


REMOVED FROM
E.S. FARLEY LIBRARY
WILKES UNIVERSITY
COLLECTION




LIBRARY

WILKES-BARRE
PENNSYLVANIA





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation



A. Debel.

Bebel's Reminiscences

Translated from the First German Edition
By ERNEST UNTERMANN

PART I

The Socialist Literature Company, New York, 1911

H X 273

B44

v. 1

COPYRIGHT, 1911

By the

Socialistic Co-operative Publishing Association



The Co-Operative Press, 15 Spruce Street, New York

To My Dear Wife

61272



CONTENTS.

Preface	7
Scenes of Childhood and Youth.....	9
Years of Apprenticeship and Wandering	29
Back to Wetzlar and Onward!.....	48
My Entry Into the Labor Movement and Into Public Life.....	53
Lassalle's Rise and Its Results.....	78
The Convention of the German Workingmen's Clubs	86
Friedrich Albert Lange	102
New Social Phenomena.....	106
The Stuttgart National Convention.....	118
Wilhelm Liebknecht.....	130
Increasing Dissatisfaction of Workingmen's Clubs.	136
The Catastrophe of 1866	142
After the War	168
The Continued Development of the Federation of German Workingmen's Clubs.....	176
Personal Matters	184
The March to Nuremberg	189
The Trade Union Movement.....	203
My First Sentence.....	217
Before Barmen-Elberfeld.....	220





P R E F A C E.

The wish of many of my party comrades that I should write my memoirs agrees with my own. When a man has attained a prominent position, through the favor of circumstances, the public has a right to know the conditions that brought about this result. On the other hand, the multitude of false charges and misconceptions, of which I have been so frequently a victim, induces me to show to the public how much truth there is in them.

To this end, frankness and truth are the first requirements. Without them, the publication of biographical data is useless. The reader of these memoirs, no matter what side he may be on, or to what party he may belong, will not be able to charge me with having concealed or retouched anything. I have spoken the truth, even in places where some may think that I might have done better by saying nothing. I am not of the same opinion. No man is without faults, and at times it is precisely the confession of a certain fault that interests the reader most, and enables him to arrive at a correct estimate.

Wishing to write the truth to the best of my knowledge, I could not rely on my memory. After the lapse of a certain number of years the memory is not reliable. Even such events as made a deep impression at the time, assume a different form in the course of years, under the pressure of varied suggestions. I have experienced this frequently, not alone in myself, but also in others. Quite often, when chatting with acquaintances and friends, I have related in good faith certain incidents, which later on, when tested, for instance, by letters written under the immediate impression of those events, turned out to have been far different than related. This has led me to the conclusion

that no judge should accept the oath of any witness, concerning any incident, after the lapse of several years. The danger of perjury is too great.

In order to verify my statements and my views at a certain period, I have made use, as much as possible, of letters, notes, articles, etc.

But there were periods in my life, during which it was dangerous to preserve any letters, because they might have betrayed others, or myself. This applies particularly to the time of the anti-socialist laws, when I was in danger every hour of having my house or my body searched, in order that the government might find evidence against myself or others. For a long time the police and the public prosecutors credited me with being a dangerous character, who must not be trusted. The same reasons also forbade the keeping of a diary.

The present volume contains some material, especially that referring to the anti-socialist labor associations of the sixties of the nineteenth century, which has not been wholly known so far. Since L. Sonnemann died in Frankfurt-on-Main, in the latter part of October last year, there is no one left except myself, who is so familiar with the history of that time by actual contact with it, and who has command of the material referring to it. I had hoped to make better headway with this work, but sickness forbade all mental exertion for nearly two years. If my health holds out, this first volume shall be followed by a second, perhaps even by a third.

Schöneberg, Berlin, New Year's Day, 1910.

AUGUST BEBEL.





SCENES OF CHILDHOOD AND YOUTH.

IF we wish to become familiar with a man, we must know the history of his childhood and youth. Man is born with certain aptitudes and characteristics, the development of which depends essentially upon the conditions surrounding him. Aptitudes and qualities of character may be promoted or retarded, or even largely suppressed, by education and by the example of the environing people. Then it depends upon the conditions of later life, and more or less upon the energy of the man, to what extent, and in what manner a wrong education, or formerly suppressed qualities, will assert themselves. This often enough costs a hard struggle with one's self, for man's feelings and ideas are most deeply influenced by the impressions received during the years of his childhood and youth. Whatever the conditions of later life may make of a man, the impressions of his younger years influence him in a good or a bad way, and frequently they determine his actions.

For my own part, I must confess that the impressions and experiences of my childhood and adolescence often took hold of me in a way that I could not escape, and I have never rid myself of them entirely.

A man is born in a certain place.

I had this good fortune on February 22, 1840. On that day I saw the light of this world in the casemate of Deutz-Cologne. My father was the petty-officer, Johann Gottlob Bebel, of Company 3, Infantry Regiment No. 25; my mother was Wilhelmine Johanne, and her maiden name was Simon. My certificate of baptism does not mention Deutz as my birthplace, altho it still was an independent commune at that time, but Cologne, probably because the garrison of Deutz belonged to that of the fortress of Cologne and to the same church congregation.

The "Light of the world," which I saw after my birth, was the dim light of a tin-lamp burning oil, which barely illumined the grey walls of a casemate-room that served as bedroom, living room, parlor, kitchen and working room. According to my mother's statement, it was nine o'clock P. M. when I entered the world, and the moment was "historical," inasmuch as the bugler outside was sounding the retreat, the age-long signal for the men to go to bed.

Prophetically endowed natures might conclude from this fact that even then I was announcing my opposition to the prevailing order of government. For strictly speaking, it was contrary to the military order that I, the child of a Prussian petty-officer, should cry out against the walls of a royal casemate at the very moment when the order to be quiet was being sounded. And it is reported that my voice was pretty strong, even at my birth.

But these prophets would be mistaken. It took a long while before I escaped from the bonds of the prejudices which life in the casemate, and the later impressions of my youth had woven around me.

It is not superfluous, but rather necessary for a better estimate of myself, to say a little about my father and my mother. My father was born in Ostrowo, province of Posen, as the son of the master-cooper, Johann Bebel. I believe I am right in assuming that the Bebels emigrated from the Southwest of Germany (Württemberg) to the East, perhaps at the time of the Reformation. I have been able to ascertain that a Bebel lived in Kreuzburg, Silesia, about 1625. A greater number of them live today in southwestern Germany. The name Bebel is also found among public officials since the time of the Reformation. I recall the author of "Facetiae," the humanist, Heinrich Bebel, who was a professor in Tübingen, and died in 1518. A printer, Johann Bebel, lived in Basle and published "Utopia," by Thomas More, in 1518. A professor, Balthasar Bebel, lived in Strasburg, in Alsatia, in 1669, and a doctor of medicine, Friedrich Wilhelm Bebel, in Nagold, Württemberg, in 1792. The name Bebel is

also found in the garbled form of Böbel, in southern Germany. My father's straying from East to West was due to the fact that he and his twin brother, August, entered a regiment of Infantry in Posen, I think the 19th regiment, in the year 1828. When the Polish insurrection broke out in the year 1830, the Prussian government considered it best to remove the Posen regiment from that province. The regiment in which my father served was transferred to the federal fortress of Mayence as a part of the Prussian federal garrison. This led to the acquaintance of my father and mother.

My mother was descended from a small bourgeois family of some means, that had long been settled in the town of Wetzlar, which was at that time one of the free cities of the realm. Her father was a baker and a farmer. His family was numerous, and so my mother, following the example of the daughters of other Wetzlar families, wandered to Frankfort-on-Main, and took service there as a maid. From Frankfort, she went to the neighboring Mayence, and there she became acquainted with my father. Later, when my father's regiment was retransferred to the province of Posen, he resigned from it and enlisted in the 25th infantry regiment, which garrisoned in Deutz-Cologne, partly because he wanted to stay with his sweetheart, and partly, perhaps, because the Rhineland suited him better than his native province. His twin-brother, August, my godfather, followed his example by transferring to the 40th infantry regiment (the 8th Rhenish regiment of fusileers), which was then stationed in Mayence.

The family of a Prussian petty-officer in those days lived in very penurious circumstances. The salary was more than scanty, and altogether the military and official world of Prussia lived poorly at that time. Most of them had to pull in their belts and starve for God, King and Country. My mother obtained permission to keep a sort of a canteen, in other words, she had license to sell sundry articles of daily use to the garrison. This was done in the only room at our disposal. I can still see

mother before me, as she stood in the light of a lamp fed by rape-oil and filled the earthen bowls of the soldiers with steaming potatoes in their jackets, at the rate of 6 Prussian pennies per bowl.

For us children—my first brother came in April, 1841, and a second followed in the summer of 1842—life in the casemate was full of delights. We rambled thru the rooms, petted or teased by the petty-officers and soldiers. When the rooms were vacant, while the men were out for drill, I would go to one of the rooms and get the guitar of petty-officer Wintermann, who was also my god-father, and I would carry on my musical exercises till there was not a whole string left on the instrument. In order to sidetrack me from these destructive musical exercises and escape their dire results, he whittled a guitar-like contrivance from a piece of board for me, and stretched some gut-strings across it. From then on, I would sit for hours on the doorstep facing a yard on the main street of Deutz, with this “instrument,” and with my brother, maltreating these strings so much that I “charmed” the two daughters of a captain of dragoons, who lived opposite us. They often regaled me for my musical accomplishments with cake or candy. Of course, the military exercises did not suffer from these musical practices. The incentive for the military exercises came from the entire environment; it was literally in the air. So as soon as I put on my first coat and my first trousers, which, of course, had been manufactured from an old military overcoat of father’s, I took a position by the side of the soldiers, drilling on the open square in front of the casemate, or behind them, and imitated their movements. My mother often told me humorously later on, that I was a master in the art of swinging into front, right and left. This exercise gave the men much trouble, and it is said that the commanding officer, or petty-officer, used to point me out as an example to the men.

However, my father’s eyes gradually looked upon the military life differently from those of his son. It is true,

as mother used to tell us, that father, like his brother, was an exceedingly conscientious, punctual and clean soldier, an exemplary soldier, as the term goes, but at that time he had more than twelve years of service to his credit, and he was heartily sick of the whole business. No doubt this service was even more petty and narrow in those days than it is to-day. At that time the drillmaster celebrated his orgies. Evidently my father did not lack a spirit of independence and opposition, and the Rhine province was the right soil for it just then, so that often father came into the dingy casemate-room from the drill ground in a high state of anger and with execrations on his lips. When, in 1840, a war threatened to break out between Prussia and France, under the rule of Louis Philippe and his minister, Thiers, it is reported that my father, highly provoked by some very young officer, stepped into our room and exclaimed, in my mother's hearing: "Mother, if this war starts, the first bullet that I'll fire will hit a Prussian officer!" The term, "Prussian officer," in the mouth of a Prussian petty-officer, may sound strange, but is easily explained. In those days, and even later, every officer and official in the Prussian Rhineland, was simply dubbed a "Prussian" by the population. The people of the Rhineland did not yet feel themselves as Prussians. If a young man had to enlist in the army, it was briefly said that he had to be a "Prussian." People even used a harder name in connection with this. As late as the spring of 1869, when I visited Elberfeld with Liebknecht on some political mission, I heard, in the barroom of the hotel in which we stayed, how one guest, seeing an officer pass by on the street, said to another guest: "What does the Prussian officer want here?" Elberfeld did not have any garrison in those days, any more than it has to-day.

This view had evidently become familiar even to my father. When he was compelled, in 1843 and 1844, after fifteen years of service, to spend a twelve-month and more in a military hospital, having fallen very ill, and when he saw only death and the poverty of his family

before him, he begged mother several times very urgently not to send us boys to a military orphanage after his death, because that would involve the obligation to serve in the army for nine years. The mere thought that mother, under the sting of poverty, might disregard his warning, stirred his diseased frame to such a pitch that he exclaimed several times: "If you do that, I'll stab the boys in front of the company!" He overlooked, in his excitement, that he would no longer be living, if that eventuality should present itself.

Relief came to my father in the shape of an offer of a position as revenue-guard in the spring of 1843, a position which he had long applied for. He accepted the offer, and so his family moved to Herzogenrath, on the Belgian frontier, partly on foot, partly seated on the freight-wagon that carried our furniture, for there were no railroads in that country at that time. But we did not stay there long. Father's trial term of three months was not ended, when the exhausting night service brought on a serious illness. My mother called it inflammation of the muscles. I suppose it was inflammatory rheumatism, complicated by consumption. Since his failure to complete his trial term still left him under military control, the sick man had to return to Cologne as he had come. This was very hard on my mother. After his arrival in Cologne, father was sent to the military hospital, and we were once more given a room in the casemate of Deutz. This time the room fronted the wall-ditch. After thirteen months of suffering, my father died at the age of 35, without having acquired the privilege of a pension for my mother. Shortly after his death, we had to leave the casemate, and mother would have been compelled, even then, to move to her home town of Wetzlar, had not my father's twin-brother, August Bebel, taken charge of my mother and of us. In order to be able to fulfill this duty in the best way, he decided, in the fall of 1844, to marry my mother.

This stepfather of mine had been discharged from the 40th infantry regiment in September of 1841 on account

of total invalidism, with a pension of two Prussian dollars per month. He became an invalid, because he lost his voice thru an inflammation of the larynx, which later also ran into consumption. After resigning from his position in the regiment, he had served for nearly two years as a police sergeant in the military hospital of Mayence, and then he had temporarily accepted a position as section-guard in the provincial house of correction at Brauweiler, near Cologne. His real intention was to enter the postal service. But at that time the postal system was still in a bad way. If any one wanted a position in it, he had to wait till a vacancy occurred thru the death or the pensioning of some one. It was typical of the character of the postal service of the time that my stepfather, when writing in the summer of 1844, to his brother in Ostrowo, in order to get an official authorization for his marriage, penned the following remark on the letter, which I happened to hold in my hand: "The sender begs to deliver this soon." Evidently the delivery of letters was then rare and slow. My stepfather at last received an offer of the position of letter-carrier, which he had so long desired, in October of 1846, after waiting for three years. But when he received this offer, he lay dead on his pall.

Late in the summer of 1844 we moved to Brauweiler. My stepfather certainly had the hardest job in the great provincial institution. Among his duties was that of prison guard for the work-house prisoners, who had been sentenced to imprisonment for misdemeanors in the institution. The institution formed a large group of buildings and courts, and also included some garden land. All this was surrounded by a high wall. Men, women and young prisoners were separated from each other. In order to get to the prison-house, in which our home was, we had to cross several courts, which were separated by heavily barred gates. The prison-house was secluded from all human intercourse. Every evening, as soon as dusk fell, dozens of owls of all sizes flew around the buildings, hooting and screeching, and scared us children. The hid-

ing place of these owls was the tower of the nearby church. In other respects, likewise, life in this place was disagreeable for us children, and presumably for our parents. The service of my stepfather, which began at five o'clock in the morning and lasted until late in the evening, was very exhausting, coupled with much aggravation. The treatment of the prisoners in those days was cruel. I saw several times young and old men, who were sentenced to extra heavy punishment, subjected to the hideous procedure of being locked in a distorted position. This procedure was as follows: The delinquent had to lie down in his cell on his belly. Then irons were snapped on his wrists and ankles. Then his right hand was locked across his back to his left foot, and his left hand in the same way to his right foot. As if this were not enough, a linen cloth was wrapped tightly, like a rope, around his body and fastened across his chest and arms on his back. Thus tied into a human bundle, the delinquent had to lie on his belly for two hours. Then he was untied, but after a few hours the same procedure began once more.

The howls and groans of the maltreated filled the entire building, and naturally this made a shocking impression upon us children.

In Brauweiler, I began to visit the village school, in the fall of 1844, when I was only four and a half years old. I was admitted at this age as a "volunteer." When we children returned from school, we had to pass thru one of the gates of the prison, which had to be opened by a guard. One day we were rigid with surprise when the guard, opening the door, wore a shining helmet of vast proportions on his head instead of the ordinary tchaco. These first helmets were veritable monsters compared to their successors, and comparatively heavy. We recovered from our surprise and astonishment when the guard growled: "Boys, hurry up and come in, or I'll shut the gate in your faces!"

Life in this institution was not very entertaining for us children. In the main it was spent between a part of the

walls of the prison. Also my stepfather, who was a very severe man, and had plenty to irritate him, became more and more irritable, and this irritability was further augmented by the incipient consumption which seized him. Mother and we children had a good deal to suffer from this. More than once mother had to stop his arm when he maltreated us severely in his unbridled excitement. If beatings are the highest expression of pedagogic wisdom, then I must have become a veritable model man. But I rather think that I became what I am in spite of those beatings.

On the other hand, stepfather was much concerned in our welfare, for in spite of all, he was a good-hearted man. For instance, if he could give us some pleasure on Christmas, New Year's Day or Easter, he did so to the extent that his small means permitted. But these means were very small. Aside from free lodging (two rooms), fuel and light, my stepfather received about eight Prussian dollars in wages per month. This had to meet the requirements of five, later of four, human beings, after my youngest brother, a very handsome child and my stepfather's pet, died in the summer of 1845.

Meanwhile my stepfather's disease made rapid advances. After being married only two years, he died on Oct. 19th, 1846. So my mother was a widow for the second time within three years, and we were orphans. This marriage, likewise, did not result in any claims upon the assistance of the state for my mother. Nothing was left to her now but to move to her home town of Wetzlar. In the beginning of November our belongings were once more loaded on a wagon—there were no modern furniture wagons in those days, I suppose—and we started on our journey to Cologne. The weather was nasty. It was cold and rainy. In Cologne our furniture was dumped on the bank of the Rhine, under the open sky, in order to be transported per vessel to Coblenz, and thence once more per wagon up the valley of the Lahn to Wetzlar. When we entered the ship's cabin, about ten o'clock, for

our passage to Coblenz, it was overcrowded with people, and filled with a stifling tobacco smoke. As nobody made room for us, we two boys, dead tired as we were, laid down close to the door on the floor and slept as only tired children can sleep. On the fifth or sixth day at last we arrived in Wetzlar, where my grandmother and four married relatives of my mother—three sisters and one brother—were still living at that time.

Here we passed our real youth. Wetzlar, a small and romantically situated town, possessed an excellent public school at that time. At first we two boys were sent to the paupers' school, which was situated in a large building, the German House, belonging then to the Knights of the German Order. In the large ante-room of this building, to the left, stands the one-story building in which Charlotte Buff, the heroine of Goethe's "Werther," lived. As accident would have it, I stayed over night several times in this house, when one of my cousins became guide for the Charlotte-Buff-room. I still remember the celebration of the hundredth birthday of Goethe in 1849, which took place on the Wildbach Well, where Goethe's linden tree is standing. The well has been called the Goethe-Well since that time. Ten years later I attended the celebration of Schiller's hundredth birthday in the city theater of Salzburg.

After several years the paupers' school was amalgamated with the public school, and we were then called "free pupils"; the girls were then assigned to the German House as a school house.

I got along fairly well with the school and with my teachers, but I could not get along with the organist, who did not like me. I belonged to the best pupils, and this induced our geometry teacher, a nice little man, to initiate me and two comrades into the secrets of mathematics. We learned to calculate with logarithms. Aside from arithmetic and geometry, my favorite studies were history and geography. Religion, for which I had no liking—my mother, who was an enlightened and free-thinking woman, did not bother us with this at home—I

learned only because I had to do so. I was in the lead also in this study, but this did not prevent me from sometimes giving answers, especially in the rehearsal of the catechism by the superior pastor, which did not fit into his theology, and brought me many a scolding sermon.

For the rest our superior pastor was a very honorable man, and by no means over-pious. But, nevertheless, he became the victim of a practical joke one night. At that time a custom prevailed in Wetzlar, which may still prevail there, to expose the geese killed late in the fall or in the winter to a night of frost. This is said to improve the taste of the roast. So the goose is hung up at a respectful height, as a rule, in front of a window. This was also done at the house of the superior pastor. But next morning the goose had disappeared. In its stead was found, hung up on the door bell, the clean-picked skeleton of the goose. Attached to it was a note, with the following inscription: "Good morning, brother-in-law! Yesterday I was fat, to-day I am lean."

All Wetzlar laughed, for such incidents are quickly circulated in a small town. I assume that even the superior pastor laughed.

Altho studious and always among those at the head in achievements, I was also the instigator of most of the pranks, which are inevitable and a matter of fact among boys who have a good deal of freedom of action. This gave me a bad "moral" reputation. Our organist especially credited me with such a character. He was in charge of the Department of the Exterior, that is, he had to punish the boys for all the pranks which were reported at school. How it was that he performed this function instead of the rector, I don't know. Perhaps his long service, or his big body, or a custom, predestined him for this. He understood the art of wielding the rod with inimitable grace and with great effect. It did not hurt so much when he struck us in the face right and left with

his fat little hands, making the room ring. Even in such a moment I could not help admiring those hands.

Our principal places of amusement were the immediate environment of the cathedral, the old building of the Chamber of Justice, whose large rooms served for years as a storage vault for some saloon-keeper, the large ruin of the castle of Kalsmut, outside of the city, the rocky hills on the road to Garbenheim, which place likewise has memories of Goethe. We used to build our "fortress" on the rocky ledges. Then there was the old town-wall, and above all, the Lookout of Garbenheim, situated upon a high plateau, from which we undertook our roving expeditions into the potato-fields in the fall, in order to fetch potatoes for roasting. One day we had to sustain a siege of several hours by some farmer's family, but finally we repulsed them victoriously. Our ramblings thru forest and field, especially during vacation time, were innumerable.

One of our favorite pastimes in summer and fall was the "picking" of fruit, as we called it, for the environment of Wetzlar was rich in fruit. The Lahn, quite a respectable little river, gave us the desired opportunity for bathing in summer and for skating in winter. On one such occasion it happened that my brother broke thru a hole covered by thin ice, close by my side, and he would undoubtedly have gotten under the ice and drowned, if he had not involuntarily extended his arms and held himself above water. A comrade and myself pulled him out of the water and carried him to a slab of rock on the road to Garbenheim. Here he had to take off his clothes, which we dried in the unusually warm February sun. It was not until after some months that mother learned of this accident to her second son. We managed to conceal it by cleaning his clothes ourselves, and also patching them as well as possible in order to hide the torn portions from mother's eyes.

The following year I helped to save the life of one of my cousins, who was a few years older than I, under similar circumstances. Being an excellent skater, he

came down the Lahn one day at a great speed, and made straight for a weir. On account of the shining mirror of ice he did not see that a broad strip of open water stretched out in front of the weir. In a great fright I called out to him to turn back. He obeyed instantly. But it was already too late. When he described a circle, in order to turn aside, he broke thru. Convulsively he clutched the ice, but as soon as he made an attempt to lift one leg up on to the ice, it broke off in a new place. Quickly I tore off my long woolen worsted shawl, such as were worn everywhere at that time, took another shawl from some comrade, tied them both together and threw one end to my cousin. He was fortunate enough to grasp it. Gradually we pulled him up on the solid ice. He was saved.

My bad reputation gradually became so well established in the opinion of our organist, that he took it for granted that I was involved in every deviltry that took place. If I tried to intercede in favor of some comrade, and protect him against unjust punishment, I was mercilessly considered as a participant in his alleged crime, and included in the punishment, even tho I had not been concerned in the matter at all. In later years, in my party activity, my tendency to be just at any price, has been dubbed my "justice fad." It is true that my organist frequently had good cause to pass sentence upon me. For instance, one day, obeying the dark impulse to be "famous," I engraved into the red sandstone steps in front of the cathedral my full name, place and date of birth, in lapidary letters. A large nail served me as a chisel and a stone as a hammer. Of course, the evil deed was discovered by everybody going to church on the following Sunday. My organist also noticed it. Final result: Several clouts on the ear and stay in school three times after closing. This meant that I had to spend the time between the closing of school in the forenoon until its re-opening in the afternoon in the "carcer," so that I could not go home until the second closing, and thus lost my dinner. Fortunately the organist had a soft-

hearted daughter. She observed me while she was out walking with her lover, as I stood at the window of the carcer on the second afternoon, engaged in philosophical reflections about the freedom of the sparrows, that were noisily disporting themselves in a crowd all over the school-yard. Touched by my fate, she at once obtained a full pardon for me from her father, and came herself to announce my freedom and dismiss me from my prison. This was the first and only pardon which I ever received in my life. If the Eternal Feminine had more frequently had my fate to decide, I should have been better off many a time.

However, the day of awakening at last came also for me, when I said to myself that it was time to begin being a decent fellow. This process came about in the following manner. The son of the major of the batallion of scouts garrisoned in Wetzlar, Moritz von G., had been my chum in many a prank. Now the school examination came along. The only man who attended it as a listener was Major von G., a giant in stature. The examination was over, and the promotion cards were read. Strange to say, the credits were apportioned exclusively on the ground of moral conduct. All the pupils of our class had already received their marks, only Moritz von G. and myself were left. We were the only ones to receive the mark "five," the lowest of all. Father major did not move a muscle of his face, but I have reason to assume that Moritz had an interesting time at home. I never saw him again after that day, for he was sent to the military academy immediately afterwards. I learned, during the nineties, that he held a high military position in K. So his "bad boy" nature had not hurt him any more than it had me. From that hour I became "decent," that is, I never did any more things that required punishment. As a consequence, I received mark "three" at the following examination, and at the next and last of my examination, I received a "one." If the sentiment of the class had been consulted at that time, I would also have received one of the prizes. When the rector was about

to mention the name of the second winner, the whole class shouted my name. But the rector was of the opinion that, while I had really improved wonderfully, I had not risen to the dignity of a prize winner. So I entered life without a prize.

Our material conditions could not be ameliorated in Wetzlar. My mother could not claim any pension. The only assistance which she managed to collect later on from the state, consisted of 15 silver "groshen" (15 cents) per month and head for us two boys. This money had been granted to her, because she had applied for our admission to the military orphanage at Potsdam, in spite of the advice of her first husband. It was penury that compelled her to do so. She had meanwhile inherited from her late mother five or six lots of land, which were scattered in various sections around Wetzlar. Under the pressure of want she had sold several of them, in order to live. But these sales cost her a good deal of struggle. All her efforts were directed toward the end of preserving the remaining property for us, in order that we might not be altogether without means in this world. What a mother can sacrifice for her child, I have experienced in my own case. For several years my mother had sewed white military leather gloves for her brother-in-law, a glove maker, at the rate of 20 pennies per pair. But she could not finish more than one pair per day. This was too little to live on and too much to starve on. But she had to give up even this work after several years of toil, for meanwhile consumption had seized her also, and made it impossible for her to work during the last years of her life. I, being the oldest boy, had to take care of our little household. I had to boil coffee, clean our living room and bedroom, and scrub every Saturday. I had to scour the tin and sheet iron ware, make up our beds, and so forth. This experience stood me in good stead later on, when I was a traveling journeyman and a political prisoner. But later it became also impossible for my

mother to do any cooking, and so each one of us boys went to an aunt for dinner, who had volunteered for this service of love. Then we took turns fetching something to eat for mother from several better situated families. In order to improve our condition somewhat, I decided to take a job in a bowling alley. After the closing of school, I went to set up bowling pins in a beer garden. As a rule, I came home about ten o'clock P. M. from this work, and on Sundays still later. But the continual bending forward gave me sharp pains in my back, so that I came home groaning every night. I had to give up this work. Another occupation, which both of us boys took up in the fall, was the picking up of potatoes at harvest time in the fields of one of our aunts. It was not a pleasant job, when it was misty, wet and cold, and we had to work in the potato fields from seven in the morning until dark. Our reward was a large sack of potatoes for winter. Besides we received every morning, before starting out for the fields, a large piece of prune-cake, which both of us loved passionately.

When I was thirteen and my brother twelve years old, we received word from the military orphanage that my brother could enter the institute. I had been declared too weak, after having been examined by a physician. But now my mother lost her courage. She felt her end approaching, and so she did not care to take the responsibility of delivering my brother over to nine years of military service in exchange for two years of military education. "If you want to be soldiers, you may go voluntarily later on; I am not going to take the responsibility," she said to us. So my brother did not enter the military orphanage, which house at that time did not care to consider me at all, to my regret.

My vivid interest as a child was awakened by the movement of the years 1848 and 1849. The majority of the inhabitants of Wetzlar were in favor of a republic, in conformity with the traditions of the town. This sentiment was also transmitted to the school children. In our disputations concerning our political views, it was dis-

covered that only one of my comrades and myself were monarchists. For this we were soundly thrashed. So, if my political opponents resent my "anti-patriotic" sentiments, because, in their opinion, a monarchy is identical with the fatherland, they may see from the above fact, to their undoubted satisfaction, that I already suffered for the fatherland at a time when their fathers and grandfathers, in the Mayday of their innocence, belonged to the anti-patriots. In the Rhineland, at least, the greater portion of the people had republican sentiments at that time.

For my mother, that period carried a little entertainment into the monotony of her daily life, inasmuch as the battallion of the 25th infantry regiment, to which my father had belonged, remained for a short time in Wetzlar, on its return march, I think, from the campaign in Baden. In it still served some petty-officers who had been acquainted with my mother. These men now visited us. At their request my mother consented to run a lunch room for them. But I doubt that she profited much by it. One day I overheard two of her guests conversing while walking downstairs. They praised her cooking, but wondered how she managed to supply it so cheaply.

We boys found much amusement in the peasants' revolts that took place in the Wetzlar district during those years. The peasants then still had to comply with sundry obligations handed down from feudalism. Since everybody was now raving about Liberty and Equality, they, too, wanted to rid themselves of their burdens. They gathered by the thousands, and marched to Braunsfels, in front of the castle of the prince of Solms-Braunsfels. As a rule, a large black and white flag was carried at the head of the parade, in token of the fact that people might agree to be Prussian, but by no means Braunfelsian. A part of the crowd carried shotguns of various calibers, but the large majority had scythes, pitchforks, axes, etc. Behind the paraders, who marched several times, and who always managed things without blood-

shed, marched, as a rule, the garrison of Wetzlar, for the purpose of protecting the prince, or they anticipated the paraders by marching out ahead of them. Very amusing anecdotes circulated in Wetzlar concerning the meeting of the leading peasants with the prince. For a long time the people of Wetzlar remained in the opposition. When, in 1849 or 1850, the prince of Prussia, who later became Emperor William the First, came to Wetzlar in the company of General von Hirschfeld, who was then commanding the 8th Rhenish army corps, for the purpose of inspecting the garrison, his wagon was pelted with mud in front of the town gate. One of my relatives, who permitted himself to be carried away to such an extent on a certain occasion that he rang the town bell in token of revolt, was sentenced to three years in the penitentiary. For the burgher's militia, which held forth also in Wetzlar during those years of unrest, I had only contempt, although several of my relatives belonged to it. I found fault with their lack of military bearing during their exercises. When the reaction gained headway, this militia disappeared.

The year 1853 made orphans of my brother and myself. In the beginning of June, my mother died. She awaited her death heroically. When she felt her last hour approaching in the afternoon of her dying day, she asked us to call her sisters. She did not give us any reasons for this. When her sisters came, we were sent out of the room. For hours we sat sadly on the stairway and waited for developments. Finally her sisters came out of the room, at about seven o'clock in the evening, and informed us that mother had just died. On the same evening we had to pack our belongings and follow our aunts, without being allowed to take a last look at our dead mother. The poor woman had seen but few good days in her married and widowed life. Nevertheless she had always been bright and hopeful. Within three years she had lost two husbands, two children—my youngest

brother, and a sister who was born before me, and whom I had never known. With us two boys mother had to pass thru several severe spells of sickness. In 1848 I was seized by a nervous fever, and for weeks I hung between life and death. A few years later I suffered from a spell of hip disease, but escaped with straight limbs. My brother, at the age of nine, while playing in a barn, fell from the top rung of a ladder to the thrashing floor and sustained a severe scalp wound and a concussion of the brain. He, too, barely escaped with his life. My mother herself suffered nearly seven years from consumption. More tribulation and sorrow can hardly be the lot of a mother.

I now came into the care of an aunt, who was hereditary tenant of a water mill in Wetzlar. My brother was taken in charge by another aunt, whose husband was a baker. I had to give a hand in the work of the mill. I took a particular pleasure in carrying flour to the farmers in the country or getting grain from them with the two donkeys belonging to my aunt. I preferred to have only a little grain as a return freight, because then I could ride to town on one of the donkeys. Our black donkey, a patient animal, used to permit this, but our grey donkey was young and fiery and had different ideas about this. Evidently he had some sort of caste-consciousness, for he would not carry anything but his accustomed burden. But when I, nevertheless, took a seat on his back one day, he at once started out on a trot, stuck his head between his forelegs and kicked his hindlegs vigorously into the air. Before I expected it, I flew in a graceful curve into the street ditch. Luckily I did not get hurt. He had accomplished his purpose, and from that time on I left him alone.

Aside from the two donkeys, my aunt also had a horse, several cows, a number of hogs and several dozens of chickens. And since she also carried on farming, we did not lack work, altho she employed a miller's helper and a servant girl, in addition to her son. If the helper did not have the time, I had to curry the donkeys and the

horse, and sometimes I had to take the horse to the swimming pond. The care of the chicken yard was wholly in my hands. I had to feed the chickens, gather the eggs from the nests or wherever they might have been laid, and clean the stable. With such occupations I passed my time until Easter of 1854. Then I graduated from school, an event which I did not anticipate with much pleasure. I should have preferred to stay in school.





Years of Apprenticeship and Wandering.

“What business are you going to take up?” was the question which my guardian, an uncle of mine, put to me one day. “I should like to study mining!” “Have you any money for studying?” This question put an end to my illusions.

That I wished to study mining was due to the fact that iron ore mining had risen to great importance in the Wetzlar district after the Lahn had been made navigable as far as this town in the beginning of the fifties. Until then the iron ores had lain in the tunnels almost worthless, because the high cost of transportation made the exploitation of these ores rather unprofitable. Since the study of mining was out of the question, I decided to become a wood-turner. I declined the offer of a tin-smith to become his apprentice, for the man was not sympathetic to me, and had the reputation of being a drinker. I became a wood-turner simply because I had reason to assume that the husband of a friend of my mother, who was a master wood-turner and enjoyed the reputation of a capable man, would accept me as an apprentice. This came true. The reason which he gave for accepting me was peculiar. He said that he had heard that I had passed my religious examination well on the occasion of my confirmation in church. For this reason he assumed that I would be a useful boy in other respects. Now it is true that I was not a dull boy, but I should be lying if I were to claim that I became an artist in wood-turning. There were some artists in that line, and my master was one of them, but in spite of all efforts I did not get beyond mediocrity. Nevertheless, three years later, I received the first mark for my journeyman’s work.

My physical ability was lessened by my bodily weakness. I was an uncommonly weak boy, and insufficient nourishment no doubt contributed to this result. For

many years our supper consisted of only a piece of bread of moderate size, upon which some jam or butter had been spread thinly. If we complained that we were still hungry, which we did every day, our mother replied regularly: "The sack must be tied sometimes before it is full." She could not do any better. Under these circumstances it was natural that we should clandestinely cut off more bread, whenever we had an opportunity. But mother would discover this at once and punish us. One day I had once again committed this crime. Altho I had tried hard to imitate the smooth cut of mother, she discovered the deed in the evening. For some reason, unknown to me, her suspicion fell upon my brother, who at once received his drubbing with the broadside of an office-straightedge belonging to the inventory of our late fathers. My brother protested that he was not the guilty party. But my mother thought he was lying and gave him a second beating. Now I wanted to tell her that I had done the deed, but just then it occurred to me that it would be foolish, because my brother already had his drubbing, and I should probably have gotten more. This was the consolation I offered to my brother, when he complained because I had not admitted my guilt. It is easy to understand why my ideal was for years to be able to eat my fill of buttered bread.

My master and his wife were very orderly and respected people. I received full board at the house, and while the food was not good it was very plentiful. My apprenticeship was strict and the hours of labor long. It began at five o'clock in the morning and lasted till seven o'clock in the evening, without a pause. From the turning bench we went to meals, and from meals to the turning bench. Immediately after rising in the morning I had to fetch four times two buckets of water for my master's wife from a well a distance of about five minutes. For this I received 14 pennies per week. This was my pocket-money during my time of apprenticeship. I was rarely permitted to go out during the week, and hardly at all in the evenings, and then only by special permission. It was

the same on Sundays, which was our principal business day, because then the farmers came to town and bought their tobacco, pipes and other things, or had their repairs made. In the later part of the afternoon, or in the evening I was then permitted to go out for two or three hours. In this respect I was probably the most strictly-kept apprentice in Wetzlar. Often I cried with anger when I saw friends and comrades out for a walk on a fine Sunday, while I had to stand in the shop, wait for customers and clean the dirty pipes of the farmers. I had permission, however, to go to church on Sunday forenoon, after I had given up going to Sunday school. But this did not suit me. So I availed myself of the opportunity to play truant. But in order to be sure, and be safe against surprises, I always found out what hymn was to be sung and which one of the pastors preached. Nevertheless, fate overtook me one Sunday. The master asked me at supper whether I had been in church. I replied boldly: "Yes." He continued his questions. "What hymn was sung?" I gave the number of the hymn, but discovered, to my discomfiture, that the two daughters, who were seated at the table, could hardly keep from laughing. And when I also gave a wrong answer to his third question, who the preacher was, they burst into a merry laugh. I had been trapped. I had gone to the church door too early, before the organist had posted the new number of the hymn, and I had been misinformed concerning the name of the preacher. The master said, dryly, that I apparently did not care to go to church, and that I could stay at home in the future. So I lost a considerable portion of my freedom. From then on I devoted myself with so much greater zeal to the reading of books, which I perused at random, most of them being novels, of course. Even in school I had used my privileged position in my relation with comrades, whom I helped in the solution of problems, or whom I permitted to copy from me, for the purpose of borrowing books from them. In this way I managed to read "Robinson Crusoe" and "Uncle Tom's Cabin." Now, I spent my scanty pennies for books from

a circulating library. One of my favorite authors was Hackländer, whose "Soldier's Life in Times of Peace," succeeded in dampening my military enthusiasm a good deal. I also read Walter Scott, the historical novels of Ferdinand Stolle, Louise Mühlbach and others. We had saved a few historical books from the bequest of our fathers. Among these was one book which contained a very excellent sketch of the history of Greece and Rome. I have forgotten the name of the author. There were, furthermore, some books on Prussian history, officially stamped, of course, whose contents I had memorized so well that I could recite all dates concerning the princes of Brandenburg-Prussia, famous generals, days of battles, etc., without difficulty. Impatiently I waited for the end of my apprenticeship. I had a longing to see the whole world. But things did not move as fast as I desired. On the same day, on which my apprenticeship was completed, my master died, likewise of consumption, which was then epidemic in Wetzlar. Thus I got into the peculiar situation of becoming business manager on the same day on which I became a journeyman. There was no other journeyman, neither was there a son who could have continued the business. Consequently, my master's wife decided to sell out gradually and give up the business. I would have gone thru the fire for her, for she was an unusually pretty and active woman for her age, and always treated me well. Now I demonstrated my devotion for her by working beyond my strength. From May to August I rose with the sun and worked till nine o'clock P. M. and later. At the end of January, 1858, the business had been closed up, and I prepared for my wandering tour. When I took leave of my master's wife, she gave me a Prussian dollar, in addition to the wages due. On February 1, I started on foot in a heavy snowstorm. My brother, who was learning to be a joiner, accompanied me for about an hour. When we said good-bye, he broke into a flood of tears, an emotion which I had never noticed in him. It was the last time that I was destined to see him. In the summer of 1859, I received news that

he had succumbed to a grave attack of inflammatory rheumatism within three days. So I was the last of my family.

