make use of the neighbouring docks, and the first German Lutheran community in the East End had been set up by a sugar refiner named Beckmann in 1763.<sup>26</sup> Subsequent English owners continued to employ northern German workers, and 1,230 sugar refiners from Germany and Prussia were counted in 1861 (out of a total of 1,549 in London).<sup>27</sup> Earning some 20 to 25s. per week, they worked under extremely unpleasant conditions at temperatures reaching 70–80°C.<sup>28</sup> This often led to respiratory diseases, and as a result they made up about 20 to 30 per cent of the patients in the German Hospital.<sup>29</sup> Most were single men in their twenties who shared living quarters, had scarcely any contact with their English surroundings, and hardly ever learned the language.<sup>30</sup> While the sugar bakers thus formed the single largest group of German men, slightly over 10 per cent, they remained strangely isolated from their English surroundings as well as the German colony. Forming the core of the ‘Little Germany’ in Whitechapel, they preferred their own amusement places such as the dance-halls in the East End. A German music hall called ‘Sugar Loaf in St George-in-the-East’ appears to have catered especially for them.<sup>31</sup> Scarcely any joined the larger social clubs such as the *Turnverein* or became involved in the politics of the colony.<sup>32</sup>

Politically the most active section of the German working class were undoubtedly the tailors, of whom there were also a fair number in the East End. They were also the most visible, and the German-language paper *Hermann* in fact mistook them for the single largest group, naming horse racing and old ale as their vices.<sup>33</sup> In London and elsewhere, tailors were often prominent in radical politics; as one observer put it in 1846: ‘Of one hundred communist artisans one can safely assume sixty to be tailors... Tailor and communist is almost synonymous in Switzerland.’<sup>34</sup> The communists Friedrich Lessner,

J.G.Eccarius and Andreas Scherzer belonged to the 913 German tailors enumerated in London in 1861 (8 per cent of all German men). In Whitechapel, where many lived and worked, large establishments had by then been replacing small-scale production by master artisans for some time. Johann Georg Eccarius, then a devoted follower of Marx, claimed that in 1850 modern clothing manufacturers, especially three large firms, in fact already controlled over a third of the industry in London.<sup>35</sup> Despite vast unemployment, especially seasonal, much recruitment of tailors for the production of cheap ready-made clothes (the slop trade) went on abroad, and Henry Mayhew singled out 'German and Polish Jew tailors, Prussians, Austrians, Belgians, and Hungarians'.<sup>36</sup> Some German tailors who had received more fashionable training in Paris as part of their *Wanderung* were employed by better establishments in the West End, but the majority produced cheap ready-made clothes for the large warehouses in Whitechapel.<sup>37</sup>

Germans were also represented in other sections of the London working class. A particularly large group was formed by about 1,000 bakers, whose numbers were to increase so much more by the 1880s that agitation was specifically directed against those in the East End.<sup>38</sup> More than 500 men made shoes, boots or slippers, among them a prominent member of the Communist League, Heinrich Bauer. While British workers regarded them as threatening their trade, German slipper makers in turn feared competition from other immigrants, especially Poles. Many felt that the sweated labour was actually worse and the cost of living higher than in Germany. Frequently they complained that workers were brought over by the group for the busy season under false pretences and subsequently kept in dependence, with lodging and food provided at extortionate costs.<sup>39</sup> Larger groups of Germans worked in the leather industry and tanneries, where the division of labour was much more advanced than in Germany. Despite seasonal unemployment, some skimmers and furriers could make up to 30s. per week, and trade boomed during the Crimean war.<sup>40</sup> While working conditions in the fur industry in the East End were unusually dirty and unhealthy, conditions were better in cigar-making, where a strong organisation had won the workers regulated hours and high wages of £1 or even 35s. a week.<sup>41</sup> Some more affluent artisans, such as cabinetmakers, goldsmiths and watchmakers, but also shoemakers and tailors, lived in Soho and in particular around Leicester Square and Tottenham Court Road.<sup>42</sup>

Germans were also prominent in the service sector, so much so in some areas in the later decades that one German grumbled that the English 'often regard us as a nation of waiters and hairdressers'.<sup>43</sup> In the 1860s hundreds attended the annual ball of the German Waiters' Association, and by 1881 there were supposedly 2,000 German waiters in the United Kingdom. (As a result of foreign competition, indeed, English waiters became increasing casualised towards the end of the century.)<sup>44</sup> German members of the YMCA formed their own group in London in 1860, and had special branches for bakers and waiters in the 1880s. Its newspaper for waiters alone sold 1,000 copies weekly, and with some exaggeration the writer Theodor Fontane claimed that every waiter, clerk or artisan in London could safely be addressed in German.<sup>45</sup>

German clerks were still a minority during Fontane's stay in the 1850s, so that only 489 commercial clerks were counted in the 1861 census. However, the emphasis on foreign languages in the German educational system and, again, undercutting by the immigrants greatly improved their chances in London businesses, so that their numbers were to swell enormously, and sometimes gave rise to considerable xenophobia. (A

young man set on a career in Germany could also profit from some years' experience in London.)<sup>46</sup> Some refugees joined their ranks, the communist Pieper earning 25s. a week, while Ferdinand Freiligrath moved up to the position of first clerk and an annual income of £350.<sup>47</sup>

With the increase in the number of clerks, however, their social status began to sink. Middle-class professionals thus tended to fall back on journalism or teaching, but income here was not necessarily better. Besides Marx many such exiles, from Lothar Bucher to Wilhelm Liebknecht, relied almost exclusively on payment for articles for their living, and many more, including Johanna Kinkel and Eccarius, supplemented their income by occasional journalistic ventures. How insufficient this was as a rule is revealed in the many desperate begging letters written by Marx and Liebknecht.<sup>48</sup> Many refugees combined journalism with teaching, although only 151 German men officially described themselves as teachers (other than of music), 75 per cent being language teachers. The work was often portrayed as more arduous, less prestigious and more subject to social restraints than in Germany, but the pay could be much better, especially through additional fees for examinations and textbooks.<sup>49</sup> Nonetheless there were too many teachers among the refugees of 1848, and Johanna Kinkel complained that 'We are now an entire colony of teachers in search of pupils'.<sup>50</sup> Karl Schapper, for example, could scarcely get by with teaching. To some degree the same was true of the scholars among the refugees. The pride of the German scholarly community were the orientalists, led by the Sanskrit scholar Theodor Goldstücker at University College London and the philologist Max Müller, editor of the *Rigveda*, who held a chair at Oxford. But while Karl Buchheim became professor of German at King's College, London, and Eugen Oswald taught at University College and among his many literary activities helped to found the English Goethe Society, others never managed to establish themselves.<sup>51</sup> (The genial *Bummler* Müller-Strüüing, an authority on ancient philosophy, was, for example, entirely dependent on the charity of the German Athenaeum, a literary society whose humble doorkeeper he became.<sup>52</sup>) To these one can add professionals such as Nikolaus Trübner, a German publisher in close contact with many refugees, who issued many of their specialised works as well as German literature generally.

The German middle class also included the medical professions, although few doctors had a sufficiently large practice to survive. The 1861 census counted only 34 physicians and 46 others in related occupations, but one refugee doctor claimed to know some forty colleagues among the Forty-eighters alone, only one of whom succeeded in practising in England.<sup>53</sup> The medical needs of the German colony, however, were mainly met by the German Hospital in Dalston. On the initiative of Dr J.C.H.Freund, who enlisted the support of the Prussian ambassador Bunsen, the hospital and two dispensaries were opened in 1845. Two German doctors were supported by British consultants and nurses sent from a German charitable foundation, whose work influenced Florence Nightingale after she visited the hospital.<sup>54</sup> Bunsen, however, pushed for greater religious influence and finally forced Freund to resign.<sup>55</sup> Workers allegedly stayed away from the hospital because of 'pestering' by pietists, but the hospital flourished in the long run.<sup>56</sup> An 'admirable institution', in the Chartist G.J.Harney's words, it admitted more than 14,000 patients in its first two decades and treated an additional 178,000 as outpatients, the largest group being sugar bakers.<sup>57</sup> It survived both world wars and in 1948 was incorporated into the National Health Service.

Most support for the German Hospital came from the higher echelons of German middle-class society, entrepreneurs, bankers, merchants and businessmen, who had constituted the core of German settlement in London from the Hansa onwards (Friedrich Huth, employer of the poet Ferdinand Freiligrath in the forties, for instance, gave £1,000 towards its foundation). Some lucky refugees were able to ascend quickly to this well-established strata of the colony; Ludwig Bamberger, for example, joined the family banking business in London.<sup>58</sup> Others at least found support here. The businessman Isidor Gerstenberg from Breslau, for instance, helped Kinkel and even Freiligrath, although his own views tended more towards moderate constitutional liberalism.<sup>59</sup> Merchants such as Baring and Grote, whose firms had been established in London in the eighteenth century (Baring surviving into the 1990s), were in the Victorian era joined by the merchant bankers Wilhelm Heinrich Göschen and Baron John Henry von Schröder, who supported virtually every German charity. Among industrialists, Karl Wilhelm (later Sir William) Siemens established his electrical engineering firm in London in 1852 and produced telegraphic equipment and steel, while Ludwig Mond settled in the 1860s and became one of the pioneers of the English chemical industry, laying the foundations for what was to become ICI.<sup>60</sup> A group of merchants, mostly from Hamburg, settled in Camberwell. With unconcealed admiration Theodor Fontane described them as 'perhaps the only ones whom... every English gentleman admits to be his equal in dress, demeanour, education and money'.<sup>61</sup> At the top of the German *Bürgertum*, they had their own parish and kept up a distinctly German social life with music and lectures. The steep fees for the Camberweller Gesangverein, a singing group founded in 1860, and for Kinkel's literary lectures indicate that the wealthier merchants preferred to keep themselves to themselves.<sup>62</sup>

Unlike most of the other immigrants, the Camberwell Germans settled with their families, and nearly half of their number was female. Otherwise only about a third of all Germans were women, for many German immigrants were *Gastarbeiter*, single young men, 38 per cent of whom were in their twenties, mainly in London for a few years on contract labour as sugar bakers, seeking seasonal employment as journeymen artisans, or gaining special expertise in trade or business.<sup>63</sup> Quite a few also went abroad to avoid conscription into the Prussian military. Thus of the immigrant populations in their early twenties, the percentage of women among London Germans was lowest, at only 25 per cent. By contrast French immigrants generally were almost as often women as men.

## Women

The picture of the female population is very different from that of the male. Almost half (44 per cent) of the 5,257 German women in London described themselves in the 1861 census as wives, giving no further designation. The next largest group, some 12 per cent, listed their occupation as 'domestic servant (general)', and another 5 per cent were cooks, nurses, housemaids and others in the more specialised 'domestic' category. Only two further sizeable groups of occupations were given for women: 417, or 8 per cent, produced clothing from boots to bonnets, while 277, or 5 per cent, were teaching. Of the first group, most were milliners, dressmakers or tailors, while others embroidered, made gloves, caps or shoes, or worked as seamstresses and laundresses. The income of female

workers in the London clothing industry was generally considered to be totally inadequate; a feminist journal in Germany reported that ‘the returns from women’s labour are so much below the most elementary needs that [the women] are without fail doomed to prostitution’. Doubtless many immigrant women shared this fate: the City Mission noted fifty German prostitutes in one Whitechapel brothel. One émigré paper thought the low pay of German female workers in London stemmed from too many unskilled women competing for the same jobs in warehouses and specialising in work like the production of shirts, vests, shoes, or knitwear, which required only very brief on-the-job training. Lack of professional education, both in Germany and in England, total neglect by the German community in London and the intervention of too many middle-men contributed to the women’s plight. The journal also claimed that ‘proper women’s work, such as embroidery, sewing, the production of shirts, etc.’ was so poorly paid that women moved to other kinds of work, often auxiliary jobs in the shoemaking industry. There—even at full employment of twelve hours a day—they made only about 8 to 10s. a week, some even as little as 6s. (while male workers earned up to 20–21s.).<sup>64</sup> Conditions in the für industry were not much healthier, and in 1851 almost a quarter of the female patients of the German Hospital were furriers.<sup>65</sup>

We know very little of the lives of most German working women in London. Occasional glimpses into the working and living conditions of domestic servants, often biased, can be gleaned from accounts of family life. One servant, Helene Demuth, well known to Marx scholars as the mother of his illegitimate son, may serve as an example here. In 1845, the Baroness von Westphalen sent her as ‘the best present she could give’ to her daughter, Jenny Marx, then in exile in Brussels. Helene Demuth shared all the misery of exile and remained a lifelong friend and confidante of the Marx family. She ran the household of the impoverished and chaotic family to everyone’s admiration, and Marx ‘often asked her advice on difficult and complicated Party matters’.<sup>66</sup> But her life as a servant was nonetheless typical in other respects. Her education, for instance, was inadequate for life abroad, and in her faulty English she resembled many other German working women, who despite decades in London never learned much English. Her wages were so low that on occasion Engels had to supplement them, but in later years, she could afford trips to the Continent, and at her death left possessions worth £95.<sup>67</sup>

Doubtless many of the other hundreds of German women in domestic service were also employed by compatriots, such as Theodor Fontane. Frequently German families abroad preferred to continue their traditional household arrangements, to retain German cooking, and to speak their mother tongue at home. German-language periodicals in London carried advertisements by families looking specifically for servants who came from home.<sup>68</sup> But little is known about the lives of these women. Instead, it is almost only from the experiences of a few democratic middle-class émigrées that we can piece together a picture of female emigrant life.

Teaching was one of the few respectable ways for middle-class women (with or without formal education) to earn their own living, and foreign governesses could expect up to £100–£120 a year. Nonetheless they often found working conditions hard and complained about their unprestigious position in the strict hierarchy of English social life. Belonging neither to the ‘ladies’ nor to the servants of the household, governesses were often also in conflict with the families’ religious conventions. Moreover, they felt exploited by the employment agencies.<sup>69</sup> From the 1850s on, too, their situation worsened

due to increasing competition. In 1861 there were 200 German governesses in London alone. Those who wanted to protect their 'individual freedom and independence at least after work' could sometimes find other teaching positions, although the initial pay of 2s 6d an hour for language teachers was as discouraging as the perpetual hunt for new pupils. Among the more successful, the music teacher Johanna Kinkel advertised her 'singing classes for children' by giving frequent piano recitals and republishing her own compositions, while Bertha Ronge, another democratic Forty-eighter, who campaigned for modern, Froebelian pedagogical methods with lectures and books on infant training, introduced the kindergarten system into England.<sup>70</sup>

### **Religious and regional fragmentation**

With the London Germans thus ranging socially from a baroness who held salons to a girl who swept floors, from sweated tailor to Camberwell banker, there was little homogeneity in the colony. It was also fragmented in terms of place of residence in London, point of origin in Germany, and religion.

Unlike many other immigrant groups, the Germans were spread out over the metropolis. There was no single residential area with a distinctly German feel—no 'Little Germany' comparable with those of American cities. Instead, there were clusters throughout the city, most notably the wealthy enclave in Camberwell but also the groups in St John's Wood and around Leicester Square, with socioeconomic divisions clearly outweighing the common national background. The largest and most visible residential area, which contemporaries alone knew as 'Little Germany', was in Whitechapel, which in 1851 boasted twelve German dance-halls and large pubs.<sup>71</sup> But only 2,683 or one in every six London Germans lived even here, and the three largest German communities together (in Whitechapel, St George-in-the-East and Mile End Old Town) comprised just one-third of the colony; in the last two parishes, however, Germans accounted for three-quarters of all foreigners.<sup>72</sup> Other large German clusters were in Marylebone and St Pancras, with about 850 individuals in each, and in Islington and Shoreditch, with some 600 in each. A special case, finally, was Poplar, where of the over 600 Germans 95 per cent were men, presumably all merchant seamen.

This wide distribution of Germans over the entire metropolitan area may account for their relatively low visibility. From the 1840s to the 1870s only Germans bothered about the history and composition of their own colony. With the exception of the London City Mission, which worried about the lack of religious belief among immigrants, British interest was not aroused until in the 1880s the general fear of aliens came to include the Germans. During the decades under consideration here, only a few minor incidents provoked ill feeling, sparked off for example by noisy excursions on Sundays, then still more formally observed. Only when Anglo-German industrial and foreign political rivalry increased at the end of the century was this combined with resentment against German clerks or with growing anti-Semitic feeling against 'German Jewish capitalists' such as the financier Sir Ernest Cassel, in Edwardian England.<sup>73</sup>

Germans were also separated by internal divisions which prevented them from appearing as a tight-knit community. One of the main features distinguishing German communities in the United States from those of other immigrants, such as the Irish or

Italians, was the 'identity-shattering' lack of a common religious bond.<sup>74</sup> To a somewhat lesser degree, this was also true in London.<sup>75</sup> The great majority of Germans were Protestants, but despite Bunsen's efforts few practised their religion. The oldest surviving church in the City had been established by Hamburg Lutherans in 1669. The East End had a Lutheran church in Whitechapel, attended by almost 500 people on Sundays in the 1850s, and a church with 400 parishioners belonging to the Prussian Union. Although there were six (later nine) German Protestant churches plus several smaller congregations in addition to a Wesleyan Church, at most 1,000 Germans were regular churchgoers.<sup>76</sup> A Catholic congregation, established in 1809, catered for the sixth of the German population of that denomination, but a reformed 'German-Catholic' congregation established after 1848 by the refugee Johannes Ronge also flourished.<sup>77</sup> A German Jewish community was active by the mid-1850s, with a synagogue in New Broad Street to which in 1861 a benefit society with 160 members was attached.<sup>78</sup> In 1900 the German Hospital ran a kosher kitchen as some 20 to 25 per cent of its patients were Jewish.<sup>79</sup>

Linked to religious divisions was the place of origin. Regional loyalty was in fact a perpetual source of complaint for patriotic immigrants. Northern Germany far outweighed other regions of origin: Prussia, Hannover and the smaller northern German states taken together were the homelands of about 60 per cent of London Germans (30 per cent alone came from Prussia and 24 per cent from Hannover). The next largest group, 17 per cent, came from the Hessian states, and only 15 per cent originally lived in the south, including about 3 per cent from Austria.<sup>80</sup> People remained attached to their respective small states. Herzen made fun of the German 'cosmopolitan and atheist who despises every nationality except Kur-Hesse or Hesse-Cassel, according to which of the Hessen he was born in'.<sup>81</sup> North Germans disliked southerners not only among the political refugees and not only because of arguments about the future role of Prussia, for largely unpolitical emigrants such as the sugar bakers also divided according to their state of origin.<sup>82</sup> One of the oldest friendly societies was tied to the Black Forest origins of its participants, thus functioning simultaneously as a *Heimatverein* and as an insurance society.<sup>83</sup> The German Swiss met in a 'Swiss tavern' on Old Compton Street, and the German YMCA founded a Swiss branch in 1888.<sup>84</sup> Hannoverians who fled the advancing Prussian troops in 1866 established a *Verein treuer Hannoveraner*.<sup>85</sup> Quite frequently, too, there was a close connection between the place of origin and certain occupations: merchants and bankers often came from Hamburg and perhaps Frankfurt, butchers from Württemberg, gold workers from Hanau and Pforzheim, watch- and clockmakers from the Black Forest, tailors from Polish areas in Germany, and musicians from Bremen. This was partly the result of specialised industries having settled in particular regions in Germany itself, and partly because a pattern of chain migration among relatives and friends emerged. This adherence to local networks and local patriotism was often derided. German 'patriots' berated natives of the small states as 'bad Germans, who disavowed their fatherland', feeling no national identity or pride.<sup>86</sup> They complained that no other people adjusted as quickly to life abroad as the Germans, to the point of feigning English mannerisms after a few years in the country—although handbooks for emigrants recommended adhering to peculiar English manners, such as saying 'please' even to your servant.<sup>87</sup>

Despite this rapid assimilation a distinctly German infrastructure did emerge in the middle of the century. Since the German colony was the size of a small town, it brought

forth not only a hospital and churches with some schools attached to them,<sup>88</sup> but also dance-halls, German taverns and restaurants and specialist shops selling Swabian sausages, Cologne bread, and bock beer. An Austro-Bavarian Lager Beer Brewery was founded, and words such as *hock*, *lager*, and *delicatessen* entered the English vocabulary. German doctors, dentists and a pharmacy advertised their services in the German-language newspapers as well as teachers, interpreters, importers and shoemakers.<sup>89</sup> The network not only provided work and positions, but also social and political clubs. As early as 1796 a German lending library distributed over one thousand books.<sup>90</sup> A German freemasons' lodge had been founded in 1779, and the oldest friendly society existing in our period was 'The Man in the Moon', established in 1786 as a health and funeral insurance for the poorer Germans off Commercial Road, and still boasting 180 members in 1913. It was overtaken in general importance for the colony by the charitable Deutsche Gesellschaft für Wohltätigkeit und Eintracht, founded in 1817, which mostly gave pensions to the elderly poor. The Society of Friends of Foreigners in Distress, founded in 1806, helped some 210,000 foreigners during the next century, of whom at least half were Germans.<sup>91</sup> About 5,000 Germans were members of at least thirty other societies, some founded merely to combat homesickness, like the Union: Verein zur Ersetzung der Heimath in der Fremde, others to preserve German language and literature, to entertain with singing and theatre performances, or, later, to represent certain trades.<sup>92</sup>

A picture thus emerges of a vibrant and variegated German colony, which offered more in terms of ethnic and social support than initially met the eye. Many refugees arriving in London without knowledge of the language or customs of their host country could fall back on German institutions as well as an informal network among compatriots to help them over the initial hurdles. From the background of the colony, however, we shall now turn to the specifically political aspects of refugee existence.



## 2

# The German Workers' Educational Society, 1840–1849

It has long been recognised that ‘the political and organisational making of the German proletariat was begun abroad by a minority of proletarianised journeymen artisans’.<sup>1</sup> From the mid-1840s on, the centre of this development shifted from Switzerland and France to London. Here, in the quintessential metropolis—London was twice the size of Paris, and three times larger than Vienna or New York—the German artisans were exposed to entirely new working and living conditions. The main developments in German socialism and the ‘making’ of the socialist movement took place here. It was also in London that the *Communist Manifesto* was commissioned. One organisation, in turn, dominated the politics of early German socialism in exile, the Communistischer Arbeiter-Bildungsverein (CABV). Founded in 1840, and active until nearly the end of the First World War, the CABV not only became an important focal point of *Vormärz* radicalism, but was also home to many leading socialists fleeing reaction after the defeat of the 1848–1849 revolution. Correspondingly it became to an equal extent the site of their own efforts to unite among themselves, to define their own distinctive position and programme, and to settle upon the best form of socialism in an era of many socialisms and widespread disagreements about strategy and aims. This chapter considers the origins of the CABV and its relation to continental organisations such as the League of the Just and the Communist League, and traces its changing attitudes to alternative concepts of socialism, especially those of Marx and Engels. It also argues that the London émigrés’ attempts to develop theories and organisational forms of internationalism, underestimated in recent accounts, were in fact vital to their distinctive brand of socialism. Finally, the impact of the emigrants returning to Germany in 1848–1849 is analysed.

### The League of the Just in London

The leading early German socialist association was the League of the Just, which emerged from earlier conspiratorial circles in Paris in the late 1830s and dominated artisan radicalism during the crucial years of the *Vormärz* period between 1838 and 1847. The League, a secret society, aimed at the ‘liberation of Germany from the yoke of disgraceful oppression, cooperation to free mankind, and realisation of the principles contained in the declaration of human and civil rights’.<sup>2</sup> The League’s immediate concerns were educating its members and conducting propaganda in Germany and abroad, and the views it sought to instil were initially quite varied, ranging from Lamennais and Fourier to Babouvist conspiratorial tactics. Desiring a more precise identity, however, the Parisian Central Authority of the League adopted Wilhelm

Weitling's *Die Menschheit wie sie ist und wie sie sein sollte* as its official programme in late 1838.<sup>3</sup>

A tailor born in 1808 in Magdeburg, Weitling at this time was the leading figure and most important theorist of early German socialism, and had joined the League of the Just in Paris in 1836. Central to his schemes was a Christian argument for community of property as the only solution for existing social misery, which Weitling saw as rooted in private property and money. A revolution led by workers (not a group of conspirators, as the League under the French revolutionary communist Auguste Blanqui's influence proposed) would establish a strictly egalitarian society based on communal property and an obligation to work. These ideas dominated the League of the Just between 1838 and 1843–1844, and with Weitling's growing influence it concentrated more on popularising the idea of a revolution led by the working classes than on seeking isolated violent insurrection. Ironically, however, it was just such an attempted putsch which led to the League's suppression in France, for in May 1839 followers of the French egalitarian Jacobin Gracchus Babeuf, organised in the *Société des Saisons*, staged an uprising in Paris, and although the League's involvement could not be proved, several of its leaders were arrested and expelled. Hydra-like, however, the League sprang up anew, especially in Switzerland, where Weitling began publishing a series of newspapers in 1841, and in London, where one of its chief supporters, Karl Schapper, had found asylum after the Blanquist uprising.

Schapper became the leading figure in the London branch of the League of the Just, and was indeed one of the most prominent Germans in London exile politics for some 20 years. As a student of forestry at Giessen University, he had joined a radical students' organisation, or *Burschenschaft* (bearing its duelling scars throughout his life), out of 'enthusiasm for Germany's freedom, unity and greatness'.<sup>4</sup> This immersion in revolutionary nationalist politics led to Schapper's involvement in 'Young Germany' groups in Switzerland and in Mazzini's ill-fated expedition to Savoy in 1834. He then joined the League of the Just in Paris, becoming a member of its Central Authority or 'People's Hall', and in 1838 writing a lengthy manuscript—his first known theoretical statement—setting out the aims of the League, which was turned down, however, in favour of Weitling's *Menschheit*. Like Weitling, Schapper assumed that an insurmountable antagonism existed between aristocratic and democratic principles, and argued that

Mankind will only be truly free and happy when all people, according to nations, live in an association of states where all possess equal rights to the earth's goods and their enjoyment, and where all work equally in some way for their production or preservation for the communal welfare of all, i.e., if there is community of goods... Community of goods is the first and essential condition of a free democratic republic.<sup>5</sup>

But Schapper was much less concerned than Weitling to detail his vision of the future society, and concentrated instead on criticising existing inequalities, taking Christian ideals of mutual love and brotherhood as his guiding lines and praising Christ as 'our first republican'. He was little concerned with constitutional changes, preferring to discuss social and moral conditions. Nine-tenths of existing society, that is, the agricultural and

commercial (*gewerbetreibenden*) classes, would benefit from community of goods, Schapper claimed, and would soon realise that a revolution would quickly improve their educational and moral standards. Only the aristocracy, paid officials and the rich factory owners would lose thereby, along with those *Geistesaristokraten* who hoped to dominate the people. Throughout most of his political career Schapper clung to this mistrust of intellectuals, 'who do not think of the people and in their brains stuffed full of bookish wisdom regard themselves as superior to others and as made for giving mankind laws and for ruling over them in lieu of the despots'. (This theme, indeed, was to become quite prominent in London exile politics, as we will see.) Other traits of this 1838 manuscript also reappeared in Schapper's later views, especially his reluctance to describe in detail future republican institutions without doing anything to instigate revolution, and in his plainly preferring 'the struggle to all plans'.

In London Schapper's closest associates were two artisans, Heinrich Bauer and Joseph Moll. Bauer was a shoemaker and former member of both the Paris League of the Banished and the League of the Just. While in Paris he had organised the distribution of Weitling's Swiss paper, *Der Hülferuf der deutschen Jugend*, for which he was expelled from France, arriving in London early in 1842. Engels described him as 'a lively, alert, witty little fellow', shrewd, determined and 'a born diplomat'.<sup>6</sup> Occasionally moved to poetry, Bauer also surprised a police agent with his incorruptibility 'although this Baur [sic!] is a shoemaker'.<sup>7</sup> A watchmaker from Cologne, Joseph Moll was by contrast quite a 'Hercules—how often did Schapper and he victoriously defend the entrance to a hall against hundreds of onrushing opponents!'<sup>8</sup> Like Schapper, he had come to the League of the Just via the nationalist republicanism of Young Germany and had fled Paris after the Blanquist uprising.

When both Schapper and Moll reached London, they found two German refugee clubs already in existence: the 'Association for Mutual Support and Education',<sup>9</sup> mainly remnants of some 60 to 70 members of Young Germany expelled from Switzerland in 1836, and a smaller organisation, called the 'German Society', which rejected Young German ideas.<sup>10</sup> These groups already demonstrated many features which were to be prominent in German life in London for the rest of the century. Language problems isolated them from their new milieu. Illusions about prospects of revolution at home fuelled the desire to hasten its outbreak. The émigrés' relative poverty meant that their newspapers were short-lived.<sup>11</sup> Moments of fragile unity were further undermined by squabbles about distributing collected funds. The consequent frequent splitting up into factions of the main body, too, was accompanied by malicious and slanderous campaigns against one another.

Nonetheless the politics of the exiled Germans were by no means merely an exercise in futility and, as we will see, they came to play an important role in the history of the German workers' movement. Their endless and often bitter arguments about the shape of the future society and the best means to achieve it were without doubt waged with an intensity and with reference to a range of interests rarely equalled in other German artisans' associations at the time. Their disputes and political divisions, although taking place abroad in an obscure club under adverse conditions, impressed political observers in Germany, influenced radical journalists and thinkers like Marx and Moses Hess, and anticipated many later political developments in Germany itself, notably with regard to the relations between democratic and socialist revolutionaries.

### The German Workers' Educational Society

On 7 February 1840, Schapper, Moll and five others founded the 'Deutscher Bildungsverein für Arbeiter' (German Workers' Educational Society), which soon surpassed the existing societies and gained fame in the history of the German socialist and labour movement as the Communistischer Arbeiter-Bildungsverein, CABV, or Communist Workers' Educational Society. Founded as 'Deutscher Bildungsverein für Arbeiter', the society changed its name several times and was often referred to merely as 'the communist society' or 'Great Windmill Street'.<sup>12</sup> With some exaggeration it has even been claimed that 'the origin of internationalism' dates from the foundation of the CABV.<sup>13</sup> Following the League's Swiss pattern, the CABV was a club open to Germans and foreigners alike, who defined themselves as 'workers' (not journeymen or artisans) and organised lectures on various topics in history, geography and the sciences, offered language, singing and drawing lessons, and engaged in weekly political debates and entertainment, including theatre productions and outings. The association soon acquired its own premises with a library, maps and musical instruments, and set up a health insurance scheme for its members.<sup>14</sup> Its aims were thus seemingly non-political and inoffensive, and its active social life, educational and financial advantages, as well as its function as a home from home, quickly attracted new members. The largest single group among these were (and remained throughout the period under discussion here) tailors, including Weitling, Andreas Scherzer, Albert Lehmann, Johann Georg Eccarius, Friedrich Lessner, and J.G.Reininger.<sup>15</sup> They were followed by cabinetmakers, shoemakers and other artisans.

But the lectures constituted the club's chief claim to function as a workers' educational society, and throughout the CABV's existence they reflected all the different shades of meaning implied in the term *Arbeiterbildung* ('workers' education'). The German humanist concept of *Bildung* undoubtedly left its mark: instruction in the classical languages, piano lessons and lectures on art history were a staple at the CABV.<sup>16</sup> But the club also provided practical education, *Ausbildung*. English-language classes were offered regularly, and workers employed in the East End tanneries or sugar refineries could benefit from courses in chemistry.<sup>17</sup> But the CABV also saw as one of its chief tasks the shaping of its members' political consciousness as workers. Lessner, for instance, reiterated this point throughout his entire career in the CABV, which he eulogised as 'the London University for Workers', and stressed that 'the solution of the workers' question depends alone on the education of the worker, since only the educated worker is able to defend his cause clearly and concisely, and to take up the struggle with other classes'.<sup>18</sup> A much later lecturer at the club defined their education as 'not superficial stuffing full of assorted trifling knowledge, but drawing the masses of the people to us and enlightening them about our aspirations'.<sup>19</sup> Marx famously taught political economy; and regular philosophical, historical and political lectures at the CABV tried to introduce aspects of current interest to workers, but also gave room to phrenology and the 'science of man', taught by Schapper. Weekly discussions and the club's own journals were meant to aid these educational efforts. Speakers stood up and took their hats off, and impressed observers with the dignity of these discussions 'in the nicest parliamentarian fashion'.<sup>20</sup> In fact, the CABV prided itself on offering a type of *Bildung* much superior to the deceptive middle-class education, for here, it was

contended, 'the worker remains unseduced by the enticements of false education, art, and science, and is thus able to receive the seed of criticism, from which a purer understanding grows'.<sup>21</sup>

Within this seemingly innocuous public body devoted to education, however, existed a secret inner circle of the League of the Just, subordinate to the Central Authority in Paris, which supervised the functions and public proclamations of the CABV and used it for agitation, discussion and recruitment. This pattern of inner and outer circles was a legacy of the clandestine activities of the continental League, and the fact that this conspiratorial tradition was not relinquished in the more liberal surroundings of London suggests a strong dependence, both organisational and ideological, on the League, whose Central Authority remained in Paris and whose theoretical outlook was dominated by Weitling.

The first known theoretical statements of the London CABV appear in correspondence published in Weitling's Swiss paper, *Die junge Generation*, between December 1841 and November 1842, and reflect some British influences on the League in England.<sup>22</sup> While the London Society, following Weitling, offered religious justifications for social change and regarded community of goods as the essence of true Christianity, for example, it also admired Robert Owen.<sup>23</sup> A delegation from the German society had been invited in March 1842 to attend the inauguration of Harmony Hall, the largest British Owenite communitarian experiment, and returned full of praise for the principle of communal property, believing that this would instil a high standard of morals, education and fraternity among the inhabitants. Schapper and the CABV seemingly ignored the rationalist and anti-religious tendencies in Owenism, but agreed with the Owenites that revolution could not be achieved by violence, but required prior education of the masses. This pacifist tendency among the London Germans, in striking contrast to the stress on violent revolution of both Weitling and Schapper in 1838, probably originated in the failure of the Blanquist uprising of 1839, and was shared by the young Friedrich Engels, whose contact with Owenism dispelled for a time his notion that violent revolution was either inevitable or desirable. Such biases may also have been reinforced by the unsuccessful Chartist strike movement in northern England in the summer of 1842, in which German observers had apparently invested some hopes.<sup>24</sup> Accordingly the society saw its aims primarily in terms of education, agitation and propaganda, particularly with a view to creating a standpoint independent of the middle classes, and thus to 'prove ourselves worthy of emancipation in the eyes of public opinion'.<sup>25</sup>

Correspondingly the CABV set out to establish its own views on a variety of issues, and from 1843-1844 onwards increasingly distanced itself from the continental League of the Just. This was partly because the Paris Central Authority under Ewerbeck leaned strongly towards the French communitarian Étienne Cabet, while the London group rejected the latter's project for communist settlements.<sup>26</sup> There were several reasons for this. The immediate occasion was the League's current debate about the wisdom of setting up a colony in Wisconsin. In discussions with the London *Société démocratique française* in May 1843 and again in May 1844, Schapper maintained that the present generation was insufficiently prepared for '*petite société*' communal living. The ill-will, corruption and wickedness of the '*grande société*' outside, he thought, would undermine any efforts they might make. Instead, communists should concentrate on exposing the 'wickedness of exploitation' and destroying the 'anti-fraternal' principles of society as a whole.<sup>27</sup> (This did not prevent the CABV from setting up very small 'communities' of

some six tailors in London when its members became unemployed.<sup>28</sup>) Schapper also criticised Owen's earlier community at New Harmony, where, as he saw it, 'capitalists' had joined the colony and tried to dominate simple workers.<sup>29</sup> What the Germans seem chiefly to have picked up from Owen, therefore, was an emphasis upon the dependence of individual moral behaviour on the general condition of society; thus they blamed the deficient organisation of society for the 'crimes' committed by Silesian weavers in 1844.<sup>30</sup>

More appealing than Cabet and Owen, thus, were Weitling's views, and when Weitling arrived in London in September 1844 a meeting of German and French communists, Owenites and Chartists enthusiastically welcomed him as the martyr, leader and founder of German communism.<sup>31</sup> His presence triggered off a series of discussions in the German club throughout 1845 which, in the words of the Communist League's historian Hundt, 'can scarcely be over-estimated in their importance for the history of the League'.<sup>32</sup> These covered a list of questions, apparently proposed by Weitling, which focused on the means of achieving communism and on various aspects of the future society, and were prototypical, in effect, of the way in which the *Principles of Communism* and the *Communist Manifesto* were later formulated by Engels and Marx.<sup>33</sup> These debates, however, soon led to a split between Weitling and the majority of the German Society led by Schapper. The latter agreed that man was essentially good, and needed only to live in accordance with natural laws, especially without private property, to prove this, a concept also present in Schapper's 1838 manuscript. But such a state could not be achieved immediately, and the majority thought that at present the communists' main aim ought to be to enlighten the general public and by science and reason to lay a stable basis for a future society. Given the sometimes disparate views among the dozen or so contributors to these discussions, contradictions remained within the CABV, but a rift was clearly developing between the majority of the Londoners and Weitling. In particular, Weitling believed that mankind was always 'ripe' for communism, and that strong emotional appeals might therefore lead immediately to a revolution which would explode 'like a thunderstorm'. The peaceful propaganda the club favoured, he asserted, would only sap the courage and enthusiasm of all concerned.<sup>34</sup> Against this, Schapper insisted that one could not 'curtail the free development and force humankind to act when they have not yet got the insight'. Communism could not be introduced by an arbitrary act of violence but had to 'unfold naturally': 'Our entire activity is for future generations; may they put into practice what we can only prepare theoretically by way of enlightening propaganda.'<sup>35</sup>

Religion was also important in these discussions. Just beforehand, in March 1845, Schapper, Bauer, Moll and Lehmann had declared that Christianity could only be realised in communism. Moreover, even communism could not 'offset the advantages others have over the weak, sick and otherwise unfortunate. Faith alone here can offer compensation.' Directly expressing their sympathies with Ronge's religious reform movement, which had patriotic and democratic overtones, the Londoners concluded that 'only that religion... which aims at the abolition of poverty, which does most for the poor, can have a lasting value in history'.<sup>36</sup> In the debates Weitling too suggested that, given its powerful emotional appeal, the communists use Christianity for propaganda purposes. But by now Bauer began to disagree, arguing that only convictions founded on rational insight could be permanent. Weitling conceded that the test for any belief should be its benefit to the

general public. But another member of the society, Rosenthal, blamed religion generally for preventing the introduction to date of communism. Schapper agreed, favouring a strict separation of political and religious matters, and while he was still unwilling to deny the existence of God, at his instigation the club discussed the Young Hegelian philosophy of religion for much of the next year.<sup>37</sup> This increasing attack upon Christianity, and perhaps also their contacts with the Owenites, led many of the German Society to term themselves atheists from the end of 1845 onwards. Christian dogmas were rejected as incompatible with the natural sciences and as wrongly focusing on an undefined other world.<sup>38</sup> In order 'to demonstrate publicly that we are no longer Christians', CABV members no longer allowed their children to be baptised, the argument being that 'we are no longer Christians but *human beings*, hence our children are taken not to church but instead into the club, where they receive a name and are accepted not into the union of Christendom but into the union of mankind'.<sup>39</sup>

Another bone of contention between Weitling and the society concerned who was most interested in introducing communism and therefore most likely to bring it about. Weitling suggested that a somewhat motley crowd—for example sympathetic princes, workers, women and the poor—might be assembled to work for communism for very different reasons. The views of the club on this question, however, were not much more unified. Schapper vehemently rejected the idea of 'reducing the whole of communism to material interests', which he thought meant pulling the whole idea 'down into the mud of meanness', while communists, on the contrary, wanted to abolish private interests in favour of community, freedom, equality and justice, and thus needed self-sacrifice rather than self-interest.<sup>40</sup> Bauer tended to come closest to the future Marxist position of the League in maintaining that the workers alone would introduce communism, later explaining that he meant 'that class which still has got something. The lowest class of the people is completely deadened; we should place our hopes on the class which has not yet fallen to the lowest level.' Similarly, Hermann Kriege, a journalist with 'true socialist' sympathies who visited London and the CABV in the early summer, declared communism to be identical with the private interest of the proletarians, which was to provide everyone with food, clothing and housing, while Lehmann suggested that the society 'follow the example of the academics [Engels was probably meant] and pay attention to the factory towns'.<sup>41</sup> The club reached a minimal consensus, however, arguing that 'Those who do not feel satisfied in the present society yet do not seek their own satisfaction to the disadvantage of others have the greatest interest' in communism.<sup>42</sup>

Unfortunately the CABV's economic discussions of this period were not fully recorded.<sup>43</sup> At this time Weitling advocated a system of *Kommerzstunden*, which meant that those who voluntarily worked longer than the socially required hours, especially in unpleasant labour, would be rewarded by extra luxuries such as travel. This scheme was rejected by the German Society, which feared that it would lead to new inequalities. According to Schapper, moreover, the most important problem was that all previous systems suffered from being exclusively concerned with the maldistribution of the hardest labour, as well as insufficient confidence in human nature. But the correct system based upon full individual development would 'put everything in the best harmony after two generations' if it was simply left alone, and would always ensure enough production to satisfy all needs. Human nature alone, not external force, could guarantee that people derived happiness from their work, and the essence of communism thus was to provide

equal opportunities for everyone to develop freely. Weitling's system was criticised for placing community of production and consumption above the cultivation of the individual, and for curtailing freedom in the equality provided by communism.<sup>44</sup> Schapper was adamant that communism and individual free self-realisation must complement one another, and that 'everyone must have his complete freedom, without infringing the personal freedom [of others or of all]'. Rejecting 'a deplorable coercion of conscience and society', Schapper said that 'the people must become human, it must become happy above all spiritually and intellectually [*geistig*]'.<sup>45</sup> Even for Kriege—soon to be attacked for his preaching of 'love'—the CABV's 'drivel' of 'mankind, reason, heart, will, *morality, honour, freedom, equality etc.*', went too far and lacked the concreteness and straightforwardness of Weitling's system.<sup>46</sup> Eventually, Weitling's views were rejected along with Owen's and Cabet's as 'too military', with Schapper maintaining that a static system like Cabet's would stultify and enslave mankind, whereas communism needed to encourage 'struggle', that is, the moral and intellectual impulse for improvement. It should be noted that this 'liberal' element in Schapper's communism was not only a recent addition to his own thinking, but was also not shared by all of his friends in the CABV. Schapper at this point indeed went so far as to consider an alliance with 'the bourgeoisie', for instance, in order to achieve progressive taxation as a first step, an element that was to crop up again in the League's arguments after the separation from Marx and Engels in 1850.<sup>47</sup>

Discussions of Weitling's questions were broken off in January 1846. Instead, Schapper, who expected 'a real system to be formed by our new German philosophers', persuaded the CABV to read and debate Friedrich Feuerbach's *Religion der Zukunft*, whose didactical format and insistence on the centrality of human nature must have made it particularly suitable for Schapper's aims in club debates.<sup>48</sup> It should be noted here that aside from their brief sympathy with Kriege, the Londoners showed little interest in the 'true socialism' prevalent in Germany at the time (where Weitling and Marx played a much smaller role than in the German artisans' clubs abroad); nor did Fourierism leave any perceptible impression on them, although Franz Strohmeier, one of its more prominent German propagators, and also a police spy, lived in London until 1842.<sup>49</sup>

Weitling thus saw his system rejected by the CABV before Marx criticised him in March 1846.<sup>50</sup> But this does not mean that the theoretical position of the London group in 1845–1846 was 'Marxist'; in particular, it did not link communism exclusively to the working classes or to any particular stage of production. This vagueness on the question of which part of society might bring communism about and by what means did not mean that class was not central to the ideology of the CABV, however. A liberal visitor in April 1846 noticed its class-consciousness, for example, as well as an increasing inclination to condone the use of violence, as in the Irish case.<sup>51</sup> This has been interpreted as pointing towards a conception of class struggle (and by implication to Marxism). But in fact the ideas of the German Workers' Educational Society of 1845–1846, after Weitling had become marginalised, merely represented, as Max Nettlau put it, 'pure Schapper', who 'always exercised the most absolute authority over his society'.<sup>52</sup> Having rejected the theories prevalent among the continental branches of the League of the Just and the socialism of Weitling, Cabet, Fourier and Owen, the CABV by no means necessarily embraced Marxism, or placidly awaited Marx's redefinition of their own inchoate ideas.<sup>53</sup> With its emphasis on human nature and the free development of the individual, the



CABV's views in this period were closest to what Schapper himself termed German 'humanistic' communism—probably gleaned by him from Moses Hess' categories—as opposed to French political and revolutionary communism and Anglo-American anti-revolutionary, practical and constructive communism.<sup>54</sup> Schapper, Bauer and Moll kept stressing this term. They proudly declared themselves to be 'human beings' instead of nationalists, since 'I am born as a man and not as a German; as man I belong to human society and not to the German League...as a man I have human interests and no others'.<sup>55</sup>

Weitling's stay in London, however, was not only significant for the CABV's ideological development: its formal organisation also changed. Many German artisans and workers in London, attracted to the discussions about political principles, flocked to the club. (Not all newcomers joined the CABV for political reasons, however, and the society even admitted some who opposed its principles.<sup>56</sup>) From about 30 members, the society grew to some 300 by February 1847, with another 160 in a branch founded in Whitechapel in July 1846, and eventually reached a strength of 700.<sup>57</sup> At least as many again joined for a shorter period before returning to the Continent, and this constant fluctuation ensured that the society had a larger impact than its numbers might suggest. The Workers' Educational Society in Hamburg, for instance, which was founded in 1845, modelled itself directly on clubs abroad.<sup>58</sup> By early 1848, by contrast, the League, which ran both the West End and the East End educational societies, had ten groups totalling 84 members. (Of these, nine groups were composed of Germans, Danes, Russians, Poles, Swiss, Spaniards, Belgians, Norwegians, Swedes, Hungarians and other foreigners, while the tenth was made up of Englishmen, presumably all from the internationalist Chartist organisation known as the Fraternal Democrats.<sup>59</sup>) As the CABV grew, it needed new premises. Its new hall in Drury Lane, by one account, was 'painted with beautiful arabesques, flowers and figures, and adorned with medallion portraits' of classic and ideologically unimpeachable masters such as Shakespeare, Dürer, Mozart and Schiller. The hall was brightly lit,

and in the middle of this sparkling brilliance stood an enormous poster, which had been painted for free by an English member of the Society, and which represented a life-size female figure with the attributes of freedom and equality, as she tramples under foot the hydra of corruption, and swings in the air the Phrygian cap, this banner of the nations awakening from their sleep...in the background one could see two figures, War and Tyranny, melting away under the rays of the rising sun of Liberty, while the warm light of the young day flows over the happy abodes of the unfettered millions.<sup>60</sup>

Freedom, equality, and national awakening—not community of goods—thus dominated the public image of the communist workers' club, whatever the League debated internally. At any rate, the image appealed. But the club's growing numbers also provoked reactions among Prussian conservative circles in London. In 1846–1847 a campaign was launched against the CABV by the Prussian ambassador in London, Ritter von Bunsen, who saw a 'unification of all good Christians' as 'the only remedy' against 'social ideas' and 'practical atheism'.<sup>61</sup> Bunsen thus helped several German clergymen in London to found Protestant 'young men's associations', for which he solicited financial

aid from the Prussian court, and warned journeymen travelling to London against the Communist club.<sup>62</sup> The club was constantly watched by police spies, and a fear of communist propaganda even led Prussia and Saxony to expel journeymen arriving from London.<sup>63</sup> The CABV was quick to exploit its increasing notoriety. The club bought a lithographic press with which to counter pietist propaganda and attract more German workers in London ‘to come to us and acquire a purely human education and help work for the physical and spiritual liberation of mankind’.<sup>64</sup>

### The beginnings of socialist internationalism

By now not only Germans started to take notice of the CABV. The Chartist *Northern Star* declared that the society, which the rising Chartist leader George Julian Harney had just joined, deserved to be better known among its readers, and explained: The great principle of the society is COMMUNISM; it is almost needless to add that this necessarily includes all that the English people understand by “the ultra-Democratic principle”.<sup>65</sup> Although the English knew the club as the German Democratic Society, it had from the beginning a number of other international connections as well as internationalist tendencies.<sup>66</sup> Its members were journeymen and workers from all countries where German was relatively widely spoken, and included Swiss, Dutch, Scandinavians, Czechs and Hungarians. There was even ‘a genuine Turk from Silistria, of Mohammedan religion’, Weitling later recalled, adding that he was ‘a tailor, speaks German and is a communist, otherwise [sic] very educated’.<sup>67</sup> Doubtless the experience of common exile in London also created a sense of solidarity among refugees from different countries. Often this meant little more than simple expressions of sympathy at each others’ celebrations of democratic or revolutionary anniversaries.<sup>68</sup> The CABV, however, lived from the beginning in an unusually close symbiosis with French emigrants, to the degree that it was early on seen as a mere appendage of the Société Démocratique Française; this relationship was reversed when influential members left the French society while the CABV prospered.<sup>69</sup> In theory, too, the CABV objected as early as 1841 to limiting itself to Germans, and in its earliest public statement ridiculed the anti-Napoleonic German nationalism of Jahn and Arndt, professing instead to be open to ideas coming from all nations, be they Bashkirs or the French.<sup>70</sup> More explicitly still, it declared in 1843 that ‘we have understood by now that we must be *human* above all...our enemies are not foreign peoples, but rather those who would excite national animosities to satisfy their own ambitions’.<sup>71</sup>

Gradually such sentiments led to co-operation with English organisations in the early 1840s, although British socialism initially only superficially impressed most of the Germans. In his 1838 manuscript Schapper had expressed admiration for English socialist schemes for introducing community of goods, and as we have seen, some Germans travelled to Harmony Hall to admire its achievements. But the similarities between the outlook of the Owenites and of the London Germans around Schapper, such as their emphasis upon political and moral education, did not lure the latter away from their theoretical and organisational adherence to the Continental League of the Just. On their part, few London Owenites took any notice of the German refugees in their midst, although they did discuss the views of the German-American reformer John Adolphus

Etzler. (An exception was John Goodwyn Barmby, whose *Communist Chronicle* introduced not only Etzler but also Weitling and the 'prophet' Albrecht in the early 1840s.<sup>72</sup>) If the Owenites learned anything about the secret structure of the League, they probably dismissed this as inapplicable to the British context, and the League's theoretical positions must have seemed sadly lacking in that awareness of political economy prevalent among British socialists. From late 1843 onwards, Engels contributed articles on continental socialism to the Owenite *New Moral World*, and already in January 1843 had rejected Schapper's invitation to join the League of the Just; his own 'philosophical arrogance' set him apart from the CABV's 'primitive communism'. Engels here shared more with the Owenites than with his fellow expatriates.<sup>73</sup>

From the autumn of 1844 onwards, however, the isolation of the German workers was reduced. Owenites and Chartists met at a public reception on 22 September 1844 celebrating Weitling's arrival in London, and used the occasion 'to introduce the members of the Rational Society to the Foreign Communists resident in London'.<sup>74</sup> In October Schapper helped to found the Democratic Friends of All Nations, the first international organisation of German, English, French and Polish socialists. The new association stressed 'the importance of cultivating a brotherly feeling among the people of all countries, and of advancing their social and political rights', and sought to adopt 'all legal means to create a public opinion in favour of the great principle of human brotherhood' as well as to help political refugees.<sup>75</sup> Its sole address, 'to the Friends of Humanity and Justice among all Nations', carried the CABV's motto, 'All Men are Brethren', and aimed 'to improve, exalt, instruct and reform society, in all countries, among all nations'.<sup>76</sup> Restating the moral force tenets of the London Working Men's Association, the Chartist and Owenite William Lovett ascribed 'misery' and 'injustice' to 'selfishness, force, and fraud' based in 'exclusive political power, class legislation, defective knowledge, corrupt rulers, bad laws, unjust privileges, and monopolies of various kinds'. But the Democratic Friends did not survive long. Lovett suggested that its strong moral force orientation repelled many physical force Chartists. But while some of the more revolutionary-minded continental exiles may have been similarly alienated, this interpretation certainly cannot hold for the CABV, which was in this period still very much inclined towards moral force alone.<sup>77</sup>

Undeterred, in September 1845 Schapper embarked upon another internationalist venture with the Chartists around Ernest Jones (who had grown up in Germany and spoke German) and G.J.Harney. Founded at a banquet of 'a thousand democrats' to celebrate the first French republic of 1792, and constituted formally on 15 March 1846, the Fraternal Democrats far surpassed their predecessors.<sup>78</sup> The Fraternal Democrats repeatedly emphasised their adherence to the principles of the People's Charter, and maintained only a very loose organisation, presumably to avoid rivalry with other Chartist bodies.<sup>79</sup> A secretary was elected for every country represented, and the structure of the Fraternal Democrats in many ways anticipated the First International, of which it is rightly regarded as a precursor.<sup>80</sup> Nonetheless, its activities were above all based on co-operation between the London physical force Chartists and the German Workers' Society. Harney and Schapper were the leading members, whereas the Poles, represented by Louis Oborski, the French around J.Michelot and the other nationalities never took the initiative, their speeches often repeating ideas outlined by Harney and Schapper. The organisation never spread beyond London, moreover, and although it published many

addresses on current issues in international politics (such as the Oregon question, the Mexican war, the Cracow uprising, and the Swiss Sonderbund war), it confined itself, unlike the later International, to mere agitation.<sup>81</sup> Nor was its programme, formulated by Harney in September 1846, more sophisticated per se than that of the Democratic Friends. Centrally, it rejected national prejudices, and stated as its 'political creed' the condemnation of 'all political hereditary inequalities and distinctions of "caste"', and of 'kings, aristocracies and classes monopolising political privileges by virtue of their possession of property'. Its 'social creed' attacked 'idlers and schemers' who 'monopolise the fruits of the earth and the productions of industry' and compelled the working classes to labour for inadequate rewards. This was regarded as the logical conclusion of the motto, 'All Men are Brethren', which the Fraternal Democrats, like the Democratic Friends, had adopted from the German Society.<sup>82</sup>

By now this development was on the German side closely linked to the internationalism within the League of the Just. The period from 1846 to March 1848 was the zenith of the development of the German Society and its internationalism.<sup>83</sup> Even vis-à-vis the nationalist feelings aroused by the complex Schleswig-Holstein affair, the CABV denied any relevance of 'national' causes for the proletariat.<sup>84</sup> Never again did the club's members encompass so many different nationalities, while it additionally corresponded with Madrid, the Brussels Democratic Association, Scandinavia, and of course Switzerland, France and Germany. At no other time did such close ties with English associations exist as during these years, when the *Northern Star* reported extensively on its activities,<sup>85</sup> and when Harney, who joined the German Society early in 1846, placed his co-operation with Schapper and the German Society above possible contacts with Marx and Engels in Brussels.<sup>86</sup>

### Enter Marx

The CABV's formulation of a distinct theoretical position and its organisational rapprochement with the Chartists altered its profile considerably.

The League of the Just acknowledged the growing importance of its London branch by moving its Central Authority from Paris to London in the summer of 1846, and by electing Schapper and Moll to the new committee.<sup>87</sup> But having rejected most of the continental forms of early socialism, the Londoners now faced a new ideological challenge from the views being developed by Marx and Engels, then in Brussels. News of their work reached the Londoners through travelling journeymen, through Engels's association with Harney, and through the publications of Marx and Engels, of which the 'Circular against Kriege' and the recent *Condition of the Working-Class in England* seemed most pertinent to the Londoners at the time.<sup>88</sup> Consequently the London League of the Just stepped up their association with Marx and Engels in Brussels throughout 1846. This step, deplored or applauded by historians according to their bias, was to put the London group on a course dominated by Marx.<sup>89</sup> For the time being, it effectively ended the independent development of the CABV, and for the next few years, in fact, its history became part and parcel of the history of the Communist League under the aegis of Marx.

Marx and Engels had of course been in contact with the London section of the League of the Just before. Engels had met Schapper, Bauer and Moll as early as 1843, but had not joined the League.<sup>90</sup> The CABV in turn had been reluctant to subscribe to the Paris *Vorwärts!*, to which Marx and Engels regularly contributed, on account of its 'filthy jokes and swearing'.<sup>91</sup> But in July and August 1845, when the club was discussing Weitling's communism, Marx and Engels were together in England and met both its leaders and Weitling in London. Engels may also have introduced Harney and Jones, whom he knew from his earlier stay in Manchester, to the German Society, and thus indirectly instigated the foundation of the Fraternal Democrats, although Schapper had already made his own overtures to the Lovett circle, while Jones's political poetry was known to readers of the London German press.<sup>92</sup>

In February 1846 Marx and Engels began the Communist Correspondence Committee in Brussels in order to organise propaganda internationally. At this time they also tried to establish communications with organisations in England, but first by approaching Harney, and not the German League in London, which they suspected of being controlled by Weitling, with whom Marx had just broken. Harney reassured them that Weitling certainly had no majority in the CABV: 'S.[Schapper] is the man who leads, and properly so. He repudiates "leadership" but nature formed some men for chiefs and she has given him the necessary qualifications.'<sup>93</sup> Hence the Brussels Committee asked the London League of the Just in May 1846 to set up a communist correspondence committee and to establish regular communications, but they still felt it necessary first to explain their reasons for breaking with Weitling. Weitling's own account of his dispute with the Brussels communists led the Londoners to infer that his 'purge' was part of the drive by Marx and Engels to exclude all workers, which immediately rekindled 'the barely extinguished hatred between intellectuals and workers'.<sup>94</sup> But having themselves rejected Weitling's views just a few months earlier, the CABV agreed that his system, his religious leanings and his personal irritability prevented further cooperation.<sup>95</sup> Besides criticising Weitling, however, Marx and the Brussels committee had also very sharply attacked Weitling's friend Kriege and his enthusiasm for 'love' and sentiment in advocating communism. A year earlier Schapper and his associates had themselves praised Eugène Sue in the vein of Kriege for kindling 'the fire of freedom and love', since 'in the communism of love everything is possible'.<sup>96</sup> In July and September 1846 the Londoners were also still contributing to Kriege's New York *Volks-Tribun*, and they found the Brussels 'Circular against Kriege' of May 1846 'too harsh'.<sup>97</sup> In particular, such a high-handed anathema proved Marx's 'damned scholar's arrogance' and could only create dissent among communists. Communism, the Londoners thought, should not be one-dimensionally based 'only on the growing misery of the workers and on the perfection of machines', but could equally accommodate non-economic justifications based on philosophy, sentiment or religion. 'Not everyone is a great political economist like you', they advised Marx, 'hence do not expect that everyone sees communism like you'.<sup>98</sup>

Based on their broad definition of communism, the Londoners were happy to join Marx's correspondence project. On other points, too, their outlook became similar. Collaboration with the 'physical force' Chartists had weakened the CABV's opposition to violent revolution, and the recent insurrection in Poland had aroused much sympathy with the Poles' cause and, by implication, their method.<sup>99</sup> More generally speaking, the

Londoners now believed that ‘things will not come to pass without a proper revolution’. Although a revolution could not be brought about, ‘the physical revolution will come by itself if the tyrants do not give in, once the intellectual and moral revolution which has now begun is finished. Our task is to enlighten the people and to propagate community of goods.’<sup>100</sup> For this purpose, then, they wanted to work jointly with Marx and Engels. In their desire to find a common basis on which heterogenous communists could collaborate, they also proposed a congress of the different groups, in particular to clarify ‘our relation to the religious party and to the radical bourgeoisie’.<sup>101</sup> These preparations, however, further strained relations between the London Central Authority of the League of the Just and the Brussels group, which had not been consulted beforehand. The Londoners, moreover, did not know the true extent of Marx and Engels’ suspicions of them. For privately Engels confided to Marx, in a letter worth quoting at length, for it reveals much of their feelings about their socialist competitors and the tensions which would underlie relations with them for many years:

The affair with the London people is annoying precisely because of Harney and because they, of all the Straubingers [travelling artisans], were the only ones with whom one could attempt to make contact frankly and without *arrière-pensée*. But if the fellows are unwilling, *eh bien*, let them go. In any case one can never know if they won’t produce another address as miserable as the one to Mr Ronge or to the Schleswig-Holsteiners. On top of that, there’s their perpetual envy of us as ‘scholars’... An immediate rupture with the fellows would bring us neither gain nor *gloire*. *Theoretical* differences with the fellows are hardly possible since they have no theory and, *sauf* for their possible unspoken misgivings, they wish to learn from us: nor are they able to formulate their misgivings, so that all discussion with them is impossible except, perhaps, face to face... *Practical* party differences would...soon degenerate into mere personalities... As a party we can enter the lists against literary men, but not against Straubingers. They are, after all, a couple of 100 strong, vouched for among the English by Harney, proclaimed in Germany by the *Rheinische Beobachter*, etc., etc., a rabid and by no means impotent communist society; they are, furthermore, the most tolerable of the Straubingers, and can certainly not be bettered so long as there is no change in Germany... *Vis-à-vis ourselves*, these lads declare themselves to be ‘the people’, ‘the proletarians’, and we can only appeal to a communist proletariat which has yet to take shape in Germany. In addition, the Prussian Constitution is in the offing, and we might then be able to make use of the fellows’ signatures.<sup>102</sup>

To allay such friction the London group decided to send an emissary, Joseph Moll, to Brussels to negotiate with Marx the League’s reorganisation.<sup>103</sup> The talks of February 1847 show that, realising its own urgent need for a programme, the League placed unity above other considerations, and was now largely willing to accept Marx’s position as a guideline for reorganisation.<sup>104</sup> Both Moll and Marx agreed that the League needed to shed its character as a secret society, and to draw up a new programme. Under these

conditions, Marx appeared prepared to join the League, and a congress was convened for June 1847 to discuss a 'communist catechism'.<sup>105</sup>

This congress took place in London on 2–9 June. As the only people who actually travelled to London from abroad, Wilhelm Wolff and Engels represented the Brussels and Paris groups respectively. Schapper, Bauer and Moll were present as the central committee, and perhaps Pfänder and Eccarius participated. This small group was to confirm and consolidate a compromise between the League leaders in London and the 'Marxists' on the Continent. It changed the name of the organisation to the 'League of the Communists', to make it clear 'that we attack the existing social order and private property, that we want community of goods'.<sup>106</sup> It also drafted new statutes, and most importantly, discussed and adopted as its new programme Engels's *Draft of a Communist Confession of Faith*.<sup>107</sup>

The *Draft* represented a very important stage in Marx and Engels' development prior to the *Manifesto*, since it combined 'Marxist' formulations with older communist opinions which had evolved during the London discussions. Several answers to the questions in Engels's text sound very much like Schapper's arguments in 1845, and were probably compromises dropped in later drafts. The 'aim of the communists', for example, was defined as 'to organise society in such a way that every member of it can develop and use all his capabilities and powers in complete freedom and without thereby infringing the basic conditions of this society'. While this still echoed Schapper's concern with individual freedom, communist teaching was defined a few months later simply as centred on 'the conditions for the liberation of the proletariat'. Similarly, the *Draft* based community of property on two distinct arguments, first, on the development of the powers of production, and second, 'on the fact that in the consciousness or feeling of every individual there exist certain irrefutable basic principles which, being the result of the whole of historical development, require no proof, such as that 'every individual strives to be happy' and 'the happiness of the individual is inseparable from the happiness of all'.<sup>108</sup> Here Engels obviously again had to defer to the Londoners' concern with harmony between the individual and human nature. On the other hand, the definition of the 'proletariat' as that class of society 'which lives exclusively off its labour' was already present, and became the nucleus for the more precise but similar formulations in the *Manifesto*.

Compromises were also evident in the *Statutes of the Communist League*, which, partially repeating the formulation used since 1838, defined the League's aim as 'the emancipation of humanity by spreading the theory of community of property and its speediest possible practical introduction'. The *Statutes* kept some conspiratorial practices, such as secret names, but in general the League's structure became more democratic, stressing the shift towards an organisation chiefly concerned with propaganda rather than conspiracy. Schapper, Moll and Bauer were elected to the Central Authority, and it was the London group, too, which in September 1847 published the sole issue of the *Kommunistische Zeitschrift*, which was meant to be the League's newspaper and was thereafter famous for its first public use of the League's new slogan, '*Proletarier aller Länder, vereinigt Euch!*'—henceforth also the CABV's motto.<sup>109</sup> Schapper's contribution to the journal, 'Proletarier!', summarised the London group's criticisms of socialists like Weitling, Cabet and Kriege (while also suggesting cooperation with the anti-socialist republican Karl Heinzen).<sup>110</sup> He gave a historical outline of the development of the

'proletariat', and defined the communist programme negatively by distancing it from 'systems', from sentimental and pacifist advocates of new worlds and from conspirators. He also emphasised the necessity for prior democratic political rights and a long period of transition to communism, which expressly included personal liberty. But for the positive definition of their aims he merely referred to Engels's *Draft of a Communist Confession of Faith*, and the main theoretical elaboration of the programme was now done by Marx in Brussels and Engels in Paris, who together produced the *Principles of Communism*.<sup>111</sup> During October the CABV continued to debate some theoretical questions, but apparently merely reconfirmed the positions of Engels's *Draft* rather than pursuing them further. At this stage there was nothing to be seen of their resistance to Marx.<sup>112</sup> In particular the Londoners recommended Marx's *Misère de la Philosophie* to those League members still sympathetic to Proudhon and Grün, while in London itself Cabet's last attempts to regain lost influence were rebuffed during the autumn and winter of 1847.<sup>113</sup>

To the great disappointment of the Londoners, the continental groups responded only hesitantly and unenthusiastically to the reconstructed League.<sup>114</sup> The Central Authority feared that such lack of interest meant that it had become isolated, and that London and Brussels at the moment seemed to be 'the pillars of the entire League—if these should waver or fall, the entire edifice is going to collapse'. Hence they especially asked Marx to attend the second, decisive congress, which completed the transformation into the Communist League.<sup>115</sup> When this congress gathered in London from 29 November to 8 December 1847, Schapper again acted as president. Marx, Tedesco and Engels travelled from the Continent, and thus the participants were largely identical to those of the June meeting. Old debates with Weitling, Cabet, 'true' socialists or Heinzen no longer played a role, nor did the Londoners' previous 'humanist' views.<sup>116</sup> Instead, the Communist League now accepted Marx's and Engels's theoretical leadership, which was reflected in the first article of the *Statutes*, which stated that The aim of the League is the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the rule of the proletariat, the abolition of the old bourgeois society which rests on the antagonism of classes, and the foundation of a new society without classes and without private property'.<sup>117</sup>

The League at the same time also entrusted Marx and Engels with the final formulation of the programme, which was then adopted without criticism as *The Communist Manifesto*.<sup>118</sup> Printed at the expense (of some £5) and in the office of the CABV, the *Manifesto* represented for these German emigrants a marked move from their earlier forms of socialism towards a Marxian view. Engels was the first to praise this uniting of the 'pure workers' movement' with the 'theoretical movement originating in the disintegration of Hegelian philosophy [and] dominated by the name of Marx', describing it as 'the fusion of these two currents, a fusion finalised and sealed in the blaze of the revolution'.<sup>119</sup> This was indeed a major stage in the formation of communist theory and political workers' organisation, a point at which the London League (and with it the CABV and the Fraternal Democrats) were as unified and strong as never before. How much of the *Manifesto* was merely imposed on the League as a whole, or on the London workers in particular, remains a subject of debate. Undoubtedly, however, all the major points of the content had been agreed on at the second congress. The form, on the other hand, presented a departure from previous confessions of faith and was decided on by Marx and Engels alone, and had not been expected by the Londoners.<sup>120</sup> As the *Manifesto*



appeared in February 1848, just prior to the outbreak of the continental revolutions, any criticism of it must have seemed irrelevant under such pressing circumstances. (And indeed, for agitation purposes, the much shorter *Demands of the Communist Party in Germany* was used.) Nonetheless, we will see that the subsequent development of the Communist League showed that the acceptance of Marx's new approach by Schapper and his fellow-émigrés was certainly not 'finalised', but was at most tentative.<sup>121</sup>

### The Londoners in the revolution of 1848-1849

When the long-awaited news of the February revolution in Paris finally reached London, it threw the exile community into a paroxysm of enthusiasm and activity. Harney recalled that after 'seeing *the news* placarded at Charing Cross, I ran like a lunatic and pulled the bell at Schapper's like a bedlamite; at some corner, on my way, knocking over an old woman's apple basket (or it may have been oranges!) I going too quickly to hear her gentle cursing'.<sup>122</sup> The London Central Authority of the Communist League was immediately transferred to Brussels and then to Paris to be closer to the front line, and most of the politically active refugees hurried to the Continent. The CABV sent Bauer, while the Fraternal Democrats delegated Schapper and Moll, together with Harney, Jones and M'Grath, to the new republican government in Paris, whom they presented with an address 'to the proletarians of France'.<sup>123</sup> Schapper, Bauer and Moll stayed in Paris, 'labouring day and night to organise their countrymen for the regeneration of Germany' (as Harney eulogised their activities in England),<sup>124</sup> and were joined by Marx, Engels and Wilhelm Wolff. There—completely ignoring the League circles which had so far existed in Paris—they reconstituted the Central Authority, readmitted the expelled Weitlingians in the interest of united action during the revolution, and issued 17 *Demands of the Communist Party in Germany*. These demands combined democratic republican and anti-feudal principles, calling above all for 'a united, indivisible republic' under the assumption that the German revolution would create a democratic republic from which—later—a proletarian revolution would emerge, but omitting the far more outspoken proletarian revolutionary aims of the *Manifesto*.<sup>125</sup> In Paris Marx, endowed with 'full discretionary power for the temporary central direction of all League affairs with responsibility to the Central Authority to be newly constituted and to the next Congress',<sup>126</sup> clearly dominated within the Central Authority. The former apprehensiveness of Schapper and his friends was drowned in the general enthusiasm over unfolding events.

The activities and the role of the Communist League in Germany during 1848-1849 have been the subject of much controversy. League members dispersed throughout Germany, joined the many emerging democratic and workers' societies and maintained only personal contacts among themselves. While as an organisation the League did not appear publicly, its members remained by no means passive.<sup>127</sup> The influence of the Communist League was strongest in the Rhineland and Cologne. Rhenish Prussia was not only a centre of the broader democratic movement; many of the more articulate and energetic League members came to work there. In Cologne League members including August Willich in the democratic workers' movement demanded 'protection of labour and guarantee of basic human needs for all'.<sup>128</sup> Here, Marx founded the *Neue Rheinische*

*Zeitung* in June 1848, which attracted numerous collaborators and became the mouthpiece of the League—so much so that Marx's supporters were later often referred to as 'the party of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. Its programme, 'a united indivisible democratic German republic and war against Russia', appealed to radicals and democrats beyond the smaller circle of the League, and ensured the wide reputation of the daily even beyond Germany. The *Northern Star* wished it well, and Harney wrote for it on the history of Chartism.<sup>129</sup> Much of the appeal of the paper, which had to close down after the victory of the Prussian troops in May 1849, also derived from the poems contributed by the popular Ferdinand Freiligrath, who at that time belonged to the 'party'.

Contact with London continued throughout the revolution. The CABV member Johannes Blum (a shoemaker originally from Russia prominent in the Fraternal Democrats and later in Willich-Schapper's League) conveyed 'brotherly greetings from the German workers in London' to the Cologne workers' society. The CABV urged them to remember the proletariat's aim to 'become independent and organise our own affairs', which meant that 'the interest of the working classes must be elevated to the interest of the state, and the proletariat must become the ruling party in the state and overthrow the old social order'.<sup>130</sup> Schapper and Moll led discussions in the Cologne workers' society very much according to the pattern of the CABV, going through lists of questions concerning, for example, the advantages of machinery, or the merits of a centralised versus a federal republic.<sup>131</sup> The Cologne society responded enthusiastically that while many workers' clubs had written from all over Germany, 'no news has delighted us as much as that from our German brothers in London'.<sup>132</sup>

Marx's *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was thus not the only centre of the Communist League in the Rhineland. Of the other former London emigrants, Schapper presided over the Workers' Association of Cologne workers' society (later over the Wiesbaden one), where he soon disagreed with Marx's attitude to the League, urging that it should be reanimated, at any rate after freedom of speech and association had been curtailed in late 1848.<sup>133</sup> In a mass assembly near Cologne Schapper also led the first calls for the 'red republic', the social democratic republic, in September 1848.<sup>134</sup> In May 1849, he presided over the congress of 21 workers' societies and those 'decidedly supporting the principles of social democracy' of the Rhineland and Westphalia.<sup>135</sup>

Moll agitated in workers' organisations in the Rhineland, and in Cologne, his hometown, was elected president of the workers' society as one of its 'most popular leaders' (in Marx's words), editing its *Zeitung des Arbeiter-Vereines zu Köln* from September.<sup>136</sup> Forced to flee Cologne, he returned to London on a brief visit in October 1848, where he noted police plots against Chartists, and warned his Cologne friends that 'this is what we can expect from a constitutional monarchy governed by an infamous bourgeoisie'. Moll also solicited help from the Fraternal Democrats for the destitute family of Schapper, at the time imprisoned in Cologne.<sup>137</sup> After a tour of agitation through Germany as an emissary of the Central Authority (which was by then back in London), he joined a fighting unit, and fell, only 35 years old, in the battle on the Murg in the Baden-Palatinate uprising on 29 June 1849.<sup>138</sup> To honour his memory the CABV commissioned Karl Pfänder to paint Moll's portrait, which thereafter adorned the society's premises on special occasions, placed next to that of Robert Blum, the member of the Frankfurt parliament summarily executed in 1848 who was quickly becoming the symbolic martyr of the entire revolution.<sup>139</sup>

Besides Schapper and Moll, many other former Londoners rallied to the cause. Lessner faithfully propagated Marx's line in Cologne, Mainz and Nuremberg, while the CABV's Rosenthal, a lithographer, was a 'guest' representing the society at the first congress of workers' societies in Berlin in June 1848.<sup>140</sup> The tailor Fr. W. Kollbeck, another member of both the CABV and the Communist League, moved to Dresden to work for the League, as did the tailor Georg Heinrich Martius in Leipzig, who also fought on the barricades in Dresden in May 1849.<sup>141</sup> Most importantly, League members joined Stephan Born's *Arbeiterverbrüderung* (or Workers' Brotherhood), with up to 18,000 members the largest organisation of local workers' societies.<sup>142</sup> Louis Heilberg, for example, returned to journalistic work in Berlin and Breslau, serving as secretary to the *Arbeiterverbrüderung* in Silesia.<sup>143</sup> The Communist League's influence on the Brotherhood has been the subject of some controversy, following the League's own post-revolutionary claim that 'the most influential members' of the Brotherhood also belonged to the League.<sup>144</sup> There was considerable friction even within the League when some members called for a congress to be convened in Berlin in late 1848 to elect a new Central Authority.<sup>145</sup> There were also serious differences within the Cologne group.<sup>146</sup> Even less homogeneity and more disagreements with Marx can be found in the League's remnants in London.

The London Society faced a crisis when its most active members left to join the revolution in Germany after March 1848. Events on the Continent initially had an exhilarating effect on the workers in the CABV, as the tailor Friedrich Lessner later said, and

the discussion evenings in the Workers' Educational Society became more and more lively and fiery. We all prepared to rush to the battlefield in Germany. But most of us did not have the means to carry out this intention at once. It was not until July 1848 that I had saved enough money to start the journey to Germany.<sup>147</sup>

A Prussian agent reported that the CABV was beginning to extend its influence to Germany and that 'out of the large number of its members it is sending the keenest and ablest advocates of its principles to Germany in order to introduce them there. These emissaries mostly travel alone so as not to attract the attention of the authorities on their arrival.'<sup>148</sup> Of the 700 people who were CABV members just before the revolution, only 179 remained in London (84 being also League members). They felt sadly 'cut off from the centre of the movement', lamenting to the workers' society in Cologne: 'We envy you for being able to enjoy the full intensity of political life.'<sup>149</sup> One new arrival, looking for 'the communist clubs', could not even find them and was told that all their members had journeyed to Germany.<sup>150</sup> While this was somewhat exaggerated, it nonetheless indicates the low visibility of the clubs' remnants. J.G. Eccarius, a tailor from Thüringen, now became the League's spokesman in London, later assisted by Carl Pfänder, a painter, and Bauer, who returned from Paris to London in March 1848. They tried to overcome the difficulties of suddenly finding themselves only at the fringe of a movement, and induced the society to collect money in order to send League members to Germany.

For those unable to return to Germany, the Chartists in early 1848 raised hopes of a British revolution too. Foreigners were early on implicated in these prospects. The CABV

suspected that the British police feared their involvement in seditious activities through the Fraternal Democrats. In early March the police magistrate withdrew the licence from the public house at 42 Drury Lane where the CABV met, which interrupted the meetings of the West End branch for a few weeks. The CABV did not believe the official explanation, 'that the foreigners make a dreadful noise', but suspected political repression.<sup>151</sup> Nonetheless, members of the German Society did accompany the great demonstration of 10 April to Kennington Common, where the London circle of the League 'was assembled in order to support the Chartists in case'.<sup>152</sup> Lessner later remembered his colleague Eccarius showing him 'his sharpened, shining big pair of tailor's scissors, with which he intended to defend himself against the attacks of the constables'.<sup>153</sup> But while some more moderate Chartists did not like 'the tone of the foreigners', Moll defended a violent insurrection 'and said: "Vot you mean? If you Chartists had bought arms instead of talking so mush you would have been something like democrats"'.<sup>154</sup> The foreigners, however, overestimated both Britain's likelihood of spawning a revolution and their own probable role therein. The demonstration failed to provoke a revolutionary outbreak, and the police had been prepared to look out for foreign agitators; allegedly some men had even shaved their moustaches off for fear of being taken for foreign revolutionaries, since the special constables 'had sworn to make an example of any whiskered or bearded rioters' by having them 'mashed...to jelly'. (The police actually saw few foreigners, none apparently inciting rebellion.<sup>155</sup>) Thereafter Chartism went into steep decline, and this instigated the Fraternal Democrats' collapse as well, the return home of most of the politically active foreigners helping to cripple the association. Chartism, as the largest working-class political movement in Europe and in particular with its experiences with the liberal anti-Corn-Law and Free Trade movements, remained, however, a prominent model. The former exiles now in Germany emphasised the importance of Chartism and of internationalism in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* and in the Cologne workers' society around Schapper.<sup>156</sup> In London itself, however, the British government (through gagging legislation and the Aliens Act) suppressed the activities of Chartists and foreigners alike. Harney reorganised the Fraternal Democrats, and they lingered on until 1853, but as an almost exclusively English group lacking its former significance.

Even without the police, the foreigners had problems. For with the outbreak of revolution in Germany, differences among London Germans erupted as well. The CABV, now for the first time described publicly as the 'communist' educational society, sharply attacked the patriotic German liberals in London, who had kept their own club for some years. About 1,000 Germans in London petitioned the new parliament in Frankfurt for reforms, but shied away from republicanism, which the minority, mostly the workers in the CABV, declared as their aim. Moreover, Ferdinand Freiligrath, whose ardent poetic calls for revolution were extremely popular throughout the entire opposition movement, became an object of tumultuous contention between the liberals associated in a German 'Reading Society' and the communists who claimed him as 'a man of the people' and the poet not merely of the republic but also of the proletariat.<sup>157</sup>

The CABV also faced internal difficulties. Eccarius had problems keeping in check those members who did not also belong to the Communist League, and six members were also expelled from the League. The journalist Louis Heilberg, for example, supported a plan by some German revolutionaries in Paris around the poet Herwegh to organise a

'German Legion' to lead an armed campaign from Paris to revolutionise Germany, a scheme opposed by the League.<sup>158</sup> In early March, Schapper too was still in sympathy with this urge 'to march into the fatherland, arms in hand, to battle for its freedom'.<sup>159</sup> But he soon acceded to the majority of the League and on a brief trip back to London helped dissuade Karl Moll and others in the CABV who 'had decided unanimously to dig up money through subscription and move to Paris with *armes et bagages* and from there with us to Germany'. Under his influence, the London League established a 'permanent committee' and persuaded the CABV to favour the individual return of each member to his home-town. Schapper found that 'the people cannot be kept here any longer—hence I have agreed that subscription lists are taken around, but only among Germans, so as to enable those Germans without work and without means to return to their home-towns'. Having just come back from revolutionary Paris, he himself shared their feelings and longed to return, insisting that 'How I will get away—so far only the devil knows—but go I will in any case, and even if I have to sell my bed'.<sup>160</sup>

But the London group achieved a few successes as well. Through Schabelitz, a Swiss member of the CABV, they gained access to a paper he edited, the *Deutsche Londoner Zeitung*, which from March on printed extracts of the *Communist Manifesto*.<sup>161</sup> This new connection for a time promised even more, for the paper was owned by the former duke of Brunswick, nicknamed 'the Diamond Duke' because when overthrown in 1830 he had decamped with much of his treasury into English exile. Hoping to wreak revenge on his unhelpful fellow-princes, he had become a sponsor of republican causes, which seduced the London communists into attempting a peculiar arrangement with him. The ex-duke planned to equip an army to invade Germany, and the Communist League apparently suggested that they could organise this. The League clearly saw this as an opportunity for extracting funds from the rich aristocrat, who soon seems to have suspected their motives and stalled negotiations.<sup>162</sup> Having once helped Schapper with £50, moreover, he now rejected a second 'infamous and ungrateful' appeal by 'the communist beggar'.<sup>163</sup>

Even without his money, Eccarius, Bauer and Pfänder managed to keep the workers' educational society going despite police harassment and plummeting membership. They also tried to save the organisation of the Communist League, putting particular stress on party unity and the need 'to follow the Central Authority in every regard', and despatching emissaries to the Continent.<sup>164</sup> The society from April 1848 onwards discussed the *17 Demands of the Communist Party in Germany*, and also kept in touch with the Cologne Workers' Society through Schapper.<sup>165</sup>

In open defiance of the policy advocated for Germany by Marx, for a while the only member of the old Central Authority left in Cologne, however, Eccarius, Bauer and Moll formed a new Central Authority in London in late 1848. Marx still favoured public and legal activities, but the Londoners regarded the British government's measures and German developments as so oppressive that further work could only be done by a secret organisation, and indeed had advocated secret propaganda for the

Chartists since the failed 'revolution' on Kennington Common.<sup>166</sup> Their new statutes were basically those of December 1847, but with one major change: the aim of the League was now defined as the 'introduction of a united, indivisible social-democratic republic', much toned down from their earlier proclaimed desire to 'overthrow bourgeois society' and introduce 'the rule of the proletariat' and a 'society without classes and without private property'.<sup>167</sup> Moll explained that they had deliberately 'left the

communism out' of the new statutes.<sup>168</sup> Unfortunately there is nothing in the surviving documents to clarify the Londoners' motives; we can only infer a greater reluctance to follow Marx's political strategy and analysis of current politics than their earlier acceptance of the *Manifesto* might suggest. At any rate the renewed League and its new statutes were received with sympathy in some places, such as Stuttgart and Berlin,<sup>169</sup> but were rejected in Cologne and the large centres of the Rhineland, where Marx's friends prevailed over Schapper and Moll.<sup>170</sup> A proposal for a congress in Berlin to sort out the League's differences came to nothing.

Other members of the CABV, such as Harry Bauer, doubtless remained 'Marxists', although Bauer had joined the new Central Authority. In spring 1849, for example, Bauer warned German workers against 'small associations' like the producers' and consumers' associations sought in the *Arbeiterverbrüderung*, as diverting workers back towards the guild system and away from 'the large movement'. This, he maintained, they had sufficiently experienced in England:

We live here in the country in which the class differences have developed furthest, in which bourgeoisie and proletariat have been separated most strictly from one another. Here particularly the worker is shown daily that he is nothing but the slave of capital, that his labour only serves to increase the capital of the bourgeois, that he will have to remain a worker in eternity unless he attempts to throw off this yoke through union.<sup>171</sup>

Despite these considerable efforts in London, however, the CABV had to abandon its branch in the East End, and only the mother club in Soho survived the revolution. But it was due to the energy of the London group that the League carried on throughout the revolution. In particular the efforts of Moll, who travelled extensively under the name of 'Taylor' from November 1848 to spring 1849, touching Hamburg, Schwerin, Bielefeld, Cologne, Berlin, Leipzig, Munich, Ulm and Stuttgart, kept the League connected in Germany. But these remnants of an organisation would soon be revived, as we will now see, when the defeated revolutionaries returned to exile.

### 3

## Between democrats and Blanquists

### The Communist League, 1849–1850

After the defeat of revolution on the Continent, London became once again the chief centre of exile politics. The refugees now were a more heterogenous crowd than during the early 1840s. They included military leaders of the Baden-Palatinate uprising, such as Willich and Struve, governesses such as Malwida von Meysenbug, members of the Frankfurt parliament such as Arnold Ruge, poets such as Freiligrath, doctors such as Tausenau, aristocrats like the Baroness von Bruiningk and the Count von Reichenbach, and tailors such as Eccarius. Their political views, similarly, comprised all shades and parties involved in the revolution, ranging from communists organised in the CABV and the Communist League around Marx and Engels to socialists of various types, radical republicans such as Karl Heinzen, and advocates of a liberal constitution, such as Lothar Bucher. Many more, no doubt, had vague and fluctuating opinions, or had become involved in events without being primarily politically motivated, such as the religious reformer Johannes Ronge and his wife Bertha, whose chief concerns were women's education and infant training. What united them all during their first years of exile was their reluctance to accept defeat and their common suffering from the privations of exile. Still hoping that further revolutions would bring them home, most refugees initially neglected to prepare for a long-term stay in England, bothering neither to find employment nor to learn the language of a country they saw as only a temporary post in the storm. Gottfried Kinkel, for instance, on being advised to study English, exclaimed: 'Learn English! What do you think? I am only a bird of passage here; the field of my activity is in Germany; in three years at the most I shall be back there—at the head of the movement!'<sup>1</sup>

On the whole, the material and psychological situation of most refugees was stifling, and was not conducive to much intellectual creativity. But preoccupation with the recent revolution did induce much political discussion which was by no means merely circular and barren. Debates about the mistakes of the revolution, the means of agitation and future aims led to divisions among the exiles which markedly anticipated future party divisions. This process of separation was gradual and not always recognised. But the crucial rift between democratic republicans and socialists came about fairly soon, and deepened until the foundation of the Social Democrats and of the national and liberal parties added an organisational dimension to it. This chapter outlines the early stages of this rift, focusing in particular on the socialists' reaction to the growing division. (Chapter 4 then traces this discussion among the non-socialist refugees.) In establishing their differences with the democrats, however, the socialists concentrated not only on reorganising the Communist League but also on seeking new allies. These they found in

particular among the French Blanquists in London, whose ideas the Communist League took up in its struggle against the attraction of the democrats, and the ensuing split.

### **The first year after the defeat: support and separation**

Soon after the revolution ended a major rift began to separate the German refugees in London, resulting in the evolution of two distinct groups. To one commentator this division was between the 'great men of exile' prominent as journalists or as military or political leaders during 1848–1849, and the 'lower refugees', mainly artisans who allegedly only longed to return home.<sup>2</sup> This perspective, however, confuses matters. Rather, the division which solidified from late 1849 onwards was not primarily a question of émigré hierarchy, but of differing political outlooks. The key issues were whether the next revolution should concentrate upon political aims such as establishing institutions in a new, united Germany freed from aristocratic oppression, and whether and when it should include social and economic changes, and what these should be. Thus the division was primarily between communists and social democrats on the one hand, and republican democrats on the other. These differences had been virtually absent in exile politics before 1848. Where they had existed throughout 1848–1849, they had largely been obscured by a common platform of revolutionary demands, whereby the communists could work within the broader democratic movement. In exile the split soon became very apparent, since what had been immediate goals had been pushed out of reach and there was now plenty of time to re-examine past and future proceedings, tactics and fundamental aims. Although often expressed in terms of 'personalities', this rupture among the Forty-eighters was founded in fundamental differences of opinion on both the strategy and aims of the next revolution. As one commentator put it, 'the history of the emigration is for a considerable part the history of the breach between bourgeois-republican Democracy and revolutionary Socialism'.<sup>3</sup> This neatly encapsulates the eventual outcome of a decade of émigré discussions and fights. But the old revolutionary democracy of 1848 in fact died a long and agonising death, and the process by which two opposing political camps emerged from the old type of democracy was protracted and by no means straightforward. Instead there was a broad middle ground, much shifting backwards and forwards on both sides; and considerable indecision all round.

However, many of the immediate squabbles concerned money, the foremost need of all refugees. There were of course a few exceptions; Arnold Ruge could rely on some income from his German assets, and Lothar Bucher found a relatively well-paid job as a correspondent for the Berlin *National-Zeitung*. But most refugees reached London penniless, without knowing the language or how to find work. Many artisans went without food for days and slept in the parks. Even where the situation was not quite as desperate, the depressing psychological effects of loss of income and status were felt by all. Britain offered asylum, but not the means of giving the refugees their daily bread.<sup>4</sup>

Thus the most immediate task of every refugee organisation was to collect money, drum up support in Germany, England and America, and help the newcomers find lodgings, employment and income. The first Committee of Support for German Political Refugees was set up in September 1849 by the CABV in Great Windmill Street and consisted of Marx, Karl Blind (a former envoy in Paris of the Baden-Palatinate



government and also a member of the Communist League), Anton Füster (formerly a member of the Viennese Imperial Diet), and the veteran Londoners Heinrich Bauer and Karl Pfänder. They published an emotional appeal for support for all the fugitives, 'whether liberal, democrat, republican, or socialist', which appeared in several German papers.<sup>5</sup> But it was initially unsuccessful: after one month they were in possession of the paltry sum of £7.<sup>6</sup>

More trouble faced the refugee committee when a new wave of democratic refugees arrived in London, including Gustav Struve, Karl Heinzen and August Willich. Wilhelm Backhaus, a private scholar branded as 'Bunsen's agent', 'incited' some CABV members 'to speak up against the club's principles in order to break up the society', but his attempt was thwarted and ended with 17 workers being expelled 'for conspiring against the society'. Shortly after this 'purge', which took place in mid-November 1849, Louis Bauer, a physician from Stolpe and a former representative of the left in the Berlin National Assembly, was also expelled for unspecified 'reactionary intrigues'.<sup>7</sup> All these former members established a Democratic Society at Hillmann's in 22 Greek Street, Soho, which was soon dominated by Heinzen and Struve. This society also attracted a number of workers from the CABV, including former Communist League members such as Friedrich Bobzin, Johann Dohl and Johann Göbel, and set up a separate refugee committee under Bauer, Struve and Rudolf Schramm.<sup>8</sup> Consequently the CABV's refugee committee excluded democratic emigrants and co-opted Engels and Willich instead. It began to call itself 'social democratic' and was run exclusively by Communist League members from December 1849 on, and mainly assisted 'members of the social democratic party'.<sup>9</sup> The Democrats in turn hoped to set up a common aid committee, inviting Marx, Engels, Willich, Struve, Heinzen and others to join it. Marx and Engels refused, suspecting that their main concern was anti-communist propaganda and intrigues against the CABV.<sup>10</sup> Willich on arriving joined the CABV and Marx, while his formerly (and subsequently) close friend Struve objected to the CABV's communism and sided with Heinzen instead.<sup>11</sup> Thus, less than three months after most of them had arrived in exile, the émigrés' support organisations were split along party lines.

Heinzen and Struve had been well established as radical writers before the revolution, and now began contributing to the *Deutsche Londoner Zeitung*, the sole German-language paper in London and also favourable towards the revolution. Naturally this was the paper in which the exiles could air their hopes and regrets, and the republican, atheist and feminist Heinzen commenced a series of public disputes among the German community with an article on the 'Lessons of the Revolution'. His call for 'a few million' heads of reactionaries even reached *The Times*, where one scandalised reader demanded such 'Social Democrats' be expelled from Great Britain. The scandal cost the refugees much sympathy; Heinzen's wife even lost needlework pupils.<sup>12</sup> The social democrats, willing neither to subscribe to Heinzen's bloodthirsty demands nor to have their refuge endangered, immediately distanced themselves.<sup>13</sup> Heinzen found an uneasy ally, however, in Struve, a republican lawyer and leader in the Baden uprising.<sup>14</sup> In exile, Struve now sought greater influence on both the *Deutsche Londoner Zeitung* and the refugee committee, in the process rising to prominence in the Democratic Society.

But Heinzen and Struve soon fell out with one another. For internal discussion only, Heinzen had drawn up a programme for uniting the German democrats.<sup>15</sup> It demanded a centralised German republic with a single-chamber parliament chosen by direct general

election, and called for basic democratic rights, such as a free press, trial by jury, a militia to replace standing armies, the accountability of civil servants, and a foreign policy guided by republicanism and the self-determination of peoples. While these points were acceptable to most democratic exiles, the programme's economic and social section raised problems. This proposed a progressive income tax, provisions for supporting the unemployed, state support for 'workers' associations', and money taken from 'the reactionary party'. Other private property, however, as the product of individual labour, was to be protected by the state, which would also ensure that 'no one can unlawfully exploit the destitution of others for his private gain'. The state was to provide opportunities for employment, state loans for workers' associations and equal education for all. But Heinzen insisted that some form of wage system was needed, provided the wage was adequate and did not enslave its recipient. Optimistically he added that such regulations might lead capitalists to hand their firms over to the state or make their workers associate owners.

Before a constitutional assembly was to create the republic, Heinzen thought that a transitional period required a revolutionary dictatorship—his fellow-exiles suspected that Heinzen had himself in mind for the post of dictator. Nor, if he intended to provide a common ground for most republicans, were his feminist demands very prudent. Free schooling and vocational training for both boys and girls were uncontroversial. Much less so was his call for women to be given the 'furthest possible independence in economic respects and thus be freed from the state of slavery and prostitution', as well as the means 'to enable them to defend their rights and interests also in political respects, such as a special representation or commission'.<sup>16</sup>

Struve announced this programme publicly at a meeting of the Democratic Society. Heinzen regarded this act as treachery, having intended the programme for internal discussion among a few selected refugees only. A permanent rift with Struve, his close ally during the revolution, ensued.<sup>17</sup> Heinzen was also disappointed that the Democratic Society took little interest in his proposals. This episode, together with his 'Lessons of the Revolution', virtually eliminated any chance of his gaining influence and a living in London, and he soon afterwards decided to emigrate to the United States.<sup>18</sup> With some other democratic refugees Struve withdrew to experiment with a communitarian farm in Yorkshire, but remained involved on and off in London exile politics before himself emigrating in April 1851.<sup>19</sup>

In our present context the split between Heinzen and Struve is less important than the fact that they had initiated the first major rift between the exiled socialists and democrats. Early tension in the refugee committee was accompanied by much mudslinging, including accusations of cronyism and embezzlement.<sup>20</sup> Struve and his friends claimed that the Great Windmill Street committee 'did not ask "Are you a democratic refugee?" and "Are you hungry?" but: "Are you a communist?"—Whoever did not profess to follow their flag, was curtly rejected.'<sup>21</sup> As a result, some radical businessmen in Stettin refused to support fugitives if the funds were to be channelled through the CABV. By contrast, Struve's Democratic Society did not demand a confession of faith from its members but only asked them to prove their status as refugees. Some regarded even this as counterproductive:

Both clubs have the disadvantage that while they don't formally demand special services and homage from the person supported, in practice they solicit devotion such as participation at meetings, living together with a mass of helpless comrades, more or less subordination to the views and plans of their leaders.<sup>22</sup>

The social democratic refugee committee, which had alone supported the destitute Germans in London before the Democratic Club's committee was launched in April 1850, however, continued to carry the bulk of the burden, in total helping about 500 refugees with a contribution of some £400.<sup>23</sup>

To provide shelter and reduce expenses, the Democratic Club's committee opened a so-called 'barracks' at a house in Southwark near Waterloo Bridge, where 18 of the poorest refugees could live communally and about 40 could be fed.<sup>24</sup> Associated with it was an attempt at a brush-and broom-manufacturing co-operative initially financed by the CABV.<sup>25</sup> Even August Willich, having failed to make a living as a language teacher, went to this 'barracks', whose semi-military lifestyle suited him and whose inmates were his strongest supporters among the refugees.

Repeated attempts were made from both inside Germany as well as by 'unaligned' refugees to reunify the émigré groups. Even members of the Communist League wrote in favour of a reconciliation, reminding their London comrades that 'the revolution is the main thing...one should drop the question of principles; we all have just but one common enemy etc'.<sup>26</sup> Such hopes for a 'united front' of all revolutionaries against reaction in Germany, however, were shattered by the uncompromising attitude of Marx and his closest followers. On his arrival in London in August 1849, Marx had intended to reorganise the Communist League and to launch a new paper. Such activity did not exclude co-operation with other refugee groups on issues of practical help for the fugitives, but a break was inevitable as soon as programmatic statements and party political debates were introduced into the support organisation. Marx rejected all proposals for rapprochement, and rigorously insisted on clear allegiances, even in his private life, as early as November 1849, when he broke all social ties with his physician, Dr Bauer, who was a member of the Democratic Society in Greek Street.<sup>27</sup> Not surprisingly, he was rapidly gaining a reputation for being obstructive and arrogant.

But if Marx sought no collaboration beyond immediately necessary help, some of his allies followed a less exclusive strategy, if not always successfully. Eduard von Müller-Telling's attempt to remain on friendly terms with both Heinzen and Marx, for example, had particularly nasty consequences. The former *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* correspondent had on arriving in London joined Marx's group, but argued for a union of all the emigrants. Trying to curry favour all round, Müller-Telling proposed to help the former Hungarian revolutionary general Klapka against Heinzen, offered Heinzen material against Marx, and meanwhile told Marx that Klapka was a 'traitor'. An insignificant incident—Engels failed to provide him with tickets for a ball at the CABV—drove Müller-Telling to fall out with the socialists. The CABV insisted on trying Müller-Telling in a 'court of honour' and then expelling him from its ranks. Insults escalated, and eventually Müller-Telling produced a brochure against Marx's dictatorship which gained the dubious distinction of being the first anti-Semitic attack on Marx.<sup>28</sup>

By the beginning of 1850 the dividing line was thus drawn between the democratic and socialist exiles. Each group had its own club, committee of assistance, and for a time its own newspaper, rallying around either the *Deutsche Londoner Zeitung* or Marx's *Neue Rheinische Zeitung—politisch-ökonomische Revue*. Despite the disagreements and strife soon to break out within each camp, it was henceforth understood that the major dividing line was between socialist and non-socialist 'Forty-eighters'. To outsiders, their shared circumstances in London repeatedly suggested the possibility of unification, especially since neither the English nor the continental public bothered greatly to differentiate between the refugees, who—if mentioned at all—were generally lumped together.<sup>29</sup> But to their participants, for whom exile magnified every disagreement, the debates dividing the camps demonstrated grave differences. The history of each group can thus only be understood with reference to the other, since many of their arguments were directed against one another.

Most German refugees belonged to the democratic camp. It was from here that the main attempts at reconciliation originated, partly because the democrats thought ideological differences respecting the future organisation of society were secondary to the overriding goal of instigating a revolution, and partly because competing factions among the democrats repeatedly attempted to woo socialists for their own ends. But the smaller socialist camp was also far from uninterested in the activities and proclamations of the other side. Repeatedly groups within the CABV or the Communist League attempted talks or common forms of organisation with the more radical democrats, especially those interested in social reforms. Even the isolated 'Marx group' scrutinised the activities of Ruge and Kinkel with the greatest interest, and became involved in various intrigues themselves. Moreover, there was always a large 'middle ground' of refugees who either from indifference or ignorance of the debates wavered between the two groups, and who were the focus of proselytising efforts from both.<sup>30</sup> Hence any account which fails to acknowledge this interaction cannot interpret accurately either the content or the intensity of the debates in exile.

### **The development of the Communist League: the circulars of March and June 1850**

When the first socialist exiles arrived in London in the summer of 1849, they were pleased to find the German Workers' Educational Association still in existence. Although its membership and activities had decreased considerably during the revolution and its East End branch had closed down, the club, and with it the London section of the Communist League, had been kept alive by the efforts of Heinrich Bauer, Karl Pfänder, Johann Georg Eccarius, and a few other dedicated workers. By the beginning of September 1849, the club could report a revival.<sup>31</sup> It soon even surpassed its former strength and grew to three sections, with the main branch in the West End still at the same address, 20 Great Windmill Street, Haymarket, where a police spy saw about 180 members in May 1850, and two further sections, meeting in the City at 55 Dorset Street, Salisbury Square, and in Whitechapel at 52 Leaman Street.<sup>32</sup> Wilhelm Liebknecht, then a young student newly arrived in London who had just met Marx at the CABV's summer picnic, later described the premises of the club with its main room full of old

acquaintances, and a private parlour with its 'massive mahogany table, the shining pewter-pots, the foaming stout, the prospect of a genuine English beefsteak with accessories, the long clay pipes inviting to a smoke—it was really comfortable'.<sup>33</sup>

But if the CABV remained a cosy place where the German exiles could meet friends and eat, drink and be merry, its political function was now somewhat different. By comparison with the statutes of 1845, the club had lost its explicitly international character. The new statutes of 1851 were no longer printed in four languages, and the clause that members could come from all nations had been dropped. However, this may have been chiefly a precaution against the threats of the Aliens Act, which at the same time forced the Fraternal Democrats to reorganise themselves into a purely English organisation. Certainly there is no indication that relations with Chartists or French exiles in any way had soured. Moreover, the Club had radicalised its political position. While it dropped the stated aim of seeking to support its members in sickness or distress, it now sought not just the 'instruction of its members in the arts and sciences', but more specifically their 'social, political and scientific instruction'. Membership was solicited no longer from 'every man against whose moral conduct there are no objections, to whatever creed, country, or station of life he may belong', but instead from 'every citizen who belongs to the party of the proletariat and against whose conduct there are no objections'. Monthly general assemblies of all sections were introduced to debate questions 'of importance for the proletarian party'. Similarly, the 1847 motto, 'Proletarians of all countries, unite!', was retained after the revolution. A spy was horrified to learn that prospective members had to declare themselves 'genuine communists' before being admitted to Great Windmill Street.<sup>34</sup>

For Marx, the Workers' Club provided welcome 'headquarters' for reorganising the Communist League and the refugee support committee. He joined the CABV in early September 1849 soon after arriving in London, and lectured to its members in the following winter, talking on the *Communist Manifesto*, on 'What is Bourgeois Property?', and on political economy and the principles of communism.<sup>35</sup> This accorded well with the great emphasis placed on workers' education by CABV since its foundation, and on lectures on socialism as well as other fields of knowledge, such as geography, the sciences, history, philosophy and political economy. Thus to outside observers this increasing emphasis seemed to confirm that the Club was dominated by the Communist League and by Marx personally.

Yet the relationship between Marx and the German workers was neither easy nor straightforward. Now exiled in London himself, Marx was happy to make use of the remnants of the League's organisation which the Londoners, against his wishes, had preserved over the previous year, and he was elected, or more probably co-opted, onto its Central Authority. Sharing the other emigrants' illusions about a speedy revolution on the Continent, he now regarded the immediate reorganisation of the League as vital.<sup>36</sup> For the time being, open propaganda in Germany was out of the question, and hence working within a broader alliance of revolutionaries no longer seemed necessary or desirable. The question of reorganising the League itself was closely related to the communists' position vis-à-vis other émigré groups. In the following months, the League twice stated its policy in this regard, in 'circulars' issued in March and June 1850. These clearly reveal the more important points of friction between Marx and various CABV members, among which alliance strategies were particularly prominent.

Expecting the coming revolution to be led by bourgeois or petty bourgeois democrats, Marx thought that the workers and communists should have a clearly defined position towards them, which would of course also affect their day-to-day dealings with the democratic organisations in London. He formulated the League's position towards 'petty bourgeois democrats' in the Circular of the Central Authority to the League in March 1850.<sup>37</sup> Here the main conclusion to be drawn from the revolution concerned the need for a separate workers' party organised independently of democrats. Hence the whole text focused chiefly on establishing strategies and tactics for independent workers' organisations, on limiting the extent of possible co-operation, and on devising plans to push the democrats as far as possible. It clearly stated that

The relation of the revolutionary workers' party to the petty bourgeois democrats is this: it marches together with them against the faction which it aims at overthrowing, it opposes them in everything by which they seek to consolidate their position in their own interests.

Workers and the petty bourgeoisie were to part ways immediately after the initial victory:

While the democratic petty bourgeois wish to bring the revolution to a conclusion as quickly as possible...it is our interest and our task to make the revolution permanent, until all the more or less possessing classes have been forced out of their position of dominance, the proletariat has conquered state power, and the association of proletarians, not only in one country but in all the dominant countries of the world, has advanced so far that at least the decisive productive forces are concentrated in the hands of the proletarians.<sup>38</sup>

Hence it would be harmful to join any union suggested by bourgeois democrats. Necessary alliances against a common enemy would emerge spontaneously when required and need not be prepared in advance.<sup>39</sup>

The position taken in the March Circular has been much debated. Obviously some sort of self-criticism by Marx was implicit here, since he had essentially postponed an independent proletarian organisation when he had put the League on ice in Cologne. The March Circular proposed independent workers' candidates at all elections, even when they had no chance of winning, which reversed the stance taken by Marx during the revolution. However, this does not necessarily mean that Marx was merely compromising with the views of the more extreme faction inside the League, as Schraepler argues, or that he had been forced to placate the artisan faction of the League in return for being accepted in it once again, which is Hunt's view.<sup>40</sup> There was a significant artisans' faction within the League which had insisted during the revolution on a separate workers' organisation. But it was not necessarily unwilling to join forces with other social reformers and democratic and republican revolutionaries, provided that separate organisations were retained, and was in fact quite prepared to collaborate on a much broader platform and to experiment with any strategy which could aid a revolution, including a union with 'bourgeois' democrats or even insurrection. What later split the League was not the artisans' desire for a purely proletarian organisation (nor, for that

matter, Marx's insistence on the same), but their wish to wage revolution immediately and by all means available, and their refusal to accept Marx's economic determinism. In March 1850, when he wrote the Circular, Marx too continued to expect that a revolution would soon break out on the Continent. But since he was sure that this revolution would first bring democrats into power, he thought it necessary to sharpen the workers' awareness of their own class interests, to arouse their suspicions regarding the democrats' social and political intentions, and to prepare them for a struggle with the new democratic state. Hence there were repeated and emphatic warnings against the democrats as 'the party that wishes to exploit the common victory for itself alone', detailed suggestions on compelling the democrats to carry out more socialist measures, both in quantity and content, than they intended, and the frequent call for 'the Revolution in Permanence'.

Besides the lesson about the treason of the German democratic bourgeoisie in 1848–1849, there were related but more immediate reasons for the Circular's advice in March 1850 and the Central Authority's attack on the democrats' policy of one united opposition party. Those democrats who now generally preached 'unity and reconciliation with the proletariat' were mainly the leading figures of the exile organisations in London, specifically Heinzen, Struve and Arnold Ruge, together with other prominent members of the Democratic Society in Greek Street, just around the corner from Marx's 'headquarters'. This party was pronounced 'far more dangerous to the workers than the previous liberal party', and its different factions were criticised one by one. Most of the exiled democrats concurred in a united front strategy, and since after 1849 London was the centre of their political activities, it was from here that their appeals were first launched. In late December 1849, Louis Bamberger and others had proposed—in vain—making common cause with the group around Marx.<sup>41</sup> Heinzen's programme, dated just a month before the March Circular, had also aimed at 'a unification...on a basis of principles', and at creating 'a recognised revolutionary authority'.<sup>42</sup> In addition, letters from the Continent urged the refugees to unite.

Thus from the socialists' perspective it was indeed particularly necessary in London to point out the differences in strategy and final aims which separated democrats from socialists. Here there were special dangers in the fact that the refugees' common plight and their own wish for a speedy return to Germany might, and did, tempt socialists to ignore more fundamental differences of principle. Hence it is precisely the context of émigré politics that explains the urgency with which Marx opposed most attempts at alliances, as it was here that unification seemed most likely to occur. Thus the March Circular was less a concession Marx had to make to the radicals and artisans in the Communist League than an attempt to keep League members from conceding too much to the democrats. It was also less a reprimand of Marx for his past efforts at collaboration with the democrats in Cologne, which were acceptable as ad hoc alliances for specific and immediate aims, than an admonition against present and future alliances involving long-term obligations to and collaboration with organisations which offered few tangible results yet demanded stepping down from socialist principles.

Analysis of both the past revolution and of the different parties was also the focus of the journal Marx edited at this time. Its title, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung—politisch-ökonomische Revue*, was suggestive: it was to be seen as a temporary continuation of his Cologne paper, to be transferred back to Germany at the outbreak of the next revolution, which Marx expected 'after the publication of 3, possibly of 2 monthly issues'.<sup>43</sup> Yet the

new journal was not supposed to replace exactly the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*; its emphasis instead moved from commentary on current news to a more distanced, theoretical ‘review’, focusing above all on the need to elucidate ‘the period of revolution just experienced, the character of the conflicting parties, and the social conditions which determine the existence and the struggle of these parties’. Marx particularly intended ‘a comprehensive and scientific investigation of the *economic* conditions which form the foundation of the whole political movement’.<sup>44</sup>

The first issue appeared in February 1850. Although it contained seminal articles such as Marx’s ‘Class Struggles in France, 1848–1850’ and Engels’s ‘Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution’, which were highly topical, the journal never really got off the ground, and succumbed to financial and distributive difficulties ten months later. The paper clearly lacked support, even from members of the Communist League, as those trying to sell it in Germany experienced. Even in London only 50 copies were distributed, although an (unnamed) historical article was still read and debated in the German Democratic Society two years later.<sup>45</sup> There was also a lack of enthusiasm among potential contributors: almost the whole journal was written by Marx and Engels themselves except for two articles by other League members, Karl Blind’s ‘Austrian and Prussian Parties in Baden’ and a piece by Eccarius on the fight between large and small capital in the tailoring trade in London, written with Marx’s help.<sup>46</sup> The paper also printed an excerpt from a letter from Marx and Engels’ old friend ‘Lupus’, Wilhelm Wolff, and a poem by L.-N.Ménard, a member of the Blanquist Société des Proscrits socialistes français a Londres. This, of course, guaranteed ideological purity in a journal undiluted by artisan communism of the Weitling or Willich variety, and also ensured a high theoretical standard. But it failed to sell, perhaps because of the exclusiveness of the contributors, perhaps because ‘such literary undertaking had to seem suspicious to the pure revolutionary, i.e. to someone who always regards a critical review of his actions as high treason against the cause’.<sup>47</sup> International support, too, left something to be desired. ‘The Chartists and the French refugees here’ blessed Conrad Schramm’s fund-raising trip to America, but that was the extent of their aid. Except for Ménard’s poem neither money nor articles appeared; Harney alone apologised for not contributing.<sup>48</sup>

The precarious support for the *Revue* was further damaged by its attack on the immensely popular German democrat Gottfried Kinkel.<sup>49</sup> Kinkel had fought in the Baden uprising under Willich and was tried for high treason before a military court in Rastatt in August 1849. His name became a symbol for the movement for amnestying the Forty-eighters in Prussia and Germany, and by the time of his second trial, in May 1850, he had become the democratic martyr par excellence. The wave of sympathy for Kinkel left neither the Communist League nor the London refugees untouched, and his immense popularity greatly irritated Marx, at this point worried above all about democratic influence on the League. A sudden, violent and seemingly gratuitous attack in the *Revue* of May 1850 followed, which assailed Kinkel as the embodiment of ‘the slackness in the German allegedly revolutionary party’, and derided Kinkel’s defence speech with its sycophantic praise of the Hohenzollern dynasty as the possible creators of a future united German empire.<sup>50</sup> But this further attempt at demarcation from the democrats backfired, for personal sympathy with Kinkel’s fate prevailed even among those who disagreed with his politics. Marx’s critique was regarded as unfair and unwarranted; even in the League only a few individuals, such as Freiligrath, Weerth and Daniels, defended him.<sup>51</sup>



That there were differing groups inside the London League can be seen even more clearly in the next Circular of its Central Authority, issued in June 1850.<sup>52</sup> Although following Engels's avowal in 1885 Marx and Engels are generally regarded as the authors of the June Circular, there remains some doubt as to whether they were responsible for all of its contents, or whether they may even have disagreed with some sections or with its arrogant tone. Stylistically the June Circular pales beside its predecessor; its repetitive structure and contradictory advice suggest that it was compiled from several sources, at least incorporating reports and material from other authors. The police were told by one informer, moreover, that the Circular was drafted at Willich and Schapper's instigation, and that Marx and Engels had protested against its exaggerated claims.<sup>53</sup>

Roughly a third of the June Circular also concerned resisting unification attempts by democrats, but whereas the March Circular offered a theoretical justification for this line, the June Circular merely recorded various such efforts, while abusing the people and groups involved. In particular, the London ventures of Struve, his abortive 'Central Bureau of the United German Emigration' and Ruge's 'European Central Democratic Committee' were singled out for criticism, but so was—at great length—the so-called 'Revolutionary Centralisation', a broad-based group in Switzerland which included former League members.<sup>54</sup> Any 'specious unity' could only further fragment the League or misuse it: 'The workers' party can use other parties and party factions for its own purposes on occasion but must never subordinate itself to any other party.'<sup>55</sup>

But it was exactly the potential ambiguity of the last statement which again brought several groups of the League into contact with democratic organisations; the occasions when the workers' party could use other parties was left undefined, and in concrete cases it was difficult to tell who was using whom. This was especially the case in those places in Germany where there were not enough 'resolute revolutionaries' to form an ideologically homogenous section of the League. For such places the Circular suggested forming two different classes of League members, 'resolute revolutionaries', and 'people who do not yet understand the communist consequences of the present movement but who are useful and reliable', and strongly recommended seeking as much influence as possible on non-communist workers' organisations, such as gaining 'a firm grip on the peasants' and sport associations'.<sup>56</sup>

These contradictory instructions, condemning on the one hand those groups which had collaborated with non-socialists, recommending on the other joining non-socialist local organisations, and even admitting non-communists into the League as second-class members, only created further confusion. This can hardly have been in accordance with Marx's wish to create a clear theoretical basis for the League, and it strongly suggests the existence of groups within the League who thought differently on the issue of collaboration. Moreover, as we will now see, this willingness inside the League to compromise with some democrats may have induced Marx to join an international organisation which was indisputably oriented against non-socialist revolutionaries and which at the same time could accommodate the more radical wing of the Communist League around Willich, namely the much-discussed *Société Universelle des Communistes Révolutionnaires*.

### The Universal Society of Revolutionary Communists

In 1928 Rjazanov published documentary evidence of Marx's co-operation with French Blanquist refugees in London in the spring of 1850, which has since been interpreted as largely proving Marx's tendency towards Blanquism after the revolution.<sup>57</sup> The main proof is seen in the six articles of the 'Universal (or 'World') Society of Revolutionary Communists', the first of which runs:

The aim of the association is the overthrow of all privileged classes, the submission of these classes to the dictatorship of the proletarians by keeping the revolution in continual progress until the achievement of communism, which shall be the final form of the constitution of the human family.<sup>58</sup>

Drawn up in mid-April 1850, this declaration was signed by Marx and Engels as well as by Willich, the French Blanquist émigrés Adam and J. Vidil, and the Chartist Harney. Since the French original of the document is in Willich's handwriting, he may have been the prime instigator of the organisation. This, however, cannot be settled, since hardly anything is known about this short-lived organisation, which Marx, Engels and Harney (though not its other members) regarded as 'long since...dissolved' in October of the same year.<sup>59</sup>

The fact that the Universal Society has received so much attention from Marx scholars is thus due not to its practical influence, but to the theoretical problems implied in its first article, quoted above. 'Revolution in permanence', combined with the call for the 'dictatorship of the proletarians'—not any longer merely the 'rule of the proletariat' as in the League's statutes—suggested that Marx had here abandoned his revolutionary strategy of the 1848–1849 period and had succumbed to some degree to Blanquism. This might have included advocating conspiratorial secret societies and insurrectionary tactics, and after the revolution the dictatorship of an élite proletarian vanguard, as well as terrorism. Hence Marx has been accused not only of abandoning his democratic policies of (albeit limited) co-operation with peasants and petty bourgeoisie and of legal and open propaganda, but also of subscribing to totalitarian measures. A milder version of this charge assumes that Marx temporarily lost his equilibrium under the impact of defeat and exile, and therefore issued contradictory statements on Blanquist strategies.<sup>60</sup> A more political explanation has been put forward by R.N.Hunt, who argues that the artisan faction around Willich in the Communist League forced Marx and Engels to a self-critical public denunciation of their own former strategies in Germany, at least in such 'official' publications as the League circulars and the statement of the Universal Society of Revolutionary Communists, whereas their 'private' views, expressed mainly in the *Revue*, prove that Marx and Engels, even during this their most radical phase, were in no way inclined to advocate the 'totalitarian' strategies of a 'minority revolution'. The existence of the Universal Society of Revolutionary Communists according to this interpretation proves not that Marx had been won over by the Blanquists but the opposite: his attempt to convert what he regarded as the most advanced group in French politics to 'Marxism'.<sup>61</sup> Hundt goes even further in turning the tables, and simply states that '1850 was not a year in which Marx and Engels wrote and worked in a "Blanquist" mode but

the year offering the Blanquists their historical chance to attach themselves to scientific socialism'.<sup>62</sup>

The nature of Marx's relation to Blanquism and Blanquists in the first half of 1850 is thus the central question in evaluating the Universal Society of Revolutionary Communists. There are too many positive remarks by Marx and Engels on Blanqui in particular to brush them aside simply as compromise statements intended to placate the League's radical artisan wing. Indeed, although there is more outspoken criticism of conspiratorial tactics in their 'private' writings than in their public pronouncements, the difference is not as significant as Hunt infers. Admittedly Marx did advocate proletarian self-education through political struggle, and thus implicitly rejected both conspiratorial practices, 'untimely revolution' and educational dictatorship.<sup>63</sup> But the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung—politisch-ökonomische Revue* also praised the Blanquists as the only true revolutionary party in France, and accepted their advocacy of the 'dictatorship of the proletariat':

the *proletariat* increasingly organises itself around *revolutionary Socialism*, around *Communism*, for which the bourgeoisie itself has invented the name of *Blanqui*. This Socialism is the *declaration of the permanence of the revolution*, the *class dictatorship* of the proletariat as the necessary transit point to the *abolition of class distinctions generally*, to the abolition of all the relations of production on which they rest, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the revolutionising of all the ideas that result from all these social relations.<sup>64</sup>

Conrad Schramm, who often acted as Marx's mouthpiece in these years, echoed this in his praise of Blanqui and 'the necessity of the dictatorship of the workers over all other classes in society until these are completely annihilated and the conditions for their existence abolished'.<sup>65</sup> The June Circular, too, extolled the Blanquists as 'the really proletarian party' of the French revolutionaries. Nor is there a single negative mention of Blanqui in the writings of these years of Marx and Engels, who of course defended Blanqui against 'pretended' Blanquists like Willich's later ally Barthélemy.<sup>66</sup>

But admiring Blanquist politics in France and collaborating with Blanquist exiles in London does not prove either that Marx and Engels accepted all of Blanqui's tenets, or that the Universal Society of Revolutionary Communists was itself a genuinely Blanquist organisation. The French Blanquist society in London—the Société des Proscrits Démocrates Socialistes Français à Londres—met in Rathbone Place and at the same Soho haunts as the German exiles, and was on friendly terms with some of the latter. (Liebknecht and Marx, for instance, frequented a fencing and pistol shooting club which the French had set up in Rathbone Place.<sup>67</sup>) The Blanquists were engaged in bitter feuds with two other organisations of French revolutionary exiles in London, which were grouped around Ledru-Rollin and Louis Blanc respectively.<sup>68</sup> The Société des Proscrits was headed by Emmanuel Barthélémy, Vidil, Adam and F. Pardigon, who were also involved in the Universal Society.<sup>69</sup> Although the Universal Society of Revolutionary Communists was briefly alluded to in the June Circular, it remained secret and did not attempt to expand beyond the narrow circle of a few leaders, but a larger and more public

propaganda organisation was not precluded. The ‘ties of solidarity between all sections of the revolutionary communist party’ which it was supposed to form could for example be a net of corresponding committees.<sup>70</sup> And keeping an organisation secret is not the same as a conspiracy, since there is no indication that the bourgeoisie was to be overthrown by planned insurrection, as the Blanquist members of the Universal Society probably had in mind. Nor did Marx embrace Blanqui’s rather different idea of the proletariat.<sup>71</sup> In short, although the Universal Society of Revolutionary Communists had strong leanings towards Blanquism, it left room for non-Blanquists to sign its statutes.

There was another strong incentive for collaboration with the London Blanquists: the desire for international co-operation. The Communist League after the revolution was essentially a German organisation in both its composition and orientation. Its internationalism had suffered severe blows: the Belgian, French and Swiss organisations were either shattered or activities severely disrupted, and only the London section still had international links, although its proclaimed ‘contact with the most progressive party of the Hungarian refugees’ was probably limited to Bertalan Szemere, and connections with London Chartists were in fact much weaker than at the height of the activities of the Fraternal Democrats in 1846–1848. Nor is there proof for the assertion that the breach within the Chartists between O’Connor and Harney was ‘substantially hastened thanks to League delegates’.<sup>72</sup> Some Chartist journals were open to the League, but much to the chagrin of Marx and Engels Harney indiscriminately allowed foreign revolutionaries to contribute to his papers, and included manifestoes and articles from people such as Arnold Ruge as well.<sup>73</sup> The Aliens Act and the general decline of both Chartism and the Fraternal Democrats after 1848 hindered political co-operation, so that the League’s links were limited to more or less personal contacts with Harney and, after his release from prison, Ernest Jones. On top of this, the Fraternal Democrats were increasingly friendly with the French émigrés supporting Ledru-Rollin, so that Marx and Engels never as much as mentioned the Fraternal Democrats in their correspondence after August 1849, even if they occasionally attended their meetings.<sup>74</sup> At a time when most other refugee groups were acquiring a cosmopolitan following, the need for an international organisation of socialists was felt. Furthermore, Louis Blanc’s London *Monthly Review* propagated notions of ‘socialism’ which included for example the demands of the Anti-Corn Law League, which must finally have convinced Marx that Blanc had abandoned socialism.<sup>75</sup> This left as possible partners only the Blanquists, the most extreme section of French radicalism.

If the desire to draw a clear line between democratic and socialist exiles attracted Marx to the Blanquists, this move also necessitated the clear indication of those Blanquist concepts with which he disagreed. In the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung—politisch-ökonomische Revue*, Marx and Engels reviewed two volumes of memoirs by French conspirators and police agents, de la Hodde and Chenu, written about their experiences in secret societies.<sup>76</sup> The review outlined at length the historical value of such secret societies, and distinguished between ‘occasional conspirators’—workers who continue their normal employment while holding themselves ready for an insurrection—and bohemian ‘professional conspirators’ who

do not confine themselves to the general organising of the revolutionary proletariat. It is precisely their business to anticipate the process of

revolutionary development, to bring it artificially to a crisis-point, to launch a revolution on the spur of the moment, without the conditions for a revolution. For them the only condition of revolution is the adequate preparation of their conspiracy... Occupied with such scheming, they have no other purpose than the most immediate one of overthrowing the existing government and have the profoundest contempt for the more theoretical enlightenment of the proletariat about their class interests. Hence their plebeian rather than proletarian irritation at the *habits noirs* (frock coats), people of a greater or lesser degree of education who represent that aspect of the movement, from whom, however, they can never make themselves quite independent, since they are the official representatives of the party.<sup>77</sup>

Since this article was written in March or April 1850, at the same time that Marx's lectures to the CABV on political economy came under attack from those workers who emphasised 'action' against the 'literary characters', there can be little doubt as to which '*habits noirs*' were meant here, and whose 'plebeian irritation' was being castigated. But the reproach was not only directed at Willich and his followers in the CABV; this was also an assault on Blanquist insurrectionary tactics and conspiratorial practice at a time when Marx and Engels were entering on an alliance with the Blanquists. Here Hunt's thesis of a 'double line' in Marx's statements in his 'public' and 'private' views seems most convincing. The length and emphasis of these comments on conspirators certainly indicate that they were meant to be noticed by those who were most prone to be tempted into conspiracy, that is, the radical faction of the Communist League. In the following remarks on public-house revolutionaries—in Paris—one can sense the very immediate and direct admonition directed against people like Willich in London:

The whole way of life of these professional conspirators has a most decidedly bohemian character. Recruiting sergeants for the conspiracy, they go from *marchand du vin* to *marchand du vin*, feeling the pulse of the workers, seeking out their men, cajoling them into conspiracy and getting either the society's treasurer or their new friends to foot the bill for the litres inevitably consumed in the process... The sinister conspirator...suddenly thaws and is transformed into a tavern regular whom everybody knows and who really understands how to enjoy his wine and women... At the same time familiarity with danger makes him utterly indifferent to life and liberty. He is at home in prison as in the wine-shop. He is ready for the call to action any day.<sup>78</sup>

But even if we assume that the Chenu review was meant to admonish Willich not to turn into a tavern regular, as well as to warn against Blanquist conspiracies, this still does not explain why Marx and Engels thought it necessary to take such a 'double line' in their public and private views in the first place. Given their strong objections to conspiratorial practice, why should they have joined the Universal Society of Revolutionary Communists at all? If the March Circular, in the context of refugee politics, was indeed less a concession to the radicals within the Communist League than an attempt to stop

them from conceding too much to their main rivals in exile, the democrats, then it makes sense that Marx and Engels warned Willich and company against conspiracies, while at the same time emphasising in the League's Circulars the class basis of the struggle. The main direction of the attacks by Marx and Engels on the republican democrats thus accounts for their alliance with the only faction of French exiles remaining, the Blanquists. Hunt may go too far in suggesting that Marx here tried to influence them towards 'Marxism', but they clearly were the only group capable of stemming the influence of democratic and republican radicalism on the refugee community as a whole and the artisans of the League in particular.<sup>79</sup>

In this light a letter which has so far been neglected in this context gains in importance. On 6 May 1850, only a few weeks after the Universal Society of Revolutionary Communists was founded, Marx and Engels wrote to François Pardigon, secretary of the Blanquist Société des proscrits socialistes français a Londres at Rathbone Place, warning him against an intended collaboration with the German democrats in Greek Street and threatening to cut all ties with the French society if this happened.<sup>80</sup> Clearly, therefore, Marx and Engels' union with the Blanquists did indeed rest on a common front against non-socialist democrats, and became invalid as soon as this alliance was abandoned by the Blanquists themselves. In their letter to Pardigon Marx and Engels also referred to 'our manifesto', saying:

We have denounced the ringleaders of this society to you as charlatans and swindlers. Swindlers and charlatans will sign everything. They would probably have signed our manifesto had we been prepared to accept their repeated proposals of union and concord.

