

# Anarchism in Germany

Vol. I: The Early Movement

by

ANDREW R. CARLSON



The Scarecrow Press, Inc.  
Metuchen, N. J. 1972

Copyright 1972 by Andrew R. Carlson

ISBN 0-8108-0484-0

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 78-186946

**For Linda**



## Preface

A rich literature exists on the German Social Democratic movement which attempts to explain the role of the German working class in the Wilhelminian Reich. A notable omission in this literature is the lack of serious studies on anarchism, which in many respects parallels the development of the Social Democratic Party in Germany. This book seeks to add a new dimension by providing a narration and analysis of the anarchist experience in Germany during the period 1830-1889, with emphasis on the years 1878-1889. The present volume is the first half of a two-volume work on anarchism in Germany. The second volume will cover the period 1890-1933.

I would like to thank Professor Vernon L. Lidtke who pointed out to me the need for a study of the German anarchist movement. This study has benefited from his criticism, suggestions and generous assistance. My work was aided by the Interlibrary Loan and Photoduplication Departments of many libraries. I would like to extend my gratitude to the Interlibrary Loan Department of the Michigan State University Library and to Mrs. Mary J. Thurman of the Interlibrary Loan Department of Eastern Kentucky University. The following libraries supplied me with microfilm copies of rare newspapers, pamphlets, and books: University of Chicago, Newberry Library, Midwest Interlibrary Loan Center, University of Wisconsin, University of Minnesota, University of Michigan, Yale University, Harvard University, Princeton University, The Library of Congress, New York Public Library, The Hoover Institute on War, Peace and Revolution, Columbia University, University of Illinois, The British Museum, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, and the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam. Mr. Edward Weber, curator of the Labadie Collection at the University of Michigan, should be singled out for his assistance in supplying materials. I am also in debt to Dr. Trumpp of the Bundesarchiv, Koblenz: Dr. Weiss, director of the Bayerische Hauptstaatsarchiv, Abteilung II, Geheimes Staatsarchiv; Dr. Scherl, Oberarchivrat Bayerische Hauptstaatsarchiv, Abteilung V, Staatsarchiv für Oberbayern; the staff of the Staatsarchiv, Ludwigsburg; Dr. Ewald, Oberarchivrat Staatsarchiv, Hamburg; and the staffs of the Hessisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Wiesbaden; Staatsarchiv Sigmaringen;

Staatsarchiv Münster; Niedersächsische Staatsarchiv, Osnabrück. A special thanks is due to the staff of the Deutsches Zentralarchiv, Merseburg; the Staatsarchiv Potsdam, and the Ministerium des Innern, Ministerrat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik. Of all the persons associated directly or indirectly with this book, none deserves more appreciation than my wife, Linda, who painstakingly typed the many drafts of the manuscript.

## Contents

	Page
Introduction	
Chapter	
I Spiritual Ancestors of the German Anarchists	13
II Max Stirner (1806-1856)	53
III Anarchism in Germany to 1878	77
IV The Hödel Assassination Attempt and the Defeat of the Socialist Law	115
V The Nobiling Assassination Attempt and the Passage of the Socialist Law	139
VI Johann Most and Wilhelm Hasselmann Threaten to Split the SPD	173
VII The Smuggling of <u>Freiheit</u> and the Formation of Anarchist Cells	205
VIII Propaganda by Deed	249
IX The Failure of Propaganda by Deed: The Tragic Careers of August Reinsdorf and Julius Lieske	283
X Bruderkrieg	321
XI John Neve and the Split in the Movement	343
Conclusion	395
Appendix I	401
Appendix II	403
Bibliography	405
Index	437

## Introduction

There is a sizeable body of opinion that there was little anarchism in Germany and that those anarchists there were contributed nothing to anarchist thought. A similar view contends that the German anarchist movement was ineffectual and meaningless so far as producing any lasting results are concerned. G.D.H. Cole writes: "In Germany Anarchism never took hold; ... after Johann Most and Wilhelm Hasselmann had left the country, German anarchism lacked leaders, and the Germans made no significant contribution to Anarchist theory."<sup>1</sup> Der grosse Brockhaus states: "In Germany on the other hand [as compared to other countries] there were only insignificant anarchists."<sup>2</sup> James Joll in his recent book relates: "In Germany ... the anarchist were limited to those individuals who had been in direct contact with the followers of Bakunin and Guillaume in the Jura." After the assassination of police President Rumpf in 1885

Anarchist ideas in Germany soon virtually vanished, except among a few bohemian intellectuals such as the Bavarian writer, Gustav Landauer, and a few dissident Social Democrats who were expelled from the socialist party for advocating direct revolutionary action.<sup>3</sup>

This is the only time Landauer's name is mentioned in Joll's book. Erich Mühsam is not mentioned at all and Rudolf Rocker is accorded only two references in the text. Joll's book is not unusual in this respect. Landauer, the anarchist, until recently was nearly a forgotten figure in Germany, although Landauer, the Shakespearean scholar, has continued to be very much alive.<sup>4</sup>

The Proud Tower, which Barbara Tuchman avers is a "portrait of the world before the war, 1890-1914," dismisses anarchism in Germany with the following remarks:

That sovereign [William] II had little to fear, however, from the Anarchists of his own country, for the last two who had attempted to kill his grandfather [attempts by Hödel and Nobiling on the Life of William I in 1878]



were the last and the only activists. Otherwise, German Anarchists remained theorists, except for those who got away to America. Germans were not fit for Anarchism, as Bakunin had said with disdain, for with their passions for Authority, "they want to be at once both masters and slaves and Anarchism accepts neither."<sup>5</sup>

Although over one-tenth of the book is devoted to a discussion of anarchism, this short statement is the only mention of the anarchist movement in Germany. To substantiate the contention that the Germans were not "fit for anarchism," Tuchman quotes Mikhail Bakunin. It would seem to be incongruous to cite Bakunin, whose remains had been molding since 1876, as an authority for the susceptibility of the German people to anarchism for the years 1890-1914. Tuchman's remarks on the German anarchist movement are shallow and misleading as this study will demonstrate.

In the respected German encyclopedia, Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaft, Karl Diehl writes:

In comparison to the Romance countries the anarchist movement in Germany was never to attain great importance. To be sure, the ideas of individualist anarchism found here in Stirner, one of their important advocates. Anarchist ideas evoked a certain amount of theoretical interest and discussion. But the anarchist movement in Germany never achieved any significant political activity, nor did the group organizations at any time approach a numerical size which could be considered important. Unquestionably the rigid centralization in the Social Democratic organization, which dominated the workers' movement and rejected all anarchist particularism, contributed to this.<sup>6</sup>

The French encyclopedia, La Grande Enclopédie, relates that

Contrary to the countries about which we have been speaking, France, Spain, Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, it is not from the Hague Congress of 1872, at which time the dispute between Marx and Bakunin resulted in a division of the International, that one **must trace the origins of the beginning of the anarchist movement in Germany.** It is much later, after the **assassination**

attempts of Hödel [May 11, 1878] and Dr. Nobiling [June 2, 1878], upon Emperor William, and after the enactment of the Socialist Law [October 21, 1878], that the division of the German socialist party resulted, less among authoritarians and anarchists than between parliamentarians and revolutionaries, moderates and extremists.<sup>7</sup>

There are grains of truth in both of these statements, but mainly they are misleading. The German anarchists did more than sit around beer gardens discussing the theoretical aspects of anarchism. There were groups that were large enough to be considered important. There were German anarchists active in both Germany and the International long before the assassination attempts of 1878.

I am of the opinion that anarchism did play a role in shaping the destiny of Germany in the 19th and 20th centuries. However, this influence cannot be seen if one examines only the positive attainments of the anarchists in Germany. If, on the other hand, one examines their negative influence he will soon discover that many suppressive measures were enacted as a result of an anarchist deed. The Socialist Law, prompted by two attempts on the life of William I in 1878, was the first such measure. This measure affected not only the anarchists, but everyone who was interested in developing a responsible parliamentary government in Germany.

Substantial amounts of materials are available on the leading anarchist figures such as Bakunin, Proudhon, Godwin, Kropotkin, Malatesta, Goldman, Tolstoy, Reclus, Tucker, and Stirner. A great deal of research is required to locate material on the lesser-known, though important, anarchist figures. There is on the other hand a considerable body of material available on Landauer, Mühsam, and Rocker but, again, to locate it requires patient searching. The great figures have been studied in depth many times. The lesser known "characters" and organizations have been all but forgotten except in the crumbling pages of some little-known anarchist monthly of which only one copy is to be found in the entire world. Many of the anarchist newspapers had a small circulation and were printed on such cheap paper that they have not survived the ravages of time. This is also true of the pamphlets of the anarchists which were so important in spreading their message. Further information on this problem can be found in the bibliography. Suffice it to say that the large

mass of periodical and documentary material on the subject of anarchism in Germany has scarcely been touched by any scholar.

A serious study of anarchism is virtually impossible unless one has access to a large number of anarchist newspapers and pamphlets. Peter Kropotkin (1842-1921) points out the reason. (Kropotkin does not here refer to our present-day concept of socialism, but to that of the 19th century, when many anarchists considered themselves to be socialists.)

Socialistic literature has never been rich in books. It is written for workers, for whom one penny is money, and its main force lies in its small pamphlets and its newspapers. Moreover, he who seeks for information about socialism finds in books little of what he requires most. They contain the theories or the scientific arguments in favor of socialist aspirations, but they give no idea how the workers accept socialist ideals, and how the latter could be put into practice. There remains nothing but to take collections of papers and read them all through, the news as well as the leading articles, the former perhaps even more than the latter. Quite a new world of social relations and methods of thought and action is revealed by this reading, which gives an insight into what cannot be found anywhere else, namely, the depth and the moral force of the movement, the degree to which men are imbued with the new theories, their readiness to carry them out in their daily life, and to suffer for them. All discussions about the impracticability of socialism and the necessary slowness of evolution can only be judged from a close knowledge of the human beings of whose evolution we are speaking. What estimate of a sum can be made without knowing its components?<sup>8</sup>

Kropotkin's assertion that it is necessary to read anarchist newspapers and pamphlets in order to understand anarchism is perfectly true. Such German anarchist ephemerae are to be found in many of the larger libraries, but no single library possesses what could be called a large collection. Therefore, the researcher is forced to comb the libraries of the world to have access to a sufficient amount of this type of material.

Perhaps it is for this reason that there is no general work on the subject of anarchism in Germany. Nothing of

significance, in the historical sense, has been written since Max Nettlau's multi-volume history of anarchism; he presents little material on the movement in Germany and nothing for the period after 1886.<sup>9</sup> Another difficulty facing the researcher on anarchism in Germany is the unavailability of any bibliographies covering the materials published on the subject. The only bibliographies which make an attempt at covering the subject are dated and sometimes inaccurate or misleading.<sup>10</sup>

Still another problem in this study is the unreliability of sources: such an anarchist writer as Johann Most for example are not entirely reliable. Many articles written by Most were for the purpose either of glorifying or vilifying some person. And too, anarchist historians, true to their belief in anarchism, make poor historians of the movement. They tend to ramble and they lack the degree of personal detachment necessary to write a substantial work of history. In certain cases, contemporary histories of the anarchist movement were written by paid police agents. Needless to say their accounts are not without bias. Accounts by socialist writers, who viewed the anarchists as their opponents, also are written with a slanted viewpoint. And bourgeois writers usually write with a less than complete understanding of anarchism.

Police files, too, must be used with caution. Government officials in Germany were slow to acknowledge publicly that there was a difference between anarchism and socialism. Separate files on anarchism were not established until 1884. Prior to this they were grouped with socialist activity. In some cases a government official would continue to maintain publicly that there was no difference between anarchism and socialism, while in his personal correspondence he acknowledged a difference.

In the final analysis the sources dealing with anarchism are no better or no worse than those on any other topic. Partiality and bias enter into practically all writing, and police reports—not only on anarchism, but in other areas—are not the most perceptive material. The burden of separating fact from fiction was at times a particularly exasperating problem. No piece of evidence cited in the present work was accepted at face value until it could be substantiated by another independent source.

Another problem in relation to sources is the near lack

of extant writings by persons who participated in anarchist activity in Germany in the 1870's and 1880's. Many of them died early and violent deaths. The great majority of them were ordinary working men who are not noted for Nachlass that amounts to much. Furthermore, of necessity, the movement was an underground one of occasional meetings of members of various groups. To a great extent tracing the German anarchists in the 1870's and 1880's is like following the trail of a fox in the melting snow. Patches are available, patches have been swallowed up entirely by time. Accounts of activity by participants for the most part do not exist. It would have been dangerous to put down on paper admission to complicity in a crime committed in Germany, even if living abroad, for this would have precluded returning to the Fatherland.

It is a mistake to think of the anarchist movement in Germany as a single coherent movement which exerted a continuing force. Anarchists in Germany covered the entire spectrum of anarchist thought: from highly individualistic to communistic anarchists. The diversity in philosophy led to the establishment of many small splinter groups. Often a group would come into being, gain a reasonably good-sized following and then fall into demise without having affiliated itself with the other anarchist groups. However, all anarchists in Germany acknowledged a common brotherhood. Additionally, there were numerous individuals who can be considered as being on the fringe of the movement. There were those who transferred their allegiance, in part, from the Social Democrats to the anarchists. Among the rank-and-file followers there was much moving back and forth between socialism and anarchism, depending upon the mood and circumstances of the individual involved. Complicating this already difficult problem were groups such as the Independent Socialists, who sometimes worked in close collaboration with the anarchists.

Many of these people, who walked in the penumbra between anarchism and socialism, cannot be labeled either anarchist or socialist. Professor Lombroso of Turin University was able to solve the problems of definition and categorization. After having studied many anarchists he concluded that anarchists possessed certain well-defined physiological characteristics which were easily discernable; for example, exaggerated plagiocephaly, facial asymmetry, cranial anomalies (ultrabrachycephaly), large jaw bone, exaggerated zygomas, enormous frontal sinus,

anomalies of the eyes, ears, nose and teeth, anomalous coloration of the skin, and neuro-pathological anomalies.<sup>11</sup>

This idea seems ludicrous today but around the turn of the century Professor Lombroso's theories were considered to have a scientific basis. Turin University at the time was a leading center for the study of criminology. Lombroso's theories were internationally respected and discussed at the World Conferences of Criminal Anthropologists which were held at Turin University. Lombroso was of the opinion that, although the anarchists possessed criminal physiognomies, they were not common criminals and thus should not be punished in the same way. He was of the opinion that their hereditary anomalies was the primary reason why they turned to anarchism.

Anarchism, as a philosophy, has a certain stigma attached to it. The word itself has a bad connotation. Anarchy has come to mean chaos, although this is not the view of anarchists. To them it is a well-ordered system which can be achieved. On the whole the anarchists were not insane neurotics, as they are often pictured—though some of the terrorists undoubtedly were. The great majority of them regarded anarchism as the only method of ameliorating the wrongs of modern society. Revolution held out the hope to the masses of an immediate end to their misery.

Anarchism has a certain negativeness about it as viewed from any contradictory philosophical point of view. As a theory it is full of inconsistencies which are apparent even to the anarchists themselves. There is no single theory which must be accepted by all anarchists for this would be a fundamental violation of the anarchist creed itself.

The question of what is a German was another problem which had to be dealt with in this book. The solution was to consider as Germans all people born in the area that became known in 1871 as the German Reich. It is apparent that this is an expedient answer to a difficult problem; but not a satisfactory one. The anarchists discussed in this study were born before Bismarck's creation of the German Reich. There are large numbers of people who share the German culture who were left out of the Reich: e.g., the German-speaking Czechs, Austrians, and Swiss. There is a certain affinity and a great deal of cooperation and working together among these three nationalities with those who come from within the borders of the Reich. The

German anarchists felt no great ties of sentiment to the Reich. By its very nature anarchism is international rather than national. The German anarchist sections in Switzerland and London were composed of exiles from the Reich, mixed in with Swiss, Czechs, and Austrians. At times, in this study, it was necessary to include Germans who were born outside the confines of the Reich. This was done only when it was necessary to explain more fully the actions of the German anarchists. The German anarchists played an important part in the rise of anarchism in Austria and the development of radicalism in the United States; however, lengthy examinations of these topics, interesting though they may be, are well beyond the scope of this study.

The exact number of sympathizers the anarchists had in Germany will never be known, but circulation statistics have been obtained for many anarchist newspapers. In Germany it was more difficult than in other European countries to publicly profess anarchism. This was especially true in Prussia where administrative and police efficiency maintained a close scrutiny of all suspicious activities. A Berlin police official related to a correspondent of the London Times that in Germany anarchists were controlled through the system which required all "new-comers to a locality ... to register their names and addresses with the police." He went on to say that "Berlin police are ex-soldiers who know how to behave in a moment of danger." He also related that "restrictions on immigration" into Germany helped to keep the foreign anarchist element out of the country.<sup>12</sup>

The difficulty of being an anarchist in Germany is further accentuated by the fact that it was common practice for police spies to attend all meetings suspected of espousing the cause of radicalism. After the meeting adjourned the spy wrote up detailed reports of what was said at the meeting and who was in attendance. The police kept long lists of people suspected of being anarchists. Many anarchist cells and anarchist periodicals were smothered while still in the embryonic stage. It was customary practice to confiscate an issue of a newspaper if it contained an article that was offensive to the government.<sup>13</sup>

Today, we view anarchists as excessive, romantic, dreamers of impractical schemes which could never be put into practice. In the latter quarter of the nineteenth-century they were not viewed in this way by many of the poor, to whom the total revolution which the anarchists promised held out the only hope of any immediate improvement of conditions. Life among

the poor urban proletariat was short and at best "brutish." To a sizeable proportion of the lower class, the piecemeal concessions of the bourgeois- and aristocrat-dominated governments came too slowly, as did socialist programs which held hope only for the future. Only the anarchist revolution held any hope of an immediate change in their desperate condition. Perhaps the surprising fact is not that there were anarchists in the 1880's, but that there were not more of them.

For some unknown reason, as noted above, historians have tended to dismiss anarchism in Germany as an insignificant force in the development of the German nation in the nineteenth century. This is probably due to looking at things in a "normal" way. Historians and writers tend to look for positive political, economic, and social achievements. Anarchists are, by nature, apolitical. Economically and socially they are an anachronism to historians, whether they be bourgeois or Marxist. In the fields of politics, economics, and social legislation the anarchists achieved nothing; nor did they try. Such ventures are anathema to the spirit of anarchism.

It is difficult if not impossible for writers to think about anarchism in terms other than political. Even Johann Most had this difficulty. For a long time he thought of anarchism as a political philosophy. Anarchism is apolitical and this must be kept in mind. Yet bourgeois and socialist historians point out the lack of definite political programs and political organizations among the anarchists without realizing the apparent contradiction in their words; the word political is alien to the vocabulary of a true anarchist.

As a force, the anarchists in Germany exerted power all out of proportion to their numbers. Prior to 1890 they achieved little in the way of success, in numerical strength, but nevertheless they aroused sufficient anxiety to bring into being repressive legislation which restricted the activities of everyone interested in reforming the monarchical system in Germany. Credit for improving the social condition of the poor in Germany is usually given to either the monarchical government or the socialists, depending on one's point of view. If credit is to be given, some of it must go to anarchists, who though unsuccessful in their immediate objectives of creating a new society either by revolutionary or peaceful means, nevertheless made it apparent to the government that concessions had to be made to assuage the masses.



This study was undertaken with the belief that it would be more than a mere cataloging and description of the activities of the German anarchists, although their recorded activities are of sufficient color and embellishment to warrant such a narrative. It was done with the belief that the anarchists exerted a substantial force on the development of Europe in the 19th century, and that perhaps in no other country is this force more demonstrable than in Germany, which most writers and historians have felt was free from anarchist activity.

Even though there were differences of opinion, among the German anarchist groups there was nevertheless general agreement that social conditions in Germany needed to be changed. They were of the opinion that meaningful reforms could not be accomplished through parliamentary means. In this respect, perhaps, the anarchists were able to see more clearly than the Social Democrats that Germany could not be reformed by electing representatives to the Reichstag. The systems needed to be changed, but the anarchists offered to feasible alternatives.

#### Notes

1. G.D.H. Cole, Socialist Thought. Marxism and Anarchism, 1850-1890 (London, 1961), p. 330.

2. (Wiesbaden, 1953), I, p. 261.

3. James Joll, The Anarchists (London, 1964), pp. 140-141.

4. Walter Laqueur, "Visionaries," Atlas, IX (January, 1965), p. 51. Landauer's commentaries on Shakespeare were nearly completed when he was killed. Martin Buber, a long time friend of Landauer, prepared the text of the commentaries for publication. For additional information on this subject see Buber's preface and introduction to Gustav Landauer, Shakespeare, 2 Vols., (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1920). Landauer's Aufruf zum Sozialismus has been republished in Frankfurt-am-Main in 1967.

5. Barbara W. Tuchman, The Proud Tower. A Portrait of the World Before the War, 1890-1914, Bantam edition (New York, 1967), p. 119.

6. 4th edition (Jena, 1924), I, p. 290.

7. (Paris, n.d.), II, p. 953.

8. Peter Kropotkin, Memoirs of a Revolutionist (New York, 1930), p. 275.

9. The following three volumes contain some material on the movement in Germany, presented in a chronological manner: Der Vorfrühling der Anarchie: Ihre historische Entwicklung von den Anfänge bis zum Jahre 1864 (Berlin, 1925); Der Anarchismus von Proudhon zu Kropotkin (Berlin, 1927); Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre: Die historische Entwicklung des Anarchismus in den Jahren 1880-1886 (Berlin, 1931).

10. Max Nettlau, Bibliographie de l'anarchie (Brussels, 1897); Josef Stammhammer, Bibliographie des Socialismus und Communismus, 3 Vols., (Jena, 1893-1909).

11. Cesare Lombroso, "A Paradoxical Anarchist," Popular Science Monthly, 56 (January, 1900), 312-315. Cesare Lombroso, "Illustrative Studies in Criminal Anthropology," Monist, I (April, 1891), 336-343. See the reply to Lombroso's article by Michael Schwaeb, "A Convicted Anarchist's Reply to Professor Lombroso," Monist, I (April, 1891), 520-524. See also: by C. Lombroso, "Der Anarchismus," Deutsche Revue (October, 1894); and "Anarchy. The Status of Anarchism Today in Europe and the United States," Everybody's Magazine, VI (1902), 165-168; Die Anarchisten (Hamburg, 1894) which is a translation from the Italian. There is also a French edition.

12. London Times (January 5, 1911), p. 6, Col. b, c.

13. On the efficiency of Prussian administration see: Frederic G. Howe, European Cities at Work (New York, 1913), pp. 4-7; H.G. James, Principles of Prussian Administration (New York, 1913).

On the suppression of anarchist periodicals see: Max Nettlau, Bibliographie de l'anarchie (Brussels, 1897), pp. 157, 164. More will be said later on the confiscation of various issues of anarchist newspapers; including the reasons given for confiscation. Libraries in the United States which contain German anarchist newspapers invariably have the confiscated numbers. This is probably due to the fact that newspapers usually send out

their subscription copies before the issue appears on the street for sale to the general public. Usually the confiscation was carried out before the papers reached the newsstands; however, German police found it more difficult to seize subscription copies. German postal regulations prohibited capricious seizure and opening of the mails. Anarchist newspapers were usually small enough that they could easily be mailed in an ordinary brown paper envelope and thus were not conspicuous. Material will be introduced later to point out the role of police spies. This material is mainly from the archives in Bavaria and Prussia as well as material from the German Foreign Office.

## Chapter I

### SPIRITUAL ANCESTORS OF THE GERMAN ANARCHISTS<sup>1</sup>

All movements in history once they become established make an attempt to ferret out their spiritual ancestors. If the movement turns out to be a pernicious one, as in the case of the Nazi movement, this arduous task will be done for them by historians both real and pseudo. The German anarchists are no exception to this rule. They sought to find their progenitors in the German radicals of the 1830's and 1840's. The German government often confirmed their suspicions by confiscating an issue of an anarchist newspaper carrying a reprint of an article written by one of these alleged ancestors.

Many anarchist historians find in the 16th century German Peasant War the first signs of the kind of social criticism which ends in anarchism. Both Joll and Woodcock are of the opinion that too much is made of this relationship by anarchist historians.<sup>2</sup> It would be futile to argue whether Thomas Müntzer and Frederick Schiller were predecessors of the anarchist movement in Germany. One has only to leaf through an anarchist newspaper to find the names of Schiller (1759-1805), Goethe (1749-1832), Lessing (1729-1781), and Heine (1797-1856) appearing again and again.<sup>3</sup> Many German anarchists would like to place Frederick Schiller at the head of the list of their spiritual precursors. Max Nettlau, in his *Bibliographie de l'anarchie*, lists many of Schiller's works as belonging in the 18th-century German anarchist movement. It is true that the German literature of the 18th-century, especially the works of Goethe, Lessing, Heine, and Schiller, are permeated by a strong current of liberal ideas. This can be seen by reading two of Schiller's works, *Sturm und Drang* and *Die Räuber*.<sup>4</sup>

Early anarchist thought in Germany came from two sources: native German thinkers and the influence of Proudhon. Patterns of thought similar to anarchism began to develop in Germany in the 18th century. Max Nettlau called *Die Ideen zu Vinem Versuch die Grenzen der Wirksamkeit des Staates zu Bestimmen* (written by Wilhelm von Humboldt (1792-1835) in

1792) a "strange mixture of essentially anarchist ideas and authoritarian prejudices."<sup>5</sup> Klaus Epstein, in tracing the origins of German conservatism, related: "Some radicals did not stop at republican demands, but went on to advocate outright anarchist ideal."<sup>6</sup>

In the 1840's the battle between socialism and anarchism had not been fought yet and so no clear line divided them. The German anarchists did not become reconciled to the fact that they could not work with the German socialists until the Erfurt Party Congress in 1891. In the International this fact was not accepted by the anarchists until the International Congress held in London in 1896. In the 1840's writers still referred to anarchists as "anarchist-socialists."<sup>7</sup> When Kropotkin started his paper *Le Révolté* in Geneva on February 22, 1879, he placed on its masthead "Organ Socialiste." This subtitle was continued until March 2, 1884, when it was changed to "Organ Anarchiste," only to be replaced by the subtitle "Organ Communiste-Anarchiste" on April 13, 1884.

The German anarchists in constructing their family tree would include all the individuals mentioned in this chapter. For this reason, and no other, this chapter is included. The brief biographical sketches which follow are not intended to include all the facets and tenets of the thought of the person discussed. Enough bibliography is presented to point the way toward a more complete study of each individual discussed, should one desire to pursue such a study. Only that part of his thought which touches on or influenced anarchist development is covered. Wilhelm Marr and Karl Grün, of all the persons discussed, could probably come the closest to being called true anarchists. It should be noted that one would be hard pressed to find a thread of continuity from the people discussed in this chapter to the anarchist of the 1870's, even though later anarchists looked back on them as their legitimate ancestors in the German anarchist movement. A number of them are noted for other achievements, and other patterns of thought. It is not generally known or usually brought out that many of them went through a stage when their thoughts either resembled or espoused anarchism.

Ludwig Börne (1786-1837) is, in the opinion of Gustav Landauer, one of the earliest of the German whose thought is anarchist in nature.<sup>8</sup> Börne, as Landauer admits, was not an anarchist; however, his thought processes to a certain extent paralleled theirs. A political pamphleteer and satirist, Börne

was born in Frankfurt-am-Main, the son of a Jewish banker. He studied medicine at the University of Berlin, Halle and Heidelberg. While he was at Heidelberg he turned to the study of "political economy and the science of government," as it was called at the time. He continued these studies at Giessen and then worked for a few years as a government official in his hometown of Frankfurt. Börne decided that the boring routine of a government office was not for him and he turned to writing for a living. In 1818 he renounced his Hebrew name Löb Baruch and started on a career as a publicist, publishing a number of political journals which were quickly suppressed. The most famous, Die Wage. Blätter für Bürgerleben, Wissenschaft und Kunst, appeared during the years 1818-1821.

Börne was an able and caustic critic of the political conditions in Germany and after Die Wage was discontinued in 1821 he led a restless life in Paris, Heidelberg, Frankfurt-am-Main Berlin, and Hamburg. In 1830, after the July Revolution, he went back to Paris where he reestablished Die Wage under the French title La Balance for the purpose of promoting a closer intellectual union between France and Germany. Landauer concluded that to Börne anarchism meant the downfall of the government and the breakup of the state. This is based on a book which Börne published in Paris in 1825 entitled Nouvelles lettres provinciales, ou lettres écrites par un provincial à un de ses amis, sur les affaires du temps. In this book Börne expressed opinions with which the anarchists would have no quarrel:

The state is the bed of Procrustes [legendary highwayman of Attica, who tied his victims upon an iron bed, stretching or cutting off their legs to fit its length] in which men are stretched or mutilated to fit. The state, which is the cradle of humanity, has become its coffin. The state is at the same time, God and Priest, and for which the sanctimonious God demands sacrifices of all, after which the priest lusts ...

People have only liberties but no liberty. Liberties are the legal evidence of the government. For that reason one hears therefore above all the power to speak only of liberties and sees the word liberty nervously avoided. They speak of free institutions: liberty will be so-called free institution, and yet there is only the government.

It matters little that the power is in this or that hand: the power itself must be diminished, in whichever hand it is to be found. But no government has on its own voluntarily permitted the power it possesses to be lessened. Government can only be restricted when it is driven from power—Freedom arises only out of anarchy. This necessity for revolution we dare not turn our sight away from or prevent, even though it is sad. We must, as men, look at the danger with a firm and steady eye and dare not shake before the surgeon's scalpel. Freedom arises only out of anarchy—this is our belief, this is the lesson of history.<sup>9</sup>

A special place is accorded in German anarchist annals to Richard Wagner (1813-1881), the brilliant, erratic, enigmatic and often maligned poet-composer.<sup>10</sup> However, it is not for the cadence of his poems nor the effects of his musical compositions that the anarchists revere Wagner; it is for his writings on the German revolution of 1849.<sup>11</sup> The German government reinforced the idea that Wagner was an ancestor of the anarchists when they confiscated the May 6, 1911 issue of Der freie Arbeiter (Berlin) which carried a reprint of Wagner's article "Die Revolution."<sup>12</sup> Max Nettlau argues that Wagner's thought at this stage in his life can definitely be called anarchist.<sup>13</sup> "Die Revolution" first appeared as an anonymous article in the Volksblätter (Dresden) April 8, 1849. Despite these claims, Wagner cannot truly be called an anarchist, although he openly coverted with Bakunin and wrote articles which lean toward anarchist beliefs.

In "Die Revolution" Wagner said many things that would appeal to anarchist. He relates that "the old world is in ruins from which a new world will arise." This was to be brought about by a revolution which "shakes so violently" that it will destroy "all that has been built for ages past." Revolution, according to Wagner, is in itself "ever-rejuvenating, ever-creating life." It is "the dream" and "the hope of all who suffer." Revolution "destroys what exists" and wherever it turns, bursts forth "fresh life from the dead rock." It "breaks the fetters that oppress" and "redeems man from the embrace of death and pours new life into his veins." According to the law of nature "whatever is, must pass away." The present order which "has sprung from sin will be destroyed" because "its flower is misery and its fruit is crime."

Revolution will "destroy the domination of one over many ... and the power of the Almighty, of law, of property" and warfare between nations will cease. It will mark the end of powerful people, of the privileged class, of both rich and poor. It "will destroy the order of things that make millions the slaves of few." Revolution will destroy the present order which "makes labor a burden and enjoyment a vice, makes one man wretched through want and another, equally wretched, through superfluity." The old order which "wastes men's power" and "condemns half of mankind to inactivity or useless toil ... compels hundreds of thousands ... to devote their youth ... to soldiering" would be destroyed and with it would vanish "every trace of this insane order of things; force, lies, hypocrisy, want, sorrow, suffering, tears, trickery and crime."

Wagner then gave a ringing exhortation for the people to rise up, follow the goddess of revolution, and crush the existing order. Out of the ashes of the old order would arise a new one in which there would be no distinctions among people.<sup>14</sup>

On March 22 of the same year Wagner wrote a poem entitled "An einen Staatsanwalt" (To a state attorney). In this poem, Wagner pours out his scorn on "the state, that absolute great egoist," and on the attorney who has been elected "to wrangle for its highest abstract nothing."<sup>15</sup>

There are several other pieces of evidence in Wagner's writings that would tend to indicate his sympathy for anarchism. In Kunstwerk der Zukunft (1850) he gives his views of the ideal community (Gemeinschaft) of the future:

In the common alliances of the men of the future the same law will make eternal need the single determining factor. A natural, not forceable, alliance of a large or small number of men can only be brought about through one of these men by mutual need. The satisfaction of this need is the sole purpose of the common undertaking; the actions of each individual will be governed by this goal, as long as the common need is in itself the strongest factor; and from this need will emanate the law for common intercourse. These laws are in themselves nothing other than the means for the establishment of a useful end ... Natural alliances or



associations have a natural existence only as long as they strive after the satisfaction of the underlying common need. ... All men have but one common need. ... This is the need of living and being happy. Herein lies the natural bond among all men ... it is only the special needs which, according to time, place, and individuality, make themselves known and increase, which in the rational condition of future humanity can serve as a basis for special associations. ... These associations will change, will take another form, dissolve and reconstitute themselves accordingly as those needs change and reappear. This rational condition of future humanity ... can be only brought about by force; state alliances of our time will oppose the free alliances of the future which in their fluid change represent an extraordinary expansion toward a more refined, closer formation of human life itself, to which the restless change holds out various individual inexhaustibly rich attractions, which during the present uniform life are morally prohibitive.<sup>16</sup>

In "Das Bühnenweihfestspiel in Bayreuth," (1882) he expressed his feeling for anarchism by saying: "This [the sure rendering of all events on, above, under, behind, and before the stage] anarchy accomplishes because each individual does what he wishes to do, namely, what is right."<sup>17</sup>

In April, 1850, Wagner wrote his ex-wife:

With all my suffering, with all my self-consuming, I have within myself a great transcending faith, the faith in the truth and splendor of the cause for which I suffer and fight. ... You cling to the peacefulness and permanence of existing conditions—I must break with them to satisfy my inner being; you are capable of sacrificing everything in order to have a respectable position in the community, which I despise and with which I don't want to have anything to do; you cling with all your heart to property, to home, household, hearth—I leave all that so that I can be a human being. ... I have broken with everything old and fight it with all my strength.<sup>18</sup>

This gives a picture of Wagner as a total revolutionary as did his article on revolution. He was willing to endure all suffering for the cause in which he believed.

After the rise of Hitler it became popular to associate Wagner with the idea of the totalitarian state. However, one of his contemporaries, a French music critic, Henri Malherbe, wrote in his essay "Richard Wagner, revolutionnaire total" that the "Ring of the Nibelungen," produced in 1876, expressed

... a savage gospel of anarchy, it is so deeply steeped in poetry and dreams that its dangerous significance may not be noticed. Thus its subterranean message, full of imagery, can permeate the souls with greater ease. Wagner wishes to attach himself to an ideal of guilelessness. To that end he sets out to cut all his ties with the human family and to ruin utterly the civilization of his time.<sup>19</sup>

Wagner, of course, cannot properly be called an anarchist, but he did add fuel to its flames. Both in his writings and in his life he exemplified characteristics admired and accepted by anarchists.

Karl Heinzen (1809-1880), in the opinion of George Schumm "came as near being an anarchist as is possible without being one." He "occupied ground next door to anarchism."<sup>20</sup> The feelings that Heinzen conjured up in the minds of the anarchists is expressed in the following poem written by Robert Reitzel:

"Dem Gedächtnisse Karl Heinzens"

Halb gönn ich ihm den Grabesfrieden  
 Halb wünsche ich es sei ihm noch beschieden  
 Die Leiden dieser Zeit zu tragen  
 Der Wahrheit goldnes Wort zu sagen  
 Und Schufften auf den Kopf zu schlagen.<sup>21</sup>

Heinzen, born in Grevenbroich, near Düsseldorf, in 1809, had a youth filled with revolt. He lost his mother at the age of four and with her disappeared probably the only being that could have had a moderating influence upon the impetuous boy. The irritating insistence of his stepmother that he become a Catholic priest aroused his antagonism and sowed the seed of his pronounced anticlericalism. From his father, who resented Prussia's absorption of the Rhineland, young Heinzen received his hatred of the Prussian spirit that never left him.<sup>22</sup> In spite of great intellectual potential, Heinzen failed to complete his

program of study at the University of Bonn. He was expelled in 1829 for giving a speech in which he accused his teachers of narrow-mindedness and condemned the lack of academic freedom. Heinzen, who stood six feet three inches tall and had exceptionally broad shoulders and a very muscular frame, was prime material for the military but a short enlistment in the Dutch Colonial Army, during which time he was stationed in Batavia, only strengthened his dislike of all kinds of coercion. Following this his required year of service in the Prussian army left him with a life-time hatred of militarism. After separation from the army he entered the Prussian civil service as a tax official. His service was a continuous battle with his superiors who he felt treated him unjustly or with whose administrative methods he disagreed. During his eight years as a tax official he wrote lyrical ballads and comedies in his spare time,—that is, when he was not writing complaining letters to his superiors, including the King of Prussia.<sup>23</sup>

He resigned from the civil service and in 1844 wrote a pamphlet entitled Die preussische Bürokratie in which he attacked the system of espionage practiced within the government of Prussia. It was suppressed and he was summoned before a court. He fled to Switzerland to avoid the proceedings which had been initiated against him. His flight across the border was followed by a warrant, which he answered with flaming articles making a return to Germany impossible. During his wanderings Heinzen met Karl Marx for whom he developed a very bitter hatred. In Switzerland he held discussions with Ludwig Feuerbach, Arnold Ruge and many others who had fled from Germany. He attempted, unsuccessfully, to publish a magazine entitled Die Opposition, which he envisioned as a weapon against Prussian reaction.<sup>24</sup>

Heinzen, at first opposed a bloody upheaval in Germany, because he thought that the enlightenment of the people would be sufficient to bring about reforms. He was of the opinion that any reforms in Germany had to be undertaken in unison with all European nations. Slowly, however, he changed his mind. In his publication Die teutsche Revolution "he advocated tyrannicide and recommended open revolt and mutiny in the army, and referred to the 449 princely drones and their bureaucracies who could be hurled from their position of power only by revolution."<sup>25</sup>

In 1847 Heinzen went to the United States. When the revolutions broke out over Europe in 1848 he borrowed money

and returned to Germany, but once there he failed to gain the confidence of the revolutionaries. He was unsuccessful in his attempt to be selected as a representative from Hamburg in the Frankfurt Parliament. In 1849 he quarreled with Hecker over the political goals of the revolution. The moderate element branded him "Bloody Heinzen" because he called for French military aid to crush Prussia. In 1850 he returned to the United States where he spent the last 30 years of his life editing and publishing a number of newspapers as well as fighting for freedom, liberty, and justice as he saw it.<sup>26</sup>

Carl Wittke, Heinzen's biographer, writes that it is difficult to understand how Heinzen can be classified as an anarchist. "It is true that Heinzen was a great admirer of Proudhon and Mikhail Bakunin .... Heinzen wants to reduce the functions of the state to a minimum in order to preserve the greatest amount of individual initiative."<sup>27</sup>

Schumm, on the other hand, sees a close affinity of Heinzen's thought to anarchism for the following reasons:

... his uncompromising war on all forms of communism together with his championship of private enterprise against State monopoly; ... he deprecated all State meddling with the industrial affairs of people; ... he utterly condemned and severely criticized all attempts at and tendencies toward the nationalization of the ways and means of communication; ... he postulated the general principle that all things that can be done by private individuals and associations of individuals should be left to these and not be usurped by the State. ... It was principally in reference to the subject of education that Heinzen's enlightened and libertarian philosophy suffered a defeat. Because he feared that education would be neglected, if left to private enterprise, he made of it a State affair. But even here he was careful not to grant the State too large powers. The State was simply to provide schools and the opportunity for education, but there was to be no compulsion of citizens to avail themselves of the State's offerings. Indeed he abominated compulsory education and combatted it with all his might. Nevertheless his position on this question was not wholly in line with anarchism. For we leave education entirely to private enterprise, confident of thus securing for it a richer future than

will ever fall to the lot of State education. We thoroughly abjure the forceable taking of money from some people for the education of other people's children. ... Heinzen radically opposed the principle of authority, and with it the idea of government, and defined the State as a "voluntary association" for "the object of facilitating and securing the realization of the life purpose of each individual through the proper authorized agents by means of their jointly-created and supervised institutions, laws, and resources." Strictly speaking this is Anarchy pure and simple notwithstanding Heinzen's disclaimer to the contrary. ... There is nothing whatever in the word Anarchy to exclude organization, and Anarchists have never called upon people to choose between organization and no-organization, but between compulsory organization and voluntary organization. It is perfectly proper therefore to describe society based on voluntary organization by the word Anarchy, while it would be manifestly improper to designate it by the word State, which has in all history stood for society based on compulsion. If, however, it should be shown that as Heinzen, in the brief summary referred to, explicitly insisted on the voluntary principle for the society of the future, he did so also implicitly in his voluminous other works; if what he calls the State was indeed to have been a voluntary association, I confess that I have no real quarrel with him, and gladly claim his for the Anarchists. ... When he talks of the State of the future doing this, that, and what not, free of cost for the poor and the needy, it is a voluntary association he has in mind.<sup>28</sup>

Wilhelm Weitling (1808-1871) today occupies a place of honor in the Communist hall of fame.<sup>29</sup> His differences with Marx are overlooked, if not completely forgotten. Forgotten also, is that at one stage in his development Weitling's thought bordered on anarchism. Even though his thought process eventually turned toward utopian forms of communism, he nevertheless left a lasting impression on two of the most influential Russian anarchists; Bakunin<sup>30</sup> and Herzen.<sup>31</sup> The German anarchists too like to claim at least a portion of the early Weitling.<sup>32</sup> They base their claim on Weitling's Garantien der Harmonie und Freiheit (Vevey, 1842) in which he wrote "a perfect society has no government but only an administration, no laws, but only obligations, no punishments, but means of correction."<sup>33</sup> This

work and his earlier Die Menschheit wie sie ist und wie sie seien sollte (1838) contain many ideas of a sketchy anarchist kind.

Weitling was born in Magdeburg on October 5, 1808, the illegitimate son of a German housemaid and an officer in Napoleon's army, who had been quartered in the home where she worked. He learned the trade of tailor, leaving home at the age of 20 to evade military service. In 1830 he took part in the liberal movement in Leipzig, publishing a number of radical articles in the Leipziger Zeitung.<sup>34</sup> During the next five years he traveled around Europe from city to city carrying his shoes in his hand, using them only when the road was rocky and "carrying his pack on his back like the snail carries his house;"<sup>35</sup> living off fruit taken from orchards he passed.<sup>36</sup> In 1835 he settled in Paris where he studied the tenets of socialism and the practice of revolutionary propaganda. He was expelled, after the uprising of 1839, together with the other foreign associates of Blanqui, taking refuge in Switzerland where he spent the next four years founding secret political societies of craftsmen, and printing with his own hands journals and broadsheets in which he presented a vision of a future utopia and of the social upheaval through which it would be attained.<sup>37</sup>

Weitling's writing eventually earned him a six-month prison sentence in Zürich. After being released he was expelled from Switzerland. At Schaffhausen, on the German border, he was taken into custody by German officials and sent to Magdeburg where he was retained by the police for having fled earlier to avoid military service. He was examined, declared physically unfit for military service and released. In August of 1844 he left Hamburg for London, where a great reception was given in his honor by the French, German and English socialists. Weitling's trial in Switzerland had made him a hero and international celebrity among the socialists. Weitling's influence in London waned quickly though. In 1846 he left London to attend a socialist congress in Brussels where he got embroiled in a dispute with Marx which shattered their relationship.<sup>38</sup> Shortly after this Weitling left for New York where he spent the remainder of his life except for a short interlude, when he returned to Germany during the revolutionary years of 1848-1849. He proved to be ineffectual in Berlin and returned to New York where he spent his last years involved in creating new inventions for the purpose of raising money, developing new scientific theories, and being involved in the International, dying on January 25, 1871.

It is quite proper to place Weitling as a forerunner of later anarchists. His thought, which included such inconsistencies as Proudhonian mutualism and Blanquian conspiratorial organization, bore resemblance to the later school of anarchism called communist-anarchism in that he rejected both private property and the wage system. He wished to destroy the state as it existed, but wanted to replace it with a utopian communist society that would be highly regimental. After the 1849 revolutions, though he moved closer to Proudhonian mutualism. In his monthly journal, Republik der Arbeiter (New York, 1850-1854), he criticized the utopian experiments in the United States while putting for the idea of a Bank of Exchange as the foundation stone of all co-operative efforts among workers. The Bank would stock both raw materials and finished products and issue money based on labor value, which would be used to provide for education, hospitals, and the care of the aged and the disabled. The Bank would destroy the capitalist monopoly supplanting it with an economic structure which would make political institutions unnecessary. These ideas of Weitling had little impact in Germany, but were influential in the neo-Proudhonian movement of the 19th century in the United States.<sup>39</sup>

Moses (Moritz) Hess (1812-1875)<sup>40</sup> was born of Jewish parents on June 21, 1812, at Bonn where he also received his education. Hess, together with Karl Grün exerted, in the early 1840's, an important anarchistic influence in Germany by developing and disseminating Proudhon's theories, both with the pen and from the speakers' platforms. Disagreement with his orthodox father resulted in his leaving home at an early age. After a precarious life in England and France he returned to Cologne, where reconciliation with his father provided him with employment in his father's company. Sidney Hook describes Hess as'

... a man of singular purity of character. He was sensitive to every form of injustice, passionate in his devotion to principles, and almost saintly in his everyday behavior. He was unable to hate even those who harmed him. Although subjected to a life-long proverty, even more grinding than that of Marx, he never wavered in his allegiance to revolutionary ideals. ... He married a prostitute—"in order to atone for the evil society had done"—with whom he lived until his death. His friends nicknamed him "the communist rabbi."<sup>41</sup>

His first published work, Die heilige Geschichte der Menschheit von einem Jüngen Spinoza's, appeared in 1836; in it he points out the necessity of a socialist ordering of society. A volume entitled Einundzwanzig Bogen aus der Schweiz, published in 1843, carried two of Hess' essays which demonstrate his anarchist tendencies at this period of his development: "Socialismus und Communismus" and "Philosophie der That."<sup>42</sup> In these two essays Hess puts forth a far-reaching system of communist anarchism.<sup>43</sup> Hess refers to his philosophy as "anarchy."

The lies of religion and politics [he wrote] must be unmasked with one relentless blow, the refuges, the fortifications, the asses and devils bridges of the adversary must, above all, be burned and destroyed. ... Liberty is morality, ... Liberty and equality are beautiful words. We have struck a blow for them, we stand for them and shall rise up again for them.<sup>44</sup>

Hess did not maintain these views very long; already in May, 1844, his ideas had become modified.<sup>45</sup> The following year he published a scathing anti-anarchist pamphlet, Die letzten Philosophie, directed against Max Stirner. He also collaborated, in 1845, with Marx and Engels in writing Die deutsche Ideologie, attacking Stirner.<sup>46</sup> Hess was allied with Marx and Engels in the struggle against Bruno Bauer, Ruge, and Feuerbach; however, this association came to an abrupt end in 1848 over the question of "true socialism."<sup>47</sup>

Hess had early in life turned his back on Judaism, but after the Moslem atrocities at Damascus in 1860 he advocated a general exodus of Jews to Palestine. His views appeared in Rom und Jerusalem, die letzte Nationalitätsfrage (Leipzig, 1862), in which he proposed a synthesis of socialism and Zionism before there was a Jewish workers' movement or a general Zionist organization. Thereafter, he lived in two different spheres and wrote for two different circles: the general socialist and the specifically Jewish. The few Jews who sympathized with him considered his socialism as a superficial appendage to his Jewish writings, while the socialists saw in his Jewish national patriotism only a whim. In 1863 he was actively connected with Lassalle. Afterwards he made France his adopted country, where he died on April 6, 1875, in the city of Paris.



The writings of Hess are curiously muddled. He was close to Proudhon, but not as close as Karl Grün. He quarreled with Bakunin, but agreed with him in his rejection of the state and organized religion. He was both an associate and an important rival of Marx. All free actions, according to Hess, must proceed from individual impulses, unmarred by external influence, which is quite close to Max Stirner's basic assumption. Hess envisaged a society in which men would work according to inclination. The needs of all members of the society would be provided for automatically by the community. This, of course, rings of Kropotkin's idea of communist anarchism; however, at the same time Hess entertained a number of ideas, such as universal suffrage and national workshops, with which neither Kropotkin nor any other true anarchist would agree.<sup>48</sup>

Karl Grün (1813-1887)<sup>49</sup> was born September 30, 1813, at Lüdenscheid. After receiving a good education he turned to writing and wandering. Friedrich Engels was much impressed with Grün's writings, especially his Buch der Wanderungen. Ostsee und Rhein (1839). Engels writes that Grün had deep thoughts but that they were expressed in "horrible Hegelian flowery language."<sup>50</sup> Grün, in addition to writing poetry, was editor of the Mannheimer Abendzeitung in 1842, but was forced out of Baden at the end of that year. Arriving in Cologne in 1843 he met Moses Hess and became editor of Sprechers. Later in the fall of the same year he collaborated on publishing the Trierschen Zeitung, eventually getting the controlling influence in his own hands. In April of 1844 he left for Bielefeld where he continued his writing.<sup>51</sup>

While in Cologne Grün met Engels through his friendship with Hess. Engels wrote to Marx, who was in Paris, that Grün was leaving for Paris and "will have something to say to you on the tactics of the people."<sup>52</sup> In the same letter he related that Hess, too, was leaving for Paris but had to wait until he had sufficient funds. In 1844 Grün wrote, F. Schiller als Mensch. Geschichtsschreiben, Denken und Dichter. Nettlau relates that in 1844 Grün's thought bore a fundamental likeness to a far-reaching system of communist anarchism.<sup>53</sup> In Paris Grün became an ardent disciple of Proudhon whose mutualist philosophy he shared. Intellectually, he was closely allied with Hess; idealistically, however, he was much closer to Proudhon than Hess was. During his early acquaintanceship with Proudhon, Grün wrote Die soziale Bewegung in Frankreich und Belgien (Darmstadt, 1845), which was the first work to introduce

Proudhon's ideas to the German public. Eventually Grün would go beyond Proudhon's theories criticizing Proudhon

... for not attacking the wage system, and pointed out that the growing complexity of industry made it impossible to decide on each man's product with any accuracy or justice. Therefore consumption and production must alike depend on chance. "Let us have no right at all against the right of the individual."<sup>54</sup>

Today Grün is remembered not for his anarchism but for the part he played in the split between Marx and Proudhon. Marx, living in Brussels, wrote Proudhon on May 5, 1846, relating that together with Engels and Philippe Gigot he had organized a Correspondence Committee for the purpose of putting the German socialists in contact with the French and English socialists

... to keep the foreigners posted on the socialist movements that are going to take place in Germany, and to inform the Germans in Germany of the progress of socialism in France and England. In this way it will be possible to air differences of opinion. An exchange of ideas will ensue and impartial criticism be secured.<sup>55</sup>

Marx went on to point out that such an organization would free the socialist movement "of its national limitation," asking Proudhon if he would undertake the Paris end of the correspondence.

In a postscript to the letter Marx attacked Grün:

I here denounce to you M. Grün, now in Paris. This man is nothing but a literary hack, a sort of charlatan who wants to make a living by exploiting modern ideas. He tries to hide his ignorance under pompous and arrogant phrases, but he does nothing but make himself ridiculous by his nonsense. This man is dangerous. He abuses the acquaintance he has made, by his impertinence, with celebrated authors so as to make a pedestal for himself and to compromise them with the German public. In his book on the French socialists he dares to call himself "Proudhon's tutor"; he claims that he has revealed important axioms of German science to him. ... Beware therefore of this parasite.

Perhaps I shall have more to say to you later of this individual.<sup>56</sup>

Proudhon in his reply refused Marx's invitation:

Let us by all means collaborate in trying to discover the laws of society, the way in which these laws work out, the best method to set about investigating them; but, God's sake, after we have demolished all the dogmatisms a priori, let us not of all things attempt in our turn to instill another kind of dogma into the people. Let us not fall into the contradiction of your compatriot Martin Luther, who, after overthrowing Catholic theology, addressed himself to the task of building up, with all the apparatus of excommunication and anathemas, a Protestant theology. For three whole centuries Germany has been doing nothing but pull down the plasterwork of Martin Luther. Let us not, by contriving any more such restrictions, leave any more such tasks for the human race. With all my heart I welcome your idea of exposing all opinions to the light. Let us have decent and sincere polemics; let us give the world an example of learned and far-sighted tolerance. But simply because we are at the head of a movement, do not let us ourselves become the leaders of a new intolerance, let us not pose as the apostles of a new religion—even though this religion be the religion of logic, the religion of reason itself. Let us welcome, let us encourage all the protests; let us condemn all exclusions, all mysticisms. But never let us think of any question as closed, and even after we have exhausted our very last argument, let us begin again, if necessary, with eloquence and irony. On that condition I shall be delighted to associate with you—but otherwise, no!<sup>57</sup>

Proudhon also defended Grün:

I sincerely regret the little divisions which, it appears to me, exist in German socialism and of which your complaints against M. Grün give me the proof. I much fear that you have seen this writer in a false light, and I appeal, my dear Monsieur Marx, to your reconsideration. G. finds himself in exile, without any money but with a wife and two children and nothing to live on

but his pen. What is there for him to make his living out of, if not by exploiting modern ideas? ... Ah, if we were all millionaires, things would be different; we should all be saints and angels. But one must live, that is to say, buy bread and meat and fuel, pay for one's lodging; and, good heavens, the man who sells a sermon.<sup>58</sup>

Proudhon goes on to relate that he is going to let Grün translate his forthcoming book into German, and asks Marx if he will withdraw his judgement he made on Grün. Marx struck back immediately lashing out at Proudhon in Misère de la Philosophie, which was a parody on Proudhon's title.<sup>59</sup> Grün was attacked in Die deutsche Ideologie, which was completed in the summer of 1846, but not published in its entirety until 1932.<sup>60</sup> Marx made a direct attack upon Grün's book Die soziale Bewegung in Frankreich und Belgien (Darmstadt, 1845) because it contained ideas which Marx called "true socialism." On April 8, 1847, an article by Marx, "Erklärung gegen Karl Grün," appeared in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung in which Marx attempts to demolish an article in Triersche Zeitung which was favorable toward Grün.<sup>61</sup>

Engels led the attack against Grün in Paris during the latter half of 1846. In a letter to Marx he relates that

... the stupid workers here, I mean the German workers, believe that piffle. ... Grün has so confused those fellows that the most senseless phrase sounds more sensible to them than the simplest fact used as an economic argument. ... I won't let go of those fellows until I have driven Grün from the field and cleansed their clogged-up skulls ....<sup>62</sup>

Engels in his letter of October 23 to the Correspondence Committee in Brussels relates that he was engaged in a running battle against the "Grünists," which was being fought out in the workshops for the workers but when it came to a vote the "Grünists" were voted down by a margin of 13 to two.<sup>63</sup>

Toward the end of the 1840's Grün's disillusionment with anarchist ideas can be seen in his election to the Prussian Nationalversammlung in 1848. The remainder of his life was spent in wandering, writing and teaching; serving as a professor at the Handels- und Gewerbeschule in Frankfurt on Main during

the years 1862-65. He died in Vienna in 1887. Grün had achieved his greatest fame and had produced his best writing by 1845. During the last 40 years of his life he accomplished little in the way of original thought.

Wilhelm Marr (1819-1904) was born in Hamburg, which he left for Switzerland in 1843. There he became the leader of the Young German Clubs, which were opposed to authoritarian communism.<sup>64</sup> Because of his activities he was banished from the Canton of Zürich in late 1843, traveling to Lausanne where he founded the monthly Blätter der Gegenwart für soziales Leben in December 1844. Eight issues of it appeared between December 1844 and July 1848 when Marr was banished from the Canton of Waadt.<sup>65</sup> In this journal Marr called for the destruction of the state, church, and private property, relating that once this had been accomplished "then will dawn a better future."<sup>66</sup> Marr's banishment crushed his paper and plans and deprived him of his organization which he had hoped to use to "reconstruct the world anew" once the explosion of anarchy had swept over Europe.<sup>67</sup> In 1846 Marr published an account of his activities in the Young German Clubs in Switzerland in Das Junge Deutschland in der Schweiz. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der geheim Verbindungen unserer Tage (Leipzig, 1846).<sup>68</sup>

He continued his attacks on the state and all forms of authority in Der Mensch und die Ehe vor dem Richtstuhl der Sittlichkeit (Leipzig, 1848) and in the weekly Mephistopheles, which he published during the years 1848-1852. In his final work on the subject of anarchism, Anarchie oder Autorität (Hamburg, 1852),<sup>69</sup> Marr discusses the question, after what should civilization strive, anarchy or authority? He concludes that liberty is to be found only in anarchy,<sup>70</sup> saying "make no more laws or constitutions and free us from the long established ones."<sup>71</sup> He answers his critics who have called his anarchy nothing more than a utopia by calling for a complete breakdown of the barriers caused by the laws and institutions of society, creating no new ones in their place.<sup>72</sup> He ends the book with the ringing phrase which would later be uttered by August Reinsdorf in 1885 as he mounted the scaffold to be beheaded for his plot against the German Emperor, "long live anarchy!"<sup>73</sup>

Marr spent the remainder of his long life wandering; writing books and articles about his travels through Central America and the United States, dying in the United States in 1904. He had early in life developed a hatred of authoritarianism; he

dedicated himself to the victory of anarchy, but as the years produced no anarchist swell to drown authoritarianism, he eventually became disillusioned, turning to wandering and journalism.

There are a number of other well-known Germans who in one way or another, early in their lives in the 1840's-1850's, were imbued with anarchist ideas. One in particular is Karl Schurz (1829-1906), who is known particularly to Americans,<sup>74</sup> although once in America his anarchist leanings vanished.

Edgar Bauer (1820-1886), one of the famous (to Marx, infamous) Bauer brothers, is another person held in high esteem by later German anarchists. Edgar Bauer's Gesetz und Recht<sup>75</sup> appealed to them. The Berlin edition of his Der Streit der Kritik mit Kirche und Staat (1843) was completely seized by Prussian officials and was not available to the public until 1844 when an edition of the work was brought out in Bern. Edgar Bauer was eventually imprisoned in Magdeburg for his attack on the state.<sup>76</sup> Marx and Engels in their composite work Die heilige Familie (1845), of which the greater share was written by Marx, attacked the Bauer brothers. Mehring has referred to it as one of the foundation stones of socialism. Under the name Martin von Geismar, Bauer published a Bibliothek der Aufklärung des 18. Jahrhunderts (Leipzig, 1846-47), and Die politische Literatur der deutschen im 18. Jahrhundert (Leipzig, 1847) and a number of other collections of works dealing with the history or revolutions. In 1849 he published a political review, Die Parteien (Hamburg), which was of a definite anti-authoritarian character.

Arnold Ruge (1802-1880) is another who for a short period in the late 1840's stood on ground that has since been claimed by the anarchists. Ruge associated with Bakunin, Hess, Grün, Proudhon, and Marx during his sojourn in Paris. Politically he favored federalism. Nevertheless he sought an ultimate system which would be as liberal as possible. He describes this system in a book entitled Die Gründung der Demokratie in Deutschland oder der Volksstaat und der sozialdemokratische Freistaat (Leipzig, 1849). The sozialdemokratische Freistaat is Ruge's theoretical utopia. To Ruge's way of thinking "... theoretical anarchy and theoretical liberty are the same. From theoretical liberty practical liberty will be born. Practical liberty is the dissolution of the lord or master, the elimination of all extraneous administration through self-regulation, the true sense of anarchic." How was Ruge's Freistaat to be governed?

No overseer will be permitted to become a ruler, the authority will reside in the community or corporate body and with the majority. The majority cannot make any decisions which will infringe upon the rights of the minority. The use of this authority must therefore be alternated constantly among the people who make up the community or corporate body. The self-rule by the community of people corresponds to what in private life would constitute individual liberty and honor. Self-rule by the people is the abolition of all government, a regulation by the people, which in fact is systematic anarchy, because there are no rulers only overseers, ... the free community or association and the working together among themselves of the appointed men, who are in all ways equal partners ....<sup>77</sup>

Karl Vogt (1817-1895), another friend of Bakunin and Proudhon, is revered by later German anarchists.<sup>78</sup> In an article "Untersuchungen über Tierstaaten" Vogt writes concerning anarchism "come then you sweet world freeing anarchy, depress the soul of the ruler, only the ruling clique will draw a breath to attempt to preserve this present condition of dullness, come and free us from the evil that one calls the state!"<sup>79</sup> Vogt, like many of the other German thinkers of the 1840's, whose thought bordered on anarchism, came into violent conflict with Marx and Engels.<sup>80</sup>

It can be said with certainty that Proudhon influenced many of the German exiles living in Paris. The influence he had in Germany proper is another question. He had a following in Germany in the 1840's-1850's, but it was probably not a large one. Those who translated his writings into German did so to disseminate his message. The profit motive was not a factor involved. A cursory look at the places of publication reveals that publication activities were not confined to a single publisher or a single area of Germany. Proudhon exerted great influence over Hess and Grün, as noted previously, but apparently this did not carry over into Germany. It appears that the magnetism of Proudhon's personality was an important factor in gathering his group of followers in Paris.

The influence Proudhon's writing exerted in Germany is difficult to judge. His formal introduction into Germany probably came by way of two short-lived radical publications which were

semi-anarchist in nature. The Allgemeine Literaturzeitung, edited by the Bauer brothers, appeared in Charlottenburg, a suburb of Berlin, between December, 1843, and October, 1844. In all, 12 issues were published. Edgar Bauer introduced Proudhon to Germany with an article entitled "Proudhon."<sup>81</sup> The other radical journal, edited by Adolf Riesz, was the Norddeutsche Blätter für Kritik, Literatur und Unterhaltung (Berlin, July, 1844-May, 1845), which ran for 11 issues total. In this journal an article by H.L. Köppen, "P.J. Proudhon der radikale sozialist," attempted to spread Proudhon's influence into Germany.<sup>82</sup> Friedrich Mann in 1850 in the city of Wiesbaden also wrote in favor of Proudhon.<sup>83</sup> No doubt more such opinion could be found, but it would require a close scrutiny of the local press of the period. Tracing out Proudhon's influence in Germany is beyond the scope of this study.

The writings of Proudhon which were translated into German appear, at least on the surface, to have had little effect as far as the development of an anarchist movement is concerned. F. Meyer translated Was ist das Eigenthum? (Bern, 1844). Grün, as noted above, translated Philosophie der Staatsoekonomie oder Nothwendigkeit des Elends (Darmstadt, 1847). Another translation of the same work by W. Jordan carried the title Die Widersprüche der Nationaloekonomie oder Philosophie der Noth (Leipzig, 1847). Grün also translated "Die französische Februarrevolution," which appeared in Heft I of Die Revolution im Jahre 1848. In zwanglosen Heften (Trier, 1848).

An eight-page pamphlet of Proudhon's P.J. Proudhon, Manifest. Einleitung zu der von Proudhon redigierten Zeitschrift "Le Peuple" appeared in Leipzig in 1848. The following year Das Recht auf Arbeit, das Eigenthum um und die Lösung der sozialen Frage was published in Leipzig. In the same year Theodor Opitz's translation Theoretischer und praktischer Beweis des Socialismus oder Revolution durch den Kredit appeared in Leipzig, and Ludwig Bamberger's translation Die Volksbank in Frankfurt-am-Main. Arnold Ruge's translations Bekenntnisse eines Revolutionars and Revolutionäre Ideen were published in Leipzig in 1850. Die sociale Revolution durch den Staatsstreich am 2. December erwiesen appeared in Bremen in 1852, followed by Ludwig Pfau's two-volume translation Die Gerechtigkeit in der Revolution und in der Kirche (Hamburg, 1858). Additional translations were made by Dr. Arthur Mülenberger at a later time as will be brought out in Chapter III.



The flow of ideas was not a one-way street. It has already been pointed out that there was an active battle going on in Paris between Grün and Engels for the minds of the German émigrés living there. To what extent these ideas influenced the native Parisians and émigrés from other countries is difficult to ascertain with any certitude. Nettlau relates that in Paris starting in the late fall of 1845 and continuing into 1846 a newspaper, Blätter der Zukunft, was published which contained unsigned articles which proclaimed anarchist ideas, especially the article "Deutschlands Menschentum," which related that "... in Germany there is being set in motion the movement of 'a real and genuine anarchy, that is to say, the downfall of the government, Germany desires to be ruled by all, not by a single ruler' hence no doctrine will prevail any longer. It will plead for completely free communism."<sup>84</sup> The term communism, of course, does not refer to the Marxian variety with which the word is usually associated. Nettlau points out that many of the unsigned articles in this newspaper bear the mark of the writing style and influence of Hess and Grün.<sup>85</sup> The extent of anarchist ideas in Germany in the 1840's, Proudhonian or otherwise, is difficult to assess with any degree of accuracy.

Strict press regulations made it difficult to disseminate anarchist ideas in periodicals or newspapers. The first German anarchist periodical was the Berliner Monatschrift (Mannheim, 1844); edited by L. Bühl. Only one 322-page volume of this journal appeared. It was to have appeared in Berlin in August, 1843, but the censor would not allow most of the articles to be passed. In the form in which they later appeared in Mannheim in 1844 they were not subject to the censor because the size of the one-volume edition of the journal put it in a book class.

The threat of anarchism in Germany in the 1840's must have existed at least in the minds of some people. Twelve numbers of a journal appeared during 1848-49 Wurst wieder Wurst: Organ gegen anarchistische Bestrebungen. A book by G.A. Fricke Woher kommt das anarchistische Treiben und wie ist ihm abzuhilfen (Leipzig, 1848) sought the remedy against anarchism. P.H. Noyes also points out that the Frankfurt Assembly wrestled with the idea of a threat of incipient anarchism.<sup>86</sup> At least some people in Germany in the 1840's were worried about anarchism. How many it is difficult to determine.

A considerable portion of the voluminous writings of Marx and Engels is concerned with refuting thinkers whose

thought was either anarchist or semi-anarchist in nature. The high point of this open warfare with the anarchists was reached in their battle with Bakunin which resulted in the break-up of the 1st International. The differences of opinion which Marx and Engels had with the anarchists and semi-anarchists have already been referred to above and need not be repeated here. Their quarrel with Max Stirner will be dealt with in the next chapter. A number of writers have argued that the writings of Marx, outspoken enemy of anarchism, contain in themselves the seeds of anarchism. They base their claim on the ultimate goal of Marxism; the withering away of the state, followed by the advent of the classless society.<sup>87</sup> Perhaps there is not much difference between the goals of anarchism and of Marxism, even though the routes to these ends differ, and perhaps the stated goal of anarchism was even appealing to Marx.

It has often been asserted that many of Marx's violent disputes came about as a result of an opponent arriving at an idea before Marx himself. If this be the case, and if the grapes of anarchism were sour, as Marx has pointed out, then logically the ultimate goal of his system, even though it may resemble anarchism, could not bear such an ignominious nomenclature. This is all very hypothetical and I would be the last to attach the term anarchism to Marx's thought, but perhaps Marx "doth protest too loudly." It should be kept in mind though that Marx considered himself to be in a life and death struggle for the minds of men and any and all opposition, regardless of its potential threat, had to be not only discredited but demolished entirely. It should also be pointed out that in the latter half of the 19th century, when the term anarchism was a muddle of confusion in the minds of most men (it still is today), Marx was often referred to as an anarchist. Michael Schaact in Anarchy and Anarchists (Chicago, 1889) in writing about the Haymarket affair attributes the development of "Propaganda by the Deed" anarchism to Marx. Such was the confusion which prevailed.

Marx's deep contempt for anarchism is revealed in a letter of November 5, 1880, written to F.A. Sorge in which he refers to them as "déclassés" and "duped workers."<sup>88</sup> In a letter of April 18, 1883, to P. von Patten, Engels elaborates the difference between the Marxist doctrine of the withering away of the state and the anarchist doctrine of the abolition of the state:

Marx and I, ever since 1845, have held the view that one of the final results of the future proletarian

revolution will be the gradual dissolution and ultimate disappearance of that political organization called the state; an organization the main object of which has ever been to secure, by armed force, the economical subjection of the working majority to the wealthy minority. With the disappearance of a wealthy minority the necessity for an armed repressive State-force disappears also. At the same time we have always held, that in order to arrive at this and the other, far more important ends of the social revolution of the future, the proletarian class will first have to possess itself of the organized political force of the State and with this aid stamp out the resistance of the Capitalist class and re-organize society. This is stated already in the Communist Manifesto of 1847, end of Chapter II.

The Anarchists reverse the matter. They say, that the Proletarian revolution has to begin by abolishing the political organization of the State. But after the victory of the Proletariat, the only organization the victorious working class finds ready-made for use is that of the State. It may require adaptation to the new functions. But to destroy that at such a moment, would be to destroy the only organism by means of which the victorious working class can exert its newly conquered power, keep down its capitalist enemies and carry out that economic revolution of society without which the whole victory must end in a defeat and in a massacre of the working class like that after the Paris Commune.<sup>89</sup>

During the decade of the 1960's scholars of Marxism have set out, with varying degrees of success, to demolish, or explain the idea that Marxism contains within it the seeds of anarchism. Adam B. Ulam contends

Marxism has something that is missing in anarchism. Anarchist feeling is too formless, too much divorced from the dynamic of economic development, to create objective conditions and organizations capable of absorbing the economic facts of life. The anti-authority premises of anarchism hardly allow it to form an efficient political movement to compete for power.<sup>90</sup>

This statement, even though it may be true, is nothing more than Ulam's own personal preference. It could be that Ulam's references to "economic development" and "political movement" reveal a less than complete understanding of anarchism.

Another author, whose success in dealing with the subject of anarchism in Marxism is not much more convincing than Ulam, is Shlomo Avineri, who believes that "For the anarchist the abolition of the state is a political act, decreed by law and carried out by force. For Marx, Aufhebung of the state is the ultimate outcome of a lengthy process of economic and social transformation, introduced and sustained by political power."<sup>91</sup> In the first sentence: it is pure nonsense to portray anarchists as decreeing the abolition of the state "by law." Anarchists do not write laws, they seek to get rid of them.

The best explanation of the anarchism found in Marxism is by Robert C. Tucker. According to Tucker "Marx's normative position with regard to the state was anarchism, which may be defined as the view that state power, being evil in essence, cannot possibly be legitimized."<sup>92</sup> Tucker points out that this would seem to be contradictory to Marx's attitude toward the proletarian dictatorship, but it is not because Marx "did not hold the proletarian political order to be a good or a just one; ... he considered it at best a necessary evil on the road to man's entry into a higher form of society which would be ... stateless."<sup>93</sup>

Marx's anarchism, relates Tucker, was grounded in the belief that the existence of the state is incompatible with the realization of freedom. But a

... problem emerges with the recognition that classical Marxism is committed to an anarchist position in its political philosophy. For if we consider anarchism not as an abstract political philosophy but as a revolutionary movement associated with a political philosophy, then we are confronted with the fact that Marxism was deeply at odds with it.<sup>94</sup>

The rivalry between Marxism and anarchism was, as Tucker quite correctly points out, seriously theoretical as well as a matter of personal differences. It is in the area of clarifying the theoretical differences that Tucker makes a great contribution.

"... Classical Marxism, while embracing anarchism as a political philosophy, disagreed with anarchism as a socialist ideology."<sup>95</sup> He goes on to demonstrate that the

... two doctrines were at odds over the issue of whether a state was needed for the purpose of abolishing the state. ... But a deeper theoretical cleavage underlay this significant strategic difference. Anarchism did more than to declare the state ... to be evil; it also singled out the state as the principal evil in society, the decisive cause and expression of human unfreedom. ... Classical Marxism rejected this view. It saw man's unfreedom in the state as something secondary to, and derivative from, his unfreedom in the polity of production. The decisive cause and principal form of human bondage, and thus the supreme evil in history, was not subjection to the state, but the imprisonment of man within the division of labor in production. The supreme end ... was the "economic emancipation of labor." ... The emancipation of man from the state would follow as a matter of course.<sup>96</sup>

Tucker concludes

The special anarchism of Marx and Engels must thus be seen as an anarchism directed primarily against authoritarianism in the society of production and only secondarily against authoritarianism as exemplified in the state. The tyranny from which it aimed to deliver man chiefly was that which he endured as a subject of the sovereign state of capital—the "despotism of capital."<sup>97</sup>

This explanation by Tucker adds an entirely new dimension to the anarchism found in Marxism by moving into the economic realm.

Conclusions.

Even though anarchist beginnings in Germany in the 1840's were not followed up by an anarchist movement, they left a lasting influence on the development of Western philosophical thought. During the decade of the 1840's Karl Marx was finding himself, opposing or humiliating everyone with whom he did not

agree. A large portion of Marx's writing of this period was concerned with replies to books or articles written by anarchists or semi-anarchists. Many of his attacks were on fellow Germans who were of anarchist leanings. If nothing else they forced Marx to sharpen his thinking and perhaps jell his thought process at a time when he did not want to. The influence of the individuals discussed in this chapter and of Stirner (in the next chapter) on the development of Marx is probably the most important contribution of these thinkers. It is difficult to speculate how Marx might have developed had there been no Grün, Heinzen, Stirner or Proudhon to attack.

A discussion of if and how the thinkers mentioned in this chapter contributed to the 1848-49 revolution in Germany would comprise conjecture alone. Such a contribution would be difficult to substantiate with facts. The 1848-49 uprising held a special place in the hearts of later German anarchists, as did the Paris Commune. Anniversaries of these events were duly celebrated each year. Anarchist newspapers often devoted the entire front page to stories concerning 1848-49.

Anarchism had a certain attraction for the German radicals of the 1840's; however, even agreeing with the philosophical ideals of anarchism, they saw the impracticality and improbability of success of such a system. The problem of the liberty of the individual in Germany was undoubtedly one which many of them considered to be beyond solution, a point was brought home to them in the failure of the 1848-49 revolution. Finding their homeland to be inhospitable, many of them spent the greater share of their adult lives in foreign countries; in many cases dying abroad.

The anarchism which held an attraction for the German radical thinkers in the 1840's never took hold of the soul of the people. The number of people professing anarchism in Germany at that time is impossible to determine, but it was not large.

#### Notes

1. Max Stirner, not discussed in this chapter, is the focus of Chapter II.

2. James Joll, The Anarchists (London, 1964), pp. 21-27; George Woodcock, Anarchism (Cleveland, 1962), pp. 40-43. See

also; Norman Cohn, Pursuit of the Millennium (London, 1957), p. 267. For anarchist thought on the subject see: "Die zweite deutsche Bauernrevolution," Der freie Arbeiter (Berlin), No. 6, XXI (February 11, 1928); "1848-1928," Ibid., No. 11, XXI (March 17, 1928); "vierzig Jahre Maifeier," Ibid., No. 17, XXII (April 27, 1929).

3. For example see: "Wer war Lessing?" Der freie Arbeiter (Berlin), No. 8, XXII (February 23, 1929); "Heinrich Heine," Litterarische Beilage zum "Sozialist" (Berlin), No. 6, III (February 6, 1897), 23-24; No. 7, III (February 13, 1897), 27-28; No. 8, III (February 20, 1897), 30-31. Der arme Konrad (Berlin), No. 6, IV (February 11, 1899), 23 contains an article on Goethe; and Gustav Landauer points out in "Börne und der Anarchismus," Sozialistische Monatshefte (1899), 353, that Schiller was not an anarchist. On this point see: A. Martin, Weitere Aufsätze. Mit einem Anhang: Schiller und der Anarchismus, oder Ausruf aus Schillers "Über die ästhetische Erziehung der Menschen. In einer Reihe von Briefen." (Dresden, 1907).

4. For a more complete treatment of this idea see: E. Weller, Die Freiheitsbestrebungen der deutschen im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert, in Zeugnissen ihrer Literatur (Leipzig, 1847).

5. Max Nettelbladt, "Bibliographie der Anarchie in deutscher Sprache," Jahrbuch der freien Generation für 1911. Volkskalender und Dokumente der Weltanschauung des Sozialismus-Anarchismus, Neue Folge, II (Paris, 1911), 119. For a further discussion of the relationship of von Humboldt's views to anarchism see: Karl Diehl, Über Sozialismus, Kommunismus, und Anarchismus (Jena, 1911), pp. 53-54.

6. Klaus Epstein, The Genesis of German Conservatism (Princeton, 1966) pp. 84-111, in which he traces for the period 1770-1806 the "Illuminati" organization founded in 1776 by Adam Weishaupt (1744-1830).

7. Amédée Hennequin, Le Communisme et la Jeune-Allemagne en Suisse (Paris, 1850), p. I.

8. Gustav Landauer, "Börne und der Anarchismus," Sozialistische Monatshefte (Berlin, 1899), 353-355.

9. Quoted by Landauer in Ibid., pp. 353-354. See the article "Die freie Generation," in Die freie Generation. Dokumente der Weltanschauung des Anarchismus, No. 1, I (July, 1906), 1-3 in which Börne's writings are used as a point of departure to explain the necessity of anarchism.

10. Some examples of anarchist opinion of Wagner are to be found in: Die freie Generation. Dokumente der Weltanschauung des Anarchismus (Berlin), I (October, 1906), 97-99; Literarische Beilage zum "Sozialist" (Berlin), No. 8, I (October 5, 1895), 30-32; and No. 11, (October 26, 1895), 44; Der Sozialist (Berlin), No. 16, IV (August, 1912), 125-127; Freie Literatur. Monatsbeilage zur Wochenschrift "Der freie Arbeiter" (Berlin), I (October, 1905); II (November, 1906).

11. On Wagner's activities in the revolution see: Ernest Newman, The Life of Richard Wagner (New York, 1938), I, pp. 54-103; Richard Wagner, My Life (New York, 1911); Hugo Dinger, Richard Wagners geistliche Entwicklung (Berlin, 1902); Georg Germann Müller, Richard Wagner in der Mai-Revolution 1849 (Berlin, 1919); Woldemar Lippert, Richard Wagners Verbannung und Rückkehr, 1849-62 (Berlin, 1927); Wilhelm Altmann (ed.), Letters of Richard Wagner, 2 Vols., (London, 1927); Priscilla Robertson, Revolutions of 1848. A Social History (New York, 1960), pp. 181-185.

12. The article was against articles 110 and 130 of the German penal code. In the following issue of Der freie Arbeiter for May 1, 1911, there is a short article which related that very few copies of the paper fell into government hands. Germany was referred to in this issue as a "house-searching state." This issue was also confiscated but not for this short article. The article which offended the government was the lead article. The issue of May 27, 1911, carries an article by Paul Luceny telling how the police searched his house in Gladbeck looking for the issues for May 6 and May 13.

13. Nettlau, Der Vorfrühling der Anarchie, p. 165.

14. Der freie Arbeiter (May 6, 1913).

15. Gesammelte Schriften und Dichtungen (Leipzig, 1907), XII, pp. 80-81.



16. pp. 216-218.
17. Gesammelte Schriften (Leipzig, 1883), X, pp. 383-384.
18. Hans Kohn, The Mind of Germany (New York, 1960), p. 199.
19. Quoted in Hans Kohn, Ibid., p. 191.
20. George Schumm, "Karl Heinzen und Anarchism," Liberty (Boston), August 1, 1891, p. 2. Schumm, the son of immigrant German parents, was bilingual and used this ability to propagate the writings of John H. Mackay, the German individualist anarchist, in the United States, and to translate the writings of the American individualist anarchist Benjamin Tucker (1854-1939) into German. Schumm, himself, was an individualist anarchist and a close associate of both Tucker and Mackay.
21. Litterarische Beilage zum "Sozialist," No. 10, (Robert Reitzel-Number, 1898), 40. Robert Reitzel was editor of the anarchist paper Arme Teufel published in Detroit.
22. A.E. Zucker, The Forty Eighters. Political Refugees of the German Revolutions of 1848 (New York, 1950), p. 170.
23. Ibid., pp. 170-171; Carl Wittke, Against the Current. The Life of Karl Heinzen, 1809-1880 (Chicago, 1945), pp. 1-88.
24. A.E. Zucker, The Forty Eighters, p. 171. Heinzen was violently outspoken in his hatred of communism. For the reaction of Engels and Marx see: Friedrich Engels and Karl Marx, Werke, Vol. 4 (Berlin-East, 1959), which contains the following two articles: F. Engels, "Die Kommunisten und Karl Heinzen," pp. 309-324. This article originally appeared in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung, No. 79 (October 3, 1847), No. 80 (October 7, 1847). Karl Marx, "Die moralisierende Kritik und die kritisierende Moral. Beitrag zur deutschen Kulturgeschichte gegen Karl Heinzen," pp. 331-359. This article originally appeared in the Deutscher-Brüsseler-Zeitung, No. 86 (October 28, 1847), No. 90 (November 11, 1847), No. 92 (November 18, 1847), No. 94 (November 25, 1847). Earlier when Marx was editor-in-chief of the Rheinische Zeitung he appointed Heinzen as his assistant. He has such confidence in him that when the paper came under fire from the government he devised a plan whereby

he (Marx) would accept full responsibility for the articles which had caused the government to suppress the paper. Heinzen would become the new editor-in-chief of the paper; thus saving the paper, because Marx assumed that the government would be satisfied with a change of editors. Marx at this time also offered to write an article about himself which Heinzen would publish. Heinzen was not satisfied with this idea, but he mentioned that Karl Grün, correspondent for the Mannheimer Abendzeitung, might do it. Before a week had elapsed Grün's article appeared in the Mannheimer Abendzeitung containing almost word for word all that Marx had wanted Heinzen to write. Marx was presented to the public as a hero in regard to the suppression of the Rheinische Zeitung and many flattering things were said of him referring to the "rare manysidedness of his talent," his "sharp, incisive mind," his "truly amazing dialectic," his "perfect diplomatic manner." Carl Heinzen, Erlebtes (Berlin, 1864); Marx-Engels, Gesamt-Ausgabe, Erste Abteilung, Band I, halb-Band 2, p. 152.