My next stopping place was Frankfort-on-Main. From the station of Langgöns, I availed myself of the railroad, and so I arrived in Frankfort on the evening of the same day. I stayed in the lodging house, "Prince Carl." I did not care as yet to accept a job, and so I rode, two days later, to Heidelberg by rail. Instead of glass windows, the train in which I rode had bergant curtains, which could be drawn. In those days, passports were compulsory. Journeymen had to carry a so-called wander book, in which the routes passed by them had to be entered by the police. Those who had no such "visum" were punished. In many cities, among them also Heidelberg, the additional rule was enforced that the journeymen had to go to police headquarters between 8 and 9 A. M., in order to be examined by a physician, especially for infectious skin diseases. Whoever missed the official hour, had to defer his departure to the next day, and did not get his "visum." This happened to me, because I did not know the rule, and came too late to the police station. From Heidelberg I wandered on foot to Mannheim, and thence to Speier, where I found work. The treatment was good and the food likewise, also plentiful, but I had to sleep in the workshop, in one corner of which a bed had been put up. The same fate befell me also in Freiburg, in the Breisgau. At that time the custom still prevailed in the handicrafts that the journeymen received board and lodging from their master, and the lodging was often miserable. The wages were also low, amounting to about 2 marks per week in Speier. When I complained about this, the master said that he had not received any more either in his first position as a journeyman. That may have been about fifteen years earlier. As soon as spring came, I could not stand it any longer in the workshop. In the beginning of April I wandered off once more. I marched thru the Palatinate by way of Landau to Germersheim, and back across the Rhine to Karlsruhe, and then up country by way of

Baden-Baden, Offenburg, Lahr to Freiburg, in the Breisgau, where I took work once more. In that spring the demand for journeymen tailors were exceedingly large. And as I wandered, well dressed and corresponded in my exterior to the conception that people generally have of a tailor, I was often accosted by master tailors in front of the town gate, because they mistook me for an object of their exploitation. Several of them did not want to believe that I was not a tailor, others excused themselves for having mistaken me for one, "because I looked just like a tailor."

In Freiburg, in Breisgau, I passed a very agreeable summer. Freiburg is, by location, one of the most beautiful cities of Germany. Its woods are charming, the hill of the castle is a magnificent piece of nature, and dozens of delightfully situated villages tempt one to make excursions into the country. But what I missed was a suitable companionship of congenial young men. In those days no community of fellow craftsmen existed. The guilds had been dissolved, and no new trade organizations existed so far. Nor did any political clubs exist that a workingman could have joined. The reactionaries were on top everywhere in Germany. For mere pleasure clubs I had neither liking nor money. But I happened to hear of the existence of a Catholic journeymen's club, which had its own clubhouse on Carl's Square. Having ascertained that men of other denominations were also admitted by this club, I joined it, altho I was a Protestant at that time.

Later, as long as I stayed in southern Germany and Austria, I belonged to the Catholic journeymen's club in Freiburg and Salzburg, and have not regretted it. In those days no fight between church and state had begun in Germany. Consequently, men of other denominations were treated very tolerantly in those clubs. The president of the club was always a priest. The president of the Freiburg club was professor Alban Stolz, who later became very prominent in the "Kulturkampf," the fight of Prussia against the Vatican. The representative of the members

was the Senior Journeyman elected by the membership, who was the most important man after the president. Lectures were given from time to time, and instruction was supplied in various lines, for instance, in French. So the clubs were a sort of educational societies. What development they took later on, I cannot say. There were only Catholic newspapers in the clubroom, but they supplied news of the world's happenings. That was the main thing for me, for I was greatly interested in politics, even during my last school years.

My need of companionship with ambitious young men of my own age also found satisfaction here. A peculiar element of the club were the chaplains, who were young and full of life, and glad to associate with congenial spirits of the same age. I have spent some very enjoyable evenings with such young chaplains. One such evening I passed in Munich, when visiting the journeymen's clubhouse on my return trip from Salzburg in the beginning of March, 1860. When a member of the journeymen's club left the town, he received a wander book, which identified him in the journeymen's clubs and with the clergymen, in case he should want to ask them for assistance. I am still in possession of such a book, on the first page of which Saint Josef, with the Christ child on his arm, is painted. Saint Josef is the patron saint of the journeymen's clubs. I became acquainted with its founder, the priest Kolping, then in Cologne, who, if I am not mistaken, was himself a shoemaker in his young days, in Freiburg, in Breisgau, where he gave a lecture one day.

In September, I felt impelled to wander further on. I left Freiburg and marched in the most delightful weather thru the Hell Valley across the Black Forest to Neustadt, Donaueschingen and Schaffhausen. It was a wonderful view that presented itself to me in those days, when a mighty comet, that of Donati, shone in the heavens even in the afternoon, and displayed a rare splendor and a tail of unusual length. At that time the Black Forest still stood out in its whole majesty and beauty. In later de-

cedes the ax and the saw felled and thinned out large areas of the most magnificent timber. Modern development demanded it. I was not permitted to stay in Switzerland. Sojourn in Switzerland was forbidden to the Prussian journeymen by their government. For the Neuenburg feud had been ended only the previous year in favor of the Prussian government. Besides, the journeymen might have assimilated republican ideas, and this had to be prevented in the interest of law and order. When, in the spring of 1858, I asked for permission at the German Embassy, to stay in Switzerland, I met with a refusal and a reference to the existing prohibition.

So I wandered along the Swiss shore to Constanz, crossed Lake Boden by boat to Friedrichshafen, and became seasick on account of the storm. From Friedrichshafen, I went on foot to Munich by way of Ravensburg, Biberach, Ulm and Augsburg. In Württemberg, the custom prevailed at that time, to grant to the traveling journeyman a so-called town gift, which, as a rule, consisted of 6 Kreuzers, in order to induce them not to beg. I conscientiously collected this gift everywhere. On leaving Ulm, I was joined by a heavy set Tyrolean, who looked like a butcher, but who was a tailor. Instead of the ordinary journeyman's pack he carried a military knapsack on his back, which gave him a queer look, especially since he also wore a linen blouse. As we were short of money, and begging was not considered a disgrace for a journeyman, we rather frequently begged our way thru the villages which we passed. One noon we had adopted a strategic plan in a certain village. "You take the right side, I take the left one!" was the agreement. When I came to a house and asked for something, the daughter gave me a handout and warned me to be careful, because a policeman was near by. I took this warning to heart, and did not beg any more. But when I saw outside of the village, on the other side of the street, a big building, which looked as tho its inhabitants could afford to assist two journeymen, I could not resist the temptation, and walked up to it. Fortunately I looked

at the building once more from the outside, before I walked up the six or seven stone steps, and discovered, to my surprise, a sign above the door with the inscription: "Royal Bavarian Field Police Station." Thereupon I passed by reverently, and lay down in a meadow outside of the village in the bright sunshine, in order to wait for my traveling companion. At last he came along, and marched directly up to the house, which lay on his side of the street. Without looking at it from the outside, he walked up the steps and went in. I confess I was seized with a laughing fit at that moment. After some seconds, the Tyrolean came out of the house flying, jumped with one mighty leap over all the steps, and ran as fast as his legs could carry him. When I asked him, laughingly, what had happened, he related to me that he had gone straight to the kitchen, whence a very savory smell had emanated; but there a field policeman was standing with his sleeves rolled up, and had asked him gruffly what he wanted. He had grasped the situation at once, and ran off immediately.

On the following afternoon we arrived in Dachau. Here my traveling companion suggested to me that we should both make the round of the master tailors. He thought I might risk that, because everybody took me for a tailor. I remark, by the way, that such a round of masters of one's trade netted better gifts than ordinary begging. No sooner said than done. Cautiously enough, I permitted the Tyrolean to take the lead. That this was wisely done, became evident immediately. We went up the steps of one house and rang the bell till the master came out. As soon as the Tyrolean said: "Two traveling tailors ask for a gift," the master replied: "Very glad, I can employ both of you right now; let me have your wander books." After a master had a man's wander book in his hands, the slave's chain was welded, and he had to begin work. While the Tyrolean was hesitatingly pulling his wander book out of his coat pocket, I faced right about, leaped downstairs in long jumps, and left the

town. I regretted losing the companionship of the Tyrolean, for he was a good comrade and pleasant associate.

At that time a straight highway, studded on both sides with spreading poplars, led from Dachau to Munich. The vista of the highway was completed by the steeples of the Woman's Church in Munich, called the "boot jack," by Heinrich Heine, which seemed to stand at the end of the several miles of highway. I was plodding on moodily, when a farmer with a wicker wagon came up behind me, evidently bound for Munich. The contents of the wagon were covered with a large sheet. The distance was still long, and it was late in the afternoon. I asked him, politely, whether he would permit me to take a seat in the wagon. He replied, in his Bavarian German, which I did not understand at that time, but I interpreted his words as meaning consent. So I climbed on the wagon, and made myself comfortable on the sheet. The farmer looked around several times, and called out something to me, but I did not catch that either. At last we pulled into Munich. The wagon stopped in front of a store near Carl's Gate. I jumped down, lifted my hat, and thanked him politely for the free ride. At the same time he had thrown back the sheet, and exposed a large clump of several pounds of butter clinging to it. Without knowing it, I had trampled with my feet in a keg of butter which had been covered by the sheet. As soon as I saw the disaster that I had worked, I became red in the face, asked him his pardon, and declared myself ready to make good the damage. At the same instant two girls broke into a peal of laughter. They had been looking out of a first-story window and observed the spectacle. This made me still more embarrassed. But the farmer helped me quickly out of my quandary by roughly declining my offer of damages, with the words: "Get along with you; you haven't anything yourself!" I did not wait for him to repeat his advice. With a few steps I had turned the corner of the Neuhauser Street. Whenever I go to Carl's Gate, in Munich, I am reminded of this scene.

I arrived in Munich on the day after the conclusion of

the seven hundredth anniversary of the foundation of the city, which had lasted for a whole week, and which was immediately followed by the October festivities. The entire population was still in high feather, and it was very lively in the lodging house on Rosenstreet, where the flavor of guild mannerisms was still strongly felt. I was received joyously, and remained in Munich for a whole week, where I liked it exceedingly well. But no matter how much my colleagues and myself tried to obtain work for me, it was in vain. All jobs were taken. So I decided to wander to Regensburg. In the company of another man, who likewise wanted to go there, I went to the Isar River, in order to see whether we could ride on a raft as far as Landshut. We had been told that we might ride free of charge, if we would be willing to lend a hand in rowing the raft, and that we could also get our board in that way. The first information was correct, the second was not. The Isar River, at that time, was low of water and had many turns. My traveling companion, who was from Treves, and who steered at the bow while I steered at the stern, sometimes handled his oar very clumsily, and so we ran aground on the sands several times, whereupon the owner of the raft became very angry, and showered a flood of vilification upon us. During one of my spells of rest, I engaged in a political conversation with the passengers, who were farmers, with the exception of one priest, and I became so excited over it that the owner of the raft threatened to throw "the damned Prussian" into the river, if I did not stop arguing. I kept still, for I did not care to get acquainted with the water of the Isar in October. When we arrived in Mosburg, toward evening, within a few hours from Landshut, we sneaked away. We had had enough of this ride.

At our night's lodging, in the shape of a village inn, which we reached late at night, hailed with the barking of furious dogs, all rooms were overcrowded with guests, who wanted to be at the fair in Landshut next morning. We had to find a place in a barn, where several dozen men and women were already resting pell-mell. We had

barely dozed off, shivering with cold, when we were awakened by a noise. One of the women, who was tucked away in the straw, had noticed her husband bestowing some rude caresses on a servant girl who was carrying a lantern and showing him the way to the barn. The woman gave him a lecture in the genuine Bavarian dialect, which stirred up all the sleepers, and called forth great laughter. In the morning it was still pitch dark, when we groped for an exit from the barn, and found out that we two, who had lain down on top of a pile of hay, had slid down on opposite sides during our sleep.

In Regensburg, I found a job, together with a colleague who had come from Breslau. We had been warned not to take this job, because the master was said to be the greatest ruffian in Bavaria. But that did not scare me.

I did not meet with much in Regensburg worth telling. In the circle of our professional comrades with whom I congregated, there was no one, with the exception of the Breslauer, who had any higher intellectual wants. Whoever drank most, was most prominent. So we two generally went to the theater on Sunday evenings, taking seats in the highest gallery, at 9 kreuzers per seat. But one day we wanted to see a play also on a week day. This, however, was impracticable, because the close of our working time coincided with the beginning of the play. So we coaxed our cook to serve supper half an hour earlier, and told her we would set the clock in the room half an hour ahead. In those days the masters in southern Germany and Austria always served a warm supper. After the meal, we dressed quickly, and ran to the theater. At the instant when we entered from one side, the master and his wife entered from the other, and just then the clock on a neighboring church struck seven. Our working time would have been up only then. We had been found out. To our surprise, the master did not say anything to us next day, but he said to the cook: "Say, Katy, be on your guard against those Prussians; they set the clock half an hour ahead last evening."

From Regensburg, I made a visit to Walhalla, which

offers a wide view across the plains from the top of the mountain. Louis the First of Bavaria, called the "German," was the builder of the Walhalla, in which the bust of Luther was missing at that time from among those placed on exhibition there.

The winter of 1858 to 1859 was very long and hard. A heavy frost began as early as the middle of November. A quarrel with my master induced me to start out on the road on the first of February, in spite of cold and snow. The Breslauer joined me. We marched first to Munich, where we tried once more for work, but vainly. Then we marched on by way of Rosenheim to Kufenstein. Our entry into Austria worried us some. At that time every journeyman, who wanted to travel across the frontier, had to show five florin of traveling money. We did not have that sum. So we conceived the idea of traveling by rail from the last Bavarian station to Kufstein. In order to look as much as possible like gentlemen, we cleaned our shoes and clothes very carefully and put on a white collar. Our trick had the desired result. Our neat exterior, and the fact that we arrived by rail, deceived the field police. They let us pass without objection. Our trip on foot thru Tyrol proceeded amid great cold and over snow three feet high. The cold and the snow drove the chamois down from the mountains. We could hear their calls at dusk, while we were marching along. We were very much surprised over the fact that we received so much money on our begging excursions, mainly copper coins of the size of our present two mark piece. But when we paid our little bill next morning, we had to cover half the table of the inn with these copper coins. It turned out that they would be valueless in a few weeks, because the Austrian government had issued new coins. So the riddle of that great liberality was solved. People were glad to get rid of the depreciated coins.

At last, after a lapse of several days, we marched by way of Reichenhall directly to Salzburg, which we reached on a certain afternoon while the sun was shining beautifully. We stood rooted to the spot when, after the

march around a small hill, the Monk's Hill, we saw the city with its many churches and its Italian architecture before us.

What seemed like a riddle to me in after life, was that I never contracted any serious disease on all these marches, altho I was often drenched to the skin and froze dismally. My clothes were by no means adapted to such hardships, woolen underwear was an unknown luxury, and an umbrella would have been an object of jeers and taunts for a wandering journeyman. Often I slipped in the morning into clothes that were still damp from the previous day's wetting, and that experienced the same fate on the following day. Youth overcomes much.

In Salzburg, I found work, while my traveling companion, assisted bountifully by the remainder of my money, continued his march to Vienna. In Salzburg, I remained until the end of February, 1860. Salzburg was one of the most beautiful cities of Germany, for at that time it still belonged to Germany; but it has the reputation of having many rainy days in summer time. An exception was the summer of 1859, which must be called wonderful. But that summer was also a war summer. The war between Austria, on the one side, and Italy and France on the other, had broken out in northern Italy. This rendered life in Salzburg especially interesting, inasmuch as masses of soldiers of all kinds and nationalities were marching, amid songs and cheers, to southern Tyrol. A few months later the poor fellows came back sadly, and beaten, followed by hundreds of wagons with wounded and footsore men. But at first they were full of joyful confidence in their coming victory. I was so excited over the political events that, on Sundays, I did not leave the Tomaselli Café until I had read nearly all the newspapers, for I had neither the time nor the money to do so on other days. A Prussian in those days had a hard time in Austria. That Prussia hesitated to come to the assistance of Austria, was considered treason by the Austrians. As a good Prussian, which I still was at that time, I attempted to defend the

Prussian policy, but had disagreeable experiences in so doing. More than once I had to leave the table of the inn, if I did not wish to get a beating. But when the volunteer Tyrolean scouts arrived from Vienna, Lower and Upper Austria and opened up a recruiting office in Salzburg, the lust of adventure seized me. With another friend, a native of Ulm, I presented myself for enlistment. But we were told that they had no use for strangers, and that only Tyroleans would be accepted. Not being permitted here to take part in the fun, I decided to report at home as a volunteer, when I heard that Prussia was mobilizing its troops. I wrote immediately to my guardian to send me a few dollars for traveling expenses. After a while the money actually arrived, six Prussian dollars, but then I did not need the traveling expenses any more, for in the meantime peace had been concluded in Villafranca. The war was over. However, the money came handy when I traveled to Wetzlar in the spring.

Wages were low also in Salzburg, as they were everywhere in the wood-turning business. It was hard to save money under these circumstances. Late in the fall, I had bought my first winter coat, on the instalment plan, and as a conscientious man, I not only saved, I starved myself for the purpose of being able to pay the weekly instalments. In addition to this I was oppressed by a great care. Work was slack, and I, being the youngest, feared that I would be discharged from the shop after New Year's Day. The master's wife had heard of this from my colleague. When I presented my best New Year's wishes to her and to the master, she gave me the comforting assurance that I could stay at my job until the time of my departure for home. This was a great relief to me. Involuntarily I thought of the New Year's reception accorded the preceding year to the Austrian ambassador, Baron von Hübner, when he attended the congratulation exercises at the Tuileries. The address of Napoleon to Hübner on that occasion had been considered the tocsin of the Italian war.

In Salzburg, there existed a club of Catholic journey-

men, with more than 200 members, among whom were not less than 33 Protestants, nearly all of them North Germans. I also joined the club, for the reasons previously given. The president of the club was a certain Dr. Schöpf, professor at the seminary for priests in that city. Schöpf was a young and handsome man, with a very amiable and jovial nature. It was said that he belonged to the Jesuit order. Schöpf knew, of course, that a number of Protestants belonged to the club.

At one of the meetings of the club, he declared frankly that he liked the Protestants best, because they were among the most diligent visitors of the club. Every Sunday evening he gave a well attended lecture, which dealt purely with morality, and which any one could have attended without regard to confession. I became acquainted with Dr. Schöpf, and at his invitation I often visited him on a Sunday afternoon in his home, where we chatted especially about the conditions in Germany and Austria. On such occasions he expressed surprisingly liberal views.

Christmas approached, and the customary Christmas celebration was to be arranged at the club. A small orchestra and a glee club had been formed by members of the club. They were to be a part of the program. In addition, Dr. Schöpf had suggested that other members, representing various German tribes, should recite. I was selected for this purpose as a representative of the Rhineland. I was supposed to recite a poem, entitled "Cigars and Men." The rehearsals took place at Dr. Schöpf's home, where he treated us to beer and bread. At these rehearsals I happened to make a certain mistake every time that I recited the final rhyme, by using a word which fitted into the rhyme, but not into meaning of the poem. Dr. Schöpf warned me pointedly not to make this mistake on the evening of the celebration. The holiday was to be on December 19th, and it arrived at last. An illustrious gathering attended the festivities! The prince bishop of Salzburg, the abbot of Saint Peter, a number of other clergymen, and representatives of the authorities. In due

course my recitation was called for. Shortly before my appearance, Dr. Schöpf enjoined me once more to be careful, and I promised solemnly to do so. But with the powers of fate no eternal compact can be made, and fate marches rapidly. I made the same mistake, whereupon Dr. Schöpf's arm rose up in the background of the hall and shook his fist at me. But the misfortune had happened. I believe that most of the audience did not notice it at all. In other respects the festivities passed off smoothly, and I went home in good spirits, without having sustained any injury to my soul.

In March, Saint Joseph's Day, one of the great holidays of Austria, is celebrated. I have already mentioned that Saint Joseph is the patron saint of the Catholic journeymen's club. A few days before this holiday, Schöpf made an impressive address to the Catholic members of the club, asking them to go to church without exception on that day. He said he knew that young men liked to evade going to church, but this time it would not do to discredit him like that, because the empress, the widow of Emperor Ferdinand, who lived in Salzburg, would surely hear about it, and she did much for the club. In the afternoon, he added smilingly, we would make a pilgrimage to Maria-Plain, a pilgrim's place, whose church is splendidly situated on a hill in the middle of the plain, at least an hour's march from Salzburg. There a keg of beer would be opened at the expense of the club's treasury, and he would pay for a second keg out of his own pocket. He was sure that no one would miss that. Everybody laughed. I believe that events proved him to be right. The pilgrimage took place, we non-Catholics marched cheerfully and without exception, in line with the others, behind the banner which was carried by the senior journeyman. The banner represented a picture of Saint Joseph bearing the Christ child on his arm. After arriving at Maria-Plain, we inspected the richly decorated church. Then we proceeded to drink. The kegs were quickly emptied, and many a man marched back to Salz-

burg with tottering steps. The parade was dissolved. I don't know to this day, how the banner of Saint Joseph got back to Salzburg.

Dr. Schöpf, myself and a Hannoverian, started back home together. When we arrived at the city, he took us to a café, where we played biliards. It was the first and last time in my life that I played this game. Of course, we two lost, but Dr. Schöpf paid the bill.

At the end of February, 1860, I went home. About thirty years later a certain Knight von Pfister of Linz sent me a letter to Berlin, in which he said that he had intended to come to Berlin, and on that occasion to bring me regards from the prelate, Dr. Schöpf, in Salzburg, but illness had prevented him from making the trip, and so he sent Dr. Schöpf's regards by mail. How it happened that Dr. Schöpf remembered me, I cannot say. It is hardly possible that he should have known that the nineteen or twenty-year-old wood-turner's journeyman, if he remembered him at all, was the Socialist member of the Reichstag. Surely I did not make such a deep impression upon him. I rather assume that some colleagues of the Center party, to whom I had mentioned my Salzburg experience, reported it to the prelate. When I chanced to come again to Salzburg, in the beginning of the present century, Dr. Schöpf had been dead for several years. It is said that he preserved his jovial and serene nature and his full love of life to the end of his days.

I will not conclude my reminiscences of my Salzburg sojourn without mentioning at least one more incident, which furnished much cause for comment and laughter to its young folk. At that time, King Louis I of Bavaria, who resigned on account of the Lola Montez affair, lived in Leopoldskron Castle, close by Salzburg. The king, a tall gentleman, who often passed by our workshop attired in a grey summer suit, with a large and somewhat worn straw hat on his head and a strong crutch cane in his hand, loved to take walks by himself in the environment of Salzburg. One day, on one of his walks, he saw a boy

making great efforts to pelt apples from a tree by throwing stones at them. The king stepped close to the boy and said: "Look, this is the way to do it." And he hurled his cane with fine success into the tree. But the farmer's wife had seen him from the house, which was situated close by, and crimson with rage, she came to her door, and, not knowing the king, shouted angrily: "You old reprobate, aren't you ashamed to help that boy steal apples?" The king picked up his cane and shambled off. Next morning a servant appeared and handed a florin to the farmer's wife, with the remark that it was payment for the apples which the gentleman had knocked out of the tree yesterday. When she asked, who the gentleman was, she received the surprising reply: "King Louis."

As I am here charging a dead Bavarian king with having stolen apples, I will add, in honor of truth, that I was not without sin in that respect. The prince-bishop had magnificent yellow plums in his garden that had captured my heart. On several occasions, when walking in this garden, I could not resist the temptation to appropriate some of this fruit. I take it that my sin did not hurt the prince-bishop, and the fruit agreed splendidly with me. Even my conscience felt relieved, when I read that Saint Ambrose, who was bishop of Milan about the close of the fourth century, had said:

"Nature gives all goods to all men **in common**; for God created all things, **in order that enjoyment might be common**. Nature, then, created the right of community, and it is merely **unjust usurpation** that produced the right of private property."

Could my action be excused, or even justified, more brilliantly?





Back to Wetzlar and Onward!

On February 27, 1860, I started out for home. There were no railroads in south-eastern Bavaria at that time, and, besides, every journeyman in those days traveled most cheaply on foot, when he begged a little. The weather was again miserable. One day during a heavy snow flurry, which lashed my face, I was walking along one of the ridges of Franconia, with my hands in my pockets, my cane under my arm and hat-rim turned down, when I was suddenly seized by my arm and thrown into the ditch. When I looked up, in surprise, I found that it was the horse in a wagon coming in the opposite direction, that had wisely seized my arm and thrown me aside. On account of the stormy weather, I had neither heard nor seen the coming wagon.

About the middle of March, after more than two years of absence, I arrived once more in Wetzlar.

At the muster of recruits, I was set back for another year on account of general physical weakness. The same thing happened to me again during the following years at the muster in Halle on Saale, so that I was finally dismissed as unfit for military service. In the meantime, since I could not obtain any work in Wetzlar, I accepted a position with a Jewish master wood-turner in Butzbach, two miles from Wetzlar. But when the weather improved more and more and one day, three of my school friends stepped into my workshop with their knapsacks on their backs, and informed me that they were on their way to Leipsic, I felt drawn into the open with irresistible force, as the journeymen's song has it, and was seized by a longing to follow them. I promised my friends to follow them within three days, and I hoped to catch up with them, if they did not cover too long distances. I could risk this offer, for I did not yield to anybody in marching ability in those days.

So far I had not had the least longing to become acquainted with Leipsic and Saxony, and if I had been consulted, I should not have seen either just then. But, nevertheless, this trip was decisive for my entire future in more than one way. So accident very often decides the fate of man.

I should like to add here that I think very little of the axiom that man is the captain of his own soul. Man always follows circumstances and conditions, which surround him and force him to act. Therefore, the so-called freedom of action is but a sorry idea. In most cases a man cannot clearly foresee the consequences of his actions. He recognizes only later what has led him to them. One step to the right, instead of to the left, or vice versa, would have carried him into vastly different conditions, which might turn out to be better or worse than those into which he got on the road actually taken by him. He recognizes the wise and the foolish step, as a rule, only by its consequences. But often the right or the wrong nature of his actions does not come into his consciousness, because he lacks the possibility of comparison. The self-made man exists only in a very relative way. Hundreds of others, equipped with far better qualities than he who rose to the top, remain unknown, live and perish, because unfavorable circumstances prevented their rise, forbade the correct application and utilization of their personal qualities. "Fortunate circumstances" give the right place to the individual in the common life. For an infinite number, who do not obtain this correct place, the table of life is not set. But if circumstances are favorable, it requires, indeed, the right kind of adaptability for the purpose of making the best of them. This may be regarded as the personal merit of the individual.

I caught up with my three friends, before they had reached Thuringia, and I arrived just in time to lend my arm to one of them, who had sore feet. This attitude of ours often caused merriment when we wandered thru the villages. We passed thru Ruhla, Eisenach, Gotha and came to Erfurt. Here we stayed over night for the first

time in the lodging house of a Y. M. C. A. But only once, and never again. The hypocritically pious and sneaking manners of the lodging house keeper nauseated me. In the evening we had to go to bed, all at the same time, at his orders. When we had climbed to the first floor, the door of a small hall was opened, and the melody of a hymn floated out to us, which was played on an organ by a smoothly combed, pale, blond youth. We entered, wondering what was coming. Thereupon the lodging house keeper stepped on a platform, and read a verse from a hymn book, line for line. We had to repeat each line, singing as he read it, with the accompaniment of the organ. Such a thing had never happened to me in a house of a Catholic journeymen's club. In Munich, for instance, a printed prayer was tacked to the wall of the room, with a request to pray it before going to bed. There was not a sign of any moral compulsion. I repeat, I do not know what the custom is now in those Catholic journeymen's clubs.

In Erfurt, the above process began to amuse us. We bawled, like lions, the melody and the text played and read for us. Then we climbed higher up into the sleeping room. After our shirt collars had been examined, for inhabitants, according to routine, we got into bed. Then the lodging house keeper went out with the light, and black darkness reigned.

But now the several dozens of young men from nearly all parts of Germany started in to jest and joke in a way such as I had never heard before. The merriment reached its climax, when, in the farthest corner of the room, one of the room mates, a man from Württemberg, dropped a few funny remarks in unadulterated Suabian. The noise did not cease until late. Next day we marched to Weimar. Here my companions declared that they could not continue the march, for all three had sore feet. They wanted to ride to Leipsic on the train. I protested against this, for I was short of money. And suppose there should be no work for us in Leipsic? But my pro-

test did not help me any, and unless I wanted to travel alone, I had to ride with them. On May 7, 1860, at 11 P. M., we arrived in Leipsic, and asked our way to the lodging house in the Grosse Fleischergasse. When, next day, we took a look at the town, and at the promenade walks clad in full spring foliage, in the finest May weather, I liked Leipsic exceedingly well. I was also lucky, and obtained work in a shop, in which I became familiar with an article that I later used as a stepping stone to independence. If I had arrived in Leipsic twenty-four hours later, the place would have been taken by another. So another "moment of luck" decided my future. For the second time I worked in a large shop. Five colleagues and an apprentice were employed with me. My master and my fellow workers were congenial, so was the work, which was of a nature to teach me something. What I did not like was the bad coffee, which we received in the morning, and the noon meal, which was inferior in quantity and quality. Breakfast, afternoon snacks and supper we had to furnish ourselves. Our beds were in the master's house. The seven of us slept in a spacious attic. I soon began to object to the food. In a few weeks I had my colleagues to the point where they agreed to a joint complaint, and we told the master, at the same time, that we would all quit work, if our complaint should not result in a remedy. So we threatened him with a strike even before we had heard the word. This form of defense followed from the situation itself. The master was taken aback. He declared that he did not understand our complaint, because he liked the food extremely well. That was natural. He ate later with his family, and had different food. He did not know that. After repeated negotiations we enforced the arrangement that he had to pay us a certain amount for board, and we boarded ourselves. He said that this was even more advantageous to him than the old arrangement. He had had to pay more to his wife for our board than we asked from him. Later, by stubbornly staying in bed, we succeeded

in putting off the beginning of work from 5 A. M. to 6 A. M. Still later, we enforced also piece work, which the master did not want to accept, because he feared that we should perform bad work. But he was mistaken, as he found out later. In the end we also obtained permission to live outside of his house.





My Entry Into the Labor Movement and Into Public Life

The transfer of the regency of Prussia to the hands of Prince William of Prussia, the brother of King Frederick William IV, and the Italian war had stirred up the people mightily. The pressure of the years of reaction, which had weighed upon the people since 1849, had ceased. It was especially the liberal bourgeoisie that began to stir politically, after prolonged reaction had promoted their economic development powerfully, and made this class much richer. And yet the development of the bourgeoisie at that time cannot be compared with the evolution of this class in industrial matters since 1871, and more especially since the nineties of the 19th century.

The bourgeoisie now demands its share in the administration of state affairs. Not only did this class desire to rule parliament in Prussia, but it also, in its large majority, aimed at a unification of Germany under the leadership of Prussia, in order to make of Germany a uniform state administered according to systematic political and economic principles, an aim, which the revolution of 1848 and 1849 had vainly tried to accomplish, as had also the parliament of those years. This aim was expressed by the foundation of the National Club of Germany in 1859, of which Rudolph von Bennigsen became president. The appointment of the old liberal ministry of Auerswald-Schwerin, by the prince regent, swelled the hopes of the liberals. The published program of the prince regent would not have justified any great hopes, and his past record, particularly his rôle during the revolutionary years, should have been a warning. But the liberal bourgeoisie saw a new era dawning.

Liberalism is always hopeful, so long as the semblance of a liberal government is in sight, no matter how many disappointments have befallen in the course of decades. Because liberalism itself lacks the courage and the energy

for strong deeds, and because it dreads every real movement of the people, it always rests its hopes in the rulers, who seemingly or actually make small concessions to it. By means of the enthusiasm and the blind confidence which it shows for such personalities, it hopes to make them subservient to its ends. In the present case, the buds of promise were soon nipped. The prince regent, a thoro-going soldier, felt, first of all, the need of a far-reaching military reform at the expense of the prevailing "landwehr" (second reserve) institutions. According to his view, the prevailing military organization of Prussia had not stood the test during and after the revolution, nor in the mobilization of the year 1859. The realization of his plans, however, not only cost much more money than had been spent so far, but also went counter to the traditions which the people had held since 1813 concerning the ability of the landwehr. Moreover, the plan of reorganization demanded the extension of the time of military service from two years to three, and for the reserves from two years to four.

It is true that the landwehr had failed the rulers here and there during the year of the revolution. Its members had felt that they belonged to the people, and had not permitted themselves to be used without ceremony for reactionary measures, nor for a war that was not popular. That was the reason that induced the prince regent to push it to the background, so far as possible, in the new plan of reorganization. But when this reorganization was definitely undertaken, without the consent of parliament, that had shortsightedly granted, in a tentative way, the funds for this purpose, the liberals, who had the majority in the second House, began to raise objections. But the prince regent did not pay any attention to them, and continued his reorganization. This led to a conflict. The elections, in December, 1861, strengthened the opposition. Altho the government tried to coax the House by making liberal concessions (a law concerning the responsibility of ministers and a new constitution of provincial districts), parliament declined the demanded appropria-

tions for the reorganization of the army. Then the parliament was dissolved in March, 1862, but the result was that the elections in May of the same year returned a still more radical body of representatives. The conservatives had dwindled down to eleven men.

The conflict became more and more acute, and the king, who was helpless, called upon Bismarck, who was Prussian ambassador at the federal parliament of Frankfort-on-Main. In September, 1862, Bismarck became the head of the ministry, which had meanwhile assumed a conservative character. This was the same Bismarck, whom Frederick William IV., in 1849, had called a red reactionary smelling of blood. This brought the conflict between the government and the parliament to a climax.

In the matter of the German question, the movement had meanwhile also become more and more active throughout Germany, and the waves of popular feeling ran high. The National Club demanded the calling of a German parliament, in accord with the national constitution and of the election law of 1849. At the same time, Prussia's rival, Austria, was to be crowded out on account of its large numbers of non-German inhabitants. The majority of the National Club wanted to form a little Germany in opposition to those who wished to see Germany and Austria combined, and who for this reason called themselves the Greater Germans. These antagonisms dominated the struggles over the solution of the German question during the first half of the sixties of the nineteenth century. Along with this went the so-called trias-idea, according to which the smaller states demanded a representation in the future government of the empire, which was to be headed by three directors, one each for Germany, Austria and all the smaller states.

The dimensions assumed by this movement, and the importance which it might have in the future, induced the more far-sighted liberals to turn their eyes in due time to the working class and make attempts to win the workers. The events of the previous fifteen years in France, such as the rapid development of Socialist ideas, the June bat-

tle, the diplomatic coup of Louis Bonaparte and his demagogic exploitation of the working class against the liberal bourgeoisie, recommended to the liberals the advisability of forestalling such things in Germany. So they availed themselves, after 1860, of the desires of the laborers and founded laborers' clubs, which they promoted and tried to dominate by the help of presumably reliable personalities whom they installed as leaders.

While the industrial development of Germany had made considerable headway at that time, nevertheless this country was still overwhelmingly a land of small business men and small farmers. Three-fourths of the industrial laborers were artisans. With the exception of work in the heavy industries, such as mining, iron construction and machine building, factory labor was despised by the artisan journeymen. The products of factories were considered cheap as well as nasty, a stigma which the representative of Germany at the world's exposition at Philadelphia, Privy Counselor Reuleaux, still impressed upon Germany factory labor sixteen years later. In the eyes of the artisan, the factory laborer was an inferior, and to be called a laborer instead of a journeyman or an apprentice, was considered an insult by many. Moreover, the vast majority of the journeymen and apprentices still harbored the delusion that they would be masters some day, particularly when professional liberty was proclaimed in Saxony and other states in the beginning of the sixties. The political intelligence of these workers was low. In the fifties, during the period of blackest reaction, in which all political life was dead, they had been raised and had not been given any opportunity to educate themselves politically. Workingmen's clubs or artisans' clubs were exceptions and served every other purpose but political enlightenment. Workingmen's clubs of a political nature were not even tolerated in most German states, or were even prohibited by a decision of the federal parliament in 1856, for in the opinion of this parliament in Frankfort-on-Main, a workingmen's club was identical with the spreading of Social-

ism and communism. And to us of the younger generation, Socialism and communism were at that time utterly strange conceptions. It is true that here and there, for instance in Leipsic, a few individuals, like Fritzsche, Vahlteich, the tailor Schilling, existed, who had heard of Weitling's communism, and had read his writings, but these men were exceptions. Never did I hear at that time of any laborer who knew anything of the "Communist Manifesto," or of the activity of Marx and Engels during the years of the revolution in the Rhineland.

All this shows that the working class at that time occupied a position in which it had neither a class interest of its own, nor knew anything of the existence of a social question. For this reason the laborers flocked in droves to the clubs formed by the assistance of the liberal spokesmen, who appeared to the workingmen as the heralds of genuine friends of "Labor."

These workingmen's clubs sprouted in the early sixties like mushrooms after a warm summer rain. This was true, particularly of Saxony, but it took place also in other parts of Germany. Such clubs arose in localities, and it required many years before the Socialist movement found a favorable soil there, altho by that time the old workingmen's clubs had disappeared.

In Leipsic, political life was wide-awake, for the city was regarded as one of the principal seats of liberalism and democracy. One day I read an invitation to attend a popular meeting for the purpose of founding an educational club. The notice appeared in the democratic "Middle German People's Paper," of which I was a subscriber, and which was edited by Dr. Peters, a participant in the revolution of 1848, the husband of the late well-known champion of women's rights, Louise Otto-Peters. This meeting took place on February 19, 1861, in Vienna Hall, a resort located near Rose Valley, in a garden. When I entered the hall, it was already overcrowded. With much difficulty I found a place in the gallery. It was the first public meeting which I attended. The president of the Polytechnic Society, Professor Dr. Hirzel,

was the speaker. He made the announcement that a club for technical education was to be founded as a second department of the Polytechnic Society, because workingmen's clubs were forbidden in Saxony by the federal decision of 1856. This started the opposition. Together with Professor Rossmassler, who had been a member of the parliament in Frankfort-on-Main and had been ousted from his position at the Academy of Forestry in Tharand by Mr. von Buest, other speakers took the floor, especially Vahlteich and Fritzsche, and demanded full independence for this club, which should be a political one. The cultivation of lines of instruction, they said, was the business of the school, not of a club for grown people. I was not in agreement with these speakers, but I admired the keen way in which these laborers took issue with the learned gentlemen, and I secretly wished that I might also be able to speak like that.

The club was founded, and the opposition joined it, altho they had not accomplished their purpose. I likewise became a member that evening. This club became, in its way, a sort of model institution. Lecturers for scientific subjects were available in plenty. Among them were the Professors Rossmassler, Bock—the editor of "Gartenlaube" and author of the "Book of Man in Health and Disease"—Wuttke, Wenck, Marbach, Dr. Lindner, Dr. Reyher, Dr. Burckhardt and others. These were followed later by Professor Biedermann, Dr. Hans Blum, of whom it was said that in his student's years he carried a visiting card with the inscription, "Student of the Rights of Man," Dr. Eras, Liebknecht, who came to Leipsic in the summer of 1865, and Robert Schweichel. One of the most diligent lecturers during the first year was Dr. Dammer, who later on became the first vice-president of the General Association of Workingmen appointed by Lassalle. Lessons were given in English, French, in stenography, in commercial bookkeeping, in the German language and in arithmetic. A turning and singing section were also founded. Vahlteich, who was a great turner, joined the former, and Fritzsche and my-

self joined the singing section. Fritzsche sang an excellent second bass, as every one does who has no singing voice.

At the head of the club stood a committee of twenty-four, and in this committee the fight over the presidency became fierce. Rossmuessler was beaten in the race by the architect, Mothes, but the opposition continued its work systematically. At the first anniversary of the club in February, 1862, Vahlteich made the address, which was decidedly political. He demanded universal suffrage. At the new election of the committee, I was likewise elected a member of it. My longing for public speaking was soon gratified in the frequent debates of the club. A friend of mine told me later that when I, for the first time, spoke a few minutes in justifying a motion, the members sitting at his table had looked at each other, and some one had asked: "Who is this man that bears himself like that?" Since various departments had been formed for the different lines of administration, I was chosen for the library and the entertainment department. I became the chairman of both of them. The election of the president of the club, which the committee had to undertake, called forth a violent struggle at this time. Four times the ballots were cast, without resulting in a plurality for any candidate. The votes were always equally distributed. At last Professor Rossmuessler was beat once more by one vote in favor of the architect, Mothes, who had voted for himself. Now the opposition carried the struggle to the general assembly, which met on Good Friday, 1862. The club then had more than 500 members. The opposition once more advanced its old demand that the club should be made a purely political one, and that school instruction should be excluded. After a violent debate of many hours, in which I took part also, the opposition was defeated by a majority of three-fourths of the votes. If the opposition had operated more adroitly, if they had demanded that political lectures on events of the day should be delivered from time to time and discussed, they would have won out easily. But that in-

struction should be banished from the club, which was of the greatest interest to the younger members of the club, called out their resistance. I, for instance, took a course in bookkeeping and stenography. A few days before that decisive meeting, Fritzsche and Vahlteich had been trying hard to bring me over to their side. I could not follow them.