This seems to indicate that some common declaration between the Blanquists and Marx and Engels had been drawn up. In early July Barthélémy wrote to the imprisoned Blanqui that:

We have begun, jointly with the German communists, to draft a revolutionary manual, which contains point by point all the measures that the people must take immediately after the revolution to ensure success and to avoid a repetition of what happened in February. We intend to turn the manual into a little book that we can distribute among the workers so that each one will know what to do to ensure the victory of the people... Let us know if we can convey our manuscript to you...so you can put the final touches to it.<sup>81</sup>

We may speculate whether this manual was part of the 'important preparatory tasks for the next French revolution' with which the London members of the League said that the Blanquists had entrusted them.<sup>82</sup> At any rate, parts of it were doubtless incorporated into a list of measures relative to the next revolution which the Willich-Schapper faction issued after the split. Unfortunately there is no further evidence of a joint declaration of Marx's and Blanqui's followers, and their motives are unclear. But from the context of this enterprise it would certainly seem that Marx's desire to draw an ideological as well as organisational dividing line between socialist and non-socialist exiles played a major

role in his thoughts at the time. Marx seems to have joined the Universal Society in order to demarcate simultaneously his position against two groups. The willingness of some League members to co-operate with democrats may well have driven him into the arms of another socialist fraction, which was definitely not 'petty bourgeois' itself and which could help in the struggle against French and German democrats alike, from Ledru-Rollin and Louis Blanc to Struve and Ruge. This also explains Marx's insistence on dropping the Blanquists as soon as he suspected them of conniving with the German Democratic Society. On the other hand, Marx and Engels shared with Willich and the left of the League a tendency to expect an imminent revolution, and thus believed that preparatory organisation with the most revolutionary proletarian party of France could be enormously useful. But if there were collaboration on an organisational level, the Universal Society of Revolutionary Communists was not an ideological 'compromise' with the artisan faction around Willich, since Marx made his theoretical objections to conspirators perfectly clear. The question which has drawn so much attention to the Universal Society of Revolutionary Communists—whether Marx was veering towards Blanquism—must thus be answered in the negative.

Practically, the Universal Society amounted to little. It did not even make any known public appearance. It is thus an exaggeration to conclude that it achieved 'a temporary unification of the European Left after 1848 and as such was a forerunner of the First International'.<sup>83</sup> Given the secrecy, the few members and the extremely short life of the Society, groups like the Fraternal Democrats or the later International Association have a much stronger claim to this lineage. But the Universal Society did perhaps contribute to a degree of understanding between Willich and the Blanquists, which grew into a close collaboration until the bombshell of Blanqui's 'Toast' exploded among the refugees and shattered their organisations in February of the following year. At any rate, in October 1850 Adam, Vidil, and Barthelémy asked Marx and Engels for a 'reunion of the association we have formed', adding that 'We have already notified Citizen Willich'. This, after the split in the League, was sufficient for Marx and Engels to refuse further contacts and to declare that they regarded the Universal Society as 'long since...dissolved by fact'.<sup>84</sup> Hence the only tangible outcome of this much debated organisation was ironically the drawing together of Willich and Barthelémy, entirely undesired by Marx and Engels, which provoked a new division among the exiles and further widened the gap within the League, finally leading to its split in September 1850.

### **The split in the Communist League, 15 September 1850**

No issue of the *Revue* appeared between April, when Marx and Engels were dallying with the Blanquists, and November, some weeks after the Communist League's split. During this period Marx and Engels reached an entirely new point of view, differing significantly not only from their own position a few months earlier but also from the views of most London refugees, including League members. Having only just embraced doctrines like 'the revolution in permanence' and the need for a 'dictatorship of the proletariat' after a violent revolution, they now increasingly voiced doubts both about the prospects for revolution and the ways of bringing it about. Not only did the *Revue* emphasise the economic preconditions for political upheavals and the need for close

economic analysis, but Marx also propagated these views among the London workers again in the first half of 1850. Certainly his meticulous analysis in these lectures on political economy was capable of arousing the old residual resentment of the artisans against ‘arrogant academics’. For the underlying assumption of these studies was that a revolution could not be expected soon, and that therefore there was now not only plenty of time for, but also a great need for, education. This irritated many in the CABV, who did not want to hear that communism could not be introduced immediately after the next revolution. In a letter to Cologne Marx remarked upon this dissatisfaction with his new teaching in the CABV, saying that he had explained in the club

that communism could be introduced only after a number of years, that it had to go through several phases, and that it could at any rate only be introduced through education and gradual development, but that Willich with his trash...had vehemently opposed him and had said that it would have to be introduced in the next revolution, even if only through the force of the guillotine.<sup>85</sup>

The main person to voice the workers’ discontent with this view was thus August von Willich, who together with Carl Schapper led the faction which broke with Marx’s Communist League in September 1850. The colourful Prussian—a persistent rumour held him to be an illegitimate offspring of the Hohenzollerns—had spent part of his childhood in the house of a relative, the theologian and philosopher Friedrich Schleiermacher, and had begun his military career as a cadet at Potsdam at the age of 12.<sup>86</sup> As a company commander in the Rhineland, where feelings against the Prussian military ran high, he had come into contact with democratic and Young Hegelian ideas. He made friends with Fritz Anneke and Joseph Weydemeyer, and had by 1847 become a ‘true socialist’ enamoured of Feuerbach and Moses Hess.<sup>87</sup> When disciplinary action was taken against him, he resigned from the Prussian army, explaining his views in a pamphlet, *Im preußischen Heere*, which placed ‘humanity’ and ‘human rights’ as the highest principles which ought to, but did not, govern the military. In true Feuerbachian fashion, he searched for ‘the essence of man and his relation to nature’, and tried to combine theory and action, his main concern being the reconciliation of the two opposing principles of man’s drive towards the unifying Whole and individual egoism, which he thought should be found in work within the community.<sup>88</sup> At this point he took a step his family never forgave: he became a carpenter—which later greatly amused Marx, who referred to him as ‘Jesus Willich’—and ‘each morning took special delight in marching by the officers assembled on the parade ground, wearing his leather apron and carrying an axe on his shoulder’.<sup>89</sup>

In Cologne, Willich joined the local circle of the Communist League, becoming its president early in 1848 and in March the same year heading a demonstration for democratic and social reforms. Briefly imprisoned, he joined the ‘determined democrats’ in Heidelberg, who believed that parliamentary institutions could not be established by gradual and peaceful measures, and assumed command of a republican army unit under Friedrich Hecker. After their defeat, Willich reorganised his troops in Besançon as the ‘Workers’ League’, finding faithful allegiance among the 320 volunteers whose poverty and hard labour he shared, and for whom Willich’s friends in Cologne and Paris



organised support.<sup>90</sup> Drilled daily in anticipation of the next revolution, his Besançon corps joined the 'self-help' German Republican Defence League, a workers' organisation in Switzerland preparing for armed intervention in Germany. Later they formed the nucleus of a corps of volunteers whom Willich commanded in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of the spring of 1849, and were also joined by the poet Gottfried Kinkel, who served as a private, and Friedrich Engels, who was Willich's adjutant. But the 'Campaign for the Imperial Constitution' was defeated, and most of its participants fled across the border into Switzerland. Just after the events Engels wrote to Jenny Marx that

when the Prussian army came I could not resist the desire to join the war. Willich was the only officer who was any good, and so I went to him and became his adjutant... Willich is brave, cold-blooded, skilful, and surveys things quickly and correctly in battle, but out of battle he is *plus ou moins* a boring ideologist and True Socialist.<sup>91</sup>

Willich at this time summarised his aims less in terms of theoretical 'true socialism' than a short, practical 'programme of the disinherited', which he formulated in Besançon. Starting from the premise that all men were brethren with the same basic needs and rights, he drew up a list of demands to create equality. A committee of public welfare in each local community was to distribute housing, food and labour, and would 'declare that from this instant exploitation of one man by the other ceases to exist, that no one individual works for another but that each works for the common good, i.e. for himself.'<sup>92</sup> Production and housing were to be arranged communally, with large-scale heavy industry and transportation as well as the arts and sciences becoming the responsibility of the nation state. For the miserable condition mankind was currently in, Willich blamed egoism, vanity and arrogance, which would disappear once all became 'conscious'. While this was neither very sophisticated nor close to the positions of the Communist League he rejoined six months later, his heartfelt sympathy with the oppressed and his lack of arrogance won him a solid and steadfast following.

In October 1849 Willich went to London, where his brand of socialism proved very attractive to the German workers and refugees. Through Marx's proposal and on Engels's recommendation he was co-opted into the Central Authority of the Communist League, 'true socialism' not being too momentous an obstacle at this point. Marx and Engels also secured him a place on the fugitives' committee, and for a few months Willich's signature appeared beside those of Marx and Engels on many public statements. Willich later said that when he met Marx in London, heading the organisation of revolutionary workers, 'it went without saying that I joined them, as I had not drawn the sword against my previous princes, against my friends and relatives, in order to enjoy peacefully regular dinners among peaceable pedants'.<sup>93</sup> But tensions soon appeared. Willich was extremely popular in the CABV, and probably put Marx somewhat in the shade as its unrivalled leader. His image as a dashing lieutenant, military hero, and spartan, disciplined Prussian was quite anathema to Marx, but won him affection among the poorer refugees. Consequently, 'Marx was respected but Willich was popular'.<sup>94</sup> He shared the refugees' life in the communal house, in appropriate military style known as the 'fugitives' barracks', and as a bachelor enjoyed its soldierly atmosphere and male camaraderie as well as the heavy drinking and conviviality of Schärttner's tavern. He joined the co-

operative broom-making venture of the 'barracks', shared the hunger and privations of the 'refugee rabble', as Marx and Engels were prone to call them, and addressed them using the familiar 'du'.<sup>95</sup> Some of the men, including the tailor Haude, who was later to act as an emissary for the Willich-Schapper League, had been his loyal supporters ever since the Baden campaign. Others were won over in London by his pub oratory—he was fond of juxtaposing 'mankind, i.e. the proletariat' to 'human animals, worse than tigers and hyenas'—and by his military plans for liberating Germany, which kept up their hopes in exile.<sup>96</sup> Believing that the state 'has to own the means of production, capital and land', if exploitation of the proletariat was to be abolished, Willich added to his social revolutionary enthusiasm a strong chiliastic streak, which did little to endear him to Marx and Engels. In retrospect, thus, Engels described Willich as

one of those sentimental communists so common in western Germany since 1845, who on that account alone was instinctively, furtively antagonistic to our critical tendency. More than that, he was entirely the prophet, convinced of his personal mission as the predestined liberator of the German proletariat and as such a direct claimant as much to political as to military dictatorship. Thus, to the primitive Christian communism previously preached by Weitling, was added a kind of communist Islam.<sup>97</sup>

With this 'communist Islam' came another crucial disagreement which centred on the difference between the 'men of action' and the 'literary characters'. Willich was unwilling to forsake his schemes for a military seizure of power, so much admired among the London refugees, merely to sit back and read, discuss and write articles. Lacking a university education, he had experienced the revolution not as a journalist but as the leader of an enthusiastic group of volunteers. Though acquainted with Young Hegelian ideas and Moses Hess, Willich's own literary products were not concerned with analysis but were calls to action, always his primary interest. He recoiled from the idea of a long wait before the proletariat could take power, and, refusing to admit the possibility of a non-socialist revolution, instead devised plans for seizing power, above all through military schemes. This emphasis on 'the deed', or 'action', was of course welcomed in particular by all those workers in the CABV who still distrusted 'the intellectuals' and longed for prompt revolutionary activity. This they still regarded as feasible in August 1850, when 30 members of the CABV travelled to Hamburg to volunteer for the Schleswig-Holstein army (including the League member Rings). They were promptly expelled, but their eagerness to take up arms in a new uprising had been demonstrated.<sup>98</sup>

Initially, however, Marx and Engels also expected a speedy revolution, and welcomed Willich's popularity. Apparently hoping to cash in on this, Engels praised Willich in his review of the Baden-Palatinate campaign, although he had in fact overestimated Willich's renown.<sup>99</sup> In April, discreet enquiries about Willich's character were made within the League, probably by friends of Marx and most probably already in response to tensions.<sup>100</sup> Thus the situation was already uneasy by early summer, when rumours of the squabbles in the Central Authority reached German League members, who reacted with annoyance.<sup>101</sup> By August, Marx ridiculed Willich's 'communist reveries' even to outsiders, and claimed that only as an able guerrilla leader was he an asset to their

party.<sup>102</sup> To Willich's adherents, however, this was a power struggle conducted by jealous 'journalists and semi-learned men' in whose eyes

the workers are zeros, who gain value only through being led by the former. As long as the workers were willing to put up with this position, they were praised, but as soon as they started to refuse blind obedience, they were [called] rogues, asses, rotters, rabble. Here in London, the formerly strong and firmly organised workers' society and the London district [of the League] have become completely disorganised, ever since Marx, Engels, etc., have been here, because they put persons above the cause and in every imaginable way pursued everybody who was not dependent enough to agree with them unquestioningly. The first personal attacks were directed against Willich, whose popularity with the workers, which he had gained through his activity in Germany, Besancon, and the last German revolution, had to be destroyed at all costs—the so-called intelligent and writing people did not want to tolerate a man of action next to them.<sup>103</sup>

In particular they accused Ferdinand Wolff and Wilhelm Liebknecht, recently arrived, of downright spying and intriguing against Willich.

On 1 July 1850, Schapper, founder of and leading figure in the CABV, returned from prison in Germany and 'already on the first evening had occasion to notice with what hatred Willich was being attacked'.<sup>104</sup> However, disillusioned by his own struggles in Germany, where the growing reaction had forced him to leave, he hesitated to join the side clamouring for action. A Prussian police agent reported back to Berlin that 'the refugees are all said to look upon him as a demi-god, and he is supposed to have great influence on the Great Windmill Street Club. But so far he has kept very quiet and has only remarked in a general way that for the time being nothing could be done in Germany.'<sup>105</sup> Schapper was promptly co-opted into the Central Authority of the Communist League, where he attempted to compromise and proposed that the circle in Cologne should take charge of the League until a congress decided the dispute.<sup>106</sup> (A conflict had been brewing between the London and Cologne circles for some time, because the Rhinelanders wanted a coalition with all democrats, new statutes and another congress in Germany, and also thought that resources spent on the refugees should more usefully be expended on propaganda.<sup>107</sup> On his arrival in London Schapper probably still sided with the Cologne circle.) However, Schapper's mediation failed, and he was forced to take sides. Within a month he joined the CABV and Willich, to the dismay of Marx, who expressed his 'great disappointment' that Schapper preferred 'this clique'.<sup>108</sup>

Schapper later declared that the breach in the League was governed by differences in principle, not by 'personalities'.<sup>109</sup> But it is difficult to see what principles united Schapper with Willich in 1850. His biographer, Lewiowa, blames 'the remnants of his earlier Utopian views' and his preference for conspiracy.<sup>110</sup> However, ever since his part in the unsuccessful Blanquist uprising of 1839, Schapper had opposed insurrections, and after the Communist League was founded he had closely followed Marx and also dropped his enthusiasm for Feuerbach (which he had shared with Willich). He had supported Marx against Gottschalk (allied to Willich) in the Cologne Workers' Society,

and in June 1849 warned against premature and hasty acts. In short, throughout the revolution in Germany he worked closely and in agreement with Marx. Their only major point of contention, when Marx had opposed the Londoners' reorganisation of the League, did not exist any longer, since Marx had also in retrospect endorsed the Londoners. It was therefore quite reasonable to expect Schapper to back Marx against Willich. He had, of course, on the other hand, even longer-standing affinities with the London German workers. Not only had he been a founder of the Educational Society, for the past decade he had been the principal spokesman for its political and intellectual development, especially after his successful challenge to Weitling. When he finally ceded this position in order to embrace Marx's proposals for reorganising the League of the Just and the principles of the *Communist Manifesto*, he went through this process slowly, but ended up firmly on Marx's side. Yet his sympathies remained with the workers in the CABV, who like him had never quite shed their suspicions of intellectuals. Since he himself opposed insurrections and conspiracies and was quite convinced that for the time being 'nothing could be done' in Germany, it seems that his loyalties to the CABV, which he saw being torn apart by internal strife, rather than admiration for Willich and his revolutionary rhetoric, led Schapper to take a stand against Marx. He did, however, remain the most conciliatory member of the breakaway faction.<sup>111</sup>

As the two sides grew apart, the politicking became nasty, and 'the most violent scenes occurred, several times on the point of an all-out fracas'. In August Willich resigned from the refugee committee amidst a major row. He then became the centre of a quarrel in the Workers' Society, when Marx's followers

fell upon him with indescribable fury, distorted his words, inveighed against everybody who did not speak directly in favour of Marx and Engels. They came very close to contracting a sound thrashing on the part of the workers, and the meeting broke up in the greatest excitement. In running away, Marx and Engels shook their fists in Schapper's face, and cried out, beside themselves, 'We'll make you remember this yet!' The workers answered this threat with general laughter.<sup>112</sup>

This episode naturally dominated the next meeting of the Central Authority, along with arguments about the Society's funds. But events now got totally out of hand. Willich, who later remembered these quarrels as systematic persecution and 'the most disgusting circumstances of my life',<sup>113</sup> accused Marx of lying, and when asked to take this back by an irate Schramm, challenged the 'Percy Hotspur' among Marx's supporters to a duel. Schramm and Willich travelled to Belgium (where duelling was legal), and the final scene of this farce took place near Antwerp. Willich was seconded by the French Blanquists Barthélémy and Vidil, his colleagues from the Universal Society of Revolutionary Communists, and by Gustav Adolf Techow, like him a former Prussian officer who had fought as chief of the general staff in the Baden-Palatinate uprising.<sup>114</sup> Schramm was slightly wounded, but instead of easing the situation, the duel only gave rise to more slander. According to Willich's friends, the duel had been set up as a trap to get him arrested, since a denunciation from London had alerted a group of Prussian officers and police who awaited them in Belgium. The other side responded with rumours

that a cowardly Willich had abandoned the wounded and unconscious Schramm to his fate while making off for England.<sup>115</sup>

By now all paths to reconciliation were barred. Marx knew that most members of the CABV and of the Communist League's London branch supported Willich and that a general assembly was imminent.<sup>116</sup> Preemptively he convened a session of the Central Authority for 15 September 1850, when the quarrel finally culminated in splitting the League.<sup>117</sup> Marx, Engels, Schramm, H.Bauer, Eccarius and Pfänder on the one side clashed with Willich, Schapper and Lehmann on the other (the latter supported by Fränkel, who was absent from this particular meeting). Marx moved to transfer the Central Authority from London to Cologne, to form two separate League districts in London, each corresponding only with the Central Authority without any further contact with each other, and finally to let the Central Authority draw up new rules. (This move of course strongly resembled Marx's later behaviour in a similar situation in the International Workers' Association, when he transferred its Central Council to New York in order to get it out of reach of the Bakuninists.) Only Schapper objected, whereas Willich and Lehmann simply walked out, leaving the Central Authority to the majority supporting Marx, who then carried the motions. The break was made final when the minority elected their own Central Authority in London immediately afterwards, and each group expelled their most prominent opponents from their respective Leagues.

For Marx, this marked the end of the only phase in his political career in which he actually headed an organisation of the German workers' movement. The next months were spent by both sides hastily trying to influence the League on the Continent, with Cologne and most other German sections siding with Marx, while Schapper and Willich were supported in France, Switzerland and a few places in Germany, such as Mainz. In January 1851 Marx 'adjourned indefinitely' his London section, which was dissolved in November 1852. The group around Willich remained active in London exile politics until Willich's move to the United States in 1853.

The reasons for the break-up have been a source of controversy ever since. Willich initially presented the differences in terms of 'mere personalities', as if the quarrels simply resulted from incompatible styles, personal dislikes and rivalry for the leadership.<sup>118</sup> But the lack of mutual appreciation between the barracks group, ready for an armed revolution-ary campaign, and the intellectuals of the League, the old mistrust between the 'Straubingers' and their learned counterparts, had been festering under the surface and was easily revived when theoretical differences cropped up.

In the first week of September Eccarius, 'in order to have the whole matter discussed', initiated a debate—significantly in the CABV, not in the Central Authority—on 'the position of the German proletariat in the next revolution'. This, as Marx put it, 'finally laid bare the differences in principle which lay behind the clash of personalities'.<sup>119</sup> The first point to be disputed was the prospect of revolution. Marx had expected a trade crisis, but was convinced from early June onwards that the economic and political situation had stabilised. On arriving from Germany, Schapper had agreed with this estimate, while Willich expected armed uprisings in Germany soon. Partially because of their different timeframes, the two factions thus, second, went on to advocate different ways in which the League should prepare for the next revolution. Willich emphasised the need for military training to harden his cadres for the inevitable battles on the barricades and in warfare, practising fencing himself with the Blanquists while trying at the same time to

strengthen the international network of secret connections. Marx, on the other hand, held that education and propaganda alone would allow the proletariat to develop its class-consciousness and an organisation strong enough to survive the years of struggle which lay ahead. In his much-quoted speech at the meeting of 15 September he told his opponents that

The materialist standpoint has given way to idealism. The revolution is seen [by the Willich-Schapper group] not as the product of realities but as the result of an effort of *will*. Whereas we say to the workers, You have 15, 20, 50 years of civil war to go through in order to alter the situation and to train yourselves for the exercise of power, it is said: we must take power *at once*, or else we may as well take to our beds. Just as the democrats abused the word ‘people’ so now the word ‘proletariat’ has been used as a mere phrase. To make this phrase effective it would be necessary to describe all the petty bourgeois as proletarians and consequently in practice represent the petty bourgeois and not the proletarians. The actual revolutionary process would have to be replaced by revolutionary catchwords.<sup>120</sup>

A few weeks afterwards, in the last issue of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung—politisch-ökonomische Revue*, Marx described in a famous passage these ‘realities’ as growing economic prosperity and subsequent political stability, and concluded:

With this general prosperity, in which the productive forces of bourgeois society develop as luxuriantly as is at all possible within bourgeois relationships, there can be no talk of a real revolution. Such a revolution is only possible in the periods when *both these factors*, the *modern productive forces* and the *bourgeois forms of production*, come in *collision* with each other... All reactionary attempts to hold up bourgeois development will rebound off it just as certainly as all moral indignation and all enthusiastic proclamations of the democrats. *A new revolution is possible only in consequence of a new crisis. It is, however, just as certain as this crisis.*<sup>121</sup>

The third point of contention, however, was decisive for all participants. This was the problem of the anticipated role of the proletariat in the revolution, which Eccarius had raised. The March Circular, while still describing revolution as imminent, had been adamant that this would bring the ‘petty bourgeois’ democrats to power, against whom the proletariat then would have to lead a long struggle. Similarly, Eccarius contended in the CABV and in the Central Authority that the communists could not gain power immediately in the next revolution, but would be ‘more important in the clubs than in the government’. Willich and his supporters now maintained that there was little point in fighting unless it brought power directly and immediately to the workers. At the meeting of the Central Authority Schapper declared:

The question at issue is whether we ourselves chop off a few heads right at the start or whether it is our own heads that will fall. In France the workers will come to power and thereby *we* in Germany too. Were this not the case I would indeed take to my bed... If we come to power we can take such measures as are necessary to ensure the rule of the proletariat. I am a fanatical supporter of this view but the Central Authority favours the very opposite... I do not share the view that the bourgeoisie in Germany will come to power and on this point I am a fanatical enthusiast—if I weren't I wouldn't give a brass farthing for the whole affair.<sup>122</sup>

Similarly, Willich insisted that communism had to be introduced at the next revolution, 'even if only through the power of the guillotine' and 'even against the will of Germany as a whole'.<sup>123</sup> Willich's faction continued to demand 'energetic measures'

so that at the next revolution of the proletariat in France and Germany people will not only be opposition and write newspapers, but so that the German proletarians take their affairs into their own hands and come to power—if this fails it would be our own fault.<sup>124</sup>

Willich abhorred the idea that for the time being the party had to 'fight all those who oppose...the present political powers', that is, the emigrants and even the communist party itself. He feared that Marx tried to undermine these in order to organise 'the *future* opposition party, which—until it can take up its activity proper—becomes the opposition party of the present opposition party and thus works into the hands of the present political powers'.<sup>125</sup>

A fourth factor has often been named as responsible for the split. In his 'History of the Communist League', Engels stated in 1885 that Willich and Schapper clashed with Marx's discovery that a revolution was impossible for now because out of their 'revolutionary impulse' they had fallen for the 'bourgeois-democratic artificers of revolution', especially Ruge and Kinkel, who were forming 'provisional governments of the future' in London at the time.<sup>126</sup> These allegations against Willich, however, seriously misrepresent the causes of the disagreement prior to the split. By July 1850, of the democratic organisations of any lasting influence only the European Central Democratic Committee had made a public appearance, and nothing links its German representative, Ruge, with either Willich or the Workers' Society. According to Willich, 'the first disagreement between Marx, Engels and me' emerged when the Communist League had been invited to a general meeting of all Forty-Eighters. Willich had wanted to accept, but he abided by the majority decision not to, and merely admitted to 'ties of sympathy' with all participants in the revolution.<sup>127</sup> Joint organisations or alliances, however, had not been mentioned, and Willich had in fact broken off all his earlier connections with Struve and had helped Marx to fend off Struve's attacks on the Social Democratic Refugee Committee.<sup>128</sup> Kinkel, the alleged main culprit, arrived after the split, in November 1850, and began collaborating with Willich in 1851. Schapper was even less prepared than Willich to cooperate with democrats and he rejected any suggestion that the bourgeoisie should ascend to power first.

Consequently, throughout 1850 and during the first few months of 1851 the Willich-Schapper faction turned down any proposals for joint projects. Their first address of October 1850 emphasised that the proletarians would henceforth manage their own affairs and was full of recriminations against those intellectuals—democrats or socialists—seeking to dominate the workers. In early 1851 they again insisted that they had rejected democratic advances.<sup>129</sup>

In fact, Willich's supporters in both the Communist League and the CABV always particularly emphasised the purely proletarian basis and aims of their organisation, and accused the faction around Marx of feeling superior to the workers and of being not radical enough to demand a wholly proletarian revolution. Thus each side called the other 'reactionary'.<sup>130</sup> Certainly Marx was not as immune to the temptations of enlisting the support of non-communists as he later pretended. Negotiations with the Swiss 'Centralisation' went on for months, and as late as August 1850 Marx negotiated with Gustav Techow, a member of the 'Centralisation' denounced by the June Circular in fairly rude tones as petty bourgeois, but who was now attractive as a 'military' counterweight against Willich.<sup>131</sup> Thus, while *after* the split alliances with non-socialist exile groups became one of the major dividing lines between the two factions, they contributed only marginally, if at all, to differences within the Communist League beforehand.

Interpretations of the division of the League have usually pointed to the incompatibility of Marx's 'scientific socialism' and historical materialist analysis with the 'Utopian' or 'sentimental' socialism of the Willich-Schapper faction as the fundamental reason for the break. Liebknecht recalled that the 'old followers of Weitling and Cabet began to assert themselves again' in the Educational Society, and that Marx had more important things to do than to 'sweep away old cobwebs' and kept away from the CABV as a result.<sup>132</sup> Engels blamed the 'communist Islam' which he added to Weitling's 'early Christian communism'.<sup>133</sup> And the centrality to the League's split of this contrast has found its way into many secondary accounts.<sup>134</sup>

Yet while many breakaway members indeed still adhered to their views of the 'Just' period, the situation in early 1850 was more complex. The old CABV leaders were split equally between the two factions: Bauer, Pfänder and Eccarius supported Marx, together with other German workers (Klose, Hain) and with 'literary men' such as Liebknecht, Schramm and F. Wolff.<sup>135</sup> But the other old CABV members who sided with Willich (Schapper, Lehmann and Fränkel) retained a no less strong adherence to their former Cabetist and Weitlingian beliefs than their fellow-Londoners on Marx's side. As we have seen above, Schapper had throughout the revolution supported Marx's position, but was strongly attached to the Workers' Society. This is also true of other rebels against Marx. Salomon Fränkel, a furrier, was one of the few London exile politicians who represented the (largely unskilled) workers of the East End. He lived off Clerkenwell Road, had been a member of the Central Authority for some time, and was the most active member of the East End CABV section set up in 1846. It is plausible that he had never been completely won over to a Marxist perspective. In a speech in June 1847 he expounded the meaning of 'freedom' and 'community of goods', and toasted 'truth and freedom', while in early 1848 he pleaded for unity among the revolutionaries, while advocating education so that the bourgeoisie could not cheat the proletariat out of the fruits of the impending revolution.<sup>136</sup> Communism for him was a 'question of the stomach':



We can only assure our cause if on the day of victory, weapons in hand, we immediately proclaim the abolition of poverty. This must be the main point of our communist propaganda. It does not matter whether communism will be introduced in the near future or only in fifty or even a hundred years, from the day of victory nobody must be hungry any longer... This is the question which every worker understands because he feels it.<sup>137</sup>

Albert Lehmann, the other London worker in the Central Authority to join Willich and Schapper, had been connected even longer with the CABV, whose various publications he had signed from 1841 on. A tailor, he had in 1845 recommended studying the factory towns after the example of academics, yet had not linked communism exclusively to the working classes and assumed communist sympathies even among some aristocrats. He had also favoured the establishment of communist colonies in the New World. But despite these views he went along with the transition of the League of the Just to the Communist League, and became a member of its Central Authority.<sup>138</sup> Fränkel and Lehmann can certainly stand for the majority of the German workers in London. They were among the 'great throng' who composed the three sections of the CABV allied with Willich; they were the 'Straubingers' and 'cads' (*Knoten*) so despised by Marx, who hoped for the immediate solution of their daily problems.

As much as theory, it was Marx's personal politics which earned him enemies. A recurrent theme in the workers' complaints against Marx was that he openly despised them, treating them as 'zeros'.<sup>139</sup> They had not forgiven Marx for high-handedly abandoning the League in Cologne in 1848 in favour of his *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. Marx differentiated between real German artisans—the men he was actually dealing with in the League, whom he regarded as undeveloped economically, politically and socially in comparison with their western European contemporaries—and the abstract proletariat for whose eventual emancipation he worked and who would have to evolve out of the existing artisans through decades of struggle in order to be able to rule. For the purposes of day-to-day politics, however, this distinction certainly came across as hypocritical, or at best as patronising. Repeatedly the Willich-Schapper faction thus accused Marx of seeking personal power through intrigues and cliquism, of creating a small elitist circle of devoted personal admirers, which explains their obsession with 'scandals', 'scenes' and 'incidents', described so minutely in their proclamations. Consequently they insisted that the proletariat take its affairs into its own hands, both in the present organisation and the coming revolution, and 'emancipate' itself from its 'bosses', such that the 'party of the intellectuals' could no longer 'lead the people by a string'.<sup>140</sup>

This anti-intellectualism was part and parcel of the rebels' emphasis on the proletariat, both in its actually existing and its abstract embodiment. This certainly reflected their social composition. Except for Schapper, none of Willich's adherents had any university education or wrote pamphlets or articles, and their jobs, as far as they are known, were all traditional artisans' occupations: tailor, furrier, carpenter, cooper. (The 'Marx party', by contrast, conspicuously comprised a large proportion of well-educated and articulate people.) Willich's group regarded the workers as perfectly capable of running their own political organisation, and also of securing the workers' rule in an immediate seizure of power. This was left entirely unexplained, and they had no answers to Marx's retort that

the proletariat would only be able to pass 'petty bourgeois' measures.<sup>141</sup> Their main fear about the coming revolution was thus that government would be monopolised by republicans and democrats, leaving them only to '[be in] opposition and write newspapers' and agitate in clubs. Hence they saw the breach in the League as a sign of the proletariat's split from 'the press', while maintaining that the communist 'principle' of both factions remained identical.<sup>142</sup>

In this vision of the proletariat the anti-intellectualism of the 'Justs' united with the new Blanquist impetus embraced by the Communist League in the preceding spring. No doubt the frequent references to France reflected not merely the widespread conviction that France was the key to European revolutions, but also the close personal relations between Willich and the French Blanquists in London. Throughout their proclamations, the new League emphasised parallel developments between France and Germany, claiming that conditions within the German communist party followed the pattern established by French workers both in France and in their London exile. (This contradicts Marx's accusation that his opponents conveyed a 'German nationalist' instead of an 'universal' message, an accusation neither answered by Willich and Schapper nor repeated by Marx.<sup>143</sup>)

These Blanquist influences emerged in what has been termed the Voluntarist' orientation of the Willich-Schapper group. A sharp eagerness to achieve victory soon was paramount; Schapper demanded a proletarian government as an immediate goal, and the group even maintained that any failure to gain power would be their party's 'own fault'.<sup>144</sup> Schapper also indicated how the proletariat should guarantee its rule: through the guillotine. Paralleling Blanqui's hopes for dictatorship of a proletarian vanguard exercising terrorism, Schapper flatly reiterated that 'the question is whether we ourselves are going to be beheaded at the beginning or whether we behead others'.<sup>145</sup> (In their hope for a speedy proletarian rule, Willich and Schapper thus of course backed away from the March Circular, which had painstakingly enumerated the ways in which the proletariat would have to push for a permanent revolution in order to keep the 'petty bourgeoisie' from consolidating its power.)

Judging their rule to be imminent, the Willich group naturally stressed immediate activity in exile, and the 'firm organisation of the League as soon as possible'; 'unity' and 'action' became their catchwords.<sup>146</sup> They reproached Marx and Engels for having completely disrupted the workers' society and the London circle of the Communist League.<sup>147</sup> Willich's adherents regarded themselves as the 'organisers of the proletariat' breaking away from the representatives of 'principle'.<sup>148</sup> They assured their followers that their principles remained unaltered, and that the 'writing coterie', while detrimental within the organisation, could aid the cause from the outside, and that both factions would 'meet again in Germany' at the next revolution.<sup>149</sup> Some should work towards the common goal with their pens, and some 'in other ways'.<sup>150</sup>

These 'other ways' were almost purely Willichian in inspiration, and added a third element to the 'Just' anti-intellectualism and the Blanquist 'voluntarism'. Willich presented himself very much as the 'man of action' required by the current state of disorganisation in the Communist League and by the impending revolutionary struggle. Increasingly his military capabilities were emphasised, while at the beginning of the schism Willich's personality provided the focus for the breakaway group. In a tone of hurt outrage, half of the group's first circular deplored the unjustified hatred directed

against Willich by a Marx jealous of his prominence, and indeed, he did owe much of his popularity among the London artisans to his personal charisma. Willich thus became the main spokesman for all the anti-Marx elements in the League, appealing to different groups in different ways. He provided a focus for those workers who did not share Marx's economic analysis of the class struggle; he presented himself as a 'man of action' for 'true socialists' like the group in Switzerland, whose communism was closer to Hess's *Red Catechism*; and he also attracted those workers who joined the Blanquist chorus clamouring for conspiracy and insurrection, in exile thus gaining a number of followers through his close association with the Blanquist émigrés and their military reputation and lifestyle. Even his opponents had to admit that 'masses' of new members were drawn into the CABV because of him.<sup>151</sup> Many of his London followers were recruited either on his continental campaigns during the revolution or in the 'fugitives' barracks'.<sup>152</sup> Like the artisans, the 'military men' shared an anti-intellectualism which was directed against Marx, and it was Willich's military connections, in fact, which later brought him closer to the democratic revolutionaries.

The Willich-Schapper faction was thus too heterogenous in its social background, theoretical development and view of the future strategy of the proletarian party to merit a single label. Its grievances were voiced not so much in terms of 'Utopian' communism as in Blanquist language, and in fact it was only by adding this Blanquist objection to Marx's economic determinism that the workers' opposition became strong enough to be heard. Thus, although there was a strong 'utopian' group inside the Communist League, whose beliefs and strategies very much resembled those of the old League of the Just, opposition to Marx inside the League cannot be subsumed under this heading. To the old mistrust between 'Straubingers' and 'academics' new differences were added which only partially overlapped with old resentments. Under the impact of the common fate of all exiled revolutionaries, many German socialists in London were more receptive to the 'true' socialist notions of class separation that Willich espoused, since their world of exile was divided much more clearly into oppressors and freedom fighters than according to any economic distinction based on classes. The important factor leading up to the split, though, was the Blanquism spread among the German workers and Willich's emphasis upon 'deeds' and immediate action. This indefatigable go-ahead spirit in the London League of the first half of 1850 also accounted for the fact that the Willich-Schapper faction saw themselves as much more 'advanced' and radical communists than the group around Marx, whom they suspected of taking defeat too easily. But to label the Willich-Schapper faction merely as 'adventurers' or 'sectarians' falls just as short as an explanation as the label 'Utopians' or 'artisans of the League of the Just'. While the arguments around the time of the split concentrate much more on a Blanquist strategy than is usually acknowledged, the new dividing line between 'voluntarists' and 'economic determinists' ran partly parallel to the older separation of artisans from 'scientific' socialists, while also partly crossing these old lines. Blanquist discussions may have dominated the forefront of the battle, but the background of the older artisan resentments must also be brought into the picture. Both were united by their common rejection of Marx's economic and 'scientific' interpretation of the current phase of the revolution.

Thus the first year of exile clarified several kinds of disagreements. Well aware that most refugees were democrats in the broad sense of the word, the Communist League

regarded as necessary a clear demarcation of its own views from those of the democrats as soon as groups of the latter began to threaten the organisational advantages the communists had through the remnants of their League and the CABV. This need for juxtaposition and boundaries dominated the League's activities in the first half of 1850, and resulted not only in the Circulars of March and June, but also in the desire to form an 'anti-democratic' bloc. This led to co-operation with French Blanquists in the Universal Society and—ironically, since these would ultimately help break up the organisation—increased Blanquist sympathies within the League itself. The resulting tensions thus combined with older currents and anti-Marx sentiments until the League gave way under the pressure. While the breakaway faction had not flirted with an alliance with democrats, the latter's importance in London exile politics nonetheless grew after the split, when they succeeded in attracting large numbers of communists in the name of a common cause. It is to the development of these different democratic exile groups, then, which we must now turn.

## 4

### The ‘Chronique Scandaleuse’

#### Ruge, Kinkel and German democracy, 1849–1853

If any one had conceived the idea of writing from the outside the inner history of the political émigrés and exiles from the year 1848 in London, what a melancholy page he would have added to the records of contemporary man: what sufferings, what privations, what tears...and what triviality, what narrowness, what poverty of intellectual powers, of resources, of understanding, what obstinacy in wrangling, what pettiness of wounded vanity!

(A.Herzen)<sup>1</sup>

#### The democratic ‘Forty-eighters’

Most participants in the German revolution of 1848, and consequently most who sought refuge in London afterwards, were not socialists but democrats, republicans, constitutional monarchists or liberal nationalists. These trickled in more slowly than the socialists as the reaction on the Continent slowly tightened its grip. The first wave were refugees from the Baden-Palatinate uprising who arrived in London from late 1849 onwards. Up to 1851 the numbers of those fleeing persecution and trials in Germany increased steadily, then the influx of refugees dried up to a mere trickle of released detainees, such as the writer Corvin von Wiersbitzki and the tailor Andreas Scherzer, who arrived in London in 1855, and Lessner, who came as late as 1856.

While the socialist exiles in London were reorganising the Communist League, they often remained socially isolated from the majority of exiles. The Communist League was of course reorganised as a secret society, and remained unknown to the general public until the first arrests were made in May 1851. But in London, too, some democratic exiles remained curiously unaware of the activities of even the more prominent League members, who after all had gained considerable public influence—including in democratic circles—during the revolution in Germany. Eugen Oswald, for example, who worked in the Refugees’ Assistance Committee of the Democratic Club in Greek Street (but also in the English co-operative movement and Working Men’s Colleges), thus remembered that Marx and Engels arrived in London ‘some years later’.<sup>2</sup> Schapper also had very few contacts outside workers’ circles, and his name rarely occurs in the letters or reminiscences of prominent democrats. Freiligrath was generally assumed to have been the only German refugee in London exile both before and after 1848.<sup>3</sup> One of the few communists well known in democratic circles was August Willich, who after the split in the Communist League co-operated more closely with the democrats around

Gottfried Kinkel, and as a former Prussian lieutenant was also accepted into the democratic salon of an émigré Livonian aristocrat, Baroness von Bruiningk.<sup>4</sup>

While as a rule relations between the two groups have been little considered by historians, there are some exceptions. Hanschmidt's insightful study of democratic internationalism in the nineteenth century, for example, deals with Ruge's role in the European Central Democratic Committee, while J.H.Schoeps contributed studies of the *Kosmos*, one of the democratic exile papers, and surveillance by the Prussian police agents.<sup>5</sup> Rosenberg emphasised the historical relevance of German exile politics in terms of the fissure of revolutionary democracy into mutually hostile socialist and democratic camps, but does not elaborate on this process of clarification, when 'the lines of party political development were drawn, which became decisive for European history'.<sup>6</sup>

Who, then, were these men against whom Marx and Engels fought with such intensity throughout the 1850s? Their activities and personalities received great attention in the correspondence of Marx and Engels, and became the focus of their longest, rudest and most polemical works of the decade, the 'Great Men of Exile' and 'Herr Vogt'. These works cannot be brushed aside as simply reflecting petty day-to-day squabbles in which Marx and Engels were forced to swat irritably at gnat-sized minds and to harp on insignificant questions in order to further their greater overall aims, as is often asserted. These 'will-o'-the-wisps over the morass of the counter-revolution' were in fact the great men of the day.<sup>7</sup> Kinkel and Ruge, for example, were far better known among both the exiles and the general public, British and German alike, than Marx. Even the Chartists gave the same prominence to all in their publications.

Yet despite their social separation, some democrats were very interested in their socialist counterparts. Most democratic exiles, perhaps, had only become aware of the socialists' politics during the revolution, through the club movement, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, or after 1849 through the trials. Their leaders, however, were well aware of the threat these posed to democratic support and revolutionary unity. Both Mazzini and Ruge in the European Central Democratic Committee, we will see, battled against the growing socialist influence among the revolutionaries. Kinkel too laboured unsuccessfully for years to define a neutral position between the two camps. Heinzen's rabid anti-communism was notorious. And the very popular poet Freiligrath became the object of a tug-of-war between the two sides, while the old radical republican Paul Harro-Harring deplored at length the workers' societies' 'decay into communist speculations'.<sup>8</sup>

But the fiercest fights, if not those with the most serious long-term consequences, were fought inside the democratic camp itself, and the discussions among these 20-odd chief members of the democratic emigration indeed dominated this period of the exiles' history. Unlike the Italian or Hungarian revolutions, the German events had not produced a single undisputed leader, and many German protagonists envied the unrivalled position of Mazzini and Kossuth. The leaders' mutual enmity received great attention in the journals open to the exiles, especially the German-American press. Democrats, national liberals, constitutionalists and republicans all sought some form of parliamentary democracy in a unified Germany, and thus called for a second revolution. But they also remained deeply divided among themselves. Radical republicans fell out with democrats seeking some social reform though not socialist measures. Prussians and south Germans did not get along. And, as in the Frankfurt Assembly, the question of whether Austria belonged in a future united Germany separated '*Grossdeutsche*' from '*Kleindeutsche*'.

Tactics and strategy also proved divisive. Whether to publish a flood of rousing appeals, or to prepare for the revolution by collecting a national loan; whether to extend international connections, or to concentrate all efforts on a revolution in Germany alone: these questions were hotly debated by the varying coalitions, debate too often accompanied by intrigue and slander. In fact the discord among the German refugees was notorious, and proved to be an almost inexhaustible source of malicious jokes for everybody from Marx to Herzen to police spies, one of whom wrote with unconcealed *Schadenfreude*:

The German revolutionaries surpass all the other nationalities in their inner strife and factitiousness...they still say and write that all Germans are 'brothers', but at a closer look one could almost think that these millions of 'brothers' descended from Cain: the North German hates the South German, the man from the Palatinate does not like the Rhenian, the Bavarian inveighs against the Saxon, the latter against the Prussian, Hessian, Baden native; and the Prussian 'brother' wishes they would all go to hell.<sup>9</sup>

While these squabbles were apparent to most who associated with the German émigrés during these years, their substance is difficult to assess. This chapter outlines some of the chief differences between the émigré factions, and details the intellectual and political development of the most prominent democratic leaders, Arnold Ruge and Gottfried Kinkel, whose position on the subject of collaboration with the socialists was indeed their main dividing line.

While the democratic exile leaders were repeatedly disparaged as 'officers without an army', this referred to their lack of popular support in Germany, not a shortage of followers in exile.<sup>10</sup> Their position was thus similar to that of Marx and the leaders of the Communist League, who, despite their network of groups throughout Germany, still battled against diminishing numbers and rarely commanded more than a few hundred people. In exile, the democratic refugees enjoyed much more support than the socialists. The Communist League in London, including the Willich-Schapper faction, could muster some 50 to 80 members (and the CABV several hundred), but the two dozen or so prominent German democratic leaders could drum up as many as 800 supporters for festivities and meetings.<sup>11</sup> These were commonly held in Schärttner's German Stores Hotel, where there was much 'lively talking and refreshing singing of patriotic songs', or at Göhringer's Golden Star Tavern, where the landlord's vanity and good nature made him unable to resist refugees who implored, 'I am hungry, General, you won't refuse me a beefsteak!'<sup>12</sup> Another popular venue, the German Democratic Club at Hillmann's at 22 Greek Street, certainly had more than the 30 members a spy mentioned in July 1850, since 22 new members enrolled between July and October 1852 alone, by which time large numbers of German refugees were already in the United States.<sup>13</sup> This Democratic Club, however, lost several prominent members in the aftermath of the quarrels between Struve and Heinzen.

This set a pattern for future developments, for the democrats certainly had their own organisational problems. Several initial projects, poorly planned and bearing little relation to political affairs in Germany, led nowhere and disillusioned the majority of the exiles

with their political leaders, who seemed capable of little but creating confusion and uttering high-sounding phrases. Often, the democratic 'great men' preferred enclosed circles, maintaining or at least seeking middle-class lifestyles, with political debates predominantly centred more around the comfortable hearths of *bürgerliche* drawing-rooms or hospitable salons than pubs and clubs open to the general public.<sup>14</sup> Contacts with émigré artisans and workers were limited to private charity, or occasional and slightly patronising lectures at workers' clubs. But despite this social distance the democratic leaders had a large political following among the workers. In particular, Kinkel was for a decade, throughout the 1850s, immensely popular among German workers in London, and was in fact the single most admired figure among all the Germans, certainly the only one whose role came close to being comparable with that played by Kossuth or Garibaldi for their own compatriots.

Yet Kinkel and his associates have not been well served by historians, still too prone to defer to Marx's verdict and the scornful dismissal of both socialists and nationalist democrats after 1870–1871. Although Marx's judgements of their activities were often incisive, if invariably derisive, the democrats still dominated the politics of the day and as such merit an analysis of their own, freed from the polemicism of contemporary rivalries. It is beyond our scope here to question whether the democrats epitomised the much-debated 'failure' of German democracy and liberalism. But until an indigenous non-socialist, democratic, national-liberal movement, primarily the Nationalverein, rose again from the ashes left by the years of reaction following the 1848 revolution, it was mainly these men who represented the dangerous ideas of the 'Forty-eighters' in the eyes of the German public, silenced democrats and the police. Only in exile did the democrats begin to comprehend the irreconcilable rupture of the revolutionary movement into socialists and democrats, as well as face many of the problems later democrats had to deal with, such as nationalism, constitutionalism, their relation to a Prussian monarchy and the questions of the desirability of revolutionary change, of how to instigate a revolution and of what changes it should include. The level of debate in the early 1850s was often crude and unsophisticated, the issues buried under the inevitable 'personalities'. But the problems with which the democrats grappled were the central issues for all types of German radicalism in this decade, and their failure to construct a more robust democracy reflects as much on their responses to these questions as on post-1848 Europe in general.

### **Arnold Ruge and the European Central Democratic Committee**

After Heinzen initiated the chief fissure between the democratic and socialist refugees by publishing his 'Lehren der Revolution' in late 1849, his old friend Arnold Ruge rose to prominence in democratic exile circles. Having served a six-year prison term for belonging to a secret Young Men's League associated with the *Burschenschaften*, patriotic and republican students' organisations, Ruge had emerged as a leading Young Hegelian philosopher. Less of a thinker than David Strauss, Bruno Bauer or Max Stirner, he nonetheless played an important role because his *Hallische Jahrbücher* helped focus rebellion against the orthodox Hegelianism favoured by the Prussian state.<sup>15</sup> His admiration for Prussia diminished by its inattention to 'pure Protestantism', Ruge turned from religion to politics, and increasingly saw democratic demands such as the freedom



of the press as being implied by Hegelian philosophy. The suppression of his second publication, the *Deutsche Jahrbücher*, persuaded him to move to Paris in 1843.

Ruge's approval of the French Revolution made him an advocate of democratic internationalism from February 1842 onwards. He thus readily seized upon Marx's idea of a 'gallo-germanic principle', and proposed a vague plan for an 'intellectual alliance' between French politics and German philosophy.<sup>16</sup> The *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, edited by Ruge and Marx, however, failed to attract any French contributors, and a combination of financial problems and increasing differences between Ruge and Marx capsized the journal after one issue. Ruge's thought here followed the same pattern as during his later activities in London exile. To his mind, a 'social revolution without political soul (i.e. without the organising insight from the viewpoint of the whole)' was impossible. Thus he juxtaposed his own philosophical humanism to the communism of the German artisans in Paris, accusing them of wishing to liberate people 'by turning them into artisans and abolishing private property by a fair and communal repartition of goods; but for the moment they attach the utmost importance to property and in particular to money'.<sup>17</sup> His favourable reports in the Paris *Vorwärts!* on French political and social movements, on Cabet and Dézamy, interpreted socialism mainly as philanthropy, but nonetheless earned him the proscription of the Prussian government.<sup>18</sup>

Embittered and suspicious of all who associated with Marx, Ruge left Paris for Switzerland. Here he befriended Karl Heinzen, who shared his enmity against communists as well as 'pious people' generally (but Heinzen did not shrink from the term 'atheism', as Ruge did). Here he also became close to the 'German Catholics' led by Ronge and Doviati, whose opposition to the established church he interpreted, rather presumptuously, as resulting from his own 'realised humanism'.<sup>19</sup> Returning to Germany during the revolution, Ruge co-edited the Berlin paper *Reform*, and was elected to the Frankfurt parliament. There he joined the extreme parliamentary left wing, the 'Donnersberg Faction', and advocated pacifist and democratic internationalism, especially the restoration of Poland, the liberation of Italy (from Austrian troops—a suggestion abhorrent to the *grossdeutsche* patriots of the Paulskirche), and an ideal of international law based on 'decrees of a sovereign congress of free nations'.<sup>20</sup> Domestically, he argued for equal rights but not equality of property, since 'inequality of property, of prestige, and of liberties, comes about through different strengths and abilities', although it must 'not endanger the essential equality and personal liberty of men'.<sup>21</sup> He was soon criticised, however, less for his political position than for inconsistency and the pomposity of his addresses, and became alienated from the popular movement, especially after he failed to join in the Dresden uprising.

In London Ruge's position strengthened throughout the first half of 1850. Marx had already suspected his hand behind the 'Draft Circular' signed by Struve and Rudolph Schramm,<sup>22</sup> but Ruge only really became prominent in émigré politics when he joined the European Central Democratic Committee (ECDC), formed in the summer of 1850.<sup>23</sup> This was the first successful attempt to gain publicity outside narrow refugee circles, and it opened the way for international recognition of the German refugees. Founded in June by Giuseppe Mazzini, the new association was, like his earlier international revolutionary organisation, the Young Europe of the 1830s, supposed to be composed of independent national committees chosen by their own citizens and working for a unified and independent republic at home while co-operating in an umbrella organisation. Mazzini's

dominance here was apparent from the outset. As a veteran conspirator with impressive revolutionary credentials even before his part in the Roman republic of 1849, he had already become a public figure during his earlier exile in England through a widely publicised scandal when the Post Office was found to read his letters.<sup>24</sup> This occasioned much English support for Mazzini's Italian nationalist cause, and his fame certainly attracted lesser-known refugees such as Ruge and Ledru-Rollin to the alliance. Ledru-Rollin, however, while formerly a minister in the French provisional government of 1848 and a leading republican democrat, was quite a liability in Britain, since his *Decadence of England*, published shortly after his arrival in exile, had been widely condemned as premature and arrogant.<sup>25</sup> The fourth founding member of the ECDC was Albert Darasz, who represented the Polish Democratic Centralisation; later D. Bratianu joined for the Romanians.<sup>26</sup>

The ECDC was pledged to republicanism and international revolutionary activity, and aimed at solidarity between 'peoples' regardless of 'party'. Its purpose, as stated in its first manifesto of July 1850, was to provide a 'collective and accepted representation', an organisation for the scattered democratic movements.<sup>27</sup> It denounced as the two vital obstacles to unity 'the exaggeration of the right of individuality' and 'the narrow exclusiveness of theories', although a further explanation showed both to be any insistence on specific political and social programmes: 'Every man who says, *I have found the political truth*, and who makes the adoption of his system his condition of fraternal association, denies the people the sole progressive interpreter of the world's law, in order to assert only his own *I*.' The address closed with a lengthy but characteristically vague and rhetorical statement of the ECDC's ideals. (This impressed the Chartist W.E. Adams as 'loftier, broader, and more enduring than even the Declaration of Independence'.<sup>28</sup>)

Mazzini had in fact written this declaration without consulting the ECDC's other members. Ruge certainly agreed with Mazzini's ideal of a republican form of government, universal suffrage and education, and with his notions of humanity and progress: 'Every patriotism which is not patriotism for the republic is pernicious', he proclaimed, and he declared the purpose of the ECDC to be 'the supersession of national consciousness by the consciousness of freedom, of love of one's tribe by love of democracy'.<sup>29</sup> But he rejected Mazzini's repeated call for a revolutionary democratic 'religion' and his identification of the laws of progress and morality with the Christian God.<sup>30</sup> Perhaps because of such criticism, religion was ignored in subsequent pronouncements by the ECDC. But the damage was done: Ruge's stance shook the credibility of the new organisation, and Marx seized the opportunity to ridicule it in the last issue of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung—politisch-ökonomische Revue*. But the extent of this attack also shows that Marx took the ECDC more seriously as a potentially popular organisation than he was prepared to admit. His polemics against its 'pompous nonsense' and 'sentimental drivel' aimed particularly at exposing the middle-class character of the Committee. 'The authors of the manifesto deny the existence of class struggles', fulminated Marx. 'Under the pretext of combating dogmatists, they...forbid the individual classes to formulate their interests and demands vis-à-vis the other classes. They ...[conceal] beneath the apparent reconciliation of all party interests the domination of the interests of one party—the bourgeois party.' Marx in particular criticised the

ECDC's views on the 'sanctity of property', contending instead that the 'socialist' proposal of work credits was merely another form of bourgeois property.<sup>31</sup>

But the ECDC was anxious to avoid controversy on such points, and none of its later manifestoes and addresses discussed the property relations or economic conditions it envisioned in future republics. All pronouncements on social issues were in fact avoided, and the watchwords of 'Association' and 'Labour' remained unexpounded, with the ECDC instead suggesting that each national committee draw up a programme addressing its country's specific moral, economic and social conditions. But all, it insisted, should share a 'progressive, national and European education' in order to imbue their peoples 'with the enthusiasm of a collective life, of joint responsibility, and of sovereign liberty'.<sup>32</sup> The ECDC's political rhetoric remained equally vague. Another address, for example, recognised the existence of only two opposed parties, the 'tyrants' and 'democracy' fighting for 'liberty'.<sup>33</sup>

While the ECDC's anti-socialist tendency was not explicit in its public addresses, it became far more prominent in its leaders' political alliances. Mazzini and Ledru-Rollin kept the negotiations preceding the Committee's foundation secret, especially hiding their intentions from Louis Blanc, Landolphe and other socialists.<sup>34</sup> Mazzini's earlier determined anti-socialist views were, of course, well known, and his various remarks against socialists were registered as far away as Weitling's *Republik der Arbeiter*, published in New York.<sup>35</sup> But Ledru-Rollin was also engaged in bitter feuds with the French socialist exiles in London grouped around Blanc, Felix Pyat and Barthélémy, who accused him of having betrayed the revolution. Thus he regarded the international membership of the ECDC and its prominent association with Mazzini's fame as useful to his own aims, especially when the reception of his *Decadence de l'Angleterre* undermined his own popularity, and he was willing to shelve, at least temporarily, his objections to some of Mazzini's peculiar nationalist ideas.<sup>36</sup> A similar division between socialist and non-socialist Polish exiles in London also induced Albert Darasz, a leading figure in the Polish national liberation movement and participant in the uprising of 1830–1831, to join forces with the ECDC.<sup>37</sup> After his death in 1852 he was replaced in the European Committee by Stanislaw Worcell who was more sympathetic to some socialist demands.<sup>38</sup>

Ruge thus was the obvious candidate to represent Germany on the European Committee, for he was attracted both to its general principle of democratic internationalism and its willingness to confine a European revolution to purely political changes. For after the *Deutsch-französische Jahrbücher* failed, Ruge's radical republicanism had excluded socialist attacks on existing property relations, and became coupled with a strong suspicion not only of Marx but of all communists. Ruge developed these themes in particular in Thornton Hunt's *Leader*, which regularly printed the ECDC's addresses and reported on the doings of Mazzini and other refugees.<sup>39</sup> Discussing the fight for religious and political democracy against the combined forces of papacy and despotism, Ruge with more than a hint of self-congratulation declared his own humanism to have been the sum total of the post-Hegelian philosophical analysis and radical democracy.<sup>40</sup> He also blamed 'the want of unity and organisation of the democratic party' for the success of the counter-revolution. But Democracy had learned from its failures. Its leaders had acquired political experience and had come to agree on their chief objects, 'the unity of the nation' and 'the sovereignty of the people', which

required universal suffrage. But these aims, Ruge concluded, should not be undermined by differing social theories:

The political question, national unity, popular liberty, and the Republic, is the question of Germany—Social theories differ, and are the origin of differing schools... Germany has thirty-four princes to overthrow, the national unity to accomplish, and the Republic to obtain ...before social theories can become anything but a subordinate question in the public mind.<sup>41</sup>

This line of argument Ruge continued in articles in democratic journals such as the New York paper of his old friend, Karl Heinzen, the *Deutsche Schnellpost*, and the *Bremer Tages-Chronik*, which also published his personal attack on Marx for which Willich and Struve allegedly provided refugee gossip.<sup>42</sup> In an open letter to Germany, Ruge explained the basic idea of the ECDC as forming an alliance of all free peoples in a community or congress. While the ECDC could not and should not direct a revolution from across the Channel, it not only wanted to unite the Forty-eighters in exile but also intended 'not to let the movements in the separate countries break out in isolation, and to create genuine information about the state of affairs of democracy in all countries...[and] to install the democratic diplomacy as efficiently as the diplomacy of despotism'.<sup>43</sup>

In London Ruge also often spoke at the numerous banquets and anniversary meetings held by the émigré revolutionaries. Here the imminence of the next revolution was a common theme, the ruling reactionary regime in Germany being frequently denounced as merely an 'interregnum of short duration'.<sup>44</sup> Ruge's actions on behalf of the ECDC certainly helped to achieve some international recognition for the German exile community. Not only did he persuade such crowd-drawing figures as Mazzini to speak at German meetings,<sup>45</sup> he also aroused the attention of the English democratic and Chartist press, who now took a greater interest in the German revolution and its protagonists. This helped redress a previous imbalance, for while Harney, through his connections with Marx, Schapper, Conrad Schramm and other German socialists, had given their affairs some coverage in his papers, other Chartist periodicals (like the *Leader* and the *Northern Star* after Harney's departure) reported mostly on the Italian, Polish, Hungarian and French refugees.<sup>46</sup>

A second address 'To the Peoples' explained the ECDC's idea of solidarity among different nations, assuming as an ideal form of co-existence a division of labour in the common progress of mankind, 'the fundamental idea of nationality' being 'the organisation of humanity in homogenous groups, with a view to the accomplishment of a common duty'. More concretely, the address proposed founding further national committees, the delegates of which would 'constitute a CENTRAL COMMITTEE of European Democracy'.<sup>47</sup> Of course the ECDC itself, in a notable inversion of Mazzini's earlier organisations, actually preceded the formation of national committees instead of resulting from them. Despite its claim to be only a provisional institution pending the various national committees' choice of their representatives, it also continued to act without much thought for those national committees subsequently formed, and which existed mostly on paper in any case, since only the Polish, and perhaps the Italian, committee had much following at home.<sup>48</sup>

Support for the ECDC on the Continent was weak for various reasons. The ECDC's express refusal to clarify its social programmes reflected an ossification of the democratic and republican internationalism of the *Vormärz* period, and, given the great prominence of the new 'social' language of reform, this to some extent doomed its activities from the outset. Not only did its leaders seek to avoid 'exclusiveness in theories', which would divide the democrats of one country, they also regarded the social conditions of each nation as unique and hence internationalist social theories originating in one country as inapplicable in another.<sup>49</sup> The anti-dogmatism of the ECDC thus masked both its rejection of a class point of view which would supersede national differences, and its own brand of internationalism, which consisted of mutual acknowledgement and help between independent and essentially differing countries. The vagueness of the envisaged mutual 'recognition' of homogenous peoples and of the humanitarian goals for which nations should struggle, and the equally amorphous 'love' between them further emphasise the limits of the ECDC's vision.

But the efforts of the Committee did not go entirely unnoticed. Not only did the continental governments and their police spies closely follow its activities, but there are also signs that at least some revolutionary hopes in Germany centred on the ECDC's plans. So-called 'Mazzini Shares' and 'Kossuth Notes' issued by the national committees to aid the ECDC were found in provinces as remote as Posen in Prussia.<sup>50</sup> The German National Committee launched a similar project under Ruge's tutelage: 'We need money. We will declare the loan a European enterprise', Ruge wrote to supporters in Germany, adding slyly: 'I myself need to be independent of the Central Committee and...need some support from the party.'<sup>51</sup> Although Ruge insisted that the recently arrived Kinkel be included in the enterprise, it failed when the German National Committee split up and Kinkel started a rival loan project of his own.

But even the slight influence the ECDC gained in northern Germany and among the exiles and Chartists in London were enough for Engels to plan a series of articles against Mazzini, Ledru-Rollin and Ruge for Harney's *Friend of the People*.<sup>52</sup> This project, however, came to nothing, not only because, as Engels feared, any criticism of the republican exiles would for the English public automatically identify the critic with the better-known communists around Willich, but also because Harney, in Engels's opinion much too indiscriminating in his sympathies for foreign refugees, published statements of all sorts of refugee groups (in fact, due to their greater output, many more by democrats than by socialists).<sup>53</sup> Marx and Engels later lambasted Kinkel, Ruge, Struve and others in their 'Great Men of the Exile', which, however, never reached a publisher.<sup>54</sup>

But the ECDC did not require such an onslaught to expire. By the spring of 1852 it was already in serious financial difficulties, which, coupled with internal dissension, led to its de facto dissolution during the same year. In February 1852 Chartist friends of the ECDC, Thomas Cooper, William Lin ton, Joseph Cowen, James Watson and George Dawson, started a subscription on its behalf, but the £50 collected hardly helped.<sup>55</sup> Moreover, a number of ECDC emissaries sent to the Continent found themselves continually hampered by police observation. Mazzini and Ledru-Rollin renewed their rivalry, arguing both about the function of the Committee's national papers, *La Voix du Proscrit* and *Italia del Popolo*, and about the question of who should commence a general European revolution, both equally adamantly favouring their own countries.<sup>56</sup>

Ruge himself became increasingly convinced that the German nation would have to play the leading role in the emancipation of mankind, especially vis-à-vis the Slav nations. Writing a year after the ECDC's collapse he insisted that 'The Magyars are superstitious aristocrats, the Poles are thorough Catholics, the Italian... Augean stable is very full... A *German Revolution*...is their only chance to arrive at an independent existence.'<sup>57</sup> He was convinced that 'the German genius' was to save all the other nations, and that 'We Germans, and none but us, can release mankind from its spiritual bondage, the most insufferable and fruitful in evil; we alone can destroy that superstition under the dominion of which even our political free colonies in England and America are now groaning.'<sup>58</sup> The world owed its first victory against mental and intellectual tyranny, in the Reformation, to Germans, who continued to liberate thought; hence the German cause was that of all nations, and the German spirit 'the central sun in the system of liberty'.<sup>59</sup> National chauvinism of this sort was clearly fatal to internationalist enterprises. Furthermore, the ECDC's backing in France was undermined by the emergence of a second international enterprise in Paris in the summer of 1851, which favoured a 'Romanic' concept excluding Germanic and Slav nations.<sup>60</sup> By September 1852 the ECDC was already comatose, and it disappeared in early 1853, presumably aided by the failure of the Milan uprising inspired by Mazzini.<sup>61</sup>

The ECDC's collapse did not of course result solely from financial problems or its leaders' personal failings, but must be seen in terms of the broader historical context of democratic republicanism after 1848. The republicanism inspired by the principles of 1792 could not survive the events of 1848, since a purely constitutional orientation as well as the conviction that democracy, republicanism and nationality were inextricably linked increasingly gave way to the belief that social and economic problems were not solvable by constitutional changes alone.<sup>62</sup> The ECDC remained entrenched in a constitutionalist discourse and was clearly weakened by the mounting assault on the definitions of key political terms such as 'republic', 'democracy' and 'nation', which led the more social democrats to define 'the people' in terms of the social question and to expand their internationalism beyond a co-operation of different democratic movements to target the common aristocratic *and* bourgeois enemy which the revolution was to overthrow. Against this another strand in pre-1848 democratic republicanism increasingly emphasised the ideal of the united nation state, willingly sacrificing republican and democratic goals upon its altar. But by the 1850s the particularly Mazzinian approach to the international organisation of national movements lacked large-scale support, while postponing discussion of social reform until after the victory of the republic became equally unacceptable.

Nonetheless the ECDC could have achieved greater propagandistic effect had its members been more united. A concerted assault on particular measures of the Prussian government, for example, would have struck home much more than the vague and overly rhetorical proclamations which were issued. But the ECDC's ineffectiveness also partly resulted from the specific conditions of exile under which it operated. Since democrats and republicans in Germany could not rally around a firm party organisation either nationally or regionally, the ECDC had no constant or reliable party support, and had to fall back upon sporadic personal contacts or links to religious groups. These could hardly be expected to drum up enthusiasm for vague appeals from London, much less to create new organisations in an increasingly oppressive political climate. Hence the usual

description of the ECDC as 'chiefs without an army' is entirely justified in relation to support from the Continent.

Ruge himself withdrew from London exile politics and his position in the ECDC even before its eventual demise, and moved to Brighton in July 1850 to make a humble living teaching and running a daguerrotype studio. Seeking new vehicles for agitation, he turned to fiction writing, and published novellas and plays on the revolution which decried elitist and cynical attitudes among revolutionary leaders and denounced 'the party of social terrorists who, lacking reasonable means to create economic equality, proposed madness of destruction instead'.<sup>63</sup> Ruge occasionally returned to London, speaking for instance to commemorate the Polish revolution in November 1853, participating in the Agitation Union and the German Democratic Society, and intermittently giving poorly attended lectures.<sup>64</sup> Almost every Saturday he came to have a drink at Schärttner's in Long Acre.<sup>65</sup> He was increasingly satisfied with merely playing the role of the 'Nestor of the German Emigration in London', or, as Marx rather less charitably put it, the role of the 'Confucius of the German Emigration'.<sup>66</sup> After the disastrous news of Napoleon's victory he toyed with the idea of becoming a preacher in one of the 'free congregations' in the United States, but he remained in Brighton for the rest of his life, continuing to write articles and pamphlets in English and German, and trying to get compensation from the Prussian government for his suppressed newspaper.<sup>67</sup> His German nationalism grew, as did his opposition to communism. In the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 his strong anti-Austrian sentiments combined with a revival of his Young Hegelian idea of Prussia as the embodiment of the Protestant state: 'For a' that and a' that, Prussia is the people, unity, freedom in sciences and in parliament, and what it is not, it can still become', he enthused in 1866.<sup>68</sup> Like many other Forty-eighters, Ruge thus reincarnated himself as an admirer of Bismarck.<sup>69</sup>

### **Gottfried Kinkel**

Shortly after Ruge's move to Brighton his more prominent rival in exile politics, Gottfried Kinkel, arrived on the scene. Kinkel had a much more flamboyant personality than the dry and somewhat prim Ruge (who was thirteen years his senior), and was, before arriving in London, already a national hero to many Forty-eighters.<sup>70</sup> A Protestant theologian in Bonn, his political disenchantment with Prussia in the early 1840s accompanied the general Rhenish disappointment with the new king, Frederick William IV, and coincided with his personal frustration at not receiving the professorship he aspired to. Furthermore, after a conflict with the church authorities over his marriage to the divorced Catholic Johanna Matthieux née Mockel, with whom he headed a small literary-aesthetic coterie in Bonn, he had to abandon his hopes of a career as an academic theologian, and became a professor in art history instead. His orthodox and pietist religious beliefs subsequently moved towards pantheism, and only with the outbreak of revolution in March 1848 did his attention focus on political and social questions. His main concern became German unity, and he remained a constitutional monarchist until August 1848, when he formulated his republicanism in a little brochure which also expounded his social ideas.<sup>71</sup>

Kinkel's *Handwerk, errette Dich!* explained that misery on earth resulted from the sin, wickedness and levity of man, and from lack of education, excess population and unfair taxation.<sup>72</sup> The remedy was to reunite the middle and working classes by restricting competition, offering state-funded credits for the acquisition of machinery by workers in associations, and fomenting a moral uplifting of the working class through educational associations emphasising 'art and beauty'. Artisans were to combine to fight the competition of cheaper factory products, thus breaking capitalism via co-operation, and the state was to aid these modern guilds by protective legislation. Artisans could thus pave the way for the republic. This programme, together with his founding of a workers' educational society, ensured Kinkel's later reputation as a 'socialist'. But these credentials mostly amount to Kinkel's genuine human sympathy with the poor, itself occasionally obscured by his sentimental jargon, theatricality and pastoral unction. 'The claim of working poverty to a humane existence: this is my communism', Kinkel wrote during his prison spell.<sup>73</sup> Kinkel in fact never returned to such programmes of social reform, and confined his future political activities to struggling for political democracy and, in particular, national unity.<sup>74</sup>

Kinkel's reputation rested more on practice than theory. After a brief spell in the Prussian Diet, he led an abortive assault upon an arsenal in Siegburg in May 1849, together with Fritz Anneke and Carl Schurz. He also signed up as a musketeer in Willich's corps in the Baden-Palatinate uprising, and in the immediate aftermath his comrade-in-arms Engels commented quite favourably on his conduct: 'Of all the democratic gentry', Engels recalled, 'the only ones to fight were myself and Kinkel. The latter joined our corps as a musketeer and did pretty well; in the first engagement in which he took part, his head was grazed by a bullet and he was taken prisoner.'<sup>75</sup>

This arrest began Kinkel's fame in German democratic circles. His sentence, 20 years in a fortress, commuted to imprisonment with hard labour at a spinning wheel, was regarded as deliberately cruel. His wife Johanna organised a large-scale propaganda campaign epitomising Kinkel as the democratic martyr, the popular professor and sensitive poet, who had forsaken a respectable position to take up arms for his patriotic beliefs, and now was the carefully chosen victim of despotic revenge. After endless letters to journals, friends and unknown admirers, and the reprinting of her husband's poems, Kinkel became a household name, a symbol of the democratic movement and of the plea for amnesty for the imprisoned Forty-eighters. Malwida von Meysenbug, a democratic feminist and—in her own word—'idealist' writer, characteristically expressed these sentiments at the height of the Kinkel cult:

The picture of the captive, whose eyes thirsting for beauty were now resting on the naked walls of his cell, who instead of arousing enthusiasm in young souls through his lectures, or streaming out of his soul's dreams in songs, had to spin wool, out of which from now on his coarse clothing was to be manufactured—day and night I could not take my mind off this grievous picture.<sup>76</sup>

Not surprisingly this wave of sympathy for Kinkel's fate angered those who had seen their political friends court-martialled and shot or disappear into prisons under much harsher conditions, without the publicity and material help which Kinkel received. To top



it all, many socialists suspected that this sickening sentimentality had fastened on the wrong object, and that Kinkel was no real revolutionary at all.

Such suspicions were greatly reinforced when, in his defence speech before the court martial in Rastatt in August 1849, Kinkel recanted his revolutionary intentions and distanced himself from the 'dirt and filth' which had recently 'unfortunately tagged on to this revolution', thereby denouncing those of his co-defendants who had already been sentenced to death. He even went so far as to hail the future empire of the Hohenzollern dynasty, a move explicable only insofar as he felt that his own life was at stake.<sup>77</sup> Kinkel did not seek only to reduce his sentence, however; he genuinely lacked a clear political position beyond the constant desire of achieving a united nation, a goal he kept throughout his life. (The personal attacks by Marx and Engels on Kinkel's wavering revolutionary convictions in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung—Revue* seemed gratuitous, however, and cost them, not Kinkel, loss of sympathy.<sup>78</sup>)

But Kinkel's real or imagined sufferings were soon over. Johanna Kinkel busily plotted his liberation, and collected money for bribes. In a spectacular coup on 6 November 1850 Kinkel's former student Karl Schurz succeeded in freeing Kinkel from Spandau prison, and both managed to flee to Britain.<sup>79</sup> News of Kinkel's escape swept through Europe. Schurz became a European celebrity overnight, while the Prussian state was made a universal laughing-stock. Since numerous people were informed of the plan beforehand, however, including mere acquaintances such as Meysenbug and even an Austrian police agent, it is quite possible that the Prussian government got wind of the project and actually allowed it to happen in order to get rid of a public embarrassment.<sup>80</sup>

The campaign for Kinkel heated up so much in the weeks before his escape that even several English papers carried articles on his plight. Though Marx alleged that Kinkel 'did not rest until Dickens had eulogised him', a lengthy article in fact appeared in Charles Dickens' *Household Words* several days before Kinkel escaped and had any opportunity to accost Dickens. This described in romanticised terms Kinkel's academic career and family life prior to joining the free corps in Baden, which step he allegedly took because of his 'strong feelings in favour of a constitutional monarchy [sic!]'.<sup>81</sup> The Chartist *Leader* printed an almost three-column eulogy on 'Professor Gottfried Kinkel', who 'appears to us to be one of the revolutionary martyrs the most worthy of sympathy'.<sup>82</sup> Again Kinkel's serene life and domestic happiness were emphasised, and the correspondent then reported the same details and exalted anecdotes as the German papers. The repetitions in all these reports, their simultaneous appearance, and the identical structure of the argument show the careful orchestration behind these attempts to increase sympathy for Kinkel. Significantly, both journals appealed to the English literati to try to influence the British public, and thereby the Prussian king, to release Kinkel.<sup>83</sup>

When Kinkel thus arrived in his London exile, his role as 'lion of the season' had been well prepared, and he entered into the part with great gusto. Two Chartist poets, George Hooper and Gerald Massey, hailed his escape in verse.<sup>84</sup> Kinkel's ambiguous political stand stood him in good stead on arrival, insofar as his fate also attracted the attention of Britons who were usually uninterested in the continental refugees. Papers such as the *Illustrated London News*, with a wide middle-class audience, even printed his picture.<sup>85</sup> Both Kinkels, in fact, set out to court middle-class sympathies, using Gottfried's momentary fame and literary connections to establish him as a well-paid language

teacher and lecturer on art history, collecting high entrance fees from well-to-do German merchants as well as from British middle-class audiences. Kinkel attributed some of his success to increased patriotism among the Germans in London, writing that my 'loyalty to national Germany, in which I am quite sincere, is to my advantage with my audience here'.<sup>86</sup> He added with unconcealed satisfaction that a series of only 16 evenings earned him a salary equivalent to that of a Prussian *Ordinarius*—enough, in fact, to give his wife, a music teacher, a grand piano after the first months in exile.<sup>87</sup>

Initially, at least, other exiles also benefited from this publicity. Located in St John's Wood, a respectable London suburb, Kinkel's house soon became a sort of social centre for his personal followers among the German democratic exiles, such as his biographer Strodtsmann, his now famous student Schurz, and a circle of aesthetically minded female admirers like Meysenbug.<sup>88</sup> Although Kinkel was now the undisputed head of the German democratic emigration in London, this lifestyle, his obsessive careerism, and his abstention from political activities earned him severe criticism from some fellow exiles. There soon convened in the rival salon of Baroness von Bruiningk a circle of German democrats, in which a group of Prussian lieutenants was prominent, which was quite hostile to the Kinkel clique, accusing him of ingratitude to 'the party'.<sup>89</sup> Other democrats assembled around Ruge. In New York, 'malicious, petty gossip about Kinkel's magnificent household furnishings' was bandied about, and Marx reported that a Bonn committee had sent £200 to Johanna Kinkel, only to be asked for more two weeks later.<sup>90</sup> Both Kinkel and his wife were stung by these accusations. Years later Johanna Kinkel gave elaborate explanations in her fictitious but undoubtedly autobiographical novel for the life of German fugitives in London, stressing especially that 'refined proletarians' such as artists or teachers were required to lead a more elegant life while working just as hard as anyone else.<sup>91</sup> But Kinkel did respond to these growing criticisms, and in a letter to a group of supporters in St Louis acknowledged his indebtedness to the party that effected his rescue, and the moral obligation which thus now required him to use his fame for the immediate political purposes of that party:

Verily, citizens, during the struggles of the past years my soul was often overcome with the desire to forget the convulsive frenzy of Europe in the mild peace of the home, in the blissful activity as researcher, teacher or farmer... No, no! My life has been saved by the party, and to the party it belongs... I belong to my fatherland and to the coming republic.<sup>92</sup>

It was this feeling of indebtedness that drove Kinkel to enter into refugee politics, and to embark upon a new revolutionary plan.<sup>93</sup> This scheme was the 'German National Loan' or 'Revolutionary Loan', which was to dominate exile politics and the minds of the German governments to the point of obsession for some two years and which became sadly symptomatic of the malaise of German democratic exile politics, with all its excitement, premature hopes, internal bickerings and money squabbles, and, ultimately, disastrous failure.

### **'The war between frogs and mice': the German National Loan and its rivals**

When the campaign for the National Loan was launched in spring 1851, the German democratic emigration put on a show of unity. In March a proclamation 'To the Germans' was published which was signed by most of the prominent democratic refugees in London.<sup>94</sup> Kinkel and Ruge, together with Struve, Ronge and Haug, constituted themselves as the Committee for German Affairs in London. In the language of the ECDC proclamations, the Committee declared its support for the 'holy alliance of the peoples against the unholy conspiracy of their oppressors', calling for financial support for Mazzini's revolutionary loan, and explaining to the Germans that 'for the time being you can have a practical effect chiefly through the ample supply of money', since Mazzini had promised the German emigrants 50 per cent of the proceeds if they helped sell his notes.<sup>95</sup> Imitating the middle-class appeal of the ECDC, too, was the proclamation's argument that Mazzini's revolutionary loan would echo the success of the English struggle for Corn Law repeal: 'Remember the English! they said: "First subscribe one hundred thousand pounds, and then we lift the Corn Laws!" And both things happened. We say to the oppressed peoples: "Subscribe ten million francs and we liberate the Continent!"'<sup>96</sup>

Unthinkable in an ECDC proclamation, however, was the announcement that 'we have asked the social democratic workers to send a representative into our midst'.<sup>97</sup> The workers in question, the CABV in London led by Willich, nonetheless soundly rejected this proposition as put to them by Ruge, whose anti-communist stance was well known.<sup>98</sup> Moreover, Schurz, who from Paris carefully observed the proceedings of his fellow-emigrants in London, repeatedly warned Kinkel against a joint venture with Ruge and Struve, who had lost much of their reputation in Germany, and against a breach with the communists, who were necessary allies both for a future revolution and the success of the loan project.<sup>99</sup> Partly due to the persistent influence of Schurz and the Paris Committee, partly because he saw himself as a 'socialist', Kinkel yielded to Schurz's admonitions and was henceforth the leading democratic exile to reach out to the socialist groups. Indeed, how the socialists and communists should participate now became the main source of contention between the different democrats.

Thus for a short while Ruge and Kinkel co-operated. One indication of this temporary unity was a banquet organised in March 1851 to celebrate the anniversary of the Viennese revolution. Chaired by Ernst Haug, a former officer in the revolutionary movements of Austria and Italy,<sup>100</sup> the meeting was well attended by all factions of the exiled democrats, totalling some 600 persons.<sup>101</sup> The meeting also enjoyed a rare amount of international support. Mazzini represented the ECDC, a Hungarian revolutionary priest, Roney, spoke, as did several Englishmen, among them the novelist George Eliot's future husband G.H.Lewes.<sup>102</sup> The 'evening of patriotic enjoyment and hope', as Amalie Struve described it, had strong nationalist tendencies, provoking the criticism of the CABV. The resolutions passed resembled those of the ECDC, while Kinkel's speech was regarded as the unrivalled highlight of the event, making it a great success for the united German democratic emigration.

This fragile unity among the democratic exiles in early spring 1851 also produced a journal, rather presumptuously entitled *Der Kosmos. Deutsche Zeitung aus London*.<sup>103</sup> Published by Haug, the paper was intended as a weekly, though only three numbers appeared. The first, of 17 May 1851, contained the address 'To the Germans' in lieu of a programme, and represented the general political platform of the contributors, Ruge,

Kinkel, Ronge and Haug. The *Kosmos* was immersed in the recent past and the mistakes of the revolution, and quite unrealistically portrayed the present as favourable to new revolutionary outbreaks.<sup>104</sup> Under Kinkel's influence, much attention was given to literary criticism and aesthetic contemplations. Marx especially ridiculed Kinkel's description of a giant mirror at Crystal Palace as epitomising Kinkel's vain and theatrical character.<sup>105</sup>

But the *Kosmos* did not completely ignore developments among socialists, and proved more sympathetic to workers than might otherwise have been expected from a purely radical democratic paper, carrying a report on the celebration of Robert Owen's eightieth birthday.<sup>106</sup> An article on the Great Industrial Exhibition stated that the exhibition exemplified the 'giant public struggle between capital and labour', asking

whether the worker could not accomplish even more perfect things independent of capital. One understands that capital drains the vital powers from the worker in the prime of life, that the worker who is oppressed by material needs cannot give adequate attention to his work. And these thoughts lead to the conclusion that capital and labour are two contrasts, that labour must be free and must rule!<sup>107</sup>

Such sentiments, however, were few and far between, and the paper usually steered clear of social and economic issues. Marx regarded it as a typical democratic émigré paper and described it to Engels as 'pretentious, puerile, piffling and of a complacent stupidity unequalled in the annals of world history'.<sup>108</sup> Possibly Marx feared that the paper would become the central organ of the democratic exile groups in London. But such derision in any case proved unnecessary, since the *Kosmos* soon succumbed to financial difficulties.

Any worry about possible attacks from the united democratic exile groups was superfluous, since for some time to come the democrats exhausted themselves in internal strife. Squabbling began almost as soon as unification was announced. Although Struve could be regarded as 'the actual contriver of the German central dodge', he was at the same time forming a separate, close alliance with Ruge and working on several other similar projects, none of which, however, materialised, since he left for New York in April.<sup>109</sup> Kinkel, on the other hand, initially regarded the National Committee as a 'firm footing against the communists', but now tried to secure his own position in the Committee by a reorganisation and by including a workers' representative, envisaged as a role for Willich or Techow. He also intrigued against the admission to the committee of Amand Goegg, who would have supported Ruge.<sup>110</sup> The more alienated from each other Kinkel and Ruge became, moreover, the more willing Kinkel was to take Schurz's advice and ally himself with 'the workers' party', that is, Willich. Unfortunately only Schurz's letters have survived from their correspondence of this period, but they still clearly reveal the change in Kinkel's opinion. On 20 February, for example, Schurz wrote, 'I find it quite natural that you don't want to have anything to do with the communists there, even if it was only because of the loan', while on 16 March he averred that the 'participation of Willich, who although a communist is very much trusted in Germany, seems to me to be quite necessary for the loan'. Schurz argued that 'after all, without the workers there is no revolution to be made in Germany... Furthermore, the workers in the emigration are not isolated. Except for Marx's enterprise, they are the only ones who have managed to

achieve some sort of cohesion.' He also promised to help reconcile the workers' party and the committee, insisting that any differences with Willich would be overcome.<sup>111</sup> Eventually Kinkel was persuaded to withdraw his commitment to the general Committee for German Affairs, largely because of his rivalry with Ruge, who provided the pretext for Kinkel's withdrawal when he used Kinkel's signature without his previous consent.<sup>112</sup>

After the united democratic committee dissolved, Ruge and Kinkel went their own ways, and remained bitter enemies for some years to come. With Tausenau, Ruge organised a club, the German Agitation Union of London, which 'excludes none of the revolutionary social democratic party except him who wants to be an exclusive and who has made his own position impossible through character and antecedents'. This proposition was directed as much against Kinkel as against Marx, since it was common knowledge that the Agitation Union 'saw it as its task to fight the separatists, i.e. the north German democrats allied with the communists, whose activities in many ways impede the realisation of German republican aims'.<sup>113</sup> The Agitation Union planned to concentrate on 'the business of agitation' without wasting its energies on discussion, and declared distinctly that it had 'no pretension whatever to be a secret Government of Germany'.<sup>114</sup> It pompously rubber-stamped Ruge's position in the ECDC, and entrusted Dr Karl Tausenau with the post of representative and agent. A popular speaker during the Vienna revolution, Tausenau had been frequently attacked by fugitives in Paris and London for wavering in his democratic convictions, and was known in particular to reject 'the social doctrines', which he declared had destroyed the French Republic.<sup>115</sup> Joseph Fickler in particular, supported by Goegg, Sigel and Tausenau, warned against any dealing with Willich.<sup>116</sup> This anti-socialist reputation quickly tainted the whole Agitation Union, and when Tausenau in the name of the Union renounced alleged connections with those German communists in Paris arrested in the so-called 'Franco-German Plot', Weitling's *Republik der Arbeiter* commented icily that the thought of connecting the two had not occurred to anyone anyway.<sup>117</sup>

While the Agitation Union thus represented the anti-socialist faction among the democratic-republican exiles, the German workers in London around Willich were increasingly cultivated by the group around Kinkel. Schurz, rushing to London from Paris for the negotiations, finally managed to forge an alliance between Kinkel and Willich. In April 1851, he reported that Willich (whose disagreement with Marx was 'stronger than ever') had agreed to a new committee which should provisionally operate under the modest title of 'finance committee' to dispel suspicions about wider ambitions.<sup>118</sup> Willich in fact was perfectly co-operative.<sup>119</sup> For his part, although Kinkel regarded Willich's communism as 'neither reasonable nor possible', he declared in a conciliatory mood that 'the state has to exist and give the necessary money for any associations, but before-hand the struggle for the liberation of the workers from the rule of capital [would] have to be organised and fought out'. Kinkel even proclaimed that his professional pursuits were intended to return the support the party had given him and 'to invest the money...in a socialist manner and give it back to the workers doubly'.<sup>120</sup>

With this rapprochement in place, Kinkel's project finally took off. His Emigration Society, or *Émigré Club*, was founded on 27 July 1851 and regarded as 'the task of the emigration to work on the further development of the party, to make good use of the experience of defeat and observations abroad. Our party has to return from its exile in a more compact and more concentrated form'; it was added hopefully that the current

divisions were only the prelude to greater unity.<sup>121</sup> The Emigration Society did not pretend to constitute a permanent leading office for all German revolutionary groups but merely envisaged a society to represent all London fugitives and to agree on some central issues.<sup>122</sup> These were defined as widely as possible, and fearing more strife, the Emigration Society declined to outline detailed social and political programmes beyond a democratic revolution. Kinkel felt that the basics of the next revolution were sufficiently accepted, including

independence of all nations from foreign domination, general suffrage, election of the government and officials by the people, separation of state and religion, universal citizens' militia, unrestricted freedom of the press and assembly, equal rights of man and woman in marriage, education paid for by society, war with Russia and opening of new markets in the East.

Beyond these essentials, 'all calls for a platform are nothing more than the old German favourite mania for theories which has always prevented us from rational action'.<sup>123</sup>

However, the Emigration Society from the start was almost exclusively concerned with propaganda for the German Revolutionary Loan.<sup>124</sup> This project, 'the only truly remarkable activity of the German revolutionary refugees',<sup>125</sup> stood within a respectable tradition of revolutionary loans, but differed from the initial plans in launching the project as a national German rather than a common European loan.<sup>126</sup> It aimed to collect money from sympathetic democrats in Europe and America, intending these loans to be repaid, with interest, as a state debt by a future republican government. Eventually the Loan sought to raise the sum of 2,000,000 Prussian thaler, but initially, before finalising the contracts, only 20,000 thaler were to be collected in order to test the contributors' willingness and the feasibility of the plan.<sup>127</sup> The money was to be used exclusively for projects leading to a revolution, although it was left undefined what means were intended, whether merely propagandistic or including military insurrection.<sup>128</sup> But funds were not to be used to support the refugees' daily existence, no matter how impoverished they were. An elected refugee committee was to head the project, and a body of guarantors, consisting of well-known participants in the 1848–1849 events, was to oversee the collection and application of the funds. The guarantors were given some rights to intervene in the decisions of the central committee in an attempt to strike a balance between the necessity to work conspiratorially and to allow democratic influence of all those involved.<sup>129</sup>

The loan idea was received with much enthusiasm. Carl Schurz, then in Paris, was its most influential promoter, and he largely persuaded Kinkel to head the project.<sup>130</sup> After much wavering and an embarrassing public statement followed by public denials, Kinkel finally agreed to lead the scheme.<sup>131</sup> In a sense Kinkel was the victim of his own romantic democratic image. It was always more for personal reasons than for Kinkel's political principles that his followers adhered to him, and now he was unable to resist their strong moral pressure, much less the idea of revolutionary leadership and fame. Kinkel, Goegg, Karl Ludwig d'Estér, Hans Kudlich and Willich were elected to the newly founded Provisional Committee for the National Loan, which published an appeal for subscriptions in May and gave out so-called 'interim notes' exchangeable for the 'original obligations' within six months.<sup>132</sup> After a further reshuffle, when Goegg left to

join Ruge, the Committee for the German National Loan was headed by Kinkel, Willich, and the moderate democrat and Silesian landowner Count Oscar Reichenbach. Schimmelpfennig's announcement that 'Reichenbach as representative of the parliamentary party, Kinkel as representative of the social republicans, Willich as representative of the workers and communists have been elected as the provisional financial committee' launched the final form in which the campaign took off.<sup>133</sup> Nonetheless, the bickering at the outset of the project resulted in a deep rift between Ruge and Kinkel, who each now headed their own societies, propagated their own respective loan projects, and sniped at each other in London and the German-American press. It also greatly harmed the personal reputations of the exile leaders and the loan project. Only Kinkel's enormous prestige among German democrats and his quite accidental and hesitant alliance with the socialist exiles around Willich permitted his National Loan to receive the publicity and support needed to survive the initial stages.

Representatives left for a variety of locations to solicit funds. Schurz went to Switzerland and managed to convince an impressive number of well-known Forty-eighters to act as guarantors for the loan, among them Richard Wagner, but also Tzschirner, Löwe, Haug, Oppenheim and even members of the Communist League such as d'Ester.<sup>134</sup> The Committee also tried to establish a network of supporters in Germany.<sup>135</sup> Johanna Kinkel solicited support from women's committees such as that led by Kathinka Zitz in Mainz.<sup>136</sup>

But the Committee for the German National Loan rested its highest hopes on America, where many German democrats now resided and where, it was commonly assumed, everyone made enough money to give generously to the cause. Eduard Meyen, who distributed most of their circulars, declared for the Emigration Society:

In America we see a second Germany which can help the old mother country... Once the Germans in America set an example...the rest of the American people will not hesitate to help us... America will not be indifferent as to whether German power of production and consumption is impeded or not. Germany is the most important market for American colonial products for which Germany pays with its industrial products. Hence the interests of both countries are closely linked, and America will have to contribute in every manner possible to liberating Germany from its current yoke.<sup>137</sup>

The person most likely to attract public attention and to collect the most funds was of course Kinkel, who was induced to undertake a propaganda tour through the United States. Setting off in September 1851, Kinkel began his series of lectures and public meetings on quite a successful note, collecting about \$15,000 in Cincinnati alone by early October.<sup>138</sup> Kinkel was not slow in adapting his propaganda to flatter the American public, in particular the German-Americans, emphasising that the London émigrés represented the vanguard in the struggle of the republican west against the despotic east.<sup>139</sup> He also convinced Wilhelm Weitling of the advantages of the National Loan project. Weitling initially had been suspicious of the undertaking, but on meeting Kinkel was greatly impressed with his amiability. He let himself be persuaded that any use of the money for at least some revolutionary purpose was advantageous, since more specifically

communist aims had no hope of any financial aid at all, and since the connection of the Loan with his political friend Willich guaranteed some of its application to communist purposes or at least use in the workers' interests.<sup>140</sup> Weitling was thus very useful to the Loan project, for not only was his weekly *Republik der Arbeiter* widely distributed among German-Americans, but his Working Men's League also had members and connections in most large American cities. The existing constellation in German émigré politics in the United States also helped to bring Weitling over to Kinkel's side. His arch-enemy Heinzen, with his New York paper, the *Deutsche Schnellpost für Europäische Zustände*, supported Ruge, while on the other side of the spectrum those American communists who followed Marx, in particular Weydemeyer, not only attacked Weitling's brand of communism but also the National Loan.<sup>141</sup> Freiligrath, too, supported Weydemeyer's point of view against the Loan, and sent a poem from London ridiculing Kinkel as the modern-age Tetzels selling tickets of indulgence for the revolution.<sup>142</sup>

Weydemeyer's criticisms came somewhat late, however, since by the beginning of 1852 Kinkel's Revolutionary Loan was already involved in such bitter quarrels with Amand Goegg's rival enterprise that both were rapidly losing credibility. A former member of the Baden provisional government,<sup>143</sup> Goegg had immediately after arriving in London in May 1851 tended towards Willich, Schapper and the CABV, but soon shifted to support Ruge, Tausenau and the Agitation Union, where he became one of the most outspoken critics of Kinkel's project.<sup>144</sup> In competition with it, the Agitation Union thus propagated the loan scheme initiated by the old 'National Committee', which varied only marginally from Kinkel's Loan by asking for regular contributions rather than selling shares. Initially, this money was intended to help Ledru-Rollin's struggle against Napoleon, since Ruge, Goegg and others exhorted the Germans to work for a revolution in France first of all.<sup>145</sup> Their methods, however, were identical: Goegg and Fickler sent emissaries to Germany and also concentrated their efforts on raising funds in America.<sup>146</sup> Goegg, too, himself went on a propaganda tour through the United States, arriving there about Christmas 1851 in a parody of Kinkel which caused both projects immeasurable harm.<sup>147</sup> But Kinkel's initial successes in the United States were already waning, and his popularity there also suffered from the rival appearance of Kossuth, who, while collecting money for his own national cause, used his greater revolutionary fame to divert most of the attention hitherto focused on Kinkel.<sup>148</sup>

But while the Americans wearied of the various revolutionary money-collectors, the war between Kinkel and Goegg was waged with unabated ferocity in the German-American journals and between the Emigration and Agitation Clubs in London. There had been repeated, unsuccessful attempts at reconciliation since the original break between the two factions in mid-1851. In August the co-operation of about 50 German democrats in London was announced, the joyous if premature news of which was even printed in southern German newspapers.<sup>149</sup> In October another attempt by the Emigration Society to persuade the individual members of the Agitation Union, Ruge, Ronge, Fickler, Goegg and Sigel, to join the Kinkelian enterprise as guarantors failed because of Goegg's strong resistance. Finally, just before Napoleon's coup d'état, news from Paris had been so promising that a union was actually agreed upon between the two rival groups. But it fell apart almost immediately afterwards.<sup>150</sup>

After this last attempt to concentrate on one loan project, Goegg left for his own American tour, and his Agitation Union called a congress of American supporters at



Philadelphia on 29 January, while Kinkel called upon his American followers, among them Struve, Weitling, Hecker, Anneke, Kapp, and—more surprisingly—Marx's follower Adolf Cluss, to attend a congress in Cincinnati, which took place from 3 to 8 February 1852.<sup>151</sup> Here the 'war between the frogs and the mice' (as Marx called it after a mock-heroic parody of Homer's *Iliad*<sup>152</sup>) reached new heights, with Goegg transforming the Agitation Union into a transatlantic organisation, the American Revolutionary League for Europe. Both congresses failed, however, either to raise more funds or create a more unified standpoint, and both ended in great embarrassment for their organisers.<sup>153</sup>

Despite these prolonged and vehement fights, it is often difficult to see the basic differences between these two factions. Both were democratic organisations composed of Forty-eighters working towards a unified, republican Germany and employing the same means of agitation, emissaries, and the collection of a large revolutionary fund. Neither laid down a fundamental programme outlining their major political and social viewpoints. Nor did their overall democratic-republican convictions, at least as stated in their respective speeches, proclamations and addresses, fundamentally differ. Hence Marx and Engels regarded both groups as more or less interchangeable, and divided only by personal preferences and prejudices. Their leaders, thought Marx and Engels, were concerned only with jockeying for position within the hierarchy of the 'Great Men of the Exile', and fought one another for purely imaginary power, allying merely to achieve 'a mutual insurance club of would-be great men and the reciprocal guarantee of government posts'.<sup>154</sup> Indeed, not even all the participants in these groups were entirely clear about the differences between them. Schurz recalled that Kinkel's opponents 'recognize in him only a poet, a learned man and a political dreamer, but not a "practical revolutionist" fit to be the real leader in a great struggle', while many of these opponents were in fact 'gathered, strange to say, around Arnold Ruge, a venerable and widely known philosopher and writer, to whom the name of a mere learned man and political dreamer might have been applied far more justly'.<sup>155</sup> From the viewpoint of the Ruge's camp Eugen Oswald, for instance, explained that while Kinkel hoped for a new rising and prepared for it by raising the National Loan, 'Ruge and his friends thought, rather sanguinely, that such a rising ought not to be waited for indefinitely, but rather called forth', and thus founded the Agitationsverein.<sup>156</sup> The police, too, saw this difference in method as central:

Through restless correspondence the Agitation Society has found a base in Baden, Austria and even northern Germany, while the Emigration Society was dealing with the money business. Once the loan project is finished, the Emigration Society will be a school of rhetoricians, and the Agitation Society the true centre of propaganda, especially since the Agitation Society contains fewer differences of opinion and hence can indeed conspire, which is impossible for the Emigration Society because of its composition.<sup>157</sup>

To compound the confusion, Kinkel himself wrote to Ruge ten years later that he 'was never your political opponent, since we differed only in respect to means, and never to principles', and signed himself 'your unflinching party comrade'.<sup>158</sup>

But both societies partially reflected the old enmity between Prussians and south Germans. The Agitation Union was almost exclusively identified with 'Baden-Palatinate particularism' after the arrival of the closely allied southern German trio of Franz Sigel, Fickler and Goegg, and the fact that they called the Emigration Society 'the Prussians' underlines this regional allegiance.<sup>159</sup> Besides Baden, close connections existed with J.Ph.Becker in Switzerland, and with sympathisers in Leipzig, Austria, Prague and Milan.<sup>160</sup> In this respect of regional affiliation, Ruge thus remained an exception in the Agitation Union. The Emigration Society, however, consisted mostly of north Germans, with a disproportionately large share of former Prussian officers such as Willich, Schimmelpfennig and Techow united by an 'unbelievably sordid esprit de corps', as Engels put it.<sup>161</sup> 'It is only the difference in the southern and northern German way of viewing things which has effected their separation', an observer declared, 'the South Germans want to "act" and "work", they feel the urge to vent their anguish, while the north Germans lock this up inside themselves and calmly wait for the time when they can step forth again'.<sup>162</sup>

But more important than these regional loyalties were the democrats' different degrees of willingness to ally with other refugee groups. The Emigration Society lacked international connections of the kind Ruge had formalised through the ECDC. But as we have seen, Kinkel emphasised his 'social' sympathies and was prepared to co-operate with Willich and the CABV, while Ruge remained opposed to such an alliance. Harro-Harring, too, for instance, loudly decried the Emigration Society's decision to join the 'Communists' Committee', pleased that Ruge's society had no such connections.<sup>163</sup> Kinkel's co-operation with Willich increased steadily during the National Loan campaign, and the Agitation Union, doubtless aware of the numerical advantages the Emigration Society would gain thereby, tried to discredit it in the eyes of the workers' club by calling it 'the Kinkel faction', assuming that this allusion to parliamentary usage and emphasis upon an individual leader would not be welcome with the workers.<sup>164</sup> As we have seen, however, Kinkel on the contrary became increasingly popular with the CABV, even if it hesitated to approve of Kinkel's loan project.<sup>165</sup> But from the political aims of both the Agitation Union and the Emigration Society, and from the way in which both groups led their respective campaigns, it remained clear that the 'prosocialist' tendency of the Emigration Society was merely a difference in tactics, not in political convictions, for neither group in any way espoused socialist or social democratic principles or language throughout this period.<sup>166</sup>

Both groups ultimately failed in their loan projects, with neither collecting enough money even to consider seriously how to employ it to promote a German revolution. By the time Kinkel returned to Europe in March 1852, the prospects for a revolution had been smashed by Napoleon's coup d'état, and the National Loan was nearly dead. Although Kinkel had even been received by President Fillmore, and found that in the United States 'the enthusiasm of the mass meetings left nothing to be desired', money was not forthcoming, and Schurz could only conclude wistfully that Kinkel's journey had been 'successful in all respects, except in that of the German National Loan'.<sup>167</sup> The German guarantors of the loan convened in London in April 1852 to decide on steps after Kinkel's return from the United States, but failed to rekindle enthusiasm,<sup>168</sup> and a planned congress of the European guarantors never took place. Meetings remained virtually unattended, with just four members gathering at the Emigration Society by June.<sup>169</sup> The

Loan's final chapter consisted of debates about how to dispose of the funds since neither repayment nor purposeful application was feasible. The 'hoard' ended up in a London bank vault, guarded over by Kinkel, pending its future usage for a German revolution.<sup>170</sup>

Napoleon's putsch of December 1851 thus squashed the hopes of the republican and democratic emigrants of the 1848 revolution. Kinkel withdrew from politics by the end of the year, as did Ruge, whose Agitation Society dissolved in early 1852.<sup>171</sup> Many of the poorer refugees now abandoned all hope of returning soon to their homes, and, despairing of finding permanent employment in England, willingly accepted the British government's offer to finance their emigration to the United States.<sup>172</sup> In April 1852 the *Republik der Arbeiter* reported from New York that 'All those German refugees, who are able to prove their identity through credentials signed by well-known refugees in London, receive from the English government free passage to America and £2 on arrival. The whole of the London workers' society seems to want to make use of this offer. A few of their precursors are already in our midst.'<sup>173</sup> Those remaining in London were too few, too disillusioned, and too exhausted to continue their quarrels, or indeed, any exile politics at all. Thus the heyday of German refugee activities in London in the immediate aftermath of 1848 was followed by years of quiescence and stagnation.

## 5

### The Sonderbund, I

#### The Willich-Schapper League at its zenith, 1850– 1851

##### Regrouping after the split

After the split on 1 September 1850, the history of the Communist League in London is virtually identical with that of the group around Willich and Schapper. Marx christened them ‘Willich-Schapper faction’ and ‘Sonderbund’ (Separatist League)—names adopted by historiography—to draw attention to his view that they were only the illegitimate offspring of the Communist League.<sup>1</sup> But Willich and Schapper themselves agreed, as did most of their contemporaries, that the group was in fact the official continuation of the League. (The Prussian police deliberately ignored differences between the two factions, of course, for their own purposes.<sup>2</sup>) In London the great majority of League members (though a minority of the Central Authority) adhered to Willich and Schapper. Some 16 to 18 socialists regularly participated in the ‘Society of Dr Marx’, but their opponents, organised in four groups, could muster over three times as many adherents.<sup>3</sup> The Marx-Engels group transferred its Central Authority power to Cologne immediately after the split and as an organisation with regular sessions it survived in London for only four more months, until January 1851.<sup>4</sup> Only when the defendants in the infamous Cologne trial urgently required outside help did the London group reconvene for the sole purpose of aiding them, finally dissolving in November 1852 directly after the verdict.<sup>5</sup> The Willich-Schapper faction, on the other hand, were active for more than two years longer both in London and on the Continent, figuring prominently in police reports as its emissaries kept in touch with the Swiss, French and some German League groups and circles. Other London exile and Chartist societies had closer contacts with it than with Marx’s associates. It is therefore not surprising that Willich, not Marx, was the best-known communist among the German exiles in London at the time.

Nonetheless, historians have strangely neglected the Willich-Schapper group, partly because of Marx’s biases, and partly because of its increasingly unrealistic schemes for revolution.<sup>6</sup> But Willich and his adherents’ idea of revolution and their attempts to achieve a ‘united front’ of all revolutionaries against the old regimes in fact epitomised the *Zeitgeist* of the exiled ‘red’ Forty-eighters much more than Marx and Engels. In the context of exile politics Willich and Schapper not only represented the left almost exclusively, but they also continued a less inflexible and more immediately practical tradition of German workers’ communism abroad, which in some respects helped to make a later alliance with democratic revolutionaries possible. The mutual attraction between the Willich-Schapper League and other exile groups, notably the French Blanquists, as well as some Chartists, can also be explained in this light.

In the period immediately after the split, the activities of Willich and Schapper's followers were almost entirely dominated by a desire to sever all remaining links with Marx and Engels' adherents, and to attract as many as possible Communist League members and sympathisers in London and abroad to their side. Initially there were money matters to squabble over, and for a few months, a financial war—over the sum of £16—raged between the two London groups. This money had been collected for use at the discretion of 'a secret committee with unlimited powers to disperse of the Society's funds' (i.e., the Communist League). After the split, however, Heinrich Bauer and Carl Pfänder, trustees of the CABV and still in possession of the money, were reluctant to repay the funds although they had left the Club. They argued that the Willich-Schapper faction, now in control of a Club 'totally changed in character', would use the money 'for purposes entirely contrary' to its original intention.<sup>7</sup> (One of these 'purposes' was Haude's secret agitation tour for Willich and Schapper on the Continent, plainly anathema to Marx.) The Society took Bauer and Pfänder to court but in November 1850 lost the suit, which caused 'considerable annoyance' in the CABV. Although £5 was handed over eventually, the CABV in the meantime publicly accused Bauer and Pfänder of fraud.<sup>8</sup> On their behalf, Marx and Engels retaliated by denouncing Schapper for 'exploiting the Society' and Willich for 'using the refugee fund'.<sup>9</sup>

But it was not only in financial matters that the Willich and Schapper group had to come to terms with the new state of affairs. Their first public pronouncements forcefully urged a justification for the split, and their initial organisational attempts aimed chiefly at strengthening their own numbers. Only a few days after the split, Willich and Schapper convened a general assembly of the London circle of the League, where they possessed a majority, who duly approved the expulsion of Marx, Engels and eight close followers.<sup>10</sup> The assembly elected four old members (Willich, Schapper, Fränkel and Lehmann) to act as Central Authority until the League's next congress, planned for 20 October, and added August Schärttner, Oswald Dietz and August Gebert.

A cooper born in 1817 in Hanau, August Schärttner was involved in the democratic congress in Frankfurt in June 1848.<sup>11</sup> In 1849 he led in battle several hundred armed *Turner* (athletes of a patriotic-democratic movement) from Hanau, including many unemployed gold workers. In London he joined the Social Democratic Refugees' Committee and became a guarantor of Kinkel's loan. By 1852 Fontane described him as no longer interested in revolution, writing that having

long ago hit upon the clever idea of turning his uselessly stabled republicanism into a milch cow, he now lives in the greatest comfort from the indestructible renown of a principle long since abandoned. He has become the husband of a pale Englishwoman, and through ample consumption of his own ale and porter he is rounding himself off more and more into the complete opposite of those Cassius types whose meagreness Caesar found so dubious.<sup>12</sup>

Oswald Dietz, secretary of Willich's League, had founded the Wiesbaden workers' society in May 1848, joined the Frankfurt democratic congress in June, and during the Baden campaign clamoured for 'energetic action'. Known to Marx as 'the cockroach', he gained notoriety when the Prussian police in August 1851 managed to steal his

correspondence file and from it constructed accusations against the Cologne League.<sup>13</sup> August Gebert, a joiner or tailor from Mecklenburg, had been prominent in the League in Switzerland, where he had argued for armed intervention already in March 1848. By December, he outlined a military organisation in workers' clubs because 'petitions and parliament cannot achieve anything', and he argued that all had the right to 'an equal part in all activities, and equal rights to everything nature and human industriousness produce, that no one can idle at others' expense, but each has to contribute to the benefit of the whole'.<sup>14</sup> Gebert fought with the Besançon corps in the Imperial Constitution campaign. Expelled in April 1850, he moved in with Willich on his arrival in London, and corresponded with Reininger, Ewerbeck and others in Paris. In London he was annoyed by the squabbles in 'the party' but felt these would cease with the next outbreak, for which he impatiently yearned, meanwhile chairing the CABV's Whitechapel branch.<sup>15</sup>

A week after its establishment, this new Central Authority issued its first circular announcing the split and the expulsions. Its interpretation of events naturally differed considerably from that of the Marx-Engels League by insisting that 'pure personalities' underlay the split, not disagreements about 'principle', in which 'Willich and all workers completely agreed with Marx, Engels'. Accordingly, much space was given to reproaching Marx and Engels for their supposed intrigues, for creating a 'literary clique' which despised workers, and for hindering a strict and effective organisation and unity.<sup>16</sup>

The debate about the proletariat's role in the coming revolution almost disappeared amidst these personal recriminations. It was impossible to detect the vehemence of Schapper's argument from the nonchalant half-sentence that the proletarians had to take affairs into their own hands and gain power. Thus, apart from the lingering objection to intellectuals, the Willich-Schapper group did not publicly acknowledge sufficient differences in political analysis, strategy or aims to justify a schism, and blamed matters on Marx's stubbornness. Marx, as Willich later put it, tried to turn 'the party of the proletariat, to which we both belong, and which essentially requires self-administration...into the "Marx party"'.<sup>17</sup> On the whole, the first proclamation of the breakaway faction thus played down any fundamental disagreements and refused to recognise their own underlying assumptions.

### **Developing a separate ideology**

Nonetheless, the direction in which the group would develop was already indicated in the terminology and emphasis of its first publication. This stressed 'activity and unification', pointed proudly to Willich's great popularity among the workers, and promised 'energetic measures' and the 'firm organisation of the League'.<sup>18</sup> These points in fact acknowledged some strategic differences evident in the old Central Authority, and belied any insistence on mere personality clashes. They also announced the future focus of the Willich-Schapper group on popularity, 'deeds', and revolutionary action.

Still, such traits did not guarantee organisational efficiency, and confusion after the split and poor preparation spoiled plans for a congress in October, which was postponed until the following July.<sup>19</sup> Throughout November the Willich-Schapper faction issued revised statutes, and published a manifesto with other continental refugees. During a war scare, when Prussia mobilised its troops in a conflict over Hesse, Willich also worked out

detailed military plans for a revolution in Germany. In all these areas, the Willich-Schapper group increasingly developed its own unmistakable brand of exile politics.

New statutes were published so soon after the split that only the group's London members had the chance to dictate revisions, which were approved by a London general assembly on 10 November 1850. But few significant alterations from the former statutes of the joint League were yet discernible. As a matter of course the motto remained 'Proletarians of all countries, unite!' The programmatic first article went back to almost exactly the original wording of 1847, and now read: 'The League aims to bring the proletariat to power, to abolish the old bourgeois society which rests on class antagonisms, and to found a new society without classes and without bourgeois property relations, i.e., the social democratic republic.'<sup>20</sup> Only the organisational part of the new statutes indicated the future direction of the group.<sup>21</sup> The demand for members to show 'firm character' was added—perhaps to underscore Marx's moral failures—and a 'confession of communism', which Moll had 'deliberately left out' in 1848, was again required. But it was no longer stipulated that League members refrain from 'participating in any other political society'; instead, no member was allowed to belong to 'another secret society without approval of his superior authority'. This soon became significant when Willich and others joined émigré organisations run by non- or positively anti-communist democrats. But it is unlikely that the Willich-Schapper faction contemplated such co-operation at this stage. Instead the wording merely legitimised the League's standing practice, and covered cases like that of Wilhelm Wolff, who had belonged to the 'Centralisation' for months.

The question of alliance with democrats also went unmentioned in Willich and Schapper's next public pronouncements, 'Aux démocrates de toutes les nations!' and 'Démocrates, Prenez Garde a Vous!'. In practice, not by a theoretical decision, the problem of joining forces with non-socialists had been solved here. For while neither manifesto was an official publication of the League, each was signed by the majority of their Central Authority, along with French, Italian, Hungarian and Polish refugees, many of whom were certainly no socialists.<sup>22</sup> 'Démocrates, Prenez Garde a Vous!' outlined the social and political structure of the hoped-for republic in terms obviously gleaned from Saint-Just's 'Fragments' in the French; and while it demanded organisation of labour according to the needs of consumption, it did not address classes or class struggle. However, the content and language of both proclamations remained acceptable to all republicans. Despite an appeal to 'Socialist Democrats', it only generally stated that 'democrats of all nations' were about to be ousted in a war between 'republicans', 'democracy' and 'common liberty' on the one side and 'hordes of barbarians', 'serpents of diplomacy' and 'despots' on the other.

Although not signed only by members of the Willich-Schapper League, this address revealed a major theme of their revolutionary convictions. For Willich revolutions were chiefly military enterprises, their failure or success being determined by military preparation, strategy and strength. While the manifesto thus began by summarising continental political events after the defeat of June 1848, these were quickly reduced to the single fact of the massive build-up of troops on the side of 'the despots', whose massed numbers, led by 'the will of the Czar', were estimated to total some 1,300,000 combatants, plus reserves. The manifesto concluded with a dramatic appeal to action.<sup>23</sup> Linked to a belief in imminent revolution which Marx and Engels no longer shared, this

concentration on revolutionary warfare was the first major point distinguishing the Willich-Schapper group, and owed much to the personal inclinations of the 'man of action', Willich himself.<sup>24</sup>

Willich was of course not alone in emphasising the military aspect of revolution. Engels's life-long interest in the subject earned him the nickname of 'the general', and Marx had also tried to draw Techow into the League as a military expert. Many other exiles had also fought in the 1848–1849 campaigns in Baden and the Palatinate, and saw their defeat as resulting from superior Prussian forces, just as the Polish, Hungarian and Austrian movements had been crushed by Russian armies.<sup>25</sup> But Willich was certainly more obsessed with armed struggle than the other socialists, and seems to have needed constant reminders that a revolution had economic, political and social aspects besides. In a subsequent proclamation, the Central Authority reported on the current state of affairs in the tone of a bulletin from the front.<sup>26</sup> With 'high probability...perhaps already this year', it announced, 'either the general world war...or the social revolution' would break out, and in either France or Germany 'demolish both the monarchy with its feudal remnants and the bourgeoisie with its moneybags for ever'. If the French people installed a dictatorship first, the Communist League and

the revolutionary forces of all countries [would] have to go promptly to France in order to form the European republican army there, in which the communist revolutionary element must dominate... This army...will also bring about the solidarity of peoples in the shortest and most practical way.

If Germany and France rebelled together, however, the League would help build a revolutionary army in Germany in order to fight Russia, whose intervention was assumed as a matter of course. Interestingly, the London Central Authority had given up all hope of a popular uprising in Germany and assumed that the revolution could be instigated there 'only through a military uprising'. This, however,

could scarcely bring the proletarian party to power at once. In this case, all revolutionary forces would have to disperse among the armies to propagandise there. In all cities... League members would have to form revolutionary committees which force the provisional authorities installed by the army to take the most energetic measures against the external and internal enemy.<sup>27</sup>

Willich hoped that from a general military movement in Germany the 'revolutionary army proper' would emerge, seeing this as 'the luckiest form of revolution'.<sup>28</sup> The address proposed no social or economic changes beyond vaguely promising to 'care for the families of the fighters', leaving details to be worked out after Russia had been 'pushed back into the Asiatic steppes' and 'our enemies at home completely destroyed'.<sup>29</sup>



### The revolutionary plans for Germany

Willich's insistence on these aspects resulted in detailed plans for an army insurrection in Germany, which were expounded in a series of letters in December 1850, when Austrian and Bavarian troops had intervened in a constitutional conflict in Hesse, giving rise to fears (or hopes) of an imminent military conflict. Willich now argued that the militia (*Landwehr*) predominated both materially and morally in the Prussian army, and since it was composed mostly of 'workers, peasants, day labourers, petty bourgeois', it could be fairly easily incited. Once the militia chose 'to see after things' themselves, they would elect committees and 'transfer the executive power from the hands of the government into those of the revolutionary authorities'. If the civilian authorities failed in their duties, especially to provide for the families of the militiamen, they would be 'court-martialled and shot'. The militia committees would be responsible only to the electorate and remain armed 'until all grievances and difficulties in the administration of the state and in the conditions of gaining a livelihood have been redressed'.<sup>30</sup>

This plan was to be set in motion in Cologne, whereupon other troops would follow suit and send delegates to the 'Rhineland Central Militia Committee' who—as an afterthought—might also co-opt some 'civilians', and would soon take over military and civilian administration. By acting rapidly, Willich stressed, 'just as the effect of a bullet is determined by its velocity and mass, of which one can largely replace the other', 'energy can in the beginning substitute for much power'.<sup>31</sup> This meant essentially that all power should be concentrated in a revolutionary government identical with military authority, and all resistance treated as treason. All property and all persons were to be made available to the elected revolutionary committees. Every community would care for its members, the means being provided by 'the rich' and from confiscating 'all the domains and estates of the reactionaries'. Willich was, however, weary of early proclamations, obviously also speaking from experience in 1848–1849:

Let us beware above all of granting rights, and let us give things instead—rights can be taken away once the people have them but never things. Let us use the existing wealth for the livelihood of all instead of proclaiming the right to live and afterwards worrying how to carry it out. Let us link the free material existence of everyone with the revolution, and the revolution will be invincible. This will be easy for us since our first decree will place at our disposal the property and persons for the struggle against our enemies—the rest will sort itself out.<sup>32</sup>

But otherwise Willich worried little about the social changes accompanying the revolution, as the organisation of the committees and their initial measures would lay an immovable basis for the new society. There was not to be much debate on these measures, however. To ensure that morale was kept up and the revolutionary idea sustained throughout the country, 'only one paper' would be issued by the government, 'which contains all the decrees, the best brief thoughts on their clarification, in short everything which draws the individual into the common interest as his own'. Willich

emphasised that he had learnt this lesson the hard way during the Baden uprising, and considered this paper, together with lectures and discussions taking place in all villages, towns, garrisons and bivouacs, to be 'the breath of life' of a revolution, 'as in the religious wars'.<sup>33</sup> Soon the contagion of revolution would spread to other German states, whose armed forces would be 'seized', and within a few months 'proper warfare' would erupt all over the Continent:

In the first moment we organise a Hungarian and a Polish legion... We are sure of the revolution in Austria... Our first strike will be on the border against the French army, but we will also win a nation, the French, for our support and reserve... We beat them, while the revolution is taking place in the *départements* and in Paris. Mazzini will at the same time make the revolution in Italy, so that our enemy must lose his head. The only serious enemy [are] the Russian armies. The struggle against them is, however, to our advantage, because only through it will the revolutionary measures become justified and practicable internally.<sup>34</sup>

Marx and Engels found these plans merely comical.<sup>35</sup> But this increasing concentration on armed revolt led the Willich-Schapper League to explore further the relation between class and power, for they faced the dilemma of needing allies for military use while rejecting the 'petty bourgeoisie'. The Willich-Schapper group in London regarded themselves, not Marx's followers, as the true proletarian core of the original Communist League. Insisting on a purely proletarian orientation, they rejected any revolutionary theory which permitted a period of middle class government, and vehemently dismissed any even temporary combination of forces with the democratic exiles. But the effort to avoid merely putschist tactics led them inevitably into alliance with democratic groups. This was in itself not sufficient to change their proletarian orientation, but such strategic considerations combined with ideological haziness and the rejection of revolutionary theory resulted later also in a theoretical rapprochement which was mostly Willich's doing and which remained hampered by various provisos. But even then the League itself was not necessarily in agreement with such compromises.

In its Circular of spring 1851, the Willich-Schapper group continued to focus intently on the problem of the democratic revolutionaries. Following the style of the *Communist Manifesto*, the circular explained the 'position of the proletarian or communist party relative to other parties who more or less profess socialism and who obviously belong to the petty bourgeoisie'. The 'petty bourgeois party' was described as being pushed by reaction and capital into the proletariat, but rather than joining the proletarian forces, it advocated craft guilds and protection against those both above and below them. Petty bourgeois leaders usually emphasised that mankind did not develop in leaps and that first of all the common enemy had to be removed. But the universal suffrage they advocated 'remained an illusion as long as the large number was dependent on the small number of owners, on the employers', and could only be realised 'when bourgeois property had ceased to exist'. Provided that the proletarian party was firm and united, it would quickly become victorious in the next revolution 'even if at the beginning representatives of the petty bourgeoisie should become powerful in the movement'.<sup>36</sup> Taking part as an independent force in the revolution, indeed as its main force, would give the proletarian

party the right and the might to determine the first institutions to be installed.<sup>37</sup> In their rejection of a tactical alliance before the revolution with democratic groups, Willich's League thus still followed the June 1850 Circular of the then unsplit League. Instead of pursuing political alliances in exile, Willich and Schapper consequently turned their attention from London to strengthening their ties to workers' groups on the Continent.

### Connections outside England

The Sonderbund managed to build and maintain a wide network of international connections, which tied it to revolutionary groups in London, on the Continent in Switzerland, France, Belgium and Germany in particular, and in the United States. While some of these links were loose and tentative, the mere fact that a small, London-based dissident faction of German exiles could muster such wide international relations is remarkable. Former members of Willich's Besançon corps and Blanquists prevailed in La Chaux-de-Fonds and Geneva, where Moses Hess lent his support on account of the affinities between his 'philosophy of the deed' and Willich's views.<sup>38</sup> Among the German communists in France, about 40 Weitlingians and Cabetists under the tailors Andreas Scherzer and J.G. Reininger became the most energetic section of Willich's League, some imbued with a strongly chiliastic sense. (Like the Swiss, they fell victim to swindlers and *agents provocateurs*, who contrived the arrests and virtual end of the Paris groups in the so-called 'Franco-German plot' of September 1851.<sup>39</sup>) In Belgium the furrier N.L.Petersen organised 40 Weitlingians for the Willich-Schapper League.<sup>40</sup> In the United States the single most influential representative of German communism was Weitling himself, who shared Willich's dislike of Marx and who, in his *Republik der Arbeiter*, publicised the 'Sonderbund's' statements and even grudgingly endorsed Willich's collaboration in Kinkel's Loan project.<sup>41</sup> Outside London, thus, the Willich-Schapper group consisted largely but not exclusively of adherents of Weitling, allowing a very broad definition of 'party' without ever seriously questioning allegiance to the London Central Authority. Connected by anti-intellectualism and a desire to act, they contained disparate elements ranging from Willich's military leanings and Hess's philosophical communism to the millenarian fervour of some members in France and Weitling's labour exchange and colony projects in the United States. Considering the extent of these connections, however, it is surprising that this organisational network has up to now been virtually ignored by historians.

Nonetheless, we must concentrate here only on the German and British activities of the League. As we saw above, the Willich-Schapper group's emphasis on revolutionary 'deed' led it to plan carefully for the event of a violent outbreak in Germany. Its contacts here were based on the existing connections of the old Communist League, and the Londoners took the obvious course after the split of first trying to secure their influence in these remaining League circles. The first, hurried measure to win German League support involved sending to Cologne a journeyman tailor, Haude, who knew the territory from his earlier stay there, in 1848–1849.<sup>42</sup> Haude had concurred in Schapper and Moll's move to reorganise the League against Marx's wishes in the spring of 1849, and had later joined Willich's troops in Baden. But he was not among Willich's unquestioning admirers, and in London had occasionally disagreed with him.<sup>43</sup> His mission, however,

was unsuccessful, both in Cologne, where thanks to Röser's manoeuvres the group accepted Marx's version of the split before Haude could even present his view, and in Frankfurt, again due to Röser's quick intervention.<sup>44</sup> Although Röser claimed that Haude failed in Mainz, too, Marx later conceded here the 'predominant influence' of the Willich group.<sup>45</sup>

Since the Rhineland, and especially Cologne, were so central to Willich's strategic plans, the Sonderbund did not abandon its efforts there even after Haude's poor showing. Attempts to persuade Becker of the validity of Willich's schemes have been noted above. In spring 1851 Alexander Schimmelpfennig travelled in Germany with the double purpose of propagating Kinkel's Revolutionary Loan project and cultivating sympathy among the workers for Willich.<sup>46</sup> Again, he mainly turned to Becker, but he also distributed a joint proclamation by Willich and himself, exhorting soldiers to rise.<sup>47</sup> But not only had feelings among the military changed by now. The few remaining communists in the Rhineland would not yield to Willich's courting, and despite some criticism they decided to support Marx and remained the firm core of Marx and Engels' League (in fact their Central Authority) until arrests broke up their organisation in May 1851.