See also: Franz Mehring, Karl Marx (Ann Arbor, 1962), pp. 133-134; Herwig Förder, Marx und Engels am Vorabend der Revolution (Berlin-East, 1960), pp. 217-238 in which the dispute between Heinzen and Marx and Engels is discussed in detail; and Hans Huber, Karl Heinzen; seine politische Entwicklung und publizistische Wirksamkeit (Bern und Leipzig, 1932).

25. A.E. Zucker, The Forty Eighters. p. 172.

26. Ibid., In a speech written in 1860, entitled "The Germans and the Americans," Heinzen tells how he longed to return to Germany. He was disappointed that the revolution had failed in Germany and expressed doubts that another revolution would occur in the immediate future which would bring freedom to the German people. Labadie Collection, Vertical File, "Karl Heinzen," University of Michigan Library (Ann Arbor, Michigan). The Labadie Collection has both the first and second handwritten drafts of this speech which is 25 very large pages long.

27. Carl Wittke, Against the Current, pp. 247-248.

28. George Schumm, "Karl Heinzen and Anarchism," Liberty (Boston), August 1, 1891. p. 2. Eunice M. Schuster, Native American Anarchism (Smith College Studies in History, Vol. XVII), pp. 124-125., refers to Heinzen as one "whose enthusiasm for reform brought him to a kind of anarchism." After the state decapitated August Reinsdorf for his part in the Niederwald dynamite plot, which will be discussed in detail in a later

chapter, Johnn Most, a very good friend of Reinsdorf, printed an article Heinzen had written 30 years before entitled "Mord contra Mord," Freiheit, March 14, 1885, p. 3, in which he discusses the idea that the use of capital punishment by the state is nothing more than legalized murder. Oddly enough, although Most could have found other writers who expounded the idea that the state did not have the right to take the life of a man because legalized retributive murder by the state does not cancel out a murder committed by an individual, he credits Heinzen for having established this principle. This would indirectly imply that Most considered Heinzen a fellow anarchist, of a sort.

Most printed this article again in the September 7, 1901, issue of Freiheit, which ironically appeared a day after the assassination of President William McKinley. The Heinzen article concluded with the ringing call to action "Murder the murderers! Through blood and iron, poison and dynamite set humanity free!" As a result of the article, on October 2, 1901, Most was sentenced to one year in prison. For additional information on this subject see: J. Langhard, Die anarchistische Bewegung in der Schweiz von ihren Anfänge bis zur Gegenwart (2nd edition, Bern, 1909), pp. 208-213; and Rudolf Rocker, Johann Most (Berlin, 1925), pp. 400-414.

29. Waltraud Seidel-Höppner, Wilhelm Weitling: der erste deutsche Theoretiker und Agitator des Kommunismus (Berlin-East, 1961).

30. E.H. Carr, Michael Bakunin (New York, Vintage edition, 1961), relates that Weitling was "the most important figure who crossed Bakunin's path during his sojourn in Switzerland ..." Weitling's Garantien der Harmonie und Freiheit (1842) left an impression on Bakunin which was "vivid and lasting." p. 127.

31. Martin E. Malia, Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism, 1812-1855 (Cambridge, Mass., 1961) relates that "... the combined influence of Fourier, Weitling, Proudhon, and Bakunin did much to suggest to Herzen the idea of the anarchist federation of communes." p. 363.

32. "Wilhelm Weitling und seine Zeit," Der freie Arbeiter (Berlin), XXVI, No. 2 (January 14, 1933); No. 3 (January 21, 1933).

33. p. 23.

34. F. Caillé, Wilhelm Weitling theorie du communisme (Paris, 1905). This work contains a great deal of interesting information, but is marred by numerous errors which are probably typographical.

35. W. Weitling, Die Menschheit wie sie ist und wie sie sein sollte, p. 43. Wilhelm Marr described Weitling as "a fanatic; ... his enthusiasm for the cause has almost the character of a religious mania." Das junge Deutschland in der Schweiz (Leipzig, 1846), p. 45.

36. Weitling, Garantien, p. 11.

37. Weitling witnessed the first uprising instigated and led by Blanqui, the so called Conspiracy of the Seasons, which occurred on May 12, 1839, when several hundred of Blanqui's followers took over the arsenals in the Paris suburbs of Saint-Denis and Saint-Martin and threw up barricades. It was a short-lived uprising put down that same evening; Weitling, Garantien, p. 14.

On Weitling's activities in Switzerland see: Franz Mehring, Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie (Berlin-East, 1960), I, pp. 206-220; Carl Wittke, The Utopian Communist. A Biography of Wilhelm Weitling (Baton Rouge, La., 1950); Max Beer, Social Struggles and Modern Socialism (London, 1925), pp. 28-37; Wilhelm Marr, Das junge Deutschland in der Schweiz (Leipzig, 1846); Georg Adler, Geschichte der ersten sozial politischen Arbeiter Bewegung in Deutschland (Breslau, 1885), pp. 32-47; J. Langhard, Die anarchistische Bewegung in der Schweiz von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart und die internationalen Führer (2nd edition, Bern, 1909); Amédée Hennequin, Le communisme et la jeune-Allemagne en Suisse (Paris, 1850); Les communistes en Suisse d'après les papiers trouves chez Weitling (Lausanne, 1843); Friedrich Engels, "Progress of Social Reform on the Continent," No. II "Germany and Switzerland," The New Moral World, V, No. 21 (November 18, 1843), 161-162; Robert Grimm, Geschichte der sozialistischen Ideen in der Schweiz (Zurich, 1931); Otto Brugger, Die Werksamkeit Weitlings (Bern, 1932); Otto Brugger, Geschichte der deutschen Handwerkervereine in der Schweiz (Bern, 1932).

38. For the reasons why Weitling's intellectual leadership was rejected see: Max Nettlau, "Londoner deutsche kommunistische Diskussionen, 1845," Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung, X (1922), 362-391. Both Marx

and Engels were highly impressed with Weitling's Garantien when it was published. On the dispute with Marx see: Georg Stiekloff, Marx und die Anarchisten (Dresden, 1913), pp. 12-14; Carl Wittke, The Utopian Communist, pp. 105-123; Franz Mehring, Karl Marx (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1962), pp. 84-85, 116-121; Max Adler, Wegweiser: Studien zur Geistesgeschichte des Sozialismus (Stuttgart, 1914), pp. 173-199; Gustav Mayer, Friedrich Engels: Eine Biographie (Haag, 1934), I, pp. 116-117; Edmund Silberner (ed.), Moses Hess Briefwechsel (S'Gravenhage, 1959), p. 151.

39. George Woodcock, Anarchism (Cleveland and New York, 1962), pp. 152-153, 428-429.

40. On the life of Hess see; Edmund Silberner, Moses Hess Geschichte seines Lebens (Leiden, 1966); Theodore Zlociste, Moses Hess jüdische Schriften (Berlin, 1905); Theodore Zlociste, Moses Hess, der Vorkämpfer des Sozialismus und Zionismus (Berlin, 1922). Three recent editions of his collected writings and letters are available: Horst Lademacher (ed.), Ausgewählte Schriften (Köln, 1962); August Cornu and Wolfgang Mönke (eds.), Philosophische und sozialistische Schriften, 1837-1850 (Berlin-East, 1961), Edmund Silberner (ed.), Moses Hess Briefwechsel (S'Gravenhage, 1959).

41. From Hegel to Marx (New York, 1958), p. 187.

42. (Zürich and Winterthur), pp. 74-91, 309-331. They are reprinted in A. Cornu and W. Mönke (eds.), Philosophische und sozialistische Schriften 1837-1850, pp. 197-209, 210-226. See also the editors' introduction on pp. XVI-XXIII. "Philosophie der Tat," was reprinted in the supplement to the anarchist paper Beiblatt: "Der freie Arbeiter," VIII, No. 10, (March 11, 1911) and No. 12, (March 24, 1912).

43. Max Nettlau, Der Vorfrühling der Anarchie (Berlin, 1925), pp. 157-160.

44. Cornu and Mönke, Philosophische und sozialistische Schriften 1837-1850, pp. 213-226.

45. See: "Über die sozialistische Bewegung in Deutschland," Neue Anekdoten (Darmstadt, 1845), pp. 188-227. Printed in Cornu and Mönke pp. 284-307. See also his article "Über das Geldwesen," Ibid., pp. 329-348, which was written in 1845.

46. Die letzten Philosophie is printed in Cornu and Mönke pp. 381-393. For Stirner's reply see: John H. Mackay (ed.), Stirner's kleinere Schriften 2nd edition (Treptow-bei Berlin, 1914), pp. 387-396. Sidney Hook, From Hegel to Marx, p. 186, relates that part of the manuscript of Die deutsche Ideologie, was in Hess' handwriting.

47. On the split with Marx see: Ibid., pp. 186-219; Förder, Marx und Engels am Vorabend der Revolution, pp. 238-241; and also Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, The Communist Manifesto.

48. Woodcock, Anarchism, pp. 429-430.

49. Grün also used the pseudonym Ernst von der Haide. There is a difference of opinion over his date of birth, which Max Nettlau gives as 1813 in Der Vorfrühling der Anarchie, p. 161. Hannes Skambraks, editor of Zwischen 18 und 25 Jugendbriefe von Friedrich Engels (Berlin-East, 1965), p. 281 gives the date as 1817, as do the editors of Marx-Engels Werke (Berlin-East, 1962), Vol. III, p. 586.

I have accepted the 1813 date on the basis of a letter written by Engels on November 20, 1839, in which he says that Grün was at the time "already 27 years old." Zwischen 18 und 25, p. 133. For more information on the pseudonym see: Werke, IV, p. 476.

50. Letter of November 20, 1839, to Wilhelm Graeber, see also the letter of April 8, 1839, to Friedrich Graeber. Zwischen 18 und 25, pp. 72-133.

51. Förder, Marx und Engels am Vorabend der Revolution, pp. 116-117.

52. Zwischen 18 und 25, p. 234.

53. Der Vorfrühling der Anarchie, p. 161.

54. Woodcock, Anarchism, p. 429.

55. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, Selected Correspondence (Moscow, 1953), pp. 32-33.

56. J. Hampden Jackson, Marx, Proudhon and European Socialism (London, 1957), p. 61. On the relationship between

Marx and Proudhon see: Pierre Hauptmann, Marx et Proudhon, leurs rapports personnels 1844-1847 (Paris, 1947); Henri de Luboc, The Un-Marxian Socialist (New York, 1948), pp. 129-139; Hewig Förder, Marx und Engels am Vorabend der Revolution, pp. 135-141; George Woodcock, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (New York, 1956), pp. 44-49, 86-93, 100-103, in which Woodcock points out Marx's early admiration of Proudhon and the basis for his later attack. A succinct appraisal of Marx's position and opinion of Proudhon is available in a letter of January 24, 1856, which Marx wrote to J.B. Schweitzer. It is printed in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, Selected Correspondence, pp. 181-192. For Engel's opinion see his letter of September 18, 1846, to Marx which is available in Der Briefwechsel zwischen Friedrich Engles und Karl Marx 1844 bis 1883 (Stuttgart, 1921), I, pp. 35-39.

57. Letter of May 17, 1846, Correspondance de P.J. Proudhon (Paris, 1875), II, pp. 198-199.

58. Ibid., pp. 200-201.

59. Ibid., p. 202, the book Systeme des contradictions economiques, ou philosophie de la misere was published in October, 1846, and immediately translated into German by Grün. At a conference held in Brussels to commemorate the 100th anniversary of Proudhon's death, Georges Gurvitch, the leading French Proudhonian scholar, presented an important paper entitled, "Proudhon et Marx." His conclusions are that Marx's The Poverty of Philosophy was directed more against Hegel than Proudhon, and that the antipathy between Marx and Proudhon was the result of purely personal feelings more than it was the result of ideas. L'actualite de Proudhon: colloque des 24 et 25 Novembre (Brussels, 1967).

60. Marx-Engels, Werke, III, pp. 473-520. The sections of this work on Feuerbach and Grün have been translated with the title The German Ideology (1947).

61. Ibid., IV, pp. 37-39. See also in the same volume pp. 222-247 for Marx's attack on Grün's Über Goethe von menschlichen Standpunkte (Darmstadt, 1846).

62. Der Briefwechsel zwischen Friedrich Engels und Karl Marx 1844-1883, I, pp. 37-38.

63. Ibid., pp. 40-45.

64. Franz Mehring, Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie (Berlin-East, 1960), I, p. 217.

65. J. Langhard, Die anarchistische Bewegung in der Schweiz, pp. 1-2. On his banishment see: Die geheim deutschen Verbindungen in der Schweiz seit 1833. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des modernen Radikalismus und Kommunismus (Basel, 1847), p. 99.

66. Die geheim deutscher Verbindung in der Schweiz seit 1833. pp. 58-60.

67. Rapport general adresse au conseil d'etat de Neuchatel sur la propaganda secrete allemande et sur les clubs de la Jeune-Allemagne en Suisse (Neuchatel, 1845), p. 27.

68. Marr was selective in the documents he published. On this point see: Amédée Henneguïn, Le communisme et la Jeune-Allemagne en Suisse (Paris, 1850).

69. Republished in part in Beiblatt "Der freie Arbeiter" (Berlin), VIII, No. 1 (January 7, 1911); and No. 2 (January 14, 1911).

70. Anarchie oder Autorität, p. 128.

71. Ibid., p. 129

72. Ibid., pp. 129-130.

73. Ibid., p. 132.

74. Nettlau, Der Vorfrühling der Anarchie, pp. 166-167. Schurz's activities in the United States are discussed in detail in A.F. Zucker, The Forty-Eighters: Political Refugees of the German Revolution of 1848 (New York, 1950), pp. 220-250.

75. Reprinted in Beiblatt "Der freie Arbeiter" (Berlin), VIII, No. 1 (January 7, 1911). An overview of Edgar Bauer's activities is to be found in Gustav Mayer, "Die Anfänge des politischen Radikalismus im vormärzlichen Preussen," Zeitschrift für Politik, VI (1913): 1-113. On p. 47 Mayer remarks that at one time Edgar Bauer was an anarchist. His activities in the "Freien" (discussed in Chapter II in relation to Stirner)



are brought out. Mayer prints the official program of the "Freien" on pp. 111-113.

76. On his trial see: Pressprocess Edgar Bauers (Bern, 1845); and "Die Reise auf öffentliche Kosten," Die Epigonen (Leipzig), V (1847), pp. 9-112.

77. Quoted by Nettlau in Der Vorfrühling der Anarchie, p. 164.

78. "Eine Rede Karl Vogts aus dem Jahre 1848," was reprinted in Beiblatt "Der freie Arbeiter" (Berlin), VIII, No. 11 (March 18, 1911).

79. Deutsche Monatsschrift (Stuttgart, 1850), 129-131.

80. For Vogt's side of the argument see: Karl Vogt, Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung (Geneva, 1859); for Marx's rejoinder see: Karl Marx, Herr Vogt (London, 1860).

81. Number 5 (April, 1844), 37-52.

82. Number 4 (October, 1844), 14-64; Number 5 (November, 1844), 1-24.

83. Nettlau, Der Vorfrühling der Anarchie, p. 164.

84. pp. 58-64.

85. Der Vorfrühling der Anarchie, p. 162.

86. Organization and Revolution: Working-Class Associations in the German Revolutions of 1848-1849 (Princeton, 1966).

87. On the relationship of Marxism to anarchism see: Solomon F. Bloom, "The 'Withering Away' of the State," Journal of the History of Ideas, VII (1946), 113-121; Max Adler, Die Staatsauffassung des Marxismus: Ein Beiträge zur Unterscheidung von soziologischer und juristischer Methode (Darmstadt, 1964), reprint of 1922 edition pp. 217-281; Luigi Fabbri, "Die historischen und sachlichen Zusammenhänge zwischen Marxismus und Anarchismus," Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik, XXVI (Tübingen, 1908), 559-605; Hans Kelsen, "Sozialismus und Staat," Archiv für den Geschichte des Sozialismus, IX (1920), 19-57; B. de ligt, Anarchismus und Revolution (Berlin, 1922),

pp. 16-19; Karl Marx, Critique of the Gotha Program (New York, 1938), pp. 12-13. See also in Ibid., appendix I, pp. 27-34 which contains a letter of March 18-28, 1875, from Engels to August Bebel, and pp. 34-35 for Marx's letter of May 5, 1875, to Wilhelm Bracke. Appendix II, pp. 47-65, contains Lenin's remarks on the Gotha Program. Appendix III, pp. 67-88, contains selections from Lenin's The State und Revolution; Georg Stiekloff, Marx und die Anarchisten (Dresden, 1913), pp. 66-69; Jean Maitron, Histoire du mouvement anarchiste en France (1880-1914) (Paris, 1955), pp. 494-514.

88. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, Selected Correspondence, p. 403.

89. Ibid., pp. 43ff. The recent student revolts in Germany have once again raised the question of the anarchism to be found in Marx's writings. Bernd Rabehl, a member of the executive committee of the Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund, concludes that the relation of Marx to anarchism is obvious. Der Spiegel, XXII, No. 18 (April 29, 1968), 86. Rabehl concludes that "The scientific and anarchistic components of Marxism are once again completely cognizant for the first time since Lenin's The State and Revolution of 1917." To Rabehl this is being done by the SDS. Another attempt to explain the anarchism in Marxism is: Richard Adamiak, "The 'Withering Away' of the state: A Reconsideration," The Journal of Politics (February, 1970), 3-18. Unfortunately, Adamiak does not carry his analysis through to the economic aspects of Marxian thought.

90. The unfinished Revolution (New York, 1960), p. 130.

91. The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 208-209. See also: pp. 238-239.

92. The Marxian Revolutionary Idea (New York, 1969), p. 85.

93. Ibid., p. 86.

94. Ibid., p. 87.

95. Ibid., p. 88.

96. Ibid., pp. 88-89.

97. Ibid., p. 90.



## Chapter II

### MAX STIRNER (1806-1856)

Max Stirner, nom de plume for Johann Caspar Schmidt, came into this world at six o'clock on the morning of October 25, 1806. He was born in a house at number 31, Maximiliansstrasse (Marketplatz) which was the principal street of the city of Bayreuth.<sup>1</sup> He was less than half a year old when his father, a maker of wind instruments, died of tuberculosis on April 19, 1807, at the age of 37. His mother, two years later, married Heinrich Ballerstedt, a 57-year-old pharmacist from Helmstedt, and they all moved to Kulm on the Vistula. Johann returned to his native town of Bayreuth in 1818 for his education, living with his godfather, and uncle, Johann Caspar Martin Sticht after whom he was named. He remained there for the next eight years, completing his studies in the gymnasium where he distinguished himself by always placing in the upper percentile of his class.<sup>2</sup>

In 1826 he left Bayreuth to study at the University of Berlin where he remained for the next two years. In Berlin he met a fellow student, Ludwig Feuerbach, who was destined to be one of his future rivals. At the University of Berlin Stirner studied logic under Heinrich Ritter, geography under Carl Ritter, "Pindar und Metrik" under Bockh, and the philosophy of religion under Hegel.

Leaving Berlin on September 1, 1828, he went to Erlangen where he matriculated in the university on October 20th, but only enrolled in two courses; one given by the theologian Georg Benedict Wiener on the Book of Corinthians, the other in logic and metaphysics by Christian Kopp, the philosopher. Stirner then "dropped out" of school for three and a half years wandering around Germany. During this period Stirner at one time matriculated at the University of Königsberg but did not attend a single lecture because he was called to Kulm to care for his mother who had lapsed into insanity.

In October of 1832 Stirner returned to Berlin to complete his studies. On June 2, 1834, he asked permission to appear before the Royal Examination Commission for the examination

pro facultate docendi in the five areas in which he had prepared himself: ancient languages, German language, history, philosophy, and religion. The examiners found that he had two deficiencies. He was lacking in a precise knowledge of the Bible, and did not possess the basic qualities of logic necessary in history, philosophy and philology. Because of this he was granted only a limited facultas docendi which qualified him to teach in the Prussian gymnasia. It should be brought out, in all fairness to Stirner, that his examinations were delayed by the visit of his insane mother to Berlin. Whether or not this visit had an affect on the outcome of his examinations is doubtful because a person of the type of unorthodox character which Stirner exemplifies in his writing, would probably be found lacking in exactly the qualities which the examination board found him deficient.

During 1834-35 Stirner served as an unpaid training teacher in the Berlin Königliche Realschule. Following this internship he tried unsuccessfully until 1837 to obtain a salaried teaching position from the Prussian government. Lack of employment did not stop him from marrying his landlady's daughter, Agnes Clara Kunigunde Burtz, on December 12, 1837. This marriage ended the following year when his 22-year-old wife died in childbirth on August 29th along with the child.

Once again it was Stirner's lot to be called upon to take care of his insane mother, a task which occupied his time until 1839, when he found a teaching position in Berlin at Madame Gropius' school for girls. He remained there performing his duties satisfactorily until 1844.<sup>3</sup>

During the five-year period he taught at Madame Gropius' school Stirner frequented Hippel's Weinstube at 94 Friedrichstrasse where the Young Hegelians gathered to refute the teachings of their master. They referred to themselves as Die Freien —the Free Ones. The leaders of Die Freien were the brothers Bauer, Bruno and Edgar. Marx, Engels and the poets Herwegh and Hoffmann von Fallersleben were occasional visitors. Ludwig Feuerbach, Wilhelm Jordon, C. F. Köppen, Dr. Arthur Müller, Moses Hess, Ludwig Bühl, Adolf Rutenberg, Eduard Meyen, and Julius Faucher also frequented Hippel's. Arnold Ruge, self-appointed high priest of these Hegelians, carried on nightly debates which were often very bitter.<sup>4</sup> A sketch by Engels<sup>5</sup> of one of these nightly disputations has survived. On the sidelines of the debate sits a lonely figure. high-browed, bespectacled, smoking a cigarette, this is Stirner. Woodcock, on the basis of

this sketch, concludes that Stirner played the role of the silent, detached listener in Die Freien, on good terms with all and a friend of none.<sup>6</sup> It is doubtful if Woodcock's conclusion would hold true. Engels at the same time also commemorated Stirner in poetry, writing:

Look at Stirner, look at him, the peaceful enemy of  
all constraint.  
For the moment, he is still drinking beer, soon he  
will be drinking blood as though it were water.  
When others cry savagely "down with the kings"  
Stirner immediately supplements "down with the  
laws also."  
Stirner full of dignity proclaims; you bend your will  
power and you dare to call yourselves free.  
You become accustomed to slavery  
Down with dogmatism, down with law.<sup>7</sup>

At Hippel's Weinstube Stirner met his second wife, Marie Dähnhardt; a pretty, brilliant and emancipated free spirit, whom he married in 1843. The wedding ceremony, if you want to call it one, took place October 21 in Stirner's apartment. The pastor, a Reverend Marot, arrived to find the bridegroom and the witnesses, Bruno Bauer and Ludwig Bühl, in their shirtsleeves, playing cards. The bride arrived late, dressed in her everyday street clothes. A Bible was not available so the neighborhood had to be scoured to locate one. Since no one had remembered to buy wedding rings, the ceremony was completed with the copper rings from Bruno Bauer's purse. Stirner continued to teach at Madame Gropius' until October 18, 1844, although he could have quit after his marriage because his wife, when she arrived in Berlin from Gadebusch, was an heiress to some 20-30,000 thalers. Marie was a petite, graceful blonde with heavy hair which surrounded her head in ringlets according to the fashion of the time. She was a striking beauty and became a favorite at meetings of Die Freien. She smoked cigars and sometimes donned male attire in order to accompany her husband and his friends on their nightly excursions.

It is not known if Stirner was forced to leave his position at Madame Gropius' school or if he left voluntarily, thinking that his forthcoming book, Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum (1844), would win him literary fame and fortune. His book won for him abuse from his contemporaries whom he had attacked, but very little fortune. In 1845 Stirner went into the dairy

business, using the remainder of his wife's inheritance as capital. This enterprise failed quickly because of a lack of business experience. Stirner had seen to it that he had a large supply of milk coming in from the dairy farmers, but he had failed to solicit a list of customers to buy it. Stirner's milk business was a never-ending source of amusement among his circle of friends, but it embittered Marie against him for squandering her inheritance.

In 1847 his wife, in disgust and anger, left him and went to London. When Mackay attempted to interview her in 1897 she replied tartly that she was not willing to revive her past but added that her husband had been too much of an egoist to keep friends and that he was "very sly." Marx, in a letter of July 13, 1852, related to Engels that "Madame Schmidt-Stirner" had left for Australia in search of gold.<sup>8</sup> In Australia she married a laborer and took in washing to earn a living. Eventually she went back to London where she used the name May Smith and became a devout Roman Catholic refusing to discuss her earlier life, even with Mackay.

Deserted by his wife, Stirner gradually sank into poverty and obscurity, living in a series of poor lodgings, earning some kind of miserable living, often in debt. During the years 1845-1847 Stirner had worked on a series of translations of J. B. Say and Adam Smith which proved to be an arduous but unremunerative endeavor. He spent much of his time evading his numerous creditors but was twice imprisoned for debt, from March 5 to 26, 1853, and January 1 to February 4, 1854, and often went hungry. Stirner could bear hunger for he was a man of moderation in his eating and drinking habits and had always lived frugally. In 1852 he published his Geschichte der Reaction in Berlin. It was not greatly successful and earned him little money. It was too pedestrian in style to arouse much interest.

The end came for Stirner on June 25, 1856, at the age of 49 years and eight months, dying from the bite of a "poisonous fly." A number of his former friends hearing of his impoverished condition collected enough money to purchase a second class grave for him. It cost one thaler and ten groats, equivalent to one American dollar at the time. Among those present at his burial were Bruno Bauer and Ludwig Bühl, who had been the witnesses at his marriage to Marie Dähnhardt.

## Early Writings.

Many people are not aware that Stirner wrote a large number of articles before he wrote Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum. They view Stirner's book as a bolt out of the blue. Nothing could be further from the truth.<sup>9</sup> It is possible, by reading through these early articles, to trace the development of Stirner's thought to the point where it is expressed in Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum.<sup>10</sup> It is not possible in this study to include a detailed examination of everything Stirner wrote prior to the appearance of his book.<sup>11</sup> In his early writings Stirner examined Hegelian principles and rejected them. His ideas on religion, education, and the political and social structure of society are to be seen in their incipient stage. Stirner's book, when viewed from the perspective of his earlier writings, is the logical outcome of a carefully thought out course he was following, and not the instantaneous aberration of a brilliant, misguided, erratic mind as is often inferred. Stirner examines, very carefully, both acceptable contemporary solutions and contemporary proposals on the problems in which he is interested before rejecting their solution as unsatisfactory. This is what is accomplished in his early writings. Once having discovered what he thinks to be the faults of society he set out in Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum to outline what he thinks is acceptable solution. The format for Stirner's assault on religion, the state and society is present in the early writings. Stirner arrived at the conclusion that everything should be determined by one guiding principle: egoism.

Der Einzige und Sein Eigenthum.

The Ego and His Own, as the English translation of Stirner's book is called, was not an immediate success when it was published in 1844.<sup>12</sup> It was re-issued around the turn of the century when the philosophy of Nietzsche was popular. Today Stirner's book is once again enjoying some popularity among the student anarchists.<sup>13</sup> Der Einzige has been analyzed many times.<sup>14</sup> What does this book contain that keeps it alive today nearly a century and a quarter after it was first published? Why do students who feel a "generation gap" between themselves and their parents feel an affinity for Stirner's book? Why does James Heneker call it "the most revolutionary book ever written?"



Stirner starts his book with a short introduction. He uses the first line from Goethe's poem Vanitas! Vanitatum Vanitas! as the title for this introduction. It reads: "Ich hab' mein Sach' auf Nichts gestellt," translated literally as "I have set my affair on nothing" or, translated more freely, "all things are nothing to me." This introduction at once lets the reader know what the subject of the book is—self.

According to Stirner the supreme law for each individual is his own welfare. Everyone should seek out the enjoyment of life. A person should learn how to enjoy and expand life. Everything a person does shall be directed toward self-satisfaction. Nothing should be done for the sake of God or for the sake of anyone else. The earth is for man to make use of. Everyone and everything mean nothing to Stirner. Things and people are to be used and then when they are no longer of any utility they are to be cast aside. Stirner loves mankind, not merely individuals, but mankind as a whole. But he loves them because of his own egoism, because it makes him feel happy to love. It pleases him. Stirner is not concerned with Christian or human values and morals. If what Stirner wants to do gives him pleasure, then it is justified. Everyone is using everyone else. The only true relationship people have with each other is useableness. Everyone you meet is food to feed upon.

Stirner rejects law. Laws exist not because men recognize them as being favorable to their interests, but because men hold them to be sacred. When you start to speak of rights you are introducing a religious concept. Since the law is sacred, anyone who breaks it is a criminal. Therefore there are no criminals except against something sacred. If you do away with the sacrosancity of the law then crime will disappear, because in reality a crime is nothing more than an act desecrating that which was hallowed by the state. There are, according to Stirner, no rights, because might makes right. A man is entitled to everything he has the power to possess and hold. The earth belongs to him who knows how to take it. Self-welfare should be the guiding principle to follow rather than law. Stirner relates that you can get further with a handful of might than you can with a bagful of right. The way to gain freedom is through might because he who has might stands above the law. A person only becomes completely free when what he holds, he holds because of his might. Then he is a self-owner and not a mere free-man. Everyone should say to himself; I am all to myself and I do all for my sake. I am unique, nothing is more important to

me than myself. Stirner does not believe that a person is good or bad, nor does he believe in what is true, good, right, and so on. These are vague concepts which have no meaning outside a God-centered or man-centered world. A man should center his interest on self and concentrate on his own business.

Stirner rejects the state. Without law the state is not possible. The respect for the law is what holds the state together. The state, like the law, exists not because an individual recognizes it as favorable to his welfare but because he considers it to be sacred. To Stirner the state, like the law, is not sacred. Stirner is the mortal enemy of the state. The welfare of the state has nothing to do with his own welfare and he should therefore sacrifice nothing to it. The general welfare is not his welfare but only means self-denial on his part. The object of the state is to limit the individual, to tame him, to subordinate him, to subject him to something general for the purpose of the state. The state hinders an individual from attaining his true value, while at the same time it exploits the individual to get some benefit out of him.

The state stands in the way between men, tearing them apart. Stirner would transform the state into his own property and his own creature instead of being the property and creature of the state. He would annihilate it and form in its place a Union of Egoists. The state must be destroyed because it is the negation of the individual will, it approaches men as a collective unit. The struggle between the egoists and the state is inevitable.

Once the state is annihilated the Union of Egoists will prevail. This union is not sacred nor a spiritual power above man's power. It is created by men. In this union men will be held together by mutual advantage, through common "use" of one another. In joining the union an individual increases his own individual power. Each person will now through his own might control what he can. It does not imply though that there will be a region of universal rapacity and perpetual slaughter, nor does it mean the wielding of power over others. Each man will defend his own uniqueness. Once he has attained self-realization of true egoism he does not want to rule over others or hold more possessions than he needs because this would destroy his independence.

Stirner's Union of Egoists is not communistic. It is a union that individuals enter into for mutual gain from the egoistic

union which will be developed within the union. There will be neither masters nor servants, only egoists. Everyone will withdraw into his own uniqueness which will prevent conflict because no one will be trying to prove himself "in the right" before a third party. Egoism will foster genuine and spontaneous union between individuals.

Stirner does not develop in any detail the form of social organization that the Union of Egoists might follow. Organization itself is anathema to Stirner's Union. Within the Union the individual will be able to develop himself. The Union exists for the individual. The Union of Egoists is not to be confused with society which Stirner opposes. Society lays claim to a person which is considered to be sacred, but which consumes an individual. The Union is made up of individuals who consume the Union for their own good.

How is the abrogation of law, state, and property to be realized so that men will be free to enter into the Union of Egoists? It will occur when a sufficient number of men first undergo an inward change and recognize their own welfare as the highest law, and then these men will bring into being the outward manifestations: the abrogation of law, state, and property.

To Stirner revolution and rebellion are not synonymous. Revolution is an overturning of the condition of the existing state or society. Revolution is thus a political or social act. Rebellion, on the other hand, is a transformation of conditions. Rebellion stems from men's discontent with themselves. It is not an armed uprising, but a rising up of individuals. Rebellion has no regard for the arrangements that spring from it. Revolution aims at new arrangements; rebellion results in people no longer permitting themselves to be arranged, but to arrange for themselves, placing no great hope on existing institutions. Rebellion is not a fight against the established order, but if it succeeds, it will result in the downfall of that order. Stirner does not want to overthrow the establishment of order merely to overthrow it. He is interested in elevating himself above it. His purpose is not political, nor social, but egoistic.

To bring about the transformation of condition and put the new condition in the place of law, the state, or property, violent rebellion against the existing conditions is necessary. Force is necessary. If each man is to have what he requires

he must take it. This will necessarily mean a war of each against all, for the poor become free and proprietors only when they rebel. The state can only be overcome by violent rebellion. Only rebellion can succeed. Revolution will fail because it will only result in setting up another unfavorable political or social condition. Only rebellion can entirely eliminate unfavorable political and social conditions and permit man to enter into the Union of Egoists where he will be able to achieve the highest realization of self.

### Stirner's Critics.

Stirner's critics did not take long to reply to his book.<sup>15</sup> His principal critics were Kuno Fischer, Ludwig Feuerbach, Moses Hess, Bruno Bauer, Marx and Engels. Marx and Engels wrote an extensive, almost word-for-word refutation of Stirner's book which was not accepted for publication at the time. In the main his loudest critics were his former friends from Die Freien. Der Einzige und sein Eigentum was not released until December 1844 but already in November Engels had obtained a copy from Otto Wigand. In a letter of November 19, 1844, Engels wrote to Marx that "we must not cast it [Stirner's book] aside," and that even though they were opposed to the ideas in the book they should make use of what they found there.

But what is true in his principle, we, too, must accept. And what is true is that before we can be active in any cause we must make it our own, egoistic cause—and that in this sense, quite aside from any material expectations, we are communists in virtue of our egoism, that out of egoism we want to be human beings and not merely individuals.<sup>16</sup>

On January 17, 1845, Hess wrote to Marx outlining his proposed attack on Stirner.<sup>17</sup> Arnold Ruge in a letter of December 6, 1844, to Fröbel wrote that Stirner's book was a good criticism of communism.<sup>18</sup> To his mother, Ruge wrote on December 17, 1844, that Stirner's book was the first readable work of philosophy in Germany.<sup>19</sup> Bruno Bauer's criticism appeared in the article written by Sozeliga.<sup>20</sup> Feuerbach's<sup>21</sup> and Bauer's attacks were hurried denunciations, more personal than philosophical.

Marx<sup>22</sup> evidently viewed Stirner's book as a great threat.

He attacked it systematically in Die deutsche Ideologie which is practically a point-by-point criticism of Der Einzige und sein Eigentum. In order to understand fully his attack you have to read it together with Stirner's book. Marx attempted to undermine the basis of Stirner's position. His comments are more than a personal vendetta against Stirner, it is one system of thought clashing with another, with Marx in the final outcome the beneficiary. Unlike the others, when criticizing Der Einzige, Marx gauged the positive merit of Stirner's work as well as the negative.

He acknowledged that Stirner was correct when he pointed out the failure of the existing system to deal with poverty. Marx furthermore agreed with Stirner that the practice of getting to the wealthy man's purse by appealing to his sense of piety and fair play, often referred to as "sentimental and idealistic philanthropy," was not sufficient. He also agreed with Stirner's contention that the process of man gaining his self-identity would, of necessity, involve class warfare. He praised Stirner for pointing out the hollowness of slogans which appealed to humanity, country, reason, justice, or abstract freedom. Stirner pointed out that these abstractions only tended to muddle and conceal the real issues. He liked Stirner's attack on private property, but he pointed out that Stirner had little insight into the origins of private property. Marx also agreed with Stirner's criticism of the doctrine of natural rights although he himself did not subscribe to Stirner's reasons nor his emphasis on egoism. Marx welcomed Stirner's claims that genuine freedom implied material power, because he reasoned that political democracy could never result in social democracy because in a political democracy which emphasizes free competition the person without the material means was in an unfavorable position from the outset. It should be noted, however, that Stirner was no admirer of social democracy, which he viewed as a subterfuge through which the weak oppressed the strong. Marx also concurred with Stirner that revolution, which stops short at political reforms, can never guarantee the freedom of the people. Revolution can only guarantee the freedom of expression, which really means nothing because, in the final analysis, no state would permit itself to be ground to nothingness by this freedom of expression.

The negative aspects of Der Einzige which Marx finds, are that while Stirner rejects God, freedom, immortality, and humanity, he nonetheless retains their method. Stirner, according to Marx, has only replaced the abstractions of God with an even

more monstrous abstraction—the ego. Marx related that Stirner rejected the ideals of patriotism, church, and family as empty abstractions which pretended to be something they were not, but then questions whether Stirner's devotion to the ego is really any different than devotion to God or country. Isn't a man more than merely his ego? Can you strip him of his social relationships and social dependencies, strip him of his bare ego, finding these the source of his friendships, his love, and his work? Can this be done? Or would it not be more correct to say that once you have done this you have destroyed him, or at least his uniqueness is destroyed. Personality exists within society. It is the effect of social life and not the pre-condition thereof. Different social systems produce different types of personalities. To understand personality you have to understand the environment in which it functions. Therefore the pure, isolated ego is something which never was and never can be.

Marx further attacks Stirner's subjectivism which comes about from the contention that the ego conditions social life rather than social life conditioning the ego. Marx thought that in not recognizing the sovereignty of the state Stirner was only deluding himself. Stirner, in Marx's estimation, could not effectively struggle against the state because he did not realize what was the real source of its corporate abstraction. To do away with the state dialectically on paper means nothing. It is still there, you cannot ignore this fact.

Marx also attacks Stirner for his belief that you can isolate an individual's state of mind from the society in which he lives. It is Marx's contention that a man's state of mind is something that is made up of a succession of states of mind; on the other hand, Stirner believed that this state of mind was controlled by self. Marx says he is mistaken that the world does consist of more than a state of mind. What a person sees and how he views it is determined by something which is not a state of mind at all. People see different things because of their different social environments. What is significant in one society may or may not be important in another. Marx concludes that:

Stirner's social nominalism, therefore, not only is incapable of explaining what the individual consciousness finds but cannot explain the significant modes of the activity of consciousness proper—its wishing, fearing and appraising. Stirner ... is erecting the contemporary order of things and consciousness into

the historical invariant. Stirner's standpoint is religious because what ever history it does treat of, turns out to be a history of ideas. The world, as it existed before Stirner came on the scene, is explained by a double inconsistency, as the result of man's mistaken religious ideas.<sup>23</sup>

This criticism of Stirner by Marx is important for therein is contained the germ of his new philosophy of history:

The standpoint with which one satisfies himself in such histories of the spirit is itself religious, for in it one is content to stop short with Religion, to conceive Religion as a cause of itself. This is done instead of explaining Religion in terms of material conditions; showing how certain determinate industrial and commercial relations are necessarily bound up with certain social forms, how these are themselves bound up with certain forms of the state and therewith with a certain form of religious consciousness. Had Stirner acquainted himself with the real history of the Middle Ages he would have discovered why the ideas of the Christians in the medieval world took the exact form they did, and how it came about that these ideas later developed into others. He would have found that "Christianity" had no history at all and that all the different forms in which it was held at different times were not "self-determinations" and progressive realizations of the "religious spirit," but that they were effected by completely empirical causes quite removed from any influence of the religious spirit.<sup>24</sup>

Marx attacked Stirner's egoistic anarchism by attempting to demonstrate that it is self-defeating. According to Marx the individual can gain greater freedom and develop his individuality better by associating himself with the group, which will protect his individual differences better than he himself can. The absence of group support will in time deprive the individual of the opportunity to capitalize on his individualized abilities. Then, according to Marx, man's individual interest, economic as well as non-economic, lies in the group. It is a sacrifice on the part of all involved but will result in harmony among men. This harmony makes it possible to "create institutional guarantees and mechanism by which the advantages of the specific capacities of all may be made available for all."<sup>25</sup>

Naturally Marx disagreed with Stirner's concept of "one's own." He pointed out that this is an artificial abstraction, and that no man can make a claim for what is exclusively his own. Marx also criticized Stirner's concept of "self interest" or "one's interest." Furthermore, Marx demonstrates that the individual "I," which Stirner considered to be above every social limitation, whether proletarian or bourgeois, is nothing more than the expression of the German *pétite bourgeoisie* who aspired to become bourgeois.

### Stirner's Influence.

It is difficult to assess accurately the influence of Stirner. There is definitely a connection between his thought and the school of individualist anarchism. The connecting link between Stirner and other thinkers and movements is not so easily established; however, some writers portray Stirner as a precursor of Nietzsche, while others point out that the seeds of fascism are found in Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum. Still others place Stirner as a forerunner of existentialism. I myself can see a logical parallel between Stirner and Rudi Dutschke, contemporary leader of the Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund. Much is attributed to Stirner today, but during his life time he was not able to attract any disciples or school of followers.

Stirner's influence during his life time seems to be limited to Julius Faucher (1820-1878), who represented Stirner's ideas in his newspaper the Berliner Abendpost. This paper was, of course, quickly suppressed.<sup>26</sup> Zenker gives us an example of Faucher's comprehension of Stirner's thought:

How strange and anomalous Stirner's individualism appeared even to the most advanced Radicals of Germany in that period appears very clearly from a conversation recorded by Max Wirth, which Faucher had with the stalwart Republican Schlöffel, in an inn frequented by the Left party in the Parliament in Frankfurt. "Schlöffel loved to boast of his Radical opinions, just as at that time many men took a pride in being just as extreme as possible among the members of the Left. He expressed his astonishment that Faucher held aloof from the current of politics." "It is because you are too near the Right party for me," answered Faucher, who delighted in astonishing people with paradoxes.



Schlöffel stroked his long beard proudly, and replied, "Do you say that to me?" "Yes," continued Faucher, "for you are a Republican incarnate; you still want a State. Now I do not want a State at all, and, consequently, I am a more extreme member of the Left than you." It was the first time Schlöffel had heard these paradoxes, and he replied: "Nonsense; who can emancipate us from the State?" "Crime," was Faucher's reply, uttered with an expression of pathos. Schlöffel turned away, and left the drinking party without saying a word more. The others broke out laughing at the proud demagogue being thus outdone; but no one seems to have suspected in the words of Faucher more than a joke in dialectics. This anecdote is a good example of the way in which Stirner's ideas were understood, and shows that Faucher was the only individual "individual" among the most Radical politicians of that time.<sup>27</sup>

Nettlau agrees with Zenker when he writes that "few books have been so misunderstood or subjected to so many varying critical examinations."<sup>28</sup>

Stirner's greatest influence came toward the end of the 19th century. It is generally acknowledged that Stirner is the father of individualist anarchism. The individualist anarchist movement, which started in Germany in the 1890's, can be traced directly to the writings of Stirner.

Was Nietzsche influenced by Stirner?<sup>29</sup> In spite of Crane Brinton's<sup>30</sup> protest to the contrary Nietzsche probably was. Although Stirner is not mentioned in Nietzsche's writings, numerous studies have compared their writings. In the final analysis there is but one piece of evidence to prove that Nietzsche knew Stirner.<sup>31</sup> Löwith states the case:

Stirner is nowhere mentioned in Nietzsche's writings; but Overbeck's witness proves that Nietzsche knew of him, and not only through Lange's history of materialism. And Nietzsche was so "economical," with his knowledge of Stirner because he was both attracted to and repelled by him, and did not want to be confused with him.<sup>32</sup>

Another interesting facet of Stirnerism is its influence on the development of fascism, specifically with regard to Mussolini. It is known that Mussolini studied Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum and admired the individualism of Stirner. Laura Fermi only raises the question of the influence of Stirner's thought on Mussolini, and does not go into detail. Her account suggests that a thorough study of Mussolini's writings would probably establish a firm connection.<sup>33</sup>

In recent years it has become fashionable to consider Stirner as an early exponent of existentialism, as a forerunner of Kierkegaard. Karl Löwith states that

Kierkegaard follows Stirner as the antithesis of Marx. Like Stirner, he reduces the entire social world to his own "self. But at the same time he finds himself in absolute opposition to Stirner; instead of grounding the individual upon creative nothingness, he places the individual "before God," the creator of the world.<sup>34</sup>

Martin Buber also makes it a point to demonstrate Kierkegaard's debt to Stirner.<sup>35</sup> Both Herbert Reed<sup>36</sup> and Henri Arvon<sup>37</sup> pose the question, if Christian existentialism recognizes Kierkegaard, why does atheistic existentialism continue to ignore Stirner? Even though many of the characters in the plays and novels of the atheistic existentialist writers are constructed round a philosophy which seems to be identical with Stirner's, there is no way to prove this satisfactorily with concrete evidence.

The atheistic existentialists may disregard Stirner, but Stirner is popular today. The battles which Marx fought out with Stirner, Bakunin and other anarchists, and which he thought he had won, solved nothing. The giants he slew have once again come to life. The issues raised by Stirner and countered by Marx have a definite relevance in the world today, especially in the United States, France and West Germany. Marxism once again is engaged in a life and death struggle with anarchism. It would appear that the anarchists will win a victory over the Marxists at least in France, West Germany and even in the United States where anarchism seems to hold out more of a promise to the Radical Left of solving the world's problems than Marxism. In West Germany, France, and the United States anarchists and other groups today advocate making use of

rebellion to bring down the state which they refer to as the Establishment. Rudi Dutschke,<sup>38</sup> in Germany, would set up small groups of people very similar to Stirner's Union of Egoists. Dutschke, and some militants of the SDS, have pointed out that only rebellion can succeed in freeing the individual. Revolution only succeeds in setting up a new arrangement; it does not transform society. They use the example of the Russian Revolution to demonstrate the failure of revolution as a vehicle for setting the individual free. I do not know if Dutschke has studied Stirner's writings, but there is a logical parallel between his faith in rebellion, and the development of small groups to set people free, and Stirner's similar belief in the superiority of rebellion over revolution and Stirner's Union of Egoists.

### Notes

1. John Henry Mackay, Max Stirner, sein Leben und sein Werk (Leipzig, 1898), pp. 34-35. There are many accounts of Stirner's life, but they all rely heavily on Mackay's work. Mackay on pp. V-X, 8-23 describes the ten years of research which went into the book. On Mackay's method of research see also: "Max Stirner, sein Leben und sein Werk, von John Henry Mackay. Die Geschichte meiner Arbeit (1888-1897)," Wochenblatt der Frankfurter Zeitung, No. 10 (March 5, 1898), 152-154. Mackay interviewed a number of people who had known Stirner and was instrumental in leading a drive to collect funds to place a marker on Stirner's grave in Berlin in the Sophienkirchhof and a bronze plaque on the house in Berlin in which Stirner died at 19 Phillipstrasse. In 1906 Mackay led another drive to raise funds to place a memorial plaque on the house in Bayreuth in which Stirner was born. A copy of the mimeographed Bericht über die Anbringung einer Gedenktafel an dem Geburtshaus Max Stirners in Bayreuth, which Mackay sent to George Schumm is preserved in the Labadie Collection of the University of Michigan Library at Ann Arbor along with some of Mackay's correspondence relative to the project. The Bericht contains a complete list of the names, addresses, and amounts given by all who contributed as well as many other details about the cost and installation of the plaque.

Mackay's book received mixed reviews. A favorable review is Rudolf Steiner, "Max Stirner," Das Magazin für Literatur (Berlin und Weimar), No. 26, 67 (July 2, 1898), 601-605. Two unfavorable reviews are: M. Kronenberg, "Der Philosoph des Anarchismus," Die Nation. Wochenschrift für Politik,

Volkswirtschaft und Literatur (Berlin), 16 (1898-1899), 48-51; and Karl Joel, "Stirner," Neue deutsche Rundschau (Berlin), IX (1898), 995-1015; Otto Stoessl, "Die Lebensbeschreibung des 'Einzigen.'" Die Gegenwart, No. 26 (1899), 406-409 is a mixed review. Another favorable review is Bernhard Zack, "Max Stirner. Sein Leben und sein Werk," Literarische Beilage des Sozialist (Berlin), IV (April 9, 1898). Jöel's main criticisms of the book are: It is padded with blank pages and title pages, which it is; Mackay included too much material in the "Life and Times" style of Lytton Strachey regarding the milieu in which Stirner lived. Jöel believed this was not germane to the subject. He also criticizes Mackay for not being dispassionate enough with his subject. Mackay in the foreword to his book related that he was writing from the position of one who was enamored of his subject. Mackay's biography of Stirner can best be described as a labor of love. He researched every possible avenue to uncover any facts about Stirner. He included everything he found about him bringing out both his good and bad points. Several reviewers criticized his biography of Stirner for being too sketchy; this is due to the lack of information he could discover about certain periods of Stirner's life. Stirner was like an iceberg, most of him lay beneath the surface. When he died he left few foottracks in the sand of time for the researcher to follow. Mackay spent ten years tracking down every iota of information he could on Stirner. He is to be commended for his determination and effort. Had he not undertaken his study of Stirner when he did much more information on the elusive character of Stirner would have been lost forever.

2. Mackay, Max Stirner, pp. 34-39.

3. Ibid., pp. 45-62

4. On Die Freien see: Ibid., pp. 67-93; and Gustav Mayer, "Die Anfänge des politischen Radikalismus im vormärzlichen Preussen," Zeitschrift für Politik. VI (1913), 45-72. On pp. 111-113 is a copy of the program of Die Freien.

5. Engels liked to illustrate his letters. See: Zwischen 18 und 25 Jugend Briefe von Friedrich Engels in which many of his sketches are reproduced.

6. Woodcock, Anarchismus, pp. 97-98.

7. Quoted in Henri Arvon, Aux sources de l'existentialisme Max Stirner (Paris, 1954), p. 14.

8. Briefwechsel zwischen Friedrich Engels und Karl Marx. I (Stuttgart, 1921), p. 326; II p. 126. Marx followed Stirner's life and that of his wife quite closely. He liked to poke fun at Stirner's wife referring to her as Stirner's Geliebchen. This was a pun directed at Stirner's dedication of his book which read "to my sweetheart Marie Dähnhardt." This dedication would tend to indicate that Stirner had begun writing his book before his marriage.

Marx was not only interested in Stirner but also in Stirner's wife's activities after she left him. It is possible that Marx knew her from his days in Berlin when he frequented the meetings of Die Freien. Did Marx and Stirner ever meet? Franz Mehring in Karl Marx, p. 19, relates that there is no evidence of such a meeting. Henri Arvon, following Mackay's lead in Aux sources de l'existentialisme Max Stirner, p. 13, says probably not because Arvon relates that Marx left Berlin in April, 1841, and that Stirner probably did not become associated with Die Freien until the end of the year. However, in a letter of November 19, 1844, to Marx Engels writes as though Marx and Stirner may have met. Zwischen 18 und 25. p. 237. At least Stirner's (Schmidt's) name was known to Marx.

Marx may have met Marie Dähnhardt though because she was associated with Die Freien. If they did meet, and what their relationship was I do not know but it does seem that Marx had an inordinate interest in her activities. It should be noted that Mackay thinks that Marie probably came to Berlin in 1843, but he is not certain of this. Her unsavory reputation could be one reason why Marx was interested in her activities. She was very attractive and Marx was human before he became a Soviet God.

9. Only Mackay and Arvon treat Stirner's early writings in any detail. Atindranath Bose, A History of Anarchism (Calcutta, 1967) says that Stirner's book "burst like a bombshell," p. 149.

10. See: Max Stirners kleinere Schriften und seine Entgegnungen auf die Kritik seines Werkes "Der Einzige und sein Eigentum" aus den Jahren 1842-1848, ed. by John Henry Mackay, 2nd edition revised (Treptow bei Berlin, 1914). This edition contains, in addition to both a number of articles written before and after he wrote his book, the material he wrote while he was

the Berlin correspondent for the Rheinische Zeitung and Leipziger Zeitung in 1842. On Stirner's life as a correspondent see: Gustav Mayer, "Stirner als Publizist," Frankfurter Zeitung (October 4, 1912).

11. For a good examination of Stirner's early writings see: Arvon, Aux sources de l'existentialisme Max Stirner, pp. 19-41. This entire book is marred by the translation of German titles into French, titles which never appeared in French. Arvon even translates newspaper titles into French. See also: Mackay, Max Stirner, pp. 107-122.

12. In this study all references to The Ego and His Own will be to the edition edited by James J. Martin and published by the Libertarian Book Club in New York in 1963. The translation in this edition was done by Steven T. Byington for the first English edition published by Benjamin R. Tucker in 1907.

13. For example see: Bernard R. Miles, "Vomit-Makers to Meet in Paris," Freedom Anarchist Weekly (London), No. 14, XXIX (May 11, 1968), p. 1. Stirner's writings and Mackay's books have been reprinted in Germany during the last few years.

14. There is a vast literature on Stirner. Much of it is concerned with his book. Some of this literature is worthless, but much is worth looking at. In addition to the discussion by Henri Arvon and John Mackay already referred to see: Paul Eltzbacher, Anarchism (New York, 1960), pp. 60-76; George Woodcock, Anarchism (New York, 1962), pp. 94-105; Carl Emge, Max Stirner. Eine geistig nicht bewaltigte Tendenz (Wiesbaden, 1964); Herbert Read, The Tenth Muse; Essays in Criticism (New York, 1958), pp. 74-82; Victor Roudine, "Max Stirner," Portraits d'hier (October 15, 1910), 65-96; Heinrich Romundt, "Max Stirner und die nachkantische Philosophie," Preussische Jahrbücher, 133 (1908), 33-47; Anselm Ruest, Max Stirner: Leben-Weltanschauung-Vermachtnis (Berlin, 1906); Henri Lichtenberger, "L'anarchisme en Allemagne. Max Stirner," La nouvelle Revue, 89 (July-August, 1894), 233-241; Gustav Kahn, "Stirner et l'individualisme," La nouvelle Revue, 104 (September-October, 1904), 131-136; A. Martin, Max Stirners Lehre (Leipzig, 1906); Ernst Schultze, "Stirnersche Ideen in einem paranoischen Wohnsystem," Archiv für Psychiatrie und Nervenkrankheiten, 36 (January, 1903), 793-818; Ernst Seilliere, "La morale imperialiste chez Stirner," Mercure de France, 60 (March 15, 1906), 179-198; Sigmund Kaff, "Der Philosoph des

Egoismus," Sozialistische Monatshefte (1907), 141-148; George Plechanoff, Anarchism and Socialism (London, 1895), pp. 16-26; James Heneker, Egoists (New York, 1932), 350-372; E. Horn, Max Stirners ethischer Egoismus (Berlin, 1907); Ola Hannsson, Seher und Deuten (Berlin, 1894), pp. 92-136; E. Horn, "Max Stirner un der Anarchismus," Die Zukunft, II (1892), 252-256; Sidney Hook, From Hegel to Marx (New York, 1950), pp. 165-185; Karl Löwith, From Hegel to Nietzsche (New York, 1964); Max Nettlau, Der Vorfrühling der Anarchie (Berlin, 1926), pp. 169-179; Francois Lugghesi, La philosophie de Stirner (Paris, 1932); Hektor Zoccoli, Die Anarchie: ihre Verkünder, ihre Ideen, ihre Taten (Leipzig, 1909), pp. 17ff; Max Adler, Wegweiser: Studien zur Geistesgeschichte des Sozialismus (Stuttgart, 1914), pp. 173-199; Jack Friedland, Max Stirner: Versuch einer Würdigung seiner Bedeutung (Hamburg, 1921); Herman Schultheiss, Stirner; Grundlagen zum Verstandnis des Werkes "Der Einzige und sein Eigentum," 2nd edition (Leipzig, 1922); Victor Pasch, L'individualisme anarchiste Max Stirner (Paris, 1904); Max Messer, Max Stirner (Berlin, 1907); Alain Sergent and Claude Harmel, Histoire de l'anarchie (Paris, 1949), pp. 149-160; Martin Buber, Between Men and Man (London, 1947); E. V. Zenker, Anarchism (New York, 1897), pp. 100-138; Camille Spiess, Max Stirner (Nice, 1949); Eduard Bernstein, "Die soziale Doktrin des Anarchismus. Stirner. Der Einzige und sein Eigentum," Neue Zeit (Stuttgart), 10 (1891-92), I, pp. 358-65, 421-28, II, 589-96, 618-26, 657-66, 772-78, 813-19; Anselm Ruest, Stirnerbrevier. Die Stärke des einsamen, Max Stirners Individualismus und Egoismus (Berlin, 1906); Georg Strugurescu, Max Stirner, Der Einzige und sein Eigentum (Munich, 1911); N. Staurzh, Max Stirners Philosophie des Ich (Berlin, 1923); K. A. Hautz, Die Philosophie M. Stirners im Gegensatz zum Hegelschen Idealismus (1936); W. Cuybers, Max Stirner als Philosoph (Würzburg, 1937); D. Koigen, Zur Vorgeschichte des modernen philosophischen Sozialismus in Deutschland. Zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Socialphilosophie des Junghegelianismus (Bern, 1901), pp. 119-146; J. L. Kreibitz, Geschichte und Kritik des ethischen Skeptizismus (1896), pp. 100-122; H. Kronenberg, Moderne Philosophen, Portraits und Charakteristiken (Munich, 1899), pp. 191-215; Karl Jöel, Philosophenwege-Ausblicke und Rückblicke (Berlin, 1901), pp. 228-261; an extensive bibliography of writings by or about Stirner is found in Hans G. Helms, Die Ideologie der anonymen Gesellschaft (Köln, 1966), pp. 510-600.

15. The main contemporary criticisms of Stirner's book are: Ludwig Feuerbach, "Über das 'Wesen des Christenthum'"

in Beziehung auf den 'Einzigen und sein Eigenthum,' "Wigands Vierteljahrsschrift, Band 2 (1845), 193-205, reprinted in Gustave Lange (ed.), Ludwig Feuerbach; Kleine Phil Schriften 1842-1845 (Leipzig, 1950), pp. 170-196; Moses Hess, Die letzten Philosophen (Darmstadt, 1845), reprinted in August Carnu and Wolfgang Mönke (eds.), Moses Hess, Philosophische und sozialistische Schriften 1837-1850 (Berlin-East, 1961), pp. 381-392; Sozeliga Bruno Bauer, "Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum," Norddeutschen Blätter für Kritik, Literatur und Unterhaltung (March, 1845), 1-34; Kuno Fischer, "Moderne Sophisten," Epigonen (1848), 277-316; Kuno Fischer, "Ein Apolet der Sophistik und ein 'philosophischer Reactionär,'" Epigonen (1847), 152-165; Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, Werke (Berlin-East, 1962), III "Saint Max," pp. 101-438. (Not printed at the time even though it was written then); W. Friedensburg, "Zur Geschichte des neuesten Philosophie. Max Stirner: Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum," Grenzboten, I, (1845), 239-241; "Die deutsche Philosophie seit Hegels Tode," Die Gegenwart (1851), 292-340; Bettina von Armin, "Die Auflösung des Einzigen durch den Menschen," Epigonen (1847), 189-251; "Feuerbach und der Einzige. Die Consequenzen Feuerbachs und ihr Kampf gegen die Kritik und den Einzigen," Wigands Vierteljahrsschrift (1846), 123-138; "Das Verstandesthum und das Individuum," Evangelische Kirchenzeitung (1846), 48; "Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum, von Max Stirner," Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung, No's 36 and 37 (February, 1846); Stirner replies to his critics in: "Die philosophischen Reactionäre," Die Epigonen (1847), 141-151. Reprinted in Mackay, Max Stirners kleinere Schriften, pp. 401-415; "Recensenten Stirners," Wigands Vierteljahrsschrift (1845), 147-194. Reprinted in Mackay, Max Stirner's kleinere Schriften, pp. 346-396.

16. Zwischen 18 and 25, pp. 237-238.

17. Moses Hess Briefwechsel, pp. 105-107.

18. Arnold Ruge Briefwechsel und Tagebuch-Blätter aus den Jahren 1825-1880. ed. by Paul Nerrlich (Berlin, 1886), I, p. 382.

19. Ibid., p. 386.

20. See note 14 Sozeliga was a pseudonym for Franz Sozeliga Zychlin von Sychlinsky (1816-1900) who at the time worked for the Norddeutsche Blätter in which the article appeared.



21. There are quite a number of interesting studies on Feuerbach and Stirner. See: Friedrich Jodl, "Max Stirner und Ludwig Feuerbach," Österreichische Rundschau, XXVI (January-March, 1911), 420-428; Albrecht Rau, "Ludwig Feuerbach und Max Stirner," Das Magazin für die Literatur des In- und Auslandes (Berlin), No. 41 (1888), 643-646; Friedrich Jodl, Max Stirner und Ludwig Feuerbach (Stuttgart, 1916); Julius Duboc, Das Ich und die Übrigen. Für und wider Stirner (Leipzig, 1897); A. Levy, La philosophie de Feuerbach (Paris, 1904), pp. 338-379; Wilhelm Bolin, Ludwig Feuerbach, sein Werken und seine Zeitgenossen (Stuttgart, 1891), pp. 98-112; Werner Schuffenhauer, Feuerbach und der junge Marx. Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der marxistischen Weltanschauung (Berlin, 1965), pp. 10, 129-130, 141-145, 148, 165, 184-185, 221, 225; Simon Rawidowicz, Ludwig Feuerbach. Ursprung und Schicksal (Berlin, 1931); Eugene Kamenka, The Philosophy of Ludwig Feuerbach (New York, 1970).

22. For two interesting analyses see: Sidney Hook, From Hegel to Marx: Studies in the Intellectual Development of Karl Marx (New York, 1950), pp. 164-185; and Arvon, Aux sources de l'existentialisme Max Stirner, pp. 146-178.

23. Hook, From Hegel to Marx, pp. 179-180.

24. Quoted in Hook, Ibid., p. 180. For an excellent article on Marx's materialist philosophy of history as it was developed in Deutsche Ideologie in response to Stirner's book see: Inge Taubert, "Zur materialistischen Geschichtsauffassung von Marx und Engels. Über einige theoretische Probleme im ersten Kapitel der 'Deutschen Ideologie,'" Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung, Sonderheft X (1968), 27-50. See also: Renate Merkel, "Zur Entwicklung der wissenschaftlich begründeten Auffassung über die kommunistische Gesellschaft durch Marx und Engels in ihrer Schrift 'Die deutsche Ideologie' (Herbst 1845 bis Sommer 1846)," Beiträge zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung, Heft 5 (1970), 734-751.

25. Quoted in Hook, Ibid., p. 182.

26. E. V. Zenker, Anarchism (New York, 1897), pp. 130-131; Franz Mehring, Geschichte der Sozialdemokratie, I, pp. 250-251.

27. E. V. Zenker, Anarchism, pp. 131-32.

28. Max Nettlau, Der Vorfrühling der Anarchie, p. 169.

29. Some of the literature attempting to solve this question is: Félicien Pascal, "Du roman tisme a l'anarchie," Le Correspondant, 225 (November, 1906), 752-780; Gustave Kahn, "Stirner et l'individualisme," La nouvelle Revue, 104 (1904), 131-136; Robert Schellwien, Max Stirner und Friedrich Nietzsche (Paris, 1904); P. Lachmann, Protogoras, Nietzsche, Stirner (Berlin, 1914); S. Jankélévitch, "L'unique et le surhomme. Le problème de la personnalité chez Stirner et chez Nietzsche," Revue d'Allemagne (January-June, 1931), 27-40, 216-243; Anselm Ruest, Max Stirner (Berlin, 1907), pp. 28ff; Camile Spiess, Max Stirner (Nice, 1948); Charles Andler, Nietzsche sa vie et sa pensée (Paris, 1958), II, 362-365, III, 377-379; Paul Carus, Nietzsche and Other Exponents of Individualism (Chicago, 1914), pp. 74-101; Arthur Drews, Nietzsches Philosophie (Heidelberg, 1904), pp. 404-405; Wolfgang Wendler, Carl Sternheim. Weltvorstellung und Kunstprinzipien (Frankfurt a. M., 1966); Anselm Ruest, "Stirner und Nietzsche. Ein Vorwort," Die Aktion. Zeitschrift für freiheitliche Politik und Literatur, I (September, 1911), 916-917.

30. Clarence Crane Brinton, Nietzsche (New York, 1965), p. 227. This book is a reprint of the 1941 edition. Brinton writes: "Nietzsche has even, by unenlightened critics, been coupled with Max Stirner, author of The Ego and Its Own." Brinton evidently did not spend much time studying Stirner or he would know that the title of his book is The Ego and His Own.

31. Karl Löwith, From Hegel to Nietzsche, p. 187.

32. Ibid., pp. 187-188. The question of Nietzsche's relationship to anarchism is one that could be undertaken with some profit. Much time and paper has been devoured by the question of Nietzsche's relationship to Nazism, as well as that of Richard Wagner. Early in life Nietzsche was a great admirer of Wagner although this admiration did not last. The question of Nietzsche's relationship with Wagner, his opinion on socialism, and his apparent affinity for anarchy are problems that would be well worth tracing out in detail. A few meager attempts at this are: "The Ideals of Anarchy," Littell's Living Age, 211 (1896), 616-636; "Neue Aphorismen," Die Zukunft, 32 (1900), 12-13; Bruno Wille, "Vom rothen Götzen," Die Zukunft, 7 (1894), 452-458; Félicien Pascal, "Du romantisme à l'anarchie," Le

Correspondant, 225 (1906), 752-780; Édouard Schuré, "L'individualisme et l'anarchie," Revue des deux mondes, 132 (August 15, 1895), 775-805; Max Nordau, Degeneration (London, 1913).

33. Mussolini, Phoenix edition (Chicago, 1966), pp. 167-174. A book which attempts to relate Stirner to the intellectual origins of German fascism is Hans G. Helms, Die Ideologie der anonymen Gesellschaft (Cologne, 1966). In general anarchists have been highly critical of the thesis of this book. For example see: James J. Martin's introduction to the English translation of Stirner's The False Principle of our Education of Humanism and Realism (Colorado Springs, 1967), p. 3; and befreiung blätter für anarchistische weltanschauung [sic] (Mannheim), February, 1969, pp. 12-16.

34. Karl Löwith, p. 249. See also pp. 318-19, 359.

35. Martin Buber, Between Men and Man (London, 1947), pp. 40-43, 82.

36. Herbert Reed, The Tenth Muse (New York, 1958), pp. 81-82.

37. Arvon, Aux sources de l'existentialisme, Max Stirner, p. 187.

38. Rudolf Dutschke was born March 7, 1940, in Schönefeld, which is now in East Germany, the son of a postal clerk. As a youth he was involved in both Communistic and Christian youth groups, graduating to a belief in Christian Socialism. As a result of his belief's he refused to serve in the army and was not permitted to continue his education so he went to work in a state-owned factory, where he remained for three years until he defected to West Berlin in 1960. In West Berlin he completed high school, winning a scholarship to the Free University for his excellent academic record. He has often said that he has been influenced in his thinking by Marx, Engels, Rosa Luxemburg, Mao Tse-Tung, Herbert Marcuse, the Bible and other sources.

### Chapter III

#### ANARCHISM IN GERMANY TO 1878

Anarchism in Germany in the early 1870's has to be treated in conjunction with the International for reasons which will become apparent in the course of this chapter. The 1850's and 1860's were not auspicious years for the development of anarchism in Germany. Proudhonist anarchism appealed chiefly to skilled workers, who hoped to attain economic independence without resorting to any illegal or revolutionary means. In Germany, as early as 1850, the methods proposed by the Proudhonists had already lost much of their meaning in the wake of industrial development which had begun its determined take-off before the middle of the century. Bakunin, who appealed to the declassé intelligentsia of the underdeveloped countries of Europe, had few followers in Germany. The revolutions of 1848-49 in Germany had demonstrated the futility of insurrection. Bakunin himself had been imprisoned for his part in the uprisings and following the period of revolution the police kept a close scrutiny on all revolutionary activity.

Not until the 1870's is it possible to pick up the thread of the anarchist movement in Germany. After the founding of the German Reich in 1871 the German socialists started to move away from revolutionary activity in the direction of parliamentary action. The policy of parliamentarism being followed by German socialists was already starting to show signs of some success by the mid 1870's.<sup>1</sup> However, this policy of capturing seats in the Reichstag was opposed by Bismarck. It was one of the critical issues of the 1870's and will be treated in detail in Chapter IV along with the question of the passage of the Socialist Law. The German socialists openly tried to discourage the anarchists, but nevertheless by 1875 there were adherents of anarchism in Berlin, Leipzig, Magdeburg, Munich, and other places.<sup>2</sup> The anarchists in Germany in the years prior to 1875 were not very active. A search of police files for this period does not indicate great concern about anarchist activities.<sup>3</sup>

As noted earlier, the German anarchists of the period exerted most of their influence on the international scene rather

than in Germany, so it will be in the context of the movement toward the establishment of an anarchist International that they will be discussed. The first attempt to interest the German speaking workers in an international anarchist organization came about as a result of a step taken by the Jura Federation of the International which, on May 24, 1874, published the first and only number of the Sozialdemokratischen Bulletin which appeared in Chaux-de-Fonds. Six hundred copies of it were printed and distributed in Bern, Locle, Biel, Neuchatel, Chaux-de-Fonds, St. Imier, Geneva, and 50 copies were sent to Germany by way of Mülhausen.<sup>4</sup>

The German influence in the international movement during these years was exerted by three individuals: Erich Otto Rinke (1853-1899), usually called Otto Rinke, Emil Werner (1845- ? ), and Friedrich August Reinsdorf (1849-1885), who rarely used his first name. Rinke was born in Schmiegel in Posen, the son of a forest official. He was a huge man and was often referred to as Big Otto. By nature he was argumentative, gruff, and heavy fisted. Until 1890 he had the respect, but not always the love of those in the anarchist movement. In 1872 he started to wander over Germany looking for work after completing his apprenticeship and becoming a journeyman locksmith. It was during his wanderings in Saxony and Württemberg that he came in contact with the German workers and became aware of the circumstances in which they lived. He was called to complete his military obligation but deserted shortly afterward on December 5, 1873, going to Switzerland where he found work at his locksmith trade in Bern and Geneva. In Bern, Rinke came in contact with groups who favored Bakunin and revolutionary activity.<sup>5</sup>

Emil-August Werner, compositor by trade, was born June 27, 1845, in Frankfurt-am-Oder. After completing his apprenticeship he left his home town, wandered through southern Germany, and eventually like Rinke, ended up in Bern where he too came under the spell of anarchist ideas. His appearance and nature were in marked contrast to that of Rinke. He was shorter, five feet eight inches, more even tempered, more intellectual, and was as fair in appearance as Rinke was dark. His blond hair was separated from his blue eyes by a high, vaulted forehead. The exceptional breadth of his face was further accentuated by a long, thin, pointed nose, a small mouth full of irregular teeth, and a full red beard.<sup>6</sup>

August Reinsdorf was born January 31, 1849, into a petit bourgeois family in Pegau-bei-Leipzig in Saxony. After completing the Volksschule he learned the compositor trade. Having mastered it by Easter 1865, the tall, thin, fair haired young man set off on a period of wandering from place to place in search of employment. His first employment was in Leipzig followed by short periods of work in Neuruppin, Berlin, Stettin, Hannover, Naumburg, Mainz, and Mannheim. It was during this time, in 1869 in Leipzig, that Reinsdorf and Johann Most met for the first time. This was a friendship that would last until 1885 when Reinsdorf was beheaded for this part in the Niederwald dynamite plot. Most and Reinsdorf, during the years of their friendship, would have a great influence on each other. Their friendship would also leave its mark on the development of Germany during the 1880's.

Reinsdorf was a skilled compositor but could not remain long in one place because he was a fugitive from the military. In spite of this he did not attempt to flee Germany immediately but went into Baden and Württemberg working in Freiburg, Mannheim, Stuttgart, Tübingen, Messkirch, and Rudolfszell. From the latter he went to Winterthur in Switzerland where he obtained employment in the then famous Bleuler-Hausherr'schen printing house where he remained a number of years. Following this he was employed in Geneva, St. Gallen, Zürich, Bern, Luzern, Basel, Solothurn, Freiburg, Lausanne, and a number of other smaller Swiss cities. During this time he was associated with the Swiss composers organization and was a prominent agitator in the blossoming Deutschen Vereine. It was during these years that he came in contact with exiles from many different countries including Philipp Becker, Bakunin, Kropotkin, and Paul Brousse the French Communist.

At the outset of 1874 Reinsdorf wrote to Most that "the only way to realize their goals and aspirations would be through a second St. Bartholomew's night," this, according to Reinsdorf, "was the only possible solution to the social question."<sup>7</sup> At this period in his life Reinsdorf was still a socialist, but was rapidly changing his views toward anarchism. Most, too, was not yet an anarchist, but was considered to be a radical socialist.

Reinsdorf worked for a time during this period on the staff of the Social Democratic paper Tagwacht, edited by Hermann Greulich (1841-1925), with whom he was soon to have a

falling out. While working for Greulich, Reinsdorf, through his writing and social agitation helped to further the cause of socialism. Of this period in Reinsdorf's life, Greulich, a quarter of a century later wrote that

August Reinsdorf was a robust young man and one of the best composers I ever knew; unfortunately he drank and was a very unpleasant person, even though he was very good-natured and kind. Reinsdorf was a comedian, though he tended more to coarse comedy. He was entirely happy when a talented glass painter painted him a plate with a picture of a homicide, the act of murder ends with the decapitation of the murderer.<sup>8</sup>

The plate also had written upon it the customary "moral" to be gained. Little did Reinsdorf realize at the time that before ten years passed, he would meet a similar fate.

The first International Anarchist Congress in which German delegates were present was the Brussels Congress of the Anarchist International. The so-called Second Anti-Authoritarian Congress, which was referred to by its participants as the Seventh General Congress of the International Workingmen's Association, was held in Brussels from September 7 to 13, 1874.<sup>9</sup> Germany was represented at this congress by two Lassalleans, Frohme and Faust (Paul Kersten),<sup>10</sup> both of whom were members of the General Association of German Workingmen (Allgemeiner deutscher Arbeiterverein). Neither was an anarchist, nor an anarchist sympathizer, and neither was able to legally represent the General Association of German Workingmen at the congress because they had been delegated by German groups living in Belgium. The congress itself accomplished nothing of any significance, but it was not, as Engels wrote to Marx, "a miserable failure."<sup>11</sup> The congress pointed out the road that anarchism was to follow for the remainder of the century. The Italian and Spanish groups revealed their affinity for following a program of conspiratorial activity or, as it became known, "propaganda by deed."

The German Lassallean delegates revealed their whole-hearted support for conquest of the political power by the working class. This policy of parliamentarism was one to which the Social Democrats would adhere more and more as the century progressed and it was perhaps the most basic distinction between

the German Socialists and the German anarchists. The German delegates related that the German workingmen, like the English, meant to work out their social emancipation by means of political power and that universal suffrage, even though it was hampered by the three class system of voting—and many socialists were not 25 and thus not old enough to vote—was working in their favor and they would continue to gain votes in the Reichstag. The German delegates could never accept the anarchist ideas of abstention from politics because this would result in arresting the movement in Germany because they felt that social emancipation was dependent upon political emancipation and acquisition of political power, explaining that without political action the working classes in Germany would never have arrived at the position they occupied at that time.

Taking part in elections was necessary for another reason. It showed what support those who occupied themselves with public questions could reckon on from the working people generally, and it also showed the strength of those opposed to the working classes. To wait till the day after the revolution before the working people were called upon to interest themselves would simply lead to disappointment and defeat. To have representatives of labour in a Legislature might not be of immediate benefit; but it gave the movement dignity, and enabled the leaders to proclaim their principles in places where otherwise they would never be heard of.<sup>12</sup>

Schwitzgebel, the delegate for Jura, then pointed out that

... in Germany it was considered revolutionary to take part in politics because they wanted to transform society downwards; they wanted to emancipate a community that had grown up under restraint; whereas the collectivists began with the free and independent individual who associated with equals, and that would revolutionize society from below upwards.<sup>13</sup>

A German member, but not a delegate replied that

... there was no great difference of opinion. If it were permitted in Germany to say publicly that one intended to transform the state by force, they would care little



for politics. But to say what they wanted was treason; they therefore went in for politics because to transform the state by means of politics was legal, and was acknowledged so in the courts of law. Political action in Germany was tantamount to an escape from punishment.<sup>14</sup>

He went on to point out that they now had ten representatives in the Reichstag but even if they had a majority it would mean nothing because if they legislated contrary to the interests of the upper classes they would simply be put down by force. They expected nothing from universal suffrage, but it was the only mode of action possible. If they did elect a majority they would be put down by force, but that would furnish the opportunity for an armed revolt.

The next day's discussion was started by the German delegate who stated his conviction that the day of the revolt of the fourth estate was at hand (the other three estates being the clergy, nobility, and the bourgeoisie). He went on to say that nothing short of a revolution would settle the social question. The Social Democrats wanted the Social Democratic State, and they could not see their way of getting it without a revolution. The working people were 80 per cent of the population in Germany, but they were dominated by the minority, a condition which would not be tolerated much longer. What the anarchists did not understand, he said, was that with the disappearance of classes, the working people could make the state as useful to themselves as the other three classes had made use of it for themselves. Thus, it would be better to transform the German state by pacific and legitimate action into a popular state. This was the lesson of history that when ever a discontented class of society had sought to elevate itself it had always aspired to political power, and the ruler of society had always maintained their disputed privileges by means of their political power. Political power was a means to work around repressive press laws and close supervision of public gatherings. Eventually they would hold a majority in the Reichstag and they would have to be reckoned with. If anything should happen then that the aristocracy and bourgeoisie endeavored to put down by armed force, they would be the rebels and treated accordingly. The Social Democrats would be on the side of the law. This was the lesson of the 17th-century English Revolution, and of the American Revolution. This policy would take time and would be opposed by the more impassionate people who longed for immediate results, but no other policy would be

effective except in the way of bringing about disastrous events and results.<sup>15</sup>

The German position at this congress has been explained in detail because essentially it established the lines along which the future debate between the German anarchists and the Social Democrats would be carried on. The congress adjourned without any agreement of the question discussed. It was decided to hold the next congress the following year in the Jura mountains and the Jura Federation was chosen to be the Central Bureau for the ensuing year.

Bern in the mid 1870's was a center for contact between French- and German-speaking anarchists, although only a few of the German radicals considered themselves to be anarchists. At first the German anarchists met within the Social Democratic Society of Bern (Sozialdemokratischer Verein Bern). Emil Werner and Otto Rinke took part in the meetings of the anarchists who frequented this circle. At the time, in 1875, Reinsdorf was still not an anarchist.<sup>16</sup> A great deal of the discussion which took place among the anarchists was in reference to the Volksstaat which had been the burning issue to the Lassallean delegation at the International Congress which had met in Brussels in September 1874.

The end result of these discussions among the anarchists was accomplished on October 2, 1875, when a program, which Nettlau calls the first German anarchist program, was drawn up, at Werner's suggestion, and signed by the 25 members of the group. The first signature was that of Emil Werner, followed by Paul Brousse and his wife Blanche, Otto Rinke, N. Landsberg, Fräulein Adele Beck, and Rudolph Kahn. It was also signed by 33 others, including A. Reichel and Bruno Gutschmann.

The program stated that the existing society was based on personal property and had as its political organization the state, which it declared was nothing more than a weapon in the hands of the ruling class. The state, it went on to say, must disappear and make room for the society of the future, which would be a society based on the principle of the free formation of groups of individuals. Such a society would have as its economic foundation the common possession of the soil, the mines, capital, the great lines of communication, and the tools of work.

History, the program contended, demonstrated that a

violent solution was necessary in order to achieve the transition from the unjust society of the past to the just society of the future. This would be the social revolution. In order to be prepared for it, it was urgent that all worker organizations, because of an unavoidable necessity, must form themselves into an alliance which would under no circumstances be permanent. Each group would continue to possess its complete independence, its absolute freedom. The best way to achieve such an alliance would be through the International Workingmen's Association. The International would be used as a vehicle for the dissemination of the social-revolutionary principle through both the spoken and the written word. Should a social revolution break out, the association would place at the disposal of the revolutionary organization of the country in question its determined support.<sup>17</sup>

A newspaper, the Arbeiter-Zeitung, was formed by the members of the group for the purpose of spreading anarchist propaganda in German-speaking areas. The Arbeiter-Zeitung was published in Bern from July 15, 1876, to October 13, 1877; in all, 33 issues appeared. Among those who helped found the Arbeiter-Zeitung were Reinsdorf, Rinke, Werner, Kachelhofer, Brousse and later even Peter Kropotkin worked on it. Articles written by Brousse and Kropotkin in French were translated into German by Werner and Fräulein Landsberg.<sup>18</sup> The first issue outlined the objectives of the group:

We want the complete, definitive, absolute emancipation of all workers. We want those who produce to have all that they produce, and those who do not produce to have nothing. We do not want that the great majority of society who work shall cringe and suffer eternally under the ferrule of a small minority which sleeps, eats, drinks and promenades. We want most of all justice—the victory of the worker over idleness. We desire still more—social brotherhood. When the entire produce of a man's labor is returned to him, economic justice will come into being and with it freedom—a practical freedom which is useful, and not a theoretical freedom which is found in the law books and of which only those who possess have need, but which for the poor always remain dead words. We want it first of all because it is fair and just, we want it also because then and only then will it be possible to have brotherhood of the entire human race.

The articles went on to explain in detail the impracticality of trying to bring about such reforms legally through a legally constituted majority pointing out that it would take approximately 250 years to achieve such a majority to change the laws. This was too slow for them. They wanted quicker results.<sup>19</sup>

The article advocated more violent methods because:

For he who possesses nothing  
 Freedom of the press is a lie  
 Freedom of speech is a lie  
 Freedom of thought is a lie  
 Freedom of assembly is a lie  
 Freedom of participation is a lie  
 All theoretical freedoms are open lies

For he who possesses nothing freedom means nothing, for the lame the freedom to walk, for the blind the freedom to see, for it is not enough to permit something to happen or to only have laws which allow it, one must also have the necessary means by which possessions can be obtained.