The opposition now withdrew from the club, and founded the "Vorwaerts" club, which opened its headquarters in the Hotel de Saxe. The hotelkeeper was the former pastor, Wuerkert, who had been dismissed during the years of reaction. He had a peculiar method of spreading enlightenment and doing business at the same time. Every week he gave lectures, delivered by himself, on a wide variety of subjects, such as the birthdays and deathdays of famous men, political events, etc. On such days his establishment was crowded. It made a queer impression when Wuerkert, after moving among his guests and bringing beer to this one or that one, took his place on the landing of the stairs leading from the lower to the upper room, and gave his lecture from there, visible to every one. Not in opposition, but rather as a supplement to these meetings in the Hotel de Saxe, acted the restaurant of the "Good Spring" on the Bruehl. It was a large cellar, recently built, and its owner was Grun, one of the men of '48. In one of the corners of the cellar stood a large table, called the criminals' table. This signified that only the venerable heads of democracy were permitted to take a seat there, men who had been sentenced to the penitentiary or to prison, or who had been removed from their positions. Sometimes both things had gone together. There sat Rassmaessler, Dolge, who had been sentenced to death for taking part in the May revolt, then pardoned to penitentiary for life, and then had spent eight years in Waldheim. Among the "criminals" were also Dr. Albrecht, who taught stenography in our club; Dr. Burkhardt, Dr. Peters, Frederick Celkers, Dr. Fritz Hofmann, called Gartenlaube-Hofmann, etc. We young men considered it as a special honor to be per-

mitted to drink a glass of beer at this table in the company of the old men.

The leaders of the Club "Vorwaerts" did not confine themselves to the mere club meetings, but carried the agitation into the meetings of the laborers and of the people in general. They called such public meetings from time to time and discussed labor and political questions in them. These discussions were very confused. Among the subjects discussed were the insurance of invalids, the opening of a world's exposition in Germany, the question of joining the National Club, and demanding that this club should levy its dues of 3 marks per year also in monthly instalments, in order that the working people might be able to join. Furthermore, a demand was discussed for universal suffrage in state elections, and for a German parliament that should take care of the laborers. The calling of a general congress of German workingmen was also discussed, for the purpose of debating the rising demands. This question of calling a general congress of German laborers appeared simultaneously also in the labor circles of Berlin and Nuremberg.

With a view to making preparations for this congress and calling other labor meetings as occasion might arise, a committee was elected, to which I also belonged, together with Fritzsche, Vahlteich and other less known workers. Aside from labor meetings, which were arranged by our side, the local directors of the German National Club used to call public meetings, to which speakers were occasionally invited from outside, such as Schulze-Delitzsch, Metz-Darmstadt, etc. In these meetings such subjects as the German question, the foundation of a German navy, the ever more acute conflict over the constitution, the question of Slesvig-Holstein, etc., were discussed. It is evident from the enumeration of these subjects that the political life of Leipsic was very active at that time and kept us moving. A favorite subject in the meetings called by the liberals was the discussion of the constitutional conditions of the smaller states, especially of Saxony, Hesse-Cassel and Hesse-

Darmstadt. In the second line followed Mecklenburg and Bavaria. Messieurs von Beust, of Saxony, and Dalwigk, of Hesse-Darmstadt, were particular objects of sharp attacks. Mr. von Bismarck also became a target, when he stepped to the helm of the Prussian government in 1862.

It is true that, after the downfall of the revolution, all sorts of violations and enforcements of the constitution had occurred in the smaller states, but the same was true of Prussia. Moreover, these smaller states had been able to carry out their criminal acts only because they were protected by Prussia and Austria, which were heartily agreed on this point. Nevertheless, the liberals, in their public attacks, dealt far more harshly with the small and medium-sized states than with Prussia. But it had been precisely Prussia that crushed the revolution, and had not been sparing with deeds of violence against the revolutionists in addition to imposing a constitution by force of arms. I recall merely the condemnation of Gottfried Kinkel to penitentiary for life, the shooting of Adolph von Trützschler, in Mannheim, and of Max Dortue, in Freiburg in Breisgau, the shooting of prisoners in the wall-ditches of the casemates of Rastatt, the awful cruelties perpetrated by the Prussian soldiers against the captured revolutionists after the crushing of the revolution in Dresden during May. Altogether the conditions in Prussia during the fifties of the nineteenth century under Manteuffel's system were such that any ordinarily independent man had to resent it, and that Prussia was badly discredited in Germany and in foreign countries. The conflict over the constitution, once under way, was also without parallel in Germany. Altho I was young and inexperienced in politics, I could not help noticing this double standard of measurement. It was practiced especially by the liberals and democrats of Saxony. It is true that the system of von Beust, as inaugurated with the consent of King John of Saxony, was particularly and justly hated, on account of its hostile measures against the people, and more especially for the cruel treatment

given to the political prisoners in the penitentiary of Waldheim. No less than 286 May prisoners, 148 of them laborers, had been crowded into the Waldheim penitentiary, and by 1854 as many as 34, or 12 per cent., had died. The death sentence had been pronounced over 42 prisoners, but they had later been "pardoned" to penitentiary. These two friends of his had escaped. Roeckel had been sentenced to the penitentiary for life on account of up. The country prison of Hubertusburg had entertained 70 political prisoners.

Among others, August Roeckel, a musical director of Dresden, a friend of Richard Wagner, and of the famous architect, Semper, was held in the Waldheim penitentiary. These two friends of his had escaped. Roeckel had been sentenced to the penitentiary for life on account of his participation in the May revolt. He was pardoned in the beginning of 1862, after having spent 11 years and a half in the penitentiary. With the lawyer, Kirbach, of Plauen, he was one of the last to be pardoned, because they had refused to beg for mercy. In 1865, he published a book, entitled "The Revolt in Saxony and the Penitentiary in Waldheim," the contents of which raised a cry of horror in Saxony and Germany. I was one of the most persistent agents for Roeckel's book. I sold more than 300 copies—of course, without any personal profit to myself. This did not protect me, however, against the charge of the Coburg "Arbeiterzeitung," that I was a follower of Beust.

Among those maltreated in Waldheim, one of the worst sufferers had been Kirbach, with whom I became personally acquainted twenty years later as his colleague in the Saxionian parliament. He was not one of those who curried favor in the penitentiary. The director of the institution, Christ, had a so-called "spring iron" fastened between Kirbach's feet. This was an iron rod about one foot long, fastened around the ankles with foot-cuffs. Whenever Kirbach wanted to walk, he had to jump, hence the name "spring iron." By this process the skin and flesh of the ankles were chafed thru. As Kirbach

not only suffered terrible agonies, but also fell dangerously ill, the spring iron had to be taken off after a while. Politically, this former revolutionist later developed into a national liberal, like so many others, but in one corner of his heart he always preserved democratic leanings. He was the only one among the national liberals who voted in the Saxon parliament in favor of our bill for the introduction of universal, equal and direct suffrage.

Quite a different political development was taken by Kirbach's fellow prisoner, August Roeckel. When, in 1866, the political crisis burst over Germany, Roeckel took sides with his former enemy, von Beust, and went to Vienna with him as his press agent, when Beust became prime minister of Austria.

But no matter what might be the conditions in Prussia, the liberals regarded it as the state which alone could realize German unity as they saw it, and which could protect them against a rule of the masses. For this reason they observed the tactics of assailing vigorously the small and medium-sized states, in order that the state of the German mission, as they regarded Prussia, might appear in a more favorable light. It is true that the era of Bismarck was very much in the way of this myth, but it was declared to be a passing phenomenon, and after it, Prussia would shine in its real glory of liberalism. But Mr. von Bismarck was a reality of the first order, and he also knew the liberals, of whom he said: "They fear the revolution more than they hate me." This was quite right. Meanwhile the passions were approaching white heat. The man who pounded Bismarck hardest, and who uttered the most significant threats, was sure of the most stormy applause. Even in some liberals, the old revolutionary passion awoke, as it did in John Miquel, who, ten years earlier, had been connected with Karl Marx, and who had not quite broken off all relations with him even in the sixties (altho Marx had proclaimed himself a communist and atheist) and offered his help for the organization of farmers' revolts. Miquel threatened the king

with the fate of the Bourbons, and insinuated that he would call out the working class against the Hohenzollerns, if these gentlemen should fail to listen to reason. A similar statement was made by him in a private circle at the general convention of the German National Club in Leipsic. Nearly thirty years later, John Miquel, then Mr. von Miquel, was minister of finance for a Hohenzollern, and meantime the national liberal party, which he had helped to found and which had then become very tame, was still too liberal for him.

However, some of these threats may have reached Bismarck's ears. The most bloody threats, thru anonymous letters, were no doubt in vogue a long time before there were any Socialist leaders, who received dozens of them. At least, Bismarck admitted publicly, later on, that he had not thought it impossible that he might have to meet the fate of Strafford, who was executed as the minister of Charles the First of England. For that reason, Bismarck said, he had put his house in order, as a good fighter should, who wants to be prepared for all emergencies.

A rumor concerning the king about this time was to the effect that he was suffering from hallucinations as a result of the continued excitement, and that he feared he would be overtaken by the fate of the Bourbons. These rumors were corroborated later on by a published statement, which the late Prussian member of parliament, von Eynern, declared to be a personal communication of Bismarck. According to this, Bismarck said: "When he was appointed minister in 1862, he rode as far as Jueterbog to meet the king. He found him very downcast. The gentry of Baden, whom the king had met, had considered the conflict with the parliament insoluble, and had tried to induce him to give in. The king then said to him: 'You have become a minister, but only to mount the scaffold that will be erected for you on Opera Place; myself, the king, will be the next to follow you.' The king thought, no doubt, said Bismarck, that I would talk these things out of him, but I did the opposite, because

I knew him to be an honest and fearless man in the face of a known danger. I said to him that I did not think these two cases were wholly impossible just then, but what did that matter? We all had to die some time, and it was immaterial whether it happened sooner or later. He, Bismarck, would die in that case, as was his duty, in the service of his king and master, and the king would die in defense of his sacred rights, as would be his duty against himself and his people. It was not necessary to think immediately of Louis the Sixteenth; he died a disagreeable death, but Charles the First had met his death in a very decent way, a way that was just as honorable as death on the battle field.

"When I appealed in this way to the military honor of the king," continued Bismarck, "he became still more serious, and then he became sure of himself, and I rode into Berlin with a serene and determined man who was eager to fight."

These statements show what the liberals might have accomplished, if they had known how to exploit the situation. But they were already afraid of the laborers standing behind them. Bismarck's word that he would move the Acheron, if things went to extremes, scared them out of their wits.

It is a fact that Bismarck used every strategem to become master of the situation. He took his tools wherever he found them. He would have allied himself with the devil and the devil's grandmother, if it had been to his advantage. For instance, he took into his service, August Brass, the editor-in-chief of the then Greater German "Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung," altho this man had been a red democrat in his time, and had written the pretty verse:

"We dye red, we dye good,
We dye with every tyrant's blood."

Nor did Bismarck raise any objections when Brass invited Liebknecht from London and Robert Schweichel from Lausanne, to become editors of his paper. Bis-

marck also succeeded, in 1864, in winning Lothar Bucher, that old democrat and refuser of taxes, whose great historical knowledge and clever pen he used to his advantage. It was also Bucher who made an attempt, in 1865, under instructions from Bismarck, to win Karl Marx as a collaborator for the Prussian "Staatsanzeiger." They offered Marx a free field to write anything he pleased, even to agitate for communism.

The methods now employed by Bismarck in his rule were copied from Louis Napoleon, who was a master in the exploitation of existing class antagonisms for his system, even under the handicap of universal suffrage. It soon became evident that Bismarck likewise tried to exploit the labor movement to his interests against the liberal bourgeoisie. His helper in this game was the Privy Counselor, Hermann Wagner, whose knowledge of social questions and cleverness made him the right man for this place.

At the end of August, 1862, a labor meeting in Berlin had also decided to call a general congress of German workingmen, to be held in that city. This induced the Leipsic committee to get in touch with the leading men of the Berlin movement, in order to come to an agreement concerning the calling of this congress. It was desired that Leipsic should be the meeting place, on account of its superior geographical location. In the beginning of October, the painter and decorator, Eichler, came to Leipsic as the representative of the Berlin movement, to hold a conference, which I attended as a member of our committee.

This conference took place in the beer house, "Zum Joachimstal," in the Hainstreet. Eichler went straight to the point. He declared that the laborers had nothing to expect from the progressive party or from the National Club. The majority of the committee shared this view on account of recent experiences. Eichler continued, saying that he was sure—and this showed him to be an agent of Bismarck, in our opinion—that Bismarck was in favor of universal, equal and direct suffrage, and was also

ready to grant the necessary funds (60,000 to 80,000 Prussian dollars) for the foundation of a productive association of the engine makers.

At that time the engine makers formed the cream of the Berlin laborers, and were considered the real bodyguards of the progressive party. The statements of Eichler started a debate of several hours, and the final result was that the committee, with the exception of Fritzsche, declared itself against Eichler. It is remarkable that Eichler proclaimed ideas which were stated six months later in Lassalle's open letter to the Leipsic committee, only that Lassalle demanded a democratic state as the founder of productive associations subsidized by it.

In those days, the name of Lassalle was as yet unknown to us, altho he had given a lecture, in April of that year, "On the particular connection of the present historical period with the idea of the workers' estate." This lecture was later published, and is still published to-day, under the title, "The Workingmen's Program." In the same year he had also given his lecture on the constitution. That these lectures remained unknown to us was probably due to the fact that none of us read any Berlin papers. We derived our information concerning the issues of the day from the Leipsic dailies, especially from the democratic "Mitteldeutsche Volkszeitung." What this paper did not publish, remained unknown to us. Times were slow then.

When Eichler informed us that Bismarck would eventually be in favor of universal, equal and direct suffrage, he had merely expressed an idea that was then being publicly propagated by others, especially by Privy Counselor, Hermann Wagner. The idea was that universal suffrage could be imposed by decree, and the argument was: If the three-class system of voting has been imposed in May, 1849, then it can be cancelled by another royal decree, and a new election system can be imposed. This prospect was very disagreeable to the liberals, because they were, in the large majority, opposed to universal, equal and direct suffrage, and Mr. von Unruh, one of

their principal leaders, gave public expression to their anxiety. The liberals concealed their dislike of this universal suffrage behind the excuse that this demand was inopportune, so long as the conflict over the constitution was not settled, and that this fight against Bismarck's ministry should first be ended, before any change should be considered in election methods. That the conservative demagogues of those days went in strong for the introduction of the most democratic of all suffrages, whereas to-day they are among its bitterest enemies, is easily explained. Napoleon the Third, who reintroduced universal, equal and direct suffrage in France after his stroke of diplomacy, while the dishonest republic had replaced it by a worse system, had made a good bargain with it. Of course, the authorities had exerted the necessary pressure on the voters. In the beginning there were only seven opposition men among six hundred delegates, all others were imperial stool pigeons. Only, in 1863, did the opposition increase to 38 members, and in 1869 to 110.

On the other hand, the three-class system of voting, which had been imposed in Prussia for the purpose of obtaining a subservient parliament, had rather resulted in a strong opposition, and so the idea suggested itself to imitate the example of Napoleon.

Another question is: How did the idea of productive associations subsidized by the state get into the circles of the conservatives? It seems that Lassalle was working on this idea as early as 1862, and communicated it to his confidential friend, the Countess Hatzfeld, by whom this idea was then carried into conservative circles, even before Lassalle had propagated it publicly. Later, when Vahlteich had become the secretary of Lassalle, he discovered the ambiguous elements that surrounded Lassalle. Liebknecht made the same observation, and warned him especially against Bismarck, but Lassalle replied: "Pshaw, I eat cherries with Mr. von Bismarck, and he gets the stones." It is very probable that Privy Counselor Wagner suggested to Eichler that productive associations with state subsidies were a part of Bismarck's

plans, even before Bismarck himself had entertained the idea.* The rôle of Eichler, and the relations of Bismarck to Lassalle, were made clear in September, 1878, during the discussion of the anti-Socialist laws, when I referred to these matters. I then accused Bismarck that he was now trying to annihilate the social democracy, but that formerly he had attempted to use it for his own political ends. I referred first to the case of Eichler, and to the offers made by him to the Leipsic committee. Then I mentioned the fact that Lassalle had been brought into touch with Bismarck thru the intervention of a Hohenzollern prince (probably Prince Albrecht, the brother of the king), and of the Countess Hatzfeld, that Bismarck's conversations with Lassalle had lasted for hours, and that one day even the Bavarian ambassador, who wanted to see Bismarck, had been dismissed, because Lassalle had been with him.

Prince Bismarck took the floor in reply to me on the following day, the 17th of September. I had made the mistake to say that the conference between Eichler and the Leipsic committee had taken place in September instead of October. Bismarck took this as a point of departure, in order to prove that he could not have given any such orders, because he did not enter the ministry until the 23rd of September. But he remembered that **Eichler later on made demands on him for services which he had not performed for him. He also admitted that Eichler had been in the service of the police and had furnished reports, some of which he had read. But these reports had not referred to the Social-Democratic party. They dealt with intimate proceedings of the progressive party and, if he was not mistaken, of the National Club.**

* After the book was written, I received a copy of the memoirs of Privy Counselor Hermann Wagner ("Erlebtes"), in which he relates that he had maintained relations with Lassalle and the Countess Hatzfeld and other leaders of the Socialists (Schweitzer?). So it is very probable that he learned the idea of the program from Lassalle personally and used it on Eichler.

This proved that our suspicions in the committee against Eichler were well founded. For the rest, Prince Bismarck denied that he had intended to allow \$60,000 to \$80,000 for a productive association. He said that he had not had any secret funds, and he asked where he could have found the money. This was said by the same man who had declared in parliament, in 1863, that the government would, if necessary, carry on a war with or without the consent of the people's representatives, and take the money for that purpose wherever it could be found—and who for years spent the money of the state without the consent of parliament. Concerning my charge that he had maintained relations with Lassalle, he replied that it was not he, but Lassalle, that had desired to speak to him, and he had not placed any difficulties in his way. And he had not been sorry. Not that he had entered into any negotiations with him, for what could the poor devil Lassalle have offered to him? But Lassalle had greatly fascinated him; he had been one of the most brainy and amiable men whom he had ever known, and he had not been a republican either. He had rather worked toward the realization of a German empire. In this they had found a common touch. Lassalle had been highly ambitious. He may have been in doubt whether the German emperors should close their line with the dynasty of the Hohenzollerns or with the dynasty of Lassalle, but at any rate he had been thru and thru a monarchist. This declaration was followed by great merriment in the Reichstag.

The offhand manner, in which Bismarck tried to make a monarchist of Lassalle, needs no refutation, for it is sufficiently refuted by Lassalle's writing and letters. But still Lassalle's rôle, in his relations with Bismarck, was rather peculiar. Relying on his great self-dependence and his independent social position, he thought he could transact business with Bismarck as one power with another, even before he had any power behind him. It is useless to speculate how this game might have ended, for

the death of Lassalle, at the end of August, 1864, removed him as a partner in this affair.

Bismarck also denied, in this speech, that he and Lassalle had discussed the idea of imposing the universal, equal and direct suffrage. I could not prove the contrary, but I did not believe Bismarck. In this case, Lassalle is more trustworthy to me, for in his defense, before the state court in Berlin, on March 12, 1864, he said, publicly: "And so I announce to you, in this solemn place, that it may not be a year before Mr. von Bismarck will have played the rôle of Robert Peel, and will have imposed the universal and direct suffrage." Lassalle could not have spoken so definitely, if the imposition of universal, equal and direct suffrage had not been mentioned in his conversations with Bismarck. I repeat, that this idea was being continually discussed very seriously, in conservative circles, and it was fully believed in the liberal camp. Besides, Bismarck, who ruled unconstitutionally against the decisions of parliament, and who, in June, 1863, issued the infamous press ordinances, in defiance of law and justice, was not the man to recoil from the imposition of an election system, if he hoped to profit from such a step. Moreover, such an imposition would not have been resented by the masses in Prussia, who had been politically disfranchised.

What a character the transactions between Lassalle and Bismarck had assumed, may be seen from two letters of Lassalle, which were published much later, but which are in their best place right here.

Lassalle wrote to Bismarck:

"Your Excellency!—Above all, I accuse myself, because I forgot yesterday to urge upon you once more that **eligibility should be accorded to every German**. An immense means of power! The real "moral" conquest of Germany! As far as the technicalities of the election are concerned, I have read last night the entire history of French legislation, and have found but little of any use there. But I have also reflected some, and I am, therefore, in a position to submit to your excellency the de-

sired recipes that will prevent abstentions from voting and scattering of votes. There is no doubt that they are thoroly effective.

"I expect, then, that **your Excellency will fix some evening for us.** I urgently request that the evening be chosen in such a way that we will not be disturbed. I have much to say concerning the technique of elections, and have other things to discuss with your Excellency, and an undisturbed and exhaustive discussion is really indispensable, considering the pressing character of the situation.

"Awaiting the decision of your Excellency, I remain, with profound respect, your Excellency's most devoted
 "F. LASSALLE.

"Berlin, Wednesday, 13, 1, 64, Potsdamer Str. 13."

And furthermore:

"Your Excellency!—I should not press you, but conditions are pressing tremendously, and so I beg you will excuse my urgency. I wrote you last Wednesday that I had the desired "recipes"—recipes of the greatest efficacy—ready for you. I believe that our next conversation will be of decisive moment, and followed by vital decisions. Believing that these vital decisions should no longer be deferred, I shall take the liberty to put in an appearance to-morrow (Saturday) evening at 8.30 P. M. Should your Excellency be prevented from seeing me, I beg another time be fixed in the near future. With profound respect, your Excellency's most devoted

"F. LASSALLE.

"Saturday evening, 16, 1, 64, Potsdamer Str. 13."

Mr. von Keudell, who was employed by the Foreign Office at that time and knew about the relations of Bismarck with Lassalle, claims that Bismarck broke off his connections with Lassalle, because the latter became too importune. The last letter of Lassalle lends color to this claim. At any rate this relation of Lassalle's with Bismarck and many other actions of his in 1864, were rather risky, and could not be undertaken by any one smaller

than he. Unfortunately, he set an example with this relationship, and with his general bearing near the end of his life, that encourages others, who were not Lassalles, to stray into wrong paths. Of this more anon.

A significant feature of Bismarck's speech of September 17, 1878, is also the manner in which he looks upon productive associations, to the horror of the liberals. After admitting that he had conversed for hours with Lassalle, and had always regretted when these conversations were over, he continued: "I admit that I spoke with Lassalle concerning the granting of state subsidies to productive associations, that is a matter the practicability of which I still maintain." This idea he carried out further. The granting of 6,000 dollars from the treasury of the king to a committee of weavers from the Reichenbach-Neurode district, for the purpose of founding a productive association, indicates that every means was welcome to him that would drive a wedge between the working class and the bourgeoisie, in order to maintain himself in power according to the maxim: "Divide and rule."

In this description of events, I have outrun the course of things a little.

A short while after Eichler's presence in Leipsic, Fritzsche, Vahlteich and Dolge went to Berlin as delegates, in order to confer with the leaders of the Berlin workers and with those of the progressive party and of the National Club, concerning the above mentioned matters. An agreement was quickly reached that the German labor congress should not be called until the beginning of 1863, to meet in Leipsic. It was also easy to agree on the order of business of this congress, from which the point "World's exposition in Berlin," was eliminated. Eichler and other laborers had been a visitor of the London exposition in the summer of 1862, to which the National Club and some communal boards had sent representatives. On the whole, about fifty laborers, under the leadership of Max Wirth, visited the London exposition. In this way the idea of a Berlin exposition had arisen.

The conference with the leaders of the liberals gave but little satisfaction to the Leipsic delegation, and they said so frankly in their report after their return. In the beginning of 1862, the National Club held its general convention in Leipsic. It could not venture to hold its convention in a Prussian city, altho it worked for the leadership of Prussia. Schulze-Delitzsch spoke on January 3d to a large audience in Tivoli, the present People's House of the Leipsic laborers, a transformation that no one in those early days would have considered possible. Here, Dr. Dammer asked Schulze-Delitzsch to say something about the relation of the National Club to the laborers. Schulze replied, among other things, that the laborer should, indeed, take an interest in politics. But, he continued, has the laborer, who is so badly off that he lives from hand to mouth, the time and the inclination to take an interest in public affairs? No, surely not! The emancipation of the laborer from this miserable existence is a great national mission for every friend of the people, and especially for Germany. And true laborers, who use their savings for the purpose of improving their condition, "I welcome in the name of the committee as intellectual members, as honorary members, of the National Club."

This speech created some bad blood in the circles of the radical laborers. It showed that the National Club wanted to keep laborers out of the membership of the club, and that for this reason it declined to accept monthly membership dues. When a new delegation went to Berlin soon after that meeting, composed of Dr. Dammer, Fritzsche and Vahlteich, it was not left in doubt concerning the sentiments of the leading people in the club toward the laborers. Then it was young Ludwig Loewe, the founder of the well-known factory of arms, Ludwig Loewe & Co., who led the deputation to Lassalle. Here the three found what they were looking for: An understanding of their demands and a willing assistance. They came to an agreement with Lassalle to defer the labor congress a little longer, until Lassalle should

have written out his ideas concerning the relations of the laborers in state and society in a pamphlet, which the Leipsic central committee would circulate.

I wish to state at this point that the change in the leading personalities of the Leipsic movement expressed itself visibly and so rapidly that they were charged by their opponents with vacillation and unclearness. In November, 1862, a large labor meeting still had decided, on a motion of Fritzsche, to nominate a committee for the foundation of a consumers' co-operative club. And in the beginning of February, 1863, at a time when connections with Lassalle had already been established, Fritzsche reported about a trip to Gotha and Erfurt, about the consumers' clubs there, and moved the foundation of such a club for Leipsic. Vahlteich obstructed the vote on this motion by declaring that the central committee had already taken this matter under advisement. This was very wisely done on his part, for it would have looked queer, if a consumers' club had been founded in Leipsic at the time when Lassalle was already at work on his open letter, in which he declared consumers' clubs to be useless as a means of improving the condition of the laborers.

Vahlteich was at that time still in a comparatively peaceful mood. At the end of 1862 he published in the Leipsic "Mitteldeutsche Volkszeitung," a long polemical article against the attacks made on the central committee. He declared that the duty to the future aims of the laborers demanded that we should exercise **the greatest moderation**. On the other hand, Vahlteich, in this article, went farther than Lassalle, who still spoke of the laborer's estate, by making the statement: "The laborers do not form a distinct estate, **but they are a distinct class created by actual conditions.**" With the appearance of Lassalle's open letter, the leaders changed front completely. It would be a mistake to blame them for this. In times of unrest, changes of mind are rapidly made. The thinking process is accelerated. Three years later, when Germany hastened toward the catastrophe of 1866, I and

many of my fellow fighters had a similar experience. The rapid transformation of a Saul into a Paul takes place again and again without miracles.

In the beginning of November, 1862, I had resigned from the central committee. My position in the industrial club took up my time, my energy and my interest to the highest degree. As I spent every evening in the club, unless I went to a labor meeting or to a committee session, I became more familiar with the wishes and wants of the members than the presidents of the club. In this way I soon became the most diligent mover of motions at the committee meetings and monthly meetings. My motions were almost always certain of adoption. This gave me a great influence. But at that time I was still a laborer, that is, I had to stand at the turning bench from 6 A. M. to 7 P. M., with an interruption of two hours for meals. So my excessive activity in different directions also became a money question. Besides the debates in the committee and in the meetings seemed very confused and useless to me, and this facilitated my resignation from the committee.

On February 6, 1863, I had a controversy with Vahlteich. He was a delegate of the Vorwaerts Club, I for the Industrial Club, at the anniversary of the Dresden Workers' Educational Club. During the banquet, Vahlteich made a provocatory speech, in which he stated in his usual way, that the workers should acquire political and humanitarian culture, but not any elementary schooling. He said it was the business of the state to furnish the schooling. He called for a cheer for the other two kinds of education. This aroused me. I took issue with him, and called for a cheer for general culture. Of course, this altercation did not make a good impression, but I could not very well ignore Vahlteich's provocation, especially since the Dresden club followed the same aims as our own.





Lassalle's Rise and Its Results.

In the beginning of March, 1863, appeared Lassalle's "Open Letter to the Central Committee for the calling of a general congress of German laborers in Leipsic." A few days previous to this publication, I had made the speech of the day at the celebration of the second anniversary of the Industrial Educational Club, in which I argued against universal, equal, secret and direct suffrage, because the workingmen were not yet ripe for it. I offended even some of my friends of the club with this view of mine. On the other hand, my speech pleased my future wife immensely, who participated in the celebration with her brother. But I have good reasons for believing that it was more the person of the speaker that pleased her than the contents of his speech, which at that time was no doubt rather immaterial to her.

The open letter of Lassalle did not make at all such an impression upon the world of labor as had been expected, in the first place, by Lassalle himself; in the second place, by the small circle of his followers. For my part, I distributed about two dozen copies in the Industrial Educational Club, in order to give the other side a chance. That the letter should have made so little impression upon the majority of the laborers in the movement of that time, may seem inexplicable to-day to some people. But it was quite natural. Not merely the economic, but also the political conditions were still very backward. Professional freedom, free migration, liberty to settle down, exemption from passports, liberty to wander, freedom of association and assembly, such were the demands that appealed more closely to the laborer of that time than productive associations subsidized by the state, of which he had no clear conception. The idea of association or of co-operation was just sprouting. Even universal suffrage did not seem an indispensable right to

the majority. On the one hand, as I have emphasized several times, political intelligence was still low; on the other hand, the fight of the Prussian House of Representatives against Bismarck's ministry appeared to the great majority as a brave deed, which deserved support and praise, but no censure or derogation. A man who was politically active, like myself, devoured the reports of the proceedings in parliament and regarded them as the outpour of political wisdom. The liberal press, which then ruled public opinion far more than it does to-day, also took care to preserve this belief. So it was the liberal press that now greeted Lassalle's appearance with cries of rage and sneers, in a way that had, perhaps, been unheard of until then. Personal insinuations and defamations poured down upon him, and that the chief conservative organs, for instance, the "Kreuzzeitung," treated Lassalle objectively, because his attack on the liberals was very welcome to them, did not increase Lassalle's credit or that of his followers in our eyes. And if we realize, finally, that even to-day, after more than forty-five years of intense labors of enlightenment, there are still millions of laborers who run after the different bourgeois parties, it is no wonder that the vast majority of the workers in the sixties of the nineteenth century were skeptical against the new movement. And at that time no success had been obtained in social legislation, such as was secured later by the Socialist movement. Pioneers are always scarce.

In Leipsic, Lassalle's appearance had the effect that our committee split, and so did the club "Vorwaerts," which was the main support of this committee. Professor Rossmassler, iron foundry proprietor Goetz, a brother of turner Goetz, of Lindenau-Leipsic, Dolge and a large number of workers in the club declared against Lassalle. Fritzsche, Vahlteich and Dr. Dammer, with a minority behind them, became the actual bearers of the new movement. In Leipsic, it found the largest following. Berlin failed to respond for a long time. It gradually found a footing in Hamburg-Altona, whence it extended to

Slesvig-Holstein, then in Hannover, Kassel, Barmen-Elberfeld, Solingen, Ronsdorf, Dusseldorf, Frankfort-on-Main, Mayence, in a few towns of Thuringia, such as Erfurt and Apolda, in Saxony, aside from Leipsic, in Dresden, where the president of the Dresden Workingmen's Educational Society, Foersterling, joined Lassalle with a small crowd of his followers in 1864; finally, in Augsburg.

But this expansion was, as I have said, a gradual and weak one, and agreed very little with the hopes entertained by Lassalle and his followers. The hundred thousand members, which, in his open letter, he regarded as a great political power, when organized in the General Union of German Workingmen which he proposed, he had hoped to see in a short time. It is well known that it required a long time before the Socialist movement was in a position to count on this number of organized followers.

Toward the close of March, the Leipsic committee resigned in a large labor meeting, and moved that a new committee be elected, which should devote itself to the foundation of the general union of German workingmen suggested by Lassalle. After a very heated debate the majority of the meeting declared in favor of the plan. Dr. Dammer, Fritzsche and Vahlteich were delegated to take hold of this new task.

On April 16th, finally, Lassalle himself came to Leipsic for the purpose of speaking in a large meeting, which, like most large meetings of that period, was held in the Odeon on Elsterstreet. This speech was published under the title of "The Labor Question." This meeting was attended by about 4,000 people, but a considerable portion of them left the hall before the close of the meeting. The liberals, under the leadership of merchant Kohner, had taken a position in the gallery opposite the speaker's platform, and frequently interrupted the speaker. The preparations for the speaker were somewhat peculiar. The edge of the speaker's desk, behind which Lassalle stood, had been packed with books, some of them heavy

volumes, as tho there were going to be a debate like that of Luther versus Eck.

Lassalle seems to have thought that he would find a strong opposition which he would have to refute. This was not the case. His personal comportment was not sympathetic to everybody. Tall, slender and strong of stature, Lassalle stood on the platform as tho boldly challenging his adversaries, and while he spoke he stuck alternately one or both hands into the arm-holes of his vest. He spoke fluently, at times pathetically, but it seemed as tho he had a slight lisp. He closed amid the stormy applause of a part of the audience, while the other part answered by hissing.

After Lassalle, Professor Rossmuessler took the floor and read a long declaration, in which he stated that he was aware that he could not get a majority in this hall for his views, but he hoped that a better understanding would come to them later. He protested against the attacks which Lassalle had aimed at the German progressive party. He also protested against the attempts to separate the workers from that party and from a distinct labor party. Lassalle replied briefly and rather amiably. He said that, in his opinion, the differences between himself and Rossmuessler seemed to be a matter of tactics rather than of principle. Evidently there was some hope left, in the Lassallean camp, of bringing Rossmuessler over to their side. Besides, Fritzsche and Vahlteich were warm admirers of Rossmuessler on account of the fight which he carried on against the church and the priests. Both of them, as well as Rossmuessler, belonged to the German-Catholic congregation in Leipsic, and both of them were hurt by their separation from him.

Lassalle was not satisfied with the applause of the crowd. He rather laid great store by the support of men of prominence and influence in the bourgeois camp, and he took great pains to win some of them. It is true that Professor Wuttke took sides with him in Leipsic, but this gentleman's other political affiliations were not easily reconciled with this support. Wuttke was a Greater Ger-

man, who had strong leanings for Austria. In this capacity he had also been a member of parliament in Frankfort-on-Main. He and Rossmassler were political and personal adversaries. In addition to this, Wuttke was a grim enemy of the little German progressive party and of the National Club—two organizations, whose members formed almost the same circle of persons. Since Lassalle assailed the progressive party, he was loudly applauded by Wuttke. But Wuttke did not have any deeper social understanding. He was, by the way, a brilliant speaker and had a beautiful voice. His small, bent| blackhaired figure had something of a gnome about it. The letter of Wuttke to Lassalle, which was read in the above mentioned meeting at Leipsic, confirms my conception of Wuttke's position. No doubt Lassalle had also estimated Wuttke correctly, but he was satisfied to have him apparently on his side.

Let me remark at this point, that I am not writing a history of the entire movement. I am merely describing my personal experiences and my relations to this movement. If any one wishes to familiarize himself with the history of the movement as a whole, I would refer him to Mehring's "History of the German Social Democracy" and Bernstein's "History of the Berlin Labor Movement."

The appearance of Lassalle and the foundation of the General Association of German Workingmen, which took place on May 23, 1863, in Chicago, were the signal for bitter fights within the labor world, which now ran their course during many years, and led to scenes that defy all description. With the years, the bitterness increased on both sides, and since laborers are not accustomed to fine language—which, by the way, fails also among those who pride themselves upon it, whenever strong differences of opinion arise between them—the coarsest invectives and charges were hurled back and forth. Not infrequently rough and tumble fights and violence were precipitated in the meetings, in which the adversaries clashed, and this often caused hall owners to refuse the use of their

halls for such meetings. One of the principal aims of each side in these meetings was to get control; so the struggle used to start in with the fight for the chairmanship. One day I discovered in a labor meeting in Chemnitz, that the Lassalleans lifted both hands for the purpose of obtaining the majority. I demanded that both parties should lift both hands. Amid great merriment the suggestion was followed. This led to the defeat of the Lassalleans.

The only advantage of this conflict of opinions was that both sides made the greatest efforts to increase their following. This took place all the more when my side also adopted Socialism a few years later, but at the same time created its own organization, and carried on its fight against the General Association of German Workingmen, which split up into two unequal sections in 1867. But strength, money and time were incredibly wasted, to the joy of our enemies, during these fights of more than a decade's duration.

In Leipsic, the rise of Lassalleanism had the effect of doing away with the old differences between the Industrial Educational Club and the Vorwaerts Club. In February, 1865, these two clubs united under the name "Workingmen's Educational Club." The Polytechnic Society had long ceased to attempt a guardianship of the Industrial Educational Society, which had proved to be a labor of Sisyphus. Besides, even the Saxon government realized that the old federal decision of 1865 would not do any longer. The government was compelled to let things go. The General Association of German Workingmen had even chosen Leipsic as its headquarters, in plain violation of that old federal decision. The government finally drew the obvious conclusions and repealed the decision on March 20, 1864.

It is an experience which we have often had since that time that all laws and oppressive measures aimed against a certain movement fail and are practically annulled, as soon as that movement becomes a natural necessity, and thus proves to be irrepressible. The

authorities themselves finally lose the belief in their power and give up the hopeless struggle. So it was also in those days with the ordinances concerning the right of association, and so it turned out to be soon after that with the ordinances forbidding labor unions in Prussia and other states, which were simply ignored.

The wage struggles, by means of cessation of labor, began in spite of all ordinances against coalition, while the wise gentlemen of the government were still debating whether they should entirely repeal those ordinances or revoke them only to a certain degree. The German Social Democracy later on had the same experience under the sway of the anti-Socialist laws, under which the authorities finally had to realize that it was impossible for them to carry thru their ordinances against meetings, organization and the printing and distribution of literature in the same way in which they had done it during the first years of this legislation. The same experience was again made later by the women's movement in those German states, in which women were enjoined from organizing political meetings or attending meetings of political organizations. Practically such ordinances had long been dead letters, before the government decided to sanction by law what had long existed in violation of a previous law. Laws always limp behind wants; they never anticipate them.

In the Leipsic Workingmen Educational Club I was elected second president on the occasion of the necessary reorganization, a position which I had already held during the last period in the Industrial Educational Club. And when the first president, Dr. med. Reyher, a disciple of Bock, resigned a little later, I stepped into his place and held it until 1872, when I had to begin my prison term, to which I had been sentenced on account of my alleged preparations for committing high treason against the German empire.

The Workingmen's Educational Club received an annual subsidy of 500 dollars from the city beginning 1865. This was granted mainly for rent of better accommoda-

tions and for maintenance of instruction. But when, during the succeeding years, the club followed the political transformation of its president, and turned more and more to the left, the city administration reduced the subsidy to 200 dollars. And when the club declared, in 1869, for the program of the Socialdemocratic Labor Party, which had been newly founded in Eisenach, which declaration was adopted by a large majority after three evenings of verbal battles, the remainder of the subsidy was lost altogether in the following year. Liberalism supports only politically good and obedient children, for the educational aims of the club had not suffered in the least from its political transformation.





The Convention of the German Workingmen's Clubs.

The number of workingmen's clubs had grown considerably, above all in Saxony. While we were working in Leipsic, Julius Motteler, whom I met in 1863 during the celebration of the anniversary of the Industrial Educational Club in Leipsic, was working with Wilhelm Stolle in Crimmitschau, coppersmith Foersterling, before his transition to the Lassalleans was at work with shoemaker A. Knoefel in Dresden, weaver Pils in Frankenburg, the weavers Lippold and Franz in Glauchau, bookbinder Werner in Lichtenstein-Callenberg, weaver Bohne in Hohenstein-Ernstthal, etc., all of them organizing workingmen's clubs. We extended our labors also to Thuringia. In the lower Iron Mountains, among the weavers and knitters, dozens of workingmen's reading clubs had been organized, and they were very active. Similar phenomena became visible in other parts of Germany. Particularly in Württemberg, a large number of workingmen's clubs were founded, which combined into a district organization as early as 1865, and soon after that created a public organ of their own. In Baden and in the kingdom of Hannover likewise, many workingmen's clubs, mainly educational clubs, came to life.