Defeated in the part of Germany they regarded as most vital, Willich and Schapper could only establish a few outposts of their League elsewhere in the country.<sup>48</sup> One promising possibility for them to exploit was the link established by Moll in 1848 with Northern Germany's Arbeiterverbrüderung, the largest workers' organisation still existing in Germany, which sought a social democratic state to be established by a revolution and prepared through workers' aid funds and producers' co-operatives. Willich and Schapper found their staunchest ally there in Gottlieb Ludwig Stechan, a Hannover carpenter who edited its mouthpiece, the *Deutsche Arbeiterhalle*.<sup>49</sup> Schapper, Greiner and Dietz wrote for the paper. By March 1851 Stechan clearly sided with Willich, whose followers in London he questioned about the 'relation between our [party] and that of Marx and Engels'.<sup>50</sup> The Arbeiterverbrüderung welcomed the Willich-Schapper group's proposal for a congress in May but, unable to send their own delegate, suggested instead establishing only indirect contact with the CABV through Stechan.<sup>51</sup>

Stechan also provided links with several groups in northern Germany, such as those in Osnabrück, Braunschweig and Bremen, which had scarcely any direct contact with Willich or Schapper in London. Although Braunschweig was one of the strongholds of the Willich-Schapper League in Germany, its contacts with London were established via Paris.<sup>52</sup> The Hannover group also corresponded with a district organisation of the League in Leipzig, presumably another foothold of Willich and Schapper in Germany.<sup>53</sup> In October 1851 Oswald Dietz was asked to send literature from London to Dresden 'as much as you can; seemingly things are dead here, but under the ashes the fire is smouldering'.<sup>54</sup> In Hamburg some workers such as Otto Berthold may have sympathised with the Willich-Schapper League, but it is doubtful that they were formally organised. As late as 25 September 1851 Starke in London still hoped that the Hamburg district might formally acknowledge the Willich-Schapper group as its Central Authority. He also presupposed a friendly attitude of the Hamburg group to Stechan, and warned them against Eccarius' brother there, who firmly sided with Marx, as did the commercial clerk Wilhelm Haupt.<sup>55</sup>

In southern Germany the situation of the Willich-Schapper League looked even more desperate than in the north, and little support at all from League members was probably forthcoming. The remnants of the former Frankfurt group which had been reorganised by Weydemeyer later supported the Cologne League, but some money at any rate was sent to London from Theodor Schuster in Frankfurt and Heinrich Feibel in Wiesbaden.<sup>56</sup> Weydemeyer, however, thought that Schapper's influence in southern Germany, including his own home state Hesse-Nassau, was nonexistent. Wiesbaden sided with Marx and Engels, and only in Mainz do Willich's supporters seem to have gained 'predominant influence' after Lessner's arrest. This could explain why the Paris emissary of the Willich-Schapper League, Reininger, travelled above all to Mainz. Otherwise only the workers' society in Heilbronn seems to have been acquainted with 'the Windmill party' of Willich and Schapper.<sup>57</sup>

Thus on the whole a fairly bleak picture emerges of overall support for Willich and Schapper in Germany. Even in those few places where workers' associations supported them, they almost always faced a rival group favouring the Cologne Central Authority, or their alleged supporters were undecided and attempted to remain on working terms with both factions. This geographical pattern changed after Marx's friends in Cologne were arrested in May 1851, with expansion of support for Willich and Schapper, above all in northern Germany. If one is to believe a rather optimistic picture Gebert drew in July 1852, Willich's League was organised in five circles: London with the Central Committee and three groups; Paris (four groups in Paris and 51 in the departments); Berlin (six groups in Berlin and a further nine in the rest of Prussia and Saxony); Braunschweig (27 groups in Braunschweig, Hannover and Bremen); and Hamburg (ten groups throughout Holstein and Mecklenburg). Thirty-five southern German groups were in the process of being constituted around Frankfurt, Mainz and Stuttgart. In France the League had 1800 members, in northern Germany 1500, and in southern Germany 1400; Gebert did not doubt that they included the more intelligent portion of the working class, so that the League comprised 'the entire educated proletariat'.<sup>58</sup>

Descriptions of these various connections do not however give a clear picture of the composition, strength, opinions and discussions of the German groups themselves. The only circle of Willich-Schapper supporters for which original documents survive was in Braunschweig.<sup>59</sup> Its letters, strewn with orthographical mistakes, use formulations and quote reading material which indicate that this group remained strongly under the influence of Weitling's communism. Besides 50 copies of the League's statutes, the literature the Braunschweig's League received from Paris included only older works by Cabet and Weitling, and they showed 'a great and predominant sympathy' for French communist works. Though the German workers outside Braunschweig who sympathised with Willich and Schapper did not necessarily share this Weitlingian predilection, it does indicate one of the main affiliations of their continental supporters.

### **The consolidation of the Sonderbund in London**

Despite its impressive network abroad, much wider than we can detail here, the headquarters of the Willich-Schapper League remained in London. Here we have seen, the first and foremost concern of the Central Authority's minority faction after the breach

in September 1850 was to build its own organisation and to demarcate its differences with Marx's League. Willich's attention was for some months in the winter of 1850–1851 almost entirely taken up with his plans for revolutionising the Rhineland militia. But he still endeavoured to expand his influence among the German socialists in London and to maintain close relations with Chartists and French exiles.

For almost a year after the League's split, until the summer of 1851, Willich and Schapper's attempts to consolidate their position in London were fairly successful. The breach with Marx and Engels did not much diminish their attraction to members of the German Educational Association, or among the many disaffected artisans and impoverished refugees hanging on in their regular pubs. The CABV remained the most important meeting place for German socialists in London, and indeed flourished so much that a third section emerged, based in Dorset Street in the City, besides the traditional headquarters in Great Windmill Street in Soho and the East End branch based in Leman Street. (Whether this was founded before or after the split is less significant than the fact that it did not suffer noticeably from Marx and Engels' absence.)<sup>60</sup> In April 1851, all three sections still existed, the location of the third section being described as 'near Blackfriar's Bridge', and in May Willich bragged about two recently established sections.<sup>61</sup> The three sections met for monthly general assemblies, one of which, in Turnlane Gate, was described by a police agent, 'Agent O': 'The locality was a large hall, draped in red and white, where only recognised members were admitted. Willich himself had introduced me. The meeting consisted of about 35 persons, two women and one child. All of them were ordinary German artisans, mostly shoemakers and tailors without education, but enormously eccentric, almost turned mad by communist teachings.'<sup>62</sup> By July 1851, however, this expansion had passed its apogee, and the League's congress dissolved one section because it was 'not communist'.<sup>63</sup> Seasonal migration away from London, but above all the general disenchantment of many workers, may have contributed to the decline. Two sections still existed in September.<sup>64</sup> In spring 1851, however, the League as well as the CABV were still booming, possibly reinforced by other small groups of socialists who had objected to Marx's domination of the CABV and may have returned to it after his departure.<sup>65</sup> As always, too, the CABV attracted penniless refugees and poor artisans by promising support to members in sickness and distress.<sup>66</sup>

Besides the CABV, Willich and Schapper found support in two other organisations. The Social Democratic Refugee Committee remained in their hands after the break, and while less efficient than earlier, continued to collect money for the more destitute exiles.<sup>67</sup> The 'fugitives' barracks', already Willich's personal stronghold for some months, remained important both to his influence among the refugees and as a shelter for many of the most impoverished and most radical exiles. Not all its inmates were happy here. Some resented the 'levelling' living conditions and atmosphere, while others grumbled about the 'despotic' military discipline—Willich had for instance imposed an early curfew until he was embarrassingly caught breaking his own rules climbing over the back wall after mid-night.<sup>68</sup> But still, many inhabitants regarded the house as a sanctuary. The refugees' committee contributed towards its upkeep, and dire necessity forced many refugees into these 'barracks'.<sup>69</sup> Nonetheless after renewed attempts to raise money for the house, it was dissolved some months later.<sup>70</sup> With it went the cohesive core of socialists whom Marx and Engels called Willich's 'bodyguard', the 'nucleus of the army of the future'.<sup>71</sup>

For many of its inhabitants retained a strong personal loyalty to Willich as former members of his Besancon legion. They drilled and lived by the bugle, and Willich undoubtedly envisaged special functions for them in his military plans. It must have been difficult to see them dispersed, many even to the United States.

Almost as important as centres of refugee life were two pubs which gained some notoriety among both exiles and the police. The first was the 'German Stores Hotel' (also known as 'Zum Deutschen Hause') at 27 Long Acre near Leicester Square, which was run by Schärttner, the former leader of the militia of *Turner* members from Hanau in the 1848 Baden campaign, and a member of Willich's Central Authority. This became a focal point for émigrés of all shades, but above all the Willich's League (a contemporary caricature depicts Willich holding a huge beer mug with the inscription '27 Long Acre').<sup>72</sup> Theodor Fontane, none too sympathetic an observer, stayed accidentally at Schärttner's hotel for a few days in April 1852, and described it laconically as 'bad rooms, bad food, bad service, in one word—a fugitives' tavern'.<sup>73</sup> To his mother he wrote:

We arrived and found—a robbers' den. That at least was our first impression, which was not relieved by eating a beefsteak of rotten horsemeat. For two minutes I even thought seriously—my hair standing on end—that it was roasted prince's hip or at least an earl's loin of which the fellow was serving me a chop.

He also described the house in 27 Long Acre as in

one of the sootiest streets of London, and no. 27 avoids breaking the street's chimney-sweep-physiognomy through untimely beauty and cleanliness. The house has a front of two windows and three stories. On the ground floor there is an ale and porter shop where a bunch of loafers drinks pints of beer, occasionally rising to a gin or whiskey. The entire first floor consists of a single room, like a hall but dark.

By the window there is a heavy round table; piled on it democratic newspapers from all parts of the world, mostly old issues. Along the walls, in the form of a rectangle, are tables pushed together, on which in the mornings a few leftover beermugs languish idly, while in the evenings future presidents of the united and indivisible German republic settle down to expound their views on government.

The next storey up was divided between Schärttner's own room and the guest chamber which Fontane found most uncomfortable, remarking that only those who had just left the dungeons of Magdeburg could feel at home there.<sup>74</sup>

Fontane had lunch in the company of Schärttner, Willich, Heise, Zinn and other followers of Willich, and although he freely announced his conservative political views, he was accepted with a calm and composed attitude which contrasted strikingly to the treatment the refugees meted out to one another (among their most favourite sayings Fontane heard the phrase, 'When I gain power, the first one I am having shot is you!'). Willich unfortunately remained silent during this meal, but Fontane thought that most of

his comrades respected the 'obstinate but honest' revolutionary. Zinn, a former grenadier, now compositor, who had recently liberated a comrade from prison, surprised Fontane by turning out to be a red-cheeked young 'spring chicken' and 'the spoilt child of the whole assembly', and also by frankly admitting that the motive for his deed had been the desire to match Schurz's liberation of Kinkel. The leading spirit of the discussion was Heise, a democratic journalist who had edited the Kassel *Hornisse* during the revolution, and—according to Fontane—'one of those naturally negative types whose joy if not destiny is destruction'. This contrasted sharply with the host himself, Schärttner, whom Fontane thought had now found his true fulfilment as an innkeeper and the very picture of pot-bellied German *gemütlichkeit*.<sup>75</sup> Schärttner had learnt his new trade as a waiter in the other pub where German refugees met regularly. This was run more professionally by Karl Göhringer, formerly innkeeper at the *Goldener Stern* in Baden-Baden, who even transferred the name of his former establishment to London. His 'Golden Star Tavern' at 11 Maddox Street, off Regent Street, became a centre not only for the refugees around Willich, but attracted middle-class Germans as well (in Johanna Kinkel's semi-fictional account of refugee life, respectable visitors from Germany could be taken there).<sup>76</sup> Both pubs, however, suffered from constant surveillance by continental police agents, and Engels claimed that not a word could be spoken in Schärttner's which was not reported back.<sup>77</sup>

Thus, besides the CABV's three sections and his 'barracks', Willich had a relatively broad base for his political activities. Many fugitives in the two German public houses may have not been full members of his League but nonetheless sympathised with its aims. In spring 1851, therefore, Willich's League was in a strong position vis-à-vis its rivals around Marx. This clearly made it more attractive as a coalition partner for the other radical and foreign groups in London, as we shall now see.

## Co-operation with Chartists and Blanquists

### *The Chartists*

In their relations with the Chartists, Willich and Schapper could fall back on a tradition of mutual support between the Communist League and Harney and Jones which dated back to 1845. Schapper and Harney had after all helped make the Fraternal Democrats the first international organisation of the working-class movements of any lasting impact. When repressive legislation forced a reorganisation in 1848, these connections did not break off, and Harney and Schapper remained especially close friends. With Marx as well as Willich and French refugees, Harney founded the short-lived *Société universelle des communistes révolutionnaires* in April 1850. As both Harney and Jones had been leading British members of the London group of the League, both factions now tried to attract them to their side. Jones had only recently been released from prison, his state of health was critical, and in resuming political activity he presumably gave his international connections low priority. Thus the task of representing Chartism among the various refugee groups fell almost exclusively to Harney.

Initially Harney sided with Marx and with him renounced the *Société universelle des communistes révolutionnaires* when Blanquists attempted to revive the group.<sup>78</sup> He



continued to publicise the views of Marx and his followers in his widely read Chartist papers, and the *Red Republican* published the first English translation of the *Communist Manifesto* in November 1850.<sup>79</sup> But for Harney the division of the League did not imply the need to sever relations with Schapper and his friends; indeed Harney's journals gave space even to announcements by non-socialist exile groups such as the European Central Democratic Committee. Harney published details of proceedings and the rare declarations of the CABV in his papers, but scarcely any news about the Willich-Schapper League appeared in the Chartist press.<sup>80</sup> This, however, was due not to any deliberate attempt by Chartist leaders to ignore them, but to the anti-theoretical bias of that faction and the lack of journalists among them. Other Chartist periodicals showed a similar impartiality to the warring exile groups.<sup>81</sup>

For the first months after the split, then, both factions of the Communist League were prepared to ignore Harney's conciliatory efforts. Eventually, however, Harney leaned increasingly to the side of his old friend Schapper. But only when Harney emphatically supported a major event in honour of the Polish general Józef Bem organised by Polish, French and German exiles, including democrats and Schapper, did Marx deem a breach to be necessary.<sup>82</sup> Engels agreed, while still hoping that Harney might be 'put on the right track', and summed up his experiences with exile politics in a much-quoted judgment:

One comes to realise more and more that emigration is an institution which inevitably turns a man into a fool, an ass and a base rascal unless he withdraws wholly therefrom, and unless he is content to be an independent writer who doesn't give a tinker's curse for the so-called revolutionary party. It is a real school of scandal and of meanness in which the hindmost donkey becomes the foremost saviour of his country.<sup>83</sup>

In effect, that meant conceding Harney's defection to Willich and Schapper, and Harney's correspondence with Engels ceased.<sup>84</sup> Matters finally came to a head two weeks later, on 24 February 1851, when French socialists organised one of the largest exile gatherings, a 'Banquet of the Equals' at Highbury Barn, to celebrate the anniversary of the outbreak of the 1848 revolution in France. The CABV as well as Polish, Hungarian and Italian exiles were invited, and Harney sold over a thousand tickets, thus turning the occasion into 'a London event'. Not to have to share the platform with rival German groups at such a prominent event was a great coup for Schapper's League. 'You can easily imagine how greatly Willich and Schapper have grown in their own esteem and how they fancy us beaten', Marx wrote.<sup>85</sup> Schapper delivered the main German speech of the evening, and Willich even presided over the banquet.<sup>86</sup>

Nonetheless Marx and Engels were able to turn this meeting—one of the largest gatherings of the international exile community in these years—to good account, for the occasion became notorious through two scandals associated with it. The explosive toast Blanqui had sent the banquet only detonated, as we will see, in the following month. During the banquet itself, proceedings were marred by a scuffle between members of the two hostile German Communist Leagues. Marx, who liked to be informed of all the doings of his rivals, had sent his minions Schramm and Pieper to attend. They arrived at

the celebration with the obvious intention of causing trouble. Pieper described what happened:

To begin with, we amused ourselves by ruining the evening for the spider Mrs Harney, to whom we made ourselves conspicuous...it did not take long until the valiant corps of Willich's positioned themselves around us for attack, and for half an hour we were exposed to the most cowardly, most infamous insults from the gentlemen Wengler, Prochasky, Covend and 10 others... We saw a catastrophe coming and prepared to turn it into an advantage for our party, if possible... The *Marseillaise* was about to begin; some voices called *Chapeau bas*, at the same time our attackers jumped up and tried to pull our hats off; not content with that they started to yell: *des espions*, a spy, 20 fists were raised before us...the chairman did nothing...to stop the cowardly assault of a hundred against two... Schapper, Barthélémy, Gebert, the whole Windmill around and over us.<sup>87</sup>

The scandal was perfect. Marx and his allies did everything to spread the story 'throughout the whole of Germany' to 'brand these cowardly, calumnious, infamous assassins before the German proletariat'.<sup>88</sup> To Willich and Schapper, of course, the story looked completely different. They laid the whole blame on Schramm's provocation, and accused his 'masters' of wanting to disturb the meeting, and succeeding by sheer impertinence, despite the peaceful character of the festive assembly.<sup>89</sup> Clearly worried that the incident would tip the scales of public opinion against them, Willich and Schapper gave this account a prominent place in their circular to their adherents abroad. But their image, and that of the Fraternal Democrats, was badly dented.

Marx and Engels also sought to exploit this incident in a London context. They briefly considered a lawsuit, but feared that the publicity would bring out some 'scenes' in the CABV, while public mudslinging might be used as an argument to introduce a new Aliens' Bill, which would threaten everybody's asylum.<sup>90</sup> The major consideration of Marx and Engels, however, was their relationship with Harney and Jones. Their particular fury focused on Harney personally, whom they suspected of supporting Schapper since the Bem meeting two weeks earlier. Instead of theoretical differences, Marx and Engels emphasised points of political allegiance and public presentation: Harney was to be attacked solely for supporting Schapper, 'our immediate personal, rascally foe'. This had occurred, Marx thought, behind his and Engels' backs and against their wishes (which he plainly thought Harney should have consulted), *after* Harney had joined them in repudiating Barthélémy and Willich some months earlier.<sup>91</sup> Harney responded that 'his party position forced him to use every opportunity for putting in an appearance. He had to remain neutral vis-à-vis all factions of the emigration'. Claiming to be privately friendly only with Marx and his associates, Harney nonetheless balked at Engels's apparent demand that he comply with the wishes of Marx and Engels in his contacts not only with Germans but with other foreigners as well.<sup>92</sup>

Harney thus stuck to his position between the factions and, as Marx suspected, relied with Schapper on the whole affair blowing over quickly.<sup>93</sup> Marx eventually compromised. In return for Schramm's promise not to sue, Harney published Schramm's

declaration about the assault and his denial of being a spy, adding a statement of his own expressing his 'unabated confidence' in Schramm's 'political integrity'.<sup>94</sup>

Harney moved away from London in early summer 1851, and Marx and Engels now came to regard Ernest Jones as their chief Chartist ally, although he also had not sided unambiguously with them over the banquet affair of 24 February.<sup>95</sup> Nonetheless his co-operation with the Marx group intensified after this event, and he began to replace Harney as their closest British ally. 'Ce n'est pas un Harney', Marx praised a few months later.<sup>96</sup> Yet this did not then provoke an estrangement between Harney and Jones, and only in the following year was a breach acknowledged.<sup>97</sup> Early in 1852 Jones suspected Harney of directing his new paper (which he was about to edit with the aid of Willich, Schapper and others) against 'us', that is, Jones, Engels and Marx.<sup>98</sup> In May, finally, Jones's *People's Paper* attacked Harney for trying to base Chartism on more than one class, on a 'general and national movement'.<sup>99</sup> Thus the same issue which by that time divided the German revolutionary émigrés clearly split the Chartists as well: Jones, as the advocate of an exclusively working class movement, sided with Marx, while Harney wanted to co-operate with democratic groups and found himself agreeing with Willich and Schapper.

This rupture was however not yet apparent in spring 1851, when both Harney and Jones worked hard to prepare the Chartist convention of late March and early April, and were naturally reluctant to endanger its success.<sup>100</sup> In April, however, Willich and Schapper became even more aware of Jones's hostility to their faction, as well as of Harney's sympathy. In the general excitement before the Great Exhibition of May 1851, the question was raised among the British public of the potential dangers of the expected influx of foreigners to London.<sup>101</sup> This focused attention on the refugees already settled in their midst, and rumour soon had it that the foreigners were plotting to use the occasion of the opening ceremony to stage a revolution, set Buckingham Palace on fire and assassinate Queen Victoria. Only one Chartist, Feargus O'Connor, shortly to go mad, took these rumours seriously, and assumed that this would be the prelude to an invasion.<sup>102</sup> The result was an angry outcry from the foreign community in London and their sympathisers. A letter of protest from the German Society of Tailors was read and approved at the Chartist Convention.<sup>103</sup> The CABV convened a general assembly and issued a rare formal protest, signed by representatives of all three sections, adding an expression of 'indignation' against O'Connor, whose letter was 'calculated to deprive the refugees of the brotherly sympathy of the British people'.<sup>104</sup> Schapper declared such suspicions to be 'a foul calumny', adding that 'any person proposing such a thing would be turned out of their society as a fool or a madman', and intimated that such rumours had been invented to injure the CABV.<sup>105</sup>

At the same time Schapper had to rebut an even more ridiculous and potentially harmful rumour. Marx reported this latest bit of gossip gleefully to Engels:

Schapper has framed a constitution for England since, after mature consideration and lengthy discussion in that same Windmill, they decided that England had no written constitution and must therefore be given one. And Schapper-Gebert will provide her with this constitution. It's already written.<sup>106</sup>

Schapper and the CABV were naturally furious about this charge, and assured the English workers that 'Nothing more idle and calumnious was ever invented. They wished England to be free, but English working men were the best judges of their own affairs'.<sup>107</sup> Willich in fact suspected an intrigue by Marx at the bottom of the whole affair:

*Marx* has also lent himself to denunciations to the English that we, the foreigners, wanted to make a revolution here in London, in which we wanted to make them slaves. Now Marx has succeeded...in convincing the Chartist leader Johns [sic!] that the German societies wanted to strike on April 25th and had an English constitution already prepared. Luckily we have been informed by another Chartist leader, Harney, and can take counter-steps, otherwise Schapper, I, etc., could easily get transported according to the English laws.<sup>108</sup>

The affair was of course highly delicate for the German refugees, endangering not only their legal status but also relations with their Chartist allies. The reception of Ledru-Rollin's *La Decadence d'Angleterre* had sufficiently shown the sensitivity of the English public to criticism of their political and social conditions by recently arrived foreigners. Moreover, it seems unlikely that the CABV or the League would have considered drawing up a constitution for Britain, even if they wished to take no account of British sensibilities. Willich was preoccupied with his military projects, and both at this point still adamantly rejected the political and constitutional orientation of their democratic fellow exiles.

Harney and the Fraternal Democrats immediately leapt to the defence of the calumniated German exiles. *The Friend of the People* smelled a 'conspiracy' to engage the English in the continental tyrants' crusade against the republican refugees. The Fraternal Democrats in a special meeting expressed their sympathies with 'the noble-hearted patriots' and condemned the 'fabrications' against the German socialists. The Chartists Ruffy, Pettie and others defended the rights of hospitality against calculated attempts to throw the apple of discord among the Chartists on the question of refugees.<sup>109</sup>

The Sonderbund was linked to the Chartists almost entirely through Schapper, as Willich had not joined the Fraternal Democrats and scarcely ever appeared at Chartist meetings.<sup>110</sup> Schapper's long-term political association with the Fraternal Democrats and his private closeness to Harney kept their League in touch with the British movement. On the other hand, Harney's lifelong interest in continental affairs and untiring support for refugees was not restricted to the League. But his efforts to remain on equally friendly terms with other exile groups failed, largely because of their demand for exclusive attention. Marx was especially adamant in this regard, but his demand for loyalty was matched by Willich and Schapper, who insisted on regarding Marx's League as their bitterest enemies and whose relationship to the Chartists depended on both Harney and Jones' current stock with Marx and Engels. The two large international meetings of February 1851, the recriminations after the fracas with Schramm and Pieper, and the rumours about their 'constitution' all show how fragile relations with the Chartists really were. Jones worked with Marx, Engels and Pieper until the end of the 1850s. Nonetheless the situation in spring 1851 marked a low point in Marx's influence on the international workers' movement, and this was reflected in his very limited contacts with the

remaining Chartists.<sup>111</sup> Harney stayed in touch with many of his continental friends from the different political groups until the end of his life, corresponding with Schramm and Eccarius, and, from the 1870s on, occasionally again with Marx and Engels. But true to his habitual neutrality towards the warring exile factions, he also remained friendly with Karl Blind, who became a nationalist republican in the late 1850s.<sup>112</sup> Nor did Harney sever his connections with former members of Willich's League: Reininger, one of the former Sonderbund leaders in Paris, was among the refugees who backed Harney against O'Brienites in late 1853.<sup>113</sup> Harney met Schapper at several political gatherings later, and their personal friendship survived the end of Chartism, the Fraternal Democrats, and the Communist League to find expression again when Schapper begged Harney to attend the funeral of his little daughter Thusnelda.<sup>114</sup>

Thus the relation to the Chartists of the two factions of the Communist League reflected two different types of socialist internationalism as well, both of which also differed fundamentally from the 'bourgeois' internationalism of the ECDC. Marx and Engels were much more adamant about an exclusively proletarian organisation and socialist principles on the English side as well. The Fraternal Democrats led by Harney, on the other hand, increasingly rejected ideological stringency as a basis for expressing international sympathies, and were willing to form alliances with the Willich-Schapper League as well as non-socialist refugees. Despite the strong influence of the French Blanquists on their internationalist ventures, and despite repeated professions to the contrary, both Harney's and Willich's groups after these events of February—April 1851 became gradually more prepared to sacrifice socialist principles for larger alliances. While this policy initially led to a much stronger influence among the London radicals and exiles, such diverse and fragile alliances could not be kept together in the long run, and Schapper's connections with the Chartists eventually proved to be an equally precarious basis for permanent co-operation along socialist and internationalist lines, as did Willich's links to Barthélémy and the Blanquists.

### *Collaboration with French exiles*

While Schapper was responsible for relations between his Communist League and the British working-class movement, it was Willich who established and polished their links to their French fellow exiles. In this sense, Willich's and Schapper's 'foreign relations' complemented each other. The CABV had of course for years maintained close relations with French refugees. In 1843–1844 it had discussed Cabet's projects together with the Société Démocratique Franchise, and French socialists were active in the Democratic Friends of all Nations and the Fraternal Democrats. After the defeat of the Parisian workers in June 1848, the first French revolutionaries returned to London, and more followed after June 1849 and again after Napoleon's coup d'état of December 1851.

Like the Germans, the French émigrés were divided into hostile groups. Ledru-Rollin and others joined the ECDC and from July 1850 on ran a journal, *Le Proscrit* (later *La Voix du Peuple*), advocating democratic republican principles.<sup>115</sup> A separate centre formed around Victor Hugo in Jersey. The 'independent' socialists grouped themselves loosely around Louis Blanc, Cabet, Pierre Leroux, Landolphe, Nadaud, Alfred Talandier and others, founding the Union socialiste in 1852.<sup>116</sup> In 1852 Felix Pyat, Talandier and others also founded the Commune révolutionnaire, which combined the Jacobin

revolutionary tradition with socialist ideas. It played an important part in London exile affairs during the 1850s, most notably in the Jersey expulsion affair of 1855, and in 1856 joined the International Association. The Blanquists around Barthélémy, Lacambre, Rougée, Adam, Vidil and others dominated the Société des proscrits démocrates socialistes français a Londres from the summer of 1850 on. The Blanquists, constantly obsessed with plotting, had socialist sympathies, though these were secondary to their insistence on revolution at any price.<sup>117</sup> Many French exiles united in early September 1850 to establish the Société fraternelle des démocrates-socialistes a Londres at 8 Church Street, which had primarily philanthropic functions and was meant to exclude all politics. (In 1854 Jeanne Deroin organised a labour market for French exiles there.<sup>118</sup>) By November 1850, 126 French exiles had joined, including Ledru-Rollin, Louis Blanc, Landolphe and Pardigon.<sup>119</sup> But like the other political exiles, the French were obsessed by political and personal quarrels, and even the 'unpolitical' Société fraternelle soon ruptured, with Blanc and his followers leaving in early 1851.

Of greatest interest to us here are the Blanquists around Emmanuel Barthélémy, whose interests and character resembled Willich's in some respects, and with whom the Willich-Schapper faction had the closest relations. Barthélémy was a mechanic from Séaux who had belonged to several secret societies and had been sentenced to forced labour for attempting to murder a police agent. (In London his political enemies did not shrink from calling him a '*meurtrier*' (murderer) and '*galérien*' (galley slave)). He took a prominent part in the June insurrection in Paris, commanding barricades in the Faubourg du Temple. He was again arrested and condemned, but fled prison with Lacambre. With Blanqui, Eugène Sue, Ménard, Lacambre and Pardigon he edited a journal '*de la Démocratie socialiste*' entitled *Les Veillées du Peuple* in late 1849 and early 1850, and by December 1849 had begun attending Fraternal Democrat functions in London.<sup>120</sup> Barthélémy was among the most violent opponents of Ledru-Rollin, one of whose followers, Frédéric Cournet, he killed in a duel in 1852. He got away with a very light sentence but was avoided by the French emigrants afterwards.<sup>121</sup> Barthélémy finally met with a bad end and was hanged in 1855 for the mysterious and apparently senseless murder of two Englishmen. His motives were never discovered, but the refugee community accepted that his reasons must have been political, and, regarding his execution as murder, blamed Palmerston who '*knew whom* he killed and [who] wanted to kill him'.<sup>122</sup> Barthélémy duly was the only refugee who made his way into Madame Tussaud's Chamber of Horrors!<sup>123</sup>

In 1850, at any rate, Barthélémy was at the height of his career as an exile leader. With Willich and two other Blanquist refugees, Adam and Vidil, he joined Marx, Engels and Harney in the Société universelle in April. When the Communist League broke apart, the latter three withdrew, but the organisation continued on a Franco-German basis. Now calling themselves the International Social Democratic Committee, Willich and Barthélémy constituted the core of this venture, which drew in Polish and Hungarian refugees, published several manifestoes and organised international meetings until the spring of 1851.<sup>124</sup>

The committee's first manifesto, '*Aux démocrates de toutes les nations*', issued on 16 November 1850, was signed by the Blanquists as well as most of Willich and Schapper's Central Authority.<sup>125</sup> As we saw above, it dwelt at some length on the military strength of the 'aristocrats' ready to strike against 'republicans'. The tone was very much in the flowery style of the French democrats, and was presumably inspired by Barthélémy,

while the listing of troops points to Willich as co-author. The manifesto, however, fell short of the avowed socialism of the Willich-Schapper League, demanding no more than a 'République Universelle Démocratique et Sociale', ignoring Blanquist demands for egalitarian communism as well as the Sonderbund's call for a proletarian revolution.

A few weeks later the International Social Democratic Committee produced a second manifesto, perhaps because the socialists and Blanquists protested against the sacrifice of their principles. It elaborated on the social tasks of a republic, the 'true reign of order and social economy'. Referring back to Saint-Just, it stated that 'labour must be organised', 'the work of production must be regulated according to the needs of consumption', and 'the nation has to guarantee to all members of the society the satisfaction of their physical, intellectual and moral needs'.<sup>126</sup> These were all the economic points mentioned—a far cry from the dictatorship of the proletariat and permanent revolution demanded by the Société Universelle<sup>127</sup>—but the manifesto is also remarkable for the attention given to political aspects of a republic. Unlike other pronouncements of the Willich-Schapper group, it considered the balance between the rulers and the ruled, and demanded that the interests of each member of society should not be separated from the interests of all, and that no public institution (in particular public officials and the army) should become a separate caste with separate interests and ambitions.

Willich and Schapper regarded the establishment of this International Committee, which also convened the London commemoration of Bem and the celebration of the French February revolution, as a great credit to their group.<sup>128</sup> Thus their strongest link with Blanquists was not in Paris, but in London. French and German socialists also met for purely social purposes, and every Saturday night Schärtner's pub saw a Franco-German meeting.<sup>129</sup> When one of Willich's London supporters was suspected of cultivating German nationalist feelings against the French communists, he was quickly silenced by the majority.<sup>130</sup> Of all the centres of their League, the internationalism of the Willich-Schapper group thus was most pronounced in their London headquarters. The London group pointedly rejected the celebration of German national events, since the workers 'have long since gone beyond the question of nationalities'.<sup>131</sup>

Barthélémy accompanied Willich's emissary Majer to Paris in December 1850 and introduced him to some political leaders there.<sup>132</sup> Barthélémy had planned to liberate the imprisoned Blanqui, in fact, and later blamed 'the miserable Adam and the imbecile Vidil' for bungling the project. Barthélémy's faith in Blanqui's powers was great: with Blanqui at the head of the London International Social Democratic Committee, Napoleon could not have succeeded with his coup d'état as easily, Barthélémy later confided in Willich. 'I don't doubt that had Blanqui been able to join the organisation we have formed in London...the events of 2 December would have found a republican organisation ready to resist.'<sup>133</sup>

Even without Blanqui, the formation of a strong republican exile organisation was attempted. Despite severe differences among the various French groups, the Blanquists, Louis Blanc and Landolphe joined Willich and Schapper to celebrate the European revolution of February 1848.<sup>134</sup> They issued an invitation to the 'Banquet of the Equals' and simultaneously laid down their 'political and social creed'.<sup>135</sup> The common programme strongly reflected the ideas of both Barthélémy and Willich. Taking 'liberté, égalité, fraternité' as its starting point, the programme focused on defining 'equality' in a socialist sense, and took the 'eventual victory of equality' to mean 'abolition of the

proletariat', and the creation of a 'workers' state'. (Interestingly, the English version toned down these clear socialist goals, completely omitting the preface about the '*Aufhebung* [abolition] of the proletariat', and translating 'workers' state' as 'social order'). The chief principle demanded '*from* each, according to his powers—to each, according to his wants'. This required 'association', that is, 'the communisation of all the means for production, and of all their produce for consumption'. While Blanc's influence can be discerned in the call for 'association', the German tradition found its expression in the Hegelian language of *Aufhebung*—transmitted either through Marx's lingering influence in the Communist League or through Willich's 'True Socialist' background. Unlike other pronouncements of the League, this programme of the 'Equals' also stressed individual democratic liberties. These included the demand that institutions be controlled by public opinion—the exact opposite of Willich's desire to ensure dictatorial power by prohibiting all but one government newspaper—and that the power of the state be restricted by universal suffrage, which would render 'the State, the servant of the people'. Willich perhaps understood this as a final socialist aim, but it too was definitely opposed to his own views about the stages necessary for achieving a socialist society.

Nonetheless the Willich-Schapper group impressed its own character on the pamphlet by adding one of their pet complaints, the need to abolish 'the aristocracy...of intellect', and 'all external privileges and prerogatives arrogated by superior mental capacity...since the tyranny of intellect is fully as unjust as the tyranny of force, and far more criminal in its nature'.<sup>136</sup> The CABV's old biases were also reflected in the manifesto's description of its internationalist ideal. Its political and social creed was introduced with the statement that 'all men are brethren, all peoples united in solidarity' (which the English version rather feebly rendered as 'all the peoples [are] one'). This of course repeated the old slogan adopted by the German Workers' Society before 1847, and which under Marx's influence had been replaced by a more specifically class-based type of internationalism. After the split, both factions of the League used the motto, 'Proletarians of all countries, unite!', but nonetheless Willich and Schapper were prepared to return to the older slogan in search of a platform and language shared by other *émigré* factions.

Although such a contradictory manifesto probably could not have served long as a platform for any sort of international co-operation, the concept initially proved fairly successful. Despite a rival meeting under Ledru-Rollin the same evening, the 'Banquet of the Equals' attracted almost a thousand guests. But while, as we have seen, the festivity became notorious for the violent expulsion of two of Marx's followers, the French Blanquists in London in fact caused an even greater embarrassment at this banquet. In preparation, the convenors had asked for the usual toasts to be sent in, which duly arrived from Paris, La Chaux-de-Fonds and Jersey, as well as from the Fraternal Democrats.<sup>137</sup> Willich's own address pressed home his point about the paramount necessity of organising 'the great revolutionary army of the proletarians', and eulogised revolutionary force as the only means by which the people could achieve their rights. Schapper echoed such views more overtly than usual.<sup>138</sup>

More important than the toasts pronounced at the banquet, however, was one that was not. The organisers did not read a letter Auguste Blanqui had sent from his prison in Belle-He to London which analysed the mistakes made in the French revolution of 1848 and deduced from these necessary measures to be taken by the next revolutionary government. Foremost was the need to disarm the bourgeois guards immediately, and to



organise the workers militarily. Social theories might one day assist social improvement, but at the initial stage of a revolution, preoccupation with theories would only induce the people 'to neglect the only practical element of security: force'. Blanqui concluded with an eloquent praise of revolutionary power remarkably similar to Willich's exhortations. However, it was not these sentiments which aroused ill feeling, but Blanqui's denunciation of Ledru-Rollin and Louis Blanc as traitors and as 'bourgeois disguised as champions of the people'.<sup>139</sup> It was because of these charges that Barthélemy decided not to publicise Blanqui's letter, assuming that the success of the evening rested partly on the presence of Blanc. But when another copy of the prisoner's letter was published in Paris, not only did Blanqui's denunciation of Blanc become apparent, but also Barthélemy's suppression of it. Both conservative journals and Marx rejoiced at this apparent attempt by an avowed and leading Blanquist to censor Blanqui's words. Marx and Engels even translated Blanqui's letter into German and had the enormous amount of 30,000 copies distributed. Their introduction made it sufficiently clear whom they sought to harm by the translation, for 'Some wretched deceivers of the people, the so-called Central Authority of European Social Democrats, in truth a committee of the European central mob, presided over by Messrs. Willich, Schapper, etc.' were pilloried alongside Blanc and Ledru-Rollin.<sup>140</sup> Confused, stung, and embarrassed, the convenors only made matters worse by issuing hurried and contradictory explanations, until finally the Parisian daily, *La Patrie*, which received all of their statements, protested exasperatedly that it would not print any further declarations.<sup>141</sup>

The scandal was considerable, and did not remain restricted to the French press, not least thanks to Marx and Engels' efforts. Stechan's *Deutsche Arbeiterhalk* printed a second German translation of the toast and preceded it with a eulogy on Blanqui and a warning to the workers' party against their democratic 'semi-friends'. Disgusted with the politicking with Blanqui's fame, the League's group in Geneva dissolved, while the one in La Chaux-de-Fonds seceded.<sup>142</sup> 'The agitation in the press because of Blanqui's toast for 24 February is enormous', a Parisian correspondent of the *New Yorker Staats-Zeitung* reported, adding that 'Louis Blanc and his so-called European Central Authority in London disavowed the document and made terrible fools of themselves'.<sup>143</sup> Even German democratic journals normally ill-informed about the socialist exiles now realised the sharp disagreements between Blanc and Blanqui, and by association also the divisions among German communists in London. One correspondent, Ludwig Simon, pointed out that Marx and Engels, who had recently praised Blanqui as 'the man of the proletarian future', had been absent from the banquet, while Willich and Schapper allied themselves—a logical but false conclusion—with Blanqui's enemy Blanc. His tentative explanation that the German participants of the banquet might have broken with the party of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was among the first public mentions of the split in the Communist League.<sup>144</sup>

But Simon also thought that Willich and Schapper were increasingly drifting away from communism towards the democratic republicanism of Kinkel and Ruge. Willich and Schapper, however, vehemently rejected this suggestion, and regarded their alliance with Blanqui, whose integrity and revolutionary credentials were undisputed, and with the French Blanquists in London, as irrefutable proof that they sided with the most uncompromising revolutionary workers' party of France. To have this association shattered by Blanqui's 'toast' was a severe blow to their image as the 'true' proletarian

organisation of the German émigrés. Both Barthélémy and Willich attempted to minimise the damage. Blanqui, in fact, came to the support of Barthélémy, albeit not publicly. In a private letter, written shortly after the affair, Blanqui declared that he had only intended to inform Barthélémy of his opinion about Blanc, and that the letter had not been intended for publication.<sup>145</sup>

This explanation was repeated by Willich and Schapper in their address to the League for the first quarter of 1851. The Central Authority thought it necessary to declare their public support for Blanc, particularly since the banquet commission had decided not to criticise individuals of 'our party', to which in their eyes Louis Blanc thus still belonged. Even 'if during 1848 he may not have shown the proper energy', that did not make him a 'traitor of the people', and the publication of Blanqui's toast had been a tactical mistake. But 'it is scarcely necessary to remark that we have in no way declared ourselves for Blanc and against Blanqui by this act', Willich and Schapper hastened to add, since 'the other views which Blanqui offers in his "Avis au peuple" are completely ours, only we believe that our party should carry them out, but not speak about them before-hand in public papers'.<sup>146</sup>

Willich and Schapper thus explicitly admitted that losing their association with Blanquism would weaken their reputation as the true proletarian and revolutionary faction of the Communist League, by contrast with pure theoreticians like Marx and Engels, whose contempt for the proletariat actually hindered the revolution. Accordingly they accused Marx and Engels of using this new pretext of the toast for new intrigues, and of seeking 'to portray us as followers of L.Blanc, as moderate communists who are inclined towards the petty bourgeoisie, but themselves as followers of Blanqui, as revolutionary communists, as the true representatives of the proletariat', a view which was 'simply infamous'. Thus the great moral authority Blanqui possessed among French as well as German communists turned the question of adherence to his doctrines into the touchstone of genuine proletarian revolutionary principles.

## 6

### The Sonderbund, II

#### Decline and dissolution of the Communist League, 1851–1853

##### **From military to political co-operation: the ‘military clique’ and Kinkel**

Marxist historians have tended to interpret the subsequent endeavours of the Willich—Schapper League as a haphazard and ill-considered groping at any chance whatsoever at revolution through ‘all kinds of quixotic acts of the bourgeois-democratic emigration’.<sup>1</sup> Yet it is admittedly perplexing that a group regarding itself as the true proletarian core of the communist party could so quickly—and apparently unquestioningly, after long fulminating at any such strategy—join forces with their erstwhile enemies around Kinkel. But this the Willich-Schapper group did in 1851.

This process appears to have begun with Willich and Schimmelpfennig, who in early 1851 wrote an address to the Prussian officer corps, still in the hope of inciting them to rise, but also indicative of a new shift in strategy. In language meant particularly to appeal to their code of honour, the officers were upbraided for Prussia’s humiliation and their own shameful passivity, and offered a stark choice between ‘Either—or! Republican—or slave! Friend—or foe!... With or without you, the people will win!’<sup>2</sup> This call clearly abandoned the appeal to ‘the people’ and the demand to redress social injustices which had still permeated Willich’s earlier overtures to the Cologne militia. Designs for the future society were left entirely vague, and the audience was exclusively the military ‘estate’. (A year later, Willich, Schimmelpfennig and probably Gehrke distributed 5,000 copies of a further appeal ‘To the German soldiers’, which called for ‘a German republican people’s army’ and accused the aristocracy of driving a wedge between the army and the people and turning soldiers into ‘servants and hangmen’. It played especially upon the soldiers’ sense of bravery and honour, emphasising that these could be preserved only where they were respected as equals, and not thrashed into submission like a base mob.)<sup>3</sup>

Willich here thus wrote not as a communist but purely as former officer turned guerrilla leader. Such concerns brought him closer to the democrat Schimmelpfennig, who shared his military background and leanings. Soon afterwards, Schimmelpfennig undertook several trips to the Continent in search of allies both for Willich and for Kinkel, allegedly even acquiring 20,000 thalers’ worth of guns for the reconquest of the Palatinate.<sup>4</sup> In July he was lecturing in London ‘on military science to teach those refugees who are to become officers in the revolution. This is after all what our party is most lacking.’<sup>5</sup> Schimmelpfennig remained convinced that ‘in military science alone can the republic...find the power to overcome the efficient armies of modern monarchies’.<sup>6</sup>

With Willich he now constituted the core of a 'military clique' (which also included Techow and Franz Sigel), linked by democratic revolutionary convictions as well as aristocratic background and military manners, which formed a very distinct subgroup in exile.<sup>7</sup> Here Willich no more than represented 'the communist element', and nothing indicates that he ever attempted to spread his socialist propaganda in the group, although in May 1851 Willich succeeded in attracting Franz Sigel and Amand Goegg (soon to be leader of the rival loan project) to the CABV; Engels thought 'this pack of soldiery' saw the CABV as 'a battalion, ready, willing and eager to march'.<sup>8</sup>

It was chiefly this social and cultural affinity with the 'military clique' which drew Willich tentatively towards alliances with other democrats, above all Kinkel. By February 1851 hints about a rapprochement between Willich and Kinkel surfaced in the German press, Marx being blamed for keeping Kinkel and Willich apart.<sup>9</sup> Kinkel had, as we have seen, arrived in London some months after the split in the Communist League, but was not immediately received with open arms by Willich, under whose command he had served in the revolution.<sup>10</sup> But Willich by February demanded that Kinkel throw his 'capital of popularity...which I regard as *property of the people*, especially of its suffering part', into the pool to support recently arrived soldiers from Schleswig-Holstein.<sup>11</sup> And at about the same time Willich signed the first hurried attempt by a 'financial commission of the German revolutionary committee' to sell 'provisional certificates' to raise 5,000,000 thalers for the National Loan.<sup>12</sup> This was connected to the tentative National Committee of all democratic refugees, from which however Willich withdrew again in March. But Schurz in particular, sensing a useful ally, prompted Kinkel to continue wooing Willich. Schurz met with Willich and recognised his conflict with Marx as stronger than ever, so that Willich easily agreed to a joint financial committee and even suggested Haug and Goegg as further participants; Schurz in fact felt by April that Willich 'turns out splendidly; I do not understand how he could be called stubborn and intractable... K[inke]l's understanding with W[illich] is now complete'.<sup>13</sup>

At this point, however, the agreement remained on a purely financial basis and did not include ideological rapprochement. 'Police agent 100' had instructions in May 1851 to ascertain Kinkel's opinion, and heard that he regarded Willich 'as strictly communist', while Kinkel thought 'strict communism neither reasonable nor possible'.<sup>14</sup> Willich for his part noted regretfully that the workers in the CABV, led by Fränkel, exhibited 'an almost insurmountable antipathy against any alliance with Kinkel, Ruge, etc.', so that the Central Authority's address to the League of May 1851 strongly rejected any collaboration 'with any other party which does not have as its first and foremost principle the complete liberation of the proletariat'. Willich still thought it worthwhile joining a commission with 'no specific principles but only financial purposes': 'I want to do everything I can to support the financial enterprise.' Willich did admit that 'the futility of the official representatives of democracy becomes steadily clearer'.<sup>15</sup> But his willingness to co-operate with non-socialist revolutionaries was clearly based on a differentiation between 'national' and 'principled' approaches. The demand for practical 'action' permitted joining forces with, for example, Mazzini, and 'the principle [was] irrelevant for the time being, if only mutual help could assure the victory of the revolution'. There was, however, nothing in common between mere republican principles and the views of Willich, who was 'fighting mainly with the proletarians and *only* for them'.<sup>16</sup> In the CABV (over whose Whitechapel section he presided), indeed, Willich was much more

critical of Kinkel, accusing him of envisioning ‘intellectuals’ instead of workers as future rulers—tailormade for his audience—and ending, ‘Down with the bourgeoisie. The time has come, it is only up to the workers.’<sup>17</sup> Trying to avoid any association with Kinkel’s politics while at the same time cashing in on his fame, Willich became a guarantor of the Revolutionary Loan which Kinkel launched in May.<sup>18</sup> His unique position within the Communist League is, however, highlighted by the fact that Schärtner was the only other prominent League member willing to act as guarantor. Given his intermediary efforts, it was fitting that Schimmelpfennig published the decisive proclamation to launch the loan under the aegis of Kinkel, Willich and Reichenbach, and for the rest of his time in London Willich remained closely linked to Kinkel’s project.<sup>19</sup>

### The Communist League’s congress of July, 1851

In the first half of 1851 Willich was thus largely occupied with reconstructing his connections to the democratic republicans around Schimmelpfennig and Kinkel. By contrast, he neglected the Communist League, apart from regularly regaling the CABV, some of whom still hoped for a reconciliation with Marx.<sup>20</sup> In July 1851 the Willich-Schapper League convened a congress in London (originally planned for October 1850) which highlighted some of the differences between Willich’s ideas on coalition and those of other League members. Democratically, the Central Authority had asked the continental groups to send suggestions for the congress. When these were apparently slow in forthcoming, the Londoners themselves proposed 12 measures to start off discussion in the local groups.<sup>21</sup> Preparations were poor, however, and three of the most energetic continental circles comprising 120 men (in Valenciennes, Braunschweig and probably Strasburg) were notified too late to send delegates, something which Scherzer and others in Paris blamed on the negligence of the London Central Authority.<sup>22</sup> Petersen from Brussels and Reininger from Paris did, however, manage to attend.<sup>23</sup> Also Ludwig Bisky, a leader of the Berlin workers’ movement and *Arbeiterverbrüderung* who had just previously emigrated to Ohio, returned briefly to Europe, attended the congress and apparently travelled to Berlin in this context.<sup>24</sup> Little is known about the proceedings of the congress, although two publications were issued, and the structure of the League was altered to abolish intermediary bodies between the Central Authority and the individual local groups. There were also tensions between the London Central Authority and the Paris group, partly because the delegate from Paris, Reininger, was a Cabetist, and partly because of disputes about control.<sup>25</sup> The Parisians suspected that ‘London is a little jealous of Paris and its influence, and that this is the reason why the congress had dissolved the higher committees; as soon as one committee has enough members, it is supposed to turn straight to the central committee’. Correspondence via London was expensive and cumbersome, and they suggested that the Strasburg group circumvent the new rules and stay in direct contact with Paris anyway.<sup>26</sup>

Besides this restructuring, the congress produced two documents. One circular, distributed by the Central Authority, became known as ‘Measures to be Taken Before, During and After the Revolution’, when it was discovered in the ‘Franco-German plot’ of September 1851.<sup>27</sup> Assuming that the bourgeoisie would soon be forced into revolting

against existing governments to establish 'so-called political liberty', the League presumed that the bourgeoisie would fail to comprehend that

in the rule of private capital over the relations of production, i.e. in the basis of its own existence, also lies its own destruction. It does not understand that the nature of capital to concentrate more and more cannot come to a halt until the whole of capital has become concentrated, and that only then the fourth estate, the proletariat, will cease to be revolutionary, because concentrated capital can only be social capital, [which is] the only way to solve the economic question underlying all free human development.<sup>28</sup>

The circular then continued by defining coming tasks, as

on the one hand to help prepare and expedite the revolution, and on the other hand during the revolution itself to bring power into the hands of the fourth estate, in order to accelerate thus the historical development of the economic conditions and in principle to bring it to a conclusion. Both can only be done through a widespread and concentrated organisation of the League as the soul of the organisation of the proletariat, and through synchronised efforts of all members.

This particular point reflects more Schapper's views in its insistence on creating 'social capital' as the basis for 'free human development', and its trust in the process of concentration of capital as the underlying force for social and political upheaval was obviously gleaned from Marx. Other compromises between the different segments within the Sonderbund were also discernible. 'Measures before the revolution' picked up on the *Vormärz* tradition of secret leagues with inner clandestine circles directing public societies.<sup>29</sup> This was combined with a distinctly gleeful anticipation of revolutionary terror. For instance, a special 'League police' (or, during the revolution, the League's 'commissars') were to punish traitors and to produce lists of 'enemies of the people who have to be handed over to the people's justice' and prevent their emigration—the authors oblivious to the irony of writing as emigrants themselves.<sup>30</sup>

Yet the anticipated dictatorship was to combine centralised and effective political power—in effect Willich's military order extended to civil administration—with democratic control, partly to ensure that control over the army by the working classes was not lost. The militia and the workers' organisation, which was to be armed and organised militarily, were to complement one another. An earlier draft from Paris demanded 'responsibility of the dictatorship, surrounded by a workers' commission', while the final version proposed elections to local committees forming the basis of the political and administrative structure, headed by a government 'by those who brought about the revolution'. Since only 'the armed fourth estate' would vote and form a central committee with dictatorial powers—in which they optimistically assumed their own influence would predominate—the League apparently did not contemplate the possibility of any considerable conflict between itself and the 'fourth estate'. (It did, however, indicate that workers employed by the state would 'be left to elect their foremen

themselves, where the workers are revolutionary; where they are not, these will be appointed by the commissars’).<sup>31</sup> The League remained remarkably vague on the kind of society and state the revolution was eventually to achieve, saying merely that political power was to rest (besides the army and executive)

on institutions which make the fourth estate materially independent from the bourgeoisie by setting it in direct relation to the state, so that the organisation of labour forms the basis for elective political bodies<sup>32</sup> and for the armed force and enables the state to overcome private capital through its competition as social capitalist.

Above all, the state would guarantee employment and sufficient wages ‘until wage relations come to an end in the organised workers’ state’. After the revolution some of the apparatus of dictatorship would be dismantled. The people’s army would gradually ‘merge into the organisation of labour’, which would then ‘form the only armed force of the state’. The commissars would relinquish their powers to a central committee formed of deputies from labour organisations and regions of the country, and elected by universal suffrage. Tribunals would be replaced by juries. The ‘fundamental condition of the social state after the revolution’ was to be ‘on the one hand, centralisation of all economic means of production and of political power. On the other hand, free self-administration, from which this centralisation has to emanate.’<sup>33</sup> This ideal of ‘free self-administration’ appeared, however, as an afterthought, and was not integrated into the overall plan with its extremely regimented vision of a centralised state.

Both the conception of the overall aims of the revolution and the League’s role in it were formulated for internal use only. For wider propaganda purposes a flysheet summarised the more immediate ‘Demands of the People at the Outbreak of a Revolution’.<sup>34</sup> These proposed that the ‘armed people’ elect ‘revolutionary committees’ which would become the main sovereign power. Delegates from these committees in the Central Authority would have ‘dictatorial powers’, and would send commissars into tribunals which would replace existing legal institutions. Renouncing all tax claims, the state was to guarantee the subsistence of all revolutionaries and their families by giving work ‘for a good wage, to be decided by workers’ committees’, and would also finance education and other public organisations. This programme would be paid for by confiscations from princes and banks, ‘mandatory loans from all capitalists’, and newly created paper money. Besides palaces and all means of communication, ‘all factories and workshops which do not have full employment and which [the State] needs for the employment of the workers’ would be confiscated. Finally, state debts would be cancelled without compensation.

Two points should be noted here. No mention was made of Kinkel or other democratic emigrants, and the subject of an alliance with them was not raised. Also, compared with other proclamations from Willich’s camp, much more weight was given to economic and social developments, with international politics and armed struggle a distinct second. The League here aimed above all to give its members practical concrete goals in possible new upheavals, for which they could work immediately in an organised fashion. Much more than most émigré programmes, this was a battle plan for seizing power, and was more concerned with devising ways of achieving goals than with detailing the goals

themselves. It was this concentration on methods rather than on the type of future society, indeed, which allowed the League members to accept Willich's alliance with Kinkel.

The congress could only briefly cover up the cracks appearing in the League. The other members of the Central Authority and the CABV only reluctantly accepted Willich's course, and on several occasions Willich was heavily criticised by his London followers. Money worries and spies also caused much dissent, any sign of which Marx fuelled from behind the scenes. With the demise of his barracks around July 1851, Willich lost an important personal power base among the socialist workers. The League's congress also dissolved the CABV's third section because it was 'not communist'.<sup>35</sup> Moreover, as a reaction to the uproar about Blanqui's toast, the group in Geneva dissolved. At the congress, too, Willich must have noticed the Parisians' dissatisfaction with the listless Londoners. Disintegration continued even after the Central Authority's attempt to tighten control over its continental associates and to link the individual groups directly, without intermediaries, to London. The large group in La Chaux-de-Fonds declared itself 'independent' of both Central Authorities.<sup>36</sup> The worst blow on the Continent for the Sonderbund came with the 'Franco-German plot' of September 1851, when on the instigation of the Prussian police officer Stieber, Scherzer and most of the prominent League members in Paris were arrested and sentenced to long prison terms.<sup>37</sup>

### **Rival organisations: the New Workers' Society in London and the Democratic Society**

In London, in the meantime, the League faced obstacles from both external and internal sources. Amid much personal recrimination, Willich, Dietz and Schapper were attacked for unfairly distributing relief money sent from Württemberg. Willich himself was repeatedly accused in the CABV of mismanaging the barracks' funds, for example by allowing a manager to abscond with £20 invested in its brush-making business. Orchestrated by Marx, these accusations were brought by some of his followers who had remained in the CABV, including Liebknecht, the tailor E. Rumpf, and the shoemaker Johann Ulmer.<sup>38</sup> Their opposition in the CABV gained strength with new arrivals from Germany, such as Marx's friends, the joiner Georg Lochner and Eccarius' brother Friedrich, who had been expelled from Hamburg in November 1851.

The internal conflicts in the CABV came to a head when, in November 1851, Stechan broke with the Sonderbund only two months after arriving from Hannover. Angry that some of his letters had fallen into the hands of the Prussian police, unwilling to guarantee the loan project as Willich had suggested, and outraged at the 'terrorism' against dissenters in the CABV, Stechan, together with other new arrivals from Germany such as Hirsch and Gumpel, was egged on by Marx and his friends Lochner and Pieper. 'At all events I shall use these Straubingers to precipitate fresh crises in the wretched hostel for tailors and idlers', wrote Marx.<sup>39</sup>

Finally, the disaffected members broke with the CABV and formed a New Workers' Society in London (Neuer Londoner-Arbeiter-Verein) in January 1852, with Pieper even claiming direct credit for having cajoled Stechan into founding the new club using statutes previously devised by Marx.<sup>40</sup> This society, run by 'Marxists' such as Pfänder, Pieper, Stechan, Lochner, Liebknecht and the brothers Eccarius, was clearly directed



against the CABV. Its organisers particularly emphasised ‘scientific education’ and carried on debates very much in the formal manner established in the pre-revolutionary CABV.<sup>41</sup> But while Eccarius and others defended a rather deterministic view of the economic preconditions for social and political revolution,<sup>42</sup> many debaters among the 150 workers who passed through the club in its seven-month existence were less dogmatic. Some argued for associating with democratic exiles and for allying with other parties to achieve the provisional aim of a republic, believing that political change had to precede social improvements.<sup>43</sup> Stechan in particular was frequently at odds with Marx’s adherents, wanting to support reform movements, hoping for a war to stimulate revolutionary feelings and showing his unfamiliarity with the prevalent Marxist concept of a ‘revolutionary bourgeoisie’.<sup>44</sup> Given such disagreements, it is not surprising that this attempt to supersede Willich’s CABV did not flourish, and when many workers left London in summer 1852, the new society could continue only as a small ‘closed circle’.<sup>45</sup> Some joined the Democratic Society, while Stechan and others returned to the CABV, only to watch it shrink as well.

The Democratic Society also rivalled the CABV for German workers’ sympathies. Despite its name, this society in its pattern and ideology bridged the gulf between the communists and the democrats around Heinzen. Many of its members had left the CABV as a result of various disagreements, and they were close enough to the New Workers’ Society to consider an affiliation. By 1852 some 35 members met in Berwick Street, stressing their educational purposes with discussions, newspapers and a library. They also owned a guitar and made excursions to Epping Forest.<sup>46</sup> Of the 85 members named between January and September 1852, three-quarters gave their occupations: 15 (or almost 25 per cent) were tailors, and five each were shoemakers, carpenters and teachers. With the exception of the clerk Hirsch, the rest were artisans and working-class (plumber, mechanic, locksmith, baker, cigar workers, furrier). Most came from northern Germany.<sup>47</sup>

Their discussions from March to September 1852 have survived. Besides some practical proposals, such as a labour referral institute and travel funds,<sup>48</sup> theoretical issues ranged from the origins of property to the alleviation of poverty through charity.<sup>49</sup> Plainly, the Democratic Society had picked up some of Heinzen’s ideas. In 1852, for instance, many members avowed atheism, and advocated a single dictator for the coming revolution to promote unity and brutal discipline.<sup>50</sup> Yet what the overall aims of the revolution were to be remained controversial. While Schröder, a fairly vociferous member, for instance, defined the ultimate goal as ‘the happiness of the people in the form of absolute rule by the people’, others disagreed:

*Launspach.* As an ideal he could imagine only the most complete community, in which all individuality, every separate person had merged into equality, in which there was only one common will left. *Beyer.* The previous speaker only needed to add: one common perfection. He thanked [them] very much for such an ideal [but] found the present state still quite bearable by comparison. He could not think of anything more nonsensical than the cessation of the passions.<sup>51</sup>

Their hopes for the future, however, were more class-based than mere ‘rule by the people’, as the members of the Democratic Society defined themselves as workers,

opposed to the bourgeoisie and to 'aristocracy of money' which ruled wherever industry had taken over.<sup>52</sup> They assumed that poverty in Germany would soon reduce the bourgeoisie to the level of the proletariat,<sup>53</sup> but did not necessarily expect the next revolution to lead to communism.<sup>54</sup> Disappointed with the lack of education among the people, which they blamed in part for the failure of 1848, several members defended secret societies for their revolutionary decisiveness.<sup>55</sup> This opened the question of how to work for a future revolution, and further discussions brought up once again the vexed issue of creating a general federation of all groups within the German revolutionary party. Gumpel (who had joined from the New Workers' Society) explained that this was a question of defining the revolutionary party, that the bourgeoisie too was revolutionary in its own sense, and that the petit bourgeoisie as well acted in a revolutionary manner by asking for a new order in its own interests. Any federation therefore was impossible, since 'the workers had no common purpose with the classes just mentioned, unless one wanted to be so absurd as to regard the republic as an aim. The workers had only one purpose, to get political power into their hands.'<sup>56</sup>

### **The League's discussions of communism**

These rival organisations were symptoms rather than causes for the decline of Willich and Schapper's workers' society, which was above all determined in France. For Bonaparte's coup d'état on 2 December 1851 was to prove a turning point in the League's history. For some days hopes ran high, and the refugees prepared to leave for the Continent at the first signs of revolutionary outrage at this blatant breach of the republican constitution. At Schärttner's pub, Schapper 'declared himself in permanence with his beer-mug'.<sup>57</sup> Baroness Bruiningk donated 1,000 thalers to ship volunteers to France.<sup>58</sup> But disappointment soon set in when the Paris *faubourgs* failed to rise, and it became painfully clear that the long-awaited French spark for a European renewal of 1848 would not come. Just after the events, Willich wrote of 'the catastrophe' in the tone of someone whistling in the dark:

What has been lost? Nothing! But immeasurably much has been gained. The reactionary parties...now merge with despotism, the eternal hypocrisy of constitution [and] liberalism is over. The people with their social demands finds the field now cleared of all sham and mockery... Everyone now understands that the...bourgeois liberties, that everything mankind has fought for in world history, can only be preserved by carrying it to its consequences; either all consequences or absolute despotism.<sup>59</sup>

Nonetheless the realisation that revolutionary prospects were over, combined with poor employment possibilities for the League's workers in Germany, Paris and London, forced many to emigrate to America, and Willich had to admit that 'their wish to continue preparing the proletariat for the next revolution and to be on the spot when it occurs, had to yield to the law of self-preservation'.<sup>60</sup>

For the League in London the Paris coup d'état thus led both to a constant erosion of membership and to some radicalisation. Thinking that the field was now clear, Willich himself laid more stress on the socialist aims of the League. The main power of reaction, he now thought, lay more in its social and economic influence on 'the bourgeois classes' than in its political control, for example in its ability to mould the minds of youth.<sup>61</sup> In fact, 'creating new political institutions was impossible unless capital relations had been overthrown... No revolutionary form of state is tenable unless it is founded on an equally revolutionary organisation of economic conditions'.<sup>62</sup> A republic, even with free associations supported by a state bank, was not sufficient to alter the fundamental economic situation:

The means of production, machines and steam, make superfluous much human labour power under [the existing] productive relations, where these means are the sacred property of individuals. Competition excludes more and more people from production and hence from consumption, while those in employment are more and more exploited to the last drop of their labour power... This, however, will continue, whether individual capitalists or independent associations own these new means of production...the only remedy is for the entire society to seize and to organise these means of production.

Despite the use of Marx's language here, Willich in fact came very close to Weitling's visions of structuring communist society around individual branches of industry. 'Abstract' government in a 'political state' could be superseded by the 'economic state' or 'social republic', where each industrial branch would be a basic organisational unit and the central administration of the different trades would form a central committee. This 'economic administrative council of potent productive forces, forming an entity whose elements interlock organically and naturally', would then replace political government. Politics would no longer be remote, and people would 'be able to understand their own affairs and cease being objects of manipulation for the intellectual aristocracy'.<sup>63</sup> In the communist state all class differences would of course be abolished and hence the proletariat would cease to exist, but while for Willich (and Gebert) this included the lumpenproletariat, not all his followers agreed. Perhaps reflecting artisanal pride, the League members Fränkel and Blum felt that 'rotten apples', 'unworthy of the social advantages', would long cling to the new society.<sup>64</sup>

This part of the CABV's theoretical discussions was perhaps resumed in response to criticism by those leaving to form the New Workers' Society or the Democratic Society. Between January and August 1852 the society debated such topics as the relation of communism to religion, education and individualism. In Willich's opinion, there would be 'no religion or church in a communist state which as such represents freedom', although he added generously that 'at any rate the church will remain untouched for the time being because it is quite irrelevant for communism how the individual sees supernatural things'. Blum, who wanted to abolish the church because of its links to the present state, was contradicted by other CABV members who wanted to preserve 'true Christian religion'.<sup>65</sup> The club also rejected a suggestion that 'communism required uniform education, [hence] religion must be condensed into specific articles to a pure

moral doctrine, which plants the communist idea as their innermost feeling as it were into young people'.<sup>66</sup> Instead they agreed that the Bible should be used as a history book only and that the state should not interfere with religion.

This was a response to what the debaters felt was the most common reproach against communism, that it destroyed individuality and would prove tyrannical. Individual liberty meant the right to do everything that did not harm others. But this freedom, the CABV emphasised, either did not exist at all at present, or merely meant that a few individuals were allowed to exploit the whole of society. This privilege would be destroyed, violently, in the communist state, as an unnatural right, but communists did not aim to control anybody's thinking. With fewer scruples Willich maintained that communism, once it took on the form of a state, would indeed suppress individuality, and that in fact it was a condition of individuals co-existing in society that the individual serve the common good with all his abilities.<sup>67</sup> In a complete reversal of his pre-1848 view that communism and individual freedom complemented one another, Schapper now echoed Willich's opinion (albeit largely replacing 'state' with 'community'): 'the communist state could only exist through the downfall of individuality, which was a crime against communality, hence against the people. Community was boundless because it was a principle.'<sup>68</sup> Others, however, vehemently opposed these views. Some felt that beyond the equal (others said, sufficient, not equal) satisfaction of basic human needs, individuality would necessitate different treatment, and in fact that it was communism which would 'bring individuality to flower by ennobling it and giving it a communal direction. Communism was the highest form of individuality.'<sup>69</sup>

Another long debate concerned the question whether physical or intellectual needs were more important. Martius argued that the proletariat was becoming revolutionarised because its stomach was a permanent protest against existing conditions. Before an individual could think, he insisted, his stomach had to be satisfied. Fränkel agreed that in order to be free in one's mind, physical freedom was also necessary, and hence intellectual insight was founded upon community of property. Against this, Wienhof felt that those who completely satisfied their physical while neglecting their intellectual needs were only vegetating machines, like the Russian serfs. He first of all wanted to aim for an intellectual and moral (*geistige*) community, because only through it could true communism and general equality be introduced. He pitied the revolutionary who spoke from the stomach.<sup>70</sup>

The CABV also debated other aspects of economic life that would change in communism, such as luxury.<sup>71</sup> Trade would no longer be run by individuals, but could only be completely centralised in the hands of the state once industry was no longer subject to individual exploitation.<sup>72</sup> Some confusion occurred in the discussion of the relation between division of labour and communism. Blum thought that a communist state would not change the division of labour, which resulted from inventions, and should not be impeded. Another speaker, Marquardt, however, thought that modern machines would concentrate labour and thus, in communism, eventually overcome the division of labour.<sup>73</sup> This apparent confusion of terminology was not resolved and indicates—not surprisingly—the very uneven reception of economic theory among the fluctuating participants in these discussions.

### League politics in 1852: links to the Continent and the loan

These debates of 1852 in the League and the CABV demonstrate a continued commitment to communism with respect to a range of economic, social and ethical issues, and the clear reception and adaptation of both Marx's teaching and Blanqui's influence. This 'business as usual' attitude combated the widespread demoralisation among the dwindling number of Willich's followers, and showed that his League was definitely not 'virtually inactive' after its congress of 1851.<sup>74</sup> Besides theoretical discussions, practical political activity also continued. Once the shock of the Paris catastrophe began to wear off, the remnants of the groups in London resumed their customary propaganda in Germany through correspondence and emissaries, and pursued contacts with other political organisations. Although separate groups of the League continued to exist, all such activity was now concentrated in the Central Authority. Its 20-odd members<sup>75</sup> continued their regular procedure of vetting prospective new members, rooting out police informers, dealing with finances (which amounted to about £144) and supporting jailed comrades.<sup>76</sup> They still expected an imminent revolution. Willich declared that in Saxony all weavers were ready to march on Dresden at the first alarm, while in northern Germany Hamburg, Bremen and Schleswig were prepared for action.<sup>77</sup> More hopes, however, were pinned on movements outside Germany. According to Willich, Napoleon was driving small property owners towards communism, although neither the French army nor the masses could be trusted to eschew the attractions of a new emperor.<sup>78</sup> Dietz, who frequently reported on France, felt that Alsace and the Pyrenees in particular, more than Paris, promised upheaval.<sup>79</sup> The prospects of war seemed particularly encouraging. Willich assumed that the Belgian revolutionary movement would erupt as soon as war with France occurred, and that a victorious Belgian republic would overthrow Louis Napoleon.<sup>80</sup> Dietz was even more sanguine about Switzerland. 'Nothing could be more welcome to the party than a war in Switzerland', where the workers were well prepared and would give the signal for an uprising in Germany.<sup>81</sup>

Encouraged by these assessments, Willich of course continued to emphasise agitation among the military. Together with Schimmelpfennig, a former sergeant, Boichot, and a Polish refugee, he kept in contact with the German armies, distributing leaflets among the men, attempting to form cadres in the Polish provinces of Prussia, and compiling exact lists of arms and ammunition stocks to which they might have access in case of an insurrection.<sup>82</sup> Willich's former corps, about 160 men, met three times a week for exercise, military training and shooting practice.<sup>83</sup> With his follower Heise, a journalist who later worked on the CABV's paper *Das Volk*, Willich even considered staging a coup in Germany.<sup>84</sup> But even if such schemes never went beyond the realm of fantasy, the Willich-Schapper League nonetheless did keep up its connections with groups in Germany throughout 1852. At least 24 different towns in Germany sent money to the Sonderbund in London between January and May 1852. The largest sums came from Hamburg, Hannover, Hildesheim, Bremen, Ulm and Wiesbaden, indicating that most of its supporters continued to be in northern Germany.<sup>85</sup> These funds were spent in part supporting the families of the Paris prisoners, and in part on keeping up an extensive correspondence, for which Willich also made a collection during the regular Saturday sessions in Great Windmill Street (although he was suspected of subsidising his own

upkeep this way),<sup>86</sup> The League did not produce much written propaganda, but continued to send emissaries to the Continent. In April 1852, for example, A.L.Pirsch, a tailor expelled from Hamburg the previous November, went to Paris, and reported back to London that the remnants of the Paris group had established close links with a 'Société des ouvriers' and a 'Ligue des prolétaires'.<sup>87</sup> C.A.Starke, a wallpaper-hanger or decorator from Stettin, travelled to Hamburg and elsewhere for both Kinkel and Willich in the summer.<sup>88</sup> Schimmelpfennig and Willich allegedly went on similar trips, but the most successful journey appears to have been undertaken by August Gebert, a member of the Central Authority, who assembled a group of 26–30 sympathisers in Magdeburg for three days of discussions.<sup>89</sup>

These activities required the League to seek loan funds, needed to pay for transport and arms.<sup>90</sup> In particular, Willich was involved in all the stages of the winding up of the National Loan after Kinkel's return from the United States in March 1852. This had become necessary not only because Kinkel had failed to raise the required sum of \$20,000, but also because even the existing funds could no longer be used for their original purpose after the coup in France. To decide on the future of the Loan, its European guarantors convened a congress in London in April, at which the communists restated the conditions of their involvement in the project. This 'manifesto to the German workers', allegedly written by Gebert, sought to 'explain the basis on which we would join a union of all revolutionary forces, and to relate the position which...we now take as the army proper of the revolution'. It asserted that 'the workers' party' was strong enough to stand up to the continental despots, and would eventually 'annihilate completely the existing political power, since only in this manner can we realise our interests'. As no means to prepare the overthrow should be neglected, they wanted to see the loan project continued. But while propaganda could help prepare a revolution, a 'brave and decisive deed' would do much to inspire the sympathy of the masses. Tired of 'all cowardly theoretical constructions spun out of nothing', the address continued, in Willich's spirit, 'we need immediately to procure the means which the revolutionary army is short of, i.e., arms'.<sup>91</sup> Concretely, the loan money financed continental trips of the League's emissaries Pirsch and Martius, and in April the League formally approved of a secret contract between Willich and Kinkel. The loan thereby became the League's business as well, although they were not concerned with either propaganda for or administration of the project, but merely hoped for some funds.<sup>92</sup>

At this time the question of the relation between the socialists and republicans before and during the next revolution provoked violent disagreement in the CABV once again. In January 1852 Blum argued that in all revolutions the proletariat was naturally in a majority, but this meant neither that they were driven into the struggle by conscious aims, nor that the character of the next revolution would be necessarily proletarian. In fact, he contended, the next revolution would not achieve the interests of the proletariat. The petty bourgeoisie would strive for its ideal, property, while the proletariat would seek the workers' state. Each class, battling for its own interests, would at most join forces tactically against the haute bourgeoisie. These were sensitive issues, and Blum's opinions incensed his audience. He was nearly thrown out of the club, and discussion of the question was discontinued in the following week for fear of a violent brawl.<sup>93</sup> The Central Authority, too, acknowledged that the prospect of co-operation with republicans had caused an open rupture among League members:

All disagreements have now come down to one question: can the communists periodically ally themselves with another party or not? With this the storm broke loose, and effectively created the breach. Two members who had directly denied this question, and who specifically had attempted to cast aspersion (who knows for what reason) on Willich and his relation to Kinkel's party, have left.<sup>94</sup>

In view of such feelings among his communist supporters, Willich had to tread carefully in his involvement in the last stages of the Loan project. With Kinkel he successfully opposed the plan favoured by the third administrator of the Loan, Count Reichenbach, to return the donations, one argument being that this would especially harm working-class donors, whose small contributions and penny collections at meetings had gone unrecorded in detail.<sup>95</sup> Eventually, as we have seen, it was agreed to deposit the money, pending future revolutionary use, under the supervision of Willich and Kinkel.

These debates must have resurfaced at a congress the Londoners planned for 15 August 1852, about which no information has survived.<sup>96</sup> Groups in Braunschweig, Stuttgart, Leipzig and Berlin had suggested a congress, and the Central Authority corresponded with Paris, Switzerland and Germany to arrange details. The Paris group wanted to meet in Belgium or Dover—plainly to curtail the preponderance of the Londoners.<sup>97</sup> Gebert's extensive discussions in Magdeburg probably formed part of the preparations for the congress. An apocryphal 'proclamation to Germany' issued by Willich in August 1852 may, however, have been formulated in this connection. In it, Willich allegedly declared: 'I preach hatred because I want love, I preach barbarism because I want it to destroy our enemies, to introduce our rule and our happiness, I preach war against the world because I want peace.'<sup>98</sup> Such rhetoric was still an important part of his appeal. A tailor, Julius Grozinski, who left Cologne in September 1852, described his impression of the Willich-Schapper circles, and in particular the continuing dislike of Marx:

On my arrival in London, I immediately went to visit Schapper and Willich, and found both men still to be the true representatives of the working class, as earlier... Don't let yourselves be carried away by this infamous literary clique around Marx, who can achieve everything with their evil pens, in order to push aside those aiming for the true welfare of the workers, in order to place themselves at the head of the literary bourgeoisie and to put the workers off with fair words after a successful revolution. By impugning the men of action, I ask you, are these literary loudmouths able to lead the people against its enemy? No, they can agitate but not guide. Here the workers despise them...<sup>99</sup>

### **Retreat and emigration**

Yet even this fierce personal loyalty to Willich could not prevent the CABV from shrinking throughout 1852. Its decline was also visibly marked by the retreat of Schapper, one of the leading figures from socialist exile politics. Schapper had for some

time had very little to do with the affairs of the CABV or the Sonderbund, which in this period really should be called the 'Willich League'. In the first few months after the split of the Communist League, Schapper had been enthusiastically on Willich's side, and had apparently planned to go to Hamburg as an emissary himself.<sup>100</sup> In February 1851 he had extolled the virtues of the Polish general Bem, in a celebration where not only Louis Blanc but also German democratic and republican fugitives such as Ruge's associate Tausenau played a prominent role, indicating that he had moved away from his disdain for non-socialist revolutionaries.<sup>101</sup> Both Schapper's emphasis on 'deeds', especially in open combat, and his willingness to ignore in his day-to-day political activities the existing dividing line between socialists and republicans, place him ideologically very close to Willich at this time. Schapper, however, stayed clear from an alliance with Kinkel and the loan project.<sup>102</sup>

But while Schapper remained popular for some time—in May 1851 Willich even credited him with the expansion of the CABV<sup>103</sup>—he was also increasingly attacked. Not only was he rumoured to be a spy,<sup>104</sup> but the CABV doubted his handling of monies received by the refugee committee, asking him to account for this 'hippopotamus's belly'.<sup>105</sup> One reason for this alienation was his alleged immorality in having, while in Cologne, 'enticed' Lessner's bride, Klara Hoppe, away from him (she later became the second Mrs Schapper).<sup>106</sup> This seriously upset some of the workers in the Rhineland. Willich, too, who tended to stress moral probity, was disdainful about the 'jouisneur', convinced that 'Whoever is unreliable in his private life is also unreliable politically'.<sup>107</sup> In May 1852, however, this story rebounded with a vengeance when Willich himself was thrown out of Baroness von Bruiningk's salon for 'a brutally brutish assault upon' her, which naturally resulted in Marx's harking back to the 'jouisseurs'.<sup>108</sup> Willich reacted by implying that she spied for the Russians.<sup>109</sup> This affair, bandied about among the refugees with the usual glee, further alienated Schapper from Willich, and may have been the last straw in bringing about Schapper's withdrawal from the CABV. Theoretical differences do not appear to have played a major role. A year after his laudatio for Bem, Schapper was again more critical of non-socialist revolutionaries, declaring in a CABV lecture on the peasants' war that 'today the so-called honourable bourgeois democracy was opposing communism just as then Luther with his entire clique of reformed princes had opposed the revolutionary talent of the peasants'.<sup>110</sup> While Schapper still lectured in the CABV during 1852, he had no official function in his old club, playing only a minor role in its debates, and virtually none in the League. Later Schapper recorded that he only 'Very rarely' attended club meetings around May 1852.<sup>111</sup> In July he approached Marx again, but hesitated to break publicly with Willich (with whom, in the same month, he had a big row in the CABV). Almost a year later Engels declared himself happy to be rid of him, and by October 1853 Schapper, the last of its remaining founders, finally withdrew from the CABV.<sup>112</sup>

Besides Schapper, other prominent leaders were also in retreat, and Willich put much of his energy during early 1852 into keeping his ranks from dispersing. Schily and Imandt left Willich's League in early summer, while Schärtner quarrelled with Willich in August, Starke opposed him in the Central Authority shortly afterwards, and Oswald Dietz left for America in the autumn.<sup>113</sup> In February an assembly of workers belonging to Willich's party debated their petition to the English government for free transit, and, when Willich's endeavours to dissuade them became too 'irksome', threw him out.<sup>114</sup>



Willich felt that the British government grants for travel and support to emigrating exiles proved that the 'cowardly' Lord John Russell had been bribed by continental despots to remove revolutionaries from their vicinity, and proposed a formal declaration by the CABV against this 'insidious reactionary expedient'. This, however, was opposed by Schmitz and Pirsch (both League members), who argued that the exiles needed to survive, and that a group of them had already petitioned the government to finance their journey. The proposed declaration was unanimously rejected by the CABV.<sup>115</sup> Blum opposed mass emigration as a weakening of the strength of the proletariat and an undermining of its complete formation as a class, which he regarded as preconditions for a proletarian revolution. Fränkel, however, contended that true revolutionaries in the New World could set a moral example in the United States and in the future export freedom from there.<sup>116</sup> Willich was losing his battle against emigration. In early March Lehmann, a Central Authority member, left with some 30 workers from the CABV. Others from the Central Authority, such as Stubbe, Gebert, Roedel and Dietz, announced their departure in the following months.<sup>117</sup> In April 1852 many of his former corps arrived in New York, some of them 'furious' at Willich and Schapper, although others planned to form a special military unit in the United States to prepare for an imminent revolution in Europe.<sup>118</sup> The Baden police reported that 'the industrious part of the emigrants in London appears not to share the eccentric hopes of their leaders and prefer to use the free transit to America offered by the English government'.<sup>119</sup> Other League members such as Dietz, Majer and (for some time) Heise left for the United States in mid-1852, as did Schimmelpfennig, Sigel, Mirbach and more of Willich's military friends.

Schapper's withdrawal and the constant drain to the United States weakened the CABV. The emigrants could not be replaced by new arrivals from Germany; the police reported only 17 new workers joining the CABV between July and November.<sup>120</sup> The CABV's admissions policy required new arrivals to make a 'confession of faith', which tended to isolate the club, turning it into a 'school of intolerance' and alienating potential members.<sup>121</sup> By November the CABV had thus fallen to some 80 artisans, mostly in employment. Willich and Schapper continued to lecture at the club, whose members, for a monthly fee of ninepence, met three times a week in the beer house of one Zimmermann from Cologne.<sup>122</sup>

## Spies

Already in decline, the CABV at this point suffered an almost fatal blow as a result of police activity. That spies had always had the capacity to cripple the League is undoubted, as is the fact that their activities were based on a plan conceived in Berlin. Edgar Bauer, a police spy himself, explained with amazing openness that 'the history of the emigration in London is not described completely if one does not add a history of the secret police. Emigration and political police are two branches growing on the same tree.'<sup>123</sup> The secret history of this other 'branch' of exile life is a tragicomedy par excellence. In the background was the expressed and (in his own words) 'not quite honourable' wish of the king, Friedrich Wilhelm IV, to have Wilhelm Stieber, the Prussian police director still known for his assiduous compilation of communist material, discover a conspiracy so that 'the desired spectacle of an exposed and (above all)

punished plot can be performed'.<sup>124</sup> Stieber justified his own mission by arguing that 'the Prussian government absolutely has to destroy the émigrés in London. History, this unerring teacher, shows us that most revolutions are made by émigrés, both political and religious revolutions. Never has a worse group of émigrés existed than the present one in London.' Stieber's task was now to persuade the British government to act against the exiles. For this he needed material, which he set out to find in London.<sup>125</sup>

To this end Stieber's agent managed to procure some 50 promising original documents from the club's archives in 14 Windmill Street, although this had to be kept strictly secret for fear that 'it would be called theft in London', and that as a result Prussia's police agents would be expelled.<sup>126</sup> These documents became known as 'the Dietz archive' after the secretary of Willich's League from whose desk they had been stolen by a fellow lodger, a bankrupt businessman Max Reuter, who then sold them to the police agent Charles Fleury. In the 1851–1852 Cologne trial of Marx's adherents these papers, along with others which were forged, played a major role, with the police trying to blur the differences between the two leagues in order to secure a conviction. Marx's efforts to prove that his friends were not involved in a 'plot' but merely in 'a society which secretly strove to create an organised proletarian party', 'the opposition party of the future', resulted in his *Revelations on the Communist Trial in Cologne*, but did not help the defendants.<sup>127</sup>

For Willich's League Stieber's mission proved disastrous. Returning to Germany in summer 1851, Stieber passed through Paris, where Cherval, head of one of the Paris sections, apparently tried to murder him, but was arrested after a scuffle. Letters found on Cherval, especially from the bloodthirsty Gipperich, led to the arrest of 200 Germans and the conviction in the 'Franco-German plot' of the ten most prominent socialists. This almost completely dismantled the Communist League in France.<sup>128</sup> In answer to Cherval's plea for support of the prisoners' families, the CABV in London organised a collection. Soon, however, Cherval and Gipperich managed to escape to London, but Gipperich then disclosed that Cherval (whose real name was Joseph Crämer) had been in the pay of the Prussian police, and had been responsible for the Paris arrests. In May 1852, the club ejected Cherval as 'infamous', despite his protests that he was a *mouchard* 'in the noble sense of [James Fenimore] Cooper's spy', 'in the interest of the proletariat'.<sup>129</sup> Willich sounded genuinely distraught 'that a member of our party can be so malicious as to betray his comrades for a well-laid table with a bottle of wine, and that even among our enlightened workers so many let themselves be duped by villains'.<sup>130</sup> When in the following month it emerged that Gipperich, too had been a police agent, the refugees' paranoia about spies reached new heights. Everyone became suspect, and demoralisation was widespread.<sup>131</sup>

Willich was greatly embarrassed, not only by the ease with which Fleury had purloined the League's materials but also by the gullibility of his comrades in his largest stronghold on the Continent. But as further details gradually emerged, his own connections with the spies came under special scrutiny. Fleury (whose real name was Carl Krause) had for some time lived in Willich's barracks, but had as a destitute fugitive offered his services to the Prussian police shortly after Stieber's arrival in London in May 1851. After marrying into a 'respectable' family Fleury continued working for the police, but also used his newly acquired wealth to help Willich with cash and gifts, which

Willich in turn accepted, partly because Fleury also offered him information on police machinations against the Cologners.<sup>132</sup>

More suspect still, however, was the fact that Fleury had introduced Willich to Wilhelm Hirsch, a commercial clerk and democratic journalist who arrived in London in autumn 1851. When it was rumoured in the CABV that he was in the pay of the Prussian embassy, he was expelled from that organisation, and briefly joined the New Workers' Society, writing a declaration against Willich and Schapper in January 1852.<sup>133</sup> Although he was soon also expelled from Marx's League, it was Hirsch who with Fleury forged the so-called 'Minutes'—allegedly originals taken by Liebknecht and Rings during the weekly sessions of Marx's society—which were intended to incriminate Marx's followers in Cologne.<sup>134</sup> During the following months, a most peculiar relationship developed between Hirsch, Fleury and Willich. Hirsch convinced Willich that he was still a democrat at heart and only pretended to serve the police in order to be able to divulge government plots to the revolutionaries:

A spy in public opinion without being one, I [now] wanted to pretend to become one but still without really being one. My plan was simple. I wanted to offer myself to the secret police and to dupe them as long as possible and to profit as much as possible by it and to find out as much as possible, so that I could serve the party.<sup>135</sup>

Willich hoped to expose police intrigues, especially those of Fleury, by using Hirsch as some sort of double agent, and to keep up this ludicrous game he even watched silently as Fleury and Hirsch fabricated the 'Minutes'.<sup>136</sup> At the same time Fleury, while supporting Willich financially, conspired with Hirsch to lure Willich into a police trap, and concocted a fantastic plan to chloroform him in order to ship him to Heligoland and Germany.<sup>137</sup>

This entire bubble burst in early November 1852, when Fleury was exposed in the Cologne trial, which in turn forced Willich to have Hirsch admit publicly to his and Fleury's forgeries. The revelations portrayed Willich in a very bad light. It became public that he had been paid by Fleury, that he had betrayed secrets about emissaries' trips to the Continent and that he had let Hirsch escape. Imandt, indeed, went so far as to call Willich an 'accomplice' and 'the originator of both trials' in Cologne and Paris.<sup>138</sup> Such evidence seemed to imply that Willich was knowingly acting for the police. Hirsch maintained that 'the party [had] committed a crime' against him, but his attempt to vindicate his own and Willich's behaviour publicly did not succeed.<sup>139</sup> Consequently many of Willich's admirers in the CABV must have believed that he was more than merely a victim of police intrigues. Amid recriminations and a new wave of resignations, Willich moved the remnants of the CABV to another location. But in fact this came close to ending Willich's personal reputation, the CABV, and Willich's League.<sup>140</sup> Thus Engels recounted that around Christmas 1852, he and Marx mingled '*sans façon* in the Kinkel-Willich-Ruge pubs, something we could scarcely have done 6 months earlier without risking a brawl'.<sup>141</sup>

### Willich in the United States

His organisation in shambles, Willich, virtually the last Communist League member to abandon ship, elected to depart for the New World. One of his last acts before leaving for the United States was to agree on 11 January 1853 with Kinkel and Reichenbach to deposit the Revolutionary Loan money in a London bank.<sup>142</sup> The move was doubtless a wise choice for Willich. On 19 February he arrived in New York aboard the 'Ocean Queen', stating his profession as 'Citizen'. More than 300 people welcomed him with a banquet, at which Weitling presented him with a sword adorned with a red sash.<sup>143</sup> Willich had initially hoped to continue the loan agitation and to transform the loan committees into 'political committees', but these did not flourish.<sup>144</sup> Accusations and recriminations about the Communist League continued in the German-American press for some time, concentrating largely on the role of police spies, but interest in the sordid details eventually died down.<sup>145</sup>

Willich continued his political agitation among German-Americans, founding a Steuben League in July 1858 for the reform of the American legal, administrative, military and educational system, organising support for Garibaldi, and editing the *Cincinnati Republikaner* as a 'workers' organ' to represent 'the material and intellectual interests of the producing classes against the corrupting influences of capital on local and national administration'.<sup>146</sup> He continued to call the workers to political struggle: The organised workers themselves have to take care of administration and legislation—only then will they turn from dependent wage labourers into intellectually and materially independent members of a community, only then will classes cease and only free citizens of the republic exist.<sup>147</sup> With rhetoric similar to that of the Jacksonian democrats, Willich defended 'the rights of the citizens of the republic, of a free community, against the infringements of monopoly-based class rule', and argued that the organisation of the producing class in the United States, by trades, should reduce politics to a mutual assurance of spiritual and material needs.<sup>148</sup> He advocated self-government and self-administration over centralised power, even in socialist and communist systems. The true nature of laws was thus to make themselves unnecessary,<sup>149</sup> and the 'state' in a republic should not be more than a 'free partnership of all its citizens', providing merely the necessary administration and mutual insurance.<sup>150</sup> Willich also advocated the abolition of all barriers to international trade for the civilising influence this would have on all peoples who could take part in irresistible progress.<sup>151</sup> His American experiences were reflected in the paper's anti-slavery attitude, its emphatic anti-Catholicism and its reports on talks by Judge Stallo, the American Young Hegelian. In the paper's pronounced (German and American) patriotism, an occasional streak of German idealistic nationalism appeared in Willich's hopes for a specifically German contribution, embracing all classes, to the free American republic through 'the spirit of pure humanity', of philosophy and sciences, as opposed to Anglo-Saxon materialism and piety.<sup>152</sup> In Cincinnati Willich also led large torchlight processions after Orsini's attentat on Napoleon had failed and again, amid many threats, when John Brown was executed after the Harpers Ferry raid.<sup>153</sup>

Marx continued to observe Willich's activities, apparently still regarding him as something of a threat, and was especially glad in 1856 to have Schapper 'out of the hands of Willich', although as late as 1858 he lost his old adherent Cluss to him.<sup>154</sup> Only after Willich had proved to be a successful major general in the Union army did Marx judge him more charitably, and admit that he was 'something more than a visionary'.<sup>155</sup> For his part, Willich later generously defended Marx against adversaries, claiming that these had 'as little humanity as Marx, but infinitely less intelligence than him. They are a pack of curs yelping at a royal tiger'.<sup>156</sup>

Back in London, the constant drain forced the Communist League in May and in August 1852 to merge groups whose membership had shrunk to below their required number.<sup>157</sup> In early 1853 a second large wave of emigration along with that of Willich virtually ended all hopes for continued League activities in Britain. This general exodus caused such disarray, indeed, that the CABV, which had sent £3 to support Scherzer's family in January 1853, soon ceased responding to letters.<sup>158</sup> With this, the history of the Communist League, which had dominated socialist exile politics for over five years, comes to an end. Yet even these severe blows did not destroy the CABV, which after enduring several years of apathy, began to revive, and once again became prominent in internationalist activities in London.

## 7

### Apathy and revival

#### The International Association, 1853–1859

In spring 1853 political activity among the German exiles in London reached its lowest ebb. Neither democrats nor socialists continued to believe in an imminent new revolution. Every project for supporting continental revolutionary movements had been abandoned. All clubs and societies had either completely collapsed or had faded into obscurity. Many Forty-eighters had left for the United States or Australia. Financial support from Germany and from the United States for the remaining refugees had dwindled to virtually nothing. European and American papers alike had become tired of refugee stories, and—a rare occurrence in the history of Germans in England—there was no German-language newspaper at all in London to voice the exiles' interests.

This chapter analyses how the refugees overcame this desolate state of affairs. Not only did German social life in London begin an unprecedented boom at the end of the decade, but there was also a substantial revival of political activity. The CABV published its own weekly paper, thereby provoking the democratic refugees around Kinkel to found a counter-organ, while Marx and his friends feuded intensely with Carl Vogt, stirring up new political discussions among the London Germans. Examining the emergence of German socialists, workers and intellectuals alike, out of oblivion and apathy involves close attention to a hitherto strangely neglected organisation of continental refugees and (former) Chartists, the International Association.<sup>1</sup> This group was the last in a series of forerunners of the First International which stimulated the German socialists to become involved again in politics. The Germans active in the International Association, above all Andreas Scherzer, carried their enthusiasm for socialist politics back into the CABV, whereupon the 'Marxists' also strove to make their own influence felt in the club. Together with the agitation following the expulsion of French refugees from Jersey, the Crimean War and the 'New Era' in Prussian politics, this restored German socialism in London to life.

#### At low ebb

By the end of 1852 the Cologne trial had finished off the Communist League on the Continent. Marx had dissolved his London branch, and the attempt by his followers to regain control of the CABV through the newly founded *Neue Arbeiter-Verein* in London had failed. Marx's 'party' was thus in obvious disarray. The workers, Eccarius, Lochner and Pfänder, now concentrated on eking out a precarious living as tailor, carpenter and painter respectively.<sup>2</sup> Dronke and Pieper occasionally contributed to papers, but to Marx's great dismay they often proved unreliable. 'Lupus' (Friedrich Wilhelm Wolff)

remained a close friend of Marx and Engels, but moved to Manchester and was kept busy with his teaching.<sup>3</sup> 'Our party is, alas, very *pauvre*', Marx sighed.<sup>4</sup>

When not absorbed with making a living, Marx's adherents diligently pursued their economic, social and political studies. Wilhelm Liebknecht, for one, earned the nickname of 'Library' from his endeavours. Like many refugees, he lived from journalism and teaching, and as a 'penny-a-liner' wrote many reports on daily events in Britain, mainly for the *Morgenblatt für gebildete Leser* and the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*. Ever seeking topics, he became well acquainted with London life, and acquired a greater affection for England and particularly for British working-class leaders than either Marx or Engels. Liebknecht particularly admired Robert Owen, counting him among his teachers, and in later years endeavoured to acquaint the German Social Democratic movement with Owen's ideas in no less than four biographical sketches.<sup>5</sup> He befriended Harney and Jones and, curiously, also praised Richard Cobden's ideas on workers' education, while acknowledging that his own aims were so different that no 'rapprochement, or even less a personal intercourse and exchange of opinions' was possible.<sup>6</sup> These years of relative calm and uninterrupted study were thus not wasted on Liebknecht, who profited from them in his later years in the German Social Democratic movement, nor on the other members of the Marx 'party'. Indeed, in Engels's opinion, these studies gave them a distinct advantage over the other exile factions.<sup>7</sup>

Engels himself endured his 'Egyptian bondage', making himself indispensable in his family's firm in Manchester (in summer 1853 finally convincing his father of his usefulness to the English branch of Ermen and Engels) and helping his London friends, particularly the Marxes, with money. His own studies especially reflected his life-long interest in military theory and strategy, and he wrote articles on the Turkish question for the *New York Daily Tribune* plus a series of strategical analyses during the Crimean war. Oriental and historical studies as well as an amazing capacity for acquiring new languages left little further spare time.<sup>8</sup>

Most biographies of Marx turn to the private life of their subject following the end of the Communist League. His privations in Dean Street, Soho, are well documented. Marx expended much of his energy in 1852–1853 writing critical satires on the emigrants' squabbles, his ill-fated *Great Men of the Exile* ridiculing mostly the democrats, and *The Knight of the Noble Conscience* aimed at undermining Willich's reputation.<sup>9</sup> After *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial* he then regarded this chapter, the history of the Communist League, as closed, and returned to currency and rent, crises in trade, relations of production, and the history of economic thought, which occupied his attention until the *Outlines of a Critique of Political Economy* (the 'Grundrisse') and the *Critique of Political Economy* were completed at the end of the decade. Marx also focused on British and European politics. Partly following his own interests, partly obliged by sheer financial necessity, he (often with Engels's help) produced hundreds of articles for Dana's *New York Daily Tribune* and other journals during the 1850s, with Palmerston, Russia and Crimean developments being his chief topics.

For most of the 1850s Marx and Engels thus worked in relative isolation, with 'party' politics and the practical workers' movement playing little part in their affairs. Marx's closest (and virtually only) ally among the British was Ernest Jones, who in December 1852 had signed an appeal supporting those sentenced in Cologne, thereby—according to Marx—publicly appearing 'actually as a party member'.<sup>10</sup> Although Chartism was clearly

in decline (the Fraternal Democrats had also faded away in early 1853), it was the only remaining organised workers' movement in Europe. The majority of London Germans did not participate in the movement—an exception being the music teacher Johann Aloys Petzler, who spoke in the Labour Parliament of 1854<sup>11</sup>—but the communists supported the Chartist press. Marx continued to contribute to Jones's *People's Paper*, along with Cluss, Eccarius and Pieper. Especially close were Marx's and Jones's views on the coalition ministry of early 1853 and on British economic development, but despite his praise of Marx and Freiligrath, Jones disagreed with Marx's view of Mazzini and Kossuth, and in the International Association two years later aligned himself with groups including the CABV.<sup>12</sup>

After the collapse of the Communist League the CABV suffered considerable fragmentation. When Willich left, Weitlingians were again the society's only active members, and even they hardly ever appeared in public. In November 1853 'deplorable scenes of brutality and violence' disrupted a meeting commemorating the Polish Revolution, when English partisans of either Jones or O'Brien (accounts differ) prevented the 'traitor' Harney from speaking.<sup>13</sup> Several refugees protested against this, and the five Germans signing in the name of the 'German Emigration holding Democratic and Social principles' were led by Johann Georg Reiningner, formerly of the Communist League in Paris, a friend of Weitling's and a Cabetist, who had recently arrived in London after his release from police custody in Mainz.<sup>14</sup> The fact that he organised the only joint activity of German socialists in London during these years again indicates that the 'utopian' Utopian' socialists kept a much stronger hold on the workers than the years of Marx's influence might suggest. But if the 'Marxist' Neue Londoner Arbeiterverein had been unable to replace the CABV, neither could the Weitlingians and Icarians alone restore the club to its former strength. Nonetheless the 'Utopians' not only effectively seized control of the CABV from Marx's followers, but also sustained a minimal level of activity through the years of reaction, and undoubtedly they alone kept the Society alive as an organised body before the revival of collective socialist politics among London Germans at the end of the decade.<sup>15</sup>

### **The international exile community and the German colony, 1853–1855**

While the German socialists in London suspended all political activities, this was certainly also true for the more numerous democratic and republican refugees. Neither the Agitation Club nor the Emigration Society survived beyond 1852–1853, while the Revolutionary Fund was safely stored away in a London bank awaiting future use. The only democratic refugee organisation which did flourish throughout the 1850s was significantly not an overtly political organisation but a religious reform group supported by many *Vormärz* democrats, the 'freie Religionsgemeinde' led by Johannes Ronge, who even visited the CABV in August 1853.<sup>16</sup> But Ronge's brand of political radicalism and religious heterodoxy ceased to inspire most German socialists in London,<sup>17</sup> and their enthusiasm for renewed political activities required other provocation.

For both socialists and democrats some of this inspiration was derived from the major international conflict of these years, the Crimean War. Hostility to tsarism was also



popular among the wider British public. For many refugees heightened British interest in continental political affairs thus created new possibilities for journalistic activity, for refugees acquainted with continental politics and who had linguistic abilities and some entrepreneurial spirit could make a fresh start as war correspondents. Sigismund Borkheim, for instance, a clerk and businessman in Liverpool who had fought with Willich in Baden, speculated with goods for the troops in Balaclava while reporting for the Berlin *National-Zeitung*.<sup>18</sup> In the Crimea he met other German war correspondents, including the former Prussian officer Otto von Wenckstern, who in London wrote for *The Times* and *Household Words*—while spying for Prussia—and who now described Crimean events for the *Daily News*. Many Forty-eighters, however, were also driven to the Crimea by the hope that renewed national liberation movements would arise if the war ended Russian domination over central and eastern Europe.<sup>19</sup> The fall of Sebastopol raised hopes in Freiligrath, too, for a speedy return home. The optimism engendered in the German refugee colony by the conflict even led Kinkel's twelve-year-old daughter to write dramatic scenes about the Crimean war—the issue was patently much debated in her parents' house.<sup>20</sup> Further international co-operation in Britain also emerged from this enthusiasm. The Chartists and many continental refugees called meetings. The Polish Democratic Society in November 1853, for example, urged an English declaration of war against Russia preliminary to a general European war of liberation, while the Chartist press abounded with articles discussing the Eastern question.<sup>21</sup> Nonetheless, few Germans were involved in these meetings.

This is curious, since some had a direct interest in the war agitation. Following a suggestion by Prince Albert, a Foreign Enlistment Bill was passed in December 1854, and among the 'mercenaries for the Crimea' more than 9,000 Germans were recruited for a British German Legion.<sup>22</sup> Baron von Stutterheim, a veteran of the Schleswig-Holstein campaign during the revolution of 1848–1849, was chosen to lead the mercenaries and recruited among men who had fought with him in the free-corps (irregular troops) against the Danes and among German emigrants in the United States and elsewhere. The democratic refugee Theodor Götz, for example, petitioned the Secretary for War for an 'officer's brevet'.<sup>23</sup> British public opinion, however, was essentially hostile to this enterprise. *The Times* wrote: 'To introduce into the army foreigners, adventurers, outcasts, nameless, unknown people, who may or may not be exiles for their crimes, is the very way to degrade the service and make it the refuge of immorality and rebellion.' The socialists, on the other hand, suspected that such troops might be used against domestic unrest: one reader of the *People's Paper* called the bill 'treacherous' and spoke of 'Germanism, alias Despotism'.<sup>24</sup> The London Germans, however, stressed the miserable conditions prevailing in the Legion and criticised the way in which artisans, clerks and others were lured into enlistment. This situation worsened in March and April 1856, when the troops were disbanded after the war. In Aldershot, Shorncliffe, Plymouth and elsewhere, quarrels between German *Jägers* and British forces made the question of where to send the troops all the more pressing. Since most could not return to Germany, many were finally sent as 'military settlers' under Stutterheim to the Cape in late 1856, although a few managed to obtain their bounties and stay in England.<sup>25</sup>

The heightened interest in politics during the Crimean War produced no new organisations among the London Germans, but it did force the Forty-eighters to rethink their attitudes. 'Democracy has sunk to a small factor within the change occurring in

Europe', Edgar Bauer observed in September 1856, adding that the war had 'paralysed democracy'.<sup>26</sup>

The war may nonetheless have helped stimulate the foundation of a new German weekly. Established in August 1855, more than four years after the last regular German-language paper in London had given up, the *Londoner Deutsches Journal* remains one of the few sources of information for the German colony in the lull of the mid-1850s. Apparently warned off by the experience of post-revolutionary acrimony, the editors proclaimed in its first issue their intention to 'avoid every political, wild party hubbub, look for our satisfaction in the calm peace of art and literature, understand the importance of commerce and above all remind ourselves of the beauty of life'.<sup>27</sup> Nonetheless, their political sympathies were soon obvious. Besides promoting an anti-Catholic bias and supporting Ronge's religious movement, the paper was generally progressive without embracing working-class politics. In particular it relished stories about Prussian police spies, giving great prominence to the exposure of Fleury, Stieber, and Engländer as a threat to the exile community.<sup>28</sup>

Uniquely among German-language periodicals in London, the *Londoner Deutsches Journal* also addressed itself to German Jews in London and gave space to announcements about, for example, Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, and the opening of a Jewish school by B. Wiener, who ran a restaurant in Bury Street. The nomination of the first Jew to become an alderman was expressly welcomed as a sign of long overdue Jewish emancipation. Nonetheless anti-Semitism emerged where economic jealousy was an issue, with Jewish owners of large sweatshops being held responsible for the low prices for tailored clothes. Competition from newly arrived Polish Jews in the shoe industry, too, provoked anti-Semitic comments. But such sentiments remained exceptional, and on the whole the *Londoner Deutsches Journal* abstained from the malicious reporting on London Jews which became increasingly popular in other German papers during the following decades.<sup>29</sup>

The paper was also more liberal than its predecessors on issues related to women. Detailed descriptions of the working conditions and the low income of German seamstresses in London were supplemented by demands for professional education for girls to provide them with a sufficient and independent income. The paper also criticised the legal situation of women in England, calling for their right to their children, to their own property and to freedom of movement. While this corresponded with the mid-Victorian women's movement's emphasis on education and property rights, the *Londoner Deutsches Journal* also complained that women were additionally subject to brutality from their husbands. But an anonymous writer ridiculed a meeting for the emancipation of women in which Jeanne Deroin and others decided to form a club of their own, and the paper ignored their specific demands. Only after Bernhard Becker assumed the editorship did the journal insert a series of articles on the history of women.<sup>30</sup>

The ambivalent progressive attitude of the paper was also reflected in its reporting on the workers' movement. The Chartist leader Feargus O'Connor was given a sympathetic obituary, for example, and occasionally articles discussed the British workers' movement and Chartism. The paper protested against the intended cutting of wages in Manchester, while the plight of German workers in Whitechapel was described in detail. But the *Journal* never renounced its own middle-class point of view, poking fun, for example, at the shabbiness of a Chartist tea party. Although the paper recognised the existence of the

'social question', it suggested only 'adequate remuneration' and the formation of employment agencies without 'communist claptrap', and proposed that German employers give preference to Germans. For the homeless it recommended that socialists offer 'practical help' out of Christian love, instead of unfathomable theoretical rigmarole.<sup>31</sup>

But the paper was sympathetic to, and indeed involved in, the foundation of a new workers' society in early 1855, the Association deutscher Arbeiter und Gewerbsleute. This was instigated by Philipp Korn, a Hungarian bookdealer and author of a 'Chronik der Magyaren'. He had led the Kaschau German Legion in the Hungarian revolution, and in London insisted on being called 'Hauptmann a.D.' (captain, retired).<sup>32</sup> Korn gained the support of a respectable German doctor, S. Weil, and of Ronge, and on 26 March the society was founded by 'workers, tradesmen, teachers and artists'. Its task was defined as 'to relieve misery among the German workers, as well as to cultivate industriousness among the Germans and immigrants generally'. The society planned to order articles of clothing and food wholesale, and to rent and furnish communal accommodation for its members. The money thus saved was to subsidise unemployed members, to provide clothes and free medical and obstetrical aid, and to teach languages, sciences and the arts. By early August the society claimed a capital of £200—hoping to raise £500 in shares—and had 129 members, of whom 44 were women. Two branches (City and West End) elected their commissions which included Rudolf Hirschfeld—the editor of the *Londoner Deutsches Journal*—and the master tailor G. Enders.<sup>33</sup> In its emphasis on economic independence, industriousness and respectability as well as the need to exclude 'polities', the Association reflected its middle-class origin and outlook, thus resembling other mid-Victorian 'self-help' attempts for working-class reform or Schulze-Delitzsch's associations in Germany.

The Association thus mixed the aims of mid-Victorian reform organisations and older co-operative forms, and treated the workers' plight as similar to the small tradesmen's economic worries, both equally remediable through collective self-help. They still alarmed the perpetually anxious German police.<sup>34</sup> But the Association proved short-lived, for after about six months the editor of the *Londoner Deutsches Journal* accused its founder, Korn, of fraud, and this effectively killed the Association.<sup>35</sup> Nonetheless Korn in 1856 founded a second society, the Association deutscher Arbeiter und Industriellen, which soon came under the patronage of Prince Albert, whose approval he must have won after eloquently praising the Prince Consort's contributions to the German Welfare Society in London.<sup>36</sup>

Nonetheless the fact that a shady character like Korn—financially careless, if not dishonest—could initiate and run a workers' association in London for some time indicated that by the mid-1850s the CABV was still incapable of representing the London German workers' interests convincingly. The German communists opposed Korn and Ronge 'because they have drawn so many workers into their association', and Stechan even reportedly undertook a trip to the Continent partly 'to tell the pure communists that they have nothing in common with Ronge'.<sup>37</sup> These efforts, however, did not rekindle much interest in the CABV. Friedrich Lessner, who returned to London in May 1856, found the CABV 'in a very sad state',<sup>38</sup> and there are no signs of political or social activity by the Club in the papers of the period. But Korn's initiative also demonstrates

the need for a German workers' organisation in London which could combine political stimulation, material advantages and social life.

### **The International Committee**

While neither Korn nor the CABV contributed much to exile politics during this period, impulses came from other foreign groups, particularly the French émigrés in Jersey. German refugees watched events in the Crimea with renewed hope, French émigrés expected the downfall of the Napoleonic regime, and Poles and Hungarians gleefully prophesied the end of Russian dominance over eastern Europe. The Eastern question also revived Chartist internationalism. In its first number, Ernest Jones's new journal, *The People's Paper*, declared its objectives to include providing oft-forgotten news about colonial rule in Asia and Africa and information about European movements.<sup>39</sup> Many of the subsequent articles were written by exiles, with France receiving particular attention.

Only when Garibaldi visited London in March 1854, however, were practical contacts renewed between exiles and Chartists. That autumn, when both Armand Barbès, who was very popular with the exiles, and Napoleon III, who was not, were expected in England, Jones helped found the 'Welcome and Protest Committee', which became the nucleus of the International Association.<sup>40</sup> The Committee soon widened its scope to declare itself in favour of 'The full and complete Enfranchisement of the People, as founded in the People's Charter. The social rights of labour, as embodied in the programme of the Labour Parliament. The brotherhood of nations under the banner of the European Democracy'.<sup>41</sup> Tension resulted when Jones called the new alliance with refugees 'the greatest and most powerful aid and leverage ever given to the Chartism of London', with James Finlen emphatically maintaining that while he admired the refugees and their republicanism, he feared a new Aliens Bill, and objected to forming an organisation without consulting the Chartist Convention. He also opposed seeking the refugees' assistance as 'a miserable declaration of weakness' on the part of the Chartists.<sup>42</sup> But the organisation took root, and as the International Committee staged its first large meeting in February 1855.

Though the post-festum description of 'one of the greatest Demonstrations, in favour of Democracy, that the metropolis has ever seen', was exaggerated, this was the first substantial meeting in years when Chartists and foreign exile groups came together to contemplate co-operation. The main event of the evening was a speech by Alexander Herzen representing Russian opposition to the tsar and his war on the Crimea, which also featured prominently in pronouncements, notably by Ernest Jones and G.J. Holyoake, about the urgency of international solidarity. Although the Viennese police happily reported that 'not a single one of the main leaders of the propaganda' had attended, the meeting passed off quite successfully, and adopted Finlen's resolutions seeking an 'alliance of the Peoples, based on mutual interests and tending to universal brotherhood'.<sup>43</sup>

The International Committee enjoyed moderate success in its first year, publishing a manifesto in July 1855 and convening another celebratory meeting in September. The manifesto differed greatly in content and style from earlier publications of the Fraternal Democrats as well as from those of Mazzini's Young Europe in disregarding the

liberation of individual nations in favour of a 'universal' republic. Clearly a translation from the French, the manifesto showed that the International Committee was at this point dominated by its French members, whose socialism was limited to the plea that 'the working classes, in the name of labour, the only producers and legitimate possessors of capital, should... govern themselves'.<sup>44</sup> A year later, however, the Committee ascribed its lack of success among the Hungarians chiefly to its own 'deeply socialist colour'.<sup>45</sup> But while most Committee members defined themselves as socialists, socialism in fact played only a secondary role in the Committee's credo. Instead its publications centred mainly on 'the idea of human solidarity' in general, with few references to workers in particular, although it eulogised labour as 'everything in the world—it is virtue, it is nobility, it is richness, it is love, it is creation pursuing its course, it is truth and beauty...it is humanity deified by its works'.<sup>46</sup>

The next public meeting of the International Committee in September 1855 was held in conjunction with a French exile society, *Commune Révolutionnaire*.<sup>47</sup> This group was largely the creation of Felix Pyat, journalist, playwright and émigré in Jersey. Though not a socialist, he was an ardent revolutionary, increasingly sympathetic towards anarchism, who also advocated tyrannicide.<sup>48</sup> Founded in 1852, the *Commune Révolutionnaire* was the most active of French exile organisations, issuing numerous vehement pamphlets urging the overthrow (and assassination) of Bonaparte, and—unlike its German counterparts—in constant touch with underground organisations in France itself. Another prominent member was Alfred Talandier, socialist and advocate of co-operation, who translated Holyoake's book on the Rochdale pioneers and pushed for closer attention to 'la question sociale'.<sup>49</sup> The *Commune Révolutionnaire* also had a few Blanquist members, such as Théophile Thoré and Jean-Baptiste Rougée.

The organisation became notorious, however, for its role in a scandal which broke after a revolutionary celebration, held jointly with the International Committee, in September 1855.<sup>50</sup> Here Felix Pyat, inveighing against the Anglo-French alliance and particularly against the queen's state visit to France, claimed that Victoria had lost her 'honour' by binding herself to a usurper and a criminal: 'Vous avez tout sacrifié, dignité de reine, scrupules de femme, orgueil d' aristocrate, sentiment d'Anglaise, le rang, la race, le sexe, tout, jusqu'à la pudeur, pour l'amour de cet allié!'<sup>51</sup> His clear sexual imagery, however, was utterly unacceptable to British moral standards of the period. Consequently, with Palmerston attempting to placate the French government, the lieutenant-governor of Jersey expelled three refugees in the most dramatic measure against continental refugees in England during this whole period.<sup>52</sup> A wave of public protests followed, with Jones and Holyoake especially supportive of the Jersey refugees. But the International Committee also arranged several meetings, and few radical gatherings in the following months did not include a speech from Pyat or any other of the now illustrious émigrés. Thus, rather than damaging the *Commune Révolutionnaire*, the Jersey affair had provided it as well as its ally, the International Committee, with greatly needed publicity.<sup>53</sup>

### German involvement in the International Committee

The Jersey outrage' naturally had serious repercussions for the refugee community. Although for Marx the affair had 'more smoke to it than fire', it clearly reanimated the German fugitives in London.<sup>54</sup> While the initiative for founding the International Committee had come from Chartists and French refugees, now Germans became increasingly involved in the organisation, and this in turn helped revive the CABV. A group of five German emigrants became affiliated at its first meeting. Jones had approached Marx, who 'laughed in his face' but nonetheless appeared as an observer, although particularly annoyed by the activities of the 'Ex-Schapper Society' and by the presence of the 'half-crazed' Stechan 'and behind him three notorious German louts. Schapper himself being no longer available, Stechan tried to ape the former's physiognomy, his morose gravity, his gesticulations, as once the butcher Legendre those of Dan ton.'<sup>55</sup> Stechan even chaired the meeting of 25 January 1855 in which the International Committee shifted to a more permanent status.<sup>56</sup> But after this the 'louts' from the CABV did not appear again publicly as Committee members, so that the 'German Secretary' on the invitation for the commemoration of 1848 was one M. Bley, who otherwise played little part in the exile community and whose speech was not delivered 'owing to the lateness of the hour'. In fact, German attendance was rather peripheral: 'During the tea-party a body of German exiles sang a number of democratic choruses with a taste and vigour that drew forth the enthusiastic plaudits of the audience', was all the *People's Paper* could report.<sup>57</sup>

During the next few months Germans were rarely active in the International Committee. Attendance and the fulfilment of statutory obligations were lackadaisical, and months of silence followed the announcement that German committee members would be elected. When the latter spoke, the content of their speeches was never recorded, and since their names changed from month to month the Chartist press had little chance to find out even approximately correct spellings.<sup>58</sup> Unlike the exiled French and Poles, the German members of the International Committee had scarcely any organisational backing, as the CABV was still reeling from the demise of the Communist League.

This changed only when Andreas Scherzer arrived on the scene. The old Weitlingian, who had led one group of Willich and Schapper's League in Paris, was released from prison spring 1855 and moved to London soon afterwards.<sup>59</sup> He became a leading activist in the International Association, the chief force behind the CABV's reorganisation, and finally proprietor of the German journal *Die Neue Zeit*. Such trust did his fellow-exiles place in this veteran communist that on his arrival they chose him to represent them on the International Committee, and from then on his name became virtually synonymous with German participation in the organisation, especially after Stechan moved to Edinburgh in late 1855.<sup>60</sup>

Scherzer immediately set out to produce a journal, *Der Verbannte* (*The Banished*), most of which was taken up with the International Committee's address of July. Although the paper was nominally published 'by German workers', it was very much Scherzer's own work, and he added one of his poems which ended with the slogan, 'Long live labour! War against money!'<sup>61</sup> Its sole issue—dated 14 July 1855—declared its intention

to express workers' feelings against the tyranny of princes and capital. To realise the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity, all needed equal rights, 'for without equality freedom is chimerical'. Hence mankind can only become happy in a state 'where communism is practised, where each works according to his abilities and consumes according to his needs'.<sup>62</sup> The venture, however, was ill-planned and had to be abandoned immediately. Scherzer was then elected to liaise with the Commune Révolutionnaire as well as to help investigate the financial state of the International Committee and the viability of a four-language almanac 'for the propagation of the Social principles'.<sup>63</sup>

But when Weitling's old adherents began to dominate the German contingent of the International Committee, Marx naturally became less interested in the group. Although he had rebuffed Ernest Jones's invitation, Marx was curious enough to attend a gathering of the Committee even before the CABV, with Stechan, became involved. Jones immediately afterwards pressed him to attend an anniversary celebration in February 1855, which was somewhat awkward for Marx because he did not want to offend the Chartists. But he seriously objected to any dealings with Herzen, whose attendance had been announced, and blamed Jones for 'leaving the management of the affair to the *crapauds* and the German louts'.<sup>64</sup> But Marx was unwilling to break with his only English allies, the Chartists around Jones, partly because he was still concerned with the goings-on among the democratic refugees.<sup>65</sup> In 1856, as the International Committee was getting firmly established, Marx twice suspended his usual reticence about appearing at Chartist demonstrations and delivered his first public speech in years at a *People's Paper* meeting, and joined a large demonstration held for the recently amnestied Chartist John Frost.<sup>66</sup> This helped him to show publicly his close relationship with Jones, in part to stake his claims vis-à-vis other exile factions. But as Marx bluntly put it, he also intended to counter the increasing influence of Scherzer's CABV, which he regarded as 'all the more necessary because...the German lout *Scherzer* (old boy) spoke and, in truly dreadful Straubingerian style, denounced the German "scholars", the "intellectual workers", for having left them (the louts) in the lurch, thus forcing them to make fools of themselves in the eyes of the other nationalities'.<sup>67</sup> Scherzer thus had not changed his opinions on 'scholars' since his days in the Willich-Schapper League, and the conflict between the 'workers' and the 'intellectuals' within the socialist movement threatened to erupt again at any moment.

### **The Revival of the CABV**

At a seminal meeting on 6 May 1856, the International Committee and the Society of German Communists used the anniversary of the Dresden barricades to mount a joint celebration of the German revolution. This began the transformation of the International Committee into the International Association, whose constitution and rules were drawn up in August. Now the organisation did not want only to concentrate on propaganda; it also wished to study the forms of a new socialist society, as well as to organise the direct support of workers on an international scale, with branches of the Association in other countries.<sup>68</sup> The same meeting also marks the point from which we can date the revival of the CABV. But it was still far from its former level of political activity and influence. When Friedrich Lessner, the loyal 'Marxist' and a defendant in the Cologne Communist

trial, was released from his Prussian prison and returned to London in May 1856, he found the CABV in sad shape. The split in the Communist League in 1850, he later recalled,

had very much weakened the Society. Many members left, and the remaining members gradually became so bourgeois that they could listen quietly to Gottfried Kinkel's lectures to the Society, in which he reviled and slandered republicanism... At the same time the Herr Professor managed quite well to train the workers in hero-worship. There was no trace left of communist opinions in the Society. The entire Society had become thoroughly shallow, quite according to the inclinations of our liberals, who thought they could abolish the misery of the workers by lectures on bookkeeping and natural sciences etc.<sup>69</sup>

To undermine Kinkel's position, Lessner began to make friends in the Society. Eventually,

Kinkel had to go. Only after Kinkel's fall did the old state of affairs return by and by. Liebknecht again began to visit the Society as well as Marx, who gave a series of lectures on social economy... Liebknecht's participation also contributed a great deal to bringing new life into the Society. Membership rose quantitatively and qualitatively, and it was again a joy to visit the Communist Workers' Educational Association.<sup>70</sup>

Kinkel's reputation in the CABV should not, however, be overestimated. His rhetorical abilities were popular with London Germans of all classes, and he continued to be invited to speak at special celebrations of the CABV.<sup>71</sup> He was considered to be an authority on German literature and art, on which he regularly lectured for his livelihood to very different audiences. But his political influence in the CABV did not match his role at such functions. In fact Kinkel refrained from all political activities during the mid-1850s, partly because such agitation seemed fruitless to him. When in 1858 his old ally Schurz hinted that public duties existed alongside private life, he replied that 'public affairs approach me only in the form of beggary'.<sup>72</sup> But during the course of 1858 he did in fact gradually resume his political involvement among the exiles.

Kinkel's continued popularity among CABV members thus hardly meant that the entire club approved of all of his opinions, as Lessner suggested. Doubtless the Club's former radical stance had fallen into decay, but Kinkel's name went unmentioned at all of the large public meetings of the Society, and he nowhere represented the Club. On the contrary, the most politically active members in these years were linked to the International Association, which Kinkel had declined to join. It thus needs to be emphasised that initial attempts at resuscitation relied on the efforts of unorthodox and of Weitlingian socialists as well as the impetus received through the International Committee.

Symptomatic of these efforts were two celebrations in 1856–1857 honouring Robert Blum, the member of the Frankfurt Parliament summarily shot in Vienna by victorious Austrian troops. Although Blum himself had not been a socialist but a member of the



democratic left, these celebrations became increasingly common in workers' clubs in the late 1850s. But as Liebknecht, later a biographer of Blum, explained, 'we were not celebrating the person Robert Blum but the revolution personified. The numerous faults of this personification were neither overlooked nor spared by any means.'<sup>73</sup> The short-lived *Bote aus London* greatly praised the CABV for its perseverance in upholding Blum's memory, but added that 'fundamentally Robert Blum was not the hero of the worker, and only his death has forged a spiritual link between Blum and the worker. In truth Robert Blum was the spokesman and demi-god of the liberal bourgeois.'<sup>74</sup> Yet it was almost exclusively socialists who commemorated Blum, with Schapper, Scherzer and Lessner representing the different groups of socialists within the CABV, and Talandier, Oborski and Chartists demonstrating the close connection with the International Association.<sup>75</sup>

This was Schapper's first public appearance after the end of his and Willich's branch of the Communist League. In April 1856 Marx met Schapper several times and 'found him very much the repentant sinner'. (Significantly, Marx added that 'there are all sorts of contingencies in which it might be advantageous to have the man to hand and, still more, to have him out of the hands of Willich'.)<sup>76</sup> But Schapper lacked the will to resume his political activism in the CABV, and was content to act as a mere figurehead, presiding over several meetings and giving general speeches without becoming much involved in propaganda or debates. Thus he participated at a Chartist meeting in May 1856, and at the Blum celebration the following November 'Herr [not "Citizen"!] Karl Schapper, who finds no enemies here' was elected president by general acclamation. Although Schapper's devotion to the workers' cause and to internationalism was undiminished, years of exile seem to have increased his fondness for his homeland, and his speeches at the Blum meetings tell of a defiant love for the 'true' fatherland. He compared German foreign policy favourably with that of Palmers ton or Bonaparte, and a few years later enthused that national unification had to precede social change in Germany. But Schapper in these years was mainly supporting his family. He could scarcely survive from his German, English, French and Latin teaching, and earned money by advising foreigners on practical problems like finding accommodation and solving bureaucratic muddles.<sup>77</sup> Besides this he taught 'the science of human nature' and gave courses in phrenology and physiognomy, popular pursuits among German exiles in which among others Struve, Liebknecht, Pfänder ('the party phrenologist and physiognomist')<sup>78</sup> and occasionally even Marx expressed interest.