Each of these so called false freedoms is then discussed at length with the specific meaning it had to the workingman who worked an 11- or 12-hour day. The statement ended by declaring that the Arbeiter-Zeitung was founded to better explain the social revolution and to encourage the economic solidarity of the workers.<sup>20</sup>

In the last issue of the Arbeiter-Zeitung (October 13, 1877) the editors announced that publication would be ceased because the purpose of the paper had been fulfilled—the spread of anarchist ideas in German-speaking areas. The group which founded the Arbeiter-Zeitung had formed a delegation to represent the German-speaking peoples at the meetings held in Verriers and Ghent in September of 1877; they had spread the ideas of the anarchist revolutionary program through Germany and were forming themselves into anarchist groups in Germany and Switzerland; the Arbeiter-Zeitung served as a correspondence center and confederation for these groups; the Arbeiter-Zeitung was founded as the organ which would represent the entire German-speaking anarchist movement; they announced that a paper soon would appear to fulfill this purpose and that there would be additional German anarchist newspapers to represent the local groups.<sup>21</sup>

How successful was the group which founded the Arbeiter-Zeitung in Bern in spreading anarchist ideas among the German-speaking peoples? How many of the above-mentioned achievements had the group actually accomplished by October, 1877, when the paper split up? To answer these questions, the following examination will study two aspects: (1) the influence of the Arbeiter-Zeitung and the Bern group on the international scene during the period from July 1876 to September 1877; and (2) the influence the group had in making inroads into Germany during this period. This will be primarily an examination of the part played by Reinsdorf, Werner, and Rinke and it is not intended to portray a complete picture of the activities of the entire Bern group, but only those which are related to the movement in Germany.

The decision had been taken at the Brussels Congress in September 1874 to hold the next congress in the Jura mountains in 1875; however, this congress did not meet until October 26-30, 1876, in the city of Bern. The so called Bern Congress of the Anti-Authoritarian International, or as it was named by the socialists, the Eighth Congress of the International Workingmen's Association, met in very inauspicious circumstances.<sup>22</sup>

Represented at this congress were the Belgian Federation, Dutch Federation, French Federation, Italian Federation, Jura Federation and a number of fraternal delegates including Julius Vahlteich (1839-1915), a German Social Democrat and member of the Reichstag; and Hermann Greulich, representing the Swiss Arbeiterbund. In all there were 28 delegates. One of the delegates from the Jura Federation was August Reinsdorf, who by 1876 had solidified his position as an anarchist.

It was obvious to everyone that the Anti-Authoritarian International was on its last legs. The Spanish glorified in their political abstentionism and referred contemptuously to the use of the workers' funds in strikes as an unproductive expenditure. The Italians, following up their proposal sent by letter to the congress in Brussels in 1874, boasted of their exploits in the realm of "propaganda by deed." Cesar De Paepe (1842-1890) let the congress know that in Holland and Belgium the trend in the workers' movement was toward social democracy and the Volksstaat. The Volksstaat, which the Brussels Congress had decided would be the society of the future, was once again pushed by De Paepe who was gravitating farther and farther away from an anarchist position. De Paepe defended the idea of the

Volksstaat, although he said that if the anarchists found the word "state" to have a connotation not palatable to them he would gladly substitute the term "public administration." The Bakuninists maintained their position that the state and its institutions had to be destroyed and that the only possible form of social organization was a voluntary federation of free corporations. Reinsdorf remarked that the Volksstaat was in reality nothing more than a Polizeistaat. The discussion of this question occupied two sittings of the congress and end result was that the matter was left open without a vote being taken on "this purely theoretical question."

The Anti-Authoritarian International, rather than consolidating the workers' movement in the various countries, proved to be a hindrance to the international consolidation of proletarian forces. Realizing this the Belgians introduced a proposal that a universal socialist congress be held in 1877. This suggestion aroused the apprehensions of the anarchists who declared that there could be no question of reconstituting the old International. The majority at the Bern Congress were not willing to follow the anarchist suggestion and would not admit that it was needless or impossible to resuscitate the old International. Vahlteich let it be known that he hoped that it would be possible to reestablish the old International, either on its former foundations or on new ones, and that the German socialists would be glad to re-join. After a lengthy discussion, the Belgian, Dutch, French, and Jura Federations voted in favor of the Belgian proposal that a universal socialist congress should be held in 1877. The Spanish and Italian delegation did not vote against the proposal, but abstained.

Reinsdorf, one of the delegates representing the Bern group, had taken two trips to Germany prior to the convening of the congress. During the first trip, at the beginning of August 1876, he traveled to Leipzig, Berlin, and several other German cities for the purpose of coming in contact with radical social democrats, hoping to organize the anarchist movement there. The trip was timed to take place as the first issues of the Arbeiter-Zeitung came off the press on July 15; Reinsdorf carried copies which he distributed along his route. After a short stay in Germany he returned to Lausanne where along with his friend Rudolph Kahn he took part in the tailors' strike. Reinsdorf and Kahn were seized by the police and were forced to leave the Swiss Canton of Waadt. He went to Geneva and then on to Bern where he remained a few days before entering Germany once

again under a false name.<sup>23</sup> The second trip took place sometime between August 21st and September 18th. There is evidence to place him in Chaux-de-Fonds, where he delivered a speech, on August 21, 1876,<sup>24</sup> and on September 18, 1876, he was back in Bern.<sup>25</sup> During the course of this trip Reinsdorf met with Most (who was still just a radical socialist and not an anarchist) in Berlin and established himself as a correspondent for the Berliner freie Presse: he wrote under the name of John Steinberg, only one of the many alias he used in his lifetime.<sup>26</sup>

Most relates that he and Reinsdorf walked and talked about the future of anarchism and that Reinsdorf's ideas on "propaganda by deed" made a great impression upon him. Reinsdorf was critical of Most's socialism. He addressed a pointed question to Most concerning the Social Democratic Party, "what are you then, a voting and newspaper-reading party and nothing else?" Reinsdorf went on to remark that "with that material you'll never attract any dogs to the oven."<sup>27</sup>

It was also at this juncture that Reinsdorf got in trouble with the Central Bureau of the Compositors Association. In a meeting which he called and presided over, Reinsdorf usurped the authority of the Central Bureau and placed the name of the printer Boechat in Delemont on the index. According to the statutes of the Association the Central Bureau had to be consulted before such action could be taken.<sup>28</sup> Evidently the payment of a fine on the part of Reinsdorf and his compatriots was involved because in the issue of Le Gutenberg for October 1, 1876, an open letter from the Central Bureau to all the various sections appeared, which indicated that Haussener, who was involved with Reinsdorf, had promised to make a "reimbursement." Reinsdorf, however, wrote the Central Bureau a letter on September 27 which was full of threats. Furthermore he did not send the seven francs fine.

In September of 1876 after Reinsdorf returned from Berlin he took part in a meeting of the Central Committee of the Arbeiterbund in Bern. Along with Werner and Rinke, he put forward the ideas of anarchism; they were opposed by Hermann Greulich. A few weeks later in the general meeting of the Berner Arbeiter-Union Reinsdorf continued to dispute with Greulich and press for the adoption of anarchist ideas but he was voted down, and along with the other anarchists he left the meeting under protest. Shortly thereafter he was voted out of the Sozial-demokratischen Verein of Bern when it became known that he

would be a delegate at the Jura Congress representing the anarchist position.<sup>29</sup>

Reinsdorf had been chosen on October 9, 1876, along with Paul Brousse and Adhemar Schwitzgebel, to represent the Bern group at the Jura Congress. At the congress Reinsdorf represented the anarchist position by putting forth the mandate sketched by Werner on the question of "Free Association of Individuals with groups and the free formation of these groups."<sup>30</sup>

At the meeting of the Jura Congress it was evident to Reinsdorf that the anarchists could not hope to work in accord with either the German Social Democratic Party or the International as they were constituted. In a number of articles written for the Arbeiter-Zeitung Reinsdorf pointed out his position on the issues discussed at the congress. Reinsdorf first of all raised the question: "Is the International practical?" In this article Reinsdorf pointed out that "the reactionaries, dumbheads, liberals, radical correspondents, and socialists" say it is not practical and that many people have swallowed this line. Reinsdorf thought that the International was practical because "It wants the abolition of the existing economic disproportion, the introduction of economic equality, the common possession of the means of work and of the production of work, the abolition of private profit, the production of the people for the people."<sup>31</sup>

In the Arbeiter-Zeitung of December 30, 1876, is an article in which Reinsdorf portrays a discussion between a Social Democrat and an anarchist. In this article Reinsdorf first outlines what freedom of the press, of assembly, and of speech mean to him; saying that they are hollow phrases when this is all a man has. Then he continues to present his case by stating:

The liberation of the oppressed is only possible when the entire means of production of private profit is removed, and regulated through the need of the general public, in whose hand it should rest when all property is collectivized. Is it possible though, that with today's arrangement, which is based on the narrow deformed idea of private property, that it can be transformed in a peaceful way to a collectivized property? How is it possible to transform the million threads which form the entire administrative apparatus of private property with a single blow, to free it without damage or offense? He who speaks of a great evolution is a utopian, he had



not yet considered that the present state of affairs is founded on private property, and that with the destruction of private property will be followed in a logical way by the destruction of the entire present day form of society.

In the same article Reinsdorf also pointed out the growing dissatisfaction of the German anarchists with the German Social Democrats. He demonstrated the need for the formation of a German anarchist party which would openly oppose the Social Democratic Party.

The growing dispute with the Social Democrats was carried one step further in the early part of 1877 when the quarrel between Hermann Greulich, editor of the Tagwacht, and Reinsdorf, developed into an open conflict. Ever since the founding of the Arbeiter-Zeitung on July 15, 1876, the Tagwacht had gone out of its way to discredit the founders of the anarchist paper.<sup>32</sup> On February 27, 1877, Emil Werner held a meeting in Neuchatel which was conducted in both French and German on the theme of "socialism in Germany" in which he pointed out the difference between the Volksstaat theory of the Social Democrats and the theory of anarchism. Werner called the Volksstaat idea a reactionary instrument of bourgeois democrats which would result in the introduction of a dangerous dualism in the socialist movement. He concluded by saying that the only thing that would be accomplished by erecting a Volksstaat would be the further entrenchment of police power.<sup>33</sup>

On May 5, 1877, Reinsdorf wrote regarding the Volksstaat:

It is clear, that the idea of the Volksstaat in which the will of the majority must be thrust upon the reluctant minority in a continuing way by an army of bureaucrats and police—it is clear, that if the Volksstaat is not allowed to develop to anarchism then entirely abnormal conditions will follow. How, under such circumstances can there be freedom of speech in such a Volksstaat, and where is the equality if an oppressed minority exists? <sup>34</sup>

Reinsdorf, in the same article, went on to point out that on every side men are subjected to the degrading devices of the state and that the Social Democratic Party sought to follow the same course, thinking that mankind cannot exist without the rules

and regulations of the state. To try to organize mankind from above is unnatural because it results in the need for an authoritarian rule under which mankind can never hope to be free. However, "If you organize from below on the basis of need then all rulers are unnecessary or detrimental. The fight for freedom will never be ended until ... every authoritarian has been annihilated."<sup>35</sup>

Reinsdorf's writings point out quite clearly that the German-speaking anarchists in Switzerland had undergone a substantial change from their earlier program in which the idea was presented that need alone should not be a determining factor in the distribution of goods, or, better phrased, he who would not work should not receive. The contention that one ought to work in order to receive is not found in Reinsdorf's writings, which point the way to the next step taken by the German-speaking anarchists in Switzerland. This step was the forming of the German-speaking Anarchist Communist Party in May of 1877. Reinsdorf, who had left Switzerland in April of 1877 for Germany, on one of his propaganda trips, did not take part in the formation of this association in May and June of 1877. However, Werner and Rinke were very instrumental in the organization of the group.<sup>36</sup>

The forming of the German-speaking Anarchist Communist Party was not without opposition. The opposition was led by Gutschmann and Bremeyer. On June 13, 1877, Rinke called together a meeting in which the program of the group was presented. The statutes of the Deutschredenden anarchisch-kommunistischen Partei stated that the purpose of the organization was to unite the diverse elements of the German-speaking peoples who recognized the anarchist-communist principle and who were associated with the International Workingmen's Association. The eight articles of the program were concerned with perfunctory matters such as admission, dues, and the establishment of a Correspondance Bureau to maintain a continuous relationship between the individual members of the organization.<sup>37</sup>

The new party was not destined to have a very long life. Several months before it was founded, on March 18, 1877, the Rote Fahnen demonstration had taken place. Following the Paris Commune a reaction set in over all of Europe against the Commune and the ideas for which it stood and one of its prominent symbols was the red flag. Eventually red flags were forbidden

even in Switzerland; however, this did not stop the members of the Jura group from carrying them through the streets to celebrate the sixth anniversary of the Commune. The Arbeiter-Zeitung on March 10, 1877, has carried an exhortation for all members of the International to gather in Bern on the 18th for the celebration of the anniversary. The Arbeiter-Zeitung proclaimed that the red flag should be the official flag of the International and said that within a few years it would be the flag of the proletariat and that the bourgeoisie would fall before it.

Both the German and French-speaking representatives were present at the gathering which took place outside at ten o'clock Sunday morning on March 18, 1877. They met again at two in the afternoon in the Jeangros Restaurant. It was decided that the march to the train station should be led by the red flag followed by a group of musicians who would be followed by the marchers. Naturally the police could not permit such a march to take place so they stepped in, halted it, and seized the marchers. They were not tried, however, until August 16 when a sentences were handed down of from 10 to 60 days imprisonment; in addition to fines, damages had to be paid to pay the medical bill of a couple of policemen who had been injured in the fracas. Rinke received 40 days, Werner and Brousse 30 days each. In addition to this Werner, Rinke, and Brousse were forbidden to enter the Swiss Canton of Bern for three years.<sup>38</sup>

The banishment of Werner and Rinke struck a severe blow at the Arbeiter-Zeitung. Reinsdorf was away in Germany at the time and it had been decided already prior to the trial that Brousse would start publication of a paper in French that would be similar in format to the Arbeiter-Zeitung. L'avant-Garde was published by Brousse at Chaux-de-Fonds from June 2, 1877, to December 2, 1878. In all, 40 issues appeared. The establishment of L'avant-Garde left Werner and Rinke as the mainstays of the Arbeiter-Zeitung, and when both of them were banished from Bern, publication of the Arbeiter-Zeitung was no longer feasible. Their banishment and the probable realization that each would be considered as persona non grata elsewhere in Switzerland probably more than anything else contributed to the demise of the Arbeiter-Zeitung. The last issue of the paper which appeared on October 15, 1877, claimed that the paper had accomplished its purpose of spreading the ideas of anarchism in Germany.

The final edition of the Arbeiter-Zeitung noted that other newspapers would be established elsewhere to take its place; a claim that is at least partially true. L'avant-Garde, which Werner and Rinke made use of to make themselves heard, due to Werner's great facility with the French language, can be considered a French cousin of the Arbeiter-Zeitung. Kropotkin's Le Révolté, founded on February 22, 1879, and his Freedom, founded in 1886, can quite logically claim to be offshoots of the Arbeiter-Zeitung. Freedom is still published today in London. Der Rebell, published in Switzerland and London by Rinke in 1881, 1884-1886, and superseded by Die Autonomie, which was published during the years 1886-1893 by the Group Autonomie, of which Rinke was a member, may also be viewed as offshoots of the Arbeiter-Zeitung. Der Rebell, Die Autonomie, and the Group Autonomie will be discussed in chapter ten. These papers were founded for the explicit purpose of spreading the word of anarchism in Germany.

Werner and Rinke left Switzerland on foot walking nearly the entire distance to Verviers, Belgium, where a meeting of the anarchist members of the International was to take place on September 6-8, 1877.<sup>39</sup> At the International Anarchist Congress at Verviers, also called the Ninth Congress of the International Workingmen's Association, Werner and Rinke represented the Swiss sections and the newly formed anarchist groups in Germany, which Reinsdorf had helped found.<sup>40</sup> At this congress the question was raised of "the best and speediest means of realizing socialist revolutionary action." No decision was taken on this point. It was decided that "whenever the proletariat may secure a triumph, it is absolutely essential that this triumph shall be extended to all other lands." The congress adopted a resolution that whenever a revolutionary movement in a particular country showed signs of success, revolutionists in other countries must give this revolution all possible support, both material and moral and try to extend it to other countries.

The main discussion at the Verviers Congress was concerned with the agenda of the forthcoming Universal Socialist Congress to be held in Ghent on September 9-16, 1877. The delegates decided that at Ghent Congress they should present a united front on the principles discussed. The main points of the agenda for the Universal Socialist Congress, along with the anarchist positions adopted at Verviers, were: (1) collective

property—not as a distant idea, but as something that should be included in current programs and every day manifestations; (2) political parties—all political parties form a single reactionary mass, and it is our duty to fight them one and all; (3) trade union organization—trade union activities are inadequate as long as they are directed at such trifles as increasing wages or reducing hours. The unions should aim at the destruction of the wage system and the seizure of the means of production. In this resolution is contained the idea of replacing the socialist parties by trade unions. (This idea of the destruction of the wage system and the worker control of production was later incorporated in anarcho-syndicalist thought). (4) Solidarity among working class and social organization—it was decided that no solidarity could be established between the International and organizations differing from it upon essential points (referring to the anarchists). And (5) foundation of a central correspondence and statistical bureau—it was felt that the Federal Bureau of the International could fulfill this function and there was no need to establish a new bureau. By maintaining the bureau as it was, a bureau dominated by anarchists, they would be able to dominate the world wide labor movement. A change would mean dominance by the German Social Democrats.

The Verviers Congress adjourned on the note that a congress would be held the next year in Switzerland. However, the proposed congress was never held and the Verviers Congress marked the death of the Anarchist International after an existence of only six years.

After the completion of the Verviers Congress Werner and Rinke, along with nine other anarchists, went to Ghent to attend the Universal Socialist Congress September 9-16, 1877, representing groups at Leipzig, Magdeburg, Berlin, Munich, Müllhausen, Thun, and Zürich.<sup>41</sup> This was the first international meeting in five years which represented the different shades of anarchist and socialist opinion. The purpose of the meeting was to see if the 42 delegates could bring the movement back together and cement former ties. Before a pact of solidarity could be reached certain questions of principle had to be agreed upon. The agenda for the Universal Socialist Congress, already discussed above in relation to the Verviers Congress, comprised the areas where some agreement had to be achieved before there could be any possibility of solidarity.

On the first point, "the tendencies of modern production from the view point of property," there was little divergence of opinion. All the delegates at Ghent were advocates of collective ownership, but opinion was divided among the state communists (Social Democrats) and the collective federalists (anarchists). The great difference of opinion was over the best method to bring the collective economy into being. The discussion eventually degenerated into an argument of the Volksstaat versus a voluntary federation of free production groups. In the final vote on this point the anarchists lost by a vote of 16 to 10.

The second issue dealing with "political parties" was another point on which the Social Democrats and the anarchists were irreconcilably split. Some of the milder anarchists, such as James Guillaume, representing Switzerland, were alarmed by the speeches of the Spanish anarchists, who called for violent revolutionary activity, insurrection, and "propaganda by deed." A resolution moved by Werner on this point stated:

We deem it necessary to combat all political parties, whether they call themselves socialist or not, in the hope that the workers who are still enrolled in the ranks of these parties, enlightened by experience, will open their eyes, and will abandon the political path in order to enter the path of anti-governmental socialism.

This resolution was supported by all of the anarchists but was voted down by the other delegates. The resolution on this point which eventually carried supported political activity as the best method to bring about social emancipation.

The congress passed a resolution supporting an international federation of trade unions as a potent instrument for the emancipation of the workers. The discussion concerning whether solidarity should be established among the various working-class groups and socialist organizations ended in a defeat for the proposal. However, that evening in a private meeting, to which the anarchists were not invited, a resolution was adopted supporting united activity on the part of the organization in all lands and promising material and moral support for one another. The discussion on the question of founding a central bureau for correspondence and for the tabulation of working-class

statistics ended in a capitulation by all but three of the anarchists.

During the congress Werner delivered what Rocker has called a first rate speech, in which he attacked the program, tactics and organization of the German Social Democratic Party. The congress listened attentively as he spoke and when the speech was finished no one rose to their feet to speak in opposition, although it should be noted that Liebknecht was not present during Werner's attack.<sup>42</sup>

On the surface it would appear that the anarchist position had been soundly defeated by the Social Democrats at Ghent. However, Kropotkin relates that "we succeeded in checking the centralization scheme" although centralization was not truly the issue in the 1877 congress. The socialists on all the items on the agenda carried the day over the anarchists. Perhaps it is ironical that at Ghent the socialists were victorious over the anarchists because they had the voting power on their side, though it should be pointed out that there were many instances of crossover votes on both sides and the issue was muddled further by a number of fence sitters who had one foot in the socialist camp and the other in the anarchist. In the final analysis the Social Democratic position probably triumphed because it was the most reasonable and appeared to have the greatest chance of success. The delegates could see the concrete evidence of what following such a program had achieved in Germany by 1877 in the form of 12 seats in the Reichstag. On the other hand there was no evidence to demonstrate that insurrection or "propaganda by deed" could be successful. The anarchists had been dominant in the International since 1872, but now they fell victim to what they originally opposed, by trying to force the whole International Workers' Movement into their own narrow framework. In attempting to do this they eventually isolated themselves and lacking the necessary support were to be soon superseded on the international scene by the socialists.

One fact became abundantly clear at the Universal Socialist Congress; if the anarchists pressed too hard in Germany they would be opposed not only by the state but by the Social Democratic Party. This came out when Greulich (representing Switzerland) said to Werner "It is easy to preach the ideas of anarchism in free Switzerland but what would happen if you tried it in Germany." Werner replied: "Yes, that is precisely what we plan to do shortly." Liebknecht, infuriated by Werner's

remark, jumped to his feet, offering a counter-challenge, "If you dare to come to Germany and attack our organization, we shall annihilate you using any means necessary."<sup>43</sup> This advice evidently fell on deaf ears for after the congress adjourned Rinke and Werner left for Germany.

It is now necessary to return to 1876 and pick up the other half of the story; the results of the Arbeiter-Zeitung's campaign to disseminate anarchist ideas in Germany and establish a number of anarchist groups there. Archival material for this period is not the best indicator of anarchist activity in Germany. The archival materials examined for the early 1870's are for the most part confused when dealing with anarchism, Social Democracy, and radical Social Democrats and are consequently of little use.<sup>44</sup> Evidence of anarchist activity during the early period in Germany is difficult to find for a number of reasons. The entire operation was of necessity an underground affair conducted for the most part by Reinsdorf, Werner, and Rinke, all fugitives from the law. Detection by the police would have meant immediate arrest and imprisonment. One reason for the dearth of material is that the principal participants did not leave memoirs. Reinsdorf was beheaded in 1885. Rinke died an untimely death in St. Louis, Missouri, at the age of 46, by choking to death on a piece of meat which he was eating in haste in order to get to an anarchist meeting. Werner left little record of his activities after he left Germany in the early 1880's. It is necessary therefore to piece the story of anarchist activity in Germany in the years 1876-78 through the use of the various anarchist newspapers published at the time in Switzerland. The correspondence written to these papers from various parts of Germany is very revealing concerning anarchist activity in Germany.

In late August and early September 1876, Reinsdorf undertook the first of several propaganda trips into Germany on behalf of the group which had founded the Arbeiter-Zeitung. On his first trip Reinsdorf traveled through the large cities of Southern Germany and eventually to Berlin where he met with his friend Johann Most, not yet an anarchist. Reinsdorf established himself as a correspondent for Most's Berliner freie Presse, sending in contributions on such topics as the free formation of anarchist groups and the Bern Congress. Reinsdorf hoped to halt the spread of Social Democratic ideas and replace them with his own anti-authoritarian ones.



During 1876-1877 Reinsdorf spent a good deal of time in Leipzig, where he posed as an American using the name John Steinberg, and attended Social Democratic meetings to present the anarchist viewpoint. Converts came slowly, but after a while Reinsdorf managed to gather a group of adherents. It soon became known among his followers that he was from near-by Pegau and eventually the police began to watch his activities more closely when they became suspicious of his command of the local dialect, which he spoke too well to be an American. One member of Reinsdorf's small circle was Max Hödel, who tried to assassinate the German Emperor on May 11, 1878. It is very possible that Reinsdorf also came in contact with Dr. Carl Nobiling, who was still a student in Leipzig at this time. Nobiling attended Social Democratic meetings during his stay in Leipzig. (It will be pointed out in Chapter V that it is possible that Nobiling knew Werner). Johann Most claimed that both Hödel's and Nobiling's attempts on the life of William I were inspired by Reinsdorf.<sup>45</sup> During this trip into Germany, Reinsdorf also traveled to Hannover, Berlin, Breslau, Cologne, Dresden, Altenburg, Munich, Düsseldorf, Augsburg and other places.

Kropotkin had great faith that the Arbeiter-Zeitung could be used as a base to found anarchist groups in Germany. On April 29, 1877, he wrote to Paul Robin:

The Arbeiter-Zeitung will become the center of a German anarchist party. ... We find here many followers for such a beginning (I am speaking of Germans and not German-speaking Swiss). Besides we already have Reinsdorf, Görge and others in Germany, who are working in the same spirit and who have succeeded in founding in Germany an anarchist party, that will drive the peaceable Germans on the road to revolution.<sup>46</sup>

The plan which the German anarchists were following was to invade meetings of the Social Democrats and use the opportunity to speak at these meetings to make converts to anarchism. In general, then, the anarchists did not seek out new territories but went to the industrial centers and cities of Germany where the Social Democrats had already made considerable inroads. The principal centers of anti-authoritarianism and anarchism in Germany in the years 1876-1878 were Leipzig,

Munich, and Berlin; Southern Germany, in general, was more receptive to anarchist ideas than Northern Germany.

Reinsdorf re-entered Germany in April 1877 after first traveling to London, Brussels, and Paris. In Leipzig he was able to find work as a compositor, something he had been unable to do in London, Brussels, or Paris, probably because he did not know the French or English languages. During 1877 Reinsdorf and others sent a considerable amount of correspondence out of Germany to the anarchist papers in Switzerland. The bulk of this material can be placed into four categories: (1) attacks on Social Democratic theory, (2) clarification of anarchist theory, (3) Social Democratic activities in Germany, and (4) indications that anarchism was spreading in Germany.<sup>47</sup> Reinsdorf wrote that the German workers were quick to understand the principles of anarchism and could see the validity of anarchist ideas over those of the Volksstaat, where the will of the majority dominated the minority.<sup>48</sup> In his articles Reinsdorf made vicious attacks on Vorwärts, the central organ of the Social Democratic Party, published in Leipzig by Wilhelm Liebknecht.<sup>49</sup> He also pointed out that the unification of Germany had little meaning for the German working man and that the Social Democrats had been unsuccessful in their attempts to ameliorate the lot of the working man.<sup>50</sup>

Reinsdorf mentioned that there were visible signs of revolutionary groups who wanted to abolish all signs of governmental prejudice. The anarchists, he said, would be assisted in forming a party in Germany by the German government itself, because the state would prove to the people how impractical legal methods are in achieving equality for the workingman.<sup>51</sup> In his correspondence in June, July, and August of 1877 Reinsdorf was carried away perhaps with his enthusiasm for the success of anarchism in Germany by the accomplishments which he himself was beginning to have. In Leipzig Reinsdorf continued to attend the meetings of the Social Democrats, mouthing his anarchist sentiments until he became a persona non grata. At the time Reinsdorf started to gather his own following. He related that "One day a young man, a street seller, came to me and asked if I would give him private instruction in the principles of anarchism." From this simple beginning a group was formed which included Hödel whom Reinsdorf considered to be a Social Democratic spy until Hödel's attempt on the life of the Emperor a few months later.<sup>52</sup>

Reinsdorf probably attended the Gotha Congress of the

Social Democratic Party in May, 1877. Brousse wrote to him offering 50 francs for his expenses if he would attend the congress and send a written report of the proceedings to be printed in the Arbeiter-Zeitung. Reinsdorf replied on May 23 that he could not attend the congress,<sup>53</sup> however, Reinsdorf's correspondence from Leipzig in the August, 1877, issue of Le travailleur indicates that he was present at the congress. In addition to this the detailed coverage given the Gotha Congress in the Arbeiter-Zeitung of June 16, 1877, bears a strong resemblance to Reinsdorf's style of writing.

Gotha is not a great distance from Leipzig, but Reinsdorf was employed and to attend the congress he would have to quit his job. Reinsdorf realized that his days in Leipzig were numbered. The police were following his activities too closely and the whole Steinberg business had a fishy smell to it as far as the police were concerned. This probably all played a part in his decision to attend the Gotha Congress. Reinsdorf was by nature a wanderer who did not like to remain long in one place. Upon his return from the Gotha Congress he left Leipzig for Berlin in August. It is possible that he also paid a short visit to Munich because Reinsdorf was very enthusiastic about the anti-authoritarian activities which were starting to develop in Munich in the summer of 1877. He was interested in the paper the Zeitgeist, which expressed anti-authoritarian ideas, favoring the free federation of groups.<sup>54</sup> In this respect it appears that Reinsdorf had reasons to be optimistic because the anti-authoritarian groups in Munich were strong enough that they were producing concern among the Social Democratic leaders.<sup>55</sup>

The group founded by Reinsdorf in Leipzig transmitted their best wishes to the meeting of the Congress of the Jura Federation which met at St. Immer on August 4, 5, 6, 1877. In the telegram they affirmed their "Brüdergruss and Solidarität."<sup>56</sup> Reinsdorf also telegraphed a greeting to the meeting from Berlin.<sup>57</sup> The congress thanked the Leipzig group for their telegram, and replied "to the anarchists of Berlin" that they "thanked them from the bottom of their hearts for their telegram," going on to urge them "to combine their efforts to form a revolutionary anarchist party in Germany, to endeavour to form free groups and abolish the State. This they should do in conjunction with the masses who were growing more aware of the favorable circumstances."<sup>58</sup>

The seed which Reinsdorf had planted in Berlin in 1876 was beginning to show signs of fruition. An unknown correspondent wrote from Berlin in the spring of 1877 that

... many German workers, who are really revolutionaries, are beginning to arrive at the conclusion that they have nothing to gain by following the methods of legal propaganda, but everything to lose. There are many German workers in the [Social Democratic] party who are anarchists, but in nearly all cases they are not well acquainted with all the principles and values of anarchism because the newspapers and brochures available in Germany speak only of the Volksstaat with centralized organization. But those workers already know that government and liberty are two words that do not go together. It would be a good thing if a brochure were written in the German language on the principles of anarchism. This brochure would be very useful because already in our party, as great numbers believe in spite of all to the contrary, it is the bourgeois who are responsible for the centralization of our organization.<sup>59</sup>

In Berlin in 1872 a new current of socialist thought appeared on the scene, which was led by Dr. Eugen Dühring (January 12, 1833-September 21, 1921), a blind Privatdozent at the University of Berlin. Dühring's Cursus der National und Sozialökonomie appeared in 1872 and was seized upon by Eduard Bernstein (1850-1932), who sent copies of it to Wilhelm Bracke (1842-1880), Friedrich Wilhelm Fritzsche (1825-1905), Johann Most (1846-1906), and August Bebel (1840-1913). At the time Dühring's writings appealed to Social Democratic leaders because a theoretical vacuum existed; Lassalleism was declining and Marxism was not yet understood. Bebel published an extravagant review of Dühring's book in the Volksstaat calling it the best book on economics published since Das Kapital. This general attitude pervaded German Social Democracy in spite of Dühring's attacks on Marx and Engels. Peter Gay contends that Dühring "enjoyed such a degree of popularity in German Social Democracy that he almost eclipsed Marx and Engels."<sup>60</sup> This was possible, Gay contends, because German Social Democracy in the 1870's was intellectually immature and poorly equipped to distinguish between conflicting claims of greatness, because none of the

leaders of the Social Democrats was trained in political economy. Another factor involved was Dühring's blindness which aroused a certain amount of compassion among the socialists.<sup>61</sup>

Dühring came to the attention of the anarchists. Reinsdorf called his writings an important symptom pointing to the revolutionary tendencies in Germany. To Reinsdorf, Dühring had "demonstrated the existing contradiction between the governmental idea of the Social Democrats and the idea of freedom." Reinsdorf went on to point out that demonstrating this contradiction Dühring became the object of persecution by the Social Democrats. Vorwärts, Reinsdorf mentions, would not accept any articles favorable to Dühring or his ideas but it carried for well over six months a long refutation by Engels. Eventually the persecution resulted in Dühring being expelled from his chair at the university.<sup>62</sup>

One of Dühring's strongest supporters was a radical named Abraham Ensz who wrote a series of articles for the Berliner freie Presse, defending Dühring against Engels. The articles later appeared in a brochure entitled Engels' Attentat auf den gesunden Menschenverstand (Geneva, 1877),<sup>63</sup> Marx's opinion of Dühring and his supporter is contained in a letter of October 19, 1877, to Sorge, in part:

A rotten spirit is making itself felt in our party in Germany, not so much among the masses as among the leaders (upper class and "workers"). The compromise with the Lassalleans has led to compromise with other halfway elements too; in Berlin (via Most) with Dühring and his "admirers," but also with a whole gang of half-mature students and superwise doctors of philosophy who want to give socialism a "higher, ideal" turn—that is to say, to replace its materialist basis (which calls for serious, objective study by anyone wanting to make use of it) by modern mythology with its goddesses of Justice, Liberty, and Fraternity. Dr. Höchberg, who publishes the Zukunft, is a representative of this tendency and has "bought his way" into the party - with the "noblest" intentions, I assume, but I do not give a damn for "intentions." Anything more miserable than his program of the Zukunft has seldom seen the light of day with more "modest presumption."

The workers themselves, when, like Herr Most and Co., they give up work and become professional literary men, always breed "theoretical" mischief and are always ready to join muddleheads from the allegedly "learned" caste. Utopian socialism especially, which for tens of years we have been clearing out of the German workers' heads with so much effort and labor—their freedom from it making them theoretically (and therefore also practically) superior to the French and English—utopian socialism, playing with fantastic pictures of the future structure of society, is again spreading in a much more futile form, not to be compared with the great French and English utopians, but with Weitling. It is natural that utopianism, which before the era of materialist-critical socialism concealed the latter within itself in nuce (in the nutshell), coming now post festum (after the event) can only be silly—silly, stale, and fundamentally reactionary.<sup>64</sup>

Marx's assessment of the situation was quite correct. Today, Dühring is all but forgotten, but in 1877 he posed a great threat to Marx. The number of people who were turning toward Dühring's brand of socialism was increasing so it was necessary to discredit him. One casualty who fell in the discrediting of Dühring was Johann Most, whose name was mentioned prominently in Marx's letter. In May 1876 Liebknecht received a manuscript from Most glorifying Dühring, for publication in Vorwärts. Liebknecht sent it off to London for Marx and Engels to review. At the time Marx was engaged on volume two of Das Kapital and Engels had to answer the threat of Dühring which he did in a series of articles published in Vorwärts January 1877-July 1878, which had the effect of destroying the Dühring boom for ever. The relationship of Dühring to the development of anarchism in Germany is significant. He influenced the development of Most's thought, a topic which will be treated in detail below. The program of the Marxists to discredit Dühring embittered Most, forcing him in a more radical direction.

Another current of anarchism in Germany starting around 1870 was led by Arthur Mülberger (1847-1907), a medical doctor from Württemberg, who was a Proudhonist and who exerted his efforts to make Proudhon known in Germany. He did not achieve much in the way of a following but he managed to incur the might of the angry pen of Friedrich Engels. Mülberger's Zur Wohnungsfrage, which appeared in the Volksstaat

(Leipzig) in 1872, was immediately opposed by Engels.<sup>65</sup> He was not discouraged by Engels' attack and he continued to write articles and books in favor of Proudhonism down to the turn of the century but with little success.<sup>66</sup> The opposition to Mühlberger came from many other socialists, including Bebel.<sup>67</sup> Mühlberger was a pure Proudhonist, accepting Proudhon's doctrines as unchangeable and immutable. This is probably why Mühlberger had so little appeal in Germany. He had nothing new to add to Proudhon and the economic situation was changing rapidly in Germany in the latter half of the 19th century, a factor which soon made Proudhon's theories incongruent with the existing situation.

Following the completion of the Ghent Congress in September of 1877 both Rinke and Werner went to Germany; Rinke to Munich, and Werner to Leipzig. In Munich an open discussion was being carried on between the anarchists and the Social Democrats. This confrontation would be continued until the assassination attempt by Hödel in May of 1878. The anarchists let it be known that they intended to step up their activities with regular propaganda campaigns to win more ground and influence among the workers.<sup>68</sup> Rinke, however, did not remain in Munich very long before he left for Cologne where he lived under the name of Otto Rau. While in Cologne in 1878-1879 Rinke was sentenced to jail under the name of Rau. Why he was sentenced or for how long is not known.<sup>69</sup> Since he was a military deserter Rinke had to travel with extreme caution in Germany.

In October of 1877, shortly after his arrival in Leipzig from Ghent, Werner delivered a speech on the subject of "The International Socialist Congress in Ghent and the principles of anarchism." In this talk he pointed out the difference between the Social Democratic Party, which he likened to authoritarian socialism, and anarchism, which he likened to free socialism. A number of converts were made among the workers present. In December of the same year Werner invaded a large meeting which the Social Democrats had called. At this meeting, which consisted primarily of trade union workers, Werner spoke out saying that "the trade union idea is only an outflowing of the old bourgeois theory of the harmony between capital and labor and the Social Democratic idea of the class struggle."<sup>70</sup> Immediately several of the local leaders of the Social Democratic Party rose to their feet, vehemently opposing Werner, and emphasizing the necessity for a concentrated campaign, to warn the workers of the dangers of anarchism, lest their judgement be distorted by

Werner's charges. In spite of this, a resolution put forth by Werner managed to garner a third of the workers' votes.

In February of 1878 the SPD held a large meeting in the Leipziger Tonhalle for the purpose of discussing the Near Eastern question. At this meeting Liebknecht spoke out the subject in a speech which was decidedly anti-Russian in tone. Liebknecht for over a month had been printing anti-Russian articles in Vorwärts and the speech was the culminating point of his anti-Russian propaganda. He related that the apparent oppression of the Slavs in the Balkans by the Turks was only an invention of the Russian subsidized press. The discussion had reached rather striking proportions among the rank-and-file members of the Social Democratic Party, even before the anarchists got involved. In response to Liebknecht's article in Vorwärts, "Should Europe Become Cossackized?" Levy wrote an article, "Should the German Workers' Party Become Turkish?" At the meeting Liebknecht presented his anti-Russian ideas and was followed by Dr. Fränkel, a National Liberal, who assaulted the Turks as Liebknecht had the Russians. Following this heated exchange Werner rose to his feet asking Liebknecht "what in his opinion should the suppressed peoples of the Turkish Empire do?" Already in the 1870's the anarchists were interested in abolishing war, and in championing the cause of oppressed peoples. A reading of any anarchist paper of this period will point out their concern over warfare and their proposals to stop it. Werner then introduced a resolution in which he proposed that the oppressed Balkan Slavs had a right to be free of their Ottoman overlords. This resolution was rejected by only a small number of votes.<sup>71</sup>

In Leipzig Werner also came in contact with a former member of Reinsdorf's circle, Max Hödel. The Italians and Spanish had been the most ardent admirers of "propaganda by deed," but it was to be a German, Max Hödel, who would make the first "attentat" on the life of a royal sovereign.

The situation in Germany in the spring of 1878 found Reinsdorf in Berlin, Werner in Leipzig and Rinke in either Munich, or Gologne. Anarchist groups had been formed in Leipzig, Munich, Berlin and a number of other places. The stage was set for a series of events which would change the entire course of the socialist movement in Germany.

Anarchism in Germany prior to the attempt, by Hödel, on



the life of the German Emperor, was more of a source of annoyance to the Social Democratic Party than anything else. The threat that the anarchists would take over the leadership of the labor movement was never close to being realized. As far as the government and the middle class citizenry of Germany were concerned the anarchists were nothing more than a part of the odious socialist movement. The confusion is not surprising because the majority of both the socialists and anarchists were not certain themselves of their respective positions. Part of the task of the next decade was to define their ideologies and clarify their differences.

#### Notes

1. Émile de Laveleye, "Le socialisme contemporain en Allemagne," Revue des deux mondes, 156 (September 1, 1876), 121-122.

2. Le Révolté, (December 10, 1881).

3. Deutsche Zentralarchiv Merseburg. Rep. 89 H (Geheimes Zivilkabinett) Abt. XXI, Generalia, Nr. 18, Vol. I, "Die Sozialdemokratie und Anarchie 1872-1909."

4. Rudolf Rocker, Johann Most, Das Leben eines Rebellen (Berlin, 1924), pp. 97-98; Max Nettlau, "Bibliographie der Anarchie in deutsche Sprache 1792-1897," Jahrbuch der freien Generation für 1913, p. 122; James Guillaume, L'International: Documents et souvenirs 1864-1878 (Paris, 1905-1910), III, p. 197; La Première Internationale Periodiques 1864-1877 (Paris, 1958), I p. 33.

5. Josef Peukert, "Otto Rinke," Jahrbuch der freien Generation für 1910, p. 83. There can be no doubt that Otto Trupp, the principal character of John H. Mackay's Die Anarchisten (Zurich, 1891) is Otto Rinke. Mackay spent several years in London in the late 1880's researching his novel. He met Rinke at this time, and of the communist anarchists was most impressed with him. On Mackay's method of research see: Josef Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiter-bewegung (Berlin, 1913), pp. 283-285.

6. Staatsarchiv Ludwigsburg, F 201 Stadtdirektion Stuttgart, 632, "Anarchisten, 1885-1898," "Personlichkeiten welche als anarchistischer Gesinnung verdächtig bezeichnet sind," p. 6. I have been unable to date Werner's death. Rocker mentions that Kropotkin spoke with him in Paris in 1913, but that he had withdrawn from the movement years before. Rocker assumed that Werner was still alive in 1924. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 113.

7. Johann Most, August Reinsdorf (New York, 1885), p. 13.

8. Volksrecht (Zurich), July 28, 1900. Quoted in J. Langhard, Die anarchistische Bewegung in der Schweiz, pp. 250-251.

9. For the proceedings of this congress see: Compte-rendu officiel du septieme congrès général de l'association Internationale des travailleurs (Verviers, 1875), and the excellent coverage given the congress by the London Times, (September 10, 1874), p. 7: a, b, c; (September 11, 1874), p. 8: c, d, e; (September 14, 1874), p. 7: d, e; (September 15, 1874), p. 5: c, d; (September 16, 1874), p. 7: a, b, c.

10. G.M. Stekloff, History of the First International (New York, 1928), p. 293.

11. Briefwechsel, IV, p. 367.

12. London Times (September 11, 1874), p. 8: c.

13. Ibid.

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid., (September 14, 1874), p. 7: d, e; (September 16, 1874), p. 7: a, b, c.

16. Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, pp. 130-132. Reinsdorf was in Lausanne working with Rudolph Kahn founding a section of the International, a plan which was realized in February of 1876. Guillaume, L'Internationale, III, p. 318.

17. Quoted in Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, pp. 131-132. For the complete text see Appendix I.

18. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 100.

19. Arbeiter-Zeitung, No. 1 (July 15, 1876).

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid., No. 33, (October 13, 1877).

22. On this congress see: Compte rendu du huitième congrès général de l'association International des travailleurs, tenu a Berne du 26 au 30 Octobre, 1876 (Bern, 1876); Nettlau, Der Anarchismus von Proudhon zu Kropotkin, pp. 237-245; Stekloff, History of the First International, pp. 329-333; Guillaume, L'Internationale, IV, pp. 91-112; Arbeiter-Zeitung, No. 8 (October 21, 1876), No. 9 (October 28, 1876).

23. Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 101-104; Guillaume, L'Internationale, IV, pp. 55-56.

24. Guillaume, L'Internationale, IV, p. 79.

25. Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, p. 133.

26. Most, August Reinsdorf, pp. 22-23.

27. Ibid.

28. See the open letter of the Central Bureau in Le Gutenberg. Journal de la typographie Belge (Brussels) (September 16, 1876).

29. Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 105-106. See also Reinsdorf's letter in the Arbeiter-Zeitung, No. 7 (October 7, 1876), in which he replied to charges made by Greulich in Tagwacht that he was nothing more than a paid agitator of the Jura Federation. Practically every issue of the Arbeiter-Zeitung contains some material on this dispute which existed with Greulich's Tagwacht.

30. Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, p. 133.

31. Arbeiter-Zeitung, No. 10 (November 18, 1876).

32. Guillaume, L'Internationale, IV, p. 110.

33. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 110.

34. Arbeiter-Zeitung, No. 22 (May 5, 1877).

35. Ibid.

36. Emil Werner in a letter of May 4, 1877, to Kropotkin related how he and Rinke were working to organize the society and drawn up a list of statutes. Guillaume, L'Internationale, IV, p. 208.

37. Quoted in Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, p. 134. For the complete text see Appendix II.

38. Langhard, Die anarchistische Bewegung in der Schweiz, pp. 66-73; Arbeiter-Zeitung, No. 19 (March 24, 1877); James Guillaume, L'Internationale, IV, pp. 167-172. On the trial see: James Guillaume, L'Internationale, IV, pp. 239-246; and the double issue of the Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne, No. 's 33-34 (August 25, 1877).

39. Kropotkin, Memoirs of a Revolutionist, p. 404, mentions that he attended the congress under the name Levashoff. See also Guillaume, L'Internationale, IV, pp. 256-258. Evidently Werner and Rinke did not serve the prison sentences of 30 and 40 days respectively handed down to them on August 18. Perhaps this is another factor in the demise of the Arbeiter-Zeitung because Werner and Rinke were now fugitives from justice in Switzerland.

40. No official report of this congress was ever published. Accounts of the proceedings can be found in Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne (September 23, 1877); Arbeiter-Zeitung, No. 32 (September 29, 1877); Guillaume, L'Internationale, IV, pp. 257-265; London Times (September 14, 1877), p. 4, col. b, c. For the complete agenda of the forthcoming Universal Socialist Congress see: Le travailleur (Geneva), No. 3 (July, 1877), 5-7. An account of the Verviers Congress is also found in Le travailleur, No. 6 (October, 1877), 10-11.

41. A privately printed account of this congress giving no date or place of publication is the Compte rendu des séances du congrès socialiste tenu à Gant 9-16 Septembre, 1877. For other accounts see: Guillaume, L'Internationale, IV, pp. 265-280; Bulletin de la fédération Jurassienne (September 23, 1877); Arbeiter-Zeitung, No. 32 (September 29, 1877), p. 6, col. d, e; (September 14, 1877), p. 4, col. d, e; (September 18, 1877), p. 4, col. c, d; Le travailleur, No. 6 (October, 1877), 11-13. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 109 mentions Reinsdorf's organization activities in Germany as does Le Révolté (December 10, 1881, p. 3.

42. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 110.

43. Quoted in Le Révolté (December 10, 1881). Lieb-knecht did not like Rinke and used every opportunity to get a dig in at him. It appears that Lieb-knecht, who was 41 at the time of the Ghent Congress, had more respect for Werner. In reply to a question posed by Werner regarding the feasibility of political activity Lieb-knecht replied that at least when he returned to Germany he would not have to change his name (this remark was aimed at Rinke who at the time was only 22 years old and a military deserter). Lieb-knecht then went on to say that if he had wanted to be rich he would have allied himself with Bismarck. He also pointed out that he had been imprisoned and in exile for the cause and that "In order to fight an armed state it is necessary to form an army." Rinke tried to reply to Lieb-knecht but his voice was drowned out and no one heard his reply. Compte rendu des séances du congrès socialiste tenu à Gant du 9 au 16 septembre 1877. p. 23. The personal animosity between Lieb-knecht and Rinke lasted for many years. See: Josef Peukert, Erinnerungen eines proletariers aus der revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung (Berlin, 1913), pp. 34-36. Peukert was a close friend of Rinke's in the years following 1880 and his memoirs constitute the best source for information on Rinke's activities in this period.

44. Deutsches Zentralarchiv Merseburg, Rep. 89, H (Geheimes Zivilkabinett), Abt. XXI, Generalia, Nr. 18, Vol. 1-2, "Die Sozialdemokratie und Anarchie 1872-1909."

45. Most, August Reinsdorf, pp. 28-29.

46. Quoted in Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, p. 135.

47. For example see: Arbeiter-Zeitung, No. 20 (April 7, 1877); No. 21 (April 21, 1877); No. 22 (May 5, 1877); No. 26 (June 30, 1877); No. 27 (July 14, 1877); No. 28 (July 28, 1877); No. 29 (August 11, 1877); No. 30-31 (August 25, 1877); Le travailleur, No. 1 (May, 1877), 19-22; No. 3 (July, 1877), 22-28; No. 4 (August, 1877), 26-29.
48. Arbeiter-Zeitung, No. 22 (May 5, 1877).
49. Le travailleur, No. 1 (May, 1877), pp. 20-22.
50. Ibid., No. 3 (July, 1877), pp. 22-28.
51. Ibid., No. 3 (July, 1877), pp. 22-28; No. 4 (August, 1877), pp. 26-29.
52. Der Anarchistenprozess Reinsdorf und Genossen Verhandelt vor dem 2. und 3. Strafsenat des Reichsgerichts zu Leipzig vom 15. bis 22. Dezember 1884 (Leipzig, 1885), pp. 15-16.
53. Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, p. 135.
54. Arbeiter-Zeitung, No. 26 (July 30, 1877); Le travailleur, No. 4 (August, 1877), p. 28.
55. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 110. For information on anarchist activities in Munich at this time see: Allgemeines Staatsarchiv München, Ministerium des Innern, 66312; Staatsarchiv für Oberbayern (Munich), RA 3784, Nr. 16803; Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne (February 4, 1878). On January 25, 1878 the "Sozialpolitische Verein Gleichheit" was founded in Munich. It is possible that Rinke or G. Görge played a role in the organization of this group. The purpose of the group was "enlightenment in all political and economic questions." The Gleichheit group included about ten members who were led by the rope maker Hermann Arnold (Stockach, Baden). They also had a group treasurer, the tailor Johann F (v) aterl (Schwandorf, Bavaria), and a secretary, the Shoemaker Adalbert Schlosser (Sagen, Prussia). Because of local obstacles, police regulations which forbid meetings, and apathy on the part of the members of the group, only two group meetings were held. These meetings were convened by Schlosser, who also spoke at them. In late March or early April the group broke up largely as a result of

Schlosser's disappearance from Munich after it was discovered he had spent a sum of money which belonged to his employer.

The Gleichheit group is typical of the anarchist groups formed in Germany in the 1870's; it was small, shortlived, and isolated from the other groups in Germany. The only thing such groups had in common was their ties, even though tenuous, to Switzerland and the emissaries of anarchist propaganda who traveled from there to Germany.

56. Arbeiter-Zeitung, No. 30-31 (August 25, 1877).

57. Ibid.

58. Ibid.

59. Le travailleur, No. 1 (May, 1877), p. 19.

60. Peter Gay, The Dilemma of Democratic Socialism. Eduard Bernstein's Challenge to Marx (New York, 1952), p. 83.

61. Ibid. Dühring began his career as a jurist, but when he became blind at the age of 30, he turned to writing and teaching. His books published in the late 1860's and early 1870's on political economy and philosophy were of a radically socialist tone, which involved him in constant arguments with his colleagues and superiors at the university.

62. Le travailleur, No. 4 (August, 1877), p. 28. On Dühring see: Friedrich Engels, Anti-Dühring (Moscow, 1954); Rocker, Johann Most, p. 51; Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, pp. 139-144; Nettlau, Bibliographie de l'anarchie, p. 41; Eduard Bernstein, Sozialdemokratische Lehrjahre (Berlin, 1925), pp. 52-59; Mehring, Geschichte der Sozialdemokratie, pp. 474-483; Arbeiter-Zeitung, No. 26 (June 30, 1877); No. 27 (July 14, 1877); Freie Generation (July, 1907), pp. 12-20.

Reinsdorf was correct in his assumption that in Dühring's works he could see elements of anarchism. The relationship of Dühring to communist-anarchism is fully explained in: Benedict Friedlaender, Der freiheitliche Sozialismus im Gegensatz zum Staatsknechtsthum der Marxisten. Mit besonderer Berucksichtigung der Werke und Schicksale Eugen Dührings (Berlin, 1892). Dühring was released from his position as a Privatdozent at the University of Berlin because of personal attacks on his colleagues, however, the socialists viewed his release as an

attack on Dühring's socialist views and rushed to his support as did students, instigated by socialists, demonstrated for his retention, but all in vain.

63. Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, p. 144; Nettlau, Bibliographie de l'anarchie, p. 41.

64. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, Letters to Americans 1848-1895 (New York, 1953), pp. 116-117.

65. For Engels' extensive comments see: Zur Wohnungsfrage (Zurich, 1872). The pamphlet in the original contained 28 pages, the 1887 edition with Engels' comment is 72 pages. See also: "Nachtrag über Proudhon und die Wohnungsfrage" in Friedrich Engels and Karl Marx, Werke, XVIII, pp. 264-287.

66. See his articles and books: "Ein Wahlmanifest Proudhons. Ein Beitrag zu Vorgeschichte der Commune," Gegenwart (1877), 251-262; "Von und über Proudhon," Die Wage (Berlin, 1878-1879); "Die Theorie der Anarchie," Die neue Gesellschaft (Zurich, March, 1878), 291-311; "Napoleon I," Neue freie Presse (Vienna, October 9 and 10, 1895); "Der Sozialismus und das Landvolk," Die Zukunft (Berlin, 1877); Zur Kentnisse des Marxismus. Kritische Skizzen (Stuttgart, 1894); Der Intum von Karl Marx, Aus Ernst Buschs Nachlass (Basel, 1894); Studien über Proudhon (Stuttgart, 1891); P.J. Proudhons Leben und Werke (1899). See his translation and commentary on Kapital und Zins. Die Polemik zwischen Bastiat und Proudhon (Jena, 1895); For his influence in Germany see: Nettlau, Bibliographie de l'anarchie, pp. 38-39; Nettlau, Der Vorfrühling der Anarchie, p. 168; Mehring, Geschichte der Sozialdemokratie, pp. 421, 479, 748.

67. Geil and J. Franz, "Eine deutsche Schrift über Proudhon," Frankfurter Zeitung (November 13, 1881).

68. Le bulletin de la fédération Jurassienne (February 4, 1878).

69. See footnote 123 in Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, p. 138, for Victor Dave's information on Rau.

70. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 110.



71. Ibid., pp. 111-112; Bulletin de la fédération Juras-  
sienne (February 25, 1878).

## Chapter IV

### THE HÖDEL ASSASSINATION ATTEMPT AND THE DEFEAT OF THE SOCIALIST LAW

#### The Hödel Attempt.

Saturday May 11, 1878, was a usual warm spring day in Berlin. The sun was shining and the water venders were busy plying their trade on the city's main thoroughfare, Unter den Linden. The German Emperor, William I (1796-1888), as was his daily habit, was out taking his afternoon constitutional in an open carriage accompanied by his daughter, the Grand Duchess of Baden. The aged Emperor, fondly called by the people the Griese Kaiser, was a man of fixed habits which varied little from day to day. Even though it was a common event to see the German Emperor, a crowd gathered along the sides of Unter den Linden hoping to catch a glimpse of their beloved Kaiser. He was returning from a ride in the Tiergarten about 3:30 in the afternoon. As the carriage was passing No. 7 Unter den Linden, which was the site of the Russian Embassy, located about halfway between the Brandenburg Gate and the Royal Palace, a tall, rather good-looking young man pushed himself into the line of spectators. The young man, Emil Heinrich Max Hödel (often referred to as Lehmann and also Traber), picked a poor spot to inject himself into the crowd.<sup>1</sup> The place Hödel wanted was occupied by Frau Julius Hauch, who along with her husband operated a water wagon, selling water to strolling crowds on Unter den Linden. Hödel tried to push into the front row, but Frau Hauch stood her ground. The Emperor's open carriage was now passing less than nine feet away from the crowd, Hödel realized that if he waited his opportunity would be lost so he raised his revolver in his right hand and pushed in as close as possible to Frau Hauch, firing over her shoulder. Frau Hauch had become annoyed at Hödel's pushing, so she shoved him just as he fired the first shot at the Emperor. The shot missed its mark passing behind the Emperor. Evidently incensed at missing, and blaming Frau Hauch for this, Hödel hit her on the side of the head with his revolver and jumped through the front row of spectators and fired a second shot which also missed. He then crossed over the street, firing a third shot at a would be apprehender, where

he assumed a semi-prone position holding the revolver in both hands and fired once again at the Emperor whose carriage by now had stopped.<sup>2</sup>

The Emperor after stopping his carriage ordered his chasseur to pursue the assailant. Hödel fled up Unter den Linden, firing two more shots at his pursuers. One of the pursuers, Herr Köhler, a senior clerk in the Prussian Widows' Pension Institution, grabbed him and held on momentarily only to be pushed aside by the stronger, younger assailant.<sup>3</sup> Hödel was finally apprehended in front of No. 5 Unter den Linden where the street is crossed by the Shadow Strasse. A large number of people had taken part in the capture, including the Emperor's chasseur. Once he was seized the captors immediately started to beat Hödel. Had it not been for the quick action of a laborer, Carl Reinhold Gustav Krüger (b. November 1, 1849 in Berlin), the crowd would have beaten Hödel to death. Because he saved Hödel from the angry crowd, Krüger became a suspect in the case but was later freed of having any part in the shooting attempt.<sup>4</sup>

When he was taken to the Mittelstrasse Police Station it was revealed that the assailant was only 20 years old, having been born in Leipzig on May 27, 1857,<sup>5</sup> the illegitimate child of Charlotte Emilie Hödel, who was little more than a girl when she bore him in Mackern near Leipzig. Her father was already deceased when Max was born and the infant lived with his grandmother in Mackern for the first two years of his life. From the time he was three until he was six he lived with an uncle in Schkeuditz which is also near Leipzig. When he was seven years old his mother married a shoemaker Johann Karl Eduard Traber with whom he lived in Leipzig until he was 11. On the occasion of his 12th birthday he spent the day in jail in Magdeburg for having run away from home; released that day, he walked home to Leipzig. When he was 13 he ran away from home once again and when he was found he was placed in the Zeitz reformatory.<sup>6</sup> During this period he was also publicly flogged as a thief in Leipzig. When he was placed in the Zeitz reformatory, a school certificate was produced, from a school which he had once attended, which branded him as a confirmed thief. After spending two years in the reformatory, he was apprenticed to a tinsmith in Zeitz named Hartling. Hödel was both quick and clever in learning the trade but his behavior was so bad that he was once again placed in the reformatory for a short period for beating a fellow tinsmith. When he qualified as a journeyman he went

off on his own working for different masters, returning to Leipzig in 1875 where he lived with friends of his parents.

In Leipzig Hödel was quickly caught up in the workers' movement, which was sweeping Germany at the time, beginning his career as a constant frequenter of socialist meetings. Evidently he showed signs of promise because he was soon a paid "filler" at socialist meetings, quickly advancing to a clique, and subsequently did wonders in crying "Good" or Hear, Hear," as circumstances seemed to demand. He then rose to the position of distributor and hawker of socialist papers, pamphlets, and fly sheets which enabled him to lead an easy life in beer gardens and meeting halls. He was also employed by the socialists in a traveling capacity which will be explained in more detail shortly. These trips took him over most of Germany, Austria, France, Hungary, Luxemburg, Switzerland, Bohemia, and Italy. On one occasion he is reported to have told a friend that he

... would never return to his craft, his present employment was so much more profitable and pleasant than the drudgery of the workshop. The leaders of the party, formerly poor devils of compositors, glaziers, and locksmiths, were now gentlemen at large with handsome incomes and nothing to do. They had certainly to undergo imprisonment every now and then; but what did it matter! Terms of imprisonment nowadays were very lenient, and the more prosecutions the greater the stipends paid the victim from party funds.<sup>7</sup>

Hödel had ambitions of being a spy for the Social Democrats and of eventually achieving a position of leadership in the party. However, his hopes were soon to be dashed on the rocks and he had a falling out with the socialists. According to Bebel, who did not know Hödel personally, the circumstances of this falling out were two-fold: one, Hödel was becoming too revolutionary for the socialists; two, while working for Die Fackel, the local organ of the Social Democratic Party, Hödel was found culpable in the embezzlement of subscription funds which he collected in his capacity as a subscription agent for both Die Fackel and Vorwärts. On April 5, 1878, Die Fackel carried the announcement that Hödel was no longer employed by the paper. A few days later at a meeting of the party members in Leipzig, Hödel received a vote of censure and a short time later was expelled from the party by the Central Party Committee in

Hamburg. Vorwärts, the Social Democratic Party organ, carried the announcement on May 9 that Hödel had been drummed out of the party. Perhaps it is ironical that the announcement of his ejection from the party appeared only a few days before his attempt on the life of the Emperor.<sup>8</sup>

Bebel would lead one to believe that Hödel's real guilt was his embezzlement of subscription funds, a charge which is without substantiation. Hödel, contemporary newspaper accounts point out, was a thief all his life: another unsubstantiated charge. If Hödel was a thief, the Social Democrats knew of it long before the spring of 1878. The fact of the matter is that Hödel was becoming too revolutionary for the SPD. The SPD, which stressed attainment of power by legal means, wanted to avoid any connection with anyone who stressed revolutionary means.

At first Hödel was a trusted party member and did a great deal of traveling as a representative of the party. His first trip took place in October of 1875, when he went to Berlin for eight days: the second trip in 1876 took him to Frankfurt, Cologne and Koblenz; the third in 1877 to Dresden, Prague, Vienna and Buda; the fourth in March and April 1878, to Koblenz, Metz, Trier, Colmar, Karlsruhe, Luxembourg, Frankfurt, Verdun, and Chalons-sur-Marne. On various occasions he made trips on behalf of the party to Chemnitz, Munich and Switzerland.

It has been noted in the previous chapter that Hödel joined the small circle led by August Reinsdorf in Leipzig in the spring of 1877, perhaps thinking of himself as a SPD spy. His conversion to anarchism evidently took place at this time. It has also been noted that in the fall of 1877 he met Emil Werner with whom he would remain in constant contact for the remainder of the time he lived in Leipzig. When he was arrested Hödel claimed to have led two anarchist meetings at Schkeuditz bei Leipzig. Police reports substantiate that he did take part in two meetings there on February 24, 1878, and March 17, 1878, in which he spoke out for the impoverished people in Germany. At these meetings he worked in conjunction with Emil Werner.<sup>9</sup>

After the meeting on March 17, 1878, he departed on his fourth propaganda trip for the SPD. On this trip Hödel's revolutionary leanings occupied the central portion of his activities. He spoke out a number of times against the king. On March 31, 1878, in Trier he said: "We do not need a Kaiser, a King or any laws. Down with all of them, all must go, we want to be free.

The state must be abolished and everyone should perform the same amount of labor."<sup>10</sup> He pointed out that mere socialist agitation and reform were meaningless, what was needed was to strike down all sovereigns. As a direct result of this trip at the time of his arrest, following his attempt on the Emperor, a charge was already pending against Hödel in Naumburg for "coupling the Emperor's name with insulting language." It is obvious that it was in the best interest of the SPD to disassociate themselves completely with Hödel because Hödel had in fact become an anarchist. In his statement, which he made when arrested, he said: "I am a friend of the Social Democrats, but the anarchists are my men. I have also read Bakunin."<sup>11</sup>

Rejected by the socialists Hödel was attracted, for monetary reasons, and reasons of personal revenge, to the opponents of the SPD, the National Liberals. Bruno Sparig, an agitator for the National Liberals, was responsible for picking up Hödel for the purpose of the propaganda value they could wring out of him. Hödel's association with the National Liberals and their organ the Leipziger Tageblatt was of short duration because Hödel was only of momentary value to his difficulties with the SPD. His affiliation with the National Liberals could not have started before April 11, 1878, the day he returned to Leipzig from his fourth trip. In his short campaign against the socialists Hödel was backed financially by the National Liberals. A letter of his was printed in the Leipziger Tageblatt in which he gave his side of the story regarding his difference of opinion with the leaders and policies of the SPD.

After belonging to the Socialist Party for a period of two years, during which time my business as a distributor of fliers brought me in personal contact with the principal leaders and officers of the association, the insolent treatment awarded to me at yesterday's meeting, on mere suspicion and without any chance on my part, to defend myself, compels me to anticipate the steps about to be taken by the chief committee at Hamburg. I therefore declare that, as a sincere socialist, I deem it beneath me to connive at the proceedings of certain parties who, profiting by the present organization of our society, do not scruple to procure large salaries for the coryphaei and officers of their set. It is at the expense of the dues-paying members of the society that these gentlemen are enabled to disburse 50 marks in three days when attending

congresses. There is an aristocracy forming itself in the midst of our socialist society which beats anything the bourgeoisie has produced, and which is a bane to the poor, disinherited people. No real socialist will tolerate this, and if his opposition is to be met by coercion, he is compelled to have recourse to hostile papers to announce his honest opinion. Corruption prevails in our party. Such a party is no better than that of the most reactionary hypocrites.<sup>12</sup>

Hödel, being of little further use to the National Liberals, was given enough money by Sparig and his associates to pay his fare to Berlin. He left Leipzig by train on April 24, 1878, but he did not travel directly to Berlin. First he went to Dresden and then to Magdeburg. There is no explanation for his itinerary because neither Dresden nor Magdeburg lay on the route to Berlin. The only possible reasons would fall into two categories: one, to make some personal connection to obtain money; or two, to collect subscription funds for Vorwärts. These suggestions are made because Hödel arrived in Berlin on April 26, with 100 marks. It is possible that he made use of his position as a subscription agent for Vorwärts to accumulate some money because when he was arrested, after the shooting attempt, he still had some subscription forms for Vorwärts in his pocket, but this suggestion is only hypothetical because the time factor does not seem to be in his favor for less than two days elapsed from the time he left Leipzig until his arrival in Berlin. German laborers were not very prosperous in 1878 so it would seem that it would take more than two days to sell 100 marks worth of subscriptions. But the fact still remains that after he arrived in Berlin on April 26 Hödel did no work other than hawk a few pictures and papers. The sum of money given him by the National Liberals was little more than train fare and Hödel made some expensive business deals as will be brought out. The money Hödel had, had to come from somewhere and if he did not solicit it himself, he must have had some backers in Berlin, Magdeburg or Dresden. At that time Reinsdorf was in Berlin but it cannot be established that he associated with Hödel. It will be remembered that Hödel had taken part in Reinsdorf's small circle in Leipzig but there is no evidence to place him in any such circle in Berlin.<sup>13</sup> The mysterious Mr. Steinberg, as Reinsdorf called himself in Leipzig, was a puzzle to the Berlin police; for a while they thought that Hödel, himself was Steinberg. At his trial, six years later, Reinsdorf laid bare his past, acknowledging his association with Hödel in Leipzig. If he had played a part in Hödel's attempt on

William I, more than likely, he would have claimed credit for it. I am of the opinion that if Hödel did, in fact, come in contact with Reinsdorf in Berlin, it was only a casual or superficial meeting and did not play a part in the assassination attempt. I tend to believe the assassination attempt was planned in advance in Leipzig in conjunction with Werner, without the knowledge of Reinsdorf.

Hödel arrived in Berlin on April 26, rented a room from the widow Breiten, at Stallschreiberstrasse 13, and, as his landlady later confirmed, occupied himself with socialist activities, and came and went at all hours of the night. Bebel also relates that Hödel attended socialist meetings when he arrived in Berlin.<sup>14</sup> On April 29 he started to attend meetings of the Christian Socialists led by the Stöcker, one of the Emperor's Court Chaplains. He took out a membership card in the organization the same day and without payment voluntarily distributed Christian Socialist tracts, especially one entitled Über die Liebe zu König und Vaterland, a six-page speech made by Stöcker on February 15, 1878, in the Saale of the Villa Colonna in Berlin.<sup>15</sup> Hödel's association with the Christian Socialists continued until the day of his attempt on the life of the Emperor and a copy of the above mentioned pamphlet was found on him when he was arrested.

The fact that Hödel claimed to be a Christian Socialist when he was captured has led many people to believe that he was probably a confused young man, who did not know the difference between a Social Democrat, a Christian Socialist, and an anarchist. Rudolf Rocker prefers to believe this and states that Hödel was not an anarchist. Hödel would not measure-up to Rocker's connotation of what an anarchist was, but Hödel had read Bakunin, associated with Reinsdorf and Werner, and his belief in "propaganda by deed," alone, was enough to qualify him as an anarchist in the late 1870's. This is the direction in which anarchism was moving in the 1870's. The highly sophisticated theories of anarchism and anarcho-syndicalism to which Rocker adhered appeared much later.

It is quite possible that Hödel's association with the Christian Socialists was only a cover-up for his anarchist sympathies. Christian Socialism would not have been compatible with Hödel's personality, Bebel made a point to demonstrate that as a boy Hödel had not learned, in spite of repeated attempts, any religious knowledge.<sup>16</sup> At his initial arrangement, when



questioned about his religious preference, Hödel replied: "Protestant."<sup>17</sup> The night before his execution a state minister talked with Hödel, and he revealed that as a boy he had believed in a life after death, but he no longer did. He did not want the minister to say any prayers for him and turned down all offers of any ministrations, saying that after death there was nothing.<sup>18</sup> Hödel, as already pointed out above, denounced the Emperor and Germany itself on a number of occasions so it does not seem possible that he could have been very serious in his Christian Socialist activities. Furthermore it was not in line with his character to be so eleemosynary. It is doubtful if he would have used his time to distribute Christian Socialist literature unless he had some purpose in mind. It is possible, although the evidence does not prove it, that Hödel's association with the Christian Socialists was to establish them as a scapegoat for his nefarious deed.

Hödel was in Berlin exactly nine days when on Saturday, May 4, he purchased a six-shot revolver from a pawn broker named Weblis for eight marks. The revolver, which is usually described in most accounts as worthless, functioned well enough for Hödel. He fired it six times without a misfire and when he was captured it was found that the chamber contained two rounds, pointing out that Hödel was skillful enough with the revolver to re-load it while in flight. On Monday, May 6, Hödel went to a photographer named Dietrich and had a portrait taken, telling the photographer to make as many copies as possible because within a week he would be dead, but his name would be known all over the world and his likeness would be in request wherever men took an interest in current affairs.<sup>19</sup> The purchase of the revolver and the taking of the picture would tend to indicate that the attempt was planned in advance and that he did not expect to survive the attack.

There is still the unresolved question of finances. Who was paying for his room rent and meals? Where did he get eight marks to purchase a pistol? Where did he get the money to have a portrait picture taken? (He must have paid for the picture because he had a copy of it on him when he was captured). Nobiling, as will be pointed out in the course of the next chapter, tried to take his own life after his attempt on the Emperor. If the two attempts by Hödel and Nobiling were masterminded by the same person, and the evidence points in this direction, it is reasonable to deduce that Hödel, too, probably expected to take his own life after killing the Emperor. His statement to

the photographer that he would be dead within a week would tend to substantiate this line of reasoning.

It is my belief that both of the assassination attempts were masterminded by Emil Werner in Leipzig, but that the stimulus for them came from the German section of the Jura Federation in Switzerland. The evidence is not as conclusive as one could hope for, but in the course of the remainder of this chapter and in the next chapter materials will be introduced which tend to indict Werner and the Jura Federation.

There is some evidence, scanty though it may be, that Nobiling gave Hödel some instruction in the use of a pistol. Hödel was no marksman, as Nobiling was, and he was jarred by Frau Hauch when firing his first shot at point-blank range. But he must have had some instruction in the use of the weapon, because after missing the first two shots which he fired while holding the revolver in his right hand, he assumed a squatting or semi-prone position holding the revolver in both hands to fire the third shot at the Emperor. The third shot was fired at a greater distance and after a short run, so that Hödel was probably in a state of excitement. I believe that Hödel probably had some training with the revolver because: one, the first two shots were fired in the customary way a marksman fires by lowering his weapon on target and firing (eye witness' accounts bear this out); two, the third shot was fired from a semi-squatting position, holding the weapon in both hands to insure greater steadiness, which reveals that Hödel had some experience with such a weapon; three, Hödel partially re-loaded the weapon in flight, while fighting off would-be apprehenders.

It was evident to Hödel that he had failed in his attempt and it would be senseless to take his own life. The fame to be afforded him by assassinating the German Emperor faded with the three wild shots. At his first hearing Hödel related that he was not firing at the Emperor, but was attempting to commit suicide in his presence to demonstrate the plight of the German poor, however, many witnesses were available who had seen him leveling his pistol at the Emperor, so he quickly dropped his pretense. In addition at his initial arrangement he declared that he was an anarchist, a fact which he seemed proud to proclaim.

When arrested, Hödel had nothing in his possession that would in any way connect him with the anarchists, but he did have

Social Democratic and Christian Socialist materials. The contents of his pockets were useful to the government because they established a firm connection with the Social Democratic Party. In addition to the items already referred to they contained: a revolver with two rounds in it, two cartridges, a passport, photographs of himself and of Bebel, Liebknecht and Most, a military muster certificate, membership cards in the Social Democratic Party and the Christian Socialist Party, a copy of Die Zukunft, the moderate Social Democratic magazine, a list of names from whom money was to be collected for their subscription to Vorwärts, two pocket knives, three letters, a birth certificate, a tax bill, a necktie, and a handkerchief.

On the evening of the assassination attempt the Emperor, after a formal dinner, accompanied by his children the Crown Prince and the Grand Duchess of Baden, attended the opera, the National Theatre, and a concert at the Zoological Gardens. Wherever he went the public gave him a jubilant reception. People rose to their feet and broke out singing Deutschland über Alles. Thousands of excited Berliners filled Unter den Linden and the square in front of the Royal Palace, cheering the German sovereign on as he repeatedly drove through the multitude. Flags were displayed and houses illuminated in the principal streets of the city. The Emperor received numerous telegrams from throughout Germany and the entire world congratulated him on escaping unscathed from his brush with death. A Te Deum was sung in the churches of Berlin for the escape of the Emperor from the assassin's bullets. It was attended by the entire diplomatic corps stationed in the German capital. Te Deums were sung to the German Emperor in many of the capitals of other countries. The Emperor, himself, was convinced that all was well on May 14, when he publicly thanked Berlin for this open display of feeling. To show his confidence in the people the Emperor continued his daily drives through the Tiergarten and along Unter den Linden, riding in the open carriage accompanied by his daughter the Grand Duchess of Baden. On May 16 a deputation from the University of Berlin waited upon the Emperor and "they afforded him the conviction that the attempt upon his life was the act of solitary individual, and that the mind of the mass of the people was healthy and uninfected."<sup>20</sup>

There is some speculation that Hödel, having failed in his attempt, thought he would receive ten or perhaps 20 years imprisonment, however, article eighty of the German Penal Code was quite specific: "Murder or attempted murder of the Kaiser

is considered to be a treasonable charge to be punished by death."<sup>21</sup>

For his defence Hödel selected Otto Freytag of Leipzig. Freytag was willing to take Hödel's case but requested that he be sent the documents in the case and be given an eighty day recess to study them, but both requests were denied so Freytag did not defend Hödel. He was given a court-appointed attorney, who knowing not what to do apologized to the Tribunal because it had fallen his lot to defend a person accused of high treason.<sup>22</sup> Hödel's trial, sentencing and execution were carried out with maximum haste. He was tried on July 10, sentenced on August 8, and executed on August 16. One of the most damaging pieces of evidence introduced at the trial was a letter Hödel had written while in prison to his parents in which he said that he had sacrificed his life for the public good and his only regret was that his shots had gone astray, but that he hoped that his failure would not damaged the cause. The court deliberated only 20 minutes to find him guilty. Throughout the trial Hödel maintained an amused expression on his face. He listened as the judge read the death sentence and responded with a laugh. The death sentence was signed not by William I, but by the Crown Prince Friedrich, due to the fact that the Emperor was unable to use his right arm because of wounds inflicted by Nobiling June 2.<sup>23</sup>

While he was imprisoned in Moabit Hödel wore hand irons. They were joined by a chain, and connected to his leg irons, which were chained to the wall. This was done for two reasons, to prevent an escape, and also to prevent suicide attempt on Hödel's part. He wore the traditional German prison dress, of the time, blue jacket, vest and trousers, brown socks, cap and slippers. After he was found guilty Hödel was asked if he did not want to appeal his case, he replied "that wouldn't do any good, off with my head." Asked if he had any special request, he replied that he was an inveterate smoker and wanted the privilege of smoking in his cell. Permission to smoke was granted to him. He also requested to be executed on Calvary, which was denied, and which would tend to show that Hödel thought of himself as a martyr for a cause. He was granted permission to write his parents which he did several times. On one occasion he signed his letter "Max Hödel, assassin of His Majesty the German Kaiser." A request to see his parents was denied. He received permission to wear his own clothing the final day before the execution. When asked if he wanted

something special to eat at his last meal he answered: "I am hungry and if you will put a menu before me I shall pick something out." The jailer replied: "We don't have a menu here, but you can have a beef steak and some wine." Hödel thanked him and proceeded to eat two beef steaks and drink the wine. The first glass he raised high in the air and toasted "Long live the Commune," and then downed it. He then wrote a letter to his parents telling them not to grieve for him, that he loved them very much and wished them well for the remainder of their lives. Time, he said, quickly heals all wounds. In his last letter he also stated: "Long live the Commune." And then as a final request he asked that all his possessions be sent to his parents.<sup>24</sup>

Hödel did not sleep very much that night before his execution, spending most of the night smoking one cigarette after another. When the jailer came to get him just before six o' clock on the morning of August 16, 1878, he was sitting on a stool smoking a cigarette. He got up and went quietly, after asking for a glass of milk which was given him and which he drank. It took Hödel three minutes to reach the scaffold from his cell. Gathered around the scaffold in the prison court yard was a crowd of about 50 spectators. Hödel climbed the four steps leading up to the scaffold and laid his head on the block asking "here?" The sentence was quickly read once more after which Hödel shouted "Bravo!" He was then told to strip to the waist, and his arms and upper body were fastened down to the block. The hooded executioner, Scharfrichter Krautz, lifted his axe above his head and with one sure blow severed Hödel's head from his body. The head bounded off the scaffold onto the ground where the eyes opened and closed twice very rapidly before coming to rest. The whole process took 90 seconds from the time Hödel arrived at the scaffold. The remains of Hödel's body were removed and concealed under the scaffold, until the crowd dispersed, and were later buried along with the head in the prison grave yard. Professor Virchow, Director of the Berlin Pathological Institute, asked for Hödel's head to examine his brain, but this request was denied. That afternoon notices were posted throughout Berlin telling of the execution and stating that the same thing would happen to anyone else who shall try to kill the German Emperor.<sup>25</sup>

## Bismarck's Exploitation of the Hödel Attempt.

The Chef der Reichskanzlei, Christoph von Tiedemann (1836-1907) informed Bismarck at Friedrichsruh, of the assassination attempt, in a long telegram. This set in motion a chain of events which culminated in Bismarck telegraphing Bernhard von Bülow (1815-1879), his State Secretary of Foreign Affairs, at 8:32 on the evening of the same day asking Bülow to consult with the Prussian Minister of the Interior Botho Graf zu Eulenburg (1831-1912) concerning the possibility of using the attempt as a pretext for repressive legislation against the socialists and their press. On May 13 Herbert von Bismarck gave Bülow a note from his father in which he said that it was the time to move against the socialists, if they did not at least attempt to pass restrictive legislation, they would be guilty of dereliction of duty.<sup>26</sup>

On the day following the attempt the Berliner freie Presse issued an extra devoted entirely to Hödel, repudiating him and condemning his crime and stating emphatically that he was in no way connected with the socialists, adding that "no political party should be held responsible for his nefarious deed." The events following the Hödel attempt came as a surprise to some people. Mr. Bayard Taylor of the U.S. Legation in Berlin wrote: "The recent attempt to assassinate the Emperor of Germany has already led to results of wider range and of greater political importance than could have been anticipated." Taylor also noted that "The Social Democratic press throughout Germany, while disowning all sympathy with the act, maintained an attitude of coldness and reserve, and failed to unite frankly in the general expression of congratulation." Taylor though was astute enough to perceive that the German government took advantage of the assassination attempt, seeing it as "the moment favorable for the introduction of a repressive measure, aimed directly at the Social Democratic Party, yet so constructed as to be capable of a much more extended application."<sup>27</sup> Enclosed with the letter was a copy of the projected law which had been laid before the Reichstag on May 20.<sup>28</sup>

It is true that Bismarck seized upon the occasion of the assassination attempt to introduce repressive measures which he

had wanted for some time to put into operation. There were four fundamental reasons why Bismarck wanted to crush the Social Democrats: one, in constitutional political outlook they were republicans, and a threat to the monarchy; two, in foreign affairs they were internationalists, which to Bismarck meant that they would be friends of Germany's enemies; three, in domestic affairs the Social Democrats wanted to transform the existing social and economic order which put them in opposition to the Junker foundation of German society; four, in religious matters they were atheists, which meant that they intended to undermine the religious and moral structure of Germany.<sup>29</sup> To Bismarck the political goals of the Social Democratic program were the most dangerous. He did not deny that the workers had legitimate complaints against the existing economic structure. Bismarck's

... repression of a dangerous political movement was to be followed by ameliorative social legislation. In true Junker fashion, Bismarck chose to apply the whip before offering the carrot. But, because the whip was so indiscriminately applied against almost all workers' organizations, Bismarck's distinction between the political and economic goals was blurred, and the carrot could not achieve the purpose for which it was intended.<sup>30</sup>

Bismarck wanted to crush the socialists but he also wanted to weaken the liberal parties in the Reichstag to clear the path for a shift in economic policies, which was necessiated by the economic crash of 1873 and the continuing slump in the subsequent years which had created serious doubts about the practicality of economic liberalism. There were demands for greater state intervention in the economy. Bismarck thought the German government should act to counter the depression; being pushed by the industrialists and agriculturalists, he decided early in 1878 to push for protective tariffs, which would be opposed by the free traders among the National Liberals and Progressives. The National Liberals would be opposed to any special law aimed at one party so Bismarck "could confront the free traders on an issue of patriotism and the defense of German society, while at the same time seeking to weaken them politically to clear the way for tariff legislation."<sup>31</sup>

Bismarck knew he could not muster enough votes in the Reichstag in May 1878 to pass an "exceptional law" designated

to outlaw one political party. He was also aware that the safety of German society did not warrant such a measure. He wanted an issue to use against the liberal parties and for that reason he had to exaggerate his demands against the Social Democrats. "The tactics Bismarck employed in May 1878, make it clear that he intended not only to combat socialism but also to provoke the majority in the Reichstag into rejecting the exaggerated measures he presented for that purpose."<sup>32</sup> The German government admitted that the Social Democrats, at best, were only indirectly responsible for Hödel's act, which demonstrated that the immediate cause for the "exceptional law" had no foundation.