The activity and unity of the Lassalleans, on the other hand, called forth the need of unity on the opposite side. But this could be but a loose unification, because the clubs lacked a common and definite aim, for which they could struggle with enthusiasm and self-sacrifice, as the Lassalleans did. The only thing, in which we were united, was our opposition to the Lassalleans and our alleged opposition to politics in the clubs. But as a matter of fact, the leaders of most of these clubs, or their backers in the clubs, tried to win its membership for their party politics. In these clubs, all shades of bourgeois parties of that time were represented, from republican democrats to

the members of the National Club on the right, from among whose midst the National Liberal party was founded later on, in 1867. But as early as 1865, the radical and greater German elements separated from the National Club and formed the Democratic People's party, whose organ became the "Deutsche Wochenblatt," in Mannheim.

Meanwhile people got along in the clubs as well as possible. The political situation did not press for any clear issue immediately, for the constitutional fight against Bismarck's ministry in Prussia demanded a united advance against him. The German Reform Club that had formed in opposition to the National Club, and advocated the unity of all Austria with Germany in one empire, was a collection of South-German particularist and Austrian elements with a strong dash of Catholicism. This club had no significance for the labor movement. Its advocacy of Austrian federal reform, which consisted in the main of a German parliament to be elected by the state legislatures of the individual states, did not awaken any sympathies anywhere. The workingmen's clubs did not arrive at a clear position in the German question, neither did they in the question of Slesvig-Holstein, which became very pressing in 1864.

The labor movement had taken root also in the West of Germany, especially in the Main district. In Frankfort-on-Main, during a convention called on May 29, 1862, by the Frankfort Workingmen's Educational Society, some acrimonious discussions concerning the political position of workingmen were held. Here the lawyer, J. B. von Schweitzer, who later played a leading rôle in the movement, advocated a separate political organization of the working class, evidently under the influence of Lassalle's lecture: "On the particular connection of the present historical period with the idea of the workers' estate." After that time the differences of opinion did not cease any more in the Main district. The publication of Lassalle's open letter kept the fire stirred. In Frankfort, Bernhard Becker also made himself felt now. A few

years later I learned to know him as a mediocre and conceited man, who was also clumsy of speech. The attempt to push a declaration against Lassalle thru a labor convention in Roedelheim, on April 19th, 1863, in which Professor Louis Buechner gave a lecture on Lassalle's program, failed. On the other hand, Lassalle himself appeared on May 17th, in Frankfort-on-Main, in order to press his case. Schulze-Delitzsch, who had also been invited, excused his absence with business matters. He did well. My later acquaintance with Schulze-Delitzsch made it evident to me that he would have been defeated by Lassalle in every way. Sonnemann, who argued against Lassalle, met this fate.

The reply to those events in the Main district was a proclamation, dated May 19th, by which the German workingmen's clubs were invited to a joint convention at Frankfort-on-Main, to be held June 7, 1863. This proclamation was signed by the central committee of the workingmen of the Main district, by the workingmen's clubs of Berlin, Cassel, Chemnitz and Nuremberg, and the Artisans' Club of Duesseldorf.

In this proclamation, the Leipsic central committee was blamed for having made the calling of a workingmen's convention impossible for a long time. The movement itself, however, it was claimed, was based upon "so important and pregnant a thought, of such far-reaching significance for the welfare of our entire nation and country, that it must not be disturbed in its healthy course by the mistakes of individual personalities. It is the duty of all who have the cause at heart to prevent, with all their powers, that the ending of an attempt which miscarried thru the fault of a few, become the beginning of a disastrous split and disintegration of the entire movement."

But the split was already there, and it was, as I realized later, a historical necessity. In the convention of Frankfort-on-Main, 54 clubs, from 48 cities, and one free labor assembly (Leipsic) were represented by 110 delegates. If the calling of this convention had not been

so precipitate, so that it looked like a surprise, and was charged against its originators as such, the delegation would have been still stronger. The Leipsic Industrial Educational Club elected me as its representative by a vote of 112 in 127. Outside of myself, Professor Rossmuessler and shop manager Bitter had been elected as delegates by a Leipsic labor meeting.

When I appeared in Frankfort at the preliminary meeting, I was introduced to August Roeckel, the chairman of the local committee, who received me with the words: "Well, you Saxon, have you finished your sleep at last? It is time." A little annoyed, I replied: "We have risen earlier than a good many others!" Roeckel laughed, and said he had not meant to hurt my feelings.

Among the delegates were Hermann Becker, or Red Becker, who had been sentenced to long imprisonment in a fortress in the Communists' process in Cologne; Eugene Richter, who had been discharged from his position as clerk of the court on account of his political activity; Julius Knorr, of Munich, the proprietor of the "Muenchener Neueste Nachrichten," which was then but a small paper, but earned a large fortune for its owner.

Whether Red Becker owed his nickname to his red hair, which covered his mighty head but scantily, and to his red mustache, or to his former red sentiments, I do not know. Becker was a large, good-looking, very jovial gentleman, whose face betrayed his liking for a good bite and a good drop. He was communicative and talkative, in distinction from Eugene Richter, whose frigid and reserved nature attracted my notice even then. Richter created the impression as tho he were looking disdainfully at all of us. Accident would have it that, one day during the noon recess, I took a walk around the city park with Becker, Eugene Richter and a few other delegates. Our conversation touched also upon Lassalle. Becker ventured the opinion that Lassalle had issued his proclamation against the progressive party merely for the reason that this party had not lifted him on its shield and given him a seat in the state legislature. Guido

Weiss was reported as saying that old Waldeck had called Lassalle's repulsion a mistake. Becker indicated also that Lassalle had given rise to "moral reservations" on the part of the progressive party thru all sorts of complications with women, but this looked a little like hypocrisy, in view of the "moral missteps" of other leaders of the progressive party of that time. I must say that Becker made his remarks about Lassalle without animosity, nor did he ever permit himself to be carried away into attacks upon his former party associates. Miquel was different in this respect, for later on he even voted in favor of the anti-Socialist laws.

The chairmanship of the convention was entrusted to Roehrig, director of a commercial school in Frankfort-on-Main, as first president, and to Dittmann, of Berlin, as second president. The first order of business was a motion by Rossmuessler, as follows:

"The first joint convention of German Workingmen's Clubs and Workingmen's Educational Clubs begins its deliberations with the statement that it is the first duty of the clubs represented in it and of all others, and of the entire workers' estate, in their efforts in behalf of the intellectual, political, civic and economic uplift of their estate, to be united among themselves, united with all those who strive for the liberty and greatness of the German fatherland, united and co-operating with all who labor in the making of a nobler mankind."

This resolution was almost unanimously adopted. It expresses more than long speeches the position of the convention. Altho this resolution was aimed directly against Lassalleanism, as were all the proceedings of the convention, the name of Lassalle was mentioned only by one speaker, if I remember correctly. This omission was not the result of previous agreement. It is permitted to assume that it was due to the fact that people did not believe in any future for the movement inaugurated by Lassalle, or, perhaps, because people did not want to honor him by mentioning his name.

The second point of order of business was the "Na-

ture and Aims of Workingmen's Educational Clubs." Eichelsdoerfer, of Mannheim, was the speaker, who stood at the left wing of the convention. I also took part in the debate. It is worth noticing that an amendment of Dittmann, which demanded that the clubs should also try to secure instructors for the education of their members in political economy and in civil government, was defeated by a vote of 25 to 25. A workingman of to-day can hardly grasp such backwardness.

Another point of the order of business was a demand for a removal of the obstacles that stood in the way of the liberty of labor. Dittmann was the reporter on that subject. His resolution demanded professional freedom, liberty to move about freely, and removal of the difficulties in the way of marriages. Another item on the order of business referred to the position of the laborers in the matter of savings and loan clubs, co-operatives of production and consumption, whose foundation was recommended to the workingmen by the convention. It also recommended the foundation of co-operatives for the common use of workshops with motive powers as the best means of promoting the national welfare and the civic independence of the workingmen. In this resolution special reference was made to the fact that these steps should be taken in accord with the suggestions of Schulze-Delitzsch. It was said, furthermore, that workingmen and employers should **jointly** promote such co-operatives, a conception which could find support only in a convention dominated by the small capitalist point of view. Finally the convention spoke in favor of the creation of old age and invalid insurance banks, which should be in a position to "do away at least partially with some cares." This was at least no overestimation of such institutions. So far as organization was concerned, the foundation of district assemblies, with monthly reunions of delegates, was recommended, in order to further the organization of new clubs and maintain the connection between the existing clubs. At this point I took the floor a second time, in order to speak against the admission of

representatives of free labor assemblies. Backed by my former experiences, I declared that those assemblies had not impressed me very deeply so far. Its members lacked the preparatory enlightenment, which was obtained in the clubs, and so they followed the momentary impressions created by some clever speaker. I was not afraid of the snares of the laws concerning associations for the present, for we had not been molested in Saxony so far, even tho a reaction might set in. I regarded district assemblies as useful. These statements called my Leipsic opponent, Bitter, to the platform, who protested against my estimate of the labor meetings. He claimed that they were much better than I depicted them, and that we should keep our backs covered by means of representation thru free labor assemblies, in view of the possibility that the law concerning associations might be enforced against us.

The ultimately adopted organization had the following form:

I.—Periodical and free meetings, as a rule, annually, shall take place between representatives of the German Workingmen's Clubs, in order to enlarge the understanding of their true interests by means of a living and personal exchange of opinions and experiences, and carry a recognition of this understanding into ever larger circles.

II.—Everything shall be discussed that can have an influence on the welfare of the working classes.

III.—Admission to these meetings is free to the representatives of the German Workingmen's Clubs, who have written credentials from their members. Exceptionally, representatives of free labor assemblies may also be admitted, if the permanent committee that is entrusted with the examination of the mandates decides to do so. If the committee refuses to admit them, they may appeal to the convention. Every club may send from one to five representatives, but each club has only one vote. Every delegate can represent only one club. The clubs that have taken part in a convention will be invited by letter. At the same time the invitation will be published in as many

papers as possible, but at all events in the "Deutsche Arbeiterzeitung" of Coburg, and the "Arbeitgeber" of Frankfurt. Every club that is represented in the convention has to pay a contribution of two dollars for every convention. The same contribution is to be paid by those clubs who do not send any representative, but desire to have all reports and printed matter sent to them.

IV.—Every convention elects a permanent committee of twelve members, which is charged with the management of the following business: (1) The committee determines the place and date of the next convention, unless the last convention has expressly decided upon this, and makes the necessary preparations in the city of the convention. (2) The committee sends out invitations and notifications, accepts names of participants, issues admission cards, receives contributions, pays bills and keeps account of them. (3) The committee draws up a preliminary order of business, nominates reporters accordingly, and forms the preparatory committees subject to endorsement or alteration thru the decisions of the convention. (4) The committee promotes between conventions the aims and the execution of the decisions of the conventions. (5) The committee nominates its chairman and determines the assignment of business matters among its members; it submits to the convention the bills for examination and endorsement. The sessions of the committee always take place at the place of domicile of the officiating chairman. The validity of a decision requires the invitation of all members, the attendance of at least seven members, and the simple majority of the voting members. A decision may be taken by correspondence. The committee fills eventual vacancies, and if no quorum is present, the chairman does so.

V.—The order of business for the proceedings of the convention is determined by the convention itself.

VI.—The chairman of the committee directs the proceedings of the conventions, until the delegates have elected their president.

VII.—The sessions of the conventions are public.

Among others, the following were elected members of the committee: Sonnemann, Max Wirth of Frankfort-on-Main, Eicheldoerfer of Mannheim, Dittmann of Berlin, etc. Sonnemann became the soul of this new organization, having charge of the duties of secretary and of the actual management.

The funds placed at the disposal of the committee by the organization were very insignificant, and many clubs did not even pay the small dues of two dollars per year. The anti-Socialist clubs of that time were not willing to make any sacrifices for their common aims, and in this they differed unfavorably from the Lassalleans. Owing to lack of funds, the committee took refuge, in the course of the summer, in the National Club and received 500 dollars from it, which were paid during the next two years. Sonnemann also addressed personally a number of large employers, with a request for funds. But the aversion against everything that called itself a workingmen's club lurked instinctively even in the bourgeois of that day, and so the contributions from that side were meager.

Here I want to mention an incident that took place in the summer of 1865, that the "Koelnische Zeitung" attempted to exploit against me to my disadvantage forty years later.

In Saxony, the fight against the followers of Lasalle was particularly bitter. The comparatively advanced industrial conditions of Saxony seemed to offer an especially favorable soil for Socialist ideas. But we lacked the means for carrying on an agitation. Whatever we managed to get together for agitation was too little, altho the speakers were miserably paid. So one day, Dr. Eras and author Weithmann, a native of Württemberg, who lived a Catilinarian existence, wrote a gushing letter to the directors of the National Club, asking them for money to carry on an agitation against the Lassalleans. I was acquainted with this letter later on, and signed it at their request, as did Eras and Weithmann themselves. The "Koelnische Zeitung," when publishing this letter

and my grateful acknowledgment for 200 dollars (not \$300 as that paper claimed) a few years ago, insinuated that all three signatures were from my hand. I emphatically repudiate this charge. In my letter of acknowledgment I stated that we intended to buy, principally, literature for the clubs, and that the directors of the National Club might exert an influence on the book dealers and induce them to sell their goods cheaply to us. The fact that the National Club allowed us money proved that it had a greater interest in the movement than it was credited with by some people. But the money was used principally for purposes of agitation tours. However, it was spent very sparingly, for when the agitation for the elections to the North German Reichstag began at the end of 1866 and the beginning of 1867, we still had \$120 of that \$200 left, and used them then. That was, indeed, an expenditure for which we had not made any provision. But the situation changed from 1865 to 1866, and the change of ideas on both sides was so rapid that very few remained in their old positions. The National Club suffered most from this transformation. It disintegrated speedily, and was practically dead when its official dissolution was pronounced in the Fall of 1867. Many were angry, because we had received the \$200. Especially, Dr. Hans Blum could not get over that. He considered himself in duty bound to oppose me in the election campaign, and to upbraid me for having accepted that money. But he had to face the discovery that all his pains to injure me were useless.

In this connection I want to state that I have never been a member of the National Club, as some have claimed. This does not mean that I was opposed to it at that time, but it seemed superfluous to me to pay dues to the National Club in addition to all the great material sacrifices which my position and activity in the labor movement demanded of me, for my income was very small. I was content to be, in the words of Schulze-Delitzsch, an "intellectual honorary member" of the club.

In Leipsic, some people felt the need of striking one great blow as a counterstroke to Lassalle's advent and the agitation of his followers. So I was instructed to confer with Schulze-Delitzsch concerning a meeting. He was willing. In his reply, he stated that we should have to be particularly careful in Saxony, because the Saxon laborers had shown an inclination for Communist and Socialist ideas, even in 1848 and 1849. In the course of January, 1864, Schulze-Delitzsch came to Leipsic.

It had been agreed that I should open the meeting with an address of welcome to Schulze, and then be elected chairman. But I was in ill luck. I opened the meeting, which was attended by 4,000 to 5,000 people, but got stuck in the middle of my address of welcome, which I had learned by heart. My temperament had run away with my thoughts. I felt like dropping thru the floor for shame. The result was that not I, but Dolge was chosen as chairman. I resolved then and there never to learn another speech by heart, and I have fared well that way. Schulze-Delitzsch did not have an agreeable voice, and his delivery was dry. Nor was the contents of his speech calculated to create enthusiasm. He was a disappointment for many. He did not stop the development in the direction of the left side.

We tried to realize the resolution of the Frankfort convention by attempting to create district assemblies in Saxony. But as the existing legislation stood in the way, we asked permission from the Beust ministry. At a state convention, held under my chairmanship in the Summer of 1864, the reply of von Beust was read. In it the minister permitted the organization of a district assembly, provided that the clubs would agree not to occupy themselves with political, social or public affairs in general. Thereupon I moved the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted: "The Saxon workingmen's clubs thank Mr. von Beust for his gracious gift, and prefer to dispense with the creation of a district assembly." A second resolution was offered, to the following effect: "The assembled delegates call on the Saxon workingmen to de-

mand energetically the abolition of the existing laws on association." But the police officer who supervised the meeting, would not permit a vote on this resolution, because it was a political act. I engaged in a sharp controversy with him over this question, but submitted, under protest, when he threatened to dissolve the convention.

On August 31, 1864, the telegraph carried the news around the world that Ferdinand Lassalle had died of the consequences of a duel in Geneva. The impression created by this news was a profound one. By far the greater part of his opponents breathed more easily, as tho freed from a nightmare. They hoped that now the movement called forth by him, would come to an end. And, indeed, it seemed so at first. Not only did his club number but a few thousand members at his death, in spite of gigantic labors, but these members soon quarrelled among themselves. Moreover, Lassalle had unfortunately chosen in the author, Bernhard Becker, whom he had recommended as his successor in the presidency of the club, a man who was not equal to his task in any way.

That even some opponents of Lassalle had a just estimate of his rôle, is shown by an article in the Coburg "Allgemeine Arbeiterzeitung," a paper founded toward the close of 1862, which had been called to life by the lawyer, Dr. Streit of Coburg, the business manager of the National Club. This paper had fought Lassalle with moderation so far. But, nevertheless, it devoted an honorable obituary to him, which closed with the following words:

"A portion of the liberal party and the liberal press, the same portion that has fought him most bitterly, and yet with the least justification, the very men who most deserved the blows of his club, may secretly gloat over his death. We regret the death of an opponent whom only injustice or narrow-mindedness can afford to measure by ordinary standards."

It is well known that the Countess Hatzfeldt, for long years the intimate friend of Lassalle, carried on a veritable cult with his corpse. She planned to transport it all over Germany, for the purpose of holding services over it everywhere. But the authorities, thru the intervention of Lassalle's relatives, spoiled this plan. On hearing the news that the corpse of Lassalle would be passing thru Mannheim, Eichelsdoerfer wrote a letter to Sonnemann, from which I take the following passages, because they show, how some individuals on our side looked upon the situation by this time:

"Dear Friend Sonnemann:

"The corpse of Lassalle will arrive here on Friday, as Reusche telegraphs to me from Geneva. It will be taken on board the steamer. We may have been his opponents in life, but in the main we agreed, we wanted to help the vast mass of our people, and I believe we have learned, in the meantime, that no trenchant improvement can be expected without universal suffrage and without the resulting transformation of our political conditions. Perhaps the present moment would be favorable for some action on our side, in order to bring about a unification of the two drifts on the basis of a fitting program, which action might serve as a monument to the dead champion. A little more moderation on the other side, and a little more determination on our own, might lead up to that, and would only serve the cause, since the Philistines of the leading liberalism must be driven, if they are to go ahead towards their aim. This view of mine I do not hesitate to communicate to you, in order to hear your opinion, so that we may induce our friends to take steps that might be far-reaching in their consequences, under certain circumstances—and that could not do any harm, on the other hand.

Also I have the vague feeling that we shall be driven to energetic resolutions in Leipsic*, since, on the one

* Leipsic had been chosen as the place of the next joint convention of the clubs.

hand, everything presses forward to the principles, and we will hardly obstruct them. Half-heartedness and vagueness are good for nothing; they do not even help to prepare the correct solution. . . . I shall not be able to evade the duty of accompanying the body of Lassalle. A few of my friends will do the same. I do not know whether I shall invite the club, since this might be misconstrued, because many people do not, and many more do not want to, understand that one can acknowledge the merits of Lassalle without going with him in everything." Finally, he asks Sonnemann to communicate his opinion to him.

In a postscript he says: "Would it not be fitting for you, as the president of the workingmen's association, to come here and pay the last respects to your opponent? If you want to do this, wire me. Then I shall let you know the time of the arrival of the body, as soon as I shall know it."

I do not know what reply Sonnemann made to this letter, at any rate, Eichelsdoerfer's suggestion was not considered. Much water had to flow down the Rhine, before any such action, as Eichelsdoerfer wanted, was realized.

After the permanent committee had decided, on motion of the Industrial Educational Club of Leipsic, to hold the next convention there, the Coburg "Arbeiterzeitung" opposed this. The paper declared that it was out of the question to hold such a convention in a Saxony ruled by Mr. von Beust, and, therefore, it opened the debate on this resolution. The only clubs who seconded the Coburg "Arbeiterzeitung" were those of Baden, which voted in this sense at their convention. In a way, the misgivings against the holding of a convention in Saxony were justified, for it depended wholly upon Mr. von Beust, by virtue of the Saxon law on association, to decree rain or sunshine.

In order to avoid the rain, we took account of the situation to the extent of obtaining from the permanent committee, at our request, the declaration that they


would not place the military question, an eminently political question, on the order of business of the convention. The local committee on preparations was formed by two members each of the "Vorwaerts" Club, the Industrial Educational Club, and the Educational Club of the printers, also by Professor K. Biedermann and a member of the committee of the Polytechnic Society. The chairmanship was entrusted to me. Mr. von Beust kept us waiting a long time for his decision, but finally he gave his consent. The convention was now called for October 23d and 24th, and the following order of business adopted: (1) Free movement. (2) Co-operatives; (a) Consumers' co-operatives; (b) Producers' co-operatives. (3) A uniform plan of instruction for educational clubs. (4) A fund for the assistance of young wanderers, which was demanded by many young laborers in the clubs. (5) Old age insurance. (6) Life insurance. (7) Regulation of the labor market, also an employment agency. (8) Workingmen's homes. (9) Election of the permanent committee.

That was a rather crowded order of business, whose completion was made possible only by publishing the reports and resolutions of the reporters beforehand, and making speeches and reports short. The thoroughness of both left much to desire.

There were 47 clubs represented, eight of them from Leipsic alone, and three district federations, namely, from the Upperland of Baden, Württemberg and the Main district. In Leipsic, there existed at that time, aside from the professional club of printers, a similar club of the bricklayers and carpenters. Besides, the Lassalleans, under the leadership of Fritzsche, had quickly founded three other professional clubs, one each of the cigarmakers, the tailors and the journeymen smiths. Among the delegates were, for the first time, Dr. Friedrich Albert Lange, representative of the Duisburg Consumers' Club, and Dr. Max Hirsch for the Magdeburg Workingmen's Educational Society. Professor V. A. Huber, the conservative

representative of the idea of co-operation, was present as a guest.

The convention elected Bandow, of Berlin, as the first chairman, Dolge and myself as his alternates. In the name of the city, the burgomaster, Dr. Koch, welcomed the convention. Right at the very first order of business, Fritzsche started trouble and his followers created scenes of disorder, having taken possession of the galleries of the hall. Fritzsche declared, after the manner of Lassalle, that liberty to move about freely should no longer be debated, but simply decreed, but that universal suffrage should be demanded. He spoke very provokingly, and thereby called forth the demonstrative applause of his followers. The delegates protested vigorously against this method. On this occasion I admired the talent of Friedrich Albert Lange for settling difficulties successfully. An energetic intervention on my part, in my capacity as chairman of the local committee, also created quiet in the galleries. Next day we had another lively scene, when Fritzsche demanded the floor after the debate had been closed. When the floor was refused to him, he protested against the prevailing terrorism and resigned as a delegate. The resolutions of this convention were of no great importance. Fr. Albert Lange, who reported on consumers' clubs, proved to be a brilliant speaker. The following members were elected to the permanent committee: Bandow, Bebel, Dr. M. Hirsch, Lachmann of Offenbach, Lange, Martens of Hamburg, who used to be a disciple of Weitling, but who showed no longer any signs of his communism, Reinhard of Coburg, formerly member of Parliament in Mecklenburg, Sonnemann, Staudinger of Nuremberg, Stuttmann of Russelsheim, Weithmann of Stuttgart and Max Wirth of Frankfurt-on-Main.





Friedrich Albert Lange.

Thru my membership on the permanent committee, I came into closer contact with Friedrich Albert Lange, personally and by correspondence. He had a short and strong figure, and was of a sympathetic presence. He had magnificent eyes, and was one of the most amiable men whom I have ever known. He won the hearts of people at first sight. Withal, he was a man of firm character, who went thru life upright, and who was not cowed by oppression. And this was not spared to him, when he openly championed the working class. Very soon he became one of the "outlawed" and "isolated" in the industrial city of Duisburg. Between us and the Lassalleans, he occupied a middle ground, as evidenced by his book on the "Labor Question," published in January, 1865. If, in later editions of his work, his standpoint inclines more to the right side, and if it is true, as critics of his history of materialism say, that he inclines towards metaphysics in it, I regard these leanings as results of a long and severe physical ailment, to which he succumbed, all too young.

On the permanent committee, Lange always stood on the left side and pressed toward the left. To me he rendered a great personal service at that time, for purely objective reasons. As I have already mentioned, we in Leipsic had come into conflict with the "Allgemeine Deutsche Arbeiterzeitung." The opposition of the paper against the holding of the convention in Leipsic had naturally created some ill-feeling among us.

The editors of the "Arbeiterzeitung," probably thru gossips in Leipsic, had received the impression that I was trying to undermine the paper, and that I was a follower of Beust. That was pretty strong. I had, on the contrary, always spoken for the paper, and had promoted its distribution. In the permanent committee, likewise, in which some opponents of the Coburg "Arbeiterzeitung"

were seated, I spoke in favor of this paper, and advocated a favorable agreement with the publishers. But when the Coburg "Arbeiterzeitung" continued its attacks against me, I sent them a peppery statement, from which they published only a passage, in which I said that I was a merciless opponent of Beust's mismanagement.

This quarrel induced the permanent committee to entrust Lange with the writing of a report, in which he defended me warmly and justified my attitude. At any rate, the "Arbeiterzeitung" at least accomplished this much, that I was beaten by one vote in the election of delegates to the Stuttgart convention, when the ballots were cast at our state convention in Clanchau, on July 30, 1865. But when I later on explained my position in the matter of the "Arbeiterzeitung," a number of delegates declared that now they looked at the matter in a different way. The "Arbeiterzeitung" later gave me full satisfaction, and declared that it had been misinformed. Streit himself personally excused himself to me at the Stuttgart national convention.

The events of the year 1866, which I shall mention later, and the attitude of Lange towards them, made him impossible in Duisburg, where he was secretary of the chamber of commerce. He dropped his little paper, "The Messenger of the Lower Rhine," and accepted an invitation of his friend, Bleuler, to transfer his domicile to Winterthur, in Switzerland. There he became a member of the editorial staff of Bleuler's "Rural Messenger of Winterthur." Bleuler was one of the leaders of the radical democracy in the canton of Zurich. Bleuler, Lange and the young Reinhold Ruedg, the subsequent co-owner of the "Zurich Post," started a sweeping agitation for a democratic reform of the constitution of the canton, with the assistance of fellow spirits, and in 1868 they saw their work crowned with success. It was due to Lange's influence that the new constitution contained the following, Article 23: "The state protects and promotes, by way of legislation,

the intellectual and physical welfare of the working classes and the development of the co-operative system."

Meanwhile, as I wish to state by way of anticipation, I had become chairman of the suburban committee of workingmen's clubs. The issue was now to induce the clubs to take the last definite step into the Social-Democratic camp. It was evident to me that this would not be done without a split. I hoped to secure Lange's assistance for this step, and on June 22, 1868, I wrote him a long letter, which his biographer, Professor C. A. Ellissen,* calls a "very peculiar letter." In this letter, I asked Lange to make the report on the military question that was to be presented at the Nuremberg convention. "Aside from the military question," so I continued, according to Ellissen, for I haven't that letter at hand, "there are still other points upon the order of business, in the discussion of which your presence and your weighty voice are of the greatest importance." In the same letter, I also mentioned the question of a program and the probability of a split, "but ten reliable clubs are better than thirty doubtful ones."

Lange replied, on July 5th:

"Dear Mr. Bebel:—

"I regret very much to have left you in doubt, but my existence during the last week was such that I was in Zurich in the day time, in order to report on the work of the committee on constitution, and that during the night I had to take care of a daily paper and a weekly. My associate and colleague, in his capacity as vice-president of the committee on constitution and member of numerous special committees, has momentarily so much to do 'pro patria,' that I have the editorial work and the care of a rather large business on my own shoulders. Under these circumstances, I cannot think of any correspondence except Saturday afternoon and Sunday. Unfortunately, I

* Friedrich Albert Lange. A biography by O. A. Ellissen. Leipzig, 1891. A book worth reading.

cannot dispose freely of my time, until after the new constitution shall have been completed, and we shall be glad to get it done this year. It is true, that we shall get a pause of several months; but I cannot tell with certainty, when it will be, and so I regret that I must decline to undertake the report on the military question. If my time should permit, I shall, nevertheless, go to Nuremberg, as I am also anxious to meet so many good friends once more, altho some of them are in another camp."

The Nuremberg convention took place without Lange. I never saw him again, and my correspondence with him ceased also. At the end of October, 1870, Lange was appointed professor at the university of Zurich. When, in 1872, the liberal minister of education, Falk, called Lange to Marburg as a professor, Zurich tried in vain to hold him. The pull of the home country, which was particularly strong in his wife, won out. But on November 23, 1875, he succumbed to his long ailment, at the age of only 47 years. With Lange, one of the best men ceased to live.





New Social Phenomena.

In the spring of 1865, the first German Women's Congress convened in Leipsic under the leadership of Louise Otto-Peters and Augusta Schmidt, resulting in the foundation of a General Association of German Women. It was the first step in the world of German women that led to an organization of women. The "Women's Paper," which was then edited by a retired captain named Korn, became the organ of the association. In addition to Korn, Mrs. Louise Otto-Peters and Miss Jenny Heynrichs became members of the editorial staff. I attended the proceedings as a guest. When the Leipsic Women's Educational Club, of which Louise Otto-Peters was president, applied to the Workingmen's Educational Club for permission to use this club's hall on Sundays for a girls' Sunday school, we gladly consented.

The year 1865, which was a prosperous one, witnessed many strikes that broke out in various cities for higher wages. There were great walkouts in Hamburg, a strike of clothmakers in Burg, near Magdeburg, a walkout of the Leipsic printers, followed by a walkout of Leipsic shoemakers and other lines. The Leipsic printers' strike had been caused by low wages and long hours of labor. The highest weekly wages amounted to five dollars and a quarter. The wage for 1000 n's amounted to 25 Saxon pennies; the journeymen demanded 30 pennies and a reduction of the hours of labor. On March 24th, notice was given by 545 men, out of 800, and eight days later they walked out. No organization existed for the payment of strike benefits. The Printers' Educational Club, whose chairman was Richard Haertel, had to remain neutral, on penalty of dissolution. Haertel himself worked in a shop, owned by Colditz, who had signed the new scale. The printers' union was not founded until 1866, and its direct cause was the Leipsic strike. An attempt

at arbitration, made by Privy Counselor, Professor Dr. von Waechter, one of the foremost jurists of Germany, had been unsuccessful.

Sonnemann, who had watched the case with particular interest, being a boss printer himself, wrote me, in order to suggest that I should offer to both sides the services of our permanent committee as arbitrators, and made various suggestions as to how I should behave in this rôle. As the correspondence, which I had with him on this subject, still has some interest to-day, I publish it herewith.

“Leipsic, May 11, 1865.

“Mr. Leopold Sonnemann, Frankfort-on-Main.

“Owing to illness, I have not been able to answer your favor of the first of this month until now. I fully sanction your plan to attempt the rôle of arbitrator in the present printers' strike. Therefore, I addressed, first of all, the president of the printers' union, in this city, in order to hear his opinion of the matter. He replied that he was himself working in a shop, which had adopted the new tariff, so that he was not directly interested in the question. He advised me to apply to the tariff committee.

“On Tuesday afternoon I conferred with this committee, and was pleased to note the readiness with which my offer was met. They named a few employers, whom they advised me to interview, in order to ascertain whether that side was willing to consider the matter of arbitration. These were Messieurs Giesecke & Devrient and Ackermann (the firm of Teubner). Yesterday I went to see them.

“Devrient was away on a trip. Giesecke was out, and at Ackermann's I was told that I had better see City Counselor Haertel, of the firm of Breitkopf & Haertel, or Brockhaus, who were chairmen of the association. I must remark at this point that I had intentionally avoided these men, because they are known to be among the most violent enemies of the workers. Nevertheless, I felt, after this reference, that I had better see Haertel. I found both brothers at home, and conferred with them for about an

hour. But the final result was that the employers did not care to take any steps that would lead to an agreement, after the tariff committee of the printers had shown itself so unyielding against the attempts of the Privy Counselor, Professor von Waechter. I replied that, during the last fourteen days, their views had evidently changed, and that they would readily listen to arbitration.

“But these, and similar statements on my part, did no good. I felt very clearly, from the remarks of the gentlemen, that they were very bitter against the tariff committee, and that they did not want any agreement.

“Among other assertions, I was told by them that this committee had no authority to act in the name of the typesetters, but that it had simply assumed this rôle. This assertion certainly looks queer, in view of all the facts. Then I was told: „What good would it do, if the committee should agree with the employers, so long as the others would not agree?” Anyway, they said, they had no reason for accepting somebody else’s arbitration, since Privy Counselor Professor von Waechter, when dropping the negotiations, had declared himself willing to resume them at any time, and if the workers were really in earnest, they could take steps accordingly.

“After these declarations I realized how little success further negotiations must have, and so I withdrew.

“I immediately acquainted the striking printers, who were holding a meeting in the Colosseum, with the situation. I have not been informed to date what they have decided.

“I am sorry not to have secured a better result.

“Nevertheless, I shall follow up the matter carefully, and if matters should shape themselves more favorably for us, I shall inform you immediately.

“I am convinced that the committee is earnestly wishing an agreement, since it realizes, no doubt, that it is dangerous to carry this thing to extremes, and an honorable compromise is best. On the other hand, I am equally convinced that the above named Mr. Haertel did

not act in conformity with the wishes of all employers, as it is known that most of them are willing to arbitrate. But we cannot confer with them individually, because Haertel, as their chairman, has to pass upon all such offers. I intend to publish the whole affair in the press, and to wait whether individual employers will not condescend to offer their hands for an agreement over the heads of such extremist leaders as Haertel, Brockhaus, etc. I also wish to state that six shops have granted the principal demands of the workers. . . .”

Sonnemann replied to this letter, by return mail, on May 12th:

“I was surprised to be without news from you so long. My inquiry of the first of this month, concerning the printers, was only a preliminary one. My clearly expressed intention was that you should act jointly with Dr. Hirsch and Bandow, and both of them had already declared their willingness to me. Not that I have not full confidence in you, or that you could not handle the matter alone; my intention was to give more formality and dignity to the action of the committee, by having three of its members act as representatives. In this respect, I counted especially upon Bandow, who is well respected in Leipsic, as the chairman of our convention. However, you have left nothing undone, and it is only to be regretted that the result of your efforts was not more favorable. Before you publish anything, I consider it appropriate that I should write once more to Brockhaus and Haertel, and offer to these gentlemen, once more, the services of a delegation from our committee. I should advance the reason that the workers have the most confidence in their chosen representatives. Perhaps we might run the thing in such a way that the printers give full powers to our delegation. The employers may choose their Privy Counselor von Waechter and a few other gentlemen, and these committees might then make a decision jointly. Write me by return mail whether you agree that I should write once more to the gentlemen. A few lines from you will suffice. I must not refrain from tell-

ing you that, in my opinion, the journeymen printers have gone too far in the form and the substance of the matter. They have been egged on by the Lassalleans, I suspect. If this were not the case, they would have secured their demands, for there was never a more favorable time for their efforts to raise wages than the present. This is demonstrated by the fact that everywhere the moderately and decently advanced demands have been granted."

The assumption of Sonnemann, that the Lassalleans had had their hands in this strike, was quite wrong. While Schweitzer's "Socialdemocrat" showed a lively interest in the strike of the Leipsic printers, it did not exert any influence over them.

On the next day I wrote the following answer:

"In reply to your favor of the 12th of this month, I wish to say that I understand fully your intention as expressed in your favor of the first of this month. But from this point of view, it was quite natural that I should first inquire of both parties whether they would be willing to accept the intervention of the permanent committee. That I did nothing else, you may see from the statement of Haertel in yesterday's 'Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung.' I have only to say, in justification of myself, that, after the personal declarations of this gentleman, it was impossible for me to make such an offer officially.

"It seems that his statement has been called out mainly by various inquiries on the part of some employers, concerning certain press notices, which reported that the printers' union of this city had declined to arbitrate the difficulty, whereas it had not been asked at all, in its corporate capacity.

"I wish to state expressly that the news items in the public papers, which are largely contradictory, have not been issued by me. But they have at least done some good by stirring up public opinion, and by inducing Privy Counselor von Waechter, yesterday morning, to invite me for a conference with him. He informed me that he was willing, at any time, to take up the matter of arbitra-

tion, and that he asked my assistance in this matter. He suggested that we should inquire once more of the tariff committee, whether they were willing to meet us, and on what basis. At the same time, he remarked that he considered it indispensable that the printers' union should make some concessions. I had to agree with him in this view, and you are right in saying that the form, in which the matter was started, was not the correct one.

"A repeated inquiry, at the tariff committee, revealed their willingness to meet Waechter, and come to an agreement with him. I declared, once more on this occasion, that the permanent committee would be willing to assume the rôle of arbitrators in co-operation with Waechter. This was accepted with thanks, and they promised to give me their answer after they would have had their conference with Waechter. Unfortunately, I was not at home yesterday afternoon, when the delegation came to see me. This morning, after receiving your letter, I betook myself immediately to the meeting place of the tariff committee, but found no one there. I shall go there again later. This is ten thirty A. M.

"One o'clock P. M. Just now a member of the tariff committee has left me, having made the following communication to me. The chairman of this committee went to Waechter yesterday, at my request, and expressed their willingness to negotiate with him once more in co-operation with the permanent committee. When asked on what basis this was to be done, they offered the proposition to make a different sort of tariff, namely, to go by the alphabet instead of by 1000 n's. Waechter agreed to this, and promised to confer with some employers and to let them know what success he had. Up to the present no such answer has come from him, and, in my opinion, we cannot do anything else but to wait for it. Then I shall send you news immediately.

"I cannot give my consent to your intention to write to Brockhaus and Haertel, for they are the bitterest enemies of the workers' and of the workingmen's clubs. Also you would place yourself in a false light by advancing

such a motive as you suggest. For it is said of Haertel, that he tried to induce the chief of police of this city to dissolve the workingmen's clubs, because they partly assisted the striking workers, and I had to hear from his own lips that the matter could be settled best if the workers and their clubs would cease to assist the printers with funds.

"Finally, I must repudiate the charge of your letter, that I wanted to arbitrate this matter alone. I had not the slightest intention of doing so, but have rather spoken expressly to the tariff committee, as well as to Haertel, of a delegation of the permanent committee, naming the members specifically. I should like to have Bandow and Hirsch here, even to discuss our own affairs."

Three days later, on May 16th, I wrote another letter to Sonnemann, in which I said:

"I am now in a position to report to you definitely on the printers' affair.

"As I informed you in my letter, the tariff committee, at my suggestion, had begun negotiations with Waechter, and had suggested a new method of calculation to him as a basis. Waechter agreed to this, and called the former arbitration committee of the employers, in order to submit to them this offer of the tariff committee. They figured and figured, but found, in the end, that the result would be the same, since often they would have to pay only 27 to 28 pennies, but equally often 32 and 33 pennies. Members of the tariff committee assured me that the price would, indeed, remain the same by this calculation, only the form would be different. The principals, then, declined to arbitrate the matter, since they did not want to come to an agreement, unless the printers would make concessions in their demands.

"When I received your favor yesterday morning,* I immediately approached the tariff committee once more, submitted to them the Frankfort tariff and your calcula-

* The ink in my copy of this letter has become so faded that it cannot be read any more.

tion as a basis for an agreement with the employers, and emphasized once more that I was myself of the opinion that it was necessary for them not to cling stubbornly to their demands, and not to drive matters to excess. The member to whom I spoke declared himself in agreement with these views, promised to lay them before his colleagues and to report to me.

"Yesterday evening I received a reply. It was negative. They justified their actions with the excuse that they had various things in prospect, and for this reason they hoped to enforce their demands in time. Leipsic, as the main seat of printing, should strive, above all, to obtain the highest possible wages, because this would be of great influence for other cities. Besides, your calculation contained a lot of points, in which they could, and would, make concessions, to the employers. I was surprised at this reply. I had confidently expected that this proposition would be accepted. After it has been declined, I have no further reason to take any more steps in this matter, unless I am asked to do so from the other side.

"It seems to me that, just as the employers are controlled by Haertel and Brockhaus, so a few members of the tariff committee command all others. Now, we must let them try which one of the two parties will win out by stubbornness.