Although Schapper did not officially rejoin the CABV until later, the society in the meantime was happy to have its old founder preside uncontroversially over formal occasions and celebrations, while relying for its political impetus on the efforts of the tailors Scherzer and, later, Lessner. The CABV now seemed to be growing so much that rumours arose about a possible union with two other radical German societies in London, the Harmonia and the Concordia clubs. Meeting twice weekly at 270 Holborn, the Deutsche Gesang-Verein Harmonia mainly provided evening entertainment and existed only briefly. The Concordia, however, was a more substantial organisation. Founded in 1849, it boasted some 200 members who came together for singing, dancing and recitals, and who also profited from the club's sickness and death funds. Its members were recruited 'from all walks of life', but its frequent joint celebrations with the CABV, its emphasis on mutual aid, and its radical leanings suggest that most of its subscribers were

working-class.<sup>79</sup> Increasingly lively during 1856–1857, the clubs also now held more social events in common, with the choirs of Concordia, Harmonia and the CABV alternating, and the three societies organising joint soirees.<sup>80</sup> The clubs never did unite. But their co-operation resulted in an increased interest in the CABV, and provided wider publicity for the International Association and the Commune Révolutionnaire as well as for the opinions of Schapper, Scherzer, Lessner and those Germans now increasingly in the foreground of the CABV, such as Bernhard Becker and Hugo Hillmann.

Besides these widening contacts, the CABV increased its international co-operation. Scarcely a CABV meeting in these years lacked a representative from the International Association, while all the important German members of the International Association came from the CABV. Indeed the CABV from 1855–1858 virtually *was* the German section of the International Association.<sup>81</sup> The two societies' joint celebration on 6 May 1856, which marks the first renewed stirrings of the CABV, was followed by similar events in the following years, such as a refugee's funeral in June 1858, which the International Association, the Commune Révolutionnaire, and the CABV (each brandishing a red flag) attended, and a joint day excursion by the CABV and the Association in August 1858. Each society's members, such as Oborski, Charles Murray, and Talandier, appeared at the others' functions, with newcomers such as the tailor H. Ermerich increasingly involved in the revived clubland.<sup>82</sup>

The link between the two organisations was most clearly personified by Scherzer, who from his arrival in London in 1855 remained involved in the CABV's politics until his death in 1879, and who was also the most tireless German representative in the International Association until its dissolution in 1859. From his first 'enthusiastic speech' in September 1855, Scherzer was present at virtually every public meeting held by either the CABV or the International Association. Scherzer renounced neither his Weitlingian distrust of 'Gelehrte' nor his revolutionary fervour. Warning his audiences against 'deifying' Blum, he argued that instead they should concentrate their energies on the coming revolution and its foremost aim, 'the improvement of the condition of the workers'. This could be best achieved by international solidarity.<sup>83</sup> In 1858 Scherzer was also busy reestablishing links between London and continental socialists, and sent propaganda to workers' societies in Switzerland. Privately Marx referred to Scherzer as an 'old Weitlingian jackass', but publicly he did acknowledge Scherzer's merits in terms of socialist agitation and propaganda.<sup>84</sup>

Scherzer's political opinions during these years were most clearly revealed in a manifesto he and Ermerich addressed to the German Communist Club in New York.<sup>85</sup> Demanding a revolution which would above all abolish the proletariat by superseding private property in capital, they described the future state as based on the 'dictatorship of labour' and the organisation of labour and consumption:

In such states no capital, no private property can exist, there is only one property which is equally distributed to every man, and that is man itself; hence each one is the highest for himself, all are the only and common property of the state. Only in this way is it possible to abolish thoroughly all differences of rank and property and the different levels of education which follow, in short, the 'classification of society'.

Besides some Weitlingian language here, Scherzer betrayed his past in the Willich-Schapper League by the emphasis he placed on differences of education as a leading source of social inequality. In the tradition of Willich's League, the manifesto also paid little heed to economic conditions in calling for a revolution.<sup>86</sup> Nor was Scherzer keen on providing an exact blueprint of the future society. Two years later, in a somewhat rambling speech to the International Association, Scherzer confirmed his opinion that

socialism can only be attained by a general revolution. Let us first look for that and for destruction of the old organisation and let us but then think of a new organisation...[where] every individual has duties and rights and...every one of us ought to enjoy the comforts of life... In a society well organized every [one] must work. The machines must be organized and care must be taken equally of intellectual work.<sup>87</sup>

Though Scherzer's views were apparently unopposed during the revival of the CABV in 1855–1857, after 1858 other forms of socialism came to the foreground in the club. Not only did 'Marxists' such as Lessner, Lochner and Liebknecht gradually assert their impact, several other newcomers also appeared on the scene. Among them was Hugo Hillmann, a brewer and publican from Elberfeld who in 1849 was involved in a local revolutionary committee and in the May uprising, had fled to London in the same year and was later to enjoy a long career in German Social Democracy.<sup>88</sup> Spies reported Hillmann's application for travel documents, noted that in May 1850 Struve's social republican club met at Hillmann's in Greek Street in Soho, where assemblies of 350 persons could be accommodated, and knew about Hillmann's employment as an interpreter at the Great Exhibition of 1851.<sup>89</sup> Besides speaking at Blum meetings, Hillmann joined the Central Committee of the International Association. There he showed himself chiefly concerned with the organisation of production and communal ownership of property, and he declared himself in favour of 'the Communism of free men. Our communism is the state of highest enlightenment', not based on primitive forms but on economic competition and modern technologies.<sup>90</sup> His political apprenticeship must have been relatively successful, for his fellow-exile Bernhard Becker later attested to Hillmann's agitational talents in the Barmen-Elberfeld region, despite his somewhat disastrous financial mismanagement.<sup>91</sup>

Becker himself, later Lassalle's highly controversial successor as president of the Allgemeine Deutsche Arbeiterverein, also took his first steps as a Social Democratic politician during his London exile, in the CABV and in the International Association.<sup>92</sup> Vacillating between the workers' organisations and the Nationalverein followers around Kinkel, Becker epitomised the dilemma of those republican democrats of 1848 who regarded organising the workers as their foremost aim. As a public speaker and journalist, for some time editor of the *Londoner Deutsches Journal* and the *Neue Zeit*, afterwards regular contributor to Kinkel's *Hermann*, Becker became more popular among London Germans than Hillmann. From 1857 on he frequently spoke in the CABV, and became the International Association's secretary in September 1859.<sup>93</sup> He passionately opposed the socialism of village communes advocated by Herzen, which some Polish members of the International Association had adopted, claiming that

Our socialism was not that of a barbarous nation still undeveloped in their material and intellectual resources, but came from the highest stage of enlightenment of our age... Our socialism followed...not from the state of nature, but from that of civilization... That culture of mind was especially to be found in towns, where there also were the army of 'proletaires' created by industrial development. The towns were in advance of the people in the country; they exhibited the very centres of enlightenment and contained the combatants of our revolution.

Villages in fact ought to be abolished entirely in favour of large centres from where modern science and new inventions could be utilised for agriculture.<sup>94</sup> Even more than Hillmann, Becker believed in exact science and planning which should replace speculation in governing production and distribution. He also felt that Scherzer's proposals of merely confiscating the instruments of labour were not enough. Instead, above all, a new organisation was needed so that competing interests should not set workmen against each other.<sup>95</sup>

The third prominent exile to link the CABV and the International Association was the Young Hegelian Edgar Bauer, who reached England in October 1851. Bauer marginally favoured Kinkel's Revolutionary Loan in 1852 but otherwise initially kept aloof from exile politics. Privately, he remained in close touch with Marx (despite their old controversy, immortalised in the 'Holy Family'), and Liebknecht later recalled that the three of them once embarked on a Tottenham Court Road pub crawl which ended with a sudden bout of patriotism on the part of the exiles, mutual insults with a group of English Odd Fellows, a series of broken street lamps and the wild flight of the three Germans from several London policemen.<sup>96</sup> Bauer had a steady if moderate income from his journalistic articles (mostly on the Schleswig-Holstein question) and—a fact unknown both to contemporaries and historians until recent discoveries—from regular payments by the Danish police. In 1852–1853 and between 1856 and 1861 Bauer sent detailed reports on London émigré circles to Copenhagen, some of which were passed on to German police.<sup>97</sup> 'Citizen' Bauer joined the CABV only in 1858, an indication of how important he regarded the club as being after its renewal, but thereafter spoke frequently there, lecturing on the history of the European powers since the Reformation and on Machiavelli and Hobbes, and even acting as the Society's 'speaker'. His talks were often summarised in the *Neue Zeit*, officially edited by Becker and Scherzer but, Marx suspected, run by Bauer from behind the scenes.<sup>98</sup> Soon Bauer also became influential in the International Association, even becoming its secretary and writing its June 1859 manifesto.<sup>99</sup>

Hillmann, Becker and Bauer thus all rose to prominence in London exile politics through the International Association and the CABV's revival. But none was typical of the socialist workers in the CABV, which still contained significant groups of 'Utopians' such as Scherzer, and the 'Marxists' led by Liebknecht, Lessner and Pfänder. Bauer and Becker, writing for *Hermann*, sided with Kinkel in the disputes of the following years, and Becker became active in the London Nationalverein. Eventually Hillmann and Becker found their way into German Social Democracy, while Bauer after returning to Germany wrote much on Schleswig-Holstein, and finally immersed himself in Christianity. Much of their collective role in the revival of German politics in London in

the late 1850s was played not only in the CABV, however, but also the International Association. Since the paths of the International Association and of German affairs in London diverged after renewed strife, we must outline the further development of the International Association, before turning our attention to internal German developments.

### The end of the International Association

In 1857 the International Association reached the climax of its career, when it published a journal printed in the languages of its associated groups, English, French, German and Polish. The monthly *Bulletin de l'Association Internationale* was the first attempt ever at the joint publication of a journal by groups from different nations, and appeared between June 1857 and March 1858.<sup>100</sup> German participation in the venture was lively. Scherzer—who remembered the *Bulletin* as the monthly ‘we’ edited—and Ermerich contributed their above-mentioned manifesto to the German communist club of New York. Bauer did the finances, and it was he who issued the final claim that the Association’s income of £53. 5s. 7d. in an entire year was insufficient to cover costs, such that publication had to cease.<sup>101</sup>

While the *Bulletin* indicated the Association’s strength in 1857, the same year also witnessed strong tensions in the group. The question at issue was an unusual cause of dissension for the German socialists and radicals: feminism. Gender equality had in fact been a standard demand of the Association from its inception. Its first manifesto of July 1855 advocated the rights of women, and the Statutes of 1856 expressly declared that ‘both ladies and gentlemen’ were members, a statement which was reiterated in later manifestoes.<sup>102</sup> But not all its members shared these opinions, much less put them into practice. One woman in particular took them to task for this. This was Jeanne Deroin, a well-known Saint-Simonian feminist and participant in the Paris club movement of 1848. She had insisted on the right of women to political participation, even running as the first woman candidate for the Legislative Assembly in 1849, and was sent to prison for attempting to organise a federation of workers’ associations. In her London exile she published an *Almanack des femmes* until 1854, pushed her French fellow exiles to accept her feminist principles and also wrote for *L’Homme*. For the refugees she proposed a ‘Projet d’Assurance Mutuelle pour le Travail et le Prêt fraternal’, for which she signed as secretary. In September 1857 Deroin demanded that the International Association support the political and social emancipation of women and pointed out that the revolution had liberated slaves but forgotten women. Her views, however, evoked much resistance in the Association. Observers later regretted ‘that the chairman permitted discussion of this question of the emancipation of women, since it evoked some passionate discussion and was quite alien to the character of this anniversary celebration’. Some weeks later a meeting for women’s emancipation was held, where a Madame de la Fontaine gave a ‘mystic-religious lecture’, but was contradicted by Deroin, whose expression of ‘socialist-revolutionary ideas’ led to the break-up of the meeting and the founding of an independent women’s club also open to German women. This Society for the Promotion of Solidarity of Socialist Women aimed to arrange mutual assistance for education and work, and to help socialist women struggle for social emancipation. No trace can be

found of the society afterwards, and it may have succumbed to fierce resistance by members of the International Association.<sup>103</sup>

In fact the Germans in the International Association were probably opposed to the notion of women's emancipation. Scherzer mentioned that the proposal of Talandier and Zeno Swietoslowski to elect women to the Central Committee 'evoked great opposition, since most members claimed that the time was not yet ripe for women'. Scherzer even blamed this vehement opposition for the break-up of the Association, which then consisted largely of CABV members. For while the club had for some years mixed with O'Brienites and Cabetists, who favoured more social and political influence for women, the CABV had hitherto opposed the emancipation of women, and nothing indicates a change in its attitude.<sup>104</sup>

In this respect only Bernhard Becker, also a Central Committee member, differed. From March 1858 on he published weekly 'Contributions on the History of Women', detailing the role of women from antiquity on. The general programme of the *Londoner Deutsches Journal* stated that men could not be free without free women and vice versa, and that 'our struggle for freedom in Europe is equally a struggle to free women'. This was unique among London Germans. And despite criticism, Becker carried this emphasis on women's issues into the successor journal, the *Neue Zeit*.<sup>105</sup> But he too objected to 'the mechanical, ridiculous practice of equality between the sexes' in the International Association.<sup>106</sup>

The debate about feminism, however, was just one among several topics causing dissension which eventually ruined the Association. Meetings became poorly attended, and police spies infiltrated several national subsections ('decuries') of the Association, whose speedy demise was prophesied, as 'its chief task, which does not seem to have been known precisely to all its members, must now be regarded as fulfilled' (a mysterious formulation perhaps hinting at involvement in a recent attentat on Napoleon).<sup>107</sup> Admitting 'great difficulties' in England, the group nonetheless produced another manifesto in June 1858 calling for 'a single moral, political and commercial law on the entire earth'. Without any particularly socialist demands, they declared that 'We are at war with the [Napoleonic] Empire and generally with every state not founded on public and personal freedom, on the right of every human being—male or female—and we only obey those laws we have freely consented to'.<sup>108</sup>

A few months later the International Association reissued the ten Demands formulated by the 1851 congress of the Willich-Schapper League, albeit concealing its provenance.<sup>109</sup> Swiętoslawski and others attempted to unite with Mazzini in a broadly based revolutionary 'party of the deed', but in December the International Association vehemently refused any collaboration 'with the selfish, property-loving, law and order republicans'.<sup>110</sup> In the Association's clearest class-orientated statement, they declared that the aid of the republican bourgeoisie was not required to work out the salvation of the human race. 'Plutocratic republicans', 'the enemies of the working classes', merely wanted to maintain the exploitation of man by man. Instead, the authors fought for a united Europe, 'one democratic and social republic, wherein all must be producers before they have the right to be consumers'. Now, therefore, 'a union of the veritable democracy—the proletarian socialists—of Europe' was needed.<sup>111</sup>

By then, however, only the recent 'extensive development' of the Association's American branches merited any praise. Groups existed in New York, Boston, Cincinnati

and Chicago. The Londoners, however, were most closely linked with the Icarian colony at Nauvoo and the Communist Club in New York, both of which largely consisted of German emigrants.<sup>112</sup> Dissent among the Icarians had repercussions in London, too, where the Association tried to avoid being drawn into the Americans' dispute.<sup>113</sup>

But while the American groups were fairly successful, the International Association in London contracted. Chartists such as Ernest Jones and Charles Murray, earlier strong supporters of the Association, no longer attended. Instead, shady characters like the Scotsman John Mackay came to 'represent' the British side. Violently opposed to co-operation with the middle classes, Mackay believed that 'only a worker can make laws for workers'. In the next revolution, he hoped, workers would retain control over arms and immediately dispense with traitors. This needed to be prepared for here and now:

Already in London the government has to be constituted which will have to be at the helm of the republic; here already the principles which are to govern France must be established. A dictatorship will have to be erected in the name of liberty; the republican government will have to confiscate all landed property in the name of the people ...the government must be the only employer.

Mackay stipulated that 'The direction of the revolution has to be put into the hands of three military dictators', advised by a committee with a majority of workers, who would call a national assembly solely dedicated to the organisation of labour.<sup>114</sup> Evidently impressed with such radicalism, the German émigrés regarded him (along with Tomlinson) as 'worthy leaders of our party'. In January 1859 he was elected to the new secretariat of the anarchist wing of the International Association. But he was soon discovered to be an *agent provocateur* in the pay of the French police, and he dropped out of sight.<sup>115</sup>

Besides the Chartists, the Polish émigrés also became increasingly dissatisfied with the Association. Though socialists like Oborski and Świętoslawski had been involved from the beginning, the Polish Central Committee in November 1856 imposed several conditions for its continued affiliation, and in January 1859 the Polish Revolutionary Commune withdrew because of the Association's increasingly anarchist tendencies, and because the Poles sympathised with Mazzini.<sup>116</sup>

This resulted in an actual split of the Association, with German members found in both branches afterwards. The more anarchist wing in January 1859 replaced the Central Committee by a 'central secretariat... always revocable', and defined the principles of the social revolution to be 'Absolute negation of all privileges; absolute negation of all authority; liberation of the proletariat. Social government can and must only be an administration nominated by the people, submitted to their control, and at any time revocable.'<sup>117</sup> These principles were also declared in a brochure addressed to a Belgian anarchist paper in May 1859. Among accusations and counter-accusations against their rivals, its authors singled out the Polish Commune révolutionnaire for having deserted the common cause and propagating unspecified 'outmoded' doctrines (probably meaning village communism),<sup>118</sup> and they especially expressed pride in having mostly workers as members.<sup>119</sup> This anti-authoritarian association comprised Mackay, many French

members, and some Germans, such as the worker N. Ulrich, recruited from the less prominent emigrants.

Most German exiles, however, stayed with the larger branch, including Hillmann, Scherzer, Bauer and Becker, besides whom only the (by now returned) Poles around Oborski and Swietoslowski remained as a recognisable national group. Only two obscure Englishmen named Young and Crump and the Frenchman Bonnin also stayed on, Talandier having amid protests retired into private life as a schoolmaster. Thus by this time the International Association had shrunk virtually into a German-Polish émigré organisation, which, however, remained quite active. In April 1859 they devised new statutes, and, unlike most other émigré organisations, they also decided to adopt English as their main language, partly because they hoped to influence a potential revolutionary turn in England.<sup>120</sup>

Continental affairs, however, remained more promising, and on the occasion of the Franco-Austrian war the group published in June 1859 an 'Address of the International Association to the Democratic Party', advocating 'a policy of neutrality', since from 'such a war no liberty, no peace, no national order can arise. The antagonism of nations is the source of the privileges of the tyrants, as the antagonism of individuals is the source of the privileges of those classes which prey upon the labour of others'. The manifesto also criticised the economic system which 'lies at the bottom of all problems of statesmanship'.<sup>121</sup> But its main subjects were the political implications of the war on the Continent and the sins of 'political gamblers'—both Napoleon III and his opponents. Although obviously concerned with the plight of 'the masses', the manifesto did not specify any classes. Instead, its appeal for 'fraternity of the peoples' was supported by general attacks on 'sham, forgery, hypocrisy' clad in a moral and psychological language.<sup>122</sup>

This manifesto was written for the Association by Edgar Bauer, then its secretary.<sup>123</sup> Bauer was soon afterwards exposed as a traitor and expelled from the Association.<sup>124</sup> As spies had repeatedly troubled the society, Bauer's exposure was now used as an excuse for reorganising the Association 'on a completely revolutionary basis'. New statutes were devised which placed more emphasis on socialism than had Bauer's *pronunciamientos* had. The Association still defined its aim as 'the universal democratic and social republic', but now expressly described itself as a 'revolutionary socialist party' seeking 'the overthrow of the economic system prevailing in the so-called civilised states' and the organisation of labour 'on the basis of equality'. Hence the association sought to reach its aim 'through the merging of nationalities' and proclamation of the 'true law of property'. The statutes permitted both men and women to join the society, and declared that 'it cannot and will not enter into association with antisocialists'.<sup>125</sup> Its internal discussions now focused on socialism and economic organisation.<sup>126</sup>

With this reorganisation the breach between the German members of the International Association and the CABV was also overcome. Schapper and Lessner, who had spoken at the annual June celebration of the Association, appeared again on the same platform as Hillmann and Oborski at the end of the year. Although no longer officially under the tutelage of the International Association, which did not meet again publicly, future gatherings carried on the idea of socialist internationalism among London émigrés, and meetings of 'socialist democrats of all countries' continued until the International Working Men's Association was founded a few years later.<sup>127</sup>



Contradictorily, the character of the International Association has been judged by historians as both 'petit-bourgeois' and 'proletarian and socialist'.<sup>128</sup> With respect to its German members, however, a single descriptive label is difficult to devise. Nicolaevsky certainly falsely assumed that in none of its statutes did the organisation speak of 'workers' or 'proletariat', which led him to define it as 'the last attempt to create an international organisation of the Young Europe type'.<sup>129</sup> Becker later described the Association as part of the working-class movement, 'completely revolutionary', and prepared 'to introduce the dictatorship of the socialist minority'.<sup>130</sup> In its social composition, too, the International Association was itself as much a workers' organisation as any other socialist international organisation of the period, from the Democratic Friends of all Nations of 1844 to the First International 20 years later.

Nor can it be doubted that the majority of its members saw themselves as socialists. The English version of the 1856 Constitution spoke of organising 'Socialist Democracy', and a year later its members specifically described themselves as not only republican revolutionists, but as socialists who maintained that the political revolution had to lead to a social revolution, abolish the existing forms of property and place the means of production in the hands of the people. Another year later they expected that a social revolution would replace bourgeois society by a workers' society. (The French version even used the expressions 'changer la société bourgeoise, en société ouvrière et communiste' and 'l'armée prolétaire'.) Scherzer's and Ermerich's manifesto in early 1858 also insisted that the revolution would abolish the proletariat, private property and capital via a 'dictatorship of labour'.<sup>131</sup> In their attack on Mazzini, they again clearly derided 'bourgeois' republicanism in favour of proletarian internationalism, and emphasised their class basis.<sup>132</sup>

But such pronouncements give only a part of the picture, since they were accompanied by non-socialist statements. For instance, the manifesto of July 1858 demanded equal political and social rights and was chiefly directed against the French emperor, without attacking any particular 'caste or estate'. Except for its anarchist and feminist tinge, it could have been formulated by most radical democratic exile groups. Bauer's 'Address to the Democratic Party' appealed to 'the friend of right and justice' in general, and his exhortations against selfishness, too, could find favour with all radical democrats.<sup>133</sup>

On the whole, though, the International Association cannot be described as 'petty bourgeois' and non-socialist. In the context of London exile politics its members did their utmost to formulate workers' demands for non-affiliated exiled revolutionaries. If their ideas on the future role of workers in post-revolutionary Europe were vague, this also reflected the necessity of remaining open to a wide variety of socialists, as well as some hesitation and indecision among the workers, who were still trying to formulate a theory for themselves. It is noticeable that Marx's adherents, such as Liebknecht and Lessner, fail to mention the International Association in their reminiscences, and that none of Marx's close circle of followers tried to steer the organisation closer to their own views. An over-concentration by historians on this narrower circle of Marx's close friends has prejudiced the evaluation of this group, too. But socialists such as Liebknecht, Schapper and Lessner actually played a much less significant role among London German workers until the late 1850s than other socialists such as Scherzer and Becker. It is due to the latter, then, that both socialism and internationalism were kept alive among the German workers around the CABV after the demise of the Communist League, and their views

clearly epitomise the kind of socialism that London German workers adhered to in the mid-1850s.

## 8

### The New Era, 1858–1860

#### The bombs of Orsini and the refugee question

For the exile community the year 1858 began—literally—with a bang. On 14 January 1858, Felice Orsini hurled two bombs which only just missed the French emperor, loathed equally by French, Italian and German refugees as the person most directly culpable for the continuing political repression on the Continent.<sup>1</sup> As soon as it transpired that Orsini's bombs had been manufactured in his English exile, both the British government and the émigré community were implicated, with the French government directly blaming the attentat on Britain's lax policy towards continental refugees. To mollify the French, Palmerston and Lord Clarendon, the Foreign Secretary, considered introducing a new Aliens Bill, and a Conspiracy to Murder Bill was drawn up.

In February the French refugee Simon Bernard was arrested for his role in the conspiracy, and tried as an accessory to murder. Public opinion reacted very strongly. As in the case of the Jersey expulsions, the machinations of a 'foreign potentate' were suspected to lie behind government activities. The situation worsened when the Polish bookseller Stanislaus Tchorzewski was also arrested for selling yet another open letter by Felix Pyat, Besson and Talandier, this time explicitly justifying Orsini's attempt as just punishment for the coup d'état. Then the radical publisher Edward Truelove was tried for publishing a manifesto by the Chartist W.E.Adams entitled 'Tyranicide: Is it Justifiable?'<sup>2</sup> Leading British radicals saw these prosecutions as an attack on the freedom of public discussion, and a defence committee was set up, which included eminent figures like John Stuart Mill, Harriet Martineau, Joseph Cowen (a lifelong supporter of exiles) and Charles Bradlaugh.

The refugees now began to regard the affair as 'a question of to be or not to be', their asylum was threatened and stories about midnight searches of refugees' desks and about prying into letters at the Post Office started to make the rounds.<sup>3</sup> Not only did the French government take an interest in the affair, but also Prussian authorities proceeded to use the opportunity against political opponents. The Berlin police linked Bernard to the German Forty-eighter and later Social Democrat Moritz Rittinghausen in Cologne, but did not follow up their inquiry among London Germans.<sup>4</sup> Many refugees regretted that the attentat had failed but worried about their own safety, and some also feared that their prospects for a Prussian amnesty were now destroyed.<sup>5</sup> The *Londoner Deutsches Journal* had spontaneously rejoiced at Orsini's attentat, approving of 'the people's revenge'. However, the paper soon trod more cautiously, and the following week it emphasised its trust in the common sense of the English people and their ability to find a solution without endangering freedom. The tone of the journal's attacks on the proposed new legislation was markedly less aggressive than that of its British counterparts among the radical press. The German paper now also stressed its abhorrence of the brutality and

inhumanity of the bombings, arguing moreover for heavy sentences for murderers, since they only served the purposes of tyranny and Jesuitism. Orsini was contrasted with William Tell, who did not contemplate assassination as a political weapon until he had secured his countrymen's support.<sup>6</sup>

Nonetheless the plight of Simon Bernard excited a great deal of sympathy among London Germans. His trial was reported at length in the *Londoner Deutsches Journal* and followed anxiously by the exile community. Many refugees, among them the democratic writer Malwida von Meysenbug, went to watch his trial, and greeted his acquittal by the jury with great relief and the feeling that 'one saw the year 1848 resurrected'.<sup>7</sup> In their eyes, the British jury had defended the rights to asylum and free speech against onslaughts by continental police. Bernard thus gained the stature of a hero of the refugees' cause, presiding over sessions of the International Association, and until his death remaining a very popular figure among exiles of all nations.<sup>8</sup>

With the fall of Palmerston's government over the Conspiracy Bill and the fortunate outcome of the trials against radicals and refugees in the wake of Orsini's bombs, the refugee question was largely closed for the British government. It had, however, considerably boosted the internal affairs of the refugees themselves, who had been propelled to the centre of radical attention in Britain. The debate among London radicals about the rights of émigrés had coincided with the recent revival of activities among London Germans. Now another opportunity for political agitation arose, and it was not lost on the more active emigrants.

One consequence of this revival was the seizure, during the first half of 1858, of the 'respectable' organ of the German community in London, the *Londoner Deutsches Journal*, by socialist workers. This rekindled the fights between socialists and democrats, but both the context and the aims of the struggles had changed. In Germany itself Prince Wilhelm had become regent and in November 1858 announced a 'New Era' in Prussian politics. New political parties had begun to emerge, with the constitutional liberal National Association agitating for German unification under Prussian leadership, and the activities of the radical liberal democrats giving a boost to the labour movement in Germany (and in London). Trade co-operatives and the Lassallean movement emerged from 1862–1863 on. Germans abroad began gradually to align with parties at home, and attempted to support struggles inside the fatherland, rather than open a separate front abroad.

These new issues and alliances chiefly became apparent on two different but related levels: in the booming social life of London Germans, and in their 'published opinion' in the various German-language London newspapers of these years. Both aspects mirror the same overall developments, the coming to terms with life as a German colony in London, and the transfer of political aspirations from exile back to the fatherland.

### **The German-language newspapers radicalised: from the *Londoner Deutsches Journal* to the *Neue Zeit***

While the *Londoner Deutsches Journal* had covered events among German workers and socialists for some time, it had generally taken a noncommittal stand. It held anti-Catholic views and advocated German unity and kept a patriotic and very cautiously

liberal profile. In January 1858, for instance, the paper detailed the joyous preparations of various London German societies for the forthcoming wedding of Queen Victoria's oldest daughter to the prince of Prussia, expressing its hope that this would lead Prussia more towards English constitutional ideas.<sup>9</sup>

In the following few months, however, the weekly underwent considerable changes. The proprietor, Vannier, dismissed its editor, Hirschfeld, because of his continued private feud with Korn, and replaced him with Bernhard Becker.<sup>10</sup> Becker at this point had become one of the most popular journalists active in local German politics, and he was particularly concerned with the need to place democratic politics on a 'scientific basis', on a 'new science deduced from the democratic principle'.<sup>11</sup> 'The principle of liberty, equality, fraternity is our uniting tie...from which we develop a science by applying its consequences to the elements of the state', he put it on one occasion. What was required now, he thought, were intensive studies of legal, economic, political and educational sciences, to be complemented by psychological and rhetorical training.<sup>12</sup>

None of this was particularly new or original, but Becker struck a chord among the radical and democratic circles whose members felt themselves to be again on an upswing. Gaining in confidence himself, Becker soon added new themes and a new and aggressive tone to his more standard democratic pronouncements. He discontinued reporting on the stock market and on theatre performances, and substituted his series of articles on the position of women in different ages and societies, undeterred by the rumpus which his argument that women's emancipation was a precondition for genuine political freedom was causing among the International Association. Moreover, Becker exceeded the constitutional liberalism so far advocated in the *Londoner Deutsches Journal*, and espoused radical republicanism as well as the merger of all European states into one republic.

But the most significant change in Becker's new approach was his turn towards the German workers in London as the journal's main readership. In his view the German bourgeoisie were merely the agents of the police of the various states. This political system could be changed only violently, and only through those artisans, workers and peasants who were capable of education. Political restructuring was not enough, unless accompanied by social reform.<sup>13</sup> But for Becker the latter would have to go well beyond the plans propagated by liberal social reformers. Apparently thinking of Hermann Schulze-Delitzsch in Germany or of Korn's recent experiment in London, he castigated proposals for savings banks and municipal reforms as narrow-minded and 'philistine'. Instead, the historical development of the last centuries pointed towards centralisation which could alone create 'peace and order through the new revolution'.<sup>14</sup>

Becker was also harsh on many other reformers, attacking Proudhon as an 'imperial court philosopher', and also publishing a sharp diatribe against Kinkel, which singled him out among many democratic leaders for 'fickleness and treason'. Becker was particularly outraged at Kinkel's arrogant appearances in the CABV which were only meant 'to keep their options open and to flirt with the workers...in order to patronise and to flaunt their professorship'. Since Kinkel had refused to attend democratic demonstrations, participate in the International Association or help its *Bulletin* or the *Londoner Deutsches Journal* either with articles or with money, Becker thought he might as well stay in his 'elegant drawing rooms' and out of 'the democratic pubs, which are not meant to serve as mirrors to your self-satisfied narcissism'.<sup>15</sup>

The venom of this attack was intended to cause embarrassment, and it did. But at this point the new owner of the *Londoner Deutsches Journal*, the bookseller V. Ermani, decided to shift its political line. Less than three months of increasingly radical editorship had exacerbated political divisions among the London Germans, and in the contest between moderate liberals and radical democrats increasingly allied with socialists, Becker fell between two stools and had to resign. As he pointed out in his parting address to his readers, the *Londoner Deutsches Journal* had been 'the only decidedly revolutionary organ of the free press in Europe' (at least for a German-language audience).<sup>16</sup> But the paper had become a pawn in the wider political struggle. In its last phase it had mainly been supported by German workers in London who had unsuccessfully lobbied Kinkel for money from the Revolutionary Loan. Andreas Scherzer had persuaded Malwida von Meysenbug to lend her help, and she in turn prepared to solicit assistance from Kinkel and Freiligrath, when the article assaulting Kinkel appeared. Immediately she declared that she would never take part in an enterprise where he was treated so ignominiously, gave Scherzer 'a piece of my mind' and wrote an article responding to Becker, apparently hoping that the journal had not yet completely gone over to the socialists: 'If he prints it, and if we can snatch the thing [i.e. the paper] from the Marxians', she wrote to Kinkel, 'all is well; but if not, the thing may s' en aller au diable', adding that 'I *do* want to work against these Marxians and to see who is stronger, the unselfish protagonists of the idea or the mercenary theoreticians'.<sup>17</sup> The gap between socialists and democratic reformers was clearly widening.

The development of the two successor journals after Becker's dismissal indicates that compromise between the two parties among London Germans was no longer possible. Ermani's own successor paper, the *Londoner Deutsche Zeitung und Allgemeiner Anzeiger*, soon took its stand against the socialist workers, gave up any republican aspirations and became fiercely *grossdeutsch*-nationalist. Described by opponents as an 'Austrian Jesuits' paper', it hoped that German unification would emerge from an alliance between Prussia and Austria, which would make Germany 'the greatest nation in the world'.<sup>18</sup> It also propagated economic and social views diametrically opposed to those of its predecessor. Espousing the motto of 'freedom and progress', it came close to the views of economic liberalism the *Kongress der Volkswirte* was just beginning to spread in Germany. A special section of advertisements 'for capitalists' seeking business connections was introduced, and the paper discussed investments, trade connections, and German industrial development.<sup>19</sup> It did, however, take a critical stand on, for instance, the pervasive poverty in London. But in common with much German liberalism, it placed high hopes on the existing authorities who should fend for 'the weak', singling out the German Hospital in London as a shining example of a charitable institution. The paper also supported Bright's parliamentary reform campaign, the literary Society of the Friends of Poland, and Mazzini's *Pensiero ed Azione*.<sup>20</sup> It also strongly favoured Kinkel, who once again was becoming a prominent figure in London German politics. Kinkel's poems were printed, his lectures on literature and art history praised as 'virtually the only intellectual common ground among the Germans in London', and his wife Johanna was extolled at great length.<sup>21</sup> However, Ermani could not compete when Kinkel began to publish his own newspaper, and the *Londoner Deutsche Zeitung und Allgemeiner Anzeiger* and its short-lived successor, *Germania*, did not find a sufficiently large audience.<sup>22</sup>

Becker, however, was to move in a very different direction. Only a week after the demise of the *Londoner Deutsches Journal*, on 26 June 1858, he began to edit a new paper, *Die Neue Zeit. Organ der Demokratie*.<sup>23</sup> It continued Becker's previous editorial policies, even resuming his series on the role of women in history. But the *Neue Zeit* was also far more ambitious than Becker's earlier efforts. Reflecting on the function of a German-language paper in England, a contributor (presumably Becker) regretted that the heterogenous composition of Germans in London did not favour such undertakings. Some Germans intended to stay permanently in England, whereas others yearned to return and were preoccupied with events in the fatherland. Only a very small portion had been driven to London through political motives, but the majority disapproved of the current German governments. An uncensored German paper capable of communicating with its readers in Germany should thus concentrate on political education and aspire to become the organ of those forced to keep quiet at home.<sup>24</sup> This ambition reflects the classic mission of an exile paper: first, to unify the disparate Germans abroad, second, to stay in touch with those left behind and be recognised as representing their political and intellectual avant-garde, and, third in this way even to be 'the embodiment of the real Germany because official events in Germany do not represent our fatherland'.<sup>25</sup> All of this became more relevant now that change in the Prussian government seemed imminent.<sup>26</sup>

More important for the development of exile politics than the professed aims of the editors, however, was the new style of management, which included an increasing orientation towards a working-class audience. Subscriptions were acknowledged publicly by name, and a committee was formed to finance the *Neue Zeit* by five-shilling shares. The shareholders met at the 'Horse and Dolphin', 11 Macclesfield Street, Soho, the premises of the CABV, and 'all friends of liberty' were invited to attend. This soon gave the club control of the paper, with other CABV members helping with editing and then supplanting Becker. From September 1858 on, Friedrich Zinn signed as the responsible editor (he was formerly an associate of Willich's and was soon to initiate the *Bund deutscher Männer*, a workers' club sympathising with Schulze-Delitzsch and Kinkel). Ten weeks later, Andreas Scherzer, the tailor with many years of experience in the Communist League, the International Association and the CABV, took over the management and editorship of the *Neue Zeit*.<sup>27</sup> Many regarded him as no more than a front man for Edgar Bauer.<sup>28</sup> An acquaintance described Scherzer's lively imagination, honesty, popularity and energy, which made him 'an agitator in the true sense of the word'. Because of his illiterate beginnings, all his previous literary attempts had been corrected by experts, and even as editor of the *Neue Zeit*, 'He never writes any articles, only once or twice his short verses were published. The true editors were E. Bauer, Becker, Oswald and Schapper'.<sup>29</sup>

The new management was reflected in the changing content of the *Neue Zeit*. Internal club affairs were again announced. From early summer 1858 on, the CABV met again three times weekly at the 'Horse and Dolphin', on Wednesdays and Sundays for lectures and discussions, on Saturdays for 'social entertainment'.<sup>30</sup> Moreover, the paper now discussed problems of the organisation of industries, workshops and associations of trades, which its predecessor had never mentioned. The *Neue Zeit* notably criticised the prejudice of many democrats against machinery and argued that, instead of resisting the inevitable trend of modern history, democratic ideas should be applied to economic life

as well. This, it was argued, implied the greatest possible centralisation to replace current industrial anarchy. More immediately practically, the paper also tried to help Germans find work in London by printing notices of vacancies, for example in domestic service or in the saddlers' and bag makers' trades, while the many German tailors in London were invited to join the 'good and respectable workers of all nations' in the United Tailors' Association of London.<sup>31</sup>

The editors of the *Neue Zeit* also wanted to offer workers a forum for open discussion. A column entitled 'Workers' Voices' printed letters from workers' clubs and readers abroad, and specifically called upon 'all proletarians, even if they hold different opinions, to join us and to tell us their views, so that we can settle the issue among ourselves and agree what to demand after the revolution'.<sup>32</sup> Readers did not hesitate to take up this encouragement, and their lively response showed the considerable interest the paper succeeded in arousing. For example, an article had claimed that only workers had sufficient strength to carry out a revolution, that workers alone bore the burden of social production which oppressed and isolated them, and that hence they could not be interested in bourgeois pseudo-revolutions but only in their own revolution. Some readers, however, were unwilling to go so far, and argued instead that this 'communist principle, taken to its utmost consequences,...[was] counter-revolutionary', and that they should first create a political revolution, and only once that had 'become permanent', should the proletariat join the struggle for its own aims. Another reader similarly objected to 'communist agitation' because that was now encouraged only by 'agents of the reaction' to keep workers from any revolutionary activity.<sup>33</sup>

If the readers' views were controversial, so were those of the paper's regular contributors. One of the dominant issues of the time, both in Germany and among Germans in London, was the question of national unification, and once again the fate of Schleswig-Holstein was the focal point of passionate debate. Thus while Scherzer argued against dividing international democracy and for a common European parliament,<sup>34</sup> the paper also contained a declaration of sympathy with the sufferings of the Schleswig-Holstein provinces living under hateful foreign rule. This, however, was followed by a retort by Bernhard Becker claiming that proletarians wanted 'neither a "great" nor a "little" Germany':

Far from wanting to lock as many Europeans as possible into the boundaries of a German Eden, we would rather abolish the barriers between the hostile and separated nations. We want generally to do away with national paradises which must always have forbidden trees for workers.<sup>35</sup>

The editors added that the Schleswig-Holstein question had 'lost all revolutionary substance' since 'German patriotism has become the privilege of princes'. It was a mistake to hope for a war to liberate the provinces, since modern wars were waged solely by and in the interests of capital. Discussing the relevance of patriotism for workers, the editors claimed that frequently it was those expelled rebels who nonetheless turned out to be the true representatives of their family. In a bout of patriotism they exclaimed: 'Leave us the consolation that we are the true children of mother Germania, who expelled us in order to nourish a generation of bastards on her pastures.'<sup>36</sup>



But the *Neue Zeit* also gave much space to internationalist activities, and Scherzer even regarded it as a direct continuation of the International Association's defunct *Bulletin*.<sup>37</sup> While rejecting the type of nationalism increasingly popular with the German middle classes, the *Neue Zeit*, like the International Association, gradually imbued the radical democratic strain of the old Forty-eight movement with notions taken from non-Marxian socialism. The paper specifically addressed an audience of 'proletarians', and identified the cause of democracy as that of the proletariat, demanding a society where the proletariat disappeared and work became everyone's social duty.<sup>38</sup> It warned workers against Bright's Reform Association as trying to persuade workers to accept the present system of exploitation. Instead the editors claimed that 'Whoever really wishes for the welfare of the people will come to us; because by liberating our class, by abolishing all class differences, we establish general and genuine freedom and abolish the exploitation of man by man'.<sup>39</sup>

This was plainly no longer mere radical democracy. In fact, the chief aim of the *Neue Zeit* as a whole can be seen in terms of an attempt to wed the revolutionary beliefs of radical democrats to the type of communism advocated at the beginning of the decade by the group around Willich. The paper also reflected the esteem in which Willich was still held among CABV members, announcing to 'all social republicans' the happy news of his new journalistic venture, the *Cincinnati täglicher Republikaner*, and reprinting his editorials. An article referred back to the proposed steps to be taken before, during and after the revolution, drawn up by the Willich-Schapper League in 1851, and described the future struggle between the propertied class and the workers in alliance with the ruined petit bourgeoisie and the academic youth, but mentioned no changes in the economic structure. Moreover, adherents of Wilhelm Weitling also wrote for the paper, arguing for instance that proletarians as individuals and as a class were tyrannised by 'the money system', while financial and industrial speculators produced nothing. (This article was probably written by the furrier Petersen, a former member of Willich's League and contributor to Weitling's *Republik der Arbeiter*.)<sup>40</sup> Another contributor, Heinrich Feibel, who praised Freiligrath as 'the true hero of the proletarian party' in an article originally published in Struve's New York paper, had also belonged to the CABV during its Willich-Schapper phase.<sup>41</sup>

On the whole, though, the *Neue Zeit* remained very open-minded, allowing for more dissent than any other German paper in London. Conceiving its role as primarily providing a forum for discussion among German workers it also rejected the repeated suggestion that it devise a 'battle plan' for revolution or a programme for the future society.<sup>42</sup> But the paper's openness extended only so far. Although the *Neue Zeit* accepted contributions from veteran republicans such as Karl Blind and even the anti-communist Harro-Harring, it drew the line at Kinkel. Having inherited the squabble with Kinkel as the exponent of 'bourgeois democracy' from its predecessor, the *Neue Zeit* did not hesitate to accuse 'Dr Godefrey Kinkle' (as it termed him) of sacrificing his German identity in order to gain acceptance in English fashionable circles. The paper printed an anonymous article (by Marx) ridiculing Kinkel's proposal to read German poetry to a 'select' party touring the English Lakes. It moreover demanded a share of Kinkel's fund. Under Scherzer's editorship, Kinkel was briefly treated more politely. His wife's death was honoured with an obituary on 'Bürgerin Johanna Kinkel' and a poem written by Freiligrath for her funeral, and Kinkel's lecture series was advertised. But after Kinkel

began his own weekly newspaper, the *Hermann*, Becker again attacked ‘the gentlemen aesthetes’ and ‘democratic bel esprit’, while not naming names.<sup>43</sup>

Money was the reason for a good part of this renewed hostility. Scherzer had tried to enlist the help of well-known Forty-eighters for his paper, but none, including Kinkel, had been willing to associate themselves publicly with the communists (except for Edgar Bauer, who lectured at the CABV anyway and was—in his own dubious way—closely tied to the International Association, and his friend Eugen Oswald).<sup>44</sup> Kinkel not only refused to write for the *Neue Zeit* but actually contributed to the financial collapse of the CABV’s paper, for in early 1859 Kinkel began to publish the *Hermann*.<sup>45</sup> Scherzer later generously attributed the demise of his paper and the rise of the *Hermann* merely to the fact that Kinkel ‘through his Revolutionary Loan could afford sacrifices that we workers were not able to make’. At the time, however, more insidious accusations of the ‘trivial manoeuvres of capital against labour’ were made. In order to prevent further issues of the *Neue Zeit*, for example, Kinkel allegedly had offered a better deal to the printer if the latter would work for the *Hermann* alone, and Edgar Bauer was accused of defecting to the better-paying *Hermann*.<sup>46</sup>

Scherzer was bitterly disappointed at the demise of his venture. He suspected intrigues by Zinn, the *Neue Zeit*’s former editor, who was ‘immensely upset because our society closed ranks with the one in Whitechapel he had been expelled from’, and who tricked subscribers into taking the *Hermann* instead. But above all he now felt that the paper had succumbed to Marx’s web of intrigues against Bauer:

I do not say what I think because Liebknecht who is Marx’s adjutant does great services to the society... Even if Bauer did not exactly enter into the social questions, his criticism was nonetheless laudable and does not deserve to be so belittled now. People who are too lazy to do anything themselves cannot and do not want to see that others act.<sup>47</sup>

With the downfall of the *Neue Zeit* in April 1859 the rejuvenation of exile politics had thus reached a climax. Democrats had become radicalised and taken up co-operation with socialists. This process had found a parallel on the side of liberal nationalism: with the ‘New Era’ and pressure from the Schleswig-Holstein issue, the national question came to the fore, with an increasing exclusion of social problems. Again, Kinkel was prominent in this process.

### The ‘Kinkel revival’

The editors of the *Neue Zeit* had good reason to focus on Kinkel. Not only might he have engineered the financial collapse of their paper, but he also rallied the democratic refugees again. This ‘Kinkel revival’, as Marx called it, began during the summer of 1858.<sup>48</sup> In June Kinkel resumed his appearances in the CABV, which greatly annoyed Friedrich Lessner. In August he canvassed for a literary-cum-social excursion, and in October his poems were again brought to the attention of the German audience. He also published a play, *Nimrod*, in which one character ‘represents bourgeois views’, another

‘the communist proletariat’, and which was causing quite a stir in the fatherland, and his wife hoped that it would lead hitherto indifferent classes ‘to the party of freedom’.<sup>49</sup>

Kinkel had thus already re-emerged from his relative seclusion from German public life in London when an unforeseeable event suddenly focused attention on him. On 15 November 1858 Johanna Kinkel fell out of an upstairs window, killing herself accidentally—as the coroner’s report stated—or committing suicide in a fit of jealousy, as many friends and foes suspected. Marx, in one of his more vitriolic moods, ignored the convention of *de mortuis nil nisi bene* and accused Kinkel and his ‘coterie’ of ‘exploiting the death of the nasty, “acrimonious shrew” (for such was the affected, speciously clever, essentially coarse personality...).’<sup>50</sup> Marx, in fact, was not without grounds in suspecting that the bereaved husband sought to garner publicity from the occasion. Against his wife’s explicit wishes Kinkel immediately published her thinly disguised autobiographical novel, and later sold her piano as a quasi reliquary.<sup>51</sup> If Kinkel aimed to curry favour, moreover, he certainly succeeded. Ferdinand Freiligrath, who had carried on an uneasy friendship with the Kinkels, wrote a poem on the occasion of Johanna’s funeral, praising her staunch faith in ‘Freiheit, und Lieb’ und Dichtung!’, and proclaimed her a martyr fallen on the battlefield of exile:

Ein Schlachtfeld auch ist das Exil—Auf dem bist du gefallen.

Marx was outraged and accused Freiligrath of thinking that ‘because the Kinkel woman has broken her neck, her husband has become a great man, or at very least a noble one’. Marx complained that ‘Schapper and I and 100 others know better what it is to “fight” in London than do the “scattered remnants” beside the old harridan’s grave’, adding that it was ‘nice of Freiligrath to give the signal for a Kinkel revival in Germany’.<sup>52</sup> And indeed Freiligrath’s poem did contribute significantly to the sympathy bestowed on Kinkel. Even the *Neue Zeit* temporarily put its feud aside to print the poem and add an article on Johanna Kinkel’s death, while the *Londoner Deutsche Zeitung* printed a long report of the funeral with a detailed obituary extolling Johanna’s musical compositions and her republican fervour.<sup>53</sup>

Kinkel spent the next few weeks in a flurry of activity. He immediately commenced a new series of lectures on art in antiquity before ‘a very numerous and select audience’ of well-to-do Camberwell Germans who shared his patriotism.<sup>54</sup> At the same time, he solicited the support of this audience for a second ambitious project which he began to advertise in December. This was a new London German-language weekly periodical, published and edited by Kinkel and destined to become the most successful of all such enterprises. Its title, *Hermann*, referred to the national hero who drove Roman legions out of the northern German forests, and indicated Kinkel’s attempt to tap growing concern for national unification. Freiligrath regarded the title as ‘antediluvian’, whereas according to the less charitable interpretation by Engels and Marx, the name, if not ‘clearly a misprint for *Gottfried*’, recalled as godfather ‘not the Cheruscan, I presume, but Goethe’s simpleton’.<sup>55</sup>

The *Hermann* survived crises of finance, management and political dissension for over half a century, until August 1914. Its initial success was due largely to the careful and professional preparation organised by Kinkel, and to his well-to-do supporters, in particular German City merchants around the banker Isidor Gerstenberg.<sup>56</sup> But the main

reason for the paper's success was its harmonisation with the views of the majority of German readers in London, among whom the issue of national unification and of the 'New Era' in Prussia began to dominate political debate. While in early 1859 Kinkel was still convinced that political freedom and German unity could only be achieved in a republic, the *Hermann* soon ceased to agitate for a republic as a goal in itself and declared in favour of German unity as the single demand on which all Germans could agree.<sup>57</sup>

As part of its scheme to foster national identity, the *Hermann* sought to include a wide spectrum of London Germans. Within a few months it published articles on different social clubs, working conditions among German sugar bakers, tailors and governesses, and the history of German settlement in England. Several articles by Karl Blind discussed Schleswig-Holstein and the relation between the state and 'nationality', repeatedly stressing the need for Germans abroad to set an example for German unification by overcoming their internal disunion, which still set, for example, the Hannoverian against the Hessian.<sup>58</sup> The aim of representing all Germans in London on the other hand also justified undermining rival papers, the *Londoner Deutsche Zeitung* as well as the *Neue Zeit* and its successor, *Das Volk*. But even before these competitors had been vanquished, the *Hermann* had attracted some 1,700 subscribers and many lucrative advertisements, and had become profitable, in 1866 selling 3,000 copies.<sup>59</sup> The main reason for this continued support was undoubtedly its identification with the renewed enthusiasm for German unification which was felt both inside Germany and among London expatriates from 1858 on.

On the social question the *Hermann* essentially echoed the position held by national liberals in Germany. The *Nationalverein*, which was founded in September 1859 by liberal and moderate democrats from many different German states, not only worked for unification under Prussian leadership, but also for the democratic goals of 1848–1849. One of its main proponents, moreover, was the very popular Hermann Schulze-Delitzsch, who aimed to relieve poverty by forming co-operatives functioning according to free market mechanisms, while providing educational institutions, which would eventually overcome the evils of unrestrained materialism.<sup>60</sup> These views the *Hermann* enthusiastically reiterated. 'Free labour' and the absence of obstacles like guild regulations had attracted many German workers to England, the paper claimed. Another leading article argued against the 'right to work', and contended that government control of industry would turn the state into an agglomeration of workhouses.<sup>61</sup> A series comparing German and English workers praised Adam Smith, free trade, free exchange, and the sanctity of property, and then launched into an attack on all varieties of communism and socialism from Weitling to Proudhon. Such economic doctrines were at the core of the conflict between the national liberals around the *Hermann* and the socialists in the CABV, who immediately rejected them in their weekly, *Das Volk*.<sup>62</sup> Kinkel also upset Ermerich and others in the CABV when he argued there that once a form of government (hopefully a republic) had been established by the will of the people and with the help of the workers, he would oppose, if necessary with arms, any attempt by one single class to overthrow this government violently, and he warned workers against the illusion of an eventual abolition of capital.<sup>63</sup>

This conflict spread to the different German societies in London. While socialists were again setting the tone in the CABV, other workers' societies supported Kinkel and the

*Hermann*. The paper, for example, applauded as an example of true workers' self-help the recently founded Germania, a mutual aid society, and warmly recommended their system of savings' banks, while warning against using such savings to support strikes for higher wages.<sup>64</sup>

Such non-socialist workers' clubs also built on earlier efforts. At Mazzini's instigation, and fuelled by the revolutionary zeal which followed the Orsini and Bernard affair, Malwida von Meysenbug for instance had in summer 1858 convened a group of German workers, among them Scherzer, for political discussion and 'direct revolutionary propaganda'. Following Mazzini's methods and aims in his recent agitation for a broad republican 'partito d' azione', she hoped to organise workers into a 'party of action', and secretly collected money not only for pamphlets and emissaries but, if necessary, for 'direct action'. She regarded Mazzini's ideas as much superior to 'the foolish communism and excessive longings for levelling of the International', and quite bluntly stated her determination to 'work against these Marxists'. She explained her project to Kinkel: 'Scherzer was here...and believe me, dear friend, morale among the workers is very good. They quite see that communism does not work for now, and one must use this disposition'.<sup>65</sup> Soon afterwards, when the big news among London Germans was Kinkel's new *Hermann*, she worried that a letter from Kinkel had antagonised Scherzer and Ermerich, and asserted that in order to collect 'the party' more consideration and prudence towards the workers was required.<sup>66</sup> By the time Meysenbug had assembled some 20 workers in her club, she persuaded Mazzini to speak to them. But his lecture again underscored the differences between mere republicans and those workers 'already too much infected with communism', some even 'entirely under the influence of Marx', who demanded to know what Mazzini's proposed universal republic offered to workers. Moreover, the social gap between the workmen and middle-class ladies like Meysenbug and her helper Angelika von Lagerström (who had been expelled from Saxony for her unorthodox religious beliefs) undermined the enterprise, since the ladies felt repelled by 'a certain conceited aspiration to step out of their own sphere' on the part of the workers, and even to exercise 'a certain coarse gallantry towards the ladies'.<sup>67</sup>

This episode clearly highlights the problems involved in organisational attempts by well-meaning if condescending Germans of the liberal middle class. A more successful example of national and republican working-class clubs was provided by the Bund deutscher Manner (League of German Men). Founded at New Year 1859 by the composer Friedrich Zinn at the 'Castle Tavern', Little Alie Street, in Whitechapel, the Bund, like most other workers' clubs, offered lessons in rhetoric, singing and English, as well as sick benefits to its members. Zinn had in late 1858 been a president of the CABV, but had found the club 'not decisive enough' and was ousted as editor of the CABV's *Neue Zeit* in November. He then attempted to rally some 30 Germans in Whitechapel, where he lived, as the 'Workers' Society of the East End'. Zinn had intended this to be a rival to the CABV, but the majority of the members of the new club (led by the tailor Lange) decided to constitute themselves as a branch of the CABV. Zinn then withdrew to found the Bund deutscher Manner, specifically directed against the CABV.<sup>68</sup> Describing its politics as '*schwarz-rot-gold*' and 'German national', the club soon sided with Kinkel, and, when he was criticised in the *Volk*, ceased its subscription to the paper.<sup>69</sup> The Bund deutscher Manner also serenaded Kinkel (at his own instigation, as the *Volk* suspected). Kinkel in turn lectured to the society, and was, with Blind, Freiligrath and Ronge, toasted

at their festivities. Thirty-five Bund members supported Kinkel against one of his opponents in the London branch of the National Association.<sup>70</sup>

The League of German Men became very popular with German workers in the East End. Within a year it claimed 95 members and twice as many visitors, and soon frequently organised events with other societies, such as the Harmonic, Germania, the Islington singing society, and even on occasion the CABV.<sup>71</sup> These social gatherings contributed to the League's popularity, as excursions, chorus bands and concerts always drew crowds among London Germans, especially when their songs were national-liberal and patriotic, such as 'Was ist das Deutschen Vaterland?' and 'Schleswig-Holstein stammverwandt'.<sup>72</sup> It maintained its close alliance with Kinkel's *Hermann* and the National Association throughout.<sup>73</sup> In 1865 the club organised a credit association modelled on Schulze-Delitzsch's in Germany.<sup>74</sup>

This revival of clubland activity, as well as Kinkel's efforts to unite the London Germans, had much to do with continental politics. Most Forty-eighters believed that the existing stalemate on the German question, on which political and social reforms seemingly depended, could only be broken up by the cathartic effect of foreign political crises. Their hopes were thus revived with the outbreak of war in Italy in April 1859. However, the Italian national movement with its revolutionary ambitions was too weak by itself to end Austrian domination in northern Italy, and accepted military help from Napoleon III. For patriotic Germans the war posed many problems. Certainly the Italian people's struggle for unification elicited much sympathy, but it was a German power, Austria, against whom the national liberation movement was directed. Above all, the emergence of Napoleon as a protagonist of national rights was eyed with suspicion, since it was widely assumed that France, strengthened by its Italian acquisitions, would attempt to expand across the Rhine. Foreign politics and diplomatic and territorial decisions were thus at the centre of debates, in which—for the first time since the revolution—a large and excited public participated. These issues were intimately interwoven with questions of German domestic politics, but disagreements did not necessarily run according to established party divisions. The majority, which out of fear of French hegemonial desires sided with Austria, included conservatives, Catholics, liberals, *grossdeutsche* democrats, and also Marx and Engels. A smaller group wanted to help Austria only if Prussia gained thereby, hoping that the German question would be solved in consequence. A third group, which comprised figures as diverse as Bismarck, Lassalle and Ruge, argued that Prussia should use the situation to expel Austria completely from Germany.

These divisions also appeared among the Forty-eighters in London. Engels's articles in the *Volk*, originally published as a pamphlet in April 1859, denounced the 'patriotic' opinion that Lombardy and Venice were 'so to speak, an integral part of Germany'. Lothar Bucher 'protested against any claim by foreigners (Italians, that is) to Venezia', and over the issue fell out with the *Hermann*, to which he had initially contributed, as did Karl Blind.<sup>75</sup>

The main organisation in London to take the Prussian side was the *Nationalverein*, or National Association. From August 1860, the *Hermann* strongly advocated membership of the organisation, and in December Trübner, Juch, Bernhard Becker and others founded a London branch which claimed over 200 members within a month and grew to be one of the most successful political groups in London.<sup>76</sup> Its agitation for unification focused on foreign politics, especially the Schleswig-Holstein issue, and included a special

committee agitating for a German fleet.<sup>77</sup> But it tended more than the Association's branches in the fatherland to include democratic demands in its constitutional programme and to criticise the Prussian government, especially in the *Hermann*. Kinkel explained to his erstwhile enemy Ruge that 'I do not believe there is a revolutionary tension in Germany and have therefore joined the Association which to begin with succeeds in getting the Germans *here* to rally and to bother about national politics at all'.<sup>78</sup>

While the Nationalverein thus united those accepting a *kleindeutsche* unification, Karl Blind, a close ally of Hecker and Struve in Baden during the revolution and in the early 1850s a member of the Communist League, became one of the leading anti-Prussians among the exiles. He plunged into brisk republican agitation in 1857.<sup>79</sup> Raising £100 even from Kinkel—surprisingly, since no-one else could squeeze funds out of the infamous *Nibelungenhort*—he produced a large number of pamphlets, among them his pronouncedly anti-Russian pamphlet *Über Staat und Nationalität*, which created quite a stir.<sup>80</sup> His attack in the *Hermann* on panSlavism duly cost the paper the support of Herzen's friend Meysenbug, much to Kinkel's regret.<sup>81</sup> But Blind also disagreed vehemently with Kinkel himself on the value of Prussia for German unification. At the beginning of the New Era, in 1858–1859, most refugees were willing to give the new Prussian government the benefit of the doubt, and until the notorious constitutional conflict between the king and the parliament erupted in 1861–1862 they hoped that Prussia would lead the unification movement. But Blind's nationalism remained republican and staunchly anti-Prussian even then, and thus constituted a third type of response to the New Era, modelled on Mazzini's ideas.<sup>82</sup>

This disagreement between Blind and Kinkel continued after Kinkel handed the editorship of *Hermann* over to Ernst Juch in July 1859. To Kinkel's chagrin the paper took a sharp pro-Austrian turn and revelled in 'insipid Froggie-baiting'.<sup>83</sup> In particular the *Hermann's* defence of Austrian oppression in Italy upset Kinkel, who after Italian unification had become convinced that only a constitutional and monarchist Prussia could achieve German unification, and only with that as a starting point might a republic ever be gained.<sup>84</sup> Blind, however, resumed his articles in the *Hermann* with an attack on Bonapartism and its territorial expansionism. (His fear of Bonapartist agents everywhere in fact led him to confide his suspicion about Vogt's connection to Napoleon to Marx, and thus inadvertently to initiate the 'Vogt affair' and at the same time embroil himself in it.) His chief concern, however, remained the German cause in Schleswig-Holstein.<sup>85</sup>

From 1860 on Blind became the chief mover behind the Verein deutsche Freiheit und Einheit (Society for German Freedom and Unity), which in four years published virtually as many pamphlets and flysheets as all the other emigrant societies had produced in the preceding twelve. Between 1865 and 1867 the society issued a bi-monthly periodical, *Der deutsche Eidgenosse*, to which republicans and democrats from Freiligrath, Ludwig Feuerbach, and Ernst Haug to Struve in New York and Franz Sigel, Friedrich Hecker and Theodor Olshausen in St Louis contributed.<sup>86</sup> Calling for a revolution and a republic, Blind and his confederates regarded the majority of the people as too subdued by long oppression, and thus argued that the national revolution would need to be attained by a minority. Despite the periodical's motto 'Alles durch das Volk! Alles für das Volk!' and its advocacy of the 'right to work', it argued that only after a revolution had established a free republic could economic problems be tackled.<sup>87</sup> Blind's *Eidgenosse* particularly insisted on the liberation of Schleswig-Holstein as the first step to national unification

and was incensed when Prussia annexed the provinces in 1864.<sup>88</sup> Blind's stepson, Ferdinand Blind-Cohen, took the paper's exhortation of 'Manus haec inimica tyrannis' literally and, outraged by Bismarck's treachery, attempted to shoot him in 1866.<sup>89</sup> Although this attentat naturally scandalised the German colony in London, Karl Blind's reputation was not seriously affected, and he carried on his republican propaganda with great fervour until his death in 1907.<sup>90</sup>

But these developments were still in the future when Blind argued with Kinkel in 1859. At the beginning of the New Era, Kinkel's pro-Prussian view might have met with some resistance, but his *Hermann* generally expressed the overwhelming feeling among Forty-Eighters that political life could be resumed, and the paper helped to fuel renewed political interest among London Germans.<sup>91</sup>

### ***Das Volk* and the reorganisation of the socialists**

The revival of the CABV was part of the resuscitation of German community and social life, but also occurred in opposition to the growing political strength of the national liberal and anti-socialist democrats in London. Although the club began to emerge from its apathy in 1856, it was not until the debates in 1858–1859 that its presence in London German politics was again felt. Simon Bernard spoke in the 'wretched' CABV in spring 1858, and suggested an association of all revolutionaries with a common fund, which however came to nothing.<sup>92</sup> But the strength of the International Association and the efforts of Andreas Scherzer had pulled the club out of its coma, and now Marx's followers set about wooing the workers away from the Weitlingians again. When the International Association ended, Marxists such as Lessner and Liebknecht, as well as Hillmann, Becker and Bauer, gained a stronger position in the workers' society, with the result that the CABV cancelled Kinkel's courses there.<sup>93</sup> The 'communist party' briefly debated issuing a new manifesto, but the CABV decided instead to reprint the *Communist Manifesto* of 1848 'now that the revolution is again in the offing'.<sup>94</sup> After the demise of the *Neue Zeit* the CABV decided to correspond with workers' societies on the Continent to ascertain their exact mood, and to prepare for a newspaper representing the interests of the working classes. For this, the club set up a correspondence committee in early 1859. Scherzer, who proudly declared that he was 'known to thousands of German workers', was its most active member (which later earned him the accusation of luring his continental correspondents into police traps),<sup>95</sup>

The most important indication of the CABV's renaissance was the founding of a second branch of the society in the East End. Many of the unskilled German workers, particularly the sugar bakers and sweated tailors, lived in the area off the Commercial Road, and during its peak years in the 1840s and early 1850s the CABV had always been represented there. In November 1858 the *Neue Zeit* announced plans for the establishment of a 'German Society in Whitechapel', to meet every Sunday in the public house of Herr Strauss, Rupert Street, near Hooper Square in Whitechapel.<sup>96</sup> Besides its social functions, which included a Christmas present lottery, the club soon offered singing classes, English lessons and a regular series of discussions and lectures. A deputation of the Workers' Society of Whitechapel attended the CABV's anniversary meeting, which took place at Willich's former stronghold, the Hotel Germania at 27 Long



Acre (after November 1858 taken over from the mortally homesick Schärttner by W. Speck—by 1868, when the CABV again met there, it had ironically been renamed British-monarchistically the ‘Windsor Castle’). They discussed a confederation of all workers’ societies in London, the effects of which Scherzer optimistically hoped ‘would soon become visible in the fatherland itself.’<sup>97</sup>

In March 1859 the club in Whitechapel formally became a branch of the West End CABV, both matching their statutes and admitting each other’s members.<sup>98</sup> With this consolidation, the CABV now planned a weekly newspaper to succeed the defunct *Neue Zeit*, to be entitled *Das Volk*. But it also gave the society renewed energy both as a social club and a political organisation. The CABV in Soho met again regularly three times a week, announced growing membership, and moved to larger premises in ‘The Australian Stores’ in Little Windmill Street, Golden Square.<sup>99</sup> A proposed Whitsun excursion of five different German workers’ clubs faltered, however, largely because the Bund deutscher Manner thought an excursion with the CABV conflicted with its friendly attitude to Kinkel.<sup>100</sup> But while this ended the club’s ambition of being a centre of all-encompassing German social life irrespective of political differences, its own members nonetheless expanded their activities. Excursions, musical entertainment, a sick benefit fund and, not least, the acquisition of a new flag thus helped to consolidate the new East End branch.<sup>101</sup>

Such activities invigorated the CABV’s political life, and the *Volk* reported lively meetings and controversial debates. By May 1859 its weekly ‘political survey’ lecture (frequently given by Liebknecht) was ‘crammed full’ for the first time in years.<sup>102</sup> In the ongoing war in Italy between Austria and France, the CABV initially condemned both warring emperors who ‘under the cloak of freedom and right, lead thousands into the slaughterhouse in order to forge new chains for the peoples’. However, its implications for the European democratic movements and for German unification were very controversial. When one lecturer for example hoped that Louis Napoleon’s defeat would provoke revolution in Paris, he met with strong opposition. J.V. Weber, a Palatinate refugee who became very active in exile politics in the 1860s, retorted that on the contrary a French victory would advance the revolution because, once Napoleon had broken Austria’s power, the European aristocracy would be more easily destroyed, and Napoleon would then be ‘freed from his guilt-ridden head, for the sake of his own peace and of human welfare!’. Weber stressed that the proletariat should not fall for any ‘patriotic swindle’ or place any trust in nationalist heroes.<sup>103</sup> Most CABV members, however, were reluctant to condone anything coming from the French emperor, and the only ‘great men’ to pass muster were Mazzini and Blanqui, despite their different aims and strategies. The debate was so animated that the club decided to reinstate the weekly discussion evening.<sup>104</sup>

This discussion, published in extenso in the *Volk*, shows that most CABV members gave more thought to the prospects of political change through war and violent revolution than to any new social and economic structure. But following a proposal by the Weitlingian Petersen, the CABV soon adopted as the most pressing topic for debate the task of the proletariat in the next revolution. In Petersen’s opinion, modern revolutionary and scientific communism now needed mainly to outline the necessary measures to abolish as far as possible the existing state, social institutions, economic relations, religious prejudices and class differences. For now, the idea ‘which is identical to the

desire for happiness innate in all men', needed to spread further among the proletariat, and would become 'deed' only when the time was ripe.<sup>105</sup>

However, Petersen's views were not shared by all members of the CABV, and the spectrum of opinions within the society can be seen from a discussion about the motto to be embroidered on the flag of the new Whitechapel branch. The overall banner was to be red, but with its head displaying black, red and gold stripes, the colours of the democratic republic. The same mixture of socialist and radical democratic symbols emerged in the various proposals put forward for the inscription: 'Proletarians of all countries, unite!' invoked the old communist tradition of the CABV. Others proposed 'Long live the social and democratic republic', which was of course the battle-cry of republicans, especially the French. Further suggestions ranged from the democratic 'Sovereignty of the people' to the vague and Utopian 'Universal brotherhood'. Discussion was lively, but when it was agreed that the slogan should express the sentiments of the entire Whitechapel branch, the majority compromised on the democratic 'Reign of the entire people' ('Herrschaft des ganzen Volkes').<sup>106</sup>

While the Whitechapel branch thus appears to have had more democratic than outspokenly socialist members, the older branch of the CABV in Soho included socialists of various types. It now used the name of 'Communist Workers' Educational Society', or KABV, which was to remain in use until the First World War.<sup>107</sup> Scherzer and Petersen had their roots in the Weitlingian movement of the 1840s. Both had been involved in the Willich-Schapper Communist League, and Scherzer had spent much of his energy in recent years on the International Association and the *Neue Zeit*. Weber, who in 1849 had been an official of the *Arbeiterverbrüderung* and in 1850 presided over the workers' society in La Chaux-de-Fonds, in the early 1850s admired Willich and Blanqui. He now expected only moderate reforms from the next revolution, such as equal education for working-class children and a state guarantee of employment.<sup>108</sup> Nor did the CABV lack followers of Marx. Eccarius, who was almost dying of consumption that spring, was missing, but Lessner had manoeuvred against the Weitlingians and Kinkel's influence in the society since 1856, and Marx also regarded Pfänder, the old member of the Communist League, as 'party'.<sup>109</sup> Moreover, Marx counted on some influence through the chairmen of both workers' associations, since Anders, the 'Laplander', headed one, and Liebknecht the other branch.<sup>110</sup>

But while Liebknecht did have considerable influence in the West End branch, he did not always agree with Marx. Liebknecht had left the CABV in 1850 when the Communist League split. But he rejoined soon, first the short-lived NLAV, then, after about a year, the CABV. But his attitude to the society was quite different from Marx's, and reflected both his lifelong concern with practical organisational work and his recognition of the need for mutual, not just one-way, education. 'I regarded it as my duty', he later wrote, 'to keep in contact with the only German workers' organisation in London... I felt that I had much to learn which I could only learn through workers'.<sup>111</sup>

Marx occasionally used Liebknecht's link with the society, but he was wary of Liebknecht's independent moves, such as the introduction of Edgar Bauer into the CABV just as Marx broke with him.<sup>112</sup> In fact, Liebknecht later recalled that his attitude to the CABV was one of only two instances when he seriously quarrelled with Marx. In view of future struggles about ideological orthodoxy, Liebknecht's account of the event bears more weight than his light and somewhat ironic tone suggests:

The society even gave rise to a conflict with Marx... People who were 'more Marxist' than Marx... agitated against me, and one fine day I found myself accused of the offence of having violated our principles through my activity in the London communist society, of having made tactically and theoretically reprehensible concessions to Weitlingian sectarians and other heretics, of having wanted to create for myself an unorthodox counterweight against the orthodoxy of the Communist League, and of having deviated from the correct path by the attempt to play as it were the 'mediator' between pure communist dogma and practice, in particular between Marx and the workers... [I] maintained my right to serve the party in the way which I regarded as the most appropriate one. I declared it to be crazy for a workers' party to lock itself up in a theoretical castle in the air; without workers no workers' party, and we would after all have to take the workers as they come.<sup>113</sup>

During this period Marx in fact had a very low opinion of Liebknecht's work in the CABV and of the *Volk*. He criticised Liebknecht for staying in the society while Bauer lectured there and edited the *Neue Zeit*, and where Liebknecht, in Marx's words, thought he was 'having to defend me against the great odium felt for me by the workers (i.e. the louts)'.

Despairing of Liebknecht's failings, Marx looked to Schapper to represent him in the CABV. In the previous autumn Schapper had appeared with Becker and Scherzer at a French meeting and had 'rejected any contract between the middle classes and the proletariat'. He had also opposed any further involvement of German democracy in the Schleswig-Holstein question because the Federal Diet had consistently exploited this involvement in its own interest.<sup>114</sup> But Schapper was not playing any prominent political role. Marx now gave 'categoric instructions to that inert hunk of flesh, Schapper, to the effect that if he did not rejoin the Workers' Society (the so-called communist one) forthwith and take over the management thereof, I would sever all "connections" with him. This is the one sphere in which we could make use of the hippopotamus, yet the fool thinks it beneath him.'<sup>115</sup> But while Schapper saw Marx privately from time to time—for example telling him about Willich's recent visit to London—he apparently had no desire to become involved in the CABV again, and Marx's 'categoric instructions' were unsuccessful. Schapper did not rejoin on order (he received an invitation to a celebration sent out to non-members<sup>116</sup>), but he did help Marx in his vendetta against Vogt. Liebknecht remained chairman of the CABV, and was elected as the club's delegate to the 'editorial committee' of the *Volk*, which in his view 'in every respect endeavoured to advance the workers' interest'.<sup>117</sup>

Marx himself was not a member of CABV at this time, although he was to rejoin later. 'I have given up associations—*organised ones*', he explained to Weydemeyer, 'after the dirty tricks I have suffered at the hands of the louts who have allowed themselves to be used as mere tools against me by a Kinkel, a Willich or some other such humbug, and since the Cologne trial, I have withdrawn completely into my study'.<sup>118</sup> Writing to Lassalle he added that 'The only workers with whom I foregather are 20–30 picked men to whom I give *private* lectures on political economy.'<sup>119</sup> (These lectures were in fact given in autumn 1859 on the premises of the CABV, which makes the division between

'private' lectures and public participation in the club rather less pronounced than Marx would have it.<sup>120</sup>) Marx carefully noted with a mixture of annoyance and contempt his 'odium' and the rumours that Edgar Bauer had 'supplanted' him 'in the eyes of the working-men'.<sup>121</sup> But besides pique Marx also had good reasons to give these lectures. The first instalment of his *Critique of Political Economy* had just appeared, which he had been working frantically to finish before the 'deluge'. He was disappointed with its reception in Germany,<sup>122</sup> and sought an audience to spread its economic theories. In the altered political climate of the New Era, he moreover felt that the party needed to 'secure positions wherever possible...so that others should not gain possession of the terrain'.<sup>123</sup> He also hoped that Engels's pamphlet on 'To and Rhine' would turn into 'a triumph for our party', leaving 'those dogs of democrats and liberal riff-raff to 'see that we're the only chaps who haven't been stultified by the ghastly period of peace'.<sup>124</sup>

Another opportunity, however, was soon provided by the London newspaper *Das Volk*, in which Marx invested high hopes. The *Volk* in fact lived to see a mere 16 numbers, circulated in only 800 copies weekly, and never gained any financial security.<sup>125</sup> Its impact, however, was much greater than its brief career might suggest, partly due to reprints in the German-American press and partly due to its role in the infamous Vogt affair. Founded 'to represent the interests and views of German workers in England on a democratic [and] social basis', it was supported by the CABV and was intended directly to continue the expired *Neue Zeit*. Elard Biscamp, its editor, was a radical republican journalist who had been connected with both Kinkel and Ruge as well as both factions of the Communist League in 1851.<sup>126</sup> However, to 'supervise the tendency' of the paper, an editorial committee was established to which all German clubs were invited to send a representative. Since only the two branches of the CABV actually sent delegates (Liebknecht and Lange), the *Volk* became its de facto organ.

Initially the paper was virulently anti-Kinkel.<sup>127</sup> Outraged at Kinkel's intrigues and at Edgar Bauer's defection to the *Hermann* with material Biscamp had intended for the *Neue Zeit*, Biscamp now above all sought allies against Kinkel, and thus turned to the workers' clubs and Marx. The subsequent history of the paper illuminates the differences among German socialists in London, with the editors, Marx, and the workers' societies representing three diverse approaches to socialist politics.

Although Marx at first did not want to contribute directly to any party paper that he and Engels did not edit themselves, he accepted the *Volk* from its inception as a 'party paper' comparable to the *Deutsche Brüsseler Zeitung* and Paris *Vorwärts*. He hoped that it might prove useful beyond the immediate local squabble with Kinkel: '*the moment may come, and that very soon, when it will be of crucial importance that, not just our enemies, but we ourselves should be able to publish our views in a London paper*'. Marx thus promised covert help, gave some articles by him and Engels to reprint, and also suggested making the style of the paper more aggressive, polemical and amusing than the *Neue Zeit*.<sup>128</sup> Only after six issues did Biscamp announce that 'the foremost literary forces of our party' had promised help, naming Marx, Engels, Freiligrath, Wilhelm Wolff and Heinrich Heise as contributors.<sup>129</sup>

This announcement, however, obviously displeased a large number of CABV members. Marx was still sufficiently resented to bring the society close to a break-up. Compared with the inclination of some CABV members (especially the East End branch) to combine democratic with socialist demands, the editors of the *Volk* espoused a more

consciously and unequivocally socialist outlook, closer to Marx. The *Volk* claimed to represent ‘the party’ in general, including Marx.<sup>130</sup> But not all the socialists shared this broad view of ‘party’. For the CABV undeniably regarded itself as the guardian of socialist politics in London, which led to an initial clash with Marx over this question. In Marx’s words—famous for his expression of the way in which he regarded himself and Engels as party representatives—the CABV’s experiences with Edgar Bauer, the *Neue Zeit* and the foundation of the *Volk* had been

a very good lesson for the louts. Scherzer...imagined that *he* could nominate party representatives. At *my* meeting with a deputation of the louts... I told them straight out that we owed our position as representatives of the proletarian party to nobody but ourselves; this, however, had been endorsed by the exclusive and universal hatred accorded us by every faction and party of the old world. You can imagine how taken aback the oafs were.<sup>131</sup>

Nonetheless the ‘oafs’ of the CABV, as the organisation which first espoused the principles now trumpeted by the paper, deduced from this fact the right to control the *Volk*. The latter’s editors, however, were quick to reject this peculiar logic of ideological possessiveness and declared that the *Volk* was

merely the organ of its editors and is only related to the workers’ educational society insofar as it advocates the same principles which occasioned the foundation of that club. Everyone who confesses these principles may regard our paper as his party organ, irrespective of whether he is a member of the society or not... The paper exists through the sacrifices we and some of our friends make and is hence a purely private enterprise. Its support by the members of the workers’ educational society is exceedingly insignificant.<sup>132</sup>

Tactically this was an unnecessary affront in relation to a club whose support was needed for the *Volk*. But while the majority of club members regarded it as their prerogative to establish the guiding principles of *Das Volk*, or even to control all expressions of German socialist politics in London, others feared that renewed ‘animosity’ would destroy the only recently recovered society. Such fears were justified, for the ideological gap, ‘the increasingly evident and decisive conflict in principle’, widened both within the club itself and between the CABV and the editors of the *Volk*. The open admission of dissent between the editorial board and the CABV, their defiant declared intention to ignore majority views, plus the announcement of Marx’s involvement, merely provoked additional resistance. At a meeting of 19 July 1859, when the CABV had learned that Marx was to be the real editor of the *Volk*, the club decided expressly to disavow any connection with the paper.<sup>133</sup>

Not only CABV members objected to Marx’s role, moreover. Outsiders also saw this conflict as a chance to gain leverage. Karl Blind, who had fallen out with the *Hermann* over its attitude towards Bonaparte and Austria, decided to write for the *Volk* instead, or even hoped to gain control of the journal. Blind proposed to Biscamp joint propagation of

'sensible socialism', provided that Marx 'and the communist element generally' left the *Volk*.<sup>134</sup> Biscamp rejected Blind's approach, but he, too, seems to have been none too happy with Marx's growing predominance, and came under pressure from 'all sorts of people', since sales of the paper had fallen steeply among the German workers in London.<sup>135</sup>

Marx now tightened his grip when all the old staff, including Scherzer, were sacked and replaced by his own supporters such as Lessner.<sup>136</sup> Marx hoped to get rid of Biscamp by persuading him to accept a schoolmaster's post in Edmonton, then not part of London. But when the 'catastrophic' news came that Biscamp would remain in London, Marx became more adamant: 'I shall press for a written agreement with the gentleman... we're not going to right the apple-cart so that someone else can drive it away. We must make sure we get *possession* of the thing.'<sup>137</sup>

Although Marx and Engels never actually did gain 'possession' of the *Volk*, they not only contributed to the paper, but took an increasing interest in its management. After the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung—politisch-ökonomische Revue*, in fact, this represented their last involvement in the administrative side of journalism. Marx's letters to Engels in July and August 1859 were largely concerned with financial and organisational details relating to the *Volk*. The paper always stood on a precarious financial footing despite a support committee.<sup>138</sup> Debts mounted so far that Biscamp, who had given up a teaching position in order to edit the *Volk*, could not even afford to rent a bed overnight and had to sleep rough. Despite all efforts at raising funds, however, only Wolff and one anonymous cobbler took out a subscription, and Engels was sorting out the paper's financial obligations in Manchester long after its demise in August.<sup>139</sup>

Besides lack of money, however, other factors hastened its downfall. Plainly, Marx's virtual editorship had cost the *Volk* readers among the workers. 'The fact is that as the paper improved, losses increased and readers fell off, Marx wrote.<sup>140</sup> Without its natural constituency among the German colony the paper was not viable. The paucity of subscribers outside London (only 60) illustrates the localised nature of paper, for while the *Volk* was not 'a rather typical product of the emigrant press in London',<sup>141</sup> it was distinctly parochial. Aiming to express the sentiments of as wide a spectrum of the German colony as possible, the paper initially reflected ethnic 'Little Germany' generally as much as it did the more politically active workers. Its first issue particularly devoted much space to German club life, with detailed reports of committee meetings as well as of a ball at the Germania, a family entertainment at the Concordia, and a charity event of the German Hospital in Dals ton. This was of obvious interest to those involved, but could scarcely be expected to attract outside readers, even if the other half of the paper was devoted to general political news. But for the CABV in 1859 the importance of politics was matched by that of ethnic ties. When the workers' societies in the West End and Whitechapel united in March, they especially emphasised their hope to see 'more energetic activity in German life abroad'.<sup>142</sup> As a result, they took a less rigid attitude to national liberals and non-socialist republicans in London. Not only did the CABV initiate various joint entertainments with other German workers' clubs, but even after the recent tensions, individual CABV members participated in a serenade for Kinkel's birthday.<sup>143</sup>

The *Volk* encouraged the clubs' unpolitical activities until, under the new policy influenced by Marx, reporting on local events played a noticeably smaller role. Instead, the *Volk* increasingly stressed its socialism and its wish to represent the interests of

German workers in London. Articles by Marx and Engels became more frequent, and a broader emphasis on class struggle became evident. In the same week, for example, the *Volk* used the suicide of a blacklisted strike-leader in Yorkshire to conclude that capitalists were ‘irreconcilable’ in their struggle against workers.<sup>144</sup> The *Volk* also accused the British working-class press (*Reynolds’s Newspaper* in particular, which at the time was the only widely read paper) of toothlessly keeping a basic ‘tone of declamatory generality’ and of being too out of touch with ‘the condition of the proletariat’.<sup>145</sup> An analysis of John Bright’s politics found that the amalgamation of aristocracy and bourgeoisie now left nothing but the two parties of oppressed labour and privileged capital to oppose each other.<sup>146</sup>

Much of the *Volk’s* economic theory was very eclectic, sometimes demonstrating Marx’s influence and sometimes not. Some reflections on the ‘influence of mechanics’, for example, noted that under present circumstances, advanced machinery was said to benefit only the class possessing it, but it was actually fulfilling its purpose of speeding up the very process of the dissolution of this class.<sup>147</sup> But while Petersen’s rendition of modern-day communism also stressed its ‘scientific’ character and foundation in political economy, it at the same time asserted in quite un-Marxian terms that ‘the power of truth’ would eventually lead the proletariat to accept the ‘idea’.<sup>148</sup> Anonymous writers also criticised the ‘inviolability of property’ proclaimed in Kinkel’s paper, arguing that labour power, the workers’ only ‘property’, meant very little indeed in view of widespread unemployment, and that civil liberties were empty phrases to those facing impoverishment and starvation.<sup>149</sup>

Thus the *Volk’s* socialism was not Marx’s, despite the large amount of practical work Marx put into the paper, and he did not control the content of all articles.<sup>150</sup> But it was nonetheless closer to Marx’s views than to those of the majority of the CABV, its original base and audience. In the interplay between the three main groups in German socialist politics in London, Marx and his immediate entourage, the *Volk* and the CABV, differences emerged which thus illuminated the contradictory approach to the role of ‘the party’ in exile socialist politics.

### Against Bonapartism: the Vogt affair

Despite these internal arguments, the socialists all rallied behind Marx when a united front against democrats and republicans was required. This was most notably so in the case of the polemics against Carl Vogt, which overwhelmingly preoccupied Marx from the summer of 1859 until the publication of his pamphlet against Vogt in December 1860. While the Vogt case itself was essentially trivial, it provided a backdrop for important shifts in the socialists’ attitudes towards Bonapartism and German unification. For the London socialist émigrés, too, it meant the final round in their demarcation from the ‘petty bourgeois’ democrats and republicans around their arch-enemy Kinkel, as well as the conclusion of the history of the Communist League after 1848.

Initially there was little unanimity among socialists in their attitude towards the contestants in the Italian War. Ferdinand Lassalle, now emerging as a main voice in Germany, regarded Austria as the chief reactionary force in Europe, and he was prepared to accept Napoleon’s support for the Italian liberation movement as the lesser evil. In his

*Der italienische Krieg und die Aufgabe Preußens*, published in spring 1859, he argued that Bonapartism constantly flirted with democratic principles, and was reorganising the south of Europe according to 'the principle of nationalities'. If Prussia was to do the same in the north and to annex Schleswig-Holstein, 'German democracy itself would carry Prussia's banner'.<sup>151</sup>

Marx regarded this pamphlet as an 'enormous blunder', and accused Lassalle of violating 'party discipline' by not ascertaining his and Engels's opinion before its publication.<sup>152</sup> Engels had already attacked the Austrian argument that the military necessity for 'natural borders' required its domination of northern Italy. As with other nations, 'real natural frontiers' could only be determined 'by language and fellow-feeling', not by military considerations. Without emulating Lassalle by appealing to the Prussian monarchy for leadership, Engels called for the unification of Germany (as well as of Italy).<sup>153</sup> Engels thus could express German patriotism without appearing to support the Hohenzollern or the Habsburg cause, and could insist on Italy's right to independence without favouring Napoleon.

This in fact was a dilemma the *Volk* was grappling with, and while it reprinted parts of Engels's work, the London paper also held different views. In its first issue, the *Volk* declared that it could support neither Austria nor France in the imminent war, and hence advocated strict neutrality.<sup>154</sup> Hostile to the fervour of the German liberal national movement, the *Volk* was less nationalistic than Engels, and in answering the question 'What is a German?', defined national identity as a problem best left to the future, and most definitely not a political issue by itself.<sup>155</sup> Yet on the whole the *Volk's* antipathy to Napoleon outweighed its hostility to Austrian oppression. This opposition to Napoleon originated as much in the domestic policy of the 'man of 2 December' as in distrust of French foreign policy, and it increased with Marx's collaboration with the *Volk*, who dealt with the war specifically from the point of view of combating Bonapartism. Marx repeatedly declared Bonaparte's policies to be influenced by Russia, and even took seriously the threat of a Napoleonic invasion of England.<sup>156</sup> He argued that war and expansion were an internal necessity of the Napoleonic regime, and in his last articles for the *Volk*, Marx concentrated on Prussia's inept reaction to this threat.<sup>157</sup>

Closely connected to these criticisms was of course the question of the relationship between the German governments and the popular movement clamouring for national unification. Whether this aim could be achieved by Austria, by Prussia alone, or through French help was passionately debated in Germany. The widely read Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* notably advocated Austria's position, while France's case was taken up by national liberal writers such as Carl Vogt, a former member of the left wing of the National Assembly in Frankfurt in 1848–1849 who, before its dissolution, had been elected by the remnants of the parliament as one of the (practically meaningless) 'imperial regents'. Vogt now lived in Switzerland as a natural science professor, and was one of the main exponents of a modern scientific materialism. Politically he had moved towards a pronounced anti-Austrian position, and argued that Bonaparte had to destroy Austrian hegemony in order for liberal and national development to become successful in Germany.

To publicise these views Vogt planned to launch a newspaper and asked, among others, the London émigrés Karl Blind and Ferdinand Freiligrath to contribute.<sup>158</sup> In a pamphlet, *Studien über die gegenwärtige Lage Europas*, however, Vogt used phrases



borrowed from official French propaganda, and suspicions were aroused that he might in fact have been bribed by Bonaparte. Blind was among the first to pronounce this suspicion a fact. He told Marx so privately in May 1859.<sup>159</sup> But Blind went beyond private gossip: he also had his accusations against Vogt printed in David Urquhart's *Free Press* in an anonymous article which did not name Vogt but clearly alluded to him, as well as in an anonymous flysheet, *Zur Warnung*, which did name Vogt.

The great Vogt affair erupted when the *Volk* made use of these revelations. Liebknecht and Biscamp had heard the rumours from Marx and inserted an article denouncing the 'imperial regent' as 'imperial traitor'. The *Volk's* editors added that they had proof that Vogt had asked a democrat from Baden to agitate on France's behalf, and had proposed to sweeten this patriotic duty with 4,000 florins.<sup>160</sup>

In retaliation, Vogt claimed that 'a net of intrigues' was spun by the London communists. He described a recurrent pattern, in which workers on the Continent answered appeals from London and were thereby invariably lured into the hands of the police. Examples were given from the history of the Communist League in Switzerland immediately after the 1848 revolution, when the agent provocateur Cherval had been active among Willich-Schapper sympathisers. Vogt alleged that the same method was still employed successfully, and in particular the *Volk* and letters sent to workers' societies abroad by 'A. Sch.' (i.e., Andreas Scherzer) were traps in the latest intrigue. The *Volk* in response sought to defuse the accusations as ludicrous by reprinting them.<sup>161</sup>

It was not long before mutual accusations moved from the journalistic to the legal field. Liebknecht found an unsigned and handwritten manuscript by Blind in the printshop where the *Volk* was produced, and inserted this 'Warning' in the *Volk*, also sending it to the pro-Austrian Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*.<sup>162</sup> The 'Warning' explicitly stated that Vogt had been bought by the French government and was now himself trying to bribe others. Vogt sued, not the *Volk* or any of the other papers which had reprinted the 'Warning', but his express political enemy, the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. Unsurprisingly, its editors turned to Liebknecht for evidence. Liebknecht turned to Marx, who had told him, and Marx turned to Blind, who had told him. Here the chain stopped, since Blind refused to admit what he had told Marx and that he had written the flysheet. From now on, for most of the next year, much of Marx's energy was devoted to forcing Blind to stand by his remarks.<sup>163</sup> He felt that this would break up the artificial homogeneity of the democratic camp and vowed that he would 'bring Vogt and Blind face to face even if it has to be done at gun point', since the 'whole of vulgar democracy is seeking to hush up the Blind affair in the German press while assailing me'.<sup>164</sup> Among others, Marx obtained evidence from one of the printshop's typesetters that Blind had indeed authored the flysheet. At Marx's prodding, the editor of the *Free Press* also named Blind as the author of the anonymous article in his paper. As a result, Vogt's action against the Augsburg paper was dismissed. But while he was still saddled with the accusation of being in Napoleon's pay, Vogt had scored something of a moral victory, since the editors had not been able to prove this accusation either.

A large number of people implicated in the affair produced statements in the following months. Blind still did not admit to having spread the rumour about Vogt, but declared that Vogt had offered money for articles—this was repeated by Julius Fröbel. Goegg denied that he had given Blind any information about Vogt. The owner and one of the typesetters of the printshop where Blind's anonymous leaflet had been found vouched

that it had neither been printed there nor had originated from Blind. A second typesetter declared that it had. Freiligrath embarrassed 'the party' by declaring that he had never worked for the *Volk* and that his name had appeared among Vogt's accusers without his knowledge.<sup>165</sup> Blind's friend Schaible declared himself as the 'origin' of the incriminating flysheet, which however did not let Blind off the hook for having himself corrected the manuscript, but did clear Marx of Vogt's attempt to label him the author of the flysheet.<sup>166</sup> There were further declarations, but this should suffice to show how many of the refugees were becoming entangled in the affair.

Vogt resorted to a public appeal and collected his views and evidence in a lengthy book, *Mein Prozeß gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung*, which appeared in December 1859. Along with Marx's refusal to let the matter drop, this rang in the second round in the battle. Vogt argued that the accusation of being a French agent had been brought against him by Marx and the *Volk*. The *Prozeß* almost completely ignored Blind and concentrated on attacking the socialists in London. Large parts of the book dealt with police agents among the democratic and socialist Forty-eighters abroad, and much of this was connected to Marx, who appeared as a sinister figure in the background orchestrating the undoing of innocent workers attracted to the cause through the Brimstone Gang (*Schwefelbande*) or the Bristlers (*Bürstenheimer*), both named after groups of German refugees in Switzerland. Vogt's accusations culminated in the following statement:

For a long time I believed that the brimstone gang, who are only satisfied when tearing to pieces the democratic party, serves reaction only indirectly. Today I have come to the conviction that they do so deliberately, that the persons mentioned are knowingly the instruments of reaction, and that they maintain the closest connection with it... Everybody who enters into any kind of political dealings with Marx and his comrades will sooner or later fall into the hands of the police.<sup>167</sup>

Vogt moreover blamed the convictions of the Communist League members in the Cologne trial of 1852 on Marx and, treating both the Willich-Schapper and the Marx—Engels factions of the League as branches of the 'Brimstone Gang', also held Marx responsible for the activities of the police agents Cherval, Mayer and Fleury. The recent renewal of political activities in London and the foundation of the *Volk* he saw merely as continuing attempts by the Brimstone Gang, now led by Marx, Liebknecht and Biscamp, to compromise innocent German workers' clubs and the general republican movement by associating them (against their own will) with communism, thus leading them into the hands of the police.<sup>168</sup>

In Marx's eyes, the international situation required that the socialists clarify their position vis-à-vis the various democratic groups, and Vogt was to provide the occasion. Marx thus began planning a pamphlet in January 1860, with Engels agreeing that 'obviously Mr Vogt must be given a thorough lambasting', though he did not envision the all-out warfare Marx had in mind. He even warned Marx against wasting his energy on Vogt, and suggested that he should instead concentrate on his *Critique of Political Economy*.<sup>169</sup> Engels wanted to ignore 'the personal aspect', and instead to use the opportunity 'to provide an expose of our Italian policy which puts the matter on a totally different plane'.<sup>170</sup> But Marx decided to sue the Berlin *National-Zeitung* for its allegation

that Marx had not only fabricated the flysheet in question, but had threatened to denounce democrats in Germany to the secret police for complicity in revolutionary activities unless they paid up.<sup>171</sup> Marx plunged into the minutiae of the lawsuit, procured affidavits, wrote press statements, threatened the *Daily Telegraph* with libel action, and sent out more than 50 letters in one week concerning the affair.

Marx then spent several weeks in Manchester with Engels going through the ‘archives’ in order to explain publicly the history of the Communist League and its relation to exile politics. The affair now focused on the revaluation of the League in the immediate aftermath of the 1848 revolution, and in particular the role played by the Brimstone Gang and police spies. Rather than the need to clear Marx’s own name, to brand Vogt as a Bonapartist agent, or to force Blind to confront Vogt, ‘the historical vindication of our party and its subsequent position in Germany’ now was at issue.<sup>172</sup> Above all, Marx wanted to prove that the ‘meetings, resolutions and transactions of the party’ since 1852 had existed solely in the imagination of Vogt, and that he, Marx, had kept completely aloof from any subsequent political agitation and organisation.<sup>173</sup>

Marx’s pamphlet certainly bears rereading as a piece of literature, and as a prime example of Marx’s biting polemical style, full of personal venom and sarcastic allusion. When *Herr Vogt* finally appeared on 30 November 1860, it did impress its few readers. Bucher and another democratic refugee in London, Zimmermann, a former friend of Vogt’s, declared themselves utterly convinced by Marx’s arguments, and both were thought to carry some weight with German democrats in England.<sup>174</sup> In Edgar Bauer’s opinion, Marx had succeeded in refuting Vogt’s allegations against him, but had made his second aim, to prove Vogt as an agent of Napoleon, merely plausible through clever insinuations, while on the whole *Herr Vogt* was ‘the final act in the disintegration and moral decay of the refugees’.<sup>175</sup>

There was no answer possible to Marx’s book. His refutation was already so detailed that any response would have finally put to sleep an already bored public. But essentially Marx had shown he was right, and this victory was belatedly confirmed when after the end of the Napoleonic empire Vogt’s name did indeed show up on a payroll of the French government—although by then, in the altered political situation, the significance of being discovered to be a Bonapartist agent had almost fallen into oblivion.

Yet the Vogt case also cost Marx more than time, for his relationship with Freiligrath became distinctly strained. Freiligrath had witnessed parts of the affair, but refused to be dragged into the fray. Marx was quite concerned to keep Freiligrath friendly and took some trouble over this, partly out of personal sympathy, partly because Freiligrath’s renown had for years made him into a trophy in the tug-of-war between democrats and socialists, with Blind and Kinkel as much as the communist ‘party’ claiming his allegiance.<sup>176</sup> Pushed by Marx to take sides, he now declared that since the ending of the Communist League in 1852 he had not belonged to any ‘party’, even if he shared Marx’s ‘sympathies’.<sup>177</sup> This was clearly a blow to the ‘party’ who had valued Freiligrath’s partisanship over the years.

In retrospect the affair cost Marx more than it did ‘the party’, and it is not clear why Marx, who had ignored so much previous slander, involved himself so deeply in it. David McLellan accurately calls the quarrel ‘a striking example both of Marx’s ability to expend tremendous labour on essentially trivial matters and also of his talent for vituperation’.<sup>178</sup> The best excuse for Marx devoting 18 months to an apparently

insignificant squabble is that it was in fact a major phase in the struggle between bourgeois democracy and the emerging proletarian party, in which a detailed refutation of Vogt's allegations was vital to ensure 'the historical vindication of the party and its subsequent position in Germany'. The book, however, sold poorly, even if the CABV alone bought six copies for its library.<sup>179</sup> But even the CABV took an ambiguous stand. Among the reverberations of the affair the *Daily Telegraph* had written that Marx had always tried to exploit and betray workers. Marx spoke at the CABV (6 February 1860) to refute these allegations and to detail his own financial sacrifices in the cause, and as a result, the club passed a unanimous resolution 'to brand as slander' Vogt's allegation that Marx had exploited the German workers in general and the London workers in particular.<sup>180</sup> Marx's speech, however, also included an attack on Biscamp, who had just publicly declared that he did not belong to Marx's 'gang'. Edgar Bauer insisted that Biscamp be given a chance to reply. This led to a general uproar, with Marx and friends finally leaving the hall.<sup>181</sup>

Thus, even if 'the party' from Schapper and Scherzer to Lassalle largely put on a show of unity to outsiders, rifts among the different groups of socialists were not overcome by Marx's refutation of Vogt. An explanation for the intensity of the Vogt affair should probably be sought more in Marx's state of mind at the time than in the broader political field. More Marx's private vendetta, the scandal was not necessary to rally 'the party', nor did it. Socialists had plenty of other opportunities to demarcate their position from that of the democrats and national liberals in the New Era. What Vogt's slander offered that, say, the foundation of the National Association in Germany or the rallying around different papers such as the *Volk* could not, was to delve into the history of the Communist League in detail. *Herr Vogt* thus struck its readers not so much as an analysis of Bonapartism and its diplomacy but as—in Lothar Bucher's words—'a compendium of contemporary history'.<sup>182</sup>

As such the Vogt affair fits very well to conclude a review of the separation of democratic versus socialist exile politics. In *Herr Vogt* Marx also gave a very conciliatory gloss to the history of the emigration of the last ten years:

except for a few persons, the emigration can be reproached with nothing worse than indulging illusions that were more or less justified by the circumstances of the period, or perpetrating follies which arose necessarily from the extraordinary situation in which it unexpectedly found itself. I am speaking here, of course, only of the early years of the emigration. A comparative history, say from 1849 to 1859, of governments and of bourgeois society on the one hand and the emigration on the other, would constitute the most outstanding apologia of the latter that could possibly be written.<sup>183</sup>

The Vogt affair once again brought into public view the different politics of socialists from the aftermath of the 1848 revolution to the Italian war. Marx's critique of the expansionist politics and the diplomatic intrigues of the Bonapartist régime were spread abroad, as was the realisation that Bonapartism and its effects on German unification were judged differently by socialists and democrats. The *Volk* and its opposition to Kinkel's national liberalism achieved a posthumous notoriety far beyond its natural local

audience through the Vogt affair. But for the London emigration itself the affair was important not just because a number of its most prominent members were involved, but because old feuds were settled. The revelation of the details of the Willich-Schapper League and the Cologne communist trial closed the history of the Communist League. The fundamental differences between the various groups among exiled Forty-Eighters were exposed, and nothing more was to be added to the history of their feuds over the past decade. The field was now clear for new allegiances.

## Epilogue

### From exile to colony—class and the formation of community

Where e'er we go, we celebrate  
The land that makes us refugees.  
(Philip Chevron, Thousands Are  
Sailing)

#### The Schiller festival

While Vogt and Marx drew a line under the history of the Communist League, the majority of refugees turned their attention to the unification movement in Germany and to a correspondingly increased sense of unity among Germans abroad. In London this was symbolised by the great Schiller celebration in November 1859. The Crystal Palace *Schiller-Feier* 'for the first time achieved a large meeting of all Germans living here, and thus awakened the sleeping consciousness of national belonging', and was subsequently hailed as founding the 'ethnic' identity of the London Germans and the beginning of a flourishing social life of the colony.<sup>1</sup> Schiller now became the main cipher for progressive patriots, and all over the world Germans used the centenary of his birth to demonstrate not only their admiration for his poetry and drama, but above all their determination to cement the cultural identity of all Germans in a common nation state. Schiller's works lent themselves well to such demonstrations, with their emphasis on liberty, on rebellion and on patriotic and republican virtues, on Wilhelm Tell's '*ein einzig Volk von Brüdern*'. In many respects, these Schiller festivities echoed the ideals and aims of the *Nationalverein*, emphasising the right of a people to elect its own leaders, the submission of the people to this leadership in the interests of liberation 'from above', national unity (both of all German 'tribes' and of all social classes), and finally the eschatological hope of achieving true humanity through national unity.<sup>2</sup> However, while the liberal and educated middle class was prominent in its acceptance of Schiller as their national symbol, the majority of the audience at these celebrations, if not the speakers, were journeymen and workers. The Hamburg workers' educational society, for many years closely associated with the CABV, for example, delegated members to assist in the preparations, and the thousand workers in the Hamburg parade formed the largest single group of participants.<sup>3</sup>

This political and even quasi-religious worship of Schiller also attracted vast numbers of London Germans. As poets Kinkel and Freiligrath had special claims on Schiller's memory and were the most prominent members of the preparatory committee and the celebration in the Crystal Palace. Aided by the *Hermann's* extensive advertising for the event, Kinkel soon dominated the committee and gave the main speech of the evening.

Freiligrath had agreed to participate, much to the dismay of Marx, who was particularly offended by Freiligrath's failure even to invite his own supposed 'party friends' to the preparatory committee, 'thus making a Kinkel demonstration of it'.<sup>4</sup>

Even if attendance in the Crystal Palace on 10 November 1859 did not in fact reach the figure of 20,000 claimed by Freiligrath, there is no doubt that virtually the entire German colony of London joined in the festivities.<sup>5</sup> German choral societies sang Schiller's songs, Karl Blind contributed a short English biography of the poet, the sculptor Andreas Grass donated a bust of Schiller unveiled at the occasion, and the Camberwell composer Ernst Pauer set Freiligrath's Ode to music. The *Hermann* heralded the event for weeks beforehand, and recommended for instance that German employers close their shops at noon so that workers, too, could take part in the all-German affair. The CABV also joined the celebration, 'having the day before salved its political conscience by a Robert Blum festivity'.<sup>6</sup> Republished as a separate pamphlet, Kinkel's speech emphasised the common struggle of all Germans for national liberation. Ranking Schiller with Martin Luther and Robert Blum as an apostle of freedom, Kinkel harangued his audience with his usual pomposity:

your fate is not fulfilled until you Germans have become one, until we have our due share of the power among the people of Europe, under the banner of Black, Red and Gold... Although we are in a foreign country, we want to remain true to our people...and when finally the hour will have come and, as far as your language resounds, One Law, One People, and One Command will rule, then we shall rejoice ... 'I am proud to be a German!'<sup>7</sup>

Although the overall tone of Kinkel's address was similarly nationalistic, the comparison with Blum drew criticism from more conservative Germans, who felt that patriotism and the desire for unity did not warrant any association with such revolutionaries. Kinkel responded 'To my rich compatriots in London', however, that 'Nobody may speak of the fatherland, who wants to be silent about Robert Blum!'<sup>8</sup> This allusion to Blum might have been a bow to the left and to the London workers who commemorated him annually, although it remained the only such reference. Even Freiligrath, whom Marx still hoped to count as one of 'the party', gave a politically very cautious speech. His contribution, 'Zur Schillerfeier. 10. November 1859. Festlied der Deutschen in London', praised Schiller as the 'herald of beauty ... who has set alight our hearts for freedom'. In contrast to the revolutionary zeal of Freiligrath's poems of the 1840s on which his reputation was based, this 'freedom' implied little more than the wish to see 'German hearts forged into one'. In fact, his appeal to national solidarity was specifically addressed to the Germans in Britain when he compared Schiller to his contemporary Robert Burns, also born in 1759, and to German-born Georg Friedrich Handel, who had died in London in the same year.<sup>9</sup> By contrast, Blind's interpretation of Schiller was far more political, linked Schiller to Martin Luther and Robert Blum and emphasised national deliverance, political dignity and the struggle of free citizens against tyranny.<sup>10</sup> But his emphasis was only shared by a minority; the overall focus of the celebration was national unification in Germany, and greater unity among the German colony in London.

### The evolution of German community life

This collective appeal for an increase in national consciousness was not lost on the German colony. Within the next few years, some 20 new clubs were formed, and only a year after the Schiller festival, the *Hermann* reported 'a lively stir' among the emigrants: 'Schools grow like mushrooms from the earth; societies form, grow and flourish; concerts and balls, outings and intellectual feasts follow upon each other in quick succession.'<sup>11</sup> Although not all of these new foundations survived, some became centres of 'ethnic' German life in London. Karl Schaible later recalled the feeling of solidarity among Germans in London, and stressed that this was especially the achievement of the political refugees, who, driven away from their home, had been 'the first to awaken the feeling for their home country among London Germans', and who 'stood in the front line of patriots and devoted their energies to the cause of the fatherland which had rejected them'.<sup>12</sup>

Many of the German societies founded in the wake of the Schiller festival were indeed strongly patriotic. The National Association, established the following year, has been described above. Its members in turn helped begin one of the most successful and patriotic German societies of the period in London, the Turnverein or Gymnastic Association. The *Turner* movement, which was closely associated with democratic and patriotic politics, promoted physical education, collective defence and an egalitarian community ideal. Developing as a prototypical political party, the Turner re-emerged in the late 1850s with a national association soon comprising almost 2,000 local societies, which became centres of 'unpolitical' nationalism and also attracted many future Social Democrats.<sup>13</sup>

In many *Turner* societies, workers began to assert themselves against the dominating liberal patriots. At Neustadt an der Haardt, for example, the son of a political refugee in London was expelled for extolling Blum and claiming that Kinkel had slandered the workers. His father, Joseph Valentin Weber, a member of the CABV, publicised the case among the London *Turner* at their Blum celebration.<sup>14</sup> In London, however, neither the socialist workers nor the national liberals dominated in the Gymnastic Society. But from its foundation in 1861 on the London Turnverein did clearly move into the direction of liberal democracy. Within a month, the Turnverein gained 200 members. Despite the claim that its members were 'Germans of all ranks and from all provinces of the great fatherland', most members were from the established German middle class. Over half of its German members (and nearly two-thirds of its British members) were described as *Kaufleute* (business people), which included everyone from merchants to shopkeepers and clerks, whereas only every third German was an artisan. Among the workers, many of whose newly founded societies failed again, 'the good elements joined the better ones and found an asylum chiefly in the Turnverein'. For many the society, with its more than 1,000 members, became 'the central point of German life in our midst', and its goals, the 'preservation of our nationality' abroad 'in order to strengthen and to support the home country in its resumed struggle' for unity, did much to animate émigré patriotism in these years.<sup>15</sup>

Such aims were also widespread in the other popular societies formed in the early 1860s. Highly influential was the prestigious *Liederkrantz*, a glee club which developed in 1860 out of the Camberweller Gesangverein, whose 300 members made it the largest of



several German singing societies. The élite of German society in London met in the Athenäum, or 'Deutscher Verein für Kunst und Wissenschaft'. This society was dedicated to scientific, historical and literary lectures, exhibitions and concerts, and was dominated by Kinkel and other teachers and professors. To strengthen the sense of national unity here, current political and religious debates were prohibited. The Athenäum developed into an upper-middle-class club with its own wine cellar and accommodation, including servants' quarters, its annual fee rising to 3 guineas for artists and 4 guineas for merchants; a special clause excluded bankrupt members from the club. From the mid-1870s on, the club reached the pinnacle of respectability when the Duke of Edinburgh, several German princes, the German ambassador and eventually the Prince of Wales joined.<sup>16</sup>

Few German societies of the early 1860s, of course, had such pretensions. Most were small clubs restricted to local residents, and were content with providing German-style entertainment and atmosphere, largely in the nostalgic way 'Little Germanics' in the United States catered for the social needs of a community slowly adapting to the lifestyle of their new country. By 1882 there were at least 30 social clubs comprising a minimum of 5,000 Germans. 'The pleasantness and advantages these clubs offer', one observer noted,

in particular to the middle classes, are not to be underestimated. For one, they emancipate their members from the English 'gin palaces'; they relieve them of the necessity of visiting the extremely uncomfortable and expensive English public houses with their prevailing common atmosphere, which can be called a considerable moral and material gain.<sup>17</sup>

This newly revived desire to associate with their countrymen and to be surrounded with things German resulted not merely in social clubs but also in a host of organisations related to the workplace and to practical day-to-day problems of the colony in finding its identity. The 'double life' of minority groups, with the working day being regularly spent among the host nation, while leisure time was devoted to things German, changed in the 1860s, when Germans increasingly came together to ameliorate their social and economic situation. A large number of self-help organisations sprang up, members of the various crafts organised, and religious and educational establishments increased the cohesion among the German community. Ronge's 'Free Congregation', for instance, which had run a kindergarten for five years, now added a women's club as well as a workmen's institute for further education.<sup>18</sup> A Christian young men's group convened for communal Bible readings, and in the spring of 1860 a German branch of the YMCA (Deutscher Jünglingsverein) was founded.<sup>19</sup> During the 1860s furthermore a German Protestant church was consecrated in Islington, and a German Wesleyan Methodist church opened in the Commercial Road, while a German synagogue ran a successful charitable society in New Broad Street.<sup>20</sup>

Throughout the 1860s self-help organisations gained in importance over older benefit societies; a Konsum-Verein, for instance, specifically emulated Schulze-Delitzsch's principles. A German Workers' Association, founded in 1860, aimed to buy cheaper food, but failed after a few months, only to be succeeded by a Society for the Purveyance of Unadulterated Foodstuffs. A London German Friends of Labour Loan Society began

operating in 1861, and was followed by a longer lasting successor, the *Vorschuss-Kassen-Verein*, in which several German clubs joined forces to found a savings bank under the patronage of the liberal Hermann Beigel.<sup>21</sup> Similar societies were the Society of United Friends for the Support of Old and Feeble Germans, the Sickness Beneficence Society for Germans, and the older *Wohltätigkeit und Eintracht* society, all of which began or expanded operations in the early 1860s.<sup>22</sup> A new society, *Workers' Reform*, was founded in 1861. Another the *Industrial Workers' Association*, again initiated by Hermann Beigel, endeavoured to establish its own workshops and retail outlets, and sought to incorporate other trades once the initial Association for tailors proved successful. Yet another optimistic initiative asked German 'capitalists' (albeit unsuccessfully) to found a work institute, where 'all Germans looking for work, irrespective of their age, sex or trade, receive work at any time for fair wages'.<sup>23</sup> A German United Lodge of Oddfellows, established in 1865 on the Commercial Road and Little Alie Street, provided health and life insurance. It encouraged especially the German workers of the East End to join, and included among its members Friedrich Zinn, formerly of the *Bund deutscher Manner*, who became 'Grand Master'.<sup>24</sup>

German workers in the 1860s also increasingly attempted to improve their economic and work situation by forming trade associations. Parallel to the emergence of the trades' council movement in Britain in this decade, and encouraged by the wave of societies founded among their compatriots in London, many of these associations stayed within the boundaries of the German community while emulating contemporary British examples. The first to organise were the German waiters, who succeeded in establishing a lasting and prosperous organisation of some 600 members. This *Deutscher Kellner-Verein* organised annual balls attended by hundreds of people, where its members wore a black, red and gold cockade adorned with a small silver corkscrew. A second organisation followed in London in 1871 and later became affiliated with the *Waiters' Association of Germany*, which grew to about 500 members. Both waiters' organisations provided insurance, labour exchange facilities and entertainment.<sup>25</sup>

The largest and politically most active of all German trade associations was formed by the tailors. Scherzer and Abels initiated a meeting of master tailors in March 1865 which discussed the organisation of tailors in Germany, with Scherzer particularly commending its pension fund scheme, although others criticised its strict statutes and doubted whether a projected 'fashion academy' was useful. A surprising number of *Weitlingians* and veterans from the *Communist League* attended this meeting, indicating that at least among London tailors there was still a continuity of pre-Marxian socialism well into the beginnings of the new labour movement.<sup>26</sup> In the following year, Scherzer established a bureau for the placement of tailors, but his English colleagues suspected it of providing scab labour during the ongoing strike and undercutting English wages. Scherzer backed off, and warned his countrymen that under the present conditions 'the English worker would receive them grudgingly as intruders'. This blunder provoked Lessner and Haufe to form a committee of German tailors 'to foil the plans of the masters...and to show our English comrades that we do not migrate abroad as complaisant undercutters of wages'. The German tailors in London warned their colleagues in Germany in a leaflet, written by Marx as secretary of the *International Workingmen's Association*. Their warnings were heeded in Germany, and the City tailors in fact won their wage struggle.<sup>27</sup> The German members of the *First International*, especially Eccarius and Lessner, were also involved in

the London tailors' strike of 1867, organised a meeting of German tailors and tried to fend off German strikebreakers. They argued that the existing 72-hour working week directly contradicted both contemporary social conditions and the intellectual culture these had created in workers, and the means of production developed in modern industry—the language alone indicated the influence Marx's thinking still had on Eccarius at this point. German and English tailors assembling in the Garrick Tavern in Whitechapel under Eccarius as chairman also formed the East London Branch of the London Operative Tailors' Protective Association, and joined their demands to those of the 5,000 West End tailors currently on strike. Lessner again denounced strike breakers, and Hamburg and Berlin tailors sent support through the International.<sup>28</sup> After the strike the German Tailors' Society continued to meet for social purposes. Together with the Bund deutscher Manner and other clubs they participated in a singing festival, and after the Franco-Prussian War debated their contribution to the general German victory celebration in London.<sup>29</sup> In 1879, the London German section of the Amalgamated Society of Tailors had eighty members.<sup>30</sup>

Not all German trade associations founded during the 1860s developed such rich social, professional and political activities, and many did not survive the first year of their existence. German stenographers, printers, compositors and bakers, for instance, established short-lived societies.<sup>31</sup> After a call for solidarity channelled through the CABV, compositors and printers had come together to support their striking colleagues in Leipzig. Hollinger and six colleagues decided to set up the Londoner deutscher Buchdruckerverein, which declared that in order to alleviate their economic situation patriotic workers first had to struggle for national unity. German journeymen bakers of Whitechapel supported their British colleagues' struggle to abolish Sunday labour and improve wages. But no lasting organisation existed until 1871, when a well-known baker in Holborn set up a job referment agency.<sup>32</sup> German hairdressers and barbers similarly came together to support their British colleagues' Sunday closing movement, while German musicians organised a mutual aid fund.<sup>33</sup> The large numbers of German clerks in England, who experienced considerable hostility towards the end of the century, failed in their first attempts to found a '*Verein junger deutscher Kaufleute*'.<sup>34</sup>

The only German women to form a professional organisation abroad were the German governesses in London, whose plight had attracted attention since 1848.<sup>35</sup> The *Hermann*, for instance, criticised the lack of choice for educated women of any profession but the low-paid and unprestigious position of governess.<sup>36</sup> The situation of foreign teachers in fact worsened from the 1850s on, although they could still gain a better salary in London than at home, and German governesses could earn as much as £100–£120 a year in the 1850s. But this attracted a flood of newcomers, growing unemployment and a resulting fall in wages. In 1865 a first shelter for recently arrived or temporarily unemployed governesses was set up but did not flourish, despite aristocratic patronage.<sup>37</sup> Governesses also regularly complained about employment agencies which took large fees and did not procure jobs. In 1876 Helene Adelman founded a Verein deutscher Lehrerinnen in London which soon flourished, partly due to the sympathy wealthy patrons gave middle-class women. The association acquired a home for unemployed women teachers, set up a credit fund and employment agency, and attracted about 700 members by 1884.<sup>38</sup> Its own newsletter, the '*Vereinsbote*', reprinted a talk on the women's rights' advocate Louise Otto-Peters, and especially praised her insistence on women's political involvement.<sup>39</sup> In

1884 a 'warning' in a Christian pamphlet series appeared in Germany which inveighed not only generally against working women but specifically singled out the German governesses in England, detailing hair-raising stories of ill treatment and exploitation. This pamphlet provoked an angry response from a German governess in England, who argued that the positions found through the Verein showed that almost 50 per cent of the German governesses had an income of between £80 and £120.<sup>40</sup>

With this wealth of professional and social organisations thus, the process of forming a German community was already well developed when, on 12 January 1861, the Prussian king decreed an amnesty for political offences committed during the 1848/49 movement. Within the next two years, large numbers of exiles returned to the various German states, including Wilhelm Liebknecht, Bernhard Becker, Hugo Hillmann, Edgar Bauer and Lothar Bucher. Kinkel and Freiligrath left a few years later with grand reverential send-off parties given by the German community.<sup>41</sup>

But many had sunk professional, social or political roots in England. The transformation from exile to colony was now easy to make for those who decided to stay in London. Blind and Ruge lived here until their deaths, as did Marx, Engels and many of their followers.<sup>42</sup> Schapper remained a socialist and atheist on his deathbed, where—not one to forget old feuds—he characteristically joked about Ruge's recent religious conversion, saying that in the unlikely event of an encounter in the next world Schapper's soul would certainly thrash Ruge's.<sup>43</sup> Scherzer continued in the tailors' movement, joined the National Association and even considered returning to Bavaria to stand for the German Social Democratic Party.<sup>44</sup> He remained in the CABV,<sup>45</sup> which staged his plays on Wolsey and on 'Die deutschen Arbeiter'.<sup>46</sup> Some 500 sympathisers with a red flag bade their farewell at his funeral in 1879.<sup>47</sup> Eccarius, above all, played a role in the English labour movement, serving as editor of the *Commonwealth* and secretary of the Land and Labour League, and in 1878 joined the International Labour Union with Bradlaugh.<sup>48</sup> Because of this alliance with the 'reformist' trade union movement Marx broke with him in 1872, but his attack on liberal economics, *Eines Arbeiters Widerkugung der nationalökonomischen Lehren John Stuart Mills*, was still required reading among German Social Democrats when he died in 1889.<sup>49</sup> Lessner retained much closer ties to the German party, frequently appearing at conferences on the Continent and siding with Kautsky against Bernstein. He also wrote for party papers, often memoirs of his political friends.<sup>50</sup> He remained a regular speaker at the CABV.<sup>51</sup> He joined in the Social Democratic Federation, signed the 1884 Manifesto of the Socialist League with William Morris, Eleanor Marx, Andreas Scheu and others, and co-founded the Independent Labour Party in 1893. Like the tailors Eccarius and Scherzer, their colleague Lessner became impoverished in old age. He survived longest of all the protagonists of this book, until 1910, but the lodginghouse he ran for decades landed him in debt, and in old age and poverty he felt bitterly abandoned by old comrades such as Eleanor Marx.<sup>52</sup> Yet both the SDF and the CABV collected for him in 1900.

All those who stayed (and even many of their offspring born in England) could thus now rely on the support system provided by a 'Little Germany', which unfolded rapidly throughout the 1860s after having been symbolically initiated by the Schiller festival of 1859. The emergence of a more closer-knit colony in London, where the Prussian amnesty of 1861 turned the majority of remaining exiles into voluntary emigrants, was complemented by political developments in Germany, where the new parties from the

Nationalverein to southern German parties and to nascent Social Democracy provided a powerful stimulus for political energies at home. For the national democratic as well as for socialist exiles (even those involved in the International) the focus of political aspiration shifted back to Germany. Their political activities in London were no longer regarded as central to the intended change, but had become subsidiary to movements at home. The references to Germany thus changed the context and the aims of the struggles in London.

### The CABV to 1914

The same can be said *cum grano sails* about the future development of the CABV. In its heyday, the club had been among the vanguard representing and leading the German workers' movement and its theoretical development. By the early 1860s, the CABV had lost its ideological initiative and independence, becoming an appendage to other movements, and never recovering its earlier pivotal role. Still active, most of its political energies were now exerted in causes initiated and led by others, in Germany and in England. Developments in Germany clearly did eclipse the CABV's independent course.

Although the Soho and East End branches of the CABV again split in 1860, the club continued its work.<sup>53</sup> About 100 members remained, kept together by the efforts of London veterans such as Scherzer and Lessner and the more recent arrivals Eichhoff and Weber.<sup>54</sup> But the CABV maintained personal and political ties to the emerging social democratic movement in Germany in the early 1860s. After his return to Germany, Liebknecht recommended that workers combine their journey to the 1862 industrial exhibition in London with a visit to his old club, the CABV.<sup>55</sup> Some of the delegates from Berlin and Hamburg, who attended talks at the CABV, afterwards helped to organise the large Berlin movement of late 1862 agitating for a congress to represent the 'separate interests of the workers'.<sup>56</sup> Hugo Hillmann, who returned to Wuppertal in 1861, became a prominent Lassallean agitator in Elberfeld-Barmen and later in the unified Social Democratic Party.<sup>57</sup> His erstwhile collaborator in the CABV and on the London *Neue Zeit*, Bernhard Becker, even succeeded Lassalle as president of the ADAV (Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverein), the first German independent workers' party agitating in language of the class struggle for universal suffrage and for productive associations supported by the state.

When the Lassallean movement took off in Germany in 1862–1863, the CABV felt that workers ought to side with Social Democracy against the lingering influence of Schulze-Delitzsch.<sup>58</sup> This reflected the situation among the German workers' societies in London, which by 1865 were neatly divided between the CABV and the Bund deutscher Manner, each holding their own Blum celebration: 'here social-republican rigour, there National Association-type mildness; here Lassalle, there Schulze-Delitzsch: state-help and self-help', as the *Hermann* put it.<sup>59</sup> The CABV supported the Lassallean movement and argued that only the association of individual trades and subsequent international co-operation could liberate the working class. Marx regarded this as a declaration of solidarity with the controversial J.B. von Schweitzer, president of the Lassallean ADAV.<sup>60</sup> But even after Liebknecht and August Bebel in 1869 founded the Social Democratic Workers' Party ('Eisenacher'), which emphasised its connection to the

International in London and opposed Lassalle's co-operation with the Prussian Junkers, the CABV continued to side with the ADAV.<sup>61</sup> Eventually, the CABV's pronounced Lassallean sympathies once more provoked Marx's resignation from the society.<sup>62</sup> Although some 20 Lassalleans, around Scherzer, J.V.Weber and Joseph Schneider, were expelled in late 1871, only a minority of German socialists in London sided with Marx over the next few years.<sup>63</sup> On arriving in London in 1874, Andreas Scheu, Austrian co-founder of the British Social Democratic Federation, found two clubs, one with some 200 Lassalleans, the other comprising only 26 Marxists (who could drum up precisely 63 loyal members for meetings),<sup>64</sup> After the social democratic movement in Germany overcame its division and the Lassallean ADAV and the 'Eisenacher' united in 1875 at their Gotha conference to found the Socialist Workers' Party of Germany, the CABV followed suit. Scheu's and Leo Frankel's agitation resulted in a merger of the two clubs. Henceforth the society supported the party in Germany as much as they could, collecting for its election fund, and organising some 60 subscriptions to the party's paper, *Vorwärts*.<sup>65</sup>

While the CABV's policies vis-à-vis Germany thus essentially mirrored the development of the Social Democratic party, the club pursued a more independent course in London itself. It focused in particular on internationalist causes. A concert raised funds for Poland in 1860,<sup>66</sup> and after the Poles had once more risen up in 1863, the CABV again collected, first in conjunction with the 'Vaterlands-Verein',<sup>67</sup> then with the International, whose joint appeal was written by Marx.<sup>68</sup> Along with its sister societies Teutonia and Eintracht, the CABV was one of the first to affiliate to the International Workingmen's Association in 1865, pointing proudly to its internationalist tradition and to its contribution to 'liberating the German workers from the bourgeois delusion that constitutional government and rule of capitalists equal welfare of the people'.<sup>69</sup> In fact, the First International can scarcely be imagined without the prior experiences of exiles such as Eccarius, Pfänder, Lochner, Lessner, Schapper and Scherzer<sup>70</sup> from the Democratic Friends of all Nations, the Fraternal Democrats, the Communist League and the International Association, in all of which the CABV had been prominent.