In this manner, Bismarck himself intimated indirectly that the opponents of the Socialist Law had legitimate reasons for rejecting it. Yet, on the other hand, the government and conservative parties argued that those who opposed the law would be held responsible for permitting conditions which led to assassinations.<sup>33</sup>

As Bismarck expected, the Reichstag on May 24 rejected the first Socialist Law with only the conservatives supporting it, the vote being 251 nays to 57 ayes.<sup>34</sup> The same day the Reichstag adjourned and was not to meet again until January. Only a few elections were slated to fill vacancies, but the Bundesrat could dissolve the Reichstag, which would necessitate elections for all seats in the Reichstag. Bismarck, even in his fondest hopes, could not have expected that within a week a situation would arise which would create new opportunities for him to exploit.

#### Notes

1. Hödel in most accounts is portrayed as a slim person with thick dark brown hair parted in the middle, a long pale yellow face, and morose, sullen, and sinister moldy grey eyes, which supposedly revealed his true fanaticism. He was pictured as having a short unfurrowed forehead which revealed that he had never done any deep thinking; in short, a laughing idiot. For such a contemporary account see: Berliner Fremdenblatt, May 14, 1878, 3rd edition. The contemporary accounts of Hödel are for the most part followed by Bernstein in Sozialdemokratische Lehrjahre, pp. 60-61; Eduard Bernstein, Die Geschichte der Berliner Arbeiterbewegung (Berlin, 1907), I, pp. 360-361; Eduard Bernstein, My Years of Exile (New York, 1921), p. 20; a classical account of Hödel is to be found in Mehring, Geschichte



der deutschen Sozialdemokratie, pp. 492-495, which portrays Hödel as having congenital syphilis, being sick in body and soul, a cheat and petty thief, an idiot, a political fanatic in addition to being politically confused. Mehring claims that all his oral and written statements proved that he was incompetent which was further demonstrated medically by the fact that when he was beheaded, his head, which was severed from his body on an angle, was examined. Mehring relates that the then renowned Professor Rudolf Virchow, Director of the Berlin Pathological Institute since 1862, examined the severed head which is an absolute falsehood. All of Mehring's claims are without any specific evidence and do not hold up in the light of documentary evidence.

More recent accounts which tend to follow the same line are: Wolfgang Pack, Das Parlamentarische Ringen um das Sozialistengesetz Bismarcks 1878-1890 (Düsseldorf, 1961), pp. 29-30; George Eckert, Die Braunschweiger Arbeiterbewegung unter dem Sozialistengesetz (Braunschweig, 1961) pp. 11-12. These accounts of Hödel do not hold up when the documents concerning his case are examined. Hödel was just under six feet tall (1.76 meters) and had a medium build. Pictures show that he had a thick neck, broad shoulders and a well-developed chest. His hair was blond and eyes blue; even his eyebrows were blond. This information and much more on his physical description is contained in the report of the arresting officer. See: Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Acta des Königlichen-Polizei-Präsidiis zu Berlin. "Das Attentat des Klempnergesellen Emil Heinrich Max Hödel gen. Lehmann auf das Leben auf das Leben Seiner Majestät des Kaisers und Königs am 11. May 1878." Geheime Präsidiat-Registratur. Lit. A. No. 248 (8626). Hereafter referred to as Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. A., No. 248 (8626) Hödel Attentat. In view of the fact that the folders are numbered I shall give the folder numbers in the footnotes rather than the exact title of the document being referred to. I shall indicate the nature of the document in the text. For the arrest form see: Fol. 3. For Hödel's statement upon his arrest see: Folders 23-27. The statement reveals, as do his letters, which will be referred to later in this chapter, that Hödel wrote a reasonably good hand and that he was coherent. It should be noted that my sole purpose in revealing these errors regarding Hödel's physical appearance is for the purpose of historical accuracy, not to rehabilitate him.

2. Most contemporary accounts tend to portray that Hödel missed the Emperor by such a margin that the Emperor

did not realize he was the object of the shooting, however, this is probably not the case. Frau Hauch in her first statement revealed that they were standing three feet from the Emperor as he passed by Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. A., No. 248 (8626). Hödel-Attentat, Fol. 6. She said three paces in her later testimony. Frau Hauch related in her testimony that she saw the bullet pass behind the Emperor's head. Other witnesses substantiate that she did indeed block Hödel's path of fire and that the bullet did pass only a short distance behind the Emperor's head. It is very possible that they did see the bullet which was rather large and blunt. In 1912 Frau Hauch implored Emperor William II to give her assistance in settling herself up once again in the water business in Berlin because she claimed that she had saved his grandfather's life. It is possible that she did save William I's life by shoving Hödel. Her claim was based on the fact that she had completely lost her hearing in her left ear and nearly all of it in the right ear as a result of the incident. She stated that her husband had died in 1883, and after being forced out of business in Berlin by competitors she moved to Wiesbaden to live with a daughter, but on November 6, 1910, she hurt herself while working as a scrub woman and could no longer do hard work. Ibid., Folders 159-166.

3. Köhler evidently received quite a beating during the few seconds he grappled with Hödel because he fell ill on the evening of May 11 and died on May 19 from ruptured intestines as revealed by the autopsy. For the eyewitness' accounts of the assassination attempt and capture see: Ibid., Folders 5-11.

4. On Krüger and his statement see: Ibid., Folders 12-13.

5. Leipzig at the time had a rather bad name because the last person to try to kill William I was Oscar Becker from Leipzig. It should be noted that Carl Nobiling, who attempted to assassinate the Emperor on June 2, also spent a number of years in Leipzig.

Assassination attempts on the German Emperor were nothing new. On July 26, 1844, the former Bürgermeister of Storkon, a man named Tscheck, wounded Friedrich William IV, because the Prussian King had refused to give him back his position as Bürgermeister which he lost in 1841 for conducting himself in a reprehensible manner. Tscheck fired a double-barreled pistol at the King wounding him slightly. Tscheck was

later beheaded at Spandau. A young man named Ottensossen planned to kill Friedrich William IV in December 1846, but he tipped his hand and was seized by the police before he got a chance to put his plan into operation. Again on May 22, 1850, Friedrich William IV was wounded by a shot fired by Max Joseph Sefeloge, a 29 year-old former artillery sergeant who had been dismissed from the service for physical reasons and was seeking reinstatement but without success. The King had seen his assailant and raised his right arm to protect himself so the shot hit him in the arm rather than the chest. Sefeloge had been a frequenter of radical clubs and organizations.

Becker's attempt on William I came on July 14, 1861, while the King was taking the waters at Baden-Baden. The King received a slight neck wound. Becker, a 21-year old law student at Leipzig, said he wanted to kill the King because he had not brought about the unification of Germany. Becker's idol, as revealed at his trial, was Orsini. Felice Orsini on January 14, 1858, had attempted to assassinate Napoleon III and the Empress but killed two other people and wounded a hundred more. From his prison cell Orsini appealed to Napoleon III to help free Italy. The effect of the episode was to move Napoleon into action. Becker was given 20 years for his assassination attempt, but was pardoned after serving only five.

On May 7, 1866, as Bismarck was strolling down Unter den Linden, when he arrived at the Shadow Strasse, a man fired two shots from a revolver at him wounding him slightly. The assassin was a 32-year-old agricultural student named Ferdinand Blind (Cohen), who came from Hohenheim in Württemberg. He was the son of the famous republican refugee Carl Blind. After a fierce struggle, in which four more shots were fired, burning Bismarck's clothing in the process, the assailant was taken into custody. While he was being questioned he took out his handkerchief, pretending to wipe his brow, and cut his throat from ear to ear. Blind wanted to kill Bismarck, as he related in a letter he left, because Bismarck was the worst enemy of liberty. He thought Bismarck would involve Germany in a series of disastrous wars. His assassination of Bismarck, he thought, would make the leaders of Germany rise to a sense of duty. Like Becker, Blind was an admirer of Orsini.

In May 1873 stories were circulated of another attempt made on the life of William I at Insterberg by a man dressed as a priest. The King was slightly wounded. On July 13, 1874, another attempt was made on the life of Bismarck while he was driving in the country near Saline, slightly wounding him. The assassin was a cooper named Kullmann from Magdeburg. This

attempt was supposedly part of a conspiracy headed by a Priest Reverend Father Hanthaler who was arrested at Schweinfurt. Kullmann, too, had worn the clerical garb during his assassination attempt. In May 1875 a man was caught prowling around the grounds of Bismarck's mansion. He had a loaded pistol and it was established that there was a plot to kill Bismarck, Dr. Falk, and the Emperor. In November 1877 a man named Lubovski was arrested for planning to kill the Emperor. He had a loaded revolver when apprehended. It was said that he was the son of Archbishop Ledochovski, an ardent Ultramontane. Lubovski was already wanted by the police for embezzling funds from his job as a law clerk at Schonlank.

More detailed information on these attempts on the lives of Friedrich William IV, William I, and Bismarck can be found in the London Times: (August 2, 1844), p. 4, Col. f; (August 3, 1844), p. 6, Col. d; (December 30, 1846), p. 5, Col. a; (May 25, 1850), p. 6, Col. a; (May 27, 1850), p. 6, Col. e; (May 28, 1850), p. 6, Col. a; (May 30, 1850), p. 6, Col. e; (July 15, 1861), p. 8, Col. f; (July 16, 1861), p. 9, Col. c; (July 20, 1861), p. 9, Col. d; (July 28, 1861), p. 12, Col. e; (September 24, 1861), p. 7, Col. a; (September 25, 1861), p. 6, Col. f; (September 26, 1861), p. 8, Col. c; (September 27, 1861), p. 7, Col. e; (May 8, 1866), p. 12, Col. a; (May 10, 1866), p. 12, Col. a; (May 12, 1866), p. 11, Col. c; (May 15, 1866), p. 10, Col. d; (May 16, 1866), p. 11, Col. b; (October 29, 1866), p. 8, Col. d; (May 13, 1873), p. 7, Col. b; (July 14, 1874), p. 5, Col. a; (July 15, 1874), p. 9, Col. e; (July 17, 1874), p. 5, Col. a; (July 17, 1874), p. 8, Col. b; (July 21, 1874), p. 10, Col. a; (May 6, 1875), p. 5, Col. a; (May 11, 1875), p. 10, Col. b; (May 12, 1875), p. 7, Col. b; (November 19, 1877), p. 5, Col. e.

6. This information on Hödel's early life is taken from an autobiography which he started to write before he was executed. It is printed in Die beiden letzten Tage des Hochverräthers Max Hödel (Kissingen, August, 1878), pp. 15-16.

7. Quoted in Leipziger Tageblatt, No. 134 (May 14, 1878).

8. August Bebel, Aus meinem Leben (Berlin-East, 1964), pp. 587-588. At a social Democratic meeting held in Gelsenkirchen on May 27, 1878, and devoted to the topic of Hödel's attempt on the life of the Emperor, one of the speakers, C.W. Fölcke, from Dortmund, related that Hödel became an entirely different person once he was thrown out of the Social Democratic Party. Leo Stern (ed.), Der Kampf der deutschen Sozialdemokratie in der Zeit des Sozialistengesetzes 1878-1890. Die

Tätigkeit der Reichs-Commission (Berlin-East, 1956), p. 710.

9. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Postdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. A., No. 248 (8626), Hödel-Attentat, Folder 108.

10. Ibid., Folders 108-110.

11. Ibid., Folder 24.

12. Quoted in Magdeburger Zeitung, No. 222 (May 13, 1878).

13. After Hödel's apprehension elaborate efforts were made by the police to piece together his background. See: Extrabeilage zu Eberhardts Allgem. Polizei-Anzeiger, No. 43, LXXXVI, (1878), p. 173. There is an unsubstantiated charge by the London Times (May 23, 1878), p. 5. Col. d, that Hödel stole a sum of money from his parents before he left Leipzig. I have discounted this story for the following reasons: one, Hödel did not live with his parents after he returned to Leipzig in 1875; they evidently did not approve of his activities so there was some animosity between them. Two, his parents were very poor and it is doubtful if they would have had 100 marks. Hödel evidently thought a good deal of his parents because he wrote a number of letters to them while in prison awaiting execution, although they wrote him only one in return.

14. August Bebel, Aus meinem Leben, p. 588.

15. Official title was: Flugblatt No. 6 des Central-Vereins für Social-Reform auf religiöser und constitutionell-monarchischer Grundlage.

16. August Bebel, Aus meinem Leben, p. 589.

17. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. A., Hödel-Attentat, Folder 3.

18. Die beiden letzten Tagen des Hochverrätters Max Hödel, pp. 11-12.

19. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam; Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin, C, Tit. 94, Lit. A., Hödel-Attentat, Folders 18-21, 107-108.

20. For contemporary description see: London Times (May 13, 1878), p. 9, Col. 6; and (May 17, 1878), p. 5, Col. 4, 5; Berliner Fremdenblatt, No. 112 (May 14, 1878), 3rd edition.

21. Leipziger Tageblatt, No. 134 (May 14, 1878).

22. August Bebel, Aus meinem Leben, p. 589.

23. A description of the trial and execution can be found in Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. Lit. 94, A., Hödel Attentat, Folders 113-128.

24. Die beiden letzten Tage des Hochverräthers Max Hödel, pp. 8-14.

25. A copy of this poster is preserved in Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. A., Hödel-Attentat, Folder 126. There can be little doubt that the execution of Hödel was intended to be an example. There had not been a capital sentence handed down in Germany for a number of years. William I was opposed to capital punishment, even in the case of Hödel, but Bismarck pushed for the death penalty. On this point see: Paul Kampffmeyer and Bruno Altmann, Vor dem Sozialistengesetz. Krise Jahre des Obrigkeitsstaates (Berlin, 1928), p. 166.

26. Christoph von Tiedemann, Aus Siebenjahrzehnten. II. Sechs Jahre Chef der Reichskanzlei unter dem Fürsten Bismarck (Leipzig, 1909), pp. 256-258; Otto von Bismarck, Die Gesammelten Werke. Vol. 6 c 1871 bis 1890 (Berlin, 1935), pp. 108-109.

27. Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States 1878, pp. 212. A few days before the attempt Hödel had submitted an article to the Berliner freie Presse in which he denounced the Christian Socialists. Ignaz Auer, the editor, rejected it on the grounds that it was too anarchistic. Freiheit (New York), No. 45 (November 8, 1884).

28. An English translation of this bill is found in Ibid., pp. 213-214. The German text is easily accessible in Pack, Das parlamentarische Ringen um das Sozialistengesetz Bismarcks 1878-1890, p. 243.

29. Pack, Ibid., p. 8. Bismarck had access to documentary evidence which demonstrated that Hödel was no longer a Social Democrat. The Police Commissioner in Leipzig, Krüger, had telegraphed von Madai on May 13, 1878, that Hödel had been thrown out of the local Social Democratic organization for embezzlement and had gone over to the anarchist camp where he was actively engaged as an agitator in meetings at Schkeuditz. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. A., No. 248 (8626), Hödel-Attentat, Folder 49. Krüger is mistaken in his dating. It is true that Hödel was in association with the anarchists in March, but he was not thrown out of the local Social Democratic organization until early April 1878.

30. Vernon L. Lidtke, The Outlawed Party Social Democracy in Germany, 1878-1890 (Princeton, 1966), p. 71.

31. Ibid., pp. 71-72. See also: Guenther Roth, The Social Democrats in Imperial Germany. A Study in Working Class Isolation and National Integration (Totowa, New Jersey, 1963), which points out that electoral gains by the Social Democrats were as early as 1874 followed up by stepped up activity by police and courts, and Bismarck began maneuvering for more stringent repressive legislation against the Social Democrats, pp. 108-109. On January 27, 1876, Count Friedrich zu Eulenburg, Prussian Minister of the Interior defended, before the Reichstag, a government bill directed against the Social Democrats. Eulenburg pointed to an article in the Lassallean Neue Sozialdemokrat of 1871, which developed the idea of the inevitability of the class struggle, which to Eulenburg contradicted the SPD emphasis on legality which most SPD speakers professed. Eulenburg also quoted the Eisenacher Volksstaat, pointing out that this paper was actually professing revolution, because it said that revolution was inevitable even if they followed parliamentary activity and that the SPD considered christianity a hindrance to social progress. Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstags, pp. 941-954.

32. Lidtke, The Outlawed Party, p. 72.

33. Ibid., pp. 71-73.

34. Pack, Das parlamentarische Ringen, p. 50. On May 29, 1878, Bismarck at Friedrichsruh dictated a press release to Tiedemann in which he chided the Reichstag for failing to pass the Socialist Law. It appeared as an editorial article in the Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung, No. 128 (June 1, 1878). It is printed in Bismarck, Die Gesammelten Werke. Vol. 6 c, 1871 bis 1890, pp. 113-114.





## Chapter V

### THE NOBILING ASSASSINATION ATTEMPT AND THE PASSAGE OF THE SOCIALIST LAW

William I continued to take his afternoon drives without any extra precautions. The aged Monarch was of the opinion that Hödel's attempt was the act of a solitary demented mind and did not reflect the thinking of the majority of the German people. Unknown to William I a second assassin had been selected and was observing the Emperor on Sunday afternoon June 2, 1878, as he drove down Unter den Linden past the Cafe National, situated on Grossen Friedrichstrasse-Ecke.<sup>1</sup> The assassin, Dr. Carl Eduard Nobiling, was watching the Kaiser from the Hunters Club, Jägerkeller, located under the Cafe National. The Verrückte Doktor, as he was called at the Hunters Club, spent many of his evenings at the club and ate many of his meals there, often with strange luncheon guests.

Nobiling had spent an uneasy morning in his room at number 18 Unter den Linden. About 10:00 A.M. as his landlady came upstairs waking guests Nobiling shouted to her through his open door, "What do you want?" She replied that she was waking guests and Nobiling quickly threw his door shut. A couple hours later the short, slight, full-bearded, prematurely balding Nobiling went out to enjoy a late luncheon at the Hunters Club where he waited for the Kaiser to take his daily ride, which would take him by the club. According to the statements of two waiters in the club he left the club sometime between 1:30 and 1:50. He then walked to his room at No. 18 Unter den Linden which was located about half way between Friedrichstrasse and Wilhelmstrasse.

The preparations for Nobiling's attempt had been completed days in advance so that once back in his room he had only to wait for the Emperor to return from his ride in the Tiergarten, riding up Unter den Linden on his way back to the Royal Palace. He did not have to wait long. At 2:30 the Emperor's carriage came into view and as it passed the Kaiser Gallerie, Nobiling leveled the sights of his double-barrelled shotgun on him, following the Kaiser until he was directly in front of his third-story

window. While the aged Monarch was acknowledging the salutes of some bystanders, Nobiling fired. The Emperor's hand moved instinctively to his face as he half rose from his seat, and the carriage, which had been stopped upon orders from William I was about to turn around; then, Nobiling discharged the second barrel. This time the old Kaiser sank back into the carriage seat, bleeding profusely from facial wounds. He was also wounded in the head, back, arms, and hands and some spectators imagined that he had been killed.

A group of spectators then decided to capture the person responsible for this attempt on the life of the Kaiser. The assault on Nobiling's third-story furnished apartment was led by an inn keeper, Herr Holtfeuer, who burst through the door of the apartment to see a small, neat man, with large pointed ears which stood out from his head like fans, seated on the opposite side of the room by an open window with a revolver in his hand. Holtfeuer moved in to capture Nobiling and the would be assassin fired a shot into the inn keeper's face, wounding him severely. He staggered back out of the room and fell down the stairway. The crowd, mistaking him for the assassin, seized him and nearly beat him to death.

Immediately after firing a shot at Holtfeuer Nobiling put the end of the barrel of the revolver to his right temple and fired a shot into his head. His hand, by now had lost some of its steadiness and the ball instead of entering his head at the right temple entered at a point more above his right eye. It was not a fatal wound. The "capture" of Nobiling was accomplished by a young infantry officer named Wilhelmy, who charged into the room, saber drawn, and proceeded to crack the wounded Nobiling on the head. The prison van or "Green Carriage," as it was called by Berliners, was summoned to carry off the wounded prisoner. As the "Green Carriage" sped out of the court yard at No. 18 Unter den Linden the driver failed to notice the low archway. He struck his head against it with such force that it broke his neck and he died. Getting Nobiling to the hospital station of the Molken Market Police District was not an easy matter. It required the protection of the mounted police (Berittene Schützleute) to protect him from the angry crowds. (Protection was also required when he was later moved to the Charite Hospital).<sup>2</sup>

At the police station it was determined that the assassin was Dr. Carl Eduard Nobiling. He was born at Kolno bei Birnbaum

in the province of Posen on April 10, 1848. He had two brothers serving as officers in the Prussian army, one in the 59th Regiment, the other in the 79th. His sister was a Protestant Sister of Charity in the Elizabeth Hospital in Berlin. His father, a Major in the Prussian army, was deceased and his mother was remarried to a Major von Gauvain. Nobiling was a protestant by birth and came from a family that was in good financial circumstances. Several of his relatives had been employed in the Prussian bureaucracy.

The assassin received his early education from a succession of private tutors, the last of whom was Friedrich Liebe, to whom Nobiling, on the last page of his doctoral dissertation in his curriculum vita, acknowledged a debt for giving him "a scientific training as full and many-sided as possible" and also for "qualifying him for the practical duties of life." He continued his education with formal classroom work at Züllichau in lower Silesia where he completed five years of school in four and one-half years during the period from Easter, 1863, to Michaelmas, 1867. The next three years he devoted himself to agricultural work before enrolling at the University of Halle where he studied agriculture and political science for three sessions from Michaelmas 1870 to Easter 1872. The following two years were again spent in practical agricultural work except for several months travel which he undertook to become acquainted with current practices followed on farms and in industrial establishments. He continued his studies again at Halle starting with Easter, 1874, for another two sessions and followed them up with three sessions at the University of Leipzig in 1875-1876, where he completed his Doctor of Philosophy degree in May, 1876, with a dissertation entitled *Beitrag zur Geschichte der Landwirtschaft des Saalkreises der Provinz Sachsen* (*Contributions to the History of Agriculture in the Saal District, Province of Saxony*), which he dedicated to Wilhelm Georg Friedrich Roscher (1817-1894), a renowned professor of political economy at the University of Leipzig.<sup>3</sup>

The Emperor's open carriage had proceeded swiftly to the palace after the second shot was fired and the Emperor was put to bed and examined by a number of doctors who discovered that he had seven pieces of shot in his right forearm and wrist, five in his head and face, 20 in his upper left arm and shoulder and six in his neck. The shot, which was quite large, was number four and five according to the German standard of measurement. The Emperor's military helmet had stopped so many of

the pellets that it was completely riddled and if he had not been wearing it he probably would have been killed instantly or at least have bled to death. During the week the Emperor wore his officer's cap but on every Sunday, according to regulation, he wore the helmet. The folds of his thick military attire, which included a coat, waistcoat, and shirt were also riddled with shot. The thick clothing he was wearing helped to deaden the effect of the two blasts. Nevertheless, the Emperor was seriously wounded and had lost a lot of blood. At first he was in a somewhat unconscious state as could be expected of a man 81 years old. However, he quickly gained his composure and had word sent to the Shah of Persia, who was visiting Berlin, that he would be unable to dine with him that evening as planned.

The doctors removed many of the grains of shot but had to stop when the muscles in the Emperor's arms started to swell. However, his healthy constitution seemed to be able to withstand the shock and loss of blood, but there was a genuine concern on the part of the doctors for the Emperor's life due to his advanced age. The Emperor, who usually slept on a small iron bedstead in an unpretentious back room of the palace, was removed to a front room facing Unter den Linden, which contained a larger bed. Some officials thought that in order to insure more peaceful condition for the Emperor, they should prohibit the passage of carriages on the opposite side of the Linden and in the Opera Square, but the old Emperor would not permit this.<sup>4</sup>

Nobiling's attempt on William I immediately turned Berlin into a city that was garrisoned as though it were in a state of siege. At once the measure for the suppression of socialism was revived. Within an hour the news of the attempt was telegraphed to all the capitals of Europe and telegrams of sympathy began to pour in to the old Kaiser, although he continued to receive a number of threatening letters as did Bismarck. The heavy hand of the law fell on everyone who suggested either by word or deed that he sympathized with Hödel or Nobiling. From June to the middle of August, 563 persons were tried for *lesemajestät* for either insulting the Kaiser or for approving of the attempts of Hödel and Nobiling and regretting that they had failed. In only 42 instances were the accused persons acquitted. In 521 cases (including 31 women) they were convicted and sentenced to terms of imprisonment amounting in the aggregate to 811 years 11 and one half months. In five cases the accused committed suicide.<sup>5</sup>

A few examples will point out just how ridiculous some of the crimes of lese-majesté were. A drunken man received two and one half years in prison for murmuring, "William is dead, he lives no more." A woman talking about the Emperor's wounds was sentenced to a year and one half for saying "The Kaiser at least is not poor, he can afford to care for himself."<sup>6</sup> A worker, Friedrich Carl Sommer, while sitting on a bench along Unter den Linden, was heard to say that, "Hödel is a dumbbell, but Nobiling planned his attempt well." This slip of the tongue cost him four years of his freedom.<sup>7</sup>

In general though the great majority of the German people felt genuine sympathy for their wounded monarch and expressed it openly in the streets, churches and schools. Most university professors denounced Nobiling's act when they met their classes on Monday morning. The students rose from their seats expressing sentiments similar to those expressed by their professors. Church services were held throughout Germany and prayer vigils were held asking God's help in healing the wounds of the Kaiser. All socialists, however, were immediately suspect and domiciliary visits were paid by the police to their residences. The editors of the various socialist papers were particularly suspect. The Berlin homes of the editors of the Berliner freie Presse were searched and their papers confiscated.

It was understandable to most Germans that a man of Hödel's background might try to kill the Emperor, but it was incomprehensible that a man of Nobiling's education, background and breeding should attempt such an act. The police immediately began an extensive inquiry into the events of Nobiling's life in order to determine if there was a connection between his attempt and that of Hödel. This meticulous search was extended over several European countries including England, Austria-Hungary, France, Switzerland, Belgium, Russia and Italy. Information poured in from many other places including the United States. A great deal of valuable information was turned up, however, for reasons which will be explained later the police failed to apprehend the group which had backed Nobiling.

It was discovered that during the period from April to August 1877 Nobiling took an extended trip, visiting Erfurt, Hannover, Ostende, London, Brussels, Paris, Basel, Zurich, Vienna and Berlin.<sup>8</sup> It was further determined that after the Hödel attempt Nobiling talked about a forthcoming socialist

revolution, relating that he was associated with revolutionary groups in Frankfurt-am-Main, Vienna and Munich.<sup>9</sup> A number of witnesses had seen him at socialist meetings in Berlin.<sup>10</sup> The police in London and Paris were aware that something was going to happen in Berlin on June 2. The French police notified von Philipshorn of this and he transmitted the message to Berlin. The London police likewise has sent a warning to the Berlin police that something was going to happen on June 2.<sup>11</sup> The newspapers somehow or other got wind of this and made a great deal out of it.<sup>12</sup> Guido von Madai (1810-1892), Polizeipräsident of Berlin, denied this charge saying it was false and that Nobiling had never been brought to their attention prior to his attempt on the life of the Kaiser on June 2. In spite of this denial the Tribune on June 15 continued to maintain the same position.<sup>13</sup>

Letters were also discovered in St. Petersburg addressed to Leon Lielsky and dated respectively, Paris April 28, and London May 8, which revealed that soon "a great blow would be struck for freedom in Berlin."<sup>14</sup> Another discovery made by the Berlin police was that Nobiling, for some unknown reason, sent copies of articles from the Berliner freie Presse, written in code, to people living in London and Paris. The Berlin police were able to break his code.<sup>15</sup>

Many facts were uncovered about Nobiling's student days at Halle and Leipzig. At Halle he attended Social Democratic meetings and spoke out against class privilege and the King saying it would be better to abolish both of them. He also said, as did Proudhon, that property is theft and the economic and political order must be overthrown. It must be replaced by a classless community in which everyone would work and share equally in the products of their labors. He maintained that if necessary dynamite should be used to usher in this new era. Other students who had known him at Halle also revealed that he had a collection of Social Democratic literature, especially the writings of Lassalle and that he had subscribed to Der neue Sozialdemokrat. Seriously by nature, Nobiling told other students that he wanted to do what he could for the Social Democratic Party, but that when he achieved a reputation in Social Democratic circles he would found his own party. At Leipzig he continued to attend Social Democratic meetings and acquaint himself better with Social Democratic principles. His interest in attending Social Democratic meetings was not so much to hear what was said, but to make himself heard and on several occasions he spoke out on the subject of the Paris Commune. At Leipzig

he frequented meetings of the National Liberals, and was associated with the Statistical Society led by the National Liberal Professor Wilhelm Roscher. He also attended the Academic Discussion Club led by Professor Karl Joseph Eugen Birnbaum (1829-?), and was a regular at the meetings of the Academic Agricultural Group. While at Halle he was nicknamed "Petroleur," a name which followed him to Leipzig. He was also called "the communist" by fellow students. The term "Petroleur" was left over from the Paris Commune and the burning of the monuments in Paris during the last days of the Commune. Perhaps the name had some association with a popular socialist song of the times which was set to the music of "La Fille de Madame Angot" and had this chorus:

Hier Petroleum, da Petroleum,  
 Petroleum um und um,  
 Lass die Humpen Frisch voll pumpen  
 Dreimal hoch Petroleum!<sup>16</sup>

In Dresden Nobiling continued to attend Social Democratic meetings for the purpose of disputing with the speakers and putting forth his own ideas which usually involved an admiration for the Commune. His involvement extended beyond attending meetings because he was a member of the Arbeiterbildungsverein of Dresden, lecturing there occasionally.<sup>17</sup> Using Dresden as a home base he traveled extensively during the months April to August 1877. In July and August he went to London, Paris, Brussels, Zurich, Vienna, Prague and Cologne carrying letters from Social Democratic friends in Dresden. In London he attended meetings of the Kommunistische-Arbeiterbildungsverein, and in Paris he associated with the Social Democrat Carl Hirsch (1841-1900). In Brussels he associated with a Mr. Brismeel who was connected with the First International. For a few days Nobiling passed himself off as being associated with the International even though he was not. Nobiling was employed at Dresden in the Saxon Statistical Department from October 1876 to October 1877.<sup>18</sup>

In October 1877 Nobiling moved to Berlin where he first lived at 41 Kochstrasse at the home of widow Köhler. He then moved to 131 Leipzigerstrasse to the home of Frau Brochnau where he lived until January 2, 1878. Frau Brochnau, as did his other landladies at Halle, Leipzig, and Dresden, reported that he lived a quiet life, that he kept a loaded revolver in his room, and that he read the socialist Berliner freie Presse and



the two reactionary organs Kreuzzeitung and Reichsboten. On January 2 he left on a trip that took him to Leipzig, Strassburg, Paris, Switzerland, and maybe to London. When he returned he took up residence at number 18 Unter den Linden renting a third-story furnished apartment for 45 marks a month. Upon his return from this trip he talked on several occasions about the formation of an International Republic. Early in February he took another trip to Leipzig, and in the early months of spring he made a number of short trips to small villages near Berlin.<sup>19</sup>

In Berlin he earned his living by writing for agricultural and scientific journals, often under the pseudonym of Ludwig. A search of his room after the attempt revealed that he still read the Berliner freie Presse and also the Ultra-Montane Germania, the Duetsche Landeszeitung, and the Neue Badische Landeszeitung. There were two shotguns, two revolvers, and a supply of ammunition for all the weapons. A certificate indicated that part of the arsenal had been purchased on April 26 from a Mr. Dreijse in Tommerda.<sup>20</sup> Like Hödel, Nobiling had his picture taken a few days before his attempt by a Berlin photographer, P. Mehlmann, in his shop at Müllerstrasse 1. After the attempt Mehlmann tried to capitalize on this, by advertising in many newspapers, selling copies of Nobiling's picture. If you bought more than 50 copies you received a 33.3 per cent discount.<sup>21</sup>

A number of people came forth voluntarily to relate to the police that they had seen Hödel and Nobiling together plotting their attempts on the life of the King. Some of these accounts are pure fiction while others are in the realm of the plausible.<sup>22</sup> Others claimed to have seen Hödel and Nobiling plotting the attempts with a man who called himself Leo Frankel.<sup>23</sup>

Numerous people related to the Berlin police that they heard Nobiling refer to Hödel on various occasions calling him a poor shot, an untrained marksman and an ordinary laborer not worthy to undertake such a project as the assassination of the Emperor. Nobiling maintained that Hödel had failed in his attempt because he did not know how to handle a gun, but someone would soon come along who did and he would not fail. Nobiling let it be known that if he had such an idea in mind he could do better than Hödel. A few days after Hödel's attempt Nobiling said to a girl working for his landlady that the Emperor was certain to be shot some day by a more practiced hand. The girl said that such an act would be useless and Nobiling replied,

"no doubt the Crown Prince will succeed but if he too is killed, and the next ten that succeed him are promptly disposed of in like manner, we shall have the Republic in no time." The girl thought that this was all a bad joke, but she maintained that she had always been somewhat suspicious of him because of the practice he had of burning his letters immediately after reading them. It should be noted in this respect that no letters were found in his room after the attempt, although according to his landlady he carried on a large correspondence.<sup>24</sup>

Exactly how large a circle of friends Nobiling had is not known, but when the contents of his room were examined 12 recently used beer glasses were found standing on a table. His landlady related that she had not noticed them in the room prior to this time. This would tend to give the appearance that some sort of final celebration had been held on Saturday night before the attempt. If such a celebration were held it is not known who attended.

The police made meticulous searches of the registrar and guest books of the hotels and inns in which Nobiling had stayed on his frequent travels to determine the other guests present. The results of these investigations were inconclusive but sometimes a known Social Democrat was found to have spent the night in the same hotel.<sup>25</sup>

The Berlin police uncovered evidence that the German section of the Jura Federation was responsible for the plot against the Emperor, and that both assassination attempts had been directed from Leipzig, but this evidence was never followed up.<sup>26</sup> Some additional revelations were turned up, the significance of which it does not seem the Berlin police could have overlooked. But they did, perhaps intentionally. Louis Pinday, a former communard and friend of former communard Leo Frankel, received a letter from Frankel dated May 20 in which Frankel related that after the unsuccessful attempt by Hödel a meeting had been held in Neuchatel in which the German section of the Jura Federation decided to make another attempt on the life of the Kaiser.<sup>27</sup> It was also reported (date not specified) to the Berlin police that James Guillaume, living in Switzerland, had remarked, "we know very well that Nobiling is one of us."<sup>28</sup>

It is almost beyond belief that the Berlin police did not attach greater importance to an undated letter Emil Werner,

living in Leipzig at the time, wrote to Paul Brousse who was serving as editor of L' avant-Garde in Chaux-de-Fonds, Switzerland. The contents of this letter revealed that Leo Frankel had been arrested and that, "it would be in the best interest of the cause if Nobiling would soon die." The letter went on to say that Nobiling was to have been initiated into the International but that his sponsor, Paul Dentler, had died in Berlin five to six weeks previously.<sup>29</sup> The tone of this letter leads me to believe that Werner was acquainted to some extent with Nobiling, which is very possible considering the time Nobiling spent in Leipzig. It is amazing, almost beyond belief, that the police did not investigate Emil Werner more thoroughly in view of the fact that their investigations had demonstrated that Hödel had associated with him in Leipzig.<sup>30</sup> There is nothing in the letter to connect Werner directly with Nobiling but the implication is there both in Werner's statement, that it would be in the best interest of the cause if Nobiling would soon die, and also in his statement that Nobiling had been slated for membership in the International. The Berlin police were cognizant of Nobiling's trips to Leipzig. Upon his return to Berlin from these trips he talked to a number of people about the International. The police had enough circumstantial evidence to pick Werner up but did not. It would appear, though, that his actions were more closely watched after this because in 1879 he tried to publish an underground anarchist paper in Berlin, Der Kampf, and was apprehended by the Berlin police and sent to jail immediately after the first issue came off the press.

It is doubtful if Leo Frankel (1844-1896) was actually involved with the attempt on the life of the Emperor even though his name is mentioned several times. Frankel was, it is true, a former communard and both Hödel and Nobiling were imbued with enthusiasm for the ideas of the Commune. However, after the Commune Frankel became prominent in founding the Social Democratic Party in Hungary and was quite closely associated with Marx. Frankel attended the Universal Socialist Congress in Ghent from September 9-15, 1877, where he came in contact with Rinke and Werner. At the congress Frankel stood in opposition to the anarchists. He was forced to leave Belgium a day before the congress adjourned and returned to his native Hungary where he took part in the first socialist congress held in Hungary during the period April 21-22, 1878. According to his biographer, Frankel was in Hungary during the period of the two attempts; nowhere in the biography is any mention made of the attempts. There is also nothing to indicate that Frankel was arrested at the time.<sup>31</sup>

The Leo Frankel reported to the Berlin police supposedly was living at the time in Frankfurt-am-Main. It is quite possible that when Werner related to Paul Brousse, also a former communard, that Leo Frankel had been arrested he was actually referring to Otto Rinke. Werner does not say where he was arrested. Victor Dave a number of years later related that Rinke had been arrested in 1878 in the city of Cologne while using the name Otto Rau. It was a common practice for anarchists to use the names of well known Social Democrats as aliases. Reinsdorf at this period called himself Bernstein.<sup>32</sup> It is quite reasonable to assume that Rinke might have used the name Leo Frankel. At Ghent Frankel had sided with the Social Democrats against the anarchists. Liebknecht had openly attacked Rinke at Ghent with the approval of the rest of the Social Democrats. One way for Rinke to retaliate against the Social Democrats and at the same time to hide his identity would be to use the name of a Social Democrat as an alias. He could not use Liebknecht's name because Liebknecht was much older and also his face was reasonably well known because it was the practice of the time to sell pictures on the street of prominent Social Democratic Party leaders. Frankel, a Hungarian, was not popularly known and was close to Rinke's own age.<sup>33</sup>

It can be said with some degree of certainty that there was some connection between Hödel and Nobiling. At least both of them were associated with the German section of the Jura Federation, whose titular head in Germany was Emil Werner in Leipzig. Another connection between Hödel and Nobiling and the Germans who helped found the Arbeiter-Zeitung in Bern is evident upon reading the lead article in Paul Brousse's L' avant-Garde (June 17, 1878) entitled, "Hödel, Nobiling and Propaganda by Deed," in which the acts of Hödel and Nobiling are praised. The article also implies that in some way L' avant-Garde should claim a share of the glory for these two attempts. Brousse helped found the Arbeiter-Zeitung along with Werner, Rinke, and a number of others. He continued to be a good friend of Werner and Rinke and, as has already been noted, L' avant-Garde took the place of the defunct Arbeiter-Zeitung. The Geneva section of the Jura Federation following Hödel's execution passed a resolution declaring Hödel to be a martyr for the rights of mankind.<sup>34</sup>

The general tenor of the Nobiling documents tend to indicate that the Berlin police were aware that the Nobiling and Hödel attempts were connected, but they never succeeded in actually getting enough concrete evidence to prove it. They

spent too much time looking in the wrong places. If they had concentrated their efforts in Leipzig, Frankfurt-am-Main, and Switzerland, they probably would have found more information. Instead they seemed to be looking for some sort of international conspiracy, on a more grandiose scale, and Nobiling's travels pointed them in this direction. They conducted no investigation in Frankfurt and the investigation in Leipzig was limited to Nobiling's student associates and his land lady. For some unknown reason they failed to investigate Emil Werner whose name appears in both the Hödel and Nobiling documents. The German police network in Switzerland does not appear to have been very well-developed in 1878. The documents give the impression that they were primarily dependent upon Swiss sources for information.

Actually, as events proceeded after the Nobiling attempt, it became less and less desirable to find the group guilty of masterminding the two attempts or to establish a connection between the two. A scapegoat was named the night of the Nobiling attempt, as it was after the Hödel attempt and the burden of police efforts were aimed not at solving the Nobiling case, but at proving that Nobiling had connections with the Social Democratic Party. The Hödel and Nobiling investigations were very similar; however, the police demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt that Hödel was an anarchist and that the SPD was not to blame for his crime. Nevertheless, an attempt was made to force through anti-socialist legislation on the false premise that Hödel was a socialist. In the Nobiling investigation the police turned up enough evidence to demonstrate conclusively, as in the Hödel case, that Nobiling had attended Social Democratic meetings and had connections with the Social Democratic Party. They also turned up conclusive evidence that Nobiling's act could in no way be attributed to the Social Democratic Party, but this evidence, as in the Hödel case, was not made public.

The afternoon extras which came off the presses announcing the second attempt on the German Emperor did not imply that the assassin was connected with the socialist. The evening editions of the *Post* and *Berliner Tageblatt* though carried information that Social Democratic writings were found among Nobiling's possessions. During the night of June 2-3, or more precisely in the early morning hours of June 3, a bomb-shell was exploded which would do irreparable damage to the image of the Social Democratic Party in Germany. At 2:00 A.M. the Wolff Telegraph Bureau in Berlin sent out over the wires

a message which was described an "official" government release on the Nobiling attempt. The next morning Germans awoke to read in their newspapers the text of the Wolff telegram which said:

Subsequent interrogation of the assassin Nobiling has revealed that he holds socialist inclinations, also that he repeatedly attended socialist meetings here and that he has intended for a week to shoot His Majesty the Kaiser, because he maintains that it would be beneficial for the common welfare to eliminate the head of the state.<sup>35</sup>

The arrival of this telegram at the news office of Vorwärts in Leipzig sent a feeling of consternation through Bebel, Liebknecht and Hasenclever who had gathered there on the morning of June 3 to determine if any of them knew Nobiling. The Wolff telegram shocked them out of their earlier feeling of security which they had achieved by receipt of an earlier telegram which carried no mention of Nobiling being connected with the socialists. Bebel had remarked, "now they can't hang us on his coattails."<sup>36</sup> This feeling of safety vanished when the Wolff telegram arrived and they became aware of the implication it could have for their movement.

Both Bebel and Bernstein on a number of occasions pointed out that this telegram was nothing more than a bold-faced lie.<sup>37</sup> Bernstein maintained that Nobiling was in no physical shape to be questioned or to reveal any information after his capture because of his serious head wound. He says that Nobiling was too severely injured to be examined and that he was unable to speak.<sup>38</sup> Bernstein's opinion is actually the same as that of Bebel, and it was probably Bebel's defense of the Social Democratic Party in the Reichstag which so firmly established this opinion in his mind. This story, that Nobiling was too severely injured to be examined and to explain the reason for his action has been accepted without reservation by virtually everyone who has written on the subject.<sup>39</sup>

The truth of the matter is that nothing could be further from the realities of the case. Nobiling was questioned at length after his capture by the Public Prosecutor Johl and the Judge of Inquiry Schramm. In his answers to their questions Nobiling not only revealed his reasons for the attempt but also said he was not a Social Democrat. Nobiling said he wanted to kill the

Kaiser because he thought it would be for the benefit of all to get rid of the head of state. This part of the Wolff telegram is taken almost verbatim from Nobiling's answers. Only a few verb tenses are changed. Nobiling admitted having attended socialist meetings, but he did not admit, as the Wolff telegram claimed, having socialist inclinations. Johl asked Nobiling if he planned the attempt alone and he replied that he had planned it with a number of accomplices whom he refused to name. Nobiling further added that it was a follow-up to the unsuccessful attempt by Hödel. Johl asked if the Social Democratic Party was involved in the plot and Nobiling answered simply "nein," but he did admit that he had associated with Social Democratic Party members and that he had attended Social Democratic Party meetings, but that he was not interested in politics. Nobiling also related that he had spoken at Social Democratic Party meetings. When asked to name a Social Democratic Party member with whom he has associated, he named Friedrich Wilhelm Fritzsche.<sup>40</sup>

The Wolff telegram then was not a complete fabrication. It was basically true, and what was not true could be implied from Nobiling's statements. The telegram was written in vague language and did not refer to the Social Democratic Party specifically, but only to the socialists. The Wolff telegram was a fabrication to the extent that it did not give the complete details of Nobiling's answers. If it had included the fact that Nobiling had said that the Social Democratic Party was not involved in the plot against the Emperor, it would have gotten the SPD off the hook immediately. If this fact had been included it would have altered the entire meaning of the telegram. But the telegram was so vaguely worded that the public could draw its own conclusions. It said Nobiling was a socialist and he was to the extent that an anarchist is a socialist of sorts. It said Nobiling had attended socialist meetings. Nobiling did attend Social Democratic meetings in Berlin as he had in Halle, Leipzig and Dresden. There is evidence which proves that he often entered Social Democratic Party meetings for the explicit purpose of putting forth his own ideas. His purpose in attending was not to hear Social Democratic theories propagated, but to dispute them. The telegram said he had socialist connections. He did, but they were not responsible for the plot.

Why was the fact that the SPD was not responsible for the attempt not included in the telegram? Why was this official news release so vague? We must conclude that someone wanted

the telegram to imply that Nobiling was connected with the Social Democratic Party, so therefore the entire Social Democratic Party was responsible for the crime and should be punished. Who would benefit from such a scheme? It is obvious that the telegram had as its intention to heat up the fires of outrage against the Social Democratic Party in Germany. In most minds in Germany socialist referred to only one thing, the German Socialist Democratic Party. It did not have to be written out, the term "Socialist" was sufficient.

Who then is responsible for this telegram which may properly be called the "second Ems telegram" because the same thing was done with it as with the Ems dispatch and it achieved a similar success. The results of Nobiling's interrogation appear in the telegram in such a way that no lies are told, but the truth was not revealed either. The real heart of Nobiling's testimony is that he acted with others in a plan to follow up the unsuccessful Hödel attempt and that the Social Democratic Party was in no way connected to the plot. This information was all missing in the Wolff telegram. The falsification was greater than Bebel or Bernstein ever imagined because they worked on the assumption that Nobiling's physical condition would not permit questioning.

It can be assumed that the Wolff telegram was authorized by someone who wanted deliberately to place the Social Democratic Party in a position of jeopardy. In the Nobiling documents there are both a handwritten copy of the telegram and a printed copy. The handwritten copy of the telegram is not signed, but it is written in the same handwriting as the extracts from the Nobiling interrogations which are signed by Lothar Bucher (1817-1892).<sup>41</sup> The document signed by Lothar Bucher is a summary of the interrogation of Nobiling by the Untersuchungsrichter Johl. It is not a verbatim account but it is accurate. It is greatly reduced in size which leads me to believe that it was shortened for the purpose of telegraphing it to someone. Numerous abbreviations are also used. The news of the Nobiling attempt was telegraphed to Bismarck, and although it cannot be proven, probably the telegram which was sent contained the summarized version of the Nobiling interrogation which Bucher had extracted.<sup>42</sup>

On the afternoon of June 2 most of the important government officials were not in Berlin, including the Crown Prince who was in France. Guido von Madai (1810-1892), the



Polizeipräsident of Berlin, was absent as was the Prussian Minister of the Interior, Friedrich Graf zu Eulenburg (1815-1881). Chancellor Bismarck was at Friedrichsruh.

At Friedrichsruh, Christoph von Tiedemann (1836-1907), head of the newly formed Reichs Chancellery, received the news and transmitted it to Bismarck. Tiedemann has left an account of this episode. It was afternoon and Bismarck was out walking with his dogs in the woods and fields surrounding Friedrichsruh. Tiedemann walked out to meet him and said, "some important telegrams have arrived," and Bismarck answered, "are they so urgent that we have to deal with them out here in the open fields?" Tiedemann replied, "unfortunately, they are. The Emperor has again been fired at, and this time he had been hit. His Majesty is seriously wounded." Bismarck stopped dead in his tracks and deeply agitated thrust his oaken stick into the ground in front of him and breathing heavily said, "now we shall dissolve the Reichstag!"<sup>43</sup> Only then did Bismarck inquire about the Emperor's condition and ask for details of the attempt.

Surely Bismarck must have been aware that if the second attempt were used properly it could open up new avenues to accomplish what he had failed to do after the Hödel attempt, namely the passage of an anti-socialist law. He saw this possibility when Hödel made his attempt on the Kaiser. At that time he was also at Friedrichsruh and the evening of the Hödel attempt he telegraphed Bülow telling him that the incident should be seized on as a pretext for introducing a law against the socialists.<sup>44</sup> Bismarck must have realized that if he managed the Nobiling affair properly he could make a great deal of political capital out of it, whip up feeling among the German public and in the end achieve his objectives, the suppression of the Social Democratic Party and the breaking of the power of the National Liberals who had voted against his bill to suppress the socialists after the Hödel affair. The original draft of the Wolff telegram, written in Bucher's handwriting, was more than likely transmitted to Berlin from Bismarck after he had read the telegram he had received which contained the summarized version of Nobiling's interrogation. Bismarck probably sent the text of the telegram to Bucher, authorizing him to release it as an official statement on the assassination attempt, Bismarck was actually the only one in a position to release an official statement. William I could not, and until the Crown Prince could return home, Bismarck, as Chancellor, was the only one in a position to authorize such a statement. In view of the fact that

the original draft of the telegram, which was probably transmitted in cipher, is in Bucher's handwriting, it is almost certain that Bismarck wrote it and authorized that it be released. Several days later Bismarck is rumored to have said to one of his intimates: "Now I've got those fellows where I want them." Somebody asked, "Your Highness means the Social Democrats?" Bismarck replied, "No, the National Liberals."<sup>45</sup> In order for Bismarck to accomplish his goal of suppressing the Social Democratic Party he had to first crush his opposition, the National Liberals.

Bismarck realized that he no longer needed the Reichstag as it was presently constituted. Twice it had refused to pass his anti-socialist bill. He must have realized that if he exploited the situation properly, he could dissolve the Reichstag and have a new one elected which would be more favorable to his will. The release of the Wolff telegram was probably the first step in this direction.

Was it necessary for Bismarck to dissolve the Reichstag and order an election to achieve this purpose? The answer to this question is probably no. The evidence shows that the National Liberals were weakening. The Reichstag deputies of the National Liberal Party, who had voted against his bill for the suppression of the Social Democrats, published in their party organ the National Zeitung on the evening of June 6, 1878, the following statement:

On May 24 many of those in the Reichstag who voted with the majority acted upon the supposition that Hödel's attempt was the deed merely of a miserable creature which would have no further consequences, and that it would be possible to steer clear of the threatening evil while adhering to the principles of common right, by completing the legislation on the subjects of clubs and associations, and by filling the loopholes in the penal code. This supposition has now fallen to the ground. The preparations made by Nobiling, his network of communication appearing to extend beyond the confines of Germany, the systematic arrangement of his murderous scheme, the spread of the most abominable opinions over all classes of the people, the shameless threats directed against persons of high public standing—all this combines to disclose to the eyes the depth and breadth of a

corruption which cannot be speedily and efficaciously encountered upon the ground of equal rights alone. Rather must extraordinary measures now be determined upon to save and heal the state.

The paper added by way of editorial comment

If the Government comes before the Reichstag with the statement that it must ask for extraordinary powers for the safety of the dynasty of the country, we are convinced that those powers will be readily granted to the Government upon its constitutional responsibility by the majority of the Reichstag. The decision whether such powers are necessary we must, of course, leave to the Government.

The decision had been made by the "Government" even before the Nobiling attempt. Now after the attempt Bismarck was no longer, as before, the voice behind the Government (the Emperor); he was the Government. The news of the attempt on William I caught up with Friedrich, the Crown Prince, at Calais and he hurried back to Berlin to take up the reins of Government if this became necessary. He was soon to discover that Bismarck was in the driver's seat holding the reins and steering his own course. The nature and severity of the wounds of the 81-year-old Emperor led most people to believe that the Crown Prince would be appointed Regent which would have vested in him full sovereign power. However, this was not the case; when the Crown Prince arrived in Berlin, Bismarck called on him with a document conferring on him the status of Deputy which obliged him to carry on his father's policies, or more accurately the policy of his father's Chancellor.<sup>46</sup>

Bismarck did not have to dissolve the Reichstag if his only purpose had been to achieve passage of the same type of bill he failed to get passed after the Hödel attempt. The liberal deputies declared publicly, as shown above, their willingness to support such a measure. Therefore it can be assumed that Bismarck had more far-reaching ideas in mind—the complete destruction of the Social Democratic Party and the subordination of the National Liberal Party. Furthermore, any measure which the presently constituted Reichstag might pass would not be severe enough, nor would it be the enduring bill which Bismarck sought. Any measure the Reichstag as it then stood might pass would be of a temporary nature and though it probably would

have included repressive measures against the socialists it more than likely would not have called for their destruction, and surely would not have called for the subordination the National Liberals.

All power in the German Reich resided in the Emperor and now that he lay seriously wounded, Bismarck, as Chancellor of the Reich, was able to wield it for his own purposes to cure what he considered to be one of the greatest illnesses in the Reich—the increase of socialism and liberalism. If he could wield the power in such a way that it would appear that he was doing it for the protection of the Fatherland and the Kaiser, he would have the majority of the German people behind him. In a single stroke he could get rid of his opposition. It would be an easy matter to discredit the National Liberals who had killed his last measure on May 24. They had more or less accepted the blame for the defeat on June 6, in the above mentioned statement by the National Liberal deputies to the Reichstag, although this was not their intention. The seeds of distrust of the socialists had been planted in the minds of the people on the night of June 2-3 with the Wolff telegram which implied that Nobiling was a socialist, a charge the Social Democratic Party could deny, but one of which they were nevertheless guilty even if only by association and nothing else.

Under the German constitution the Reichstag could be dismissed only by a decision of the Federal Council in conjunction with the Emperor. Neither the Prussian Cabinet nor the Federal Council was unanimously in favor of dissolving the Reichstag. Some members thought it was unnecessary and dangerous and were of the opinion that a new socialist bill would now pass the present Reichstag. The Crown Prince, representing his father, did not favor dissolution, but acting merely as Deputy and not as Regent, he had to do what his father wanted. Bismarck had William I's ear, because the old Kaiser was still lying flat on his back in his sick bed, and the Reichstag was dissolved on June 11.

New elections were called for July 30, 1878. In the election the Social Democratic Party lost 56,000 votes, polling 437,158 votes or 8 per cent of the total vote. The large cities stood firm behind the Social Democratic Party and they were able to increase the number of votes they received in some. In Berlin the Social Democratic vote rose from 31,522 in 1877 to 56,147 in 1878; however, the number of Social Democratic

Deputies in the Reichstag dropped from 12 to nine. The National Liberals dropped from 127 deputies to 99; the Progressives, from 35 to 26, while the Conservatives rose from 40 to 59 seats; the Free Conservatives, from 38 to 57; and the Center Party, from 93 to 99.<sup>47</sup> Bismarck was disappointed at the Social Democratic Party's show of strength but the back bone of the liberals had been broken. Passage of a new anti-socialist bill was assured in spite of the still large number of Reichstag deputies from the National Liberal Party. Most of them had been re-elected only by promising the voters that they would support measures against the socialists.

The Government introduced a new socialist bill into the Reichstag when it convened on September 9, 1878. The Social Democratic Party, Center Party, and Progressives opposed the bill, while the conservative parties and National Liberal Party backed it. The Social Democratic deputies went out of their way to demonstrate the peaceful reform nature of their party during the Reichstag debates, hoping to counter the charges of radicalism fired at them. They presented themselves as innocent victims, and August Bebel pointed out that the Wolff telegram was a lie from start to finish. However, Wilhelm Hasselmann ruined this image when in an excited outburst, which went on for two hours, he defended the Commune and hinted that further acts of violence could be expected if the bill were passed. He ended his speech with the remark that Bismarck would do well to consider how the revolution of 1848 broke out. In the end neither tactic of the Social Democratic Party, the appeal to reason or the appeal to fear, was successful. On October 19 by vote of 221 to 149 the Reichstag passed the socialist bill; two days later it became the law of the land.<sup>48</sup>

In the form in which it passed it was not what Bismarck, the Emperor, and the conservatives had hoped for. It was not a permanent law, but would expire in two and one half years, but it nevertheless contained sweeping power of suppression. It contained broad powers to abolish societies with social democratic, socialist, or communistic tendencies. It prohibited the publication of social democratic books, pamphlets, and periodicals. Professional agitators who violated the law might be expelled, by court order, from specific towns and districts, but expulsion from a personal place of domicile was legal only if he had lived there for less than six months. All meetings had to be approved in advance by the police. Fines and terms of imprisonment were to be levied on those who broke the law.<sup>49</sup>

Even though the Socialist Law empowered authorities to impose a minor stage of siege, it was not rigorous enough for Bismarck who had hoped for the power to dismiss socialist civil servants without a pension and for a prohibition against socialists running for public office. At the time Bismarck said:

The majority of the poorly paid minor officials in Berlin, the railroad signalmen, the switchmen, and similar categories, are socialists, a situation whose dangers may become evident in times of insurrection, in the transportation of troops. I believe, that if the law is to be effective, then it is impossible in the long run to allow any citizen proved to be a socialist to retain the vote, the right to run for office, and the enjoyment of the privilege of representation in the Reichstag . . . . The bill as it now stands does no serious harm to socialism and is completely inadequate for its suppression.<sup>50</sup>

The Socialist Law lost some of its effectiveness as a result of the suggestion made by the Liberal Deputy Lasker and adopted by the Reichstag, which limited the life of the law to two and one half years. Whenever the law came up for renewal the Social Democratic Reichstag deputies had a forum, in the Reichstag, from which they could appeal to the workers.

The Socialist Law which Bismarck intended to use to suppress the socialist movement did not achieve this desired goal. Johannes Ziekursch, liberal professor at the Universities of Breslau and Cologne, is of the opinion that the passage of the Socialist Law marked the death knell for the liberals. He maintains that there was a belief among liberals in Germany, which prevailed since 1866, that after political unity was achieved then would be the time for liberal developments. Ziekursch thought that the passage of the Socialist Law indicated that the liberals had rejected the workers, "Just as it had completely embittered the Catholics by the Kulturkampf, and provoked the conservatives through the reforms of the Prussian administration without weakening them."<sup>51</sup> Bismarck could, according to Ziekursch, safely dispense with the liberal support in domestic affairs, upon which he had relied up to this point.<sup>52</sup>

It is difficult to make an accurate assessment of the long term efforts of the Socialist Law. The Socialist Law helped to shape the course followed by the Social Democratic Party in the

period 1878-1890, a course which was not altered greatly until the outbreak of World War I. The course followed by the SPD was to capture as many seats as possible in the Reichstag. On the eve of World War I the SPD was the largest single party in the Reichstag. The success of the SPD in electing Reichstag deputies had little meaning because the Reichstag, according to the 1871 Constitution, was not where the real center of power in Germany lay. It was in the Emperor, the Chancellor and the Bundesrat.

Zeikursch sees a relationship between the Socialist Law and the unsuccessful government of the Weimar period, "the Socialist Law thrust a thorn into the flesh of the German people; a festering wound was opened which has not healed to the present time."<sup>53</sup> Perhaps this statement is an oversimplification, but it does point out what was an obvious fault of Wilhelminian Germany which became apparent in the Weimar period: the lack of meaningful participation in Government by mass of the German people. If, after the unification of Germany, one had to put his finger on a particular point where the German Government took a turn away from meaningful participation in Government, it would surely have to be the passage of the Socialist Law.

A great deal has been written about the Socialist Law being unfair to the Social Democratic Party. Bebel attempted, without success, to point out during the Reichstag debates on the socialist bill that Social Democratic Party was not guilty of the crimes of Hödel and Nobiling. His arguments fell on deaf ears which failed to comprehend the subtleties of his defense. It was not an auspicious time to appeal to reason. Guido Weiss accurately summed up the feeling in Germany following the Nobiling attempt when he wrote in *Die Wage*, "The Kaiser has the wounds but the nation has the wound fever."<sup>54</sup> In the Reichstag debates it was pointed out by the Conservative Deputy von Kleist-Retzow on October 18 that both Hödel and Nobiling "had drunk from the intoxicating cup of Social Democracy."<sup>55</sup>

The public was in no mood to attempt to grapple with the subtle differences between the Social Democratic Party and other socialist or anarchist groups. It must be remembered that the anarchists often referred to themselves as socialists. All were lumped under the heading of revolutionaries by the public and it was assumed that a revolutionary wanted to overthrow the state and kill the sovereign who headed it. The French revolution had amply demonstrated this. Even the educated people had difficulty

discerning the difference between the various socialist groups. In some cases these differences were perceptible only to those who belonged to the groups. In the minds of most people an anarchist was a socialist, as were the members of the Social Democratic Party. The general public could not distinguish between the two. Police records were kept in much the same way; socialist, anarchist, and revolutionary groups were filed together. It was not until 1884 that the Berlin police established separate files for the anarchists.<sup>56</sup>

If the police officials, bureaucrats, and educated people could not distinguish between socialists and anarchists it is no wonder that the great mass of the people lumped them all together. They were instructed by the press to think of them as a single unit and not as diverse groups and different factions which had little in common. If you look at the passage of the Socialist Law from this perspective, the difficulty of distinguishing between socialism and anarchism, you have to conclude that its passage was justified.

The results of the Socialist Law concerning the suppression of periodicals, books and Social Democratic organizations have been covered in detail in other books and need not be repeated here.<sup>57</sup> The Socialist Law had the effect of increasing the importance of parliamentarianism in the Social Democratic Party. The law did not forbid the election to the Reichstag of Social Democratic deputies because it was thought it would be unnecessary. Bismarck noticed this loophole but was unable to close it. During the period the Socialist Law was in effect, 1878-1890, the Social Democratic vote increased as did their representation in the Reichstag. The Hödel-Nobiling attempts led to another development, a reorganization of the Berlin police. By the time the Socialist Law was on the books the Berlin police had been reorganized to increase their efficiency.<sup>58</sup>

The Socialist Law is, undoubtedly, one of the most significant pieces of legislation passed in Germany in the last quarter of the 19th century. It is doubtful if Bismarck would have been able to achieve passage of such a bill, had it not been for the back to back assassination attempts of Hödel and Nobiling on the life of William I. Even then, he had to manipulate the evidence, in such a way, to attempt to demonstrate that the Social Democrats were responsible for both acts. It has been amply demonstrated that both Hödel and Nobiling were, at best, only indirectly connected with the SPD, and that the SPD was



in no way responsible for their actions. At the time Hödel made his attempt he had broken with the SPD and was in the anarchist camp, having been lured there by August Reinsdorf and Emil Werner. Nobiling, although he attended SPD meetings and was even a member of the SPD Arbeiterbildungs Verein in Dresden, probably never adhered to SPD principles. His purpose in attending SPD meetings was to propagate his own anarchist message. The evidence is not as conclusive as one would like, but all indications point in the direction that both the Hödel and Nobiling attempts were the work of the German section of the Jura Federation, and that probably Emil Werner, in Leipzig, played the chief role in planning of both of them. It has been definitely established that Hödel worked in conjunction with Werner in Leipzig. Nobiling's name has been tied to Werner through a letter which Werner wrote to Paul Brousse. The tone of the letter leads me to believe that Nobiling was no stranger to Werner. Nobiling in his confession, after he was apprehended, admitted that there were others involved, and that his attempt was a follow up to Hödel's unsuccessful attempt. It is my contention that both attempts were related, and that they were planned by Emil Werner and the German section of the Jura Federation.

#### Notes

1. After Nobiling was apprehended he made a statement in which he said that others were involved in the assassination attempt, but that he had been selected to carry out the act because of his skill in the use of weapons. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam. Acta des Königlichen Polizeipräsidenten zu Berlin. "Das Attentat des Dr. Phil. Carl Nobiling auf das Leben Sr. Majestät des Kaisers und Königs am 2. Juni 1878." Geheim Präsidial Registratur C. Pol. Praes. Tit. 94, Lit. A., No. 242, Vol. III (8615), Folders 11-12. Hereafter cited as Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. A., No. 242, Nobiling-Attentat, and the appropriate volume and folder numbers.

2. Local anzeiger der "Presse" (Vienna), XXXI, No. 155 (June 7, 1878); Tribune (Berlin), XVIII, No. 128 (June 4, 1878); Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam. Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. A., No. 242, Nobiling-Attentat, Vol. I (8613), Folders 1-14, 32, 64, 269; Vol. III (8615), Folders 8-9, 25-41, 48-50.

3. Times (London, June 4, 1878), p. 5, Col. 5-6. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam. Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. A., No. 242, Nobiling-Attentat, Vol.III (8615), Folders 15-17.

4. It appears that Nobiling's attempt on the Emperor had its beneficial side. Bismarck relates in his memoirs that in the middle 1870's the Emperor's intellect began to decline and he had difficulty comprehending what others said and in developing his own thoughts. At times he completely lost the thread of conversations in which he was engaged. His remarks, like his mind, wandered. After the Nobiling attempt he no longer suffered from these symptoms, "the Emperor was freer, had more life, and was also more easily moved." William, himself remarked, "Nobiling knew better than the doctors what I wanted—a good letting of blood." Otto von Bismarck, The Memoirs (New York, 1966), II, p. 303.

5. Bernstein, Die Geschichte der Berliner Arbeiterbewegung, I, p. 41. For the reaction to the attempt in other parts of Germany see: Georg Eckert, Die Braunschweiger Arbeiterbewegung unter dem Sozialistengesetz; Heinrich Laufenburg, Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung in Hamburg, Altona und Umgegend (Hamburg, 1931), II, pp. 631-646.

6. Mehring, Geschichte der Sozialdemokratie, II, p. 500.

7. Bernstein, Die Geschichte der Berliner Arbeiterbewegung, I, p. 368.

8. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. A., No. 242, Nobiling-Attentat, Vol. III (8615), Folder 36.

9. Ibid., Folder 47.

10. Ibid., Folder 59.

11. Ibid., Vol. I (8613), Folders 44ff.

12. Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung, No. 153 (June 30, 1878); Tribune, No. 133 (June 9, 1878).

13. See also Berliner Fremdenblatt, No. 146 (June 26,

1878) which maintains the same position as the Tribune saying that the burden of guilt fell on the Berlin police for their negligence in failing to heed the reports from Paris and London.

14. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. A., No. 242, Nobiling-Attentat, Vol. I (8613), Folders 134-135.

15. Ibid., Folder 65.

16. Quoted in Ernest Alfred Vizetelly, The Anarchists (New York, 1911), p. 42.

17. Leo Stern (ed.), Der Kampf der deutschen Sozialdemokratie in der Zeit des Sozialistengesetzes 1878-1890. Die Tätigkeit der Reichs-Commission (Berlin-East, 1956), II, p. 700; Freiheit (New York), No. 45 (November 8, 1884).

18. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. A., No. 242, Nobiling-Attentat, Vol. I (8613), Folder 148, Vol. III (8615), Folders 14-15. At this time Carl Hirsch was the Paris correspondent for the Social Democratic press in Germany. Later it was speculated by some that Nobiling had gone to London to see Marx, which of course was not his purpose in going there. Mountstuart Grant Duff, a liberal member of Parliament, dined with Marx on January 31, 1879, at the Devonshire Club on St. James Street. He posed the question to Marx, what if Nobiling had requested to see him? Marx replied that since Nobiling was employed in the Dresden Bureau of Statistics, and he, himself, was interested in statistics, he probably would have talked with him.

When the news of Nobiling's attempt arrived at Marx's home, he was in his study with the Russian Historian Maxim Kovalevsky. Kovalevsky relates that Marx cursed Nobiling, not for the attempted assassination, but for failing. Marx also said, and he was proved correct, that the attempt could only lead to new persecutions of the socialists. Erinnerungen an Marx und Engels (Berlin-East, 1965), p. 398.

19. Ibid., Vol. III (8615), Folder 21ff.

20. Ibid., Folders 85-87.

21. Local Anzeiger der "Presse" (Vienna), XXXI, No. 155 (June 7, 1878).

22. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. A., No. 242, Nobiling-Attentat, Vol. III (8615), Folder 66, Vol. IV (8616), Folders 3-14.

23. Ibid., Vol. IV (8616), Folder 1.

24. Ibid., Vol. III (8615), Folders 48-55.

25. Ibid., Vol. I (8613), Folder 43.

26. Ibid., Vol. IV (8616), Folder 33.

27. Ibid., Vol. I (8613), Folders 154-155.

28. Ibid., Vol. I (8613), Folder 154.

29. Ibid., Vol. I (8613), Folder 155. The Social Democrat Paul Dentler died on April 24, 1878, which means that Werner probably wrote the letter sometime between June 6th and 13th, or after Nobiling's attempt. Dentler was a young man when he died in prison. He was the responsible editor of the Berliner freie Presse and on January 18, 1878, was accused of several instances of lèse-majesté and of allowing other detrimental articles to be printed in the Berliner freie Presse. On February 7 he was sentenced to 21 months in prison and later died in the prison section of the Charité hospital, in which Nobiling also died on September 9. Dentler's funeral was held in Berlin on April 28 and was the occasion of a great outpouring of feeling for the cause of the Social Democratic Party. The huge Dentler funeral led some people at the time to speculate that the funeral was the catalyst that set off the attempts. On this point see: Bernstein, Sozialdemokratische Lehrjahre, pp. 62-63. Nobiling's association with Dentler remains mysterious as does his sponsorship of Nobiling in the International. What is meant by this sponsorship is not clear from Werner's letter. This naturally leads to the speculation that perhaps there was a growing dissatisfaction among the younger leaders in the Social Democratic Party. Johann Most, and Wilhelm Hasselmann, who represented the SPD in the Reichstag, were soon to be drummed out of the party in 1880 after becoming too radical. Most's radicalism was already evident in 1878. How deep seated this feeling was among the younger leaders is not known, but many of them were dissatisfied with the methods of Bebel and Liebknecht. They wanted to see things move more rapidly even if it meant resorting to violence.

30. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. A., Hödel-Attentat, Folders 108-110. After Werner's arrest in Berlin on December 25, 1879, in connection with the publication of Der Kampf, Der Sozialdemokrat (January 18, 1880), carried an article which said that Werner had been breaking laws for years and that the police had done nothing about it. The article also asserted that Werner's name was prominently mentioned in the documents concerning the Hödel attempt. The writer of the article claimed that the police did not arrest him at the time because they were waiting for Werner to commit a serious crime to press for more repressive measures in the Reichstag. Rudolf Rocker, Johann Most, p. 113, said that this charge was baseless. An examination of the documents proves that Rocker was wrong and substantiates the article in Der Sozialdemokrat but they do not contain any clue why Werner was not arrested. The implication of the article in Der Sozialdemokrat is that Werner was an unwitting tool of police repression. One fact not explained by the article is their source of information. It would appear that either the Social Democrats had a spy in the government who had access to the Geheime Präsidential-Registatur which contained the Hödel documents, or that the writer of the article made a brilliant assumption that Werner's name figured prominently in the documents. However, the fact remains that there was sufficient evidence connecting Werner with Hödel and Nobiling that he should have been, at the least, picked up and questioned by police, but they chose to do nothing. Reinsdorf claimed that the reason the Berlin police did not arrest Werner at the time was because they did not know his whereabouts, a story that is difficult to believe.

31. Magda Aranyossi, Leo Frankel (Berlin-East, 1957), pp. 116-140, 390. Often times his name appears as Fränkel, however, for the sake of consistency I have used it as does his biographer.

32. There is also evidence stating that the Berlin police were interested in a man named Bernstein who had been seen associating with Nobiling. Reinsdorf at this time was in Berlin so it is very possible that the Bernstein reported to the Berlin police was Reinsdorf. On this point see: Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. A., No. 242, Nobiling-Attentat, Vol. I (8613), Folders 87-88.

33. Another piece of information which Pinday is supposed to have allowed to leak out to police agents in Switzerland, where he was living in exile after the Commune, is that Leo Frankel masterminded the Nobiling attempt on William I. More than likely this piece of information was a pure fabrication thought up by some police informer. But it is possible that Pinday, who was an anarchist, let the information out to discredit Frankel who was a Marxist. However, this explanation does not seem plausible if they continued to correspond. But no police agent in Switzerland ever saw the letter from Frankel to Pinday; they only knew of its contents indirectly from hearing Pinday talk. Perhaps there never was a letter. Probably he knew that whatever he said was bound to end up in the police records so he included the name Frankel to confuse the police. Ibid., Vol. I (8613), Folders 154-155.

34. Avant-Garde (October 7, 1878).

35. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. A., No. 242, Nobiling-Attentat, Vol. III (8615), Folder 84 contains a printed copy of the telegram bearing the number 2512 assigned to it by the Wolff Telegraph Bureau and the date June 3, 1878. Folder 10 contains a handwritten copy of the telegram with no identification number assigned to it and it is dated June 2, 1878, so it is assumed that the handwritten copy is the original.

36. Bebel, Aus meinem Leben, pp. 593-594.

37. Ibid., p. 594; Bernstein, Die Geschichte der Berliner Arbeiterbewegung, p. 365.

38. Bernstein, Die Geschichte der Berliner Arbeiterbewegung, p. 365.

39. For example see: Pack, Das parlamentarische Ringen, p. 15; Erick Eyck, Bismarck and the German Empire (New York, 1964), pp. 238-239; Werner Richter, Bismarck (New York, 1965), p. 219.

40. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. A., No. 242, Nobiling-Attentat, Vol. III (8615), Folders 11-12. Naturally Fritzsche

denied that he knew Nobiling. Evidently the story leaked out though and Fritzsche felt obligated to give a public denial. In the Volks-Zeitung, No. 164 (July 16, 1878) Fritzsche said that he did not know Nobiling and that he had not participated in any meeting with Nobiling on the theme of Schutzzoll und Freihandel, as Nobiling claimed. According to an account which appeared in the Berliner Tageblatt, No. 157 (July 7, 1878) such a meeting had taken place in the late fall of 1877. It was held in the Andreasgarten in the Andreasstrasse and the meeting ended with Nobiling speaking on the glories of the Paris Commune. Fritzsche replied in the Volks-Zeitung, No. 164 (July 16, 1878), that if someone had gotten up from the audience to speak and announced himself as Dr. Nobiling, the title doctor would have stood out in a workers' meeting and he would have remembered it. More than likely Nobiling did, as he claimed, have some association with Fritzsche, but perhaps he was more of a thorn in his side than anything else.

41. Bucher was a Vortragender Rat in the Foreign Office, 1864-1886. The part he played for Bismarck in the Hohenzollern candidacy has been treated in detail by Robert H. Lord, The Origins of the War of 1870 (Cambridge, Mass., 1924); and Lawrence D. Steefel, Bismarck and the Hohenzollern Candidacy and the Origins of the War of 1870 (Cambridge, Mass., 1962) and need not be repeated here. Bismarck, according to Holstein, regarded Bucher as a tool and "used him to carry out all kinds of strictly confidential and personal business." Norman Rich and M.H. Fisher, The Holstein Papers, I, Memoirs (Cambridge, 1955), pp. 52-53. For the Congress of Berlin, which convened less than two weeks after the Nobiling attempt, Bismarck named Bucher the Senior Counsellor of the Political Division of the Foreign Office. Norman Rich, Friedrich von Holstein. Politics and Diplomacy in the Era of Bismarck and William II, I (Cambridge, 1965), pp. 101-102. Bucher resigned when Herbert Bismarck became Under State Secretary in 1885. Herbert corrected some of Bucher's work in such a rude way that Bucher demanded his release which was granted but Prince Bismarck saw to it that Bucher received a handsome pension of two thousand marks a year. Later in life Bismarck sought, and received, the services of Bucher in writing his memoirs. Ibid., pp. 122; Rich and Fisher, The Holstein Papers, I, Memoirs, p. 68. There can be no doubt that Bismarck used and trusted Bucher. Erich Eyck relates that Bucher was one of the few persons for whom Bismarck felt something like friendship and that Bucher knew more of Bismarck's most intimate secrets than

any other man. Eyck, Bismarck, p. 164. The obvious question that now has to be asked, was the appointment of Bucher as Senior Counsellor in the Political Division in the Foreign Office a reward for services performed in Nobiling affair? The question has to remain open, there is no answer, but the fact remains that the original draft of the Wolff telegram is in Bucher's handwriting which means that it had to come from Bismarck.

42. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. A., No. 242, Nobiling-Attentat, Vol. III (8615), Folder 11.

43. Tiedemann, Sechs Jahre Chef der Reichskanzlei unter dem Fürsten Bismarck, p. 268.

44. Ibid., pp. 256-258.

45. Eyck, Bismarck, p. 240.

46. The Crown Prince never forgave Bismarck for this. On June 18, 1885, he related: "He's done things to me which can never be forgotten. I still remember, for instance how he called on me after Nobiling's assassination attempt with the document conferring on me the status of 'Deputy.'" Rich and Fisher, The Holstein Papers, II, Diaries, pp. 205-206.

47. Lidtke, The Outlawed Party, p. 74.

48. Ibid., p. 77.

49. For the complete text of the law in German as well as earlier versions of the bill see: Pack, Das parlamentarische Ringen, pp. 243-263. A complete English translation is found in Lidtke, The Outlawed Party, pp. 339-345.

50. Quoted in Johannes Ziekursch, Politische Geschichte des neuen deutschen Kaiserreichs II Das Zeitalter Bismarcks (1871-1890) (Frankfurt a.M., 1928), pp. 332-333. Evidently William I was satisfied with the law Bismarck was able to obtain. In a letter of November 6, 1878, William thanked Bismarck for passage of the Socialist Law and awarded him by conferring on him a number of new orders. The Correspondence of William I and Bismarck (New York, 1903), I, pp. 186-187.

51. Ibid., p. 333.



52. Ibid.

53. Ibid.

54. Quoted in Mehring, Geschichte der Sozialdemokratie, II, p. 497.

55. Berichte über die Verhandlungen des deutschen Reichstages (1878), Bd. I, p. 354.

56. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. A., "Die anarchistische Bewegung 1884-1885." The Minister of the Interior though had established a separate file as early as 1881, see: Deutsches Zentralarchiv Merseburg, Rep. 77 (Ministerium des Innern), Tit. 2512, Nr. 8, Vol. 1-3, "Massregeln gegen die anarchistische Bewegung."

Prior to 1884 anarchist activities were lumped with either Social Democratic or revolutionary groups. In many cases this method of filing persisted down to World War I. For example see: Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. 1-8 (13,087/94), "Die Übersichten die allgemeine Lage der sozialdemokratischen und revolutionären (anarchisten) Bewegung 1878-1910," and Ibid., Tit. 95, Sekt. 7, Lit. J., Nr. 4a, Vol. 1-4 (15,874/77), "Übersichten über die Lage der sozialdemokratischen und anarchistischen Bewegung," Deutsches Zentralarchiv Merseburg Rep. H (Geheimnis Zivilkabinett), Abt. XXI, Generalia, Nr. 18, Vol. 1-2, "Die Sozialdemokratie und Anarchie 1872-1909," and, Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, E 150, Ministerium des Innern IV, 2055, "Bekämpfung der Sozialdemokratie und Anarchie 1897-1914," and Staatsarchiv Ludwigsburg, F 181, Oberamt Ludwigsburg, 143b, "Umstürzlerische Elemente, Anarchisten, Linksradikale, 1880-1918," and, Ibid., F 201, Stadtdirektion Stuttgart, 627-628, "Erfassung Stuttgarter Sozialdemokraten und Anarchisten 1877-1894," and, Ibid., F 210, Oberamt Waiblingen, 531, "Überwachung der SPD und anarchistischer Organisationen, 1832-1918." In general most governmental agencies concerned with such problems started to maintain separate files on anarchism starting with 1885, however, lest any reader be lead astray there are numerous files that concentrate solely on Social Democracy that pre-date the year 1885 by many years. For the years 1872-1885 anarchist records generally were filed together with those of the Social Democrats. Exactly how the police or Minister of the Interior determined what should

be put in a purely Social Democratic file and what should be placed in a mixed Social Democratic-Anarchist file is not clear, unless it had something to do with the amount of radicalism or lack thereof demonstrated by the Social Democrat in question.

57. See: Lidtke, The Outlawed Party, pp. 78-82.

58. For an account of this see: Dieter Fricke, Bismarcks Praetorianer. Der Berliner politische Polizei im Kampf gegen die deutsche Arbeiterbewegung (1871-1898), (Berlin-East, 1962), pp. 50-62; Werner Pöls, "Staat und Sozialdemokratie im Bismarckreich. Die Tätigkeit der politischen Polizei beim Polizeipräsidenten in Berlin in der Zeit des Sozialistengesetzes 1878-1890," Jahrbuch für die Geschichte Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands, 13 (1964), 200-221.



## Chapter VI

### JOHANN MOST AND WILHELM HASSELMANN THREATEN TO SPLIT THE SPD

Johann Most (1846-1906)<sup>1</sup> was born February 5, 1846 in the Bavarian city of Augsburg. His father, a good singer who played the guitar and zither, worked in the theater before he became dissatisfied with the wandering and aimlessness that such a life involved. He returned to the city of Augsburg where he was able to obtain employment as a copyist in a law office, a position which paid a meager salary. His mother, formerly a governess, was an educated and refined woman of liberal ideas. Johann was a love child "conceived between the door and the sill" as he remarked later in life to Emma Goldmann. His parents wanted to marry but his father was too poor to obtain a marriage licence, thus they were not legally married until 1848. Even though the family was poor Johann received a great deal of love and attention from his mother who also gave him his first instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic. The atmosphere at the Most home was dominated by his mother's free thinking and liberal ideas.<sup>2</sup>

The first tragedy in the life of little Hans was the sudden loss of his mother who died in 1856 during a cholera epidemic along with his sister and his maternal grandparents. His father remarried to a woman who hated Johann and she not only forced him to work extremely hard, but starved and beat him. Young Johann sought release from his stepmother's fury by often running away from home, begging and stealing food, and sleeping in parks or hallways. His father sometimes intervened on behalf of him and his younger sister, but during the day his stepmother had free reign over the two young children.<sup>3</sup> Most, later in life, remarked to Emma Goldmann, regarding this period of his life, "My whole childhood was a nightmare. My soul was starved for affection and my whole being was filled with the hatred of the woman who had taken the place of my gentle, refined mother."<sup>4</sup> He claimed that his hatred of tyranny stemmed from the experience of his unfortunate childhood.<sup>5</sup>

The second tragedy in his life occurred on March 8, 1859.