"The printers expect a favorable influence from the bookdealers' exchange, which is being organized. To what extent this will help the demands of the strikers, remains to be seen. It is a fact that many letters of encouragement and money are still coming to them, and keeping up their fighting spirit.

"As you will know, the police are proceeding against the striking printers, and I do not like this at all. Nineteen men have already left the city on account of this, on Monday. One has gone back to work. This is certainly a deplorable result, if the police repression has been resorted to, with this end in view."

Another letter of mine to Sonnemann, dated May 28th,

contains the laconic postscript: "In the matter of the printers, everything is in the same old condition."

On June 20th, Sonnemann writes again:

"I am not a little surprised that you left my letter of the 17th of this month wholly unnoticed (it could not be deciphered, for the reason named above, but it had something to do with the printers' affair). If the mechanism between us does not dovetail any better, then the publication of the pamphlets will be pretty difficult for me."

This requires the following explanation: The permanent committee, being continually in conflict with the publishers of the "Allgemeine Arbeiterzeitung," in Coburg, had decided to issue leaflets, which should appear weekly, if possible. These leaflets were to contain all matters referring to the labor movement, and the members of the committee were to be the principal editors. My reply to Sonnemann's letter is dated June 23d, and is as follows:

"I must repudiate the charges of neglect which you hurl at me in your last letter of the 20th of this month. You would not have made them, if you knew my circumstances. These are such that I cannot dispose of my time at will. While I have my independent business, I am compelled, by my lack of means, to earn my living by work; in addition to this, a good portion of the burden of business in the Workingmen's Educational Club rests also upon me, and I am compelled to sacrifice many an hour to it, aside from the evenings, which are taken up wholly with club matters. Nevertheless, I shall try to fulfill my obligations, so far as I am able to do so, and I should have answered your first letter long ago, if I had anything worth mentioning to report.

"Particularly in regard to the labor and wage question, a regular calm has ensued, as was to be expected after the excitement and the noise of the preceding weeks.

"In the matter of the book printing, I saw Heinke, the editor of the 'Correspondent' (founded in 1863), on Tuesday. Heinke will send you the paper regularly, in a wrap-

per, beginning July 1st, in exchange for leaflets or other communications. . . . He also promised to let me have important news concerning book printers' affairs, either in the city or outside, and in that case I shall report to you as quickly as possible.

"In regard to the printers' strike, he told me that the greater portion of the tariff committee, and of the executive committee of the Printers' Educational Club, had no employment so far, and would not be likely to find any in the near future. Nevertheless, he did not think that they would accept any assistance from our side, because, in the first place, they still had money, and in the second place, those who had work were contributing weekly to a fund for the unemployed, and in the third place, they would be likely to have to contribute to other trades in case of a strike, and that would drain their small resources still more; they had decided, from the outset, not to accept any contributions from any one but printers, or, at least, not to do so except in extreme cases."*

The apprehension of the printers, that they might be called upon to contribute to the strikes of other trades, was justified, in so far as the tailors, as well as the men employed in the construction of the city's water works, went on strike that spring, and so did the shoemakers.

In regard to the letter, I wrote to Sonnemann on June 28th:

*Gustav Jaeckh claims, in his book, on "The International" (Leipsic, 1904), that the German printers had applied to the General Council of the International through their federal president, in order to interest the International, and particularly the printers' union, in the strike of their brothers in Leipsic. These statements can hardly be correct. In the first place, no federation of printing trades existed at that time, consequently no federal president. In the second place, the printers refused to accept money from political organizations, let alone from the International. At best it might be true that the Leipsic printers addressed the General Council with the request to transmit their letter to the London printers' union. But even this seems doubtful to me.

"Yesterday, a meeting of shoemakers took place, for the purpose of debating a raise in wages. As we had an urgent meeting ourselves, I could not go there until late. So I could not give you a full report. Dr. Eras, who attended the proceedings from beginning to end, will have sent such a report to the 'Neue Frankfurter Zeitung,' and you may use it in the leaflet.

"To judge by the spirit which prevailed in that meeting, the laborers will not persist with their very just demands. Lack of clearness, disagreements among themselves, will not permit such a thing, altho they need it worse than other laborers, since a good worker earns \$2.00, 20 new groshen to \$3.00 per week. We, being outsiders, could not take part in the debate, but Eras and myself told them what we thought of them in private conversation. Only it will not do any good."

On July 1st, Sonnemann replied as follows:

"I have your favors of June 23d and 28th before me. My hint to you was not meant as an offense, as you may have taken it. I know very well that your time is taken up, and that it is very hard for you to sacrifice still more time to our cause; neither do I expect any long letters; two lines are always enough in order to report a thing briefly. If you had written me at once that the printers did not need any assistance from us, it would have been enough for the moment.

"As concerns this point, I am glad that the strikers are not short of funds. I merely ask, to tell them repeatedly, that our committee is ready to take sides with them, and I have expressed myself accordingly in our leaflet."

This ended our correspondence on the printers' strike. The printers obtained but a partial success. The majority of their men were discharged. In August, the printers' union decided to quadruple the dues, first, in order to pay back the loans made to it, and in the second place, for the purpose of being able to assist the remaining victims of the strike. The tariff committee was sentenced to ten days of imprisonment for violation of the strike

clause of the Saxon trade ordinance. Their appeal from this sentence resulted in its reversal. The shoemakers were luckier, contrary to expectations, for they enforced a raise of wages up to 25 per cent. What helped them was the fact that the masters were not organized, and most of them were small masters, who could not offer any resistance.

The attitude of a number of well known liberals during the Leipsic strike, induced me to say, in Number 8 of our leaflet, that it was a fact that the demands of the laborers had met with the most determined resistance, precisely from that side which was continually flirting with the people, and pretending to be the friend of the workingmen. It was no wonder, therefore, that one could hear, even in those labor circles, which had nothing to do with Lassalleanism, remarks about the progressive party that were anything but flattering. This would not increase the sympathies of the laborers for that party.

In the same summer (July), we called a labor meeting, in order to protest against the decisions of the chambers of commerce and trades, which had decided that the newly introduced work books should be preserved in the hands of the employers, contrary to the trade ordinance, instead of those of the laborers. Also, the employers claimed the right to enter testimonials into those books, without the consent of the laborers. A proclamation, calling upon interested parties to join our protest, which we addressed to the Saxon workingmen, had good success. The Lassalleans, in that case, made common cause with us.





The Stuttgart National Convention.

The third national convention of the workingmen's clubs had been called by the permanent committee for September 3d to 5th, 1865, to Stuttgart. In it, sixty clubs and one district federation were represented by sixty delegates. Among the delegates, the following were prominent: Hermann Grulich of Reutigen, Professor Eckhardt of Mannheim, Banker Edward Pfeiffer of Stuttgart, Julius Motteler of Crimmitschau, who had been in Leipsic in 1864, Streit of Coburg, Staudinger of Nuremberg, Professor Wundt of Heidelberg, who later acquired a great name as a physiologist, and who is now professor at the University of Leipsic. Of the men named here, Hermann Grulich went, shortly after the Stuttgart convention, from Reutigen to Zurich, where he became a Socialist about the same time that I did. He was a disciple of Carl Buerkli and Jean Philipp Becker. Julius Motteler passed thru the same development about the same time. Professor Eckhardt was the editor of the "Deutsche Wochenblatt," founded in Mannheim in 1864. Eckhardt stood on the extreme left wing of democracy.

In the local committee sat Banker Pfeiffer and Lawyer Hoelder, who was later on Minister of the Interior for Württemberg, and who, in the name of the local committee and of the city, welcomed the delegates. Bandow presided. The order of business was once more overcrowded. The point, "old age insurance," was stricken off, at the request of Sonnemann. He desired to issue a leaflet about it first. I had to make a report on co-operative meals, such as were in vogue in the German workingmen's clubs of Switzerland for unmarried men. My printed report was very meager. My speech on it was the shortest of all. Max Hirsh had the report on the conquest of universal, equal and direct suffrage. He advocated, in the resolution offered by him, that the working-

men's clubs should exert their whole strength for its conquest. This resolution called forth the opposition of Wundt, who moved, in the name of the clubs of Oldenburg and Baden, with the exception of Mannheim, that the regular order of business be taken up, which called forth a storm of anger. Finally, Hirsch altered his resolution by substituting "German workingmen" for "German workingmen's clubs," whereupon the resolution was unanimously adopted. Hirzel-Nuremberg reported on the right of coalition; he demanded the abolition of all barriers which stood in the way of the exercise of this right, and it was so resolved, unanimously. With the same unanimity, the motion of Bandow, to abolish the wanderbooks and the compulsory identification, was adopted.

Moritz Mueller, of Pforzheim, a somewhat peculiar but zealous and in his way benevolent manufacturer of jewelry, had to report on the woman question, which question he handled as a specialty. In his written report he demanded the full social equality of women with men, the foundation of educational institutes for female laborers, and the organization of unions of female laborers. The debate on this question consumed the longest time. Professor Eckhardt declared expressly, that the social emancipation of women implied also the **granting of suffrage to women**, such as the convention demanded for men. With this interpretation, the resolutions of Mueller were adopted by a considerable majority.

The decisions of the Stuttgart convention signified, as a whole, a decided step toward the left. In all practical questions of internal politics, the so-called "self-helpers" and the Lassalleans, stood upon the same ground. The organization, likewise, underwent a slight improvement. The contribution of \$2.00 per year from each club, signified the financial impotence of the permanent committee. So I made the suggestion in the leaflets of the permanent committee, to begin by levying a per capita tax of one groschen per year on each member, and paying the chairman of the permanent committee \$300.00, in order

that men who were financially dependent, might be able to accept this position. Furthermore, I suggested that the chairman be elected directly by the national convention. And, finally, I moved that the national convention should be called only once in two years, on account of the great expense, and thus to enable the district federations to develop better. This was not exactly a master stroke on my part. After a lively debate, the dues of one groschen per capita, which the committee on organization also advocated, were adopted, but my other suggestions were declined. The convention also decided, by a vote of 30 against 22, that an official organ of the clubs was not needed. By this decision, a clash with the publisher of the Coburg "Arbeiterzeitung" was avoided, which paper had a strong following among the clubs. I should like to remark at this point, that the available reports of the proceedings of these conventions are exceedingly brief and very incomplete.

The following were elected members of the permanent committee: Bandow, Bebel, Eichelsdoerfer, M. Hirsch, Hochberger of Esslingen, Koenig of Hanau, F. A. Lange, Lippold of Glauchau, Richter of Hamburg, Sauerteig of Gotha, Sonnemann, Staudinger of Nuremberg. Sonnemann, who was re-elected chairman of the committee, declined the position. His place was taken by Staudinger, who was not equal to it, as experience showed. He was a man of some years, a master tailor by profession, and the engineer, Hirzel of Nuremberg, was to be his assistant, in the capacity of secretary.

At no other national convention did the effort of the various bourgeois party leaders to gain a dominating influence over these clubs show itself so plainly as at this Stuttgart convention. All felt that they were approaching a decision on the German question. The discussions between the left and the right became more and more lively and acrimonious. The antagonisms between Prussia on the one side, and Austria and the majority of the small and medium sized German states became more acute. The joint occupation of the duchies of Slesvig-

Holstein by Austrian and Prussian troops, after the defeat of the Danes and their exodus from both lands, which became German territory, generated more and more cases of conflict. The German people drifted, gradually, into a state of high excitement.

These feelings were evidenced also in the toasts at the banquet of the convention, which took place on Saturday evening, in the meeting hall of the convention, the "Liederhalle," the same hall in which, 42 years later, in August, 1907, was held for the first time on German soil, the international congress of workingmen. While men, like Hoelder and his followers, were covertly praising the leading rôle of Prussia, the democrats, particularly their spokesman, Carl Mayer, of Stuttgart, advocated a radical solution, which we younger men, without saying as much in so many words, conceived as a demand for a German republic. Carl Mayer, then the most celebrated popular speaker of Württemberg, whom nature had endowed with a powerful voice, sat opposite me at the banquet table. He rose, in order to thunder with all the strength of his lungs, and in striking pictures, against the reactionary federal parliament in Frankfort, which should be removed, in order to pave the way for a democratic union of Germany. In his zeal, he shoved back the sleeves of his coat and shirt, and showed a pair of muscular arms, which he swung about to emphasize his speech. Now and then he pounded on the table with his fist, and made glasses and plates dance on it. Naturally his cheer for a free and democratic Germany brought forth thundering applause. The city of Stuttgart had also gone to some expense, and regaled us with an afternoon lunch and some Suabian wine, when we took a walk on Monday afternoon, to see the "Schuetzenhaus."

Streit, in Coburg, was at that time publishing a work entitled "Germany's Liberation from Its Deepest Shame," in which open propaganda was made for a German republic, a thing that naturally would have been impossible without a revolution. But the idea of revolution did not

terrify people in those days. The memories of the revolutionary years had been brought back to life thru the speeches and writings of participants and non-participants. That a victorious revolution was possible, nearly all Germany, with the exception of the East-Elbian provinces, believed. I have already mentioned that Bismarck and Miquel adapted themselves to this possibility. The latter's friend, Mr. von Bennigsen, wrote a letter to his mother in 1850, in which he said, after discussing the situation in Slesvig-Holstein :

"So long as the national party does not rule in Prussia—and even at this moment the leaders are in doubt whether they should start a serious opposition against the present government for the next legislature—the heroic struggle of this German country will be in vain. I fear only too confidently that we shall witness the complete subjugation of Slesvig-Holstein, in order to fill the measure of shame and bitterness. But the rest of our European families of royal lineage shall not be disturbed by bad memories and dreams alone. In a dozen years, at the most, the thunder will no doubt roll again, and the lightning will strike, and among us younger men a greater number are daily taking a quiet oath that they, whether constitutionals or radicals, will not permit themselves to be deceived again by miserable promises, given in the moment of fear. The whole bunch will be shipped to America, and then we shall try to come to an agreement whether we want a king or a president. And the followers of von Gagern and Dahlmann will hardly try to prevent this, nor feel inclined to sooth. . . ."

Twelve years later the writer of this letter, in his capacity as president of the German National Club, was among the most influential personalities of Germany; he was, perhaps, the most influential. But Mr. von Bennigsen then observed the same policy which he had once condemned in the followers of von Gagern and Dahlmann. The idea of a revolution against Bismarckian Prussia had become incomprehensible to him. What he thought toward the end of his life, about the revolution of 1848

and 1849, may be seen by the excited debate which I called forth, intentionally, on the fiftieth anniversary of March 18th, on March 18th, 1898, in the German Reichstag, when Mr. von Bennigsen was my principal opponent.

What Lassalle, Marx and Engels thought of a coming revolution in Germany, may be seen by their correspondence which Mehring published, thru Dietz, in Stuttgart. The victorious march of Garibaldi to Naples and Sicily, in 1860, which secured an immense popularity for him throught the entire civilized world, had also fortified the faith in the power of revolutionary masses.

That even in very high circles of southern Germany, the probability of a revolution in the interest of Germany was considered, is shown by the memoirs of Prince Hohenlohe, who, after dwelling at length upon the insufferable disruption of Germany, and the incompatibility of such a condition for any length of time, with the requirements of those days, declares: "This explains why even the most peaceful and conservative people of Germany arrive at the point where they proclaim that we must inaugurate unity by means of a revolution, because we cannot reach this goal by the legal road." And Prince Carl of Bavaria wrote to Hohenlohe, on March 23, 1866: "It seems to me that a more favorable opportunity to accomplish a federal reform **without a revolution.** . . ."

If people thought that way on top, why shouldn't they have thought in the same way below?

The proceedings and decisions of the Stuttgart national convention, concerning the liberty of coalition, were a reply to the similar proceedings of the Prussian legislature. Schulze-Delitzsch and Faucher—the latter was a so-called political economist, who tried to demonstrate seriously in a public meeting in Leipsic, in 1864, that the social question could be solved most easily if every one understood double entry book-keeping, and had a correctly going watch, so that he could calculate

by the time—had moved to repeal the paragraphs 181 and 182 of the trade ordinance of 1845, referring to the prohibition of coalitions. But, strange to say, they had neglected to demand, also, the repeal of paragraphs 183 and 184. According to paragraph 183, the formation of organizations of factory employees, journeymen or apprentices, **without the permission of the police**, was punishable. The initiators and chairmen of such organizations could be punished with a fine of not more than \$50.00, or imprisonment up to four weeks. The members could be fined not more than \$20.00, or imprisonment for fourteen days. According to paragraph 184, it was punishable to quit work voluntarily, or keep away from it in order to shirk it, or to be disobedient, or to be renitent persistently, by a fine of \$20.00, at a maximum, or imprisonment up to fourteen days. When called to order for this neglect by J. B. von Schweitzer's "Socialdemocrat" and in public meetings, the movers of this repeal sent out the statement that paragraph 183 had been repealed for fifteen years by the Prussian constitution, and that paragraph 184 had nothing to do with the right of coalition. This conception created bad blood, even in our own ranks, and the Coburg "Arbeiterzeitung," which had become ever more aggressive, sharply attacked Schulze-Delitzsch and his followers.

The leading conservative demagogue, Privy Counselor Wagener, made adroit attempts to exploit this weak attitude of the liberals in this question, by going them one better. He moved that the bill of the liberals, offered by the committee, be declined, because its formulation was ambiguous, and that the government be asked to introduce a bill by which, not merely all the exceptional decrees of the trade ordinance concerning the restrictions of the workingmen's right of association, would be repealed, but which would also pave the way for such organizations to carry them into effect, in order to enable the workingmen to assume their due position within the state and manage and represent their own interests indepen-

dently. In other words, compulsory trade unions organized by legal enactment.

So acted the conservatives at a time when they wished to cut off the water from the liberal bourgeoisie.

Another matter, in which both labor parties went hand in hand, was the festival of the members of parliament in Cologne and its course. The progressives of Cologne had invited the progressive members of the Prussian parliament, in other words, the overwhelming majority of the second House, to Cologne, for a reform festival, to be held July 22, 1865. The most brilliant feature of this was to be a banquet in the "Guerzenich." Mr. von Bismarck issued a decree prohibiting this festival, and the first burgomaster of Cologne, Bachem, was weak enough to withdraw his permission for the use of the Guerzenich hall. This incident created a great sensation. When the representatives arrived in Cologne, Mr. von Bismarck ordered their meetings dispersed by the police and the soldiers. Thereupon they steamed to Oberlahnstein, in order to do there upon the soil of a small state what could not be done in the state of the German mission, Prussia. But even there the soldiers interfered and made a meeting impossible.

Everywhere vigorous protests arose against this brutal policy of Bismarck. In Berlin, in Leipsic and in other places, the Lassalleans and the members of workmen's clubs went hand in hand, in order to protest against the incidents in Cologne, and to demand the full liberty of the clubs and meetings. Like the "Social-democrat," the Coburg "Arbeiterzeitung" started a campaign of derision and scorn against the progressive representatives that had behaved with anything but bravery in this affair.

These incidents gave rise to a correspondence between Sonnemann and Fr. Albert Lange. The latter had been in Cologne to witness the festival. Sonnemann complained, because Lange had not sent him a report on the Cologne events, and ventured the opinion that the Social Democrats were playing a game of chance, and would

lose it. He sent Lange, by the same mail, a letter about the Cologne happenings from Bandow, who, unfortunately, was ill at this critical time, and requested that Lange forward this letter to me, after reading it, whereupon I might return it to Sonnemann. I do not remember any more what the letter contained.

Lange replied, on July 31, 1865: "As for the meeting at Lantsch (labor meeting in Cologne), I did not think it opportune to say much about it. The sentiment of the audience was excellent. But I do not care any more than you to assume the responsibility of giving out any watchword on my own hook in these times of ferment, and this would have been necessary in a report of this meeting, with its interesting consequences. . . .

"I judge the time very much as you do, as a very critical one. By the way, I do not think that Schweitzer is playing a game of chance altogether. For in that case, the game would be lost already. The workingmen at present, especially in the Rhineland, do not think at all of rising for the sake of principle. I believe that the intention is rather to kill the 'Socialdemocrat' honestly, and then, relying on the publicly started organization, to introduce the system of secret societies (? ! A. B.). I am no longer blinded by the splendor of the House of Representatives. Never have I felt more clearly that the present Progressive Party has reached its end, but **our** time has not come yet.

"Let us observe and keep the threads in our hands, enlarge our connections, gather friends; but do not let us give out any watchword. **We shall find out by and by whether we can go together**, when the time comes. Meanwhile, let us cultivate our interrelations. . . .

"Reverting to the attitude of our paper (the leaflets), and the political and social crisis, I recommend once more to keep the social part exhaustive and interesting, but objective; **but make the political part sharp, as frank against all rulers, as possible. We cannot take any other part in the controversies of this gentry but the same,**

against all of them, more particularly against those who are now whistling a liberal melody."

In a postscript, Lange writes: "I see just now that the beginning of my letter is unnecessarily mysterious. The reports of all liberal papers on the Lantsch meeting are invented out of the whole cloth. With the exception of W. Angerstein, no reporter was present. After the meeting, a voluntary parade was formed, and marched thru the streets to welcome the representatives. In front of the Main guard-house, the right of association was cheered, etc. The movement was as completely out of the hands of the Lassalleans as it was unwelcome to the Liberals. The people were looking for leaders. At a hint from Angerstein and myself, they would have done anything we wished. . . . Things took their natural course. No one led. But it was easy to see what would happen, if the government should continue in the same way."

In the above letter, Lange intimated that later on there might be a split in the permanent committee and in the clubs. Still more clearly, he expressed himself on that point in a letter of February 10th, to Sonnemann. In it he said:

"In the matter of my attitude toward the labor question, my plan was at first to make my stay on the permanent committee dependent upon the reception of my little work ("The Labor Question"). But now it seems more appropriate, in every respect, that I should hold my position, even if I should get in a somewhat sharper opposition to the majority. The minds are bound to clash."

In the years 1865, and in the beginning of 1866, it seemed for a while as tho the hostile brothers in the labor movement would come to terms. Aside from the above mentioned cases, in which Lassalleans and members of workingmen's clubs made common cause, and worked for the same demands, a meeting of the main district, on July 17, 1865, in which Lauer and Welcker of Frankfort-on-Main, appeared as speakers from the General Association

of German Workingmen, expressed itself in the following manner :

“The labor meeting declares that, in the interest of the good cause of the laboring estate, it considers a split of the labor movement injurious and disadvantageous. This meeting, attended by members of the Main district and of the General Association of German Workingmen, stands ready to lend a hand in any measures leading to a unification.”

The principal speaker at that meeting was Professor Eckhardt, who had the subject, “State Help and Self-help,” as a basis for his speech. A similar attempt at unification, made about the middle of January, 1866, failed ; but an agreement was made to fight unitedly for the conquest of universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage. The main speaker at this meeting was Professor Wuttke.

Another public meeting, soon after the foregoing one, which had once more been called by both labor parties, in Dresden, demanded a constitutional parliament, on the basis of universal suffrage, and for its protection and support, the introduction of universal popular armament. The same demands were made in Berlin by a large public meeting, over which Bandow presided.

On Christmas, 1865, a general congress of German cigarmakers was called to Leipsic, as a result of a proclamation by Fritzsche. This congress resolved to form an organization for the whole of Germany. In the following spring appeared the organ of this organization, “Der Botschafter,” under the editorship of Fritzsche. In this way the first centrally organized labor union of Germany was founded. At its head stood a board of three, with Fritzsche as chairman. Local unions existed at this time in large numbers, both in Leipsic and in other places. As early as the Summer of 1864, a union of miners was organized in Zwickau, and its members spread over the coal region of Zwickau, Lugau and Stollberg. This was the first modern German mine workers' organization. The founder and leader of this organization was a blacklisted miner, Ditner by name, whose

efforts were vigorously supported by Motteler, W. Stolle and myself, later also by Liebknecht.

At the state convention in Glauchau, in July, I had made the suggestion that a district federation be formed in spite of the government, and that we dare the government to suppress and punish us. But the sentiment was against the proposition. So I withdrew my motion. On the other hand, it was decided to found an organization for the promotion and support of the intellectual and material interests of the workingmen's clubs, and I became chairman of this organization. It was, furthermore, decided that every member should pay dues at the rate of one groschen per year. The new organization was joined by 29 clubs, with 4600 members. The authorities did not put any obstacles in the way of this organization.

When, twenty years later, as a member of the Saxon state legislature, I criticized the successor of Mr. von Beust, Mr. von Nostitz-Wallwitz, very sharply on account of the shameless interpretation given under his rule to the Saxon law concerning clubs and associations, and when I declared that, compared with his rule, the rule of Mr. von Beust had been highly liberal, the latter hastened to embody this statement in his memoirs by way of justification. To a certain extent he had a right to do so. What was later tried for decades, in the way of trickery and bold misinterpretations of the laws on association, surpasses all description. Both Mr. von Nostitz-Wallwitz and his successor, Mr. von Metzsch, declared repeatedly from the ministers' desk, that the Social Democracy must be measured with a different measure than any other party. In other words, in place of law, there should be the arbitrary will of the officials. The latter have, indeed, made an almost unlimited use of such arbitrary will.

In August, 1865, Bismarck had prohibited the Coburg "Arbeiterzeitung" for Prussia. Among the men who fell victims to his rule, because they opposed his policy and exposed his true character to the working people, one of the first was Liebknecht.



Wilhelm Liebknecht.

Liebknecht and Bernhard Becker were driven out of Prussia in 1865. Liebknecht had returned to Berlin in the Summer of 1862, after an exile of thirteen years. The amnesty of 1860 made this possible for him. He followed the call of the old revolutionist, August Brass, with whom he became acquainted, like Engels, in Switzerland, and who had founded a Greater German democratic newspaper, the "Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung," in the summer of 1862, in Berlin. Liebknecht had been won, together with Robert Schweichel, for the editorship, the former for foreign politics. But when Bismarck assumed the ministry at the end of September, 1862, both of them soon discovered that something was wrong. Their suspicions were confirmed, when one day an accident would have it that Schweichel received a letter for Brass from a messenger of the ministry, who said that the contents of the letter were to be published at once. Both of them gave notice and resigned from the editorship. As Liebknecht declared publicly, later on, Lassalle upbraided him, even one year after his resignation, for having left his position on the "Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung." Liebknecht, who then had a wife and two children, whom he had summoned from London to Berlin, meanwhile earned a living as a correspondent for various papers. When I became acquainted with him, he wrote, among others, for the "Oberrheinischen Kurier," in Freiburg, Baden, for Rechbauer's democratic "Tagespost," in Graz, and for the "Deutsche Wochenblatt," in Mannheim, from which last named, however, he could not have received very much. Later he wrote for several years for the "Frankfurter Zeitung." He gave public lectures in Berlin, particularly in the printers' and tailors' unions, also in public labor meetings and other popular meetings, in which he combatted Bismarck's policies. He regarded

J. B. von Schweitzer, the editor of the "Socialdemocrat," as the stool pigeon of those policies.

After his expulsion, he went first to Hanover, where Schweichel had found a position as editor of the "Anzeiger." But, since nothing could be found for him there he came to Leipsic, where, one day in August, he was introduced to me by Dr. Eras, who was then the editor of the "Mitteldeutsche Volkszeitung." Liebknecht, whose work and expulsion I was familiar with thru the newspapers, naturally interested me greatly. I was then forty years old, but possessed the fire and vivacity of a young man of twenty. Immediately after our introduction, we engaged in a political conversation, in which he attacked the Progressive Party and its leaders vehemently and ruthlessly, and gave them a bad character, so that I, who myself did not regard them any longer as saints, was quite dumbfounded. However, he was a first-class man, and his aggressive manners did not prevent us from becoming good friends.

Liebknecht was very welcome to us in Saxony. In July, at the state convention in Glauchau, we had decided to send agitators out on a tour. But it was easier to decide than to carry this out, for we lacked suitable personalities, whose existence permitted such an activity. Liebknecht readily placed himself at our disposal for lecture tours. He was also welcome in the Workingmen's Educational Club as a speaker, and soon his lectures were the best attended. He also undertook to teach English and French in this club. In this way he gradually worked up a modest living. Nevertheless, as I learned later, he was compelled to carry many a good book to the second hand dealer. His condition was still more deteriorated by the fact that his (first) wife was ailing with lung trouble, and needed stronger food. Liebknecht's exterior did not show that he had any cares. Whoever saw him, and heard him, would have thought that he lived in contentment.

His first agitation tour led him into the iron mountains, especially into the workingmen's villages of the

Muelsen Ground, whereby he paved his way to his subsequent candidacy for the North German Reichstag. As I also undertook frequent agitation tours, and the two of us generally acted together in all political questions, our names were mentioned more and more in public, until we were regarded as two inseparables. This went so far that, when a party comrade became my business associate in the second half of the seventies, sometimes business letters would arrive which were addressed to Liebknecht & Bebel, instead of Issleib & Bebel. This always created merriment among us.

I shall have to mention Liebknecht more frequently in these pages, but I cannot give a description of his life here. Those who are interested in that, will find more details in the book on "The Leipsic Process for High Treason against Liebknecht, Bebel and Hepner," and in the work of Kurt Eisner, on "Wilhelm Liebknecht." Both works are published by the Vorwaerts Publishing House.

Liebknecht's genuine fighter's nature was keyed up by an impregnable optimism, without which no great aim can be accomplished. No blow that struck him, personally or the party, could rob him for a minute of his courage or of his composure. Nothing took him unawares; he always knew a way out. Against the attacks of his antagonists, his watchword was: Meet one rascal by one and a half. He was harsh and ruthless against our opponents, but always a good comrade to his friends and associates, ever trying to smooth over existing difficulties.

In his private life, Liebknecht was a considerate husband and father, and was greatly attached to his family. He was also a great nature lover. A few beautiful trees, in an otherwise charmless landscape, could make him enthusiastic, and induce him to consider this place fine. In his wants, he was simple and unpretentious. An excellent soup, which my young wife placed before him shortly after our marriage, in the spring of 1866, pleased him so much that he never forgot it. A good glass of beer or a good glass of wine and a good cigar, were agreeable to

him, but he did not spend much for them. If he had donned some new garment, which did not happen very often, and if I had not noticed it immediately and appreciated it, I could be sure that before many minutes, he would call my attention to it, and ask my opinion of it. He was a man of iron, with the mind of a child. When Liebknecht died, on August 7, 1900, it was exactly thirty-five years since we had first met.

In his party activity, Liebknecht liked to force matters, whenever he expected that one of his plans would meet with opposition. I suffered considerably in the beginning under this peculiarity of his, for, as a rule, I had to eat the soup which he had stirred. On account of his lack of practical ability, others had to carry out the measures inaugurated by him. But, finally, I gathered the courage to free myself from the influence of his dictatorial manners, and after that we sometimes clashed vigorously, without showing it in public, and without permanently disturbing our friendship.

Much has been written about the influence which Liebknecht is supposed to have had over me. For instance, it has been said that my becoming a Socialist was due only to his influence. In a pamphlet, published by Langen, in Munich, in 1908, the writer says that Liebknecht made a Marxian of me, and that I had avowed myself as such in September, 1868, at the national convention of Nuremberg. Accordingly, Liebknecht would have worked for three years in turning Saul into a Paul.

Liebknecht was fourteen years older than I, so that he had the advantage of a long political experience when we met. He was a scientifically trained man, who had studied diligently. I lacked this scientific training. Besides, Liebknecht had been intimately associated with men like Marx and Engels during his stay of twelve years in England and had learned much thereby, while I had no such intercourse. That Liebknecht should exert considerable influence over me under such circumstances, was a matter of course. It would have cast a sad reflection on him not to have known how to exert this influence, or

on me for not profiting anything from such intimacy. One of my acquaintances wrote some time ago, in the Leipsic "Volkszeitung," that he had heard me telling of my intimacy with Liebknecht in 1865, to a small circle of friends, and that I had said: "Thunder, from that man we can learn something!" That was no doubt true. But I should have become a Socialist even without Liebknecht, for I was on the way when I became acquainted with him. In the continuous struggle with the Lassalleans, I had to read Lassalle's writings, in order to know what they wanted, and this soon wrought a change in me. The attitude of the Liberal spokesmen in parliament and outside of it, had gradually made us dissatisfied, their glory was fading away. It was especially the attitude of the Liberal spokesman on the labor question that created ill feeling. My intimacy with Liebknecht hastened my transformation into a Socialist. This was his real merit. It is about the same with the assertion that Liebknecht made a Marxian of me. In those years I heard many excellent lectures and speeches from him. He spoke on English trade unionism, on the English and French revolutions, on the German popular movement, on political questions of the day, etc. When he touched upon Marx and Lassalle, he always did so in a controversial way. So far as I remember, I never heard any long theoretical discussions from him. Neither he nor I had time for any private instruction, the struggles of the day and their concomitants did not leave us any opportunity for private theoretical discussions. By all his aptitudes, Liebknecht was far more a farseeing politician than a theoretician. Great politics was his favorite occupation.

Like most of those who became Socialists at that time, I came to Marx by way of Lassalle. Lassalle's writings were in our hands before we knew any work by Marx and Engels. Lassalle's influence is still plainly visible in my first pamphlet, "Our Aims," which appeared at the close of 1869. Toward the end of 1869, I first found sufficient time and leisure to read carefully the first volume of Marx's "Capital," published late in the summer of 1867,

and it was my imprisonment that gave me this leisure. Five years previously I had tried to study the work of Marx entitled, "A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy," which had appeared in 1859, but I did not get beyond the attempt. Overwork and the struggle for existence did not leave me the necessary leisure to digest this heavy work intellectually. The "Communist Manifesto," and the other writings of Marx and Engels, did not become known in our party until the end of the sixties or the beginning of the seventies. The first work of Marx that I came across and enjoyed was his "Inaugural Address," at the foundation of the International Workingmen's Association. I became familiar with this work in the beginning of 1865. Toward the close of 1866, I joined the International.





Increasing Dissatisfaction of Workingmen's Clubs.

The disagreeable public conditions, which impressed themselves more and more on the consciousness of the workingmen, naturally affected their sentiments. All of them were longing for a change. But in the absence of any clear and farseeing leadership that inspired confidence, without any powerful organization that could have united their strength, this sentiment came to nothing. Never did a movement, which was good in its kernel, run its course with so little results. All the meetings were crowded, and whoever made the sharpest speech was the man of the hour. This sentiment prevailed especially in the Leipsic Workingmen's Educational Club. Toward the end of October, I induced Professor Eckhardt, who was one of the most brilliant speakers of that time, after a speech made by him in a public meeting in Leipsic, to give a lecture also in the Leipsic Workingmen's Educational Club. In this lecture he dealt with the position of the workingman under the prevailing situation, particularly referring to his social demands. In this respect, he favored decidedly the assistance of the state. He had no objection to Lassalle's idea of state help, so long as it came from a democratic state. The speaker evoked stormy applause, and did not meet with any opposition.

In spite of repeated refusals, we had once more addressed ourselves, at the end of 1865, to the Saxon government, with a request to permit the formation of a district federation. A frequent exchange of opinions had become a need. The ministry again imposed conditions which we could not accept. But we decided, in the committee of the club for the promotion of the intellectual and material welfare of workingmen's clubs, to leave the decision to the clubs, and so we called a state convention, on January 28, 1866, at Zwickau, and fixed its order of

business as tho no legal obstacles existed. According to this order of business, the reply of the ministry was to be discussed after the report of organization. Other points for discussion were: Petitions for a full professional liberty and unhampered freedom of movement, for the promotion of a liberal law on associations, for the abolition of work books, servants' books and all passport limitations. Then the motions of the clubs and the election of the executive committee were to follow. In the matter of securing universal suffrage, we wanted to come to an agreement privately.

Our order of business was too much for the Leipsic chief of police. Our secretary, Germann and myself, were summoned and asked to change it, otherwise the conference would be prohibited, and the clubs declared to be political, which would make their federation impossible. The police chief of Leipsic, at that time, was Dr. Rueder, a former democrat of 1848, who, however, handled the law on clubs and associations in such a way that no Conservative could have been more severe. Consequently we placed only the discussion of the ministerial ordinance on the order of business, but sent, secretly, word to the clubs to send good representatives, because we were going to try to push thru the conference all we could. Thirty-one delegates, from twenty-four clubs, were present. The proceedings began on Sunday forenoon. When a delegate from Werdau, moved to place the legal reduction of the working time on the order of business, the police commissioner, who watched the meeting, objected. I advised the convention to declare, in reply to the ordinance of the ministry (Beust):

"In view of the fact that the ordinance of the Minister of the Interior permits to the workingmen's clubs of Saxony the foundation of a district federation only on condition that these clubs shall not occupy themselves with political, social or public affairs, and in view of the further fact that this limitation reduces the activity of the clubs to zero, the convention resolves to dispense with the formation of a district federation, and to let the indi-

vidual clubs fulfill their duties according to their own choice."

The consequence of those events in Zwickau, was that the Leipsic police chief placed the Workingmen's Educational Club under the law of associations, in other words, regarded it as a political club from then on.

Much dissatisfaction had long been felt in the Leipsic Workingmen's Educational Club over the attitude of the "Berliner Volkszeitung," which was on file in the reading room. It was not merely the undemocratic attitude of the paper, but also the animosity with which it combatted the more far-reaching demands of the laborers, that gave cause for resentment. In the general meeting of the club, in March, 1866, I moved, in conformity with the instructions of the board of directors, that the "Berliner Volkszeitung" be discontinued, and in its place the "Rheinische Zeitung" of Cologne be placed on the subscription list. This motion gave rise to an excited debate, but was finally adopted, by a vote of 160 against 17. This decision called forth vicious attacks of the Liberal press against our club, and myself personally. I was regarded as the originator of the motion.

The professional liberty introduced into Saxony in 1863, required that those who wished to start in business for themselves must first acquire the right of citizenship in a commune. But this cost a good deal of money in the larger towns. In the Winter of 1865-66, a movement arose in Leipsic aiming at the abolition, or at least, the reduction of the citizenship dues, and at a radical reorganization of the Saxon city constitution. Liberal leaders were then at the head of the movement. I also attended these meetings and made speeches, which some people later assured me had been the best. After a program had been formulated, a committee was nominated, to which I also belonged, which was instructed to inaugurate an agitation of this question thruout Saxony. But our work soon proved to be useless. When we were ready to begin the agitation, in the spring of 1866, the accentuation of the antagonisms between Prussia and

Austria, and the discussions of the German question, had arrived at a point where they pushed every other interest into the background. The same fate overtook our agitation for a reorganization of the Saxon trade ordinance. On the other hand, the political demands now came to the front.

On March 25th and 26th, several meetings took place in Dresden for political purposes. I was sent to them as a delegate from Leipsic, the question of unity being one of the points on the order of business. As a delegate from Leipsic, I spoke in favor of united action, but Vahlteich made the mistake of sharply attacking the members of the General Association of German Workingmen and overwhelming them with reproaches, thereby calling forth a storm of resentment. Vahlteich could not forget the treatment which he had received in his former capacity as Lassalle's secretary at the hands of the General Association of German Workingmen. He had been expelled from it on a motion of Lassalle, who could not bear any contradiction. So he slammed the Association whenever an opportunity offered. Nevertheless, the close of those meetings led to a joint conference, in which the workmen's clubs of Leipsic, Dresden, Chemnitz, Glauchau and Goerlitz, the members of the General Association of German Workingmen of Dresden, Plauenscher Grund, Chemnitz and Glauchau, the old journeyman's club and the Typographia of Dresden, were represented by twenty delegates. It was decided to begin a joint agitation for universal suffrage, for a democratic right of association and assembly, for the right of free locomotion, for professional freedom, for the abolition of passport limitations, for the introduction of school reform, for maintenance of schools by the state, regulation of wages, of sick and death benefit funds, and of associations. The delegates present constituted themselves into a committee. Foersterling became chairman.

When the meetings were called, all the labor organizations in Dresden, including the book printers' helpers, participated in them. They acted as tho no Saxon law

on association existed any longer, which forbade the co-operation of clubs for political purposes. On all sides, a permanent co-operation of labor organizations was being demanded. The parliamentary question became, from now on, the object of vigorous agitation in labor circles. We demanded a constitutional parliament for all of Germany, and the introduction of universal popular armament for the protection of this parliament. This last demand was considered a matter of course in the democratic circles of that day, because without such a protection, the parliament might become the victim of a diplomatic surprise.