The CABV's work in the International took several forms. Although the club had lost members, it managed to send a delegate representing German workers in London to the 1868 Lausanne conference.<sup>71</sup> It supported various strikes, for example in Leipzig and Basel, during the late 1860s.<sup>72</sup> It also frequently contributed to J.Ph.Becker's *Vorbote*, the International's paper.<sup>73</sup> The CABV remained an enthusiastic supporter of the International, and as late as 1875 (under its then president Andreas Scheu) attempted to prevent the International from collapsing.<sup>74</sup> This was one of the few instances in which the CABV's position on the International differed from Marx's. On the whole, though, while the International was a broad church and stretched from British trade unionists and old Owenites to supporters of Mazzini and those of Bakunin, the CABV members who appeared on the International's General Council (such as Lessner, Lochner, Pfänder, Schapper and initially Eccarius) acted chiefly as Marx's supporters.<sup>75</sup>

It was mostly through their collaboration in the International that the CABV remained close to Marx in those years. In February 1866 Lessner entreated Marx, whom many expected to give a talk in the society, to at least send a few lines of apology for appearance's sake, as 'there are currently very few members but mostly quite good'. Apparently Marx was quite unfamiliar with the club at that time, and Lessner had to give

its address and advance Marx's membership fee.<sup>76</sup> In 1867 Marx sent the CABV a copy of the first volume of his *Kapital*, which had just appeared.<sup>77</sup> When Marx gave a talk on wages to the CABV in May 1868, its president described 'a considerable increase in new members' and asked Marx to attend regular sessions as well, as currently only Lessner lectured on 'moral education'.<sup>78</sup> In November 1868 the CABV asked Marx to speak at their Blum meeting, especially since most of the younger club members had not yet heard him.<sup>79</sup> This pattern continued after membership began to rise again in 1868–1869, with the CABV frequently entreating Marx to attend celebrations or give talks, and with Marx complying only very occasionally, keeping his distance but following developments at the club through Lessner's regular reports.<sup>80</sup> In one of his occasional speeches, however, Marx reminded the CABV of its history and its connection with the Leagues of the 1840s and 1850s; he emphasised the internationalism of that movement and its role as predecessor for the current German Social Democracy, thus reflecting the tone prevalent in many meetings of the later years of the CABV, which largely rested on its laurels acquired decades previously.<sup>81</sup> Finally, the CABV sent a representative, Lemke, to Marx's funeral in 1883, with Engels, Liebknecht, Lessner, Lochner and others, and the following year the CABV, proud of its most famous member, organised a large procession to his grave which was attended by some 1,000 persons.<sup>82</sup> Engels during his last years like Marx maintained a distance from the society and kept politely aloof, for example warding off the CABV's plan to serenade him on his birthday in 1891.<sup>83</sup> But after Engels's death, the club organised a special commemorative gathering on 10 August 1895, when Lessner and Bebel spoke.<sup>84</sup>

However, the CABV also acted independently of the International and of the policies of Marx and Engels, especially within the context of the German colony. During the Franco-Prussian war of 1870–1871, when patriotism and admiration for Bismarck reached feverish heights among London Germans, the CABV remained staunchly internationalist and republican. Although it had recently participated with many other German societies in the London German *Sängerfest*,<sup>85</sup> the club now stood apart. In support of official German war aims, a meeting of German workers in London had demanded the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine.<sup>86</sup> Against this, the CABV and its affiliated sister society Teutonia declared that 'the peace and security of Germany have so far been endangered not by a lack of strategic borders such as the Vosges but by the territorial greed of the Hohenzollern dynasty'.<sup>87</sup> The CABV and the Teutonia added an attack on Prussian despotism, and congratulated Garibaldi on his republican support for France.<sup>88</sup> A mass meeting of outraged patriotic German workers in London denounced them as traitors,<sup>89</sup> and further heated declarations followed.<sup>90</sup> Although their attitude contrasted so sharply with the majority of metropolitan Germans, the CABV wanted to send a speaker to the celebration of German unification but was—predictably—turned down out of fear of 'social democratic propaganda'.<sup>91</sup> Naturally, the CABV was enthusiastic about the Paris Commune, and J.V. Weber, who translated a history of the Commune, praised it as 'the first Government erected by the working classes,...the beginning in earnest of the struggle between Capital and Labour'.<sup>92</sup> After the defeat of the Commune, when thousands of French refugees arrived in London, the CABV contributed to their relief.

But it was not until the late 1870s that the CABV again broadened its sphere of influence. Also known as the Social Democratic Working Men's Club and organised in

an English and a German section, it now consisted largely of followers of the former 'Eisenacher' party.<sup>93</sup> A new generation of emigrant politicians, among them F.J.Ehrhart, attempted to rebuild connections between socialist groups from different nations, helped prevent scab labour arriving from Germany in a London stonemasons' strike, and sent delegates to socialist congresses.<sup>94</sup> Their activities succeeded in attracting new members, even before political persecution in Bismarck's *Reich* changed the entire scene yet again: in June 1877 a second section opened, in July 1878 the mother club (the first section) acquired its own premises at 6 Rose Street, Soho (and was soon known as Rose Street Club), which allowed for a trebling of membership just as expellees from Germany were to arrive, and in January 1879 the CABV opened a third section in Whitechapel.<sup>95</sup>

But only when the 1878 anti-Socialist laws in Germany prohibited agitation and organisation and forced many party members into exile did the CABV regain some of its erstwhile stature. The club not only received the new refugees but also launched a campaign to support their persecuted comrades at home. Yet its role was different from the period of its heyday, since in the 1870s a centralised party structure had been created, which even under the repressive laws retained control over the party's organisation, finances, newspapers, and theoretical agenda. Under the impact of the government's attack on the party in Germany, the CABV thus saw its function initially and primarily as a subsidiary to the party organisation back home.

Most importantly, the CABV helped in early 1879 to launch Johann Most's controversial *Freiheit*, initially a powerful Social Democratic paper intended for illegal distribution in Germany. Most had been a leading party propagandist and deputy to the Reichstag, but in exile he became increasingly irritated at the Social Democrats' cautious tactics under the oppressive laws and soon advocated insurrection and 'propaganda by deed'.<sup>96</sup> This split the CABV in March 1880—both sides confusingly kept the old name. About 200 members in the second section of the CABV in Tottenham Street under Heinrich Rackow, a typesetter from Berlin, sided with the party's executive committee, while about 300 in Rose Street joined Most. The third section, in the East End, also backed Most.<sup>97</sup> Yet despite this clash with the officially 'Marxist' German party, the CABV in 1880 and 1881 issued another edition of the *Communist Manifesto* as its fundamental programme, adding 'social revolutionary' footnotes.<sup>98</sup> Only after Most was duly expelled from the Social Democratic Party in Germany, did he (and the CABV) lose touch with developments at home and turn more towards other foreign groups in London, among which Russian revolutionaries with more violent tactics and anarchist leanings were increasingly prominent. *Freiheit* became the first anarchist paper published in England.<sup>99</sup> When in 1881 Most hailed the assassination of the tsar he was imprisoned<sup>100</sup>—the first such case among German exiles—and the CABV joined in a 'Freiheit Defence Committee', which published a short-lived English edition of the paper.<sup>101</sup>

The CABV's increasing involvement during this period with English or other foreign socialist, radical and anarchist organisations in London included an especially close relationship from 1876 to 1880 between the third section of the CABV and the Jewish Socialist Union around Aron Lieberman, and in 1885–1886 with the East End Jewish socialists in the Berner Street Club.<sup>102</sup> Through its connections in the lively club activity in the metropolis, CABV members also joined in the emerging British socialist movement. The club participated in a meeting of radical and workers' clubs in 1879 in



the Westminster Democratic Club, and in preparations in 1881 for the foundation of the Democratic Federation.<sup>103</sup> A large CABV procession to Marx's grave in 1884 was held in conjunction with the Democratic Federation and the Labour Emancipation League, and several CABV members worked for the Socialist League.<sup>104</sup>

The CABV was, however, less concerned with British developments than with German Social Democracy. But this meant, for the Londoners to a much greater degree than for the party in Germany, constantly being on the defensive against the popular pull of anarchism. In 1884 the club had moved to Stephen Mews, Rathbone Place, into a three-storey house with a restaurant on the ground floor, library, reading room and billiards room on the first floor, and on the second floor a hall with a small stage for assemblies and entertainments, all constructed entirely for the club's purposes. Its members largely belonged to the anti-election wing among Social Democrats, or were adherents of Most, with a small scattering of anarchists.<sup>105</sup> But the main centre for German (and other) anarchists soon shifted to the Autonomie Club, founded in 1886 by the anarchistcommunist Josef Peukert. His paper, *Rebell* (and from 1886, *Die Autonomie*), became embroiled in an acrimonious 'brothers' war', in which followers of the *Freiheit* and Bakuninist collectivists concentrated in the first section of the CABV around the Belgian anarchist Victor Dave, while Peukert and others seceded to found the Autonomie.<sup>106</sup> Accusations went back and forth in many pamphlets, and by the early 1890s this 'war' had 'turned the splendid German [anarchist] movement...into desolate rubble and narrow-minded sects'.<sup>107</sup>

In 1895 Rudolf Rocker arrived in London and found the Autonomie group weary but the German movement, which by now also included the CABV's anarchist historian Max Nettlau, flourishing. Rocker was elected librarian at the CABV's first section in Graf ton Street, with over 500 paying members, but found his calling as 'an anarchist missionary to the Jews' of the East End, and in 1898 he became editor of the Yiddish *Arbeter Frainit*.<sup>108</sup>

Although anarchism continued to be attractive to CABV members until the club's demise, the Social Democratic Party kept a foothold there. The establishment of a section of party faithfuls, however, proved difficult. Bernstein secretly gave £200 to set this second section up in its club-house in Tottenham Street, and in 1912 still fought for the return of this money from anarchists again controlling the CABV.<sup>109</sup> Most's old antagonist, the typesetter Heinrich Rackow from Berlin, became a leading representative of German Social Democracy within the CABV, and for instance defended the importance of election campaigns to bring socialists into power against the social revolutionary and anarchist positions prevalent in the club.<sup>110</sup> During the anarchist war between the CABV's first and third sections and the Autonomie, this second, Social Democratic, section grew to some 300–400 members.<sup>111</sup> In 1886 Rackow, Karl Kautsky and others launched a *Londoner Arbeiter-Zeitung* (later the *Londoner Freie Presse*), which was owned and edited by the CABV until the Anti-Socialist Laws in Germany were ended in 1890.<sup>112</sup>

The mainstream Social Democratic party also set up a prospering publishing co-operative in 1887.<sup>113</sup> In the following year Eduard Bernstein and Julius Motteler were expelled from Switzerland and came to London to edit the party newspaper, *Sozialdemokrat*, which sold up to 12,000 copies, until it too moved back to Germany with the end of the repressive legislation there. Bernstein occasionally lectured in the CABV,

and the last prominent Social Democrat to be involved in the CABV's internal affairs, such as a corruption scandal in the 1890s, was Julius Motteler.<sup>114</sup> At this stage the CABV was particularly closely tied to the Social Democratic Party, and reprinted the programme of the latter's 1891 Erfurt conference along with a brief summary of the club's own statutes. The CABV's new statutes, drawn up in 1895, placed the society as close as it ever was organisationally to the German party, and defined its aim as 'the propagation of Social Democratic principles according to the German party programme ...in order to work for the political and social liberation of the entire working class'.<sup>115</sup>

When Motteler and Bernstein left London in 1901, the CABV was still firmly allied to the German party, but, based on the English model, now called itself the Communist Working Men's Club and Institute.<sup>116</sup> Within a few years, however, anarchists again reached such large numbers in the club that the Social Democratic committee expelled several in 1904 and feared for the possession of its club-house.<sup>117</sup> This renewed anarchist activity was largely the work of Pierre Ramus (an Austrian whose real name was Rudolf Grossmann, later editor of the *Freie Generation*) who defined the CABV's aim as a 'free social community' without private property or any authority, especially that of the state.<sup>118</sup> At the Amsterdam anarchists' conference of 1907 the CABV was represented among others by Siegfried Nacht (Arnold Roller), whose syndicalist brochure advocating the general strike the CABV republished in 1909.<sup>119</sup> The CABV also launched another paper, the *Londoner Volks-Zeitung*, which was supported by Max Beer, Theodore Rothstein, Andreas Scheu and Ernest Belfort Bax, and which hoped above all to bring the German and English labour movements into closer co-operation to influence foreign policies in the wake of increasing Anglo-German antagonism.<sup>120</sup>

Ironically it was this inter-governmental antagonism which broke the back of the club which had promoted socialist internationalism for three-quarters of a century. German emigrants continued the CABV even as the First World War began. But eventually all remaining Germans were interned as enemy aliens, and members of the CABV were soon breaking stones in the 'Olympia' internment camp, or imprisoned on the 'Royal Edward', or at Alexandra Palace.<sup>121</sup> The club and its impressive library passed into the hands of Russian emigrants, whose return to the revolution in 1917 ended the CABV.<sup>122</sup> Attempts by Italian anarchists such as Malatesta and Russian Bolsheviks around Chicherin to keep it going were finally thwarted by the British government, who closed the club in 1918. In an ironic ending its meeting place was razed during the London blitz of the Second World War, when the Luftwaffe finally extinguished all traces of the longest-lived experiment in German émigré socialist organisation.<sup>123</sup>

# Notes

## Preface

- 1 G.A.Sala, *Gaslight and Daylight with Some London Scenes They Shine Upon*, London 1859, pp. 88–91.
- 2 B.Porter, *The Refugee Question in Mid-Victorian Politics*, Cambridge 1979; C. Anderson, 'Britons abroad and Aliens at home. Nationality law and policy in Britain 1815–1870', Cambridge PhD, 2004.
- 3 R.Ashton, *Little Germany, Exile and Asylum in Victorian England*, Oxford 1986; P. Panayi, *German Immigrants in Britain during the Nineteenth Century, 1815–1914*, Oxford 1995; and see also P.Alter and R.Muhs (eds) *Exilanten und andere Deutsche in Fontanes London*, Stuttgart 1996.
- 4 The term 'Trennung' means separation, severance or divorce. The debate among historians about the reasons for the Trennung' was initiated in 1912 in a classic essay by Gustav Mayer, 'Die Trennung der proletarischen von der bürgerlichen Demokratie in Deutschland 1863–1870'. See G.Mayer, *Radikalismus, Sozialismus und bürgerliche Demokratie*, Frankfurt 1969, pp. 108–78.

## Introduction: socialism and exile in the German colony in midnineteenth-century London

- 1 Paul Tabori, *The Anatomy of Exile* (Harrap, 1972), p. 31.
- 2 Robert C.Williams, 'European Political Emigrations: A Lost Subject', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 12 (1970), 140.
- 3 Gustav Mayer, *Friedrich Engels. Eine Biographie*, 2 vols (Frankfurt: Ullstein, 1975), II, p. 534; Julius H.Schoeps, "'Der Kosmos"', ein Wochenblatt der bürgerlichdemokratischen Emigration in London im Frühjahr 1851', *Jahrbuch des Instituts für deutsche Geschichte*, 5 (1976), 211.
- 4 E.g., Colin Holmes, *John Bull's Island: Immigration and British Society, 1871–1971* (Macmillan, 1988); David Feldman, 'The Importance of Being English', in David Feldman and Gareth Stedman Jones, eds., *Metropolis London* (Routledge, 1989), pp. 56–84.
- 5 Stephan Thernstrom, ed., *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press), 1980; *Immigrants and Minorities* (vols 1–, 1982–). Andreas Gestrich, Gerhard Hirschfeld and Holger Sonnabend, eds., *Ausweisung und Deportation: Formen der Zwangsmigration in der Geschichte* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1995) provide examples from antiquity to the twentieth century, while Colin Holmes, ed., *Migration in European History* (Cheltenham and Vermont: Edward Elgar, 1996) I, discusses individual groups of immigrants but also general theories of migration. John Simpson, ed., *The Oxford Book of Exile*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995) collects descriptions ranging from Plutarch to Chinese and Cherokee exiles.
- 6 Lynn Lees, *Exiles of Erin. Irish Migrants in Victorian London* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1979); Joseph Buckman, *Immigrants and the Class Struggle: The Jewish Immigrant in Leeds, 1880–1914* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1983); David Feldman, 'There

- was an Englishman, an Irishman and a Jew... Immigrants and Minorities in Britain', *Historical Journal*, 26 (1983), 185–99; Woodford McClellan, *Revolutionary Exiles. The Russians in the First International and the Paris Commune* (Frank Cass, 1979); Margaret C.W. Wicks, *The Italian Exiles in London, 1816–1848* (1937) (Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1968).
- 7 Bernard Porter, *The Refugee Question in Mid-Victorian Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979) is, however, little concerned with internal refugee affairs.
- 8 Panikos Panayi, *The Enemy in Our Midst. Germans in Britain During the First World War* (New York: Berg, 1991); Marion Berghahn, *German-Jewish Refugees in England* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1984); Gerhard Hirschfeld, ed., *Exil in Großbritannien. Zur Emigration aus dem nationalsozialistischen Deutschland* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1983). Both centuries are covered in Gottfried Niedhart, ed., *Großbritannien als Gast- und Exilland für Deutsche im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Bochum: Brockmeyer, 1985), and Werner E. Mosse et al., eds., *Second Chance: German-speaking Jews in the United Kingdom* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1991).
- 9 Hartmut Keil and John B. Jentz, eds., *German Workers in Industrial Chicago, 1850–1910: A Comparative Perspective* (De Kalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1983). A.E. Zucker, *The Forty-Eighters: Political Refugees of the German Revolution of 1848* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950), however, remains a standard work. Herbert Reiter, *Politisches Asyl im 19. Jahrhundert: Die deutschen politischen Flüchtlinge des Vormärz und der Revolution von 1848/49 in Europa und den USA* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1992), treats internal refugee politics as an afterthought.
- 10 E.g., Klaus Urner (*Die Deutschen in der Schweiz*, Frauenfeld: Huber, 1976) carefully analyses the formation of a colony and exile politics. Also useful, if narrower, are Hans-Joachim Ruckhäberle, ed., *Bildung und Organisation in den deutschen Handwerksgelesen- und Arbeitervereinen in der Schweiz* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1983), pp. 3–35, and Antje Gerlach, *Deutsche Literatur im Schweizer Exil: Die politische Propaganda der Vereine deutscher Flüchtlinge und Handwerksgelesen in der Schweiz von 1833 bis 1845* (Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1975). For France, Jacques Grandjonc has studied German immigrants mostly before 1848 ('Die deutsche Binnenwanderung in Europa 1830 bis 1848', in Otto Büsch and Hans Herzfeld, eds., *Die frühsozialistischen Bünde in der Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung* (Berlin: Colloquium, 1975), pp. 3–20. Lloyd Stephen Kramer, *Threshold of a New World: Intellectuals and the Exile Experience in Paris, 1830–1848* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988), treats only Heine, Marx and Mickiewicz.
- 11 Exceptions can be found in the collection edited by Peter Alter and Rudolf Muhs, *Exilanten und andere Deutsche in Fontanes London* (Stuttgart: Akademischer Verlag Hans-Dieter Heinz, 1996), which is largely concerned with cultural aspects, but includes studies of journalists and diplomats. See also Utz Haltern, *Liebknecht und England* (Trier: Karl-Marx-Haus, 1977). Bucher remained aloof from internal exile politics but discussed British parliamentarianism and issues of nationality; see Christoph Studt, *Lothar Bucher, 1817–1892* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), pp. 167–88, 193–205.
- 12 Franz Mehring, *Karl Marx* (Berlin: Dietz, 1976); Mayer, *Engels*. Asa Briggs, *Marx in London* (BBC, 1982) includes illustrations of many exiles' haunts.
- 13 Robert Richter ('Studien zur Londoner Emigration von 1850–1860', Ph.D. dissertation, Freie Universität Berlin, 1966), discusses only select problems connected with Lothar Bucher, Wilhelm Liebknecht's journalism and the Vogt affair, but makes many factual errors.
- 14 Rosemary Ashton, *Little Germany: Exile and Asylum in Victorian England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).
- 15 The views of Weitling, Willich and Kinkel cannot be lumped together as 'sentimental neo-feudalizing' (Ashton, *Little Germany*, p. 151). Ashton's meagre account of Schapper ignores modern accounts (pp. 229–30), while another very active workers' spokesman, Andreas Scherzer, is not even mentioned. Similar factual errors occur in her treatment of the British

- and German opposition. The 'German-Catholic' Ronge, for instance, did not found Protestant 'Free Congregations' (p. 179), nor Marx *Das Volk* (p. 104), nor Harney the Democratic Friends of all Nations (p. 229). Blind was not a victim of 'lengthy and obsessive denunciations' (p. 23) in Marx's *Great Men*, which in fact mentions him only once; although she discusses Blind extensively, Ashton ignores his most important contribution, the journal he edited for three years.
- 16 Panikos Panayi, *German Immigrants in Britain during the Nineteenth Century, 1815–1914* (Oxford: Berg, 1995). Panayi also edited a collection of essays on selected aspects (*Germans in Britain since 1500*, The Hambledon Press, 1996), which continues the story up to the present time (Lothar Kettenacker, 'The Germans after 1945', pp. 187–208), but provides only a brief overview of the period under discussion here, focusing on literary and religious life. A helpful survey of the German colony before 1848 is Bernhard Gattner's 'Emigration und Exil von Deutschen in London 1830–1848', M.A. thesis, University of Munich, 1989.
  - 17 Sabine Sundermann, *Deutscher Nationalismus im englischen Exil* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1997).
  - 18 Franz Mehring, *Karl Marx. Geschichte seines Lebens* (Berlin: Dietz, 1976). David McLellan's *Karl Marx: His Life and Thought* (St Albans: Paladin, 1977) remains the best study of Marx, including his relations with other German exiles. Still good on Engels is Gustav Mayer, *Engels*, and Terrell Carver, *Friedrich Engels: His Life and Thought* (Macmillan, 1989), pp. 211–21.
  - 19 Hal Draper, *Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution*, 3 vols (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1977–1986); Richard N. Hunt, *The Political Ideas of Marx and Engels*, 2 vols (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1974–1984); Wolfgang Schieder, *Karl Marx als Politiker* (Munich: Piper, 1991).
  - 20 E.g., G.D.H. Cole (besides overrating Eccarius' influence in the 1840s) inverts the relation between the London Germans and Weitling (*A History of Socialist Thought*, Macmillan, 1953–1954, I, p. 227, and II, pp. 2–4). Keith Taylor sees Weitling's revolutionary fervour as linking the early socialists and Marx, but omits important steps involving the Londoners (*The Political Ideas of the Utopian Socialists*, Frank Cass, 1982, pp. 186–206). The only English full-scale biography, Carl Wittke's *The Utopian Communist: A Biography of Wilhelm Weitling, Nineteenth-Century Reformer* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1950) sees him as a 'Utopian moralist' rather than an advocate 'of a class-conscious proletariat' (p. 50), a view recent scholarship has rejected.
  - 21 East German work includes *Der Bund der Kommunisten. Dokumente und Materialien*, 3 vols (Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1982–1984), and the *Marx-Engels-Gesamtausgabe* (henceforth *MEGA*) (Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1975–1990), since edited by the Internationale Marx-Engels-Stiftung (Berlin: Dietz, and Amsterdam: IISG, 1991–); Waltraud Seidel-Höppner, 'Zu einigen theoretischen und methodischen Fragen der neueren Weitling-Forschung', in Hans-Arthur Marsiske, 'Wider die Umsonstfresser': *Der Handwerkerkommunist Wilhelm Weitling* (Hamburg: Ergebnisse, 1986, pp. 9–38); Walter Schmidt, ed., *Der Auftakt der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung. Beiträge zur ersten Periode ihrer Geschichte 1836–1852* (Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, 1987), esp. pp. 13–41.
  - 22 Wolfgang Schieder, *Anfänge der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung: Die Auslandsvereine im Jahrzehnt nach der Julirevolution von 1830* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1963). Ernst Schraepfer, *Handwerkerbünde und Arbeitervereine 1830–1853* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972), tackles a wider field but adds little interpretatively. Glaus-Dieter Storm, *Verfolgt und geächtet: Handwerker zwischen Liberalismus und Kommunismus* (Hamburg: Ergebnisse, 1980), XII, provides a brief introduction to the refugees' clubs in 1834–1840.
  - 23 Helga Grebing, *Arbeiterbewegung: Sozialer Protest und kollektive Interessenvertretung bis 1914* (Munich: 1985), Jürgen Kocka, *Arbeitsverhältnisse und Arbeiterexistenzen: Grundlagen der Klassenbildung im 19. Jahrhundert* (Bonn: Dietz, 1990); Thomas Welskopp, *Das Banner der Brüderlichkeit: Die deutsche Sozialdemokratie vom Vormärz bis*

- zum Sozialistengesetz (Bonn: Dietz, 2000). The European context is highlighted in Wolfgang Abendroth, *Einführung in die Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung*, I (Heilbronn: Distel, 1997); a popular introduction is Axel Kuhn, *Die deutsche Arbeiterbewegung* (Ditzingen: Reclam, 2004); Detlef Lehnert's brief *Sozialdemokratie zwischen Protestbewegung und Regierungspartei 1848 bis 1983* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1983), pp. 23–8.
- 24 Klaus Tenfelde, ed., *Arbeiter und Arbeiterbewegung im Vergleich* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1986); Friedrich Lenger, *Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Handwerker seit 1800* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1988).
- 25 Manfred Hahn and Hans Jörg Sandkühler, eds., *Sozialismus vor Marx* (Cologne: Pahl-Rugenstein, 1984); Ernst Nolte's controversial *Marxismus und Industrielle Revolution* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1983); Shlomo Na'aman, *Emancipation und Mes-sianismus: Leben und Werk des Moses Heß* (Frankfurt: Campus, 1982). No larger study has systematically tackled theoretical issues such as the role of the future state, theories of property, etc. in pre-Marxian German socialism, but see W. Seidel-Höppner, 'Aufklärung und revolutionäre Aktion—ein Grundproblem im Arbeiterkommunismus und bei Marx', *Jahrbuch für Geschichte*, 5 (1971), 7–69.
- 26 Lothar Knatz, *Utopie und Wissenschaft im frühen deutschen Sozialismus: Theoriebildung und Wissenschaftsbegriff bei Wilhelm Weitling* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1984), Lothar Knatz and H.-A. Marsiske, eds., *Wilhelm Weitling—ein deutscher Arbeiterkommunist* (Hamburg: Ergebnisse, 1989), and Waltraud Seidel-Höppner, 'Zu einigen theoretischen und methodischen Fragen der neueren WeitlingForschung', in Marsiske, 'Wider die Umsonstfresser', pp. 9–38.
- 27 Alexander Brandenburg, *Theoriebildungsprozesse in der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung 1835–1850* (Hannover: SOAK, 1977) tends to idealise the 'spontaneous' and 'autonomous' movement and to ignore its internationalism.
- 28 A National-Socialist curiosity is Werner Brettschneider, 'Entwicklung und Bedeutung des deutschen Frühsozialismus in London' (Ph.D. dissertation, Königsberg, 1936), which uses some archival material since unavailable. He sees 'a German socialism originating in the *Arbeitertum*' as becoming 'leaderless' abroad and 'cut off from the German people', thus an easy prey to internationalism and Marxism 'stemming from Jewish intellectuals' (pp. 63–5).
- 29 Martin Hundt, *Geschichte des Bundes der Kommunisten 1836–1852* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1993), p. 777.
- 30 Friedrich Engels, 'Die Entwicklung des Sozialismus von der Utopie zur Wissenschaft', *MEW*, XIX, pp. 181–228, and his 'Zur Geschichte des Bundes der Kommunisten', *MEW*, VIII, pp. 577–93. E.J. Hobsbawm, too, emphasises the pre-Marxian character of early socialism, and its negligible role both in Marx's own thinking and in socialism after 1847 ('Marx, Engels and Pre-Marxian Socialism', in Eric Hobsbawm, ed., *The History of Marxism*, I: *Marxism in Marx's Day* (Brighton: Harvester, 1982), p. 25. Werner Hofmann, *Ideengeschichte der sozialen Bewegung des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, 6th edn (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1979), juxtaposes the political strength of non-Marxist thought with its theoretical weakness.
- 31 Cole, *A History of Socialist Thought*, I, p. 222. Cole concedes, however, that earlier forms of socialism lived on in the co-operative, anarchist and other movements, but that Marxism 'drove them out of the centre of both argument and organisation', thus overestimating Marx's influence before the First International.
- 32 See my 'Die Emigration der deutschen Achtundvierziger in England: Eine reine "school of scandal and of meanness"?' in Gottfried Niedhart, ed., *Großbritannien als Gast- und Exilland für Deutsche im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Bochum: Brockmeyer, 1985), pp. 22–47.
- 33 See Hans Henning Hahn, 'Möglichkeiten und Formen politischen Handelns in der Emigration', *AfS*, 23 (1983), 123–61; Oscar Blum, 'Zur Psychologie der Emigration', *AGSA*, 7 (1916), 412–30.
- 34 Alexander Herzen, *My Past and Thoughts*, 3 vols (Chatto and Windus, 1968).

- 35 Alwin Hanschmidt, *Republikanisch-demokratischer Internationalismus im 19. Jahrhundert* (Husum: Mathiesen, 1977); Frits van Holthoon and Marcel van der Linden, eds., *Internationalism in the Labour Movement, 1830–1940* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1988).
- 36 Kinkel to Schurz, 9 Jan. 1858, in Adolph Busse, 'Die Briefe Gottfried Kinkels an Karl Schurz', in Paul Wentzcke, ed., *Quellen und Darstellungen zur Geschichte der Burschenschaft und der deutschen Einheitsbewegungen*, XIV (1934), p. 254; *LDJ*, 22 Sept. 1855, 1. Liebknecht modified this somewhat saying that patriotism infects a sensible person only abroad (*Karl Marx zum Gedächtniß: Ein Lebensabriß und Erinnerungen*, Nürnberg: Wörlein, 1896, pp. 82–3).
- 37 Gustav Mayer, 'Die Trennung der proletarischen von der bürgerlichen Demokratie in Deutschland (1863–1870)', *AGSA*, 2 (1912), 1–67. For a more recent discussion of this view see Jürgen Kocka, 'Die Trennung von bürgerlicher und proletarischer Demokratie im europäischen Vergleich', in J.Kocka, ed., *Europäische Arbeiterbewegungen im 19. Jahrhundert: Deutschland, Österreich, England und Frankreich im Vergleich* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), pp. 5–20.

## 1

### The German colony

- 1 The worst case of this is I.A.Bach, 'Karl Marx und die Londoner Zeitung "Das Volk" (1859)', *Aus der Geschichte des Kampfes von Marx und Engels für die proletarische Partei* (Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1961), pp. 203–5.
- 2 Liebknecht recalled that at least a dozen of his acquaintances went mad (Liebknecht to Cotta, 14 Dec. 1861, in Haltern, *Liebknecht und England*, p. 62).
- 3 Heinrich Dorgeel, *Deutschlands Pioniere in London* (Berlin: Otto Janke, n.d. [1882?]), pp. 5–51; Karl Heinrich Schaible, *Geschichte der Deutschen in England* (Strassburg: Karl J.Trübner, 1885). C.R.Hennings, *Deutsche in England* (Stuttgart: Ausland und Heimat Verlag, 1923), pp. 17–58, starting before the fifth-century Angles and Saxons, lists great names in commerce, the sciences and arts, from Gottfried Kneller and Charles Hallé, to Karl Wilhelm Siemens, Ernest Cassel and Julius Reuter.
- 4 Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).
- 5 Hermann Kellenbenz, 'German Immigrants in England', in Colin Holmes, ed., *Immigrants and Minorities in British Society* (George Allen & Unwin, 1978), p. 72.
- 6 *The Penny Satirist*, no. 148 (15 Feb. 1840), 1, and no. 154 (28 March 1840), 1. The image of all Germans arriving as paupers to be fattened in England at the expense of John Bull reappeared in 'A Shower of German Paupers, Or Bad Weather for John Bull', *The Penny Satirist*, no. 152 (14 March 1840), 1, and similarly in caricatures in *Cleave's Penny Gazette*, no. 300 (15 July 1843), 1. Popular songs directed against 'German influence' referred especially to the 'Co-bugs' (Theodor Fontane, *Bilderbuch aus England*, ed. Friedrich Fontane, introd. Hanns Martin Elster (Berlin: G.Grote'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1938), pp. 109–10).
- 7 *Hermann*, 15 Jan. 1859; *LDZAA*, no. 21, 13 Nov. 1858. The *City Mission Magazine* (25, 1860, 233) estimated c. 60,000. *Census of Great Britain, 1851. II.: Ages, Civil Conditions, Occupations, and Birth-Places of the People* (HMSO, 1854), I, p. 36; *Census of England and Wales for the Year 1861* (HMSO, 1863), II, p. 42, which however noted a want of precision in information about birthplaces. I have in the following used the census figures, unless otherwise stated, for demographic data. Details of foreigners' professions are taken from the 1861 census; they were not given in that of 1851. Further complications are added by the ethnic minorities in Prussia or Austria who may not have defined themselves as

- Germans. The 1841 census gave no details about the place of origin of the 19,148 foreigners in the metropolis.
- 8 Arthur Shadwell, 'The German Colony in London', *The National Review*, 26 (1896), 805. Calculations about naturalised Germans and British-born children are discussed in *Hermann*, 21 and 28 May 1864; 11 June 1864.
  - 9 In 1851 neither Austria nor Prussia were given separate categories. In 1861, 619 Austrians and 3,634 Prussians were listed apart from Germans.
  - 10 Annual reports of the German Hospital (Jürgen Püschel, *Die Geschichte des German Hospital in London 1845 bis 1948* (Minister: Verlag Murken-Altrogge, 1980), p. 20). Jacques Grandjonc ('Die deutsche Binnenwanderung in Europa 1830 bis 1848', in Otto Büsch and Hans Herzfeld, eds., *Die frühsozialistischen Bünde in der Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung* (Berlin: Colloquium, 1975), p. 20) estimates 40,000 in the late 1840s. Schieder (*Anfänge der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung*, pp. 101–2) assumed a colony of 20,000, in contrast to some 50,000 in Paris in 1846 (J. Grandjonc, 'Les Étrangers à Paris sous la Monarchie de Juillet et la Seconde République', *Population*, 29 (1974), 79–80, 84). A similarly wide definition of German Jews was used by C.C. Aronsfeld, who includes natives of Austria, Bohemia and Hungary ('German Jews in Victorian England', *Publications of the Leo Baeck Institute*, 7 (1962), 313).
  - 11 Freiligrath to K. Buchner, 30 Nov. 1859, in Wilhelm Buchner, ed., *Ferdinand Freiligrath* (Lahr: M. Schauenburg, 1882), II, p. 325.
  - 12 *British Parliamentary Papers. 1871 Census England and Wales. Population 18* (1871; repr. Shannon: Irish University Press, 1970), III, p. li. In addition there was a large transient population, including commercial travellers, visitors to the Great Exhibition and sailors.
  - 13 August Jäger, *Der Deutsche in London* (Leipzig: 1839), I, p. 148; L.F. Use, *Geschichte der politischen Untersuchungen* (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1975 [1860]), p. 381.
  - 14 Ernst Barnikol, *Weitling der Gefangene und seine 'Gerechtigkeit'* (Kiel: Mühlau-Verlag, 1929), pp. 197, 201.
  - 15 The 'wanted' list of 1842 in Werner Kowalski, ed., *Vom kleinbürgerlichen Demokratismus zum Kommunismus. Die Hauptberichte der Bundeszentralbehörde* (Vaduz: Topos, 1978), pp. 308–40, included Schapper, Heinrich Bauer and Joseph Garnier.
  - 16 Police reports (by Sanders), 4 March and 14 Oct. 1852, PRO Metropolitan Police 2/43 and HO 45/4547A, cited in Porter, *The Refugee Question*, p. 14. The Prussian ambassador in London, Freiherr von Bunsen, reported fewer than 300 Germans enrolled in London democratic clubs in February 1851 (Schoeps, 'Der Kosmos', 212).
  - 17 HO Papers, OS 4816, and FO Papers, 27:1233, according to Alvin R. Calman, *Ledru-Rollin après 1848 et les proscrits français en Angleterre* (Paris: F. Rieder, 1921), p. 135.
  - 18 Adelheid von Asten-Kinkel, 'Johanna Kinkel in England', *Deutsche Revue*, 26 (1901), 70. The Social Democratic committee alone helped about 500 refugees. In 1851 the CABV had at least 250 members, and a rival club, the NLAV, at first 60 to 70 members, with another 80 joining later (Gerhard Becker, 'Der "Neue Arbeiter-Verein in London" 1852', *ZfG*, 14 (1966) 79). Alter and Muhs calculate that one in seven Germans in London was a refugee ('Begegnungen mit Fontane in London', in Alter and Muhs, *Exilanten*, p. 6).
  - 19 Following attacks in the *Morning Advertiser*, the *Londoner Deutsches Journal*, 67 (8 Nov. 1856), protested that Prince Albert did nothing for German interests in London. He did however support certain German charities (*LDJ*, 68–9, 15–22 Nov. 1856).
  - 20 Martin Sadek, 'Metternichs publizistische und pressepolitische Betätigung im Exil (1848–1852)', Ph.D. dissertation, Vienna University, 1968, pp. 35–71. Its influence on the English press and the House of Lords was condemned by the *Standard of Freedom* (5 Oct. 1850).
  - 21 Klaus D. Gross, 'Der preußische Gesandte in London', in Erich Geldbach, ed., *Der gelehrte Diplomat: Zum Wirken Christian Carl Josias Bunsens* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980), pp. 13–34. Kingsley's ambassador in *Alton Locke* was modelled on Bunsen.



- 22 Heinrich Dorgeel, *Die deutsche Colonie in London* (Leipzig: Commission A. Siegle, 1881), pp. 17–18; Leopold Katscher, ‘German Life in London’, *The Nineteenth Century*, 21 (1887), 734. In 1900 a Farm Colony was established for unemployed Germans (*Deutsche Arbeiter-Kolonie in England. 1909* (n.p., n.d. [1909]), p. 5).
- 23 ‘A Shower of German Paupers’, *The Penny Satirist*, 14 March 1840, 1; Jäger, *Der Deutsche in London*, II, pp. 120–3, assumed 5,000 of them and described the chain-migration that led parents to send their children off to London.
- 24 *Census 1861*; Joan Evans, *John Ruskin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954), p. 137; Dorgeel, *Die deutsche Colonie*, p. 98. The following figures taken from the census returns include Germans, Prussians and Austrians, partly because the differentiation is unreliable and because they all formed a part of the colony.
- 25 A clarinet player from Hannover confirmed that he knew of five German bands in London, and added, ‘We don’t associate with any Englishmen. Zare are three public-houses kept by Germans, where we Germans meet. Sugar bakers and other trades are of ze number’ (Henry Mayhew, *The Morning Chronicle Survey of Labour and the Poor: The Metropolitan Districts* (Firle: Caliban Books Reprint, 1980–1982), IV, p. 233, V, pp. 2–3).
- 26 Carl Schoell, *Geschichte der deutschen evangelischen Kirchen in England* (Williams & Norgate, 1852), p. 46.
- 27 *1861 Census*, II, pp. 50–51, 16. See Thomas Fock, ‘Über Londoner Zuckersiedereien und deutsche Arbeitskräfte’, *Zuckerindustrie*, 110 (1985), pt 1, 233–5, pt 2, 426–32. The ‘sugar-side’ remained the only part of the docks which employed foreigners (Mayhew, *The Morning Chronicle Survey*, V, p. 51).
- 28 ‘Die Deutschen in Whitechapel’, *LDJ*, 8 (22 Sept. 1855), 2; *Freiheit*, 3 (18 Jan. 1879), 5 (1 Feb. 1879); Dr von Hoff, *Die deutschen Gekhrten, Kaufleute, Handwerker und Tagelöhner in England, Schottland und Irland* (Mannheim: Tobias Löffler, 1863), pp. 3–6. For casual labour in sugar processing see Gareth Stedman Jones, *Outcast London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), pp. 117–20, 154.
- 29 Pütschel, *Die Geschichte des German Hospital*, pp. 20–1.
- 30 Schoell, *Geschichte der deutschen evangelischen Kirchen* (1852), p. 20; *Hermann*, 19 Oct. 1860. E.g., at 12 Leman Street lived 37 German labourers, most in their twenties, of whom only nine were married (HO 107/1545, ff. 587–8); at 27 Great Alie Street, under the sugar refiner Samuel Bowman, lived another 33 sugar refiners from Germany (ff. 614–15). For the decline of the sugar industry see Schoell, *Geschichte der deutschen evangelischen Kirchen*, pp. 15, 17, 20; Dorgeel, *Colonie*, p. 43; *Freiheit*, 18. Jan., 1 Feb. 1879, and 8 March 1879. In 1871 there were only 793 German sugar refiners left in London (*Census of England and Wales, 1871. Population Abstracts*, III, p. 33). Some 200 sugar refiners from Hannover lived in Liverpool, reputedly influenced by republicans, liberals and communists (Albert Rosenkranz, *Geschichte der deutschen evangelischen Kirche zu Liverpool* (Stuttgart: Verlag Ausland und Heimat, 1921), pp. 26–31, 40, 56–7).
- 31 *Hermann*, 26 Feb. 1870.
- 32 An exception was Johann Jacob Brüning from Schleswig-Holstein, who joined the CABV. He was described as a sugar baker, but also as a baker (*BdK*, III, pp. 500–1). The ‘New London Workers’ Society’ (NLAV) admitted two sugar bakers from Hannover in 1852 (NLAV file, Potsdam 8535, ff. 23 and 26).
- 33 *Hermann*, 26 March 1859.
- 34 Wilhelm Marr, *Das junge Deutschland in der Schweiz* (Leipzig: Verlag von Wilhelm Juvany, 1846), pp. 124–5.
- 35 He detailed how the credit policy of finance capital pushed out small masters (‘Die Schneiderei in London oder der Kampf des großen und des kleinen Capitals’, excerpts in *BdK*, II, pp. 320–3), and later used examples from his own tailoring experiences in his attack on John Stuart Mill (J.G.Eccarius, *Eines Arbeiters Widerlegung der national-ökonomischen*

- Lehren John Stuart Mills*, 1888; repr. Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der DDR, 1971, pp. 10–11).
- 36 Mayhew, *The Morning Chronicle Survey*, II, pp. 108, 112, 146–8.
- 37 ‘Die Deutschen in Whitechapel’, *LDJ*, 12 (20 Oct. 1855), 1–2. The London German section of the Amalgamated Society of Tailors comprised 80 members in 1879 (*Freiheit*, 18 Jan. 1879). In 1852 the tailor Julius Grozinski wrote that work in London was much easier and better paid than in Cologne, but warned that out of the 7 thaler he received for an entire dress and coat he needed about 5 thaler for his basic needs. Typically, he planned to stay in London until he had learned enough English to go to America (Julius Grozinski, 40 Brewer Street, Golden Square, London, 1 Sept. 1852, to friends in Cologne, Revolutionary party file, Potsdam 13835, f. 123).
- 38 Colin Holmes, ‘Germans in Britain 1870–1914’, in Jürgen Schneider, ed., *Wirtschaftskräfte und Wirtschaftswege* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1978), p. 593.
- 39 A slippermaker from Butzbach near Frankfurt described one of his fellow Germans who imported ‘de green hand from de country’ as cheap labour (Mayhew, *The Morning Chronicle Survey*, III, pp. 163, 189–92).
- 40 Schoell, *Geschichte*, p. 59; *LDJ*, 8 (22 Sept. 1855), 2–3; 9 (29 Sept. 1855), 1–2.
- 41 Although the census counted only 75 German tobacco and cigar makers, a German author assumed some 300 of them in Whitechapel, adding that the cigar workers found it difficult to adapt to the strict English factory rules (‘Die Deutschen in Whitechapel’, *LDJ*, 11 (13 Oct. 1855), 1–2). Marx on the other hand claimed that ‘factory hands’, such as cutlers from Solingen, were ‘quite unsuitable for London handicrafts’ (Marx to Engels, 3 June 1864, *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 184; perhaps Marx here wanted to dissuade Lassalleans from coming to England).
- 42 The 1861 census counted 254 cabinetmakers and upholsters and 449 watchmakers and clockmakers, while *The London City Mission Magazine*, 25 (1 Aug. 1860), 254–5, estimated some 1,100 clockmakers from Baden, especially around Leicester Square. Joseph Moll from Cologne, a leader of the Communist League, was a watchmaker. August Jäger, *Neuestes Gemälde von London* (Hamburg: Hoffman & Campe, 1839), II, p. 248, had earlier described them as well paid and content.
- 43 Shadwell, ‘The German Colony in London’, 807; Hennings, *Deutsche in England*, p. 124.
- 44 Hermann, 22 Oct. 1864, 22 Feb. 1868; Dorgeel, *Colonie*, 140; Stedman Jones, *Outcast London*, p. 60.
- 45 *Ein deutsches Glaubenswerk in der Themsestadt* (n.d.), p. 61; *Die Deutsche Kolonie in England* (Anglo-German Publishing Company, 1913), pp. 73, 87; Fontane, *Bilderbuch*, pp. 60–1.
- 46 J.J. Findlay, ‘The Genesis of the German Clerk’, *Fortnightly Review*, 66 (1889), 533–6; Colin Holmes, ‘Germans in Britain 1870–1914’, p. 586; Gregory Anderson, ‘German Clerks in England, 1870–1914’, in Kenneth Lunn, ed., *Hosts, Immigrants and Minorities* (Folkestone: Dawson, 1980), pp. 202–6.
- 47 Engels to Marx, 14 Sept. 1852, *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 184; Manfred Häckel, ed., *Freiligraths Briefwechsel mit Marx und Engels* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1968), I, p. 49, II, pp. 94–5.
- 48 Bucher alone was made independent by his solid income as regular correspondent for the Berlin *National-Zeitung*, supplemented by income from historical lectures (Bucher file, Potsdam 8892, f. 19). The 1861 census counted 42 Germans ‘engaged in literature’, including translators.
- 49 Friedrich Althaus, ‘Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Kolonie in England’, *Unsere Zeit*, N.F. 9 (1873), 547–8. One success story was Karl Schaible, a medical doctor who became a teacher in London and published widely on education, among others a *Theory and Practice of Teaching Modern Languages* (Schaible, *Siebenunddreißig Jahre aus dem Leben eines Exilierten*, Stuttgart: A. Bonz, 1895, p. 103).

- 50 J.Kinkel to K.Zitz, 25 Sept. 1851, in Rupprecht Leppla, ed., *Johanna und Gottfried Kinkels Briefe an Kathinka Zitz 1849–1861*, *Bonner Geschichtsblätter*, 12 (1958), 41.
- 51 Hennings, *Deutsche in England*, pp. 86–91; Althaus, 'Beiträge', 433–45, 534–48; Alter and Muhs, *Exilanten*, pp. 23–100.
- 52 Karl Heinrich Schaible, *Erinnerungen an Dr. Hermann Müller-Strübing* (A.Siegle, 1894), pp. 12–28; Herzen, *My Past and Thoughts*, III, pp. 1172–9.
- 53 Schaible, *Siebenunddreißig Jahre*, pp. 65, 162–4. Unlike Paris, London had no separate association of German doctors (*Germania*, 1 (1847), 283–5).
- 54 Püschel, *Die Geschichte des German Hospital*, pp. 33–4, 45, 112–15. Frederick Parkes Weber, ed., *Autobiographical Reminiscences of Sir Hermann Weber* (Bale and Danielsson, 1919), pp. 49–70. Freund was also Marx's physician, and at one point Marx was temporarily hiding out in Camberwell because Freund demanded payment (Marx to Engels, 2 Dec. 1854, *MECW*, XXXIX, pp. 501–2).
- 55 *DLZ*, 134 (22 Oct. 1847), 136 (5 Nov. 1847); *Germania*, 2 (1848), 191–4; Fontane, *Bilderbuch*, p. 71. Freund's reminiscences are in *Hermann*, 10 Feb.–19 May 1866.
- 56 *Das Westphälische Dampfboot*, 3 (1847), 662–3. Jewish patients were harassed (*DLZ*, 178 (25 Aug. 1848); cf. also no. 278 (26 July 1850)), as were democrats (*Volk*, 8 (25 June 1859)).
- 57 Harney in *BdK*, III, p. 492. About 20 per cent of patients were English (Püschel, *Die Geschichte des German Hospital*, pp. 65, 75).
- 58 Ludwig Bamberger, *Erinnerungen*, ed. Paul Nathan (Berlin: G.Reimer, 1899), pp. 211, 230; Marie-Lise Weber, *Ludwig Bamberger. Ideologie statt Realpolitik* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1987), pp. 94–112. He is often confused with Louis Bamberger, editor of the *Deutsche Londoner Zeitung* in the 1840s (e.g. in Aronsfeld, 'German Jews in Victorian England', 314).
- 59 Häckel, *Freiligraths Briefwechsel*, II, p. 36; *DLZ*, 5 May 1848.
- 60 Kellenbenz, 'German Immigrants', pp. 73–4; Hennings, *Deutsche in England*, pp. 100–11; Schaible, *Geschichte der Deutschen in England*, pp. 419–22. The 1861 census listed almost 500 'merchants' and four bankers in London. For businesses in northern towns, besides the well-known textile firm of Ermen & Engels in Manchester, see Asa Briggs, *Victorian Cities* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963), p. 152; C.C.Aronsfeld, 'German Jews in Nineteenth Century Bradford', *The Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 53 (1981), 111–17.
- 61 Theodor Fontane, 'Die Camberwell-Deutschen und Gottfried Kinkel' [1857], in *Sämtliche Werke*, XVIIIa (Munich: Nymphenburger, 1972), p. 764.
- 62 Dorgeel, *Pioniere*, p. 133. The 1861 census counted 224 Germans in Camberwell.
- 63 See also Panayi's discussion of gender structure (*German Immigrants*, pp. 108–10), which does not differentiate socio-economic groups.
- 64 'Weibliches Elend', *Frauen-Zeitung*, 19 Jan. 1850, repr. in Ute Gerhard, Elisabeth Hannover-Drück and Romina Schneider, eds., 'Dem Reich der Freiheit werb' ich Bürgerinnen': *Die Frauen-Zeitung von Louise Otto* (Frankfurt: Syndikat, 1979), pp. 213–14; 'The Germans in London', *The London City Mission Magazine*, 241; 'Die deutschen Arbeiterinnen in England', *LDJ*, 4 (25 Aug. 1855), 5 (1 Sept. 1855); 'Die Deutschen in Whitechapel', *LDJ*, 10 (6 Oct. 1855).
- 65 Schoell, *Geschichte der deutschen evangelischen Kirchen*, p. 59. The hospital's report gives 13 women furriers, while the census of 1861 lists only two German women as furriers. A hostel for German working women was established in 1881 (*Hermann*, 14 May 1881).
- 66 *Marx and Engels Through the Eyes of Their Contemporaries* (Moscow: Progress, 1972), pp. 172, 35, 169.
- 67 Yvonne Kapp, *Eleanor Marx* (Virago, 1979), I, pp. 239, 152; Wilhelm Liebknecht, *Karl Marx zum Gedächtniß: Ein Lebensabriß und Erinnerungen* (Nürnberg: Wörlein, 1896), pp. 28, 68–9; Jenny Marx, 'Kurze Umriss eines bewegten Lebens', in *Mohr und General: Erinnerungen an Marx und Engels* (Berlin: Dietz, 1965), p. 229. There is evidence that she

- was essentially content with her fate. Despite opportunities to make 'a good match', she chose to stay with the Marxes, and encouraged her half-sister Marianne Kreuz to join her. 68 *NZ*, 27 (1 Jan. 1859).
- 69 Malwida von Meysenbug, *Memoiren einer Idealistin* (Berlin: Schuster & Loeffler, n.d.), II, pp. 29–33, 124–7; 'Aus dem Tagebuch einer Gouvernante', *Hermann*, 5 Feb. 1859.
- 70 Meysenbug, *Memoiren*, II, p. 57; J.Kinkel to K.Zitz, 18 July 1851, in Leppla, J. und G.Kinkels Briefe', p. 38; *Hermann*, 29 Jan. 1859, 30 June 1860. Johannes and Bertha Ronge's *A Practical Guide to the English Kinder Garten* (1855) reached its fourth edition in 1871. Bertha Ronge also devised a system of using coloured pieces of cardboard to teach children letters (*Madame Ronge's Kinder Garten Alphabet*, n.d.).
- 71 Despite the title of Ash ton's book, she says very little about this 'Little Germany'. The figures are from the 1861 census, the first to indicate distribution within the city. Peter Meinhold, ed. *Johann Hinrich Wichern: Sämtliche Werke*, II (Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1965),+283; Count E.Armfelt ('German London', in George R.Sims, ed., *Living London*, III, Cassell, 1903), pp. 58–60 (this three-volume survey of foreign communities included the still comparatively 'invisible' Germans only as an afterthought).
- 72 Contrast this with other foreign communities: almost as many Dutch as Germans lived in Whitechapel alone, but they formed almost 60 per cent of the entire Dutch colony in London. The French (nearly 50 per cent of whom were women) were much more widely spread over the entire metropolis. Their largest settlement was in Marylebone, and they were very strongly represented among the professions and some specialist handicrafts. Of Italians, only one in six was female, and a third lived in Holborn, the largest group earning a living connected with music, including organ-grinding. Of Poles two-thirds lived in Whitechapel and other parts of east London, and 20 per cent were tailors.
- 73 Katscher, 'German Life in London', 726–41; Findlay, 'The Genesis of the German Cleric'; Arthur Shadwell, 'The German Colony in London', *The National Review*, 26 (1896), 798–810. This hostility peaked in anti-German mob violence during the First World War: Holmes, 'Germans in Britain 1870–1914'; Panikos Panayi, *The Enemy in Our Midst: Germans in Britain during the First World War* (New York: Berg, 1991). Perhaps with the exception of the indignation following Pyat's letter discussed below, there were virtually no specifically 'ethnic' conflicts in the mid-Victorian era.
- 74 LaVern J.Ripley, *The German-Americans* (Boston: Twayne, 1976),+222; and Kathleen Conzen, 'The Paradox of German-American Assimilation', *Yearbook of German-American Studies*, 16 (1981), 153–60.
- 75 Although Panayi acknowledges the religious divisions among London Germans, he maintains that churches 'served like rods of steel in the development of the German communities' (Panayi, *Germans in Britain since 1500*, pp. 84, 40–1). In the same volume, however, Susanne Steinmetz ('The German Churches in London, 1669–1914', pp. 67–71) points out that closer co-operation was difficult even between the Protestant churches.
- 76 Schoell, *Geschichte der deutschen evangelischen Kirchen*, pp. 21, 26–50; Dorgeel, *Deutschlands Pioniere*, pp. 56, 96–7; *Die Deutsche Kolonie*, pp. 17–27. Missions among the 'infidels' started in 1849, both from the London City Mission and from Young Men's Clubs associated with Bunsen (*City Mission Magazine*, 234).
- 77 *Die Deutsche Kolonie*, pp. 25–8; Dorgeel, *Die deutsche Kolonie*, p. 50; *Hermann*, 3 June 1865. A 'German-Catholic' congregation existed in London even before Ronge's arrival (*DLZ*, 8 (23 May 1845); Susanne Steinmetz and Rudolf Muhs, 'Protestantische Pastoren und andere Seelsorger', in Alter and Muhs, *Exilanten*, pp. 441–4).
- 78 The 'Deutsch-israelitische Synagogen- und Unterstützungsgesellschaft' had 160 members in 1868 (*LDJ*, 4 (25 Aug. 1855); *Hermann*, 16 May 1868).
- 79 Püschel, *Die Geschichte des German Hospital*, pp. 75–7. 'Die deutschen Juden in London', *Die Gartenlaube*, 20 (1863), 312–15, is an anti-Semitic description of 'types'. Aronsfeld, 'German Jews in Victorian England', discusses eminent individuals.

- 80 The census of 1861 lists 22 per cent Prussians and under 4 per cent Austrians. The other figures are derived from 9,094 patients in the German Hospital from 1845 to 1864 (*Hermann*, 14 May 1864). The figures for patients in 1851 alone confirm this general picture, except that here 25 per cent were Hannoverians, slightly outnumbering the Prussians and vastly more than the 13 per cent Hessians and 4 per cent Württembergers (*Schoell, Geschichte der deutschen evangelischen Kirchen*, p. 59).
- 81 Herzen, *My Past and Thoughts*, III, p. 1181.
- 82 Wilhelm Blos, ed., *General Franz Sigel's Denkwürdigkeiten aus den Jahren 1848/49* (Mannheim: Bensheimer, 1902), p. 145; *Hermann*, 12 March 1859.
- 83 The 'Schwarzwälder Unterstützungs- und Wohltätigkeitsverein' was founded in 1847, excluded politics and religion, and still had some 200 members in 1913 (*Die Deutsche Kolonie*, pp. 96–7).
- 84 Schabelitz Papers, Diary notes, 17 Jan. 1847, p. 23; *Volk*, 3 (21 May 1859); *Deutsches Glaubenswerk in der Themsestadt*, p. 69.
- 85 *Hermann*, 27 April 1867, 15 June 1867, 21 Dec. 1867; the society had 91 members in Whitechapel.
- 86 Schaible, *Siebenunddreißig Jahre*, pp. 78–80.
- 87 Emil Stargardt, *Handbuch der Deutschen in England mit Wegweiser für London* (Heilbronn: Henninger, 1889), p. 49.
- 88 *Grundris einer Schul-Ordnung bey der Deutschen Evangelischen St. Marien-Gemeinde, In der Savoy, in London* (C.Heydinger, 1782), preserves the rules of one such school, including the stipulation that no English be spoken during the German part of the lessons (pp. 14–15).
- 89 Advertisements e.g. in *Hermann*, 5 May 1860, 1 Jan. 1870.
- 90 *Neues Bucher Verzeichnis der Deutschen Lese-Bibliothek* (C.Heydinger), 1796, p. 3.
- 91 *Die Deutsche Kolonie*, pp. 43, 97; slightly different in Schoell, *Geschichte der deutschen evangelischen Kirchen*, pp. 54–6.
- 92 *Hermann*, 2 Nov. 1861; Dorgeel, *Deutschlands Pioniere*, pp. 124–44, and his *Die deutsche Kolonie*, pp. 63–83.

## 2

**The German Workers' Educational Society, 1840–1849**

- 1 Brandenburg, *Theoriebildungsprozesse*, pp. 233–9.
- 2 Statutes of the League of the Just, in *BdK*, I, pp. 92–8; Hundt, *Geschichte*, pp. 70–6. See also Hundt, 'Die Historiographie in der DDR zur Geschichte des Bundes der Kommunisten', in Martin Hundt, ed., *Der Bund der Kommunisten 1836–1852* (Berlin: Akademie, 1988), pp. 9–51, and Ernst Schraepfer, 'Der Bund der Gerechten: Seine Tätigkeit in London 1840–1847', *AfS*, 2 (1962), 5–29.
- 3 Wilhelm Weitling, *Die Menschheit wie sie ist und wie sie sein sollte* (Paris: 1838); excerpts in *BdK*, I, pp. 108–10, and discussed in Hundt, *Geschichte*, pp. 87–94, and Marsiske, 'Wider die Umsonstfresser', pp. 52–60. The main biography remains Waltraud Seidel-Höppner, *Wilhelm Weitling* (Berlin: Dietz, 1961). For the most recent English summary see Keith Taylor, *The Political Ideas of the Utopian Socialists* (Frank Cass, 1982), pp. 186–208. Several obituaries wrongly mention Weitling as the founder of the CABV (e.g., *Der Reichsbote*, Berlin, 28 Aug. 1887, and *Vossische Zeitung*, 2 Sept. 1887, in Weitling file, Potsdam 14047, ff. 8 and 8a).
- 4 This is Schapper's own expression before a Wiesbaden jury in 1850, where he gave some autobiographical details, including his career as brewer and cooper, typesetter and language teacher. He omitted his role in the League, the CABV and the Cologne workers' society and stressed his desire for German unity as his paramount political concern (*BdK*, II, p. 87, I, p.

- 115). On his life see A.W.Fehling, 'Karl Schapper und die Anfänge der Arbeiterbewegung bis zur Revolution von 1848', Ph.D. dissertation, Rostock 1922, Sofia Lewiowa, 'Karl Schapper', in *Marx und Engels und die ersten proletarischen Revolutionäre* (Berlin: Dietz, 1965), pp. 76–119, and Armin M.Kuhnigk, *Karl Schapper* (Camberg: U.Lange, 1980). Some additional information on his youth is in Andreas Scherzer, untitled letter to the *Neuer Social-Demokrat* (18 Feb. 1876).
- 5 This and the following quotes are in Schapper, 'Gütergemeinschaft', *BdK*, I, pp. 98–107. Schapper broke off his draft, leaving some questions unanswered, including the problem of introducing community of goods through revolutionary violence, of continuing private property, and of combining 'personal freedom' with a just distribution of labour. Marsiske convincingly argues that both Schapper's and Weitling's manuscripts were written as part of one fundamental debate in the League ('Utopischer Entwurf und Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland: Die Gütergemeinschaftsdiskussion im "Bund der Gerechten"', in Hans-Jürgen Goertz, ed., *Alles gehört alien: Das Experiment Gütergemeinschaft vom 16. Jahrhundert bis heute* (Munich: C.H.Beck, 1984), pp. 165–87). See also Brandenburg, *Theoriebildungsprozesse*, pp. 20–44, and Hundt, *Geschichte*, pp. 76–87. Jacques Grandjonc and Hans Pelger, "'Gütergemeinschaft'" (Juni-Dezember 1838). Materialien von Carl Schapper für die Grundsätze des Bundes der Gerechten', in *Studien zur Geschichte*, H. 15 (Berlin 1989), pp. 65–115, analyse the development of his manuscript.
- 6 F.Engels, 'On the History of the Communist League', in Rodney Livingstone, ed., *The Cologne Communist Trial* (Lawrence and Wishart, 1971), pp. 40 and 53.
- 7 X [Friederichs] to Hinckeldey, London 29 May 1850, Simon file, Potsdam 11374/1, f. 38. Bauer's song 'Aufruf', to the tune of the Marseillaise, called proletarians to the struggle (*Deutsche Londoner Zeitung*, 154 (17 March 1848), supplement). See also Martin Hundt, 'Einer der ersten revolutionären Proletarier: Heinrich Bauer', *BzG*, 14 (1972), 642. Bauer emigrated to Australia in late 1851 after some discord with Marx. Bauer was *not* one of the founders of the London CABV, as is sometimes stated.
- 8 Livingstone, *The Cologne Communist Trial*, pp. 40–1. See also N.Beloussowa, 'Joseph Moll', in *Marx und Engels und die ersten proletarischen Revolutionäre*, pp. 42–75, and Gerhard Becker, 'Joseph Moll', in Helmut Bleiber, Walter Schmidt and Rolf Weber, eds., *Männer der Revolution von 1848* (Berlin: Akademie, 1987), II, pp. 53–83. His brother Karl co-founded the CABV.
- 9 The republican 'Association', led by Gustav Kombst, had about 100 members, including many relatively well-to-do watchmakers, and was chiefly concerned with aiding emigration to America (August Jäger, *Der Deutsche in London*, Leipzig, 1839, I, pp. 187–205). According to Gustav Kombst, the Young Germany group in London planned to take part in a Young Europe military expedition to Spain to support the republicans (*Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben*, Leipzig, F.L.Herbig, 1848, pp. 301ff). Harro-Harring, who was among those reaching England in 1836, described only his dislike of English habits (Paul Harro-Harring, *Skizze aus London*, Strassburg, 1838).
- 10 This 'Deutsche Gesellschaft', led by Joseph Heinrich Garnier, aimed to promote 'German education' and 'the German mentality' ('Statuts de la Reunion allemande', *Renseignement sur le Communisme Allemand, L'Actualité de l'Histoire. Bulletin trimestriel de l'Institut français d'Histoire sociale*, 19 (1957), 26–7; Schieder, *Anfänge*, pp. 63–4). It was still known to the CABV in 1846, when some of its sixty republican members were sympathetic to socialism (*BdK*, I, p. 438). Their statutes have been mistaken for those of the CABV (Jacques Grandjonc, Karl-Ludwig König and Marie-Ange Roy-Jacquemart, eds., *Statuten des 'Communistischen Arbeiter-Bildungs-Vereins' London 1840–1914* (Trier: Karl-Marx-Haus, 1979), p. 23; but see Alexander Brandenburg, 'Der Kommunistische Arbeiterbildungsverein in London (1840–47)', *IRSH*, 24, 1979, 353.
- 11 Garnier edited a journal, *Deutsches Leben, Kunst und Poesie* (later *Deutsches Leben*), devoted 'exclusively to the interests of German nationality and...to German literature', (no.

- 1, 15 Aug. 1834, [p. 1], to no. [illegible], 8 Oct. 1834). A later paper in London, *Die Deutsche Presse: Zeitung für Politik, Literatur, Handel und Gewerbe*, published in nine numbers in 1841, apparently did not have any connections with refugees, and attempted to report on 'German life and German mentality' without offending anyone (no. 3, 12 June 1841), but reprinted patriotic songs in its supplement (*Belletristische Blätter*, n.d., p. 39).
- 12 In its first, 1841, declaration, it was 'Deutsche Demokratische Gesellschaft', later 'Bildungsgesellschaft für Arbeiter', 'Wissenschaftlicher Verein', or 'Great Windmill Street' and 'Rose Street Club' after its residences. Its English contemporaries also knew it as the 'German society', London Germans in 1848 as the 'communist society' (*DLZ*, 162 (5 May 1848)). In historiography it has become known as the 'Kommunistischer Arbeiter-Bildungsverein' (CABV or KABV), a name Lessner remembered as having come into use with the beginnings of the Communist League (Lessner's account, 'Die Geschichte eines Vereins', *Vorwärts*, 257 (2 November 1892, supplement), cited in Hundt, *Geschichte*, pp. 321–2). It certainly was in use by 1859 (*Volk*, 16 (20 Aug. 1859)), several decades earlier than Alexander Brandenburg assumes ('Der Kommunistische Arbeiterbildungsverein', 345). On the CABV, see also Grandjunc, König and Roy-Jacquemart, *Statuten*, pp. 5–17, and Hundt, *Geschichte*, esp. pp. 121–9.
- 13 J. Grandjunc and M. Werner, 'Les émigrations allemandes au 19e siècle (1815–1914)', in Jacques Grandjunc and Klaus Voigt, eds., *Emigrés français en Allemagne. Emigrés allemands en France, 1685–1945: Une exposition* (Paris: Institut Goethe, Paris, et Ministère des Relations Extérieures, 1983), p. 100.
- 14 Brandenburg, 'Arbeiterbildungsverein', 347–52. Lists of books the club owned in 1845 and 1864 have survived (Grandjunc, König and Roy-Jacquemart, *Statuten*, pp. 37–9, 53–64).
- 15 An 1845 list of 23 members of the League of the Just in London gives nine tailors and seven shoemakers (police interview of Friedrich Mentel, in *BdK*, I, pp. 238–9).
- 16 E.g., *Neue Zeit*, no. 2 (3 July 1858), no. 4 (17 July 1858), no. 25 (18 Dec. 1858). For education in a similar club in Hamburg see John Breuilly and Wieland Sachse, *Joachim Friedrich Martens (1806–1877) und die deutsche Arbeiterbewegung* (Göttingen: Schwartz, 1984), pp. 185–207. The cabinetmaker Martens, who founded this Hamburg society, had briefly worked in London in 1841, and the club's statutes referred to the experiences of workers' societies abroad (*BdK*, I, p. 206). Martens was later described as an admirer of Schapper (Haupt to Marx, after 23 Dec. 1850, *MEGA*, III/3, p. 708). See also Johannes Schenk, 'Bildungspolitische Positionen und Aktivitäten des Bundes der Kommunisten (1836 bis 1852)', *Jahrbuch für Erziehungs- und Schulgeschichte*, 23 (1983), 62–77.
- 17 *LDJ*, no. 148 (29 May 1858).
- 18 *Hermann*, 19 Feb. 1870.
- 19 Henry Rackow, *Vor und nach der Schlacht* (1888), p. 25.
- 20 Schabelitz to M. Hess, 25 Nov. 1848, in *BdK*, I, p. 874.
- 21 *NZ*, no. 31 (29 Jan. 1858).
- 22 'Auszug aus einem Briefe von London', 'Die Fortschritte des sozialen Systems in England', and 'Korrespondenz', *Die Junge Generation*, 1, no. 2 (16 Dec. 1841), 17–21, no. 5 (21 March 1842), 65–9, no. 12 (5 Nov. 1842), 203–7, reprinted in Werner Kowalski, ed., *Vom kleinbürgerlichen Demokratismus zum Kommunismus: Zeitschriften aus der Frühzeit der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung (1834–1847)* (Berlin: Akademie, 1967), pp. 178–81, 209–12, 301–4. The Londoners had not contributed to Weitling's earlier paper, *Der Hülfesruf der deutschen Jugend*, but 100 of its 1,000 copies were sold in London (Kowalski, *Zeitschriften*, p. liv). They also sent money to Weitling in December 1842 (*BdK*, I, p. 1010).
- 23 'Was it not Christ who taught community of goods?' (letter of 16 Dec. 1841, in Kowalski, ed., *Zeitschriften*, p. 181).
- 24 One concluded that 'the poor people, too easily trusting, have again been cheated...by the heroes of the mouth and the pen, who excite the people with beautiful phrases and then beat a cowardly retreat in the moment of danger' ('Korrespondenz', 5 Nov. 1842, in Kowalski,

- Zeitschriften*, p. 301, and pp. 209–12, for the CABV's opinion of Owen). On Owenite politics in this period see Gregory Claeys, *Citizens and Saints* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 208–60.
- 25 'Auszug', 16 Dec. 1841, in Kowalski, *Zeitschriften*, p. 179; 'Die deutschen Arbeiter in London sammeln für die schlesischen Weber', *Tekgraph für Deutschland* (Hamburg), no. 165 (Oct. 1844), 660.
- 26 A.L. [Arthur Lehning], 'Discussions a Londres sur le Communisme Icarien', *Bulletin of the International Institute of Social History*, 7 (1952), 87–109. 'Our père Cabet' was still regarded with sympathy in March 1845 (Bauer, Schapper, Moll and Lehmann, 'An Eugen Sue', *Telegraph für Deutschland*, no. 56 (April 1845), 222). Joint discussions between some 80–90 French and over 90 German socialists continued after Weitling's arrival in London (police report of 21 April 1845, in Ernst Barnikol, *Weitling der Gefangene und seine 'Gerechtigkeit'*, Kiel, Mühlau-Verlag, 1929, pp. 214–17). In 1847 Cabet visited London to promote his Icarian colony, which the CABV rejected in September and December; see Friedrich Lessner, *Ich brachte das 'Kommunistische Manifest' zum Drucker* (Berlin: Dietz, 1975), pp. 62–6, *Kommunistische Zeitschrift*, in *BdK*, I, pp. 508–10, and A.L. [Arthur Lehning], 'La réponse de Cabet a Schapper', *Bulletin of the International Institute of Social History*, 8 (1953), 7–15.
- 27 Lehning, 'Discussions', 98–9.
- 28 *BdK*, I, pp. 376–7.
- 29 Lehning, 'Discussions', 103 (meeting of 13 May 1844).
- 30 'Die deutschen Arbeiter in London sammeln für die schlesischen Weber'. For Weitling this collection was one of the most effective acts of the CABV, because it called forth 'most touching scenes' (Wilhelm Weitling, 'Vorrede zur 3. Auflage' [1849], in Weitling, *Garantien der Harmonie und Freiheit* [1842], ed. Bernhard Kaufhold, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1955, p. 294). This Owenite view of human character being formed by circumstances was vehemently rejected by the republican refugee Kombst (*Erinnerungen*, pp. 287–9).
- 31 *New Moral World* (28 Sept. 1844), 109–11; reprinted as *Young Germany* (J. Watson, n.d. [1844]). The *Vorwärts!*, nos. 79, 91–2 (2 Oct., 13–16 Nov. 1844) objected to Weitling being described as 'leader', as German communism was opposed to leaders. Weitling's prominence was generally acknowledged, however, and his reception in London regarded as newsworthy even in the *St Louis Anzeiger des Westens* (Walter Schmidt, *Sozialistische Bestrebungen deutscher Arbeiter in St Louis vor 1848: Der St. Louis-Communistenverein*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1990, p. 37).
- 32 Hundt, *Geschichte*, p. 200.
- 33 Max Nettlau, 'Londoner deutsche kommunistische Diskussionen, 1845: Nach den Protokollen des C.A.B.V.', *AGSA*, 10 (1922), 362–91. The debates are reprinted in *BdK*, I, pp. 214–38, and analysed in Hundt, *Geschichte*, pp. 200–13. The club's archive with these minutes must be regarded as lost, but documents from the 1880s and 1890s have been found among the former NSDAP archive in Koblenz (Thomas Kuczynski, 'Archivmitteilung zum Restbestand "Communistischer Arbeiter-Bildungs-Verein"', *BzG* 35 (1993), 100–4). Possibly minutes were not kept regularly after the mid-1840s (Rudolf Rocker, *The London Years*, Anscombe, 1956, p. 71).
- 34 While Weitling still believed that mankind could achieve communism at any point in history, Schapper had abandoned his 1838 conviction and now argued that certain preconditions, largely moral and educational, had to be fulfilled first. Schapper in particular opposed revolutions, because they always ended 'in anarchy and despotism': 'a communist revolution is nonsense; it is totally opposed to the principle of communism' (Nettlau, 'Diskussionen', 372, 370). However, he admitted to a temperamental inclination 'to die on the battlefield', and when Bauer argued that pressure from the governments would create counter-pressures until 'in the end the old society will be blown asunder', Schapper conceded that 'By our



- peaceful behaviour we have to force the governments to become revolutionary' (Nettlau, 'Diskussionen', 370, 374–6). Willich later came close to Weitling's views in seeing it as the duty of the party to revive revolutionary hopes, and arguing that it was only their sentiments, not their reason, which made the masses revolutionary (CABV debate, 29 May 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 47).
- 35 Nettlau, 'Diskussionen', 368–9. Hundt demonstrates how important historical arguments were for the CABV (*Geschichte*, pp. 209–11). But his opinion that the Londoners recognised 'the overall ascending line of historical development, an objective process', strikes me as too much coloured by their subsequent rapprochement with Marx; Schapper relied on a vague 'eternal law of nature', while H. Bauer thought that communism, once established, would also experience historical ups and downs (Nettlau, 'Diskussionen', 370, 374).
- 36 Bauer, Schapper, Moll and Lehmann, 'An den Apostel Ronge', *Telegraph für Deutschland*, 56 (April 1845), p. 221. This passage was omitted in Püttmann's *Rheinische Jahrbücher zur gesellschaftlichen Reform*, I (Darmstadt: 1845, p. 327), and the entire address is not included in the *BdK* edition. It was probably formulated by Weitling (Nettlau, 'Diskussionen', 365), and seemed to Engels particularly 'miserable' (Engels to Marx, late December 1846, *BdK*, I, p. 443).
- 37 This, too, differs much from his pronounced Christian position in 1838. These debates were echoed by the Democratic Society, which argued about the relationship between Christianity and communism in 1852 (debates of 7 March and 9 August 1852, Democratic Society file, Potsdam 9529, ff. 7 and 39).
- 38 Carl Grünberg, 'Bruno Hildebrand über den kommunistischen Arbeiterbildungsverein in London', *AGSA*, 11 (1923–1925), 457.
- 39 Schapper, Sept. 1846, in *Prometheus* (*BdK*, I, pp. 404–5). Garnier saw 'German-Catholic' influence in this practice, but described the ceremony in the society's beer parlour in less elevated terms (*Zur Geschichte der Arbeitervereine*, Karlsruhe: n.d. [1852], p. 10). This practice was encouraged by the high cost of baptism but later quietly abandoned. Reininger in Paris also did baptisms (Georg Eckert, 'Aus der Korrespondenz des Kommunistenbundes (Fraktion Willich-Schapper)', *AfS* 5, 1965, 293).
- 40 Schapper had opposed Weitling's justification of theft already in 1843 ([Johann Caspar Bluntschli], *Die Kommunisten in der Schweiz nach den bei Weitling vorgefundenen Papieren*, Zürich: 1843; repr. Hildesheim: H.A. Gerstenberg, 1972, p. 111).
- 41 Nettlau, 'Diskussionen', 374, 379–80. Engels, who met the London workers in the summer of 1845, had just finished his *Condition of the Working Class in England*, and possibly inspired Lehmann's interest in factory towns. Engels had left England in 1844 and was still struggling with the impact of the new 'economic facts' on his hitherto philosophical communism. For the shift in Engels's perceptions see Gareth Stedman Jones, 'Engels and the Genesis of Marxism', *New Left Review*, 106 (1977), 91–101, Harry Schmidtgal, *Friedrich Engels' Manchester-Aufenthalt 1842–1844* (Trier: Karl-Marx-Haus, 1981), and Gregory Claeys, *Machinery, Money and the Millennium: From Moral Economy to Socialism, 1815–1860* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), pp. 166–83.
- 42 Nettlau, 'Diskussionen', 372, 380–1.
- 43 These concerned the best system of exchange, Weitling's proposed organisation of pleasant and unpleasant labour and work incentives, but not all were discussed because the club decided to debate Feuerbach instead. No records survive of debates in 1846 on competition, machinery, and of a lecture by Ernest Jones on 'the present condition of the workers in England' (Nettlau, 'Diskussionen', 386–7).
- 44 Schapper in Nettlau, 'Diskussionen', 382–5.
- 45 Nettlau, 'Diskussionen', 368–9, 370, 372, 383. Hundt (*Geschichte*, p. 213) describes similar positions held in a Parisian brochure, *L'esclavage du riches*, written by Blanqui's friend Huber in February 1845, which the Londoners were probably aware of.
- 46 Kriege to Marx, 9 June 1845, *BdK*, I, p. 241.

- 47 Nettlau, 'Diskussionen', 384, 375–6.
- 48 Friedrich was a younger brother of Ludwig Feuerbach, whose philosophy he popularised. He argued that 'Every man is called upon and entitled to be happy in accordance with the will of human nature as with the natural needs and demands of society' (Friedrich Feuerbach, *Die Religion der Zukunft*, Zurich: 1843; vols 2 and 3 Nürnberg, 1845; here II, pp. 67–8).
- 49 The CABV owned a copy of Strohmeyer's *Organisation der Arbeit* (Grandjonc, König and Roy-Jacquemart, *Statuten*, p. 38). Neither Strohmeyer nor John Adolphus Etzler, a communitarian inventor in London from 1840 to 1844, apparently had any contact with London German societies.
- 50 Weitling worked on a 'system' during his stay in London. His studies for a theory of language as the 'symbolised representation of the universe' were part of his attempt to classify the universe (Ernst Barnikol, ed., *Wilhelm Weitling, Klassifikation des Universums*, pp. 5–7; Lothar Knatz and H.-A. Marsiske, 'Die Wilhelm Weitling-Papers', *IRSH*, 29 (1984), 62–91). In order to reach 'truth', he tried to classify language so as to facilitate consensus about social changes (introduction to *Grundzüge einer allgemeinen Denk- und Sprachlehre*, ed. Lothar Knatz, Frankfurt: Lang, 1991, pp. 29–37). In London he also wrote down his memories of his recent spell in prison, entitled Justice' (Barnikol, *Weitling der Gefangene und seine 'Gerechtigkeit'*), and in 1848 an extended English translation of his *Evangelium eines armen Sünders* appeared (Gerlach, *Deutsche Literatur im Schweizer Exil*, p. 242). Despite his disputes, Weitling continued to regard himself as 'party' and was miffed at not having been invited to contribute to the *Communist Manifesto* (J.Rokitjanskij and O. Worobjowa, 'Begegnung Wilhelm Weitlings mit Karl Marx im Herbst 1849', *Marx-Engels-Jahrbuch*, 3 (1980), 314).
- 51 Grünberg, 'Hildebrand', 457.
- 52 [Garnier], *Geschichte der Arbeitervereine*, p. 9; Nettlau, 'Diskussionen', 387.
- 53 Martin Hundt went furthest, arguing that the 1845 discussions alone 'freed the way to the reception of Marxism' in the League (*Wie das 'Manifest' entstand*, Berlin: Dietz, 1973, pp. 26–36). Brandenburg (*Theoriebildungsprozesse*, pp. 113–28) treated the CABV as a separate group in its own right, which to some degree influenced later orthodox Marxist historians, see e.g., Werner Kowalski, 'Der Bund der Gerechten', in Walter Schmidt, ed., *Der Auftakt der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1987), pp. 13–41.
- 54 Nettlau, 'Diskussionen', 376–7.
- 55 Schapper, Bauer and Moll to the Communist Correspondence Committee in Brussels, 17 July 1846, in *BdK*, p. 379; Schapper's correspondence for *Prometheus*, September 1846, *BdK*, I, p. 405; 'Adresse des Bildungsvereins in London an die deutschen Proletarier', *BdK*, I, p. 408. As late as February 1848, Heinrich Bauer, applauded by the entire society, repeated that 'the social revolution will make everybody human' (*DLZ*, 151 (18 Feb. 1848)).
- 56 Ja. G.Rokitjanskij, 'Neue Materialien über das Wirken Wilhelm Weitlings und Karl Schappers in London 1846', *ZfG*, 31 (1983), 726–7. A young Swiss journalist joined the CABV in September 1846, although opposed to its principles, out of 'a desire for company and entertainment' (Jakob Lukas Schabelitz, diary notes 20 Sept. 1846, typescript copy p. 21, Schabelitz Papers, University Library, Basel). Through the CABV's treatment of the Swiss *Sonderbund* crisis, however, he was drawn into the Communist League.
- 57 Figures in *BdK*, I, pp. 439–40 (November 1846), 457–8 (February 1847). The inner League in London comprised two or three circles in the spring of 1845, hence perhaps 50 members at most, of whom 23 names are known (Mentel's evidence, *BdK*, I, p. 238). For fluctuation and short-term membership see also *BdK*, I, p. 376, and *Vorwärts*, 24 (25 Feb. 1877).
- 58 Hundt, *Geschichte*, p. 125; Breuilly and Sachse, *Joachim Friedrich Martens*, pp. 24–5, 95–6.
- 59 The CABV received an earlier boost when a 'Sunday Society' of artisans affiliated, raising the total membership to 130, and when the French society declined (report by Gasperini, not Chotsky, 9 June 1845, in Ernst Barnikol, *Weitling der Gefangene*, pp. 220–2, cf. Rokitjanskij, 'Neue Materialien', 728; [Garnier], *Geschichte der Arbeitervereine*, pp. 7–8).

- Its hall for 400 people filled to overflowing four times a week (DLZ, 12 Feb. 1847; Eccarius' report, 18 June 1848, in *BdK*, I, p. 806).
- 60 *Das Westphälische Dampfboot*, 3 (1847), 266–7 (correspondence of 31 March 1847).
- 61 Schapper to the Communist Correspondence Committee, Sept. 1846, *BdK*, I, p. 403. An agent—one of the original founders of the CABV who had fallen out with Schapper—suggested ‘that a sum of money should be invested to break up the club here, which could be done quite legally and honourably’ (Chotsky on Schapper, Feb. 1846, and Bunsen to Canitz, 13 Feb. 1846, in Rokitjanskij, ‘Neue Materialien’, 727–8).
- 62 Bunsen to Sieveking, 13 March 1847 (Frances Baroness Bunsen, ed., *Christian Carl Josias Freiherr von Bunsen*, Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1869, II, p. 356). Other Protestants, concerned especially about communism and atheism among German tailors, sugar bakers and others, employed city missionaries in 1849 and 1851 (Johann Hinrich Wichern, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Peter Meinhold, Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, I, 1962, pp. 300–1, 436–7, II, 1965, pp. 288–9).
- 63 Offermann, *Arbeiterbewegung und liberales Bürgertum*, p. 82.
- 64 Schapper to the Communist Correspondence Committee in Brussels, early September 1846, in *BdK*, I, p. 403. For the CABV's propaganda against this ‘pietist’ campaign, see Schapper, September 1846 in *Prometheus* (*BdK*, I, p. 404). Address (of the Central Authority in London), Nov. 1846, and Address, Feb. 1847, *Demokratisches Taschenbuch für 1848* (Leipzig: 1847), pp. 286–8, 296.
- 65 *NS*, 14 Feb. 1846.
- 66 International contacts existed well before 1840, originating in Mazzini's ‘Young Europe’ and the League's continental activities. The League had for instance smuggled into Germany copies of the London Working Men's Association's *Adresse des Londoner Arbeitervereins an die arbeitenden Klassen Belgiens, Hollands und Deutschlands*, signed by R. Hartwell, J. Gast and others (1836), which were reprinted in Frankfurt and circulated in Kassel and Hannover (F.G. Use, *Geschichte der politischen Untersuchungen*, Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1975, pp. 418ff). The CABV made a point of changing its name, from ‘German Educational Society’ to ‘Educational Society for Workers’ (DLZ, 4 Feb. 1848).
- 67 Weitling to friends, May 1845, in Barnikol, *Weitling der Gefangene*, p. 274.
- 68 E.g., Italian, French, and Polish émigrés attended a German banquet organised in 1837 to commemorate the Hambacher Fest (Jäger, *Deutsche*, II, p. 47).
- 69 Lehning, ‘Discussions’. The French society, which had moved from republican to Cabetist principles, allegedly became a mere appendage to the CABV after its leader Cavaignac had left London ([Garnier], *Geschichte der Arbeitervereine*, p. 7). The two societies however did not actually merge in 1847, as Brandenburg assumes (‘Arbeiterbildungsverein’, 358; see Grandjone, König and Roy-Jacquemart, *Statuten*, p. 15, n. 44).
- 70 Letter of 16 Dec. 1841, Kowalski, *Zeitschriften*, p. 180.
- 71 Schapper, Bauer and Moll to Cabet, 23 Aug. 1843, in [Etienne] Cabet, *Procès du communisme à Toulouse* (Paris: Au Bureau du Populaire, 1843), p. 31.
- 72 One of Barmby's projected ‘communisteries’ was to be named after Weitling; see H. Gustav Klaus, ‘Frühsozialistische Utopien in England 1792–1848’, *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 67 (1985), 330; see also G. Claeys, ‘John Adolphus Etzler, Technological Utopianism, and British Socialism’, *English Historical Review*, 101 (1986), 31–55.
- 73 Engels' *New Moral World* articles appeared from 4 November 1843 onwards, and his discussion of Weitling on 18 Nov. 1843, and were credited with first introducing continental socialism to British readers (*New Moral World*, 28 Sept. 1844, 110).
- 74 *New Moral World*, 28 Sept. 1844; *Young Germany. An Account of the Rise, Progress, and Present Position of German Communism* (1844). Holyoake's *The Movement* (nos. 41–3) gave the event great prominence.
- 75 Manuscript draft of the Rules, signed by Schapper as secretary pro tem., 19 Oct. 1844, MS. *The Democratic Friends of all Nations* (also in *The Movement*, no. 46, pp. 397–8). The

- Democratic Friends wanted to avoid appearing as a continental secret society, hence the Rules demanded public meetings. They met at 20 Great Windmill Street, also the home of the German Society. Kuhnigk wrongly assumes that Schapper 'did not think much' of the group (*Schapper*, p. 109). See my 'The Beginnings of Socialist Internationalism in the 1840s: The "Democratic Friends of All Nations" in London', in Frits van Holthoorn and Marcel van der Linden, eds., *Internationalism in the Labour Movement, 1830–1940* (Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1988), I, pp. 259–82.
- 76 *All Men are Brethren* (1845), signed on 20 January 1845 by Schapper as Honorary Secretary and Oborski as Chairman.
- 77 William Lovett, *Life and Struggles* (1876; repr. MacGibbon & Kee, 1967), p. 256; Henry Weisser, *British Working-Class Movements and Europe, 1815–1848* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1975), p. 156.
- 78 Preparatory talks began in August 1845 (*NS*, 23 Aug. 1845; see also *NS*, 27 Sept. 1845, 26 Sept. 1846). Engels reported in the *Rheinische Jahrbücher* on the meeting (*MECW*, VI, p. 14).
- 79 Harney to Engels, 30 March 1846, in F.G. and R.M.Black, eds., *The Harney Papers* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1969), p. 244. Mistrust by the Chartists seems to have lingered on (see E.Jones in *NS*, 5 Feb. 1848). On shifts in Chartist thinking generally in this period see Gareth Stedman Jones, 'Rethinking Chartism', in his *Languages of Class: Studies in English Working Class History 1832–1982* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 90–178.
- 80 Theodor Rothstein, 'Aus der Vorgeschichte der Internationale', *Ergänzungshefte zur Neuen Zeit*, 17 (31 Oct. 1913), 5.
- 81 *The Fraternal Democrats...to the Democracy of Europe, Address of the Fraternal Democrats...to the Working Classes of Great Britain and the United States, Address ...to the Members of the National Diet in Switzerland* (reprinted in *NS*, 4 July, 7 Dec. 1846, 13 Dec. 1847).
- 82 'Principles and Rules of the Society of the Fraternal Democrats' (1847), *NS*, 18 Dec. 1847. Harney praised the CABV's internationalism even before the Fraternal Democrats (*NS*, 25 March 1848).
- 83 Walter Schmidt, 'Nationales und Internationales im Bund der Kommunisten', *ZfG*, 34 (1986), 223–38.
- 84 *Adresse des Bildungsvereins in London an die deutschen Proletarier* [1846] (also in *DLZ*, 18 Sept. 1846, and *NS*, 26 Sept. 1846; *BdK*, I, pp. 406–9). This address had been formulated by a recent arrival, Johann Heinrich Sievers, a teacher, bookseller and radical democrat from Wismar (Horst Schlechte, ed., *Die Allgemeine Deutsche Arbeiterverbrüderung 1848–50*, Weimar: H.Böhlau Nachf., 1979, p. 483n).
- 85 From February 1846 on, the *Northern Star* reported on CABV meetings.
- 86 Harney welcomed Engels's correspondence project, but added that as a member of the German Society 'I have great faith in S-p-r [Schapper], and if he is not consulted I do not see how I could join you' (Harney to Engels, 30 March 1846, *Harney Papers*, pp. 242–3). This internationalism was a central element of the Londoners' thinking, but it is marginalised in both Brandenburg's and Hundt's interpretations of the CABV's socialism.
- 87 'Adresse der Zentralbehörde des Bundes der Gerechten an den Bund vom November 1846', *Demokratisches Taschenbuch für 1848* (Leipzig: 1847), p. 282. For the dating see Hundt, *Geschichte*, p. 261.
- 88 Besides Engels, Georg Weerth described English proletarian life, but there is no indication of the Londoners' reaction (Doris Köster-Bunselmeyer, *Literarischer Sozialismus: Texte und Theorien der deutschen Frühsozialisten 1843–1848*, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1981, pp. 120–7).
- 89 Predictably, this step was severely criticised by Nettlau, who concluded: 'Marx ...chained their minds to the analysis of conditions of production...this audacious promise, this apparently simple solution [was] a fascinating surprise for these people who up until then

- had not found any way out... Marx bowled them over intellectually, and they and their successors have not regained their intellectual freedom until today' ('Diskussionen', 388).
- 90 MEW, XXI, p. 210.
- 91 Weitling to Marx, 18 Oct. 1844, *BdK*, I, p. 199. See also Jacques Grandjonc, 'Vorwärts!' 1844. *Marx und die deutschen Kommunisten in Paris* (Bonn: Dietz, 1974).
- 92 This was suggested by Rokitjanskij, 'Neue Materialien', 724. For Jones's poem see *DLZ*, 25 April 1845, supplement.
- 93 Harney to Engels, 30 March 1846, *Harney Papers*, p. 243.
- 94 Schapper to Marx, 6 June 1846, 17 July 1846, *BdK*, I, pp. 347, 379–80; Weitling to Kriege, 16 May 1846, *BdK*, I, p. 1042. Weitling regarded himself as the victim of a 'purge' to rid the 'party' of 'artisans' communism' and 'philosophical communism', to discontinue propaganda based on sentiment, and to renounce hope for the immediate introduction of communism, accepting instead initial rule by the bourgeoisie (Weitling to Hess, 31 March 1846, in Ernst Barnikol, ed., *Weitling der Gefangene*, p. 269).
- 95 Schapper to Marx, 6 June 1846, *BdK*, I, pp. 347–8.
- 96 Bauer, Schapper, Moll and Lehmann, 'An Eugen Sue', *Telegraph für Deutschland*, no. 56, April 1845, p. 222.
- 97 Hundt, *Geschichte*, p. 227; Walter Schmidt, 'Dokumente des Bundes der Gerechten in den USA aus dem Jahre 1846', *ZfG* 40 (1992), 650–65; Schapper to Marx, 6 June 1846, *BdK*, I, p. 350. The 'Circular against Kriege' is in *MEW*, IV, pp. 3–17.
- 98 Schapper to Marx, 17 July 1846, *BdK*, I, p. 379. The Londoners at that point signed their letters with the formula: 'Long live labour! Down with capital! Down with prejudices and popery, long live education and enlightenment!' (letter from London, 25 July 1846, in the New York *Volks-Tribun*, no. 35, 29 Aug. 1846, cited in Hundt, *Geschichte*, p. 227).
- 99 The CABV had immediately collected £4.10.6 and declared themselves 'ready to make any and every sacrifice to serve' their Polish brethren (*NS*, 21 March 1846). By September 1846 Schapper declared that the Chartists around Harney had 'essentially the same purpose' as the CABV (article in *Prometheus*, in *BdK*, I, p. 405).
- 100 Schapper to Marx, 6 June 1846, *BdK*, I, pp. 347–8, 350.
- 101 'Adresse der Zentralbehörde des Bundes der Gerechten an den Bund vom November 1846' (*Demokratisches Taschenbuch für 1848*, Leipzig, 1847, p. 282). The Londoners were throughout 1846 quite preoccupied with religious questions, because of Bunsen's campaign, their own interest in Feuerbach and because Sievers impressed them as 'a committed atheistical communist, or better, humanist' (Schapper to Marx, 17 July 1846, *BdK*, I, pp. 377–8).
- 102 Engels to Marx, mid-Nov.-Dec. 1846, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 91–2.
- 103 *BdK*, I, p. 451.
- 104 The second address of the Central Authority of February 1847 (*Demokratisches Taschenbuch*, pp. 290–9) suggested a complete revision of the general policy of the League. The Londoners now defined communism as a system according to which 'the earth is the common property of all men, each works, [or] "produces", according to his abilities, enjoys, [or] "consumes", according to his strengths'. League members were asked to discuss community of property as well as the speed, scale and manner of its introduction. Schapper also dropped his earlier plans for a newspaper (Tibor Dénes, 'Lehr- und Wanderjahre eines jungen Schweizers: Jakob Lukas Schabelitz', *Schweizensche Zeitschrift für Geschichte*, 16, 1966, 68–9).
- 105 *Demokratisches Taschenbuch*, pp. 292–3. Schieder (*Karl Marx als Politiker*, p. 37) argues convincingly that Marx could not have joined the League before August 1847.
- 106 Circular letter of Congress, 9 June 1847, *BdK*, I, p. 481. The surviving documents of the congress are in *BdK*, I, pp. 466–89; Hundt, *Geschichte*, pp. 300–11. Marx did not attend, possibly weary of the potential failure of the congress.
- 107 Engels, 'Draft of a Communist Confession of Faith', *MECW*, VI, pp. 96–103.

- 108 Engels, 'Grundsätze des Kommunismus', *BdK*, I, p. 589. An English version of these 'Principles of Communism' is in *MECW*, VI, pp. 341–57.
- 109 *Kommunistische Zeitschrift*, Probeblatt, no. 1, London, im September 1847, in Carl Grünberg, 'Die Londoner Kommunistische Zeitschrift und andere Urkunden aus den Jahren 1847–1848', *AGSA*, 9 (1921), 283. Of special interest to London Germans must have been the *Kommunistische Zeitschrift's* discussion of America-bound emigrants, which called for proletarians to found a republic in Germany instead of emigrating ('Die deutschen Auswanderer', 312–16, also reprinted in *ZAVK*, no. 10, 25 June 1848, 92).
- 110 Heinzen, who also wrote for the *Deutsche Londoner Zeitung*, shortly afterwards came under attack from Marx and Engels.
- 111 Engels also pushed through his version among the Parisian League members, against a competing 'confession of faith' drafted by Moses Hess (Engels to Marx, 25–26 Oct. 1847, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 138–9). He greatly stressed historical development in particular of the industrial revolution, cut the first six points of the 'Draft', and added a brief description of the future, classless, communist society.
- 112 Max Nettlau, 'Marxanalekten', *AGSA* 8 (1919–1921), 393–4.
- 113 'Ansprache der Zentralbehörde...an den Bund', 14 Sept. 1847, *BdK*, I, p. 536.
- 114 'Ansprache der Zentralbehörde...an den Bund', 14 Sept. 1847, *BdK*, I, pp. 528–42; Hundt, *Geschichte*, p. 313.
- 115 Schapper, Moll and Bauer to Marx et al., 18 Oct. 1847, *BdK*, I, pp. 580–2.
- 116 Weitlingians in Switzerland and Paris were expelled, but none was mentioned in London (Hundt, *Geschichte*, p. 377).
- 117 'Rules of the Communist League', Dec. 1847, *MECW*, VI, p. 633. The German original is in [Karl] Wermuth and [Wilhelm] Stieber, *Die Communisten-Verschwörungen des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin: A.W.Hahn, 1853) (hereafter Wermuth/Stieber), pt. 1, pp. 239–43. The Statutes allowed members to join other political organisations, and gave the congress more power to act without consultation with the individual League groups, which the Londoners interpreted as allowing more democracy (*BdK*, I, p. 581). The second congress also issued a circular but no copy survived (Jakov Rokitjanskij, 'Zum Rundschreiben des II. Kongresses des Bundes der Kommunisten', *BzG*, 24 (1982), 377–86).
- 118 It should be noted that the *Communist Manifesto* echoed Schapper's earlier views in its definition of the future social organisation as 'an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all' (*MECW*, VI, p. 506). The League's, Marx's and Engels's individual contributions are analysed in Gareth Stedman Jones's 'Introduction' to his edition of *The Communist Manifesto* (Penguin, 2002), pp. 39–73; cf. Thomas Kuczynski, ed., *Das Kommunistische Manifest (Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei) von Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels*, Schriften, 49 (Trier: Karl-Marx-Hans, 1995).
- 119 Engels, 'Der Sozialismus in Deutschland' (1891), *MEW*, XXII, p. 248. This remained the 'official' interpretation, repeated e.g. by Martin Hundt (*Wie das 'Manifest' entstand*, p. 11).
- 120 Clearly the Londoners had in mind that Marx and Engels would merely do a secretarial job of putting the congress's points together, while Marx (until late December with Engels) was working not only in a new form but also on a much more fundamental exposition of communist theory and programme. Thus on 24 January, tired of waiting for the completion of what the central authority saw as a very straightforward task, they informed Marx 'that, unless the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" has arrived in London by Tuesday, 1 February, further steps will be taken against him' (Schapper, Bauer, and Moll to the leading circle in Brussels, 25 Jan. 1848, in *BdK*, I, p. 654).
- 121 During the congress, Marx lectured to the CABV, but an old Cabetist was perplexed by the 'Achtblätter' Marx mentioned, expecting some secret society, and was surprised to hear that 'workers' were meant in Marx's dialect (Liebknecht, *Marx zum Gedächtniß*, p. 35). This anecdote illustrates that the 'fusion' between Marx's theory and the workers had some

- merely accidental elements in it, if some could so completely have missed the gist of Marx's lecture.
- 122 Harney to Engels, 23 Feb. 1894, *Harney Papers*, p. 355.
- 123 *NS*, 5 Feb., 25 March 1848.
- 124 *NS*, 25 March 1848.
- 125 'Demands of the Communist Party in Germany', *MECW*, VII, pp. 3–7. Engels later feared its publication could endanger the League's position in Germany (Engels to Marx, 25 April 1848, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 173).
- 126 Decision of the Central Authority, 3 March 1848, *MECW*, VI, p. 651; Schieder, *Karl Marx als Politiker*, p. 40.
- 127 On the long debate on whether or not Marx dissolved the League in Cologne in 1848 see Wolfgang Schieder, 'Bund der Kommunisten', *Sowjetsystem und demokratische Gesellschaft* (Freiburg: Herder, 1966), I, col. 906; H. Förder, 'Zu einigen Fragen der Reorganisation des Bundes der Kommunisten nach der Revolution von 1848/49', in Hundt, ed., *Der Bund der Kommunisten*, p. 253; *BdK*, I, pp. 969–70, 1164–5; II, p. 449. The assumption of a dissolution is based on Röser's shaky evidence, which, however, appears to be correct where it relates arguments between Marx and Schapper and Moll, and is corroborated by Stephan Born (Born to Marx, 11 May 1848, *BdK*, I, p. 784; Werner Blumenberg, 'Zur Geschichte des Bundes des Kommunisten: die Aussagen des Peter Gerhardt Röser', *IRSH*, 9 (1964), 81–7). Hundt (*Geschichte*, pp. 417–18, 469) argues that the League kept its 'organisational continuity' through a fundamental change from a secret society for propaganda to the nucleus of a 'party of action', and that the tactical and temporary joining of forces with democrats was 'perhaps the most important achievement' in the entire League's history. However, while there can be little doubt that the League members on the whole kept their political independence and continued to work for the aims of the League, albeit by different means, the activities of the organisation were disrupted. Whether or not that required a formal decision to dissolve the League appears immaterial, as personal ties remained and after the failure of the revolution the organisation's activities could be, and were resumed without difficulty.
- 128 'Demands of the People', 3 March 1848, *BdK*, I, p. 714. Just as the later 'Demands of the Communist Party', these Cologne 'Demands' did not include specific communist aims, but summarised radical democratic points. Cologne League members later explained that 'only the bad distribution of labour and its exploitation in the interest of individuals prevents the production of enough [goods] to satisfy the needs of all individuals. Hence it is up to the state to liberate production from the interest of the individual and to manage it in the interest of all' (*BdK*, I, p. 725).
- 129 *NS*, 24 June 1849. For Harney see *BdK*, I, pp. 818–19. Generally on the movement in the Rhineland see Dieter Dowe, *Aktion und Organisation* (Hannover: Verlag für Literatur und Zeitgeschehen, 1970), Jonathan Sperber, *Rhineland Radicals* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), and Joachim Strey and Gerhard Winkler, *Marx und Engels 1848/49* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1972).
- 130 *ZAVK*, no. 6, 28 May 1848, 49, no. 7, 4 June 1848, 63. Eccarius, writing for the CABV, here still expected the proletariat to come to power soon, while Marx and the League's *Demands* merely called for it to organise separately in order to push the bourgeoisie as far as possible.
- 131 E.g., *BdK*, I, pp. 822–4. On Moll in Germany see N. Beloussowa, 'Joseph Moll', pp. 59–75, and Becker, 'Joseph Moll', pp. 58–83. On Schapper see S. Lewiowa, 'Karl Schapper', pp. 95–112; Gerhard Becker, 'Karl Schapper', in Karl Obermann, ed., *Manner der Revolution von 1848* [I] (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1970), pp. 123–47; and Kuhnigk, *Karl Schapper*, pp. 153–214.
- 132 *ZAVK*, no. 9, 18 June 1848, 83; CABV to Cologne workers' society, 4 July 1848, *ZAVK*, no. 15, 16 July 1848, 119.

- 133 Röser's evidence, *BdK*, I, pp. 969–70. Schapper also organised a group of the League in Mainz (Schapper's letter of 26 April 1848, in *BdK*, I, p. 775).
- 134 Report on the assembly in Worringen, 17 September 1848, in *BdK*, I, p. 848. Engels, Dronke, Moll, Lassalle and others also spoke.
- 135 Hundt, *Geschichte*, p. 573.
- 136 Becker, 'Moll', pp. 68–70. Marx, The "Revolution of Cologne", *MECW*, VII, p. 463.
- 137 ZAVK, no. 39, 19 Oct. 1848, 216; Röser for the Cologne workers' society to the Fraternal Democrats, *Freiheit, Brüderlichkeit, Arbeit*, I, 26 Oct. 1848, 3. An address of the Fraternal Democrats appeared not only in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* but also in *Freiheit, Arbeit*, 3 (21 Jan. 1849), 12.
- 138 Lewiowa, 'Schapper', pp. 95–112; Lessner, *Ich brachte*, pp. 74–94; Beloussowa, 'Moll', pp. 57–75. Engels's posthumous praise is in *MECW*, X, pp. 225–6.
- 139 Pfänder to the CABV, 21 Jan. 1852, *MEGA*, 1/10, pp. 1010–11.
- 140 Harald Steindl, 'Die Verhandlungen des ersten Kongresses der Arbeitervereine zu Berlin vom 18. bis 20. Juni 1848', *IWK*, 22 (1986), 561. As a matter of course, this congress included the German workers' societies abroad in their call for a workers' parliament to convene in August 1848, in Berlin where a German 'social people's charter' was to be hammered out (Dieter Dowe and Toni Offermann, eds., *Deutsche Handwerker- und Arbeiterkongresse 1848–52*, Berlin: Dietz, 1983, pp. xx, 44–5); Rüdiger Hachtmann, *Berlin 1848* (Bonn: Dietz, 1997).
- 141 K.Kranke, 'Zur Wirksamkeit eines Mitglieds der Dresdner Gemeinde des Bundes der Kommunisten', *Sächsische Heimatblätter*, 29 (1983), 201–2; A.Wolf, 'Friedrich Wilhelm Kollbeck: Ein Kommunist aus Sachsen', in Bleiber et al., eds., *Manner der Revolution*, II, pp. 115–25. Martius returned to London (with three siblings) in late 1851 to join Willich's League (H.Förder and G.Ziese, 'Zur Geschichte der Ansprache... vom Juni 1850', in *Aus der Frühgeschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964, pp. 256–9, 266).
- 142 Stefan Born, *Erinnerungen eines Achtundvierzigers* (Bonn: J.H.W.Dietz Nachf., 1978), and Hermann von Berg, *Entstehung und Tätigkeit der Norddeutschen Arbeitervereinigung als Regionalorganisation der Deutschen Arbeiterverbrüderung nach der Niederschlagung der Revolution von 1848/49* (Bonn: Verlag Neue Gesellschaft, 1981).
- 143 Boris Nicolaevsky, 'Towards a History of "the Communist League", 1847–1852', *IRSH*, 1 (1956), 243. Heilberg's 'empty phrases' in the CABV, however, had aroused the ire of some League members (*BdK*, I, p. 805).
- 144 June Circular, *BdK*, II, p. 199. W.Schieder described the *Verbrüderung* as a pragmatic reform movement ('Die Rolle der deutschen Arbeiter in der Revolution von 1848/49', in Dieter Langewiesche, ed., *Die deutsche Revolution von 1848/49*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1983, pp. 332–9), while Schlechte implied that many of its 'functionaries' adhered to 'scientific communism' (Schlechte, *Die Allgemeine Deutsche Arbeiterverbrüderung*, pp. 11, 25–45, 80–5). An extreme position is taken by Frolinde Balsler, who denied that Marx had any influence on the Brotherhood (*Sozial-Demokratie 1848/49–1863*, 2 vols, Stuttgart: Klett, 1962, p. 20).
- 145 Ewerbeck to Hess, 1 Nov. 1848, in E.Silberner, ed., *Moses Heß. Briefwechsel*, pp. 206–7.
- 146 Röser's evidence, *BdK*, I, pp. 969–70.
- 147 Friedrich Lessner, *Ich brachte*, pp. 71–2.
- 148 *BdK*, I, p. 1107 n. 191.
- 149 Report of the Communist League in London of 18 June 1848, in Nicolaevsky, 'Towards a History', 245–6; 'The Educational Society for Workers in London to the Workers' Society in Cologne', 4 July 1848, ZAVK, 15 (16 July 1848), 3. Later the story was gleefully told that during this period Louis Napoleon, soon to become French emperor but then a refugee in London, offered to give 'socialist lectures' to the CABV but was scornfully rejected (*Hermann*, 17 Nov. 1860).



- 150 Wichern, *Sämtliche Werke*, II, p. 101.
- 151 Pfänder and others to the Central Authority, 15 March 1848, *BdK*, I, p. 728; Nicolaevsky, 'Towards a History', 241–2. This closure has falsely been constructed as reprisal for the CABV's subsequent participation in the Chartist demonstration of 10 April (e.g., *Der Volksstaat*, 27 Feb. 1876, in *BdK*, III, p. 383).
- 152 Eccarius to the Central Authority in Cologne, 18 June 1848, in Nicolaevsky, 'Towards a History', 247.
- 153 Lessner, *Ich brachte*, p. 71.
- 154 Joseph McCabe, *Life and Letters of George Jacob Holyoake* (Watts, 1908), I, p. 132.
- 155 Henry Weisser, *April 10: Challenge and Response in England in 1848* (Lanham, NY, University Press of America, 1983), pp. 113, 118–19.
- 156 Hundt, *Geschichte*, pp. 550–5; Stefan Born's paper demanded a 'social people's charter for Germany' (*Volk*, 11 (27 June 1848), p. 41).
- 157 *DLZ*, no. 158 and 162, 7 April and 5 May 1848. See also my 'Ferdinand Freiligrath in London', *Grabbe-Jahrbuch*, 8 (1989), 109–11.
- 158 Nicolaevsky, 'Towards a History', 246–7; Rokitjanskij, 'Der Kampf der Leitung des Bundes der Kommunisten gegen die Schafrung einer deutschen Legion in Paris', *BzG*, 17 (1975), 469–88. The Central Authority, then in Paris, warned the Londoners 'not to act rashly and hastily and ruin the entire affair', though most, throwing caution to the winds, preferred to rush into battle, 'better today than tomorrow' (Pfänder, Moll and others to the Central Authority, 15 March 1848, *BdK*, I, p. 727).
- 159 Schapper's speech in Paris, 6 March 1848, *DLZ*, no. 154, 10 March 1848.
- 160 Schapper to the Central Authority, 28 March 1848, *BdK*, I, pp. 741–3. He also approached for money the novelist Amely Bölte, who responded that she would rather collect money to keep the communists in London 'because we need principled men to organise the state, and not runaway riff-raff (letter dated 15 April [1848], *Amely Böltes Briefe aus England an Varnhagen von Ense*, ed. Walther Fischer and Antje Behrens, Düsseldorf: M. Tritsch, 1955, p. 61).
- 161 *DLZ*, 3 March–28 July 1848. The *DLZ* went as far as to demand a 'democratic and social republic of the workers', the 'right to work' and 'guarantee of a minimum of property' (*DLZ*, 30 June 1848, 18 Aug. 1848).
- 162 In early January Schapper, Schabelitz and the duke discussed 'communism, revolution and such things' for several hours, after which 'Schapper pronounced himself favourably about the duke, although they did not agree on all points, e.g. religion' (Diary entries for 20 Dec. 1847, 6 January 1848, Schabelitz Papers, Diary notes, pp. 63, 65).
- 163 Pfänder went to see him, but declared that 'having recovered from his fright, the fellow will not swallow the bait any more' (Pfänder and others to the Central Authority, 15 March 1848, *BdK*, I, pp. 726–8). Pfänder's impressions of the duke's aims are in *BdK*, I, p. 1099. For a last-minute appeal Schapper rushed back from Paris, only to report 'Nothing! Nothing! Nothing! Nothing! Nothing can be done any more with the cowardly, stubborn dog'. This ended the affair, undertaken with Marx's knowledge and no doubt approval (Charles Moll and others to the Central Authority, 22 March 1848, Schapper to the Central Authority, 28 March 1848, *BdK*, I, pp. 734–5, 741–2). Letters from Schapper are cited in Dénes, 'Lehr- und Wanderjahre', 65. By 1850, the exduke still promised to support democrats but only if they had no connection with communists (agent 'X' [Friederichs] to Hinckeldey, 11 June 1850, Simon file, Potsdam 11374/1, f. 61).
- 164 Eccarius to the Central Authority, 18 June 1848, Nicolaevsky, 'Towards a History', 246 (also in *BdK*, I, p. 805).
- 165 Nettlau, 'Marxanalekten', 395.
- 166 Eccarius to the Central Authority, 18 June 1848, Nicolaevsky, 'Towards a History', 247.
- 167 Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 235–8 (with some variations, see *BdK*, I, pp. 876–80, and Hundt, *Geschichte*, pp. 515–18).

- 168 Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 50–1 (Hätzel's evidence).  
 169 H. von Berg, 'Ein unbekanntes kommunistisches Dokument vom Jahre 1849 aus London', *BzG*, 11 (1969), 460, and *BdK*, I, p. 920. Lithographed copies of the statutes were circulating in Berlin in March 1849 (Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 46–7).  
 170 Röser's evidence, *BdK*, I, p. 970.  
 171 Von Berg, 'Ein unbekanntes kommunistisches Dokument', 460.

## 3

### Between democrats and Blanquists: the Communist League, 1849–1850

- 1 Friedrich Althaus, 'Erinnerungen an Gottfried Kinkel', *Nord und Süd*, 25 (1883), 64.  
 2 Richter, 'Studien', p. 35; following Mayer, *Engels*, II, p. 2.  
 3 A.Müller-Lehning (The International Association', *IRSH* 3 (1938), 204), referring to various French exile organisations.  
 4 The Lord Mayor of London turned down a request for employment for 100 German refugees on the grounds that many English workers were in the same plight (*The Times*, 24 May 1850).  
 5 S.Seiler, 'Aufruf zur Gründung einer Hülfskasse', *DLZ*, 7 Sept. 1849; *DLZ*, 28 Sept. 1849.  
 6 This was partly blamed on the committee, which had asked for money to be sent to 'Heinrich Bauer, shoemaker, 64 Dean Street', rather than to a more respectable banker's address (Dronke to Weydemeyer, early Nov. 1849, in Kurt Koszyk and Karl Obermann, eds., *Zeitgenossen von Marx und Engels: Ausgewählte Briefe 1844–1852*, Assen: Van Gorcum, 1975, p. 276). By 18 November, ~~£36.12s.5½d.~~ had been collected, mostly in London (*MECW*, X, p. 599). By the following September, some £360 had been distributed in over 1,000 individual cases.  
 7 The 'purge' was welcomed by Blind (to Marx, 1 Nov. 1849, *BdK*, II, p. 45). Weitling remembered that Backhaus commanded a majority in the CABV (J. Rokitjanskij and O.Worobjowa, 'Begegnung Wilhelm Weitlings mit Karl Marx im Herbst 1849', *Marx-Engels-Jahrbuch*, 3 (1980), 313). Bunsen confirmed having supported Backhaus in a report by the Prussian police lieutenant Simon, 16 May 1850, Simon file, Potsdam 11374/1, f. 13. On Bauer's expulsion see *BdK*, II, p. 48.  
 8 The Democratic Society appears to have grown out of the Reading Society founded in 1835, which had organised a large German meeting in 1848 to send a moderate address to the Frankfurt Parliament (*DLZ*, 30 May 1845, 7 April and 5 May 1848). Their committee hoped that donors would ignore petty political considerations, but failed to attract much support ('Aufruf an alle Menschenfreunde', *DLZ*, 28 Dec. 1849).  
 9 Declarations of 3 Dec. 1849 (*DLZ*, 7 Dec. 1849) and 20 April 1850, *BdK*, II, pp. 51, 163–4; *MECW*, X, p. 352, 27 May 1850.  
 10 Engels to J.Schabelitz, 22 Dec. 1849, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 222.  
 11 Willich to the League in La Chau-de-Fonds, 1 Feb. 1850, *BdK*, II, pp. 81–2. Willich had co-edited one of Struve's newspapers in March 1848 (Matthias Tullner, 'Gustav von Struve', in Bleiber et al. eds., *Manner der Revolution*, II, p. 259).  
 12 Karl Heinzen, 'Lehren der Revolution', *DLZ*, 9–16 Nov. 1849 (also published as a flysheet in 1850). His bloodthirstiness confirms the general observation that exile as a condition breeds contempt for human dignity and human life (Blum, 'Zur Psychologie der Emigration', 421). Karl Heinzen (*Erlebtes*, Boston: Selbstverlag, 1864 [misprint for 1874], pp. 410–15, 446) and Edgar Bauer (report of 7 Nov. 1852, in Erik Gamby, ed., *Edgar Bauer: Konfidentenberichte über die europäische Emigration in London 1852–1861*, Trier: Karl Marx Haus, 1989, p. 35) thought that the Prussian ambassador Bunsen had alarmed *The*

- Times* in order to discredit the refugees. For Heinzen's radical republicanism see Hans Huber, *Karl Heinzen* (Bern: Paul Haupt, 1932), pp. 27–86, and Carl Wittke, *Against the Current: The Life of Karl Heinzen (1809–1880)* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945), pp. 71–5, 79–81.
- 13 *The Times*, 23 Nov. 1849; more on 28 and 29 November; Engels in *Northern Star*, 1 Dec. 1849. Heinzen, too, denied any connection with the Social Democratic Party 'consisting of one monopolist' (*DLZ*, 7 Dec. 1849), and had in fact earlier attacked Marx and Engels (*Die Helden des deutschen Kommunismus*, Bern: 1848).
- 14 For Struve's virtuous republicanism until 1849 see Jürgen Peiser, 'Gustav Struve als Politischer Schriftsteller und Revolutionär' (Ph.D. dissertation Frankfurt, 1972). See also Haupt's evidence, in *BdK*, II, p. 495, Marx and Engels, 'The Great Men of Exile', *MECW*, XI, pp. 261–4, 280–1.
- 15 Heinzen, 'Programm der deutschen Revolutionspartei. Als Entwurf und Vorschlag der Diskussion preisgegeben', February 1850, copy in IISG, ME S 1A, and in 'Auszüge aus den von der Polizei in Paris mit Beschlag belegten Papieren des Am. Gögg', pp. 17–23, BGLAK, 49/1021.
- 16 Marx marked these sections in his copy of Heinzen's 'Programm' and ridiculed particularly the rejection of 'the privileges of the male sex, especially in marriage' (*MECW*, XI, p. 279). This passage was singled out for praise in the first democratic German women's paper (*Frauen-Zeitung*, 23 March 1850, in Ute Gerhard et al., eds. *'Dem Reich der Freiheit werb' ich Bürgerinnen'*, p. 242).
- 17 Heinzen, *Erlebtes*, pp. 377–82. Unforgiving, Heinzen later satirised Struve's idiosyncrasies such as his vegetarianism and phrenology and Amalie Struve's literary aspirations ('Die Geschichte von Johann Struff...', *Erlebtes*, pp. 384–408).
- 18 *DLZ*, 26 July 1850. Heinzen remained close to Mazzini and his old friend Ruge, who shared his anti-communism (*Erlebtes*, pp. 359–60, 412). For Heinzen's comments on Marx, see his *Erlebtes*, pp. 414–44. Heinzen's republican and anti-religious writings found their way back into Germany, especially in the 1870s and 1880s, and the Berlin police kept a file on his influence (Heinzen file, Potsdam 10433).
- 19 Struve established his colony on an estate owned by Thomas Fothergill, a friend from student days in Bonn, who regularly supported refugees ('X' to Hinckeldey, 11 June 1850, Simon file, Potsdam 11374/1, f. 61). On his colony see Heinzen, *Erlebtes*, pp. 369–70. He was given a rapturous welcome in New York on 14 May (*RdA*, 17 May 1851).
- 20 Engels to J. Weydemeyer, 25 April 1850, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 234.
- 21 Struve and others for the Committee of the German Refugee Association, 'Rundschreiben an sämtliche Freunde der Deutschen politischen Flüchtlinge', April 1850, IISG, ME, O39.
- 22 Rudolph Schramm to Hörffel, Ostende, 8 May 1850, Schramm file, Potsdam 12797, ff. 19–20.
- 23 The Social Democratic Committee collected £161 until April 1850, and another £245 until the split of the Communist League ended its existence. The democratic 'Committee of the German Refugee Association' distributed £147 between 24 April and 23 August 1850 (*DLZ*, 26 April, 24 May, 21 June, 19 July, 9 and 23 Aug., 27 Sept. 1850).
- 24 Wilhelm Liebknecht, *Erinnerungen eines Soldaten der Revolution*, ed. Heinrich Gemkow (Berlin: Dietz, 1976), pp. 210–12. Schapper had brought some of the initial money for the rental from Wiesbaden ('X' to Hinckeldey, 16 July 1850, Simon file, Potsdam 11374/1, f. 101).
- 25 *DLZ*, 9 Aug. and 27 Sept. 1850.
- 26 K.v. Bruhn to Schramm, Altona, 2 May 1850, in Koszyk and Obermann, *Zeitgenossen von Marx und Engels*, pp. 347–8. Similarly, Balsler, *Sozial-Demokratie*, pp. 221–2.
- 27 Marx to Louis Bauer, 30 Nov. 1849, *MEW*, XXVII, p. 514.
- 28 Marx had rejected the unification attempt by L. Bamberger, R. Schramm and Müller-Telleriner because they had specifically excluded his followers in the CABV, 'who for years

- have been in the vanguard of German democracy in London' (Marx to E.v.Müller-Telling, 1 Jan. 1850, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 223). See W.B. [Werner Blumenberg], 'Eduard von Müller-Telling', *Bulletin of the International Institute of Social History*, 3 (1951), 178–97, Karl Heinzen, *Erlebtes*, pp. 416–23 (including Telling to Heinzen, 28 March 1850, pp. 418–22, about his fight with Marx), *MEW*, XXVII, pp. 520, 522, 525–6.
- 29 As late as 1852, Cotta's widely read *Morgenblatt für gebildete Leser* expressed surprise that not everybody within 'the extreme revolutionary party' approved of Kinkel's Loan project (Manfred Häckel, ed., *Freiligraths Briefwechsel mit Marx und Engels*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968, II, p. 55). An exception was the well-informed spy Edgar Bauer, who discerned 'a genuine intellectual rift' among the exiles, where 'one side regards social conditions from a purely political point of view, and the other from a purely economic point of view' (report of 7 Nov. 1852, in Gamby, ed., *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, p. 18).
- 30 This rivalry was admitted by Engels, who explained that 'it becomes a matter of honour for us to go on supporting at least our own refugees, and not to let the best of the new arrivals fall in their turn into the clutches of those jackasses [around Struve]' (Engels to J.Weydemeyer, 25 April 1850, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 233–4).
- 31 *DLZ*, 7 Sept. 1849.
- 32 Simon (to Hinckeldey, 16 May 1850, Simon file, Potsdam 11374/1, f. 13) mentions 180 members; 48 of these are named in Simon's report of 27 June 1850, Simon file, Potsdam 11374/1, f. 89. *Statuten des Londoner deutschen Arbeiter-Vereins. Gegründet am 7. Februar 1840. Proletarier aller Länder, vereinigt Euch!* (copy in Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, ff. 111–12) gave the addresses. Grandjone, König and Roy-Jacquemart (*Statuten des 'Communistischen Arbeiter-Bildungs-Vereins'*, p. 10) date these statutes to the first half of 1850. However, the copy of the statutes held at the BLPES (*Statuten des Londoner deutschen Arbeitervereins*, London, n.d.) is bound together only with brochures from 1851, and the three sections still existed in 1851 (*FP*, 19 April 1851, 166; 'Ansprache...1851', Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 275).
- 33 Wilhelm Liebknecht, *Karl Marx* (The Journeyman Press, 1975), pp. 54–5.
- 34 *Statuten des Londoner deutschen Arbeitervereins*, Simon to Hinckeldey, 14 May 1850, Simon file, Potsdam 11374/1, f. 8.
- 35 Liebknecht, 'Reminiscences', in *Marx and Engels*, pp. 53–4.
- 36 Marx to Weydemeyer, 1 Aug., 19 Dec. 1849, *MEW*, XXVII, pp. 506, 515; Hundt, *Geschichte*, pp. 597–600.
- 37 'March Circular', *MECW*, X, pp. 277–87; Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 251–9. For variations of the Circular and its distribution in Germany see *MEGA*, I/10, pp. 848–71.
- 38 *MECW*, X, pp. 280–1.
- 39 *MECW*, X, p. 281.
- 40 Schraepfer, *Handwerkerbünde und Arbeitervereine*, pp. 365–6; Richard N.Hunt, *The Political Ideas of Marx and Engels*, I.Hunt is concerned with defending Marx and Engels against accusations of totalitarianism and Blanquism. Although he concedes that the March Circular is the most bloodthirsty of all their writings in its advocacy of terror, he argues that it remains basically democratic and does not advocate a one-party dictatorship (pp. 235–48).
- 41 Marx to Müller-Telling, 1 Jan. 1850, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 223; *MEGA*, III/3, pp. 443–5.
- 42 Heinzen, *Erlebtes*, pp. 377–8, and Heinzen, 'Programm der deutschen Revolutionspartei'.
- 43 Marx to Weydemeyer, 19 Dec. 1849, *MEW*, XXVII, p. 515.
- 44 Announcement of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue*, *MECW*, X, p. 5. Later in the year, Marx was to start his economic excerpts (see *MEGA*, IV, vols 7–11).
- 45 Engels to Schuberth, about 11 April 1850, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 232; discussion of 2 May 1852, Demokratischer Verein file, Potsdam 9529, f. 14.
- 46 Marx and Engels' preference for Eccarius was interpreted as politicking by the other German workers in London who suspected that 'Eccarius...had been won over by flattery, by

- declaring him to be the only really intelligent proletariat' ('Ansprache...1851', Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 276).
- 47 Bauer's report of 7 Nov. 1852, in Gamby, ed., *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 30–1.
- 48 Marx to Freiligrath, 11 Jan. 1850, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 225; *The Harney Papers*, p. 257.
- 49 Marx and Engels, 'Gottfried Kinkel', *MECW*, X, pp. 345–7.
- 50 *MECW*, X, p. 345. The *New Yorker Staats-Zeitung*, which was sympathetic to Kinkel, hinted that the attack was written for tactical reasons, as 'a well-calculated bomb, hurled [by Marx] into his own camp as a stimulant' (21 Sept. 1850).
- 51 *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue*, 26 June 1850; Häckel, ed., *Freiligraths Briefwechsel*, I, p. Ixv; *MEGA* I/10, pp. 904–7.
- 52 Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 260–5; *BdK*, II, pp. 195–201; *MECW*, X, pp. 371–7.
- 53 According to this report, the June Circular contained such obvious lies about events in Cologne that the League did not dare send a copy there (Röser's evidence, in *BdK*, II, p. 452). For distribution in Germany see *MEGA* I/10, pp. 924–40.
- 54 Some Communist League members called for rapprochement with the Centralisation or even negotiated about an affiliation (Bruhn to Schramm, 2 May 1850, *BdK*, II, p. 176; Dronke to the Central Authority, 3 July 1850, *BdK*, II, pp. 223–5). When the June Circular became public, its sharp criticism offended many Centralisation members, who in particular regarded the attacks on Sigel and J.Ph.Becker as a direct expression of Willich's personal animosity. Nonetheless Marx still negotiated with their representative, Techow, in late August (Techow to N.N., 26 Aug. 1850, in Carl Vogt, *Mein Prozeß gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung*, Geneva, 1859, pp. 144–5; Dronke to Engels, July/Aug. 1850, *BdK*, II, p. 246).
- 55 *MECW*, X, p. 372–3.
- 56 *Ibid.*, p. 375. This throws doubt on spy reports claiming that Marx repeatedly proposed a joint committee with the Democratic Society because he mistrusted the CABV (report from Greek Street, 25 June 1850, Simon file, Potsdam 11374/1, f. 88, and by X [Friederich], 29 July–3 Aug. [1850], f. 114).
- 57 D.Rjazanov, 'Zur Frage des Verhältnisses von Marx zu Blanqui', *Unter dem Banner des Marxismus*, 2 (March–Nov. 1928), no. 1–2, 140–9. On the basis of the March Circular alone, Eduard Bernstein had first accused Marx of Blanquism (*Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus und die Aufgaben der Sozialdemokratie*, Stuttgart: 1899, p. 29). See also A.Brandenburg, 'Utopischer Sozialismus, Arbeiterkommunismus, Marxismus: Ein Tagungsbericht', *IWK*, 24 (1988), 195. Blanqui emphasised the need for a period of educational dictatorship. His appeal largely relied on a fervently emotional call for revolution, and he worried little about economic aspects, preferring to emphasise the purely political character of revolution. He was also strongly associated with an elitist, insurrectionist view of revolution to be led by a minority, and conducted even against the will of the majority. See generally Samuel Bernstein, *Auguste Blanqui and the Art of Insurrection* (Lawrence and Wishart, 1971), pp. 299–303.
- 58 *MECW*, X, pp. 614–15; *MEW*, VII, pp. 553ff.
- 59 'Société universelle des communistes révolutionnaires', *BdK*, II, pp. 161–2; *MEGA* I/10, pp. 1080–1 (the original in IISG, ME, O 19). Harney occasionally supported the idea of a universal communist society led by an international 'general staff, e.g. at a Fraternal Democrats gathering in early April (*BdK*, II, p. 160). After the split of the Communist League he initially remained on the side of Marx and Engels, and signed the disclaimer with them (Marx, Engels and Harney to Adam, Vidil and Barthelémy, 9 Oct. 1850, *MECW*, X, p. 484).
- 60 Schraepler, *Handwerkerbünde und Arbeitervereine*, p. 373.
- 61 Hunt, *The Political Ideas of Marx and Engels*, I, p. 253 and passim.
- 62 Hundt, *Geschichte*, p. 638.
- 63 *The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850*, *MECW*, X, pp. 45–145; cf. Hunt, *The Political Ideas of Marx and Engels*, I, pp. 232–4. See also Hal Draper, *Karl Marx's Theory of*

- Revolution, III: The 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat'* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1986), pp. 286–322. See also Weydemeyer's article on 'Die Diktatur des Proletariats', written in December 1851 (*BdK*, III, pp. 126–9).
- 64 *MECW*, X, pp. 126–7.
- 65 Speech by C.Schramm, 5 April 1850, *BdK*, II, p. 160.
- 66 *MECW*, X, p. 377, and Engels to Dronke, 9 July 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 381.
- 67 Wilhelm Liebknecht, *Karl Marx zum Gedächtniß* (Nürnberg, Würlein, 1896), p. 58.
- 68 H.C.Payne and H.Grosshans, 'The Exiled Revolutionaries and the French Political Police in the 1850s', *American Historical Review*, 168 (1963), 954–73.
- 69 Pardigon's membership is likely from Marx and Engels to Pardigon, 6 May 1850, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 235.
- 70 *BdK*, II, p. 162; *MECW*, X, pp. 614–15.
- 71 Bernstein, *Auguste Blanqui*, pp. 299–303; Maurice Dommanget, *Les idées politiques et sociales d'Auguste Blanqui* (Paris: Rivière, 1957).
- 72 June Circular, *MECW*, X, pp. 374–7; cf. Schmidt, 'Nationales und Internationales im Bund der Kommunisten', 236–7.
- 73 'To The Peoples', Manifesto of the European Central Democratic Committee (*Red Republican*, 7 Sept. 1850); Marx to Engels, 11 Feb. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 285.
- 74 *Deutsche Londoner Zeitung*, 8 Feb. and 5 April 1850.
- 75 *Louis Blanc's Monthly Review*, 4 (November 1849), 134: 'the Anti-Corn Law League was a Socialist League, because its object was to destroy Agricultural privileges and monopolies...for the benefit of a few'.
- 76 *MECW*, X, pp. 311–25. Hunt, *The Political Ideas of Marx and Engels*, I, pp. 250–3.
- 77 *MECW*, X, p. 318.
- 78 *Ibid.*, pp. 317–18.
- 79 Hunt, *The Political Ideas of Marx and Engels*, I, p. 353.
- 80 Engels and Marx to Pardigon, 6 May 1850, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 235. François Pardigon, born in 1827, law student, a follower of Blanqui and member of several secret societies, had been one of the instigators of the June insurrection in Paris (*Dictionnaire Biographique du Mouvement Ouvrier Français*, ed. Jean Maitron et al, III, Paris, 1966, pp. 176–7). In January 1850 he signed an address of the 'French exiles of the "13th of June"' in London, to the Fraternal Democrats', together with Ledru-Rollin and others (*The Democratic Review of British and Foreign Politics, History, and Literature*, Jan. 1850, 290).
- 81 Barthelémy to Blanqui, 4 July 1850, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, MSS Blanqui, N.A.F. 9581, f. 210.
- 82 June Circular, *BdK*, II, p. 200.
- 83 McLellan, *Karl Marx*, p. 236.
- 84 Barthelémy, Adam and Vidal to Marx and Engels, 7 Oct. 1850, and Harney's, Marx's and Engels' answer of 9 Oct. 1850, *BdK*, II, pp. 291–3, and *MECW*, X, p. 484.
- 85 Blumenberg, 'Röser', 99 (and *BdK*, II, p. 451). Similarly, an exasperated League member in Switzerland wrote about the Londoners that 'they are only interested in communism. They do not pay any attention to calling forth the revolution—they only think about exploiting it...first we have to have it before we can exploit it.' (c. 15 April 1850, *BdK*, II, p. 564).
- 86 Loyd D.Easton, *Hegel's First American Followers* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1966), pp. 160–203, and [H.A.Rattermann], 'General August Willich', *Der Deutsche Pionier*, 9 (February 1878), no. 11, 439, give some biographical details with slight differences. Willich gave a short autobiographical account in 'Schluß-Erklärung', *Cincinnati Republikaner*, 19, 43 (19 March 1860), p. 2. The Prussian police circulated a short biography and description (BGLAK, 236/8743, weekly report of 26 Dec. 1852, no. 3).
- 87 Bauer's report of 7 Nov. 1852, in Gamby, ed., *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, p. 29.
- 88 *Im preußischen Heere! Ein Disciplinarverfahren gegen Premier-Lieutenant v. Willich* (Mannheim: Heinrich Hoff, 1848), pp. 28–9, 37–52.