At the age of seven he had contacted an inflammation of the left jawbone and was experimented upon, for five years, by a number of local quacks because there was no competent physician in Augsburg and his parents were too poor to take him elsewhere for proper treatment. It is possible that he might have died had not a leading surgeon, Dr. Agatz, gotten hold of the case quite by accident and saved his life, by opening up the left side of his face from his temple to the corner of his mouth, and removing three inches of his jawbone which left him forever with a cruelly disfigured face, making him the target of derision and ridicule, of insults and indignities at home, at school, and at work. Perhaps his disfigured face holds the key to the life of protest he lived.<sup>6</sup>

Most greatly admired the theater and deprived himself of the necessities of life in order to attend. On one occasion after attending a performance in New York of The Merchant of Venice, starring the famous German actor of the period, Possart, he remarked to Emma Goldmann, with whom he had viewed the performance, "The cruelty of it, the bitter cruelty! To think that I could have been in Possart's place, perhaps even greater than he, but for my dreadful face. The blind cruelty of it!"<sup>7</sup> Emma Goldmann, who had the opportunity to view Most's performance in the amateur theater, said he had unusual gifts as an actor. She also concluded that he had an inferiority complex which was caused by his disfigured face. That Most had great ability as speaker and rabble rouser cannot be denied, perhaps to some extent they served as an outlet for the frustrated actor living inside him.

Johann's father, who had a great love of learning and was self-educated, had high hopes for his son; however, these hopes turned to despair, for at the age of 12 Hans organized a strike against his French teacher, Professor Bourier, who was particularly brutal and despotic. He was disliked by all his students, but because Johann was the ringleader in the strike he was expelled from school. His father decided it would be best for his son to learn a trade so young Hans became an apprentice in the workshop of a bookbinder. At first this situation was welcomed by Hans because it enabled him to get away from the persecution of his stepmother, but the bookbinder proved to be no better, working his apprentice from dawn to nightfall, half starving him, and generally treating him in an ill manner. During the period of his apprenticeship he served his first jail sentence. At that time in the Catholic sections of Germany, confessional

was obligatory, but Hans, brought up in a secular atmosphere, paid no attention to this requirement. This attitude resulted in a violent encounter with the town priest who pulled Hans out from the bookbinder's home into the street, holding him by the ear, and forced him to kneel on the sidewalk. This only served to accentuate his antagonism for the church, and he stopped attending church altogether. He was then brought before the police court and given a sentence of 24 hours in jail.<sup>8</sup>

In 1863 at the age of 17 he completed his apprenticeship, obtained his journeyman papers, and started out on his Wanderschaft with 15 Gulden in his pocket. The Wanderschaft in search of employment was a compulsory part of the life of all skilled workers in Germany in the 19th century. It was a tradition held over from the age when medieval guilds had dominated the skilled trades in Germany. Most spent the next five years of his life as a Wanderbursch, visiting practically every city in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland in addition to sections of northern Italy. He moved from place to place on foot, working when he could, and begging when he could find no work. His disfigured face and his delicate physique worked against him, often making it impossible for him to hold a job, much less to make friends. When he inquired for work he was often told that a man with a face like his was not wanted because customers would object to such a sight, and furthermore if the wife of the employer should happen to get pregnant she would give birth to a monster if she had him around to look at, and what's more, he really belonged in an asylum rather than in the bookbinding trade. Humiliations such as these filled him with a bitterness which was to pervade his whole life. Later, during his most active years, this bitterness was expressed in a hatred of the privileged class. In the final years of his life, when he no longer held out any hope that a revolution was just over the horizon, it found expression in an all-embracing contempt for the human race. During the years of his Wanderschaft thoughts of suicide often entered his mind as he was rebuffed whenever he sought work. At one time he thought of giving up all his ambitions and becoming a vagabond, but he had one final hope—he was convinced that one day he would become a famous actor. He hoped that the director of some theater and the public would pay attention to his histrionic ability and not to his misshaped face, but when he asked for a tryout he was told that his face was more suitable for a clown than for an actor. Nevertheless, this is one ambition he was to hold for several years before he came to realize that with his face it was futile to ever hope to be an actor.<sup>9</sup>

In March 1867 he was able to obtain employment in Locle, in the French-speaking Swiss canton of Neuchatel. He spent his spare time reading the classics, history and the natural sciences, accumulating a smattering of knowledge, to compensate for his physical inferiority. His growing store of knowledge was soon to be put to use. One Sunday he went to La Chaux-de-Fonds, an industrial community of 40,000 only a few miles from Locle, where a branch of the First International had recently been formed. The speaker 21-year-old Most heard there that Sunday afternoon filled him with an enthusiasm that would alter the entire course of his life. When the meeting was adjourned he purchased a number of brochures of Lassallean literature to take home with him. He started to attend the meetings in La Chaux-de-Fonds regularly, speaking out from the floor as was the custom and taking part in the discussion clubs. The young convert was eager to spread his new found ideas among the German workers in the area. He increased the membership of the group from 17 to 72 and was soon elected secretary because of his eloquence and restless activity. He devoted more and more of his time to this "missionary" activity, often times staying up all night. As a result his performance on his job suffered and he was fired.<sup>10</sup>

In his memoirs Most wrote of his conversion:

What I heard there I could endorse fully. It was all perfectly logical. Such thoughts had often passed through my own head, only I had not known how to put them together, how to systematize them. The speaker called this simple teaching socialism. I soon realized that, I too, was a socialist, and had been one for a long time without being aware of it. From that time I began to really feel that I was a human being; there was an aim before me, which went beyond the bare struggle for existence and the satisfaction of momentary individual wants; I began to live in the realm of ideals. The cause of humanity became my cause, and each step in advance that could be recorded filled me with the greatest joy.<sup>11</sup>

From Locle, he moved to Zürich, where he found work and new inspiration. A branch of the First International was being formed there; it was here that he met Herman Greulich, also a bookbinder, who later would be one of his most bitter adversaries. During the year he spent in Zürich Most and

Greulich became good friends, and Most, being an ardent pupil and admirer, learned a great deal from Greulich.<sup>12</sup>

In the fall of 1868 Most left Switzerland for Vienna, where socialism was starting to make headway among the Austrian workers. In Vienna the energetic young Most soon became a well-known figure at workers' gatherings. His humorous and satirical style of speaking won him the admiration of those attending these affairs. He was not as yet delivering lectures, but would take the floor and deliver a few pointed, sarcastic remarks which were always well received by the audience. Some of his impromptu remarks spoken at one meeting earned him a month in prison. During his trial he was referred to in the Austrian press as the "impudent bookbinder."<sup>13</sup>

Late in 1869 the Viennese socialists sent delegates to the German Socialist Convention which alarmed Austrian authorities. The Austrian Minister of the Interior, Dr. Giskra, issued orders which were aimed at curtailing the activities of the socialist groups in Austria. The promulgation of this order was followed on December 13 by 50 to 60 thousand workers appearing before the building in which the Chamber of Deputies was scheduled to convene that day. A delegation was sent from the protestors to the Prime Minister, presenting the demands of the masses. In the meantime the popular socialist orators, Most included, were addressing the assembled crowd. The government struck back, arresting the members of the delegation sent to the Prime Minister as well as other known agitators, although Most's arrest did not come until March 2, 1870. Most was again in prison, accused of high treason for which he received a five year sentence, but he was released after serving less than a year by a conservative regime which wanted to play the workers off against the liberal bourgeoisie.

Throughout his life Most was to spend a great deal of time behind bars, a fact of which he was proud. Max Nomad thinks that the Austrian prison sentence had the effect of giving Most stature and importance in the workers' movement.

Young Most left the prison with a greatly enhanced ego. The heavy penalty for which he had been singled out from a few score of other prisoners was a distinct flattery. He was not only a popular speaker and entertainer, but a dangerous man as well, threatening the existence of one of the greatest empires. The



judge, in motivating this sentence, had particularly emphasized "Most's unusual intelligence and determined character," adding that his appearance in Austria meant "the personified propaganda for the Republic" ... [and] one of the important dailies wrote "at first one might believe oneself unwittingly reminded of the first French Revolution ... and one must admit that this seemingly insignificant little man must be taken seriously."<sup>14</sup>

Out of prison Most rose in the hierarchy of the labor movement, primarily as a result of the Austrian government singling him out as a dangerous man. The ready wit he displayed at his trial and his service as editor of a prison newspaper demonstrated to those in the movement his versatile qualities which they now decided to utilize to spread the socialist message. He was sent on a successful propaganda trip to Germany. A similar tour was planned for the German-speaking section of Bohemia, but the Austrian government, being alarmed at the activities of the Paris Commune, decided to expel Most from Austria "forever."<sup>15</sup> At ten o'clock on the morning of May 2, 1871, Most, accompanied by a large crowd (he claimed a thousand people were there) went to the train station to leave Austria for Germany.<sup>15</sup>

Upon his return to Germany Most found a socialist movement which was torn by factional strife. He joined the faction led by August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht. On June 3, 1871, he took over as editor of the sagging Chemnitzer freie Presse which had a circulation of 200 and was being printed on a hand press. Within six weeks the circulation had risen to 1200 and the hand press had to be replaced by one that could turn out papers at a faster rate. His activities as propagandist and editor of the Chemnitzer freie Presse resulted, within one year, in no less than 43 court summonses.<sup>16</sup> On February 26, 1873, he started to serve a prison sentence in Zwickau, this time under charges of lèse-majesté and insult to the army. While he was in prison Most worked on producing a popular version of Karl Marx's Das Kapital, which he entitled Kapital und Arbeit. Ein populärer Auszug aus "Das Kapital" von Marx (Chemnitz, 1873). Unfortunately Most did not understand what Marx was trying to convey in Das Kapital and Engels was extremely harsh in his criticism of Most's abstract. During his term of imprisonment Most also wrote a pamphlet entitled Die Lösung der sozialen Frage (Berlin, 1876), in which he related

that Proudhon was "the most confused among the third-rate social quacks." This pamphlet points out his admiration for Marxism. Most's later pronouncements on terrorism and violence were not noticeable in his writing of this period. He thought that violence was unnecessary. His radicalism was not to come for two years.<sup>17</sup> At this juncture in his life Most evidently thought of himself as a potential leader in the international socialist movement because he made a determined effort while in prison to learn foreign languages, especially French. On April 21, 1873, he wrote to Bebel regarding his language studies, pointing out the need for work to be done in France, adding "I say to you: if only there were one thousand men as you, or even as I (without being presumptuous) then Europe, not merely Germany, would be socialist within five years."<sup>18</sup> This conveys the impression that in 1873 Most must have regarded himself as being in the avant-garde of the socialist movement.

His release from prison came on October 26, 1873. Shortly afterwards he met with Bebel and Liebknecht in Hubertusburg; at this meeting his abstract of Das Kapital was discussed. Liebknecht's reaction to Most's work was one of complete outrage, stating that there was not a single word in Kapital which could be omitted because Marx had already pared everything down to the bone and it would be sacrilege to change anything. In his memoirs Most said that at the time he thought to himself that Liebknecht was as sick as a religious zealot. Liebknecht went on to tell Most that there was no place in the German socialist movement for any of his revolutionary phraseology.<sup>19</sup>

Shortly after his release from prison Most was offered, and he accepted, the editorship of the Süddeutschen Volkstimme (Mainz), an important socialist publication. This position he held until 1874, when he was elected to the Reichstag, which he soon came to call "The theater of marionettes." In the Reichstag Most was looked upon as a comic figure. When, after many efforts, he was given the floor to speak it was on a minor question of compulsory smallpox vaccination which to Most meant "forceable mass poisoning and possible syphilization." He opposed the establishment of new vaccination stations and spoke out in favor of increasing the number of public bath houses. This particular speech did little to enhance his prestige. Parliament, to Most, was a disappointing experience, he viewed it as a huge machine full of cogs and cranks, directed by the government and party wire pullers, who themselves were directed by money and other vested interests. He entered the Reichstag thinking that

he would be able to speak out on behalf of socialism and the misery of the workers, but never got an opportunity to speak on these subjects. This demonstrated to him the fallacy of achieving reform through parliamentary means, which Liebknecht thought possible.

During the first recess of the Reichstag, late in April 1874, Most was arrested in connection with a speech he had delivered in March on the third anniversary of the Paris Commune. The fiery orator was sentenced to 26 months in the Bastille am Plötzensee, a prison near Berlin. During his imprisonment he wrote Die Bastille am Plötzensee (Braunschweig, 1876), which was smuggled out of the prison and published.<sup>20</sup>

Upon his release from prison, the party faithful in Berlin, because of Most's popularity, gave him a position as editor of the Berliner freie Presse, a socialist daily, which had been founded on January 1, 1876. It grew from an original circulation of 2000 to 18,000 by the end of 1877. In addition to his editorial work Most also contributed articles to Die neue Welt, Die Zukunft (Berlin), Neue Gesellschaft (Zürich), and the Russian revue Slovo. The style and general tenor of the Berliner freie Presse was not liked by Liebknecht who was chief editor of Vörrwarts in Leipzig.<sup>21</sup> The year 1877 was marked by a polemical exchange between Most and Liebknecht, which started as a result of articles Most had written for the Berliner freie Presse. Exactly how serious this riff in the socialist camp was, is beyond the scope of this study, but it is a topic that deserves an in-depth study. It appears that a younger and more revolutionary socialist group was forming in Berlin which resented the older leadership of Bebel and Liebknecht based in Leipzig. It can only be speculated what such a split might have done to the socialist movement in Germany because there was not sufficient time for such a riff to become full-blown because of the Hödel and Nobiling attempts on the life of William I and the subsequent passage of the Socialist Law.

Most was a public speaker par excellence and held forth often in the summer and fall of 1877. In July and August of that year he delivered a series of lectures in the Saale of the Handwerkerverein in Berlin on the theme of "The Social Revolution and Caesarism in Ancient Rome," which were attended by workers, students, and academicians such as the then renowned ancient historian Theodor Mommsen (1817-1903). His lectures demonstrated considerable depth of learning about ancient Rome

which he had acquired during his recent 26 months in prison. At this time Most also debated with Stöcker, with whom he violently disagreed,<sup>22</sup> and openly defended Dühring, which earned him the wrath of Friedrich Engels. Rocker is of the opinion that the influence of Dühring on Most's thought can be seen as early as July 1876 in a series of lectures he delivered on the topic of "Die Lösung der sozialen Frage." While he was imprisoned in the Bastille am Plötzensee Most wrote a critique of Dühring's thought which was to have appeared in Vorwärts; however, Liebknecht first sent the manuscript to Engels for his judgment. Engels, of course, said it should not be published. Later it was printed in the Berliner freie Presse with the title "Ein Philosoph."<sup>23</sup>

The activities of Most continued in this same vein until May 26, 1878, following the assassination attempt by Hödel, when he spoke in Chemnitz, though not in laudatory terms, about the Hödel attempt. The meeting had been infiltrated by police spies and Most was seized and eight days later sentenced to six weeks in prison. When he completed the sentence he was transferred to Berlin where he was sentenced to five months in the Bastille am Plötzensee for remarks he had made in some of his earlier writings. During his imprisonment he wrote a review of Professor Schaffle's four-volume work Bau und Leben des sozialen Körpers, which was later published in Richters Jahrbuch für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik (Zürich, 1879). He also wrote a number of other essays, but during this term of imprisonment he was more closely confined than during his earlier sentence in the Bastille. This was due to his pamphlet Die Bastille am Plotzensee in which he revealed the leniency and laxness of the prison conditions. Prisoners could, more or less, do as they pleased. This condition did not prevail during his second term in the Bastille. The greater share of his second term was spent in solitary confinement. He was forced to wear a face mask whenever he had to leave his cell in order to conceal his identity.<sup>24</sup>

On December 16, 1878, he was set free and given 24 hours to leave Berlin. After a short visit with some friends he left Berlin for Hamburg where he discussed with several party leaders tactics to be followed. His appearance in Hamburg had an unnerving effect on the party members there who advised him that it would be in the best interests of everyone if he would go to America. Realizing that he could no longer speak or write in Germany, and being hounded for his earlier writings, he knew

his effectiveness was at an end in Germany. Shortly before Christmas he left Germany for England, never to see his homeland again.<sup>25</sup>

In London Most was received with open arms by the Kommunistischer-Arbeiterbildungsverein. They backed Most financially in the founding of a newspaper Freiheit. Most was installed as the chief editor of the paper at No. 6 Rose Street, Soho Square West, which served as an editorial office, composition room, and living quarters. Working with Most on Freiheit were a number of people; some are all but forgotten, while others achieved considerable fame in anarchist and socialist circles. Those who were with Most at the start of the Freiheit venture were John Neve, G.C. Uhly, F.J. Ehrhart, A. Benek, F. Autmann, W. Hoffmann and L. Weber. Sebastian Trunk, Wilhelm Merten, and the brothers Paul and Moritz Schultze and many others soon joined forces with Most. Freiheit was founded for the purpose of disseminating information into Germany. In its original format, when the first issue appeared on January 4, 1879, it called itself a Social Democratic paper and claimed to be in complete agreement with the Social Democratic Party program; however, the appearance of Freiheit was in itself an act of revolt against the discipline required of all members of the party. In reality since the passage of the Socialist Law the party was officially non-existent. The leaders of the Social Democratic Party had published a statement announcing the dissolution of the party and calling upon the membership to disband. The leadership of the party was now vested in the socialist membership of the Reichstag. Most had not consulted the party leaders about founding Freiheit and the socialist deputies in the Reichstag were afraid that the revolutionary tone of the paper might lead to further persecution.

Freiheit was written with verve, energy, and enthusiasm, in strong graphic language which gave it appeal to the German working-class. It carried news of not only the infamous police persecutions but no small number of acts of cowardice and wavering on the part of some Social Democrats. Nettlau claims that Karl Marx was discontented with the Social Democratic tactics of feigned submission, and was glad to see Most stand up and speak freely, but the official party leaders Liebknecht, Bebel, and Hasenclever denounced Most as speaking with impunity from a safe asylum.<sup>26</sup> If Marx felt this way at the outset, he was soon to be disillusioned with Freiheit for on September 19,

1879, he wrote to Friedrich Sorge that Most's paper contained "no revolutionary content, only revolutionary phrases."<sup>27</sup> The Social Democratic Party soon founded an official party organ, Der Sozialdemokrat, on September 28, 1879, in Zürich, with Georg von Vollmar as editor to counteract the views expressed by Most in Freiheit.<sup>28</sup>

Bismarck quickly capitalized on both Freiheit and Der Sozialdemokrat. In a memorandum, dated February 24, 1880, prepared for the purpose of influencing the Reichstag to renew the Socialist Law, Bismarck noted that the only difference between the anarchists and the Social Democrats was to be found in the tactics they followed. While Freiheit, in unrestrained language, constantly called for the violent destruction of the state, the church, existing society, and above all, all kings; Der Sozialdemokrat called for the same thing, but pointed out, that with the current situation in Germany the tactics advocated by the anarchists were senseless, and other more peaceful tactics should be employed. This, of course, is an oversimplification of the Social Democratic position, but it does demonstrate to what ends Bismarck would go to distort the truth. If the end justifies the means, then Bismarck was successful because by using such half truths and other dubious methods he was able to renew the Socialist Law four times.<sup>29</sup>

Freiheit began as a Social Democratic organ, but soon underwent substantial changes in its content and format. The tone of the paper was too radical for the Social Democrats who wished to disavow themselves of Most and his flamboyant sheet. This is not to say that Freiheit was already an anarchist paper. The first genuine anarchist article did not appear in Freiheit until the summer of 1880 and Most did not usher the paper into its most violent phase until it was published in the United States. The conversion of Freiheit to an anarchist paper, espousing the philosophy of "propaganda by deed," will be discussed in full in relation to the career of August Reinsdorf.

In its initial stages Freiheit was thought of, at least in Most's mind, as having the potential of becoming the official organ of the Social Democratic Party. With the suspension of any meaningful Social Democratic press in Germany after the passage of the Socialist Law, Freiheit was virtually unchallenged, except by Die Laterne, published in Brussels by Carl Hirsch, until the establishment of Der Sozialdemokrat in Zürich. As a theoretical organ which represented German Social Democracy

as envisioned by Bebel or Liebknecht, Freiheit fell far short of the mark; on the other hand as a source of influence among the German workers it was more successful. Freiheit was aimed at workingmen and it was written in language which they could understand. There are no deep philosophical questions presented in Freiheit. Actually, the language is crude and often times vulgar, but it was nevertheless the language of the worker. As a theoretician of socialism and later of anarchism, Most leaves much to be desired, but as a flamboyant speaker and fiery journalist few in the Social Democratic movement could equal his style and vigor.

Today most is viewed as a radical, a historical oddity, who shot off obliquely from the socialist movement. In the climate which prevailed in Germany in 1879-1880 he posed a threat to the old leadership of the Social Democrats. Starting early in February 1879 Most began to downgrade parliament as an instrument through which socialist goals could be achieved. His discouragement with parliamentary methods had their origins from the time he served in the Reichstag. In the sixth issue of Freiheit, February 6, 1879, Most began a course of action which resulted in his being drummed out of the Social Democratic organization in the summer of 1880. In this issue, in an article entitled "Revolutionsangstmichel," he declared that the socialist victory could be achieved through parliament without revolution, only "if the governing classes are reasonable." If they are not "reasonable," then the victory would have to be achieved through revolution. Most does not say it, but the implication is present, that the Socialist Law demonstrated ipso facto that the governing classes were not "reasonable." In the same issue of Freiheit Most remarked that the Reichstag had convened that same week. He goes on to belittle the topics which they are about to discuss, saying that the situation being what it was in Germany, one should expect anything of the Reichstag: "Experience teaches us that Caesar Bismarck can in any case stop anything with a simple 'I forbid that.'" He concluded his remarks on the convening of the Reichstag by again downgrading parliament as a useful institution.

The issue of Freiheit for March 13, 1879, was a special, devoted to the dual anniversaries of the uprising of March 1848 and also to the start of the Commune of 1871. On Thursday March 20, 1879, at eight in the evening, a Märzfeier celebration was held in Princess rooms of Castle Street. At this festive occasion speeches were given in German, French and English.

Most delivered the German speech to the 800-900 who had assembled, declaring that the social question could only be solved by means of a violent revolution.<sup>30</sup>

He followed this speech up in May with a three part article entitled "Ist die Sozialdemokratie eine Revolutionspartei?"<sup>31</sup> in which he concluded that the Social Democrats preached revolution and could back up their claim that they were a revolutionary party with hundreds of citations taken from speeches and articles; but the revolution was confined to the spoken word and the printed page, and the actual "Putsch" was never attempted. He ended the article with a quotation from Ludwig Börne: "They are as thick-skinned as an elephant, they are not sensitive to a tender touch, you have to hit them in the ribs with a chain."<sup>32</sup> This quotation reveals the tactics Most thought necessary to use in dealing with the governing classes.

In effect, Most was saying that the moderate parliamentary approach adopted by the Social Democrats in Germany was a denial of socialist principles, and that such an approach would not succeed. On the other hand, it should be noted that Most's talk about revolution was only talk; the situation in Germany was not ripe for a revolution and any uprising would have been crushed immediately. Following Nobiling's attempt on William I, Berlin was turned into an armed camp. This could be easily done again. Bismarck suggested that the Templehof drill field be turned into an area to garrison a large number of troops who could be put into service in Berlin should the need arise. The plan was vetoed, but if there had been a series of uprisings in Berlin such a plan undoubtedly would have been followed, with severe reprisals taken against anyone of socialist leanings. The Social Democrats were following the only course open to them—moderate parliamentary means.

Freiheit, which carried the subtitle Sozialdemokratisches Organ, had a reasonably large audience in Germany. Neither the government, nor the people made an attempt to separate the radical writings of Most from the peaceful, legal policies advanced by Bebel and Liebknecht; they were lumped under the same heading—socialism. The Social Democratic leaders in Germany feared adoption by the government of more stringent anti-socialist measures, unless they were able to do something to disassociate themselves from "General Bumbum," as Most was nicknamed. Furthermore, unless something was done



quickly, there was the danger of alienating the moderate elements of the Social Democratic Party, namely the "petite bourgeoisie and the peasants who had supported the party in the election of 1878."<sup>33</sup>

There was a danger that Most could build a base of power in Germany which he could then use as a lever to force the Social Democratic Party leaders along a more radical path, which they were not inclined to follow. The party founded Der Sozialdemokrat to counter the propaganda in Freiheit, but such a course of action placed the Social Democrats on the horns of dilemma. If they stressed legal methods and peaceful tactics too much there was the danger of alienating the more revolutionary elements in the party; on the other hand, if they adopted Mostain tactics and language, there was the chance that more suppressive measures would be brought against the socialists living in Germany. It was rumored in Berlin that the Socialist Law, which was about to be renewed, would be even more repressive.<sup>34</sup>

The parliamentary tactics of the Social Democrats were, to Most, just so much nonsense and an admission of weakness. A revolutionary party, as the Social Democratic Party claimed it was, should be concerned with revolution, and not whether what they were doing was legal.<sup>35</sup>

In 1880 Most was even more abusive in his articles against parliament than he had been in 1879. He was especially outraged over the position taken by Bebel on Bismarck's seven-year military bill (the Septennat) in March 1880. Bebel had guaranteed that the socialists were ready to fight for Germany in a defensive war. This explanation was not satisfactory to Most, or to those who sided with Most, who saw no reason to fight for Germany in any instance because they reasoned that the Fatherland was not worth fighting for. The Fatherland only represented arbitrary and capricious justice, heavy taxation, and despotism. There was no freedom of speech in Germany, most people owned no land, the churches taught the beliefs of yesteryear, the schools stunted the learning of the youth and what education they did provide was poor. How, asked Most, could you ever fight for such a Fatherland until the King and everything which he represented in the government was destroyed.<sup>36</sup>

On the front page of Freiheit (May 15, 1880), Most addressed an open letter to the voters in the fifth election district of Berlin, in which he said that Germany had arrived at a juncture when it was no longer feasible to speak of achieving reform through politics—only revolution could change conditions. Society, as it was constructed, had to be destroyed and replaced by another. He appealed to the voters not to enter his name in the election and ended on the note of "Down with the throne, altar, and gold sack. Long live the social revolution."<sup>37</sup>

It would be easy to cite examples, ad infinitum, appearing in Freiheit which could have hurt the image of legality and peacefulness that Bebel and Liebknecht were trying to portray. It is an understatement to say that a state of animosity existed between Der Sozialdemokrat and Freiheit. Der Sozialdemokrat was forced to the defense, many times, disclaiming statements made by Most which he claimed were representative of Social Democrat opinion.

In addition to Freiheit Most had another weapon in Germany, Wilhelm Hasselmann (1844-?), a member of the socialist delegation to the Reichstag. In many respects Hasselmann's early life paralleled that of Most. Physically he was the direct opposite of his compatriot; he was big-boned, with a large frame, and he had a sharp bony face that always had a hostile look about it. His youth was spent in Bremen, where he lived in dire need. His father left the family and his mother in Bremen and went to America and was never heard from again. The lessons of poverty and economic deprivation he learned at an early age. Not many years after his father left his mother died and he went to live with a well-to-do uncle, who treated him like the poor relation he was. The only other person in the house was a sister of his mother (the uncle was his mother's brother), who was a very pious old woman. She, too, was supported by her brother. She tried to train young Hasselmann in the ways of religion but had little influence over him.

When Hasselmann was 16 he left his uncle's home to learn pharmacy because he was fascinated by chemistry. He did not remain long at these studies and started wandering about Germany on foot reading Blanqui and developing an intense hatred of people who own property and other possessions. His wanderings took him to Berlin where he associated with

the Lassalleans. Because of his size and youth his socialist friends referred to him as Der lange Student. Eventually he obtained a position as an assistant editor on Der Sozialdemokrat, a Lassallean organ, which was edited by Jean Baptiste von Schweitzer (1833-1875). When Schweitzer left the movement Hasselmann took over the editorship. As a Lassallean, he reconciled himself to the position Bebel and Liebknecht gained in the party, as a result of the Gotha Unity Congress of 1875. As a speaker he was influential over the masses and was able to get elected to the Reichstag from the Elberfeld-Barmen district. From Barmen he poured out his wrath on Bebel, Liebknecht, and Vorwärts in his weekly Die rote Fahne.<sup>38</sup>

In Berlin in November 1878 Hasselmann established the paper Glück auf and also the colorless weekly Berlin, Organ für die Interessen der Reichshauptstadt. He was able to obtain the subscription list of the Berliner freie Presse which, as a result of the Socialist Law, had been forced to stop publication. The list contained 15,000 names but did Hasselmann no good because the government confiscated Berlin and his plan fell through. Following the closing of Berlin, Hasselmann, along with a number of his faithful followers, left Berlin for Hamburg.<sup>39</sup>

In the Reichstag, Hasselmann did not fall in with the party line followed by the other socialist deputies. Hasselmann, himself as opposed to the other socialist deputies, believed that the socialist victory was near at hand. Having a tempestuous nature, he was not inclined to sit by and wait for a victory which the party leaders had promised for the future. His turbulent nature often found him on the opposite side of the law. The police were not the only group who were interested in muzzling Hasselmann; the Social Democratic deputies in the Reichstag also wanted "to isolate Hasselmann and render him innocuous."<sup>40</sup>

Hasselmann was watched closely by police in Berlin, Hamburg and Altona who cooperated to watch his every move. He was under constant observation during his trips to Berlin to attend the meetings of the Reichstag and then on the return trip to Hamburg. His publishing activities were under continual scrutiny.

In Hamburg he continued his publishing activity with Glück auf appearing on December 6, 1878, in an edition of 10,000 copies. Hasselmann was seized immediately in Altona, not because of the contents of Glück auf, but because he violated an

order which had been issued in Berlin forbidding him to publish the paper, an order which he erroneously constructed to apply only to Prussia. After giving a judge a satisfactory explanation he was released from prison and Glück auf was permitted to be published in Hamburg, with Karl Schneidt (1854-?) as responsible editor; published by the publishing firm of W. Wissmann. Glück auf was a family paper, containing historical novels, humorous stories, and poetry. In the three years it was published only one issue, Number 48 (December 14, 1879), was confiscated by the Hamburg political police. Glück auf was joined at Christmas of 1879 with a weekly Seeschlange. Rezeptblatt gegen Trübsal und Langweile, which appeared in an initial issue of 20,000 copies. Glück auf and Seeschlange were two harmless papers which supplied the money needed to publish a political organ. On March 23, 1879, the first issue of the weekly Deutsche Zeitung appeared with the Sunday supplement of Glück auf. Hasselmann, of course, had not consulted with the Social Democratic Party leaders before venturing forth on this project. The Berlin Control Committee of the Party advised him that he should let the Deutsche Zeitung perish as quickly as possible, a policy he was not inclined to follow. Unknown to Hasselmann his most recent publishing scheme gained him the suspicion of Botho zu Eulenburg (1831-1912), the Minister of the Interior of Prussia, who on July 10, 1879, wrote to Berlin Police President von Madai, that he thought that the Deutsche Zeitung should be watched more closely.<sup>41</sup> The Deutsche Zeitung adhered rigorously to the regulations set down in the Socialist Law and was able to publish 30 numbers without difficulty before number 31 was seized by the police.<sup>42</sup>

On September 28, 1879, Hasselmann published the first number of the Schleswig-Holsteinische Volkszeitung. Freisinniges Organ für Jedermann auf dem Volke, which was a verbatim printing of number 82 of the Deutsche Zeitung. The Schleswig-Holsteinische Volkszeitung appeared after that as the cover page of the Deutsche Zeitung on Sunday, Wednesday and Friday, and was published by W. Wissmann. All of the lead articles and all articles expressing political views were written by Hasselmann even though Karl Schneidt was the responsible editor. The purpose of the new venture was to raise the circulation of the Deutsche Zeitung, which had 2200 subscribers, by appealing to the people living in the Schleswig-Holstein region. The Schleswig-Holsteinische Volkszeitung ran afoul of point 11 of the Social Law in the first issue, but when the case was brought

before the court, the judgment was in favor of the paper and publication was continued.<sup>43</sup>

Hasselmann's activities now came under even closer scrutiny by the Berlin Police President von Madai, who noted that there was a substantial difference of opinion between Hasselmann and the other socialist deputies in the Reichstag. Von Madai noted that Hasselmann himself thought it would be better to drop the mask the Social Democrats were wearing and "proceed immediately with forceable revolts" because this was the only way that the socialists could hope to win the battle. Should such a revolution misfire, it would at least have the effect of bringing the party back together. Hasselmann, von Madai noted, thought it would be better to fight than to see the party shaking in fear and falling into decay as it attempted to change conditions in Germany through peaceful means. The Police President further noted that there was a connection between the distribution of Most's Freiheit and Hasselmann's organization in Hamburg. He went on to say that appropriate steps should be taken to infiltrate Hasselmann's organization with police spies.<sup>44</sup>

Encouraged by the decision of the court in the case of the Schleswig-Holsteinische Volkszeitung, Hasselmann now decided to spread his wings a little further. On January 11, 1880, the first issue of the Neuen Bremer freien Zeitung appeared. The contents of this paper were identical with those of the Deutsche Zeitung. Hasselmann had hoped that the title of the paper would appeal to the people living in Bremen and would add about 500 subscribers to the Deutsche Zeitung. Evidently neither the Schleswig-Holsteinische Volkszeitung nor the Neuen Bremer freien Zeitung ventures were very successful in spreading the appeal of the Deutsche Zeitung, because in late January of 1880—the Deutsche Zeitung, on account of financial difficulties, became a weekly and was printed with a smaller sized page.

Hasselmann and Schneidt were still not at the end of their attempts to capture the newspaper reading market. On March 14, 1880, they brought out the Hamburg-Altonaer Hafenzzeitung in an edition of 1000. The contents of this paper were a happy smattering of the Deutsche Zeitung, Glück auf, and See-schlange. It was colorless in tone and the police had no objection to its contents.

The newspaper publishing activities of Hasselmann were only part of the threat which Hasselmann posed to the Social

Democrats. In the Reichstag, the socialist faction had lost control completely over Hasselmann. His language became more violent in tone and his thoughts increasingly reflected the ideas of Blanqui and also of the Russian anarchists. On May 4, 1880, as the Reichstag was about to renew the Socialist Law, he took the rostrum and declared that he was a "revolutionary socialist" and went on to say that under the Socialist Law the socialist deputies in the Reichstag were helpless to do anything to ameliorate the suffering of the masses. He predicted that the German workers would rise up against their oppressors and strike a blow for liberty, as the French workers had done, and as the anarchists in Russia, with whom he felt an affinity, were doing at that time. He concluded with "the time for parliamentary chatter is passed and the time for deeds begins."<sup>45</sup>

The reference to the Russian anarchists was particularly damaging, though neither Hasselmann nor the other socialist deputies were aware of it. Throughout the Nobiling documents runs a thread of trying to associate Nobiling with the Russian anarchists.<sup>46</sup> The Prussian Minister of the Interior was especially concerned about the Russian anarchists.<sup>47</sup>

The other socialist deputies in the Reichstag repudiated Hasselmann's speech. Auer, Bebel, Fritsche, Hasenclever, Kayser, Liebknecht, Vahlteich, and Wiemer (Hartmann did not sign) signed a declaration which said that Hasselmann was being excluded from the Social Democratic Party for the following reasons: 1) He was trying to produce a split in the party and create a more revolutionary party; 2) he had established newspapers without the permission of the party leaders; and 3) in a private letter, which had fallen into the hands of the Social Democrats, he had referred to Vorwärts as Rückwärts, central organ of the German petits bourgeois.<sup>48</sup>

Hasselmann's speech in the Reichstag revealed the seriousness of the Most-Hasselmann dispute with the party leaders. Viewed from the perspective of 1880 it was much more serious than might be imagined today. In effect it was outright power grab, although, neither Most nor Hasselmann had the power to carry off such a coup. Most and Hasselmann did have a small base of power and both of them had drifted away from the opinions held by the party leaders, in the direction of anarchism. The actual danger was not so much that Most and Hasselmann could seize control of the reins of the party, but the officials in Germany would think that they spoke for the party.

Both Most and Hasselmann had lashed out hard against the party leaders, pointing out that their parliamentary activities were meaningless. They wanted to change the party into one with more revolutionary fervor. It should be noted that up to this point neither Most nor Hasselmann had thought of abandoning the party; they wanted only to give it a more radical tone. They had planned to use *Freiheit* and small cells of socialists revolutionaries to carry their case to the German workingmen. Hasselmann had already started to develop a plan of secret organizations in the Blanquist fashion, consisting of groups of four or five men to a group, each of whom was to form similar groups. A member of a group would know only the members of his own immediate group, so as to avoid the possibility of too much damage being done in the event of discovery by the police.<sup>49</sup>

In the spring of 1880 the Social Democrats had made plans to hold a secret party congress in May at Rorschach, Switzerland. Preparations had been made to deal with the two mavericks, Most and Hasselmann, at this congress, but the congress never took place because the party discovered that a police spy had informed the Berlin Police President, von Madai, of the secret meeting.<sup>50</sup> Langhard claims that had the congress taken place Most and Hasselmann would have had considerable popular support for their cause in the form of 25 to 30 delegates. This figure is probably greatly exaggerated.<sup>51</sup>

Once it was deemed inadvisable to hold the congress at Rorschach in May, as planned, plans were made to hold the secret congress at the uninhabited Wyden Castle near Ossingen, Switzerland, on August 21-23, 1880.<sup>52</sup> Most and Hasselmann were not invited to the Wyden congress as they had been to the congress which was to have taken place at Rorschach. They were invited to the earlier congress so that they might confront the party leaders directly; at the Wyden congress they would not have this privilege.<sup>53</sup> Precautions were taken to restrict the influence of Most and Hasselmann at the congress by limiting the delegates only to those who represented groups in Germany.

At the Wyden only three delegates out of the 45 assembled sided with the position taken by Most and Hasselmann. One of these, Heufelder from Berlin, was in the pay of the Berlin Police President von Madai.<sup>54</sup> The other two delegates favorable to Most and Hasselmann were Rudolf Tiedt from Berlin and Winterberg representing Barmen.<sup>55</sup>

At the Wyden Congress the censure motion against Most and Hasselmann was introduced by Wilhelm Liebknecht representing Leipzig and Carl Hillmann representing Elberfeld; only Tiedt and Winterberg spoke against it. When the vote on the motion was taken only three votes were cast on behalf of Most and Hasselmann.

The action taken at the Wyden Castle disposed of the Most-Hasselmann threat to the Social Democratic Party, but it had the effect of pushing Most and Hasselmann over the brink and down the road toward anarchism, a road, on which Most never, during the course of his life, was at ease. Max Nomad writes that

Most's expulsion from the Social Democratic Party was the great tragedy of his life. Despite his opposition to the tactics of the leadership, in many respects he still fundamentally agreed with those who had excommunicated him; ... he was a man of revolutionary action ... and not a politician. He was an inspired preacher of the ultra-revolutionary word. There was no place for a man like him under a semi-absolutist system that was still afraid of slogans.<sup>56</sup>

Most's attempt to establish a following, that could be called anarchist, was not started until the decision of the Social Democrats to dump him and Hasselmann from the party. These moves on the part of Most will be taken up in the subsequent chapters.

The Wyden Congress was important for another reason. Peter Gay concludes that "the meetings" at Wyden "served to reunite all prominent Social Democrats" and "also strengthened the morale of the party by expelling Most and Hasselmann."<sup>57</sup>

The results of the congress at Wyden were not, however, all beneficial for the party. One resolution approved at Wyden could be interpreted as a concession to the more radical wing of the Social Democratic Party. A resolution was passed to strike out the word "legal" from the phrase set down in the Gotha Program, "The Socialist Labor Party of Germany strives to attain the Free State and the Socialist society by all legal means."<sup>58</sup> Striking out the word, legal, was not intended as a call to revolutionary action, but merely the recognition of the existing state of affairs in Germany, under which socialist



activities were illegal. On the other hand, the deletion of the word legal, could be interpreted by German officials that the Social Democratic Party was advocating a revolutionary program. The statement was not intended as a concession to the revolutionaries, but it nevertheless, proved to be of inestimable value to the police, for they now had in black and white a statement which demonstrated that the Social Democratic Party was willing to use "all means" necessary to bring about the existence of a socialist state in Germany. Berlin Police President von Madai took special notice of the deletion of the word "legal" and interpreted the omission to mean that the Social Democratic Party was embarking on a program of revolutionary tactics.<sup>59</sup>

Hasselmann, after his fiery speech in the Reichstag on May 4, 1880, walked out of the Reichstag building, never to return; his activities in Germany were not yet at a close though. On July 18, 1880, appeared the first number of a Hasselmann-Schneidt collaboration with the title Hamburg-Altonaer freies Volksblatt. The first issue was limited to an edition of 1000 copies.<sup>60</sup> Evidently a copy of this newspaper was in Bismarck's hands immediately, for on July 19, 1880, he wrote to William I, from Friedrichsruh, that it was time something was done about Hasselmann and his publications, suggesting that article 28 of the Socialist Law could be invoked.<sup>61</sup> William I replied on July 26 that it would be better to use articles one through four against Hasselmann.<sup>62</sup>

The day before William I sent his reply to Bismarck, July 25, another number of the Hamburg-Altonaer freies Volksblatt came off the press and was sold out so quickly that on July 28 it was necessary to print an additional 500 copies of the issue. The paper was too radical in tone and on July 30 von Madai ordered Georg Ferdinand Kunhardt (1824-1895) to prohibit publication of the paper.<sup>63</sup> The part of the paper which was found objectionable was a column, written by Hasselmann, entitled "Zeichen der Zeit," in which Hasselmann preached class warfare. "Here, on the one hand, is the working-class—disinherited; there, on the other hand, is the leisure class—rich." Each worker has suffered "all conceivable toil, hardships, insults, and need, while the members of the leisure class have indulged in pleasure and wantonness to the point of excess." Another story carried in the same issue of the paper was that of a young pregnant girl who had been seduced by a rich man. She had committed suicide because she was pregnant and he refused to marry her; yet the rich man, because of his wealth,

remained unpunished. Still another example was the story of a miner with five children who died of hunger. "Isn't that atrocious, the diligent worker, the father of a family who died a wretched death from hunger, while the mine owner does not know what to do with all his worldly riches. Horror! Horror!"<sup>64</sup>

These statements were more than Kunhardt could take, they rang of anarchism, and the publication of the Hamburg-Altonaer freies Volksblatt was stopped.

Hasselmann was still to take part in another short-lived publishing adventure, the Neue deutsche Zeitung, which appeared on August 3, 1880. His choice of Karl Emmerich as responsible editor was an unfortunate one, for Emmerich was nothing more than a strawman for the Berlin police spy August Rudolf Wolf (d. 1883), also known as Richard Wolf.<sup>65</sup> In his initial appeal for subscriptions for the Neue deutsche Zeitung Hasselmann blasted the bourgeois press saying, "They, more or less, serve the capitalist class, their editors worship the golden calf and humiliate themselves by kissing the feet of powerful people of the world."<sup>66</sup> This statement was against the spirit of the Socialist Law and Kunhardt suspended publication of the Neue deutsche Zeitung. This marked the end of Hasselmann's attempts to seize control of the workers' movement in Hamburg. His aim had been to gather around him a large following. He thought this could be done by spreading his message in his newspapers. This was no longer possible.

Hasselmann now became a wanted man. The police spent three days searching Hamburg and Altona for him and Karl Schneidt, because a house search had produced papers deemed to be revolutionary. In addition to this an important letter written by Hasselmann and intended for Most was found during the search. This was not the only incriminating piece of evidence the police had connecting Hasselmann with Most. On a number of occasions Hasselmann had sent materials to Most in London via Oskar Neumann a police spy. Neumann had been able to infiltrate a secret, radical organization in Berlin shortly after the passage of the Socialist Law. After attending meetings for a while, he informed the members of the group that he had to go to London. Once in London he became close to Most, who did not doubt his sincerity. Neumann was often used as a courier to send messages and other items between Germany and London. It can be assumed that the Berlin police were fully aware of the contents of any message he carried. Still another police spy

played a rôle in the exposure of Hasselmann's activities in the Hamburg area. The paid informer of the Altona Police Commissioner August Engel and Police Director Krüger was W. Wichmann, who, like Wolf, served as a correspondent for Freiheit. All of Hasselmann's plans for the development of cells (Gruppen) and the promotion of his papers were revealed to Wichmann who promptly turned them over to the police. Hasselmann and Most were completely hoodwinked by the police spies Wolf, Neumann and Wichmann. Most in an article in Freiheit revealed how the police on October 16, 1880, had searched "Genosse" Wichmann's house in Altona, finding nothing, and how packages which he had sent Wichmann had been intercepted by police officials. The police arrested Wichmann, held him for a short time, and of course released him.<sup>67</sup>

Expelled from the Social Democratic Party, unable to compromise his own conscience with the provisions of the Socialist Law governing the press in Germany, and sought by the police, early in August 1880 Hasselmann left Hamburg for London, accompanied by Schneidt.<sup>68</sup> There Hasselmann realized that he and Most, being of entirely different natures, could not work together. He held a number of meetings in which he spoke in order to raise money to travel to New York. In New York Hasselmann was given a hero's welcome.<sup>69</sup>

In November 1880, in the city of New York, Hasselmann founded a revolutionary club that had anarchist overtones. This club was opposed of former members of the Socialist Labor Party.<sup>70</sup> Hasselmann's moment of glory in the United States was to be of short duration. Only a few bright spots are to be found in his career in the United States and even they are not too brilliant. Early in 1885, in New York City, he founded the so called Naturwissenschaftlichen Verein, whose members were instructed in the secrets of chemistry, in order that they would be prepared for the revolution of the future. The whole affair was quite harmless and injury came to no one as a result of it. In 1886 he founded the Amerikanischen Arbeiterzeitung in New York with himself as editor. The paper failed after six months.<sup>71</sup>

His later circumstances are vividly described in a letter of April 24, 1889, written by Hermann Schlüter, a former member of the staff of Der Sozialdemokrat, who had moved to the United States in 1889, to August Bebel:

I visited him [Hasselmann] in the cafe which he runs, without disclosing my identity. It must go very badly for him, and his cafe which he runs can in no case pay for itself. His wife works, and certainly it is to cover the [cafe's] deficit. As we, my wife and I, entered, he was busy in the kitchen cooking soup. With a very dirty child on his arm, he finally came to bring us a glass of beer. Everything was covered with the dirt of Hasselmann and the fellow's appearance was disgusting. I almost felt sorry, although he really deserves his fate.<sup>72</sup>

Hasselmann had no influence on the German anarchist movement after he left Germany, as opposed to Most, who exercised considerable influence from England and later from the United States. Most's influence on the course of anarchism in Germany in the decade of the 1880's will be taken up in subsequent chapters.

#### Notes

1. The only full length biography of Most is Rudolf Rocker, Johann Most. Das Leben eines Rebellen (Berlin, 1924; Nachtrag, 1925). In general it is a good book but in some cases Rocker is not as objective as he could be. New evidence has also tended to modify some of his opinions. Most was in the process of writing his memoirs when he died. The first four volumes appeared under the title Memorien. Erlebtes, Erforschtes und Erdachtes, 4 Vols. (New York, 1903-1907). Unfortunately they cover only the years 1846 to the late 1870's. An earlier work by Most, appeared as Anonymus Veritas, Acht Jahre hinter Schloss und Riegel. Skizzen aus dem Leben Johann Most (New York, 1891) covers the period to 1886. A series of articles written by Most entitled "Zur Geschichte der Freiheit," Freiheit (June 20-October 3, 1896) relate his experiences in publishing the paper. A short, but informative, account on Most is found in Max Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, pp. 145-166. Nettlau also wrote a series of articles, following Most's death which appeared in Freedom. A Journal of Anarchist Communism (London), No.'s 205-207, XX (April-June, 1906). These articles are marred by a number of factual errors and tend to be excessively laudatory. An article by Emma Goldmann, "Johann

Most," American Mercury, VIII (1926), 158-166, is valuable because of her personal relationship with Most; over many years however, it is highly inaccurate and should not be relied upon, except for the author's personal recollections about Most. The longest treatment of Most in English is found in Max Nomad, Apostles of Revolution (Boston, 1939), pp. 256-301. In the main Nomad tends to rely on Most's memoirs and Rocker's account. Generally for the earlier period of his life, all authors have relied upon Most's memoirs. For the period of his life, after he came to the United States, the issues of Freiheit should be consulted. Emma Goldmann's autobiography Living my Life, 2 Vols. (New York, 1931) is also useful, in addition to the work by Rocker. A bibliography of works by and about Most is: Ernst Drahn, Johann Most: eine Bio-bibliographie (Berlin, 1925).

2. Most, Memorien, I, pp. 9-10
3. Ibid., pp. 14-17.
4. Goldmann, "Johann Most," American Mercury, pp. 160-161.
5. Most, Memorien, I, p. 17.
6. Ibid., pp. 14-15.
7. Goldmann, "Johann Most," American Mercury, p. 159.
8. Most, Memorien, I, pp. 17, 21-23; Anonymus Veritas, Acht Jahre hinter Schloss und Riegel, pp. 7-10.
9. Most, Memorien, I, pp. 25-50.
10. Ibid., pp. 50-54.
11. Ibid., pp. 52-53.
12. Ibid., pp. 59-60.
13. For the indictment see: Ibid., II, pp. 6-15. The trial is covered in Ibid., pp. 16-51. For his imprisonment at Suber see: Ibid., pp. 55-57.
14. Nomad, Apostles of Revolution, p. 262. At the trial Most was singled out as the editor of a prison newspaper

Nussknacker which he wrote in code. The prisoners had a key to the code and a single handwritten copy of the paper was circulated from hand to hand. Eventually prison authorities were able to obtain a copy of the key. Most, Memorien, I, pp. 70-71.

15. Most, Memorien, II, pp. 60-61.

16. Ibid., III, pp. 8-14.

17. Ibid., pp. 23-25.

18. Bebel, Aus meinem Leben, p. 461.

19. Most, Memorien, III, p. 26; Rocker, Johann Most, p. 47.

20. For an account of the trial see: Most, Memorien, IV, pp. 5-46. On his imprisonment see: Ibid., pp. 51-107.

21. Rocker, Johann Most, 45-47. Most's career as editor of the Berliner freie Presse is described in Bernstein, Sozialdemokratische Lehrjahre, pp. 84-86.

22. Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 48-49.

23. Ibid., p. 54. For a general account of his activities in the years 1877-1878 see: Most, Memorien, III, pp. 61-72.

24. Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 59-61.

25. Ibid., p. 63; Bernstein, Die Geschichte der Berliner Arbeiterbewegung, II, p. 26. His pamphlet Die sozial Bewegung in alten Rom und der Cäsarismus was brought under censure by the Reichs-Commission on December 9, 1878. Other writings, by Most, soon to be placed on the same list are: Die Bastille am Plötzensee, Die Pariser Kommune vor den Berliner Gerichten, and Die Losung der sozialen Frage, Ein Vortrag gehalten vor Berliner Arbeiter. For more detailed information on the prohibition of his writings see: Stern, Der Kampf der deutschen Sozialdemokratie in der Zeit des Sozialistengesetzes 1878-1890, I, pp. 12-14, 425-426, 437-447, 467-469.

26. Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, pp. 143-147. Bebel's feelings toward Freiheit did not stop him from asking Robert Seidel (1850-1933) to send a review copy of his

Die Frau und der Sozialismus to Most. See Bebel's letter of March 28, 1879 to Robert Seidel. Printed in Rolf Dlubek and Ursula Hermann, "Briefe August Bebels an Robert Seidel," Beiträge zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung, Heft 4 (1970) 569-570. See also: Freiheit (April 6, 1879) for the notice regarding Bebel's pamphlet. Evidently this letter was written before it became apparent to Bebel that Most and Freiheit posed a threat to the existing leadership of the SPD. When Bebel realized that Most could not be controlled, nor could the leadership of the SPD hope to control the contents of Freiheit, he became a critic of the paper. Bebel, Aus meinem Leben, 3 Teil, (Stuttgart, 1914), p. 44.

27. F.A. Sorge, Briefe und Auszüge aus Briefen von Joh. Phil. Becker, Jos. Dietzgen, Friedrich Engels, Karl Marx u. A. an F. A. Sorge u. Andere (Stuttgart, 1906), p. 163. It should be noted that Most had been in disfavor with Marx and Engels since the Dühring affair. Engels in a letter of April 3, 1880 to Herman Meyer described Freiheit as being "deformed." Henryk Skrzypczak, "Engels an Meyer, Kaufmann, und andere Beiträge zur neuen Mega," Internationale wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung, Heft 10 (June, 1970), p. 11.

28. On the founding of Der Sozialdemokrat see: Lidtke, The Outlawed Party, pp. 89-97, On July 19, 1879, Bebel wrote to Engels: "With this newspaper [Sozialdemokrat] we have a suitable weapon against Most; however, we are determined to make Most's position impossible by ignoring him, rather than through a direct assault." Bebel, Aus meinem Leben, p. 52.

29. Bundesarchiv Koblenz, "Abwehr sozialdemokratischer Ausschreitungen," Abteilung P. 135, Folder 5.

30. Die Maerzfeier," Freiheit, No. 13 (March 29, 1879).

31. Freiheit, No. 18 (May 3, 1879); No. 19 (May 10, 1879); No. 20 (May 17, 1879).

32. Freiheit, No. 20 (May 17, 1879).

33. A more detailed discussion of this dilemma which faced the Social Democratic Party is found in Lidtke, The Outlawed Party, pp. 111-112. Freiheit was read by prominent members of the Social Democratic Party. In Chemnitz the police

found every issue of the first quarter of Freiheit in the home of Julius Vahlteich (1839-1915). Rudolph Strauss and Kurt Finsterbusch, Die Chemnitzer Arbeiterbewegung unter dem Sozialistengesetz (Berlin-East, 1954), p. 44.

34. For a more complete description of the parliamentary tactics by the Social Democratic Party see: Lidtke, The Outlawed Party, pp. 112-115.

35. Freiheit, No. 11 (March 13, 1880).

36. Emil Werner, "Unser Vaterland," Freiheit, No. 18 (May 1, 1880).

37. Johann Most, "Offener Brief an die Wähler des V Berliner Reichstagswahlkreises," Die Freiheit, No. 20 (May 15, 1880).

38. Hasselmann was editor of the Lassallean Neue Sozialdemokrat 1874-1877, and served in the Reichstag during the years 1874-1880. The information on his early life is from his friend Karl Schneidt. "Vom jungen Anarchismus," Die Kritik (Berlin), No. 81 (April 18, 1896), pp. 717-721. Die Kritik was started by Schneidt in 1894.

39. Laufenberg, Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung im Hamburg, Altona und Umgebung, II, p. 169.

40. Jürgen Jensen, Presse und politische Polizei. Hamburgs Zeitungen unter dem Sozialistengesetz 1878-1890 (Hannover, 1966), p. 73.

41. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br., Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255 "Die Übersichten über die allgemeine Lage der sozialdemokratischen und revolutionären Bewegung 1878-.910," Vol. I (13,087), Folders 72-76. Hereafter referred to as Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255 and the appropriate volume and folder numbers.

42. More complete details of this suppression are found in Jensen, Presse und politische Polizei, pp. 76-77.

43. Ibid., pp. 77-79.

44. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam,



Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. I (13,087),  
Folders 100-102, 133-134.

45. Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen  
des deutschen Reichstags, IV, iii (1880), Vol. II, p. 1167.

46. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr.  
Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. A., No. 242, Nobiling-Attentat,  
Vol. I (8613)-Vol. IV (8616).

47. Deutsche Zentralarchiv Merseburg, Rep. 77 (Min-  
isterium des Innern), Tit. 2512, Nr. 8, "Massregeln gegen die  
anarchistische Bewegung," Vol. I, Folders 1-21.

48. Le Révolté, No 9 (June 20, 1880), p. 3.

49. Nomad, Apostles of Revolution, p. 272.

50. Fricke, Bismarcks Prätorianer, pp. 95-96.

51. Langhard, Die anarchistische Bewegung in der  
Schweiz, p. 218.

52. Julius Mottler (1838-1908) had rented the castle  
under the name of Moretti.

53. Most had arrived in Switzerland before the Rorschach  
congress was cancelled. He was able to talk at length with Eduard  
Bernstein and other Social Democrats living in Switzerland, but  
this did nothing to bridge the gap between them. For more de-  
tailed information see: Bernstein, Sozialdemokratische Lehr-  
jahre, pp. 102-107; Freiheit, No. 22 (May 29, 1880); Lidtke, The  
Outlawed Party, p. 118.

54. Fricke, Bismarcks Prätorianer, p. 98. A copy of the  
Heufelder report to the Berlin Police President is found in Stern,  
Der Kampf der deutschen Sozialdemokratie in der Zeit des Sozial-  
istengesetzes 1878-1890, I, pp. 394-400. The official account of  
the congress, which is a summary of the speeches, without the  
names of the speakers is Protokoll des Kongresses der deutschen  
Sozialdemokratie. Abgehalten auf Schloss Wyden in der Schweiz,  
vom 20. bis 23. August 1880 (Zurich, 1880). For an account of  
the congress written by Mottler see: Lidtke, The Outlawed Party,  
pp. 120-121. For another interesting account of the congress

see; Karl Kautsky, Erinnerungen und Eroerterungen (The Hague, 1960), pp. 456-460.

55. Stern, Der Kampf der deutschen Sozialdemokratie in der Zeit das Sozialistengesetzes 1878-1890, I, pp. 395-398.

56. Nomad, Apostles of Revolution, p. 270.

57. Gay, The Dilemma of Democratic Socialism, Eduard Bernstein's Challenge to Marx, p. 3.

58. Protokoll des Kongresses der deutschen Sozialdemokratie. Abgehalten auf Schloss Wyden in der Schweiz, vom 20. bis 23. August 1880, pp. 27-29.

59. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. I (13,087), Folders 178-179.

60. Jensen, Presse und politische Polizei, p. 80

61. Deutsches Zentralarchiv Merseburg, Rep. 89 H (Geheimes Zivilkabinett), Abt. XXI, Generalia, Nr. 18, "Die Sozialdemokratie und Anarchie 1872-1909," Vol. I, Folders 262-265.

62. Ibid., Folder 266.

63. Jensen, Presse und politische Polizei, p. 80. Kunhardt was during the years 1869-1887 a judge, President of the Hamburger Burgerschaft, and a Senator.

64. Quoted in Ibid.

65. Ibid., p. 81; Fricke, Bismarcks Prätorianer, pp. 91-96. Wolf was a baker by trade, but served as an agent of the Berlin Police. In this capacity he worked as a spy in the Hamburg area and also as a correspondent for Freiheit. After he was exposed as a police agent he offered to sell his memoirs to a publisher. When Police Director Krüger heard of this he was outraged that Wolf would consider offering his memoirs for sale because it would have revealed the entire spy network established by the Berlin police. Wolf then told Krüger that he could have his memoirs, but they would cost him 20,000 marks. Krüger

offered him 1000 marks and then had Wolf thrown into jail in Berlin for blackmail. After he was released from prison Wolf was again about to offer his memoirs for publication when he was apprehended in Altona and thrown in jail for lèse-majesté. A few days later he was found hanged in his cell, apparently a suicide victim. Since both Krüger and the Altona Police Commissioner, August Engel (1840-1910) benefited from Wolf's death, as did the entire structure of the Berlin police, there is always the possibility that Wolf was murdered and it was made to look like a suicide. There is no evidence to substantiate such a claim, but the death of Wolf was timely and convenient for maintaining the secrecy of internal structure of the political police. Eugen Ernst, Polizeispitzeleien und Ausnahme-gesetze 1878-1910. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Bekämpfung der Sozialdemokratie (Berlin, 1911), p. 26.

66. Quoted in Jensen, Presse und politische Polizei, p. 81.

67. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 457; Mehring, Geschichte der Sozialdemokratie, pp. 554-555. Schneidt, "Vom jungen anarchismus," p. 721, Freiheit, No. 43 (October 23, 1880). p. 2.

68. Hasselmann on August 23, 1880, wrote an open letter entitled "Ein Wort an die Arbeiter Deutschlands," which appeared in Die Freiheit, No. 35 (August 28, 1880). The purpose of this letter was to put to an end the speculation carried on in the press throughout Europe and England as to why he left Germany. See also: Die Freiheit, No. 33 (August 14, 1880). Karl Schneidt did not go to London, but remained in Brussels and later went to Northern France and Paris. Schneidt, "Vom jungen anarchismus," p. 768.

69. Schneidt, "Aus jungen anarchismus," p. 769.

70. Morris Hillquit, History of Socialism in the United States (New York, 1965), p. 213.

71. Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 160, 298. Hasselmann by profession was a chemist.

72. Quoted from the original letter found in the International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, by Lidtke, The Outlawed Party, p. 116.

## Chapter VII

### THE SMUGGLING OF FREIHEIT AND THE FORMATION OF ANARCHISTS CELLS

Freiheit was founded for the express purpose of sending it to readers in Germany and Austria, which was a dangerous and difficult task. The smuggling of Freiheit into Germany is a colorful chapter in the history of German anarchism and points out the determination and courage of the German anarchists of the decade of the 1880's. Nearly the entire printing of each issue of Freiheit was destined for shipment to Germany and Austria. Exact circulation figures are not available but I have been able to piece together, from police records and from printed sources, what I believe to be reasonably accurate figures on the number of copies of Freiheit printed and the number shipped to Germany. The circulation varied from issue to issue, and the precise number of copies sent to Germany by mail cannot be determined with complete certitude. Police records do not usually reflect the number of copies sent in letters, which were more difficult to intercept, however, it was not unusual for the German police, especially at the border, or in cities just inside the German border, to intercept fifty or a hundred copies of Freiheit sent in letter envelopes. The following chart is an attempt to give the average circulation figures for Freiheit for the years 1879-1886, but it must be kept in mind that the figures varied from issue to issue.

Date	No. of Co- pies Printed	No. of Copies Sent to Germany
1879	1,000-1,500	800-1,200
1880	2,000	1,800
1881	500-1,200	400-1,000
1882	2,000-2,700	1,800-2,500
1883	5,000	4,500 (Inc. Austria)
1884	5,000	4,500 (Inc. Austria)
1885	5,000	4,500 (Inc. Austria)
1886	5,000	4,500 (Inc. Austria) <sub>1</sub>

The smuggling operation from London, and later from New York, extended beyond Freiheit into the realm of leaflets, fly sheets, pamphlets and even included some booklets of nearly one hundred pages. Often single fly sheets were posted in public places in Germany where they could be read by all who passed. When they were discovered they were quickly taken down. One of the favorite leaflets, aimed at the young men of military age, was An unsere Brüder in der Caserne, which was smuggled into Germany in bundles of 30,000 copies. Das Recht auf Revolution was printed in Germany from plates smuggled into Germany in a cake of soap. Die Zeiten sind schlecht was another favorite. Most's article on the assassination of Tsar Alexander II, Endlich, was another favorite, as was a collection of poetry taken from Freiheit entitled Sturmvögel. It was a common practice to reprint articles from Freiheit in leaflet form and smuggle them into Germany for distribution. Most claimed that his pamphlet, Die Gottespest und Religionsseuche (New York, 1883), sold over 100,000 copies in Germany alone; his Die Eigenthumbestie (New York, 1883), August Reinsdorf und die Propaganda der That (New York 1885), and Revolutionäre Kriegswissenschaft (New York, 1885), also sold well even though they were thicker and thus more difficult for street hawkers to conceal. Even though thousands of leaflets, fly sheets, pamphlets, and booklets were smuggled into Germany, this operation was only secondary to the smuggling of Freiheit. It was an easy matter to print Freiheit in London, at least until the spring of 1882, but getting it to the readers in Germany was not so easily done.

At first, Freiheit was sent to Germany through the mail in ordinary newspaper wrappers. Before long though it had to be sent in ordinary brown paper letter envelopes, because copies sent in newspaper wrappers were too conspicuous and more liable to seizure by the police than those in letter envelopes. The price of an overseas subscription, sent out in newspaper wrappers, was 2s 6d (2 and 1/2 Reichsmarks) per quarter. The price of a subscription, sent in a letter envelope was 4s (4 Reichsmarks) per quarter, which meant that a subscription for a year cost 16 marks, a figure that was too expensive for the German working man at whom the paper was aimed. The selling price of individual copies in Germany was 2 pf. (1 1/2d in London) which most workers could afford each week. The problem was how to get Freiheit to Germany in sufficient quantities to distribute it among the workers for 2 pf. an issue.

The method of sending Freiheit through the mail in ordinary letter envelopes was never discontinued even after the paper was moved to the United States, but many other methods were employed to smuggle Freiheit into Germany in large quantities. Sailors, who sailed between England and the port cities in Germany, especially Hamburg, Bremen and Lübeck, often carried bundles with them. A favorite method that was successful for a time was for anarchists working in a mattress factory in Hull England to stuff copies of Freiheit into mattresses exported to Germany. Once the mattresses arrived in Germany a contact there opened them, removed the copies of Freiheit, and then sewed up the seam. It was also sent by the overland route to Germany from France, Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg, Switzerland, and even from Hungary. It was brought across the border in various ways: carried in packs on the back of hikers, hidden in bundles of English newspapers, sewed in the lining of garments in cigarette tins, sardine cans, condensed milk cans, baby food cans, bamboo poles, and in numerous other devices that could be used to conceal a few copies. Some people living near the border carried a bundle across the border every Sunday while they were out for an afternoon stroll. Freiheit was brought to France by ship and sent through the mail to Germany. Often times bundles were smuggled into Germany where they were broken down and mailed to individual subscribers from such places as Cologne, Aachen, Mülhausen and other points. The envelopes in which they were mailed usually carried for the return address the name of some local firm. A favorite scheme used when bringing Freiheit across the border by train was to place the bundles on the roof of the train, on the side away from the platform, while the custom agents searched the train. When the search was completed the bundles would be brought back into the train compartments. Suitcases containing bundles were transferred from a train car being inspected to one where the inspection was already completed. Smuggling of Freiheit always involved a certain amount of risk, but Most and his group in London tried their utmost to stay one step ahead of the German police. Many copies of Freiheit fell into police hands, but many more reached their destination, the German workers.<sup>2</sup>

The second issue of Freiheit appeared on January 11, 1879, with a notice on the front page that the first issue had been prohibited in Germany.<sup>3</sup> The same issue also carried a short notice that subscriptions would still be sent to Germany in both

ordinary brown letter envelopes and newspaper wrappers. The third issue of Freiheit, January 18, 1879, had on its front page an announcement that the editors were pleased to see that the German officials had singled out their paper by placing it on the proscribed list. The readers in Germany were assured by Most that they would continue to receive their copies of Freiheit in letter envelopes, but that it was no longer possible to send them out in newspaper wrappers. He related that the paper would be printed on extra thin paper so that it would fit well into a letter envelope and would not appear conspicuous by being too thick. The price of such a subscription was still four marks a quarter. Prospective subscribers were warned to use a false return address on the outside of all correspondence sent to Freiheit. Most also told his readers in Germany that they were not breaking any law by having copies of Freiheit in their possession. It was not against the law for an individual to subscribe to Freiheit. It was against the law, he related, to disseminate copies of Freiheit, but not to possess them for one's own personal use.

The dissemination of Freiheit, he said, would take place from London, which was beyond the pale of Bismarck's law. Issue number four, January 25, 1879, carried a notice on the front page that Freiheit was permanently forbidden in Germany as a result of action initiated by the Reichskanzler. Most assured Bismarck, and the Minister of the Interior, Eulenburg, that he had no intention of stopping the publication of Freiheit, and he would continue to send it to Germany because the Socialist Law did not forbid individuals in Germany from reading newspapers placed on the proscribed list.

Once again on February 16, 1879, Most reassured his readers that possession of Freiheit was not illegal. Granted, he wrote, it was against the law to sell it, or distribute it in any way, including; placing it in lending libraries, reading rooms, or at inns where a single copy could be read by several people, but an individual in his own home could have a copy of it. Besides, he reasoned, how could the government prove whether a person ordered it or whether it was sent to him as a sample copy. How could you punish a person in such a case, asked Most, because a person has no control over what is sent to him in the mail. Furthermore, a person found guilty of distributing Freiheit, according to Most, could not be held responsible for the contents of the paper, which he had no part in writing. Most also pointed out an apparent loophole in the Socialist Law. According to article 19 a person found guilty of "distributing or

reprinting" a prohibited publication was to be punished by "a fine not exceeding 1000 marks or with imprisonment not exceeding six months," while on the other hand article 21 left an out for a person caught distributing or reprinting a prohibited publication because if a person did it "without knowledge of the prohibition in the Reichsanzeiger" the maximum penalty was a fine "not exceeding 150 marks." The fiery little editor advised his distributors in Germany to make use of this loophole and to continue to distribute Freiheit.

An early device used by Most to get Freiheit through the mail was the use of various names for the paper. Before postal officials could confiscate newspapers, wrapped in ordinary newspaper wrappers, they had to determine first of all that they were on the proscribed list which appeared in the Reichsanzeiger. For several weeks Most was able to keep ahead of the prohibited list by sending Freiheit out under fictitious titles such as Bis-marck, Tessendorf, Lehmann, Eulenburg, Bitter, Forchenbech, Madai and also in the names of other prominent Germans. Franz Ehrhart in an article published in the Pfalischen Post on March 22, 1906, at the time of Most's death, related that this scheme was used because of the increased difficulty of getting Freiheit into Germany.<sup>4</sup>

This ruse came to an end when the German officials were able to place a title on the proscribed list before Most could get copies of it to Germany. This, of course, meant that there was a spy in the editorial office of Freiheit in London. Frank Kitz, the English anarchist eighteen years later revealed how the problem was solved. "One fine evening, on the occasion of a concert in the vicinity of Hamstead Head a man was walking quietly when a shot was heard and our friend was taken to a hospital to enjoy a long vacation. The Freiheit was not so easily prohibited after this incident; and one spy had to retire from business."<sup>5</sup>

By the spring of 1879 Freiheit was already in financial danger. In an article entitled "Soll unserer Blatt in dritten Quartal weiter erscheinen" Most pointed out that a cheaper method had to be found to smuggle the paper into Germany.<sup>6</sup> Berlin Police President von Madai, too, thought that if Freiheit were going to survive its publishers would have to resort to smuggling it into Germany in larger bundles, which was already being done to a certain extent.<sup>7</sup>

The decision to smuggle Freiheit into Germany in larger



bundles was taken in May 1879. Feelers were sent out on April 4, 1879, for opening up a southern route when John Neve, in London, wrote the Deutsche Arbeiterbildungsverein in Schaffhausen

Thus we were forced to find other places on the continent from which we could effectively make our shipment. This we have done, but it is necessary that these shipments come from several places. We would like to arrange with you, if possible, for you to assist us. It would be solely up to you to take care of the job; perhaps a couple of comrades could take the trouble on Sunday to transport the mail over the German border and re-mail it there in the nearest place (the German postage stamps could be affixed on the bundles in Switzerland in order not to arouse any attention). We would wrap everything here, address the bundles, and enclose the cost of the postage.<sup>8</sup>

The distribution would take place from within the country. Berlin Police President von Madai was prepared for this move. He knew in advance that the main routes for the smuggling operations would be Hamburg, where bundles could be brought in by ship, and the overland from Holland, Belgium, and Denmark where they would be brought in in the luggage of travelers. Von Madai even knew the names of some of the travelers whose luggage would contain bundles of Freiheit. He knew that Franz Ehrhart, Friedrich Milke, Karl Ulrich (1853-1933), and the paperhanger Solomon Kaufmann (b. January 11, 1835 in Münstermaifeld bei Koblenz) were involved in the shipping of Freiheit across the German border in their luggage.<sup>9</sup> The port of Hamburg was the place where the great majority of the copies of Freiheit entered Germany in the years 1879-1880. From Hamburg Freiheit was sent out to the subscribers in various parts of Germany. Entire bundles were sent from Hamburg to the urban areas such as Berlin and Munich. Copies brought in through the overland route, by way of Belgium or Luxembourg, were remailed in Cologne or Aachen. On the southern overland route through Switzerland copies were mailed in Mülhausen. Unfortunately for Most the Berlin political police never seemed to be lacking in ingenious methods to uncover his smuggling schemes.

The Berlin political police had a spy, Oskar Neumann, in the editorial office of Freiheit in London. Early in May, Neumann notified the police in Hamburg that a man named Saevecke

was being sent to Hamburg with a large shipment of Freiheit. Hamburg police acted quickly and the house where Saevecke was staying was searched and 663 copies of Freiheit were found, as well as a number of letters and a subscription list.<sup>10</sup> This was followed by a series of arrests with 45 persons being imprisoned. At his trial four months later Saevecke related that it was his job to ship Freiheit in large bundles from Hamburg to Berlin and Munich. He also supplied the court a list of subscribers to Freiheit, 150 of whom lived in the Hamburg area. Saevecke also revealed that he was assisted in this operation by a man named Wölky. The trial, at which only 12 of the 43 arrested were tried, concluded with prison sentences for some, freedom for others; Saevecke received three months in prison, Wölky two months, four others received sentences of one month each, and the remaining six were set free.<sup>11</sup>

A second trial in Hamburg involving the smuggling of Freiheit took place in September 1879. The accused was Carl Peterson and 12 of his associates, who had formed a reading society, and who took turns purchasing a copy of Freiheit; in order to reduce the cost to each individual only one copy was purchased and it was passed around among the members of the group. They were charged with distribution of Freiheit; however, when they were brought to trial the court decided that what they were doing was not distribution in the sense intended in the Socialist Law and the defendants were set free.<sup>12</sup>

The story of the smuggling of Freiheit in Germany is marked with numerous accusations on the part of the Social Democrats that Most's organization was infiltrated with police spies. Some people have attributed these accusations to the competition which existed between Freiheit and Der Sozialdemokrat, or to the differences in personality between Most and the leaders of the Social Democratic Party.<sup>13</sup> It is true that there was a great deal of friction between Freiheit and Der Sozialdemokrat. It is also true, although it is not so apparent today, that a battle was being waged for the leadership of the Social Democratic Party. Freiheit was published a full nine months before Der Sozialdemokrat appeared on the scene. Freiheit had great appeal to the workers. Many of those involved with Freiheit in the initial stages were radical social democrats who felt they could no longer associate with the party.<sup>14</sup> On the other hand, it is also true that the more research that is done into police files the more is borne out the contention that Most's

organization was infiltrated with police spies, but the Social Democratic camp had their share as well.

The Berlin Political Police under the leadership of von Madai conducted a relentless campaign against Freiheit, making use of spies and agents provocateurs. The remuneration paid a police spy was very good. German agents, depending on their location, received from 200 to 450 marks a month.<sup>15</sup> The growth and budget of the Berlin Political Police in the years immediately following the passage of the Socialist Law was tremendous.

Year	Budget (in marks) <sup>16</sup>
1877	5,900
1 Jan. to July 1878	4,850
1 Sept. 1878 to 30 Sept. 1879	46,384
1 Oct. 1879 to 31 Dec. 1880	69,910.83
1881	70,746.19
1882	75,699.30
1883	71,734.52
1884	79,749.61

Some of the correspondents for the Freiheit living in Germany were actually in the pay of the German Minister of the Interior and of the Berlin Political Police. Two outstanding examples are August Rudolf Wolf and W. Wichmann.<sup>17</sup> Wolf, editor of the Schleswig-Holsteinische Volkszeitung, started his service as a spy for the Berlin Police President von Madai on October 19, 1878, the same day the Socialist Law was passed. On November 8, 1878, Wolf sent von Madai an eight-page report on the socialist situation in Hamburg.<sup>18</sup> Hamburg, in the opinion of Bismarck, was after Berlin, the place where the socialists were most likely to start something.<sup>19</sup> Shortly after this Wolf abandoned his position as editor of the Schleswig-Holsteinische Volkszeitung and went on a long trip, at the expense of the German government, which ended in Bohemia. The Berlin police needed an undercover agent in Bohemia and this became his first assignment. From Bohemia he sent reports to von Madai in Berlin, using a cover address. Von Madai soon noted that a man of Wolf's ability was being wasted in Bohemia so in March of 1879, he was stationed in the Hamburg area, which von Madai, like Bismarck, considered one of the key spy posts in Germany. Wolf's salary at this time was 250 marks a month.<sup>20</sup>

In Hamburg Wolf worked with W. Wichmann, who served as a correspondent for Freiheit in the Hamburg area. The articles which Wichmann sent to Freiheit were written by August Engel (1840-1910), Police Commissioner and Criminal Police Inspector in Altona.<sup>21</sup> The articles which Wichmann submitted were highly volatile in their nature, intended to fan the flames of police and popular oppression against the socialists and anarchists living in Germany. The articles were placed in Freiheit so the Minister of the Interior, Robert von Puttkamer (1829-1900) could introduce them in the Reichstag as evidence to substantiate the renewal of repressive measures against the socialists and anarchists. Articles from Freiheit, used in this manner, were referred to as pieces from "Puttkamers Zittensack."

Some examples of the types of articles attributed to Wichmann will help to demonstrate how they could be used to promote their campaign against the socialists and anarchists. In one of his first articles he says that it is like throwing money out of a window to spend it campaigning for votes; it would be better to spend it on arms. The socialists should take up arms and kill everyone who stands in their way or who hinders them from carrying out the socialist revolution. The King, religion, and all capitalists should be destroyed.<sup>22</sup> Following the assassination of Tsar Alexander II he wrote, "May the day not be far off when a similar occurrence will free us from tyranny. We only regret that the other scoundrels did not receive their deserved reward at the same time."<sup>23</sup> He went on to say that before very long the other monarchs of the world would receive the same treatment given Alexander II because the social revolution was about to break out. Wichmann's article amounted to a verbal threat on the life of William I.

Again in 1881 he called William I, whom he referred to as Lehmann, "the perjured hero of Rastatt" who was now "shaking for his life" as a result of an "unbroken chain of villainous actions and cruelties."<sup>24</sup>

Articles of this sort had their effect and were used by von Puttkamer to force a renewal of the Socialist Law in the Reichstag, because, as he argued, if stringent measures were not taken against the socialists, then "throne, altar, and Geldsack" would fall under the social revolution as Wichmann

claimed. The value of such articles cannot be overestimated because German authorities interested in suppressing socialism could show, printed in black and white, what could be expected if the socialists and the anarchists were allowed to multiply.<sup>25</sup>

The smuggling of Freiheit into Germany, for the purpose of dissemination of its radical message, is usually viewed as a haphazard affair. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The goal was to establish thousands of small cells (Gruppen). Hasselmann, as noted above, in January 1880 sent an article to Freiheit, with the police spy Oskar Neumann acting as courier. The article called for the organization of cells, composed of five to six men who were acquainted with one another. There would be no list of members, nor would anything, such as minutes of meetings, be written down; this would eliminate the possibility of police using such records against them. The members of one cell would not know the members of another. Each cell would have at its head a Vertrauensmann, who would be the only person, who may or may not know the Vertrauensmänner of other cells. Even if a spy were able to infiltrate one cell, he could expose that cell, but he could not damage the organization as a whole. The purpose was to spread the ideas of the social revolution through both the spoken and the written word, by giving speeches when possible and by distributing newspapers such as Freiheit and other printed literature. Each cell would arm itself with rifles. Hasselmann assumed that they would be able to organize about 4000 such cells in Berlin alone. He thought that the industrial cities of Germany would be fertile ground for the formation of cells. He reasoned that, if they worked at the organization of cells, when the revolution came, they would have 100,000 armed men ready to strike a blow for freedom.<sup>26</sup>

Some cells had been formed by Hasselmann before he had to flee Germany in August 1880. He gave the addresses of the Vertrauensmänner of these cells to Most. The most important cells formed by Hasselmann were in Frankfurt-am-Main and in Darmstadt. Most quickly got in touch with the existing cells in Germany, either by sending his friend Victor Dave (1847-1922) or Theodor Eisenhower to meet with the Vertrauensmänner of the cells. In the Christmas issue of Freiheit for 1880 Most proudly announced that cells had been formed in Berlin, Hamburg, Hanau, Frankfurt, Mannheim, Darmstadt, Pforzheim, Augsburg, Nuremburg, Munich, and a number of other cities, especially in

the south of Germany.<sup>27</sup> This was actually a hollow boast because the groups about which Most was writing no longer existed, because the German police, early in December, had successfully smashed Most's organization of cells in Germany.

The facts surrounding the break-up of Most's organization in Germany late in 1880 are not entirely clear. On this issue, as on many others, the anarchists and the Social Democrats are at odds. Anarchist historians tend to discredit Social Democratic evidence on the subject. Research in police records helped to clarify the matter, but not entirely. One fact, which is undisputed by all, is that Most's key man inside Germany, the Belgian Victor Dave, was captured by the police; beyond this there is little agreement. The following account will attempt to demonstrate what led to the capture of Dave and the smashing of the cell organization.

Before starting with the events leading up to Dave's capture, in view of the fact that he is a leading figure in the German anarchist movement of the 1880's, it would not be out of place to give a brief sketch of his early life.<sup>28</sup> Dave was born February 27, 1847, in Alost, Belgium. His family moved to Hasselt, a short distance away, where he received a good education. He was something of a linguist knowing, in addition to French, Flemish, German, English, and Latin. At the age of 14 he discovered that one of his professors, a renowned cleric, who had written a history of the province of Limbourg, had actually plagiarized it from an earlier book. This was proven in a series of articles which Dave published in a liberal newspaper, Vedette du Limbourg, which was published in the neighboring town of Tongres. The editor of the paper encouraged Dave to look further into the writings of his professor and from what he discovered he wrote a series of articles "U.L. an Impudent Plagiarist," which had the effect of ruining the professor. After the completion of this series of articles he continued to write for the paper, writing a history of liberalism, which was printed in installments. His research for this work carried him into an acquaintanceship with the liberal political writings of the time.