On the other hand, a meeting, held in Dresden, on May 7th, and attended by 2000 people, adopted resolutions that were in part rather strange. Among them, was the following:

“(1) We condemn every policy that paralyzes the strength of the people, and does not guarantee their liberty and welfare. (2) We declare the cession of even one foot of German country to be high treason to the fatherland. (3) We demand that His Majesty, the King, and the government, fulfill their duties to the fatherland and the people, and that, therefore, those men, who, contrary to these duties, paralyze the energy of the country's resistance, be replaced by others who will act energetically and in keeping with the people's will. (4) We demand that the rule of interests, whose injurious results to the country are now becoming apparent, be replaced by the restitution of universal, equal and direct suffrage, with secret ballots and unrestricted eligibility. (5) We demand that the government of His Majesty proclaim its intention of calling parliament, in conformity with the federal decisions of March 30th and April 9, 1848, and begin the solution of the German constitutional question in pursuance of its willingness expressed to the German national assembly in February, 1849. (6) We demand the immediate restitution of the fundamental German rights and a universal armament of the people.”

A delegation was then elected, to which belonged Foersterling, Knoefel and Lawyer Schrap, who were instructed to lay the wishes of the meeting before the king. As a matter of course, this delegation was not received.

At last, however, the Saxon government was compelled to yield willy-nilly to the sentiment of the country and to the state legislature, which had been called in the meantime, and take a position on the question of federal reform. Mr. von Beust, who had so far been an advocate of the impossible Austrian reform project, and had also spoken warmly in favor of the trias-idea, now got into a tight place. When asked by a delegation of the second chamber of the state legislature, what position the government now took on the Austrian reform project, he declared that it was not the intention of the government to revert to the subject of delegates; the government was ready, on the contrary, to work for federal reform and for a parliament, which should be elected pursuant to the election law of 1849. With reference to the Prussian reform project, he made various confused reservations. The delegation of the second chamber moved, jointly with the delegation of the first chamber, to address the following resolution to the government:

"The government should work with all energy to the end of promoting an order that the elections for the German parliament by means of universal and direct suffrage take place in all of Germany in the course of this month (June), preferably in conformity with the national election laws of March 27, 1849, and that parliament be called within short order."

But the ball was already rolling and ran in another direction than had been expected.





The Catastrophe of 1866.

For an understanding of the coming events, and of our position towards them, it is necessary to give a brief review of the happenings which finally brought the long diplomatic struggles between Austria and Prussia for the supremacy of Germany, to a decision on the battle field.

The death of the Danish king, Frederick VII, in November, 1863, gave rise anew to the question of Slesvig-Holstein, since the Oldenburg line became extinct with the demise of this king. The Slesvig-Holsteinians would not acknowledge that the new Danish king, Christian IX, was entitled to the position of hereditary duke, but decided in favor of Prince Frederick of Augustenburg, who thereupon announced his accession to the government as Duke Frederick VIII. This implied the affiliation of these two duchies with Germany, and created general satisfaction. Denmark opposed this solution. Therefore the federal board had to order the execution of this claim against Denmark by means of federal power, and the task was entrusted to Saxony and Hannover. But this did not agree with Bismarck's plans. He instructed one of his crown jurists to demonstrate that the Augustenburger was not entitled by heredity to the succession, and this decision aroused public sentiment extremely against Bismarck's policy. Bismarck, the man who violated the Prussian constitution, was not regarded as one who would solve this question in conformity with the will of the people of Slesvig-Holstein, and it was remembered that it had been Prussia which was mainly to blame for the shameful outcome of the first war about Slesvig-Holstein, in 1851.

Under these circumstances, the Executive Board of the National Club met with vigorous assent, when it issued a proclamation to the people in the late fall of 1863, signed by Rudolf von Bennigsen as president, calling

upon them to help themselves. The proclamation contained the following passages: "The National Club calls upon all communes, corporations, clubs, co-operatives and all friends of the fatherland to join it in the great cause and contribute money without delay, for the purpose of getting ready men and arms and all other means necessary to free our brothers in Slesvig-Holstein."

No doubt this proclamation violated a number of laws in the individual states, but no public prosecutor stirred. The sentiments of the people sympathized with this procedure.

Shortly after that the committee of the National Club for Slesvig-Holstein issued a proclamation, in which were found the following words: "Well, then! Let us prepare, in order that the young men of Germany may take up arms as soon as the moment for action shall arrive. . . . Let them utilize the short interval, which may be left to us, to drill in the use of arms and in tactical instruction."

This shows that the Liberal spokesmen of that time considered an armament of the people, on short notice, possible. Woe to the Social-Democrat who would issue a similar proclamation to-day. That is the progress made since that time!

Here I wish to mention that, in the beginning of the sixties, not only workingmen's clubs, but also turners' and marksmen's clubs, sprang up in large numbers, and played a prominent rôle in the national movement. Bismarck frowned darkly upon this stirring life. The great festivals, which those associations alternately arranged all over Germany, were assemblies of masses who mainly occupied themselves with the German question. In Leipzig, during August, 1863, the general German turn festival took place, to which even Dr. von Beust paid his respects. But while he was making a patriotic speech on the gymnasium square, the Leipzig police prohibited the sale of the national constitution of 1849 in public places. I also participated in this festival, inasmuch as our singing section, whose chairman I had become after Fritzsche's resignation, carried out the program of songs, together

with other singing societies in the festival hall. In October of the same year, the fiftieth anniversary of the battle of Leipsic, was also celebrated. This festival, in its way, was still far grander than the turn festival. It was also utilized for great political demonstrations. In this I also took part as a member of our singing society.

From then on meetings in favor of the independence of Slesvig-Holstein were organized all over Germany. A labor meeting in Leipsic, in which all shades of political creeds were represented, resolved "that it is the duty of the German workingmen to offer their arms in all cases where the honor, the rights and the liberty of the fatherland are in danger." Similar resolutions were adopted in other cities. The convention of representatives held, at the end of 1863 in Frankfort-on-Main, which was attended by 500 representatives, declared against the annexation of Slesvig-Holstein by any German state. This declaration was aimed at Prussia and Bismarck, for whose policies even the Liberals did not dare to stand up in those days, altho in their hearts, they were in favor of annexation by Prussia.

Of course, Bismarck was highly indignant over the obstacles placed in the way of his policies. He demanded that the Frankfort Senate dissolve the committee of thirty-six of the convention of representatives, whose chairman was the City Counselor, Mueller, in Frankfort. Furthermore, he demanded that this senate prohibit the military exercises of the young men of Frankfort. Both his demands were declined. But he did not forget Frankfort. In 1866, that "nest of democrats" had to suffer for it, for he first worried it and then annexed it. In the end, the question of Slesvig-Holstein was solved, after all, according to Bismarck's wish. He succeeded in getting the best of the manager of Austrian politics, Count Rechberg, and in winning him for his immediate plans. Instead of the federal troops that had meanwhile marched into Slesvig-Holstein, Prussia and Austria made war on Denmark, which soon succumbed, and was compelled to cede Slesvig-Holstein and Lauenburg to Prussia and

Austria in the treaty of peace. Austria ultimately made a good bargain with Prussia by selling its share in Lauenburg to Prussia for two and a half million dollars. This war was carried on by Bismarck against the will of the state legislature, which had refused to vote the demanded war loan by a majority of 275 against 80. It is easy to understand that this mode of governing did not fortify the sentiment in favor of Prussia, and the dissatisfaction was increased still more in the remainder of Germany, when after long negotiations between Prussia and Austria, the treaty of Gastein, of August 14, 1865, was made public, by which Prussia assumed the administration of Slesvig and Austria that of Holstein. This was the second master stroke of Bismarck, who thereby drove the wedge between Austria and the federation deeper and deeper. On the other hand, the world now witnessed the amusing spectacle that in Slesvig the Prussians, under Manteuffel, ruthlessly suppressed all demonstrations in favor of the Augustenburger, and altogether ruled with a hard hand, while in Holstein, the Austrians, under General Gablenz, let things take their course freely. How Gablenz interpreted his mission, may be seen from his statement: "I shall obey the existing laws of the land, in order that no Holsteinian may be able to say, after my eventual departure, that I ruled lawlessly. I do not wish to rule this land like a Turkish pasha." That was a moral slap at Mr. von Manteuffel.

That the new order could be but a provisional one in the duchies, was evident. This solution did not solve the question. The settlement between Prussia and Austria was inevitable before long, and in Bismarck's opinion, this could be decided only by a war, after all other expedients had been eliminated. So he worked systematically towards this war. On the one side, he tried to win Napoleon's neutrality by dilatory negotiations, as he later called them, in which he made tentative promises of ceding certain German provinces to France, mentioning the Rhine Palatinate and the Prussian Saar region, and on the other hand, he made an agreement with Italy to

the effect that this country should attack Austria in the South as soon as Prussia should strike the first blow in the North. The negotiations with the Italian diplomats, which the Italian Prime Minister, La Marmora, later published in his book, "More Light," are typical instances of the way in which Bismarck tried to enforce his "national" policies. In March, Bismarck remarked to the extraordinary military plenipotentiary of Italy in Berlin, that the king had given up his over-timid legitimate scruples. He had been reluctant to ally himself with Italy, which had become great by crown robberies and annexations, and he did not want to make war on Austria for legitimate reasons. In a few months, so Bismarck continued, he would bring up the question of German reform, embellished by a parliament, thereby creating confusion, which would bring Prussia into conflict with Austria, and then war would be declared between them.

This program was promptly executed.

On June 3d, the Italian ambassador in Berlin, Govone, reported to his government that Bismarck had said to him: "I am far less a German than a **Prussian**, and I should not hesitate to agree to the cession of the entire country between the Rhine and the Mosel, to France; the Palatinate, Oldenburg, a portion of the Prussian territory . . . But he had trouble with the king, who had the religious, or even superstitious scruple, that he must not assume the responsibility for a European war."

I shall not dwell in detail upon the underhanded intrigues which Bismarck carried on in Italy, for the purpose of weakening Austria by stirring up revolutionary uprisings in Hungary and Croatia, and detaching the armed forces of those countries from the Austrian army. These transactions show that even treasonable enterprises suited Bismarck so long as they promoted his aims, and that high treason is a crime only when it is committed by men of the oppressed classes. Prussia and Italy came to an understanding that they would share in the expenses of these revolutionary uprisings. Needless to say, that Austria now recognized its situation, and

took measures to defend itself. Toward the end of March the diplomatic play became lively. Reproaches were bandied back and forth and—preparations for war were made. On April 9th, Prussia introduced its demand for federal reform in Frankfort-on-Main. It moved that the federal parliament adopt a resolution to call, on a certain date, a national convention, composed of representatives of the entire nation, elected by direct ballot and universal suffrage. In the meantime, until this parliament could convene, the governments were to agree among themselves on the bills for a reform of the federal constitution.

This reform proposal naturally met with intense distrust in wide circles. People said to themselves: "How is it that Bismarck declares in favor of a German parliament, elected by universal and direct suffrage, and pretends to be a radical reformer, when he is ruling Prussia in violation of the clear statements of the constitution, when he is responsible for the infamous press ordinances, for the war against Denmark, in spite of the opposition of the state legislature, for the recent decision of the Supreme Court on paragraph 84 of the constitution, referring to the free speech of legislative representatives, and for many other villainies?" The opposition shown against the Prussian reform bill elicited from the "Kreuzzeitung" the remark, in April, that only one alternative remained: Federal reform or revolution. In reality, Bismarck was not serious about his proposal of a universal German parliament, as was proved later by his parliamentarian proposal to the federal convention. But he did not even think of taking into the union the southwestern German states, as was discovered later, when the question of the formation of the North German federation came up.

This was amply corroborated by the memoirs of Prince Hohenlohe. Bismarck, at that time, regarded the vast majority of the South Germans as heterogeneous elements that would disturb his circles. His misgivings were not laid to rest until the elections to the revenue

parliament had taken place, and until the war of 1870-71 had been supported by South Germany.

The procedure of Bismarck, in the Slesvig-Holsteinian and the German question, had a disintegrating influence on the Liberals; they were split into two camps. One camp sympathized with his policy, the other could not forgive him for his internal interference in Prussia and opposed him. Twesten wrote, in the beginning of October, 1865, to the chairman of the committee of thirty-six: "We (he spoke in the name of several men, then), prefer **any** alternative to a defeat of the Prussian state." In other words: If Prussia should win in the struggle for supremacy in Germany, even by the help of a foreign power, and by ceding some German territory, we shall stand by Prussia. That was identical with Bismarck's: "I am more a Prussian than a German." Mommsen said that the differences in the questions of liberty were no reason to withhold support from Bismarck on questions of foreign policy. And Ziegler, who refused to pay taxes in 1848, and had been charged with high treason, sentenced to imprisonment in a fortress, removed from his position as first mayor of Brandenburg, declared shortly before the outbreak of the war to his Breslau electors: "The heart of the Prussian democracy is where the flags of the state are waving." Ziegler was a queer man. A few months before this, he had thrown a drastic quotation from Mar-rast at the heads of his party colleagues, by telling them: "Perverseness has risen from your bowels to your brains. You cannot think any more."

The National Club, in its way, also tried to come to the support of Bismarck's policies by calling a general meeting to Frankfort-on-Main, at the close of October, 1865. But the club received no thanks for this. Bismarck was so angered by this intention that he induced the Austrian government to join him in sending a note to the Frankfort senate, in which both demanded that this general meeting be prohibited, a step which could be taken only by a man who was no longer master of his nerves. The senate declined also this demand, and the

general meeting took place. The resolutions declared: "The National Club confirms its former resolutions, according to which it is striving to establish a central power and a parliament with the national constitution of 1849, the central power to be in the hands of Prussia. It demands autonomy for Slesvig-Holstein, with this limitation, that so long as no central power exists, the attributes belonging to a central power shall be transferred to Prussia. A state legislature of the duchies shall be called." After a heated debate, these points were adopted by a large majority. Evidently these resolutions indicated a willingness to meet Prussia half way. Farther than that, the National Club could not go for the present.

When the possibility of a war between Austria and Prussia became more and more imminent, the efforts of the Liberals were directed toward the end of enforcing the neutrality of the small and medium-sized states, for they said to themselves, that the large majority of them would take sides with Austria in case of a war.

In Saxony, the Liberals even turned the tables, and made the Saxon government responsible for the eventual outbreak of a war; they demanded disarmament and an alliance with Prussia. The Leipsic city authorities endorsed this demand by a resolution on May 5th. Against this attitude, a public meeting of 5000 people protested. It had been called by Professor Wuttke and his close political friends, assisted by the Lassallean Fritzsche and others. It was called for May 8th, and we joined in the call. The Lassallean Steinert presided. Wuttke made the first speech. He protested against the step of the city senate and city councilors, and offered a resolution demanding that the government extend its measures of defense and introduce universal popular armament for the protection of the country. The government was asked, furthermore, to secure the help of its allies as soon as possible, and to oppose steadfastly every privileged position of Prussia in Slesvig-Holstein and in the remainder of Germany.

This resolution was too weak for our taste. So I took

the floor, and spoke in favor of the following resolution, drawn up by Liebknecht and myself:

(1) The present threatening situation in Germany has been provoked by the attitude and the steps of the Prussian government in the Slesvig-Holsteinian question, and it is at the same time the natural result of the policy of the National Club and of the Gotha leaders, in favor of Prussian supremacy. (2) We consider a direct or indirect support of this anti-German policy as an injury to the interests of the German people. (3) These interests can be protected only by a parliament elected by universal, direct and equal suffrage with secret ballots, supported by a universally armed nation. (4) We expect that the German people will elect only those men as their representatives who are opposed to any hereditary central power. (5) We expect that, in case of a war between German brothers, which can serve only to gamble German territory into the hands of a foreign power, the German people will rise as one man in order to defend their property and honor by force of arms.

The chairman of the city council, Dr. Joseph, attempted to justify the city senate and city council, but he received sharp replies from Liebknecht and Fritzsche. Wuttke's resolution was adopted against a minority, mine unanimously.

The Liberal press of Leipsic published the most lying statements concerning this meeting, and thereby angered the workers in the shop of Giesecke & Devrient so much that they solemnly burned the offending number of the "Mitteldeutsche Volkszeitung." The Leipsic example found many imitators. Among others, the labor convention of the district federation of the Main region, which met on May 13th, under Professor Louis Buechner as chairman, expressed itself in the same sense.

Under these circumstances, the committee of thirty-six of the convention of representatives felt the need of hastening to the aid of Prussia. They called a convention of representatives to Frankfort-on-Main, to be held on the first Sunday of Pentecost. The democracy of

Frankfort decided to arrange a counter-demonstration for the same day, and Wuttke and myself were invited to be present from Saxony. The convention of representatives was attended by about 250 delegates, and was opened by the chairman of the committee of thirty-six. Mr. von Bennigsen became president. Among those present was also Blunschli, who had a bad reputation on account of his action against Weitling, in Switzerland, during the forties. The old Privy Counselor, Welcker, was also present. Altho he favored the leadership of Prussia, he was so embittered by Bismarck's policy, that, as the papers reported at that time, he had posed the queer prize puzzle: "How can a bad government be removed without a revolution?" It was another version of the old question: "How can a skin be washed without getting it wet?"

Among the audience at the proceedings were also the veterans of '48, Amand Goegg, August Ladendorf and Gustav Struve. The latter was a spare, tall figure with a piping voice and a peculiarly red nose, altho he was an opponent of alcoholism. I had had a different conception of the former leader of the revolution in Baden, but discovered soon that I had the same experience with Struve that others had with me, whom they had imagined different from my real self.

Dr. Voelck, of Augsburg, who later received the nickname of the spring lark, because he jubilantly announced in the revenue parliament that spring would soon come in Germany, was one of the reporters of the convention. He spoke in favor of the following resolution of the majority of the committee of thirty-six:

"The victory of our arms has restored our northern boundaries to us. Such a victory would have elevated the national spirit in every well ordered state. But in Prussia, thru the disrespect shown for the rights of the reconquered provinces, thru the effort of the Prussian government to annex them by force, and thru the fatal jealousy of the two great powers, it has led to a conflict that reaches far beyond the original object of the dispute.

"We condemn the imminent war as a cabinet enterprise, serving merely dynastic ends. It is unworthy of a civilized nation, threatens all achievements of fifty years of peace, and adds fuel to the greed of foreign countries.

"Princes and ministers who will be responsible for this unnatural war, or who increase its dangers for the sake of special interests, will be guilty of a grave crime against the nation.

"The curse, and the punishment for high treason, shall strike those who will give up German territory in their negotiations with foreign powers.

"If it should not be possible to prevent this war, in the eleventh hour, thru the expression of the unanimous will of the people, we should at least strive to prevent that Germany be divided into two great camps by limiting this war to the smallest space.

"This seems to us the most effective means of hastening the re-establishment of peace, keeping off the intervention of foreign powers, protecting the frontiers by the armed forces of the neutral states and, in case that this war should assume a European character, meeting the enemy outside with fresh forces.

"These states, then, are in duty bound, so long as their position is respected, not to plunge without necessity into the war between the two great powers. Particularly the states of the southwestern group should keep their forces unweakened, in order to stand up in case of need for the integrity of the German territory.

"It shall be the duty of the state legislatures, when deciding on demands for military purposes, to ask such guarantees from their governments as will insure the employment of such grants in the above-mentioned direction, and in the true interest of the fatherland. Only in this way can the danger be averted, of making way for a new era of general reaction in Germany under the present complicated circumstances.

"Just as a German parliament is the only authority that can decide on the German interests in Slesvig-Holstein, so the settlement of the German constitutional

question by a freely elected German representation of the people will alone be able to prevent the return of such fatal conditions effectively. Consequently, all state legislatures, and the entire nation, should demand the immediate calling of a parliament, elected according to the national election law of April 14, 1849."

The salient points of this resolution lay in paragraphs 5, 6 and 7, which demanded guarantees for the neutrality of the medium-sized and small states. The Prussian representative, Julius Freese, took issue with the resolution of the committee and with the speakers that had defended it, and his speech was so effective that he was frequently interrupted by the stormy applause of the minority and of the audience in the hall. Concerning the rôle assigned to the medium-sized and small states, he said:

"And what would be the result, if the two states had now taken hold of each other? Just as two bucks fight for the possession of a doe, while the doe looks on unarmed and quiet, so Austria and Prussia are to fight with each other, and the third Germany is supposed to be the mild and gentle doe that waits to see who will claim her as a winner at the end of the battle." . . . And he closed with the words: "**Only then shall Prussia become free, when it shall enter the service of Germany; but if you permit Germany to be absorbed by Greater Prussia, then may God have mercy on those who live to see the rule that shall come over Prussia and Germany.**"

These words called forth great applause, lasting a long time.

But the tragic was also relieved by the comic. In the midst of Voelck's speech, several cannon shots rang thru the hall, so that every one jumped up in alarm and looked up at the ceiling, fearing it would fall down. Voelck himself seemed to think that an assault was planned against him. With a mighty leap he jumped back from the platform to the wall, accompanied by the loud hooting and hand-clapping of the top galleries. The Lassalleans of Frankfort and Offenbach had set off some cannon crack-

ers, led by Oberwinder, in order to hand in their visiting card to the convention of representatives in this manner. The fright was followed by general merriment.

As a matter of course, the resolutions of the committee were adopted by a large majority against the motion of Mueller-Passavant.

In the afternoon of the same day, a public meeting, called by the democratic side, took place in the Circus, attended by about 3000 people. Among other speakers, I also took the floor.

In the resolutions offered by us, the following demands were made:

“(1) Armed resistance against the Prussian policy of breaking the peace, neutrality would be cowardice or treason. (2) Slesvig-Holstein shall have autonomy on the basis of the existing laws. (3) The Prussian parliamentary proposal must be unconditionally declined, in its stead a constitutional people’s parliament, clad with the necessary powers, shall decide upon the constitution of all Germany. (4) Introduction of fundamental rights and legal inauguration of popular armament. (5) The people should get together everywhere in political clubs.”

After the adoption of these resolutions, a committee was elected and instructed to work out a program, and call a meeting of delegates to Frankfort, in order to discuss the program thoroly. The following were elected members of this committee, at the suggestion of Haussmann of Stuttgart, the father of the Reichstag member, Conrad Haussmann: Bebel, Eichelsdoerfer of Mannheim, Goegg of Offenburg, K. Gruen of Heidelberg, Kolb of Speier, K. Mayer of Stuttgart, Dr. Morgenstern of Fuerth, von Neergardt of Kiel, August Roeckel and Gustav Struve of Frankfort, Trabert of Hanau, Kraemer of Doos, Bavaria. Of these twelve, I am the only survivor. True, I was the Benjamin of that body.

The committee prepared the following program:

“(A. 1) A democratic basis for the constitution and administration of the German states. (2) A federal

union, based upon autonomy. (3) Installation of a federal power and popular parliament superior to the governments of the individual states. Neither Prussian nor Austrian supremacy.

("B. 1) We demand the preservation of peace in Germany. The danger of war arose out of the Slesvig-Holstenian question; it can be removed only by the immediate inauguration of state autonomy in those duchies on the basis of law and popular will. Slesvig-Holstein's voice in the federation should be admitted at once, its military power must be mobilized. No disposition to be made of the duchies against the will of their population; no division of Slesvig. (2) The resistance of Germany is justified against the war policy of Prussia. Neutrality would be cowardice or treason. (3) Not a foot of German soil shall be ceded to any foreign country. The danger of losing German territory, and the shame of an intervention of foreign powers in German internal affairs, can be averted, resistance can be successful, **the danger of an Austrian victory can be avoided only** if the allies, in their struggle, follow a national, instead of dynastic, policy, and base their union upon the full armed power and the parliamentary co-operation of the people. The legal introduction of the militia system must be demanded above all things. (4) The parliamentary proposal of Prussia must be rejected. Only a national parliament, arising from the people and elected in full liberty, equipped with a deciding voice and with the necessary power, can definitely settle the question of the national constitution."

The calling of a delegates' convention, to whom this program was to be submitted, had to be abandoned, because the war broke out in the meantime. The committee thereupon issued the following proclamation:

"To the German People!

"The war between German brothers has been ignited. Germany has been hurled back into the time of the brutal law of force. This gravest of crimes against the nation

falls on the shoulders of that party in Prussia, which is so lost to all justice, that it wants to cap the climax by outraging all Germany after it has broken the popular law of Prussia and of Slesvig-Holstein. At the moment, when the future of Slesvig-Holstein as a state, should at last have been decided by the peaceful way of German law, this party has gone to the extreme of breaking the eternal bond of the German tribes, and of pushing the enforced will of the individual into the place of public right and of the collective will. It has invaded the German countries of Hannover, Hussia, Saxony, as tho they were the land of the enemy, and it threatens with the same force all German states that will not submit to it. In Prussia itself, this party incites the people to a hatred of Germany, and speaks of imaginary dangers, of humiliations, degradations, dismemberment, which are supposed to be visited against it by Germany.

“For the present, Prussia is not in danger of any degradation, except such as it harbors in itself. The downfall of the war party would be the best victory for Prussia. The danger of dismemberment has been brought over all of Germany precisely by that party. By its alliance with Italy, it has endangered German territory in the South. In the West it has conjured up the old danger which is always threatening whenever Germany is disunited.

“The German tribes, whom the policy of force of the Berlin government has called to arms against itself, do not war against the people of Prussia, do not take the field for the policies of the house of Habsburg. **The nation cares as little to serve Austria as it does to serve Prussia.** It wishes to be free, to be master of its own house. Having been implicated in the present disaster against its will, the nation must not, and will not, await inactively the consequences. Just as it has declined, in response to the correct prompting of its patriotism, to play the offered rôle of a neutral power in this fratricidal war, so it now has the duty of securing, with its full power and unanimous determination, its participation in

the decision of its fates by means of a general armament of the people and a common people's parliament.

"These two demands should at once occupy the attention of the German people everywhere. A general agitation in public meetings should be inaugurated without delay. The German people alone can still save the German fatherland.

"Frankfort, July 1, 1866.

"The Committee of the Public Meeting in Frankfort on May 20th, per G. F. Kolb, Aug. Roedel."

This proclamation was well meant, but it came too late. The only thing that could have given it effective backing, namely, a great and compact organization, was missing.

On the day following the above mentioned events in Frankfort, the second holiday of Pentecost, I was invited to dinner at the house of Siegmund Mueller, together with a number of other gentlemen. After dinner, we stepped to the wide-open windows, in order to enjoy the magnificent May day. As tho the word had been given, we simultaneously burst into Homeric laughter. From Mueller's house, we had a view of the old Main river and the old Main bridge, upon which crowds of Austrian soldiers, in their white uniforms, were promenading back and forth, nearly every one arm in arm with a girl. This had stirred our mirth. Our host looked upon this matter more seriously, and said: "Gentlemen, it's all right for you to laugh, but the girls will all get babies, and the city will have to support them." We replied by another round of laughter. A short time after that, on June 10th, the Prussians belonging to the federal garrison of Frankfort left the city, amid martial music, and on June 11th, the Austrians followed suit. The Austrians never came back. Many a one of the merry boys who frolicked across the Main bridge on that memorable Sunday, no doubt fertilized the battle field with his blood a little later.

On June 10th, the permanent committee of the workmen's clubs met in session in Mannheim, for the pur-

pose of defining its position towards the prevailing political conflict. With the exception of M. Hirsch, the entire committee was present, and Streit of Coburg, attended in response to a special invitation.

An excited discussion arose over the German question. A Prussian member denied that the Prussian people harbored any sympathies for annexations. In this he was thoroly mistaken, as events proved. The vast majority of the committee was opposed to any neutrality of the middle states. One side argued that Prussian leadership would promote industrial development, the other side contended that Prussian leadership was not needed to that end. Finally, it was unanimously decided to affiliate with the existing people's party and endorse the program of the Frankfort committee. It was also recommended that the following compromise motion be incorporated in the program of the people's party: "Every popular government must seek to promote the gradual elimination of class antagonisms, to the extent that a respect for individual freedom, and for the collective interests of the people, will permit. The material and moral uplift of the laboring estate is to the common interest of all classes, is an indispensable pillar of civic freedom."

In view of the fact that the political disturbances had already caused much unemployment, it was agreed to send a request to the employers for a corresponding reduction of the hours of labor during the period of depression, instead of discharging employees. The state and municipal authorities were asked to continue the construction work inaugurated by them, and to carry out construction that had already been planned. The financial report was discouraging, and so was the report concerning the condition of the "Arbeiterzeitung." Its subscription list had been considerably reduced by the prohibition of the paper in Prussia, by political differences in many clubs, by the animosities and obstacles leveled against the paper by the publishers' association. And the passive resistance maintained by some members of our committee against Streit and his paper prevented us from

supporting him effectively. Streit saw himself compelled to stop publication on August 8th.

My repeated motions, aiming at reorganization, were again defeated, but, on the other hand, it was decided to allow the chairman a fixed salary of \$200.00 per year as a compensation of his work. The place for the next national convention also was a subject for discussion, and Chemnitz or Gera were taken under advisement. But the course of events compelled us to abandon a national convention for 1866. The proceedings were then interrupted for a few hours, in order to hold a public meeting, which occupied itself with the prevailing political events that were of paramount interest.

From then on events crowded each other and hastened toward a catastrophe. On May 9th, Bismarck had dissolved the legislature, in order that he might not be hampered in his political steps by its opposition. On the other hand, the middle states called their legislatures together. On June 1st, Austria referred the question of Slesvig-Holstein to the Federal parliament. It had realized, too late, that it had made a mistake when it permitted itself to be taken in tow by Prussia. Two days later, on June 3d, Prussia proclaimed the fact that this step of Austria had canceled the Gastein treaty. On June 11th, Prussia dissolved, by military force, the assembly of the Holsteinian estates, called together at Itzehoe. Thereupon the Austrians evacuated Holstein on June 12th. On the same day, Austria recalled its ambassador from Berlin, and issued passports to the Prussian ambassador in Vienna. On June 14th, the Federal parliament decided against Prussia, whereupon the Prussian ambassador placed on the table of the parliament a draft of the constitution for a new federation. Its first article read as follows: "The territory of the federation consists of the states hitherto belonging to it, with the exception of the Imperial Austrian and the Royal Hollandish regions (Luxemburg and Limburg)."

In other words, Smaller Germany. The war was declared. Contrary to the expectations of many, it took a

remarkably favorable course for Prussia. Within a few weeks the Austrian army was thrown out of all its positions in Bohemia, and the Prussians stood in front of the gates of Vienna. The armies of the middle states played a pitiful rôle, with the exception of the Saxon, which fought in Bohemia, and of the Hannoverians, who succumbed to the Prussians at Langensalza after a stubborn resistance. Their opposition was broken down before it came to a battle with them. In Italy, the war developed a little differently. Bismarck was at first a little doubtful whether Italy would carry on a war against Austria seriously. In a telegram of June 13th, addressed to the Prussian ambassador, von Usedom, he recommended to demand energetically that the Italian government should come to an understanding with the Hungarian committee. A refusal of La Marmora to do so might cause Prussia to suspect that Italy did not intend to carry on a serious war against Austria. The ambassador should inform Italy that Prussia would begin hostilities next week. But a fruitless war, in the fortified Square of Italy, would give rise to suspicions. On June 17th, von Usedom sent a long telegram to La Marmora, in which he made suggestions concerning the conduct of the war in the name of his government. The war should be pushed to the point of annihilation of the enemy. Without regard to the future boundaries of their territories, both powers should seek to make this war decisive, final, complete and irrevocable. Italy should not be content to penetrate merely to the northern frontier of Venetia. It should meet Prussia in the center of the Austrian monarchy. In order to secure for itself the permanent possession of Venetia, it should strike the Austrian monarchy to the heart.

This was the famous "strike to the heart" telegram which created such great excitement when it became known in 1868. But things went differently. Not the Italians, but the Austrians, were victorious. The Italians were beaten ashore in the battle of Custozza, and at sea in the naval battle of Lissa. In spite of these victories,

Austria ceded Venetia to Napoleon, and not to Italy, because matters were in bad shape in the northern part of the Austrian monarchy. Austria hoped to secure the intervention of Napoleon. This new situation induced Bismarck, in spite of the great dissatisfaction which he created in the Prussian headquarters, to grant an armistice to Austria, which was concluded in Nickolsburg, and which led to peace preliminaries at its close, on July 27th. In the final peace treaty, concluded in Prague, Prussia received Slesvig-Holstein, Hannover, Nassau, Hessa and Frankfort. Austria escaped with a moderate war indemnity. Political reasons induced Bismarck to treat Austria mildly. The Southwestern German states were to form their own federation. Venetia was ceded by Napoleon to Italy.

That Austria should have ceded Venetia to Napoleon, created a great storm of indignation among the German Liberals. They called this treason. This charge struck Prussia as well as Austria. It was kept secret as much as possible, that Prussia had allied itself with a foreign power, Italy, for the purpose of annihilating a German state, and that Bismarck had communicated with Klapka for the purpose of raising a rebellion in Hungary. As a result, Klapka had issued the following proclamation: "To the Hungarian Soldiers:

"By virtue of the confidence of my fellow-citizens, I assume command of the entire armed forces of Hungary; I speak to you as your leader.

"Prussia's and Italy's mighty kings are our allies. Garibaldi is hastening this way from Italy, Tuerr from the Danube, Bethlen from Sevenburgen, in order to free the fatherland; from here I am leading the brave Hungarian band into the country. Louis Kossuth will be with us. Thus united, we shall chase the Austrians, who robbed us of our possessions and our liberty, out of the country. We shall reconquer what is ours: the soil of Arpad. In the years of 1848 and 1849, we earned eternal fame, and now the wreath of laurel and of victory awaits us, if we liberate the fatherland. Forward, then, follow

the Hungarian banner! Our fatherland's sacred soil is but a few days distant, thither I shall lead you. Come home, then, where mother, sister and sweetheart are waiting for you with open arms.

"Choose! Do you want to remain miserable prisoners, or become glorious defenders of the fatherland?"

"Long live the fatherland!"

"Klapka, M. P., Hungarian General."

Neither did the spokesmen in Prussia care to dwell upon the recollection of the fact that the Prussian army headquarters, when invading Bohemia, had published a proclamation: "To the Inhabitants of the Glorious Kingdom of Bohemia," containing such passages as the following:

"Should our just cause win, then the time may come also, in Bohemia and Moravia, when they shall be able to realize their national desires the same as Hungary. May a lucky star then assure their fortunes forever!"

It was the old song of measuring by two different standards. If two do the same thing, it is not the same. If Prussia committed the greatest villainies—and the proceedings in Bohemia and Hungary certainly could not be considered as a loyal warfare—they were excused, or even justified. But woe to the opponents who imitated its example. For instance, what would the Prussian government say, if some foreign power should some day invade the province of Posen and issue a similar proclamation as that of the Prussians in Bohemia?

Treason on a large scale, such as was promoted in Austrian countries, was accompanied by treason on a small scale in Germany. In the beginning of August, 1866, the Saxon Liberals decided, under the leadership of Professor Bedermann, Dr. Hans Blum, etc., to adopt a resolution at a state convention in Leipsic, containing the following passages: "We consider that the German and Saxon interests are best preserved by the incorporation of Saxony in Prussia." Still more emphatically did Mr. von Treitschke, a born Saxon, express himself, when, in

his capacity as editor of the "Prussian Annals," he called upon Bismarck to annihilate the opposing states, Saxony, Hannover, Hessa:

"Those three dynasties are ripe, over-ripe, for their merited annihilation. Their re-establishment would be a danger to the security of the new German federation, a sin against the morals of the nation. . . . Next to the house of Hapsburg, no other line of princes has for centuries committed graver crimes against the German nation than the house of Albertines. . . . King John is no doubt the most worthy of respect among the exiled princes of Germany, but with a large fund of learning, he has remained an ordinary man, narrow of heart, unfree, a philistine in his judgment of the world and the times. The crown-prince, a man who is not without a rough good-nature, but withal crude and without political understanding, was ever a pillar of the Austrian party, and still less is to be expected from Prince George, whose arrogance and bigotry cause resentment even in tame Dresden. . . . Above all, we fear that a restoration will demoralize the people by the spirit of lying, by the pretense of a loyalty which the younger generation can no longer feel after the events of this summer. Imagine the scene of King John entering his capital, of the ever faithful city fathers of Dresden receiving the spoiler of his country with words of thanks and veneration, of white and green robed young women wearing evergreen wreaths and bowing before this sullied and desecrated crown—verily, the mere thought is nauseating."

And he closed with the words: "In days like these, men should have the heart to disregard the paragraphs of the Albertinian penal code. . . . We do not wish that a house, condemned by God and men, should return to the throne."

Bismarck saw to it that his fiery worshippers were not hurt. In Article 19 of the peace treaty, the King of Saxony had to guarantee that "none of his subjects, or whoever may be subject to the laws of Saxony, shall be called to account by process of law, or by the police, or by

disciplinary measures, or shall in any way be curtailed in his honorable rights, on account of any crime or misdemeanor committed with reference to the relations between Prussia and Saxony during the time of war against the person of His Majesty, or on account of high treason, or treason against the state, or, finally, on account of his political attitude during that period."

Liebknecht and myself have often been asked, later on, what would have happened, if Prussia had been defeated by Austria. It was a sad fact that, under the conditions prevailing at that time, only this alternative remained, so that, taking sides against one, was construed as taking sides for the other. But that was the condition. My opinion is that a nation **existing in an unfree state** may be furthered, rather than held back, by a defeat in war. Victories make a government that stands above the people arrogant and exacting, defeats compel it to approach the people and to win their sympathy. This is taught in the case of Prussia by 1806-07, for Austria by 1866, for France by 1870, by the defeat of Russia in the war with Japan in 1904. The Russian revolution would not have occurred without that defeat, it would have been made impossible for many years by a victory of Tsarism. On the other hand, history shows that when the Prussian nation had overthrown the rule of Napoleon by immense sacrifices of wealth and blood, and saved the dynasty from a bad plight, the rescued princes forgot all their beautiful promises which they had made in the hour of danger to their people. After a long period of reaction, it required the year 1848 to recover for the people what the princes had withheld from them for decades. And think of the way in which Bismarck later rejected every truly Liberal demand in the North German Reichstag! He behaved like a dictator.

If Prussia had been defeated in 1866, Bismarck's ministry, and the rule of the aristocracy, which weighs like a nightmare upon Germany to this day, would have been swept away. No one knew this better than Bismarck. The Austrian government would never have become so

strong after a victory as Prussia did. Austria was, and is, by its whole structure, an internally weak state, differing from Prussia. But the government of a strong state is more dangerous to its democratic development. No democratic state has a so-called strong government. It is powerless against the people. Most probably the Austrian government, after its victory, would have attempted to rule Germany in a reactionary way. But in that case, it would have had not merely the entire Prussian people against itself, but also the greater portion of the remainder of the nation, including a goodly part of the Austrian population. If any revolution was certain and assured of success, it would have been one against Austria. The democratic unification of the empire would have been the result. The victory of Prussia precluded that. And still another thing. The exclusion of German Austria from the national community—not to mention the abandoning of Luxemburg—condemned ten millions of Germans to an almost hopeless condition. Our "patriots" fall into national ravings, when some German is maltreated somewhere in a foreign country, but they do not resent the assassination of the culture of ten millions of Germans in Austria.

By the way, similar discussions had taken place among our great men a few years before 1866, as I was informed later.

In a letter to Lassalle, dated January 19th, 1862, Lothar Bucher wrote (two years before he entered the service of Bismarck), concerning the eventuality of a war with France, in which Prussia might win: "A victory of the soldiery, which means of the Prussian government, would be an evil."