- 89 [Rattermann], 'General August Willich', 440; Marx to Weydemeyer, 20 Feb. 1852, *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 42.
- 90 By April 1849 the corps was reduced to some 150 men (*Zeitung des Arbeiter-Vereines zu Köln*, 7 (4 June 1848), 62; *Freiheit, Brüderlichkeit, Arbeit*, II, no. 3, (15 Feb. 1849), 7; *Freiheit, Arbeit!*, no. 27, 29 April 1849, 110).
- 91 Engels to J.Marx, 25 July 1849, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 202–4. Engels also described the 700 to 800 volunteers Willich commanded in the Palatinate as 'certainly the most reliable soldiers in the whole Palatinate' (Engels, 'The Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution', *MECW*, X, pp. 196–7; see also Sperber, *Rhineland Radicals*, pp. 421–4, 465). They formed the rear of the revolutionary army on its withdrawal to the south, and in its last battle on the river Murg, on 29 June 1849, Joseph Moll fell, among others. Other participants later attacked Willich as 'impractical' and a 'dreamer' ([Amand Goegg], *Nachträgliche authentische Aufschlüsse über die Badische Revolution von 1849*, New York: 1876, pp. 51–2).
- 92 Willich, 'Programm der Enterbten', *Freiheit, Brüderlichkeit, Arbeit*, II, 12 (18 March 1849), 41–2 (This programme is not included in the edition of documents of the *BdK*). For similar formulations, see Willich to the La Chaux-de-Fonds group, 1 Feb. 1850, *BdK*, II, pp. 79–81. Another appeal from Besancon to the Cologne workers' society called the workers as the poor, cheated and disinherited masses to commence world war and the final judgment and to install 'freedom, welfare and education' (which was Struve's slogan at the time) (quoted in report of 7 Nov. 1852, Gamby, ed., *Bauer, Konfidentenberichte*, p. 30, also in *NYCZ* (5 Nov. 1852), 8).
- 93 *Cincinnati Republikaner*, 19, 52 (29 March 1860), 2.
- 94 Boris Nicolaevsky and Otto Maenchen-Helfen, *Karl Marx: Man and Fighter* (Methuen, 1933), p. 127.
- 95 Nicolaevsky and Maenchen-Helfen, *Karl Marx*, p. 231. Jenny Marx disliked Willich's 'colourful attire and excessive bonhomie' (McLellan, *Karl Marx*, p. 246), whereas Herzen described 'the celebrated communist Willich' as 'a pure-hearted and very good-natured man' (*My Past and Thoughts: The Memoirs of Alexander Herzen*, Chatto & Windus, 1968, III, p. 1091).
- 96 Willich to the La Chaux-de-Fonds group, 1 Feb. 1850, *BdK*, II, pp. 79–81; Gamby, ed., *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, p. 30.
- 97 F.Engels, 'On the History of the Communist League', in Rodney Livingstone, ed., *The Cologne Communist Trial* (Lawrence & Wishart, 1971), p. 52.
- 98 A total of fifty refugees left from London for Schleswig-Holstein (discussed in Democratic Society in Berwick St., undated report [c. 10 Aug. 1850], Simon file, Potsdam 11374/1, f. 135). On the volunteers see *BdK*, II, p. 678. Schleswig-Holstein's connection to Germany or Denmark remained controversial throughout the century, especially when Prussia for hegemonic purposes supported the German popular nationalist movement in the duchies, and democrats thus found themselves fighting for dynastic claims of minor princes whom they opposed in principle. Many refugees wrote on the issue, including Karl Blind, Edgar Bauer, Alexander Schimmelpfennig, from different perspectives also the brothers Rudolf and Conrad Schramm, and Paul Harro-Harring (*Sendschreiben an die 'Schleswig-Holsteiner'*, Hull, 29 Nov. 1850, a leaflet admonishing republican volunteers not to battle for sea-ports for Prussia under the illusion of fighting for the cause of the people; HarroHarring file, Potsdam 10463, f. 16).
- 99 *BdK*, II, pp. 175, 190, 334. Willich later claimed that by New Year 1850 Engels felt that Willich had cast aspersions on his courage, which caused the first frictions ('Doctor Karl Marx und seine Enthüllungen', *NYCZ*, 28 Oct. 1853, 329).
- 100 Bruhn to Schramm, 2 May 1850, *BdK*, II, p. 175.
- 101 Marx to Röser, received end July, Blumenberg, 'Röser', 99, 102.
- 102 Techow to N.N., 26 Aug. 1850, in Vogt, *Mein Prozeß* p. 146.

- 103 Address of the Central Authority (Willich/Schapper) to the leading circle, 1 Oct. 1850 (henceforth: 'Ansprache') in Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 267.
- 104 Ibid., p. 267.
- 105 Report by 'X' [Friederichs], 3 July 1850, Simon file, Potsdam 11374/1, f. 92.
- 106 Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 269; also Marx at the meeting of 15 Sept. 1850, *MECW*, X, p. 625.
- 107 *BdK*, II, pp. 148, 231, 96.
- 108 Blumenberg, 'Röser', 99.
- 109 Schapper to Marx, 11 May 1860, *BdK*, III, pp. 360–1.
- 110 Lewiowa, 'Karl Schapper', in *Marx und Engels*, p. 114.
- 111 E.g., in the meeting of 15 September 1850 and subsequently, when Schapper approached Marx again in 1852 (Marx to Engels, 3 July 1852, *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 126).
- 112 'Ansprache', Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 267–8; see also Willich, 'Doctor Karl Marx', 329. Willich's supporters also simply shouted their opponents down, see Rothacker to Marx, c. July to early August 1850, *BdK*, II, pp. 243–4.
- 113 *Cincinnati Republikaner*, 19, 43 (19 March 1860), p. 2.
- 114 Differing versions of the episode are in Engels to Marx, 23 Nov. 1853, in Marx, The Knight of the Noble Consciousness', *MECW*, XII, p. 493; Liebknecht, *Marx zum Gedächtniß*, p. 59; Röser's evidence, *BdK*, II, p. 455, and 'Ansprache', Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 268–9.
- 115 Willich's second recalled an amicable parting after the duel (Techow, Aug./Sept. 1850, in Vogt, *Mein Prozeß*, pp. 160–1). Willich's own version is in his 'Doctor Karl Marx', 329–30. Willich's version, including denunciation to the Belgian police by Marx and Engels, was repeated by the tailor J.Grozinski to friends in Cologne (1 Sept. 1852, Revolutionary party file, Potsdam 13835, f. 123). See also Marx, The Knight of the Noble Consciousness', *MECW*, XII, pp. 492 ff, and 'Herr Vogt', *MECW*, XVII, pp. 83–5.
- 116 Willich to Marx, 5 Sept. 1850, and Pfänder to Marx, 14 Sept. 1850, *BdK*, II, pp. 262, 266. Marx's politicking in these months is analysed in Schieder, *Karl Marx als Politiker*, pp. 55–64.
- 117 Minutes of the 'Meeting of the Central Committee, Sept. 15, 1850' (*MECW*, X, pp. 625–9). Excerpts were published in 1852 by Marx in his 'Revelations concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne' (e.g. *MECW*, XI, p. 403). The full text became known only in 1956 (B.Nicolaevsky, 'Toward a History', 248–52).
- 118 'Ansprache', Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 267.
- 119 Minutes, *MECW*, X, pp. 626–7, 629.
- 120 *MECW*, X, pp. 625–9, here 626. In his speech on 15 September, Schapper did not indicate any precise time for the revolution, but according to Marx's notes, 'Schapper even promised to be beheaded within one year, i.e., by Sept. 15, 1851' (*BdK*, II, p. 269). Willich later maintained that arguments about revolutionary development had not caused the split but became important only afterwards (Willich, 'Doctor Karl Marx', 330).
- 121 Marx and Engels, 'Review, May to Oct. 1850', *MECW*, X, p. 510; excerpts in *Deutsche Londoner Zeitung*, 305–7 (31 Jan., 7–14 Feb. 1851). In a letter to Cologne Marx listed four phases through which communism had to go from the present co-operation of bourgeoisie and proletariat through opposition against the ruling petty bourgeoisie until its final introduction (Blumenberg, 'Röser', 115–16).
- 122 Eccarius and Schapper at meeting, Minutes, *MECW*, X, pp. 628–9.
- 123 Blumenberg, 'Röser', 99.
- 124 'Ansprache', Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 270.
- 125 Willich, 'Doctor Karl Marx', 330.
- 126 Engels, 'History of the Communist League', in Livingstone, ed., *The Cologne Communist Trial*, p. 54. Karl Obermann (*Zur Geschichte des Bundes der Kommunisten 1849–1852*, Berlin: Dietz, 1955, pp. 36–7) follows this chronology, as does Schraepfer, who blames Kinkel's London activities for increasing tensions inside the League (*Handwerkerbünde und Arbeitervereine*, pp. 393, 414–17).



- 127 Willich, 'Doctor Karl Marx', 329 (where Willich also explained that he had earlier corresponded with the Kinkels about Kinkel's defence speech but that Marx or Becker intercepted their letters). Later, after Schapper had rejoined Marx, he reiterated that Willich's intention to form an alliance with all émigré factions caused a rift, which, however, might never have become a formal split without the intrigues of police agents (Schapper to Marx, 11 May 1860, *BdK*, III, pp. 360–1).
- 128 Declaration of the Social Democratic Refugee Committee, 14 June 1850, *BdK*, II, pp. 209–10. Willich here supported Marx although he had earlier advised simply to ignore Struve's criticism (Willich to Marx, 29 April 1850, *MEGA*, III, p. 524).
- 129 'Ansprache' and 'Ansprache...1851', Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 270, 280–1.
- 130 Pfänder to Marx, 14 Sept. 1850, *BdK*, II, p. 266, and Marx at the meeting (*BdK*, II, p. 268).
- 131 Walter Schmidt, *Wilhelm Wolff*, II: 1846–1864 (Berlin: Dietz, 1979), pp. 243–57; Techow to Schimmelpfennig, 26 Aug. 1850, in Vogt, *Mein Prozess*, pp. 142–3, 158. After these negotiations broke down, Techow went over to Willich.
- 132 Liebknecht, 'Reminiscences', p. 54.
- 133 Engels, 'History of the Communist League', in Livingstone, ed., *The Cologne Communist Trial*, p. 52.
- 134 Schraepfer, *Handwerkerbünde und Arbeitervereine*, p. 432, and Brandenburg, *Theoriebildungsprozesse*, pp. 214–15.
- 135 However, the former 'Just' who in September 1850 sided with Marx had not always been his unflinching admirers either. Bauer, Pfänder and Eccarius had opted to reorganise the League not two years earlier, when Marx decidedly opposed this. Bauer and Pfänder had disagreements with Marx in the summer of 1850, too; the CABV later insinuated that financial self-interest drove them to Marx's side ('Ansprache...1851', Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 276).
- 136 *BdK*, II, p. 232; *DLZ*, 18 June 1847, 18 Feb. 1848.
- 137 Fränkel to Brüning, 23 Sept. [1850], Reiningger file, Potsdam 12524, ff. 214–15. Fränkel later voiced the CABV's refusal to co-operate with non-socialists ('Ansprache...1851', Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 280–1).
- 138 *Die junge Generation*, 2. Lieferung, Feb. 1842, 21; *Telegraph für Deutschland* (Hamburg, 1844), 66, and *Vorwärts!*, no. 87, 30 Oct. 1844; *Rheinische Jahrbücher zur geselkchaflichen Reform*, 1 (1845), p. 329; Nettlau, 'Londoner deutsche kommunistische Diskussionen', 366, 379–80; *BdK*, I, pp. 350, 719. When the Cologne Central Authority expelled the rebellious faction, they strangely omitted Lehmann's name, although in the aftermath he remained staunchly on Willich's side.
- 139 'Ansprache', p. 267. Noticeably Schapper did not pick up these accusations, thus staying clear from his own earlier anti-intellectualism. Indirectly Marx confirmed this when he rejected any suggestion of 'flattering' their 'artisanal pride' (*Standesbewußtsein*), adding peevishly that he did not value 'popularity' and that the rebel faction was 'welcome to keep the whole bunch' of members for themselves (Marx in meeting, *BdK*, II, pp. 268–9).
- 140 'Ansprache', Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 266–9.
- 141 *BdK*, II, p. 268–70.
- 142 'Ansprache', Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 267, 270; *BdK*, II, p. 270.
- 143 *BdK*, II, p. 268–9; 'Ansprache', Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 266–7.
- 144 *BdK*, II, pp. 268, 270; 'Ansprache', Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 270.
- 145 Schapper at meeting, *BdK*, II, p. 269. The League's circular did not pick up this point, but Willich echoed these views on revolutionary terror by a minority (Blumenberg, 'Röser', 99).
- 146 'Ansprache', Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 266, 270.
- 147 *Ibid.*, pp. 267, 270.
- 148 *BdK*, II, p. 269.
- 149 'Ansprache', Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 267, 270.
- 150 Schapper in meeting, *BdK*, II, pp. 269–70.

151 Declaration by Wilhelm Pieper, January 1852, *BdK*, III, p. 431.

152 His London partisan Haude had served in the Baden campaign under Willich. The cooper August Schärttner, who now ran the emigrants' tavern in 27 Long Acre and who joined the Central Authority of the Willich-Schapper League, had led a *Turner* group in the Baden uprising.

#### 4

### The 'Chronique Scandaleuse': Ruge, Kinkel and German democracy, 1849–1853

1 Alexander Herzen, *My Past and Thoughts*, III, p. 1045.

2 Eugene Oswald, *Reminiscences of a Busy Life* (De La More Press, 1911), p. 251.

3 Althaus, 'Beiträge zur Geschichte', pt 3, 'Die Flüchtlinge', 230, 241.

4 Hence his appearance in the memoirs of Herzen, Schurz and others, and even in Johanna Kinkel's novel, *Hans Ibeles in London*, where he is caricatured as the communist Wildemann.

5 Alwin Hanschmidt, *Republikanisch-demokratischer Internationalismus*; Julius H. Schoeps, 'Der Kosmos', *Jahrbuch des Instituts für deutsche Geschichte*, 5 (1976), 211–26; idem, 'Agenten, Spitzel, Flüchtlinge: Wilhelm Stieber und die demokratische Emigration in London', in Horst Schallenger and Helmut Schrey, eds., *Im Gegenstrom* (Wuppertal: Hammer, 1977), pp. 77–104. Neither Ashton nor Panikos address this question.

6 Arthur Rosenberg, *Demokratie und Sozialismus* (Amsterdam: de Lange, 1938), p. 129.

7 Franz Mehring, *Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie*, I (Berlin: Dietz, 1975; *Gesammelte Schriften*), p. 524; and Franz Mehring, ed., *Aus dem literarischen Nachlaß von K.Marx, F.Engels und F.Lassalle*, 4 vols (Stuttgart: Dietz, 1913), I, p. 111.

8 Paul Harro-Harring, *Historisches Fragment über die Entstehung der Arbeiter-Vereine und ihren Verfall in Communistische Speculationen* (C.Deutsch, 1852); Heinzen, *Erlebtes*, pp. 414–44.

9 Austrian police agent's report on German refugees in London, 1853, BGLAK, 236/8757, p. 1.

10 E.g., Schoeps, 'Kosmos', p. 215.

11 For the numbers see Amalie Struve, *NYSZ*, 12 April 1851, and Johanna Kinkel (Adelheid von Asten-Kinkel, 'Johanna Kinkel in England', *Deutsche Revue*, 26 (1901), 70).

12 Otherwise he made a jolly drinking companion, who once won a bet by drinking six bottles of champagne in an hour and then riding to Richmond and back within the next hour (Theodor Fontane, *Bilderbuch aus England*, Berlin: G.Grote, 1938, p. 119); Oswald, *Reminiscences*, pp. 243–4.

13 Ludwig Brügel, 'Aus den Londoner Flüchtlingstagen von Karl Marx', *Der Kampf*, 17 (1924), 350–1. This was also known as Gustav Julius' 'social' refugees' association. The lists are weekly police reports from 6 July 1852 to 26 Dec. 1852 (BGLAK, 236/8743), and often give occupations and date of birth, indicating that here too, as in the other workers' societies, tailors formed the largest single group.

14 See Johanna Kinkel, *Hans Ibeles in London*, 2 vols (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1860), I, pp. 171–2, and Malwida von Meysenbug, *Memoiren einer Idealistin*, 3 vols (Berlin: Auerbach, 1882), II, pp. 9–13, 64–77. The 'tone', however, of Baroness Bruiningk's salon, for example, upset some democrats, one of whom wrote that 'one has banished aristocratic social forms and stiffness, but replaced them by *liberties* which I like even less' (Charlotte [Voss] to Meysenbug, London, 6 April 1852, Brüningk file, Potsdam 8889, ff. 71–2).

15 John Edward Toews, *Hegelianism: the path towards dialectical humanism 1805–1841* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), pp. 357–64.

- 16 Ruge, 'Über die intellectuelle Allianz der Deutschen und Franzosen', repr. in Hans-Martin Sassi, ed., *Arnold Ruge, Werke und Briefe, IV: Politische Kritiken 1838–1846* (Aalen, Scientia, 1988, pp. 301–53).
- 17 [A.Ruge], 'Der König von Preußen und die Sozialreform', *Vorwärts*, no. 60 (27 July 1844), reprinted in Jacques Grandjonn, *Vorwärts! 1844: Marx und die deutschen Kommunisten in Paris* (Berlin: Dietz, 1974), p. 157; Paul Nerrlich, ed., *Arnold Ruges Briefwechsel und Tagebuchblätter aus den Jahren 1825–1880*, 2 vols (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1886), I, p. 356. On the *DeutschFranzösische Jahrbücher* and Ruge's disagreement with Marx see Stephan Walter, *Demokratisches Denken zwischen Hegel und Marx: Die politische Philosophie Arnold Ruges* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1995), pp. 276–306.
- 18 Grandjonn, *Vorwärts!*, pp. 94, 97, 102; Ruge, 'Studien und Erinnerungen aus den Jahren 1843–1845', *Gesammelte Schriften* (Mannheim, 1847), V, pp. 394ff. A wanted poster in the mid-1840s described him as having thin blond hair, lively blue or blue-grey eyes, a flat nose, a small mouth with strong lips, a round face of somewhat pale but not sickly complexion, of fluent and declamatory language with a slightly sharp tone but without proper nasal sound (Ruge file, Potsdam 12528, f. 82).
- 19 Walter Neher, *Arnold Ruge als Politiker und politischer Schriftsteller* (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1933), pp. 151–4; idem, 'The Lodge of Humanism' (1852), in Ruge, *New Germany, Its modern history, literature, philosophy, religion, and art* (Holyoake, 1854), p. 54.
- 20 Neher, *Arnold Ruge*, pp. 174–5.
- 21 Arnold Ruge, *Ein Brief an die Berliner* (Hallé, 1849; a leaflet about his expulsion and electoral campaign; copy in Ruge file, Potsdam 12528, f. 86).
- 22 Marx and Engels, 'Great Men of the Exile', *MECW*, XI, pp. 260, 274. The circular (Rudolf Schramm, *Entwurf eines Rundschreibens an deutsche Demokraten (Als Manuscript gedruckt)*, n.b., n.d. [Bamberger, 1850], copy in Schramm file, Potsdam 12797, ff. 35–6) did in fact echo much of Ruge's language. Schramm here argued (pp. 2–3) that the German democrats should draw advantages from their experience abroad and, precisely because they lacked the unifying national identity of other emigrants, they were free to become 'the representatives of a higher, general nationality, which assigns to the German people a leading and mediating role within the burgeoning movement of peoples... Germany alone comprises all the positive, creative elements of the new formations required by the century, such as the new state, the new law, the new religion and morality'. In 1854, however, as a respectable house-owner in Paddington, he asked the Berlin police president 'from gentleman to gentleman' about his chances for an amnesty, explaining that 'I used to believe that one's nationality could be thrown off like an old coat, if one finds elsewhere panem et circenses. Now I know that I have to live and die as a Prussian and a German' (Rudolph Schramm to Hinkeldey, 28 Sept. 1854, Schramm file, Potsdam 12797, ff. 40–7). Subsequent publications confirmed Schramm's change of heart (*Der Norddeutsche Staat. Das Zusichkommen des weltlichen Gewissens der Nation. Wirkungen. Gegenwirkungen. Zweck* [1855], *Von Schleswig-Holsteins Pflichten. Erstes Sendschreiben...* [Berlin: 1864], and *Die rothe Fahne von 1848 und die schwarzweiße Fahne von 1863* [Berlin 1863]), and in 1858 he was removed from the wanted list (Schramm file, Potsdam 12797, ff. 64–5).
- 23 This is the translation Ernest Jones chose for the *Friend of the People*, no. 1 (14 Dec. 1850), I, but variations occur. Cf. *MEW*, XXVII, p. 644, and Hanschmidt, *Republikanisch-demokratischerInternationalismus*, pp. 69–82.
- 24 G.Claeys, 'Mazzini, Kossuth, and British Radicalism, 1848–1854', *Journal of British Studies*, 28 (1989), 225–61; William Roberts, *Prophet in Exile: Joseph Mazzini in England, 1837–1868* (New York: P.Lang, 1989), pp. 49–68, and Denis Mack Smith, *Mazzini* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), pp. 85–9, 196–202. The 'epic duel' between Mazzini's liberal nationalism and communist internationalism among the London exiles is outlined in

- Enrico Verdecchia, 'Red Germans and Italian White Knights', in Alter and Muhs, eds., *Exilanten*, pp. 447–59.
- 25 Alvin R. Calman, *Ledru-Rollin après 1848 et les proscrits français en Angleterre* (Paris: F.Rieder, 1921), pp. 41–54. Even his own publisher prefaced the book by saying that Ledru-Rollin 'must be set down amongst the bitterest enemies of this country' ([A.] Ledru-Rollin, *The Decline of England* (Churton, 1850, p. 1).
- 26 Albert Darasz (1808–1852), Polish national liberal active in the insurrection of 1830–1831. Dmitri Bratianu, in 1848 a member of the provisional government in Bucharest, later became a prominent politician in the Danube principalities, and the *Hermann* noted with disapproval that someone who had defended equality and fraternity in 1848 was now responsible for the expulsion of Jews from Rumania (*Hermann*, 1 June 1867).
- 27 *Red Republican*, 7 Sept. 1850, 94–5.
- 28 'We believe in the sacredness of both individuality and society... We believe in the holiness of work, in its inviolability, in the property which proceeds from it as its sign and its fruit. In the duty of society to furnish the element of material work by credit, of intellectual and moral work by education... We believe...in a social state having God and his law at the summit, the people, the universality of citizens free and equal at its base' (*Red Republican*, 7 Sept. 1850, 94–5); W.E.Adams, *Memoirs of a Social Atom* (Hutchinson, 1903), I, p. 263.
- 29 Ruge, 'An den Herrn Legationsrath L...', open letter, dated 10 Nov. 1851, Ruge file, Potsdam 12528, f. 139, and similarly [Arnold Ruge], *Vertraulicher Brief Arnold Ruge's an die Verbrecher in Deutschland* [1851], Ruge file, Potsdam 12528, f. 117.
- 30 Nerrlich, *Ruge*, II, p. 118.
- 31 *MECW*, X, p. 530 (Marx used a slightly different text, cf. pp. 528–32).
- 32 'Manifesto of the European Central Democratic Committee', *FP*, 21 June 1851, 242.
- 33 'To the Italian, Polish, German, Austrian and Dutch Committees', *FP*, 28 Dec. 1850, 21. This address to both German and Austrian committees is one of the few indications that the ECDC took a *kleindeutsche* stance on the question of Austrian inclusion, presumably influenced by Ruge's contempt of 'Jesuitic' Austria.
- 34 Blanc to Barbès, 3 Sept. 1850, quoted in Calman, *Ledru-Rollin*, p. 95.
- 35 *RdA*, 1 May 1852, 137, 17 July 1852, 225–6.
- 36 Mazzini to Ruge, 30 Oct. 1850, in Nerrlich, *Ruge*, II, p. 119.
- 37 Peter Brock, 'The Socialists of the Polish "Great Emigration"', in Asa Briggs and John Saville, eds., *Essays in Labour History* (Macmillan, 1967), pp. 140–73.
- 38 Stanislaw Worcell (1799–1857) had participated in the uprising of 1830 and in 1847 in the Brussels Association démocratique. His funeral in 1857 became one of the largest demonstrations of the democratic and socialist emigration (*LDJ*, 14 Feb. 1857). Alexander Herzen turned down an invitation to represent the Russians (Herzen, *My Life and Thoughts*, II, pp. 1141–3).
- 39 *Leader*, 12 Dec. 1850, 679, 21 Dec. 1850, 921, and 28 Dec. 1850, 944; also in *NS*, 4 Jan. 1851, 8.
- 40 *Leader*, 21 Dec. 1850, 921.
- 41 *Leader*, 28 Dec. 1850, 944.
- 42 *Bremer Tages-Chronik*, no. 474, 17 Jan. 1851; Marx to Engels, 22 Jan. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 265. Marx's and Engels's response remained unpublished at the time (*MECW*, X, pp. 535–6, XXXVIII, p. 397).
- 43 Ruge, 'An den Herrn Legationsrath L...', open letter, dated 10 Nov. 1851, Ruge file, Potsdam 12528, f. 139.
- 44 Schoeps, 'Kosmos', p. 219; the quote is from *Kosmos*, 17 May 1851.
- 45 *NYSZ*, 12 April 1851.
- 46 *Leader*, 14 Dec. 1850, 896. When the ECDC, however, stretched its internationalism to the length of publishing a strongly Christian address, 'To the Roumanians', the *Leader* could not refrain from adding, 'Who are the Roumanians? what is this "imperishable race"?' are

- questions which ninety-nine Englishmen out of one hundred might be fairly supposed to put' (*Leader*, 19 July 1851, 685–6). Weitling, whose international sympathies were otherwise beyond doubt, sneered that 'shortly the gipsies too will be honoured with a proclamation by the committee' (*RdA*, 26 July 1851, 113).
- 47 *Leader*, 9 Nov. 1850, 777, and *DLZ*, 293 (8 Nov. 1850).
- 48 Hanschmidt, *Republikanisch-demokratischerInternationalismus*, p. 80.
- 49 *FP*, 21 June 1851, 242.
- 50 Knaack, 'Die Überwachung der politischen Emigration in Preußen', p. 132.
- 51 Ruge to Dulon, Brighton, 1 Dec. 1850, Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, f. 1. In northern Germany Rudolph Dulon, the leading figure of the oppositional religious movement of the 'Lichtfreunde', spread the influence of the ECDC (Ruge file, Potsdam 12528, ff. 144–6). Ruge also hoped for support in Hamburg, Frankfurt, Oldenburg, Hannover, Braunschweig and Magdeburg.
- 52 Engels to Marx, 5 Feb. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 279.
- 53 Engels to Marx, 12 Feb. 1851, *ibid.*, p. 287.
- 54 Marx and Engels, 'The Great Men of the Exile', *MECW*, XI, pp. 227–326.
- 55 *English Republic*, II, 212. Holyoake claimed they collected £450 (*Bygones Worth Remembering*, T.Fisher Unwin, 1905, I, p. 211). Herzen refused further funds (*My Past and Thoughts*, II, pp. 1141–3).
- 56 Mazzini to Ruge, 30 Oct. 1850, Nerrlich, *Ruge*, II, p. 119. In October 1852 the ECDC 'came alive from the dead' in order to join in distributing funds from the National Loan (BGLAK, Karlsruhe, 236/8757).
- 57 Ruge to Lin ton, 16 Aug. 1854, quoted in F.B.Smith, *Radical Artisan: William James Linton, 1812–97* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1973), p. 118.
- 58 Ruge, *New Germany*, p. 51.
- 59 Ruge's speech at international gathering, 13 March 1851, unidentified newspaper clipping, Ruge file, Potsdam 12528, f. 113.
- 60 Hanschmidt, *Republikanisch-demokratischerInternationalismus*, p. 75.
- 61 Calman, *Ledru-Rollin*, p. 105. See also Revolutionary party file, Potsdam 13835, f. 109, about the effects of the Milan uprising on the ECDC and on an alliance between Ruge and Ledru-Rollin against Kossuth and Mazzini in early 1853. The Committee was succeeded by a short-lived triumvirate of Mazzini, Ledru-Rollin and Kossuth.
- 62 Hanschmidt, *Republikanisch-demokratischerInternationalismus*, pp. 81–2.
- 63 Arnold Ruge, *Revolutionsnovellen*, Leipzig, Verlagsbureau, 1850, pt. 1, pp. 62–70, 76, 218. A short story attacked the early Swiss communists Treichler and August Becker even more directly ('Die Komödie in Wädenschwyl am Zürichsee', *ibid.*, pt. 2, p. 100). A play, written in 1853, treated the psychological conflict of an egoistic genius faced with the moral values of society (*Die neue Welt*, Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1856).
- 64 Herzen, *My Past and Thoughts*, III, p. 1157. Herzen may well have been piqued at Ruge's denunciations of Russia as the heart of all barbarism and despotism (Ruge, *New Germany*, p. 21).
- 65 Weekly police report, Dresden, 20 June 1855, Ruge file, Potsdam 12528, f. 216.
- 66 Althaus, 'Die Flüchtlinge', p. 235; Marx and Engels, 'The Great Men of the Exile', *MECW*, XI, p. 274. By the autumn of 1852, Herzen found him 'a grumbling old man, angry and spiteful' (*My Past and Thoughts*, III, p. 1156).
- 67 Arnold Ruge, *My Claim against the Prussian Government* (Brighton: John Buck, 1862).
- 68 Arnold Ruge, *An die deutsche Nation: Manifest* (Hamburg: Otto Meissner, 1866), p. 1. However, Ruge saw Bismarck as having genuinely picked up some of the ideas of 1848 (Walter, *Demokratisches Denken*, pp. 364–81).
- 69 In 1854 Ruge had already declared that now Prussia 'must become Germany itself (Ruge, *New Germany*, p. 10); Oswald, *Reminiscences*, pp. 400–1.

- 70 Adolph Strodtmann, *Gottfried Kinkel*, 2 vols (Hamburg, 1850–1851) formed the basis for Marx's satire on Kinkel's sentimentality, vanity, and political vagueness ('The Great Men of the Exile', *MECW*, XI, pp. 229–53).
- 71 On his republicanism in 1848 see Hermann Rösch-Sondermann, *Gottfried Kinkel als Ästhetiker, Politiker und Dichter* (Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1982), pp. 250–4, 266–77.
- 72 Gottfried Kinkel, *Handwerk, Errette Dich!* (Bonn: W.Sulzbach, 1848), p. v; Alfred de Jonge, *Gottfried Kinkel as Political and Social Thinker* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1926), pp. 117–28; Marx, 'The Great Men of the Exile', *MECW*, XI, pp. 249–52.
- 73 Undated letters, Kinkel file, Potsdam 10968, ff. 165, 167–8; *Prozeß-Verhandlungen gegen Gottfried Kinkel und Genossen*, Bonn, W.Sulzbach, s.d. [1850], p. 117; and Carl Schurz, *The Reminiscences of Carl Schurz* (J.Murray, 1909), I, p. 264.
- 74 He did, however, continue to agitate for international causes (Gottfried Kinkel, *Polens Auferstehung die Stärke Deutschlands*, Wien, Tendler, 1868) and legal reforms, such as the abolition of capital punishment in 1879 (Gottfried Kinkel, *Gegen die Todesstrafe und das Attentat sie in der Schweiz wieder einzuführen*, Zürich: Cäsar Schmidt, 1879).
- 75 Engels to Jenny Marx, 25 July 1849, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 203. Marx's later account of the same affair, written during the fiercest fights between the two émigré leaders, related the episode with great spite (Marx and Engels, 'The Great Men of the Exile', *MECW*, XI, p. 253).
- 76 Meysenbug, *Memoiren*, II, pp. 6–7. Marx sarcastically observed that 'Every heart yielded to a melancholy langour and the need began to be felt for a democratic Christ, for a real or imagined sufferer who in his torments would bear the sins of the philistine world with the fortitude of a lamb and whose suffering would epitomise in extreme form the inert, chronic nostalgia of the whole of philistinism... Kinkel was the man of the moment' (*MECW*, XI, p. 255). Richard Sander related an instance where peasants actually tried to worship Kinkel's portrait on the altar of a local church (*Kinkels Selbstbiographie 1832–48*, Bonn: Fr. Cohen, 1931, p. 253, n.301).
- 77 Gottfried Kinkel, *Verteidigungsrede vor dem Rastatter Kriegsgericht am 4. August 1849* (Munich: Nationalverein, 1912, p. 25); Rösch-Sondermann, *Gottfried Kinkel*, pp. 300–1; Leppla, Johanna and Gottfried Kinkels Briefe an Kathinka Zitz', p. 19.
- 78 *MECW*, X, pp. 345–7.
- 79 Schurz, *Reminiscences*, I, pp. 285–315.
- 80 Meysenbug, *Memoiren*, II, p. 9; Schraepler, *Handwerkerbünde und Arbeitervereine*, p. 378). The Berlin police president admitted to having had reports on a complot generously financed by Méry Bruiningk shortly before Kinkel's liberation (Note by Hinckeldey, Berlin, 22 Nov. 1851, Brüningk file, Potsdam 8889, f. 2). The *Illustrated London News* (no. 457 (30 Nov. 1850), 417) suspected that the Prussian government had connived at his escape. They still persecuted severely those involved in the liberation. One of Kinkel's helpers was found out because he had kept Kinkel's prison uniform like a relic in his house (Kinkel file, Potsdam 10968, f. 257). Kinkel's police file was still kept secret in 1914 (Kinkel file, Potsdam 10968, ff. 259–69).
- 81 Marx and Engels, 'The Great Men of the Exile', p. 258; 'Gottfried Kinkel: A Life in Three Pictures', *Household Words*, 2 November 1850, reprinted in Livingstone, ed., *The Cologne Communist Trial*, pp. 282–3.
- 82 *Leader*, 2 Nov. 1850, 747.
- 83 *Leader*, 9 Nov. 1850, and 'Gottfried Kinkel: A Life in Three Pictures', pp. 284–5.
- 84 *FP*, preliminary number, 7 Dec. 1850, 8, where Harney added that Kinkel, who had just been declared a constitutional monarchist in *Household Words*, was a devoted republican; *FP*, 1 (14 Dec. 1850), 3.
- 85 *Illustrated London News*, no. 457 (30 Nov. 1850), 417.
- 86 Adolph Busse, 'Die Briefe Gottfried Kinkels an Karl Schurz', *Quellen und Darstellungen zur Geschichte der Burschenschaft und der deutschen Einheitsbewegungen*, 14 (1934), 254,

- letter dated 9 January 1858. Kinkel's efforts very nearly won him a professorship in English (!) at University College (Ashton, 'Gottfried Kinkel and University College London', in Alter and Muhs, eds., *Exilanten*, pp. 29–33).
- 87 Schurz, *Reminiscences*, I, p. 367.
- 88 Herzen described him as a typical German professor, stately, inspiring respect, 'but he added to it as it were an official unction, *Salbung*, something judicial and episcopal, solemn, stiff, and modestly self-satisfied'. Herzen satirised Kinkel's relations with his wife, who 'supported him in his idea that he was a genius, at any rate not inferior to Lessing, and that in him a new Stein was being provided for Germany; Kinkel knew that this was true, and mildly restrained Johanna in the presence of outsiders when her praise went rather too far' (*My Past and Thoughts*, pp. 1157–9). His vanity lost him friends (report of 5 April 1853, Revolutionary party file, Potsdam 13835, f. 111).
- 89 Bruiningk had generously funded the campaign for Kinkel's liberation. The *Kosmos* (3 (21 June 1851), 16) reported on a police raid to her house, after which she was expelled from Hamburg. The confiscated letters and a police report are in Brüningk file, Potsdam 8889, ff. 11–65. Kinkel later complained that she had published one of his private letters from prison (Kinkel to Bruiningk, 13 January 1851, Kinkel file, Potsdam 10968, f. 154). For her London salon and the differences with Kinkel see Meysenbug, *Memoiren*, II, pp. 64–77, 144–7.
- 90 *NYSZ*, 29 March and 9 Aug. 1851. The *Bremer Tages-Chronik* (16 April 1851), e.g., published an appeal to collect 'for Kinkel and the good cause', because 'only in this manner, do you help yourselves' (Kinkel file, Potsdam 10968, f. 80); Marx to Engels, 21 May 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 359.
- 91 Johanna Kinkel, *Hans Ibeles in London* (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1860), I, pp. 168–9.
- 92 *NYSZ*, 29 March 1851.
- 93 Schurz, *Reminiscences*, I, pp. 371–2.
- 94 'An die Deutschen', dated London, 13 March 1851, leaflet in UL, Bonn, S 2702; reprinted in *NYSZ*, 12 April 1851, and *Neue Preussische [Kreuz] Zeitung*, 86, Berlin, 12 April 1851, 2; without the signatures in *Bremer Tages-Chronik*, 534 (28 March 1851); and in another version in Marx and Engels, 'The Great Men of the Exile', *MECW*, XI, pp. 297–8. Copies were still distributed in 1855 in Magdeburg (police report, Ruge file, Potsdam 12528, ff. 218–19). The provisional committee, elected 1 February, had consisted of Kinkel, Goegg, Willich, d'Ester and Kudlich (Dresden police report, 13 March 1851, Revolutionary loan file, Potsdam 8537, f. 3).
- 95 Schurz to Kinkel, 11 Feb. 1851, in Eberhard Kessel, *Die Briefe von Carl Schurz an Gottfried Kinkel* (Heidelberg: C. Winter Universitätsverlag, 1965), p. 59.
- 96 'An die Deutschen'.
- 97 'An die Deutschen'.
- 98 'Ansprache...1851', Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 280.
- 99 Schurz to Kinkel, 30 March 1851, Kessel, *Briefe*, p. 75 and elsewhere.
- 100 Originally from Silesia (which he regarded as 'Germany's Ireland'), Ernst Haug (or Haugh) was an Austrian lieutenant. He had to resign from the military in 1846 when he was suspected of stealing jewellery from his lover, a rich miller's wife. He then became a writer (note from a military commission in Vienna, 16 December 1850, Haugh file, Potsdam 10427, ff. 18, 20, 41–3). A general of the Roman republic, he remained close to Mazzini, but also to Ruge, Ronge and Herzen. He was later in Constantinople as a correspondent for the *Morning Chronicle*, and on his return to England married a wealthy lady from Holstein (Haug file, Potsdam 10427, ff. 53, 65, and 68). In 1850 he proposed a community of Forty-eighters, laying down as their aim 'the German republic united by democratic and republican laws, by a common representation internally and abroad, by a people's militia, by a social administration of national property, by a common education to civic virtues, based on free congregations'. He added that he wanted 'the family of German peoples to fulfil its mission

- within human progress on the world stage, with its deep soul, with its rich intellectual powers, in philosophy and in activity' (Haugh file, Potsdam 10427, ff. 3–5).
- 101 Struve's report, *NYSZ*, 12 April 1851. The *Northern Star*, 15 March 1851, gives all the resolutions passed; the *Leader*, 15 March 1851, 243, more sympathetic towards the ECDC, suppressed Kinkel's and Franck's speeches. The 'Ansprache...1851', Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 280–1, repeats the scornful refusal of Fränkel (on behalf of the CABV) to join.
- 102 Lewes was a shareholder in the *Leader* (F.B.Smith, *Linton*, p. 94).
- 103 See Schoeps, 'Kosmos'. For previous plans see Marx to Engels, 23 February 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 296.
- 104 For example, an article by Ruge on 'Die englische Gastfreundschaft' in *Kosmos* (see Schoeps, 'Kosmos', pp. 219–20); Marx to Engels, 21 May 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 359–60.
- 105 Marx to Engels, 28 May 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 367–8, 'The Great Men of the Exile' (*MECW*, XI, p. 259), and Marx to Ebner, 15–20 Aug. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 359–60.
- 106 *Kosmos*, 17 May and 14 June 1851. The editor of *Kosmos* persuaded Owen at this meeting to recommend the paper as containing his own principles (Marx to Engels, 21 May 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 360).
- 107 *Kosmos*, no. 3, 21 June 1851, 17.
- 108 Marx to Engels, 21 May 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 359–60; Marx to Weydemeyer, 27 June 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 351.
- 109 Marx to Engels, 22 March 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 321; Struve and Rasch, *Zwölf Streiter*, p. 101.
- 110 Schurz to Kinkel, 15 March 1851, and s.d., in Kessel, *Briefe*, pp. 66, 71–2.
- 111 Schurz to Kinkel, 20 Feb. 1851, 16 March 1851, 30 March 1851, in Kessel, *Briefe*, pp. 62, 69, 75.
- 112 K.S. [Karl Schurz] to friends in Paris, London, 12 April 1851, Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, f. 8.
- 113 Ruge to Freiligrath, 4 July 1851, in Manfred Häckel, ed., *Freiligraths Briefwechsel mit Marx und Engels* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1968), II, p. 28, and Marx and Engels, 13 July 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 385. Among its twenty-odd founders were Tausenau, Sigel, Goegg, Fickler, and Ronge.
- 114 *Leader*, 23 Aug. 1851, 799; the German original was presented to the Prussian police by the spy Bangya and is in Agitation Society file, Potsdam 8531, f. 5a. The anti-Kinkel direction was announced in a Vienna weekly report, 6 Sept. 1851, Agitation Society file, Potsdam 8531, f. 3.
- 115 Rasch and Struve, *Zwölf Streiter*, pp. 160–1.
- 116 Appendix to weekly report from Berlin, end of December 1851, Agitation Society file, Potsdam 8531, f. 11.
- 117 *Leader*, 13 Sept. 1851, 879; *RdA*, 18 Oct. 1851, 209. For Weitling this 'politicalrevolutionary party' was 'bourgeois under the masks of the republic, socialism, free citizenry', who actually despised workers (*RdA*, 11 Oct. 1851, 201).
- 118 Schurz to N.N., London 12 April 1851, Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, f. 9.
- 119 Schurz to N.N., London, 16 April 1851, Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, ff. 10–11.
- 120 Report of the 'agent with the number 100' to Stieber, 27 May 1851, Saegert Papers, B.P.H., Rep. 192, no. 35. Kinkel even pressed the embarrassed police agent to accept a thaler from him.
- 121 H.B.Oppenheim, 'Zur Organisation der Partei' (pamphlet for the Emigration Society), 9 Oct. 1851, Meyen file, Potsdam 11651, f. 150.
- 122 All the circulars of the loan committee, its financial plan and its statutes are reprinted in the most complete, if hostile, summary of the loan project, compiled in April 1852 by the Prussian police: 'Die deutsche RevolutionsAnleihe', *Mittheilungen des Königl. Polizei-*



- Präsidiu zu Berlin zur Beförderung der Sicherheitspflege*, supplements no. 3436–40, in Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, ff. 134–50 (here pp. 1–2, f. 134).
- 123 Kinkel's memorandum, *Mittheilungen des Königl. Polizei-Präsidiu*, no. 3439, p. 1, in Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, f. 146.
- 124 The Emigration Society was joined by Oppenheim, Schurz, Reichenbach, Meyen, Techow, Schimmelpfennig, Haug, Borkheim, Schmolze, Schönemann, Damerow, Gerke, Jülich, and the Communist League members Oswald Dietz and Gebert (*Mittheilungen des Königl. Polizei-Präsidiu*, pp. 1–2, in Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, f. 134).
- 125 Reiter, *Politisches Asyl*, p. 275.
- 126 A 'Central Committee for the Benefit of the Poles' in France had raised four million francs up to 1831. In 1848, German exiles in Switzerland around Struve and Heinzen had distributed 'provisory notes in favour of a German republic' (one of the certificates of this loan is reprinted in Wilhelm Blos, *Die Deutsche Revolution*, Stuttgart, Dietz, 1893, between pp. 408–9). Clearly the model for the new German project, however, was Mazzini's widely supported Italian loan (N.J.Gossman, 'British Aid to Polish, Italian, and Hungarian Exiles, 1830–1870', *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 68 (1969), 231–45). Kossuth worked on a similar scheme, for which he also travelled to the United States. Unlike Mazzini and Kossuth, however, the organisers of the German loan could not claim to have a direct mandate from their people.
- 127 Mehring, *Marx*, p. 219; BGLAK, 236/8757, pp. 33–6.
- 128 Several concrete plans for military intervention emerged in America, where e.g., Hillgärtner on special mission from the Loan's finance committee discussed equipment with arms for the revolutionary army, setting up of depots and conscription lists in Philadelphia. The New York Social Turner Society sent Bernhard Geiger to London to discuss armaments; weapons were allegedly shipped from St Louis to London, where Oppenheim was supervising acquisition of rifles (Report by Greiff, 15 June 1852, Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, ff. 230–1). A lithographed circular by Techow, called 'The Loan and the Military Organisation in America for the German Revolution', dated London, 22 Dec. 1851, listed the future formation of revolutionary army units (Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, f. 53).
- 129 Memorandum, Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, f. 45. The guarantors were to exercise more control over the finances 'in case the German revolution had not begun by 1 June 1852' (Reichenbach and Willich to 'Citizens!', 9 Oct. 1851, lithographed circular, Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, f. 34).
- 130 'In order to be *chief* of the party, you only need to tell people now that you are still existing as a *man* of the party in old strength... For your name is indeed the only central point' (Schurz to Kinkel, 11 Feb. 1851, Kessel, *Briefe*, p. 60).
- 131 Marx and Engels, 'The Great Men of the Exile', *MECW*, XI, pp. 302–4.
- 132 *NYSZ*, 10 May 1851.
- 133 Schimmelpfennig to N.N., 4 Sept. 1851, UL, Bonn, S 2675.
- 134 Schurz to Kinkel, 21 October 1851, Kessel, *Briefe*, p. 89.
- 135 For the dangerous trips of these emissaries see Schurz, *Reminiscences*, I, pp. 378–9. One of the agents was Ernst Haug, who used an English passport to tour Germany under the eyes of the Prussian and Austrian police, whose reports followed his movements with a few days' delay but who failed to arrest him. See Knaack, 'Die Überwachung der politischen Emigration', pp. 171–5, and the weekly reports of the Berlin police (e.g., 12 Oct. 1852, no. 56, BGLAK, 236/8743).
- 136 J.Kinkel to K.Zitz, 25 Sept. 1851, with a circular signed by Kinkel, Reichenbach, Meyen, Oppenheim, Haug and Schmolze, Stadtarchiv Mainz, K.Zitz Papers.
- 137 E.Meyen, circular on 'The German Loan', 9 Oct. 1851, repr. in *Mittheilungen des Königl. Polizei-Präsidiu*, p. 2, in Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, f. 138. Pamphlets of the Emigration Society written and distributed by Meyen are in Meyen file, Potsdam 11651, ff.

- 147–51. Biographical notes on Meyen are in Gamby, ed., *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 525–7.
- 138 *RdA*, 22 Nov. 1851, 250. The Emigration Society's and Kinkel's own glowing reports are reprinted in *Mittheilungen des Königl. Polizei-Präsidii*, no. 3438, pp. 1–8, and no. 3439, pp. 1–5, in Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, ff. 142–8. For his reception in St Louis see Heinrich Börnstein; *Fünfundsiebzig Jahre in der Alien und Neuen Welt* (Leipzig: Otto Wigand, 1884), II, pp. 124–37. See also Reiter, *Politisches Asyl*, pp. 309–26.
- 139 Kinkel's correspondence in the *NYSZ*, 13 Sept. 1851.
- 140 *RdA*, 22 Nov. 1851, 252–3, similarly in *RdA*, 29 Nov. 1851, 262.
- 141 The Marxists took some time before establishing their position on the Loan. Adolph Cluss was involved in the Loan project, where he acted more or less as Marx's spy (Cluss to Weydemeyer, 20 Dec. 1851, in *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 634, n.508). Weydemeyer criticised the Loan as voluntaristic: 'It is the movements of trade and industry which create the revolutionary situation... But revolutions cannot be "made" at all... The peoples of Europe would indeed be in sad shape if their fate could be decided by a few dollars collected by begging' (*Turn-Zeitung*, 1 March 1852). Karl Obermann (*Joseph Weydemeyer*, New York: International Publishers, 1947, pp. 34–5, 46) almost implies that the downfall of the German-American labour movement resulted from the Loan campaign.
- 142 'An Joseph Weydemeyer. London, den 16. Januar 1852', in Rudolph von Gottschall, ed., *Ferdinand Freiligraths Sämtliche Werke* (Hamburg, Hansa, n.d.), I, pp. 264–6; *MEGA*, I/11, pp. 784–90. See my 'Ferdinand Freiligrath in London', 112–14.
- 143 Goegg (in the Baden Provisional Government in June 1849) co-founded a democratic 'Alliance des peuples' in Paris in the winter of 1849–1850, which published a weekly paper and printed brochures on the fraternal alliance between the French and German peoples and on revolutionary martyrs ([Amand Goegg], *Nachträgliche authentische Aufschlüsse über die Badische Revolution von 1849*, New York: Commissions-Verlag S.Zickel, 1876, pp. 1–2). On his American tour and subsequent plans for a republican journal in Switzerland see police report of 5 April 1853, Revolutionary party file, Potsdam 13835, f. 110. Biographical notes and a description are in a letter by the Baden police to the Police President in Berlin, 7 Sept. 1852, Goegg file, Potsdam 10083/1, ff. 17–18. In 1867, he became one of the leaders of the International Peace and Freedom League, heading the paper *Die Vereinigten Staaten Europas* (obituary in *Vossische Zeitung*, 22 July 1897, in Goegg file, Potsdam 10083/1, f. 36).
- 144 Marx to Engels, 16 May 1851, 13 July 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 356, 385.
- 145 Spy report, 5 April 1853, Revolutionary party file, Potsdam 13835, ff. 109–10.
- 146 Kessel, *Briefe*, p. 78. Goegg's emissaries were recorded in the weekly Berlin police reports, BGLAK, 236/8743 (e.g., 1 October 1852).
- 147 Marx to Freiligrath, 27 Dec. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 520.
- 148 In fact, the central demand of many American supporters remained the complete co-operation of all revolutionary groups of all nations (Report by Greiff, 15 June 1852, Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, ff. 232–3). For the various fund-raising tours see Sabine Freitag, 'Begging bowl of revolution', in Sabine Freitag, ed., *Exiles from European Revolution: Refugees in MidVictorian England* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2003), pp. 164–86.
- 149 Stuttgart *Beobachter* of 10 Aug. 1851, quoted in Balsler, *Sozial-Demokratie 1848/49–1863*, p. 555.
- 150 Kessel, *Briefe*, pp. 79, 94–5 (Schurz to Kinkel, 10 Oct. and 12 Dec. 1851).
- 151 *TZ*, 4 (15 Jan. 1852).
- 152 Marx and Engels, 'The Great Men of the Exile', *MECW*, XI, p. 259.
- 153 Weydemeyer to Marx, 6 Feb. 1852, in Kurt Koszyk and Karl Obermann, eds., *Zeitgenossen von Marx und Engels. Ausgewählte Briefe 1844–1852* (Amsterdam, Van Gorcum, 1975), p. 443; Börnstein, *Fünfundsiebzig Jahre*, II, pp. 146–51.

- 154 Marx and Engels, 'The Great Men of the Exile', *MECW*, XI, pp. 259, 311. This view has been followed by most Marxist historians. Arthur Rosenberg thus even spoke of 'Kinkel-Ruge' in the singular (*Demokratie und Sozialismus*, pp. 130–2).
- 155 Schurz, *Reminiscences*, p. 371.
- 156 Oswald, *Reminiscences*, p. 247.
- 157 Undated police report, *Einige Worte über hervorragende Persönlichkeiten des Agitationsvereins* (Goegg file, Potsdam 10083/1, ff. 12–13). Reiter (*Politisches Asyl*, pp. 278–82) describes their differences mainly in terms of organisational variations, while Sundermann (*Deutscher Nationalisms*, p. 44) describes their aims as confusingly alike.
- 158 Kinkel to Ruge, 7 May 1861, Nerrlich, *Ruge*, p. 209.
- 159 Otto Lüning to Johann Günther, 7 Jan. 1852, in Koszyk and Obermann, *Zeitgenossen*, pp. 434–5. See also Marx and Engels, 'The Great Men of the Exile', *MECW*, XI, p. 316. Sigel was a general in the Baden revolutionary campaign and later in the American civil war.
- 160 Appendix to weekly report from Berlin, end of December 1851, Agitation Society file, Potsdam 8531, ff. 11–13.
- 161 Engels to Marx, 23 May 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 362.
- 162 Anon. report, London, 23 Aug. 1851, Agitation Society file, Potsdam 8531, f. 7.
- 163 [Paul] Harro-Harring, *Anhang zum historischen Fragment über die Entstehung der Arbeiter-Vereine und ihren Verfall in Communistische Speculationen* (C.Deutsch, 1852), pp. 2–3. On Harro-Harring see Marx's 'Great Men of the Exile', *MECW*, XI, pp. 284–90, Gamby, ed., *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 550–4, and Walter Grab, *Radikale Lebensläufe* (Berlin: Verlag Asthetik und Kommunikation, 1980), pp. 159–76.
- 164 O.Lüning to J.Günther, 7 Jan. 1852, in Koszyk and Obermann, *Zeitgenossen*, p. 436.
- 165 Discussions of 16 May and 12 July 1852, Demokratischer Verein, Potsdam 9529, ff. 16, 29, where in particular Tuczeck warned against thwarting the character of a revolution by premature provocation, while Schröder and others argued in favour of collecting monies and arms to be prepared for an outbreak.
- 166 I have nowhere argued for a 'new dimension' of the squabbles between the Emigration and Agitation Societies, as Reiter (*Politisches Asyl*, p. 286) misinterprets my comments on the disagreements between democrats and socialists, the latter of which he does not treat in his volume.
- 167 Schurz, *Reminiscences*, p. 378. Schurz put Kinkel's collection at 'a few thousand dollars', while a spy reported that by October 1852 only £1,587/6/4 had been gathered, and £584/18/5 spent on expenses (BGLAK, 236/8757, p. 35).
- 168 Report on the London meeting of 20 to 25 German guarantors, 29–30 April 1852, in Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, ff. 84–5, 106–14.
- 169 Report on meeting of the Emigration Society of 4 June 1852, Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, f. 225.
- 170 Reichenbach, who was in conjunction with Willich and Kinkel authorised to dispose of the '*Nibelungenhort der Emigration*,' favoured its return to the original donors, since the sum necessary to finalise the Loan had not been reached. To decide on this, two guarantors' congresses met in April and August 1852 (BGLAK, 236/8757, pp. 4–5, 8–9). Kinkel, Willich and Goegg agreed on a 'union treaty' on 11 August 1852, which was consented to by both the guarantors of the National Loan and the American 'Revolutionary League' at a congress in Wheeling in September (*RdA*, 11 Sept. 1852, 290, and 27 Nov. 1852, 382–3). But as treasurer of the original National Loan Committee, Reichenbach refused to hand over the money (BGLAK, 236/8757, pp. 31 ff; see also Kessel, *Briefe*, p. 38). The remaining guarantors, Kinkel, Willich, Reichenbach, Schärttner and Löwe, on 11 January 1853, decided to deposit the money in a London bank (Minutes of the negotiations are in 'To the Guarantors and Committees of the German National Loan', *RdA*, 19 Feb. 1853, 61). Other guarantors declared their own role as finished (open letter by Reichenbach, London, 13 Jan. 1853, to loan guarantors and committees, Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, f.257). In

the following years, Kinkel rebuffed repeated attempts to draw on the fund (e.g., in a war scare in 1854, see Dresden police to Hinckeldey, 10 Jan. 1854, Revolutionary party file, Potsdam 13835, f. 137; or when Willich proposed to support Garibaldi in 1860, see Gamby, ed., *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 572–5). In 1858, however, Karl Blind's nationalist democratic pamphlets were subsidised (Kinkel to Blind, 4 May 1858, British Library Add. MSS. 40124, II, fol. 43, Blind MSS.). The funds were finally handed over in toto, ironically, to August Ladendorff and Kinkel's old enemy Goegg, who used it for agitation, partly in support of August Bebel and the Social Democratic Party (Kessel, *Briefe*, p. 41).

171 Two members declared the dissolution of the Agitation Union at the congress in Philadelphia in January 1852 (Kinkel's memorandum, 5 Feb. 1852, repr. in *Mitteilungen des Polizei-Präsidentii*, 110, 3439, p. 3, Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, f. 147). By April, however, the Agitation Union was still meeting in London (Greiff's report, London 30 April 1852, Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, f. 80).

172 Porter, *The Refugee Question*, pp. 160–1.

173 *RdA*, 17 April 1852, 121.

## 5

### The Sonderbund, I: the Willich-Schapper League at its zenith, 1850–1851

1 Engels merely stated that the Sonderbund expired a few months after Marx and Engels' League ('History of the Communist League', in Livingstone, *The Cologne Communist Trial*, pp. 54–5). This deliberate ignoring of the Sonderbund has since been perpetuated in Marxist historiography. The otherwise thorough edition of Communist League documents uses the Sonderbund only to illustrate the history of Marx's League (e.g., *BdK*, II, p. 718). Martin Hundt's history of the Communist League is weakest in his analysis of Willich's ideas and merely echoes Marx and Engels' condemnation of this 'war communism' as 'primitive' and 'fundamentally inhuman and barbarous' (*Geschichte*, pp. 650–2, generally pp. 641–57, 660–71).

2 Marx et al. in the *Morning Advertiser*, 20 Nov. 1852, *BdK*, III, p. 236; Marx, 'Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne', *MECW*, XI, pp. 401–3.

3 Marx to Engels, 28 Oct. 1852, *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 223. 'Ansprache...1851', Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 275, claims 60 members in four groups.

4 Engels wrote in a revealing paragraph: 'At long last we again have the opportunity...to show that we need neither popularity, nor the support of any party in any country, and that our position is completely independent of such ludicrous trifles...haven't we been acting for years as though Cherethites and Plethites were our party when, in fact, we had no party, and when the people whom we considered as belonging to our party...didn't even understand the rudiments of our stuff?... Truly, it is no loss if we are no longer held to be the "right and adequate expression" of the ignorant curs with whom we have been thrown together over the past few years' (to Marx, 13 Feb. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 289–90).

5 On Marx's League under its Cologne Central Authority see Dowe, *Aktion und Organisation*, pp. 250–82, and Hundt, *Geschichte*, pp. 659–767.

6 Since Wolfgang Schieder deplored the absence of a study of the Willich-Schapper League in 1966 ('Bund der Kommunisten', col. 907), little progress has been made, and no League historian has yet integrated the extensive records on Willich's League in the Potsdam archive. Tenfelde also notes this major gap ('Wege zur Sozialgeschichte', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, special issue 4, 223).

7 *MECW*, X, p. 533.

8 Marx to Engels, 23 Nov. 1850, 2 Dec. 1850, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 243, 245.

- 9 Dietz's accusations against Bauer and Pfänder appeared in Basel and Hannover, and claimed that the two had joined Marx and Engels 'in order to steal £16 from the workers' society' ('Ansprache... 1851', Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 276). The question of the trustees' money again worried Marx and Engels after Conrad Schramm's arrest in late 1851 (Engels to Marx, 15 Oct. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 477), and more statements were issued in January 1852 by Pfänder and Pieper (*MEGA*, 1/10, pp. 1010–1, and 1012–3; Marx and Engels, 'Entwurf einer Erklärung Bauers und Pfänders über Gelder des Arbeiterbildungsvereins in London', *MEGA*, 1/10, pp. 489–90). The CABV debated this on 21 and 28 Jan. 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, ff. 5, 9.
- 10 'Ansprache', Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 270. Also expelled were Schramm, Wolff, Seiler, Liebknecht, Pieper, Pfänder, Bauer and Eccarius.
- 11 By late 1852 he had quarrelled with Willich about payments. Nonetheless he was condemned in absentia in 1857 to eight years. His 'Hotel Germania' in Long Acre was sold in late 1858, and shortly afterwards (22 Feb. 1859) Schärttner died 'of homesickness' (Wermuth/Stieber, II, p. 108; Paul Mess, 'August Schärttner: Der Turnerführer von 1848', *Deutsches Turnen*, no. 9, 3 May 1952, 5–6; Karl Geisel, *Die Hanauer Turnerwehr*, Marburg: N.G.Elwert, 1974, pp. 274–7, 366–8, includes letters during the campaign showing his impatience and hope for the 'deed'; *Kosmos*, no. 1, 17 May 1851; *Neue Zeit*, no. 20, 6 Nov. 1851).
- 12 Theodor Fontane, *Wanderungen durch England und Schottland* (Berlin: Verlag der Nation, n.d. [1981]), I, p. 162.
- 13 Dietz to Hertter, 8 June 1849, *BdK*, I, pp. 956, 1114; II, pp. 633–4; Marx, 'Revelations', *MECW*, XI, pp. 403–7. He moved to America in 1852 (Marx to Engels, 6 Aug. 1852, *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 151).
- 14 *BdK*, I, p. 763; Gebert to Engels, 21 Dec. 1848, *BdK*, I, pp. 886–8.
- 15 Gebert to Reininger, 28 April 1850, *BdK*, II, p. 170; *FP*, 19 April 1851. From July 1852 on he toured northern Germany—under constant police observation—as an emissary from Willich and Kinkel, and assembled two dozen people in a communist group in Magdeburg (BGLAK, 236/8743, weekly report from Berlin, 12 Oct. 1852, no. 47; Marx to Cluss, 3 Sept. 1852, *BdK*, III, p. 182). Police reports cited him as the author of an apocryphal manifesto by 'the Central Committee in London' to the German workers (BGLAK, 236/8743, weekly report from Berlin, 10 Nov. 1852, no. 11). In the 1860s, Gebert donated money to strike funds from Paris (*BdK*, II, pp. 568–9).
- 16 'Ansprache', Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 267, 270.
- 17 Willich 'Doctor Karl Marx und seine Enthüllungen', *NYCZ*, 4 Nov. 1853, 339. Even worse, Willich accused Marx of deliberately introducing personal squabbles to demoralise the communist party because it had become too strong a force to remain Marx's exclusive personal property ('Doctor Karl Marx', *NYCZ*, 28 Oct. 1853, 330).
- 18 'Ansprache', Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 266–7, 270.
- 19 *BdK*, II, n. 467.
- 20 'Die revidirten Londoner Statuten vom 10 Novbr. 1850', Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 244–7. The next quarterly address of the Londoners, issued in January 1851 and dealing mainly with the Cologne faction, must be regarded as lost (*Auszüge aus den... Papieren des communistischen Complots*, n.p., n.d., p. 20).
- 21 Little in the document indicates a return to the style of secret societies. But the League still claimed the right to impose unspecified sentences in cases of 'crimes against the League' and kept the customary code names. Both these rules were dropped by the Cologners (*BdK*, II, pp. 331–4).
- 22 Both manifestoes appeared originally in French. In place of the Central Authority members Fränkel and Lehmann, who did not play prominent roles in the Willich-Schapper League after the split, 'Aux démocrates de toutes les nations!' was also signed by Adolphe Mayer (or Majer). He and his co-signatories, Dietz, Gebert and Schärttner, became increasingly important in the League, but here figured merely as representatives of the CABV and the

- German Social Democratic Refugees' Committee (London, 10 Nov. 1850, printed leaflet in Dietz file, Potsdam 11373, f. 42; English translation, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 247–8). 'Démocrates, Prenez Garde a Vous!', dated 3 Dec. 1850, had the same German signatories, originated among the Blanquists around Barthelémy, and was also signed by other refugees. A copy of the one-page leaflet is in Dietz file, Potsdam 11373, f. 41.
- 23 *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 248, emphasis added by Marx. According to Engels, himself at the time busily studying military science, most of the armies were mistakenly counted over twice (Engels to Marx, 17 Dec. 1850, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 254). In the same conflict, members of Marx's League distributed leaflets against the 'idiotic patriotism' used to exploit the population (*BdK*, II, pp. 312–15).
- 24 The *Hamburger Nachrichten* (no. 51, 28 Feb. 1851, 1) praised Willich as a 'spartan' and 'honourable' soldier, adding: 'In general one can see that the revolutionary masses are gradually imbued with the recognition that the revolution is helped very little by all the writers, priests, intellectuals and speakers; one should chat and write less, but march and fight much; he who is the best fighter is the best man. This changed mood, too, contributed to tipping the balance in favour of the soldier Willich over the doctrinarian Marx among the London fugitives.'
- 25 These years were the only time in German history when a palpable portion of officers were susceptible to revolutionary propaganda. Many leading Forty-eighters came from the (mostly Prussian) military, such as von Techow, von Schimmelpfennig, von Willich, Weydemeyer and Sigel, and retained a life-long military disposition, which in many cases led them to fight for the North during the American Civil War.
- 26 'Ansprache... 1851', Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 271–82. This must have been written in early May, as it referred to plans for the *Kosmos* and for the national loan. The 'Ansprache' did not survive completely, but parts were published in *RdA*, no. 19 (23 Aug. 1851), 146–7, no. 20 (30 Aug. 1851), 154–5, no. 21 (6 Sept. 1851), 162–3 (reprinted in *BdK*, III, pp. 462–73). The League's circles in France similarly saw revolution in terms of a military putsch with subsequent dictatorship, 'surrounded by a committee of the most revolutionary workers', while Reininger specified that 'the country will be kept in a state of emergency by the proletarian army... A dictator for Germany will be elected by the French proletarians' (debates in Paris, January-February 1851, in Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 82–3).
- 27 'Ansprache... 1851', Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 271–2.
- 28 Willich to Schimmelpfennig, 17 April 1851, Saegert Papers, Geh. Pr. St. A., Dahlem, Rep. 192, B.P.H., Nr. 35.
- 29 'Ansprache... 1851', Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 273. Both the Democratic Society and the CABV debated the function of standing armies after the revolution (1 July 1852, Demokratischer Verein, Potsdam 9529, f. 26; CABV, 22 Feb. 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 19).
- 30 Willich to Becker, 6 Dec. 1850, IISG, ME, O 25, copy by Becker. The Cologne League also issued a leaflet on the conflict, exhorting the *Landwehr* not to aid in a possible attack on France (*BdK*, II, pp. 312–15). Willich claimed that his plans were supported by all the militia officers he spoke to ('Doctor Karl Marx', *NYCZ*, 28 Oct. 1853, 330).
- 31 Willich to Becker, 6 Dec. 1850, 24 Dec. 1850, IISG, ME, O 25–6, copies by Becker. The Central Authority later incorporated many of these proposals into its list of measures to be taken during the next revolution.
- 32 Willich to Becker, 24 Dec. 1850, IISG, O 26, Becker's copy.
- 33 During the American Civil War Willich was known to 'put his troops at ease, address them as "citizens", and proceed to a lecture on socialism' (Easton, *Hegel's First American Followers*, p. 195).
- 34 Willich to Becker, 24 Dec. 1850, IISG, O 26, Becker's copy.
- 35 Hermann Becker to Marx, 27 Jan. 1851, *BdK*, II, pp. 368–9. Marx was not beyond attempting to get more such letters out of Willich. In what the editors of *BdK* politely term a

- 'ruse of war', he asked Schramm to fake an answer (pretending that it had been written by Becker) and to entice Willich into further elaborations, which Marx planned to publish (*BdK*, II, pp. 727–9). Willich claimed that Becker had 'lied shamelessly about the letters. At first I wrote him nothing more than the plan of a revolutionary organisation of the *Landwehr*, without further additions. Thereupon he wrote me an extensive letter... which I answered. Beyond that he does not possess a single line from me.' (Willich to Schimmelpfennig, 17 April 1851, Saegert Papers, B.P.H., Rep. 192, no. 35).
- 36 'Ansprache... 1851', Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 273–5, 280–1. Willich rejected petty bourgeois 'hobbies' such as storehouses or educational institutes, since the communist party did not want to improve current conditions (debate in the CABV, 9 May 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 41), and neither universal suffrage nor transitional periods could introduce communism (CABV, 20 June 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 64).
- 37 Willich 'Doctor Karl Marx', *NYCZ*, 4 Nov. 1853, 339.
- 38 Dronke explained Willich's strength in Switzerland with Blanqui's popularity there (to Marx, 7 Feb. 1851, *BdK*, II, p. 373). Moses Hess's brochures of the period reflect a chiliastic view of revolution as world war close to Willich's views. See 'Rother Katechismus für das deutsche Volk', in Wolfgang Mönke, ed., *Moses Heß: Philosophische und sozialistische Schriften, 1837–1850* (Berlin: Akademie, 1980), pp. 445–57, [Eduard Bernstein, ed.], 'Das jüngste Gericht über die alte sociale Welt. Eine verschollene Schrift von Moses Hess', *Documente des Socialismus*, I (Berlin: 1902), pp. 533–52, and Shlomo Na'aman, *Emanzipation und Messianismus: Leben und Werk des Moses Heß* (Frankfurt: Campus, 1982), pp. 239–50. Hess's 'Red Catechism' was discussed in Willich's League (15 September 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 109), although Willich denied ever having seen it in London ('Doctor Karl Marx', *NYCZ*, 4 Nov. 1853, 339). The Berlin police intercepted reports of his Geneva League circle (Moses Hess file, Potsdam 10464, ff. 8a and 11). In 1848–1849 Willich and Gebert sympathised with Hess's, Ewerbeck's and Scherzer's agitation against Marx's dominance in the League (Gebert to Engels, 21 Dec. 1848, *BdK*, I, pp. 886–8).
- 39 Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 78–102; Eckert, 'Fraktion Willich-Schapper', 282–317; *RdA*, Feb. 1851, 28 (correspondence from Paris dated 2 Jan. 1851). The Parisian group became formally linked to the London communists only after the split of the League (*RdA*, 17 July 1852, 227, Willich's letter dated 9 June 1852). They approached French factory and mine workers 'as our League has stopped existing through the Germans alone' (Reininger, Scherzer and Cherval to Gipperich, Paris, 14 May 1851, copy in Gipperich file, Potsdam 10084/1, f. 14).
- 40 Hans-Norbert Lahme, 'Niels Lorents Petersen: Eine Skizze seines Lebens in der Arbeiterbewegung', *IRSH*, 29 (1984), 188–90.
- 41 *RdA*, 7 June 1851, 62 ('Programm der Gleichen'); 23 Aug. 1851, 146–7, 30 Aug. 1851, 154–5, 6 Sept. 1851, 162–3 ('Die Centralbehörde des B.d.C. an den leitenden Kreis'); 29 Nov. 1851, 262. Most League members in America, however, disapproved of Weitling's associations (League meeting, 10 July 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 100).
- 42 Röser's statement, *BdK*, I, pp. 969–71, II, pp. 456–7.
- 43 Rothacker to Marx, c. July/Aug. 1850, *BdK*, II, pp. 243–4.
- 44 Röser's evidence, *BdK*, II, p. 457. Shlomo Na'aman ('Zur Geschichte des Bundes der Kommunisten in der zweiten Phase seines Bestehens', *AfS*, 5, 1965, 57) considers the possibility of a dissenting pro-Willich faction in Cologne. The circular issued from Cologne in December 1850 indicates at least less than totally enthusiastic support of Marx's policy (*BdK*, II, p. 325). Dowe found support for Willich only in Mainz and Bonn (*Aktion und Organisation*, pp. 278–9). Reinecke, a locksmith from Cologne, escaped with the League's cash of some 500 thalers and claimed that they had never placed much trust in Marx (Scherzer et al. to Reinecke and Müller, 1 Sept. 1851, and Cherval et al. to Gipperich, 1 Sept. 1851, and to the Strasbourg group, 31 Aug. 1851, in *Auszüge aus den... Papieren*, pp. 29,

- 40–2, 46). At the time of their congress, the London Central Authority again approached Cologne, but indirectly via Paris and Gipperich ([Rödel] to [Gipperich], London, 19 July 1851, and Cherval et al. to the group in Valenciennes, 20 July 1851, *Auszüge aus den... Papieren*, pp. 53, 55). On arriving in London from Cologne in 1852, the tailor Grozinski went straight to Willich and, apparently expecting some sympathy with this view, warned his friends at home against Marx (Julius Grozinski to friends in Cologne, 1 Sept. 1852, Revolutionary party file, Potsdam 13835, f. 123). The police, however, concluded even after the arrests that Marx's group 'much outweighs the influence of any other organisation' in the Rhineland (Greiff's report, London 30 April 1852, Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, f. 80).
- 45 See Rudolf Herrstadt, *Die erste Verschwörung gegen das Internationale Proletariat: Zur Geschichte des Kölner Kommunistenprozeß 1852* (Berlin: Rütten & Loening, 1958), p. 166. The police noted Willich's connections in Mainz, Braunschweig, Hannover, Hamburg and Frankfurt, and that Feise from Hannover acted as their go-between (Notes to report, dated Paris, 28 Aug. 1851, Saegert Papers, B.P.H., Rep. 192, no. 37).
- 46 Alexander Schimmelpfennig von der Oye (1824–1865), a Prussian lieutenant turned republican in 1848, fought in the Schleswig-Holstein and Baden campaigns, and joined the 'Revolutionary Centralisation' in Switzerland and a Paris committee with Amand Goegg. He was close to Willich and Kinkel, but defended Baroness von Bruiningk, in whose salon he was a regular, against their accusations, and after her death inherited £1,000. In London he married Sophie von Glümer. Emigrating to America in 1853, he became a military engineer in the War Department and later a Civil War general, commanding in the Second Battle of Bull Run and, injured, spent the last two days of the most celebrated battle of the war hiding in a pig-sty in Gettysburg (Wermuth/Stieber, II, p. 111; Marx to Cluss, 25 March 1852, *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 300; A.C.Raphelson, 'Alexander Schimmelpfennig' [sic!], *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 87 (1963), 156–81).
- 47 Willich's and Schimmelpfennig's proclamation, dated Jan. 1851, partly in Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 129–30 (excerpts in the *New Yorker Criminal-Zeitung*, 5 Nov. 1852, 7–8, which attributed it to Schimmelpfennig alone). To dissuade Schimmelpfennig from the loan project and his approaches to Prussian officers, the Cologners read him Willich's notorious letters to Becker, but with little success, since Schimmelpfennig then asked Willich how to respond (*BdK*, II, p. 482; Willich to Schimmelpfennig, 17 April 1851, Saegert Papers, B.P.H., Rep. 192, No. 35).
- 48 Na'aman, 'Zweite Phase', 57. Frankfurt, Hamburg, Koblenz, and Leipzig sided with Cologne in the spring of 1851 (Hundt, *Geschichte*, pp. 722–30).
- 49 A former member of the League of the Banished and of the League of the Germans in Paris before 1840, he had already been arrested, but was released because of psychological disorders. In 1848 he helped found a Hannover workers' society and the *Arbeiterverbrüderung*, and was elected town councillor. He represented the workers' associations of the Hannover area at the congress of the *Arbeiterverbrüderung* in Leipzig in February 1850 (Balsler, *SozialDemokratie*, I, pp. 170–1; Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 311, II, pp. 124–5; Schlechte, ed., *Die Allgemeine Deutsche Arbeiterverbrüderung*, pp. 30–1; von Berg, *Entstehung und Tätigkeit der Norddeutschen Arbeitervereinigung*, esp. pp. 155–75; *BdK*, II, pp. 695–6, n.515; Na'aman, 'Zweite Phase', 59–67).
- 50 Stechan to contributors, n.p., n.d. (c. March 1851), Dietz file, Potsdam 11373, ff. 45a–46. Stechan echoed the Londoners in attacking social democratic intellectuals, who 'only want to reign and guide the working classes': The doctor feeling is stuck as firmly in these curs as the *von* in the nobility, as the self-conceit in the master artisan, as contempt of the country-bumpkin journeyman in the guild-cads of the towns' (Stechan to members of the Willich-Schapper group, 24 March 1851, quoted in Na'aman, 'Zweite Phase', 64). H.Geiling describes the *Arbeiterhalle* as representing neither League faction ('Zur Verarbeitung der



- politischen Niederlage von 1848: Die "Deutsche Arbeiterhalle", *Hannoversche Geschichtsblätter*, 39 (1985), 173).
- 51 Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 149, minutes of 18 April 1851. On 10 June Stechan was still waiting for an answer from London about the congress (p. 150). Perhaps it was this typical inefficiency which subsequently made Stechan disillusioned with Willich. In mid-June the *Arbeiterhalle* sided with Marx against Heinzen and Kinkel (*BdK*, III, pp. 30–1).
- 52 Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 149–52. Eckert, 'Fraktion Willich-Schapper', 305–13, reprints some correspondence between Braunschweig and Paris. The Braunschweigers' plan to donate 2,000 thalers via Schimmelpfennig for Willich's refugee committee was thwarted by the Cologne group (Marx to Engels, 21 May 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 359).
- 53 Karl Gangloff of the *Arbeiterverbrüderung* in Leipzig had joined the Willich-Schapper faction; Hamburg and Hannover were in contact with the Leipzig group, who in late 1850 also distributed a leaflet published by the Cologne Central Authority (*BdK*, II, pp. 486–7, 437, 316).
- 54 Schunk to Oswald Tietz [sic!], 20 and 26 Oct. 1851, cited in Wolf, 'Kollbeck', in Bleiber et al., *Manner der Revolution*, II, p. 124.
- 55 O.Berthold to Schapper, Hamburg, 14 Jan. 1851, Dietz file, Potsdam 11373, f. 8; Starke to N.N. in Hamburg, 25 Sept. 1851, Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 122–7; Haupt on conditions in Hamburg, *BdK*, II, pp. 338–42, 348. Martens and Bruhn seem to have favoured Schapper (Cologne Central Authority to London, 10 Dec. 1850, *BdK*, II, pp. 344–5, and Röser in *BdK*, II, p. 489).
- 56 Dronke in Zürich to the London Central Authority, 3 July 1850, *BdK*, II, pp. 221–2; Röser and Burgers *BdK*, II, pp. 472, 488. For transferral of money to London see Dietz file, Potsdam 11373, ff. 7–8.
- 57 Weydemeyer to Marx, 13 Oct. 1850, *BdK*, II, p. 295 (see also pp. 635–6); Herrstadt, *Kommunistenprozeß*, pp. 166–7; Balsler, *Sozial-Demokratie*, p. 234. Hinckeldey, the Berlin police president, listed Mainz, Wiesbaden, Braunschweig and Hannover as siding with London (Gipperich file, Potsdam 10084/1, f. 11).
- 58 Gebert's report, (?) July 1852, minutes of League meetings, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, ff. 96–7.
- 59 Eckert, 'Fraktion Willich-Schapper', 310–3.
- 60 *Statuten des Londoner deutschen Arbeiter-Vereins* (Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, ff. 111–12) gave the addresses as '20, Gt. Windmill St., Haymarket'; City section: '55 Dorset St., Salisbury Sq., City'; Whitechapel section: '52 Leman Street, corner of Prescott Street'. Grandjonec, König and Roy-Jacquemart (eds., *Statuten des 'Communistischen Arbeiter-Bildungs-Vereins'*, p. 10) date this to 1850 and give a Germanised spelling of 'Lehman-street', probably added by the Berlin police official who copied it from papers seized at Lessner's arrest on 18 June 1851. These statutes remained in force at least until 1859 (police note of 26 Sept. 1859, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 118).
- 61 *FP*, 19 April 1851, 166; Marx to Engels, 3 May 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 343.
- 62 'Bericht des Agenten 0 an den Polizeirath Stieber über die am 27t Mai Abends stattgehabte General-Versammlung der Arbeiter-Vereine in London', Saegert Papers, B.P.H., Rep. 192, Nr. 35. This information was passed on to Baden (supplement to Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Carlsruhe, 17 June 1851, BGLAK, 49/1021).
- 63 Anonymous letter from London, 9 July 1851, Gipperich file, Potsdam 10084/1, f. 15.
- 64 Starke in London to N.N., 25 Sept. 1851, in Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 124.
- 65 A Weitlingian group for example may have rejoined, who had earlier seceded to form their own society because the CABV under Marx's influence had not accepted their affiliation (*RdA*, Oct. 1850, 151, letter by Th. Sch.', dated London 14 Aug. 1850).
- 66 The Prussian *Polizeirath* Stieber thought that this was how German workers were 'lured' into the society (Stieber to Hinckeldey, n.d. [May 1851], in Saegert Papers, B.P.H., Rep. 192, no. 35).

- 67 Willich, Schapper and Dietz signed an appeal by the committee in May 1851, and Willich inserted an urgent call for financial help in the *Kosmos* (Willich, Schapper and Dietz for the refugee committee, 7 May 1851, Wermuth/Stieber, II, p. 138, Willich to the editors, 10 March 1851, *Kosmos*, no. 1 (17 May 1851)).
- 68 Liebknecht, *Erinnerungen*, pp. 209–16. Marx's follower Haupt complained: 'Life in these barracks, with their concentrated filth, roughness and ignorance, naturally was pure hell for the educated refugees...with dinner I and some others had to bear the mockery of the other inhabitants, who were mostly artisans and who decried as aristocrats etc. those of us who lived occasionally in private accommodation or inns... Everything was communal: dirt, laziness, and stupidity' (*BdK*, II, pp. 495–6). In the Besançon Brigade Willich had also been criticised as 'a spiritual aristocrat and despot' (Marx, 'Herr Vogt', *MECW*, XVII, p. 83). Dronke added a twist in claiming that Willich enjoyed 'barracks' because he allegedly slept with young men (*MEGA*, 1/12, pp. 1076–80). Similar 'barracks' had been established on the basis of strict equality by democrats of all nations, housing 97 in Turnmill Street (*NS*, 17 and 31 May 1851), and in 1836 some 30 German refugees had set up a community in Whitechapel (Jäger, *Der Deutsche in London*, I, pp. 155–7).
- 69 Of £72 9s 10d received, £58 11s. were spent on the barracks between 1 Dec. 1850 and the end of Feb. 1851 (accounts, Dietz file, Potsdam 11373, f. 50). The *Kosmos* extolled its achievements as having 'prevented many a suicide... it housed all men of action except those who resisted [only] peacefully' (*Kosmos*, no. 1 (17 May 1851)). The last qualification was particularly telling: Willich meant to include only active guerrilla fighters, not parliamentarians or journalists.
- 70 Willich still lived there in June, but by July, dissension had set in and it was decided to abandon the 'barracks' (Engels to Weydemeyer, 19 June 1851, Marx to Engels, 13 July 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 373, 384–5).
- 71 Marx to Engels, 13 July 1851, Engels to Weydemeyer, 7 Aug. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 385, 407.
- 72 Drawing by Karl Heinrich Schmolze, reproduced in Rösch-Sondermann, *Gottfried Kinkel*, plate 14.
- 73 Theodor Fontane, *Bilderbuch aus England* (Berlin: G.Grote'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1938), pp. 50–1 (diary notes of 23 April [1852]). A more positive description was given in Oswald, *Reminiscences*, p. 244.
- 74 Fontane, *Wanderungen*, I, p. 141 (letter to his mother, 29 April 1852), 160–1.
- 75 Fontane, *Wanderungen*, I, p. 162.
- 76 Advertisements for both pubs are in *Kosmos*, no. 2, 14 June 1851, 12; Johanna Kinkel, *Hans Ibeles in London*, II, p. 196. Engels noted that the Golden Star Tavern had become so respectable that it advertised in *The Times* (Engels to Marx, 19 March 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 319). The 'honourable' spy Friederichs regarded the pub as 'not totally common' and ventured there himself (X to Hinckeldey, 2 Sept. 1850, Simon file, Potsdam 11374/1, f. 127). Göhringer helped to get Marx into some financial trouble by passing on old IOUs from Marx to Willich (report by Großherzoglicher Polizeiamtman Guérillot, London 13 June 1851, BGLAK, 49/1021, f. 27; Marx to Engels, 19 Oct. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 483; Jenny Marx to Schapper, 6 Nov. 1851, *MEGA*, III/4, p. 555).
- 77 Engels to Weydemeyer, 7 Aug. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 407.
- 78 Engels, Marx and Harney to Adam, Barthelémy and Vidil, 9 Oct. 1850, *BdK*, II, pp. 292–3; Harney to Engels, 16 Sept. 1850, *Harney Papers*, p. 256.
- 79 Eccarius, Schramm and others of Marx's League contributed to Chartist periodicals both before and after September 1850. See Schramm, 'Bloodshedding Ordermongers' (*Democratic Review*, I (March 1850), 391–3) and 'The War in Schleswig-Holstein' (*Red Republican*, 9 Nov. 1850, 161–2; 16 Nov. 1850, 170–2; 23 Nov. 1850, 181–3; 30 Nov. 1850, 189–90). Eccarius' articles in the *Friend of the People* (which from December 1850 succeeded the *Red Republican*) on 'The Last Stage of Bourgeois Society' (*FP*, 4 Jan. 1851,

- 27–8, 11 Jan. 1851, 34–5, 18 Jan. 1851, 42–3, 25 Jan. 1851, 50) and on 'The Discernment of a Manchester School Philosopher' (*FP*, 8 Feb. 1851, 66–7, 15 Feb. 1851, 74–5) were among the earliest attempts to popularise Marx's views in England, but also touched on British politics, delicate ground for any exile.
- 80 See e.g., declaration of the CABV, in *FP*, 19 April 1851, 166.
- 81 The *Northern Star* detailed meetings of the Fraternal Democrats and refugees, and described with unperturbed neutrality speeches by Schapper and Barthelémy as well as Haug, Ronge and Struve: see e.g., *NS*, 7 Dec. 1850, 8; 21 Dec. 1850, 8; 4 Jan. 1851, 1, 8; 15 March 1851, 5; 19 April 1851, 8.
- 82 Marx to Engels, 11 Feb. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 285–6.
- 83 Engels to Marx, 12 Feb. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 287.
- 84 Peter Cadogan, 'Harney and Engels', *IRSH*, 19 (1965), 75. The next letter from Harney to Marx dates from 8 March 1853 and is remarkably stiff in tone (*Harney Papers*, p. 262).
- 85 *NS*, 15 Feb. 1851, 5, *FP*, 8 March 1851, 98–9; Marx to Engels, 23 Feb. 1851, Marx to Engels, 10 Feb. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 294, 283–4.
- 86 Gebert, a member of the League's Central Authority, responded to the toast of 'Victory to the Proletarians' (*NS*, 1 March 1851, 5); *Leader*, 1 March 1851, 208. According to Pieper and Marx, 700 people attended, of whom 250 were Germans (Pieper to Engels, 26 Feb. 1851, *BdK*, II, p. 385; Marx to Engels, 24 Feb. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 297).
- 87 Pieper to Engels, 26 Feb. 1851, *BdK*, II, pp. 385–6; Marx to Engels, 24 Feb. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 298. At the same time, Ferdinand Wolff and Liebknecht kept watch for Marx at a rival banquet of Ledru-Rollin's.
- 88 Marx to Hermann Becker, 28 Feb. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 308–11.
- 89 'Ansprache...für das erste Quartal 1851', Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 277–8.
- 90 Engels to Marx, 28 Feb. 1851, and Marx to Engels, 1 March 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 307–8, 311–12.
- 91 Marx to Engels, 26 Feb. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 304.
- 92 Schramm to Engels, 26 Feb. 1851, *BdK*, II, p. 388; but Marx to Engels, 26 Feb. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 303.
- 93 Pursuing his course of neutrality, Harney had also spent part of the evening at a simultaneous event given by Ledru-Rollin (*FP*, 8 March 1851, 98–9).
- 94 Marx to Engels, 1 March 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 311–12; *FP*, 15 March 1851, 107. But by way of dissociating himself from Marx's desire for publicity, Harney explicitly 'regretted that the deplorable occurrence...should be forced upon the attention of the English democrats' (*FP*, 15 March 1851, 107). He also reported further details of the offending banquet, printing the convenors' declaration of principles signed by Willich, Schapper, Blanc, Landolphe and Barthelémy, which contained every tenet Marx disliked in the Willich-Schapper League (*FP*, 15 March 1851, 105–7).
- 95 Jones had no qualms over helping to prepare the meeting, but on Marx's advice refrained from attending, though he worried about losing Chartist support as well as showing antipathy towards foreign revolutionaries. Afterwards, Jones rejected Chartist responsibilities for the attack and refused to see any serious political implications in the row (Marx to Engels, 23 Feb. 1851, 1 March 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 294–5, 312; Jones to Marx, 3 March 1851, *BdK*, II, p. 744).
- 96 Marx to Engels, 31 July 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 399.
- 97 W. Galkin ('Ernest Jones', in *Marx und Engels und die ersten proletarischen Revolutionäre*, pp. 473–4, 478) wrongly implies that Jones fully supported Marx's attitude towards the meeting and also that this incident led to the breach between Harney and Jones. See John Saville, ed. *Ernest Jones: Chartist* (Lawrence and Wishart, 1952), introduction, pp. 26ff. Jones emphatically resisted a break with Harney and explicitly cited financial and organisational, not political, difficulties, when a joint project failed (Marx to Engels, 5 May 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 346). In his own paper, Jones pointedly dedicated one of his

- poems to Harney 'as a tribute of respect, and as a mark of friendship' (*Notes to the People*, I, [no. 3] (1851), 41; *MEGA*, 1/10, pp. 705–7).
- 98 Jones to Engels, 6 Jan. 1852, in Peter Cadogan, 'Harney and Engels', 77.
- 99 Marx to Cluss, [7 and c. 15 May 1852], *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 107.
- 100 Chiefly drafted by Jones, the programme for the Chartist convention was, despite its obvious 'Marxist' influences, ambivalent enough to satisfy both League factions ('Programme of Agitation', reprinted in *BdK*, II, pp. 405–12). The programme was serialised in Stechan's *Deutsche Arbeiterhalle* (Stechan was at this point still allied with Willich) in May–June 1851.
- 101 Porter, *The Refugee Question*, pp. 86–8.
- 102 *NS*, 5 April 1851, 1.
- 103 *NS*, 12 April 1851, 1, 7; 19 April 1851, 8. See also *FP*, 19 April 1851, 166; *Leader*, II (12 April 1851), 339, for a protest by the French Society. Even the *Glasgow Sentinel*, 12 April 1851, 4, reported that the German refugees declared this allegation to be utterly ridiculous.
- 104 *EP*, 19 April 1851, 166. August Gebert signed the statement as chairman of the CABV's mother section.
- 105 *NS*, 19 April 1851, 8. Engels declared himself 'morally convinced' that Willich and his supporters were indeed plotting a revolt for the time of the Exhibition (Engels to Marx, c. 6 May 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 348).
- 106 Marx to Engels, 15 April 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 334.
- 107 *NS*, 19 April 1851, 8.
- 108 Willich to Schimmelpennig, 17 April 1851, Saegert Papers, B.P.H., Rep. 192, no. 35. Willich's Central Authority referred to similar intrigues by the embassies in London, who aimed to make the British government expel the fugitives and to cause more internal dissention within the revolutionary party. The address also attacked O'Connor and already identified Jones as among Marx's allies against Harney ('Ansprache...1. Quartal', Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 281–2).
- 109 *EP*, 5 April 1851, 132; 19 April 1851, 166; 26 April 1851, 173; *NS*, 19 April 1851, 8.
- 110 A year later Willich still Germanised Jones's name into Johns' (letter of 22 April 1852, in *RdA*, 15 May 1852, 154).
- 111 E.g., in May 1853 (*PP*, 7 May 1853, 5), Jones declared that he belonged to the party that was represented among the Germans by Marx and Freiligrath, and among the French by Barbès and Blanqui. H.-J. Bochinski, 'Marx' Mitarbeit an der chartistischen Zeitung "The People's Paper" im Jahre 1853', *MarxEngels-Jahrbuch*, 3 (1980), 165–95, emphasises the Marxian influence on Jones's paper, but ignores other socialist contributions. Marx, Pieper and Jones appeared together in 1856 (*The People's Paper*, 19 April 1856, 4). After Jones's death, the CABV joined a large commemorative Trafalgar Square demonstration and its members were singled out as 'ragamuffins' by *The Times* for its red flag with the 'Proletarians of all countries, unite' inscription (*Hermann*, 3 April 1869).
- 112 *Harney Papers*, pp. 14, 98, 141, 173–6, 262, 267, 270, 288–9, 355–6.
- 113 *Ibid.*, pp. 68–70.
- 114 *Ibid.*, p. 72.
- 115 Calman, *Ledru-Rollin*, pp. 135–61.
- 116 Alexandre Zévaès ('Les Proscrits français en 1848 et 1851 a Londres', *La Revolution de 1848 et les revolutions du XIXe siècle*, 20, 1923–1924, 345–75 and 21, 1924, 94–114) gives details.
- 117 Vidil, a former Hussar captain, described this society to Blanqui as 'essentiellement communiste. La fraction la plus énergique, sans contrait, se dit et est, de fait, *blanquiste*.' He added the names of two more members, Watrison and Ménard, a contributor to the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung—Revue* (Vidil to Blanqui, 19 July 1850, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, N.A.F. 9581, MSS. Blanqui, f. 214).
- 118 *L'Homme*, no. 24 (10 May 1854), 4.

- 119 Calman, *Ledru-Rollin*, pp. 35–6.
- 120 On Barthelémy see *BdK*, II, p. 64, and Jean Maitron, ed., *Dictionnaire Biographique du Mouvement Ouvrier*, 1. Pt. (1789–1864), I, pp. 160–1. Malwida von Meysenbug (*Memoiren einer Idealistin*, II, pp. 166–8, 197–209) and Alexander Herzen (*My Past and Thoughts*, III, pp. 1086–102), portray Barthelémy as a quiet, melancholic, intelligent man. The two numbers of *Les Veillées du Peuple, Journal mensuel de la Démocratie socialiste* (Nov. 1849, March 1850) are reprinted in vol. 2 of *Les Révolutions du XIXe siècle*, 3ème série, Paris, Editions d'Histoire Sociale [1984]. The Cologne workers' society advertised a brochure about his trial in Paris ('Der Prozeß der Juniinsurgenten Barthelémy und Racary vor dem Kriegsgerichte zu Paris, 9.1.1849', *Freiheit, Arbeit*, no. 25, 15 April 1849). For the Fraternal Democrats' banquet of 31 Dec. 1849 see *BdK*, II, p. 64, for his epithets see Marx to Engels, 26 Feb. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 304.
- 121 Report of 7 Nov. 1852, in Gamby, *Bauer, Konfidentenberichte*, p. 55; *Reasoner*, 4 March 1855, quoted in Calman, *Ledru-Rollin*, p. 138.
- 122 Meysenbug to G.Kinkel, 24 Jan. 1855, in Stefania Rossi, ed., *Malwida von Meysenbug: Briefe an Johanna und Gottfried Kinkel* (Bonn: L.Röhrscheid, 1982), p. 103. The *People's Paper* (27 Jan. 1855, 5, 1, 7) hinted darkly: There is a mystery which we could solve, but dare not. We know why Barthelémy perished, and who sacrificed him.'
- 123 Porter, *The Refugee Question*, p. 30.
- 124 At a Polish banquet both Barthelémy and Schapper said that the workers of most European countries were about to form an alliance (*NS*, 7 Dec. 1850, 8). See MEGA 1/10, p. 1032, on its end.
- 125 Quoted in full in Marx to Engels, 2 Dec. 1850, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 246–9, and criticised in Cologne (1 Dec. 1850, *BdK*, II, p. 325). The Hungarian and Polish signatories belonged to democratic exile clubs.
- 126 *Démocrates, Prenez Garde a Vous!* (pamphlet dated 3 Dec. 1850, signed by the French Blanquists, Polish, Italian and Hungarian refugees, and for the Germans by Willich, Schapper, Dietz, Gebert, Majer and Schärttner, copy in Dietz file, Potsdam 11373, f. 41).
- 127 W. Pieper to Engels, 16 Dec. 1850, *BdK*, II, p. 346.
- 128 Dronke to Marx, 7 Feb. 1851, *BdK*, II, p. 373. A Parisian paper printed a further manifesto signed by Willich and Schapper about the participation of French democrats at municipal elections (Schurz to Kinkel, 20 Jan. 1851, in Kessel, *Briefe*, p. 54).
- 129 'Long Acre 27', in Fontane, *Wanderungen*, I, p. 163.
- 130 Willich to Schimmelpfennig, 17 April 1851, Saegert Papers, B.P.H., Rep. 192, no. 35.
- 131 'Ansprache...1851', Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 281.
- 132 Dronke to Marx, 7 Feb. 1851, *BdK*, II, p. 373.
- 133 Barthelémy to Willich, Sept. 1852, copy in IISG, ME, O 30.
- 134 Marx to H.Becker, 8 and 28 Feb. 1851, and Marx to Engels, 10 Feb. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 282, 309–10, 283–4. Adam disapproved of this liaison with Blanc and Landolphe, and left the group around Willich and Barthelémy.
- 135 'Programm und Einladung der Gleichen zur Feier des Jahrestages der Europäischen Revolution am 24. Februar 1851 in London', afterwards printed in German as a leaflet (BLPES, pamphlet collection, 4 pp., reprinted in *RdA*, 7 June 1851, 62; a shortened translation in *FP*, 15 March 1851, 106). Referring to themselves as the 'Equals' points to the Babouvist tradition, perhaps to the 'Conspiracy of the Equals' or directly to Maréchal's 'Manifesto of the Equals'.
- 136 This was a point of debate among the French left, too, from Babeuf on. Blanc, Landolphe, Vidil and Barthelémy, for example, attacked the 'usurpation' of the 'pretended right of the intelligent over the less intelligent', and instead emphasised the social obligations of 'intelligence' (quoted in *Le Banquet des Égaux. Londres, 24 Février 1851*, Paris, Joubert [1851], pp. 3–5). Marx thought this was hilarious, as it held 'out to Schapper & Co. the

- immediate and cheerful prospect of an “*aristocracy of stupidity*” (Marx to Engels, 23 Feb. 1851, MECW, XXXVIII, p. 293).
- 137 *NS*, 1 March 1851, 5; *Leader*, 1 March 1851, 208; *Banquet des Égaux*. Interestingly, one address was also signed by Dronke, probably resulting from his attempt to spy on Willich’s sympathisers in Switzerland (Engels to Dronke, 9 July 1851, MECW, XXXVIII, p. 381). Pieper noted gleefully that the organisers had apparently not managed to commission an address from Germany itself (Pieper to Engels, 26 Feb. 1851, *BdK*, II, p. 385).
- 138 Happy to leave the description of the future society ‘to our thinkers’, Willich merely gave a toast To the revolutionary army! To extreme means!’ Schapper toasted his ‘brother democrats of Great Britain and Ireland’, but also echoed the chiliastic hopes for ‘a final and holy war...of extermination against kings’ (*Banquet des Égaux*, pp. 22, 24–5).
- 139 The French text was first published in *La Patrie*, 27 Feb. 1851, and is reprinted in *MEGA*, I/10, pp. 1030–2, English in MECW, X, pp. 537–9.
- 140 Marx and Engels, ‘Introduction to the Leaflet of L.A.Blanqui’s Toast sent to the Refugee Committee’, MECW, X, p. 537; Engels to Dronke, 9 July 1851, MECW, XXXVIII, p. 381. The ‘Toast’ was confiscated in many places in Germany, e.g. in the Nuremberg workers’ society (Offermann, *Arbeiterbewegung und liberates Bürgertum*, p. 84; *MEGA*, I/10, pp. 1024–33).
- 141 Marx to Engels, 17 and 22 March 1851, and Engels to Dronke, 9 July 1851, MECW, XXXVIII, pp. 318, 321, 381. For the various embarrassed explanations for the suppression of Blanqui’s ‘Avis au peuple’ see e.g., *Banquet des Égaux*, p. 19, n.1, and Marx to Engels, 8 March 1851, MECW, XXXVIII, p. 313.
- 142 *BdK*, II, pp. 401–2, 740–1, n.574; Dronke to Marx, before 30 Aug. 1851, *MEGA*, III/4, p. 448.
- 143 *NYSZ*, 29 March 1851 (correspondence from Paris dated 6 March 1851). See also *ibid.*, 22 March 1851.
- 144 Ludwig Simon, ‘Das allgemeine Stimmrecht und die Arbeiterdictatur’, pt. 3, in *Deutsche Monatschrift für Politik, Wissenschaft, Kunst und Leben*, ed. Adolph Kolatschek, year 2, 6, 5 [May 1851], 279–80. For earlier hints at the split: *RdA*, Feb. 1851, 28, and *Hamburger Nachrichten*, no. 51 (28 Feb. 1851), 1.
- 145 Blanqui to Maublanc, 27 March 1851, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, MSS. Blanqui, N.A.F. 9583, ff. 392–93. Blanqui later referred to ‘this toast of London which, anyway, was not at all a toast and was never conceived for the Banquet of the Equals’, and again declared that he had merely sent it on ‘as testimony of my sentiments towards the supposed conciliation in London’. In the long run, however, Blanqui thought the publication had done good: ‘Yes, that publication irritated me, and I was wrong; it did no harm, to the contrary. It has irritated some democrats, but it has gathered the masses and produced good results’ (Blanqui to Barthelémy, 16 May 1852, BN, Paris, MSS. Blanqui, N.A.F. 9581, f. 237).
- 146 ‘Ansprache...1851’, Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 278–9.

## 6

### The Sonderbund, II: decline and dissolution of the Communist League, 1851–1853

- 1 Mehring, *Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie*, I, p. 531.
- 2 Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 129–30, dated early January 1851.
- 3 ‘An die deutschen Soldaten’, signed by ‘three soldiers from the Seventh Prussian Army Corps’, Leaflets file, Potsdam 9820, ff. 2–21, 39–40. It was distributed in the garrison towns of Glogau, Königsberg, Magdeburg and Spandau as well as in Silesia and the Rhineland (reports by Greif, London, Jan. 1852 and 30 April 1852, *ibid.*, ff. 37–8, 48). Another appeal

- To our German brothers, the soldiers!', allegedly by Willich and Schimmelpfennig but quite possibly a police forgery—is much cruder and argues 'Whoever is the enemy of our princes, is our friend and ally', demanding that Napoleon as 'an honest master' should replace the dozens of German princes (Saegert Papers, B.P.H., Rep. 192, no. 43, dated 1 March 1853, but added to a report Stieber's dated 29 January 1853 [sic!]; also in Leaflets file, Potsdam 9820, ff. 59–61). Schimmelpfennig argued that Napoleon would inevitably need a war which in Germany could give the incentive to a democratic movement and also create German unity, under whichever head (letter dated London, 23 March 1853, Leaflets file, Potsdam 9820, ff. 71–3; *ibid.*, ff. 59–61, a slightly different version of the leaflet). Similar proclamations, *Aufruf an die deutschen Soldaten*, and *Betrachtungen eines Preussischen Soldaten, der an dem Badischen Feldzuge Teil genommen*, were found in 1853 (Ladendorf file, Potsdam 11387, f. 130, and Potsdam 11388, ff. 2–5). See also Offermann, *Arbeiterbewegung und liberales Bürgertum*, p. 96.
- 4 At his arrest in Paris letters by Willich, Goegg and Schurz were confiscated and Schimmelpfennig and his roommate Schmolze expelled (report of a French agent, 19 May 1851, and Stieber to Saegert, 31 May 1851, Saegert Papers, B.P.H., Rep. 192, no. 35). The German police were still watching him in 1859 (Bay. HStA, Munich, Abt. II, MA II, 1798, ad. 148). See also *BdK*, II, pp. 422, 482–3.
- 5 J.Kinkel to K.Zitz, 18 July 1851, in Leppla, 'Briefe', p. 38.
- 6 Alexander Schimmelpfennig, *The War between Turkey and Russia: A Military Sketch* (Trübner, 1854), p. 7.
- 7 Techow was convinced that 'the question of the coming revolution is identical to that of a European war', and listed the manpower of 'royalists' and revolutionaries in a manner very similar to Willich ('Umrisse des kommenden Krieges', *NYSZ*, 6 Sept. 1851). His analysis was taken surprisingly seriously by Marx and Engels, since it was so close to Willich's ideas of a world war with 'the "postponement of internal politics" and... military dictatorship' (Marx to Engels, 23 Sept. 1851, and Engels to Marx, 26 Sept. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 463–7, 469–71). Techow's background mirrored that of Willich: the son of a Berlin *Hofrat*, he became premier lieutenant, participated in the Baden uprising and was sentenced to 15 years' fortress confinement but was sprung in 1849 (commandant in Magdeburg to Berlin, 5 May 1849, Techow file, Potsdam 13701, f. 1; biography and description in ff. 2, 23–4, 45). A dashing man of 'upright military deportment', Techow pursued a passionate love affair with one Rosa Herzog, whose elopement and marriage to someone else was obsessively monitored by the police (Techow file, Potsdam 13701, ff. 17–60). In London he cohabited with Mrs Schmidt-Denhardt, previously married to Max Stirner, 'you understand, what one calls being married among reasonable people', in Willich's words (note by Greiff, 15 Aug. 1852, Techow file, Potsdam 13701, f. 62). On 31 August 1852 they left together for Australia, where Techow reportedly became a gold-prospector and farmer (Techow file, Potsdam 13701, ff. 62, 70, 72). In 1888 Bis-marck, out of personal malice, refused him a passport to Germany (Ludwig Bamberger, *Bismarcks großes Spiel*, ed. Ernst Feder, Frankfurt, 1932, p. 356).
- 8 Marx to Engels, 16 and 21 May 1851, Engels to Marx, 23 May 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 356, 359, 362.
- 9 *Hamburger Nachrichten*, 51 (28 Feb. 1851), 1; perhaps this was leaked by Schurz.
- 10 This was Bauer's assumption (report of 7 Nov. 1852, in Gamby, ed., *Bauer, Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 33, 37).
- 11 Willich wrote in the tone of a well-established relationship, using the familiar *du* (Willich to Kinkel, 21 Feb. 1851, University Library, Bonn, S 2675,28). Willich received over £200 for these Schleswig-Holstein refugees from well-to-do German merchants whom he also asked to support Kinkel (Marx to Engels, 21 May 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 360).
- 12 Dresden police report, 13 March 1851, Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, f. 3; report from Dresden, dated 17 April 1851, about a meeting in early February, *NYSZ*, 10 May 1851.

- 13 Schurz to Kinkel, 20 March 1851, in Kessel, *Briefe*, pp. 66–75. K.S. [Schurz] to friends in Paris, London, 12 April 1851, Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, ff. 8–9, and 16 April 1851, ff. 10–11. Schurz had the previous year travelled through Germany and had ‘found all the useful elements already in the hands of the League’, which obviously suggested an alliance with the League (June Circular, *BdK*, II, p. 196).
- 14 ‘Agent with the number 100’ to Stieber, 27 May 1851, Saegert Papers, B.P.H., Rep. 192, no. 35.
- 15 ‘Ansprache...1851’, Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 280–1; Willich to Schimmelpfennig, 17 April 1851, Saegert Papers, Rep. 192, no. 35.
- 16 ‘Agent 0’ to Stieber, 14 May 1851, Saegert Papers, B.P.H., Rep. 192, no. 35. At least in Paris, an alliance with Mazzini was reluctantly welcomed (Cherval, Reininger and Übel, 8 Feb. 1851, Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 85). For a suggested alliance with the ECDC see report of 7 Nov. 1852, in Gamby, ed., *Bauer, Konfidentenberichte*, p. 34, and ‘Ansprache...1851’, Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 280–1.
- 17 ‘Agent 0’ to Stieber, 29 May 1851, Saegert Papers, B.P.H., Rep. 192, no. 35; BGLAK, 49/1021, report of 17 June 1851. Schapper seconded Willich, rejecting compromise and preaching violence.
- 18 Willich to Schimmelpfennig, 17 April 1851, Saegert Papers, B.P.H., Rep. 192, no. 35.
- 19 Schimmelpfennig, ‘Burger’, 4 Sept. 1851, UL Bonn, S 2675.
- 20 Proposals for a reconciliation between the inimical Leagues and for a congress were rejected both by Cologne and London (Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 75–7 and 279; *BdK*, II, p. 757).
- 21 Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 273.
- 22 Tietz et al., to the Central Authority, 15 July 1851, in letter by St [Stieber], Paris, 26 Aug. 1851, Saegert Papers, B.P.H., Rep. 192, no. 35.
- 23 *BdK*, II, p. 632; Lahme, Tetersen’, 190.
- 24 Kurt Wernicke, ‘Ludwig Bisky: Ein Berliner Arbeiterführer’, in Bleiber et al., eds., *Männer der Revolution*, II, p. 148.
- 25 Reininger told the police: ‘In London only very few people convened for the so-called congress. I was the only one from Paris, from London a few workers [attended], i.e. Gebert, Schapper, Willich and another worker whose name I cannot give; nobody else was there besides, not from other places either. I attended several hours of a discussion; but since I could not agree to their views, I left these people, did not attend their meetings any more and went back to Paris... My views...conform to those of Cabet... I got very little from the Parisians for my trip to London, perhaps 30 francs’ (interrogation of 5 Oct. 1851, Reininger file, Potsdam 12524, f. 65). At his interrogation Reininger carefully protected his comrades and disguised the purpose of his trip (Reininger file, Potsdam 12524, ff. 23–8, 50, 62–5, 120–6). He claimed, e.g., that the clubs in London and Paris negotiated merely about mutual support and job recommendations for their travelling members, and that the singing societies could not be covers for communists since even women visited them which ‘should say enough against the communist tendencies of this society’ (8 Sept. 1851, and 29 March 1852, Reininger file, Potsdam 12524, ff. 36 and 141).
- 26 Although they regarded the central authority as ‘lazy and negligent’, they did not want to oppose it directly, ‘we want to stay united at all costs; but...one has to resort to a ruse’ (Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 97–8). Fraud by the London emissary Meyer had already damaged the relations between the two circles. Reininger admitted that all in Paris were disappointed with the congress, but played down their differences as a conflict between the Londoners’ political aims and the Parisians’ efforts merely to provide travelling assistance (23 and 24 Jan. 1852, Reininger file, Potsdam 12524, ff. 118, 120–1, 126). Changes in the statutes could not have been too drastic as the old ones continued to be used (police notes, September 1851, Gipperich file, Potsdam 10084/1, f. 12).
- 27 Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 293–8; *BdK*, III, pp. 414–8. A copy with considerable variations is in *Auszüge aus den... Papieren*, pp. 6–14. Engels thought that the circular stemmed from



- Willich and Barthelémy (Engels to Marx, 23 Sept. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 459–60). French influences abound in the copy seized in Paris, whose French terms (such as comité, arrondissement) are translated in Wermuth/Stieber's version; sentence structure and some formulations also point to a French original text. A preparatory list, probably from Paris, emphasised the need to infiltrate democratic organisations, spoke of the Central Authority as the 'Mountain' (*Berg*) in the fashion of the League of the Just, and focused on the needs of the soldiers during the revolution (Reininger file, Potsdam 12524, ff. 214–15). French exiles had debated an earlier list of 'measures' in 1839 (Nettlau, 'Marx-Analekten', 392).
- 28 Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 293.
- 29 Edgar Bauer attributed this to Schapper's 'pet idea of founding a secret society' (Gamby, ed., *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 33, 28).
- 30 Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 294, 296. Perhaps this vengeful streak was linked to Willich's aversion to abstract thinking. Discussing the barbarism of child labour, Willich refused to blame circumstances, but instead felt that 'one always needs to accuse people as the state is composed of human beings... the old society faces us as persons, hence these individuals had to be done away with' (CABV debate, 18 April 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam + 8534, ff. 34–5). Schapper also defended revolutionary terrorism. He said, 'the communist party... knows neither a law of politics nor its ethics. It knows only one law, and that is its party interests... The communist party as the only intelligent representative of the workers will bring terrorism into the revolution, first because it is a question of destroying the old society; second, because it must not run the danger of exhausting itself in the tedious aspects of the struggle... [They] wanted *that* terrorism which begins with the crushing of the old institutions, and ends with the last head of its representatives' (CABV debate, 27 June 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, ff. 65–6).
- 31 Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 295–7. A draft in Reininger's handwriting, 'During the revolution', is in Reininger file, Potsdam 12524, f. 215.
- 32 This read 'for the right to vote', in *Auszüge aus den... Papieren*, p. 9.
- 33 Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 295, 297–8.
- 34 'Forderungen des Volkes im Augenblicke der Revolution', Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 115 (slightly different in Wermuth/Stieber, I, pp. 291–2, and in *BdK*, III, pp. 418–19). These 'Forderungen' were to enjoy a long after-life. Headed 'Proletarier aller Länder, vereinigt Euch!', and 'Muth, Einigkeit—Nicht Worte, sondern Thaten', and with a new preface, they were circulated by Scherzer in 1855–1856 (Dresden archive, Confiscation of Publications file, f. 104; this proclamation was appended to *Der Verbannte* and also distributed as a separate flysheet in May 1856). Marx suspected that Stieber was behind this 'miserable gallimaufry of our things' (Marx to Jenny Marx, 21 June 1856, *MECW*, XL, p. 56). Struve again reprinted this version together with a letter from the International Association and a proclamation by a 'committee of the party of action, London' (*Sociale Republik*, 23 (25 Sept. 1858), 4). Bauer assumed Scherzer and Simon Bernard to be the authors (Gamby, ed., *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 418–19, with a different preface). The same 'Demands' were used as evidence against Social Democrats in 1871–1872, when Liebknecht mistook them for a version of the League's 1848 'Demands', although comparable 'Demands' drawn up during 1848 had laid more stress on democratic principles of government (Eckert, 'Fraktion Willich-Schapper', 316–17; *BdK*, I, pp. 714, 739–41).
- 35 Anonymous letter from London, 9 July 1851, Gipperich file, Potsdam 10084/1, f. 15; another version declared that the section had been dissolved 'because they have the inscription on their cards: "League of communist workers", yet they do not want to be communists', in: *Auszüge aus den... Papieren*, p. 30. It is worth noting that the League and the GABV are synonymous here, although separate minutes were kept throughout 1852 (Schapper-Willich file Potsdam 8534, *passim*).
- 36 Dronke to Marx, before 30 Aug. 1851, *BdK*, III, p. 93.
- 37 *RdA*, 27 Sept. 1851, 185; 4 Oct. 1851, 198; 27 March 1852, 102–3; 17 April 1852, 124–5.