In 1865 he entered the University of Liege where he studied for two years before leaving to continue his studies at the University of Brussels. In the autumn of 1865 the First International Student Congress was held in Liège. A number of students from Paris, imbued with Proudhonist ideas, attended

the congress and expressed these ideas. At the age of 18 in the autumn of 1865, in the city of Liège, Dave was thrust into the midst of a flourishing republican, free-thinking, anti-clerical, socialist current. From 1865-1873 Dave was associated with the Belgian Socialist movement. During the years 1866-1877 he worked for socialist newspapers in Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Italy, and Spain. After the fall of the First International he became involved with the Anti-Authoritarian International and was converted to anarchism. During the First International he had served as the official journalist of the movement and at The Hague Congress in 1872 he stood on the side of Bakunin. It was in Paris in the winter of 1878-1879 that he came under the spell of the German revolutionaries living there. It was also in Paris in 1879 that Most and Dave met for the first time. Dave soon became one of Most's trusted associates. The conversion of Most to anarchism is, at least in part attributed to his association with Dave, a claim which Dave himself doubted.

Dave was a journalist; in appearance, speech, and manners he looked the part of a respectable bourgeois writer. He was of average height, on the thin side, had a full red beard, blue eyes, bright blond hair, and on his small nose he wore steel rimmed spectacles. He spoke and wrote well.

In 1880 he was forced to leave Paris and went to London where he became associated with the Kommunistischer Arbeiterbildungsverein. His first propaganda trips to Germany to assist in the organization of cells there had already taken place in 1879.<sup>29</sup>

Rodolf Rocker, Most's biographer, tends to disregard the accusations of the involvement of police spies in the arrest of Dave as being baseless and the opinion of prejudiced witnesses.<sup>30</sup> Unfortunately these charges cannot be dismissed so lightly. Sufficient evidence existed at the time Rocker wrote his biography of Most to demonstrate conclusively the involvement of police spies in the arrest of Dave, but Rocker chose to ignore it. Likewise, Rocker ignored other evidence of police infiltration of Most's organization, which was available when he was writing; specifically, evidence regarding Wolf, Wichmann, and Neumann. The finger of guilt had been pointed at them, by the Social Democrats, decades before Rocker wrote his biography of Most, but Rocker chose to ignore these claims. In fact Wolf, Wichmann and Neumann are not even mentioned in Rocker's study, although Neumann's name does appear in the Nachtrag

to the study, which came out the year following the publication of the biography. Needless to say, recent work in police files has shown that Rocker was wrong. Rocker conveys the impression that Most was too clever to be outwitted by any police spy. Most, himself, often said so in the columns of *Freiheit*; however, on a number of occasions Most was completely hoodwinked by police spies. By nature, Most was not a careful or cautious man. Other men would have avoided many of the pitfalls into which Most fell headlong; often they were pits of his own making as in the case of the Plötzensee affair already referred to above. Numerous other examples could be cited, but Rocker tends to overlook these shortcomings that his subject possessed. In all fairness to Most it should be said that he was usually working under extremely undesirable conditions. In England he was in a strange land and had a very limited knowledge of the English language. He had to trust someone and practically the only people he got to know well were fellow Germans. The situation, at the time, regarding the comings and goings of Germans in the city of London was in a constant state of flux, so Most almost had to trust a person until he was proved to be untrustworthy. At the time police spies of all nations lived in London on the fringes of the anarchist and socialist groups who operated there in exile. Many spies were able to operate for years before being discovered.

Andreas Scheu, the Austrian socialist, who associated with Most in the early days of *Freiheit*, has left in his memoirs a detailed picture of Most at this juncture in his life. Rocker considers Scheu to be a hostile witness. It should be noted that Scheu did not write his memoirs until 40 years later, when the events about which he is writing could have been hazy in his mind. Some points are confusing and this is why Rocker tends to discount Scheu's account of the story leading up to the arrest of Dave. In the main Scheu's memoirs are quite accurate, except he does confuse some events. One difficulty in reading Scheu's memoirs is that the people whom he mentions were all arrested many times in the course of their life and he does not relate specifically about which arrest he is writing. Written 40 years after the events happened, Scheu's memoirs give the reader a sense of compression; the events of a decade seem to happen simultaneously. Perhaps it should also be considered that he was writing his memoirs for people familiar with the events and he did not feel the need for great description, so the events of a decade are compressed into the space of paragraphs. They are not written in good chronological order. It takes many



close readings of Scheu's memoirs, and a knowledge of the events to which he is referring to sort out the occurrences of a decade and put them in their proper place. Once this is done Scheu's account corresponds quite closely to other available evidence.

Scheu relates that he told Most that London was crawling with police spies and that he should be careful not to leave his correspondence, telegrams, or personal papers lying around, but Most did not heed his warning. Instead he held court at the Perry Street office of Freiheit where he was surrounded by questionable people with whom he shared information. The door to the editorial office of the paper was never locked and access to the house, in which the office was located, was easily obtained by knocking on the door; and the housekeeper would look out from a basement window and let anyone in who was knocking.

Scheu tells that he and Most often dined together at Madame Audinet, a French restaurant in Charlotte Street, where good meals could be had for a reasonable price. Many of the exiles of the Paris Commune ate there, but the place was also frequented by police spies, some of whom were almost permanent fixtures. According to Scheu, one afternoon Most came into Madame Audinet's as pale as a ghost and whispered into his ear that his subscription list for Freiheit was missing. Scheu asked him if he suspected anyone. At first Most said no, but then he mentioned Oskar Neumann who had been recently exposed as a spy. Thinking that there might still be time to retrieve the stolen list, Most, accompanied by Scheu, went immediately to the house on Gower Street where Neumann rented a room, however, a girl working there informed them that Neumann had left, the same day, for the continent.<sup>31</sup>

It cannot be determined exactly when this meeting, between Most and Scheu, took place. In the October 16, 1880, issue of Freiheit there appeared a warning which said "Recently Oskar Neumann was exposed at a socialist meeting as a spy from Berlin. He was beaten and set free. Everyone is hereby warned to have no further dealings with this man." Rocker, on the basis of this announcement, concludes that the meeting took place before the publication of the warning in Freiheit on October 16, 1880.

In reality a careful reading of the conversation exchanged between Most and Scheu in the restaurant reveals that Most was already aware that Neumann was a spy:

Scheu: "Don't you suspect anyone?"

Most: "No! Or, I mean—that damned Neumann!"

Scheu: "What does he do for living?"

Most: "Confound it! I believe his main occupation is spying. He used to serve as an intermediary for the office."<sup>32</sup>

This conversation indicates that the meeting between Scheu and Most took place after the notice which had appeared in Freiheit on October 16, 1880, because Most knew that Neumann was a spy and Most said that Neumann had previously served as an intermediary for Freiheit. At the time of the Meeting Neumann was no longer with Freiheit. Exactly when the meeting took place I do not know, but it must have been much later than the time assumed by Rocker, which was sometime before October 16. The date the meeting took place is important because Dave left for the continent on November 28, 1880. Since Rocker assumes that the meeting between Scheu and Most took place before October 16, he reasons, why then did Dave wait until November 28 to go to Germany. In Rocker's mind there is no connection between Neumann, the spy, and Dave's trip to Germany and subsequent arrest. More than likely the meeting between Scheu and Most took place after October, probably on November 28, 1880, the same day that Dave left for the continent.

Once it was discovered that the subscription list was missing something had to be done. Most thought that the best thing to do would be to send someone out immediately to warn the leaders of the cells in Germany. According to the account by Scheu, Most listed about 30 names of his cell leaders (Vertrauensmänner) in Germany and gave the list to Dave, who was to travel to Germany, going first to Aachen and then to other locations. Immediately, Scheu, pointed out to Most the danger to the cell leaders, if Dave happened to be captured with such a list. Scheu suggested that Dave should travel first to Berlin,

where the largest number of cells were, warn the leaders there; and then proceed to warn the cells in other areas. Then, if he were apprehended only part of the addresses of the cell leaders would fall into the hands of the police. Scheu's pleading for caution, however, fell on deaf ears. Dave traveled to Germany with names written in invisible ink. Eight days later a letter arrived in London for Most, from Dave, in which he related that the ink had become permanently invisible, and could not be made to reappear. Most then sent to Dave a list written in regular ink containing the names of the cell leaders, but the letter fell into the hands of the police and shortly thereafter Dave himself was captured in Augsburg.<sup>33</sup>

Rocker does not put any credence in Scheu's account of Dave's trip to Germany.<sup>34</sup> He further doubts that Neumann was able to obtain a copy of either the subscription list, or a list of the cell leaders (Vertrauensmänner) in Germany, although he does concede, as does Most, that Neumann probably did obtain the subscription list for France, Switzerland, and other countries.<sup>35</sup> The assumption is made by Rocker that John Neve, who was in charge of the list for Germany and Austria, was too cautious to permit it to fall into Neumann's hands, but Wilhelm Wentker, points out that Neumann was seen in Neve's house at different times, and it was nothing unusual to see Neumann alone in the editorial office of Freiheit.<sup>36</sup> Rocker claims that Most warned Neve not to let anyone see the list of subscribers of Freiheit in Germany. On the basis of this warning, Rocker concludes that the list could not have fallen into Neumann's hands, a conclusion not based on sound evidence. Furthermore, Rocker ridicules the use of invisible ink and discounts the possibility that the notebook kept by Dave in code, which contained information on the cell organization in Germany, could have been deciphered by the police if it had fallen into their hands. According to Rocker, Max Nettlau told him that in conversations Nettlau had had with Dave, Dave had related to him that he had kept a notebook in code that was made up primarily of a French dialect and which the police were never able to break. Nettlau also told Rocker that some invisible ink was used, but not for a list of names sent to Dave.<sup>37</sup>

No evidence has turned up to show that such a list of names was sent to Dave by Most, or if there was such a list that it ever fell into the hands of the police. If such a list existed, it was not mentioned at the trial, nor did the Berlin Police President von Madai refer to it as a list. However, evidence

introduced at the trial, and police records, indicate that when Dave was apprehended he was carrying a number of letters from Most, a fact which Rocker did not deny.<sup>38</sup>

The Berlin police noted that when Dave was apprehended in Augsburg he had in his possession a quantity of written material, including his travel plans written in code. This tends to bear out Nettlau's contention accepted by Rocker, that Dave used a code. The Berlin police cryptographers had little difficulty in deciphering the code and were fully aware of Dave's travel plans. Police records also indicate that some of the material Dave was carrying was written in invisible ink. The upshot of the police evidence is that Dave was traveling around to organize groups and to announce that a large meeting was going to be held on December 5, 1880, in the city of Darmstadt.

The question of whether Dave had a list on him when he was apprehended is to a large degree an extraneous one, because it is questionable to what degree the Berlin police had to rely on evidence received from London. From their own sources within Germany they were able to ferret out and put under surveillance the leaders of many of the cells, but information received from Neumann was probably of great value in confirming their own investigations. The Berlin police were aware already in 1879 that secret cells were being formed in Germany.<sup>39</sup> As a result of police surveillance in June 1880, they were able to apprehend Fleuron in Leipzig—he had traveled there by way of Paris, Pest, Vienna, Prague, Breslau, Dresden, and Liegnitz. In Liegnitz he worked especially hard for the establishment of a cell there. Also during the summer of 1880 the Berlin police kept Ehrhart under complete surveillance as he traveled around Germany visiting the cell leaders.<sup>40</sup>

In August 1880, Theodor Eisenhower, one of the leaders in the organization of cells in Germany, was expelled by police from both Berlin and Hanau as an undesirable person.<sup>41</sup> Eisenhower was one of the most dedicated anarchists of the period and was responsible for much of the cell organization that existed in Germany. He was based in Switzerland, but acting upon orders from Most in London, he made a number of trips into Germany in 1880 to organize cells in Munich, Augsburg, Frankfurt-am-Main, Stuttgart, Karlsruhe, Pforzheim, Mannheim, Darmstadt Offenbach, and Hanau. He was chiefly responsible for the establishment of a central control point for the cells in the area from Karlsruhe to Hanau, including Mannheim,

Darmstadt, Bessingen, Frankfurt, Offenbach, Steinheim, Pforzheim, Karlsruhe and Hanau.<sup>42</sup> The group for the Darmstadt-Bessingen area was well enough developed to authorize a delegate named Hahn to represent the group at the Belgian Congress which took place in Brussels on September 19, 1880.<sup>43</sup>

As a result of another piece of evidence uncovered by the Berlin police in June 1880, they were able to associate the stenographer Friedrich Waterstraat with Wilhelm Ludwig Fleuron, Reinsdorf and Most. They were aware that Waterstraat corresponded with Most in London, as well as with other revolutionaries both within Germany and in other countries. They maintained a constant watch on Waterstraat as he worked in the Berlin area and in other sections of Germany developing cells. They also kept a close watch on his communications with Reinsdorf and Most. Toward the end of November 1880, Most sent two letters to Waterstraat which fell into police hands. In these letters Most wrote that the great break-through had been made in Berlin and that the organization of cells in Berlin and in other areas was proceeding well. Most warned Waterstraat of the need for strictest caution. Waterstraat's role was more in sustaining cells once they had been formed than in founding new cells.<sup>44</sup>

In May 1880 the Berlin police were able to implicate Waterstraat with Eisenhower when a list of cell leaders fell into police hands. Furthermore, a letter sent to a comrade Lechhause fell into police hands which told of the cell organization in Frankfurt-am-Main as well as revealing nearly all the cells in southern Germany which Eisenhower had organized. A letter written by Eisenhower in Bern was discovered in Mannheim. In this letter Eisenhower told of his plans to organize cells in all the cities between Hanau and Karlsruhe. These cells were to be used for the distribution of anarchist literature and ideas. Eisenhower in the return address on the envelope used his alias, G. Franz, which was known to the police. His address was, chez Mr. Stein, Vevey, Rue d'Italie. Eisenhower also related in the letter that he would soon be traveling through other parts of Germany for the purpose of organizing cells there. The trip was taken in August, 1880, and Eisenhower was quickly forced by the police to leave Berlin and Hanau.<sup>45</sup>

The Berlin police were also informed of a meeting which was scheduled to take place in Darmstadt on December 5, 1880. At the meeting the cells from Frankfurt, Hanau, Münster,

Pforzheim, Offenbach, and Augsburg were to have been represented.<sup>46</sup>

In addition to these sources of information the police had at least two spies well placed in the cell organization. Wichmann, already referred to above, was active in the organization of cells in the Hamburg-Altona area. The name of the principal cell leader in Frankfurt, Joseph Breuder, was known to the police—Hasselmann had told Wichmann of him and Wichmann promptly turned in this information to the police—but the police did not act for months after they were aware of Breuder's activities. Shortly after Hasselmann's arrival in London in August 1880, Most obtained Breuder's name from Hasselmann and got in touch with him by letter. Breuder replied that there were a number of others in the Frankfurt-am-Main area who were interested in revolutionary activities. Inspired by this reply from Breuder, Most immediately wrote to Eisenhower in Switzerland instructing him to proceed to Frankfurt for the purpose of forming a number of cells there.<sup>47</sup> Eisenhower did so, but shortly after he left the city the Frankfurt Police Chief, Dr. Rumpf, was able to infiltrate the tailor Horsch into the cell organization there. Horsch was drafted by Rumpf from a jail cell where he had been serving a sentence. Part of his compensation for his service to Rumpf was the commuting of his jail term.<sup>48</sup> Horsch was paid 20 marks a week by Rumpf to seek out the followers of Most and to assist whenever possible in the organization of cells.<sup>49</sup> Following the orders given him by Rumpf, Horsch was to organize a plot among the anarchists to kill Rumpf. Another plot concocted by Rumpf was to have Horsch attempt to throw some sulphuric acid in Rumpf's face. Hermann Baum, a member of a cell in Darmstadt, had stolen some sulphuric acid from the Merkschen chemical factory in Darmstadt and the plans were all set to throw it into Rumpf's face, but the actual attempt never took place, because Rumpf only wanted evidence to present in court that someone was preparing to throw acid into his face. The evidence concerning Horsch's relationship with Rumpf is conclusive, and it is presented in a series of three letters sent by Rumpf to Hollmann, the examining magistrate in the Leipzig trial.<sup>50</sup>

When you take into account the evidence produced by police spies, and the evidence gained by the police through normal police intelligence work, the presence of a list, alluded to by Scheu, is inconsequential. All the evidence indicates that Dave, when he left London on November 28, 1880, had a definite mission

to warn the cells in Germany that a list, containing the names of the cell leaders, had fallen into police hands. In 1914 in some notes Dave wrote, he related that he visited cells in "Eupen, Aachen, Cologne, Koblenz, Neuss, Düsseldorf, Mainz, Ulm, and so forth. In these places not a single one of our friends was arrested."<sup>51</sup> It is quite clear that Dave is trying to make a point that in the cells which he was able to visit there were no arrests, while in those which he was unable to reach there were arrests. Another fact revealed by this set of notes is that Dave knew nothing of the Ebersbacher Conference which was to be held in Darmstadt, even though at the trial evidence was introduced to prove that Dave was in Germany for the explicit purpose of attending it. This was the opinion of the Berlin police; Rocker, likewise, tends to believe that this was Dave's reason for going to Germany, but the notes Dave wrote in 1914 seem to contradict this idea.<sup>52</sup>

On December 1, 1880, the German police started to close the net over the cells. In Frankfurt-am-Main the tailor Breuder and six other persons were arrested. On December 2 four cell members were arrested in Darmstadt. This was followed by arrests in Bessingen, Bockenheim, Lechhausen, and Offenbach. Other arrests took place in Pforzheim, Mannheim, Hanau, Berlin, and other places. Dave, himself, was arrested in Augsburg on December 8. In all, 44 cell members were arrested, but all but 15 of them were set free. The 15 were accused of high treason against the constitution of Germany and for impingement of the Socialist Law and were ordered to stand trial before the Imperial Tribunal in Leipzig. They were accused of having smuggled Freiheit and other revolutionary writings into Germany for the purpose of disseminating them among the people, especially in the army barracks. Those who were ordered to stand trial were (occupations, places of residence, and ages of defendants are given):

- Josef Breuder (hoemaker, Frankfurt-am-Main age 36)
- Hermann Baum (hoemaker, Frankfurt, age 30)
- Gustav Kristupeit (tailor, Frankfurt age 26)
- Hermann Christ (tailor, Frankfurt, age 28)
- Heinrich Jacobi (locksmith, Bessingen bei Darmstadt, age 26)
- Georg Mahr (gardener, Darmstadt, age 31)
- Peter Boell (shoemaker, Darmstadt, age 49)
- Albert Lichtensteiger (metal worker, Lechhausen bei Augsburg, age 36)

August Peschmann (shoemaker, Frankfurt, age 28)  
Wilhelm Braun (baker, Darmstadt, age 28)  
Heinrich Dillich (day laborer, Bessingen bei Darmstadt,  
age 24)  
Victor Dave (journalist, London, age 34)  
Friedrich Waterstraat (stenographer and engineer, Ber-  
lin, age 23)  
Maximilien Metzkwow (merchant, Berlin, age 37)  
Martha Legel (seamstress, Berlin, age 25)53

An interesting side light of the case were the almost fantastic stories circulated by the press, some of which were actually believed by the police. It was assumed by the Berlin police that an attempt would be made to throw a bomb from the gallery of the Reichstag down onto the deputies while they were in session. It was also believed that someone would try to blow up the police station in which the records of the accused were being stored. Police investigation, however, did not turn up any evidence to substantiate these wild claims.

The fifteen accused were arrested in December 1880, but the trial did not take place until October 1881. In the meantime the Minister of Inquiry, Hollmann, made extensive use of informers who were placed in the prison cells of the accused. One such informer was a man named Schnitzer from Berlin. Hollmann promised to pay him 1000 marks for his services. During the nine months that the accused waited in prison for the trial, they communicated with each other by sending notes called Kassiber (clandestine communications between prisoners). Schnitzer, it seems, was allowed a great deal of freedom and he was used to pass the Kassiber between the prisoners. Naturally all the Kassiber were taken first to the prison officials who wrote down the contents which were then presented to Hollmann. Incriminating evidence found in the Kassiber was used against the defendants in the trial. Schnitzer was not the only informer; Hollmann made use of other criminals who presented evidence at the trial. The criminals had been placed by Hollmann in the cells of the accused and promised that their sentences would be shortened if they could find some useful information to be used as evidence at the trial. Hollmann also offered some of the accused beer, coffee, and sandwiches and other special privileges if they would give evidence against their comrades at the trial. At the trial the accused were bound by oath to answer all questions asked them by the examining judge; many were actually incriminating in nature. One council for the defendants



said the whole investigation and method of obtaining evidence was reminiscent of the Spanish Inquisition.<sup>54</sup>

The trial itself opened before the Supreme Tribunal in Leipzig, composed of 14 members, on Monday, October 10, 1881, at nine in the morning, and it continued through October 18. The charges against the 15 defendents were: that they were attempting, through forcible and overt acts, to alter the constitutions of the German Empire and the Federal States; that they had met together in associations, whose existence, constitution, and aims were kept secret from the government; that they had disseminated and smuggled into the barracks of the Kaiser Franz-Grenadier Regiment, within the shadow of the Emperor's palace, publications of a revolutionary nature, especially Freiheit and a pamphlet entitled An unsere Bruder in der Caserne, a work which urged soldiers to disobey orders and to kill their superiors on the outbreak of the revolution; and that they had distributed another publication Die revolutionäre Sozialdemokratie in which Bismarck was described in flamboyant terms as the greatest monster in the world.<sup>55</sup>

The 15 on trial were for the most part all young artisans or skilled workmen; Dave was the notable exception. Eight of the accused declared themselves to be protestants, five Catholics, and two claimed to have no religion; Dave was in the latter category. During his examination Dave was to shock the judges with his remarks that he had no religion.

During the trial the 15 prisoners were guarded by 12 policemen who wore swords throughout the trial. Most of the defendents pleaded guilty to the charge of disseminating forbidden literature, but denied any connection with secret societies or cells formed for revolutionary purposes, alleging that the meetings they had attended were merely for the purpose of collecting money for the victims of the Socialist Law. It was presented in evidence that cell members in Frankfurt-am-Main in October 1880 had passed out literature and posted some of it to the gates of the city. They had done this on the same day that the Emperor was to enter the city for the purpose of opening a new opera house, and copies of some of their publications were attached to the triumphal arch through which His Majesty had to pass. At the trial it was also revealed that the favorite meeting places of the cells were church graveyards late at night, as well as inns and other public places.

It was also brought out at the trial that a general meeting of all anarchist cells had been hastily called for December 1, 1880, in Frankfurt-am-Main. Messengers had been sent out to notify other cells of the meeting. It was not explained whether the meeting had been called because the list had fallen into Neumann's hands, but it is plausible. The police were aware of this meeting and arrested a number of men in Frankfurt as already noted above. The meeting was then transferred to Darmstadt but most of the cell members did not attend for fear of being arrested.

All of the paraphernalia of a typical anarchist trial was introduced as evidence to condemn the 15 accused: letters written in invisible ink, secret printing presses, revolvers, ropes, cipher-writing, poison, rifles, daggers, dynamite cartridges, sulphuric acid, strychnine and other assorted destructive chemicals. In Martha Legel's home was found a poem glorifying dynamite. She confessed to being an assiduous reader of Freiheit and a close friend of Most's current mistress in London, but denied knowing anything about the cell organization.

Dave was considered to be the leader of the cell organization. His examination is the most interesting of all the defendants. He asked for permission to speak in French, but this was denied because it was felt that he could express himself well enough in German. Dave's examination before the tribunal was the high point of the trial. He admitted being an anarchist, but he denied any connection with the cell organization in Germany. Furthermore, he said, his business in Germany had nothing to do with the cells. Dave's speech was a clear, concise explanation of anarchism which the judges failed to comprehend. They continued to question Dave using terms politics and party and were quite surprised when Dave replied that these terms had no meaning for an anarchist. Then he told the panel of judges that he would like to see the aims of anarchism achieved peacefully, but had great doubts if this could be accomplished. He pointed out that the lessons of history demonstrate that the working class would eventually lead a revolution to achieve the goals of anarchism, although it would not be a national revolution but an international one. He went on to say that he no longer believed, as he once did, that a compromise could be worked out between the working-class and the bourgeoisie. When questioned about Most's pamphlet Taktik contra Freiheit, he related that the pamphlet was not anarchist at all, but that it contained

the ideas of Blanquism and Jacobinism. The ideas which it contained, he said, were confused and that he, himself, was in opposition to many of them.<sup>56</sup> It should be noted that Dave's appraisal of the pamphlet was an accurate one, for Most at the time he wrote Taktik was more of a Blanquist than an anarchist; but a Blanquism of words rather than a true Blanquism which essentially stressed action.

The trial ended with four of the 15 being set free. Martha Legel, the heroine of the trial, was freed, as were Hermann Baum, Hermann Christ, and Friedrich Waterstraat. Dave and Breuder were sentenced to two and one half years in prison; Braun, to two years and seven months; Jacobi, two years and three months; Kristupeit, Peschmann, and Metzkwow, to two years each; Lichtensteiger, to one and a half years; Dillich and Boell, to one year each; and the gardener Georg Mahr was sentenced to three months.<sup>57</sup>

The person the judges would like to have had on trial was Johann Most. His name cropped up more often than any other at the trial. Most and his paper Freiheit were the primary reasons behind the trial; thus Most was probably quite accurate when he claimed that his name was mentioned in every treason trial in Germany and Austria during this period.<sup>58</sup> It was not empty bragging when Most made such a statement. During the decade of the 1880's his name was known to most German officials, a household word synonymous with violence. There are vast amounts of material on Most in the German archives but it does not alter our impression of him, beyond realizing how intently his activities in London and in the United States were followed. Historians of the German Social Democratic Party reiterate the exploits of the early leaders of their movement, without apparently realizing that Most was an integral part of the movement, or that his paper Freiheit was at first widely read among the leaders of the movement. During the period of the Socialist Law, Most was better known than some of the less significant members of the Social Democratic Party who have since been enshrined.<sup>59</sup>

Once the trial in Leipzig was finished, Berlin Police President von Madai expressed relief that they had been able to break up the cell organization while it was still in its incipient stages, because he feared that if it had been allowed to function much longer it could have gotten out of hand. He also pointed out that Most had many friends in neighboring countries who

could be used to spread revolution into Germany.<sup>60</sup> Von Madai is correct in his assessment of the situation; it was a significant defeat for the cause of anarchism in Germany. It did not stop the smuggling of Freiheit and other forbidden literature into Germany, but it smashed the existing cell organization there and made men more fearful of joining or organizing future networks of cells. At no time during the 1880's did the prospects look brighter for the organization of a network of cells than it did before December 1, 1880. Cells were in existence in Germany throughout the decade of the 1880's but probably at no time did the number exceed 50, with a total membership of two to three hundred. New cells were being formed even while the 15 awaited trial, but these cells were closely watched and never allowed to multiply beyond a number which the government thought necessary for their needs. In Berlin in the early months of 1881 ten new cells were formed with a total membership of about 60. The police were fully aware of this and made no move against them.<sup>61</sup>

At the same time in Stuttgart three pastry bakers formed a cell for the distribution of Freiheit: the brothers Adolf (b. March 31, 1857 in Riedlingen), and Friedrich Sautermeister (b. April 16, 1860 in Rielingen), and a friend Franz Xaver Vollmer (b. May 2, 1860 in Waldersee). Their story is similar to that of a great number of anarchists in Germany in the decade of the 1880's. The Freiheit cell which they formed in Stuttgart came under police surveillance and they fled to Switzerland where they came in contact with Hermann Stellmacher and were imbued with ideas of "propaganda by deed." They returned to Stuttgart with the intention of carrying out a deed, but before they could begin the police were once again after them and they were forced to flee. They obtained employment on ships that sailed the Mediterranean sea, eventually staying for a while in Egypt for a while before returning to Switzerland in 1885, where they were apprehended by 20 policemen and a number of plain clothes detectives. After five days of interrogation they were shipped over the border into Germany as undesirable persons. In Germany they were quickly arrested and brought to trial in Frankfurt-am-Main in March 1886; after serving short prison sentences they left Germany for London.<sup>62</sup>

December 1880 marked the high water mark of the cell organization in Germany. After that date Dave was finished in Germany; Eisenhower was deathly ill and was soon to die; and Most himself left London late in 1882 for America. The results

of the treason trial had not dampened Most's spirits and he continued to smuggle Freiheit into Germany, but he got in trouble with English officials over a story he wrote following the assassination of the Russian Tsar, Alexander II. Most wrote an article entitled Endlich on the assassination of the Tsar that so outraged opinion in England that he was brought to trial and sentenced to eighteen months in prison. The article appeared in an issue of Freiheit that had a red border on it. In the article Most described the final moments of Alexander II concluding with "Endlich Krepierete er." The court interpreter had difficulty in translation, but finally rendered the phrase with "at last he died like a dog." The verb krepieren is used to refer to the death of an animal; said of humans, it is a vulgar form corresponding to "croak"—indicates of the style of journalism used by Most.<sup>63</sup>

Once Most was imprisoned his faithful associate John Neve took over the editorship of Freiheit, a position he held until he was forced to flee from England. On May 6, 1882, Lord Cavendish was assassinated in Dublin's Phoenix Park. In the May 13th issue of Freiheit appeared an article entitled "Der Rebellen Antwort," which praised the murder of Lord Cavendish. Following this, on May 16, the two compositors of Freiheit, W. Merten and Schwelm, were arrested (Schwelm was eventually sentenced to 16 months in jail and Merten to three). John Neve barely escaped being arrested. The police had gone to the rooming house where he lived, and while they were standing at the door, Neve's landlady saw him coming down the street. She quickly invited the police inside to wait for Neve's return, while she ran outside and warned Neve of the waiting policemen. Neve made good his escape to Paris and then to Switzerland. During the period May 20 to June 3 the responsible editor of Freiheit was another friend of Most, Johann Trunk.<sup>64</sup> Eventually it became impossible to publish Freiheit in England, the police then confiscated the issue for May 20th, and threatened printers not to print the paper. This left only one avenue open, if Freiheit were going to continue to be published, it had to move to another country. The move was made to Switzerland and the first issue of Freiheit to be printed there appeared on July 8, 1882. The last issue of Freiheit printed in London was on June 3, 1882.

Before continuing with the events surrounding the printing of Freiheit in Switzerland, I would like to return briefly to the efforts to suppress Freiheit. The German scene in the decade of the 1880's is a muddled and confused one. The outward

impression is that the government wanted to suppress the anarchists completely, yet there is evidence to demonstrate that when the anarchists reached a low point, the German government itself subsidized the movement through agents provocateurs. The cases of Wichmann and Wolf who wrote for Freiheit have already been referred to above. In 1881 the merchant Elias Schmidt from Dresden was hired by the Dresden Kriminalrat Weller and Kommissar Paul, as well as Police Inspector Kaltenbach in Mülhausen. Schmidt was sent to Switzerland and in Zürich he established an assassination fund" for the purpose of carrying out acts of "propaganda by deed" in Germany. The first 20 francs donated to the fund were given by Schmidt which came from police funds. He was not exposed as a police agent until November 1882. The plumber Weiss, from Dresden, who in Liestal bei Basel in Switzerland distributed anarchists literature glorifying robbery, murder, and "propaganda by deed," was also, like Schmidt, a paid police agent.<sup>65</sup>

In a personal memorandum early in April 1881, Bismarck noted delightedly that the English were going to do something about Most for his story on the death of Alexander II. He hoped that they would impose more stringent measures against Freiheit and the followers of Most in England.<sup>66</sup> On the other hand once the English got Freiheit on the run for the publication of the article glorifying the assassination of Lord Cavendish and the paper had to leave England for Switzerland, there is considerable evidence to show that the Berlin police may have paid for the printing of Freiheit. During the period that Freiheit was in Switzerland the Berlin police made considerable use of a cabinet maker named Karl Schröder whom they had hired in 1881 as a spy. He was paid 250 marks a month. His duties were to gather socialist and anarchist literature in Switzerland which he mailed to von Madai in Berlin; he was also to attend socialist and anarchist meetings and send accounts of these meetings to Berlin, as well as the names of anyone involved in the smuggling of anarchist or socialist literature into Germany. In Switzerland Schröder came in close association with many of the leaders of the German-speaking anarchist movement including Josef Peukert, Hermann Stellmacher, Josef Kaufmann, Friedrich Kennel, Anton Kammerer. He also wrote to Julius Schwab in New York, John Neve and others. Schröder was able to supply Berlin with information which led to the arrest of some anarchists in Germany, but more important was his ability to infiltrate the Freiheit organization in Switzerland, where he had the

confidence of both anarchists and socialists, not being exposed until late in 1887.<sup>67</sup>

Another spy active in Switzerland was the foundry moulder Christian Haupt, born in Bernburg (Anhalt). He was employed by Adolf Hermann Krüger in 1880 and after 1884 worked for the Polizeirat of the Berlin Political Police, Gustav von Hake. Fricke maintains that Haupt was a Social Democrat with anarchist tendencies. He entered the service of the Berlin police in 1880 because he hated Bismarck and wanted to register a protest against the Socialist Law, by being a spy for the Social Democrats within the Berlin police system, but once he got into the service of the police he sank deeper and deeper into police activities and spied on, and turned in many of his former comrades. He started out at a salary of one hundred marks a month but quickly rose to two hundred marks a month. Haupt and Schröder were exposed as spies at the same time. The total cost of the services of Haupt and Schröder to Germany in wages alone was twenty-four thousand marks, of which Schröder received ten thousand marks and Haupt fourteen thousand.<sup>68</sup>

The question of whether or not the Berlin police paid for the publication of Freiheit in Switzerland, like so many other questions involving the anarchists, has two sides; one, presented by the anarchists, and another by the Social Democrats. Both sides strive to make a point. The facts in the case are not entirely clear, but it can safely be said that the period when Freiheit was published in Switzerland was not a time of which the anarchists can be proud. It is a sordid, dirty mess whether viewed from the anarchist side, or from the side of the involvement of the Berlin police. The first inkling that the Berlin Political Police may have been involved in the publication of Freiheit came on January 27, 1888, when Social Democratic Reichstag Deputy Paul Singer (1844-1911) exploded a bombshell during the debate on the renewal of the Socialist Law. Singer revealed that he had received information from the Zürich Police Commandant Fischer that Christian Haupt and Karl Schröder had been employed by the Berlin Police Präsidium since 1880 and 1881 respectively; a charge which Robert von Puttkamer (1828-1900), Prussian Minister of the Interior admitted on the following day. In addition to introducing an extensive listing of the activities of Schröder and Haupt, Singer produced a written statement from Fischer stating that they were all true. Singer also presented to the Reichstag a signed statement from the printer, Wilhelm Bühner of Schaffhausen, which related that in

the year 1882 he had printed Freiheit. In the statement, Bührer said that he was paid one hundred francs for each issue of Freiheit which he printed in an edition of two thousand copies. According to Bührer, the group responsible for the management of Freiheit, in addition to Schröder, were Hermann Stellmacher, Josef Kaufmann, and a painter named Schneider. Bührer related that it was Schröder who always paid him for the printing of Freiheit, after which he sent a receipt to John Neve in London.<sup>69</sup>

Was Freiheit printed with Berlin police funds? Nettlau says no, as did Most when he wrote his history of Freiheit in 1896, and Rocker is of the same opinion; however, none of them can produce any evidence to substantiate their claims.<sup>70</sup> On the other hand an examination of the available evidence does not prove conclusively that Freiheit was printed with police funds, but the evidence does demonstrate that something was wrong in Switzerland and that Most was aware of it.

Numbers 23 through 33 of Freiheit (July 8-October 7, 1882) were printed in Schaffhausen, Switzerland, but list the place of publication as London. Numbers 34-39 (October 14-November 18, 1882) were printed in Paris, but carry the place of publication on the mast head as Exeter. Number 40 never was printed and Number 41, for December 9, 1882, was the first issue printed in the United States.<sup>71</sup> The editor of Freiheit while it was in Switzerland was Hermann Stellmacher, who was soon to be enshrined in the anarchist hall of fame by Most. In 1882 Most had a different opinion of him. In a letter of November 1882 to Friedrich Kennel in Bern, Most wrote that he was dissatisfied with Stellmacher's work as editor of Freiheit and said that "The main thing is to get the paper out of Stellmacher's hands as quickly as possible."<sup>72</sup> In the same letter Most also spoke about the "mess in Zürich" and went on to demean Stellmacher's handling of the situation there. He also pointed out that Stellmacher had ordered large printings of Freiheit without authorization from London and had even made advance payments to the printer. Most questions this, wondering where the money had come from. (Most was in prison until October 26, 1882). In addition to this, Most related that Stellmacher took a weekly salary of 30 francs for himself, which Most questions because he said no one else was receiving such a salary.<sup>73</sup>

Shortly after the publication of Singer's accusations



against Freiheit an article appeared in Die Autonomie to refute his claims. According to the article the income for numbers 23-28 was 740 fr and the expenses 751.45 fr or a deficit of 11 francs, 45 centimes; for numbers 29-39 the income was 1599.75 fr, while the expenses were 1771.70 fr, or a deficit of 171 fr, 93c. The total deficit for the time Freiheit was published in Switzerland was then 183.40 fr, which the article claimed the London office paid. The article claimed that they received their information from a former editor of Freiheit, who was not named.<sup>74</sup> It should be noted that by 1888 the personages involved in the publication of Freiheit in 1882 were either dead or in prison. Stellmacher was dead, Neve was in prison, Kaufmann had been exposed as a police spy, and Schneider had left the movement and faded into anonymity. Die Autonomie does not reveal the source of its information, but it is of marginal value. The article is not signed. Whoever wrote the article—and it is doubtful that it came from a former editor, as claimed—did not have his dating correct. Throughout the article he writes about the publication of Freiheit in Switzerland as taking place in 1883. Anyone who had been closely associated with Freiheit would have known that the paper was published in Switzerland in 1882 and from December 1882 in the United States. The figures given in the article appear to be too exact. The article claimed that the London group paid everything owed on the debt down to the last cent, but it has already been demonstrated that Most himself wondered where the money was coming from for the publication of Freiheit in Switzerland and had firmly stated that the London group would not be responsible for the debt. Nevertheless, Nettlau and Rocker accept this article uncritically. They both assume that the debt was paid by the London group. Likewise both Nettlau and Rocker accept, without question, the account given by Most in 1896. It should be pointed out that when Most wrote his account in 1896, he did not mention his letter of November 1882. Long before 1896 Stellmacher had met a "martyr's death" in Austria and had been personally enshrined as an anarchist saint by Most, and for a number of years regular contributions had been made by Freiheit to Stellmacher's widow and children.<sup>75</sup>

Rocker admits that while Schröder may have paid the printer Bühner 100 francs for the printing of each issue of Freiheit, the money still came from London and not from the Berlin police. He cites the letter written by Most in November 1882, stating categorically that it proves that the money to print Freiheit came from London. The letter reveals that perhaps some of the money came from London, but it also indicates that

Stellmacher was spending more money than London had given him.<sup>76</sup> While not commenting on whether Freiheit was printed with police funds, Peukert reveals another facet of the affair. Stellmacher and Most had come into conflict because Stellmacher wanted to keep Freiheit in Switzerland while Most wanted to move it to the United States. Most won and Freiheit was moved.<sup>77</sup>

The evidence neither proves nor disproves the allegation that Freiheit was printed in Switzerland with police funds, but one thing is certain: the Freiheit group in Switzerland which was responsible for the publication of the paper was completely infiltrated by police spies. It is also certain that Freiheit continued to be published because it was to the advantage of the German police to have it appear. If they had been intent on putting Freiheit out of business or stopping entirely the flow of the paper into Germany, they more than likely could have accomplished either goal with the help of the spies they had within the Freiheit organization. It seems that after 1881 the only time that the German police moved with force against Freiheit or the cells in Germany was to capture an important person in the structure.

Even though Freiheit was printed in New York after December 9, 1882, it continued to maintain an office in London which was used as a central point for the distribution of the paper to the continent, although the first few issues printed in the United States were sent directly to Germany in letter envelopes. Starting at the end of 1882 Gustav Knauerhase was in charge of operations in London. G. Brinkmann<sup>78</sup> was also involved, as were Wechsel, and in 1885, John Neve. When Neve left London in 1885 to take over the smuggling operations in Belgium, Victor Dave took over the London office. Starting in 1883 and lasting until Neve's arrest on February 21, 1887, Belgium was the main route used to smuggle Freiheit into Germany. It was a route the Berlin police wanted to smash, and Neve was a person they wanted to imprison, but it took them several years of work and the assistance of several police spies before they were able to achieve these two goals. The capture of Neve is the subject of a later chapter.

Once Freiheit was in the United States little about the paper changed, at least for a few years; the goal was still to smuggle it to the workers in Germany, at whom Most aimed his writing. It was in Germany where Most's heart and mind lay. At best, he only became reconciled to his life of exile in the

United States. His real interest throughout the first half of the decade of the 1880's was in Germany; a reading of Freiheit for the period will reveal this. The productive years of Freiheit were in this period when Most's attention was centered on Germany.

Starting with Number 27 (July 4, 1885), Freiheit underwent substantial changes in format and style. It went from three columns to five, and from four pages to eight. The columns no longer had any space between them, but were crowded close together and were filled with small print. The paper after that date also contained a full page and a half of advertising. In its new format, sometimes the paper would carry a full double-page illustration, but more often than not the columns were filled with useless information. The titles of the feature articles, and there were fewer of them, were so small that nothing in the paper, with the exception of the title of the paper itself, stood out, as they had in earlier years. The subtitle of the paper changed from Organ der Revolutionären Sozialisten, to, Internationales Organ der Anarchisten deutscher Sprache. With the same issue the old page headings that had appeared for years were dropped: "Gegen die Tyrannensind alle Mittel berechtigt," "Agitation, Organisation, Rebellion," "Arbeiter aller Laender vereinigt Euch," "Nieder mit Thron, Altar, und Geltsack." In its new form the paper was twice as large and less than half as good. By the end of the decade of the 1880's Freiheit was a very bland paper. The old slogans had lost their meaning, the language was less violent, many of the columns were filled with meaningless correspondence. John Neve, shortly before his capture, was thoroughly disgusted with Most and Freiheit; he felt that the paper was not worth the risk he was taking to smuggle it into Germany, and he was probably correct.

What had happened to Most that he should change Freiheit so? Probably by the year 1885, after the death or imprisonment of many of his former comrades in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, Most became reconciled to the hopelessness of his cause. Even though outwardly he still expressed a belief in "propaganda by deed," inwardly he probably no longer believed it. He probably realized by then that he could never hope to return to Germany. The execution of August Reinsdorf, who along with Victor Dave had instructed Most in the principles of anarchism, must have been a devastating blow. A still greater blow, the arrest and imprisonment of John Neve, was soon to occur. Since 1879 Most had dedicated his life and resources to the

smuggling of Freiheit into Germany, but for all apparent purposes, the organization he hoped to create in Germany, among the workers, eluded him.

Freiheit continued to be published until 1910, four years after the death of its founder, but the important or creative years of the paper came before 1885. In its heyday thousands of copies of each issue were smuggled into Germany and read assiduously by the workers, but Freiheit failed to ignite the spark that was necessary to start a mass movement. Whether this was out of fear on the part of the workers following the smashing of the cell organization in December 1880, or if it was from indifference, cannot be determined. On thing, Freiheit did not offer to the workers was a concrete plan or a tangible set of goals with which the workers could identify. If Most had offered more constructive alternatives and a better organization perhaps he would have attracted more support. The logical rejoinder to this line of thought is that had Most done this he would have lost considerable support among the true anarchists who already thought he was too doctrinaire and stressed centralization too much. Most was caught in the anarchist dilemma, which had often been debated in the columns of Freiheit; how much organization can you permit, before it ceases to be anarchism.

One thing appears to be certain; the police in Germany seemed to be able to regulate, at a desired level, the amount of anarchism they wished to have in Germany. To a great extent they were able to control the flow of Freiheit into Germany; the notable exception being the overland route through Belgium headed by John Neve. The German government appeared to operate on the premise that a little anarchism was good, as long as it were not permitted to get out of hand. Some anarchism was necessary to keep Puttkamer's "Zittensack" full for presentation to the Reichstag and the country whenever the debate came up on the renewal of the Socialist Law. There can be no doubt that the German government used the actions of the anarchists to enforce stringent measures against the socialists. Additional information on government exploitation of anarchist activities will be introduced in subsequent chapters.

#### Notes

1. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. I (13,087), Folders

137, 287, Vol. II (13,088), Folders 46, 106; Anonymus, Sozialismus und Anarchismus in Europa und Nordamerika während der Jahre 1883 bis 1886 (Berlin, 1887), p. 38; Bismarck, Die gesammelten Werke, Vol. 6 c, 1871-1890, p. 210.

2. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lt. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. I (13,087), Folders 61-62, 103-104, 182-183, 287; Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. B., Polizeipräsidium, Nr. 934, Vol. I (9016) "Die in Mülhausen i.e. erfolgte Beschlagnahme verschiedener Nummern der Zeitung 'Freiheit' und anderer verbotener Druckschriften 1879;" Vol. 2 (9016), 934, "1880"

3. Reichsanzeiger, Nr. 5 (January 6, 1879).

4. The article by Ehrhart is reprinted in Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 447-449. Ehrhart, himself, was arrested in Germany while on business for Freiheit early in the summer of 1880. Additional information on the sending of Freiheit out in the name of prominent Germans is found in Freiheit, No. 7 (February 15, 1879), p. 3; No. 10 (March 8, 1879), p. 3; Zentralblatt für das deutsche Reich, No. 7 (February 14, 1879); Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. I (13,087), Folders 61-62. The name Bitter referred to Karl Hermann Bitter (1813-1885), who was Under State Secretary in the Prussian Ministry of the Interior 1877-1879, and Prussian Finance Minister 1879-1882. Lehmann was a name used by William I, in 1848, in his flight from the revolutionaries. Other masking titles used by Most were: Der Volksstaat (June 28, 1879), Die Wahrheit (August 2, 1879), Die innere Mission (August 30, 1879), Die Fackel (September 20, 1879), Die Phalox (October 18, 1879), Die Avantgarde (October 25, 1879), Der Hammer (November 1, 1879), Der Anker (November 8, 1879).

5. Freedom (London), (April, 1897), p. 31.

6. Freiheit, No. 19 (May 10, 1879), p. 1.

7. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. I (13,087), Folders 61-62.

8. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Polizeipräsidium, Tit. 94, Lit. B., Nr.

934, Vol. I (9016), "Die in Mülhausen i.e. erfolgte Beschlagnahme verschiedener Nummern der Zeitung 'Freiheit' und anderer verbotener Druckschriften 1879."

9. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. I (13,087), Folders 61-62. For information on the religious and political beliefs of Kaufmann's parents see: Henryk Skrzypczak, "Engels an Meyer, Kaumann und andere," pp. 4-5. Kaufmann was apprehended during the summer of 1879 while on a smuggling trip inside Germany. See: Hauptstaatsarchiv Wiesbaden, Bestand des Regierungspräsidiums Wiesbaden, Abt. 405, Nr. 114, Folder 79 which contains a warrant for his arrest dated July 16, 1879. Kaufmann was arrested in Frankfurt a.M. He was tried before the Reichsgericht in Leipzig for distributing Freiheit in Germany, but was not convicted of the charge. Following this, on January 30, 1880, he was acquitted by the Landgericht in Frankfurt a.M. of charges brought against him in this court. Freiheit, No. 29 (July 19, 1879), p. 4; No. 38 (September 20, 1879), p. 2; No. 42 (October 18, 1879), p. 2; No. 43 (October 25, 1879), p. 2. See also: S. Kaufmann, "Offener Brief an den Reichs-Oberstaatsanwalt in Leipzig," Freiheit, No. 7 (February 14, 1880), p. 3. on the acquittal of Kaufmann in Frankfurt a.M. See: Frankfurter Zeitung, No. 31 (Morning edition) (January 31, 1880), p. 3. See also: Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 1 (January 4, 1880), p. 4; and No. 6 (February 8, 1880), p. 3; and Ignaz Auer, Nach zehn Jahren. Material und Glossen zur Geschichte des Sozialistengesetzes, New Edition (Nuremberg, 1929), p. 248.

10. Jensen, Presse und politische Polizei, p. 66; Laufenburg, Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung im Hamburg, II, p. 105. Most maintained that no such subscription list existed in Hamburg. In the same article he also related that a spy had been found in their midst, but he was referring to the spy shot on the Hamstead Head, and not to Neumann who was the real culprit. Most stated that neither he nor any of the members of the editorial board of Freiheit were so stupid and naive as to let a new person in their organization have access to the subscription list, and furthermore all the people who carried Freiheit into Germany were trusted members of the Kommunistischer-Arbeiterbildungsverein. "Die Feinde der 'Freiheit' in mehren sich," Freiheit, No. 21 (May 24, 1879), p. 1.

11. Jensen, Presse und politische Polizei, pp. 66-67; Laufenburg, Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung im Hamburg, II,

pp. 110-112. Saevecke and Wölky, along with their families, immigrated to the United States in 1881.

12. Laufenburg, Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung im Hamburg, II, p. 110.

13. Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 451-458.

14. Laufenburg, Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung im Hamburg, II, p. 60.

15. Fricke, Bismarcks Prätorianer, pp. 52-53.

16. Ibid., p. 318

17. Fricke in Ibid., p. 393 given Wichmann's first initial as A, but Jensen, in Presse und politische Polizei, p. 70, prints a facsimile of the first page of Wichmann's unpublished memoirs "Um Ehre, Recht und Wahrheit oder wahre und erwiesene Erlebnisse des damaligen Geheimpolizisten W. Wichmann." On this basis I have used W.

18. Fricke, Bismarcks Prätorianer, p. 92. Wolf's report is printed in Ibid., pp. 329-332.

19. Deutsches Zentralarchiv Merseburg, Rep. 89 H, Abt. XXI, Generalia, Nr. 18, Vol. I, Folder 261.

20. Fricke, Bismarcks Prätorianer, pp. 92-93.

21. Laufenburg, Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung im Hamburg. II, p. 230; Ignaz Auer, Nach zehn Jahren. Material und Glossen zur Geschichte des Sozialistengesetzen (Nuremberg, 1913), p. 183; Jensen, Presse und politische Polizei, p. 71; Ernst, Polizeispitzeleien und Ausnahmegesetze 1878-1910, p. 26; Richard Lipinski, Die Sozialdemokratie von ihren Anfängen bis zu Gegenwart (Berlin, 1928), II, pp. 97-98. Engels was rewarded for his service with the Kgl. Adlerordens 4. Klasse in 1881, and the Toten Adlerordens 4. Klasse in 1904. Jensen, Presse und politische Polizei, p. 180.

22. Freiheit, No. 46 (November 13, 1880), p. 4.

23. Ibid., No. 23 (June 4, 1881), p. 4.

24. Ibid., No. 39 (September 24, 1881), p. 2.

25. In spite of the service which Wolf and Wichmann rendered to Germany, both of them fell victims to the Reich. The fate of Wolf has already been detailed in the previous chapter. Wichmann, like Wolf, received no reward for his services. The decorations were reserved for the superiors for whom they worked. The Altona workers eventually discovered that Wichmann was a spy, and being of no further use to the Berlin police he was dismissed without a pension or any other form of compensation. Like Wolf, Wichmann, too, wrote his memoirs, but once again as in the case of Wolf, they were never published. It cannot be established that he was intimidated by the Berlin police, or if they paid him not to publish them, but nevertheless the handwritten copy of his memoirs "Ehre, Recht und Wahrheit oder wahre und erwiesene Erlebnisse des damaligen Geheimpolizisten W. Wichmann" is found in Acten des Senats der Freien und Hansestadt, Staatsarchiv, Hamburg. How did it get there?

26. Freiheit, No. 4 (January 24, 1880). These ideas were repeated in Most's Taktik contra Freiheit. Ein Wort zum Angriff und zur Abwehr (London, October, 1880), pp. 78-80.

27. Freiheit, No. 52 (December 25, 1880). The first Freiheit group in Frankfurt a.M. was led by the tailor Hentschell. It was called the "Central Komitee" and was in contact with both Most and Eisenhower. During the period of November 27-30, 1879, it was broken-up and the members arrested.

28. The account of Dave's life to 1865 is taken from a hand-written fragment of a manuscript by Max Nettlau "Victor Dave 1847-1922," Vertical File, Labadie Collection, The University of Michigan Library. Nettlau met Dave in 1887 and remained his close friend until Dave's death in Paris in November 1922. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep 30 Berlin C, Polizeipräsidium, Tit. 94, Lit. D., Nr. 398 (9582), "Victor Joseph Dave 1880-1922).

29. Rudolf Emil Martin, Der Anarchismus und seine Träger (Berlin, 1887), pp. 60-63. Martin (1867-1916) was a police spy stationed in London. He wrote a column for the Kölnische Zeitung in which he exposed the anarchist activities in London. This book was published anonymously.

30. Rudolf Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 453-454.



31. Andreas Scheu, Umsturzkeime, III, Auf freien Boden.  
Quoted in Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 451-452

32. Ibid., p. 452.

33. Ibid., pp. 452-453.

34. Ibid., pp. 453-456.

35. Ibid., p. 457.

36. Der Sozialdemokrat, (January 2, 1881).

37. Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 457-458.

38. G. Künzel (ed.), Der erste Hochverratsprozess vor dem Reichsgericht. Bericht über die Verhandlungen des vereinigten 2. und 3. Strafsenats des Reichsgerichts in Anklagesachen wider den Schuhmacher Josef Breuder aus Frankfurt a.M., den Literaten Victor Dave aus London und 13 Genossen wegen Vorbereitung zum Hochverrat und andere Verbrechen, verhandelt zu Leipzig vom 10. bis 21. oktober 1881 (Leipzig, 1881); Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. I (13,087), Folders 186-187; Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 457-458.

39. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. I (13,087), Folders 103-104.

40. Ibid., Folder 185. On Fleuron's trip see: Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Polizeipräsidium, Tit. 94, Lit. F., Nr. 397 (9892), "Der Chemiker und Apotheker Wilhelm Ludwig Fleuron 1881-1905;" Geheimes Staatsarchiv Munich, Ministerial-Extradition 1921, II, Deutsches Reich, Abteilung West I, Tit. II Polizeiwesen, A., Sozialdemokratie und Anarchismus, 76526, "Anweisung d.k. Gesondtsch. zur Berichterstattung über die sozialistische, Kommunistische und anarchistische Arbeiterbewegung 1885-1893."

41. Ibid.

42. Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, pp. 160-161.

43. Eisenhower was a true believer in the cause of anarchism. His death at an early age from tuberculosis was a severe blow to the German anarchist movement. Like Werner, he was associated with Kropotkin in Switzerland from 1879. Early in 1880 he was told by the doctors that unless he gave up all his activities and took a complete rest he would soon die from tuberculosis. This advice was ignored by Eisenhower and he continued to work for the organization of anarchist cells in Germany.

Fortunately for Eisenhower he was not caught when the German police closed the net over the anarchist organization in Germany late in 1880. In Switzerland he continued to work for the cause of anarchism. Often times his speeches were interrupted by long coughing spells, which forced him to pause for a rest, but he always finished the speech. His last speech was delivered in Geneva on Saturday afternoon, February 12, 1882. The following day he died in a hospital. An article by Eisenhower entitled "Zur Organization" appeared in Freiheit, No. 30 (July 23, 1881), pp. 2-3. For Most's and Kröpotkin's eulogies see: Freiheit, No. 8 (February 25, 1882), p. 1; No. 9 (March 4, 1882), p. 4; Le Révolté, No. 26 (February 18, 1882), p. 2. At the grave side Emil Werner delivered the eulogy on behalf of Eisenhower's German comrades.

44. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. I (13,087), Folders 186-187.

45. Ibid.

46. Ibid.

47. Lipinski, Die Sozialdemokratie von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart, II, pp. 97-98. Schneidt, "Aus jungen Anarchismus," p. 770.

48. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 90.

49. Ibid., p. 98.

50. "Polizeispitzelein aus früheren Tagen," Der Sozialist. Organ für Anarchismus-Sozialismus (Berlin), No. 51 (December 19, 1896), p. 302.

51. Quoted in Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, p. 162.

52. The evidence against Dave introduced at the trial is found in Anklageschrift in der Untersuchung wider Breuder und Genossen wegen Hochverrats und anderer Vergehen (Leipzig, June 25, 1881). The police account is found in Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 2155, Vol. I (13,087), Folders 186-187.

53. G. Künzel, Der erste Hochverratsprozess vor dem Reichsgericht, pp. 1-11.

54. "Polizeispitzelein aus früherer Tagen," Der Sozialist, No. 51 (December 19, 1896), p. 302.

55. Hessischen Hauptstaatsarchiv Wiesbaden, 407 Polizeipräsidium Frankfurt, 174 "Untersuchung gegen den Sozialdemokraten Joseph Breuder und Genossen in Frankfurt a.M. wegen Hochverrats, 1880-1881;" G. Künzel, Der erste Hochverratsprozess vor dem Reichsgericht, pp. 11-28.

56. Ibid., pp. 92-95.

57. Ibid., pp. 101-118.

58. "Geschichte der Freiheit," Der Sozialist, No. 43 (October 24, 1896), p. 255.

59. In Chemnitz early in 1880 the police, in a search to Julius Vahlteich's (1839-1915) house, found the entire first quarter of Freiheit including the first number. Rudolf Strauss and Kurt Finsterbusch, Die Chemnitzer Arbeiterbewegung unter dem Sozialistengesetz (Berlin-East, 1954), pp. 43-46; One file on Most, which contains some interesting material, but nothing new, is Staatsarchiv Ludwigsburg, 664, "Die Freiheit;" Another file, which contains nothing new, but which reveals the significance contemporary officials attached to Most, is: Hessischen Hauptstaatsarchiv Wiesbaden, 407 Polizeipräsidium Frankfurt, 177 Sozialdemokratisches Organ die "Freiheit" von Johann Most. Intus: Verschiedene Zeitungsexemplare, 1879-1894; a good example of police interest in the activities of Most in England and the United States is found in Geheimes Staatsarchiv Munich, Ministerial-Extradiction 1921 II, Deutschen Reich, Abteilung West I, Tit. II Polizeiwesen A, Sozialdemokratie und Anarchismus, MA 76512, "Die sozialdemokratische und anarchistische Bewegung," Folders 46-56, 94-110.

60. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. I (13,087), Folder 187.

61. Ibid., Folders 234-235.

62. Staatsarchiv Ludwigsburg, F 201 Stadtdirection Stuttgart, 632, "Anarchisten 1885-1898," Folders 1-82. An account of their arrival is found in Waldsee'r Wochenblatt, No. 28 (March 7, 1885), p. 109; an account of their trial is in Neues Tagblatt (Stuttgart), (March 12, 1886), p. 3.

63. Freiheit (March 19, 1881); on Most's difficulties with English officials see: Freiheit for April and May 1881. For an account of the trial see: The 'Freiheit' Prosecution. The Trial of Herr Johann Most with Verbatim Rapport of the Address of Mr. A.M. Sullivan M.P. for the Defense (London, June, 1881). For Bismarck's gleeful reaction to the trial see: Die Gesammelten Werke, Vol. 6c, 1871 bis 1890, pp. 210-213.

64. Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, p. 314.

65. Lipinski, Die Sozialdemokratie von ihrer Aüfängen bis zum Gegenwart, II, p. 99; Ernst, Polizeispitzeleien und Ausnahmegesetze 1878-1910, pp. 20-21.

66. Bismarck, Die Gesammelten Werke, Vol. 6c, 1871 bis 1890, pp. 210-213.

67. Fricke, Bismarcks Prätorianer, p. 235. Schröder, representing Lausanne, took part in a high level conference in Bern on June 18, 1882. The purpose of the conference was to discuss ways to improve the smuggling of Freiheit into Germany and Austria. Others present were: Kennel (Freiburg), Otter (Vevey), Schmelzbach (Zürich), Heilmann (Biel), Deschner, and Czerkauer. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Polizeipräsidium, Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 442, Vol. 9 (12,808), "Die politischen Zustände in der Schweiz 1882."

68. Ernst, Polizeispitzeleien und Ausnahmegesetze 1878-1910, p. 19; Langhard, Anarchistische Bewegung in der Schweiz, p. 318. On December 16, 1901, Haupt, who at the time was living in Buenos Aires, prepared a memorandum, at the request of

Julius Mottler, detailing his activities as a police spy. This memorandum is preserved today among Mottler's papers in the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam. Haupt was a miserable man for having betrayed his former friends. Fricke, Bismarcks Prätorianer, p. 158.

69. Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des deutschen Reichstages, VII, ii (1887/88), Vol. I, pp. 532-534. The same material is reprinted in: Schulthess' Europäischer Geschichtskalender (1888), pp. 16-17; Fricke, Bismarcks Prätorianer, pp. 340-344; Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 6 (February 4, 1888), p. 2.

70. Nettelau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, pp. 316-317. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 132; "Geschichte der Freiheit," (July 18, 1896).

71. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, p. 316.

72. Printed in Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 36 (September 3, 1884), p. 4.

73. Ibid.

74. "Der Wahrheit die Ehre," Die Autonomie, No. 35 (February 25, 1888), pp. 1-2.

75. Nettelau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, pp. 316-317; Rocker, Johann Most, p. 132; Most, "Geschichte der Freiheit," Freiheit (July 18, 1896).

76. Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 133-134.

77. Peukert, Erinnerung eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, p. 183. While he was in Switzerland during the year 1883, Peukert was a close friend of both Schröder and Kaufmann. Kaufmann (b. 1841 in Bludenz, Vorarlberg) was also exposed as a spy by Singer at the same time he exposed Schröder and Haupt. As early as December 6, 1884, Most in a letter to Victor Dave related that Friedrich Kennel and Moritz Schultze in Switzerland had written telling him that Kaufmann was writing to the Berlin police, but Kaufmann maintained that it was only for the purpose of deceiving them. Schröder later related that he was responsible for converting Kaufmann

from an anarchist to a police spy. On December 15, 1884, Kaufmann, along with John Neve and Peter Hauser, were expelled from Switzerland by the Swiss Bundesrat. Langhard, Anarchistische Bewegung in der Schweiz, p. 317; Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. II (13,088), Folders 243-244.

78. For an account of his death see: Freiheit (April 3, 1886).



## Chapter VIII

### PROPAGANDA BY DEED

During the intervening period from the meeting of the Verviers Anarchist Congress, September 6-8, 1877, to the meeting of the International Anarchist Congress in London, July 14-20, 1881, no anarchist congress on an international scale was held; there were anarchist congresses, but they were small and for the most part were attended only by anarchists living in Switzerland where the meetings were held. These small annual congresses of the Jura Federation were not without significance though, for in the discussion which took place at these meetings the two principal themes, later adopted by the International Anarchist Congress in London in 1881, were hammered out: "propaganda by deed," and communist-anarchism. These were the dominant themes anarchism followed in the decade of the 1880's. Before the close of the decade both "propaganda by deed" and communist-anarchism were to be the source of great dissension within the anarchist movement. "propaganda by deed" discredited the movement in the eyes of the workers, and brought forth cries from the frightened bourgeois for further repressive measures against the anarchists.

At the 1878 Congress of the Jura Federation, held in Freiburg, Switzerland, on August 3-8, Paul Brousse and Peter Kropotkin disputed on the usefulness of "propaganda by deed" in destroying the state. Kropotkin's view—that all methods, including "propaganda by deed" (which had been brought up first at the Bern Anarchist Congress of 1876) must be used to destroy the state—was approved by the Congress.<sup>1</sup> At the Congress of the Jura Federation on October 12, 1879, in Chaux-de-Fonds, Kropotkin pressed once again for local action, including "propaganda by deed." As envisioned by him "propaganda by deed" differed from the tactics of Bakunin who thought that the only need was an organization of conspirators who at the proper moment would capitalize on the revolutionary potential of the masses. In the spring of 1878, James Guillaume, who had been the unofficial titular head of the movement since the death of Bakunin in the summer of 1876, abdicated his position and was succeeded by Kropotkin. Along with his followers, Kropotkin



replaced the Bakuninist idea of insurrection, with the idea of well-planned acts of terror carried out by individuals or small groups who had been educated in the techniques of "propaganda by deed." Kropotkin assumed that such acts would arouse the spirit of revolt in the masses.<sup>2</sup>

Again in 1880 the Congress of the Jura Federation was held in Chaux-de-Fonds, on October 9-10. The dominant figures at the congress were Kropotkin, the French scholar-anarchist Elisée Reclus, and Carlo Cafiero, a wealthy young Neopolitan anarchist. At this congress they struck out hard against the collectivism of Bakunin, once again declaring themselves as they had done at the 1879 congress, to be in favor of communist-anarchism which they declared would be the end result of the social revolution. According to the doctrine of communist-anarchism there would be not merely collective ownership of the means of production, but complete communism in respect to the utilization of the products of production. At the congress Kropotkin, Elisée Reclus, and Cafiero were able to push through a program of communist-anarchism which was accepted by the anarchists present. A resolution was passed in which they declared that they would no longer refer to themselves as "anti-state socialists," but as communist-anarchists. The terms "anti-authoritarian collectivists," and "federalists" were to be dropped from their vocabularies.<sup>3</sup>

Late in 1880 the need of resuscitating the International was felt. On December 25 a congress of Belgian anarchists passed a resolution to the effect that an International Anarchist Congress should be held in 1881. This resolution was accepted by anarchists of all countries and the three leading anarchist newspapers of the period, Most's Freiheit, Kropotkin's Le Révolté, and Citizen Serreaux's La Révolution Sociale (Paris), gave the forthcoming congress, which was to be held in London, the widest possible coverage to attract delegates.<sup>4</sup>

The London Congress opened July 14, 1881, in the meeting room of a Public House in Charrington Street, Euston Road. Only the delegates were permitted to enter the hall; the press and all other observers were not allowed admission. The proceedings of the congress were held behind closed doors to protect the delegates who had come from the continent.<sup>5</sup> According to Kropotkin the 45 delegates present represented 60 federations and 59 groups. More than likely this is an overestimation on the part of Kropotkin. The most important role at the congress

was played by the German delegates who were in the majority, even though many of them represented countries other than Germany.<sup>6</sup>

Of the 45 delegates at the congress only two represented anarchist groups within Germany; Carl Henze, who had been in the anarchist movement since 1878, represented the cities of the Niederrhein, and Balthasar Hohn represented the social-revolutionary groups in Darmstadt and Paris. There were many active German anarchists at the congress who represented other groups; Sebastián Trunk represented the Kommunistischer Arbeiterbildungsverein of London; John Neve represented a New York group; Fritz Kürschner, a German social revolutionary group in Brussels. In addition to this there were a number of Swiss and American Germans present, as well as other Germans living in exile in London who represented various groups unable to send a delegate, and Austrian German-speaking anarchists including Josef Peukert. None of the earlier leaders of the German anarchist movement who had worked on the Arbeiter-Zeitung in Bern were present, although Otto Rinke, now living in Paris, along with Balthasar Grün and J. A. Goosens, signed the mandate for Jean Miller who represented the Cercle d'Études Sociale de Lavallois-Perret (Paris), and the Club International de Paris.

Kropotkin claimed that the congress was international by virtue of the many different federations and groups represented. However, a number of the federations and groups represented at the congress existed only on paper and, what is more, some of them sent no delegates but were represented by German exiles living in London. Nevertheless, Kropotkin and the other delegates met behind closed doors during the period of July 14-20 and developed an anarchist program which determined to a great extent the route followed by anarchism in the 1880's.

"Propaganda by deed" occupied a prominent place in the discussion at the congress. The assassination of Alexander II earlier in the year had made an impression on the delegates and they gave their approval to a program of "propaganda by deed."<sup>7</sup> Kropotkin stressed the need to spread the ideas of the anarchist movement among the farmers because he reasoned that if the anarchists were going to be successful they needed the support of the farmers.<sup>8</sup> The congress declared itself to be opposed to parliamentary activity and recognized the

autonomy of both the individual and the group.<sup>9</sup> A vigorous discussion took place in which all points of view were presented, from revolutionary dictatorship to extreme individualism, but in the end the congress united behind the principles of communist-anarchism.<sup>10</sup>

The main ideas of the congress were expressed in a resolution passed by the delegates. The resolution had a drastic effect on the course followed by anarchism in the 1880's. The adoption of a program of "propaganda by deed" had tragic consequences, especially in Germany and Austria, where it practically led to the elimination of the leaders of the anarchist movement by the middle of the decade. It also resulted in the loss of Switzerland as an anarchist refuge and base of operations. In view of the importance of the resolution it should be quoted in its entirety.

Whereas the International Workingmen's Association deems it necessary to add "Propaganda by Deed" to oral and written propaganda; and, furthermore, whereas the moment of a general conflagration is not far distant, and the revolutionary elements of all countries will be called upon to do their utmost—the congress urges all organizations affiliated with the International Workingmen's Association to heed the following proposals:

It is absolutely necessary to exert every effort towards propagating, by deeds, the revolutionary idea and to arouse the spirit of revolt in those sections of the popular masses who still harbor illusions about the effectiveness of legal methods.

Those who no longer believe that legality will bring about the revolution will have to use methods that are in conformity with that belief.

The persecutions directed against the revolutionary press of all countries prove the necessity of organizing an underground press.

Whereas the agricultural workers are still outside the revolutionary movement, it is absolutely necessary to make every effort to win them to our cause, and to keep in mind that a deed performed against the existing institutions appeals to the masses much more than thousands of leaflets and

torrents of words, and that "Propaganda by Deed" is of greater importance in the countryside than in the cities.

Whereas the technical and chemical sciences have rendered services to the revolutionary cause and are bound to render still greater services in the future, the Congress suggests that organizations and individuals affiliated with the International Workingmen's Association devote themselves to the study of these sciences.<sup>11</sup>

The year following the congress in London the Jura Federation held its annual congress in Lausanne, in the Hall of the Hotel de France, on June 4th. At Lausanne the decisions taken at London were reinforced. Elisée Reclus and Emil Werner pushed through a resolution to the effect that the Jura group would henceforth use all means possible, including "propaganda by deed," to spread the anarchist revolution. Once again delegates argued the necessity of spreading the anarchist movement among "our brothers" in the country.<sup>12</sup> A congress of the Jura and other anarchist groups from France, Italy, Spain and Belgium met later that summer (August 13-14) in Geneva and again expressed their adherence to the principles laid down by the London Congress.<sup>13</sup> During the year 1883 the Jura Federation held its congress in Chaux-de-Fonds on July 7-9 and again reiterated their belief in the principles of the London Congress.<sup>14</sup>

As can be seen by the foregoing presentation the change in the anarchist movement to anarchist-communism and a commitment to "propaganda by deed" was not a hasty one. It was well thought out and thoroughly debated by the leading anarchist minds of the period; but more than anyone else Kropotkin was responsible for the change.

"Propaganda by deed" had an obvious appeal to Johann Most, and he grasped its implications immediately, but on the other hand it is doubtful if he ever fully understood communist-anarchism. Late in 1880 articles started to appear in Freiheit which were intended to instill in the readers the value of terrorism and "propaganda by deed," often giving explicit instructions in the manufacture and use of explosives including dynamite and nitroglycerin. Instructions were also given in detail how to use fire, poison, and knives in the most effective way.<sup>15</sup> Most told his readers that "The revolution has no respect for things or people who are connected with the existing system of robbery and murder. Such people are condemned and will

sooner or later receive their just fate."<sup>16</sup> He called for the destruction of the means of communication, the dynamiting of homes, offices, churches, stores, and factories, saying that "lead and dynamite, poison and knives are the weapons with which our brothers will open the skirmish."<sup>17</sup> "All methods are justified to achieve the social revolution."<sup>18</sup> and "it was time for the atonement of the crimes committed against society using the principle of 'an eye for an eye.'"<sup>19</sup> To people of the temperament of Hödel and Nobiling living in Germany, Most advised "Ready, aim, fire."<sup>20</sup>

Most warned the German aristocracy that

Every prince will find his Brutus. Poison on the table of the gourmet will cancel out his debt. Dynamite will explode in the splendid, rubber tired, coaches of the aristocracy and bourgeois as they pull up to the opera. Death will await them, both by day and by night, on all roads and footpaths and even in their homes, lurking in a thousand different forms.<sup>21</sup>

Shake you dogs, you blood suckers, you violators of young girls, you murderers and executioners—the day of retribution, the day of vengeance draws near.<sup>22</sup>

Most said quite frankly

We will murder those who must be killed in order to be free.... We do not dispute over whether it is right or wrong. Say what you will, do what you do, but the victor is right. Comrades of Freiheit, we say murder the murderers. Rescue mankind through blood, iron, poison, and dynamite.<sup>23</sup>

We believe once and for all in powder and lead, poison, knives, dynamite, and fire. With these the people will be able to argue more loudly and stronger; with these our goals will be attained more surely and quickly.<sup>24</sup>

The columns of Freiheit for the period from late 1880 through July 1885 are literally full of articles urging workers on to perform acts of "propaganda by deed." Much of the information contained in these articles on the production and deployment of bombs, explosives, poison, knives and so forth were incorporated into a 74-page book by Most entitled Revolutionäre

Kriegswissenschaft. Ein Handbüchlein zur Anleitung betreffend  
Gebrauches und Herstellung von Nitroglycerin, Dynamit,  
Schliessbaumwolle, Knallquecksilber, Bomben, Brandsätzen,  
Giften usw.<sup>25</sup>

Revolutionäre Kriegswissenschaft is both a handbook and a do-it-yourself book for the person interested in "propaganda by deed." One interesting aspect gives information on how to burn down your own home to collect insurance and donate it to the cause of anarchism. Most did his research well on the writing of the book. In 1884, unknown to his friends, he took a job in an explosives factory in Jersey City Heights where he received on-the-job training in the production of explosives. More important, he was able to steal dynamite that was more reliable than the home made variety and, of course, cheaper. His object in stealing the dynamite was to send it to Europe which he quickly realized was for all practical purposes an impossible task, so he had to resort to his second plan of action, to send instructions on the manufacture of the "stuff" to Europe where it could be produced on the spot. He set about writing down in the columns of Freiheit, and later in book form, the knowledge he had acquired both from his practical on-the-job experience and from various technical books dealing with explosives. Even though detailed information was given in the book on how to manufacture explosives, Most advised against it pointing out that it was safer to break into a factory and steal factory produced dynamite or nitroglycerin which was much more reliable. If possible the best way to get the "stuff" was to purchase it. He went on into elaborate details on how to make proper use of explosives. Also included in the book were chapters on revolutionary chemistry; production of invisible ink; production of self-igniting liquid compounds which could be used for starting fires safely; the poisoning of bullets, nails, and daggers; and various assorted hints about the placing of all kinds of deadly chemicals in various delicacies which were to be served at the tables of the rich.

Freiheit was not the only German anarchist newspaper venting its spleen on the issue of "propaganda by deed." Der Rebel, which appeared in 17 issues from 1881-1886, proclaimed many times that it was better to kill a tyrant than to give a thousand revolutionary speeches in parliament.<sup>26</sup>

A satisfactory discussion of the significance of "propaganda by deed" in Germany is impossible without the

consideration of diverse elements which are only indirectly concerned with the German scene. This has been amply demonstrated regarding the milieu in which the policy of "propaganda by deed" was adopted by the anarchists. Before proceeding with a history of the implementation of "propaganda by deed" in Germany, it is necessary to sketch out the broad outline of anarchist activities in Austria in the early 1880's. For several years in this period the activities of the German and Austrian anarchists are so interwoven that it is impossible to separate them with any satisfactory results; the practice of "propaganda by deed" is such a case. In order to make the situation in Germany understandable it is necessary to bring out the close cooperation that existed between the German and Austrian anarchists in Switzerland. This will necessitate bringing into the picture a number of Austrian anarchists, but as in the case of the Belgian anarchist Victor Dave, they played an integral part in the development of the German anarchist movement.

There was a strong connection between the workers movement in Germany and Austria in the late 1870's. Freiheit was well received in Austria although there too it had to be distributed secretly. In Austria, as in Germany, at the close of the decade of the 70's there was a more radical element in the workers' movement rising to challenge the moderates.<sup>27</sup> In October 1879 Die Zukunft; Zentralorgan der sozialdemokratischen Partei appeared as the organ of the radical faction which had its largest number of followers in the industrialized section of Bohemia and in Vienna and Budapest.

When Josef Peukert (1855-1910) took over as editor of Die Zukunft the radical movement was given a boost. Peukert, an interior decorator by trade, was born January 22, 1855, in Albrechtsdorf bei Gablanz in northern Bohemia. As a young man, after finishing his apprenticeship, he went on his Wanderschaft in Germany where he became imbued with the ideas of socialism. In 1874 he returned to his home town and took over the control and dissemination of socialist literature and ideas there. He left home again in 1877 going to Metz, which was under German rule at the time, where he remained only a short time before traveling on to Bordeaux and Paris. While he was in France he learned the French language well enough to take part in the socialist movement in that country. When he left home in 1877 Peukert was a Social Democrat, but as he observed the split taking place in the German movement he sided with the Freiheit group against the Social Democrats. In Bordeaux he

made plans to enter Spain to familiarize himself with the tactics employed by the revolutionaries in that country, but at this juncture the French expelled around 20 social revolutionaries from Paris, and he was called upon by Most to go to Paris to undertake the reorganization of the group there. This was an important assignment, for Paris was a dissemination point for the smuggling of Freiheit into Germany.

In Paris Peukert became acquainted with Otto Rinke and worked in close collaboration with the French communist-anarchist Emile Gautier who is credited with converting him to communist-anarchism. In July 1881 Peukert was a delegate at the International Congress held in London, representing the German groups in Switzerland. After the completion of the congress he traveled to the continent to work in the movement; under Neve's orders he smuggled Freiheit from Switzerland into Baden and Bavaria and into Austria, traveling under the alias of Schaufert.<sup>28</sup> Before long his activities came to the attention of the Austrian police and he was apprehended and detained for three months, but finally had to be freed when they were unable to prove that he had violated any laws. Upon his release from prison he returned to his home town in Bohemia for the purpose of obtaining a passport which would enable him to return to Vienna. Arriving once again in Vienna he quickly put his talents as a speaker to use stirring up audiences and before long began to play an important role in the radical movement in Vienna. Peukert was an anarchist, but during the entire period he worked in Austria he never openly used the word anarchism. He was anti-parliamentary, worked to establish small secret cells, and to put into action the policy of "propaganda by deed." At this time there was a tendency to draw a parallel between the political conditions in Russia and those in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, concluding that the revolutionary activities being employed in Russia should be used in Austria. The deeds of the Russian terrorists which had captured the imagination of the London Congress, held out a certain fascination for anarchists worldwide and especially those in Austria.

In 1882 two members of the Radical Party, Josef Engel and Franz Pfefer, committed the robbery-murder (with chloroform) of the shoe manufacturer Josef Merstallinger, succeeding only in obtaining a few hundred kroner the victim had on him. The upshot of the murder was the arrest of Johann Richter who was subsequently sentenced to 12 years at hard labor because he had printed 50,000 copies of a leaflet which the police had been



able to seize before he could distribute a single copy. The Radical Party now took on a new image as a party of robbers and murderers and were openly opposed by the moderate faction of the Social Democratic Party. Seven months passed before the robbery-murder trial of Engel and Pfefer took place, beginning on March 9, 1883, and lasting until March 23. Both of the defendants were sentenced to 15 years each at hard labor. A colleague of Pfefer named Berndt, who had acted as the crown witness, received two years in prison. It was also demonstrated at the trial that the Radical Party as an organization was not connected with the crime. As a member of the Radical Party, Peukert was charged along with the party itself, as being an accomplice in the crime of Engel and Pfefer. Peukert was the only member of the Radical Party who availed himself of the opportunity to speak at the trial and he delivered a long and eloquent speech on the treacherous manner in which the trial had been conducted. The conclusion of the trial marked the end of the Radical Party as a Party, it now became transformed into a group bent on a policy of terrorism.<sup>29</sup>

After the trial the crescendo of violence was stepped up in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, which was followed immediately by the arrest of hundreds of radicals and the censoring of the radical press. Prison sentences of 15 months were given out to those who demonstrated, protesting the more stringent measures handed down by the government against the radicals.

In April 1883 the shoemakers union in Vienna had its treasury seized by the police who claimed that the union leaders were participants in radical actions. The workers gathered in front of their union hall to protest what they considered to be an illegal act on the part of the police. The government tried to break up the demonstration with peaceful methods, but when these failed they called in cavalry to restore peace. Finally the treasury was returned to the union and the laws which the government had enacted against the unions were annulled.

This was followed by a large workers' demonstration on the Schottenring in Vienna protesting police practices and methods which the workers considered to be arbitrary, capricious, and even brutal, especially in regard to the imprisonment of workers. A bloody clash resulted between the police and the workers and it was necessary to call in the military to restore order. Many of the demonstrators were sentenced to the customary 15 months in prison. It was in this atmosphere, of

violent confrontation between workers and police, that the "propaganda by deed" finally captured the minds of the workers, who were now more willing to turn to conspiratorial methods and secret organizations. They were of the opinion that the ineffectiveness of legal methods of protest, which could easily be broken up by police, had been amply demonstrated and it was time to move on to different and more violent tactics.

A secret meeting of the German-speaking anarchist groups was held in St. Gallen in August 1883. The conferees came out in favor of the small group and against the idea of a large international organization, deciding that the small group would be less difficult for the police spies to infiltrate. They also resolved to promote the spread of anarchist propaganda in Germany and Austria and in their struggle against the ruling class to employ all possible methods and all available weapons, admonishing the peasants in their huts and the workers in the factories to join together into groups of two or three people, telling them that two people working together secretly could accomplish that which a thousand men working in the open could not. Small secret meetings were to be the order of the day in the cities of Germany and Austria. They declared that every movement which attempted to cultivate the state in any form was their avowed enemy. They stated dogmatically that they could never hope to win the struggle against the state unless they employed all methods at their disposal in the struggle.

The meeting in St. Gallen was highly significant; there the most violent anarchist crimes of the next few years were planned. What transpired at the conference was known to the authorities because at least two of those present, Schröder and Kaufmann, were in the pay of the Berlin police. Also attending this conference were several anarchists who would soon undertake a series of anarchist crimes which would shock and outrage the entire world, Hermann Stellmacher, Anton Kammerer, and Michael Kumics. Although the Berlin police were aware of what was going to happen they did nothing to stop these heinous crimes. Evidently the German government was more interested in the propaganda value than in protecting the innocent victims of the crimes.<sup>30</sup>

Soon after the meeting in Switzerland a series of violent acts occurred—precipitated by anarchists who had attended the St. Gallen conference—which shocked even those in the workers' movement for whose benefit they supposedly had been committed.