About the middle of June, 1850, Lassalle wrote to Marx: "Only in a **popular** war against France . . . do I see misfortune. But a war that is **unpopular with the nation is immensely fortunate for the revolution. . . .**" Lassalle went still farther and elaborated his idea: "A defeat of France would be **the** event for the counter-revolution for a long time to come. Matters are still in such a

shape that France, despite all Napoleons, represents the revolution compared to the rest of Europe, and a defeat of France the downfall of the revolution." At the end of March, 1860, Lassalle also wrote to Engels: "Only for the sake of preventing misunderstanding, I must remark that I desired very much, even last year, when I wrote my pamphlets ("On the Italian War"), that Prussia should start a war against Napoleon. **But I desired it only on condition that the war be made by the government, that it be as unpopular and hated by the people as possible. In that case it would, indeed, be a great windfall (for the revolution.)**"*

In his speech, entitled "What Next?" which Lassalle made in October, 1862, he says, in the first edition, on pages 33 and 34: "Finally, the existence of the Germans is not so precarious that **a defeat of their governments would imply a real danger for the existence of the nation.** If you, gentlemen, read history carefully, and with an understanding of its inner workings, then you will see that the labors of civilization which our nation has performed, are so gigantic and enormous, so record-breaking and leading the way for the rest of Europe, that no doubts can arise as to the necessity and impregnability of our national existence. If we should become involved in a great external war, **then our various governments, the Saxon, Prussian, Bavarian, might break down, but, like a phenix out of its ashes, would arise indestructibly what is alone essential to all of us—The German Nation.**"

The outcome of the war seemed to throw an unexpected success into our lap. One day, Liebknecht appeared, full of joy, in my shop, and informed me that he had bought the "Middle German People's Paper," which the Liberals had abandoned, because the deficit of the paper had become larger from day to day. The subscription list of the paper had dropped from 2800 to 1200. I was scared by this news, for we didn't have a penny of

* Letters of Ferdinand Lassalle to Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. Stuttgart, 1902.

cash, and it was quite out of the question that we could put the paper on its feet under the prevailing conditions. Moreover, we had to take the Prussian army of occupation into consideration. Liebknecht tried to console me. The publisher did not ask for any money for the time being, and what we would need in other respects, we could provide for. He was happy to be the possessor of a paper, in which he could voice his views. And this he did so valiantly that one would have thought he was master of the country instead of the Prussians. Of course, the fun did not last long. The paper was suppressed. I was not angry over this event, altho I took good care not to tell him so. We were rescued from a great embarrassment, for the daring plan which we had concocted, to place 5000 shares of one dollar each in the German workingmen's clubs, would have met with a great failure.





After the War.

The result of the war was the creation of the North German federation, in which the giant Prussia took the lead among a lot of political pigmies. Since the inauguration of a North German Reichstag, on the basis of universal suffrage was now in prospect, a more solid political organization became necessary for us, also a program around which the new party could rally. That this program should be frankly Social-Democratic, was out of the question, in view of the position taken by a portion of its leading elements, such as Professor Rossmuessler and others. Moreover, a portion of the workingmen's clubs was politically too backward to permit our risking such a step. It would have led to a split, and this we had to avoid at this stage of the development. Finally, we were also influenced by the consideration that it would be necessary to combine all forces for a democratization of Germany, so long as vast portions of the bourgeoisie were dominated by such sentiments as prevailed on account of the recent military events, and the partition of Germany into three parts.

We called a state convention to Chemnitz, on August 19th, in which participated also members of the General Association of German Workingmen (Fritzsche, Foersterling, Noething and others), in order to found the new democratic party. The adopted program was as follows:

“Demands of the Democracy.

“(1) Unlimited autonomy of the people. Universal, equal and direct suffrage, with secret ballots in all fields of political life (parliament, the legislatures of individual states, the municipalities, etc.). Popular armament, instead of a standing army. A parliament equipped with the greatest possible authority, which shall have to decide particularly about peace and war.

"(2) Unification of Germany in a democratic form of the state. No hereditary central power. No Small Germany under Prussian leadership, no Greater Germany under Austrian leadership. No Trias. Such dynastic and particiularist aims and others like them, which lead to loss of liberty, disunion and the rule of a foreign power, must be energetically combatted by the democratic party.

"(3) Abolition of privileges of estate, birth and confession.

"(4) Improvement of the physical, intellectual and moral culture of the people. Separation of the school from the church and of the state from the church, amelioration of the teachers' institutes, and a dignified position of the teachers, establishment of the public school as a state institution, with free tuition, maintained by state funds. Creation of funds and foundation of institutes for the higher education of those who have graduated from public school.

"(5) Promotion of the general welfare and emancipation of labor and of the laborers from every oppression and every handicap. Improvement of the condition of the working class, freedom of migration, freedom of occupation, universal German citizenship, promotion and support of co-operatives, especially of co-operatives of production, in order that the antagonism between capital and labor be abolished.

"(6) Autonomy of the communes.

"(7) Uplift of the popular consciousness of rights, by the independence of the courts, juries, particularly in political and press cases; public and oral court procedure.

"(8) Promotion of the political and social culture of the people by means of a free press, free right of assembly and association, right of coalition."

This program left nothing to desire in the way of outspoken determination. The members of the General Association of German Workingmen had also assented to it, but they were induced by von Schweitzer to keep aloof from the formation of the new party. Rossmassler

was also suspicious and dissatisfied, for the social demands went too far for him, and he discovered the Socialist hoof in the program. When I visited him shortly after the state convention, he did not conceal his dissatisfaction. He thought he should warn me emphatically against Liebknecht, whom he called a dangerous man and a disguised Communist. I tried to pacify him, but could not prevent his meeting many a disappointment up to his death, in the following spring. For instance, it hurt him, when he declined to accept a candidacy for the Reichstag in Leipsic, that his personal opponent Wuttke, was nominated in his stead. Rossmuessler had the queer idea that the parliament of 1849 still existed by right and that Loewe-Calve, who had been the last president of that parliament, and who loved to hear himself called the last president of the first German parliament, should call it together. As a matter of fact, Loewe-Calve had declared a few years previously at a convention of representatives that he considered himself as the legitimate heir of the parliament of 1849 and that he would eventually call it together again. But he took good care later on not to make himself so ridiculous.

On November 7, 1866, the chairman of the permanent committee, Staudinger, published a leaflet, in which he expressed himself on the changes which had taken place in Germany in the meantime. This leaflet subjected the situation, created by the peace treaty of Prague, to a dissenting critique. He said that little was to be expected for popular liberty and popular rights, but that, on the other hand, the system of standing armies was fixed for many years to come, at least in the North of Germany. Less than ever, was any reduction of the state expenditures, or any reduction or abolition of indirect taxes, to be expected. On the contrary, it was certain that these burdens would be increased.

The leaflet was not so fortunate in its critique of the prevailing social conditions. In this respect, it had in

mind the numerous backward economic institutions still existing in the individual states. These institutions would have to be abolished in the process of inaugurating the new order, in order to render it reasonable. For the essential thing was, of course, that the need of the bourgeoisie for a free development of its forces should be satisfied.

In addition to the dark sides resulting from the catastrophe of recent months, according to Staudinger, there were also some bright sides, at least in a negative way. Two phenomena he regarded particularly as significant for the working class. In the first place, the large majority of the progressive party had shown itself **utterly unfit** for the political and social regeneration of the fatherland. This was elaborated more at length by the writer. In the second place, it was a welcome sign that the workmen of all Germany had expressed themselves in favor of the general introduction of universal, equal and direct suffrage, and social legislation making for freedom.

The leaflet stated, finally, that the experiences during the year 1866 had demonstrated the fact that there was no ground to fear any split within the working class, and that, on the contrary, the increases of opposition to the progressive party demanded, more than ever, unity and unanimity.

"The important demand for universal and direct suffrage is a common slogan of both factions. Both of them also demand a complete transformation of the taxing systems exploiting labor, and a reorganization of the military system that makes a serf of the citizen. Neither side denies the great importance of coalitions and co-operatives, and consequently the necessity of a revolution of the conditions of production. But the debate on the lesser or greater degree of **the duties of the state toward the individual** (underlined also in the original) is futile, so long as the government, clinging to feudal traditions, disposes of the citizens as though they were a herd without a will, and so long as the sword dictates the political

transformation of the fatherland. This sword, while it stands for despicable oppression instead of freedom, threatens to deprive all of us of the foundation for a peaceful solution of the social question."

In conclusion, the leaflet calls upon the laborers to go to work briskly, and to forget all feuds among themselves.

This proclamation had been published by Staudinger personally. The permanent committee had not been asked for its opinion. We were taken by surprise when this leaflet appeared. I, who was rather closely acquainted with Staudinger, thought that it could not agree with his own views. And my assumption proved to be correct. When called to account concerning this leaflet by his progressive friends in Nuremberg, he confessed that Sonnemann was its author, and that he had merely signed it.

The rapidly approaching elections to the North German Reichstag compelled us to engage in an intense agitation and organization, which demanded heavy sacrifices of all of us. In the eyes of our bourgeois opponents, Socialist agitators are men that fatten on the dimes of the laborers. This charge was never less justified than it was at that time. It required a great deal of enthusiasm, persistence and devotion to the cause to engage in the work of agitation. The agitator had to be glad when he was reimbursed for his cash outlay, and in order to reduce this as much as possible, it was natural that he accepted every invitation to stay with some party comrade that offered it. In this way, he sometimes had peculiar experiences. More than once it happened that I had to sleep in the same room with some married couple. At another time, a domestic cat gave birth to its young under the couch, upon which I slept, and this did not take place without noise and wailings. Again, one other time, I was lodged by my friend, Motteler, in the garret of a house that was filled with strains of yarn, which the foreman had to deliver to the weavers. When I was awakened early in the morning by the sun, whose rays

fell in my face thru a window in the roof, I discovered that I was bedded in a heap of yellow yarn, and that Motteler's blackhaired head rested upon a pile of purple yarn. This excited my laughter, so that Motteler woke up and asked in surprise what was the matter. Similar experiences were made by every one who agitated for the party at that time, and even later. Liebknecht was then particularly active in the agitation. Unexpectedly, he was delayed for months in this work. A sweeping amnesty had been proclaimed in Prussia after the war. Liebknecht, assuming that his expulsion from Prussia had also been canceled in this way, went to Berlin in the beginning of October, and gave a lecture in the printers' union. He was arrested on the same evening, and later sentenced to three months of imprisonment for breaking the ban. He passed this time in the "Stadtvogtei," where he was treated like a common criminal. For instance, he was deprived of light at six o'clock in the evening, and this he felt particularly as a hardship. His opponent, J. B. von Schweitzer, fared much better in this respect. This gentleman was granted such liberties and amenities during his imprisonment as have never been allowed since then to any political prisoner in a Prussian prison.

The elections for a constitutional North German Reichstag had been called for February, 1867. This induced us to call a state convention to Glauchau for Christmas, 1866, in order to nominate our candidates. Our financial resources and our propaganda forces compelled us to limit ourselves to those election districts, in which our organization was a good one. These were, in the first place, the seventeenth election district, Glauchau-Merane, in which I was nominated as a candidate; the eighteenth, Crimmitschau-Zwickau, in which Lawyer Schrap was a candidate; and the nineteenth, Stollberg-Lugau-Schneeberg, which was assigned to Liebknecht. Since he was not released from his prison until the second half of January, he could work but insufficiently in his district, and so he was defeated. Schrap and myself carried our districts. I had four opponents, among them

Fritzsche, in his capacity as a member of the General Association of German Workingmen, who received only 400 votes. He opposed me in a large voters' meeting in Glauchau, but was worsted. Politically, I was ahead of him, and in Socialist matters, I did not lag behind him. With 4600 votes, I gained a good start over my next opponent, and in the second elections, I won out by a vote of 7922. My opponent received 4281 votes.

The elections were fought, even then, in a very dishonest manner. For instance, one day, when traveling in my election district, I heard some gentleman make disparaging remarks about me in another section of the railroad car. He claimed I had promised the weavers in Glauchau double wages and an eight-hour day, if they would elect me. These lies made me angry. I arose and asked my detractor whether he had been told by Bebel himself what he had just related. He replied in the affirmative. I called him an insolent liar, and when he wanted to fly at my face, I revealed my identity. He became very small, and the passengers heaped ridicule and scorn upon him. At the next station he hurriedly left the car.

The year 1867 brought with it two general Reichstag's elections. In the first election, in February, the constitutional convention was elected that was to draw up the future constitution, and that ceased to exist after the fulfillment of this mission. The elections for the first legislative period, which took place in the beginning of August, resulted, on our side, in the election of Liebknecht, Schrap, Dr. Goetz of Lindenau, a turner, who was at that time a red republican, and myself. From among the Lassalleans, J. B. von Schweitzer and Dr. Reinecke were elected. The latter resigned later on and was replaced by Fritzsche. In an after-election, Hasenclever won out. Since a portion of the General Association of German Workingmen had meanwhile detached itself under the patronage of the friend of Lassalle, the Countess von Hatzfeldt, and founded a Lassallean General Association of German Workingmen, this faction likewise elected a representative in the person of Foer-

sterling, and later a second one, in the person of Mende, who became Foersterling's successor in the presidency of the association. Mende was a hollow head, who had so run himself down in the service of the countess that he did not dare to speak without an injection of morphine, and who used to close his speeches with the phrase: "I have spoken," whereby he always created much merriment in the Reichstag.

Later, I shall refer to my position and activity in the Reichstag.





The Continued Development of the Federation of German Workingmen's Clubs.

In the session of the permanent committee, which was held in Cassel, at the end of March, 1867, but was attended by only a few members, we ascertained that the political events of the last year had exerted a positively destructive influence on the clubs. The treasury was empty, the organ of the clubs, the "Allgemeine Arbeiterzeitung," had been abandoned; a monthly, "Die Arbeit," published by Dr. Pfeiffer, Stuttgart, and printed by Sonnemann, had also succumbed after a short period of existence. In addition to this, the management of the club was not in the right hands. The committee decided to issue a new club organ, which was to be edited by Eichelsdoerfer, under the title of "Arbeiterhalle," and to appear once every fourteen days. I became his most regular co-worker. The paper appeared from June 1, 1867, to December 4, 1868, when it was suspended in favor of the "Demokratisches Wochenblatt," founded by us in Leipsic in the beginning of January, 1869, and edited by Liebknecht. Finally, it was decided to call a national convention once more in the fall.

The foundation of the "Demokratisches Wochenblatt" filled a want long felt for all of us. Until then we had not had at our disposal any organ in which we could voice our views, and so we had lacked the opportunity to carry on the effective political and social enlightenment of our followers, a thing that was needed very much. Thus we had been without weapons to defend ourselves against the attacks of our opponents. Of course, the paper laid heavy burdens upon us, but we carried them gladly, for it was the most important instrument of warfare which we had.

The laxity in the management of the federation of workingmen's clubs induced me to push Staudinger

ahead by means of frequent letters. At the end of May, 1867, I wrote him that, in my estimate, the greatest advantage, which the North German Federation had brought to us so far, and would bring to us in the future, was that it stirred the masses in a way that had no parallel since 1848, and that on this account we had acquired many new connections which we ought to utilize in the interest of the movement. He ought to establish connections with the International. I protested against the continued attempts to keep the workingmen away from politics. We should also consider the advisability of a new organization, for there was something in the air which indicated that the North German Federation would proceed against the workingmen's clubs.

In Saxony, the political life of the clubs was particularly active; we agitated uninterruptedly, in order to win the masses. On Pentecost, we had again called a workingmen's convention at Frankenberg. I presided, and the convention occupied itself principally with a petition for a reform of the Saxon laws on occupations. We demanded a normal ten-hour day, abolition of Sunday work, abolition of the prohibition of coalitions, abolition of child labor in factories and shops, representation of the workingmen in boards of trade and boards of arbitration, autonomy of workingmen's treasuries, agreement concerning the management of factories and shops between employees and employers. Vahiteich, reporting on the question: "What attitude should the workingmen's clubs take toward political parties, and what attitude toward the Saxon government?" offered the following resolution: "Resolved, that the convention declines the measures suggested by Schulze-Delitzsch, as insufficient for the solution of the social question, and declares that this question can be solved only in a democratic state by the intervention of the collectivity."

He also recommended the reading of Socialist writings and newspapers. The resolution caused quite an excitement among the minority, and so I thought I ought to pacify the excited minds by a compromise resolution.

In this I was mistaken. Vahlteich's resolution was adopted against 7 votes, mine against 9 votes. Gera was selected as the meeting place for the next German convention, and the permanent committee sanctioned this choice.

This convention, the fourth, was held on October 6th and 7th. In it 37 clubs and three district federations were represented by 36 delegates. A newcomer among them was the free-religious pastor, Uhlig of Magdeburg, a man of more than medium size, with long white hair. Unfortunately, nature had placed upon his otherwise sympathetic face an immense nose, which disturbed the symmetry. Among the three candidates for president of the convention, who had received the same number of votes, the author, Wartenburg of Gera, was elected by lot. In the course of its proceedings, the convention honored the memory of Bandow of Berlin, who had died in the middle of the Summer of 1866, and of Professor Rossmassler, who had died in April, 1867. Uhlig reported on the school question in a somewhat mushy lecture, which wound up in sixteen demands. The convention disposed of it by declaring, in a resolution, that it agreed "in a general way." On the question of organization, upon which Hochberger and Motteler reported, the views at last enforced themselves which I had advocated for years. According to Art. IV, the convention elected a president, who was to be the head of an executive consisting of six other members. This executive was elected by the club to which the president belonged. The seat of this club was the headquarters of the federation. It was, furthermore, decided that the executive of the headquarters should be allowed \$300.00 per year for its trouble. In addition to the federal executive, 16 trustees, who would be distributed all over Germany, were to be elected, who should act as a control over the management of the executive, and as advisers in important matters. The balloting on the president resulted in my election by a vote of 19 out of 33, while Dr. Marx Hirsch received 13 and Krebs of Berlin, 1. This made Leipsic headquarters.

The new tendency had won out. We had accomplished what I had long aimed at. The federation now became somewhat capable of action. 1

Another point of the order of business was a report by myself on the condition of the miners. This report had been suggested by a great calamity in the Lugau coal region, in the Summer of 1867, when 101 workers had been killed, leaving 50 widows and about 150 children. Pursuant to instructions of the workingmen's club, I had taken up a collection, which netted \$1,400.00. We agreed to adopt the following resolution:

"The accidents which have of late occurred in the mining industry make it the duty of every workingman to demand that the governments of the states draw up laws by which every employer or owner of an industrial establishment, is made liable for every injury incurred by his employees during the work and caused by the negligence of the former. Particularly are the following measures regarded as necessary for the protection of the miners: (1) Strictest supervision by the state of mining companies. (2) Legal introduction of the system of two shafts, consisting of one working shaft and one safety shaft. (3) Introduction of the principle of compensation to victims of accidents or their families on the basis of a law that shall be passed, and strictest enforcement of the ordinances concerning death or injury thru negligence. (4) Determined opposition to the one-sided introduction of so-called miners' ordinances (fines, shift rules, miners' banks), issued by mine owners and mine owners' organizations, without any consultation, and without the agreement of the workers. (5) Administration of miners' banks by the workers."

This was the first time that a German workingmen's convention demanded the passing of an employers' liability law, a demand which was fulfilled in 1872 by national legislation, altho in an inadequate manner.

A report on the military question was dispensed with on account of lack of time, but it was agreed to adopt a resolution, which represented a weak compromise, owing

to the prevailing divergence of opinions. For this reason, this question was discussed once more at the next national convention in Nuremberg.

With the new organization, a new spirit entered the federation. It was necessary, above all, to stir the majority of the clubs out of their indifference and bring them into effective action. This could be done only by giving them work to perform, and demanding that it be performed. From now on, hardly any issue of the "Arbeiterhalle" appeared that did not bring at its head an appeal of the executive, engaging the activity of the clubs in different matters. The success gradually became apparent. The clubs took on more life. Now the moderate dues of the federation were also paid more regularly than ever before. But in the administration of executive business matters, things took such a course that almost the whole burden fell on me, my having been its president, secretary and treasurer. The elected secretary kept only the minutes of the executive's sessions, and took care of the files. Among the members of the executive were also Otto Freytag, a lawyer, who soon resigned, Ch. Hadlich and P. Ulrich. The business and the resulting correspondence with the clubs soon grew to gigantic proportions. At the close of the first business year, including August, 1868, the incoming business correspondence amounted only to 253, the outgoing to 543, which was, nevertheless, considerably more than formerly. But from the Nuremberg convention, beginning September 1868, to the Eisenach congress, beginning August, 1869, the number of incoming mail pieces amounted to 907, that of the outgoing to 4484, the greater half of them second class matter. All the rest were letters, and often long letters, by myself.

In addition to this work, there were the sessions of the executive, the management of the Workingmen's Educational Club, the activity of the North German Reichstag and revenue parliament, numerous agitation tours, and, beginning with the Fall of 1869, the permanent collaboration with the "Demokratisches Wochen-

blatt," to which I contributed the entire labor department. Of course, this activity compelled me to neglect my young wife and my small business in an excessive way, and so it was but natural that in financial matters the water reached up to my mouth, so that I did not know what to do.

Since I demanded a similar activity as my own also from others, I had written repeatedly to Vahlteich, and urged him to be more active. In reply, he came back at me in a letter of May 25, 1869, in which he wrote:

"Dear Friend!—Some months ago you wrote me a similar letter of encouragement as that of the day before yesterday. My reply to that former letter made a 'pitiful' impression on you. I believe you, but I want to ask you to grant the value of truth to my letters, in view of the fact that I, in a similar situation as yourself, have also worked feverishly and with self-sacrificing impatience.

"From this point of view, I must speak frankly: I fear that you are ruining yourself in more than one way. If I am mistaken, it is very well in the interest of the cause, and I shall be glad of it; but so far as I can judge of matters, I do not understand how you can keep up your activity as an agitator, or your public activity in general, in the long run. . . ."

Then he concluded with the statement that he was in a position where he would have to give up either his position in business or his activity as an agitator.

I must say with reference to this last remark, that a large number of party comrades found themselves in the same position as Vahlteich, in the course of years. Our opponents still like to point out to-day that no real laborer is a member of the Socialist representation in the Reichstag. But the simple reason for this is that every workingman, who publicly champions the Social Democracy, **is discharged immediately.** Either he keeps his mouth shut, or the party that needs agitators, editors, managers, gives him a position. Independent business men in our party were treated even worse, from the early days. At the same time, our opponents denounce the so-called terror-


ism of the Social Democracy. O these hypocrites! No one exerts a worse terrorism than they. Many and many a brave party comrade have I seen bled to death in the course of decades by the terrorism of our opponents.

For instance, there was Julius Motteler, a man of high idealism, who took part in our agitation in 1867, and for this reason was discharged from his position as business manager of a factory. In order not to give in, and not to clear the field for his opponents, he founded a co-operative spinning and weaving association in Crimmitschau. For a few years it really thrived. But when the war of 1870-71 came, and the Liberals were angry over our attitude, the bank withdrew its credit from the co-operative, and compelled Motteler to go into bankruptcy. He sacrificed his entire fortune, in order to satisfy the creditors as much as possible. Then he took charge of the Leipsic Co-operative Printing Association. Similar proceedings also explain how it is that there are so many tobacco and cigar dealers, saloon keepers, etc., among the leading Socialist and Socialist representatives. They had to take refuge in these lines of business, because these are about the only lines in which the persecuted members can be supported by the comrades. I have also suffered much in twenty-five years of business activity from withdrawals of customers, and the clash of interests between a public activity and business.

Very often friends of mine in bourgeois positions, who could not understand my activity in the labor movement, told me that I was a fool to sacrifice myself for the laborers. They told me to get busy for the capitalist class, and take an interest in municipal affairs, and then I would do a brilliant business, and would soon become city councilor. That seemed the highest attainment to them. I laughed and told them that my ambitions did not aim in that direction.

That I managed to carry the burden of my work—and the years from 1867 to 1872 were the busiest of my life, altho I have never lacked something to do until today—puzzled a good many. To a certain extent it was

a wonder even to myself, for I had to struggle several times against disease. In those days, I was a man of small stature with hollow cheeks and a pale face, so that some friends of my wife, who attended our wedding, ventured the prophecy: "Poor girl, she won't have him long." Fortunately, it turned out differently.





Personal Matters.

To a man who, in public life, is battling with a world of opponents, it is not immaterial what sort of a mind the wife at his side. Either she may be a helper and a co-worker in his efforts, or a leaden weight and an obstacle to them. I am happy to say that my wife belongs to the first class. She was the daughter of a section worker on the Leipsic-Magdeburg railroad. He had died before I became acquainted with her. She was working in a modiste's shop in Leipsic. We were engaged in the Fall of 1864, shortly before the death of her mother, and we were married in the Spring of 1866. I have never had any cause to regret my marriage. I could not have found a more loving, devoted, always self-sacrificing woman. If I managed to accomplish what I did, it was possible, in the first place, only thru her untiring care and readiness to help. And she has had to go thru many hard days, months and years, until at last the sun of calmer days shone for her.

A source of happiness and a consolation for her became our daughter, who was born in January, 1869, and with whose birth an amusing incident is connected. On the forenoon of the critical day, I was sitting at my desk in my room and waiting with great excitement for the expected event, when some one knocked at the door, and at my call a gentleman stepped into the room and introduced himself as a lawyer, Albert Traeger. Traeger's name was familiar to me thru his poems in the "Gartenlaube," and his public activity. After our introduction, Traeger said, surprised: "Why, you are still a young man; I thought you were an oldish and rotund man, who had given up his business and played politics for his pleasure." I stood before him in the usual green wood-turner's apron, and replied, smiling: "You see, you are mistaken." Then we conversed for a while, until I heard the expected

baby's cry in the adjoining room. Now, nothing could hold me any longer. With a few words I explained the situation to Traeger, whereupon he congratulated me heartily and left. A few years later we became colleagues in the German Reichstag, and remain good friends to this day, in spite of our widely divergent principles.

My position in the labor movement, and my engagement, made my permanent residence in Leipsic desirable. While Saxony had introduced business freedom in 1863, every "foreigner" who wanted to avail himself of it, and that means every one not born in Saxony, had to become naturalized. That cost much money in those days, for a man had to acquire citizenship in the community at the same time. I lacked the means to make myself independent and become naturalized. This, and the municipal citizenship in Leipsic, cost about \$150.00, and what I had to expect from home, amounted to about \$350.00. Unexpectedly, I was compelled to make myself independent, because my master, pretending that he had no more work for me, gave me notice to quit at the end of 1863. In reality he gave me notice, because he had heard that I intended to make myself independent. He wanted to keep a competitor out of the field. Thereupon I went to Wetzlar and secured as much money as I could. Then I rented a shop in the center of the town, in the yard of a merchant's store which had just been changed from a stable into a workroom. The room was so primitive that it had no fireplace as yet. Until this could be completed, I had to violate the police regulations by running my stove-pipe thru the window into the yard. As my small funds melted away like butter in the sun, this small room had to serve me also as a bedroom, and on hard winter nights I felt the cold bitterly. In order to circumvent the naturalization for a while, I had opened my business under the name of a bourgeois friend, until, in the Spring of 1866, in order to be able to marry, I went into debt for the naturalization. Two years later, the legislation of the North German Federation would have saved me a great deal of expense.

I began business on the smallest scale with the assistance of an apprentice. After a few months I could afford to engage a helper. But when I had been elected to the Reichstag, in February, 1867, and had to give my helper an insight into the business during my absence, which he could not have gotten while I was present, he gave notice after my return and made himself independent. When I related this incident later to a former colleague, he said, dryly: "Serves you right; why did you pay wages that enabled him to save money?" This "enormous" wage amounted to \$4.50 per week in those days; it was higher by half a dollar than in any other shop, and working hours, with me, were ten hours, as compared to eleven, in other places.

For the rest, I became thoroly familiar with the miseries of a small master. The ordered goods had to be delivered to the customers on a long credit. Wages for employees, express and one's own living expenses, required daily and weekly expenditures. Where to find the money? So I supplied a merchant with my goods for cash at a price that was but a little higher than the cost price. But when I went to get my money on Saturday, I received nothing but dirty paper bills, with which Leipsic was flooded at that time thru its traffic with the Thuringian states. Every one of these small states utilized its coining privilege to the utmost, and flooded the market with its paper money. But this money was taken and given everywhere and served as traffic money. In addition to this, I received checks from some industrial business that were not yet due, or ducats which the manipulator had filed so much that, instead of \$3.00 and 5 groschen, which they represented in payment to me, I received only \$3.00 and less from the banker, who had to change them for me. And it was about the same with the checks. I was angry over this mode of payment, but what was I to do? I doubled my fist in my pocket, delivered my goods next week as usual, and received the same payment.

My public activity gradually incensed the employers

against me. Orders were refused to me. That was a boycott. If I had not succeeded in securing a small circle of customers outside of Leipsic for my articles (knobs for doors and windows made of buffalo horn) I should have been compelled to go into bankruptcy at the end of the sixties. I fared badly during the wartime of 1870-71, in which work was slack anyway. And when, in the Winter of 1870-71, I was imprisoned for 102 days, together with Liebknecht and Hepner, my wife had to inform me one day that not an article was being ordered any more, but that the helper and the apprentice had to be paid weekly. That was a bitter and sad situation. But it soon changed for the better. With the conclusion of peace, the period of prosperity began which lasted until 1874. The orders then came into the house unsolicited, the customers were glad when they were served. So when, in the Spring of 1872, I entered, with Liebknecht, upon my 22 months of imprisonment in Hubertusburg, which were followed in my case by nine months more of prison, I was able to leave the business in charge of a foreman with six helpers and two apprentices. Nevertheless, it was not all silk, even if my wife was at her post. I carried on my business correspondence by way of the fortress and of the prison. But things went to the bad once more, when, simultaneously with the industrial depression of 1874, my competitors manufactured the same articles by factory methods, and sold them at prices which I could not meet with my hand labor methods. I was about to give up the business and accept a position in the party, when, accident would have it, that I found an associate in the person of a party comrade, the merchant, Ferd. Issleib, in Berka, who had not only the necessary means, but also the merchantile knowledge, and who soon acquired the necessary technical knowledge in a very appreciable manner. In the Fall of 1876, we moved into a small factory with steam power, in which we undertook also to manufacture the same articles of bronze, in which we rapidly gained a good reputation. In the beginning we had a hard struggle, for the

crisis was still on. My principal activity now became to look up customers and to undertake business trips, by which I was enabled later on, under the anti-Socialist laws, to perform good services for the party. After I had been expelled from Leipsic in 1881 by virtue of the so-called "small state of siege," and when this expulsion was renewed every year, and I renewed my acquaintance with the jails in the meantime, I dissolved my partnership with Issleib, and held the position of a traveling agent for the business. I felt that I could no longer justify my taking part in the meagre returns of the venture at the expense of my self-sacrificing associate, for he had to carry the principal burden and perform most of the work for it. Besides, my permanent removal from Leipsic estranged me more and more from the internal affairs of the business. So I resigned also the position of traveling agent in 1889, and devoted myself to literary work, thru which I came into permanent business relations with my friend, Heinrich Dietz, in Suttgart.

I have remarked before that people often have a wrong conception of a man's personality. My associate corresponded altogether to the picture which people had of me. He was a tall, strong man, with red hair and red whiskers, reaching to his chest. Thus it happened that people coming to the office and wishing to see me, without knowing me personally, would address him. This mistake of identity always amused us greatly. It also tickled me one day, during a business trip in Tuebingen, while I was taking leave of some acquaintances in a wine room, to hear a citizen of Tuebingen back of me utter the astonished remark in purest Suabian: "What? That little man is Bebel?" Similar incidents often occurred in my experience. In former days it happened not unfrequently that fellow-travelers engaged in conversation about me, without knowing that I was sitting right among them and quietly listening to them. Sometimes they told veritable bandit's tales about me.



The March to Nuremberg.

In July, 1867, after long negotiations between North Germany and the South German states, an agreement had been reached by which the regulation of the taxation and indirect revenue was to be placed in the hands of a so-called revenue parliament, consisting of the members of the North German Reichstag, and of representatives of the four South German states, elected expressly for that purpose. Bismarck had declined to comply with the wishes of the Badensian government and of the South German Liberals, who wanted to be fully admitted to the North German Federation. He had declared that the Prussian government would merely be embarrassed by the entry of eighty South German representatives in the Reichstag. The suffrage for the representatives in the revenue parliament was the same as that for the North German Reichstag. Nevertheless, a large portion of the South German People's Party, especially in Württemberg, declined to take part in the elections, altho Lieb-knecht and myself made every effort at a conference in Bamberg, in February, 1868, to prevent such a senseless position, which signified nothing else but desertion in plain view of the enemy. A large portion of the workingmen's clubs in Württemberg also followed the example of the People's Party. Another portion of them voted, and since the People's Party was also divided on this, several Democrats made a successful run for the revenue parliament. It was different in Hessa, which at that time was politically divided into halves. Upper Hessa belonged to the North Federation, Rhine Hessa and Starkenburg were independent and now voted for candidates to the revenue parliament. Liebknecht and myself supported the democratic candidates in Southern Hessa in the campaign, and held meetings for them. On the occasion of one of these meetings, we also came to Darmstadt, to

the house of Louis Buechner (the author of "Force and Matter"), where Liebknecht made the acquaintance of his future second wife. His first wife had died a year previously. Liebknecht was the only one to gather a trophy in this campaign—namely, his second wife, while the rest of us marched home beaten. The democratic candidates in Mayence and Darmstadt had been defeated.

In Bavaria and Württemberg, a large portion of the workingmen's clubs at that time worked in conjunction with the People's Party for the introduction of the militia system, since in both states a military reorganization was planned. Success was obtained in so far as the government of Württemberg came to an agreement with the legislature to introduce a military service of seventeen months. In Bavaria, under the influence of the renowned statistician, Kolb, the military committee of the legislature had even declared in favor of a service of only nine months, and decided to abolish four cavalry regiments. These achievements were overthrown by the Franco-German war, and the admission of the South German states into the empire.

In Saxony, where a new election law was to be introduced, we agitated in favor of the same suffrage as that for the Reichstag. Furthermore, the headquarters stirred the workingmen's clubs to take a position against the bill brought before the North German Reichstag by Schulze-Delitzsch, concerning the position of the associations in private law, which fell far below the corresponding law in Saxony. Other agitations were directed against the tobacco and kerosene tax planned by the revenue-parliament, and against a whole series of reactionary regulations in the draft of a bill concerning a new trade ordinance pending in the North German Reichstag. I elucidated this subject in an article written for the "Arbeiterhalle."

That the political dissension in the federation of workingmen's clubs could not be continued much longer was evident to us at headquarters. After we had gotten

control in Gera, the situation had to be exploited. A firm program had to be created, no matter what the result might be for the federation. Our own conceptions were met half way by the Workingmen's Educational Club in Dresden, at which Vahlteich presided from September, 1867. He introduced a resolution there to this effect. In South German, Eichelsdoerfer agitated the same idea.

I sent a reply to the latter on April 18, 1868, telling him that the question of a program had been discussed and affirmed by us, but that it would mean a split in our organization. We first asked Sonnemann, whether he intended to submit a draft of a program. He declined. Then we asked Robert Schweichel, who had moved from Hannover to Leipsic, and who assisted Liebknecht in the editorship of the "Demokratisches Wochenblatt," to work out a draft and to report on it at the next convention. We selected Schweichel in agreement with Liebknecht. Schweichel's conciliatory nature was better adapted to this case than Liebknecht's aggressiveness, because it was necessary to win over some of the hesitating representatives of the clubs.

As soon as it became known that the headquarters wanted to submit a program to the next convention, great excitement arose in the clubs controlled by the Liberals. The Liberal press, north and south, pounded us, and tried to stir the clubs against us. From various sides letters of protest and warning came to me. The chairman of the Nuremberg Workingmen's Club, a superior teacher named Roegner, insinuated all sorts of motives on our part. He said we were trying to make up for our "ill-success" in the Reichstag and in the revenue-parliament by our procedure in the convention, we were inspired by hatred of Prussia, etc. But we would be mistaken and suffer defeat. I replied that precisely the proceedings in the Reichstag and in the revenue-parliament had demonstrated how much value the workingmen attributed to their energetic participation in politics in a manner corresponding to their interests. Social and political matters could not be separated, the one supple-

mented the other. . . . The laborer should be democratic from the point of view of his interests. . . . The vagueness manifested by the federation so far could not be continued. . . . Roegner might contend that it is unjust at the time, when the sharp antagonisms between state-help and self-help are disappearing, and both parties have approached each other, to throw a new apple of discord between them. But my reply is that it is precisely the aim of our program to give expression to this approach. . . . Antagonisms cannot be overcome by silence, but by discussion. . . . It is possible that we may be defeated at the convention, but that would not detain us from making the step planned by us. This would not be the first time that I would be in the minority, but had gradually obtained the majority by renewed trials. I recalled merely my motion to elect the president and the headquarters by direct ballot, which had been combatted since 1865, but won out in 1867. . . . With the chairman of the Oldenburg Workingmen's Club I had a long controversy. I informed him that we considered a program necessary, in order that everybody might know where our federation stood, and especially in order that the headquarters and the executive might know just in what manner the majority of the membership wished to be governed. We had often felt the lack of a clear point of view. For the one side we went too far, for the other side, not far enough. I wanted to confess, for my part, that if the majority of the clubs should decline a Social-Democratic program, the headquarters and the majority of the Saxon clubs would ask themselves whether they still cared to belong to the federation.

At the same time, Moritz Mueller, of Pforzheim, advocated the organization of labor unions, and recommended that steps be taken to do away with the administration of the clubs by doctors and professors. I replied to him on July 16th, that I agreed with his ideas concerning labor unions. The printers and cigarmakers of Germany had already followed the example of the English workingmen, now the shoemakers of Leipsic and the

bookbinders in Dresden were following suit. I also agreed with him that the workingmen's clubs should elect leaders from their own ranks. That doctors and professors were no good as leaders, we had learned by our own experience.

As was expected, the convention, held at Nuremberg, by the choice of the large majority of the clubs, was uncommonly well attended. Ninety-three organizations were represented by 115 delegates. Among the invited guests were also Eccarius of London, as a representative of the International,* Oberwinder and Hartung as representatives of the Vienna Workingmen's Educational Club, Quick and Greulich as representatives of the German workingmen's clubs of Switzerland, Dr. Ladendorf of Zürich, formerly an inmate of the Berlin penitentiary, as the representative of the German Republican Club of Zürich, Dr. Heger of Bamberg, as the representative of the German section of the International in Geneva, Buetter, as the representative of the French section of the In-

* My letter of invitation to the General Council was as follows:
To the General Council of the International Workingmen's Association in London.

Gentlemen:—

An important event pending in a large portion of the German workingmen's clubs induces me to address a few lines to you.

On September 5th, 6th and 7th, the federation of German workingmen's clubs will hold its national convention in Nuremberg. Among the important questions on the order of business, the leading one is the "Program Question," in other words, it is to be decided whether the federation shall continue in its present unprincipledness and planless working methods or whether it shall work according to definite principles and in a definite direction.

We have decided in favor of the last-named policy and intend to recommend the adoption of the program of the International Workingmen's Association, as published in the first issue of the "Vorbote," eventually also our affiliation with the International. A majority for this plan is assured and our success beyond question. We believe, however, that it would create a good impression if a delegate from the International Workingmen's Association would

ternational in Geneva, Brueckmann and Niethammer of Stuttgart, as representatives of the committee of the German People's Party. Among the delegates of the clubs was Jacob Venedey, as the representative of a Badensian club, who had acquired some renown, thanks to Heinrich Heine, in the rôle of Kobes of Cologne. A member of the General Association of German Workingmen, Dr. Kirchner, was also present; he had a credential from the Hildesheim Weavers' Union. Kirchner was the first swallow from the General Association of German Workingmen that flew over to our side. In the eyes of J. B. von Schweitzer, this was a crime. Kirchner was elected later as a trustee. The main proceedings of the convention took place in the large historical hall of the city hall, which the Nuremberg city authorities had offered, in the hope that the Liberal faction would win out. This hope was vain. I opened the convention with an address of welcome to the foreign delegates, and called for the election of officers. Out of 94 votes cast, 69 fell to me and 21 to Roegner of Nuremberg, while 4 were scattered. This was decisive evidence of the spirit that would dominate the convention. Loewenstein, of Fuerth, was elected as first vice-president with 62 votes, Buerger of Goepfingen, as second vice-president, with 59 votes. The opposition was defeated along the whole line. Now they tried to save what they could in the fixing of the order of business. They demanded the striking of the program

attend these proceedings, which are of the greatest interest to you. and for this reason we have the honor of expressing to you our wish and tendering to you our urgent invitation to send one or several delegates from the International Workingmen's Association to our convention at Nuremberg.

We entertain the pleasant hope that you will comply with our request and let us have your affirmative answer soon. Your delegates may be sure of a friendly reception.

With greetings and handshake,

The Headquarters of the Federation of German
Workingmen's Clubs.

August Bebel, Chairman.

question from the order of business. A sharp discussion ensued. "No compromises!" was shouted on various sides, and so the adoption of the unabridged order of business was voted by a large majority.