- 38 Marx to Engels, 25 and 31 Aug. and 13 Sept. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 440–3, 445, 456.
- 39 Marx to Engels, 1 Dec. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, p. 498; Marx to Weydemeyer, 23 Jan. 1852, *MECW*, XXXIX, pp. 14–15; ‘Der “demokratische” Mouchard’, *NYCZ*, 7 (29 April 1853), 66.
- 40 Pieper to Engels, 14 Jan. and 6 Feb. 1852, *BdK*, III, pp. 131, 153.
- 41 G. Becker, ‘Der “Neue Arbeiter-Verein in London” 1852’, *ZfG*, 14 (1966), 85. The club also criticised the ‘brutal abolition of property’ preached by Willich (94). Complete reports are in NLAV (New London Workers’ Society) file, Potsdam 8535, including deliberations about an amalgamation with the Democratic Society (ff. 9 and 12). Police officer Greiff even assumed that the Democratic Society was about to change its name to NLAV after being joined by the group of disaffected CABV members around Stechan, Pieper, Liebknecht and Eccarius (report of 13 Jan. 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 2). The strength of the NLAV can be gauged by its total worth of £15s.6d. for which the club acquired maps (21 March 1852, NLAV, Potsdam 8535, f. 13).
- 42 Pieper for instance castigated striking engineers for seeking mere ‘palliatives’ and for trying to advance themselves at the cost of other workers (NLAV file, Potsdam 8535, f. 20, 21 April 1852).
- 43 Becker, ‘Der Neue Arbeiter-Verein’, 86, 96, 92.
- 44 Becker, ‘Der Neue Arbeiter-Verein’, 91–2, 96. Stechan’s opinions here support the argument that he did indeed at this point bridge Willich’s and Marx’s factions, as Stieber assumed (Leopold Auerbach, ed., *Denkwürdigkeiten des Geheimen Regierungsrathes Dr. Stieber* (Berlin: 1884), p. 31; Becker, ‘Der Neue Arbeiter-Verein’, 79). He was, moreover, about to join the democrats Meyen and Tausenau in January 1852, but returned to the CABV (Pieper to Engels, 14. Jan. 1852, *BdK*, III, p. 131; Becker, ‘Der Neue Arbeiter-Verein’, 82). In 1853 he reported on strikes in England to a democratic paper in Hannover (Wolfram Siemann, ed., *Der ‘Polizeiverein’ deutscher Staaten*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1983, p. 174; Wermuth/Stieber, II, pp. 124–5).
- 45 This group, presumably only members of Marx’s League, still existed in November (report of 7 Nov. 1852, in Gamby, ed., *Bauer, Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 55–6).
- 46 Introductory report by Greiff, 13 Jan. 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 2.
- 47 Demokratischer Verein, Potsdam 9529, *passim*.
- 48 *Ibid.*, f. 21, 7 June 1852.
- 49 *Ibid.*, ff. 36, 38, 22 July and 2 Aug. 1852.
- 50 *Ibid.*, f. 34, 15 July 1852 (atheism), and f. 24, 24 June 1852. Ried, Launspach, Tuczeck and Schröder advocated an absolute dictatorship. Launspach elaborated that ‘Every adherent and advocate of the old system was a criminal. He did not understand the views of those speaking of humanitarianism. During the revolution humanitarianism would need to be proclaimed as the greatest vice.’ This was supported by all but one speaker who felt that treating political opponents as criminals meant ‘committing suicide of principles’ (Demokratischer Verein, Potsdam 9529, ff. 44–5, 16–19 Aug. 1852). The shoemaker Müdeking, a frequent speaker, defended revolutionary terror during the French Revolution, while Schröder, the society’s president, regarded terrorism as barbaric because it diverted the revolution from its proper object and ‘dishonoured’ it. The secretary, Tuczeck, held that a revolution was a crisis which required extraordinary measures, and in it terror was not revenge but ‘the statute-book of political necessity’ (discussion of 25 April 1852, Demokratischer Verein, Potsdam 9529, ff. 12–13).
- 51 Demokratischer Verein, Potsdam 9529, f. 45, 23 Aug. 1852.
- 52 *Ibid.*, f. 10, 4 April 1852.
- 53 *Ibid.*, f. 8, 27 March 1852 (this was Müdeking’s opinion).
- 54 *Ibid.*, f. 5, 22 Feb. 1852.
- 55 Schröder thought the masses were not yet educated enough, and a new revolution now would fail because of their unchanged stupidity (*Ibid.*, f. 12, 18 April 1852). Tuczeck, Beyer, and

- Schröder defended secret societies, while Ried thought these had only damaged the party by provoking factionalism and treason, and had abandoned revolutionary principles by justifying inequality (Ibid., ff. 26–7, 5 July 1852).
- 56 This view was widely supported (Ibid., f. 55, 27 Sept. 1852). There was no unanimity on ‘premature provocation’ of a revolution, when several members approved the collection of money and arms in preparation (discussions of 16 May and 12 July 1852, Ibid., ff. 16, 29).
- 57 Marx to Engels, 9 Dec. 1851, *MEW*, XXVII, p. 383.
- 58 Note by police agent Greiff, London, 29 April 1852, Bruiningk file, Potsdam 8889, f. 75 (200 thalers of this money were later given to the CABV). Her relative, the Princess Lieven, also donated £30 to Willich’s League (central authority meeting, 11 July 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 74).
- 59 *RdA*, 3 Jan. 1852, 4. Willich’s admirer Starke compared his account of the putsch favourably with those of Carl Schurz and Louis Blanc: ‘Willich is thorough in [his] class-consciousness, i.e. he clearly understands the gap between the bourgeoisie and the fourth estate and knows that the third estate needs to be overthrown in order to bring the fourth into power’ (Starke to N.N., London, 19 Dec. 1851, Reininger file, Potsdam 12524, ff. 214–15, cutting from *Mainzer Journal*, no. 107, 6 May 1853, 1–3). Within the CABV, however, reaction was not uniform, and, for instance, Blum, a former Fraternal Democrat, did not believe that the next revolution would see a joint struggle of petty bourgeoisie and proletariat (*BdK*, II, p. 570).
- 60 *RdA*, 27 March 1852, 103. *RdA*, 17 April 1852, 121, announced their arrival in America.
- 61 CABV discussion, 24 June 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 65.
- 62 CABV discussion, 18 July 1852, *ibid.*, f. 101. Gebert seconded Willich in this, but Blum thought that political freedom needed to be achieved before social freedom could be won, an opinion Willich derided as ‘purely democratic rubbish’.
- 63 *RdA*, 27 March 1852, 103. Also, Willich’s view of hunger being the best revolutionary motive echoed Weitling’s doctrine. Willich reconfirmed that ‘the communist state would introduce associations which would be centralised and guaranteed by the state’; these associations should even include the arts (according to Schapper, CABV discussions, 28 March and 4 April 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, ff. 23 and 32) and agricultural workers (CABV discussion, 5 Sept. 1852, *ibid.*, f. 102).
- 64 CABV discussion, 6 June 1852, *ibid.*, ff. 70–1.
- 65 CABV discussions, 23 May 1852, *ibid.*, ff. 45–6.
- 66 CABV discussions, 4 July 1852, *ibid.*, f. 92. Fränkel, who had discussed Feuerbach with the CABV before 1848, saw atheism as the necessary consequence of a proletarian revolution, since material liberation from capital provided the precondition for spiritual liberation from the ‘phantom’ of religion, which had turned self-conscious creatures into cringing hypocrites (CABV discussion, 1 Feb. 1852, *ibid.*, f. 11). Tuczeck argued in the Democratic Society that religion did not mix with a revolution or a republic, as it replaced reason by imagination (9 May 1852, Democratic Society file, Potsdam 9529, f. 15).
- 67 CABV discussions, 2 May 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, ff. 39–40.
- 68 CABV debate, 29 Aug. 1852, *ibid.*, ff. 88–9.
- 69 CABV debate, 29 Aug. 1852, *ibid.*, ff. 88–9.
- 70 CABV debate, 22 Aug. 1852, *ibid.*, f. 86–7.
- 71 CABV debate, 1 Aug. 1852, *ibid.*, f. 80.
- 72 CABV debate, 25 July 1852, *ibid.*, f. 102.
- 73 CABV debate, 11 July 1852, *ibid.*, f. 93.
- 74 Editors’ comment, *BdK*, III, p. 445.
- 75 Twenty-two members of the central authority are named in March, including Prohasky, Haude, Starke, Botenus and Roedel, but not Schapper who however figured in Willich’s group in July (meetings of 28 March and 11 July 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, ff. 24 and 73); sometimes only 18 or 13 attended meetings.

- 76 Central authority meetings of 13 Feb. (candidates), 2 Jan. (spies), 5 March, 25 June, 11 July, 8 Sept. (money) and 23 Jan. (prisoners) 1852, ff. 16, 1, 26, 67, 74, 90 and 7.
- 77 Willich in central authority meeting, 27 Feb. 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 25, where further German regions were reviewed (this is the unspecified report Karl Obermann dates February 1851, *Zur Geschichte des Bundes der Kommunisten*, Berlin: Dietz, 1955, p. 88); see also 25 June 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 68.
- 78 Willich in CABV meeting, 21 Jan. and 24 March 1852, *ibid.*, ff. 6 and 23.
- 79 Dietz in central authority meeting, 20 Feb. 1852, *ibid.*, f. 24.
- 80 Willich in central authority meeting, 11 July 1852, *ibid.*, f. 74.
- 81 Dietz in the CABV, 24 March 1852, and in League meeting, 26 March 1852, *ibid.*, ff. 22 and 26. Pirsch's report from Switzerland in May, however, dampened hopes (League meetings, 14 May 1852, *ibid.*, f. 43).
- 82 BGLAK, 48/5212, monthly report from Karlsruhe, 13 May 1852. Pirsch urged all League members on the Continent to practise shooting, while a railway employee allegedly offered to sabotage telegraph and rails. Since at the same time weapons had been bought in the United States, 'the Continent is indeed in danger of a coup de main' (Greiff's report, London 30 April 1852, Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, ff. 80–1). Schimmelpfennig also ordered arms from Rostock (Stieber to Hinckeldey, 20 April 1852, Ladendorf file, Potsdam 11387, f. 215).
- 83 Extract from weekly report, Dresden, 10 June 1852, Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, f. 226; central authority meeting, 23 April 1852, *ibid.*, f. 37.
- 84 Marx to Engels, 24 April 1852, *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 86. Engels, mistaking Heise for a member of Marx's party, jointly with him reviewed Schimmelpfennig's study on the Crimean War (Marx to Engels, 29 April 1854, Engels to Marx, 1 May 1854, *MECW*, XXXIX, pp. 442–3).
- 85 They gave a total of 421 thalers and £30, while Baroness von Bruiningk donated another £30 (BGLAK, 236/8743, weekly report from Berlin, 10 July 1852, no. 18). Northern German groups later gave another £45.6. (report of 1 Oct. 1852, nos. 28, 40).
- 86 Marx to Engels, 23 Sept. 1852, *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 195.
- 87 League debates, 16 April 1852, *ibid.*, f. 37. Pirsch is described in Greiff's report of 18 April 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 33.
- 88 BGLAK, 236/8743, weekly report of 12 Oct. 1852, no. 47.
- 89 For Willich's trip see BGLAK, 236/8743, weekly report of 10 Nov. 1852, no. 16, and for Gebert see Marx to Engels, 30 Aug. 1852, and Marx to Cluss, 3 Sept. 1852, *MECW*, XXXIX, pp. 169, 176–7. Gebert's description was forwarded by the police (BGLAK, 236/8743, weekly report of 12 Oct. 1852, no. 47). New communist circles were also founded in Thuringia and the Black Forest according to weekly reports of 1 Oct. 1852, no. 35, and 12 Oct. 1852, no. 23.
- 90 Dietz and Willich in League meetings, 26 March and 16 April 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, ff. 26 and 37.
- 91 Address of the Communist Workers' Association, presented by Willich to the Loan Conference, signed 'in the name of the German workers, the Central Committee, London, W.S.G.D.P.' (Willich, Schapper, Gebert, Dietz, Prohasky), 22 April 1852 (Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, ff. 234–5; excerpts in BGLAK, 236/8743, weekly report of 10 Nov. 1852, no. 11). A Prussian police officer commented that the League 'thought it dangerous to leave powerful resources in the hands of the democrats who might easily use them against the workers' party'. He saw the true reason for the address as a 'provision against reproaches against the workers' party when they later would have to oppose democracy openly'. The address expressly excluded any kind of community with representatives of the non-German bourgeoisie, such as Mazzini, with whom Willich, a year earlier, had considered a limited alliance for practical 'action', against some opposition in

- the CABV (Greiff's report, 15 June 1852, Revolutionary Loan file, Potsdam 8537, ff. 228–9, 232–3).
- 92 Greiff's reports, 10 and 30 April 1852, *ibid.*, ff. 76–7 and 79–82.
- 93 CABV, 18 and 25 Jan. 1852, *ibid.*, ff. 4–5, 8. Willich insisted that the next revolution would decide 'the workers' question' immediately by securing employment, which for the CABV members Keiling and Haake meant instituting credit banks and national workshops (CABV, 25 April 1852, *ibid.*, ff. 35–6).
- 94 Letter from a London League member, read at central authority meeting, 25 June 1852, *ibid.*, ff. 67–8. Martius reiterated this in an attack on Mazzini (debate in the CABV, 4 Aug. 1852, *ibid.*, f. 81). Cf. an inconclusive debate at the same time in the Democratic Society (26 July 1852, Demokratischer Verein, Potsdam 9529, ff. 36–7).
- 95 Kessel, *Briefe*, pp. 38–41, 110–11.
- 96 BGLAK, 236/8743, weekly report of 10 July 1852, no. 18, and League meeting, 21 May 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 43.
- 97 League meetings, 28 May and 4 June 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, ff. 44 and 73.
- 98 'Aufwurf an Deutschland', August 1852, quoted in Brettschneider, 'Entwicklung und Bedeutung des deutschen Frühsozialismus in London', p. 58. The original is no longer in the Potsdam Archive and this is its only known fragment, possibly a mis-attribution.
- 99 Julius Grozinski to friends in Cologne, 1 Sept. 1852, Revolutionary party file, Potsdam 13835, f. 123.
- 100 Jenny Marx to Engels, 11 Jan. 1851, MECW, XXXVIII, p. 561.
- 101 *NS*, 15 Feb. 1851, 5; *FP*, 22 Feb. 1851, 81. Schapper added an emphatic call for revenge (Marx to Engels, 11 Feb. 1851, MECW, XXXVIII, p. 285; similarly *BdK*, II, p. 269), but his speech came under attack even in the *New Yorker Staats-Zeitung* (8 March 1851); cf. 'Ansprache...für das erste Quartal 1851', Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 277. Schapper's rhetoric tended to gruesome imagery, when he for example declared that 'the plague boils which the Czar of Russia has brought to Germany with his long-accursed cadaver have swollen up, and have infected all of Europe' (CABV discussions, 30 June 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 91).
- 102 Sundermann erroneously claims he supported the loan (*Deutscher Nationalismus*, p. 43).
- 103 Marx to Engels, 3 May 1851, MECW, XXXVIII, p. 343.
- 104 Schurz to Kinkel, 20 Jan. 1851, Kessel, *Briefe*, p. 54, and Weydemeyer to Marx, 6 Feb. 1852, *Zeitgenossen*, p. 442.
- 105 Marx to Engels, 25 Aug. 1851, MECW, XXXVIII, pp. 442–3.
- 106 N.N. to Weydemeyer, June–July 1850, *BdK*, II, p. 218.
- 107 Marx to Engels, 10 Feb. 1851, MECW, XXXVIII, p. 284; Willich to Weitling, 14 May 1852, Wilhelm Weitling Papers, New York Public Library, MSS. Collection, Box 1. Clearly in response to criticism in Cologne, Willich had written that 'Schapper can go to Nassau if his effectiveness in Cologne weakens. What you tell me about the Cologne workers also takes place among the Parisians. They say: Nous ne voulons plus des jouisseurs' (Willich to Becker, 24 Dec. 1850, IISG, ME, O 26).
- 108 Marx to Engels, 22 May 1852, *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 112.
- 109 This further almost led to a duel (!) between Marx and her husband, who suspected Marx of spreading this rumour to the United States (Marx to Cluss, 5 Oct. 1852, and to A. v. Bruiningk, 18 Oct. 1852, *MECW*, XXXIX, pp. 204, 213–14).
- 110 Schapper in the CABV, 18 Jan. 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 4.
- 111 Schapper to Marx, 2 Feb. 1860, *BdK*, III, p. 442; dating after *RdA* (3 June 1852), 180. Schapper did, however, participate in club and League meetings in April, June, July and September 1852. He lectured on social conditions (CABV, 21 and 28 April 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, ff. 35 and 36), defended terrorism (CABV, 27 June 1852, *ibid.*,

- ff. 65–6), gave optimistic revolutionary speeches and suggested changes of statutes in the League (CABV, 8 Sept. 1852, and League, 26 Sept. 1852, *ibid.*, ff. 107 and 104).
- 112 Marx to Engels, 3 July 1852, and Engels to Weydemeyer, 12 April 1853, Marx to Cluss, 5 Oct. 1853, *MECW*, XXXIX, pp. 126, 309, 378. For the Willich-Schapper fight see minutes of debates in the CABV, 14 July 1852 (Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, ff. 93–4). After two years of ‘retirement’, during which he was ‘furiously angry with the Windmill louts’, Schapper finally reconciled himself with Marx in 1856 (Marx to Engels, 16 April 1856, *MECW*, XL, pp. 38, 41). For Marx and Engels, too, Willich instead of Schapper was the central figure in the rival League. In late 1851 Engels was working on a satirical essay on ‘K.Schnapper’s “tippling jaunts”’ but spared him when writing the satire on ‘The Great Men of the Exile’ in May–June 1852 (Marx to Engels, 24 Nov. 1851, and Engels to Marx, 16 Dec. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 492, 516).
- 113 On Schily, Imandt and Schärttner see Marx to Engels, 19 and 30 Aug. 1852, *MECW*, XXXIX, pp. 162, 170, on Starke and Dietz BGLAK, 236/8743, weekly report of 12 Oct. 1852, nos. 47, 64.
- 114 Weekly report, n.d., accidentally filed in NLAV file, Potsdam 8535, f. 15.
- 115 CABV debate, 1 Feb. 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 10.
- 116 CABV debate, 14 March 1852, *ibid.*, f. 21.
- 117 CABV notes and debates, March 1852, 12 March, 14 April and 21 July 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, ff. 29, 26, 34, and 102. Roedel, Reininger and others were later active in Struve’s New York *Arbeiterbund* which co-operated closely with Willich’s Steuben Association; Roedel became one of the editors of the *Sociale Republik* (no. 26, 16 Oct. 1858, pp. 1–3, and special leaflet, added to no. 5, 26 May 1860). Oswald Dietz fell as a Union officer around Petersburg, Virginia (Zucker, ‘Biographical Dictionary’, p. 287).
- 118 Weydemeyer to Marx, 6 and 9 April 1852, *MEGA*, III/5, pp. 308, 315–16, and Weydemeyer to Engels, 17 June 1852, cited in *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 613. Willich’s plan to organise an invasion of Hamburg from New York is mentioned in H.A.Rattermann, ‘General August Willich’, *Der Deutsche Pionier*, 9 (Feb. 1878), 445.
- 119 Monthly report, Carlsruhe, 13 May 1852, BGLAK, 48/5212. On £5,525 6s. 2d. spent on sending 613 foreigners to New York within seven months in 1852 and on further large payments from the British government see Duane Charles Anderson, ‘English Working-Class Internationalism, 1846–1864’ (Ph.D. thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1976), pp. 85–6, 169, and Porter, *Refugee Question*, pp. 160–1.
- 120 BGLAK, 236/8743, weekly reports 10 July–10 Nov. 1852. Six out of the 17 were tailors. Of course, the lists may not have been complete.
- 121 Discussion of 20 Sept. 1852, Demokratischer Verein, Potsdam 9529, f. 54.
- 122 Report of 7 Nov. 1852, Gamby, ed., *Bauer, Konfidentenberichte*, p. 53. In July, 74 members had attended a tumultuous meeting (CABV, 14 July 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 94).
- 123 Gamby, ed., *Bauer, Konfidentenberichte*, p. 76.
- 124 Friedrich Wilhelm IV to Prime Minister Otto von Manteuffel, 11 Nov. 1850, quoted in Schoeps, ‘Agenten, Spitzel, Flüchtlinge’, p. 75. Just prior to this the police recruited a Herr Friederichs to report on the democratic clubs. His high-handed manner reveals how desperate the police were: they accepted his self-definition as a ‘diplomatic agent’ who was ‘too honourable and too independent to allow [himself] being used as a police spy’. The police also agreed to bypass the Prussian embassy and resident Prussian officials completely and paid him the exorbitant amount of £500 originally, plus another £270 in July and August 1850, in return for his accurate listings of members and proceedings procured through his three agents in various groups (X to Hinckeldey, 3, 8 and 20 July 1850, 8–9 Aug. 1850, Simon file, Potsdam 11374/1, ff. 92, 95–6, 109, 133; for his identification see ff. 14 and 145).

- 125 Stieber to Saegert [c. May 1851], Saegert Papers, B.P.H., Rep. 192, no. 35. The Berlin police president Hinckeldey also declared that the trials against Lessner and Reininger in Mainz, Stapler in Braunschweig and others were ‘all instituted on our initiative, and founded on information, proofs etc. suggested and produced from here’ (Hinckeldey, 20 Dec. 1851, Reininger file, Potsdam 12524, f. 87).
- 126 Report by Saegert, 3 Aug. 1851, p. 12, in Saegert Papers, B.P.H., Rep. 192, no. 35. Copies of the ‘Dietz Archive’ are in the Dietz file, Potsdam 11373, ff. 3–51.
- 127 Marx, ‘Revelations’, *MECW*, XI, pp. 446, 449; Livingstone, ed., *The Cologne Communist Trial*, pp. 17–22. Julius Vindex’, a pseudonymous speaker for ‘the radical people’s party’, reprinted for distribution in Germany the revelations in the English press of the theft, forgeries and fraud of Stieber and his spies Hirsch, Haupt, Cherval and Gipperich, but the planned series of broadsheets did not appear (‘Deutsche Flugblätter aus London’, Potsdam 9863, ff. 6–7). A later radical song asked who the most hated person in Germany was, contrasting the demerits of the various police officers (to the tune of ‘Was ist des Deutschen Vaterland?’): ‘Ist’s Wermuth oder Hinckeldey./Ist’s insgesamt die Polizey?’, and came to the conclusion that the worst enemy was Prussian prime minister Manteuffel (Adolf Wermuth, *Ein Beamtenleben: Erinrentngen*, Berlin: Scherl, 1922, pp. 12–13).
- 128 *RdA*, 27 March 1852, 102–3. Cherval’s description of the trial and call for support is in *RdA*, 10 April 1852, 124–5.
- 129 *RdA*, 3 June 1852, 180–1, Marx to Engels, 25 Oct. 1852, *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 217, Marx, ‘Herr Vogt’, *MECW*, XVII, p. 56. Shortly before the unmasking of Cherval, Scherzer had suspected the emissary Majer and Dietz (*RdA*, 22 May 1852, 162). Cherval had already given speeches in the CABV in 1846 which according to Nettlau (‘Diskussionen’, 388) revealed his intentions as agent provocateur.
- 130 *RdA*, 5 June 1852, 181.
- 131 *RdA*, 17 July 1852, 227–8.
- 132 Gamby, ed., *Bauer, Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 59, 79, 90, Kurt Kranke, ‘Marginalien zum agent-provocateur Charles Fleury’, *Beiträge zur Marx-Engels-Forschung*, 13 (1982), 79–88.
- 133 Hirsch’s declaration appeared later in ‘Der “demokratische” Mouchard’, *NYCZ*, 7 (29 April 1853), 66. Marx did not use this declaration because he soon also recognised Hirsch as a spy and expelled him from his League in mid-February 1852 (Marx to Engels, 5 March 1852, *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 59). His police records survived in Hirsch file, Potsdam 10485, ff. 1–3.
- 134 For this ‘Minute-Book’ see Marx, ‘Revelations’, *MECW*, XI, pp. 420–43.
- 135 Hirsch’s ‘Confessions’ in an undated letter to Willich, UL Bonn, S 2661, and another version in W.Hirsch, ‘Die Opfer der Mouchardie’, *NYCZ*, 3 (1 April 1853), 2–3; 4 (8 April 1853), 32–3; 5 (15 April 1853), 42–3; 6 (22 April 1853), 52–3.
- 136 Report of 14 Dec. 1852, Gamby, ed., *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 59–60.
- 137 Hirsch, ‘Die Opfer der Mouchardie’, *NYCZ*, 5 (15 April 1853), 43.
- 138 Imandt to J. Ph.Becker, 6 Dec. 1852, *BdK*, III, p. 252. Even before these revelations, Marx had been ‘morally convinced that Messrs Willich and Schapper and their good-for-nothing pack of rascally curs are directly taking part’ in the intrigues leading to the Cologne arrests (Marx to Weydemeyer, 27 June 1851, and Engels to Weydemeyer, 7 Aug. 1851, *MECW*, XXXVIII, pp. 375, 407; also Miquel to Marx, not before August 1851, *MEGA*, III/4, p. 458).
- 139 Hirsch, ‘Die Opfer der Mouchardie’. Willich and Kinkel alone believed Hirsch, and even continued to pay him. See Hirsch to Kinkel, 20 Oct. 1853, UL Bonn, S 2661, Marx to Cluss, 17 April 1853, Marx to Engels, 26 April 1853, *MECW*, XXXIX, pp. 313, 316, and Marx, ‘Hirsch’s Confessions’, *MECW*, XII, pp. 40–3.
- 140 Marx to Cluss, 14 Dec. 1852, *MECW*, XXXIX, pp. 266–7, Gamby, ed., *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, p. 61, and pp. 76–97, Marx to Lassalle, 3 March 1860, and c. 2 June 1860, *MECW*, XLI, pp. 91, 147–52. These were by no means all the spies who reported on émigrés for the police. Besides Friederich, Langenschwarz, Dohl, Lindau, Backhaus all spied on the refugees during this period. A former lieutenant, A.Hentze, succeeded in connecting a

- democratic group around Dr Ladendorf in Berlin in 1853–1854 to Willich, but their trial revealed only insignificant links to London (e.g., Stieber to Hinckeldey, 19 April 1853, Ladendorf file, Potsdam 11387, f. 213, and passim, Potsdam 11386–91). Marx's group was similarly plagued by spies such as Haupt, Bangya, Edgar Bauer and an anonymous agent in the NLAV, and Marx himself employed a Prussian informer to spy on Greif and Fleury (Marx to Engels, 10 Nov. 1852, *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 242). The entire process of recruiting spies, guiding their observations, checking on their reports, weeding out sheer fantasies, keeping an eye on their expenses, and co-ordinating efforts with the reluctant Prussian ambassador can be read in letters to Berlin by a Prussian police lieutenant Simon (Simon file, Potsdam 11374/1, e.g., ff. 8, 14, 89, 92, 95–6).
- 141 Engels to Weydemeyer, 12 April 1853, *MECW*, XXXIX, pp. 304. Gebert, reporting on the powerlessness of Marx's party in London and Paris, also sounded much more conciliatory in mid-1852, praising Marx 'for sticking to principle and not falling into intrigues' (Gebert in League meeting, [2?] July 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 97).
- 142 *NYSZ*, 1 Feb. 1853; Kinkel to Hess, in Silberner, ed., *Heß Briefwechsel*, p. 542. Willich initially intended to return soon (*NYSZ*, 7 March 1853, and *Cincinnati Republikaner*, XIX, 43 (19 March 1860), 2; see also Marx to Cluss, 26 April 1853, and to Engels, 14 Dec. 1853, *MECW*, XXXIX, pp. 317, 403).
- 143 *RdA*, 12 March 1853, 82–3; Cluss to Marx, 25 Feb. 1853, *MEGA*, III/6, p. 389.
- 144 Schurz to Kinkel, 12 April 1853, Kessel, *Briefe*, p. 113; Klein to Freiligrath, 31 July 1853, *BdK*, III, pp. 290–1; extensive details in Willich to Kinkel, 19 Nov. [1853], UL Bonn, S2663.
- 145 See e.g., Willich's letters of 2 May and 26 Aug. 1853, *NYCZ*, 13 May and 2 Sept. 1853, and A. Willich, 'Dr. Karl Marx und seine Enthüllungen', *NYCZ*, 28 Oct. 1853, 329–30, 4 Nov. 1853, 339–40, and the declaration by Weydemeyer, Cluss and Jacobi against Willich, *NYCZ*, 25 Nov. 1853; Marx, 'The Knight of the Noble Consciousness', *MECW*, XII, pp. 479–508.
- 146 Reports of 16 Oct. 1858 and 23 Aug. 1860, Gamby, ed., *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 422, 572–3. The platform of the *Cincinnati Republikaner* was reprinted in *Sociale Republik*, 35 (18 Dec. 1858), p. 5.
- 147 *Cincinnati Republikaner*, 19, 28 (1 March 1860), 2.
- 148 *Ibid.*, 19, 41 (16 March 1860), 2.
- 149 *Ibid.*, 18, 179 (19 Aug. 1859), 2.
- 150 *Ibid.*, 19, 29 (2 March 1860), 2.
- 151 *Ibid.*, 19, 32 (6 March 1860), 2.
- 152 Willich to Struve, 12 Sept. 1858, *Sociale Republik*, 23 (25 Sept. 1858), 1.
- 153 Moncure Daniel Conway, *Autobiography: Memoirs and Experiences* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1904), I, p. 269; Easton, *Hegel's First American Followers*, pp. 180–203. Willich's experience in the American civil war reconfirmed his long-held advocacy of a militia to replace standing armies (Maj. Gen'l August Willich, *The Army: Standing Army or National Army? An Essay*, Cincinnati: A. Frey, 1866, p. 23, where he proposed details of army organisation, drill and strategy). He claimed similarly that 'Only that nation is free whose citizens are soldiers and whose soldiers are citizens' (*Cincinnati Republikaner*, 18, 169 (8 Aug. 1859), 2; no. 183, 24 Aug. 1859, p. 2).
- 154 Marx to Engels, 16 April 1856, to Weydemeyer, 1 Feb. 1859, *MECW*, XL, pp. 41, 375. Marx sent Engels Willich's letters in the *Cincinnati Hochwächter* and reported on Willich's European visit (Marx to Engels, 8 Oct. 1858, 24 May 1859, *MECW*, XL, pp. 346, 449).
- 155 Marx, postscript to second (1875) edition of *Revelations*, in Livingstone, ed., *The Cologne Communist Trial*, p. 131.
- 156 *Cincinnati Republikaner*, 19, 52 (29 March 1860), 3. Willich's *Cincinnati Republikaner* also reprinted and praised the preface to Marx's *Kritik der politischen Oeconomie* (18, 190 (1 Sept. 1859), 2, and 202 (15 Sept. 1859), 2). Willich died in 1878 in St Mary's near



Cincinnati, where a monument was erected to him (A.E.Zucker, 'Biographical Dictionary of the Forty-Eighters', in Zucker, ed., *The Forty-Eighters*, p. 355).

157 League meetings, 7 May and 3 Aug. 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, ff. 42 and 78.

158 *RdA*, 26 Feb. 1853, 69–70.

## 7

### Apathy and revival: the International Association, 1853–1859

- 1 Arthur Müller-Lehning 'The International Association (1855–1859)', *IRSH*, 3 (1938), 185–286.
- 2 Ute Emmrich ('Johann Georg Eccarius und sein Wirken in der revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung: ein biographischer Abriss, 1818–1864', Ph.D. dissertation, Erfurt, 1988, pp. 122–64) adds new material on his private miseries and his contribution to the *Volk*. His articles for Chartist and German-American papers are reprinted in e.g., *MEGA* 1/11, pp. 459–63, and 1/12, pp. 605–17, 629–31.
- 3 His proximity to Engels provoked some jealousy in Marx, although Lupus proved his loyalty by bequeathing £900 to Marx in 1864 (Schmidt, *Wilhelm Wolff*, pp. 286–315; Marx to Engels, 14 Dec. 1853, *MEW*, XXVIII, p. 314). See also Walter Schmidt, 'Wilhelm Wolff in der Vielfalt sozialistischen Denkens', *BzG*, 38 (1996), 3–19.
- 4 Marx to Adolf Cluss, 17 April 1853, *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 312.
- 5 Bernd Lindner ('Die publizistische Tätigkeit Wilhelm Liebknechts in der Zeit der Londoner Emigration bis zur Rückkehr nach Deutschland (1850–1862)', Diss. phil., Hallé (Saale), 1975) plays down his differences with Marx but details much of Liebknecht's writings on English workers and British foreign and colonial policy. Haltern (*Wilhelm Liebknecht und England*) has a useful introductory essay. Liebknecht's writings include 'George Julian Harney', *Der Wahre Jacob* no. 276 (Stuttgart, 1898), Beilage, 2385–6, 'Ein Vorachtundvierziger' [G.J.Harney], *Die Neue Zeit*, 15 (1897), 636–40, and *Robert Owen* (Nürnberg, Würlein, 1892).
- 6 Cobden's opinion that 'one issue of *The Times* contains more facts and more civilisation than the complete works of Thucydides' struck a chord in Liebknecht. He even took Cobden's idea as the basis for a talk in the CABV (Liebknecht, 'Eine Erinnerung an Cobden und Bright', *Cosmopolis. Internationale Revue* 12 (Oct. 1898), 548–75).
- 7 Engels to Weydemeyer, 12 April 1853, *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 309.
- 8 Mayer, *Friedrich Engels*, II, ch. 2; W.O.Henderson, *Frederick Engels*, 2 vols (Frank Cass, 1976); Terrell Carver, *Friedrich Engels: His Life and Thought* (Macmillan, 1989), pp. 209–32; H.-J.Bochinski, 'Friedrich Engels und die "New York Tribune"', *Beiträge zur Marx-Engels-Forschung*, 19 (1985), 23–44.
- 9 Shorter articles on the Prussian police during the Cologne trial appeared in the *New York Daily Tribune*, and when Marx finally realised that he had been tricked by the police agent Bangya and that his 'Great Men' was not to be published, he attacked Hirsch for misrepresenting the whole story (Marx, 'Hirsch's Confessions' and 'The Knight of the Noble Conscience', *MECW*, XII, pp. 40–3, 479–508).
- 10 *BdK*, III, p. 266, and Marx to Cluss, 7 Dec. 1852, *BdK*, III, p. 267.
- 11 He proposed, e.g., emigration of the unemployed to America (*PP*, 18 March 1854, 1, 4). Expelled from Paris in 1849, he had collected for the Social Democratic Refugees' Committee (*DLZ*, 31 Aug. 1849, 9 Aug. 1850), and wrote several Utopias in his later years, e.g., *Social Architecture* (1876; excerpts in *Vorwärts*, 25 April 1877), *Life in Utopia* (1890), and *Große Jubiläumsfeier und imposanter Triumphzug in Erinnerung des hundertjährigen*

- Bestehens der socialdemokratischen Staatseinrichtung in Britannien* (Nürnberg, 1897), describing himself as a member of the CABV in the last one.
- 12 *PP*, 7 May 1853, 5. Jones omitted sections of Marx's criticism of Mazzini and Kossuth (Bochinski, 'Marx's Mitarbeit an... "The People's Paper"', 177).
- 13 *Harney Papers*, pp. 68–70, Cluss to Weydemeyer, 12 Dec. 1853, *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 587; *PP*, 3 Dec. 1853; Harney's defence in the *Beacon*, 7 Dec. 1853, 101–2 and 112. Cf. Anderson, 'English Working-Class Internationalism', pp. 125–6.
- 14 On Reininger's arrival in London see *RdA*, 9 July, 27 Aug. 1853. Little is known about the other Germans. The tailor Thielmann or Thielemann had already corresponded from London with Reininger in June 1851 on dissension between Communist League members (Thielemann in Soho to Reininger, 26 June 1851, Reininger file, Potsdam 12524, f. 12. C. Bauer may be identical with 'Bauer' mentioned in this letter).
- 15 Liebknecht later recalled that 'When the tide of emigration had ebbed the Society shrivelled up and became somewhat sectarian, the old followers of Weitling and Cabet began to assert themselves again' ('Reminiscences', in *Marx and Engels*, p. 54).
- 16 'Citizen' Ronge's ticket is in Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 116. Ronge, however, specifically attacked communism, or 'negating atheist materialism' (*Aufruf an die deutschen Manner und Frauen*, Hamburg: Niemeyer, 1850, p. 8). Instead of 'German-Catholicism', Ronge used less compromising terms such as 'Humanistic Association' or 'Free Religious Community' in England. Edgar Bauer described Ronge as Ruge's representative in London, and derided his society as the whim of merely eight eccentrics (Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 74–5; see also report of 5 April 1853, Revolutionary party file, Potsdam 13835, ff. 110–11). But the Democratic Society appreciated the German-Catholic communities as the last refuge for progressive elements in Germany (29 Feb. 1852, Demokratischer Verein, Potsdam 9529, f. 6). See also Steinmetz and Muhs, 'Protestantische Pastoren', in Alter and Muhs, eds., *Exilanten*, pp. 441–4.
- 17 Ronge was disappointed with the German refugees who 'mostly belonged to the superficial school of Bruno Bauer', and instead sympathised with Holyoake's secularist movement (Lothar W. Silberhorn, 'Der Epilog eines religiösen Reformers: Ungedruckte Aufzeichnungen Johannes Ronges aus dem Londoner Exil', *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte*, 6 (1954), 129–38). Ronge claimed that his own religious groups introduced higher ethics into politics, based on the idea of free mankind, on independence of the nation and on the duty of each citizen to help solve the historical task of his nation (*Die Ursache meiner Verbannung* (1860), pp. 4, 8). He continued his agitation throughout the 1850s and 1860s. In Frankfurt, many copies were found of his *An die Deutschen in Amerika am Vorabend des Volkskampfes* (April 1854, Ronge file, Potsdam 12462, f. 51), and in May 1854 he distributed *An das deutsche Volk. Kampf gegen Russland, wenn nicht mit, dann ohne die Fürsten* (May 1854, Ronge file, Potsdam 12462, f. 65), where he claimed ([p. 1]) that 'Never before has the importance of Germany for European civilisation become clearer than in the present crisis'. He juxtaposed 'Russian-Mongolian barbarism' with Teutonic culture and the religion of humanity', and declared that now, finally, Germans had found their political model in the English people. In another widely publicised leaflet he exhorted the German nation not to 'fritter away its energy in squabbles about the *form* of the state but aim for the essence of freedom and the welfare of all to fulfil its historical task' (*Der Czaaren-Rock in Deutschland*, 1855, Ronge file, Potsdam 12462, ff. 72–82, here [p. 2.]). In 1861 Ronge's proposal that the German National Association agitate for religious freedom was turned down by a London assembly on tactical grounds (*Hermann*, 9 Feb. 1861). Although he had become an English citizen, Ronge was imprisoned in several German states in the 1860s (Ronge file, Potsdam 12462, ff. 130, 134–7).
- 18 Reinhold Rüegg, ed., 'Erinnerungen eines deutschen Achtundvierzigers (Sigismund Borkheim)', *Die Neue Zeit*, 8 (1890), 305–23. Engels's biographical sketch stressed Borkheim's life-long preoccupation with fighting Russian absolutism (Friedrich Engels,

- 'Einleitung', in Sigismund Borkheim, *Zur Erinnerung für die deutschen Mordspatrioten 1806–1807*, Hottingen-Zürich, Verlag der Volksbuchhandlung, 1888, pp. 4–5). Borkheim had been a member of the Emigration Society (NLAV file, Potsdam 8535, f. 9, 18 Feb. 1852).
- 19 Schlesinger allegedly established a factory near Gravesend, employing about 600 people, in particular Hungarian and Polish refugees, to produce cartridges for the British army in the Orient (H.Alberts, 7 Oct. 1854, to Berlin Police, Revolutionary party file, Potsdam 13835, ff. 170A–170B).
- 20 Her mother, however, warned the London fugitives against enticing their continental friends into chimerical conspiracies (von Asten-Kinkel, 'Johanna Kinkel in England', 184–6; J.Kinkel to K.Zitz, 31 May 1854, in Leppla, Johanna und Gottfried Kinkels Briefe an Kathinka Zitz', 50–1). Lothar Bucher, who closely observed the War, also focused on its repercussions for German politics (Studt, *Lothar Bucher*, pp. 152–67).
- 21 W.J.Linton, *Memories* (Lawrence & Bullen, 1895), pp. 141–2; *PP*, 3 Dec. 1853, 6–7, 20 Jan. 1855, 7; Reiningner on the Crimean War (*RdA*, 27 May 1854).
- 22 C.C.Bayley, *Mercenaries for the Crimea* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1977); R.Harris, 'British German Legion', *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, 62 (1984), 182–5. The editors of *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 658, n.613, wrongly assume that the Legion was never formed.
- 23 Marx to Engels, 12 Jan. 1855, *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 508.
- 24 Bayley, *Mercenaries*, p. 165; *PP*, 6 Jan. 1855, 5; cf. also 16 June 1855, 4 Aug. 1855. Referring to old working-class fears of foreign oppression, the paper objected to the proposed special conditions of the Foreign Legion, suggesting that the British soldiers receive better treatment instead, and echoing recent attacks on Prince Albert's role (J.Paulmann, '“Germanismus” am englischen Hof, oder: Warum war Prinz Albert unpopular?', in Alter and Muhs, *Exilanten*, pp. 389–91).
- 25 *LDJ*, 27 Oct., 17 Nov. 1855, 5 April 1856 and 2 May 1857 (a reporter for the *Londoner Deutsches Journal* was allegedly even arrested for sympathising with his fellow nationals' fate in the Legion); Theodor Fontane, ['Über Raufereien zwischen deutschen und englischen Jägern'], 'Die letzten Tage der deutsch-englischen Legion', and 'Von Stutterheim und die Kap-Legionare', in Theodor Fontane, *Sämtliche Werke* (Munich: Nymphenburger Verlagshandlung, 1972), XVIIIa, pp. 689–91, 699, 701–3. Willich's newspaper reported on some 900 men of the German Legion remaining in India by 1859 (*Cincinnati Republikaner*, 19, 51 (28 March 1860), p. 2).
- 26 Gamby, ed., *Edgar Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, p. 99 (report dated 26 Sept. 1856).
- 27 *LDJ*, no. 1, 4 Aug. 1855. A *Deutsches Athenäum* had existed between 1853 and 1855, but as a purely literary magazine (*Hermann*, 15 Sept. 1866).
- 28 *LDJ*, no. 12, 20 Oct. 1855 (Fleury), nos. 62, 65, 92 (4 and 25 Oct. 1856, 2 May 1857, on spies in London and on Stieber's activities in Silesia and Berlin). Sigmund Engländer protested his innocence (*LDJ*, no. 125, 19 Dec. 1857) but did not convince Marx, who saw him behind the *Londoner Deutsches Journal* (*MECW*, XVII, p. 277; and Marx to Engels, 6 Sept. 1855, *MEW*, XXVIII, p. 459). W.Häusler does not mention these accusations ('Sigmund Engländer', in Walter Grab and Julius H.Schoeps (eds.), *Juden im Vormärz und in der Revolution von 1848*, Stuttgart: Burg Verlag, 1983, pp. 83–137). Engländer had written for Kolatschek's *Deutsche Monatsschrift für Politik, Wissenschaft, Kunst und Leben*, 6 vols (Stuttgart: 1850–1851) on French Socialism, and later became editor-in-chief of Reuter's Agency (Aronsfeld, 'German Jews in Victorian England', 321).
- 29 *LDJ*, 20 Oct. 1855, 25 Aug. 1855, 20 June 1857. Anti-Semitism also played a role in the feud between the editor of the *Londoner Deutsches Journal*, Rudolf Hirschfeld, and Phillip Korn (27 Feb. 1858). A later spiteful description is, e.g., 'Die deutschen Juden in London', *Die Gartenlaube*, no. 20 (1863), 312–15. Curiously, the Democratic Society simply regarded the question of Jewish emancipation as settled, although some felt that the revolution of 1848

- had not achieved enough in this regard (9 Sept. 1852, Demokratischer Verein, Potsdam 9529, f. 51).
- 30 *LDJ*, 25 Aug., 1 Sept. 1855, 7 June 1856, 24 Oct. 1857, 8 May 1858.
- 31 *LDJ*, 15 Sept., 24 Nov. 1855; the series on 'Die Deutschen in Whitechapel', 22 Sept.–20 Oct. 1855; on Chartists, 5 Jan. 1856; on communism 31 Aug., 3 Oct. 1857; the paper's own proposals, 1 Sept. 1855.
- 32 Wilhelm Blos, *Die Deutsche Revolution* (Stuttgart: Dietz, 1893), p. 616. He arrived in London in October 1850 and kept close contact with Hungarian refugees (Simon file, Potsdam 11374/1, f. 142). Korn was in the 1860s involved in Louise Otto-Peters' General German Women's Association and helped edit the *Allgemeine Deutsche Frauenzeitung* (Ruth-Ellen Boetcher Joeres, ed., *Louise Otto-Peters*, Frankfurt: Fischer, 1983, pp. 171, 182, 192, and August Bebel, *Aus meinem Leben*, Berlin: Dietz, 1978, p. 86).
- 33 *LDJ*, 11–18 Aug. 1855. Enders, a tailor from Schwerin, had been prominent in the League of the Just in Paris, but had denounced 'the communist principle' and was duly expelled from the League with several followers by the London Central Authority in 1847 (*BdK*, I, pp. 118–19, and 581). By 1850, Enders had moved to London and hosted Reininger during Willich's congress (Reininger file, Potsdam 12524, f. 23; on his tailoring shop in Regent Street see Simon file, Potsdam 11374/1, f. 128). Enders was in the Democratic Society (Friederich to Hinckeldey, [c. 2 Sept. 1850], Simon file, Potsdam 11374/1, f. 128), in Willich's League in early 1852 (League meeting, 16 Jan. 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 3), and in Stechan's Neuer Arbeiterverein (NLAV file, Potsdam 8535, f. 6, debate of 4 Feb. 1852). In 1865, Enders spoke at a meeting of German master tailors in London (*Hermann*, 11 March 1865).
- 34 One over-excited spy reported that Ronge and Korn had been joined by Kinkel, Marx and Willich (BGLAK, 236/8757, report from Vienna, 18 Oct. 1855, no. 47); similarly weekly police report from Dresden, 10 Aug. 1855, Ronge file, Potsdam 12462, f. 88.
- 35 Korn was attacked in the *LDJ* (29 Sept., 6 Oct., 8 Nov. 1856, 6 Feb. 1858) and carried on a personal feud with the paper's editor Hirschfeld until the paper's exasperated proprietor eventually replaced Hirschfeld with Bernhard Becker (*LDJ*, 27 Feb., 6 March, 20 March 1858).
- 36 *LDJ*, 15 and 22 Nov. 1856; 'Programm. Populäre Vorträge über die Erziehung der Töchter... von P.A.Korn', copy in IISG, ME, S 16.
- 37 Weekly police report from Dresden, 10 August 1855, Ronge file, Potsdam 12462, f. 88.
- 38 Lessner, *Ich brachte*, p. 94.
- 39 *PP*, no. 1, 8 May 1852, 1.
- 40 French exiles were excluded from the Committee because Jones wanted to avoid the impression that 'exiles have got up the affair, and that it was not a genuine manifestation of British feeling' (*PP*, 2 Dec. 1854, 4). Jones proposed that the Committee declare itself permanent, 'with a view to organize the democracy of London' (*PP*, 9 Dec. 1854, 4).
- 41 *PP*, 6 Jan. 1855, 4.
- 42 *PP*, 10 Feb. 1855, 4. Lehning ('The International Association') misses this disagreement among the founding Chartist members, which recalls apprehensions when the Fraternal Democrats began ten years earlier. But Fr. de Jong relates a similar incident in the following year ('Ernest Jones and Chartism c. 1856', *Bulletin of the International Institute of Social History*, 5, 1950, 99–104). The French exiles carefully explained that only this special incident warranted a deviation from their usual abstinence from British politics 'as strangers and refugees' (*L'Homme*, 22 Nov. 1854, 1–2).
- 43 BGLAK, 236/8757, reports from Vienna, 23 March 1855, no. 11; *PP*, 3 March 1855, 4; *L'Homme*, 7 March 1855, 2, 14 March 1855, 2–3, and 21 March 1855, 2–3. Meysenbug had failed to persuade Kinkel to participate (Meysenbug to Kinkel, 24 Jan. 1855, in Rossi, ed., *Briefe*, p. 102).

- 44 Labour, science and justice all called for ‘an alliance of the peoples’ ‘in order to crush...monarchy, aristocracy, and moneyocracy’ (PP, 21 July 1855, 6, also in *L’Homme*, 18 July 1855, and *Der Verbannte*, July 1855).
- 45 PP, 3 May 1856, 4.
- 46 PP, 3 May 1856, 4.
- 47 Lehning, ‘The International Association’, 201–12. Boris Nicolaevsky (‘Secret Societies and the First International’, in Milorad Drachkovitch (ed.), *The Revolutionary Internationals, 1864–1943*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966, pp. 36–56, 228–33) sees revolutionary freemasons behind both the Commune and the International Association, although the Association placed little emphasis on secrecy, publicly announcing discussions and members, and a regular *Bulletin*. The Berlin police kept a file on the Commune (Comité Révolutionnaire file, Potsdam 9357), but apparently did not receive Edgar Bauer’s detailed information.
- 48 Pyat’s internationalism did not stop him from claiming the left bank of the Rhine for France, as the German national liberal Schaible indignantly noted (*Siebenunddreißig Jahre*, p. 70). In 1880 Pyat with Johann Most embarked upon *The An-archist, Socialist-Revolutionary Review* (IISG, Becker Papers, D II 499).
- 49 Talandier saw the Chartists as ‘the only people who, in England, think and speak as we do, and who not only desire political liberty, but also social equality’ (PP, 20 Oct. 1855, 1). On Talandier see Jean Maitron, ed., *Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français*, pt. I, III, pp. 428–30, and his articles in *L’Homme* (no. 35, 26 July 1854, 1, and a series from August to October 1854).
- 50 LDJ, no. 9, 29 Sept. 1855; PP, 29 Sept. 1855, 6.
- 51 Pyat’s letter to Victoria, quoted in Kenneth Ward Hooker, *The Fortunes of Victor Hugo in England* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), p. 114 (and pp. 125–37 on Hugo’s involvement).
- 52 For the role of Palmerston and his police agent, Sanders, see Anderson, ‘English Working Class Internationalism’, pp. 159–63, who shows that the decision to expel the refugees was taken in August, over a month before Pyat’s ‘Letter’. However, interference from the French government, which Becker immediately regarded as proven (LDJ, no. 12, 20 Oct. 1855) was only traced by Porter (*The Refugee Question*, pp. 162–9, 151–7).
- 53 As a result of this publicity, 2,000 copies of subsequent open letters by Pyat reached Aachen (Aachen police to Berlin police, 16 October 1856, Pyat file, Potsdam 12191, ff. 36–7).
- 54 Marx to Moritz Elsner, 8 Nov. 1855, MECW, XXXIX, p. 555.
- 55 Marx to Engels, 2 Feb. 1855, MECW, XXXIX, p. 521.
- 56 PP, 3 Feb. 1855, where Stechan appears as ‘Mr Steadier’.
- 57 PP, 10 Feb. 1855, 4, 3 March 1855, 4–5. This must have been disappointing, since the handbill had announced Kinkel, Ruge, Marx and Schapper, none of whom appeared (copy in the Marx-Engels-Papers, IISG, S 4). Bley was a ‘thorough democrat’ lodging with Enders (X to Hinckeldey, report s.d. [August 1850], Simon file, Potsdam 11374/1, f. 128), and was apparently close to Reininger (police interrogation of Müdeking, 17 Oct. 1851, Reininger file, Potsdam 12524, f. 82).
- 58 PP, 17 March 1855, 5, PP, 9 June 1855, 6; 16 June 1855, 6; 4 Aug. 1855, 6, 8 Sept. 1855, 4. One Gläntz, a tailor from Darmstadt who was named as ‘president of the Communist League in London’ in 1855 by the Dresden police, gave Stechan letters of introduction for Darmstadt (Weekly police report from Dresden, 10 August 1855, Ronge file, Potsdam 12462, f. 88). Of the others, I have only been able to find the name of J.J.Schröder, member of the refugees’ support committee (DLZ, 28 Dec. 1849), presumably also the president of the Democratic Club, possibly identical with a German J.L. Schröder who wrote ‘39 Articles’ for the Chartists in 1839 (NS, no. 96, 14 Sept. 1839, 7), the tailor Jacob Schröder who had joined the volunteers for Schleswig-Holstein in 1850 (Wermuth/Stieber, I, p. 116; BdK, II, p. 679), or a later president of the CABV of the same name (*Hermann*, 16 Nov. 1861).

- 59 *RdA*, 13 Jan. 1855. In May 1855 he joined the CABV, which had helped Scherzer's family during his imprisonment (A.Scherzer, in *Neuer SocialDemokrat*, no. 20, 18 Feb. 1876). He edited *Der Verbannte* in July (i.e., began his activities earlier than previously assumed, *BdK*, III, p. 482).
- 60 Heiko Ceiling, *Die moralische Ökonomie des frühen Proletariats* (Frankfurt: Materialis, 1985), pp. 203–4. Stechan still contributed to a fund for a FortyEighter in 1867 (*Hermann*, 17 Aug. 1867).
- 61 'Und giebt es Herrn und giebt es Knechte,/Was ist die Schuld? Nichts als das Geld!/Für Gleichheit ist der Mensch geboren!/. . . Die Arbeit hoch und Krieg dem Geld!' (*Der Verbannte*, copy in StA Dresden, MfI No. 278dd, Confiscation of Publications file, f. 75).
- 62 *Der Verbannte*, ff. 70–1. Copies of the paper were seized in Saxony. A police report on *Der Verbannte* also claimed that the International Association planned set fire to Paris as a torch of revolution—an allegation which even the police reader noted with a red question mark (weekly report from Dresden, 10 Aug. 1855, Scherzer file, Potsdam 12865, ff. 16–17).
- 63 *PP*, 22 Sept. 1855, 4 and 29 Sept. 1855, 6. The proposed almanac, planned like the Association's later *Bulletin*, does not seem to have appeared.
- 64 Marx's refusal to appear alongside Herzen was quite ironic because the prospect of Marx's presence had attracted Herzen (Marx to Engels, 13 Feb. 1855, *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 523, Herzen, *My Past and Thoughts*, III, pp. 1169–70).
- 65 Marx to Engels, 22 Nov. 1854, *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 499.
- 66 *PP*, 19 April 1856, 4 (Marx's speech also in *MECW*, XIV, pp. 655–6); *LDJ*, no. 60 (20 Sept. 1856). *The Leader* (7, 339 (20 Sept. 1856), pp. 892–3) reported on the twenty to thirty German refugees in beards and 'wide-awakes' among the large crowd welcoming Frost, carrying a crimson banner inscribed 'Es lebe die Allgemeine [sic!] Sociale Democratiche Republik'.
- 67 Marx to Engels, 16 April 1856, *MECW*, XL, p. 38.
- 68 Müller-Lehning, 'The International Association', pp. 222–5.
- 69 Lessner, *Ich brachte*, pp. 94–5. Althaus praised Kinkel's lectures to the CABV during 1855–1856 as providing cohesion within the German colony at a period of otherwise complete disarray ('Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Colonie', 240).
- 70 Lessner, *Ich brachte*, pp. 95–6. Lessner's account contradicts, e.g., Liebknecht's recollections of having abstained from the CABV only for 'about one year' after the split of the League (*Marx zum Gedächtniß*, p. 38) and of having lectured there weekly for more than eight years, i.e., from mid 1854 (Liebknecht, *Erinnerungen*, p. 240).
- 71 Kinkel spoke at the anniversary meeting in 1856 and lectured occasionally in 1859 (*Hermann*, 8 Feb., 1 March 1862).
- 72 Kinkel to Schurz, 9 Jan. 1858, in Busse, 'Die Briefe Gottfried Kinkels an Karl Schurz', p. 260.
- 73 Wilhelm Liebknecht, *Robert Blum und seine Zeit* (Nürnberg, 1888), p. iv, quoted in Kurt Adamy, 'Biographische Arbeiten Wilhelm Liebknechts', *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Pädagogischen Hochschule Potsdam*, 26 (1982), 233.
- 74 *Der Bote aus London*, no. 4, 17 Nov. 1860, published by F.Zinn (the Harmonia and Concordia societies joined the commemoration, see Gamby, ed., *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, p. 582). Schapper, Liebknecht and Lessner also discussed Blum's role (*Hermann* 16 Nov. 1861).
- 75 *LDJ*, 15 Nov. 1856, 14 Nov. 1857.
- 76 Marx to Engels, 16 April 1856, *MECW*, XL, pp. 38–41. Bauer claimed that Schapper was as isolated as Marx (8 June 1857, in Gamby, ed., *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, p. 226). The German police found it worthwhile to report that Schapper had been inclining towards Marx of late (police report in BGLAK, 236/8757, reports from Vienna, 6 Nov. 1857, where Schapper's conditions were noted as 'needy'). In 1858 Marx and Schapper were socialising

- with apparently no ill feelings left (*MECW*, XL, pp. 319, 330). Their reconciliation was completed in 1860, when Schapper supported Marx against Vogt.
- 77 *PP*, 10 May 1856, and *LDJ*, 15 Nov. 1856. 'Professor Karl Schapper, 34 Dean Street' (later 5 Percy Street, Bedford Sq., where he lived from May 1858 until his death), advertised his services regularly (*LDJ*, 5 July 1856, *NZ*, 21 Aug. 1858, *LDZAA*, 13 Nov. 1858, *Hermann*, 1 Jan. 1870). For Schapper's public appearances see *Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper*, no. 342, 1 March 1857, 7, no. 349, 12 April 1857, 4, and no. 424, 26 Sept. 1858, 4.
- 78 This 'title' for Pfänder is in Liebknecht, *Erinnerungen*, ed. Gemkow, p. 142. For Marx's interest in phrenology see e.g., Liebknecht, *Marx zum Gedächtniß*, p. 35.
- 79 *LDJ*, 12 Dec. 1857. For the 'Concordia' see *LDJ*, 1 Nov. 1856, *Volk*, 7 May 1859, *Hermann*, 22 Oct. 1859, 23 Jan. 1864 (a ball in support of Schleswig-Holstein), 16 Nov. 1867.
- 80 For joint celebrations of the 'radical' German societies see *LDJ*, 22 Nov. 1856, 7–14 Nov. 1857, 3 April 1858, *NZ*, 20 Nov. 1858.
- 81 Edgar Bauer wrongly assumes that the Association from 1855 to 1857 was almost exclusively made up of Poles, and (perhaps deliberately) he confuses an ECDC manifesto with the later society (Bauer, *Die Wahrheit über die Internationale*, Altona: 1872, pp. 5, 8). The International Association has been called 'quasi another branch of the CABV (Bach, 'Marx und das Volk', p. 222), but if anything the relationship was the other way round. Bernhard Becker regarded the CABV, the French and the Polish Communes *Révolutionnaires* as 'integral parts' of the Association (*Geschichte der Arbeiter-Agitation Ferdinand Lassalles*, Braunschweig: W.Bracke, 1874, p. 12).
- 82 Thus Ermerich (also spelt Emmerich and Ermich) typically attended both celebrations, signed a manifesto of the International Association and an address of German and French émigré societies protesting Blanqui's treatment (*LDJ*, 26 Sept. 1857). For other events see *LDJ*, 14 Nov. 1857, 13 Feb. 1858 and 12 June 1858, *Hermann*, 4 May 1861, 5–12 April 1862.
- 83 *LDJ*, 29 Sept. 1855, 16 Aug. 1856, 13 Sept. 1856, 15 Nov. 1856; *BdK*, III, p. 330.
- 84 Vogt, *Mein Prozeß*, p. 323, *Volk*, no. 4, 28 May 1859, and no. 6, 11 June 1859; Marx to Engels, 18 May 1859, *MECW*, XL, p. 440, and Marx, 'Herr Vogt', *MECW*, XVII, p. 316.
- 85 The manifesto was published in the *Bulletin de l'association Internationale* (London), 1 March 1858, but only excerpts have survived (in *Hermann*, 5 April 1862).
- 86 The relevant passages are missing and can only be inferred from Ermerich's later disavowal, after he had obviously been impressed by Marx's theories: 'since writing this I have truly learned that such school exercises in style are no tools for freeing the worker from the pressure of capital, but that presentday bourgeois ways of production do this by themselves' (*Hermann*, 12 April 1862).
- 87 'Minutes of the International Association', [pp. 12–13], 30 Jan. 1860. He also attacked standing armies, the clergy and nationalism, and here (as well as later) Scherzer supported Weitling's pet idea of a 'universal language' (*Hermann*, 13 Jan. 1866, at a meeting of the 'Nationalverein').
- 88 H.Hümmeler, 'Hugo Hillmann', in *Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung: Biographisches Lexikon* (Berlin: Dietz, 1970). After 1861 Hillmann returned to Elberfeld and joined the Lassallean ADAV. In 1869 he was among the convenors of the Eisenach Congress which founded the SDAP led by Liebknecht and Bebel. He was forced to emigrate for the second time in 1880, this time to the United States. Hillmann was one of the founders of the *Neue Zeit*, according to Scherzer (*Neuer Social-Demokrat*, 18 Feb. 1876). Na'aman, (*Konstituierung*, p. 805, n.21–2) called Hillmann the 'prototype of the new social phenomenon of the professional agitator', who used English examples for organised class struggle.
- 89 Brügel, 'Flüchtlingstage von Marx', p. 348; police report of 14 May 1850, Simon file, Potsdam 11374/1, f. 8. The employment of refugees during the Exhibition was regarded as

- highly dangerous by the German police officers sent to London to observe this event; see FO, PRO, MEPO 2/99.
- 90 *LDJ*, 14 Nov. 1857; *Hermann*, 3 Dec. 1859, 17 Nov. 1860; Minutes of the International Association, p. 8, 16 Jan. 1860, and p. 11, 23 Jan. 1860; Lehning, 'The International Association', 284.
- 91 Becker, *Geschichte der Arbeiter-Agitation*, pp. 143, 268–79.
- 92 Becker was expelled from the ADAV in 1865 'as a liar, an infamous traitor and incurable idiot', and Liebknecht claimed that Becker had never actually taken part in the workers' movement but had always remained a 'progressive' (Carl Schilling, *Die Ausstoßung des Präsidenten Bernhard Beckers aus dem Allgemeinen deutschen Arbeiterverein*, Berlin: 1865, pp. 43, 15, 23).
- 93 E.g., *LDJ*, 21 Nov. 1857, with numerous articles from March 1858 on; *NZ*, no. 9, 21 Aug. 1858, no. 11, 4 Sept. 1858; *Hermann*, 8 Dec. 1860, 16 Nov. 1861, 7 June 1862.
- 94 'Minutes of the International Association', [pp. 9–10], 23 Jan. 1860.
- 95 *Ibid.*, [pp. 13–14], 30 Jan. 1860.
- 96 Liebknecht, *Marx zum Gedächtniß*, pp. 82–5; Marx to Elsner, 20 Dec. 1854, *MEW*, XXVIII, p. 610, Marx to Engels, 23 April 1857, 17 Dec. 1858, 18 May 1859, *MEW*, XXIX, pp. 131, 377, 433–5.
- 97 Erik Gamby, *Edgar Bauer* (Trier: Karl-Marx-Haus, 1985), pp. 30–7. The Prussian police apparently remained unaware of this connection. Bauer's file concerns political offences in the forties, his compromise with the Danish party as editor of the *Altonaer Zeitung* in 1851, and his public life in London, but there is no hint of his secret activities (Edgar Bauer file, Potsdam 8893). Some portions of his reports, however, did end up in Berlin anonymously, e.g., a report of 5 April 1853 describing Ruge's and Kinkel's circles (Gamby, ed., *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 72–5) is also in Revolutionary party file, Potsdam 13835, ff. 109–11. Bauer also published on English political affairs, e.g., Cobden, Palmerston and Chartism, in *Englische Freiheit* (Leipzig: Otto Wigand, 1857).
- 98 *NZ*, no. 18, 23 Oct. 1858, no. 33, 12 Feb. 1859; *Hermann*, 8 Aug. 1863; Marx to Engels, 29 Nov. 1858, *MEW*, XXIX, p. 372.
- 99 Lehning ('The International Association', 234–5, 281–4) for Bauer's manifesto, and *Volk*, 6 (11 June 1859); Bauer, *Die Wahrheit*, p. 9.
- 100 No complete series of the *Bulletin* has survived. Lehning ('The International Association', 230) reproduces a page of no. 10, 1 March 1858 (this issue is quoted in *Hermann*, 5 April 1862); Rudolf Knaack ('Die Überwachung der politischen Emigranten in Preußen', p. 181) mentions that no. 6, dated 2 November 1857, exposed a Polish police spy.
- 101 Bauer, *Die Wahrheit*, p. 8; Andreas Scherzer, [untitled letter dated London, 13 February], *Neuer Social-Demokrat* (Berlin), 20 (18 Feb. 1876).
- 102 *L'Homme*, 18 July 1855; Lehning, 'The International Association', 263; repeated in the last statutes of 1859 (Bay. HStA München, MAII, 1798, Ad. no. 39B, p. 4, excerpt from Berlin weekly report of 29 Oct. 1859). They also proclaimed that neither gender nor colour or race should be grounds for discrimination (*NZ*, 3 (3–10 July 1858)).
- 103 *L'Homme*, 11 (8 Feb. 1854), 3; 24 (10 May 1854), 4; Jeanne Derooin, *Lettre aux Associations sur l'organisation du credit* (Paris, 1851); Claire Goldberg Moses, *French Feminism in the Nineteenth Century* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984), pp. 145–9, 266n, and Michelle Riot-Sarcey, 'A Public Life Denied by History: Jeanne Derooin and the Forge of Self, *History of European Ideas* 11 (1989), 253–61. From England she still contributed to *Le Droit des femmes* in 1883. For her connection with the Association see *LDJ*, 113 (26 Sept. 1857) 117 (24 Oct. 1857). Lehning, 'The International Association', 228, summarised the programme of this women's society.
- 104 Scherzer, in *Neuer Social-Demokrat*, no. 20, 18 Feb. 1876; Hildebrand's visit to the CABV on 15 April 1846, *BdK*, I, pp. 311–12. The club's debates with Kriege did not raise this question. In 1852, the Communist League member Blum stated that he found 'today's



- emancipated women rather disgusting' but added that this was precisely why he advocated women's political emancipation in communism. Other CABV debaters emphasised the need for prior political and intellectual education (CABV debate, 8 August 1852, Schapper-Willich file, Potsdam 8534, f. 81). Weitiing did not think highly of women's contributions either, and wrote, discussing arrangements in a communitarian settlement in 1852: 'I do not like having the kitchen cleaned by men... Not all of them are that dedicated, and we might lose some good unmarried worker just because of that. Better to lose half a dozen women' (Weitiing to Meier, 2 Dec. 1852, Wilhelm Weitiing Papers, New York, Box 1).
- 105 *LDJ*, 145 (8 May 1858). The series appeared in *LDJ*, 139 (27 March 1858) and foll., and in the *Neue Zeit* from p. 2 (3 July 1858), on; also *NZ*, 20 (6 Nov. 1858).
- 106 Becker, *Geschichte der Arbeiter-Agitation*, p. 12.
- 107 *LDJ*, 145 (8 May 1858); Becker, *Geschichte der Arbeiter-Agitation*, p. 12. Bauer remembered agitation in Poland as its main purpose (Bauer, *Die Wahrheit*, p. 8).
- 108 'Manifest des Zentralaussschusses des in London tagenden Internationalen Vereins', signed by Oborski, Nash and Talandier, *NZ*, 2, 3 (3, 10 July 1858). The weekly report from Berlin of 29 July 1858 claimed that it was written in English (Bay. HStA München, Abt. II, MAII, 1798, ad. no. 271, p. 6). Lehning ('The International Association', 267–71) gives a French version.
- 109 Gamby, ed., *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 418–19 (report of 16 Oct. 1858, with a new preface). Bauer assumed that Simon Bernard and Scherzer had written it as part of a drive to create a new 'party of action', and claimed that the 'Demands' were based on Blanqui's ideas merely as the first steps to consolidate the revolution. The *Neue Zeit* (11 (4 Sept. 1858)), however, referred to those 'Measures' agreed on in 1851; for the Willich-Schapper version see *BdK*, III, pp. 418–19.
- 110 *Manifesto of the Central International Association* (7 Dec. 1858); Lehning, 'The International Association', 233, 274–80. Bauer conjectured that the CABV supported the rapprochement with Mazzini hoping to use some of his funds for their new paper, *Die Neue Zeit* (Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, p. 424; see pp. 423–30, 435, 443–52, for the debate about Mazzini).
- 111 *Manifesto of the Central International Association*, pp. 3, 5–6. Bauer mentions Hebert, Mackay and Becker as the authors (Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 435, 443).
- 112 *NZ*, 25 (18 Dec. 1858), 28 (8 Jan. 1859); Bay. HStA, MAII, 1798, ad. no. 26B, weekly report from Berlin, 9 Oct. 1858, p. 2, mentions Scherzer's and Petersen's connections in Hamburg and elsewhere in Germany, and claims that the committee in Neufchatel had already founded 22 sub-committees; Bay. HStA, MAII, 1798, ad. no. 109B, weekly report from Dresden, 27 Dec. 1858, named 31 clubs adhering to it, allegedly taken out of the 'Journalbuch' of the International Committee, but the contacts on the Continent remained peripheral. Struve's *Sociale Republik* reported on the American branches, e.g., their decision to abide by the London statutes (7 (5 June 1858), p. 5), and statutes of the German organisation (9 (19 June 1858), p. 3).
- 113 Becker, *Geschichte der Arbeiter-Agitation*, p. 12.
- 114 Mackay's speeches are in Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 412, 429; *NZ*, 14 (25 Sept. 1858), 22 (27 Nov. 1858); *LDZAA*, 17 (16 Oct. 1858).
- 115 Mackay was exposed as an agent around the turn of the year (Nicolaevsky, 'Secret Societies', 45).
- 116 *LDJ*, 68 (15 Nov. 1856). A lengthy report on Abicht, Swietoslawski, Tchorzewski and other Polish émigrés in London is in Bay. HStA, MAII, 1798, ad. no. 271, excerpted from the weekly report from Berlin, 29 July 1858; cf. also P. Brock, 'Polish Socialists in Early Victorian England', *Polish Review*, 6 (1961), 41–8. According to Bauer, the anti-Mazzini manifesto split the Association, and the only German to sign the manifesto was the worker Ulrich; there was no German translation (Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 443–6).

- 117 *L'Association Internationale au rédacteur du journal le Prolétaire* (flysheet, London, 27 March 1859, signed for the Central International Association by Girard, Mackay and Ulrich), p. 6; Lehning, 'The International Association', 233–6. The first draft of the 'Manifesto of the Central International Association' had already in December 1858 decried committees as belonging 'to the old centralising order of things' and as prone to usurping undue powers (p. 8).
- 118 In January 1860, the German and the Polish members strongly disagreed on the question of village communes (Minutes of the International Association, pp. 9–12).
- 119 *L'Association Internationale au rédacteur du journal le Prolétaire*. Its rival (Polish/German) branch accused it of being directed by the anarchist *Prolétaire* paper in Belgium, and mocked its protests against authority (*Das Volk*, 1, 8 (7 May, 25 June 1859)). An attempt to reunite the two feuding International Associations failed in the summer, indicating that this splinter group existed longer than Lehning recognised (Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 511–12).
- 120 Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 476–7 and 481 (reports of 6 and 19 April 1859).
- 121 Lehning, 'The International Association', 281–4.
- 122 Possibly Mazzini had masterminded this manifesto because he wanted the Association to join his 'partito d' azione' and to declare itself neutral in the Franco-Austrian war (Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 470–1, report of 16 March 1859).
- 123 The CABV questioned whether the manifesto should be published in its own paper, the *Volk*, as there was 'no longer' a connection between the German Workers' Society and the International Association (*Volk*, 6 (11 June 1859)).
- 124 Strangely, this was not made public but only disclosed in a police report, itself perhaps reported by Bauer (Bay. HStA, MA II, 1798, ad 39B, weekly report from Berlin, 29 Oct. 1859, p. 3). Bauer's reports often played down his own role in the Association and claimed that he drew up such mild new statutes that Hillmann and Becker forced him to resign on 29 August 1859. Bauer did not mention his authorship of the latest manifesto (Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 532–3, 9 Nov. 1859). On his disagreement with Hillmann and his resignation see Minutes of the International Association, [pp. 1–2], 22 Aug., 5 and 12 Sept. 1859.
- 125 Bay. HStA, MA II, 1798, ad. no. 39B, weekly report from Berlin, 29 Oct. 1859, pp. 3–4. Bernhard Becker (as secretary), Hillmann and Scherzer signed the statutes, as did Oborski, Swietoslawski, Abicht, Bonnin and others. Discussions about revising statutes had taken place in August 1859 (Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, p. 512). Lehning did not see these statutes, passed in October 1859, and concluded that the Association was defunct after June.
- 126 Minutes survived from August 1859 to January 1860, passed on by Bauer to the Danish police (Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 559–60; Minutes of the International Association).
- 127 *Hermann*, 3 Dec. 1859, 22 June 1861, 20 June 1863.
- 128 Karl-Heinz Leidigkeit, 'Zur Kontinuität des Kampfes von Marx und Engels um die Partei der Arbeiterklasse 1852–1860', Diss. phil. Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, 1975, p. 190. Lehning notes a 'strongly marked deviation from bourgeois internationalism' and maintains that the Association constituted for the first time 'an international organization of a proletarian, socialist and revolutionary character' ('The International Association', 224). Henry Collins and Chimen Abramsky term it 'the first society to attempt—though it could never implement—the idea of a world-wide organisation of labour controlled by a central council meeting in London', although it 'caused scarcely a ripple in the wider labour movement' (*Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement: Years of the First International*, Macmillan, 1965, pp. 12, 283).
- 129 Nicolaevsky, 'Secret Societies', 42–3. For Nicolaevsky its character was centrally defined by conspiratorial methods and advocacy of individual acts of political terror. His contention

- that the Association 'never tried to establish contact with workers' organisations' is clearly wrong as far as the Germans were concerned, for they worked closely with the GABV and liaised with German workers' societies in Switzerland and the United States.
- 130 Becker, *Geschichte der Arbeiter-Agitation*, pp. 11–12.
- 131 Lehning, 'The International Association', 222, 228–9, 272–3, and in German in *NZ*, 11 (4 Sept. 1858). Scherzer's and Ermerich's manifesto is in *Hermann*, 5 April 1862.
- 132 Manifesto of the Central International Association (Dec. 1858); Lehning, 'The International Association', 233, 274–80.
- 133 'Manifest des Zentralausschusses des in London tagenden Internationalen Vereins', *NZ*, 2, 3 (3, 10 July 1858). But many Germans refused even to have Bauer's address printed for discussion.

## 8

**The New Era, 1858–1860**

- 1 Michael St John Packe, *Orsini: The Story of a Conspirator* (Boston: Little, Brown 6 Co., 1957), pp. 216–81. The implications for the British government are reconstructed in Porter, *The Refugee Question*, pp. 170–99, and R. Woodall, 'Orsini and the Fall of Palmers ton', *History Today*, 26 (1976), 636–43.
- 2 Adams, *Memoirs*, II, pp. 352–70, and Herzen, *My Past and Thoughts*, III, pt. vi, pp. 1111–27.
- 3 Meysenbug, *Memoiren*, p. 110. These rumours were not entirely unfounded, cf. Porter, *The Refugee Question*, p. 189.
- 4 Weekly report dated Berlin, 26 March 1858, ad no. 184, BayHStA, Munich, MA II, 1798. Other more or less fantastic reports alleged that Ruge had joined a conspiracy to liberate Orsini from prison (*ibid.*, ad. 142, weekly report dated Dresden, 4 March 1858).
- 5 J. Kinkel to K. Zitz, 9 Feb. 1858, Leppla, 'Briefe', 63; Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, p. 294.
- 6 *LDJ*, 129 (16 Jan. 1858), 131 (30 Jan. 1858), 132 (6 Feb. 1858), and 137 (13 March 1858).
- 7 J. Kinkel to K. Zitz, 29 April 1858, in Leppla, ed., 'Briefe G. und J. Kinkel an K. Zitz', 68. Accounts of the trial appeared in *LDJ*, 142 (17 April 1858), and 143 (24 April 1858); Meysenbug, *Memoiren*, pp. 112–15.
- 8 *NZ*, 7 (7 Aug. 1858), and 12 (11 Sept. 1858); *Hermann*, 6 Dec. 1862. Bernard's acquittal was still nervously recalled by the British government in 1894 (Bernard Porter, 'The British Government and Political Refugees, c. 1880–1914', *Immigrants and Minorities*, 2 (1983), 28).
- 9 *LDJ*, 129 (16 Jan. 1858).
- 10 *LDJ*, 138 (20 March 1858).
- 11 *LDJ*, 121 (21 Nov. 1857).
- 12 *LDJ*, 146 (15 May 1858).
- 13 *LDJ*, 139 (27 March 1858).
- 14 *LDJ*, 145 (8 May 1858).
- 15 *LDJ*, 144 (1 May 1858) (Proudhon), and 151 (19 June 1858) (Kinkel).
- 16 *LDJ*, 151 (19 June 1858).
- 17 Meysenbug to G. Kinkel, 25 June 1858, in Rossi, *Malwida von Meysenbug, Briefe*, p. 147. The identification of Scherzer, Becker and the newspaper in this edition are mistaken. It is worth noting that she saw all socialists automatically as 'Marxians', irrespective of their internal differences.
- 18 *LDZAA*, 1 (26 June 1858).
- 19 *LDZAA*, 3 (10 July 1858), 16 (9 Oct. 1858).
- 20 *LDZAA*, 26 (18 Dec. 1858), 21 (13 Nov. 1858), and 17 (16 Oct. 1858).

- 21 *LDZAA*, 16 (9 Oct. 1858), 31 (22 Jan. 1859), 23 (27 Nov. 1858) and 25 (11 Dec. 1858).
- 22 *Germania*, even more nationalist, survived only from 9 April to 7 May 1859. *Germania* defended German workers in London against the collective accusation of being a ‘rebellious, blood-thirsty rabble, a pile of political idolators blindly worshipping “the red republic” and its priests... It is plainly untrue that the German workers in London want anything else than what they want in Germany, too, namely Bread, Freedom, and Progress’ (4 (30 April 1859)). Marx saw an intrigue by the Prussian embassy and Kinkel behind the *Germania*’ demise (Marx to Engels, 18 May 1859, *MEW*, XXIX, p. 435).
- 23 Scherzer recollected that Hillmann had initially been a co-editor (A. Scherzer, [letter dated London, 13. February] *Neuer Social-Demokrat*, 6, 20 (18 Feb. 1876)). Bauer described the *Neue Zeit* as under the auspices of the CABV where Hillmann and Becker were the main agitators (Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 385, 456–7, report of 1 Feb. 1859; referring to the *Neue Zeit*, not the *Volk*, as the editor assumes).
- 24 *NZ*, 5 (24 July 1858).
- 25 *LDJ*, 68 (15 Nov. 1856); H.H.Hahn, ‘Möglichkeiten und Formen politischen Handelns in der Emigration’, *AfS*, 23 (1983), 148–9.
- 26 Report, London 2 June 1858, added to Dresden weekly report of 31 July 1858, Bay. HStA, Munich, Abt. II, MA II, 1798, Ad. 266, supplement; also in Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 369–71.
- 27 *NZ*, 18 (23 Oct. 1858), 21 (21 Aug. 1858), 11 (4 Sept. 1858), and 21 (20 Nov. 1858).
- 28 Marx to Engels, 29 Nov. 1858, *MEW*, XXIX, p. 372.
- 29 Letter from Liverpool, 25–26 April 1859, Scherzer file, Potsdam 12865, f. 24. The anonymous writer added that Hillmann had given £20 for the paper.
- 30 *NZ*, 2 (3 July 1858), 4 (17 July 1858), 25 (18 Dec. 1858).
- 31 *NZ*, 6 (31 July 1858), 16 (9 Oct. 1858), 27 (1 Jan. 1859), 28 (8 Jan. 1859), 19 (30 Oct. 1858), and 36 (5 March 1859).
- 32 *NZ*, 28 (8 Jan. 1859), and 21 (20 Nov. 1858).
- 33 *NZ*, 31 (29 Jan. 1859), 36 (5 March 1859); further letters were discussed in 35 (26 Feb. 1859).
- 34 *NZ*, 14 (25 Sept. 1858).
- 35 *NZ*, 21 (20 Nov. 1858), and 31 (29 Jan. 1859).
- 36 *NZ*, 35 (26 Feb. 1859), and 24 (11 Dec. 1858).
- 37 *NZ*, 2 (3 July 1858), 21 (20 Nov. 1858), 32 (5 Feb. 1859), and elsewhere.
- 38 *NZ*, 20 (6 Nov. 1858).
- 39 *NZ*, 19 (30 Oct. 1858), and 22 (27 Nov. 1858).
- 40 *NZ*, 27 (1 Jan. 1859), 36 (5 March 1859), 11 (4 Sept. 1858). For Petersen see *NZ*, 15 (2 Oct. 1858), and Lahme, ‘Petersen’, 194.
- 41 BGLAK 236/8743, weekly report from Berlin, 17 October 1852; Marx to Engels, 29 November 1858, *MECW*, XL, p. 359. Feibel had apparently not shared all of Willich’s ideas; cf. *BdK*, II, pp. 635–6.
- 42 *NZ*, 35 (26 Feb. 1859).
- 43 Marx to the editor of the *Neue Zeit*, c. 12 July 1858, *MEW*, XXIX, pp. 564–5; Marx to Engels, 18 Aug. 1858, *MECW*, XL, pp. 340–1; *NZ*, 4 (17 July 1858), 21 (20 Nov. 1858), 24 (11 Dec. 1858), 25 (18 Dec. 1858) (however, the money Kinkel gave Scherzer at about that time—without conditions as to the paper’s principles but with the request to keep the payment secret—may have softened the *Neue Zeit*’s stand, cf. Scherzer’s letter in *Hermann*, 29 March 1862); 32 (5 Feb. 1859).
- 44 *NZ*, 21 (20 Nov. 1858), and 22 (27 Nov. 1858); Oswald, *Reminiscences*, pp. 405–6.
- 45 *NZ*, 41 (10 April 1859).
- 46 Scherzer, [letter dated London, 13 Feb.] *Neuer Social-Demokrat* 6, 20 (18 Feb. 1876); *Volk*, 4 (28 May 1859).

- 47 Scherzer to N.N., 22 April 1859, Scherzer file, Potsdam 12865, ff. 25–6. Marx was incensed at the *Neue Zeit*'s attacks on his 'surlly' and 'distrustful' isolation (Marx to Engels, 16 March 1859, *MECW*, XL, pp. 403–4).
- 48 Not after Johanna's death, as Rösch-Sondermann claims (*Kinkel*, p. 311). See *LDJ*, 150 (12 June 1858); *LDZAA*, 16 (9 Oct. 1858).
- 49 Johanna Kinkel to Carl Schurz, 9 Nov. 1858, in A. Busse, 'Ein Brief Johanna Kinkels an Carl Schurz', *Germanic Review*, 5 (1930), 185; Gottfried Kinkel, *Nimrod: Ein Trauerspiel* (Hannover: Carl Rümpler, 1857), prefaced by the exiles' declaration of love for Germany.
- 50 Marx to Engels, 11 Dec. 1858, and Marx to Weydemeyer, 1 Feb. 1859, *MECW*, XL, pp. 359 and 376. Suspiciously many friends took great pains to point out the accidental nature of her fall, e.g. Meysenbug, *Memoiren*, II, pp. 137–44.
- 51 The serialisation of her novel *Hans Ibeles in London* began with the first issue of *Hermann*, 1 (8 Jan. 1859); *Hermann*, 22 June 1867 (piano). Marx resented Kinkel's lament that his wife's death had damaged him financially (e.g., Leppla, *Johanna und Gottfried Kinkels Briefe an Kathinka Zitz*', 76; Marx to Engels, 17 Dec. 1858, *MECW*, XL, p. 363). Kinkel had earlier maintained the right of women to an income of their own and to the resulting independence ('Die Camberwell-Deutschen und Gottfried Kinkel', in Fontane, *Sämtliche Werke*, XVIIIa, p. 765.)
- 52 Ferdinand Freiligrath, 'Nach Johanna Kinkels Begräbnis', in *Sämtliche Werke* (Hamburg: Hansa, n.d.), I, pp. 301–2; Marx to Engels, 11 Dec. 1858, *MECW*, XL, p. 359, and 16 Dec. 1858, *MECW*, XL, p. 361. See my 'Ferdinand Freiligrath in London', pp. 115–20.
- 53 *NZ*, 21 (20 Nov. 1858) and 24 (11 Dec. 1858); *LDZAA*, 23 (27 Nov. 1858), and 25 (11 Dec. 1858). One of her compositions was a comical oratorio for children with socialist mice and military cats (Helen Chambers, *Johanna Kinkel's Novel "Hans Ibeles in London"*, in Alter and Muhs, *Exilanten*, p. 160).
- 54 Kinkel's lectures were serialised in *LDZAA* from no. 25 (25 Dec. 1858) and praised as 'virtually the only intellectual cohesion among Germans in London' 36 (26 Feb. 1859); Fontane, 'Die Camberwell-Deutschen', pp. 764–5.
- 55 Martin Bollert, *Ferdinand Freiligrath und Gottfried Kinkel* (Bromberg: Krahl, 1916), p. 34; Engels to Freiligrath, 25 Jan. 1859, and Marx to Engels, 6 Jan. 1859, *MECW*, XL, pp. 370, 366.
- 56 Marx to Engels, 17 Dec. 1858 and 16 March 1859, *MEW*, XXIX, pp. 377, 411.
- 57 *Hermann*, 26 March 1859; G.Kinkel to Kathinka Zitz, 28 Dec. 1858, in Leppla, 'Johanna und Gottfried Kinkels Briefe an Kathinka Zitz', 77.
- 58 E.g., *Hermann*, 15 Jan. 1859, 22 Jan. 1859, 12 March 1859.
- 59 E.g., Marx to Engels, 3 March 1859, 16 March 1859, 12 April 1859, and 18 May 1859, *MECW*, XL, pp. 399, 404, 415, 438; *Hermann*, 1 Sept. 1866; Sundermann, *Deutscher Nationalisms*, pp. 195–211.
- 60 Shlomo Na'aman, *Der deutsche Nationalverein: Die politische Konstituierung des deutschen Bürgertums 1859–1867* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1987).
- 61 *Hermann*, 23 April 1859, 9 April 1859, and Schönemann on 2 April 1859.
- 62 *Hermann*, 11 June 1859; *Volk*, 7 (18 June 1859), p. 3.
- 63 Anon, letter [by H. Ermerich] in *Hermann*, 8 Feb. 1862, H. Ermerich in *Hermann*, 12 April 1862, and Kinkel in *Hermann*, 5 April 1862.
- 64 *Hermann*, 7 May 1859 and 30 April 1859.
- 65 Meysenbug to G.Kinkel, 25 June 1858, in Rossi, *Malwida von Meysenbug, Briefe*, p. 147; G. Reich, 'Malwida von Meysenbug in ihren Briefen an Gottfried und Johanna Kinkel', *Bonner Geschichtsblätter*, 1 (1937), 165; Meysenbug, *Memoiren*, III, p. 117. On Mazzini's renewed republican nationalist agitation see Denis Mack Smith, *Mazzini*, pp. 125–8.
- 66 Meysenbug to G.Kinkel, 22 Nov. 1858, and 1–7 Jan. 1859, in Rossi, *Malwida von Meysenbug, Briefe*, pp. 152–3, 159 (the editor mistakes Scherzer's colleague Ermerich for the *Germania*'s proprietor, Ermani).

- 67 Meysenbug, *Memoiren*, III, p. 170. The dislike may have been mutual, as Scherzer's *Neue Zeit* 26 (25 Dec. 1858) at about the same time criticised ladies with pretensions to wit and erudition. For a discussion of Meysenbug's motives see my 'Im englischen Exil 1852–1859: Der Rückzug der Demokratin ins Privadeben', in Gunther Tietz, ed., *Malwida von Meysenbug* (Frankfurt: Ullstein, 1985), pp. 87–90.
- 68 Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, p. 531 (report of 9 Nov. 1859).
- 69 *NZ*, 42 (16 April 1859); *Hermann* 9 June 1860, 13 Aug. 1864, and 12 March 1859; *Volk*, 5 (4 June 1859), 7 (18 June 1859), 8 (25 June 1859).
- 70 *Volk*, 15 (13 Aug. 1859), *Hermann*, 15 Dec. 1860, and 9 June 1860, Marx to Engels, 12 July 1861, *MECW*, XLI, pp. 309–10. The *Bund* apparently elected Prince Albert and Edgar Bauer as honorary members (Marx to Engels, after 11 Jan. 1860, *MECW*, XLI, p. 4; Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 531).
- 71 *Hermann*, 7 Jan. 1865, 14 Jan. 1860, 12 May 1860; *Volk*, 15 (13 Aug. 1859); *Hermann*, 27 Feb. 1864. The 'Islingtoner Gesangsverein' by 1861 even edited its own newspaper, the *Brenn-Nessel*, for its several hundred members (*Hermann*, 1 June and 8 June 1861).
- 72 *Hermann*, 9 June 1860.
- 73 Except for a brief pro-Austrian spell (*Hermann*, 7 Jan. 1865). They had some 140 members in 1866, and over 100 members in the early 1880s (*Hermann*, 30 June 1866; Dorgeel, *Deutschlands Pioniere*, p. 138). Between October and December 1860, Zinn published his own paper, *Der Bote aus London*.
- 74 *Hermann*, 18 Feb. and 1 April 1865.
- 75 F.Engels, 'To and Rhine' (*Volk*, 2 (14 May 1859), and foll.), *MECW*, XVI, here p. 216; Herzen, *My Past and Thoughts*, III, pp. 1171–2; *Volk*, 6 (11 June 1859).
- 76 *Hermann*, 18 Aug., 8 Dec. 1860, and 12 Jan. 1861; Sundermann, *Deutscher Nationalismus*, pp. 135–53. Kinkel joined soon afterwards.
- 77 *Hermann*, 12 Oct. 1861.
- 78 Kinkel to Ruge, 7 May 1861, in Nerrlich, *Arnold Ruges Briefwechsel*, II, p. 209. As president of the London *Gesellschaft der Vaterlandsfreunde*, Kinkel had earlier emphasised vis-à-vis the National Association that any national agitation needed to be anti-dynastic and not merely a cover for Prussian aggrandisement (Open letter, *Neue Preußische [Kreuz] Zeitung*, 25 Nov. 1859, 1, copy in *Vaterlandsfreunde file*, Potsdam 12058, f. 15).
- 79 G.Rasch, 'Karl Blind', in Gustav Struve and Gustav Rasch, eds., *Zwölf Streiter der Revolution* (Berlin: Wegener, 1867), pp. 125–42; Julius H.Schoeps, 'Karl Blind und die Revolution in Baden 1848/49', in Julius H.Schoeps and Immanuel Geiss, eds., *Revolution und Demokratie in Geschichte und Literatur* (Duisburg: W.Braun, 1979), pp. 259–76.
- 80 Kinkel to Blind, 12 Jan. 1858 and 4 May 1858, Blind Papers, II, general correspondence, 1849–1866, British Library, Add. MSS 40124, f.27 and f.43; Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 384–5, 388–9; *Hermann*, 22 Jan. 1859, 24 Dec. 1859.
- 81 Kinkel to Blind, 3 April 1859, Blind Papers, BL, Add. MSS 40124, f.65.
- 82 'Die Flüchtlinge von 1848 und 1849', *Die Grenzboten*, 22 (1863), 15.
- 83 Kinkel to Schurz, 19 Aug. 1860, in Busse, 'Briefe Gottfried Kinkels an Karl Schurz', 261.
- 84 *Hermann*, 3 March 1860; Rösch-Sondermann, *Kinkel*, p. 312.
- 85 Kinkel in *Hermann*, 3 March 1860; Blind in *Hermann*, 7 and 14 April 1860; Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 538–9, 556. Schleswig-Holstein was the cause most likely to rally Germans of different political views, e.g., when some 300 signatories protested against Danish oppression, including Kinkel, Blind, Ruge, Ronge, Schaible, Borkheim and Zinn (*Adresse an das Volk in Schleswig-Holstein*, London, March 1860, copy in IISG, ME, SI2; *Hermann*, 31 March and 5 May 1860).
- 86 *Der deutsche Eidgenosse*, 1 (15 March 1865), printed a list of the Society's publications, e.g., 'German Democracy versus Danish Tyranny'. See Melvin Chernov, 'Der deutsche Eidgenosse and its collapse, 1865–1867: An attempt to stimulate a German revolution through émigré propaganda', *German Life and Letters*, 35 (1981–82), 138–49.

- 87 *Der deutsche Eidgenosse*, 1 (15 March 1865), p. 1 and pp. 14–15, and 7 (15 March 1866), p. 228.
- 88 *Ibid.*, 6 (15 Jan. 1866), p. 196.
- 89 *Ibid.*, 8 (15 June 1866), pp. 233–45, ‘In Memoriam’, and no. 12 (May 1867), p. 349, ‘Pro Filio’; Sundermann, *Deutscher Nationalismus*, pp. 235–48.
- 90 For Blind’s later activities in London, see Ashton, *Little Germany*, pp. 167–73. A later generation of German refugees honoured the *Eidgenosse* as an antityrannical journal in a bygone era ‘when the bourgeoisie was still radical’ (*Der Sozialdemokrat*, 2 (8 Jan. 1888)).
- 91 In 1869 the *Hermann* began to support Bismarck’s policy and renounced further ‘demagogy’ against existing governments (*Hermann*, 10 April 1869).
- 92 Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, p. 372.
- 93 *Ibid.*, p. 389.
- 94 *Ibid.*, pp. 390 and 403. The reprint may not have appeared at all.
- 95 Scherzer to Marx, 29 April 1860, IISG, ME, D3918, printed with some omissions in Marx, ‘Herr Vogt’, *MECW*, XVII, pp. 316–17.
- 96 *NZ*, 20 (6 Nov. 1858), and 21 (20 Nov. 1858).
- 97 *NZ*, 25 (18 Dec. 1858), 33 (12 Feb. 1859), and 34 (19 Feb. 1859).
- 98 *NZ*, 37 (12 March 1859).
- 99 *Volk*, 3 (21 May 1859), *Hermann*, 24 Dec. 1859.
- 100 *Volk*, 1 (7 May 1859), 3 (21 May 1859), and 6 (11 June 1859).
- 101 *Volk* 3 (21 May 1859).
- 102 *Volk*, 1 (7 May 1859), and 2 (14 May 1859).
- 103 *Volk*, 5, 4 June 1859.
- 104 *Volk*, 3 (21 May 1859), and 4 (28 May 1859).
- 105 *Volk*, 4 (28 May 1859); ‘P.’ published his defence of modern communism in *Volk*, 6 (11 June 1859) (on the authorship see Lahme, ‘Petersen’, 194. Petersen lived in London at the time, not in Paris, cf. *BdK*, II, p. 544).
- 106 *Volk*, 5 (4 June 1859). The flag had been offered by ‘the ladies’, who otherwise do not get much mention (*Volk*, 3 (21 May 1859)).
- 107 *Volk*, 16 (20 Aug. 1859).
- 108 *Hermann*, 16 Nov. 1861; biographical details in Schlechte, *Arbeiterverbrüderung*, p. 52.
- 109 For Pfänder see Marx to Engels, 6 May 1859, *MECW*, XL, p. 431. For Eccarius see Marx to Engels, 9 and 15 Feb. 1859, Engels to Marx, 10 Feb. 1859, *MECW*, XL, pp. 384, 387, and 386.
- 110 Marx to Engels, 18 May 1859, *MECW*, XL, p. 440. Marx was possibly mistaken here, as Lange, not Anders, was the most prominent member of the Whitechapel association.
- 111 Liebknecht, *Karl Marx zum Gedächtniß*, pp. 38–9.
- 112 Marx to Engels, 18 Aug. 1858, *MECW*, XL, p. 437; Marx to Engels, 17 Dec. 1858, *MECW*, XL, p. 363.
- 113 Liebknecht, *Karl Marx zum Gedächtniß*, p. 39. Raymond H. Dominick, *Wilhelm Liebknecht* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), p. 430, erroneously places this dispute in the early 1850s (p. 65). See also Haltern, *Liebknecht und England*, pp. 14–15. Marx saw the outcome of the clash differently and reported that Liebknecht had ‘declared himself a contrite sinner’ (Marx to Engels, 18 May 1859, *MECW*, XL, pp. 437–8).
- 114 Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 413 and 436–7 (reports of 25 Sept. and 2 Dec. 1858).
- 115 Marx to Engels, 25 May 1859, *MECW*, XL, p. 451.
- 116 Marx to Engels, 28 Jan. 1860, *MECW*, XLI, p. 11. Bach (‘Karl Marx und die Londoner Zeitung “Das Volk” (1859)’, p. 201) and Lindner (‘Die publizistische Tätigkeit Wilhelm Liebknechts’, p. 155) wrongly assume that Schapper was to take over another section of the CABV.
- 117 *Volk*, 2 (14 May 1859); Marx to Lassalle, 6 Nov. 1859, *MECW*, XL, p. 520.

- 118 Marx to Weydemeyer, 1 Feb. 1859, *MECW*, XL, p. 376.
- 119 Marx to Lassalle, 6 Nov. 1859, *MECW*, XL, p. 520. No account of the audience's reaction has survived, except for Marx's impression of 'a great deal' of interest (Marx to Engels, 5 Oct. 1859, *MECW*, XL, p. 502).
- 120 This distinction is completely lost in Lessner's recollections.
- 121 Marx to Engels, 21 Jan. 1859, *MECW*, XL, 369.
- 122 Marx to Lassalle, 6 Nov. 1859, *ibid.*, p. 518.
- 123 Marx to Lassalle, 28 March 1859, *ibid.*, p. 409.
- 124 Marx to Engels, 25 Feb. 1859, *ibid.*, p. 393. Marx and Engels even considered issuing a new 'party manifesto' in view of the confusingly different attitudes to the war (Marx to Engels, 18 May 1859, *ibid.*, p. 437).
- 125 Carl Vogt (*Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung*, Geneva, 1859, p. 58) claimed that the paper was founded specifically to attack him.
- 126 In his Swiss exile Biscamp had, according to Marx, joined the League, although in 1860 Biscamp declared that he never had belonged to 'the Marx party'. He had guaranteed Kinkel's Loan and travelled to Germany at Kinkel's behest (BGLAK 236/8743, weekly report from Berlin, 1 Oct. 1852, no. 27; Marx to Cluss, 8 Oct. 1852, *MECW*, XXXIX, p. 205). After 1852 he lived in England as a language teacher and newspaper correspondent (Werner Simon, 'Christian Elard Biscamp', *Zeitschrift des Vereins für hessische Geschichte und Landeskunde*, 88 (1980–1981), 169–94). Marx characterised him to Lassalle (6 Nov. 1859, *MECW*, XL, p. 519) as 'a strange mixture of noble instincts, innate (and also physical) weakness, asceticism and idleness, Kantian moral consciousness and tactless whimsicality'.
- 127 Lessner, *Ich brachte*, p. 97. Marx solicited funds for the *Volk* by pointing out 'that our only interest in the thing is that it's anti-Kinkel', and hoped that the *Hermann* would succumb to its pressure (Marx to Engels, 18 May and 14 July 1859, *MECW*, XL, pp. 439 and 464). On his part, Kinkel also manoeuvred against the sale of the *Volk* (Marx to Engels, 24 May 1859, *MECW*, XL, p. 449).
- 128 Marx to Engels, 18 May 1859, *MECW*, XL, p. 439; *Volk*, 2 (14 May 1859). Engels added 'The Campaign in Italy', *Volk*, 4 (28 May 1859), and 'The Events of the War', *Volk*, 6 (11 June 1859).
- 129 *Volk*, 6 (11 June 1859); Marx to Engels, 10 June 1859, *MECW*, XL, p. 461.
- 130 *Volk*, 3 (21 May 1859), 5 (4 June 1859).
- 131 Marx to Engels, 18 May 1859, *MECW*, XL, p. 440.
- 132 *Volk*, 7 (18 June 1859). Biscamp had earlier asserted that the CABV's sacrifices for the *Neue Zeit* did not oblige him to explain his decisions to them (*Volk*, 4 (28 May 1859)).
- 133 Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, p. 507 (report of 29 July 1859).
- 134 Marx to Engels, 1 June, 14 July, 22 July and 5 Oct. 1859, *MECW*, XL, pp. 456, 463, 473, 502–3.
- 135 Marx to Engels, 26 Aug. 1859, *ibid.*, p. 484.
- 136 Marx to Engels, 19 July 1859, *ibid.*, p. 470. Despite his later praises of Scherzer, Marx suspected him of theft and private skulduggery (Marx to Engels, 22 July and 13 Aug. 1859, *ibid.*, pp. 472, 483).
- 137 Marx to Engels, 14 July, 19 July and 1 Aug. 1859, *ibid.*, pp. 464, 469, 477.
- 138 Karl Marx, 'Herr Vogt', *MECW*, XVII, p. 117.
- 139 Marx to Engels, 27 Sept. 1859, *MECW*, XL, p. 495.
- 140 Marx to Engels, 26 Aug. 1859, *ibid.*, p. 484.
- 141 Bach, 'Marx und "Das Volk"', p. 208 (similarly in the introduction to the reprint of *Das Volk*, edited by Richard Sperl). 'Typical' émigré papers such as the *Kosmos* or *Eidgenosse* were much more concerned with their immediate impact on politics in Germany, and both relied on well-known Forty-eighters to attract readers. By contrast, the *Volk* regarded the German workers in London as their main audience, without assuming that they waited eagerly to return to Germany.



- 142 *NZ*, 38 (19 March 1859).
- 143 *Hermann*, 13 Aug. and 3 Sept. 1859.
- 144 *Volk*, 5 (4 June 1859).
- 145 *Volk*, 3 (21 May 1859).
- 146 *Volk*, 6 (11 June 1859).
- 147 *Volk*, 6 (11 June 1859), signed by 'W.', who may have been Weber.
- 148 *Volk*, 6 (11 June 1859).
- 149 *Volk*, 7 (18 June 1859).
- 150 Without Marx's prior knowledge, a 'rotten poem' by Georg Herwegh eulogising patriotic republicans was published, and against Marx's wishes Biscamp continued to write the leaders (*Volk* 12 and 13 (23 and 30 July 1859); Engels to Marx, 25 July and Marx to Engels, 1 Aug. 1859, *MECW*, XL, pp. 475 and 477).
- 151 Ferdinand Lassalle, 'Der italienische Krieg und die Aufgabe Preußens', in Eduard Bernstein, ed., *Ferdinand Lassalle: Gesammelte Reden und Schriften* (Berlin: Paul Cassirer, 1919–1920), I, pp. 360, 364. But see Franz Mehring, *Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie* (Berlin: Dietz, 1976), I, pp. 626–34.
- 152 Marx to Engels, 18 May 1859, *MECW*, XL, pp. 435–6.
- 153 F.Engels, 'Po and Rhine', *MECW*, XVI, pp. 254–5; *Volk*, 2 (14 May 1859).
- 154 *Volk*, 1 (7 May 1859). This conforms to the arguments for neutrality in Bauer's address written for the International Association at the same time and of course reflects the controversies in the CABV as well.
- 155 *Volk*, 2 (14 May 1859).
- 156 *Volk*, 12 (23 July 1859); *MECW*, XVI, p. 415; K.Marx, 'Invasion!', *ibid.*, p. 441, originally in *Volk*, 13 (30 July 1859).
- 157 K.Marx, 'The French Disarmament', *MECW*, XVI, pp. 442–3; Marx, 'Quid pro Quo', *ibid.*, p. 452, originally in *Volk*, 14 (6 Aug. 1859); *MECW*, XVI, pp. 453, 457
- 158 Vogt called for neutrality in the Italian war as long as it did not infringe on the territory of the German Federation, for readiness to defend Germany against possible attacks from France, and for criticism of both Bonapartism and Austrian ultramontane absolutism (Vogt, *Mein Prozeß*, Appendix, p. 35).
- 159 Marx to Engels, 16 May 1859, *MECW*, XL, p. 434. Marx added that so far only Kinkel had taken up Vogt's offer (to Lassalle, 10 June 1859, *ibid.*, p. 460). Although Vogt advertised in the *Hermann* against the libel of the Augsburg paper (*Hermann*, 10 Sept. 1859), this bit about Kinkel was quietly dropped later in the affair.
- 160 *Volk*, 2 (14 May 1859). Reprinted in Vogt, *Mein Prozeß* Appendix, pp. 17–19. This article on the 'Reichsregent' was actually written by Biscamp, not Liebknecht, based on information supplied by Marx (Marx to Engels, 25 May 1859, *MECW*, XL, p. 450).
- 161 *Volk*, 6 (11 June 1859); Vogt, *Mein Prozeß*, Appendix, pp. 31–3. Scherzer defended himself by claiming that the London proceedings had been public and the letters uncompromising (Scherzer to Marx, 29 April 1860, IISG, ME, D3918, with some omissions in Marx, 'Herr Vogt', *MECW*, XVII, pp. 316–17).
- 162 *Volk*, 7 (18 June 1859); also in Vogt, *Mein Prozeß*, Appendix, pp. 4–5. On Liebknecht's role in the affair see Lindner, 'Die publizistische Tätigkeit Wilhelm Liebknechts', pp. 188–211.
- 163 E.g., Marx to Liebknecht, 17 Sept. 1859, *MECW*, XL, pp. 486–8; Marx to Lassalle (not before 2 Oct. 1859), *ibid.*, p. 498; Marx to Engels, 5 Oct. 1859, *ibid.*, pp. 503–4; Marx to Engels, 3 Nov. 1859, *ibid.*, pp. 513–14; Marx to Lassalle, 6 Nov. 1859, *ibid.*, pp. 521–2.
- 164 Marx to Engels, 7 Nov. 1859, *ibid.*, p. 523; and similarly Marx to Lassalle, 14 Nov. 1859, *ibid.*, p. 525.
- 165 All of these declarations appeared in the Appendix to Vogt's *Mein Prozeß*, more were published in various journals; some additional ones in Marx's 'Herr Vogt'.
- 166 Marx, 'Herr Vogt', *MECW*, XVII, pp. 130–2.

- 167 Vogt, *Mein Prozeß*, p. 166.  
 168 Ibid., pp. 178–80.  
 169 Engels to Marx, 31 Jan. 1860, MECW, XLI, pp. 13–14.  
 170 Engels to Marx, 1 Feb. 1860, *ibid.*, pp. 19–20.  
 171 Marx to Engels, 3 Feb. 1860, *ibid.*, p. 22, and Marx to J.M.Weber, 13 Feb. 1860, *ibid.*, pp. 41–3.  
 172 Marx to Schapper, 27 Feb. 1860, *ibid.*, p. 78. A lawsuit pending in Berlin at the same time also brought up the history of the Communist League. Wilhelm Eichhoff, a socialist in Berlin, had published in the London *Hermann* (in September and October 1859; cf. also *Hermann*, 14 April 1860, 19 May 1860, 1 Dec. 1860) an account of Stieber's role in the Cologne communist trial. During his ensuing trial, the public was again reminded that the Prussian police had concocted the 'minute-book' allegedly kept by the Communist League in London. The publicity surrounding Eichhoff's trial was of course welcomed by Marx, who toyed with the idea of translating Eichhoff's *Berliner Polizei-Silhouetten* (Berlin 1860) into English. Eichhoff afterwards moved to London (*Hermann*, 16 March 1861) and became the first political refugee there under the new reign in Prussia of William I.  
 173 Marx to Freiligrath, 29 Feb. 1860, MECW, XLI, p. 84; Marx to Weber, 24 Feb. 1860, *ibid.*, pp. 70–2.  
 174 Marx to Engels, 19 Dec. 1860, *ibid.*, p. 232.  
 175 Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 586–7.  
 176 See my 'Freiligrath in London', pp. 118–20.  
 177 Freiligrath to Marx, 28 Feb. 1860, in Häckel, *Freiligraths Briefwechsel mit Marx und Engels*, I, p. 138. An undated report on the Vogt affair, probably based on Bauer's information, is in Freiligrath file, Potsdam 9793, ff. 43–5.  
 178 Mehring, *Marx*, p. 302; McLellan, *Marx*, p. 311.  
 179 Marx to Engels, 19 Dec. 1860, MECW, XLI, p. 232.  
 180 Marx, 'Herr Vogt', MECW, XVII, p. 264.  
 181 Gamby, *Bauer: Konfidentenberichte*, pp. 543–4.  
 182 Jenny Marx to Louise Weydemeyer, 11 March 1861, MECW, XLI, p. 573.  
 183 Karl Marx, 'Herr Vogt', MECW, XVII, p. 26.

### **Epilogue: from exile to colony—class and the formation of community**

- 1 Dorgeel, *Deutschlands Pioniere in London*, p. 124; Sundermann, *Deutscher Nationalisms*, p. 124.
- 2 Rainer Noltenius, *Dichterfeiern in Deutschland* (Munich: W.Fink, 1984), pp. 71–181.
- 3 The relation of the workers' movement to Schiller's works remained controversial, and for example in 1905 caused a large debate within the SPD involving Karl Kautsky, Franz Mehring, Rosa Luxemburg, Kurt Eisner and others.
- 4 Marx to Engels, 26 Oct. and 3 Nov. 1859, MECW, XL, pp. 508, 513.
- 5 Freiligrath to Buchner, 30 Nov. 1859, in Buchner, ed., *Ferdinand Freiligrath*, II, p. 325; *Hermann*, 19 Nov. 1859.
- 6 Franz Mehring, 'Freiligrath und Marx in ihrem Briefwechsel', in *Gesammelte Schriften* (Berlin: Dietz, 1961), X, p. 568.
- 7 Gottfried Kinkel, *Festrede bei der Schillerfeier im Krystallpalast, 10. November 1859* (London: Wertheimer, 1859), p. 15.
- 8 The responding poem is quoted in Rösch-Sondermann, *Kinkel*, p. 313.
- 9 'Zur Schillerfeier. 10. November 1859. Festlied der Deutschen in London', in Freiligrath, *Werke*, I, pp. 302–4.

- 10 Karl Blind, *Schiller: A Sketch of his Career and Works* (1859).
- 11 *Hermann*, no. 94, 20 Oct. 1860.
- 12 Schaible, *37 Jahre*, p. 148.
- 13 Julius Vahlteich, *Ferdinand Lassalle und die Anfänge der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung* (repr. Berlin: Dietz, 1978), p. 11.
- 14 J.V. Weber to Marx, IISG, ME, D4458; [W. Weber to L. Weber], 3 May [1862], IISG, ME, R130; *Hermann*, 16 Nov. 1861; Wilhelm Weber, *Meine Ausstoßung aus dem Turnverein zu Neustadt a.H.* (Neustadt a.H.: Selbstverlag, 1862), pp. 3–6.
- 15 Extensive reports on the *Turnverein* are in *Hermann*, 10 Aug. and 14 Sept. 1861, 30 Aug. 1862, 30 Jan., 30 April 1864, 7 and 28 Jan. 1865, 20 Jan. 1866. Its final rise from oppositional patriotism to establishment nationalism was completed when the annual celebrations of the Kaiser's birthday, from 1899 on, eventually joined efforts with the imperial embassy (*Die Deutsche Kolonie*, pp. 61–3). Of all Germans in London, 17 per cent of *Kaufleute*, 5 per cent of scholars, artists and teachers, 3 per cent of artisans and only 1 per cent of workers had joined (*Hermann*, 21 May 1864).
- 16 *Die Deutsche Kolonie*, pp. 84–6, 54–61.
- 17 Dorgeel, *Pioniere*, p. 125; Dorgeel, *Kolonie*, pp. 63–83.
- 18 *Hermann* 30 June, 19 May and 8 Sept. 1860. At the same time, Ronge's group did not lose its political impetus but, for instance, organised a collection for Garibaldi's struggle.
- 19 *Ibid.*, 16 April 1859 and 28 Oct. 1865; *Ein deutsches Glaubenswerk in der Themsestadt* (Leipzig: E.Bredt [1910]).
- 20 *Hermann*, 11 Jan. 1862, 3 June 1865, 16 May 1868.
- 21 *Ibid.*, 21 Jan. 1865; 15 Sept. 1860, 2 Feb. 1861, 26 Oct. 1861; 29 June 1861, 1 April 1865, 16 Sept. 1865, 21 April 1866, 16 Feb. 1867.
- 22 *Ibid.*, 5 Oct. 1861, 29 Oct. 1864, 25 March 1865.
- 23 *Ibid.*, 12 Oct. 1861, 30 March 1867, 21 March 1868.
- 24 *Ibid.*, 22 July 1865, 11 Aug. 1866, 14 Nov. 1868.
- 25 *Ibid.*, 7 Nov. 1863, 9 Jan. 1864, 22 Feb. 1868, 12 Feb. 1870, 30 Sept. 1871, 25 Nov. 1871; Dorgeel, *Pioniere*, pp. 140–2; *Die Deutsche Kolonie*, pp. 95–6.
- 26 *Hermann*, 4 March and 11 March 1865. Among its members were Stohwasser, Enders, Stammwitz, Scherzer and Abels. The journeyman tailor Joseph Abels had been suspected of communist sympathies in La Chaux-de-Fonds and Cologne in 1851, and Enders had been in Stechan's 'Neuer Arbeiterverein' (Wermuth/Stieber, II, pp. 17–18 and p. 44). Stammwitz could be identical with Schapper's co-signatory of a letter in *Die junge Generation*, 16 Dec. 1841 and 21 March 1842; Stohwasser could have been the associate of Willich in the Communist League in 1850 and the vice-president of a German charity in 1867 (*BdK*, II, p. 261; *Hermann*, 15 June 1867).
- 27 Albert E. Haufe and Lessner for a 'Deutsches Komitee, London', 3 May [1866], request an address sent to Germany to prevent undercutting (IISG, ME, D1025), *Hermann*, 28 April, 5 May, 9 June, 11 and 25 Aug. 1866. 'Die deutschen Schneider in London an ihre Arbeitsgenossen in Deutschland' (May 1866), in *MEW*, XXXI, p. 216; cf. 'Warming', in *MEW*, XVI, pp. 164–5.
- 28 Eccarius later again warned German tailors not to interfere in a London dispute (*Hermann*, 27 April 1867). The *Hermann* reported almost weekly on the developments of the tailors' strike between 11 May and 29 June 1867.
- 29 *Hermann*, 9 Nov. 1867, 22 Feb. 1868, 5 Sept. 1868, 8 May 1869, and 8 April 1871.
- 30 *Freiheit*, 3 (18 Jan. 1879).
- 31 *Hermann*, 20 Feb. 1864, 22 Oct. 1864, 16 Dec. 1865, for some 50 stenographers.
- 32 *Ibid.*, 29 April 1865, 20 May 1865, 27 May 1865, and 18 Nov. 1865 for composers, and 22 Sept. 1866, 29 April 1871, 6 and 20 May, 17 June and 14 Oct. 1871 for bakers (but *Freiheit*, no. 1 (4 Jan. 1879) criticised the lack of organisation among German bakers in London).
- 33 *Hermann*, 22 Sept. and 29 Sept. 1866, and 11 June 1870.

- 34 *Ibid.*, 16 Dec. 1865. The ‘threat’ of the German clerks was first debated around 1867 (Gregory Anderson, ‘German Clerks in England, 1870–1914’, in Kenneth Lunn, ed., *Hosts, Immigrants and Minorities*, New York: St Martin’s Press, 1980, pp. 201–21). J.J.Findlay, ‘The Genesis of the German Clerk’, *Fortnightly Review*, 66 (1889), pp. 533–6, describes German secondary education as the cause of this competition.
- 35 ‘Deutsche Lehrer und Erzieherinnen’, *Germania*, II (1848), pp. 194–9, and J.Kinkel to K Zitz, 30 July 1857, in Leppla, ‘J.und G.Kinkels Briefe’, pp. 59–60.
- 36 ‘Aus dem Tagebuch einer Gouvernante’, *Hermann*, 5 Feb. 1859. The author was probably Meysenbug, who detailed working conditions in her autobiography (*Memoiren*, II, pp. 84–101). Johanna Kinkel made similar comments (J.Kinkel, *Hans Ibeles*, I, pp. 268–87).
- 37 *Hermann*, 12 Aug. 1865.
- 38 Magdalene Gaudian, ‘Die deutsche Lehrerin in England’, *Die Deutsche Kolonie*, pp. 89–92; *Der Vereinsbote: Organ des Vereins deutscher Lehrerinnen in London* (9, 1 (15 Feb. 1897), p. 3, and 13, 4 (15 Nov. 1901), pp. 59–68) give details on membership. *Statutes of The Association of German Governesses in England* (n.p., n.d. [?1876]), and *Auszug aus dem ersten Jahresbericht des Vereines für deutsche Lehrerinnen in England* (Speyer, 1877) detail membership and assistance provided.
- 39 A.S. (Auguste Schmidt), ‘Bücherschau’, *Neue Bahnen. Organ des Allgemeinen Deutschen Frauenvereins*, 33, 7 (1 April 1898), 76; Dorgeel, *Pioniere*, pp. 120–1. Later a home for German servants was also set up (Dorgeel, *Pioniere*, 122).
- 40 Julius Einsiedel, *Das Gouvernantenwesen in England: Eine Warnung* (Heilbronn: Henninger, 1884), pp. 147–92, and H.J.König, *Authentisches über die deutsche Erzieherin in England* (J.W.Kolckmann, 1884), pp. 25, 43. For the 1840s an average wage of £35 is given in Ursula Schmidt-Brümmer, ‘Zwischen Gouvernantentum und Schriftstellerei: Amalie Bölte in England’, in Alter and Muhs, *Exilanten*, p. 200.
- 41 After a party attended by some 300 well-wishers (which Freiligrath and Blind refused to attend), Kinkel left for a professorship in Switzerland, where he helped later Social Democratic exiles (*Hermann*, 29 Sept. 1866; Eduard Bernstein, *Aus den Jahren meines Exils: Erinnerungen eines Sozialisten*, Berlin: E.Reuss, 1918, pp. 96–7). Freiligrath went to Germany (but avoided Prussia) in 1867 with a ‘national honour tribute’, for which in London Ruge, F.Althaus, Gerstenberg, Bulwer Lytton and others had collected (*Hermann*, 4 May 1867). By then, of course, many Forty-Eighters had settled elsewhere, mostly in the United States, like Willich, Schurz, Struve, Heinzen and Sigel.
- 42 Blind died in 1907 aged 80, having remained a republican and advocate of Anglo-German friendship to his end (Otto Bielefeld, ‘Karl Blind in London’, in *März: Halbmonatsschrift für deutsche Kultur*, 1 (1907), 354–9, and Ashton, *Little Germany*, pp. 167–73).
- 43 Marx to Engels, 28 April 1870, *MEW*, XXXII, p. 485. Marx, who had planned to write his obituary, did not. Nor did his own foundation, the CABV, organise any public appreciation, but the ‘Teutonia’ club, then very active and closely associated with it, inserted a short notice in *Hermann*, 28 May 1870, praising him—ironically together with Harro Harring—as a faithful republican. Schapper may later have compromised on republicanism and declared that one German emperor and parliament (necessarily including workers) was preferable to 36 princes, and he recommended it to the working-class cooperative associations as ‘the realisation of communism’ (*Hermann*, 16 Nov. 1861).
- 44 *Hermann*, 13 Jan. 1866; *Vorwärts*, 22 Dec. 1876. He also told readers of the *Vorwärts* about the CABV, and the CABV about the Gotha conference, and praised Pyat.
- 45 According to his obituary he had been uninterruptedly a member of the CABV for the previous 24 years (*Freiheit*, 17 (26 April 1879)) but Engels claimed that the CABV had expelled him in 1872 for supporting Lassalleans and opposing the International (Engels to Liebknecht, 18 Jan. and 15 Feb. 1872, *MEW*, XXXIII, pp. 377 and 401).
- 46 *Freiheit*, 15 Feb. 1879.

- 47 *Freiheit*, 18 (3 May 1879). A picture of Scherzer in old age is in F.J.Ehrhart, 'Aus meiner Londoner Zeit', *Der Neue-Welt-Kakder für 1908*, Hamburg, 1908. His restaurant never seems to have flourished (*Hermann* 28 Jan. 1865), and Scherzer died so impoverished that his widow soon wrote for help to Marx (Sophie Scherzer to Marx, 11 Oct. [1880], IISG, ME, D3919).
- 48 J.B.Leno affectionately remembered that Eccarius kept a nightingale and was fascinated by natural history (John Bedford Leno, *The Aftermath: with Autobiography of the Author*, Reeves & Turner, 1892, pp. 61–2).
- 49 Collins and Abramsky (*Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement*, pp. 305–9) defend Eccarius against the later accusation of spying for the Austrian police.
- 50 Lessner, who had a large family—including triplets—was very fond of children, and there is much material in Kautsky Papers, IISG, D XV, 425–48. A summary of his later political activities is in Lessner, *Ich brachte*, pp. 293–352.
- 51 E.g., Jenny Marx to Becker, August 1876, *MEW*, XXXIV, p. 521. For correspondence of Lessner and the CABV from 1881–1889 see Kuczynski, 'Archivmitteilung', *£zG35* (1993), 101.
- 52 See e.g., E.B.Bax to Bebel, 3 Feb. 1899, IISG, Bebel Papers, 61. Lessner was left nothing by Engels although he had been much closer to him than many other beneficiaries (to Kautsky, 2 Jan. 1899, IISG, Kautsky Papers, D XV, 433), and he felt bitter when Eleanor Marx failed to visit him after giving a talk nearby (Lessner to Benno Karpeles, 14 Dec. 1897, IISG, 'Kleine Korrespondenzen'). On Lessner's last years see also Irma Sinelnikowa, *Friedrich Lessner* (Berlin: Dietz, 1980), pp. 167–91, who omits these complaints.
- 53 See Weber's and Bornemann's remarks in *Hermann*, 17 Nov. 1860. The CABV members Weber, Lessner, Ulrich (of the International Association) and Ermerich protested against the brutal prison regime imposed on Blanqui (*Hermann*, 4 May 1861; J.V.Weber to Marx, 22 June 1861, IISG, ME, D4456).
- 54 About 160 persons took part in the club's summer excursion to Epping Forest under its red flag, and almost 100 members listened to Scherzer, Marx, Eichhoff, Lessner and Weber in February 1862 (*Hermann*, 22 June 1861, and 15 Feb. 1862). Speeches by Scherzer, Schapper, Liebknecht, Becker, Weber and Lessner are reported in *Hermann*, 16 Nov. 1861.
- 55 Lindner, 'Die publizistische Tätigkeit Wilhelm Liebknechts', pp. 216–17.
- 56 Shlomo Na'aman, *Die Konstituierung der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung 1862/63: Darstellung und Dokumentation* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1975), pp. 28 and 637, n.16; *Hermann*, 15 Nov. 1862; Franz Mehring, *Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie* (Berlin: Dietz, 1976; Gesammelte Schriften, 2), II, pp. 22–4, 27.
- 57 *Hermann*, 9 Feb. 1861; Mehring, *Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie*, II, p. 137.
- 58 D.Wulf, secretary of CABV, to J.Ph.Becker, 10 April 1863 (IISG, J.Ph. Becker papers, D III, 188). Perhaps this sparked the new statutes of 1864 which declared as the society's purpose 'the education of its members, the propagation of social-political-revolutionary principles, and the enlightenment of workers about their class interests' (Grandjone, König, RoyJacquemart, *Statuten*, p. 49).
- 59 *Hermann*, 7 Jan. 1865, and 2–9 Nov. 1867.
- 60 *Vorbote*, 3 (Dec. 1868), p. 191, and 4 (Jan. 1869), 13–14.
- 61 Carl Speyer to Marx, 22 Nov. 1868, IISG, ME, D4171; Marx to Speyer, 23 Nov. 1868, *MEW*, XVI, p. 337.
- 62 Marx to Th. Kroll, 10 Aug. 1871, *MEW*, XXXIII, p. 263. On Lassalleans in the CABV in 1871 see also *MEW*, XXXIII, pp. 70, 118–19, 213, and n. 94. Due to financial squabbles between Marx and the CABV, Lessner suggested resigning from the club as soon as Marx's followers (Lessner, Fränkel, Wigand, Czilinsky) had used the CABV to have their say in the general victory celebration. He added that 'an agent of Schweizer', Schneider, dominated the society and agitated against the International (Lessner to Marx, 8 [Aug.?] and 15 Aug. 1871, IISG, ME, D3014–62).

- 63 Engels to Liebknecht, 18 Jan. 1872, *MEW*, XXXIII, p. 377.
- 64 Andreas Scheu, *Umsturzkeime: Erlebnisse eines Kämpfers*, pt. III: *Auf freiem Boden* (Vienna: Wiener Volksbuchhandlung, 1923), pp. 13–22.
- 65 *Vorwärts*, 36 (22 Dec. 1876), and 31 Dec. 1876 (at this point the CABV had some 100 members, and the 120 new arrivals within a year indicate the level of fluctuation).
- 66 *Hermann*, 30 May 1860.
- 67 Address by the CABV and the Vaterlands-Verein, signed by H.Bolleter, R.Berger, and J.V.Weber, *ibid.*, 22 Aug. 1863.
- 68 Signed by Bolleter, Berger, Eccarius, Lessner, Troups, Wolf and others, *Hermann*, 21 Nov. 1863 (also in *MECW*, XIX, pp. 296–7). Weber helped to persuade Marx to formulate the club's address (J.V.Weber to Marx, 8 and 16 Sept. and 29 Oct. 1863, IISG, ME, D4461–3).
- 69 *Hermann*, 14 Jan. 1865.
- 70 Scherzer's contribution should not be ignored, although he did not join the International.
- 71 *Hermann*, 22 Feb. 1868.
- 72 *Ibid.*, 29 April 1865; Braunthal, *Geschichte der Internationale*, I, p. 129.
- 73 E.g., *Vorbote*, 2 (Feb. 1866), p. 31; originals by the CABV are in IISG, J.Ph. Becker Papers, B7 and DII 1282–6.
- 74 Scheu for the CABV, 5 Feb. 1875, to the General Council, IISG, Jung Papers, 954/1.
- 75 Collins and Abramsky, *Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement*, pp. 41, 60. Eccarius was an exception. Even before he broke with Marx in 1872, he had lost his close contact with the CABV because of his almost exclusive work for the British trade union movement and the *Commonwealth* (*Hermann*, 17 Feb. 1866; *Der Vorbote*, 2 (March 1867), 43). Emmrich's short biography (*Eccarius*) unfortunately does not cover any of his conflicts with Marx. Heinrich Bolleter and Karl Kaub were newcomers among the Germans, who joined the General Council on account of their activity in the CABV (Braunthal, *Geschichte der Internationale*, p. 374).
- 76 Lessner to Marx, 12 Feb. 1866 (and similarly 9 Oct. 1867 and 10 Jan. 1868), IISG, ME, D3014–62. On Lessner's influence in the CABV during those years see Sinelnikowa, *Friedrich Leßner*, pp. 129–34.
- 77 Carl Speyer thanked Marx and added that although none of the members had yet read it they were already aware of its value as 'the first chop of the axe against the bulwark keeping us down' (Carl Speyer, for the CABV, to Marx, Oct. 1867, IISG, ME, D4167).
- 78 Speyer to Marx, 17 May 1868, IISG, ME, D4169.
- 79 Lessner to Marx, 7 Nov. 1868, IISG, ME, D3014–62, adding that the younger members 'behaved very well' in Weber's latest intrigue.
- 80 E.g., Speyer to Marx, 15 Dec. 1869, IISG, ME, D4173.
- 81 *Volksstaat*, 27 Feb. 1876.
- 82 *Justice*, 1, 10 (22 March 1884).
- 83 Meyer, *Engels*, II, p. 475. Letters from the CABV's secretary, Richard George, to Engels (IISG, ME, L1976–1985, 1885–1891), almost exclusively concern support for impoverished comrades, requests for attendance at CABV celebrations or talks, and the Gilles affair, while Lessner kept Engels informed about club events between 1872 and 1895 (IISG, ME, L3340–3401, letters Lessner to Engels, 1868–95).
- 84 Mayer, *Engels*, II, p. 526.
- 85 *Hermann*, 1 Aug. 1868. More than the Schiller celebration, this called for a united social republic including Austria, without Bismarck (*Hermann*, 15 Aug. 1868).
- 86 Eugen Oswald, *Reminiscences*, pp. 411–18.
- 87 'Erklärung des Londoner Arbeiter-Bildungs-Vereins und der Teutonia: Die deutschen Arbeiter Londons', signed by Eccarius, J.V.Weber and others (p. 2, copy in IISG, ME, S 20); also in *Vorbote*, 5 (Nov. 1870), pp. 174–6, and Dec. 1870, pp. 184–5.
- 88 *Hermann*, 28 Jan. 1871.
- 89 *Ibid.*, 4 Feb. 1871.