On October 22, 1883, the pharmacist Lienhard was murdered in Strassburg. During the same evening that this murder took place, a soldier named Adels, who was on guard duty, was severely beaten and left for dead. Before he died he related that he had been attacked by four unknown assailants. In Stuttgart on November 23 of the same year the robbery-murder of the banker Heilbronner occurred. Three men entered the bank about six in the afternoon. Heilbronner was alone except for an acquaintance with whom he had been talking. Both men were beaten about the head with severe blows; Heilbronner dying and his friend receiving a severe skull fracture. The robbers seized some gold and bonds and fled.

A short time after this Michael Kumics was arrested and charged with the murders in Strassburg and Stuttgart. In Switzerland Kumics had been active in an anarchist group in St. Gallen and had taken part in the smuggling of anarchist literature into Germany. He had also taken part in the St. Gallen meeting held in August. The evidence against him was overwhelming. It was demonstrated beyond a shadow of doubt that he was one of the people responsible for the crimes in Strassburg and Stuttgart. Police were able to implicate Kumics in the cashing of bonds which had been stolen at Stuttgart. The funds received from the bonds had been used for the promoting of anarchism so the robbery-murder had a two-fold purpose, to strike fear into the hearts of the bourgeois, and to obtain money needed to finance the propagation of anarchist ideas.

On December 15, 1883, Vienna Police Commissioner Hlubek was shot. He had attended a workers meeting in Florisdorf, an industrial suburb of Vienna; on his way home he was followed by several men who had taken part in the meeting, among whom were Johann Ondra and Ferdinand Schaffhauser, both members of the Radical Party. As Hlubek approached a crossroad a shot rang out from the darkness and the police commissioner fell dead, with the assailant fleeing into the night. It was clear that neither Ondra nor Schaffhauser had anything to do with the murder, but nevertheless they were apprehended by the police and after months of investigation brought to trial. At the conclusion of the trial Schaffhauser was given a sentence of two years and Ondra was set free. Even though the police had not been able to establish the identity of the murderer they set out on a relentless persecution of the Radical Party.

Goaded by the mounting evidence that the murders in Strassburg, Stuttgart, and Vienna had been committed by anarchists who had lived in Switzerland, Swiss authorities started to move against the anarchists. This is important because the anarchist groups had been using Switzerland as a base of operations to smuggle propaganda into Germany and Austria. The German and Austrian anarchists had also used Switzerland as a place where congresses could be held and where future deeds to be carried out in Germany and Austria could be planned in relative safety. Late in 1883 Swiss officials made a feeble effort against the anarchists by searching a number of homes of known anarchists, seizing letters and quantities of printed literature. Public opinion in Switzerland became outraged concerning anarchist activities. Realizing that the anarchists posed an immediate threat to Switzerland itself, Swiss officials, for all practical purposes, were soon going to close down completely anarchist operations in Switzerland. This will be discussed below in this chapter.

Naturally the bourgeois press made great copy out of the atrocious acts committed in Strassburg, Stuttgart, and Vienna. The Social Democratic Party did everything in its power to demonstrate that they were in opposition to such acts of violence. Peukert, editor of Die Zukunft, was denounced by the moderate faction of the Social Democratic Party in Austria and held responsible for the crimes which had been committed.

The most outrageous of the series of anarchist crimes occurred on January 10, 1884, in Vienna, after which not many Austrian workers had much stomach left for "propaganda by deed." At 5:30 on the afternoon of January 10 two men entered a home at No. 55 Mariahilferstrasse, which was also the place of business of the money changer Heinrich Eisert, saying that they wanted to exchange some Russian rubles. When Eisert turned around to assist them they threw sand into his eyes and hit him on the head with a heavy blow. Eisert was only stunned by the blow and tried to flee, but one of the assailants caught up with him on the stairway and hit him in the head with an axe, inflicting such injury that he died 12 days later. While this was going on, in a neighboring room separated from the place of business by only a glass wall, sat Eisert's two sons who were nine and 11 years old respectively and their French tutor, 65-year-old Karoline Berger, observing all that had taken place.

One of the assailants, not wanting to leave any witnesses to their nefarious deed, went into the room and beat in the heads of the three with an axe. The nine-year-old died immediately, the 11-year-old died 14 days later, but Karoline Berger later recovered from her wounds.

In addition to the two men inside the place of business a third man had remained outside, acting as a lookout. Once the murders were committed, he came inside and assisted the other two in picking up all the money they could find, in all about 3,755 gulder in gold, and 4,000 gulder in bonds.

A month later in Budapest a young houseboy was apprehended while trying to pass one of the bonds stolen in the robbery. He informed the police that he had purchased the bond from a 20-year-old bookkeeper named Jonas Julius Fried, a precocious young man who had already traveled through Russia and the United States. Fried was a member of the Radical Party in Budapest. The police questioned him and shortly afterward picked up 16 more members of the radical circle in Budapest. Investigation showed that Fried had obtained the bonds from Hermann Prager, editor of the Budapest newspaper Die Radikale. Prager told police he had gotten the bonds from a man named Koditek, who related that the bonds had been sent to him, wrapped in newspaper, from an unknown person in Vienna. Later it was revealed that the anonymous sender was Anton Kammerer. The bonds were sent to Budapest to aid the families of members of the Radical Party who had been imprisoned and also to assist in the financing of Die Radikale.

Fried was a bookkeeper in a bank and Prager had entrusted him with the job of cashing the bonds. It appears that Fried was aware that the bonds had come from Kammerer, and that Koditek was telling the truth when he said he did not know who had sent them to him, because Koditek wrote to Peukert asking if he had sent them, but Peukert replied that he had no knowledge of any bonds.

The next in the series of anarchist crimes occurred between 7:00 and 8:00 on the morning of January 25, 1884, when the police agent Blöch was shot as he walked to police headquarters past a stone quarry situated between Mühlshüttel and Florisdorf. The assailant went through Blöch's pockets, taking his notebook, revolver and watch. A number of men who had seen the shooting ran after the assailant who fled into the stone

quarry where some men were at work. When the assailant saw that the men had him cornered on all sides he shot and wounded one of the workers, named Meloun, in the foot, but to no avail for the superior number of men seized and overpowered him and turned him over to the police. A police search of the assailant's pockets produced a metal-box-bomb which contained two and one half kilograms of dynamite which was not fused. In his coat pockets, in addition to the bomb, he had two revolvers, a quantity of ammunition, a knife, and two bottles filled with a liquid used to apply and to remove a false beard.<sup>31</sup>

At his arraignment the assailant said he had killed Blöch in the interest of anarchism because of what the police had done to the families of many workers. The Vienna police were unable to identify the assailant until the police in Dresden sent a picture which identified him as Herman Stellmacher (1855-1884). Soon the Swiss police sent information on Stellmacher's activities in Zürich as editor of Freiheit. At the same time the Swiss police sent information that Anton Kammerer (1816-1884) was a very close friend of Stellmacher and that Kammerer had been using a passport with the name of Arnold Otter, deceased brother of the anarchist Victor Otter.

A police net was laid for Kammerer and on February 28, 1884 he was set upon by police as he was about to enter Austria. It was not an easy matter to subdue him for Kammerer was young and strong and fought desperately, wounding three policemen with his revolver before they were finally able to hold him down. While he was lying on the floor and as the policemen were tying him he was able to get off one more shot which struck the man kneeling on his chest in the thigh. On his person Kammerer had, in addition to the revolver, a file sharpened to a point and two kilograms of dynamite and some fuses.<sup>32</sup>

At the time of his arrest Stellmacher was 30 years old. He was a married man and had two children, aged four and 18 months. By trade he was a shoemaker and had been born in Grottkau, Regierungsbezirk, Oppeln, in Prussian Silesia. He had served with distinction in the military, achieving the rank of non-commissioned officer, but was accused of the abusive treatment of subordinates and was punished. In Switzerland he lived in Vevey where he served 45 days in prison and loss of civil rights for five years when he was found guilty of swindling. In Vevey he was a member of the Arbeiterverein but was thrown out because of his anarchist tendencies. His last place of

residence in Switzerland was Flunters bei Zürich, Zürichbergstrasse 12.

Those who knew Stellmacher during the three years he lived in Switzerland said he was an impudent and brutal man. A friend of Rudolf Rocker's described Stellmacher as an austere and reserved person who gave little outward indication of his inner thoughts and feelings. Stellmacher was very obstinate, dogmatic and easily incited to acts of violence. He once threw a writer for Der Sozialdemokrat into a lake by Zürich for writing an article which depicted the anarchists in a bad light. On the other hand he was also capable of acts of great self-sacrifice and gave himself openly to his associates, who for the most part did not personally like him. Stellmacher spent very little time at home with his wife, who was from Bern, but was usually gone from morning until evening. When he was home he shut himself up in his own room which was filled with anarchist and socialist newspapers. He was unable to read French so his wife had to translate the French papers into German for him. He also held secret conferences at his home which were attended by his German comrades and which lasted until late into the night.<sup>33</sup>

Some socialists have attempted, without success, to prove that Stellmacher was a police spy. Evidence exists to prove that Stellmacher tried to obtain a position as a police spy, but he claimed that he only wanted to infiltrate the police organization. Late in 1882 or early 1883 Stellmacher wrote two letters to A. Kaltenbach; Police Chief in Mülhausen, offering his services as a spy. He offered to send copies of Der Sozialdemokrat as they were printed and to turn in certain unnamed people who were distributing literature in Germany. On January 13, 1883, he wrote to the Austro-Hungarian Minister in Bern, Baron von Ottenfels, offering his services as a spy. He said he would give the name of an Austrian who had worked as an editor for Freiheit during the period July 8 to August 12, 1882. He also related that he would reveal the names of the individuals who were involved in the operation of smuggling Freiheit into Austria, including the routes they were using. In addition he would send copies of Der Sozialdemokrat as soon as they were printed, and would also give him a list of names of the people who were involved in smuggling it to Austria as well as the route they were using. In a post script to the letter he cautioned Baron von Ottenfels not to send his reply in an envelope bearing the ministerial seal because it would prove to be very embarrassing to him. Stellmacher evidently thought his military service would

demonstrate to von Ottenfels his sincerity so he signed the letter: H. Stellmacher, Cordonnier. Res. - Unteroffizier d. sächs. 2. Grenadierregiments 101.<sup>34</sup>

Later at his trial Stellmacher did not offer any explanation for these three letters. The logical explanation is that Stellmacher was probably sincere in his attempts at seeking a position as a police spy. The letters were written only a couple of weeks after Most had dumped him as editor of Freiheit and moved the paper to New York, a move which had been strenuously opposed by Stellmacher, Stellmacher appears to have been bitter over this rejection and sought revenge. To support his family he needed money, which was no longer coming in once he lost his position as editor of Freiheit. There is no evidence to indicate that either Kaltenbach or Ottenfels ever considered Stellmacher's offer. On the other hand perhaps Stellmacher's offer was not sincere, but only an attempt to obtain some quick money, while giving out as little information as possible. If his offer was sincere, it appears that it was rejected, and if this is the case it could have had the effect of increasing his bitterness against the bourgeois and aristocratic elements of society who were his original enemies. Whatever his intentions, along with Anton Kammerer he went on a spree of vicious murders.

Anton Kammerer was born in Florisdorf bei Vienna in 1861. On December 31, 1882, he received the news that he had been assigned to the infantry regiment commanded by Freiherr von Bauer. He was scheduled to go on active duty on April 1, 1883, but before the date came to report he fled to Switzerland as a result of socialist activities in which he had been involved in Korneuburg. Several weeks passed and he did not report for military service, so on March 26, 1883, Kammerer's name was added to the list of regimental deserters.

In Switzerland he worked as a book binder, first in Thun and later in Bern. In Bern he soon associated himself with an anarchist group and was involved, among other things, in the smuggling of Freiheit into Germany and Austria. Kammerer was the ideal type of person to carry out acts of terrorism; he had boundless energy, a strong physique, and a bitter hatred of society. A friend of Rudolf Rocker, who knew Kammerer, described him as young, fanatical and unusually bold. He had a mild nature and was very helpful, often being so generous that he gave away whatever he had until he himself was left in need.<sup>35</sup>



Accompanied by several friends in October 1883 he left Bern for Mülhausen to kill the Police Chief Kaltenbach. When that proved impossible, they went to Strassburg where on October 22, 1883, they killed the pharmacist Lienhard and the soldier Adels. On November 21, 1883, they murdered the banker Heilbronner in the city of Stuttgart.

One of those traveling with Kammerer on this trip was Michael Kumics, a cabinet maker from Czernich, Slavonia, who had arrived in St. Gallen in May 1883. He immediately joined an anarchist group and worked to smuggle anarchist literature into Austria. Like Kammerer, Kumics fell under the spell of the more experienced Stellmacher who actually planned the aborted murder of Kaltenbach and the subsequent crimes in Strassburg, Stuttgart, and Vienna. An unnamed friend of Rudolf Rocker, who was acquainted with the two men, said that Kammerer and Kumics thought of anarchism as a stateless society, but that its deeper significance escaped them.

For the most part Kammerer and Kumics associated anarchism with acts of terror and violence.<sup>36</sup> Kammerer was a true believer in the cause of "propaganda by deed." In a letter written shortly before his attempt on Hlubek he wrote:

I will not rest until the last decadent stone of the capitalist society is smashed by the blows of the social revolution. Send me money as soon as possible; it will be the last time I will ask for money because I am going to sacrifice my life, and for this need the aid.<sup>37</sup>

After the murder of Hlubek, Kammerer stopped at the home of Josef Peukert in Vienna, asking Peukert to send a message to his parents. He related to Peukert that he was responsible for the acts in Strassburg and Stuttgart but that Stellmacher had planned them. Peukert claims in his memoirs that he convinced Kammerer that such acts were unfortunate for the cause of the anarchist movement. Kammerer, according to Peukert, said that he was in Vienna waiting to meet Stellmacher in order to carry out further acts of violence. When Peukert brought out the fact that such acts could be injurious to anarchism, Kammerer suggested that perhaps, he, Peukert, should meet with Stellmacher and talk about scaling down the violence. Peukert claims that Stellmacher did not want to see him. A friend of Peukert supposedly told him that Stellmacher had said that he would not be

influenced by anyone in his actions and deeds—especially not by Peukert. According to the story Stellmacher was supposed to have told Peukert's friend that Peukert was a "chatterer who was afraid to take part in such acts" and what is more Peukert was "too authoritarian" and so Stellmacher refused to meet with Peukert and talk about diminishing the violence.<sup>38</sup> This story by Peukert, that he was able to raise a doubt in Kammerer's mind about the effectiveness of "propaganda by deed," is of course unsubstantiated, but it is possible that Peukert could see the adverse effect that such crimes were having on the anarchist movement. Peukert was basically an intellectual, a speaker, and a writer and not an assassin. If he had Kammerer alone for a while, being older and more eloquent, perhaps he was able to convince Kammerer that too much violence was not a good image for the movement. On the other hand evidence will be introduced below to show that Peukert, some time after this meeting with Kammerer, was himself advocating "propaganda by deed."

Kammerer and Stellmacher were captured, tried, and executed. Since Kammerer was considered to be a military deserter he was tried by a military court. He openly admitted killing Hlubek by himself, but said he only shared in the crimes committed in Strassburg and Stuttgart and in the Eisert murders. He was found guilty and was hanged September 20, 1884.

Stellmacher, at his trial, never lost his composure even when the letters were introduced in which he offered his services as a spy to Kaltenbach and Ottenfels. He, too, was found guilty and met his fate, by hanging, with quiet dignity at 5:00 on the morning of August 6, 1884.<sup>39</sup>

A great effort was made by Most to glorify Kammerer and Stellmacher, calling them martyrs of the social revolution. Most said that their deaths would be avenged by a general blood letting. The occasions of the executions of Stellmacher and Kammerer were accompanied by large demonstrations of anarchists, especially in New York City, but also in some cities in Europe. In an eulogy delivered by Most in New York, he said that if he had one thousand Stellmachers the social revolution would be accomplished in three months.<sup>40</sup>

The radical movement in Austria never recovered from the acts of Stellmacher and Kammerer. The movement was shattered because its leaders were either in jail or exile. The violent crimes committed in Vienna resulted in a severe

repression of the radicals. On January 30, 1884, an exceptional law was passed which forbade all meetings by the radicals and made all radical organizations illegal. Radical presses were closed down and about 500 radicals, most of them family men, were forced to leave Vienna; hundreds of others were arrested. Those fortunate enough to be faced only with expulsion from Vienna went to other parts of Austria, Switzerland, France, England, and the United States. A ministerial decree declared that henceforth all anarchist crimes would be tried before a special tribunal. This decree was followed by a number of treason trials in which the defendants were given long terms of imprisonment. The radical organization in Austria was not eliminated but what remained of it was infiltrated by police spies. For all practical purposes anarchism in Austria was suppressed. The excess of violence on the part of a few had caused such a general feeling of outrage among the people that the government had moved quickly to end the movement in Austria.

The policy of "propaganda by deed" soon made itself felt in Switzerland, but a police crack-down there dealt a severe blow to the German anarchist movement. Berlin Police President von Madai noted what was becoming apparent to Swiss officials, that all of the anarchists involved in the acts of terror had spent some time in Switzerland, often using the country as a haven for rest, recuperation, and planning between acts of terrorism.<sup>41</sup>

The movement by the Swiss Bundesrat against the anarchists started on March 22, 1884, with the expulsion of a number of noted anarchists. The initial expulsion came as the result of a meeting of a Freiheit group which took place February 14, 1884 in Zürich. The theme of this meeting was the recent crack-down in Austria against the anarchists. Peukert spoke out at the meeting glorifying Stellmacher saying that acts such as his would hasten the day of the social revolution. He went on to point out that thanks to dynamite they were not able to kill thousands with a single blow and could even paralyze an entire artillery regiment. The compositor Moritz Schultze (b. 1860 Gottbus in Prussia) at this meeting said it was necessary to use all possible means to spread the anarchist movement.<sup>42</sup>

Sufficient numbers of German anarchists were expelled from Switzerland in 1884 and 1885 that Switzerland could no longer be used as a route for smuggling Freiheit and Rebell into Germany and Austria. The anarchist cells which had been formed around 1880 in Switzerland for the smuggling of Freiheit were

broken up, as was the Jura Federation itself. Le Révolté left the country for Paris where it published its first issue in that city on April 12, 1885. Anarchists who tried to enter Switzerland were detained for questioning and subsequently shipped out of the country. Not all anarchists were forced to leave Switzerland, but a sufficient number of the leaders and rank-and-file followers had to leave so that Switzerland could no longer be considered a refuge for anarchists.<sup>43</sup>

Another dimension of the crack-down on the anarchists was the amount of cooperation between the police in Switzerland and other nations. International police cooperation, especially between Germany, Austria and Russia in matters relating to anarchism started in the late 1870's. With the series of violent crimes in 1883-1884 the Swiss police became more cooperative; it was obvious to them that violence planned in Switzerland could just as easily be carried out there as in Germany and Austria. The police official in Berlin, Gustav von Hake, who after 1885 became Police Chief of Frankfurt-am-Main, worked in close cooperation with the Swiss Procurator-General, Eduard Müller, who was responsible for the expulsion of anarchists from Switzerland. Of course the guiding hand behind von Hake was Bismarck.<sup>44</sup>

The soundness of the new Swiss policy against anarchists was demonstrated in the summer of 1884 when an anarchist congress met in St. Gallen. The main topic discussed at this congress was the smuggling of anarchist literature into Germany and Austria. This congress was well attended by the Germans but more importantly it was attended by the Hungarian shoemaker Karl Halbedl (b. 1847), who had already set up a laboratory in Switzerland and was producing explosives. This was the first such laboratory in Switzerland. The ramifications such a laboratory could have on the international status of Switzerland were of course evident to the Swiss.<sup>45</sup>

Naturally the new Swiss policy of expulsion was not well received in the anarchist quarter; it could be expected that a disgruntled anarchist would soon resort to the use of "propaganda by deed" in Switzerland. And so it happened that on January 25, 1885, the President of the Federal Assembly, Schenk of Bern, received a mysterious letter announcing a plan to blow up the Federal Palace while the Federal Assembly was in session. The anonymous writer of this letter revealed that 17 men were prepared to carry out the plan and that they had in their

possession enough dynamite to raze all of Bern to the ground. The writer said that the explosives had already been put in position in the Federal Palace and could be set off when an order was given. Furthermore as a sequel to blowing up the Palace, von Madai in Berlin and a number of police officials in Hamburg were going to be murdered. In all, four such threatening letters were sent during the period of January 25 to March 13, 1885. The first letter came from St. Gallen while the others were post-marked Frauenfeld and Winterthur. It was unknown to Swiss officials whether these letters pointed to the existence of a real plot or whether they were the work of a crank. They had to work on the assumption that a plot was in the making for a number of dynamitings had already taken place in Europe and it would have been gross negligence on their part if they had not taken the threat seriously. Swiss officials proceeded to round up and question all known anarchists; homes of suspicious people were searched, but nothing was turned up on the alleged plot to blow up the Federal Palace. Naturally Freiheit had to get involved with a statement of over-kill by saying that they "would blow up the Palace and sow the land on which it stood with salt."<sup>46</sup>

An extensive investigation of the alleged plot was undertaken by the Procurator-General, Müller. The results of his preliminary investigation completed on March 25 tended to point in the direction of a real plot, but he had no idea who had sent the letters, or who was involved in the plot. It was only by accident that the identity of the writer of the anonymous letters was discovered. On November 13, 1884, a young man named Wilhelm Huff (1858-1885) had been arrested in St. Gallen for allegedly stealing a pair of shoes in the Mohrin hotel. When this charge could not be proved he was set free after being detained for 12 hours. At the time it was the custom in some of the Swiss cantons to grant a person, who had been imprisoned on a charge that could not be proven, an indemnity. Huff, however, had used the name of von Strauss in registering at the hotel and in using the alias automatically forfeited his right to the usual allowance. He wrote several violent letters to local officials demanding payment of the 50 francs which he claimed they owed him; this the police steadfastly refused to do. Unfortunately for Huff the police kept the letters he had written, and when Müller began his investigation, facsimiles of the letters threatening to blow up the Federal Palace were circulated among the police agencies and Herr Maggion, Commandant of the Police in St. Gallen, to whom Huff had addressed his letters demanding payment of the indemnity, identified the handwriting as that belonging to Huff.

Handwriting experts soon corroborated the claims of Maggion, and Huff was arrested on March 31 in Heiden. He immediately repudiated the charge of writing the letters threatening to blow up the Federal Palace, but his answers were contradictory and he was already considered to be a suspicious person, so he was remitted to prison pending further inquiry.<sup>47</sup>

The Swiss authorities knew very little about Huff so Müller contacted the German police who sent the following information on him. He was born in Freiburg in Breisgau in 1858 and had received a solid elementary education. In 1873 he went to Schopfheim, in the Duchy of Baden, to learn the trade of hair-dressing. After an 18-month period of learning the trade he took a job in Ludwigsburg, where he remained for a year and a half, before traveling on to Tübingen where he stayed 14 months. Then, with the money he had saved from these two jobs, he traveled through Northern Germany, Southern Russia, Sweden, England, France and Switzerland. In 1877 he went to Switzerland and worked in a series of places: Rastatt, Basel, St. Immer, Lausanne, Geneva, Bern, Bad Schinznach, then back to Bad Schinznach, and back to Rorschach, before going to St. Gallen, and to Heiden where he was arrested.<sup>48</sup>

Huff was well-educated and fluent in several languages. He also wrote well and intelligently, using the pen name von Strauss and published contributions in magazines for hairdressers, Friseur (Leipzig) and the Neue Coiffeur. On political subjects he wrote articles which appeared in Weiländer, Rorschacherboten, Ostschweizerische Wochenblatt, St. Gallen Volksblatt, Volkszeitung (Zürich), and the Unterhaltungsblatt (Rorschach).<sup>49</sup>

He also told different people various stories about his early life, picturing himself as a student, a seminarian, a teacher in Baden who had lost his position because of his views, and even a doctor of philosophy, which he had told his girl friend Emilie. At the same time he carried on a correspondence with five or six different girls, promising his sole love to each of them. His letters were in a very correct, pretentious literary style, interspersed with poetry, Latin quotations, and nice phrases designed to appeal to the feminine heart. In his letters he seemed more interested in vaunting his learning than in proving his love.<sup>50</sup>

The investigation of Huff was concluded on May 13, when

he declared that he had not written the threatening letters regarding the plan to blow up the Federal Palace. He was then sent back to his cell, but half an hour later the judge wanted to confront him with additional evidence presented by another anarchist. A jailer was sent to his cell to get him and found him dead; he had hanged himself on the door of the cell, which led many people at the time to believe that he probably knew much more than he had admitted.<sup>51</sup>

Müller's investigation pointed out the danger that unchecked anarchism could have for Switzerland. On the other hand he found that the greater share of the workers were repulsed by "propaganda by deed" and Mostian tactics, and that some had even left the anarchist movement as a result of these differences. The number of people who favored Most and the violent tactics was declining rapidly. Müller wisely did not recommend the complete suppression of Freiheit, Revolte, or Rebell, because he said if they were forbidden other titles would soon take their place. He also said that it would be impossible to keep anarchist newspapers from circulating in Switzerland unless they resorted to a complete search of the mails which would be very costly and time consuming and which would require numerous additional policemen. What Müller did oppose was the violence of the anarchists. Switzerland, he said, would no longer be a haven for murderers, robbers, dynamiters, bombers, or for people who wanted to use it as a base from which the dissemination of anarchist propaganda could be sent into Germany and Austria.<sup>52</sup>

Thus were the effects of the adoption of a policy of "propaganda by deed" and the subsequent crimes committed in the name of such a policy: suppression of anarchism by both the Swiss and the Austrian governments. In Germany this had already been accomplished in 1878 with the passage of the Socialist Law, but now more stringent measures were called for and a special law was enacted to cover the use of dynamite and the renewal of the Socialist Law was guaranteed.

The violence preached by Most in the columns of Freiheit did not go unnoticed in Germany. Every act of "propaganda by deed" was highly praised by Most. On the occasion of the dynamiting of the Frankfurt police headquarters he said "bravo!"<sup>53</sup> When Hlubek was murdered he exclaimed "Long live propaganda by deed!"<sup>54</sup> Following the murder of Blöch he declared "Long live anarchist terrorism!"<sup>55</sup> The weekly pronouncements of

Most were duly noted by Berlin Chief of Police von Madai, who continued to claim that the Social Democrats and the anarchists were both revolutionary groups; the only difference between them being the tactics they wanted to employ to accomplish the revolution. Von Madai noted that Most emphasized the use of any tactics necessary to bring about the social revolution as quickly as possible, while on the other hand the Social Democrats were willing to wait and to take a longer, slower, but surer road. To substantiate this claim von Madai brought out the examples of Georg von Vollmar (1850-1922), who had often said that he and his associates stood for revolution, and Karl Grillenberger (1848-1897), who in a meeting held in Zürich, had declared that they should train their followers in the use of weapons so that in the event that their peaceful methods should fail they could resort to more violent tactics. On the basis of these observations, von Madai noted that on the surface it appeared that Freiheit and Der Sozialdemokrat opposed each other, but actually below the surface both of them stood for revolution, Most for immediate revolution, and the Social Democrats for a gradual one.<sup>56</sup> Feelings of this sort among the German police reflected what was probably the official policy dictated by Bismarck. The repercussions such opinions had on the willingness to suppress socialism in Germany cannot be overlooked. The part violence played in the renewal of the Socialist Law had already been referred to in the previous chapter, and will be treated in more detail in the next chapter.

In general the articles in Freiheit advocating violence and terrorism had the effect of frightening the bourgeois and aristocratic elements of society, at whom most of the articles were aimed. These segments of society possessed the power to demand protection and repressive measures against such fanaticism. Being frightened out of their wits they were not about to quibble over the differences between the Social Democratic Party and the anarchists. All of the violent articles in Freiheit were voraciously devoured by the police, and read with great trepidation by the people at whom the crimes were aimed. Many of the articles written by Most started with "Shake, you dogs" and the "dogs" were shaking, but in the end the opposite of the desired effect was achieved.<sup>57</sup>

The effect of terrorism on one member of the royal family was recorded by Friedrich von Holstein (1837-1909) in a diary entry for August 27, 1884:



The Crown Princess is terrified of attempts on her life. She recently discussed with somebody in great detail the further security measures which might be taken. She demanded a considerable increase in the police estimates and the formulation of a large and efficient secret police.<sup>58</sup>

The government reaped great propoganda benefits as well by releasing to the press alleged attempts against the life of the aged Emperor, some of which had enough substance to them that they were investigated in detail by the police. One interesting example is the case of the young man from Koblenz who was arrested during the Emperor's visit to Ems in June 1884. The young man was armed with a knife and a loaded revolver. The police were unable to prove what he intended to do with the weapons, but the newspapers assumed that he intended to assassinate the Emperor.<sup>59</sup> In general the press associated any act of violence with the anarchists; for example, the Münchener Allgemeine Zeitung reported a story of a man who entered the shop of a money changer in Munich with the pretense that he wanted to do business, but when the proprietor turned around, the man fired two shots at the store owner, neither of which hit their mark. The assailant then ran from the place of business but was apprehended outside. The writer of this article associated this apparent attempt robbery with the murder of Eisert, the Vienna money changer. More than likely the attempted robbery in Munich was not anarchist inspired, as was the Eisert crime, but the confusion in the public mind is understandable.<sup>60</sup>

Another widely circulated story was that the Emperor, who had planned to visit Wiesbaden in the late spring of 1884, called off his visit because police had warned him that a woman with a "deep sonorous voice" was traveling from New York to Bremen with four trunks which contained explosives which were going to be used in a plot to blow up the Emperor in Wiesbaden. This story was taken seriously by the police who maintained a close watch on the passenger list of the North German Lloyd ship Necker, which sailed from New York to Bremen, but they did not find the four trunks containing dynamite or the woman with the "deep sonorous voice" which were supposed to be on board the ship. Threatening letters from the United States were not uncommon during this period so when a mysterious attentat (assassination attempt) was about to occur it was often rumored that it was coming from the United States. Stories of this sort, whether true or contrived, achieved their purpose of frightening

the Emperor, the aristocracy, and the bourgeoisie. They were widely circulated in the popular press and there was little reason why they should be doubted by the German people, because Most and his cohorts were proclaiming that deeds of violence would occur.<sup>61</sup>

It did not take many terrorist acts to create a general feeling of uneasiness among the people who were intended victims of the crimes. It was no secret that those in positions of authority or those who possessed substantial amounts of material goods were the prospective victims. The mayor's home in Walsenhausen was completely demolished by two bombs; two policemen in Wattenschied were shot; in Erfeld a factory owner was stabbed to death. These crimes occurred in a three-month period from December 1884 to March 1885.<sup>62</sup> These were not the only crimes which took place; some even more sensational have already been discussed and some which shocked the imagination of everyone will be discussed in the next chapter.

The adoption at the London Congress of 1881 of "propaganda by deed" as the official policy that anarchism was going to follow was a disaster. It sent anarchism down a futile road from which, in the case of Germany, it did not recover until after 1890 and then only slowly. The leadership of the anarchist movement in Germany during the 1880's was either imprisoned, executed, or forced into exile as a result of trying to follow "propaganda by deed." Once the leaders were gone it was impossible to hope that any sizeable movement could be developed in Germany. "Propaganda by deed" frightened the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie into a state of hysteria which played into the hands of the German government, in that it assured the continuation of the repressive measures against the socialists. "Propaganda by deed" spelled the end of a flourishing anarchist movement in Austria, and eliminated Switzerland as a refuge and base of operations.

"Propaganda by deed" left a permanent stain on anarchism. It also encouraged actions by agents provocateurs. The London Congress assumed that "propaganda by deed" would find its greatest reception among workers, but the murder of the Eisert children generated a feeling of revulsion among many workers who might otherwise have been receptive to anarchist ideals. Anarchism, in the mind of the public, was mainly characterized by acts of violence. Still another adverse effect of "propaganda by deed" was that many criminals started to think

of themselves as anarchists, and the anarchists were reluctant to protest against such claims because they believed that the criminals were to an extent justified in their actions because they were victims of the society which they themselves sought to destroy. The bourgeois press had traditionally presented the anarchists as criminals and maniacs and now they were supplied with ample evidence to prove their assertions. "Propaganda by deed" was essentially negative, adding nothing to anarchism, while at the same time placing a powerful lever in the hands of the German government which could be used against the workers' movement.

### Notes

1. Avant-Garde (August 12, 1878); (August 26, 1878); (September 9, 1878).

2. Le Révolté, No. 18 (October 18, 1879); No. 19 (November 1, 1879). The last issue of the Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne appeared on March 15, 1878; for six years it had been the leading organ of the Bakuninists. On May 1, 1878, James Guillaume left Switzerland for Paris and dropped out of the anarchist movement. He was soon followed by others who were anarchist leaders, such as Paul Brousse and Andrea Costa.

3. Le Révolté, No. 17 (October 17, 1880).

4. Serreaux was a pseudonym of Egede Silleaux. La Revolution Sociale, which was the first anarchist paper to appear in France after the Commune, was printed with funds provided by the Paris Prefect of Police. Serreaux was at the same time, both a police spy and an agent provocateur. La Revolution Sociale ceased publication in September 1881 when Louis Andrieux left his position as Paris Prefect of Police. The first widely publicized act of violence in France, an attempt to blow up a statue of Louis Thiers at Saint-Germain in June 1881 was planned by Andrieux and Serreaux. Louis Andrieux, Souvenirs d'un Prefect de Police (Paris, 1885), I, pp. 337-344.

5. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Prolitariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, p. 67.

6. Le Révolté, No. 11 (July 23, 1881). For the events leading up to the congress see: Nettlau, Anarchisten und

Sozialrevolutionäre, pp. 167-186. Accounts of the congress are given in: Freiheit, No. 30 (July 23, 1881), p. 1; No. 31 (July 30, 1881), p. 3; No. 33 (August 13, 1881), p. 3; Le Révolté, No. 10 (July 9, 1881), p. 1; No. 11 (July 23, 1881), pp. 1-4; No. 12 (August 6, 1881), pp. 1-3; No. 13 (August 20, 1881), pp. 1-3; No. 14 (September 3, 1881), p. 1. In both of these accounts the delegates are identified by number. Identification of the names of the delegates and an account of the minutes of the congress are found in: Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, pp. 187-231. An account of the congress by a participant is: Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Prolitarians aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, pp. 66-73.

7. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Prolitarians aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, p. 70.

8. Le Révolté, No. 13 (August 20, 1881), pp. 1-3.

9. Ibid., No. 11 (July 23, 1881), pp. 1-4.

10. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Prolitarians aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, pp. 68-71.

11. Le Révolté, No. 11 (July 23, 1881), pp. 1-2.

12. Ibid., No. 8 (June 10, 1882), pp. 1-3; No. 9 (June 24, 1882), pp. 1-3; No. 10 (July 8, 1882), pp. 2-3.

13. Ibid., No. 13 (August 19, 1882), pp. 2-3.

14. Ibid., No. 11 (July 21, 1883), p. 2; No. 12 (August 4, 1883), pp. 1-3; No. 13 (August 18, 1881), pp. 1-2.

15. A partial listing of articles of this nature contained in Freiheit is as follows: "Durch Terrorismus zur Freiheit," No. 50 (December 11, 1880), p. 1; P. Knauer, "Die Taktik der revolutionären Arbeiter-Partei," No. 29 (July 10, 1881), p. 1; E. Nathan-Ganz, "Die Chemie und die Revolution," No. 33 (August 13, 1881), p. 2; Publicca, "Die Propaganda durch die That," No. 42 (October 15, 1881), p. 1; "Die Propaganda durch die That," No. 38 (November 11, 1882), p. 2; "Wissenschaftliche Winke," No. 3 (January 20, 1883), pp. 3-4, and No. 5 (February 9, 1883), pp. 1-2; "Praktische Winke," No. 15 (April 14, 1883), p. 1; "Dynamit," No. 18 (May 5, 1883), p. 1; "Ein Salon-Blatt über Dynamitpolitik," No. 19 (May 12, 1883), pp. 1-2, "Das

Nitroglyzerin," No. 26 (June 30, 1883), pp. 1-2; "Zur Propaganda der That," No. 47 (November 24, 1883), pp. 1-2; "Revolutionäre Kriegskunst," No. 52 (December 29, 1883), p. 2; "Zur Propaganda der That," No. 2 (January 12, 1884), p. 1; "Zur Propaganda der That," No. 7 (February 16, 1884), pp. 1-2; "Neue Kriegstaktik der Revolution," No. 10 (March 8, 1884), p. 2; "Die Propaganda der That," No. 23 (June 7, 1884), p. 1; Also on the masthead of Freiheit starting on March 25, 1882, was carried the admonition "Gegen die Tyrannen sind alle Mittle gesetzlich." Evidently someone pointed out to Most that the word gesetzlich had no meaning for an anarchist and it was later changed to berechtigt. In a letter of November 5, 1881, Sebastian Trunk proudly proclaimed to Victor Dave: "Today Freiheit is what it should be. A newspaper that is completely for the revolutionary worker." Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Polizeipräsidium, Tit. 94, Lit. D., Nr. 398 (9582), "Victor Joseph Louis Dave 1880-1907)."

16. "Dynamite," Freiheit, No. 18 (May 5, 1883), p. 1.

17. "Neue Kriegstaktik der Revolution," Ibid., No. 10 (March 8, 1884), p. 2.

18. Ibid.

19. "Die Propaganda der That," Ibid., No. 23 (June 7, 1884), p. 1.

20. "Hödel und Nobiling," Ibid., No. 34 (August 23, 1844), p. 2.

21. Ibid.

22. "Justizmorderei," Freiheit, No. 40 (October 4, 1884), pp. 1-2.

23. "Mord contra Mord," Ibid., No. 11 (March 14, 1885), p. 3.

24. Ibid.

25. Some examples of articles which appeared in Freiheit in the first half of 1885 are: "Zur Propaganda der That," No. 1 (January 3, 1885), p. 2; "Theorie und Praxis der revolutionären Kriegswissenschaft," No. 3 (January 17, 1885),

p. 1; "Kriegswissenschaftliche Praxis," No. 4 (January 24, 1885), p. 2; "Zittere Kanaille," No. 4 (January 24, 1885), p. 1; "Taktische Winke," No. 4 (January 24, 1885), pp. 1-2; "Dynamit," No. 5 (January 31, 1885), pp. 1-2; "Bomben," No. 6 (February 7, 1885), p. 2; "Stoff und Kraft," No. 7 (February 14, 1885), p. 2; "Spreng-Uebungen," No. 8 (February 21, 1885), pp. 1-2; "Einfache Chemie," No. 10 (March 10, 1885), p. 2; "Mord contra Mord," No. 11 (March 14, 1885), p. 3; "Schliessbaumwolle und Nitroge-latin," No. 12 (March 21, 1885), pp. 1-2; "Knallquecksilber," No. 13 (March 28, 1885), pp. 2-3; "Kampf mit allen Mitteln," No. 14 (April 4, 1885), p. 2; "Weitere chemische Winke," No. 26 (June 27, 1885), p. 2; "Dynamit," No. 27 (July 4, 1885), p. 1; "Der Propaganda der That," No. 30 (July 25, 1885), p. 1; After this there is a marked change in Freiheit, as noted in the previous chapter, the number of articles advocating violence practically ceases.

Ironically Revolutionäre Kriegswissenschaft was published at a time when Most was already starting to doubt the usefulness of "propaganda by deed" as an instrument to bring about the social revolution. Although he does not renounce "propaganda by deed," Most's actions and words in Freiheit point out that by the middle of 1885 he had lost his confidence in violence. This facet of Most's character was not brought out into the open, at the time, even though many of his close friends suspected it, until Alexander Berkman's assassination attempt on the life of Henry Fricke in 1892.

26. A complete discussion of Der Rebell and its place in the German anarchist movement will be taken up below in relation to the Bruderkrieg which breaks out in the movement.

27. For more detailed information on the early movement in Austria see: August Kreal, Zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung Oesterreichs (Berlin, 1894).

28. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, p. 75. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Polizei-präsidium, Tit. 94, Lit. P., Nr. 519 (12,276), "Der Maler Josef Peukert 1881-1914."

29. Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 179-180.

30. For accounts of the meeting in Switzerland see: Ernst, Polizeispitzeleien und Ausnahmegesetze 1878-1890,

pp. 19-22; Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 198-220; Freiheit, No. 35 (September 1, 1883).

31. Langhard, Die anarchistische Bewegung in der Schweiz von ihre Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart, p. 273.

32. Ibid., p. 272; Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 185-188.

33. Langhard, Die anarchistische Bewegung in der Schweiz von ihre Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart, p. 264; Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 189-190; "Hermann Stellmacher," Freiheit, No. 12 (March 22, 1884), p. 1.

34. Langhard, Die anarchistische Bewegung in der Schweiz von ihre Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart, pp. 265-267.

35. Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 189-190.

36. Ibid.

37. "Ein Mann der That," Freiheit, No. 40 (October 4, 1884), p. 2.

38. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, pp. 183-186.

39. For a complete account of the Stellmacher trial see: Prozess gegen den Anarchisten Hermann Stellmacher (Vienna, 1885).

40. "Zum Gedächtnis an den topperen opfermütigen Genossen Hermann Stellmacher," Freiheit, No. 33 (August 16, 1884), p. 1; "Anton Kammerer," Ibid., No. 39 (September 27, 1884), p. 1.

41. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. II (13,088), Folders 350-353. For an interesting article on the anarchist operations in Switzerland see: "Die Sozialisten und Anarchisten in der Schweiz," Die Gegenwart, Wochenschrift für Literatur, Kunst und öffentliches Leben, XXV, No. 12 (March 22, 1884), 177-180.

42. It should be pointed out that the Bundesrat expelled undesirables from Switzerland before this, but starting with

1884 a determined effort was made to cleanse the country of the leadership of the German and Austrian anarchist movement. For a list of those expelled see: Langhard, Die anarchistische Bewegung in der Schweiz von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart, pp. 472-473. For an account of the meeting of February 16 see: Neue Züricher Zeitung (February 19, 1884). Some of the important German anarchists expelled in 1884 were: Moritz Schultze, the tinsmith Friedrich Philipp Kennel (b. 1852 Schwegenheim, Rheinbayern) and a close friend of Most, John Neve, the brazier Peter Hauser (b. 1859 Tuttlinger, Württemberg), and Karl Schultze (b. 1852 Gottbus, Prussia).

43. For the treatment accorded German anarchists who tried to enter Switzerland after this see: Staatsarchiv Ludwigsburg, F. 201, Stadtdirektion Stuttgart, 632-633, "Anarchisten 1885-1898," Folders 1-82. Two accounts of the suppression of the anarchists in Switzerland are: "Gegen die Anarchisten," Wochenblatt der Frankfurter Zeitung, No. 11 (March 15, 1885), 82-83; "Die Schweiz und die Anarchisten," Ibid., No. 26 (April 26, 1885), 132.

44. Fricke, Bismarcks Praetorianer, pp. 164-172.

45. Langhard, Die anarchistische Bewegung in der Schweiz, pp. 303-304.

46. Freiheit, No. 8 (February 21, 1885), p. 3; Bericht über die Untersuchung betreffend die anarchistischen Umtriebe in der Schweiz an den hohen Bundesrath. Eidgenossenschaft erstatter durch Bundesrat Eduard Müller (Bern, 1885), pp. 66-69.

47. Ibid., pp. 77-119, 130-135.

48. Ibid., pp. 125-126.

49. Ibid., pp. 126-127.

50. Ibid., pp. 128-130.

51. Ibid., p. 37.

52. Ibid., pp. 175-189.

53. Freiheit, No. 44 (October 31, 1883), p. 2.



54. Ibid., No. 51 (December 21, 1883), p. 1.

55. Ibid., No. 5 (February 2, 1884), p. 1.

56. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. II (13,088), Folders 166-169.

57. An excellent contemporary article which points out the German reaction to "Propaganda by Deed" is "Die anarchistische Gefahr," Wochenblatt der Frankfurter Zeitung, No. 30 (July 27, 1884), p. 235 which called anarchism a sickness.

58. The Holstein Papers, II, Diaries, p. 158.

59. Münchener Allgemeine Zeitung, June 23, 1884.

60. February 5, 1884.

61. An extensive investigation by the police into this supposed plot against the Emperor is found in: Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Polizei-Präsidii zu Berlin, "Die Dynamit Attentate in Elberfeld, Frankfurt a.M., Rüdesheim, und auf dem Wege zum National Denkmal auf dem Niederwald." Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Polizei Präsidii, Tit. 94, Geheime Präsidial-Registratur, Lit. D., Nr. 421, Vol. I (9,588), Folders 254-271. Hereafter referred to as Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94. Lit. D., Nr. 421, Vol. I (9,588).

62. Le Révolté, No. 21 (December 7 & 20, 1884), p. 4; Ibid., No. 1 (March 1 & 14, 1885), p. 4.

## Chapter IX

### THE FAILURE OF PROPAGANDA BY DEED: THE TRAGIC CAREERS OF AUGUST REINSDORF AND JULIUS LIESKE

The significance of "propaganda by deed" can be brought into better focus by tracing out the careers of August Reinsdorf<sup>1</sup> and Julius Lieske. It is within the framework of the lives and activities of these two men that the most meaningful discussion of "propaganda by deed" in Germany can be developed.

Reinsdorf's activities prior to 1878 have been brought out above. He dropped out of sight around the time of the Hödel and Nobiling attempts on the life of William I and does not appear again until late in 1879 when he and Emil Werner collaborated on the publication of a clandestine anarchist newspaper, Der Kampf, printed in Werner's flat in Berlin at Planufer 20. The first issue of this paper came off the press on December 25, 1879, but before a single copy could reach the streets the police entered Werner's apartment and seized the copies which had been printed, along with the plates and the printing press.<sup>2</sup>

The police arrested Werner, the bookbinder Theodor Anders, the shoemaker Franz Jurschitzka, and a student Moritz Krohn, all of whom were in Werner's apartment at the time of the police raid; Reinsdorf was not apprehended in the raid. Jurschitzka and Anders were friends of Werner and both had been members of the Bern anarchist group, while Krohn was a curious student who was only coincidentally present at the time the police raided the clandestine press. Jurschitzka was released after a short time, but the other three were held for nine months while an investigation was being conducted into the affair. In the end Werner and Anders, after serving their terms, were released and forced to leave Berlin on August 10, 1880. Werner went to Leipzig where a minor state of siege had been declared. Unable to stay he traveled on to Switzerland to work with Prince Peter Kropotkin on the printing of Le Révolté; there he took part in the Congress of the Jura Federation where the policies of "propaganda by deed" and communist-anarchism were hammered out.<sup>3</sup>

After the raid on Der Kampf Reinsdorf left Berlin to travel around Germany, working in Bavaria and Württemberg before going into Switzerland, where he and a number of friends organized a celebration of the Commune which caused an uproar. He also helped to smuggle anarchist literature into Austria and Germany. In May 1880 he met with Most in Freiburg, Switzerland. Most had traveled to Rorschach for the purpose of defending himself before a Social Democratic Congress that had been called to investigate charges against himself and Hasselmann. The congress at Rorschach was not held as noted above and was finally held at Wyden. When Most was informed that the congress at Rorschach had been called off he spent some time speaking at meetings in Switzerland. In Freiburg he and Reinsdorf had a long talk. Karl Schneidt claims that Reinsdorf converted Most to anarchism at this time. According to Schneidt the process which had been started by Dave was now completed by Reinsdorf. Certainly Reinsdorf exerted considerable influence over Most, but whether he converted him to anarchism is doubtful. Victor Dave even maintained that Most never understood the true meaning of anarchism. Perhaps the implication of Schneidt's statement is that Reinsdorf was able to convince Most of the necessity of carrying out a program of violence in Germany, because Schneidt claims, and quite correctly, that it was Reinsdorf who acquainted Most with the theories of political murder and "propaganda by deed."<sup>4</sup>

At their meeting, Most and Reinsdorf decided that Reinsdorf should travel to Berlin and kill the Police President von Madai. Reinsdorf left Freiburg, Switzerland, early in July 1880 and traveled to Hanau and Offenbach where he spoke with anarchists who were receiving Freiheit by letter directly from London, and discussed the possibility of increasing the circulation of the paper in these two cities. He then went to Frankfurt-am-Main where he remained for a short time, using the name Ernst Eckstein, before traveling to Berlin.<sup>5</sup>

During the same period, starting with his meeting with Most, Reinsdorf contributed a number of articles to Freiheit dealing with organization, tactics and his conception of anarchism. Basically he opposed any system of anarchist organization which would divide the people into "the leaders" and "the led." He believed in freedom for the individual and autonomy for the group. He stated that a network of cells should be developed in Germany to spread anarchism, with the individual cells having the freedom to join as they saw fit with other cells in the network.

He also pointed out that poison, knives, dynamite, and any other method at their disposal must be employed to free the individual. The local group, he said, should have the power to make their methods fit their own individual locality. His arrest in Berlin ended the series of articles, but incomplete though they may be they are nevertheless useful for revealing Reinsdorf's thought process at this stage of his development.<sup>6</sup>

Late in July 1880 Reinsdorf showed up in Berlin using the name Adolf Gfeller and claiming he was a Swiss; before many days passed he was picked up by the Berlin police for suspicious activities, but after a short period of detention he was released. He told the police he was a Swiss compositor and gave them his false name. The police were cognizant of his true identity but released him because they claimed he had done nothing wrong; however, legally they could have held him for using a false name. They probably released him to obtain further evidence; they were already aware that he had come to Berlin for the purpose of killing von Madai.<sup>7</sup>

On September 1, 1880, Reinsdorf wrote Most of a plan he had to blow up the Reichstag building during a session. The plan called for Reinsdorf to dig a tunnel under the building and set charges at the points of maximum stress. If charges could be placed in these critical places the entire structure would be brought down because, as Reinsdorf pointed out correctly, much of the building was only a facade, with only a few points supporting the weight of the structure. The spy Oskar Neumann in London heard of this plan and informed the Berlin police who quickly apprehended Reinsdorf on November 14, 1880, in the vicinity of von Madai's home carrying a long dagger. At this time the police were able to determine that he was also the mysterious John Steinberg who had caused them trouble earlier in Leipzig.<sup>8</sup>

During the three months Reinsdorf was imprisoned the police closed their net over the cell network in Germany apprehending Dave, Breuder and the others already referred to above. The police tried, unsuccessfully, to connect Reinsdorf with the cell organization, because they wanted to place him on trial with the group being tried for high treason in Leipzig. When he was released from prison Reinsdorf was forced to leave Berlin; he went to Leipzig, and was also forced out of that city; going to Witzenhagen bei Kassel where he worked for three weeks. Now, wherever Reinsdorf traveled in Germany the police were after

him. He was unable to remain in one place for more than a few days, but nevertheless being a true anarchist he continued to work for the spread of anarchist ideals and helped to distribute Freiheit. In Berlin once again he was arrested on March 15, 1881, and held for four weeks for using false papers. When he was unable to find any work in Germany he finally traveled to Freiburg, Switzerland.

In Freiburg Reinsdorf was involved in a morals charge which Most ignores completely in his life of Reinsdorf; Rocker calls the incident "an infamous comedy of Justice."<sup>9</sup> What occurred is as follows: in Freiburg, Reinsdorf lived with the tailor, Otter, on Murtentor, but took his meals at the home of a widow F. at No. 239 Rue de Morat. On the evening of October 10 when the widow was returning home about 8:30 she looked in the window of her living room and observed Reinsdorf having sexual relations with her ten-year-old daughter. Widow F. swore out a warrant for Reinsdorf's arrest, but he fled before the police had an opportunity to apprehend him. A trial was held and Dr. Schaller, who had examined the girl, said conclusively that the girl had had sexual relations. The girl herself confirmed this and Reinsdorf was sentenced "in contumacian [contempt of court]" on November 26, 1881, to three years.<sup>10</sup>

When he left Freiburg in October Reinsdorf went to Bern seeking a friend, but realizing that the police were after him he decided to go to Munich where he assumed the names Hackel and Beugel, and was quickly apprehended for the distribution of forbidden materials. He had brought with him from Switzerland 800 copies of the pamphlet Wahlenthaltung. For this he was sentenced to four months in Amberg prison.<sup>11</sup> During the trial the German officials requested and received from Freiburg a copy of the documents concerning the incident regarding the ten-year-old girl. When these documents were placed before the Landgericht München I, the judge decided that the evidence was not sufficient to substantiate such an accusation; the judge concluded that the witnesses for the prosecution were unreliable.<sup>12</sup> This struck Reinsdorf as ironical that German justice had found him innocent of the charge.<sup>13</sup>

On March 30, 1882, Reinsdorf was freed and went to his home town of Pegau. This was a difficult period in his life; letters written at this time indicate that he was very despondent, trying to rationalize all the suffering he had gone through with what little he had accomplished. He wrote a friend in America

that if he had the money he would leave Germany for the United States.<sup>14</sup> He was not in Pegau long before the police apprehended him on a charge of stealing dynamite, but the man from whom the dynamite had been stolen was not able to identify Reinsdorf as the thief. He was then set free and wandered to Berlin where he was placed in jail in June for a period of ten days for using a false name. When he was released after serving this sentence he returned to Pegau.<sup>15</sup>

A hunted man in Germany, Reinsdorf decided to leave; on foot he traveled to Nancy, France, arriving there with well-worn shoes and not a cent in his pockets. His route, long and circuitous, had taken him by way of Eisenach, Kassel, Elberfeld, Essen, Erefeld, Düsseldorf, Cologne, Bonn, Aachen, Verviers, Spa, Luxembourg, Trier, Saarbrücken, Metz, Pont-a-Mouson, and finally Nancy. He had intended to go directly to Paris, but had to stop in Nancy long enough to work and earn some money. On his walking trip to Nancy, Reinsdorf came in contact with many of his former comrades who gave him new hope for the eventual success of the movement and invigorated his low spirits. He abandoned his plan to go to the United States, realizing that he was needed more in Germany. In Nancy he obtained employment that paid five francs a day and spent his free time studying the French language, reading Freiheit and Étendard revol, and attending the free concerts given by the military bands. Having no friends in Nancy, and since all his diversions cost him nothing Reinsdorf saved enough money in a short time to travel to Paris.

While he was in Nancy Reinsdorf wrote a friend that he believed he did not have long to live, and that before very long he was going to follow the same route Eisenhower had and succumb to tuberculosis. This obsession with death is very important because it played an important role in the decisions he later made which sealed his doom.<sup>16</sup>

In the fall of 1882 Reinsdorf went to Paris where he lived in squalid conditions until 1883, passing his time by writing articles for Freiheit, and corresponding with friends in Germany.<sup>17</sup> Toward the end of February 1883 he left Paris and returned to Southern Germany renewing acquaintances with former friends in Stuttgart, Frankfurt-am-Main, Mannheim, and Hanau. In Mannheim he struck up a good relationship with Carl Mildemberger. After traveling around Germany he decided to settle in Elberfeld on March 19, 1883, using the alias of John Pelzenbach and claiming he was from Baltimore, Maryland. His

rationalization in selecting Elberfeld was that he thought it would be an ideal place to sow the seed of "propaganda by deed," because of the rapidly increasing number of workers who were coming to the city to work in the expanding chemical and clothing factories. He reasoned that the workers in these industries would be receptive to anarchism and "propaganda by deed" because of the miserable conditions in which they worked and lived. His hopes were not realized in the way he thought they would be; he reported to a friend that years of misery, dire need, and physical deprivation had robbed the workers of their zeal for revolution. Reinsdorf concluded that the workers were worn out, unnerved and their morale was at too low a point to hope for revolution.<sup>18</sup>

He succeeded in gathering a small group of men in the Elberfeld area who adhered to his ideas. In the group were the compositor Emil KÜchler (b. November 9, 1844 Krefeld); the saddler Franz Reinhold Rupsch (b. March 19, 1863 Rathewitz, Kreis Naumburg a.d.s.); the weaver Karl Bachmann (b. December 4, 1859 Triplis, Sachson-Weimar); the shoemaker Karl Holzhauer (b. May 16, 1835 Weiderröde); the 43-year-old weaver Carl Rudolf Palm; the weaver Wilhelm Weidenmüller (b. July 14, 1841 Elberfeld); and three factory workers—the ribbonmaker Karl Rheinbach (b. December 3, 1842 Ronsdorf); the buttonmaker August Töllner, and the dyer Fritz Söhngen (b. October 3, 1851 Hafslinghausen). The meetings of the group were held at the home of Karl Holzhauer.<sup>19</sup>

In one of these meetings plans were made to dynamite the Emperor Wilhelm I, the Crown Prince and a number of other public dignitaries. The plan was discussed at length, because there was a difference of opinion how it should be carried out; since a police spy was present at this meeting we can assume that all the details of the meeting were given to the police.<sup>20</sup>

The explosion was planned to coincide with the dedication of the National Monument, which would be unveiled by the Emperor on September 28, 1883. The monument was situated high on the summit of the Niederwald, which rises some 800 feet above the villages of Assmannshausen and Rudesheim. The National Monument was a symbolic "Wacht am Rhein" and faced toward the Rhine River at the point where it rushed past Bingen and the Mouse Tower of legend which Southey put into English verse. The colossal statue, designed by Johannes Schilling of Dresden and said to be an idealized likeness of the sculptor's daughter,

represents Germania as a woman in a girdle-bound robe, her left hand resting on the hilt of a drawn sword, and her right hand holding a laurel-wreathed Imperial Crown. The bronze figure, cast by von Mitler of Munich, was itself 36 feet in height; with pedestal and socket it measured 80 feet. It cost 1,196,000 marks, part of which was raised by public subscription, the remainder coming from a parliamentary grant.<sup>21</sup>

All of the celebrities of the reign of William I were to be assembled at the dedication of the Niederwald Monument; his son the Crown Prince "Unserer Fritz," his nephew William the "Red Prince," Prince Albert of Prussia, the King of Saxony, the Grand Duke of Baden, the Grand Duke of Hesse-Darmstadt, Prince Luitpold of Bavaria, von Moltke, Bismarck, the surviving military leaders of Königgrätz, Wörth, Mars-la-Tour, Sedan, and Metz, as well as numerous other members of the aristocracy, government officials, and dignitaries. This was perhaps the greatest opportunity ever presented to eliminate so many members of the upper strata of German society with a single blow, and Reinsdorf fully intended to avail himself of it.<sup>22</sup> Reinsdorf, for reasons which will be explained below, thought his days on earth were numbered and he wanted to make a final contribution to the freeing of mankind; a contribution which he thought would shake the entire world from its lethargy.

The plans for the attempt were made well in advance of September 28, the day of the dedication. The dynamite and some of the money needed for the trip to Rüdesheim were also gathered well in advance. The dyer Söhngen contributed eight marks, the ribbonmaker Rheinbach, 9.50; and the buttonmaker Töllner, about 2.50. Rupsch pawned his trunk for ten marks and Palm, the police spy, gave Küchler 40 marks for the trip.<sup>23</sup>

Reinsdorf had intended to carry out the attempt himself, but on September 8 he went to Barmen, and later that evening when he returned as he departed from the train and crossed the railroad tracks he sprained his ankle so severely that he had to be taken to St. Joseph's Hospital where he remained until October 21.<sup>24</sup>

The date of the dedication was September 28, and as the day drew near and his ankle was no better, Reinsdorf summoned two members of his Elberfeld circle to his bedside; the saddler Rupsch and the compositor Küchler. Originally the plan was to send only Rupsch on the mission because he was single and



because of limited finances, but when Palm gave K uchler, who had six children, the 40 marks this enabled him to go along to watch the young Rupsch. After a lengthy discussion with Reinsdorf the two men agreed to carry out the plan and Reinsdorf gave them all the pertinent details of the plot, including the location where the dynamite was hidden. The money which had been collected and which was intended primarily for travel funds was also turned over to them.

On September 26 Rupsch and K uchler picked up the 16 pounds of dynamite where it had been hidden in the woods and on the following day traveled to Assmannshausen and to the site of the Niederwald Monument in order to put the plan into operation. That night, when it got dark, they concealed the dynamite in a drainage pipe which traversed, about three and one half feet underneath, the only roadway leading to the monument; to the dynamite they connected a fuse that was nine meters long. The fuse was led out of the culvert into the woods adjacent to the roadway. It was buried just under the surface of the ground and led to a tree which was marked so that they would be able to find the end of the fuse on the following day. Reinsdorf had specifically instructed K uchler to purchase a waterproof fuse, but instead he obtained one that was not waterproof because it was fifty pfenning cheaper. Unfortunately for the conspirators a heavy rain fell during the evening of September 27-28, and the dynamite and fuse which had been laid in the drainage culvert were soaked.<sup>25</sup>

The next day some time before the dedication Rupsch and K uchler returned to the area where they had placed the dynamite to await the arrival of the Emperor and his party-minus Bismarck.<sup>26</sup> K uchler acted as the lookout and when he saw the Emperor's party approaching he signalled to Rupsch, who was to have ignited the fuse, but Rupsch was unable to get the wet fuse to burn. Having failed in the first attempt, they tried once again when the group returned after the dedication ceremonies, but once more were unsuccessful.<sup>27</sup> Then the two men took the dynamite from the culvert and carried it to R udesheim where at eight in the evening they placed the explosives against the wall of the Festhalle where a concert was being given. The explosives were placed on the wall adjacent to the kitchen area of the hall and the explosion was so loud that it caused the bartender, Johann Lauter from R udesheim, to lose his hearing for several hours. The caterer Porsberger from Mainz who was also in the kitchen was covered by wine, goulash, veal cutlets, and roasted veal loin

which were blown into the air by the shock of the bomb. Everything in the kitchen made of glass was shattered, as was part of the wall, but no one attending the concert was injured. The Emperor and his party were not in the hall, but had gone on to Weisbaden after the dedication ceremony, so the majority of those inside the hall were ordinary citizenry of Rüdesheim. After the explosion Rupsch and KÜchler returned to Elberfeld on money they had obtained from pawning of KÜchler's watch. After a few days Rupsch, who came from a solid farming family, went home to help with the fall harvest. His father was dead and he was the middle son. He also had two sisters, one of whom had been recently confirmed.<sup>28</sup>

One fact which is usually not brought out in relation to the Niederwald attempt is that nothing was mentioned about it in the press for several months. This delay gave rise to the belief that the government, quite by accident, stumbled onto the plot some months later when arrests were made for other bombing attempts. This assumption is false. The government knew about the plan before the attempt was made and withheld the news, releasing it to the press at an advantageous moment.

Reinsdorf was not released from St. Joseph's Hospital until October 21, 1883, nearly a month after the dedication of the monument, but only a few days before an explosion severely damaged the Frankfurt Police Headquarters building (Gleserne Hof) at 6 P.M. on October 29. The building was unoccupied at the time of the explosion, but considerable damage was done. Frankfurt Police Chief Rumpf tried to prove that Reinsdorf was responsible for the explosion, but Reinsdorf was able to show that he had been in Barmen at the time of the explosion.<sup>29</sup> This was a source of amusement to Der Sozialdemokrat which wrote "poor Rumpf, he can't pin the dynamite explosion on Reinsdorf because he couldn't possibly have been in Frankfurt a.M. on the day of the explosion."<sup>30</sup> The article also claimed that the explosion had been planned and executed by Rumpf himself, to be used against the Social Democrats in the campaign to renew the Socialist Law. There is no evidence to substantiate this statement in Der Sozialdemokrat but many people thought it was a strange coincidence that the building had been completely empty when the explosion took place. Johann Most likewise stated dogmatically that Reinsdorf was not in Frankfurt at the time the explosion took place. Like Der Sozialdemokrat Most claimed it was the work of Rumpf and was nothing more than another example of police harassment.<sup>31</sup>

What was Reinsdorf doing between October 21, when he was released from the hospital in Elberfeld, and November 7, when he was again hospitalized in Hamburg. He remained in Elberfeld until October 27, working for a book printer using the alias John Pelzenbach from Baltimore. He became ill after a few days and withdrew 14 marks from the sick fund of the book printer and went to Barmen.<sup>32</sup> Barmen was the place to which the dynamite had been shipped for the attempt at the Niederwald, as well as the explosives used in the explosions which had occurred in some of the local casinos and beer halls, such as the "Erholung," "Deutsche Kaiser," "Frankfurter Beerhalle," and the explosion carried out by Bachmann in the beer garden of the Willemsen Restaurant. Other explosions had occurred during the same summer in the area; one at a social gathering in Wupperthale, and another in the cellar of the Lutheran Association. These were all preliminary to the Niederwald Attentat. Probably the great attraction that Barmen had for Reinsdorf was that this is where he could get the "stuff." Dynamite was actually being produced in Wupperthale, which was an industrial suburb of Elberfeld, but it was the home made variety and very unreliable, and the quantities available were limited.<sup>33</sup>

Reinsdorf traveled to Wiesbaden where he planned an explosion in the train station, but at the last minute did not go through with it when he realized that many innocent women and children would be killed or injured.<sup>34</sup> He then traveled to Hannover where he stayed for a few days using the name of Johann Schmitt. From Hannover he went to Hamburg where he became ill on November 7, 1883, and was hospitalized until January 9, 1884. This time he was confined for tuberculosis, as he had been in St. Joseph's Hospital in Elberfeld during the period June 23 to July 30, 1883, before he injured his ankle. In Hamburg Reinsdorf used the name John Pelzenbach.<sup>35</sup> On January 11, 1884, only two days after he was released from the hospital, the Hamburg police arrested him, acting on orders from Rumpf. He was taken to Frankfurt-am-Main to be questioned about the dynamite explosion of October 29, 1883. Although Rumpf could not prove that Reinsdorf was involved in the affair, he did not release him.<sup>36</sup> In the columns of Freiheit Most demanded to know why they were holding Reinsdorf when it had been demonstrated that he had nothing to do with the Frankfurt affair.<sup>37</sup> Rumpf had a good reason for not releasing Reinsdorf, but it was not yet time to make it public.

Meanwhile the police rounded up the other members of Reinsdorf's small Elberfeld circle, as well as a number of other suspects. The Volkszeitung on March 8, 1884, released a story which said that the weaver Carl Rudolf Palm had been arrested in Elberfeld. According to the account in the newspaper Palm also implicated KÜchler, the weaver Wilhelm Weidenmüller Senior, and Carl Bachmann. Palm related that they had all taken part in the explosion which occurred in the beer garden section of Willemsen's Restaurant on September 4, 1883.<sup>38</sup> Rupsch was not arrested until April 20, 1884, in Rossbach, but it was given the usual publicity.<sup>39</sup>

Now the stage was set. All of Germany had been made aware of the explosion which had occurred in Frankfurt and the several explosions which had taken place in the Elberfeld area in the summer and early fall in 1883. The police had gathered the cast, each of whom was given full press coverage as they were apprehended. Now the moment had arrived to start the production.

Information on the attempt to kill the Emperor at the dedication of the Niederwald monument was made public on April 24, 1884. It had been withheld by Bismarck, William I, and Puttkamer until the proper time. On April 23, William I wrote to Minister of the Interior Puttkamer with clear evidence that they were about to make political capital out of the Niederwald attempt in conjunction with the debate on the renewal of the Socialist Law; William wanted to make sure that Prince Bismarck would make an official news release for the illumination of the voters.<sup>40</sup> An announcement to the Reichstag committee on the renewal of the Socialist Law was actually made by Eugene Richter, leader of the Freisinnige Party.

The news of the Niederwald plot contributed to the renewal of the Socialist Law in May 1884 and the subsequent passage of a dynamite law on June 9, 1884 (Dynamitgesetz. Gesetz gegen dem verbrecherischen und gemeingefährlichen Gebrauch von Sprengstoffen). The latter made it illegal to manufacture, possess, sell, or import explosives without a license from the police. Those who possessed such a license were required to keep a register accounting for all explosives they had obtained and sold. If through the use of explosives, including gunpowder, a person caused damage to the property, wealth, or life of

another he was liable to stringent penalties. In the case of serious bodily harm the penalty was to be not less than five years in prison. In the event that an explosion caused the death of a person the penalty could range from ten years to life imprisonment. If the explosion caused the premeditated death of an individual then capital punishment would be invoked. Even if it could only be established that a person had merely agreed to carry out an explosion, and even if no evidence could be produced that such an act had taken place, he could still be sentenced to prison for not less than five years. The possession, manufacture, procurement, ordering, or passing on to others, of explosives for the purpose of committing an unlawful act was punishable by five years imprisonment. Anyone, who by public word or deed, incited another person to commit a crime with explosives was liable to five years in prison, as was any person who glorified or lauded any acts involving explosions. Likewise, if a person were privy to a plan to commit such an act, and did not give the police an advance warning of the impending explosion, he, too, was liable to five years in jail.<sup>41</sup>

The dramatic manner in which the renewal of the Socialist Law and the passage of the Dynamite Law was accomplished resulted in a wave of hysteria which swept across Germany, especially among the aristocracy and the bourgeois who had been frightened by Most's propaganda. Now they had their worst fears reinforced by the public exposure of Reinsdorf and his groups and the passage of the Dynamite Law.<sup>42</sup>

On the surface the German government maintained a hard-line policy against explosives, a policy which was aided by agents provocateurs. The spy Schröder, who was involved in the publication of Freiheit in Switzerland, was also involved in planning dynamite attempts. He obtained a case of dynamite from the German anarchist Ulrich Wübbeler (b. 1851 in Barnsdorf, Hannover), and Martin Etter (b. 1859 in Gänningen, Württemberg). They had stolen the dynamite from a dynamite factory in Opladen near Düsseldorf and had given it to Schröder in Switzerland, who was holding it while waiting for orders from the police official Adolf Krüger in Berlin as to when and where it should be used.<sup>43</sup>

The trial of the Niederwald conspirators opened in Leipzig on Monday December 15, 1884, at nine in the morning. The size of the court room of the Reichsgericht was not large enough to accommodate the number of people involved in the trial so it had to be transferred to the Landsgericht, where the case was

heard before the Second and Third Criminal Senates of the high court, with Drenkmann acting as president. The judges, 14 in all, occupied a dias at one end of the room, seated around a horse-shoe shaped table which was covered with a green cloth. The eight prisoners sat in a raised dock at one side of this table, and they like the 54 witnesses stood in the free space in front of the dias when they were being examined by the judges. On the other end of the table was a press section full of reporters. The audience, which was limited by the size of the room, and which was admitted by ticket only, occupied the back of the room and the gallery. For the duration of the trial all other matters in Germany were momentarily set aside while all eyes were focused on Leipzig. The business of the Reichs Chancellory, the Reichstag, and all other business of state slowed down during the period of the trial from December 15 to 22.<sup>44</sup>

The defendents were charged with the explosion which took place in Elberfeld in the Willemsen Restaurant, the dynamiting of the Police Headquarters in Frankfurt-am-Main; the explosion at the Festhalle in Rüdesheim, and the attempt on the life of the Emperor at the unveiling of the Niederwald monument. The chief crown witness was the weaver Palm, a police spy, who testified that he knew in advance of the Elberfeld bombing and of the attempt that was to occur at the Niederwald, but said that he was not actually present at either of the affairs. The fact that no one other than Rupsch and KÜchler were present at the ill-fated Niederwald attempt could have been to the advantage of the defendents, had they not been so willing to fill in the missing gaps for the prosecution and thus put the blame on Reinsdorf. Of the eight defendents only Reinsdorf showed any courage. If Rupsch and KÜchler had not been so willing to volunteer information the prosecution would have had a weak case, especially on the Niederwald episode.

The testimony of Rupsch and KÜchler included a long series of lies designed to make the judges view them favorably; it should be noted that the judges did not believe the stories told by Rupsch and KÜchler. KÜchler claimed he had told Palm in advance that he was going along with Rupsch for the purpose of frustrating Reinsdorf's plan, because at the last minute he was going to pull the fuse out of the 16 pounds of dynamite they had placed in the culvert, but that the wet fuse made the preventive action unnecessary. Rupsch said he took advantage of the paid trip to the Niederwald because he wanted to see the Emperor, whom he liked and also he wanted to spoil the plan. He claimed

that when K uchler gave him the signal he put a cold cigar to the fuse and that on the return trip he ignited the fuse only after cutting it so that about two feet burned. Rupsch said that he had read Freiheit, but did not understand it. He said he did not know what anarchism was nor could he explain the meaning of the phrase "property is theft." He said he was about to break off his association with Reinsdorf and his group. Both Rupsch and K uchler placed the entire blame on Reinsdorf saying that if they had not gone through with the plan he would have sought revenge on them. Rupsch signed a long statement detailing all aspects of the attempt and even took officials to the scene to show them where the dynamite had been concealed. Both Rupsch and K uchler admitted setting off the explosion at the Festhalle in R udesheim, but claimed that the dynamite was placed ten feet from the building; due to the damage done to the structure the judges did not believe the story.<sup>45</sup>

Reinsdorf tried to shield rather than incriminate his accomplices. He said the only part Rheinbach, S ohnngen and T ollner played in the Niederwald attempt was in contributing money for travel expenses. He said that the three factory workers read Freiheit and let him use their homes as cover addresses, but that they were not involved in the planning of the explosions. On the other hand, Bachmann admitted setting off the dynamite in the Willemsen Restaurant in Elberfeld, but denied that he intended to hurt anyone. He only wanted to register a protest! He blamed Reinsdorf, claiming that Reinsdorf supplied him with the dynamite and the plan.<sup>46</sup>

Reinsdorf put on an admirable show admitting he had planned the Niederwald attempt, regretting his inability to carry it out because of his injured ankle, and explaining how he got Rupsch and K uchler to put the plan into operation. He was highly critical of Rupsch and K uchler for bungling the job. Then he went on to describe the developments which had taken place in Germany since the unification in 1871, pointing out that workingmen had not benefited from the unification. He called the conflict of 1870-71 a war of conquest and called upon the workingmen in the Reich to rise up against the government. Suffrage, he said, was meaningless; direct action by the working masses was needed to help bring down the state, even if it meant killing many people. The end would justify the means. He denounced the Social Democratic Party as a bourgeois party, bound by parliamentarism, doing nothing to improve the conditions of the working classes.

So he proclaimed; "down with the ballot box; it is time for you to act."<sup>47</sup>

Reinsdorf used the witness stand, and his own personal cross-examination of the witnesses, as an opportunity to explain the meaning of anarchism. Several times during the course of the trial his language became so violent that the presiding officer had to caution him that additional charges would be brought against him if he did not tone down his remarks. He declared himself to be an anarchist, and the judge asked: "What is anarchism?" Reinsdorf answered:

A society in which every person can develop to the fullest extent of his abilities. In order that this may be accomplished no one should be burdened with excessive labor; want and misery should be banished from the world; every form of force should cease to be; all forms of ignorance and superstition should be eliminated from the world.<sup>48</sup>

The judge asked him if he were guilty or innocent of the charges presented against him. Reinsdorf refused to answer with a simple yes or no, but replied: "I look upon this matter as a question of power. If we, German anarchists, had a couple of army corps at our disposal, then I would not have to speak to this court. I have nothing further to say. Do with me as you please."<sup>49</sup>

Later in the trial, after the sentence had been handed down, Reinsdorf responded to the remarks of the judge that the hand of providence had saved the Emperor from death.

I tell you the bungling hand of Rupsch saved him. I am sorry to say that I had no one else at my disposal. The only thing I have to regret is that the attempt failed. ... In the factories the workers are used for the benefit of the stockholders. These honest christians swindle the working people out of half of what they earn. My lawyer wanted to save my head, but for a hunted proletarian as myself, the quickest death is the best.<sup>50</sup>

He went on to point out that the excessive use of house searches by the German police and the paying of police spies



such as Palm and Weidenmüller demonstrated how corrupt society had become. He told how Police Commissioner Gottschalk, who had employed Palm and Weidenmüller, knew in advance of the Niederwald attempt and did nothing to stop it. Reinsdorf claimed that it was Gottschalk who was responsible for Kùchler being on trial because he had instructed Rupsch to carry out the plan alone, but when Palm gave Kùchler 40 marks then there was enough money for Kùchler to go along and keep an eye on the younger Rupsch. Reinsdorf maintained that the use by the police of such people as Palm was sufficient evidence of the decadence and corruption of society; "against such corruption are not our deeds justified?" If I had ten heads I would offer them gladly and lay them on the block for the cause of anarchism."<sup>51</sup> He ended his moving speech with "The social revolution will never be abandoned, even if there are a hundred tribunals. The people will one day have enough dynamite to blow up all of you and every other member of the bourgeois."<sup>52</sup>

There can be little doubt that Reinsdorf by his actions at the trial hoped to establish himself as a martyr for the cause of anarchism. He acknowledged his connections with Hödel; he fully admitted responsibility for the Niederwald plot. He defined anarchism, and from the witness stand urged the workers on to violence, admonishing them to bring down the government of the Reich, even if it meant killing many people. It is evident that Reinsdorf was aware that these voluntary assertions and his incendiary speeches were to his detriment. There can be no question that his conduct at the trial was heroic, something to be emulated by future generations of anarchists. Reinsdorf was seriously ill with tuberculosis and more than likely he preferred a quick, heroic death on the scaffold to the miserable end tuberculosis would soon bring him if he were confined to prison. As early as August 23, 1882, Reinsdorf thought that the end could come for him at any time. He indicated in a letter to a friend that he was going to see his parents for what he thought would be the last time.<sup>53</sup> From the time he arrived in Elberfeld on March 19, 1883, until he left there on October 27 of the same year he spent June 23 to July 30 in the hospital for tuberculosis, and September 9 to October 21 in the same hospital for a sprained ankle and tuberculosis. He was only out of the hospital for a few weeks before he was again hospitalized in Hamburg on November 7, again with tuberculosis, a stay which lasted until January 9, 1884, being apprehended by the police only two days after his release.<sup>54</sup> To put it bluntly Reinsdorf knew he did not have long to live and he wanted people to remember his going.

The chief witness for the prosecution, the weaver and police spy Rudolf Palm, whose name appeared first on a list of 54 witnesses, was introduced in such a way that those present at the trial assumed that he had purchased his freedom by betraying his companions. The prosecution accomplished this by not requiring him to swear an oath before testifying because of his supposed complicity in the crime—which is how the government intended that it should appear, but which was not the case at all because Palm's so called "complicity" in the attempt came about as a direct result of his service as a police spy.<sup>55</sup> On the witness stand Palm revealed how, where, and by whom the plans had been made for the Niederwald attempt. He further explained that the 40 marks he had given to KÜchler, which were used for KÜchler's traveling expenses to the Niederwald site, were given to KÜchler to help his family because KÜchler had six children and was out of work and had asked him for money. In cross-examination Reinsdorf asked Palm where he had gotten the 40 marks, claiming that they had been supplied by the police, which Palm of course denied. He also asked Palm where he had obtained the 700 marks to lease a large home in Elberfeld, and Palm's reply was that it had come from his mother-in-law. Palm's testimony was the capstone in proving the guilt of the defendants.<sup>56</sup>

The outcome of the trial was practically a foregone conclusion, but it was necessary to go through the formalities. Much to the dismay of the police and the prosecution they were not able to connect Reinsdorf nor any of the other defendants with the explosion which had damaged the Frankfurt Police Headquarters.<sup>57</sup>

On December 22, 1884, Reinsdorf, Rupsch, and KÜchler were sentenced to death, but on February 6, 1885, Rupsch's sentence was commuted to life in prison because of his youth and because it was felt that he had come under the spell of Reinsdorf. Also he had been very helpful in proving the government's case against KÜchler. According to Rocker, Rupsch was still in prison in 1924. Bachmann and Holzhauser were given ten years in prison, but Holzhauser hung himself soon after the completion of the trial. The other three defendants Rheinbach, Söhngen, and Tollner were set free.<sup>58</sup>

The end for Reinsdorf and KÜchler came at seven o'clock on the cold winter morning of February 7, 1885. Reinsdorf was reconciled to his fate and welcomed his martyrdom, passing the days between the sentencing and the carrying out of the execution

smoking cigarettes and singing a song which had been sung for years by university students.

Stiefel, du musst sterben  
 Bist noch so jung—Juchhe!  
 Stiefel, du musst sterben,  
 Bist noch so jung.  
 Wenn das der Absatz wüsst  
 Das der Stiefel sterben müsst,  
 Würd sich betrüben,  
 Bis in den Tod—Juchhe!  
 Würd sich betrüben,  
 Bis in den Tod.<sup>59</sup>

The executions took place at Halle prison with Reinsdorf going first. Shortly before the execution he ate a hearty meal and smoked a cigar; as he was led to the execution block, he once again sang his little song. He mounted the steps leading up to the scaffold, peeled off his shirt as requested, and stood stripped bare to the waist in the cold February weather. The Reichsanwalt approached him asking, "Are you August Reinsdorf," and Reinsdorf replied "Yes"; the sentence was then read and the copy of it signed by the Emperor was shown to the accused. Reinsdorf was then strapped down to the block and the executioner lifted the huge axe in the air, but before he struck the fatal blow Reinsdorf said, "I die for humanity, down with barbarism, long live anarchism." With his last words still echoing around the prison courtyard, where 60 people stood, the crack of the Scharfrichter's axe was heard as it hit the block, and Reinsdorf's head bounced off the platform and onto the ground. The Scharfrichter turned to the Reichsanwalt and said, "The sentence has been carried out."

Küchler had been watching this whole process from the window in his cell. He continued to watch as Reinsdorf's head and body were picked up and placed in a cart (Handwagen) and taken to the prison morgue. The blood was then cleaned off the platform, and also from the axe, and it was placed back in its sheath.