The negotiations of the convention took a splendid course. The Nuremberg session was one of the best which I ever attended. As a reporter for the headquarters, I was able to state that the new organization had stood the test well, and that the federation was in better shape than ever before. The clubs belonging to the federation numbered about 13,000 members. An attempt of Venedey to eliminate the program question by a modified order of business failed. The debate on the program attracted universal interest. The final result was that the program was adopted by 69 votes, representing 61 clubs, against 46 votes, representing 32 clubs. The minority protested against this decision, left the hall, and did not take part in the proceedings any more. Their attempt to create a new organization, under the name of German Workingmen's Federation, failed. The clubs belonging to it lost all political significance, and acted only as tails to the various Liberal parties.

The adopted program was as follows:

"The fifth convention of German workingmen's clubs, held at Nuremberg, declares its agreement with the program of the International Workingmen's Association in the following points:

"(1) The emancipation of the working classes must be the work of these classes themselves. The struggle for the emancipation of the working classes is not a struggle for class privileges and monopolies, but for **equal rights and equal duties**, and for the **abolition of all class rule**.

"(2) The economic dependence of the workingman upon the monopolist (the exclusive owner) of the tools of production, forms the basis of servitude in every form, of social misery, of intellectual degradation and political dependence.

“(3) Political freedom is the indispensable instrument of economic emancipation for the working classes. The social question is, therefore, inseparable from the political question, its solution by political action based upon and practicable only in a democratic state.

“Furthermore, in view of the fact that all efforts of the working class, directed towards economic emancipation, have failed so far from lack of solidarity between the many lines of labor of every country, and the absence of a fraternal bond of unity between the laboring classes of the various countries; in view of the further fact that the emancipation of the workers is neither a local nor a national, but a social problem comprising all countries having modern societies, a problem depending upon the practical and theoretical co-operation of the most advanced countries, the fifth German workingmen’s convention decides to join in the efforts of the International Workingmen’s Association.”

The resolutions of the Nuremberg workingmen’s convention left no longer any doubt as to where the clubs stood. Nevertheless, the majority at the general convention of the People’s Party, held in Stuttgart on September 19th and 20th, acted as tho no change had taken place. They even declared their agreement with the program resolution of Nuremberg, and added, by way of explanation, that questions of state and social questions were inseparable, and that particularly economic emancipation of the working classes and political freedom were conditioned upon each other. They also declared their agreement with the program speech of Johann Jacoby, delivered in Berlin on May 24, 1868.

This was a degree of intelligence which later on was completely lacking in the successors of the People’s Party men. It was especially the lawyer, Niethammer, who had attended the Nuremberg convention, that advocated a continued co-operation. He was of the opinion that the democracy should rise to the social democracy, if it wished to fulfill its duties. He probably would have

joined us completely later on, if a sudden death by heart failure had not carried him off too soon.

In addition to Niethammer, it was especially Sonnemann who worked in harmony with these resolutions. Sonnemann, who did not desire any dissolution of the relations between workingmen's clubs and the People's Party at any price, had consented to the Nuremberg program, altho he was not enthusiastic over it. Now he was concerned, above all, in having the general convention of the People's Party endorse his step in Nuremberg.

The exodus of the minority had destroyed the order of business of the workingmen's convention, for the reporters on various points were among those who left. A report of Sonnemann on the establishment of old age funds under state supervision, raised opposition, inasmuch as all the speakers, especially Vahlteich, expressed themselves to the effect that the entire workingmen's insurance should be administered by the workingmen united in centralized labor unions.

The corresponding resolution, offered by Vahlteich and Greulich, and unanimously adopted, read as follows:

"Whereas, The transfer of the management of a universal old age insurance for workingmen to the existing state unconsciously leads the laborer to have an interest in the prevailing form of the state, to which he cannot trust himself by any means;*

"Whereas, Sick and Death Benefit Funds, as well as Old Age Pensions, are best inaugurated and maintained by **labor unions**, as experience has shown,

"Therefore, The fifth national convention decides to recommend to the members of the federation, and especially to the headquarters, that **they work energetically for a unification of the workers in centralized labor unions.**"

* Much later, Bismarck declared, likewise, that small pensions are the best incentive, even for workingmen, to make them favorably inclined to the existing order of the state, and so he suggested the idea of invalid and old age insurance.

Germann, of Leipsic, spoke on sick benefit funds. He summed up his report in the following resolution: "The convention should recommend to the members of the federation that they form a board of local delegates which shall aim at a good organization of the funds, a complete autonomy, **unification of these by trades in unions and a discussion of the interests of these funds in a suitable organ**; secondly, **free transfers between union treasuries**, and administration of the sick benefit capital by the business methods of banks; in the third place, establishment of such banks for servants and working women, in order to relieve the existing want of these things."

In the further process of the convention proceedings, Schweichel reported on indirect taxation, Liebknecht on the military question. The committee, which had been nominated to examine into the management of the headquarters, expressed high praise for it. Books and files were in the best order, altho the burden of work had increased considerably, and the headquarters received the warmest commendation. The material compensation for the work performed amounted to \$57 and 4 new groschen for the business year. In the election for president, I received 57 out of 59 votes cast. This left the management in Leipsic for the next year.

The following were selected as trustees: Buerger of Goepingen, Notz of Stuttgart, Eichelsdoerfer of Mannheim, Guenzel of Speier, Sonnemann of Frankfort-on-Main, Stuttmann of Ruesselsheim, Dr. Kirchner of Hildesheim, Heymann of Coburg, Motteler of Crimmitschau, Krause of Muelsen (St. Jacob), Bremer of Magdeburg, Vahlteich of Maxem (near Dresden), Kobitzsch of Dresden, Oberwinder of Vienna, Loewenstein of Fuerth. The small representation of North Germany among the trustees was caused by the fact that the representatives of the North German clubs, with a few exceptions, belonged to the opposition, and had bolted with their clubs from the federation.

The Workingmen's Federation, after its formation, published a proclamation, in which violent charges were

hurled against the Nuremberg convention, and in which even untruths and misstatements were not missing. I replied in No. 46 of the "Demokratisches Wochenblatt," under date of September 23, 1868, refuting these charges in a long statement. Among other things, the proclamation of the opposition had claimed that we wanted to lure the workingmen into a "social communist standpoint." I replied that the "social communist" standpoint was a very queer one. It consisted of only two words, and yet they contained, first, an absurdity; secondly, a lie; thirdly, a denunciation. The denunciation was meant to scare not only the possessing classes, but also the working classes by the word communism. The terms, "socialist" and "socialism," were no longer effective enough, for the workingmen and employers were getting used to them. They were discovering more and more that Socialism was not so very terrible, and so the word "communist" had to be dragged in for the purpose of terrifying the philistines.

The resolutions of the Nuremberg convention created a new situation for our movement. Now there could no longer be any talk of a small bourgeois party, as Schweitzer had so far always announced to the members of the General Association of German Workingmen, in his paper, the "Social-Democrat," and as he used to dub particularly the Saxon People's Party, altho he knew very well that the bourgeois elements were an insignificant minority in that party. At any rate, they were not more numerous than they were in the General Association of German Workingmen, as Liebknecht told him to his face in the following spring, at the general convention of the association in Elberfeld, where he admitted it by nodding affirmatively. That was also discovered by the agitators whom he sent to Saxony a few months later for the purpose of combatting us. One of them, L. Sch., who later went over to the guilds, and is to-day the First Master of a shoemakers' guild, said later: "Schweitzer has fooled us thoroly, for in the crowded meetings which we held, we never saw anybody but workingmen and again work-

ingmen." He might have added: "And our success was zero." Liebknecht and myself followed them into nearly every meeting which they held, and defeated them again and again.

From now on it could no longer be denied that a Socialist party existed in the Saxon People's Party, and in the federation of workingmen's clubs standing on the same basis as the International. The Nuremberg convention and its results, therefore, made an impression in the General Association of German Workingmen, in which suspicions were already awake against Schweitzer. The effect showed itself in the course of the following year. If the right man had then stood at the head of the General Association of German Workingmen, the unification of the socialistically thinking workingmen would have become a fact even then. Seven years of injurious conflicts with one another would have been saved to the movement.

Shortly after the Nuremberg convention, animated discussions took place in the Berlin Workingmen's Club, whose president, Krebs, had maintained an ambiguous attitude thruout the entire controversy. The result was that a strong minority left the club and founded a democratic workingmen's club, which declared in favor of the Nuremberg program. Among the founders of the new club were, among others, G. Boas, Havenith, Karl Hirsch, Jonas, Paul Singer, O. Wenzel. Later they were joined by Th. Metzner, Milke and Heinrich Vogel, who had either left the General Association of German Workingmen or had been expelled, like Vogel. The club had a hard time with the Lassalleans in Berlin. The latter sneeringly called it a club of officers without an army, which was not altogether wrong. But the officers accomplished something and gradually created the missing army.

The Achilles heel of the workingmen's federation was its weak financial condition. Little could be accomplished with the annual dues of one groschen, altho the federation had 10,000 members. With an eye to dues for local purposes, the greater sacrifices for the federation

were overlooked. In this respect the General Association of German Workingmen excelled us. We at headquarters, therefore, were thinking seriously of remedies by means of changes in organization. The situation became still more disagreeable for us, when Schweitzer announced great agitation tours thru Saxony and South Germany, for which he had selected a number of agitators. Our defense required, above all, money, which we did not have. The "Demokratisches Wochenblatt" also needed considerable cash contributions, having become the organ of the federation since December, 1868. We had founded it with a total cash fund of \$10 in our pockets, to which other small contributions were added. On a similar "financial basis," party organs were often founded later on. So far as calculations went, they were bankrupt with the very first issue. But the self-sacrifice and enthusiasm of the members for their paper knew hardly any bounds. The leading personalities naturally had to be satisfied with ridiculously small sums for their work, and they were so. The present generation in our party has no idea of the penury of those conditions and of the demand for gratis services. For instance, Liebknecht as editor of the "Demokratisches Wochenblatt," received only \$40.00 per month, later as editor of the "Volksstaat," \$65.00 per month. Hepner was employed, in 1869, at \$25.00 per month. The labor department in the "Demokratisches Wochenblatt" I wrote free of charge, for the management of the circulation department I received \$12.00 per month, but I had to supply the rooms. When the war broke out in 1870, I relinquished this enormous salary. A raise of salary was not known in those days. For instance, when the "Vorwaerts," the successor of the "Volksstaat," was killed in 1878 by the anti-socialist laws, Liebknecht still had the same salary as nine years previously. But in the meantime he had five children more by his second marriage, the oldest of whom was not ten years old. In financial respects we have become a bourgeois party compared to old days, for what I say here of the working-

men's clubs applies also to the General Association of German Workingmen.

But the party has always been lucky. For this reason I often said jokingly to my friends: "If there is a God, He must love the Social Democracy very much, for when the need is greatest, help is always nearest. In the present case help came from a source from which we could not have expected it. I was just complaining to one of our trustees from the outside, who was visiting me, how embarrassing our position was, when the letter-carrier brought me a registered letter. Its sender was Dr. Laden-dorf of Zürich, whom I had met in 1866 in Frankfort, and with whom I had renewed my acquaintance at the Nurem-berg convention. He wrote that he was placing at my dis-posal, out of a fund, the so-called revolution fund en-trusted to himself and to his friends, the sum of 3,000 francs, which I should receive in three instalments, and for which I should give him a detailed account. Who was happier than I? I jumped with joy, and communicated the good news to my wondering friend. This revolution fund, which later also played a rôle in the Leipsic process for high treason, and about whose origin more can be found in the proceedings of that process, helped us out of a tight place several times. But this spring dried up when we came into conflict with Ladendorf and his friends on account of our position on the resolutions of the Basle international congress in the matter of the land question and of the martial events of 1870.

The agitation which Schweitzer inaugurated against us was unsuccessful. In southern Germany, it was ac-companied by but a moderate success. Contrary to ex-pectations, his agitators had been met also in South Ger-many by men of our clubs who were able to defeat them. But it is evident that such mutual fights made the senti-ment in both parties continually more bitter.





The Trade Union Movement.

I shall deal with the trade union movement only to the extent that I think I can count myself among those who assisted at its birth. The year 1868 might be called the birth-year of the German trade unions, but with certain restrictions. I have already mentioned the fact that the year of prosperity, 1865, carried in its train a large number of strikes in various cities, most of which failed because the workingmen were not organized and had no funds. Now they were forcibly reminded of the fact that both these things are necessary. A large number of mostly local trade unions were formed, but it was soon recognized that these were not adequate either. Just as the General Association of German Cigar Makers was founded Christmas, 1865, at Fritzsche's instigation, so in the year 1866 the book printers, who, from the outset, remained strictly neutral towards political labor parties, followed suit. But this did not prevent Richard Haertel from declaring, in a meeting of Berlin printers, in October, 1873: "In his capacity as president of the federation, he considered it best not to join any party formally, but in spirit we belong to the Social-Democratic Party, with the Eisenach program." Strictly speaking, he could not say so for all printers, for many of them belonged to the General Association of German Workingmen. A union of goldsmiths also existed even before 1868, with its own organ, and so did the General Union of German Tailors. On the whole, little had been done so far by the leaders of the political movement for the organization of trade unions. It was principally Liebknecht who created an understanding for trade union organization by his lectures on English trade unionism in the Leipsic Workingmen's Educational Club, and in public meetings in that city and others. In May, 1868, we also had discussed the foundation of trade unions at headquarters, but the amount of

current business, and, above all, the necessity of creating clearness in the federation by means of a program, prevented us from occupying ourselves immediately with the elaboration of the plan. In the Summer of 1868, Max Hirsch had traveled to England for the purpose of studying the trade unions there, and he published a report on them in the Berlin "Volkszeitung." This may have induced Schweitzer and Fritzsche to forestall Hirsch, who hoped to attach the workingmen to the Progressive Party by means of trade unions. Both of them now went into action, at the instigation of Fritzsche, as I am inclined to believe, who fully recognized the significance of the trade unions, but who would also have given the new organizations a different form, if he could have had a free hand independently of Schweitzer. The Brunswick members presented the following motion thru Fritzsche, who had instigated it in agreement with Schweitzer and also with the consent of Bracke, at the general convention of the General Association of German Workingmen in Hamburg, on August 25, 1868:

"The general convention declares: (1) Strikes are not a means of altering the foundation of the present mode of production, and thus improving the condition of the working class fundamentally; but they are a means of promoting the class-consciousness of the workingmen, of breaking down police supervision, and, if backed by a proper organization, of eliminating some pressing evils of present society, such as excessive hours of labor, child labor, and the like. (2) The general convention instructs the president of the association to call a general congress of German workingmen for the purpose of founding universal trade unions that shall work to this end."

The first part of the resolution was adopted, the second was defeated. But, on the other hand, the workingmen's convention of Nuremberg decided, a few days later, without much debate, to intrust the headquarters with the organization of trade unions. This was the opposite conception of that held by the majority of the General Association of German Workingmen. After that vote in

Hamburg, Schweitzer and Fritzsche declared that they would call a workingmen's congress for the foundation of trade unions in their capacity as Reichstag members. But when opposition made itself heard against this, Schweitzer threatened to resign immediately, if instructions were given preventing his doing this, and that he would leave the association. This threat had the desired effect. The congress took place on September 27th, and on the following days, in Berlin. Not less than 206 delegates were present, who had mostly been elected in workingmen's meetings, and who represented 140,000 workers. The following remarks of Schweitzer, in a speech opening the congress, were significant:

"England is by far the richest country of the world in the matter of capital, and if the industry of other countries has, nevertheless, mastered the English, it is due to the fact that the English laborers are making so much trouble for their capitalists. That may also be done in Germany, and even more easily. **The German workingmen can ruin the German industry altogether, if they want to do so, and they have no interest in maintaining it, so long as they derive but the scantiest wages from it. . . .** The German workingmen, if they are strongly organized, **can drive the German industry out of competition,** and if the capitalists don't like that, they may pay higher wages." This was not a very able argument, but perhaps it was not intended to be.

The congress established so-called workers' groups, under the control of a central board, composed of Schweitzer, Fritzsche and Karl Klein of Elberfeld, as president and vice-presidents. This organization was not very happily chosen, and was due to Schweitzer, who, under no circumstances, would permit any part of a movement under his influence to have any independence.

Schweitzer, who was very anxious to obtain a favorable answer from Marx for his enterprise, had written a letter to him on September 13th, and inclosed a draft of his constitution. Marx, who had misunderstood the first

letter, replied only to a second letter of Schweitzer. The following passages refer to Schweitzer's organization :

"So far as the Berlin congress was concerned, the time did not press, since the law on coalition had not been passed as yet. You should have conferred with the leaders **outside** the Lassallean circle and drawn up a common program and called a joint congress. Instead of that, you left no other alternative but to follow **you** or to take up a position **against you**. This congress itself seemed but an enlarged edition of the Hamburg congress (the general congress of the General Association of German Workingmen). As for the draft of the constitution, I consider it a failure in the matter of principle, and I think I have as much experience in trades unionism as any contemporary. Without going into details at this point, I will merely say that this form of organization, while suitable for secret societies and sects, contradicts the nature of trades unionism. If it were possible—I declare it to be utterly impossible—it would not be desirable, least of all, in Germany. There, where the laborer is under the thumb of bureaucracy from childhood and believes in the authority of the instituted government, the first duty is **to make him self-dependent**.

"Your plan is impractical also in other respects. In your organization you have three independent powers of different origin: (1) The committee, elected by the unions; (2) the president, a wholly superfluous personality, elected by general vote,*; (3) the congress, elected by the locals. This makes everywhere for friction, and this hinders rapid action. Lassalle made a serious mis-

* Here Marx made the following marginal remark: "In the constitution of the International Workingmen's Association a president is also mentioned. But in reality he never had any other function but that of presiding at the sessions of the General Council. At my suggestion the office was abolished in 1867, after I had already declined it in 1866, and his place was taken by a chairman, who was elected at each weekly session of the General Council. The London Trades Council also has only a chairman. Its permanent official is

take when he borrowed the 'person elect' of universal suffrage from the French constitution of 1852. In a trades union movement that person is utterly out of place. It turns mostly on money questions, and you will soon discover that there all dictatorship comes to an end.

"However, whatever the faults of the organization, they may perhaps be eliminated more or less by a rational practice. I am willing, as the secretary of the International, to act as mediator between you and the Nuremberg majority, which has joined the International directly—of course, upon a rational basis. I have written to Leipsic to this effect. I do not ignore the difficulties of your position, and I never forget that every one of us depends more upon circumstances than upon his will.

"I promise you, under all circumstances, that impartiality which my duty demands. On the other hand, I cannot promise that I shall not some day, in my capacity as a private writer, as soon as I may consider it absolutely necessary in the interest of the labor movement, publish a frank critique of the Lassallean superstition, as I did at one time with that of Proudhon.

"Assuring you personally of my sincere good will, I remain,

Yours loyally,

"Karl Marx."

The newly created organization did not suit Schweitzer very long. As was to be expected, various tendencies towards independence soon made themselves felt in the workers' groups. Schweitzer opposed them energetically in the "Socialdemocrat" of September 15th. He complained that some people were trying to separate the

only the secretary, because he performs a continuous business function."

Thus wrote the "dictator" of the International. I must state for myself, that Marx and Engels, even in their correspondence with me, never showed themselves as anything but advisers, and in several important instances, their advice was not taken, because I considered that I was more familiar with the situation. Nevertheless I never had any serious differences with them.

A. B.

federation of workers' groups from the General Association of German Workingmen, and place it under an independent leadership. He warned against this attempt. Three months later he went still farther. In No. 152 of the "Socialdemocrat" he announced, under date of December 29th, that wishes had been expressed on various sides to amalgamate the different unions in one single general union. To this end he had elaborated a plan which he published in the same number. Fritzsche had previously severed his connection with the General Association of German Workingmen and with the federation of workers' groups, and resigned from his position as vice-president. Schweitzer had also been abandoned by Louis Schumann, president of the General Association of German Shoemakers, York, president of the General Association of German Wood Workers, and Schob, president of the General Association of German Tailors.

The general convention of the General Association of German Workingmen, which met in Berlin in January, 1870, consented to fulfill Schweitzer's wish, and decided to amalgamate the unions within the time between the convention and July 1st, and to found a new association under the name of General Association of German Trade Unions. Immediately after the general convention of the General Association of German Workingmen, the convention of the General Federation of German Workers' Groups met. The majority of its delegates likewise declared in favor of Schweitzer's proposition. Luebkert, the president of the General Union of German Carpenters, expressed the opinion that the trade unions were at bottom merely training schools for the political education of the workers. Zilowsky was also in favor of amalgamation for the purpose of doing away with the hankering for the title of president, to which he attributed much of the division in the unions. Hartmann, Schallmeyer and Vater of Hamburg also spoke in favor of amalgamation for similar reasons as the preceding speakers.

Amalgamation was favored by delegates representing 12,500 votes, and opposed by delegates representing 9,000

votes. Altho the constitutionally required two-thirds majority necessary for the dissolution of the association had not been obtained, the majority decided, nevertheless, to found a new association, which should be known by the name of General Association for the Assistance of German Workingmen, and which should take the place of the workers' groups on July 1st.

This decision was not followed by a number of workers' groups. The opposition to trades unions remained alive among some of the most influential members of the General Association of German Workingmen, so that even at its general convention in 1872, Toelcke introduced the motion that the convention should decide to dissolve all unions existing within the party by the side of the General Association of German Workingmen, especially the General Association for the Assistance of German Workingmen, the Workingmen's League of Berlin, the General Union of German Masons, the General Union of German Carpenters and all membership groups belonging to them. Their equipment should be transferred to the General Association of German Workingmen and their members join this association. But his motion could not be adopted, because the general convention had no power to dissolve organizations standing outside of the General Association of German Workingmen.

What other leaders than Toelcke thought, may be seen from the following statement of Hasenclever: "If the League (Berlin Workingmen's League) has fulfilled its end, we shall take care ourselves that it will disappear." Hasselmann said: "We have founded the league merely for the purpose of attracting trade unions to us, and we have succeeded very well in this. So we did not intend to do anything particular with this league, it was merely a means to an end." Grottkau and others expressed themselves in a similar way. Finally, the following motion was adopted: "The general convention should express the desire that the trade unions existing within our party should be dissolved as soon as possible, and their memebtrs transferred to the General Association of

German Workingmen. It is the duty of the members of the General Association of German Workingmen to work in this direction."

If Mende can be trusted—and, so far as I am aware, his statement has not been contradicted—Schweitzer had promised Mende and the Countess Hatzfeldt, when making an agreement with them in the Spring of 1869, to let the trade union movement recede more and more into the background on the plea that they were in contradiction with Lassalle's views. I shall revert to this later. The views of the members of the General Association of German Workingmen changed later on in favor of trades unions.

We, on our part, performed the work assigned to us by the Nuremberg convention, and drew up a normal constitution for trade unions. I was the author of the original. As soon as it had been completed, it was sent in large numbers to the organizations, with the request to become active in the organization of international trade unions, this being the title chosen by us. I also went to work at it. This title really went a little too far, for we could count only on starting organizations in the German speaking countries. But the name was mainly intended to express a tendency. In fact, quite a number of such organizations were started, such as the international unions of manufacturing and factory employees, hand laborers, masons and carpenters, metal workers, wood workers, tailors, leather workers, cap makers, shoe makers, bookbinders, miners and smelter men.

It was evident that when the political movement suffered from the existing divisions, the trade union movement would suffer still more from them. Fritzsche was made to feel this in his own flesh during the following year, for the violent factional fights reduced the membership of his association from 9000 to 2000. It is true that this falling off was due partly to the bankruptcy of the Berlin and Leipsic productive associations of the tobacco workers which had been founded after a lost strike.

We in Leipsic tried to prevent schisms in the trade union movement as much as possible. At the end of October, 1868, we called a well attended workingmen's meeting, in conjunction with members of the General Association of German Workingmen. The order of business was: The trades unions. Liebknecht was the reporter, and recommended the following resolution:

"Whereas, The foundation of trades unions, after the model of the English, is necessary for the organization of the working class in defense and maintenance of its interests and for the invigoration of its class-consciousness; and,

"Whereas, The resolutions of various workingmen's congresses have already suggested and made a beginning in the organization of trades unions, the present meeting of workingmen decides to carry on energetically the formation of such trades unions and instructs a committee to be elected for this purpose to take the necessary steps and to establish connections especially with the workingmen's banks, etc."

A committee was then elected, in which Seyfert and Taute, of the General Association of German Workingmen, were seated by the side of Liebknecht and myself. The committee invited members of all unions, in order to discuss with them the question of organizing labor unions. This conference took place with myself as chairman. The following resolution, drawn up by Liebknecht and myself, was unanimously adopted:

"The conference decides: The labor unions founded, or to be founded by the majority of the Nuremberg workingmen's convention, and by the majority of the Berlin workingmen's convention, should work in the direction of the following aims:

"(1) That both sides, after joint agreement, call a common general convention **for the purpose of unification and amalgamation.**

"(2) That until such a unification and amalgamation can become a fact, the trades unions on both sides enter

into a mutual agreement, particularly for the purpose of assisting each other with funds and, if possible, of electing a joint provisional committee:

“(3) That both sides reject, under all circumstances, any and all community with the Hirsch-Dunker unions, which, founded by enemies of the working class, have no other purpose but that of undermining the organization of the workers and degrading the workers to the rôle of instruments of the bourgeoisie.”

This request was not received favorably by the other side. In No. 141 of the “Socialdemocrat” of December 2, 1868, Schweitzer published a resolution to the effect that the executive and the central committee of the General Association of German Workingmen had jointly rejected our demands, and that they called upon the workingmen “to oppose every attempt to divide the movement in favor of personal animosities of individuals.”

This signified the momentary failure of our attempt to come to an agreement.

On our side, the trade union question was again discussed at the Eisenach congress in August, 1869. We found fault especially with the rule advocated by Schweitzer, that the admission of members should be made dependent upon the political views of applicants. Greulich spoke in favor of an international organization, for the problem was to bring the masses into the trade unions. It was these unions which the capitalist feared, not our petty pennies. Finally, a resolution was adopted on motion of York, favoring the unification of unions. A motion of Motteler was also adopted, to the effect that the trade unions should work for the establishment of mutual agreements (cartels). The national convention of Stuttgart, in June, 1870, once more had the trade union question upon its order of business. The proceedings moved in the old channels. The question of unity once more played the principal rôle. With the year 1871, the unions began to develop better, favored by a period of prosperity, and so they assumed a more independent attitude. The epoch of prosperity, which lasted until the be-

ginning of 1874, carried in its wake an untold number of strikes in all lines. This phenomenon gave rise, even at the end of May, 1871, to long discussions in the Leipsic Workingmen's Club, culminating in the adoption and publication of the following resolutions:

"(1) Strikes are but one of the palliatives which do not result in any **lasting** remedy; (2) the aim of the Social Democracy is not merely to procure higher wages within the present capitalist mode of production, but to abolish this mode of production altogether; (3) under the present capitalist mode of production the level of wages is regulated by supply and demand, and cannot be driven beyond this level even by the most successful strikes; (4) in recent times several strikes have notoriously been instigated by the manufacturers for the purpose of having a plausible reason for raising the prices of commodities during the fair, and such strikes do not benefit the workmen, but only the manufacturers, for they raise the prices of commodities more than they do wages; (5) lost strikes encourage the manufacturers and discourage the workingmen—consequently they are doubly injurious to our party; (6) the great manufacturers sometimes derive an extra advantage from strikes, for while they prevent the small manufacturers from running their plants, they enable the large capitalists to dispose of their supplies with greater profit; (7) our party is not in a position at present to support so many strikes materially.

"In view of all these facts, the party members are urgently requested to go on a strike only in cases where a bitter necessity compels them to it, and where sufficient means are available. They are also requested to proceed more systematically than heretofore, and to follow a plan of organization comprising all of Germany. As the best way to secure funds and organizations, we recommend the foundation and maintenance of trade unions."

In Vienna, the central organ of the Austrian party members, the "Volkswille," published similar reflections

and recommendations, since the strike fever was seizing larger circles also in Austria. These recommendations were good, but they were followed only in rare instances. Nevertheless, the union movement showed a welcome development in those years.

About the middle of June, 1872, a union congress met in Erfurt, in which especially the question of a central board for the unions and the creation of a special trade union paper were discussed. In an article, published on June 8th, in the "Volksstaat," I outlined my program for the congress and elaborated my views concerning the best way of uniting the unions among themselves. Among other things, I said: "It cannot be denied that the labor union movement in Germany is still in a bad way. This is due to the division of the workers into various factions that fight each other bitterly. It is bad enough that workingmen oppose each other in different political organizations, but it is worse to see workingmen of the various unions fight each other in every factory or even in every shop. This is particularly bad, because it is not a principle that is at stake, but merely a form of organization, which is changeable and must be adapted to circumstances. Under this curse the movement is suffering. It is also to be regretted that the masses permit themselves to be made fanatic by unscrupulous men, and it proves that a part of the working class is suffering from mental limitations. People sneer at the ossification of Christianity which has eighteen centuries behind it, an age that is calculated to make for ossification. But the new social movement is only ten years old, and already it is showing symptoms of ossification. Of course, these would be overcome, but for the present they hinder the development. . . . **The future of the working class rests upon the trade union movement; it is this movement by which the masses arrive at class-consciousness, learn to combat the power of capital, and so naturally make Socialists of the workingmen.**" Then I explained my suggestion for organization in detail.

At the Erfurt trade union congress, in which six labor


organizations were represented, the manufacturing and factory workers, the metal workers, the wood workers, the tailors, the shoemakers, the masons and various professional clubs, a federation of unions and a labor union paper, "The Union," were endorsed. On motion of York, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

"Whereas, The power of capital oppresses and exploits all workers, regardless of the fact whether they are Conservative, Progressive, Liberal or Socialist, the congress declares it to be the most sacred duty of the workers to set aside all party division, and to create the prerequisites of a successful and powerful resistance **upon the neutral soil of a uniform trade union organization**, to fortify their threatened existence and to fight for an improvement of their condition as a class. Particularly, the various sections of the Social Democratic Labor Party are in duty bound to promote the labor union movement to the best of their ability, and the congress expresses regret over the fact that the general convention of the General Association of German Workingmen in Berlin should have adopted a resolution to the contrary."

When I came back to freedom in the Spring of 1875, after a long stay in the fortress and in prison, August Geib suggested that I should take charge of the editorship of the central organ of the labor unions, "The Union," in place of brave York, who, unfortunately, had died on New Year's Eve, 1875. He offered me \$50.00 per month. The party and the unions had meanwhile become financially stronger. Geib thought that I might easily assume the editorship in addition to my business. I declined. It was impossible to be active in the labor union movement in addition to my business and my party work.

In the meantime the Prussian government had begun the persecution of both the Socialist parties and of the trades unions. The public prosecutor, Tessendorf, who had won his spurs upon this field in Magdeburg, had been called to Berlin in 1874, in order to continue this persecution on a larger scale. Tessendorf fulfilled the government's expectations. By his charges he accomplished not

merely the suppression of the party organizations, but various trades unions also fell victims to him. Then came the year 1878, with its attempt on the life of the king, and with its anti-Socialist laws, and one blow destroyed what had been created by more than ten years of work with untold sacrifices in time, money, energy and health.





My First Sentence.

The mismanagement and favoritism that had taken root in Spain, under the rule of Queen Isabel, united all opposition in a violent uprising, which resulted, at the end of September, 1868, in the flight of Isabel. The indecision with which the provisional government, composed of the leaders of the opposition parties, treated the question of the new form of the state, induced the democracy of the various countries to recommend to the Spanish people in resolutions and addresses the foundation of a republic. Of course, we thought we had to go still farther by advising the Spaniards to found a Socialist republic, for which every prerequisite was in reality missing. Of a membership of more than sixty thousand that had joined the International, according to newspaper reports, not even fifty thousand existed on paper; they were a product of imagination. It was a period of exaggerations that benefited especially the International. If you believed the bourgeois press, the International had millions of members in Europe, and its funds were correspondingly enormous. The good citizen was horrified, when he read in his paper that the treasurer of the International had merely to open his strong box in order to find millions at his disposal for strikes. I was myself a witness one evening that Prince Smith, who sat opposite me in a social meeting at the Berlin Press Club, related confidentially to his neighbor: "He had received a letter from Brussels to the effect that the General Council of the International had placed two million francs at the disposal of the striking coal miners in the Borinage (Belgium)." I refrained, with difficulty, from laughing. The General Council would have been glad if it had had two millions of cents in its treasury, or about twenty thousand francs. The General Council had a great moral influence, but money was always its weakest side.

These exaggerations concerning the power of the International misled even Bismarck a few years later, after the revolt of the Commune. He wanted to hold an international conference for the purpose of combatting the International. The Austrian Prime Minister, Mr. von Beust, willingly lent a hand in this, altho he confessed that the International was not a matter of concern in Austria. The English government prevented the realization of this beautiful plan. Not only Bismarck, but even an able diplomat and political agent, like Colonel von Bernhardt, permitted himself to believe the greatest nonsense about the International. For instance, in his work, "Glimpses of the Life of Theodore von Bernhardt," he published the report of one of his trusted men, in which we find the following passages:

"Above all, the Socialist intrigues were zealously continued by way of London and Geneva, in order to revolutionize the whole of Europe, and this revolution was to be not merely political, but social. These intrigues were directed by the two international committees in London and Geneva. The chairman of the London committee is Louis Blanc, of the Geneva committee, Philipp Becker. The revolution is to break out, first in Paris, and when it is victorious there, it shall be extended to Italy and then to southern Germany, where there is plenty of fuel; thereafter it shall also reach to northern Germany, where they likewise have many connections, and in general all Europe is to be revolutionized. Their first efforts aim at a military organization of the city proletariat by means of the right of coalition."

According to Bernhardt, all capital cities of Germany were already primed for a revolt. The leaders of the movement were especially Schweitzer and Bebel. Such nonsense was spread by very serious men.

The "Address to the Spanish People," which Liebknecht justified in a public meeting, and which I, in my capacity as chairman, had read to the audience, brought us into court. In the end each of us was sentenced to three weeks of prison for disseminating doctrines dan-

gerous to the state. We served our time in the Leipsic county jail at the end of 1869, the line of red tape having dragged on so long.

That the Spanish revolution in its further course would give cause indirectly for a war between France and Germany, was not suspected by anybody at that time.





Before Barmen-Elberfeld.

The fights with the Lassalleans of both factions became more and more violent with the year 1868. This was not altered by the fact that we took up a collection for the campaign of Hasenclever in the Duisburg election district, in the fall of 1868, and that we supported the close contest of York against the national liberal Prof. Planck, who later on, as one of the principal collaborators on the Civil Code, wrote a commentary on it, in the election district of Celle. Both these steps were intended to prove that we made a distinction between the members of the General Association of German Workingmen and their president. For the beginning of March, 1869, we had called a general Saxon workingmen's convention to Hohenstein-Ernstthal, with the order of business: Reform of the Saxon law of association and election laws. The invitation had also been signed by the Saxon leaders of both factions of the Lassalleans. On the day before this convention our party was to hold a state convention, with the order of business: The trade unions. But the wisdom of Mende-Hatzfeldt had decreed otherwise.

When I came to Hohenstein on Sunday morning from a meeting in Mittweida, I saw that many workingmen, who looked night-worn and were covered with dirt, were hastening to the railroad station. I learned then that these men, followers of Mende and Hatzfeldt, altogether from 80 to 100 men from Chemnitz, had forced their way into our hall for the purpose of breaking up our meeting. There had been a great disturbance, and finally a fight, so that the mayor had called out the fire department, because the police proved to be helpless and could not restore order. Vahlteich had been arrested, because he had pulled a sword out of his cane. He was released after a few days. The terrible excitement caused among

the entire population by these incidents had resulted in calling the state convention off, which I regarded as a tactical mistake. I was congratulated on various sides for having been absent during the disturbance, because the disturbers had been especially after me and had threatened to knock me down.

Six months later, when the Eisenach congress was over, I held a monster meeting in Chemnitz with an overwhelming success. After the meeting a number of workmen who had participated in the row came to me at Hohenstein and begged my pardon. They could not understand how they had been led into such intrigues.

Liebknecht and myself had long desired to have a personal meeting and discussion with J. B. von Schweitzer. Our wish was fulfilled more quickly than we had hoped. On February 14th, a meeting called by the Lassalleans in Leipsic, which neither Liebknecht nor myself attended, resolved to invite Schweitzer and Liebknecht to face each other in a public meeting and prefer charges against each other. Liebknecht declared at once in the "Demokratisches Wochenblatt," that he would gladly accept the invitation, that he was ready to face Schweitzer in a popular meeting and to prove that Schweitzer, either for money or from personal inclination, had tried systematically since the end of 1864 to undermine the organization of the labor party and had played the game of Bismarckian Cæsarism. If Schweitzer should evade him, as he had done before, Liebknecht stood ready, alone or with me, to appear at the general convention of the General Association of German Workmen, or to face Schweitzer in the presence of his authorized representatives and of the presidents of the workers' groups, and to substantiate his charges. Liebknecht added the suggestion that the General Council of the International should act as arbitrator between Schweitzer and himself.

After the "Socialdemocrat" had stated the fact, that Schweitzer had been almost unanimously elected presi-

dent by the last general convention, and so must have the full confidence of the association, it replied: According to the by-laws of the organization, the president is responsible for his actions only to the general convention of the General Association of German Workingmen. Schweitzer was in prison. The "Socialdemocrat" could not forestall his decisions, but it thought it could give assurance that Schweitzer would answer everybody, even Messieurs Liebknecht and Bebel, at the general convention in Barmen-Elberfeld. Liebknecht would be taken at his word. But the General Association of German Workingmen could not sanction the intervention of any arbitrator in matters concerning its president.

We were much gratified by this reply, which evidently had been written by Schweitzer himself. In view of the course which this matter had taken and the stir it had made, Schweitzer could not afford to evade us. That he was willing to have us admitted to the general convention suited us, although from a strict point of view we did not belong there, since we were not members of the association. Evidently, Schweitzer assumed that he would find the best backing amid his own delegates at the general convention, and that a session behind closed doors would compromise him least.

Strange to say, the "Socialdemocrat" declared three days later that Schweitzer would not meet us, because we had no right to appear at the general convention. This was revoked in the next issue of the paper. We were again invited and assured that Schweitzer would even use his influence at the general convention to have us admitted. In Barmen-Elberfeld things looked differently later on.

After we had received the official invitation to the general convention, we got under way. In Cassel a gentleman stepped into our compartment. We took him for a delegate to the general convention. Our assumption proved to be correct. In the course of the conversation we learned that our traveling companion was Wil-

helm Pfannkuch, who had guessed immediately who we were. We rode together to the Wupper Valley.

I leave the description of the events at the general convention in Barmen-Elberfeld and the incidents following it to the next part of my reminiscences. Above all, I shall explain the reasons that made opponents of J. B. von Schweitzer and ourselves.

In conclusion, I wish to remark that the year 1869 became of paramount significance for the German labor movement. During it, after vehement struggles and after the elimination of many misunderstandings, the guiding lines were laid down which proved to be decisive for the ensuing development. The Eisenach congress, in the beginning of August, when the Socialmocratic Labor Party of Germany was founded, formed the climax of this development. Politically, likewise, the situation was vastly different from that of a few years previous. The constitution of the North German Federation had been made to order for its creator, Bismarck, and naturally the liberal demands, and still more the democratic ones, had fared badly. The hopes and expectations which had existed in the circles of the liberals in this respect turned out to be vain. Bismarck was not the man to let a favorable opportunity slip by. Now he tried to make such events, as had taken place during the time of the conflict, utterly impossible. And the greater portion of the liberals met him half-way in this. They had become afraid of their own divinity as men of the strict opposition. The Prussian military system was transferred to the North German Federation without any fundamental changes, only more extended. The first germs were planted for the navy. The responsibility of the ministers and the salaries of representatives were thrown on the scrap heap. Bismarck was the unhampered master of the internal situation.

In exchange for its willingness to meet Bismarck in all important political questions, a willingness that went to the point of stultification, the liberal bourgeoisie se-

cured full satisfaction for its industrial demands, which naturally fulfilled also some demands of the working class. Freedom of domicile, abolition of passport restrictions, facilitation of marriage and settlement, were followed in 1869 by a draft of the new trade ordinance and became established laws. The creation of the revenue-parliament had also given rise to parliamentary discussions, in which the South German States had participated, concerning laws on revenues, industrial and indirect taxation. This opened up a field of activity which I helped to plough to the best of my ability. In what manner and with what success I helped in this work, will be related in the second part of these memoirs.

(The End.)





1000084075

WILKES COLLEGE LIBRARY

HX273

61272

B44

v.1

Bebel, August

File By Date

Bebel's reminiscences.

HX273

61272

B44

v.1