- 90 E.g., L. Weber for the Teutonia': 'Erwiderung der Vereine Teutonia und Arbeiter-Bildungs-Verein auf die Herzensergüsse eines freien Großdeutschen im "Hermann"', n.d. [1871] (IISG, J.Ph. Becker Papers, B7), while thousands of London Germans signed an address of loyalty to Emperor Wilhelm (*Hermann*, 11 March 1871).
- 91 *Ibid.*, 9 Sept. 1871.
- 92 P. Vésinier, *History of the Commune of Paris*, trans. J.V. Weber (Chapman & Hall, 1872), p. v. Weber and Vésinier collaborated in the 'Section française de 1871', an organisation of refugees from the Commune.
- 93 Ehrhart to Engels, 21 Jan. 1879, IISG, ME, L1334. Ehrhart described the CABV in late 1877 as a disappointing gathering of some 50 members with a low level of political discussions (Ehrhart, 'Aus meiner Londoner Zeit', pp. 58–9).
- 94 Engels dismissed the 'Very depraved louts' in the CABV (Engels to P. Pauli, 30 July 1878, *MEW*, XXXIV, p. 336), referring probably among others to a 'Universal Federal Workman's League' aiming at 'l'Unité d'action parmi les ouvriers de différentes nations, et de défendre le Travail, contre l'oppression du Capital' (Louis Weber to Engels, 8 April 1878, IISG, ME, L6230); Ehrhart, 'Aus meiner Londoner Zeit', p. 60. The CABV delegated Ehrhart and Maltman Barry to the socialist congress in Lausanne (Marx to Talandier, November 1878, *MEW*, XXXIV, p. 352).
- 95 *Freiheit*, no. 1 (4 Jan. 1879), no. 5 (1 Feb. 1879), and no. 23 (7 June 1879). In November 1878 the club had 200 members, and devoted a meeting to Robert Owen, when J.B. Leno and Mottershead praised Marx (Lessner to Engels, 25 Nov. 1878, IISG, ME, L3340–3401). The Berlin police observed the CABV and its connections to Germany in late 1878 (Reinhard Höhn, ed., *Die vaterlandslosen Gesellen: Der Sozialismus im Licht der Geheimerichte der preußischen Polizei 1878–1914*, Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1964, 1, pp. 4–6).
- 96 *Freiheit. Socialdemokratisches Organ*, 1 (4 Jan. 1879), described its function as giving voice to silenced Social Democrats at home. Most's own account of the CABV and early years of the *Freiheit* is in Anonymus Veritas [Johann Most], *Acht Jahre hinter Schloß und Riegel: Skizzen aus dem Leben Johann Mosts* (New York: 1886), pp. 57–65.
- 97 *Freiheit*, 27 March, 17 April and 18 Dec. 1880, and *Sozialdemokrat*, 2 (11 Jan. 1880), 14 (4 April 1880), and 31 (1 Aug. 1880) on the split of the CABV (described in *Freiheit*, 24 Jan. 1880). See also Johann Most, '*Taktik*' contra '*Freiheit*' (London, printed by the Socialdemokratische Genossenschafts-Buchdruckerei 'Freiheit' [1880]). Engels suspected that the CABV, after several failed attempts to initiate international organisations, now saw its chance to regain the importance it had had between 1849 and 1862 (Engels to J.Ph. Becker, 1 July 1879, *MEW*, XXXIV, pp. 382–3).
- 98 Copy at IISG, An38–9 and D1181–1E.
- 99 August Reinsdorf, 'Zur Organisation' (*Freiheit*, 10 July 1880). The paper soon also encouraged 'propaganda by deed' and terrorism. See George Woodcock, *Anarchism* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977), p. 415.
- 100 *Freiheit*, 12 (19 March 1881), 'Endlich!'; special edition, 4 June 1881 (trial); Bernard Porter, 'The *Freiheit* Prosecutions 1881–1882', *Historical Journal*, 23 (1980), 833–56. After the *Freiheit* (13 May 1882) applauded the Fenian Phoenix Park murders, the British government suppressed the paper.
- 101 Letters by Frank Kitz for the *Freiheit* Defence Committee, 6 and 12 April 1881, are in IISG, ME, D2662–3, and BLPES, Mill/Taylor Collection, XVIII, item 110. The English issues are *Freiheit (Freedom): A Journal for the Diffusion of Socialistic Knowledge amongst the People*, 1 (24 April 1881), 6 (29 May 1881).
- 102 William J. Fishman, *East End Jewish Radicals, 1875–1914* (Duckworth, 1975), p. 129; Rocker, *The London Years*, pp. 117–21, 126.
- 103 *Freiheit*, 34 (23 Aug. 1879); Siegfried Büniger, *Friedrich Engels und die britische sozialistische Bewegung 1881–1895* (Berlin: Rütten & Loening, 1962), pp. 34–5; Logic

- Barrow, 'The Homerton Social Democratic Club, 1881–1882', *History Workshop Journal*, 5 (1978), 188–97.
- 104 *Justice*, 1, 10 (22 March 1884); Lessner to Sparling, 26 Sept. 1886, IISG, Socialist League, K2006; for 1887–1888 see e.g., K1 154–55, 1262, 1493–4.
- 105 Josef Peukert, *Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung* (Berlin: Verlag des sozialistischen Bundes, 1913), p. 198; Rudolf Rocker, *Johann Most: Das Leben eines Rebellen* (Berlin: Verlag P 38, 1984), pp. 244–5. Dorgeel (*Deutschlands Pioniere*, pp. 59 and 139) calculates that with over 800 members in three sections the CABV was 'the strongest of all [German] societies in England' in 1882.
- 106 Rocker, *Most*, pp. 216–83; Peukert, *Erinnerungen*, pp. 203–73, and [Martin], *Der Anarchismus und seine Träger: Enthüllungen aus dem Lager der Anarchisten* (Berlin: Neufeld & Mehring, 1887), pp. 58–76.
- 107 Rocker, *Most*, p. 282. See also CABV resolution, in Albert Baethke to W. Morris, 11 Sept. 1886, IISG, Socialist League, K718.
- 108 Rocker, *The London Years*, pp. 66–71; Fishman, *East End Jewish Radicals*, pp. 229–53.
- 109 W. Hoffmann to Bernstein, 4 Dec. 1881; G. Lemke to Bernstein, 27 March 1881; and H. Rackow to Bernstein, 31 July and 17 Aug. 1912, IISG, Bernstein Papers, D283, D404, and D560.
- 110 Henry Rackow, *Vor und nach der Schlacht* (printed by Henry Detloff, 1888).
- 111 [Martin], *Der Anarchismus*, pp. 78–80.
- 112 *Sozialdemokrat*, 2 (8 Jan. 1888); IISG, Marx-Engels Papers, M31, and Kautsky Papers, DII 133; Peukert, *Erinnerungen*, pp. 248–52, 269–71. Bernstein's and Kautsky's Papers at the IISG contain much material on the CABV's position between the party leadership in Germany and Peukert's 'Autonomie' in two affairs centred on Ferdinand Gilles, a journalist for the *Londoner Arbeiterzeitung*. See also 'Socialdemokraten', a leaflet announcing the resignation of 28 members from the Tottenham Street CABV in 1892 (IISG, ME, S41); Ferdinand Gilles, 'Sozialdemokratische' Ketzergericht im Communistischen Arbeiter-Bildungs-Verein, 49 Tottenham Street, W. (1892); Yvonne Kapp, *Eleanor Marx* (Virago, 1979), II, pp. 461–70.
- 113 'Londoner Verlags-Genossenschaft', founded 1 Oct. 1887 (IISG, ME, S31 and S32); Fritz SchAAF, 'Die "Sozialdemokratische Bibliothek" der Schweizerischen Volksbuchhandlung in Hottingen-Zürich und der German Cooperative Printing and Publishing Co. in London', *Marxismus und deutsche Arbeiterbewegung* (Berlin: Dietz, 1970), pp. 431–84.
- 114 Eduard Bernstein, *My Years of Exile* (L. Parsons, 1921), p. 252; B. Weingartz, 'Aus vergangenen Tagen: Erinnerung an den 7. Februar 1840', *Vorwärts* (Berlin), 7 Feb. 1928.
- 115 *Statuten des Communistischen Arbeiter-Bildungs-Vereins London* (London, printed by Henry Detloff, 1895), p. 3. Its administration had become vastly expanded, and these statutes are not included in Grandjonc, König, Roy Jacquemart (eds.), *Statuten* (who also note the bureaucratic structure of the 1903 statutes). Further statutes dated 1897 are mentioned in I.M. Sinel'nikova, 'Londonskoe kommunisticheskoe prosvetitel'noe obshchestvo nemetskich rabotchich i I. Internatsional', *Novaia i noveishaia Istorii* 8 (1964), p. 58. The club's minutes exist for 1897–1899 (Kuczynski, 'Archivmitteilung', 101).
- 116 Grandjonc, König, Roy Jacquemart (eds.), *Statuten*, p. 67.
- 117 O. Manske et al. for the managing committee, *An die Mitglieder des C.A.B.V. [1904]* (leaflet without title page, IISG, Bro 229–4), pp. 1 and 6.
- 118 [Pierre Ramus], 'Principienerklärung und Statuten des Communistischen Arbeiter Bildungs-Vereins' (MS copy, London, 1905; not included in Grandjonc, König, Roy Jacquemart, *Statuten*).
- 119 Rudolf Rocker, *Aus den Memoiren eines deutschen Anarchisten*, ed. Magdalena Melnikow and Hans Peter Duerr (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1974), p. 230; Arnold Roller, *Der Soziale Generalstreik* (London: Verlag der Broschürengruppe des C.A.B.V., 1909).
- 120 J. Sachse to Kautsky, 5 Oct. 1909, IISG, Kautsky Papers, D XX 28.



121 Rocker, *The London Years*, pp. 252, 267.

122 Grandjonn, König, Royjacquemart, *Statuten*, p. 8; Weingartz, 'Aus vergangenen Tagen'.

Max Beer recalled that the CABV fell victim to the Great War in 1915 (*Fifty Years of International Socialism*, Allen & Unwin, 1935, p. 70).

123 Carl Levy ('Hermia Oliver, The International Anarchist Movement in Late Victorian London', *History Workshop Journal*, 18 (1984), 186) gives this slightly different version of the CABV's ending after a letter by Silvio Corio, 7 Aug. 1951. The club's library was moved to Berlin and in 1933 rescued to Amsterdam, where it is now in the IISG (Kuczynski, 'Archivmitteilung', 100).

# Bibliography

## Primary sources

### *France*

Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, N.A.F. 9581, and N.A.F. 9583:  
MSS Auguste Blanqui, ff. 210–393, correspondence Blanqui, 1850–1852

### *Germany*

Badisches Generallandesarchiv Karlsruhe (BGLAK):  
236/8743: weekly reports from Berlin, 1852  
236/8757: weekly reports from Vienna, 1853–1858  
49/1021: reports on refugees, from Karlsruhe, 1851–1853  
48/5212: monthly reports, Karlsruhe, 1852  
48/5206: police reports on revolutionary propaganda, 1853–1856  
48/5204: reports from Ministry of the Interior, Karlsruhe, 1850–1851  
Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv München:  
Archives of the Bayrisches Geheimes Staatsarchiv, Deutscher Bund,  
Bay. HStA München, Abt. II, MA II, 1798:  
weekly reports from Berlin, Dresden, Hannover, Stuttgart, and Vienna, 1851–1860  
Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv, Potsdam:  
Agitation Society file, 8531  
Bauer (Edgar) file, 8893  
Bnünink file, 8889  
Bucher file, 8892  
Comité Révolutionnaire file, 9357  
Democratic Society file, 9529  
Dietz file, 11373  
Freiligrath file, 9793  
German Broadsheets from London file, 9863  
Gipperich file, 10084/1  
Goegg file, 10083/1  
Harro-Harring file, 10463  
Haugh file, 10427  
Heinzen file, 10433  
Hess file, 10464  
Hirsch file, 10485  
Kinkel file, 10968  
Ladendorf file, 11386–11391  
Leaflets file, 9820  
Meyen file, 11651  
Neue Londoner Arbeiter-Verein, 8535  
Pyat file, 12191  
Reininger file, 12524  
Revolutionary Loan file, 8537

- Revolutionary party file, 13835  
 Ronge file, 12462  
 Ruge file, 12528  
 Schapper-Willich file, 8534  
 Scherzer file, 12865  
 Schramm file, 12797  
 Simon file, 11374/1  
 Techow file, 13701  
 Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin-Dahlem: Geheimes Preußisches  
 Staatsarchiv, Brandenburg-Preußisches Hausarchiv (B.P.H.), Rep. 192  
 Carl Wilhelm Saegert Papers, nos. 35–7: police reports about refugees, 1851–1853  
 Sächsisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Dresden: H.St.A. Reg. 1893, No. 551 (MdI No. 278dd and 278z,  
 Abt. für Preß-Polizei II)  
 Confiscation of Publications file, IV, fol. 39b, no. 56  
 Stadtarchiv Mainz:  
 Kathinka Zitz Papers: correspondence with refugees in London, 1851  
 University Library, Bonn, Manuscript Department:  
 Gottfried Kinkel Papers:  
 S 2661: correspondence G.Kinkel, A.Willich, W.Hirsch, 1853  
 S 2663: correspondence A.Willich, G.Techow, 1851–1861  
 S 2675: correspondence G.Kinkel, A.Schimmelpfennig, A.Willich, 1851  
 S 2702: circular from Kinkel, Ruge et al., 1851, 'An die Deutschen'  
 Karl-Marx-Haus, Trier:  
 Minutes of the International Association, 1859 [1859–1860] (copy; original in Rigsarkivet  
 Kopenhagen, Braestrup's Archive, Privatarkiv Nr. 5232, C. 15)

### ***Netherlands***

- International Institute for Social History (IISG), Amsterdam:  
 Bebel Papers  
 J.Ph. Becker Papers  
 Bernstein Papers  
 Jung Papers  
 Kautsky Papers  
 Kleine Korrespondenzen  
 Marx-Engels Papers (ME)  
 Socialist League Papers

### ***Switzerland***

- University Library, Basel:  
 Jakob Lukas Schabelitz Papers, Diary notes and correspondence

### ***United Kingdom***

- Manchester: Co-operative Union,  
 Holyoake Collection, *The Democratic Friends of all Nations* (MS., 1844, item 128)  
 London: BLPES,  
 Mill/Taylor Collection  
 London: British Library,  
 Karl Blind Papers, Add. MSS. 40123ff., 1849–1866  
 [Pierre Ramus], 'Principienerklärung und Statuten des Communistischen Arbeiter Bildungs-  
 Vereins' (MS copy, London, 1905)  
 London: Public Record Office,

Home Office Papers, H.O. 107/1545, ff. 587–8, ff. 614–15 (Census Returns, 1861);  
H.O. 45/3623 (correspondence respecting foreigners attending the Great Exhibition, 1851)  
F.O., MEPO 2/99

### **United States**

New York Public Library, New York, MSS. Collection:  
Wilhelm Weitling Papers, Box 1: correspondence, 1844–1859

### **Secondary sources**

(Place of publication is London unless otherwise indicated.)

- A.L. [Arthur Lehning]. 'La réponse de Cabet a Schapper', *BIISH*, 8 (1953), 7–15.
- A.L. [Arthur Lehning]. 'Discussions a Londres sur le Communisme Icarien', *Bulletin of the International Institute of Social History*, 7 (1952), 87–109.
- A.S. [Auguste Schmidt]. 'Bücherschau', *Neue Bahnen, Organ des Allgemeinen Deutschen Frauenvereins*, 33, no. 7 (1 April 1898), 76.
- Abendroth, Wolfgang. *Einführung in die Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung*, 2 vols (Heilbronn: Distel, 1997).
- Adams, W.E. *Memoirs of a Social Atom* (Hutchinson, 1903).
- Adresse an das Volk in Schleswig-Holstein* (March 1860).
- 'Adresse der deutschen Arbeiter in London an Johannes Ronge', *Rheinische Jahrbücher zur gesellschaftlichen Reform*, 1 (1845), 327–9.
- Adresse des Bildungsvereins in London an die deutschen Proletarier* [1846].
- Adresse des Londoner Arbeitervereins an die arbeitenden Klassen Belgiens, Hollands und Deutschlands*, signed by R.Hartwell, J.Gast and others (1836).
- Address of the Fraternal Democrats Assembling in London, To the Members of the National Diet of Switzerland* (1847).
- Aldenhoff, Rita. 'Das Selbsthilfemodell als liberale Antwort auf die soziale Frage im 19. Jahrhundert. Schulze-Delitzsch und die Genossenschaften', in Karl Holl, Günter Trautmann and Hans Vorländer, eds, *Sozialer Liberalismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), pp. 57–69.
- Alexander, Sally. *Women and Work in Nineteenth Century London* (Journeyman Press, 1983).
- '*All Men are Brethren*'. *An Address to the Friends of Humanity and Justice among all Nations, by the Democratic Friends of all Nations* (1845).
- Alter, Peter, and Rudolf Muhs, eds. *Exilanten und andere Deutsche in Fontanes London*, Festschrift für Charlotte Jolles, Stuttgarter Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 331 (Stuttgart: Akademischer Verlag Hans-Dieter Heinz, 1996).
- Althaus, Friedrich. 'Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Colonie in England', I: 'Die Orientalisten', II: 'Die Lehrer', III: 'Die Flüchtlinge', *Unsere Zeit: Deutsche Revue der Gegenwart*, N.F. 9 (1873), 1. Hälfte, 433–45, and 534–48, 2. Hälfte, 225–45.
- Althaus, Friedrich. 'Erinnerungen an Gottfried Kinkel', *Nord und Süd*, 25 (1883), 54–75.
- Anderson, Duane Charles. 'English Working-Class Internationalism, 1846–1864', Ph. D. thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1976.
- [Anon.] 'Die deutschen Juden in London', *Die Gartenlaube*, 20 (1863), 312–15.
- [Anon.], 'The Germans in London', *The London City Mission Magazine*, 25 (1 Aug. 1860), 233–56.
- Anonymus Veritas [Johann Most], *Acht Jahre hinter Schloß und Riegel: Skizzen aus dem Leben Johann Mosts* (New York: 1886).
- Armfelt, Count E. 'German London', in George R.Sims, ed. *Living London*, III (Cassell: 1903), pp. 57–62.
- Armytage, W.H.G. 'The Journalistic Activities of J.Goodwin Barnby Between 1841 and 1848', *Notes and Queries*, 201 (1956), 167–8.

- Aronsfeld, C.C. 'German Jews in Nineteenth Century Bradford', *The Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 53 (1981), 111–17.
- Aronsfeld, C.C. 'German Jews in Victorian England', *Publications of the Leo Baeck Institute: Year Book*, 7 (1962), 312–29.
- Ash ton, Rosemary. *Little Germany: Exile and Asylum in Victorian England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).
- Asten-Kinkel, Adelheid von. 'Johanna Kinkel in England', *Deutsche Revue*, 26 (1901), 69–80.
- Auszug aus dem ersten Jahresbericht des Vereines für deutsche Lehrerinnen in England* (Speyer: Jäger'sche Buchdruckerei, 1877).
- Auszüge aus den von der Polizei in Paris mit Beschlag belegten Papieren des communistischen Complots* (n.p., n.d.) [copy in Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv, Potsdam Rep. 30, Berlin C, Tit. 94, Nr. 10084/1].
- Bach, I.A. 'Karl Marx und die Londoner Zeitung "Das Volk" (1859)', in *Aus der Geschichte des Kampfes von Marx und Engels für die proletarische Partei: Eine Sammlung von Arbeiten* (Berlin: Dietz, 1961), pp. 175–234.
- Balsler, Frolinde. *Sozial-Demokratie 1848/49–1863: Die erste deutsche Arbeiterorganisation 'Allgemeine Arbeiterverbrüderung' nach der Revolution*, 2 vols, Industrielle Welt, 2 (Stuttgart: Klett, 1962).
- Bamberger, Ludwig. *Erinnerungen*, ed. Paul Nathan (Berlin: G.Reimer, 1899).
- Bamberger, Ludwig. *Bismarcks großes Spiel: Die geheimen Tagebücher Ludwig Bambergers*, ed. Ernst Feder (Frankfurt: Societats-Verlag, 1932).
- Barnikol, Ernst. *Weitling der Gefangene und seine 'Gerechtigkeit'. Eine kritische Untersuchung über Werk und Wesen des frühsozialistischen Messias*, Christentum und Sozialismus in Quellen und Darstellungen, 1 (Kiel: Mühlau-Verlag, 1929).
- Barnikol, Ernst, ed. *Wilhelm Weitling, Klassifikation des Universums*, Christentum und Sozialismus in Quellen und Darstellungen, 3 (Kiel: Mühlau-Verlag, 1931).
- Barrow, Logic. 'The Homerton Social Democratic Club, 1881–1882', *History Workshop Journal*, 5 (1978), 188–97.
- Bauer, Edgar. *Englische Freiheit* (Leipzig: Otto Wigand, 1857).
- Bauer, Edgar. *Die Wahrheit über die Internationale* (Altona: 1872).
- Bayley, C.C. *Mercenaries for the Crimea: The German, Swiss, and Italian Legions in British Service, 1854–1856* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1977).
- Bebel, August. *Aus meinem Leben* (Berlin: Dietz, 1978).
- Becker, Bernhard. *Geschichte der Arbeiter-Agitation Ferdinand Lassalle's* (Braunschweig: W.Bracke, 1874; repr. Hildesheim: H.A.Gerstenberg, 1972).
- Becker, Gerhard. 'Der "Neue Arbeiter-Verein in London" 1852: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Bundes der Kommunisten', *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, 14 (1966), 74–97.
- Becker, Gerhard. 'Karl Schapper', in Karl Obermann, ed., *Manner der Revolution von 1848* [I] (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1970), pp. 123–47.
- Becker, Gerhard. 'Joseph Moll', in Helmut Bleiber, Walter Schmidt and Rolf Weber, eds, *Manner der Revolution von 1848*, II (Berlin: Akademie, 1987), pp. 53–83.
- Beer, Max. *Fifty Years of International Socialism* (Allen & Unwin, 1935).
- Beloussowa, N. 'Joseph Moll', in *Marx und Engels und die ersten proletarischen Revolutionäre* (Berlin: Dietz, 1965), pp. 42–75.
- Berg, Hermann von. 'Ein unbekanntes kommunistisches Dokument vom Jahre 1849 aus London', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung*, 11 (1969), 451–60.
- Berg, Hermann von. *Entstehung und Tätigkeit der Norddeutschen Arbeitervereinigung als Regionalorganisation der Deutschen Arbeiterverbrüderung nach der Niederschlagung der Revolution von 1848/49* (Bonn: Verlag Neue Gesellschaft, 1981).
- Berghahn, Marion. *German-Jewish Refugees in England: The Ambiguities of Assimilation* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1984).
- Bergmann, Karl Hans. *Blanqui: Ein Rebell im 19. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt: Campus, 1986).

- Bernstein, Eduard. *Aus den Jahren meines Exils: Erinnerungen eines Sozialisten* (Berlin: E.Reuss, 1918).
- Bernstein, Eduard. *Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus und die Aufgaben der Sozialdemokratie* (Stuttgart: Dietz, 1899).
- [Bernstein, Eduard, ed.] 'Das jüngste Gericht über die alte sociale Welt. Eine verschollene Schrift von Moses Hess', *Documente des Socialismus*, I (Berlin: 1902), 533–52.
- Bernstein, Samuel. *Auguste Blanqui and the Art of Insurrection* (Lawrence & Wishart, 1971).
- Bielefeld, Otto. 'Karl Blind in London', *März: Halbmonatsschrift für deutsche Kultur*, 1, no. 3 (1907), 354–9.
- Bird, John Clement. *Control of Enemy Alien Civilians in Great Britain 1914–1918* (New York: Garland, 1986).
- Birker, Karl. *Die deutschen Arbeiterbildungsvereine 1840–1870* (Berlin: Colloquium-Verlag, 1973).
- Black, Frank Gees, and Renee Métivier Black, eds. *The Harney Papers* (Assen, Van Gorcum, 1969).
- Blake, Robert. 'Prince Albert and the Crimean War', in Adolph M. Birke and Kurt Kluxen, eds, *Viktorianisches England in deutscher Perspektive*, Prinz-Albert Studien 1 (Munich: Saur, 1983).
- Blind, Karl. *Schiller: A Sketch of His Career and Works (Written at the Request of the General Assembly of the Schiller Festival Committee)* [1859].
- Blos, Wilhelm. *Die Deutsche Revolution: Geschichte der Deutschen Bewegung von 1848 und 1849* (Stuttgart: Dietz, 1893).
- Blos, Wilhelm, ed. *General Franz Sigel's Denkwürdigkeiten aus den Jahren 1848/49* (Mannheim: Bensheimer, 1902).
- Blum, Oscar. 'Zur Psychologie der Emigration', *Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung*, 7 (1916), 412–30.
- Blumenberg, Werner. 'Zur Geschichte des Bundes der Kommunisten: die Aussagen des Peter Gerhardt Röser', *International Review of Social History*, 9 (1964), 81–122.
- [Bluntschli, Johann Caspar], *Die Kommunisten in der Schweiz nach den bei Weitling vorgefundenen Papieren* (Zürich: 1843; repr. Hildesheim: H.A.Gerstenberg, 1972).
- Bochinski, Hansjürgen. 'Marx' Mitarbeit an der chartistischen Zeitung "The People's Paper" im Jahre 1853', *Marx-Engels-Jahrbuch*, 3 (1980), 165–95.
- Bochinski, Hans-Jürgen. 'Friedrich Engels und die "New York Tribune" im Jahre 1855', *Beiträge zur Marx-Engels-Forschung*, 19 (1985), 23–44.
- Boetcher Joeres, Ruth-Ellen, ed. *Louise Otto-Peters* (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1983).
- Bollert, Martin. *Ferdinand Freiligrath und Gottfried Kinkel* (Bromberg: Krahl, 1916).
- Borkheim, Sigismund. *Napoleon III. und Preußen: Antwort eines deutschen Flüchtlings auf die Broschüre 'Preußen in 1860' von Edmund About* (Petsch: 1860).
- Borkheim, Sigismund. *Zur Erinnerung für die deutschen Mordspatrioten 1806–1807* (Hottingen-Zürich: Verlag der Volksbuchhandlung, 1888).
- Born, Stefan. *Erinnerungen eines Achtundvierzigers* (Bonn: J.H.W.Dietz Nachf., 1978).
- Börnstein, Heinrich. *Fünfundsiebzig Jahre in der Alien und Neuen Welt: Memoiren eines Unbedeutenden*, 2 vols (Leipzig: Otto Wigand, 1884).
- Brandenburg, Alexander. *Theoriebildungsprozesse in der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung 1835–1850*, Texte zur Arbeiterbewegung (Hannover: SOAK, 1977).
- Brandenburg, Alexander. 'Der Kommunistische Arbeiterbildungsverein in London. Ein Beitrag zu den Anfängen der deutschen Arbeiterbildungsbewegung (1840–1847)', *International Review of Social History*, 24 (1979), 341–70.
- Brandenburg, Alexander. 'Utopischer Sozialismus, Arbeiterkommunismus, Marxismus: Ein Tagungsbericht', *Internationale wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung*, 24 (1988), 192–212.
- Braunthal, Julius. *Geschichte der Internationale*, 3 vols (Berlin: Dietz, 1978).

- Brederlow, Jörn. *'Lichtfreunde' und 'Freie Gemeinden': religiöser Protest und Freiheitsbewegung im Vormärz und in der Revolution von 1848/49* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1976).
- Brettschneider, Werner. 'Entwicklung und Bedeutung des deutschen Frühsozialismus in London', Diss. phil. thesis, Königsberg, 1936.
- Breuilly, John, and Wieland Sachse. *Joachim Friedrich Martens (1806–1877) und die deutsche Arbeiterbewegung*, Göttinger Beiträge zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte, 8 (Göttingen: Schwartz, 1984).
- Briggs, Asa. *Victorian Cities* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963).
- Briggs, Asa, with John Dekker and John Mair, *Marx in London: An Illustrated Guide* (British Broadcasting Corporation, 1982).
- British Parliamentary Papers. 1871 Census England and Wales. Population 18* (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1970 [1871]).
- Brock, Peter. 'Polish Socialists in Early Victorian England: Three Documents', *Polish Review*, 6 (1961), 33–52.
- Brock, Peter. 'The Socialists of the Polish "Great Emigration"', in Asa Briggs and John Saville, eds. *Essays in Labour History: In Memory of G.D.H.Cole* (Macmillan, 1967), pp. 140–73.
- Brügel, Ludwig. 'Aus den Londoner Flüchtlingstagen von Karl Marx', *Der Kampf*, 17 (1924), 346–51.
- Bucher, Lothar. *Der Parlamentarismus, wie er ist* (Berlin: 1856, 2nd edn. 1882).
- Buchner, Wilhelm, ed. *Ferdinand Freiligrath: Ein Dichterkben in Briefen*, 2 vols (Lahr: M.Schauenburg, 1882).
- Buckman, Joseph. *Immigrants and the Class Struggle: The Jewish Immigrant in Leeds, 1880–1914* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1983).
- Bünger, Siegfried. *Friedrich Engels und die britische sozialistische Bewegung 1881–1895* (Berlin: Rütten & Loening, 1962).
- Bunsen, Frances Baroness, ed. *Christian Carl Josias Freiherr von Bunsen. Aus seinen Briefen und nach eigener Erinnerung geschildert von seiner Witwe. Deutsche Ausgabe durch neue Mittheilungen vermehrt von Friedrich Nippold*, 3 vols (Leipzig: F.A.Brockhaus, 1869–71).
- Busse, Adolph. 'Ein Brief Johanna Kinkels an Carl Schurz', *Germanic Review*, 5 (1930), 183–7.
- Busse, Adolph. 'Die Briefe Gottfried Kinkels an Karl Schurz', *Quellen und Darstellungen zur Geschichte der Burschenschaft und der deutschen Einheitsbewegungen*, 14 (1934), 247–67.
- Cabet, Etienne. *Procès du communisme a Toulouse* (Paris: Au Bureau du Populaire, 1843).
- Cadogan, Peter. 'Harney and Engels', *International Review of Social History*, 19 (1965), 66–104.
- Calman, Alvin R. *Ledru-Rollin après 1848 et les proscrits français en Angleterre* (Paris: F. Rieder, 1921).
- Carver, Terrell. *Friedrich Engels: His Life and Thought* (Macmillan, 1989).
- Census of England and Wales for the Year 1861* (HMSO, 1863).
- Census of Great Britain, 1851. II: Ages, Civil Conditions, Occupations, and Birth-Places of the People* (HMSO, 1854).
- Cherno, Mervin. 'Der deutsche Eidgenosse and its collapse, 1865–1867: An attempt to stimulate a German revolution through émigré propaganda', *German Language and Letters*, 35 (1981–1982), 138–49.
- Claeys, Gregory. John Adolphus Etzler, Technological Utopianism, and British Socialism', *English Historical Review*, 101 (1986), 31–55.
- Claeys, Gregory. *Machinery, Money and the Millennium: From Moral Economy to Socialism, 1815–1860* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987).
- Claeys, Gregory. *Citizens and Saints. Politics and Anti-Politics in Early British Socialism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- Claeys, Gregory. 'Mazzini, Kossuth, and British Radicalism, 1848–1854', *Journal of British Studies*, 28 (1989), 225–61.
- Cole, G.D.H. *A History of Socialist Thought, I: The Forerunners, 1789–1850; II: Marxism and Anarchism, 1850–1890* (Macmillan: 1953–4).

- Collins, Henry, and Chimen Abramsky. *Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement: Years of the First International* (Macmillan, 1965).
- Conway, Moncure Daniel. *Autobiography: Memoirs and Experiences*, 2 vols (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1904).
- Conzen, Kathleen. 'The Paradox of German-American Assimilation', *Yearbook of German-American Studies*, 16 (1981), 153–60.
- Dammermann, Bernhard. 'Lothar Bucher in England: Seine Entwicklung vom Achtundvierziger zum Gehilfen Bismarcks', *Archiv für Politik und Geschichte*, 8 (1927), 186–230.
- de Jonge, Alfred. *Gottfried Kinkel as Political and Social Thinker* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1926).
- Démocrates, Prenez Garde a Vous!* (pamphlet dated 3 Dec., 1850, signed by the French Blanquists, Polish, Italian and Hungarian refugees, and for the Germans by Willich, Schapper, Dietz, Gebert, Majer and Schärttner, copy in Dietz file, Potsdam 11373, f. 41).
- Dénes, Tibor. 'Lehr- und Wanderjahre eines jungen Schweizers (1845–1848): Jakob Lukas Schabelitz, Herzog Karl II. von Braunschweig und die Deutsche Londoner Zeitung', *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Geschichte*, 16 (1966), 34–79.
- Der Bund der Kommunisten: Dokumente und Materialien*, 3 vols (Berlin: Dietz, 1982–1984).
- Deroin, Jeanne. *Lettre aux Associations sur l'organisation du credit* (Paris: 1851), reprinted in *Les Révolutions du XIXe siècle*, troisième série (1848–1851), VI (Paris: EDHIS, n.d.).
- Deutsche Arbeiter-Kolonie in England*. 1909 (n.p., n.d. [1909]).
- Die Deutsche Koknie in England* (Anglo-German Publishing Company, 1913).
- 'Die deutschen Arbeiter in London sammeln für die schlesischen Weber', *Telegraph für Deutschland* (Hamburg), 165 (Oct. 1844), 659–60.
- Dominick, Raymond H. *Wilhelm Liebknecht and the Founding of the German Social Democratic Party* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982).
- Dommanget, Maurice. *Les idées politiques et sociales d'Auguste Blanqui* (Paris: Rivière, 1957).
- Dorgeel, Heinrich [i.e. Heinrich Geehl]. *Die deutsche Colonie in London* (Leipzig: Commission A.Siegle, 1881).
- Dorgeel, Heinrich [i.e. Heinrich Geehl]. *Deutschlands Pioniere in London. Ein Wegweiser und Rathgeber für Deutsche in England und speciell in London* (Berlin: Otto Janke, n.d. [1882?]) (This is identical to Heinrich Dorgeel [i.e. Heinrich Geehl], ed. *Jahrbuch der Deutschen in England*. 1882, Leipzig, Commissionsverlag A.Siegle, 1882).
- Dowe, Dieter. *Aktion und Organisation. Arbeiterbewegung, sozialistische und kommunistische Bewegung in der preußischen Rheinprovinz 1820–1852*, Schriftenreihe des Forschungsinstituts der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, 78 (Hannover: Verlag für Literatur und Zeitgeschehen, 1970).
- Dowe, Dieter, and Toni Offermann, eds. *Deutsche Handwerker- und Arbeiterkongresse 1848–52: Protokoll und Materialien* (Berlin: Dietz, 1983).
- Draper, Hal. *Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution*, 3 vols (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1977–1986).
- Easton, Loyd D. *Hegel's First American Followers. The Ohio Hegelians: J.B.Stallo, P.Kaufmann, M.Conway, and A.Willich* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1966).
- Eccarius, J. George. *Eines Arbeiters Widerlegung der national-ökonomischen Lehren John Stuart Mills* (Hottingen-Zürich: Volksbuchhandlung, 1888; repr. Sozialdemokratische Bibliothek, 21, Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der DDR, 1971).
- Eckert, Georg. 'Aus der Korrespondenz des Kommunistenbundes (Fraktion Willich-Schapper)', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 5 (1965), 273–322.
- Ehrhart, F.J. 'Aus meiner Londoner Zeit', *Der Neue-Welt-Kaknder für 1908*, XXXII (Hamburg: Auer, 1908), pp. 58–62.
- Ein deutsches Glaubenswerk in der Themsestadt. Rückblick auf 50 Jahre Vereinsarbeit des Deutschen Christlichen Vereins Junger Männer zu London* (London: Selbstverlag; commission Leipzig, E.Bredt, n.d. [1910]).



- Einsiedel, Julius. *Das Gouvernantenwesen in England: Eine Warnung*, Zeitfragen des christlichen Volkslebens, 9, 3 (Heilbronn: Henninger, 1884).
- Eisner, Werner. *Solidarität und deutsche Misere: Erfahrungsmomente der frühen sozialen Bewegungen bis 1848* (Frankfurt: Materialis, 1982).
- Elsner, Helmut, et al, eds. *Fragmente zu internationalen demokratischen Aktivitäten um 1848*, Schriften, 48 (Trier: Karl-Marx-Hans, 2000).
- Emmrich, Ute. 'Johann Georg Eccarius und sein Wirken in der revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung: Ein biographischer Abriß, 1818–1864', Diss. phil. thesis, Erfurt, 1988.
- Fehling, August Wilhelm. 'Karl Schapper und die Anfänge der Arbeiterbewegung bis zur Revolution von 1848. Von der Burschenschaft zum Kommunismus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Handwerker-Kommunismus', Diss. phil. thesis, Rostock, 1922 (2 parts).
- Feldman, David. 'There was an Englishman, an Irishman and a Jew...: Immigrants and Minorities in Britain', *Historical Journal*, 26 (1983), 185–99.
- Feldman, David. 'The Importance of Being English', in David Feldman and Gareth Stedman Jones, eds, *Metropolis London* (Routledge, 1989), pp. 56–84.
- Feuerbach, Friedrich. *Die Religion der Zukunft* (Zurich-Winterthur: 1843; II, III, Nürnberg: 1845).
- Findlay, J.J. 'The Genesis of the German Clerk', *Fortnightly Review*, 66 (1889), 533–6.
- Fischer, Walther, and Antje Behrens, eds. *Amely Böltes Briefe aus England an Varnhagen von Ense (1844–1858)* (Düsseldorf: M. Triltsch, 1955).
- Fishman, William J. *East End Jewish Radicals, 1875–1914* (Duckworth, 1975).
- Fock, Thomas. 'Über Londoner Zuckersiedereien und deutsche Arbeitskräfte', *Zuckerindustrie*, 110 (1985), pt 1, 233–5, pt 2, 426–32.
- Fontane, Theodor. *Bilderbuch aus England*, ed. Friedrich Fontane, introd. Hanns Martin Elster (Berlin: G.Grote'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1938).
- Fontane, Theodor. *Sämtliche Werke*, XVIIIa (Munich: Nymphenbuger, 1972).
- Fontane, Theodor. *Wanderungen durch England und Schottland*, 2 vols (Berlin: Verlag der Nation, n.d. [1981]).
- Förder, Herwig. *Marx und Engels am Vorabend der Revolution: Die Ausarbeitung der politischen Richtlinien für die deutschen Kommunisten (1846–1848)* (Berlin: Akademie, 1960).
- Förder, Herwig. 'Zu einigen Fragen der Reorganisation des Bundes der Kommunisten nach der Revolution von 1848/49', in Martin Hundt, ed., *Der Bund der Kommunisten 1836–1852* (Berlin: Akademie, 1988), pp. 252–88.
- Frei, Jürgen. 'Die schweizerische Flüchtlingspolitik nach den Revolutionen von 1848 und 1849', Diss. phil. thesis, Zürich 1977.
- Freitag, Sabine, ed. *Exile from European Revolutions: Refugees in Mid-Victorian England* (New York: Berghahn, 2003).
- Freiligrath, Ferdinand. *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Rudolf von Gottschall, 2 vols (Hamburg: Hansa, n.d.).
- Galkin, W. 'Ernest Jones', in *Marx und Engels und die ersten proletarischen Revolutionäre* (Berlin: Dietz, 1965), pp. 456–92.
- Gamby, Erik. *Edgar Bauer. Junghegelianer, Publizist und Polizeiagent*, Schriften, 32 (Trier: Karl-Marx-Haus, 1985).
- Gamby, Erik, ed. *Edgar Bauer: Konfidentenberichte über die europäische Emigration in London 1852–1861*, Schriften, 38 (Trier: Karl-Marx-Haus, 1989).
- [Garnier, Joseph Heinrich]. *Zur Geschichte der Arbeitervereine* (Karlsruhe: n.d. [1852]).
- Gattner, Bernhard. 'Emigration und Exil von Deutschen in London 1830–1848', M.A. thesis, University of Munich, 1989.
- Geiling, Heiko. *Die moralische Ökonomie des frühen Proletariats. Die Entstehung der Hannoverschen Arbeiterbewegung aus den arbeitenden und armen Volksklassen bis 1875* (Frankfurt: Materialis, 1985).
- Geiling, Heiko. 'Zur Verarbeitung der politischen Niederlage von 1848. Die "Deutsche Arbeiterhalle. Wochenschrift für die arbeitenden und besitzlosen Volksklassen, redigirt von L.Stechan"', *Hannoversche Geschichtsblätter*, N.F. 39 (1985), 169–88.

- Geisel, Karl. *Die Hanauer Turnerwehr: Ihr Einsatz in der badischen Revolution von 1849 und der Turnerprozeß*, Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission für Hessen. 32/1, Quellen und Darstellungen zur hessischen Geschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts (Marburg: N.G.Elwert, 1974).
- Gerlach, Antje. *Deutsche Literatur im Schweizer Exil: Die politische Propaganda der Vereine deutscher Flüchtlinge und Handwerksgelesen in der Schweiz von 1833 bis 1845*, Studien zur Philosophie und Literatur des 19. Jahrhunderts, 26 (Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1975).
- Gestrich, Andreas, Gerhard Hirschfeld and Holger Sonnabend, eds. *Ausweisung und Deportation: Formen der Zwangsmigration in der Geschichte*, Stuttgarter Beiträge zur historischen Migrationsforschung, 2 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1995).
- Gilles, Ferdinand. 'Sozialdemokratische' Ketzerrichterei im Communistischen Arbeiter-Bildungs-Verein, 49 Tottenham Street, W. (1892).
- [Goegg, Amand]. *Nachträgliche authentische Aufschlüsse über die Badische Revolution von 1849, deren Entstehung, politischen und militärischen Verlauf. Nebst einem Nachtrag und als Einleitung eine gedrängte Darstellung der politischen Vorgänge in Baden von 1818 an, unter Hinweisung auf die Hauptereignisse in den übrigen Theilen Deutschlands* (New York: Commissions-Verlag S.Zickel, 1876).
- Grab, Walter. *Radikale Lebensläufe* (Berlin: Verlag Asthetik und Kommunikation, 1980).
- Grandjonc, Jacques. 'Vorwärts!' 1844. Marx und die deutschen Kommunisten in Paris. Beitrag zur Entstehung des Marxismus, Internationale Bibliothek, 71 (Bonn-Bad Godesberg: J.H.W.Dietz Nachf., 1974).
- Grandjonc, Jacques. 'Les Étrangers a Paris sous la Monarchie de Juillet et la Seconde République', *Population*, 29 (1974), 61–88.
- Grandjonc, Jacques. 'Die deutsche Binnenwanderung in Europa 1830 bis 1848', in Otto Büsch and Hans Herzfeld, eds, *Die frühsozialistischen Bünde in der Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung: Vom 'Bund der Gerechten' zum 'Bund der Kommunisten' 1836–1847*, IWK Beiheft 2 (Berlin: Colloquium, 1975), pp. 3–20.
- Grandjonc, Jacques, and Klaus Voigt, eds. *Emigrés français en Allemagne. Emigrés allemands en France, 1685–1945: Une exposition* (Paris: Institut Goethe et Ministère des Relations Extérieures, 1983).
- Grandjonc, Jacques, and Hans Polger "'Gütergemeinschaft'" (Juni bis Dezember 1838). Materialien von Carl Schapper', in *Studien zur Geschichte*, 15 (Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1989), pp. 65–115.
- Grandjonc, Jacques, Karl-Ludwig König and Marie-Ange Royjacquemart, eds. *Statuten des 'Communistischen Arbeiter-Bildungs-Vereins' London 1840–1914*, Schriften, 23 (Trier: Karl-Marx-Haus, 1979).
- Grebing, Helga. *Arbeiterbewegung: Sozialer Protest und kollektive Interessenvertretung bis 1914* (Munich: 1985).
- Gross, Klaus D. 'Der preußische Gesandte in London: Bunsens politisches und diplomatisches Wirken', in Erich Geldbach, ed., *Der gelehrte Diplomat: Zum Wirken Christian Carl Josias Bunsens*, Beihefte der Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte, 21 (Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1980), pp. 13–34.
- Grünberg, Carl. 'Die Londoner Kommunistische Zeitschrift und andere Urkunden aus den Jahren 1847–1848', *Archiv für die Geschichte des Socialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung*, 9 (1921), 249–341.
- Grünberg, Carl. 'Bruno Hildebrand über den kommunistischen Arbeiterbildungsverein in London. Zugleich ein Beitrag zu Hildebrands Biographic', *Archiv für die Geschichte des Socialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung*, 11 (1923–1925), 445–59.
- Grundris einer Schul-Ordnung bey der Deutschen Evangelischen St. Marien-Gemeinde, In der Savoy, in London* (C.Heydinger, 1782).
- Hachtmann, Rüdiger. *Berlin 1848* (Bonn: Dietz, 1997).
- Häckel, Manfred, ed. *Freiligraths Briefwechsel mit Marx und Engels*, 2 vols (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1968).

- Hahn, Hans Henning. 'Möglichkeiten und Formen politischen Handelns in der Emigration', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 23 (1983), 123–61.
- Haltern, Utz. *Wilhelm Liebknecht und England. Zur Publizistik Wilhelm Liebknechts während seines Londoner Exils (1850–1862)*, Schriften, 18 (Trier: Karl-Marx-Haus, 1977).
- Hanschmidt, Alwin. *Republikanisch-demokratischer Internationalismus im 19. Jahrhundert: Ideen—Formen—Organisierungsversuche*, Historische Studien, Heß 430 (Husum: Mathiesen, 1977).
- Harris, R. 'British German Legion', *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, 62 (1984), 182–5.
- Harro-Harring, [Paul]. *Skizze aus London. Besondere Vorrede zur Autobiographie eines Verbannten* (Strasbourg, 1838).
- Harro-Harring, Paul. *Sendschreiben an die 'Schleswig-Holsteiner'* (Hull, 1850).
- Harro-Harring, Paul. *Anhang zum historischen Fragment über die Entstehung der Arbeiter-Vereine und ihren Verfall in Communistische Speculationen* (C.Deutsch, 1852).
- Harro-Harring, Paul. *Historisches Fragment über die Entstehung der Arbeiter-Vereine und ihren Verfall in Communistische Speculationen* (C.Deutsch, 1852).
- Häusler, W. 'Sigmund Engländer—Kritiker des Vormärz, Satiriker der Wiener Revolution und Freund Friedrich Hebbels', in Walter Grab and Julius H. Schoeps, eds, *Juden im Vormärz und in der Revolution von 1848*, Studien zur Geistesgeschichte, III (Stuttgart: Burg Verlag, 1983), pp. 83–137.
- Heinzen, Karl. 'Programm der teutschen Revolutionspartei. Als Entwurf und Vorschlag der Diskussion preisgegeben', February 1850 (copy in IISG, Marx-Engels Papers, S 1A).
- Heinzen, Karl. *Erlebtes* (Boston: Selbstverlag, 1864 [misprint for 1874]).
- Henderson, W.O. *Fredrick Engels*, 2 vols (Frank Cass, 1976).
- Henderson, W.O., and W.H.Chaloner. 'Friedrich Engels in Manchester', *Memoirs and Proceedings of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society*, 98 (1956–1957), 20–9.
- Hennings, C.R. *Deutsche in England*, Schriften des Deutschen Auslands-Instituts, 9 (Stuttgart: Ausland & Heimat Verlag, 1923).
- Herrnstadt, Rudolf. *Die erste Verschwörung gegen das Internationale Proletariat: Zur Geschichte des Kölner Kommunistenprozess 1852* (Berlin: Rütten & Loening, 1958).
- Herzen, Alexander. *My Past and Thoughts. The Memoirs of Alexander Herzen* (Chatto & Windus, 1968).
- Hirschfeld, Gerhard, ed. *Exil in Großbritannien: Zur Emigration aus dem nationalsozialistischen Deutschland*, Veröffentlichungen des Deutschen Historischen Instituts London, 14 (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1983).
- Hobsbawm, Eric. 'Marx, Engels and Pre-Marxian Socialism', in Eric Hobsbawm, ed., *The History of Marxism*, I: *Marxism in Marx's Day* (Brighton: Harvester, 1982), pp. 1–28.
- Hoff, Dr von. *Die deutschen Gelehrten, Kaufleute, Handwerker und Tagelöhner in England, Schottland und Irland, mit ihren Institutionen, in ihrem Leben und Treiben* (Mannheim: Tobias Löffler, 1863).
- Hofmann, Werner. *Ideengeschichte der sozialen Bewegung des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, 6th edn (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1979).
- Höhn, Reinhard, ed. *Die vaterlandslosen Gesellen: Der Sozialismus im Licht der Geheimberichte der preußischen Polizei 1878–1914* (Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1964).
- Holmes, Colin. *John Bull's Island: Immigration and British Society, 1871–1971* (Macmillan, 1988).
- Holmes, Colin, ed. *Migration in European History*, I (Cheltenham and Vermont, Edward Elgar, 1996).
- Holyoake, George Jacob. *Bygones Worth Remembering*, 2 vols (T.Fisher Unwin, 1905).
- Hooker, Kenneth Ward. *The Fortunes of Victor Hugo in England* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938).

- Huber, Hans. *Karl Heinzen (1809–1880). Seine politische Entwicklung und publizistische Wirksamkeit*, Berner Untersuchungen zur Allgemeinen Geschichte, ed. W.Näf, 6 (Bern: Paul Haupt, 1932).
- Hundt, Martin. 'Einer der ersten revolutionären Proletarier: Heinrich Bauer', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung*, 14 (1972), 638–50.
- Hundt, Martin. *Wie das 'Manifest' entstand* (Berlin: Dietz, 1973).
- Hundt, Martin. 'Die Historiographie in der DDR zur Geschichte des Bundes der Kommunisten', in Martin Hundt, ed., *Der Bund der Kommunisten 1836–1852* (Berlin: Akademie, 1988), pp. 9–51.
- Hundt, Martin. *Geschichte des Bundes der Kommunisten 1836 bis 1852*, Philosophic und Geschichte der Wissenschaften, III (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1993).
- Hunt, Richard N. *The Political Ideas of Marx and Engels*, I: *Marxism and Totalitarian Democracy, 1818–1850*, II: *Classical Marxism, 1850–1895* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1974–1984).
- Use, Friedrich Leopold. *Geschichte der politischen Untersuchungen, welche durch die neben der Bundesversammlung errichteten Commissionen, der Central-Untersuchungs-Commissionen zu Mainz und der Bundes-Central-Behörde zu Frankfurt in den Jahren 1818–1827 und 1833–1842 geführt sind* (Frankfurt a. M.: 1860; repr. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1975).
- International Association. *Statutes* (n.p., n.d.).
- Jäger, August. *Der Deutsche in London: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der politischen Flüchtlinge unserer Zeit*, 2 vols (Leipzig: W.Engelmann, 1839).
- Jäger, August. *Neuestes Gemälde von London. Ein Wegweiser durch die englische Hauptstadt*, 2 vols (Hamburg: Hoffmann & Campe, 1839).
- Kapp, Yvonne. *Eleanor Marx*, 2 vols (Virago, 1979).
- Eatscher, Leopold. 'German Life in London', *The Nineteenth Century*, 21 (1887), 726–41.
- Keil, Hartmut, and John B.Jentz, eds. *German Workers in Industrial Chicago, 1850–1910: A Comparative Perspective* (De Kalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1983).
- Kellenbenz, Hermann. 'German Immigrants in England', in Colin Holmes, ed. *Immigrants and Minorities in British Society* (George Allen & Unwin, 1978), pp. 63–80.
- Kessel, Eberhard, ed. *Die Briefe von Carl Schurz an Gottfried Kinkel*, Beihefte zum Jahrbuch für Amerikastudien, 12 (Heidelberg: C.Winter Universitätsverlag, 1965).
- Kiehnbaum, Erhard. *Peter Imandt-eine Biografie (1823–1897)* (Berlin: Karl Dietz, 2002).
- Kinkel, Gottfried. *Handwerk, Errette Dich! Was soll der deutsche Handwerker fordern und thun, um seinen Stand zu bessern?* (Bonn: W.Sulzbach, 1848).
- Kinkel, Gottfried. *Nimrod: Ein Trauerspiel* (Hannover: Carl Rümpler, 1857).
- Kinkel, Gottfried. *Festrede bei der Schillerfeier im Krystallpalast, 10. November 1859* (1859).
- Kinkel, Gottfried. *Polens Auferstehung die Stärke Deutschlands* (Wien: Tendler, 1868).
- Kinkel, Gottfried. *Gegen die Todesstrafe und das Attentat sie in der Schweiz wieder einzuführen* (Zürich: Cäsar Schmidt, 1879).
- Kinkel, Gottfried. *Verteidigungsrede vor dem Rastatter Kriegsgericht am 4. August 1849, Vorkämpfer deutscher Freiheit, XXXVI* (Munich: Buchhandlung Nationalverein, 1912).
- Kinkel, Johanna. *Hans Ibeles in London*, 2 vols (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1860).
- Klaus, H.Gustav. 'Frühsozialistische Utopien in England 1792–1848. Basisdemokratie, soziale Harmonie und moralische Kultur', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 67 (1985), 311–38.
- Klenke, Dietmar. 'Nationalkriegerisches Gemeinschaftsideal als politische Religion: Zum Vereinsnationalismus der Sänger, Schützen und Turner am Vorabend der Einigungskriege', *Historische Zeitschrift* 260 (1995), 395–448.
- Knaack, Rudolf. 'Die Überwachung der politischen Emigranten in Preußen in der Zeit von 1848 bis 1870', Diss. phil. thesis, Berlin, 1960.
- Knatz, Lothar, and Hans-Arthur Marsiske, eds. *Wilhelm Weitling-ein deutscher Arbeiterkommunist* (Hamburg: Ergebnisse, 1989).
- Kocka, Jürgen. *Lohnarbeit und Klassenbildung: Arbeiter und Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland 1800–1875* (Bonn: J.H.W.Dietz Nachf., 1983).

- Kocka, Jürgen. *Arbeitsverhältnisse und Arbeiterexistenzen: Grundlagen der Klassenbildung im 19. Jahrhundert* (Bonn: Dietz, 1990).
- Kombst, Gustav. *Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben* (Leipzig: F.L.Herbig, 1848).
- König, H.J. *Authentisches über die deutsche Erzieherin in England* (J.W.Kolckmann, 1884).
- Korn, Philipp. 'Programm. Populäre Vorträge über die Erziehung der Töchter zu selbständigen Jungfrauen und über Heranbildung weiblicher Talente zu den verschiedenen Branchen des öffentlichen Wirkens und Schaffens. Nebst einer chronologischen Darstellung von der pflichtgetreuen Erfüllung des weltgeschichtlichen Berufes der Frauen bei den civilisirten Völkern der Erde. Gehalten im Schulsale der deutschen Association in London von P.A.Korn, Hauptmann a. D., vormals Editor of the London German Advertiser und Sekretär der deutschen Association in London.' (copy in IISG, Amsterdam, Marx-Engels-Papers, S 16).
- Köster-Bunselmeyer, Doris. *Literarischer Sozialismus: Texte und Theorien der deutschen Frühsozialisten 1843–1848* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1981).
- Koszyk, Kurt, and Karl Obermann, eds. *Zeitgenossen von Marx und Engels: Ausgewählte Briefe 1844–1852* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1975).
- Kowalski, Werner. 'Der Bund der Gerechten—Größe und Grenzen einer elementar-proletarischen Bewegung', in Walter Schmidt, ed., *Der Auftakt der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung: Beiträge zur ersten Periode ihrer Geschichte 1836–1852* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1987), pp. 13–41.
- Kowalski, Werner, ed. *Vom kleinbürgerlichen Demokratismus zum Kommunismus: Zeitschriften aus der Frühzeit der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung (1834–1847)*; Archivalische Forschungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung, ed. Leo Stern, V, 1 (Berlin: Akademie, 1967).
- Kowalski, Werner, ed. *Vom kleinbürgerlichen Demokratismus zum Kommunismus. Die Hauptberichte der Bundeszentralbehörde in Frankfurt am Main von 1838 bis 1842 über die deutsche revolutionäre Bewegung*, Archivalische Forschungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung, ed. Leo Stern, V, 2 (Vaduz: Topos, 1978).
- Kramer, Lloyd Stephen. *Threshold of a New World: Intellectuals and the Exile Experience in Paris, 1830–1848* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1988).
- Kranke, Kurt. 'Marginalien zum agent-provocateur Charles Fleury', *Beiträge zur Marx-Engels-Forschung*, 13 (1982), 79–88.
- Kranke, Kurt. 'Zur Wirksamkeit eines Mitglieds der Dresdner Gemeinde des Bundes der Kommunisten', *Sächsische Heimatblätter*, 29 (1983), 201–2.
- Kuczynski, Thomas. 'Archivmitteilung zum Restbestand "Communistischer Arbeiter-Bildungs-Verein" sowie zu anderen "abseitigen" Restbeständen im ehemaligen Hauptarchiv der NSDAP', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung*, 35 (1993), 100–4.
- Kuczynski, Thomas, ed. *Das Kommunistische Manifest (Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei) von Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels*, Schriften 49 (Trier: Karl-Marx-Haus, 1995).
- Kühnhardt, Ludger. *Die Flüchtlingsfrage als Weltordnungsproblem. Massenzuwanderungen in Geschichte und Politik*, Abhandlungen zu Flüchtlingsfragen, 17 (Vienna: Braumüller, 1984).
- Kahn, Axel. *Die deutsche Arbeiterbewegung* (Ditzingen: Reclam, 2004).
- Kuhnigk, Armin M. *Karl Schapper* (Camberg: U.Lange, 1980).
- Lahme, Hans-Norbert. 'Niels Lorents Petersen: Eine Skizze seines Lebens in der Arbeiterbewegung', *International Review of Social History*, 29 (1984), 172–214.
- Landolphe et al. *Programm und Einladung der Gleichen zur Feier des Jahrestages der Europäischen Revolution am 24. Februar 1851 in London* (Grubb, [1851]).
- Langewiesche, Dieter, ed. *Revolution und Krieg: Zur Dynamik historischen Wandels seit dem 18. Jahrhundert* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1989).
- Lassalle, Ferdinand. *Gesammelte Reden und Schriften*, ed. Eduard Bernstein (Berlin: Paul Cassirer, 1919–1920).
- L'Association Internationale au rédacteur du journal le Prolétaire* (1859).
- Latek, Christine. 'Die Emigration der deutschen Achtundvierziger in England: Eine reine "school of scandal and of meanness"?' , in Gottfried Niedhart, ed., *Großbritannien als Gast- und*

- Exilland für Deutsche im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Arbeitskreis Deutsche England-Forschung, 4 (Bochum: Brockmeyer, 1985), pp. 22–47.
- Lattek, Christine. 'Im englischen Exil 1852–1859: Der Rückzug der Demokratin ins Privatleben', in Gunther Tietz, ed., *Malwida von Meysenbug: Ein Portrait* (Frankfurt: Ullstein, 1985), pp. 71–110.
- Lattek, Christine. 'Radikalismus im Ausland: Die Entwicklung des deutschen Frühsozialismus in London 1840–52', in Liselotte Glage and Gregory Claeys, eds, *Radikalismus in Literatur und Gesellschaft des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt: Lang, 1987), pp. 39–64.
- Lattek, Christine. 'The Beginnings of Socialist Internationalism in the 1840s: The "Democratic Friends of All Nations" in London', in Frits van Holthoorn and Marcel van der Linden, eds, *Internationalism in the Labour Movement, 1830–1940* (Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1988), I, pp. 259–82.
- Lattek, Christine. 'Ferdinand Freiligrath in London', *Grabbe-Jahrbuch* 8 (1989), 101–30.
- Lattek, Christine. 'German Socialism in London after 1849: The Communist League of August Willich and Karl Schapper', in Sabine Freitag ed. *Exiles from European Revolutions* (New York: Berghahn, 2003), pp. 187–208.
- Le Banquet des Égaux. Londres, 24 Février 1851* (Paris: Joubert, n.d. [1851]).
- Ledru-Rollin, Alexandre-Auguste. *The Decline of England* (E.Churton, 1850).
- Lees, Lynn Hollen. *Exiles of Erin. Irish Migrants in Victorian London* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1979).
- Lehnert, Detlef. *Sozialdemokratie zwischen Protestbewegung und Regierungspartei 1848 bis 1983* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1983).
- Leidigkeit, Karl-Heinz. 'Zur Kontinuität des Kampfes von Marx und Engels um die Partei der Arbeiterklasse 1852–1860', Diss. phil. thesis, Martin-Luther-Universität, Halle-Wittenberg, 1975.
- Lenger, Friedrich. *Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Handwerker seit 1800*, Neue Historische Bibliothek, 532 (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1988).
- Leno, John Bedford. *The Aftermath: with Autobiography of the Author* (Reeves & Turner, 1892).
- Leppa, Rupprecht, ed. 'Johanna und Gottfried Kinkels Briefe an Kathinka Zitz 1849–1861', *Bonner Geschichtsblätter*, 12 (1958), 7–82.
- Lessner, Friedrich. *Ich brachte das 'Kommunistische Manifest' zum Drucker* (Berlin: Dietz, 1975).
- Levin, Michael. *Marx, Engels and Liberal Democracy* (Macmillan, 1989).
- Levy, Carl. 'Hermia Oliver, The International Anarchist Movement in Late Victorian London', *History Workshop Journal*, 18 (1984), 186–92.
- Lewiowa, Sofia. 'Karl Schapper', in *Marx und Engels und die ersten proletarischen Revolutionäre* (Berlin: Dietz, 1965), pp. 76–119.
- Liebknecht, Wilhelm. *Erinnerungen eines Soldaten der Revolution*, ed. Heinrich Gemkow (Berlin: Dietz, 1976).
- Liebknecht, Wilhelm. *Karl Marx zum Gedächtniß: Ein Lebensabriß und Erinnerungen* (Nürnberg, Wörlein, 1896).
- Liebknecht, Wilhelm. *Karl Marx: Biographical Memoirs* (The Journeyman Press, 1975, English trans. of *Karl Marx zum Gedächtnis*).
- Liebknecht, Wilhelm. *Robert Owen: Sein Leben und sozialpolitisches Wirken. Zwei ausgegrabene Skizzen* (Nürnberg, Wörlein, 1892; repr. Münster: Packpapier, n.d.).
- Lindner, Bernd. 'Die publizistische Tätigkeit Wilhelm Liebknechts in der Zeit der Londoner Emigration bis zur Rückkehr nach Deutschland (1850–1862)', Diss. phil. thesis, Hallé (Saale), 1975.
- Linton, W.J. *Memories* (Lawrence & Bullen, 1895).
- Livingstone, Rodney, ed. *Karl Marx: The Communist Trial* (Lawrence & Wishart, 1971).
- Lovett, William. *Life and Struggles of William Lovett in his Pursuit of Bread, Knowledge and Freedom* (Macgibbon & Kee, 1967 [1876]).
- Lunn, Kenneth, ed. *Hosts, Immigrants and Minorities: Historical Responses to Newcomers in British Society, 1870–1914* (Folkestone: Dawson, 1980).

- McCabe, Joseph. *Life and Letters of George Jacob Holyoake* (Watts, 1908).
- McClellan, Woodford. *Revolutionary Exiles: The Russians in the First International and the Paris Commune* (Frank Cass, 1979).
- McLellan, David. *Karl Marx: His Life and Thought* (St Albans: Paladin, 1977).
- Maitron, Jean, ed. *Dictionnaire Biographique du Mouvement Ouvrier Français*. Première Partie: 1789–1864, 3 vols (Paris: 1966–1968).
- Manifesto of the Central International Association* (1858).
- Manske, O., et al. for the managing committee, *An die Mitglieder des C.A.B.V.* [1904].
- Marr, Wilhelm. *Das junge Deutschland in der Schweiz: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der geheimen Verbindungen unsere Tage* (Leipzig: Verlag von Wilhelm Juvany, 1846).
- Marsiske, Hans-Arthur. 'Utopischer Entwurf und Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland: Die Gütergemeinschaftsdiskussion im "Bund der Gerechten"', in HansJürgen Goertz, ed., *Alles gehört alien: Das Experiment Gütergemeinschaft vom 16. Jahrhundert bis heute* (Munich: C.H.Beck, 1984), pp. 165–87.
- Marsiske, Hans-Arthur. *Wider die Umsonstfresser'. Der Handwerkerkommunist Wilhelm Weitling* (Hamburg: Ergebnisse Verlag, 1986).
- [Martin]. *Der Anarchismus und seine Träger: Enthüllungen aus dem Lager der Anarchisten* (Berlin: Neufeld & Mehring, 1887).
- Marx and Engels Through the Eyes of Their Contemporaries* (Moscow, Progress, 1972).
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *Werke* (Berlin: Dietz, 1956-).
- Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. *Collected Works* (Lawrence & Wishart, 1975–2001).
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *Gesamtausgabe (MEGA)* (Berlin: Dietz, 1975–1990; ed. Internationale Marx-Engels-Stiftung, Berlin: Dietz [and Amsterdam, IISG], 1991-).
- Mayer, Gustav. 'Die Trennung der proletarischen von der bürgerlichen Demokratie in Deutschland (1863–1870)', *Archiv für die Geschichte des Socialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung*, 2 (1912), 1–67.
- Mayer, Gustav. *Friedrich Engels: Eine Biographie*, 2 vols (Frankfurt: Ullstein, 1975).
- Mayhew, Henry. *The Morning Chronicle Survey of Labour and the Poor: The Metropolitan Districts*, 5 vols (Firle: Caliban Books Reprint, 1980–1982).
- Mehring, Franz. *Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie*, Gesammelte Schriften, I–II (Berlin: Dietz, 1976).
- Mehring, Franz. *Karl Marx: Geschichte seines Lebens*, Gesammelte Schriften, III (Berlin: Dietz, 1976).
- Mehring, Franz. *Aufsätze zur deutschen Literatur von Klopstock bis Weerth*, Gesammelte Schriften, X (Berlin: Dietz, 1977).
- Mehring, Franz, ed. *Aus dem literarischen Nachlaß von K. Marx, F.Engels und F.Lassalle*, Gesammelte Schriften von Marx und Engels 1841–1850, I (Stuttgart: Dietz Verlag, 1913).
- Meinhold, Peter, ed. *Johann Hinrich Wichern: Sämtliche Werke*, 10 vols (Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1959–1988).
- Mess, Paul. 'August Schärttner: Der Turnerführer von 1848', *Deutsches Turnen: Organ des Deutschen Turnerbundes*, 9 (3 May 1952), 5–6.
- Meysenbug, Malwida von. *Memoiren einer Idealistin*, 3 vols (Berlin: Auerbach, 1882).
- Mohr und General: Erinnerungen an Marx und Engels* (Berlin: Dietz, 1965).
- Mommsen, Wolfgang J. *1848: Die ungewollte Revolution. Die revolutionären Bewegungen in Europa 1830–1849* (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1998).
- Mönke, Wolfgang, ed. *Moses Heß: Philosophische und sozialistische Schriften 1837–1850. Eine Auswahl* (Berlin: Akademie, 1980).
- Moses, Claire Goldberg. *French Feminism in the Nineteenth Century* (Albany, State University of New York Press, 1984).
- Mosse, W.E., et. al., eds. *Second Chance: Two Centuries of German-Speaking Jews in the United Kingdom*, Schriftenreihe des Leo Baeck Instituts, 48 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1991).

- Most, Johann. *'Taktik' contra 'Freiheit'* (London, printed by the Socialdemokratische Genossenschafts-Buchdruckerei 'Freiheit', [1880]).
- Most, Johann. *Die Freie Gesellschaft: Eine Abhandlung über Principien und Taktik der kommunistischen Anarchisten* (New York: Selbstverlag, 1884).
- Müller-Lehning, Arthur. The International Association (1855–1859). A Contribution to the Preliminary History of the First International', *International Review of Social History*, 3 (1938), 185–286.
- Na'aman, Shlomo. 'Zur Geschichte des Bundes der Kommunisten in der zweiten Phase seines Bestehens', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 5 (1965), 5–82.
- Na'aman, Shlomo (with H.-P. Harstick). *Die Konstituierung der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung 1862/63. Darstellung und Dokumentation* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1975).
- Na'aman, Shlomo. *Emancipation und Messianismus: Leben und Werk des Moses Heß* (Frankfurt: Campus, 1982).
- Na'aman, Shlomo. *Der deutsche Nationalverein: Die politische Konstituierung des deutschen Bürgertums 1859–1867*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien, 81 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1987).
- Neher, Walter. *Arnold Ruge als Politiker und politischer Schriftsteller*, Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur mittleren und neueren Geschichte, 64 (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1933).
- Nerrlich, Paul, ed. *Arnold Ruges Briefwechsel und Tagebuchblätter aus den Jahren 1825–1880*, 2 vols (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1886).
- Nettlau, Max. *Geschichte der Anarchie*, III (repr. Bremen: Impuls, n.d.).
- Nettlau, Max. 'Marxanalekten', *Archiv für die Geschichte des Socialismus und der Arbeitbewegung*, 8 (1919–1921), 389–401.
- Nettlau, Max. 'Londoner deutsche kommunistische Diskussionen, 1845: Nach den Protokollen des C.A.B.V.', *Archiv für die Geschichte des Socialismus und der Arbeitbewegung*, 10 (1922), 362–91.
- Neues Bücher Verzeichnis der Deutschen Lese-Bibliothek, No. 63, Charing-Cross, Im Anfange des Jahrs 1796* (C. Heydinger, 1796).
- Nicolaevsky, Boris. 'Towards a History of "the Communist League", 1847–1852', *International Review of Social History*, 1 (1956), 234–52.
- Nicolaevsky, Boris. 'Secret Societies and the First International', in Milorad Drachkovitch, ed., *The Revolutionary Internationals, 1864–1943* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966), pp. 36–56.
- Nicolaevsky, Boris, and Otto Maenchen-Helfen. *Karl Marx: Man and Fighter* (Methuen, 1933).
- Niedhart, Gottfried, ed. *Großbritannien als Gast- und Exilland für Deutsche im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Bochum: Brockmeyer, 1985).
- Nolte, Ernst. *Marxismus und Industrielle Revolution* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1983).
- Noltenius, Rainer. *Dichterfeiern in Deutschland. Rezeptionsgeschichte als Sozialgeschichte am Beispiel der Schiller- und Freiligrath-Feiern* (Munich: W. Fink, 1984).
- Obermann, Karl. *Joseph Weydemeyer: Pioneer of American Socialism* (New York: International Publishers, 1947).
- Obermann, Karl. *Zur Geschichte des Bundes der Kommunisten 1849–1852* (Berlin: Dietz, 1955).
- Offermann, Toni. *Arbeiterbewegung und liberales Bürgertum in Deutschland 1850–1863, Politik und Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, 5 (Bonn: Verlag Neue Gesellschaft, 1979).
- Oswald, Eugene. *Reminiscences of a Busy Life* (De La More Press, 1911).
- Our May Day Manifesto* (Published by the Communist Working Men's Club, 209, Hampstead Road, London, N.W., 1906).
- Packe, Michael St John. *Orsini: The Story of a Conspirator* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1957).
- Paletschek, Sylvia. *Frauen und Dissens: Frauen im Deutschkatholizismus und in den freien Gemeinden 1841–1852*, Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft, 89 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990).



- Panayi, Panikos. *The Enemy in Our Midst. Germans in Britain During the First World War* (New York: Berg, 1991).
- Panayi, Panikos. *German Immigrants in Britain during the Nineteenth Century, 1815–1914* (Oxford: Berg, 1995).
- Panayi, Panikos, ed. *Germans in Britain since 1500* (The Hambledon Press, 1996).
- Payne, Howard C., and Henry Grosshans. 'The Exiled Revolutionaries and the French Political Police in the 1850s', *American Historical Review*, 68 (1963), 954–73.
- Peiser, Jürgen. 'Gustav Struve als Politischer Schriftsteller und Revolutionär', Diss. phil. thesis, Frankfurt, Johann Wolfgang Goethe Universität, 1972, printed Nürnberg 1973 as typescript.
- Pettegree, Andrew. *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).
- Petzler, Johann Aloys. *Die sociale Baukunst, oder Gründe und Mittel für den Umsturz und Wiederaufbau der gesellschaftlichen Verhältnisse, besonders wie solche sich in neuester Zeit in England, dem großen Musterstaat der modernen Civilisation, ausgebildet haben* (Hottingen-Zürich: 1879).
- Petzler, Johann Aloys. *Große Jubiläumsfeier und imposanter Triumphzug in Erinnerung des hundertjährigen Bestehens der social-demokratischen Staatseinrichtung in Britannien* (Nürnberg, 1897).
- Petzler, John. *Life in Utopia: Being a faithful and accurate description of the Institutions that Regulate Labour, Art, Science, Agriculture, Education, Habitation, Matrimony, Law, Government, and Religion, in this delightful Region of human Imagination* (Authors' Co-operative Publishing Co., 1890).
- Peukert, Josef. *Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung* (Berlin: Verlag des sozialistischen Bundes, 1913).
- Porter, Bernard. 'The British Government and Political Refugees, c. 1880–1914', *Immigrants and Minorities*, 2 (1983), 23–45.
- Porter, Bernard. 'The *Freiheit* Prosecutions 1881–1882', *Historical Journal*, 23 (1980), 833–56.
- Porter, Bernard. *The Refugee Question in mid-Victorian Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).
- 'Programm und Einladung der Gleichen zur Feier des Jahrestages der Europäischen Revolution am 24. Februar 1851 in London', [1851].
- Prozeß-Verhandlungen gegen Gottfried Kinkel und Genossen, zu Köln: 29 April bis 2 Mai 1850, wegen angeblichen Attentats, Sturm des siegburger Zeughauses und Aufreizung zum Bürgerkriege* (Bonn: W. Sulzbach, n.d. [1850]).
- Püschel, Jürgen. *Die Geschichte des German Hospital in London (1845 bis 1948)*, Studien zur Geschichte des Krankenhauswesens, 14 (Minister, Verlag Murken-Altrogge, 1980).
- Rackow, Henry. *Vor und nach der Schlacht* (1888).
- Ramus, Pierre. *Nach vierzig Jahren: Ein historisches Gedenkblatt zur vierzigjährigen Gründung der Internationalen Arbeiter Assoziation* (London: Communistischer Arbeiter Bildungs Verein, 1905).
- Raphelson, Alfred C. 'Alexander Schimmelfennig [sic!]: A German-American Campaigner in the Civil War', *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 87 (1963), 156–81.
- [Rattermann, H.A.], 'General August Willich', *Der Deutsche Pionier*, 9, 11 (February 1878), 439–45, 12 (March 1878), 487–95; 10, 2 (May 1878), 68–71, 3 (June 1878), 114–17, 4 (July 1878), 144–7.
- Reich, G. 'Malwida von Meysenbug in ihren Briefen an Gottfried und Johanna Kinkel', *Bonner Geschichtsblätter*, 1 (1937), 165.
- Reisig, Hilde. *Der politische Sinn der Arbeiterbildung* (Berlin: Verlag für das Studium der Arbeiterbewegung, 1975 [1933]).
- Reiter, Herbert. *Politisches Asyl im 19. Jahrhundert: Die deutschen politischen Flüchtlinge des Vormärz und der Revolution von 1848/49 in Europa und den USA*, Historische Forschungen, 47 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1992).

- Richter, Robert. 'Studien zur Londoner Emigration von 1850–1860', Diss. phil. thesis, Freie Universität Berlin, 1966.
- Riot-Sarcey, Michelle. 'A Public Life Denied by History: Jeanne Deroin and the Forgetfulness of Self', *History of European Ideas*, 11 (1989), 253–61.
- Rippley, LaVern J. *The German-Americans* (Boston: Twayne, 1976).
- Rjazanov, D. 'Zur Frage des Verhältnisses von Marx zu Blanqui', *Unter dem Banner des Marxismus*, 2 (1928), 140–9.
- Roberts, William. *Prophet in Exile: Joseph Mazzini in England, 1837–1868*, Studies in Modern European History, 3 (New York: P.Lang, 1989).
- Rocker, Rudolf. *The London Years* (Ancombe, 1956).
- Rocker, Rudolf. *Aus den Memoiren eines deutschen Anarchisten*, ed. Magdalena Melnikow and Hans Peter Duerr (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1974).
- Rocker, Rudolf. *Johann Most: Das Leben eines Rebellen* (Berlin Verlag, p. 38, 1984).
- Rocker, Rudolf. *Max Nettlau* (Berlin: Karin Kramer, 1979).
- Rokijtanskij, Jakov. 'Neue Materialien über das Wirken Wilhelm Weitlings und Karl Schappers in London 1846', *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, 31 (1983), 720–9.
- Rokijtanskij, Jakov, and Olga Worobjowa. 'Begegnung Wilhelm Weitlings mit Karl Marx im Herbst 1849. Unveröffentlichte Erinnerungen Weitlings', *Marx-Engels-Jahrbuch*, 3 (1980), 307–17.
- Roller, Arnold. *Der Soziale Generahtreik* (London: Verlag der Broschürengruppe des C.A.B.V., 1909).
- [Ronge, Bertha] *Madame Rouge's Kinder Garten Alphabet* (n.p., n.d.).
- Ronge, Johannes. *Aufruf an die deutschen Manner und Frauen, nebst Grundbestimmungen der freien Kirche* (Hamburg: Niemeyer, 1850).
- Ronge, Johannes. *An das deutsche Volk. Kampf gegen Russland, wenn nicht mit, dann ohne die Fürsten* (1854).
- Ronge, Johannes. *An die Deutschen in Amerika am Vorabend des Volkskampfes* (1854).
- Ronge, Johannes. *Der Czaaren-Rock in Deutschland* (1855).
- Ronge, Johannes. *Die Ursache meiner Verbannung* (1860).
- Ronge, Johannes and Bertha. *A Practical Guide to the English Kinder Garten (Children 's Garden), for the Use of Mothers, Nurses, and Infant Teachers; Being an Exposition of Froebel's System of Infant Training* (J.S.Hodson, 1855).
- Rösch-Sondermann, Hermann. *Gottfried Kinkel als Ästhetiker, Politiker und Dichter*, Veröffentlichungen des Stadtarchivs Bonn, 29 (Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1982).
- Rosenberg, Arthur. *Demokratie und Sozialismus: Zur politischen Geschichte der letzten 150 Jahre* (Amsterdam: de Lange, 1938).
- Rosenkranz, Albert. *Geschichte der deutschen evangelischen Kirche zu Liverpool*, Schriften des Deutschen Auslands-Institut Stuttgart, 3 (Stuttgart: Verlag Ausland & Heimat, 1921).
- Rossi, Stefania, ed. *Malwida von Meysenbug. Briefe an Johanna und Gottfried Kinkel 1849–1885*, Veröffentlichungen des Stadtarchivs Bonn, 28 (Bonn: L. Röhrscheid, 1982).
- Rothstein, Andrew. 'Adam Weiler—ein Freund von Marx und Engels', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung* (1975), 1067–74.
- Rothstein, Theodor. 'Aus der Vorgeschichte der Internationale', *Ergänzungshefte zur Neuen Zeit*, 17 (1913), 1–44.
- Rothstein, Theodor. *From Chartism to Labourism: Historical Sketches of the English Working Class Movement*, intr. John Saville (Lawrence & Wishart, 1983 [1929]).
- Ruckhäberle, Hans-Joachim, ed. *Bildung und Organisation in den deutschen Handwerks-gesetzen- und Arbeitervereinen in der Schweiz: Texte und Dokumente zur Kultur der deutschen Handwerker und Arbeiter 1834–1845*, Studien und Texte zur Sozialgeschichte der Literatur, 4 (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1983).
- Rüegg, Reinhold, ed. 'Erinnerungen eines deutschen Achtundvierzigers (Sigismund Borkheim)', *Die Neue Zeit*, 8 (1890), 125–39, 204–22, 253–71, 305–25.

- Ruge, Arnold. 'Studien und Erinnerungen aus den Jahren 1843–45', *Gesammelte Schriften*, V (Mannheim, 1847).
- Ruge, Arnold. *Ein Brief an die Berliner* (Hallé, 1849).
- Ruge, Arnold. *Revolutionsnovellen* (Leipzig: Verlagsbureau, 1850).
- [Ruge, Arnold], *Vertraulicher Brief Arnold Ruge's an die Verbrecher in Deutschland* [1851].
- Ruge, Arnold. *New Germany: Its modern history, literature, philosophy, religion, and art* (Holyoake, 1854).
- Ruge, Arnold. *Die neue Welt: Ein Trauerspiel in fünf Aufzügen. Mit einem Vorspiel: Goethe's Ankunft in Walhalla* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1856).
- Ruge, Arnold. *My Claim against the Prussian Government: A Correspondence with the Prussian Ministry of the 'New Era'* (Brighton: John Buck, 1862).
- Ruge, Arnold. *An die deutsche Nation: Manifest* (Hamburg: Otto Meissner, 1866).
- Rumjanzewa, N. 'Konrad Schramm', in *Marx und Engels und die ersten proletarischen Revolutionäre* (Berlin: Dietz, 1965), pp. 392–420.
- Sadek, Martin. 'Metternichs publizistische und pressepolitische Betätigung im Exil (1848–1852)', Diss. phil. thesis, Vienna, 1968.
- Sander, Richard. *Kinkels Selbstbiographie 1832–48*, Veröffentlichungen aus der Handschriftensammlung der Universitätsbibliothek Bonn, 1 (Bonn: Fr. Cohen, 1931).
- Sass, Hans-Martin, ed. Arnold Ruge, *Werke und Briefe, IV: Politische Kritiken 1838–1846* (Aalen: Scientia, 1988).
- Saville, John. *1848* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- Saville, John, ed. *Ernest Jones: Chartist* (Lawrence & Wishart, 1952).
- Schaaf, Fritz. 'Die "Sozialdemokratische Bibliothek" der Schweizerischen Volksbuchhandlung in Hottingen-Zürich und der German Co-operative Printing and Publishing Co. in London', in *Marxismus und deutsche Arbeiterbewegung: Studien zur sozialistischen Bewegung im letzten Drittel des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin: Dietz, 1970), pp. 431–84.
- Schaible, Karl Heinrich. *Geschichte der Deutschen in England von den ersten Germanischen Ansiedlungen in Britannien bis zum Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Strasbourg: Karl J. Trübner, 1885).
- Schaible, Karl Heinrich. *Erinnerungen an Dr. Hermann Müller-Strübing* (A. Siegle, 1894).
- Schaible, Karl Heinrich. *Siebenunddreißig Jahre aus dem Leben eines Exilierten: Ein flüchtiges Lebensbild* (Stuttgart: A. Bonz, and London, A. Siegle, 1895).
- Schenk, Johannes. 'Bildungspolitische Positionen und Aktivitäten des Bundes der Kommunisten (1836 bis 1852)', *Jahrbuch für Erziehungs- und Schulgeschichte*, 23 (1983), 62–77.
- Scheu, Andreas. *Umsurzkeime: Erlebnisse eines Kämpfers*, pt. III: *Auf freiem Boden* (Vienna: Wiener Volksbuchhandlung, 1923).
- Schieder, Wolfgang. *Anfänge der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung. Die Auslandsvereine im Jahrzehnt nach der Julirevolution von 1830*, Industrielle Welt, 4 (Stuttgart: Klett, 1963).
- Schieder, Wolfgang. 'Bund der Kommunisten', *Sowjetsystem und demokratische Gesellschaft*, I (Freiburg: Herder, 1966), cols. 900–909.
- Schieder, Wolfgang. 'Der Bund der Kommunisten im Sommer 1850: Drei Dokumente aus dem Marx-Engels-Nachlass', *International Review of Social History*, 13 (1968), 29–57.
- Schieder, Wolfgang. 'Die Rolle der deutschen Arbeiter in der Revolution von 1848/49', in Dieter Langewiesche, ed., *Die deutsche Revolution von 1848/49*, Wege der Forschung, 164 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1983), pp. 322–40.
- Schieder, Wolfgang. 'Sozialismus', in Otto Brunner, Werner Conze and Reinhart Koselleck, eds. *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, V (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1984), pp. 923–96.
- Schieder, Wolfgang. *Karl Marx als Politiker* (Munich: Piper, 1991).
- Schilling, Carl. *Die Ausstoßung des Präsidenten Bernhard Beckers aus dem Allgemeinen deutschen Arbeiterverein* (Berlin: 1865).

- Schimmelpfennig, Alexander. *The War between Turkey and Russia: A Military Sketch* (Trübner, 1854).
- Schindler, Norbert. 'Der Geheimbund der Illuminaten—Aufklärung, Geheimnis und Politik', in Helmut Reinalter, ed., *Freimaurer und Geheimbünde im 18. Jahrhundert in Mitteleuropa* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1983), pp. 284–318.
- Schlechte, Horst, ed. *Die Allgemeine Deutsche Arbeiterebrüderung 1848–50: Dokumente des Zentralkomitees für die deutschen Arbeiter in Leipzig*, Schriftenreihe des Staatsarchivs Dresden, XI (Weimar: H.Böhlau Nachf., 1979).
- Schlüter, Hermann. *Anfänge der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung in Amerika* (Stuttgart: Dietz, 1907; repr. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1983).
- Schmidt, Walter. *Wilhelm Wolff: Kampfgefährte und Freund von Marx und Engels*, 2 vols (Berlin: Dietz, 1963–1979).
- Schmidt, Walter. 'Biographische Skizze: Redakteur und Korrespondent der 'Neuen Rheinischen Zeitung': Ferdinand Wolff', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung*, 25 (1983), 270–2.
- Schmidt, Walter. 'Nationales und Internationales im Bund der Kommunisten', *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, 34 (1986), 223–38.
- Schmidt, Walter. *Sozialistische Bestrebungen deutscher Arbeiter in St. Louis vor 1848: Der St. Louis-Kommunistenverein*, Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Gesellschaftswissenschaften, 5 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1990).
- Schmidt, Walter. 'Dokumente des Bundes der Gerechten in den USA aus dem Jahre 1846', *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, 40 (1992), 650–65.
- Schmidt, Walter. 'Wilhelm Wolff in der Vielfalt sozialistischen Denkens', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung*, 38 (1996), 3–19.
- Schmidtgall, Harry. *Friedrich Engels' Manchester-Aufenthalt 1842–1844*, Schriften, 25 (Trier: Karl-Marx-Haus, 1981).
- Schoell, Carl. *Geschichte der deutschen evangelischen Kirchen in England* (Williams & Norgate, 1852).
- Schoeps, Julius H. "'Der Kosmos"', "'Der Kosmos"', ein Wochenblatt der bürgerlich-demokratischen Emigration in London im Frühjahr 1851', *Jahrbuch des Instituts für deutsche Geschichte*, 5 (1976), 211–26.
- Schoeps, Julius H. 'Agenten, Spitzel, Flüchtlinge: Wilhelm Stieber und die demokratische Emigration in London', in Horst Schallenberg and Helmut Schrey, eds. *Im Gegenstrom. Für Helmut Hirsch zum Siebzigsten* (Wuppertal: P. Hammer, 1977), pp. 71–104.
- Schoeps, Julius H. 'Im Kampf um die deutsche Republik: Karl Blind und die Revolution in Baden 1848/49', in Julius H. Schoeps and Imanuel Geiss, eds, *Revolution und Demokratie in Geschichte und Literatur: Zum 60. Geburtstag von Walter Grab* (Duisburg: W. Braun, 1979), pp. 259–76.
- Schraepfer, Ernst. 'Der Bund der Gerechten. Seine Tätigkeit in London 1840–1847', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 2 (1962), 5–29.
- Schraepfer, Ernst. *Handwerkerbünde und Arbeitervereine 1830–1853: Die politische Tätigkeit deutscher Sozialisten von Wilhelm Weitling bis Karl Marx*, Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission zu Berlin, 34, Publikationen zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung, 4 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972).
- Schraepfer, Ernst. 'Aus dem Briefwechsel des hannoverschen Polizeidirektors Wermuth über die Tätigkeit des Kommunistenbundes', in Anita Mächler, Eberhard Grünert, Helmut Kraemer and Klaus-Rudolf Seidel, eds, *Historische Studien zu Politik, Verfassung und Gesellschaft: Festschrift für Richard Dietrich zum 65. Geburtstag* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1976), pp. 241–73.
- Schramm, Rudolf. *Entwurf eines Rundschreibens an deutsche Demokraten (Als Manuscript gedruckt)* (n.p., n.d.), [Bamberger, 1850]).
- Schramm, Rudolf. *Der Norddeutsche Staat. Das Zusichkommen des weltlichen Gewissens der Nation. Wirkungen. Gegenwirkungen. Zweck* (1855).
- Schramm, Rudolf. *Die rothe Fahne von 1848 und die schwarzweiße Fahne von 1863* (Berlin 1863).

- Schramm, Rudolf. *Von Schleswig-Holsteins Pflichten. Erstes Sendschreiben...* (Berlin: 1864).
- Schurz, Carl. *The Reminiscences of Carl Schurz*. 2 vols (J.Murray, 1909).
- Seidel-Höppner, Waltraud. *Wilhelm Weitling: Der erste deutsche Theoretiker und Agitator des Kommunismus* (Berlin: Dietz, 1961).
- Seidel-Höppner, Waltraud. 'Aufklärung und revolutionäre Aktion—ein Grundproblem im Arbeiterkommunismus und bei Marx', *Jahrbuch für Geschichte*, 5 (1971), 7–69.
- Seidel-Höppner, Waltraud. 'Zu einigen theoretischen und methodischen Fragen der neueren Weitling-Forschung', in Hans-Arthur Marsiske, ed., 'Wider die Umsonstfresser': *Der Handwerkerkommunist Wilhelm Weitling* (Hamburg: Ergebnisse, 1986), pp. 9–38.
- Seiler, Sebastian. *Das Complot vom 13. Juni 1849, oder: Der letzte Sieg der Bourgeoisie in Frankreich. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Gegenwart* (Hamburg: Hoffmann & Campe, 1850).
- Shadwell, Arthur. 'The German Colony in London', *The National Review*, 26 (1896), 798–810.
- Shipley, Stan. *Club Life and Socialism in Mid-Victorian London* (History Workshop Pamphlets, no. 5, 1971).
- Siemann, Wolfram, ed. *Der 'Polizeiverein' deutscher Staaten: Eine Dokumentation zur Überwachung der Öffentlichkeit nach der Revolution von 1848/49*, Studien und Texte zur Sozialgeschichte der Literatur, 9 (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1983).
- Siemann, Wolfram. *'Deutschlands Ruhe, Sicherheit und Ordnung': Die Anfänge der politischen Polizei 1806–1866* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1985).
- Silberhorn, Lothar W. 'Der Epilog eines religiösen Reformers: Ungedruckte Aufzeichnungen Johannes Ronges aus dem Londoner Exil', *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte*, 6 (1954), 114–38.
- Silberner, Edmund, ed. *Moses Heß. Briefwechsel, Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der deutschen und österreichischen Arbeiterbewegung*, 2 (The Hague: Mouton, 1959).
- Simon, Werner. 'Christian Elard Biscamp', *Zeitschrift des Vereins für hessische Geschichte und Landeskunde*, 88 (1980–1981), 169–94.
- Simpson, John, ed. *The Oxford Book of Exile* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).
- Sinel'nikova, I.M. 'Londonskoe kommunisticheskoe prosvetitel'noe obshchestvo nemetskikh rabochikh i I. International', *Novaia i noveishaia Istorii*, 8 (1964), pp. 55–63.
- Sinelnikowa, Irma. *Friedrich Leßner: Eine Biographie des Kommunisten und Freundes von Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels* (Berlin: Dietz, 1980).
- Smith, Denis Mack. *Mazzini* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994).
- Smith, F.B. *Radical Artisan: William James Linton, 1812–97* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1973).
- Sperber, Jonathan. *Rhineland Radicals. The Democratic Movement and the Revolution of 1848–49* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991).
- Stargardt, Emil. *Handbuch der Deutschen in England mit Wegweiser für London* (Heilbronn: Henninger, 1889).
- Statuten des Communistischen Arbeiter-Bildungs-Vereins London* (London, printed by Henry Detloff, 1895).
- Statuten des Londoner deutschen Arbeitervereins. Gegründet am 7. Februar 1840. Proletarier aller Länder, vereinigt Euch!* (London, n.d. [1851?]).
- Statutes of The Association of German Governesses in England* (n.p., n.d. [1876?]).
- 'Statute de la Reunion allemande', Renseignement sur le Communisme Allemand, *L'Actualité de l'Histoire. Bulletin trimestriel de l'Institut français d'Histoire sociale*, 19 (1957), 26–7.
- Stedman Jones, Gareth. *Outcast London. A Study in the Relationship Between Classes in Victorian Society* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).
- Stedman Jones, Gareth. 'Engels and the Genesis of Marxism', *New Left Review*, 106 (1977), 79–104.
- Stedman Jones, Gareth. 'Rethinking Chartism', in Gareth Stedman Jones, *Languages of Class: Studies in English Working Class History 1832–1982* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 90–178.

- Stedman Jones, Gareth. 'Introduction', in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. *The Communist Manifesto* (Penguin, 2002), pp. 1–187.
- Steindl, Harald. 'Die Verhandlungen des ersten Kongresses der Arbeitervereine zu Berlin vom 18. bis 20. Juni 1848. Ein Fundbericht', *Internationale Wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz*, 22 (1986), 556–62.
- [Stieber, Wilhelm]. *Denkwürdigkeiten des Geheimen Regierungsrathes Dr. [Wilhelm] Stieber. Aus seinen hinterlassenen Papieren bearbeitet von Leopold Auerbach* (Berlin: 1884).
- Storm, Claus-Dieter. *Verfolgt und geächtet: Handwerker zwischen Liberalismus und Kommunismus* (Hamburg: Ergebnisse, 1980, XII).
- Strey, Joachim, and Gerhard Winkler. *Marx und Engels 1848/49: Die Politik und Taktik der 'Neuen Rheinischen Zeitung' während der bürgerlich-demokratischen Revolution in Deutschland* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1972).
- Strodtmann, Adolph. *Gottfried Kinkel: Wahrheit ohne Dichtung: Biographisches Skizzenbuch*, 2 vols (Hamburg: 1850–1851).
- Struve, Gustav. *Diesseits und jenseits des Oceans* [I] Coburg: F.Streits Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1863).
- Struve, Gustav, and Gustav Rasch. *Zwölf Streiter der Revolution* (Berlin: R.Wegener, 1867).
- Studt, Christoph. *Lothar Bucher (1817–1892): Ein politisches Leben zwischen Revolution und Staatsdienst* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992).
- Sundermann, Sabine. *Deutscher Nationalismus im englischen Exil: Zum sozialen und politischen Innenleben der deutschen Kolonie in London 1848–1871*, Veröffentlichung des Deutschen Historischen Instituts London, 42 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1997).
- Tabori, Paul. *The Anatomy of Exile: A Semantic and Historical Study* (Harrap, 1972).
- Taylor, Keith. *The Political Ideas of the Utopian Socialists* (Frank Cass, 1982).
- Tenfelde, Klaus. 'Sozialgeschichte und vergleichende Geschichte der Arbeiter', in Klaus Tenfelde, ed., *Arbeiter und Arbeiterbewegung im Vergleich* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1986).
- Thernstrom, Stephan, ed. *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980).
- Toews, John Edward. *Hegelianism: the path towards dialectical humanism, 1805–1841* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
- Tullner, Mathias. 'Gustav von Struve', in Helmut Bleiber, Walter Schmidt and Rolf Weber, eds, *Manner der Revolution von 1848*, II (Berlin: Akademie, 1987), pp. 245–71.
- Uerner, Klaus. *Die Deutschen in der Schweiz. Von den Anfängen der Kolonienbildung bis zum Ausbruch des Ersten Weltkrieges* (Frauenfeld: Verlag Huber, 1976).
- Vahlteich, Julius. *Ferdinand Lassalle und die Anfänge der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung* (repr. Berlin: Dietz, 1978).
- Vésinier, Pierre. *History of the Commune of Paris*, trans. J.V.Weber (Chapman & Hall, 1872).
- Vierhaus, Rudolf. 'Bürgerliche Hegemonie oder proletarische Emanzipation: der Beitrag der Bildung', in Jürgen Kocka, ed., *Arbeiter und Bürger im 19. Jahrhundert: Varianten ihres Verhältnisses im europäischen Vergleich*, Schriften des Historischen Kollegs, 7 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1986), pp. 53–64.
- Vogt, Carl. *Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung: Stenographischer Bericht, Dokumente und Erläuterungen* (Genf: Selbst-Verlag, 1859).
- W.B.[Werner Blumenberg]. 'Eduard von Müller-Telling, Verfasser des ersten antisemitischen Pamphlets gegen Marx', *Bulletin of the International Institute of Social History*, 3 (1951), 178–9.
- Walter, Stephan. *Demokratisches Denken zwischen Hegel und Marx: Die politische Philosophie Arnold Ruges: Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Demokratie in Deutschland*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien, 104 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1995).
- Weber, Frederick Parkes, ed. *Autobiographical Reminiscences of Sir Hermann Weber* (Bale & Danielsson, 1919).

- Weber, Marie-Lise. *Ludwig Bamberger. Ideologie statt Realpolitik*, Frankfurter Abhandlungen, 28 (Stuttgart: Franz-Steiner-Verlag-Wiesbaden, 1987).
- Weber, Wilhelm. *Meine Ausstoßung aus dem Turnverein zu Neustadt a. H. Nebst Beiträgen zur Charakteristik des Prof. Gottfried Kinkel zu London* (Neustadt a. H.: Selbstverlag; printed Mannheim: J. Schneider, 1862).
- Weingartz, B. 'Aus vergangenen Tagen: Erinnerung an den 7. Februar 1840', *Vorwärts* (Berlin), 7 Feb. 1928.
- Weisser, Henry. *British Working-Class Movements and Europe, 1815–1848* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1975).
- Weisser, Henry. *April 10: Challenge and Response in England in 1848* (Lanham, NY: University Press of America, 1983).
- Weitling, Wilhelm. *Die Menschheit wie sie ist und wie sie sein sollte* (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1971 [1838]).
- Weitling, Wilhelm. *Garantien der Harmonie und Freiheit*, ed. Bernhard Kaufhold (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1955 [1842]).
- Weitling, Wilhelm. *Grundzüge einer allgemeinen Denk- und Sprachlehre*, ed. and introd. Lothar Knatz, *Philosophie und Geschichte der Wissenschaften*, XIII (Frankfurt: Lang, 1991).
- Welskopp, Thomas. *Das Banner der Brüderlichkeit* (Bonn: Dietz, 2000)
- Wermuth, [Karl Georg Ludwig] and [Wilhelm] Stieber. *Die Communisten-Verschwörungen des 19. Jahrhunderts* (2 vols in one, Berlin: A.W.Hahn, 1853; facsimile edn, Berlin: Verlag K.Guhl, 1976).
- Wermuth, Adolf. *Ein Beamtenleben: Erinnerungen* (Berlin: Scherl, 1922).
- Wernicke, Kurt. 'Ludwig Bisky: Ein Berliner Arbeiterführer', in Helmut Bleiber, Walter Schmidt and Rolf Weber, eds, *Manner der Revolution von 1848*, II (Berlin: Akademie, 1987), pp. 127–49.
- Wheen, Francis. *Karl Marx* (Fourth Estate, 1999).
- Wicks, Margaret C.W. *The Italian Exiles in London, 1816–1848* (Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1968 [1937]).
- Williams, Robert C. 'European Political Emigrations: A Lost Subject', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 12 (1970), 140–8.
- [Willich, August.] *Im preußischen Heere! Ein Disciplinarverfahren gegen Premier-Lieutenant v. Willich...als Folge der durch den Prozeß 'Anneke' in dieser Brigade herbeigeführten Vorgänge* (Mannheim: Heinrich Hoff, 1848).
- Willich, August. *The Army: Standing Army or National Army? An Essay* (Cincinnati: A. Frey, 1866).
- Wittke, Carl. *Against the Current: The Life of Karl Heinzen (1809–1880)* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945).
- Wittke, Carl. *The Utopian Communist: A Biography of Wilhelm Weitling, Nineteenth-Century Reformer* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1950).
- Woodcock, George. *Anarchism: A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements* (Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1977).
- Young Germany. An Account of the Rise, Progress, and Present Position of German Communism; with a Memoir of Wilhelm Weitling, its Founder:—and a Report of the Proceedings at the Banquet Given by the English Socialists, in the John Street Institution, London, September 22, 1844, to commemorate his escape from the persecution of the Prussian Government, and Arrival in England* (J.Watson, n.d. [1844]).
- Zaddach, Carl. *Lothar Bucher bis zum Ende seines Londoner Exils (1817–1861)* (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1915).
- Zévaès, Alexandre. 'Les Proscrits français en 1848 et 1851 a Londres', *La Revolution de 1848 et les revolutions du XIXe siècle*, 20 (1923–1924), 345–75 and 21 (1924), 94–114.

- Zucker, A.E. 'Biographical Dictionary of the Forty-Eighters', in Adolph E. Zucker, ed., *The Forty-Eighters: Political Refugees of the German Revolution of 1848* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950), pp. 269–357.
- Zucker, A.E. *The Forty-Eighters: Political Refugees of the German Revolution of 1848* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950).
- 'Zwei Adressen der deutschen Arbeiter in London', *Telegraph für Deutschland* (Hamburg), 56 (April 1845), 221–2.

### ***Newspapers and periodicals***

(An asterisk indicates that only individual issues have been consulted.)

*Beacon*\*

*Bremer Tages-Chronik* (Bremen: 1851)\*

*Cincinnati Republikaner. Organ der Arbeiter* (Cincinnati: 1859–1860)\*

*Cleave's Penny Gazette of Variety* (1843)\*

*Cosmopolis. Internationale Revue* (1898)\*

*Das Volk. Organ des Central-Komitees für Arbeiter* (Berlin: 1848)\*

*Das Volk* (1859)

*Das Westphälische Dampfboot* (1847)\*

*Democratic Review of British and Foreign Politics, History, and Literature* (1849–1850)

*Demokratisches Taschenbuch für 1848* (Leipzig: 1847)

*Der Bote aus London* (1860)

*Der deutsche Eidgenosse* (London and Hamburg: 1865–1867)

*Der Hülfereif der deutschen Jugend/Die junge Generation* (Geneva: 1841–1843)

*Der Kosmos. Deutsche Zeitung aus London* (1851)

*Der Sozialdemokrat* (Zurich and London: 1879–1890)

*Der Verbannte* (London: 1855)

*Der Vereinsbote: Organ des Vereins deutscher Lehrerinnen in London* (1888–1914)

*Der Volksstaat* (Leipzig: 1876)\*

*Der Vorbote* (Geneva, 1866–1871)

*Der Wahre Jacob* (Stuttgart: 1898)\*

*Deutsche Londoner Zeitung* (1845–1851)

*Deutsche Monatsschrift für Politik, Wissenschaft, Kunst und Leben* (ed. Adolph Kolatschek, Stuttgart: 6 vols, 1850–1851)

*Deutsche Revue*\*

*Deutsches Leben, Kunst und Poesie* (from no. 3: *Deutsches Leben*, 1834)

*Die Deutsche Presse: Zeitung für Politik, Literatur, Handel und Gewerbe* (1841)

*Die Gartenlaube*\*

*Die Grenzboten* (1863)\*

*Die Neue Zeit* (Stuttgart: 1890, 1897)\*

*English Republic*\*

*Freiheit* (1879–1882)

*Freiheit (Freedom): A Journal for the Diffusion of Socialistic Knowledge amongst the People*, 1 (24 April, 1881), 6 (29 May, 1881)

*Freiheit, Arbeit. Organ des Kölner Arbeitervereins* (Cologne: 1849)

*Freiheit, Brüderlichkeit, Arbeit* (Cologne: 1848–1849) *The Friend of the People* (1850–1851)

*Germania: Archiv zur Kenntniß des deutschen Elements in alien Ländern der Erde* (Frankfurt: 1848–1850)

*Germania* (1859)

*Gesellschaftsspiegel* (Elberfeld: 1845–1846)

*Glasgow Sentinel* (1851)\*

*Hamburger Nachrichten* (Hamburg: 1851)\*



- Hermann* (1859–1871)  
*Household Words* (1851)\*  
*The Illustrated London News* (1850)\*  
*Justice* (1884)\*  
*The Leader* (1850–1852)  
*Les Veillées du Peuple, Journal mensuel de la Démocratie socialiste* (Nov. 1849, March 1850),  
 reprinted in *Les Révolutions du XIXe siècle*, 3ème série, II, Paris: Editions d'Histoire Sociale  
 [1984]  
*L'Homme* (Jersey: 1853–1856)  
*Londoner Deutsche Zeitung und Allgemeiner Anzeiger* (1858–1859)  
*Londoner Deutsches Journal* (1855–1858)  
*Louis Blanc's Monthly Review: The New World of Politics, Art, Literature and Sciences, published  
 under Louis Blanc's Immediate Inspection, and edited by F.R.Trehonnais* (1849)  
*The Movement; Anti-Persecution Gazette and Register of Progress* (1843–1845)  
*Neue Zeit* (1858–1859)  
*Neuer Social-Demokrat* (Berlin: 1876)\*  
*The New Moral World* (1844)\*  
*New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung* (later *Belletristisches Journal und New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung*)  
 (New York: 1852–1853)\*  
*New-Yorker Staats-Zeitung* (New York: 1851–1853)\*  
*Northern Star* (1844–1851)  
*Notes to the People*\*  
*The Penny Satirist* (1840)\*  
*The People's Paper* (1852–1856)  
*Red Republican* (1850)  
*Republik der Arbeiter* (New York: 1850–1855)  
*Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper* (1857–1858)\*  
*Sociale Republik. Organ der freien Arbeiter* (New York: 1858–1860)  
*Standard of Freedom* (1850)\*  
*Telegraph für Deutschland* (Hamburg: 1844)  
*The Times* (1850, 1853)\*  
*Turn-Zeitung. Organ des sozialistischen Turnerbundes* (New York: 1851–1853)\*  
*Vorwärts!* (Paris: 1844)  
*Vorwärts* (Leipzig: 1876)\*  
*Vorwärts* (Berlin: 1928)\*  
*Zeitung des Arbeiter-Vereines zu Köln* (Cologne: 1848)

# Index

- Abels 220  
Adam 61, 63, 67, 131–3  
Adams, W.E. 89, 183  
Adelmann, H. 222  
Albert, Prince 6, 10, 12, 163, 165  
Albrecht, C. 34  
Anders 201  
Anderson, C. xi  
Anneke, F. 68, 96, 107  
Arndt, E.M. 33  
Ashton, R. xi, 2
- Babeuf, G. 23  
Backhaus, W. 50  
Bakunin, M. 225  
Bamberger, Louis 58  
Bamberger, Ludwig 16  
Barbès, A. 166  
Baring 16  
Barmby, J.G. 34  
Barthelémy, E. 63, 66, 67, 73, 90, 126–7, 130–3, 135–6  
Bauer, B. 87  
Bauer, E. xi, 154, 163, 176–7, 180–2, 188, 191–2, 199, 202–4, 212–13, 222  
Bauer, H. 14, 24, 28–9, 31, 36, 38–9, 41, 44, 46–7, 50, 54, 74, 78, 111  
Bauer, L. 50, 53  
Bax, E.B. 229  
Bebel, A. xiii, 224, 226  
Becker, B. 164, 173, 175–6, 178, 180–2, 185–9, 191, 197, 199, 202, 222, 224  
Becker, J.Ph. 108, 119, 225  
Beckmann, D. 13  
Beer, M. 229  
Beigel, H. 219  
Bem, J. 125, 127, 132, 152  
Bernard, S. 183–4, 195, 199  
Bernstein, E. 222, 228–9  
Berthold, O. 120  
Besson 183  
Beyer 145  
Biscamp, E. 203–6, 209, 211, 213  
Bisky, L. 140  
Bismarck, Prince O.von 95, 197–8, 226  
Blanc, L. 63–4, 67, 90, 131, 133, 135–6, 152

- Blanqui, A. 23, 62–3, 66, 80, 126, 131, 133–6, 143, 148, 200–1  
 Bley, M. 168  
 Blind-Cohen, F. 198  
 Blind, K. xi, 50, 59, 130, 191, 194, 196–8, 205, 209–10, 212, 216–17, 222  
 Blum, J. 42, 147–8, 150, 153  
 Blum, R. 43, 171–3, 175, 216–18, 224–5  
 Bobzin, F. 50  
 Boichot 149  
 Bonnin 180  
 Borkheim, S. 162  
 Born, S. 43  
 Bradlaugh, C. 183, 222  
 Bratianu, D. 89  
 Bright, J. 187, 190, 207  
 Brown, J. 157  
 Bruiningk, M., Baroness von 12, 48, 84, 98, 145, 152  
 Brunswick, K., Duke of 12, 46  
 Bucher, L. 2, 15, 48, 50, 197, 212–13, 222  
 Buchheim, K. 15  
 Bunsen, C., Baron von 12, 16, 19, 32, 50  
 Burns, R. 217
- Cabet, E. 27–8, 30–1, 39–40, 78, 88, 121, 130–1  
 Cassel, Sir E. 19  
 Chenu, J. 64–5  
 Cherval, J. 155, 209, 211  
 Chicherin, G.V. 230  
 Clarendon, Lord G. 183  
 Cluss, A. 107, 158, 161  
 Coben, R. 160  
 Coke, Sir E. xi  
 Cole, G.D.H. 4  
 Cooper, T. 93  
 Courmet, F. 131  
 Covend 126  
 Cowen, J. 93, 183  
 Crämer, J. *see* Cherval J.  
 Crump 180
- Dana, C.A. 161  
 Daniels, R. 60  
 Darasz, A. 89–90  
 Dave, V. 228  
 Dawson, G. 93  
 Demuth, H. 18  
 Deroin, J. 131, 164, 177  
 d'Ester, K.L. 104–5  
 Dézamy, T. 88  
 Dickens, C. 97–8  
 Dietz, O. 111–12, 120, 143, 149, 153–4  
 Dohl, J. 50

- Doviati, R. 88  
 Draper, H. 3  
 Dronke, E. 160  
 Dürer, A. 32  
 Dutschke, R. 10
- Eccarius, J.F. 120, 143–4  
 Eccarius, J.G. 13, 15, 26, 38, 44–6, 48, 54, 59, 74–6, 78, 120, 130, 144, 160–1, 201, 221, 223, 225  
 Ehrhart, F.J. 227  
 Eichhoff 223  
 Eliot, G. 100  
 Enders, G. 165  
 Engels, F. xi–xii, 1–4, 18, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 34–41, 48, 50–1, 53, 59–74, 77–8, 80, 84, 93, 96–7, 101, 107–8, 111–12, 114, 117, 119–20, 122, 124–7, 130, 132, 135–6, 138, 153, 156, 160–1, 193, 196–7, 203–4, 206–8, 211, 222, 226  
 Engländer 164  
 Ermani, V. 186–7  
 Ermerich, H. 173–4, 177, 182, 194–5  
 Etzler, J.A. 34  
 Ewerbeck, H. 27, 112
- Feibel, H. 120, 190  
 Feuerbach, F. 31, 68  
 Feuerbach, L. 31, 72, 198  
 Fickler, J. 102, 106, 108  
 Fillmore, M. 109  
 Finlen, J. 166–7  
 Fleury, C. 154–6, 164, 211  
 Fontaine, Mme de la 177  
 Fontane, Th. 14–16, 18, 111, 123–4  
 Fourier, C. 23, 31  
 Fränkel, L. 224  
 Fränkel, S. 74, 78–9, 111, 139, 147–8, 153  
 Frederick William IV 95, 154  
 Freiligrath, F. 11, 15–16, 42, 45, 48, 60, 84–5, 106, 161–2, 186, 190–3, 196, 198, 204, 209–10, 212, 216–17, 222  
 Freund, J.C.H. 10, 16  
 Fröbel, J. 210  
 Frost, J. 170  
 Füster, A. 50
- Garibaldi, G. 86, 157, 166, 226  
 Gebert, A. 111–12, 121, 126, 128, 147, 150–1, 153  
 Gehrke 137  
 Gerstenberg, I. 16, 193  
 Gipperich, J. 155  
 Göbel, J. 50  
 Goegg, A. 101–2, 104, 106–8, 138, 210  
 Göhringer, K. 86, 124  
 Goldstücker, Th. 15  
 Göschen, W.H. 16

- Gottschalk, A. 72  
 Götz, Th. 163  
 Grass, A. 216  
 Greiner, Th. L. 120  
 Grossmann, R. *see* Ramus, P.  
 Grote 16  
 Grozinski, J. 151  
 Grün, K. 40  
 Gümpel, J.H. 143, 145
- Hain, A. 78  
 Hallé, C. 12  
 Handel, G. 10, 217  
 Hanschmidt, A. 84  
 Harney, G.J. 16, 33–8, 41–2, 45, 59, 61, 64, 92–3, 124–30, 132, 160–1  
 Harney, M. 126  
 Harro-Harring, P. 85, 108, 191  
 Haude 70, 111, 119  
 Haufe 220  
 Haug (Haugh), E. 99–100, 105, 138, 198  
 Haupt, W. 120  
 Hecker, F. 69, 107, 197–8  
 Heilberg, L. 43, 45  
 Heinzen, K. xi–xii, 39–40, 48, 50–2, 58, 84, 86–8, 91, 105, 144  
 Heise, H. 124, 149, 154, 204  
 Herwegh, G. 45  
 Herzen, A. 5, 20, 83, 85, 167, 170, 175, 197  
 Hess, M. 3, 7, 25, 31, 68, 71, 81, 118–19  
 Hillmann, H. 50, 86, 173–6, 180–1, 199, 222–4  
 Hirsch, W. 143–4, 155–6  
 Hirschfeld, R. 165, 185  
 Hobbes, Th. 176  
 Hodde, L. de la 64  
 Holyoake, G.J. 167–8  
 Hooper, G. 98  
 Hoppe, K. 152  
 Hugo, V. 131  
 Hundt, M. 28, 62  
 Hunt, R.N. 3, 57, 62, 65  
 Hunt, T. 91  
 Huth, F. 16
- Imandt, P. 153, 156
- Jahn, F.L. 33  
 Jones, E. 34, 36, 41, 64, 124–5, 127–9, 160–1, 166–70, 179  
 Juch, E. 197–8
- Kapp, F. 107  
 Kaufmann, A. 10

- Kautsky, K. 222, 229  
 Kinkel, G. xi, 7, 9, 16, 48, 54, 59, 69, 77, 83–6, 93, 95–109, 119, 136–9, 142, 150–2, 156–7, 159, 162, 171, 175–6, 186–8, 191–200, 203–4, 206–8, 212, 214, 216–18  
 Kinkel, J. 15, 18, 95–9, 105, 124, 187, 191–3  
 Klapka, G. 53  
 Klose, J.G. 78  
 Kollbeck, F.W. 43  
 Korn, Ph. 165–6, 185–6  
 Kossuth, L. 85–6, 93, 106, 161  
 Krause, C. *see* Fleury, C.  
 Kriege, H. 5, 29–31, 36–7, 39  
 Kudlich, H. 104
- Lacambre, Dr. 131  
 Lagerström, A. von 195  
 Lamennais, F.R. 23  
 Landolphe, H. 90, 131, 133  
 Lange 195, 204  
 Lassalle, F. xii, 175, 197, 203, 208, 213, 224  
 Launspach 145  
 Ledru-Rollin, A. 63–4, 67, 89–90, 93, 106, 129, 131, 134–5  
 Lehmann, A. 26, 28, 30, 74, 78–9, 111, 153  
 Lemke 226  
 Leroux, P. 131  
 Lessner, F. 13, 26, 43–4, 83, 152, 166, 170–4, 176, 181–2, 192, 199, 201, 205, 220–3, 226  
 Lewes, G.H. 100  
 Lewiowa, S. 72  
 Liebermann, A. 227–8  
 Liebknecht, W. xiii, 2, 15, 55, 63, 72, 78, 143–4, 156, 160, 171–2, 174, 176, 182, 192, 199–204, 209–11, 222–4, 226  
 Linton, W. 93  
 Lochner, G. 143–4, 160, 174, 225–6  
 Lovett, W. 34, 36  
 Löwe, W. (von Calbe) 105  
 Luther, M. 153, 216–17
- Machiavelli, N. 176  
 Mackay, J. 179–80  
 McLellan, D. 3, 212  
 Majer, L.A. 133, 153, 211  
 Malatesta, E. 230  
 Marquardt 148  
 Martineau, H. 183  
 Martius, G.H. 43, 148, 150  
 Marx, E. 223  
 Marx, J. 18, 69  
 Marx, K. xi–xiv, 1–8, 14–15, 18, 22, 25–6, 28, 30–1, 35–43, 46–8, 50–1, 53–75, 77–82, 84–93, 95, 97, 99, 101–3, 106–7, 110–14, 117–22, 124–30, 132–6, 138, 141, 143–4, 146, 148, 151–62, 168–73, 176, 182, 191–3, 196, 198–9, 201–17, 221, 222, 225–6, 228  
 Marx, L. 10  
 Massey, G. 98

- Matthieux, J. *see* Kinkel, J.  
 Mayer, G. 8  
 Mayhew, H. 14  
 Mazzini, G. 23, 84–5, 88–94, 99–100, 117, 139, 161, 167, 178–9, 182, 187, 195, 197, 200, 225  
 Mehring, F. 3  
 Ménard, L.-N. 59, 131  
 Metternich, Prince K W. 12  
 Meyen, E. 105  
 Meysenbug, M.von 12, 48, 97–8, 184, 186–7, 195, 197  
 M'Grath, P. 41  
 Michelot, J. 35  
 Mill, J. St. 183  
 Mirbach, O.von 154  
 Mockel, J. *see* Kinkel, J.  
 Moll, J. 24–5, 28, 31, 36, 38–9, 41–4, 46–7, 113, 119  
 Mond, L. 16  
 Morris, W. 223  
 Most, J. 227–8  
 Motteler, J. 229  
 Mozart, A. 32  
 Müller, M. 15  
 Müller-Struüing, H. 15  
 Müller-Tellering, E.von 53  
 Murray, C. 173, 179
- Nacht, S. 229  
 Nadaud, M. 131  
 Napoleon III 95, 106, 109, 131, 133, 145, 149, 157, 166–7, 172, 180, 196, 198, 200, 205, 208–9, 212  
 Nettlau, M. 31, 228  
 Nicolaevsky, B. 181  
 Nightingale, F. 16
- Oborski, L. 35, 172–3, 179–81  
 O'Brien, J.B. 130, 161  
 O'Connor, F. 64, 128, 164  
 Olshausen, Th. 198  
 Oppenheim, H.B. 105  
 Orsini, F. 157, 183–4, 195  
 Oswald, E. 15, 83, 107, 188, 191  
 Otto-Peters, L. 222  
 Owen, R. 27–8, 30–1, 101, 160, 225
- Palmerston, H., Viscount 132, 161, 168, 172, 183–4  
 Panayi, P. xi  
 Pardigon, F. 63, 66, 131  
 Pauer, E. 216  
 Petersen, N.L. 118, 140, 190, 200–1, 207  
 PettieJ. 129  
 Petzler, J.A. 161  
 Peukert, J. 228

- Pfänder, K. 38, 43–4, 46, 50, 54, 74, 78, 111, 144, 160, 172, 176, 201, 225  
 Pieper, F.L.W. 15, 126, 129, 143–4, 160–1  
 Pirsch, A.L. 149–50, 153  
 Porter, B. xi, 1–2  
 Prochasky 126  
 Proudhon, P.J. 40, 186, 194  
 Pyat, F. 90, 131, 167–8, 183
- Rackow, H. 227–9  
 Ramus, P. 229  
 Reichenbach, O.von, Count 12, 48, 104, 139, 151, 157  
 Reiningger, J.G. 26, 112, 118, 120, 130, 140, 161  
 Reuter, M. 154  
 Rings, M.W. 71, 156  
 Rittinghausen, M. 184  
 Rjazanov, N. 61  
 Rocker, R. 228  
 Roedel, P. 153  
 Roller, A. *see* Nacht, S.  
 Roney 100  
 Ronge, B. 18, 48  
 Ronge, J. 20, 29, 38, 48, 88, 99–100, 106, 162, 164–6, 196, 219  
 Rosenberg, A. 84  
 Rosenthal, G. 29, 43  
 Röser, P.G. 119  
 Rothschild, N. 10  
 Rothstein, Th. 229  
 Rougée, J.B. 131, 168  
 Ruffy, D.W. 129  
 Ruge, A. 2, 7, 48, 50, 54, 58, 60, 64, 67, 77, 83–5, 87–9, 91–3, 95, 98–102, 104–9, 136, 139, 152, 156, 197, 204, 222  
 Rumpf, E. 143  
 Ruskin, J. 13  
 Russell, Lord J. 153
- Saint-Just, L. de 114, 132  
 Sala, G.A. x  
 Schabelitz 46  
 Schaible, K.H. 210, 217  
 Schapper, K. xi–xiii, 4, 11, 15, 23–31, 33–43, 45–7, 60, 68, 72–80, 84, 92, 106, 110–12, 114, 118–21, 124–30, 132–7, 141, 143, 145, 147, 151–5, 158, 168, 172–3, 181–2, 188, 193, 202–3, 213, 222, 225  
 Schapper, Th. 130  
 Schärttner, A. 70, 86, 95, 111, 123–4, 133, 145, 153, 199  
 Scherzer, A. xi, 4, 13, 26, 83, 118, 140, 143, 158–9, 169–70, 172–8, 180, 182, 186–91, 195, 199, 201–2, 204–5, 209, 213, 220, 223–5  
 Scheu, A. 223–5, 229  
 Schieder, W. 3  
 Schiller, F. 6, 8, 11, 32, 216–17, 223  
 Schily, V. 153  
 Schimmelpfennig von der Oye, A. 12, 104, 108, 119, 137–9, 149–50, 154



- Schleiermacher, F. 68  
 Schmitz 153  
 Schneider, J. 224  
 Schoeps, J.H. 84  
 Schraepler, E. 57  
 Schramm, C. 59, 62, 73–4, 78, 92, 126–7, 129–30  
 Schramm, R. 50, 88  
 Schröder, Baron J.H.von, 16  
 Schroeder, J. 144  
 Schulze-Delitzsch, H. xiii, 165, 186, 188, 194, 196, 219, 224  
 Schurz, K. 2, 96–8, 100–4, 107, 109, 138, 171  
 Schuster, Th. 120  
 Schweitzer, J.B.von 224  
 Shakespeare, W. 32  
 Siemens, K.W. 16  
 Sigel, F. 102, 106, 108, 138, 154, 198  
 Simon, L. 135  
 Smith, A. 194  
 Speck, W. 199  
 Stallo, J.B. 157  
 Starke, C.A. 120, 150, 153  
 Stechan, G.L. 120, 135, 143–4, 166, 168–70  
 Stieber, W. 143, 154–5, 164  
 Stirner, M. 87  
 Stockmar, Baron C.F.von 10  
 Stoppard, T. 1  
 Strauss, D. 87  
 Strauss 199  
 Strodttmann, A. 98  
 Strohmeyer, F. 31  
 Struve, A. vi, 100  
 Struve, G. 2, 48, 50–2, 58, 60, 67, 77, 86, 88, 91, 93, 99–101, 107, 172, 174, 190, 197–8  
 Stubbe 153  
 Stutterheim, Baron von 163  
 Sue, E. 37, 131  
 Sundermann, S. 2  
 Swietoslowski, Z. 178–80  
 Szemere, B. 63
- Talandier, A. 131, 167, 172–3, 178, 180, 183  
 Tausenau, K. 48, 102, 106, 152  
 Tchorzewski, S. 183  
 Techow, G.A. 74, 77, 101, 108, 114, 138  
 Tedesco, V. 40  
 Tetzl, J. 106  
 Thoré, Th. 168  
 Tomlinson 179  
 Trübner, N. 15, 197  
 Truelove, E. 183  
 Tzschirner, S. 105

Ulmer, J. 143  
 Ulrich, N. 180  
 Urquhart, D. 209

Vannier 185  
 Victoria, Queen 10, 128, 168, 185  
 Vidil, J. 61, 63, 67, 73, 131–3  
 Vogt, C. 5, 159, 198, 203, 207, 209–15

Wagner, R. 105  
 Watson, J. 93  
 Weber, J.V. 200–1, 218, 223–4, 226  
 Weerth, G. 60  
 Weil, S. 165  
 Weitling, W. xii, 2–3, 6–7, 11, 23–4, 26–31, 33–4, 36–7, 39–40, 59, 71, 73, 78, 90, 102, 105–7, 118–19, 121, 146, 157, 161, 169, 190, 194  
 Wenckstern, O.von 162  
 Wengler 126  
 Westphalen, Baroness C.von 18  
 Weydemeyer, J. 68, 106, 120, 203  
 Wiener, B. 164  
 Wienhof 148  
 Wiersbitzki, C.von 83  
 Wilhelm, Prince, later King, of Prussia 183, 222  
 Willich, A.von xi, xiii, 2, 4–5, 7, 12, 42, 48, 50–1, 53, 59–63, 65, 67–82, 84, 91, 93, 96, 100–6, 108, 110–39, 141–58, 161–2, 172–3, 188, 190, 199, 201, 203  
 Wolff, F. 72, 78  
 Wolff, W. 38, 41, 59, 160, 204, 206  
 Worcell, S. 91

Young 180

Zimmermann 154, 212  
 Zinn, F. 124, 188, 191, 195–6, 220  
 Zitz, K. 105