Once again the "Armensünderglocke" struck and Küchler was brought out from his cell; his step was unsteady, his composure broken; he could scarcely be recognized, because the short period of imprisonment had reduced him to half of his former self. He practically had to be carried by the three men

who accompanied him. The same process was followed as with Reinsdorf, but before the axe fell he said, "I die an innocent man, my poor wife, my poor children." With the word children still on his lips his head was severed from his body. The whole process of the two executions took only about fifteen minutes.<sup>60</sup>

Thus died Reinsdorf, greatest of the German anarchists of the decades of the 1870's and 1880's. The day before he died he wrote three letters, one to his brother Bruno, the second to his brother Franz, and the third to his parents. To Bruno he wrote that he was deathly ill and greeted his approaching death. He told him to take care of their father and mother when they were old. In the letter to his brother Franz he said, "I feel that I have done my duty; and this is what makes my final walk easy, to receive joyfully the everlasting sleep as something well earned." He advised his brother Franz against following

The wandering existence of an anarchist ... [but instead] bear with strength, endurance and friendly submission the burden which you have placed upon yourself, and try to find satisfaction in it, so that you can raise your children so that they may be useful and an adornment to you; ... when you, therefore, in the years to come look back upon the days of honest, peaceable labor, and of difficult duties fulfilled, then you will be filled with a joyful certainty and a quiet happiness that will repay you for all your sufferings. ... So do your duty as the father of your family.<sup>61</sup>

Reinsdorf asked his parents to greet the remainder of his brothers and sisters to whom he could not write individual letters. He said

Sick as I am, and with a prospect of long suffering, it should be looked upon as a blessing when such an existence is put to a quick death. And what an end it is? Whoever they are, progressive or reactionary, liberal or conservative, they all hate the anarchist Reinsdorf. As they have condemned his activities, they cheer his death. ... But his steadfastness, in defiance of thousands of obstacles, no one can deny. And this shall be your consolation. ... My last thoughts are of you and of my brothers and sisters, and of the great cause for which I die.<sup>62</sup>

These letters, if nothing else, reinforce the impression that Reinsdorf thought he was deathly ill and preferred to die the death of a hero and martyr than to meet the miserable end of a consumptive in a prison cell. Most quickly elevated him to the position as the greatest hero of the German movement of the period.

### Julius Lieske.

The career of Julius Lieske can best be thought of as a corollary to the Niederwald attempt. Most called for revenge to atone for the death sentences handed down by the tribunal in Leipzig. On the night of January 13, 1885, the hand of an assassin cut down the Frankfurt Police Chief Carl Ludwig Franz Rumpf (b. February 9, 1822). Rumpf had been in the army but a bad fall from a horse forced his early retirement in 1852. He then studied law, received a Ph.D., and began specializing in criminal investigation, finally attaining the position of chief of police in Frankfurt. He was able and rigid, but also unscrupulous, as illustrated above by his part in the High Treason Trial of 1881. He was also responsible for much of the investigation into the Niederwald attempt. The anarchists hated him, both for his efficiency and for his duplicity. Many asserted that Rumpf himself blew up the Frankfurt Police Headquarters building, an unsubstantiated charge, but one that is at least credible in view of his personality and tactics.<sup>63</sup>

Police Chief Rumpf lived at 6 Sachsenlager, a street where the wealthy inhabitants of Frankfurt resided. His home was large, and had an extensive garden in front of it with a fence and gate separating the garden area from the Sachsenlager. On the night of January 13, 1885, Rumpf, a man of set habits, left police headquarters at 7:15 and walked home, arriving there sometime between 7:30 and 7:45. He entered by the front gate, walked through the garden, and was about to enter the front door when an assailant struck him in the chest with two vicious stab wounds from a long triangular dagger. The fatal wound was made at a point three centimeters below the right collar bone and two centimeters to the right of the middle of his chest; it pierced both the right lung and the heart and caused instantaneous death. The blow must have struck with great force because it had to penetrate Rumpf's overcoat, suit coat, vest, shirt, and undershirt, all of which were made of heavy material. His body was found on the steps by a servant girl who returned home at

8:00. She summoned the police and a doctor, but Rumpf had already died. The only evidence found at the scene of the crime was a bloody hand print on the gate. Robbery was ruled out immediately as a motive, because Rumpf had not been robbed. The natural suspects in the crime were the anarchists who had served notice that they were going to settle their score with the police chief.<sup>64</sup>

This impression was reinforced on January 24, by Freiheit when Most wrote "Shake, you dogs! Rumpf is dead—stuck in the back like a rat." The article declared that no one was safe anymore, not even in the Imperial Palace, the Reichs Chancellery, or in any police station; at any moment someone standing behind an official could plunge a knife into his back. "Rumpf is dead, the anarchists have tried him. Rumpf was only number one on a long list of those who are to die, and blow by blow, stabbing by stabbing they will follow." Le Révolté greeted the murder of Rumpf by writing "Bravo to the German anarchists! They are not much for threats, but oh the deeds! Deeds are much better than ceaseless threats and pointless agitation."<sup>65</sup>

The police were very interested in capturing the assassin of Rumpf and offered a reward of 3000 marks for information on the killing. The reward was quickly raised to 10,000 marks. Six days later in Hockenheim a young man whose papers identified him as Heinrich Nau was captured by the police. On him were found two revolvers and it was soon discovered that the true identity of the 21-year-old shoemaker they had seized was Adolf Julius Lieske (b. February 1, 1863 in Zossen, Kreis Teltow, in the Mark of Brandenburg). He had learned the shoemaking trade in his native Zossen and in 1881 went on his Wanderschaft, traveling to St. Gallen, where he was introduced to anarchism by the Austrian anarchist Ondra. During his trial it was brought out by von Hake that in Switzerland Lieske had been a member of anarchist groups in Lausanne, Geneva, Zürich, and Basel. In Switzerland Lieske worked as a shoemaker and distributed anarchist literature, including handbills which proclaimed Stellmacher a martyr for the cause of anarchism. He also made several trips to Germany at that time, telling his fellow workers that he was going to visit his father in Zossen. The last such trip took place on December 30, 1884; however, he did not go to Zossen, but went directly to Frankfurt-am-Main.<sup>66</sup>

The case presented against Lieske was only circumstantial; he steadfastly maintained his innocence but nevertheless

was found guilty. Lieske registered in an inn in Frankfurt named the "Deutscher Hof" at Maenzergasse 16, using the papers of the cabinet maker Heinrich Nau. He remained at the inn until the day of January 13. He claimed that he spent the night of the 13th on the road walking; his statement is probably true, because between 7:00 and 8:00 on the morning of January 14 he showed up in Bickenbach in a tavern owned by Anton Rau. Prior to going to the tavern he went to the shop of Frau Bentheim and purchased paper, envelopes, and stamps. At the trial Frau Bentheim testified that his left hand was wrapped in a handkerchief. At Rau's tavern Lieske spent five pfennigs on schnaps, ink, and a pen. While drinking the schnaps, he wrote two letters. When the tavern clientele had departed Lieske showed the owner and his 15-year-old daughter the wound on his left hand. It was about two and one fourth inches long, located between his thumb and his index finger. He said he had received the wound from falling on a sharp object. The tavern owner and his daughter cleaned and dressed the wound.

Lieske then left the tavern and Bickenbach and walked down the main road to Zwingenberg where between three and four in the afternoon he stopped at the office of Dr. Weil, telling him that he was on his way to see a friend in Mannheim, but that he had injured his hand. The doctor treated the injured hand and gave Lieske 20 pfennig because he thought he looked completely destitute. At the trial the cut hand was a strong point used against Lieske, even though Dr. Weil testified that the cut could have been caused by falling on a sharp object as Lieske claimed.<sup>67</sup>

From Zwingenberg Lieske traveled by foot to Lautenbach and on to Mannheim on January 15. On the 16th he was in Heddesheim and about 8:00 on the evening of the 18th arrived in Schwetzingen. In Schwetzingen he told an innkeeper that he had just come in on the train and wanted a room, but the innkeeper told him that the inn was full for the night. He moved on to the neighboring town of Hockenheim, arriving there about 9:30. In Hockenheim a policeman asked to check his papers and discovered that they were falsified. He asked Lieske to follow him to police headquarters, but Lieske fled firing two shots at the policeman who pursued him. Unfortunately for Lieske he ran into the arms of two men who were standing nearby and they held him until the policeman caught up with him.

Prior to being arrested, during his stay in Mannheim, Lieske had stopped at the home of Guttmann, a former anarchist whom he had met in Lausanne. Guttmann gave him a new purse with money so that he no longer had to travel on foot; when he was captured the purse still contained 13 marks. In addition to the purse and the two revolvers, there was a brown stain six centimeters long and two centimeters wide in his right coat pocket. An analysis of the stain by a chemist showed that it was blood. The shape of the stain demonstrated that the blood could not have come from his injured left hand but probably from a bloody instrument which had been placed into his pocket.

At Lieske's trial in Frankfurt from June 29 to July 1, 1885, a parade of witnesses was brought out to testify against him. A worker named Hüber testified that he had met Lieske in Frankfurt. He told how he and Lieske had discussed the Reinsdorf trial and how Lieske said that he was going to avenge the sentence of Reinsdorf. Hüber also related that Lieske praised Stellmacher. The cabinet maker Heinrich Nau related that he met Lieske in Frankfurt on January 4 and that he had given him his identification because he was an anarchist and Reinsdorf was his idol. For letting Lieske use his identification Nau was later sentenced to four months in prison.

A 14-year-old paper hanger's apprentice, Schmidt, who was in the vicinity of Rumpf's home on the night of the murder, said he had heard a scream, a garden gate slam, and then saw a long lanky figure, about 24 to 30 years old, without beard, run down the street and turn the corner. Schmidt was unable to say for certain that Lieske was the man he had seen.

The most damaging witness against Lieske was Frau Kamphausen who said she was passing Rumpf's home at 8:00 on the evening prior to the murder. She was walking with her 13-year-old daughter on the other side of the street when she saw what she thought was a vagabond lurking near the door of Rumpf's home. She and her daughter crossed the street and Frau Kamphausen asked him what he was doing there, and the man replied "None of your business." Frau Kamphausen retorted that she planned to make it her business, and then the man leaped out at them. She described him as being dressed in dark clothing, without a beard, a cap on his head, and with piercing eyes. At the trial she identified Lieske on the basis of his eyes, saying



they were the same eyes she had seen by the Rumpf house the night before the murder. Her 13-year-old daughter told the same story, but was unable to identify Lieske for certain. Lieske denied being near Rumpf house on the night of January 12th and said he did not own a cap, even though one was found in his bag after he was arrested. Another witness testified that he had the cap over the injured hand while he was in Bickenbach.

Other people living on the Sachsenlager had seen a man near the Rumpf house on the night before the murder, but were unable to identify Lieske. It was assumed that the murder had been planned for the night of January 12, but that evening Rumpf brought a friend home with him so the plan had to be delayed until the next night. Lieske denied being in the vicinity of the Rumpf home on either the 12th or 13th of January, but to no avail. The testimony of Frau Kamphausen, placing him in the yard of the Rumpf home on the night of January 12th, was very damaging. That she could be so certain of Lieske's identity was disputed at the time, due to the fact that it was dark, the street was poorly lighted, and the suspect was a considerable distance away. Lieske also denied owning a shoemaker's knife, for it was assumed that such a knife had been the murder weapon. However, witnesses were produced at the trial who testified that they had seen a shoemaker's knife in Lieske's possession, but it could no longer be located.

That so much credence should have been placed in Frau Kamphausen's testimony is remarkable when her past is considered. An account of her earlier life was sent to Der Sozialdemokrat by a number of socialists living in Cologne who had known her family for years. At 17 she was a prostitute, married at 20 to the gilder Kamphausen, who left her after a short time to go to the United States. She then returned to her old profession and went to Belgium. "She returned from the trip so syphilitic that her face was covered with sores" and went to work in a house of prostitution in Germany. She left this house to return to Belgium, but later returned to Germany "more syphilitic than the time before." Once back in Germany she went to Bonn and eventually settled in Frankfurt-am-Main where she was hired by the police as a witness to testify in the Rumpf murder. According to this unsubstantiated account all the lines she spoke at the trial were put into her mouth by the police.<sup>68</sup>

Although the evidence against Lieske was circumstantial, the fact that he had left Frankfurt in bad weather on the night

of January 13-14 and traveled on foot to Bickenbach, was sufficient in the mind of the judge to warrant the death sentence. When the sentence was handed down Lieske stomped his feet, slammed his fist on the table and shouted "Who will condemn me! Where is the evidence against me?" He then turned to the judge and said, "You have handed down your last death sentence." The guards in the room seized him and he shouted; "Ha! Rumpf is dead, Rumpf is dead!"; as they dragged him from the court house he shouted to the crowd "Up with anarchy!" and as they pushed him into the waiting van he yelled, "Throw dynamite bombs!"<sup>69</sup>

Lieske maintained his innocence, and Der Sozialdemokrat said that the evidence did not prove his guilt conclusively.<sup>70</sup> Both Max Nettlau and Rudolf Rocker include Lieske as an anarchist but claim that he did not murder Rumpf.<sup>71</sup>

Karl Lieske, brother of the accused, made an attempt to save his brother's life. Der Sozialdemokrat printed a letter dated October 25, 1885, which Karl said he had received from his brother Julius awaiting death in prison in Wehlheiden near Kassel. Julius wrote: "If I had committed the deed I should receive the punishment, but I swear to you, dear brother, I did not do it myself, nor did I take part in the murder. They have condemned an innocent man." Several other places in the same letter he stated categorically that he did not murder Rumpf. The letter had first appeared in Cri du Peuple (Paris), before it was reprinted in Der Sozialdemokrat. Karl Lieske related that he had tried to send the letter to other papers but that they had refused to print it "because they want to perpetuate the legend."<sup>72</sup>

The attempt of Karl Lieske to save his brother was to no avail, for the sentence was carried out at two minutes after eight on the morning of November 17, 1885. According to an account printed in Freiheit, the night before the execution Lieske ate a good meal, and drank some schnaps, and slept so well that he had to be awakened at seven in the morning. His head was severed with such a blow that it split the block, with blood spurting down into the newly formed split in the block. Again Most called the letter printed in Cri du Peuple and reprinted in Der Sozialdemokrat a fake, and said that for Lieske's death ten people would be killed as Rumpf had been killed for Reinsdorf. He closed his article with "Proletarians, arm yourselves! Prepare yourselves for battle! Use knives, poison, incendiary torches,

and guns to free the earth from the scum of humanity; from the exploiters, and tyrants."<sup>73</sup>

What is the truth about Lieske? Did he kill Rumpf acting alone? Did he do it while acting in conjunction with someone else, or was he, as Nettlau and Rocker maintain innocent? A final solution to this perplexing problem is not possible, but there is one account that is worth examination.

The most interesting account of the murder of Rumpf is given by the police spy Rudolf Martin, who associated with many anarchists in London, and who claimed that he had received his material from a source close to the murderers themselves. According to Martin four persons were involved in the murder, but only three of them were actually in Frankfurt. He claims that the murder of Rumpf was planned in London by Victor Dave, in November of 1884, after his release from prison.<sup>74</sup> The event was still in the planning stages at the time of Reinsdorf's trial in December in Leipzig. Dave organized a group in London for the purpose of carrying out acts of "propaganda by deed," and for the purpose of coordinating all propaganda efforts directed toward the continent. The members of the group were Dave, who set himself up as the leader, Sebastian Trunk, Gustav Knauerhase, Otto Rinke, and Josef Peukert. Rinke and Peukert balked at the attempt by Dave to establish himself as the leader of the group. According to Martin, Dave wanted Rumpf murdered in revenge for the prison sentence he had received at the Leipzig treason trial of 1881, because it was Rumpf, more than anyone else who was responsible for the prosecution's success in the trial. Martin claims that Dave contributed the largest share of the money to finance the project in order to repay Rumpf for the part he had played in the 1881 trial and to avenge the sentence handed down to Reinsdorf and his friends.

Of the four people involved in the murder of Rumpf, according to Martin, only one, Guttman, was actually inside Germany at the time the event was planned. He was in Mannheim, and it was to him that the money was sent to finance the venture. The other three, who were to carry out the murder, were in addition to Lieske, the house servant Kratz, and the cabinet-maker Heinrich Nau. Martin claims that Lieske had the least important job in the murder, and he was the only one of the conspirators who had not already compromised himself with the law, so he was sent to Frankfurt first, and for two weeks observed Rumpf's actions. Kratz and Nau had to be more

cautious because their names were already on the police blotter. Guttman was to remain in Mannheim and receive the money from London to be forwarded on to the conspirators in Frankfurt.

Martin says that on the morning after the murder Lieske wrote two letters from Bickenbach to London asking for 50 marks; he instructed that the money be sent to a cover address in the vicinity of Mannheim. According to Martin 400 marks had been accumulated for the attempt on the life of Rumpf, but when they received the two letters from Lieske, the problem which faced them in London was how to send the money to him. Supposedly Rinke was in charge and wanted to send it to a cover address with which he was familiar, and Dave concurred; but unfortunately for Lieske, the money was not sent to Germany. Dave later accused Rinke of embezzling the money, but the charge could not be proven. According to Dave, Lieske was captured because he did not have sufficient money to enable him to flee Germany.<sup>75</sup> Dave hated Rinke and Peukert so it is possible that the story is a fabrication. On the other hand it was not beneath Rinke's character to embezzle. One must conclude that Martin's account of the murder of Rumpf, even though he may have received his information from German anarchists in London, was a product of the inner struggle going on at the time in the German anarchist movement. It does not clarify the issue of who murdered Rumpf, but only obfuscates it further, and demonstrates the individual biases of the German anarchists living in London at the time.

This account is unsubstantiated except for the revelation in Peukert's memoirs that such activities were planned in London by Dave in conjunction with such a group, but Peukert does not indicate if there was any connection between this group and the killing of Rumpf.<sup>76</sup>

There is no final word on the Rumpf murder. One cannot prove Lieske's guilt or his innocence, or demonstrate that the murder was carried out by more than one person. It would appear that Lieske was not the only person involved in the murder, but the circumstances surrounding the whole affair are not clear; if there were others involved they escaped the notice of the police, and after the trial and execution of Lieske it was no longer in the government interest to investigate the matter further.

The murder of Rumpf helped to bring out into the open the widening split in the German anarchist movement. In

Freiheit, Most claimed that Rumpf had been condemned and ordered killed by the command of an executive committee.<sup>77</sup> Le Révolté, replied by asking if the German anarchists were still institutionalized.<sup>78</sup> Der Rebell answered Freiheit by saying that the German anarchists did not follow the orders of any executive committee, but undertook such ventures on individual initiative. Such acts were spontaneous and committed at the discretion of the individual and were not influenced by other members, groups, or executive committees. Der Rebell maintained that they sought to achieve the complete suppression of all authority and for that reason would never acknowledge that an executive committee had the right to order anything.<sup>79</sup>

These statements point out the disparity of views in the German anarchist camp, which were eventually going to shatter what solidarity the movement had.

#### Notes

1. An interesting poem glorifying the deeds of Reinsdorf is: Erich Mühsam, "August Reinsdorf," Fanal. Organ der Anarchisten Vereinigung, III, No. 5 (February, 1929), 118-119.

2. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. I (13,087), Folder 105. Police reports indicated that several hundred copies of the paper were found. All printed sources on this subject claim that a thousand copies of the first issue were printed, see: E. Bernstein, Die Geschichte der Berliner Arbeiterbewegung, II, p. 36; Rocker, Johann Most, p. 172.

3. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. I (13,087), Folder 184; Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. D., Nr. 421, Vol. I (9,588), Folder 21.

4. Schneidt, "Vom jungen Anarchismus," pp. 676-677; Johann Most, August Reinsdorf und die Propaganda der That (New York, 1885), p. 32. This little book was written by Most to glorify Reinsdorf and consequently is full of inaccuracies and misrepresentations, which will be pointed out in the course of this chapter, but it is useful for a number of valuable letters that are printed in it.

5. See Reinsdorf's letter of June 20, 1880 and July 17, 1880 to Most printed in Most, August Reinsdorf, pp. 33-35.

6. For the articles by Reinsdorf see: "Zur Organization," Freiheit, No. 28 (July 10, 1880), p. 3; "Zur Organisationsfrage," Ibid., No. 41 (October 9, 1880), p. 1; "Zur Organization und Taktik der Anarchisten," Ibid., No. 39 (September 25, 1880), p. 1. See also his lengthy articles in Freiheit on the make-up of a revolutionary in No. 38 (September 18, 1880), pp. 1-2 and No. 39 (September 25, 1880), pp. 1-2.

7. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. I (13,087), Folder 184; Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. G., Nr. 548 (10196), "Der Schriftsetzer Joseph Alfred Gfeller, recte: Friedrich August Reinsdorf 1880-1902.

8. Ibid.; Most, August Reinsdorf, pp. 37-38; Ernst, Polizeispitzeleien und Ausnahmegesetze 1878-1910, p. 57. The arrest of Reinsdorf added to the battle taking place between Freiheit and Der Sozialdemokrat. On November 21, 1880, Der Sozialdemokrat printed a short piece stating that Reinsdorf, alias Bernstein, alias Gfeller, had gone to Germany to meet Fleuron, alias Peterson, for the purpose of carrying out an act of "propaganda by deed," and that they had received 30 pounds (600 marks) from London. Reinsdorf was already locked up when the article appeared, but it was still considered by the anarchists a journalistic low to print such an item.

9. Rucker, Johann Most, p. 115.

10. Langhard, Die anarchistische Bewegung in der Schweiz von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart, pp. 256-257.

11. For a description of his life in Amberg prison see his article in Freiheit, No. 36 (October 28, 1882), p. 1.

12. Langhard, Die anarchistische Bewegung in der Schweiz von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart, p. 257.

13. Letter of May 11, 1882, to a friend in America printed in Most, August Reinsdorf, p. 50. Peukert claims in his memoirs that he gave Reinsdorf the money to take the trip to Munich, money which he himself had received from John Neve. He also

states that Reinsdorf told him that Most and Dave were too authoritarian; describing Most as a tyrant who permitted no opinions other than his own. Peukert claims that Reinsdorf told him that Most was as opposed to anarchism as Liebknecht, and that he, Reinsdorf, had broken with Most, even though his articles still appeared in Freiheit. Reinsdorf was supposed to have called Dave an arrogant libertarian who pictured the workers as nothing more than a bunch of dumbbells. Of course this is Peukert's rendering of a conversation that took place in Switzerland in October 1881 and there is no evidence to substantiate it. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, pp. 74-76.

14. Letter of May 11, 1882, printed in Most, August Reinsdorf, pp. 49-50; Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. G., Nr. 548a (10197), "Die Ausweisung des Schriftsetzers Alfred Gfeller, recte: Friedrich August Reinsdorf 1881-1884."

15. Reinsdorf actually was innocent of the charge of stealing dynamite. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. D., Nr. 421, Vol. I (9,588), Folder 15.

16. Letter of August 28, 1882, printed in Most, August Reinsdorf, p. 51.

17. For examples of his writing in this period see: Freiheit, No. 35 (October 14, 1882), and No. 36 (October 28, 1882).

18. Letter of July 15, 1883, printed in Most, August Reinsdorf, pp. 58-59; Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. D., Nr. 421, Vol. I (9,588), Folder 5.

19. Der Anarchistenprozess Reinsdorf und Genossen Verhandelt vor dem 2. und 3. Strafsenat des Reichsgericht zu Leipzig vom 15. bis 22. Dezember, 1884 (Leipzig, 1885), pp. 4, 26; Brandenburgisches Laneshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Tit. 94, Lit. D., Nr. 421, Vol. I (9,588), Folders 6, 87-88, 94, 157. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Acta des Königlichen Polizei-Präsidii, Geheime Präsidial-Registratur, Lit. A., Nr. 286, Vol. I (8641), "Die anarchistische

Bewegung, 1884-1885," Folders 4-10. Hereafter cited as Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Lit. A., Nr. 286, Vol. I (8641).

20. Ernst, Polizeispitzeleien und Aushahmgesetze 1878-1910, p. 57. Actually three of the members of the group were working for the police as will be brought out in the course of this chapter.

21. The Annual Register 1883 (London, 1883), pp. 40-41; A.E. Vizetelly, The Anarchists (New York, 1911), pp. 86-87.

22. G. Valbert, "L'attentat du Niederwald," Revue des deux Mondes, LXVII (February 1, 1885), p. 669.

23. Ibid., p. 673; Der Anarchistenprozess Reinsdorf und Genossen, p. 61; Lipinski, Die Sozialdemokratie von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart, II, p. 100.

24. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. D., Nr. 421, Vol. I (9,588), Folder 5.

25. Ibid., Folders 312-313. Originally they had planned to place the dynamite beneath the platform upon which the dignitaries would sit during the ceremony, but decided this was too risky.

26. Bismarck, claiming ill health, did not attend the ceremony. His absence leads to the unfounded speculation, that, if he had been informed of the plot in advance by the police spy Palm, and he obviously did nothing to stop it, if KÜchler and Rupsch had been successful, this would have put Bismarck in charge of Germany. As noted, this is only wild conjecture, but it is in the realm of the possible. The Emperor was 86 years old and could not hope to live much longer. Bismarck was aware by this time that William's successor, Friedrich, felt a deep seated animosity for him, so there was no hope that he could ever control him the way he had the old Emperor.

27. Expert opinion confirmed that the place where the dynamite had been planted was such that if the explosion had gone off as planned it would have doubtlessly killed all the intended victims. Der Anarchistenprozess Reinsdorf und Genossen, pp. 31-32.



28. Volkszeitung, No. 185 (August 9, 1884).

29. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. D., Nr. 421, Vol. I (9,588), Folders 111-112; Hessischen Hauptstaatsarchiv Weisbaden, 5 Reichsstadt Frankfurt a.M., A 8 Politische Parteien, 355, "Das Dynamit Attentat im Polizeidienstgebäude zu Frankfurt," Folders 26-30.

30. No. 7 (February 14, 1884), p. 2.

31. Freiheit, No. 6 (February 14, 1884), p. 2.

32. Die Post, No. 27 (January 28, 1884).

33. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. D., Nr. 421, Vol. I (9,588), Folders 134, 309-312.

34. Ibid., Folders 157-158.

35. Ibid., Folder 12.

36. The announcement of the arrest of Reinsdorf did not appear in the newspapers until January 15, when it appeared in the Frankfurter Gen. Anzeiger. The story was reprinted in the Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung, No. 26 (January 16, 1884), supplementing the earlier account with additional material obtained from the Frankfurter Journal and the Berliner Zeitung. In all cases Reinsdorf's name appears as Rablsdorf.

37. No. 9 (March 1, 1884), p. e.

38. A statement made by Palm to the police in Elberfeld on March 6, 1884, does contain all this information as well as information on Reinsdorf not contained in the article. He told how, on the evening of September 3, he saw Reinsdorf, KÜchler, and Bachmann meet in the Elberfeld restaurant "Gemütlichen Gottlieb," at which time Reinsdorf gave a packet containing dynamite to Bachmann as well as a quantity of money to be used to leave Elberfeld after the attentat. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., 94, Lit. D., Nr. 421, Vol. I (9,588), Folders 157-158.

39. Neue Preussische Zeitung, No. 95 (April 23, 1884). Friedlaender tells an interesting story about the arrest of Rupsch and K uchler, but does not give the source of his information. He relates that on the second day of Christmas, 1883, a workers' meeting took place in Elberfeld which was attended by workers from Elberfeld and Barmen. The group had a surplus in their treasury so Rupsch placed a bill before it for ten marks. He had pawned his trunk to obtain money for the trip he and K uchler had taken to R desheim and now needed the money to get his trunk out of hock. According to Friedlaender both Rupsch and K uchler were arrested a short time after this, so he concludes that there must have been a spy at the meeting. This is a nice story, but hardly a factual one. Hugo Friedlaender, Interessante Kriminal-Prozesse von Kulturhistorischer Bedeutung (Berlin, 1912), p. 164. At the trial Rupsch told that he had left Barmen on October 19, and had sent Holzhauer 13 marks from Sangerhausen to get the trunk out of hock, which Holzhauer did, sending the trunk to him along with a number of copies of Freiheit. K uchler, as noted below, had pawned his watch to get back to Elberfeld from R desheim, and at the meeting, which Friedlaender alludes to, he tried to obtain money to get the watch out of hock, but there is no connection between this and his subsequent arrest. Der Anarchistenprozess Reinsdorf und Genossen, pp. 32-47.

40. Fricke, Bismarcks Praetorianer, pp. 160-161; Karl Braun-Wiesbaden, "Das Attentat auf dem Niederwald und der Hochverrathsprozess vor dem Reichsgericht," Nord und S ud, XXXIII (1885), p. 66; P.M. "Das Verbrechen am Niederwald," Preussische Jahrb ucher, LV (1885), 116-123.

41. The text of the law is found in the Berliner Tagblatt, June 11, 1884. The law in many respects follows a similar law enacted earlier in England following a long series of violent bombings.

42. Fricke, Bismarcks Praetorianer, p. 161.

43. Ibid., pp. 235-240; Langhard, Die anarchistische Bewegung in der Schweiz von ihren Anf ngen bis zur Gegenwart, p. 317.

44. "Das Drama vor dem Reichsgericht," Wochenblatt der Frankfurter Zeitung, No. 51 (December 21, 1884), p. 403; "Der Anarchistenprozess," Ibid., No. 52 (December 28, 1884), p. 411. The trial also caught the imagination of Henry James for the principal characters in his novel, The Princess Casamassima (London, 1886), bear a strong resemblance to those who were on trial at Leipzig. For a study of this see: W.H. Tilley, The Background of the Princess Casamassima (University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, 1961).

45. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. D., Nr. 421, Vol. I (9,588), Folders 312-313; Der Anarchistenprozess Reinsdorf und Genossen, pp. 32-47. The police investigation was extensive but failed to turn up much new information beyond what they already knew at the outset. Two of the more interesting statements were made by Hermann Stellmacher and Karl Grillenberger. Stellmacher related to the police that he knew that Reinsdorf had some dynamite and that he was planning an explosion and he thought it was to be in Frankfurt. Grillenberger on February 16, 1884, in Nuremberg, told all that he knew to the police about anarchist activities, relating that he had known Reinsdorf in Leipzig in 1879. Another person the police arrested was Carl Mildemberger, who was seized in Mannheim on January 19, 1884. They tried to connect him with the explosion in Frankfurt, but had to release him after 14 days when they were unable to associate him with the crime. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. D., Nr. 421, Vol. I (9,588), Folders 102-103. 111-112. For an account of Mildemberger's imprisonment see: Carl Mildemberger, "In Sachen Rumpfs," Freiheit, No. 5 (January 31, 1885), pp. 2-3.

46. Der Anarchistenprozess Reinsdorf und Genossen, pp. 17-22.

47. Ibid., pp. 55-58.

48. Ibid., p. 57.

49. Ibid., pp. 58-59.

50. Ibid., p. 88.

51. Ibid., p. 89.

52. Ibid.

53. Most, August Reinsdorf, p. 51.

54. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. D., Nr. 421, Vol. I (9,588), Folders 4-5, 12.

55. For example see: The Times (London), December 19, 1884, p. 5, Col. c.

56. Der Anarchistenprozess Reinsdorf und Genossen, pp. 22-27, 61-65. It appears that the police had two other spies or informers working for them in conjunction with Palm in the Elberfeld area. The two men, both of whom were weavers, were Johann Schiebeck (b. July 28, 1852 in Langenau), and Wilhelm Weidenmüller, already mentioned above. A detailed statement by Schiebeck implicating Reinsdorf and his associates is found in the police files. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. D., Nr. 421, Vol. I (9,588), Folders 337-339. At the trial Reinsdorf called Schiebeck, Weidenmüller, and Palm all police spies. Der Anarchistenprozess Reinsdorf und Genossen, pp. 61-67. Weidenmüller's name was mentioned often at the trial and appears frequently in police documents on the case. He, along with Palm, was present at the planning of the explosion which took place in the Willemsen Restaurant, and also at the planning of the Niederwald plot. The evidence against Weidenmüller was substantial. He played a greater role in the obtaining and hiding in the woods of the dynamite than some of the individuals who were on trial. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. D., Nr. 421, Vol. I (9,588), Folders 135, 158, 220, 315. These facts were brought out at the trial and Reinsdorf repeatedly asked the Police Commissioner Gottschalk about Weidenmüller, but received little information in the answers given him. Reinsdorf claimed that Weidenmüller was sent to the United States to work as a spy for the German police. This assertion by Reinsdorf is probably correct because Weidenmüller was "arrested" in March around the same time that Palm was "apprehended" by the police. Volkszeitung, No. 58 (March 8, 1884). Even though there was a great deal of evidence against him, Weidenmüller was released and "emigrated" to the United States. In the United States he remained in New York, joining the Freiheit group there, who found him a job.

His arrival is mentioned in a letter probably written in late April 1884 (the date on the letter is 1884, but the contents indicate that it was probably written in late April). The letter was from Friedrich Erenkoller in New York to Richard Külpmann in Barmen. For the letter see: Brandenburgisches Landeshaup-tarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. D., Nr. 421, Vol. I (9,588), Folders 218-219. A shortened version of the letter was read at the trial. There can be little doubt that Weidenmüller was sent to the United States to act as a spy. His arrival in New York, shortly after that of Carl Mildenerger, who had been held for questioning in the explosion which damaged the police headquarters in Frankfurt, was heralded as another hero who had barely escaped the clutches of the German police. A spy infiltrated the inner circle of Most's group in 1884. This unnamed spy sent many long and detailed reports on Most and Freiheit to the Berlin police. Brandenburgisches Landeshaup-tarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. A., Nr. 286, Vol. I (8641), "Die anarchistische Bewegung 1884-1885."

57. The police never solved the question of who blew up the Frankfurt Police Headquarters Building. In 1887 a group of anarchists captured in Mannheim claimed that the explosion was set off by Julius Lieske. Die Autonomie, No. 15 (May 2, 1887), p. 3.

58. Der Anarchistenprozess Reinsdorf und Genossen, pp. 90-97; Rocker, Johann Most, p. 211.

59. Karl Braun-Wiesbaden, "Das Attentat auf dem Niederwald und der Hochverrathsprozess vor dem Reichsgericht," p. 76.

60. Ibid., pp. 76-82. A crowd gathered early outside the prison gates hoping to see the execution, but were not allowed in. Friedlaender, Interessante Kriminal-Prozesse von Kulturhis-torischer Bedeutung, p. 240. An interesting sidelight to the Reinsdorf execution is the article, "Nieder mit den Barbarei," Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 7 (February 12, 1885), p. 1, which spoke out against the execution of Reinsdorf and Kückler. This added to the confusion in the public mind as to just where did the Social Democratic Party stand. While Reinsdorf was alive the Social Democratic Party went out of their way to malign him, now that he was dead they were opposed to his execution.

Articles such as this did little to clarify the differences between the anarchists and Social Democrats.

61. The letter to Bruno is printed in Most, August Reinsdorf, pp. 75-76. The letter to Franz in Schaact, Anarchy and Anarchists, pp. 98-99.

62. Printed in Schaact, Anarchy and Anarchists, p. 99.

63. "Die Ermordung des Polizeirath Rumpf," Wochenblatt der Frankfurter Zeitung, No. 3 (January 18, 1885), pp. 21-22; Der Anarchismus und seine Träger, p. 101.

64. Martin, Der Anarchismus und seine Träger, pp. 102-103.

65. No. 25 (February 1-14, 1885), p. 4.

66. "Der Prozess Lieske," Freiheit, No. 29 (July 18, 1885), pp. 4-5; "Der Prozess Lieske," Wochenblatt der Frankfurter Zeitung, No. 27 (July 5, 1885), pp. 209-210; Le Révolté, No. 8 (July 10-August 2, 1885), p. 3; Ludwig Fuld, "Die Ermordung des Polizeiraths Dr. Rumpf in Frankfurt a.M." Nord und Süd, ~~XXIV~~ (1885), p. 476; Bericht über die Schwurgerichts Verhandlung von 29. Juni bis 1. Juli 1885 gegen Julius Lieske (Leipzig, 1885), pp. 1-40.

67. Ibid.

68. Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 47 (November 19, 1885), p. 1.

69. "Der Prozess Lieske," Freiheit, No. 29 (July 18, 1885), p. 4; Fuld, "Die Ermordung des Polizeiraths Dr. Rumpf in Frankfurt a.M.," p. 480.

70. No. 28 (July 9, 1885), p. 1.

71. Nettelau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, p. 332; Rocker, Johann Most, p. 212.

72. Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 47 (November 19, 1885), p. 1. A reply came quickly from Most who said the letter had

been falsified, Freiheit, No. 48 (November 28, 1885), p. 1.

73. "An Grabe Lieske," Freiheit, No. 49 (December 5, 1885), p. 1; Ibid., No. 50 (December 12, 1885), p. 1; Le Révolté, No. 18 (December 20-January 2, 1886), p. 2.

74. Dave was released from prison April 21, 1884, and arrived in London in early May of the same year. Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, p. 332.

75. Der Anarchismus und seine Träger, pp. 113-119. It should also be noted that Guttman was arrested in Mannheim a short time after the arrest of Lieske. He was transported to Frankfurt a.M. where he underwent a long interrogation in connection with the Rumpf murder. Evidently the police were not able to establish that he had taken part in the affair for he was returned to Mannheim where he remained, for a period of time, under police custody for being an anarchist. Freiheit, No. 19 (May 9, 1885), p. 4.

76. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, pp. 14-15.

77. No. 27 (July 4, 1885), p. 1.

78. No. 8 (July 14-August 2, 1885), p. 3.

79. October, 1885, p. 1.

## Chapter X

### BRUDERKRIEG

In analyzing the German anarchist movement during the 1880's one factor stands out—the substantial amount of infighting that existed in the movement in London after 1884, infighting which contributed heavily to the demise of the movement. Primarily two issues were involved in the Bruderkrieg; who should be the leader of the movement and what should be its ideology. All of the principal characters who played a role in the Bruderkrieg had been in London prior to 1884, but only on a temporary basis. In the year 1884 they returned to London after being released from German prisons, or after having been forced out of Switzerland as undesirables. Johann Most, who can be thought of as the titular head of the movement, in 1884 was in permanent exile in the United States, but nevertheless he played an important role in the split in the German anarchist movement. The leading roles in the struggle were acted out by Victor Dave and Josef Peukert, with John Neve, Gustav Knauerhase, Sebastian Trunk, and Otto Rinke playing secondary roles. The rank-and-file German-speaking anarchists lined up with either Dave or Peukert.

The split in the German-speaking anarchist movement started to emerge when Victor Dave returned to London in early May 1884 after being released from Halle prison in Germany on April 21. He had been incarcerated since his arrest in Augsburg on December 8, 1880. Many things had changed in the years during his imprisonment. The London Congress had taken place, at which the delegates had officially adopted the policy of "propaganda by deed" and the philosophy of communist-anarchism; Freiheit and Most had moved to the United States; the movement in Austria had been crushed; several of the leading Austrian anarchists had been either imprisoned, sentenced to death, or forced into exile. The same was true in Germany. When Dave was imprisoned the only anarchist paper published in the German language was Freiheit, but when he arrived in London he founded Der Rebell as a rival organ.

The first issue of Der Rebell, Organ Anarchisten deutscher Sprache was published by Otto Rinke and Emil Werner in



Geneva, Switzerland in December, 1881. The name Erste freie Druckereie Deutschland appeared on the masthead as the printer of the paper, but the German police quickly discovered that no such company existed in Germany. They assumed, incorrectly, that the paper had been printed in London.<sup>1</sup> From Switzerland Rebell was smuggled in bundles overland into southern Germany, and copies were sent out in letters as well. In February 1882 about 500 copies of the December issue were found in Grabow; copies were also discovered in Riedlingen, Stettin, Gotha, and Munich.<sup>2</sup>

It was a long time before the second issue of Der Rebell appeared in October 1883, followed by numbers three and four in November and December respectively. The October issue declared adherence to the principles of communist-anarchism, and declared war on the "holy trinity"—the state, individual property rights, and religion. The October issue claimed it was printed by the Freie Volksbuchdruckerei Gemeinigt in Nirgendheim, but it was actually published in London. Large numbers of copies appeared in Germany and for several months the German police were unsure of exactly where it was being printed. It was distributed in the streets of some German cities, placed in private letter boxes, thrown into the vestibules and hallways of homes, and left in neighborhood bars. In December, 1883, two packets containing 150 and 100 copies respectively were found in Altona. These two bundles had been destined for Karlsruhe and Magdeburg. In the same month in Bockenheim a packet of 50 copies was discovered by postal authorities. The bundle had been returned from Magdeburg with the notation "addressee unknown." In February 1884 two bundles intended for Speyer and Mannheim were found in Lörrach in the possession of a young boy who had brought them there from Basel, Switzerland. On March 2, 1884, Otto Naumann (b. July 15, 1847 in Dresden) was apprehended in Stuttgart distributing Der Rebell. Shortly after that a bundle of 30 copies of Der Rebell was found by police in Altona who assumed that the main smuggling route was by ship from Hull in England to Hamburg.<sup>3</sup>

Many copies of Der Rebell sent through the mail fell into the hands of the police. In the third issue of Rebell appeared an open letter to the German Postmaster General, Stephen, which said that the Post Office had been set up by the state to serve all the people, but now it was working in close conjunction with the police. The letter said that service both to and from

known socialists was very poor and claimed that all mail to and from such known socialists was opened and inspected.

This same issue of Der Rebell carried a short article on the dynamite explosion which had occurred in Frankfurt-am-Main on October 29. Also published were the most recent contributions to the propaganda fund which listed ten marks for nitroglycerin, six marks for rebellion, eight marks from "only through poison can we be victorious," three marks from "down with the friends of the military," three marks from "in darkness, yes in darkness," and six marks from Brutus.

The printing of Rebell in London was done by Rinke who returned to London in October 1883. He had been released from Ulm prison on October 10, after serving a sentence for his military desertion of 1873. The prison sentence and the events in Rinke's life for the years immediately preceding must be recounted because they help to explain the depths of distrust which developed among fellow German anarchists.

During the years 1879-1880 Rinke, using Paris as his headquarters, slipped in and out of Germany while helping to develop the cell organization there. In the fall of 1880 when the German police moved against the anarchist cell network they arrested him in Mannheim. At the time Rinke was using the name Otto Rau, and the police evidently were not aware of how important a person they had arrested and so they released him after a short time. He then returned to Paris where he met Peukert for the first time. They remained life-long friends, and constituted the leadership of one faction of the German-speaking anarchist movement. The occasion of their first meeting was an assembly at which Liebknecht spoke on the subject of "Die Revolutionäre Kraft der deutschen Sozialdemokratie."<sup>4</sup>

Rinke spent nearly all his time after 1881 in Paris except for short trips to Germany and Switzerland. In Paris he became the constant companion of Balthasar Grün, a young and impressive German anarchist. On February 28, 1882, in Paris a woman, Céline Renoux was robbed and left with her head crushed by a thick champagne bottle. It was assumed, at the time, that the crime had been committed by Grün, but that Rinke had masterminded it.<sup>5</sup> In March 1882, Rinke and Grün went on a propaganda trip to Germany, but were quickly apprehended by the police in Darmstadt. After they were imprisoned Grün took

his life in Hanau in September 1882, where both of them were held before Rinke was transferred to Ulm. The part that Grün's suicide in prison played in the bitter infighting of the Bruderkrieg will be detailed below.<sup>6</sup>

Peukert, who along with Rinke led the opposition against Dave and the Mostian forces, arrived in London during the last part of February 1884. On February 16 Peukert had spoken to the 70 members of the "Freiheit" group who had assembled in the Cafe Rütli in Bern.<sup>7</sup> At this meeting he was warned by Karl Moor that the Swiss police were looking for him to extradite him to Austria where police officials wanted to question him because of his connections with Stellmacher and Kammerer. He left Switzerland immediately and went to Paris where he remained for a few days before going to London. In London Peukert quickly renewed his old friendship with Rinke and collaborated with him on the publication of Rebell. The paper was in such poor financial straits that it did not have an editorial office; the type was set and the printing was done in Rinke's living room. With considerable newspaper experience as editor of Zukunft, Peukert assumed the editorial duties and wrote most of the copy himself. Rinke set the type, assisted by the compositors Moritz Schultze and E. Milly.<sup>8</sup>

It had cost 471 marks to purchase the printing equipment necessary to publish Der Rebell. It cost 90 marks to publish a single issue, while only ten marks an issue came in from the subscribers. By and large the paper was distributed free of charge. The deficit which Rebell encountered was covered by gifts from interested anarchists who wanted to see the paper continue. Usually 1000 copies per issue of Rebell were printed, but sometimes this figure dropped as low as 500 copies per issue. In addition to the Rebell Rinke and Peukert printed Flugblätter which were issued in editions of 1200; it cost 87 marks to print such an edition. The smuggling of Rebell into Germany was not a well-planned operation. Those who smuggled Rebell employed many of the same techniques as those who smuggled Freiheit; often times using the same route. Sometimes the same people smuggled Freiheit and Rebell into Germany simultaneously. The main route used to smuggle Rebell into Germany was through Belgium.<sup>9</sup> When Dave arrived in London in May 1884, Rebell, although it was not thriving, was proclaiming itself to be the organ of all German-speaking communist-anarchists.

In London in 1884 most German-speaking socialists, anarchists, and revolutionaries belonged to the Kommunistischer-

Arbeiterbildungsverein. There were three different sections of this organization and each group had its own club house. In the First Section were found, for the most part, anarchists and revolutionaries. They called themselves the Whitfield Club and had their club house at 46 Whitfield Street, Stephens Mew, Rath-bonne Place, which was a small street east of Regents Street. This group was responsible for the distribution of Freiheit to the continent. Their club house was a small, unfriendly appearing place with splintered windows held together, with great difficulty, by large quantities of sealing wax. Written over the window of the front door were the words "Whitfield Chambers 6d the night for single men." The participants who took part in the Bruderkrieg came from this section.

The Second Section, composed primarily of Social Democrats, had its headquarters on Tottenham Street, while the Third Section, which like the First was made-up of mainly anarchists and revolutionaries, was called the Club Morgenröthe and was situated in the east side of London not far from the British Museum on Princess Square, 23 Gable Street, in one of the worst sections of London, inhabited primarily by outcasts. Over the inner door of the club house appeared the words "Internat. Workingmen's Educational Society." Inscribed on the wall of the meeting room of the club in large golden letters was the admonition "Arbeiter gedenkt eurer Märtyrer." Below this phrase were written the names Reinsdorf, Holzhauer, Kändler, Lieske, Stellmacher, Grün, and Kammerer. In the Bruderkrieg the Club Morgenröthe remained neutral.<sup>10</sup>

The clubs had been formed because the public houses (pubs) which the anarchists and socialists had formerly been using for their meeting places closed too early at night and were open for only a few hours on Sunday and the holidays. What is more, they were too small and "too public" for the tastes of the anarchists and socialists. The clubs either built a club house, or bought a building and remodeled it to suit their needs. In the club beer and other alcoholic beverages were served. Members could entertain guests in the bar room of the club. There were also reading rooms, a billiard room, buffet, and on the second floor there was a large meeting room, which had a stage at one end of the large room. This room was also used for dances, plays, suppers, and other forms of entertainment. The purpose of the club was that it should serve as a center for the distribution of propaganda and the collection of money for the movement. It was also a place where the members

could meet and discuss the ideas of anarchism and socialism, as well as serving as a focal point of entertainment for both the club members and their families.<sup>11</sup>

The clubs were more interested in the number of members than the quality of those they attracted. Membership dues in some clubs were two pence a week. Admission to dances and plays was six pence. The suppers which were held were either "pot luck" affairs or, if the entire meal was prepared at the club, usually the wives of the members were in charge of the preparations. The price of such a dinner was quite nominal. Each of the clubs had a steward who lived in the club and took care of it in return for his room and board. The number of anarchists in the clubs was about 300.<sup>12</sup>

Before moving on to the actual events of the Bruderkrieg it should be made amply clear that the infighting which took place in the movement was more complex in motives than merely a struggle of differing personalities or an attempt by one side to dominate the other: a basic ideological difference was at the root of the trouble. Victor Dave, who had been imprisoned from December 1880 to April 1884, was a product of the First International. He had been thoroughly indoctrinated by the ideas of Bakunin and Proudhon. Those who opposed him in the Bruderkrieg, Peukert and Rinke, had on the other hand been influenced by Kropotkin. Both of them had worked in Switzerland in close collaboration with the Russian anarchist prince during the developmental period of communist-anarchism. At times Rinke had worked on Le Révolté, and it should be noted in this respect, although it is obvious, that the title of Rinke's and Peukert's paper Der Rebell is nothing more than the German equivalent of Le Révolté.

In France both Rinke and Peukert traveled in communist-anarchist circles, associating with the well-known communist-anarchists, Emile Gautier and Elisée Reclus. Both Rinke and Peukert read and spoke French and kept abreast of the most recent developments in anarchist thought. Peukert had little knowledge of Bakuninist anarchism and it is doubtful if Rinke knew much more about the old master of the First International even though he was in Switzerland before Bakunin's death in 1876.

Even before he was apprehended by the German police in December 1880 Dave had lost touch with the movement on

the continent. He spent his time in London where he worked in conjunction with Most on Freiheit; also, his earlier activities on the continent had been confined to areas and persons which were outside the mainstream of the newly developing philosophy of communist-anarchism. In London Dave and Most became the best of friends, and as has been already pointed out, Most at this time was not an admirer of communist-anarchism. Since late in 1882 Most had been in the United States and was out of touch with the new currents in anarchism; devoting most of his time and energy to "propaganda by deed."

Bakuninism had already started to disintegrate in 1874 and by 1876 new ideas started to develop in anarchism under the guidance of Peter Kropotkin, Elisée Reclus, Errico Malatesta, and Carlo Cafiero which gradually rejected the tactical and theoretical tenets of "collectivist anarchism" as Bakunin's version of anarchism is usually called.<sup>13</sup> The new school of communist-anarchists concluded that Bakunin's ideas were not a formula for freedom, but a collection of abstract, contradictory libertarian and anti-authoritarian ideas, enforced by Bakunin's own dictatorial, authoritarian practices. The communist-anarchists disagreed with Bakunin's demands for absolute submission to his authority and the forming of an "invisible dictatorship" that would steer the revolution down the right path. Kropotkin and the other adherents of communist-anarchism wanted a form of organization that would have no trace of hierarchial principle in it. Everyone would work voluntarily according to his abilities and consume according to his needs. The communist-anarchists based their hopes for success on a belief in the inherent goodness of man and on the principle of mutual aid.

The Bakuninist ideology held out a greater appeal to Social Democratic converts to anarchism than to neophytes; Bakuninism, in the estimation of the converts, was not as radical as the "Ultra-utopian dream of Kropotkin."<sup>14</sup> The Bakuninist appeal was especially strong in the United States where the greater share of the German anarchists were former Social Democrats. Johann Most is the striking illustration. He has been described by Nomad as a "reluctant anarchist" who emphasized terror and whose philosophy was a "hybrid of Bakuninist, Blanquist, Marxist and Lassalleian (iron law of wages) ideas."<sup>15</sup> It is doubtful if Most ever truly accepted the ideas of communist-anarchism, although in later years he did pay lip-service to them. To the end of his life Most remained a strong believer in the principle that he who does not work should not receive.

This is of course diametrically opposed to the beliefs of communist-anarchism.

Ideologically then the two camps in the Bruderkrieg were separated by a wide chasm which had been opening for a decade. In one camp Most and Dave adhered to the older ideas of anarchism, while in the other Peukert and Rinke followed communist-anarchism. Ironically both camps believed in "propaganda by deed."

The contrasting personalities of Peukert and Most played important roles in the Bruderkrieg; they carried a bitter hatred of each other to the grave. Ostensibly they were both fighting for the same thing, but in personality they were direct opposites: a natural antagonism erupted between them almost from their first meeting. Peukert resented the favorable position Most held in the German-speaking anarchist movement and his domination of Freiheit, but it cannot be said that this resentment can be equated with jealousy. It is doubtful if Peukert was actually jealous of Most, or if he considered himself as a rival for the mantle which Most wore; Peukert's argument with Most was more basic than this, as will be demonstrated. On the other hand Most considered himself the titular head of the German anarchist movement and viewed all who opposed him as aspirants to his crown. Peukert was more than willing to work within the established framework of the German-speaking anarchist movement if he had been accorded a position commensurate with what he considered to be his abilities. Unfortunately, he estimated his potential more highly than Most did.

Peukert's dislike of Most can be traced to 1880 when he assumed the responsibilities for the movement in Paris. In a letter of September 20, 1880, to Victor Dave, Peukert spoke in critical terms of Most's diatribe against the voters in Germany. He was also angry with Most for having refused to print an article which he had sent to Freiheit. The reason Most gave for rejecting the article was that it "stood too far to the right." Peukert went on to criticize Most and Freiheit by saying that any newspaper which was controlled by one man had no right to call itself Social Democratic which was still the subtitle of Freiheit at the time. He also said dogmatically that Freiheit was not a newspaper for "all socialists." A Paris comrade of Peukert, H. M. Weiss, gave Most a more detailed account of Peukert's feelings and Most sent Dave to Paris to talk to his lieutenant in charge there. Peukert and Dave had a long

talk about his unfriendly attitude toward Most and Freiheit. In the end Peukert's opinions were not changed, but he became reconciled, at least for the moment, to the position of power which Most held in the movement.<sup>16</sup>

It is known for certain that Peukert did not welcome Most into the anarchist movement. Nettlau believes that the reason Peukert hated Most stems from the fact that he thought of himself as the person who should have been the leader of the German-speaking anarchists as well as the editor of Freiheit. Nettlau points out that Peukert thought he possessed greater organizational abilities and more potential for agitation than did Most. It is doubtful if Peukert actually thought of himself in such a way. In the course of this chapter, as well as in the next, evidence will be introduced which will demonstrate that organization and centralization was something which Peukert strongly opposed, regardless of who was in charge of the organization. In Nettlau's opinion Most was a more capable agitator than Peukert which is probably true. He also concludes, after having read everything that Peukert had written in Zukunft (Vienna), Der Rebell, Die Autonomie and Der Anarchist (New York), that Most's style of writing was more effective; while Peukert's style was dull, flat, theoretical, verbose and long-winded. Nettlau relates that he had heard Peukert speak in meetings in Vienna in 1882-1883, and in London in 1886 and that his speaking abilities did not match those of Most; however, Nettlau does not claim that he ever heard Most speak and it is doubtful if he ever did. Nettlau finds Peukert to be obstinate, opinionated, and bitter. Rudolf Rocker concurs with Nettlau in his appraisal of Peukert, although he admits he never met him in person. Likewise it is doubtful how accurate Nettlau's estimation of Peukert is. His relationship, if it can be called that, was confined to attending meetings which were also attended by Peukert in London in 1886, meetings which were assembled to settle outstanding recriminations in the Bruderkrieg.<sup>17</sup>

Peukert's style of writing is more pedantic than that of Most and is aimed at the reader's reason; Most, on the other hand, appealed to the reader's emotions. Peukert lacked Most's flamboyant style of writing and his ability to put things in the vernacular of the worker, but what he had to say was better thought out, more logical, and more accurate than what appeared in the columns of Freiheit. Accuracy and logic were not important to Most; only the impact of the message was important. Essentially Most was a revolutionary and his talents lay in the



areas of emotional rhetoric and flamboyant yellow journalism; as a theoretician or stickler for details he had no ability. Most was an outgoing insecure extrovert, while Peukert was basically an introvert. To Peukert anarchism had a significant theoretical dimension, while to Most it was a practical goal to be achieved. Peukert's articles were often highly theoretical and it would have been difficult for the ordinary working man to comprehend the subtle implications of his arguments. On the other hand, Most always hit at the core of a matter in simple, direct language which the workers could understand. Peukert stood for individualism and individual initiative, against centralization in any form; he demanded that anarchism should place the initiative of the individual above all else. By its very nature anarchism meant the negation of authority in all forms. These views were anathema to Most who thought of the anarchist movement in terms of the leaders, and the led.

Emma Goldman, who was acquainted with both Most and Peukert in the United States, called Peukert a "weak-kneed revolutionist," who lacked Most's "vivid personality ... genius ... and fascinating spontaneity. Peukert was a grave pedantic, utterly devoid of humour ... and was not made of the stuff of heroes or martyrs."<sup>18</sup> In all fairness to Peukert it should be noted that Emma Goldman carried on a love affair with Most, while her attempt to establish a dialogue with Peukert was scorned.

Max Nomad finds that Peukert "had neither the journalistic brilliancy nor the oratorical verve of Most," and states that Most refused to print Peukert's articles in Freiheit because they were "purely theoretical and exceedingly dull discourses" which "would not be of any interest to the readers,"<sup>19</sup> On the other hand a contemporary of Peukert during his London days, the police spy Rudolf Martin, was more favorably impressed by his abilities. He describes Peukert as having pitch black hair and as being tall and thin, with disproportionately long arms and exceptionally large hands which he swung widely in the air as he spoke. Martin found that when Peukert spoke he generated a great deal of excitement in the audience.<sup>20</sup>

The differing personalities and abilities of Peukert and Most are important because they eventually split the German-speaking anarchist movement down the middle into two opposing camps; a split which was never healed, and which even spilled

over into the German-speaking anarchist groups in the United States.

Before continuing it should be noted that despite their deep-seated theoretical and tactical differences the relations between Most and Peukert remained cordial until Dave's arrival in London in May 1884. In a letter of April 25, 1884, Most related to Peukert that an Associated Press dispatch, which he said had been carried in many American newspapers, claimed that Peukert had been exposed in Geneva as a police spy, a charge which Most, himself, described as ludicrous.<sup>21</sup> Before the Bruderkrieg was finished Most considered Peukert to be many things, including perhaps a police spy. The influence that Victor Dave had on forming Most's opinion of Peukert is a factor which cannot be overlooked.

The Bruderkrieg existed underneath the surface of the German anarchist movement for over a year before it broke out into the open. It existed in personal antagonisms, which, at first, appeared to be important only to the leadership of the warring camps. One factor which became involved early in the inner struggle was concerned with the publication of Der Rebell. Again in 1884 Freiheit was in serious financial trouble because the money sent from Germany and Austria did not even cover the cost involved in transporting the paper across the ocean, let alone the cost involved in smuggling it into Germany and Austria. This deficit had to be defrayed by contributions from those within the movement living in the United States and England. Even though Most himself welcomed the reappearance of Der Rebell in October 1883, there were those within the movement who were not so enthusiastic. They considered Der Rebell to be at best a financial risk and were doubtful if it could succeed. Furthermore they thought that Der Rebell would drain away from Freiheit funds which were badly needed. Der Rebell was not therefore welcomed with open arms by everyone in the anarchist camp, even though it had received Most's official endorsement in the columns of Freiheit. Although Rinke, and later Peukert, were fully aware of the financial risk involved in such a publishing venture, as well as the significance it could have to the movement, they persisted in pointing out the need for a European anarchist paper published in the German language, claiming that Freiheit was too American and as such could never hope to pay its own way in Germany. Like Freiheit, Der Rebell was plagued with serious financial troubles. It was published

irregularly with only 17 issues appearing in the period 1881-1886. The opponents of the paper claimed that the editorial work was shabbily done and that Rinke and Peukert were not suited to the task of publishing a newspaper; claims which are not substantiated by reading Der Rebell. The fact that the editorial work on Der Rebell often did not match that of Freiheit was not as disturbing as the fact that the paper threatened to cut into the readership of Freiheit in Germany and Austria, a threat which especially Dave and the Freiheit group in London could not afford to let go unanswered.

Soon after his arrival in London Victor Dave took over the responsibilities for the distribution of Freiheit to Germany and Austria. He came out in opposition to Der Rebell as did Sebastian Trunk and John Neve. Acting on the advice of Dave, Neve wrote from Zürich to Rinke and Peukert asking them to voluntarily cease the publication of Der Rebell, telling them that it would be in the best interest of the movement if the paper were terminated. In his letter Neve expressed fear that if the paper continued to be published it would have the effect of splitting the movement into two opposing camps.<sup>22</sup>

On December 15, 1884, Neve was forced by Swiss officials to leave Switzerland and so he went to London. Soon after his arrival there, a conference was held to discuss the fate of Der Rebell. At this conference Peukert maintained that Most would not permit any opinion other than Most's own to appear in Freiheit. He related that, on many occasions, he had sent articles to Freiheit, but Most had refused to publish them. Neve then rose to his feet and said that this was not sufficient cause to start a new anarchist newspaper which threatened to split the movement; Dave and Trunk quickly expressed their agreement with this opinion. At this juncture, Rinke vehemently declared that as long as he had ten fingers Der Rebell would continue to be published. The conference solved nothing. Der Rebell continued to be published, and in the end the opponents remained as they had been at the outset, with Rinke and Peukert in opposition to Most and Dave.<sup>23</sup>

There were other undercurrents involved in the early stages of the Bruderkrieg. In April 1884 Most started to publish in Freiheit a series of articles which appeared in July in pamphlet form with the title Die freie Gesellschaft. Eine Abhandlung über die Prinzipien und Taktik der Communistischen Anarchisten. The ideas set forth in this series of articles did not coincide

with the prevailing themes of communist-anarchism, but more closely resembled the ideology which Bakunin had espoused during the First International. Strong objections to this Mostian interpretation of anarchism were expressed by Rinke and Peukert. In a letter written in August 1884 to Karl Helbedl in Winterthur, Peukert said that the Mostian articles on "freie Gesellschaft" were a "disgrace to the movement" and that many German-speaking anarchists in London were beginning to question the acceptability of Freiheit as their official organ.<sup>24</sup> Helbedl showed Peukert's letter to a number of his friends and eventually the contents of it found their way to Most. This disclosure embittered Most even more against Peukert and his letters to Dave seethed with hatred for his rival.<sup>25</sup>

Still another aspect of the undercurrent was Peukert's charge that Dave wanted to centralize all threads of the German-speaking anarchist movement in his own hands in London, and that he also wanted to control all contacts made with the continent. Dave had entered the anarchist movement much earlier than Peukert and had received his training in the First International. He could see the value of organization. But to anarchists who had entered the movement at a latter date, such as Peukert, organization was something to be avoided at all costs.

The arrival of Dave in London, after his release from prison, just about coincided with the implementation of the Swiss policy of expelling anarchists from their borders. Before long this resulted in practically closing Switzerland as a route that could be used to smuggle Freiheit into Germany and Austria. The closing of this route severely curtailed the distribution of Freiheit in southern Germany and Austria. Shortly after his arrival in London Dave wrote to Neve, who was still in Switzerland, asking if it were possible to reopen the Swiss smuggling route. This proved to be an impossible task and on December 15, 1884, Neve himself was forced again to leave the country. The connections which had been established for the smuggling of Freiheit into Germany and Austria were thrown into a state of complete disorganization because Switzerland was the place from which the smugglers operated and it was now closed to them. Dave and Neve saw the need to rebuild the smuggling routes completely to get Freiheit into Germany and Austria. As a result of this realization a so called European Office of Freiheit was established in London with Sebastian Trunk and Gustav Knauerhase in charge, with the greater share of the work and responsibility falling on the shoulders of Knauerhase.<sup>26</sup>

A conference was held in London to discuss better methods to establish firmer ties with Germany and Austria. At this conference Dave and a few of his associates set up a commission which was to be composed of three or four trusted and capable men. This small commission would be responsible for the smuggling of Freiheit into Germany and Austria. It would control all connections the London office made with the movement inside Germany and Austria. Dave suggested that in order to aid the commission all German-speaking anarchists should turn over to the group all addresses and connections they had within Germany and Austria. In the opinion of Dave such a commission would serve two purposes: first, it would increase and somewhat regularize the number of contacts that could be made with Germany and Austria; and second, by selecting only people who had demonstrated that they could be trusted it would make connections with Germany and Austria safer. This plan would also eliminate the need for making connections with people in Germany and Austria who were unknown to the members in London. Frequently an anarchist in Germany or Austria was arrested as a result of the haphazard system of communication that existed between London and the continent.<sup>27</sup>

Of those present at the conference only two, Rinke and Peukert, disagreed with Dave's plan. They objected to it on the grounds that it would hinder individual initiative in the movement and pointed out that it would be dangerous to have all the connections to the anarchist groups in Germany and Austria leading out from a single central point in London.

Peukert said he would never surrender the addresses and connections he had to the commission. He claimed that the only reason his associates, Rinke and Knauerhase, took part in the meeting was to see who Dave intended to place on the commission. In the battle over the commission Trunk was on Dave's side. When Neve arrived in London in December 1884, both Dave and Peukert tried to sway him over to their respective point of view of the commission. Dave eventually won, although it should be noted that Neve continued to have a foot in each of the camps.<sup>28</sup>

As set up by Dave, the commission was to be composed of Peukert, Rinke, Knauerhase, Trunk and Dave, but Peukert refused to join because he would not hand over his addresses and connections on the continent. Rinke and Knauerhase joined it to see what Dave had in mind. The commission members,

being of such divergent points of view, found it impossible to work together. When the commission was formed Knauerhase was still in charge of the distribution of Freiheit on the continent. When it became apparent that Knauerhase's sympathies lay with Rinke and Peukert, it was revealed by Dave that he had spent ten pounds of club funds for conspiratorial purposes without the permission of the First Section of the Kommunistischer-Arbeiterbildungsverein. This money had not been used for his own purposes, but was actually spent in Germany to aid the movement there. Nevertheless, he was held accountable for the missing funds and was forced to give up the position he held in charge of distribution of Freiheit to the continent. He joined with Rinke and Peukert in publishing Der Rebell, saying that Der Rebell was more suited for his talents than Freiheit. When this occurred Rinke and Knauerhase were thrown off the commission which Dave had established.<sup>29</sup> Knauerhase moved immediately to increase the circulation of Der Rebell by sending Johann Eisenbacher, alias Hase to Germany. He succeeded in gathering a list of subscribers in Hamburg, Altona, and St. Pauli, but was discovered by the police and was arrested with the subscription list in his possession.<sup>30</sup>

At this juncture an article appeared in Der Sozialdemokrat which was highly critical of Peukert and his followers. The article called Peukert a commonplace scoundrel who lived an idle life off funds which were intended for the movement. Some of the information contained in the article was known only to the commission Dave had formed so Peukert immediately accused Dave of having written the article, a charge which Dave categorically denied, while saying he agreed nonetheless with the article because everything contained in it was true.<sup>31</sup>

By the first week of May 1885 it was obvious to both sides that an impasse had been reached and there was going to be a split in the German-speaking anarchist movement. The inner-war was finally brought out into the open on May 16, 1885, when Freiheit published a short notice which said that henceforth only those addresses in Germany and Austria which were contained on the list drawn up by the commission in London would be considered to be safe. In the same issue Freiheit absolved itself of the solidarity it had declared for Der Rebell in the late fall of 1883. This blow was aimed directly at Peukert and his followers whose addresses and connections on the continent were now considered unsafe. When the news of the split became public the popular press in London published articles about it. One such article entitled "Die Spaltung in Lager der Anarchisten"

portrayed Peukert and his followers in the worst possible light, while speaking very highly of Dave. Naturally Peukert said the article had been placed in the paper by Dave, which is probably true.<sup>32</sup>

Peukert answered the charges in this article by writing the pamphlet Trau, schau, wem! which was a scathing indictment of Dave. As a result of this pamphlet Peukert, Rinke, Knauerhase, Prinz, Szimmoth and a number of their followers, who believed in the principles of communist-anarchism, were thrown out of the First Section of the Kommunistischer Arbeiterbildungsverein. In all about 15 people were expelled including the six individuals whose names were listed at the bottom of the pamphlet as subscribing to the views contained in it; August Reeder, R. Walhausen, Jakob Nowotny, F. Kirchhoff, H. Heinrich, R. Lieske ( a 20-year-old brother of Julius).

Once they were thrown out of the First Section, Peukert and his followers formed the Gruppe Autonomie and established a club house at 32 Charlotte Street West. The membership of the group grew rapidly and soon the club rooms on Charlotte Street became too small. A new club house was needed but the ever present problem of money was the stumbling block that stood in the way. Eventually a home was purchased for 100 pounds at Windmill Street 6, which was very well located. Funds for the purchase and remodeling of the house were raised by the club members pawning their rings, watches, and other valuables. The club house was similar to those described above, with the exception that a section of the house was set aside for singing. In addition to this a club band was organized.<sup>33</sup>

"The Club Autonomie was a very dingy, badly furnished place. A few rough benches, chairs, and tables were the only accommodations offered to regular frequenters or the casual visitor. Anyone could enter unquestioned, and take part in the discussions."<sup>34</sup> Meetings held at the club were typical of anarchist gatherings of the period. There was "no chairman or president, anyone could speak when and how he pleased, so long as he received the approbation of the meeting. Generally speaking the meetings were very orderly."<sup>35</sup>

The rhetoric engaged in at the Club Autonomie evidently was quite flamboyant because "if half the threats which made the rafters of the Club Autonomie resound ... had been meant, few rulers or millionaires would have been left to end their days in

peace."<sup>36</sup> The club also had a certain picturesqueness about it "most of the men affected sombrero hats and red neckties; the women usually cut their hair short, wore triby hats, short shabby skirts, red rosettes in their mannish coats, business-like boots."<sup>37</sup>

The Gruppe Autonomie also decided to undertake the publication of an entirely new newspaper. The paper previously associated with Peukert, Rinke and their followers, Der Rebell, had been published irregularly, often with several months elapsing between issues. In many respects Der Rebell resembled more closely a Flugblätter than it did a newspaper, since it contained little news. In September 1886, Die Autonomie, Anarchistisch-Communistisches Organ was founded. The printing equipment which had been used to print Der Rebell was not sufficient to print the new paper so 30 pounds sterling had to be raised to purchase additional printing supplies for the new venture.<sup>38</sup> The 17th and final issue of Der Rebell appeared in October 1886 and was soon followed by the first issue of Die Autonomie on November 6, 1886. The paper came out every other week. Its editorial office was located at 96 Wardour Street, Soho Square, London W. In all, 211 issues of Die Autonomie were printed before its demise on April 22, 1893. Die Autonomie was well received, and rightly so because it was well written, informative and contained many interesting articles and a great deal of news about the anarchist movement. Most and Dave set out to undermine the paper by discrediting it, claiming that the Gruppe Autonomie had stolen the subscription list of Freiheit and that the paper was printed with police funds supplied by Berlin. These charges were examined by an impartial panel of anarchists in London and found to be erroneous.<sup>39</sup>

John Neve, who maintained ties with both sides, welcomed Die Autonomie by writing to Peukert: "Finally a paper whose distribution one need not be ashamed of, while on the other hand, most numbers of Freiheit with its smutty articles I would like to throw in a cesspool."<sup>40</sup>

The founding of Die Autonomie was another step in the Bruderkrieg. As its subtitle clearly indicated it was committed to the communist-anarchism in ideology. It had the backing of the leading anarchists of the period including Kropotkin. As a newspaper it was on a higher level than Freiheit which had started to degenerate in mid 1885. The purpose behind the founding of Die Autonomie was to propagate the ideas of



communist-anarchism in Germany and Austria. It was successfully smuggled into these countries and cut into the already thin readership of Freiheit in these places. In effect Die Autonomie constituted unwelcome competition to Freiheit at a time when Freiheit was in financial trouble and could least afford to lose any subscribers. Die Autonomie stood for individualism, group sovereignty, and for the free formation of federations. Most attacked such ideas by calling them "the numbskull's anarchism" and "sick ideas."<sup>41</sup>

By 1886 the stage was set for the final battle of the Bruderkrieg. The differences in ideology and personality were out in the open. The personal mistrust that existed now reached a point where the occupants of the opposing camps spent all their time in the meaningless activity of printing allegations against their opposition, accusations which were met by counter-charges. The columns of Freiheit, Der Rebell, and Die Autonomie are filled with such barbed charges. Even Der Sozialdemokrat managed to get involved in the infighting, sometimes as an active participant, other times in the role of an "unbiased" observer savoring the dissension in the German anarchist movement.

It is questionable whether by 1886 there were any hope that the deep cleavage which had opened up in the movement could be closed. Rudolf Rocker thinks the two opposing camps might have been able to heal their wounds and rejoin forces if it had not been for the arrest of John Neve.<sup>42</sup> I myself do not think so because the split in the movement was based on the ideological difference that would have required a substantial change of position by one side. The side which would have had to change its ideology in order to end the infighting was the Mostian side, and I doubt very much if that could have been accomplished, because Most and Dave were not ready to make any concessions to Peukert and Rinke. On the other hand, after founding the reasonably successful Die Autonomie, Peukert and Rinke had no reason to want to rejoin forces with Most and Dave.

The capture of John Neve by Belgian police on February 21, 1887, ensured that the split in the movement would never be sealed. With the capture of Neve the opposing positions were solidified further and the Bruderkrieg reached the white hot stage; little energy remained for anything other than vicious infighting. By the time the opposing sides finished washing their dirty linen in the Neve affair the German anarchist movement practically ceased to exist. The leaders of the movement

fell and the rank-and-file membership was disillusioned. The arrest of Neve and the subsequent events of the Bruderkrieg are the subject of the next chapter.

#### Notes

1. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol I (13,087), Folder 331.

2. Staatsarchiv Ludwigsburg, F 201, Stadtdirektion Stuttgart, 632, "Anarchisten 1885-1898," Folders 1-5. Also on the first issue of Der Rebell see: Freiheit, No. 9 (March 4, 1882), p. 4; Le Révolté, No. 1 (March 4, 1882), p. 4. The comments of these papers on the first issue were favorable.

3. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. II (13,088), Folders 166-167. Staatsarchiv Ludwigsburg, F 201, Stadtdirektion Stuttgart, 632, "Anarchisten 1885-1898," Folders 7-17, 23.

4. Josef Peukert, "Otto Rinke," Jahrbuch der freien Generation für 1910, p. 84. Peterson, alias Fleuron, mentioned above in connection with Reinsdorf, was also present and delivered a speech.

5. Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 33 (August 10, 1882), p. 4; the French anarchist Jean Grave claimed in his memoirs, claimed that the idea for the robbery-murder was suggested to Grün by "P.", who was a member of the anarchist group "Levallois Perret." Two or three years later it was discovered that P. was an agent provocateur. In 1930 Grave told Max Nettlau that P. stood for a man named either Pigeon or Pichon. Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, pp. 327-328.

6. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. I (13,087), Folder 331.

7. Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 10 (March 6, 1884), p. 4.

8. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, p. 198.

9. Martin, Der Anarchismus und seine Träger, pp. 164-179; Anonymous, Sozialismus und Anarchismus in Europe und Nordamerika während der Jahre 1883-1886, p. 51.

10. Ibid., p. 71. Obviously this description by Martin is for 1885 or 1886 and not 1884, but it nevertheless gives an idea of what the inside appearance of the club was by one who frequented it.

11. Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 218-219.

12. Martin, Der Anarchismus und seine Träger, p. 57. The membership of the Gruppe Autonomie, which will be discussed below is included in this figure.

13. Milorad Drachkovitch, The Revolutionary International 1864-1943 (Stanford, 1966), p. 70.

14. Ibid., p. 72.

15. Ibid.

16. Nettelau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, pp. 164-165; Rocker, Johann Most, p. 227; Brandenburgisches landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C, Polizeipräsidium, Tit. 94, Lit. P., Nr. 519 (12,276), "Der Maler Josef Peukert 1881-1914."

17. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 228.

18. Emma Goldman, Living My Life (New York, 1931), I, pp. 75, 90, 98.

19. Nomad, Apostles of Revolution, p. 283.

20. Martin, Der Anarchismus und seine Träger, p. 74.

21. The letter is printed in Der Sozialist. Organ des Sozialistischen Bundes (Berlin), No. 6 (March 15, 1914), p. 43.

22. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 232.

23. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, pp. 215-217; Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 232-233.

24. Letter quoted in Rocker, Johann Most, p. 236.
25. For a selection of these letters see: Ibid., pp. 236-237.
26. Ibid., p. 239; "John Neve in den Jahren 1884-1886," Der Anarchist (Berlin), No. 13 (July, 1906).
27. Ibid., p. 240.
28. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, pp. 204-206; Trau, schau, wem! (London, 1886), pp. 4-10. This pamphlet does not carry the name of the author but Peukert wrote it.
29. In December 1885, when the pastry baker Karl Scupin was apprehended while smuggling Der Rebell into Germany, he had in his possession a letter from Rinke which related that Rinke had severed his connections with Neve and Dave because they had accused Knauerhase of being a swindler. Rinke's letter also contained a charge against Dave, relating that in 1874, while Dave was in Verviers, he had embezzled workers' funds and had spent them on his own personal pleasures. When this charge leaked out into the open it was immediately denied by Dave. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 237.
30. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Polizeipräsidium, Tit. 94, Lit. E., Vol. 4, Nr. 298 (9709), "Emmissäre der revolutionären Propaganda 1885-1887."
31. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, pp. 217-218; Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 243-244.
32. Trau, schau, wem! pp. 11-16.
33. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, p. 233.
34. Peter Latouche, Anarchy. An Authentic Exposition of the Methods of Anarchists and the Aims of Anarchism (London, 1908), p. 63.
35. Ibid.

36. Ibid., pp. 63-64.

37. Ibid., p. 64.

38. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, pp. 220-221, 232.

39. Ibid., p. 232.

40. Quoted in Peukert, Ibid., pp. 232-233. At this time Neve was living in Verviers and was involved in the smuggling of Freiheit and Die Autonomie into Germany. Earlier he had also smuggled Der Rebell into Germany. In a letter of December 1, 1885, to Dave, Neve called Rebell a "rag" and was critical of the editors of the paper saying "these people don't know what they really want. The last issue of Der Rebell was a sorry imitation of workers' literature; those who work on the paper, including the editors, are not qualified for the positions which they hold." Quoted in Rocker, Johann Most, p. 230.

41. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, p. 235.

42. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 216.

## Chapter XI

### JOHN NEVE AND THE SPLIT IN THE MOVEMENT

The arrest of John Neve, a central figure in the German anarchist movement of the 1880's, assured that the wounds of the Bruderkrieg would never be healed. He was a very likeable person, who gave unselfishly of his money and time to the movement. An article eulogizing him said that in the 1880's Neve was "almost the soul of the German anarchist movement and was one of those comrades who devoted their lives fully and unreservedly to the cause."<sup>1</sup> Neve was not formed in the Mostian mold and bore little resemblance in appearance or in actions to the type of person usually associated with anarchist or revolutionary activities. He was

... of medium height, fair and robust with a genial frank countenance, quiet and unobtrusive, neither an orator nor a writer, yet [he] possessed a certain power of inspiring in others confidence and enthusiasm which made him the life and soul of the German movement in London.<sup>2</sup>

He earned high wages and lived abstemiously so that he might devote the bulk of his earnings to the furtherance of anarchism. As already noted in earlier chapters, he was willing to undertake any job on Freiheit to help the movement. He had been in the original group that founded Freiheit in 1879 and was editor of the paper after the imprisonment of Most, until he himself was forced to flee to Switzerland in June of 1882 after the assassination of Lord Cavendish.

The events of Neve's life between the summer of 1882 and his capture in 1887 help to give a more complete picture of the German anarchist movement at the time. It is also necessary to establish his actions in these years because at his trial in 1887 some of these activities would be introduced as evidence against him.

When Neve left London in June 1882, he traveled to Paris and then on to Switzerland. In Switzerland he met Stellmacher

and other German and Austrian anarchists. On June 18 he attended a conference held in Bern. The main topics of discussion at this conference centered around developing better smuggling routes into Germany and Austria, and the relocation of Freiheit in Switzerland. After remaining for a short time in Bern and Zürich, Neve entered Germany. Basically there were three reasons for Neve's trip: to build new groups in Germany, to make contact with established groups and familiarize them with new revolutionary tactics, and to seek out people not already suspected by the police who would be willing to take part in the smuggling operations of Freiheit and other literature and the subsequent distribution of these materials within Germany. For the purpose of increasing the dissemination of anarchist propaganda within Germany a secret conference was held in Mannheim. From Mannheim Neve traveled to Hanau, Frankfurt-am-Main, Augsburg and Munich where he distributed copies of Freiheit and other materials before entering Austria and going to Vienna in November 1882. On December 23 of the same year he was arrested in Vienna. At the time he was using the name Ernest Stevens, claiming that he was an Englishman. Neve could speak English very well as a result of his having lived in London since 1864, except for a period of time he spent in Paris during 1866-1868, and another period when he lived in the United States from 1868-1874.<sup>3</sup>

According to Austrian law, if the police officials could prove he was John Neve, as they suspected, he could legally be held responsible for every word written in Freiheit since he had been editor of the paper and had also been engaged in the smuggling of the paper into Austria. He persisted in his story that he was Ernest Stevens and after being held for seven months he was taken to the German border at Passau in Bavaria and turned over to the German police. They expressed interest in "Ernest Stevens" whom they assumed was Neve. When Neve was taken into custody in Germany he was transported to Hanau where he was wanted in connection with the distribution of Freiheit in that city. It was later claimed that German officials had been aided in their identification of Neve by a short piece which appeared on February 8, 1883, in Der Sozialdemokrat, which stated that "in Vienna the anarchist Neve, the former editor of Freiheit, was arrested." At the same time Der Sozialdemokrat printed this piece Freiheit carried a notice that Neve was in New York.<sup>4</sup>

In Hanau, Neve was held for six months before he was brought to trial on January 31, 1884. During this period he continued to maintain that he was Ernest Stevens in spite of the efforts of the German police to prove otherwise. While he was being held in Austria police officials had shown Peukert, who was acquainted with Neve, a picture of the man who called himself Ernest Stevens. They asked Peukert if this man was Neve and Peukert replied that it did not resemble him at all.<sup>5</sup>

At his trial in Hanau, German police officials also called upon the services of Peukert in an attempt to identify Neve, but again Peukert denied that the man they were holding, who called himself Stevens, was Neve.

The only charge that could be proven against Ernest Stevens was that he was guilty of distributing forbidden literature some time earlier in Hanau. This was a violation of Article nineteen of the Socialist Law and for this he was sentenced to six months in prison.<sup>6</sup>

The fact that Peukert was called upon by both the Austrian and the German police to attempt to identify Stevens, was considered as evidence in the minds of many that Peukert was a police spy. In 1887 Liebknecht proclaimed that he was fully aware, as early as 1880, that Peukert was a police spy; however, this charge is without substantiation. The enemies of Peukert also base part of their claims that he was purportly a police spy on the fact that he left Austria just a few days before the mass arrest of anarchists took place there. The fact that he had been able to escape the Austrian police net was conclusive evidence of his guilt in some people's minds. In his memoirs Peukert explained that he was summoned to Hanau as a witness to identify Neve. But Peukert's enemies claim that he was not called to Hanau, but rather was sent there by the tribunal in Vienna. After Peukert's death, Gustav Landauer found among Peukert's papers conclusive evidence that he had been summoned to Hanau; Landauer found a postal money order receipt for 60 marks for transportation expenses which had been sent to Peukert on January 26, 1884, by the Konigliche Steuerkasse in Hanau. On the back side of the money order was written "Payment in advance for the editor Josef Peukert in Vienna, summoned as a witness in the criminal proceedings to be held against Neve on the 31st of this month."<sup>7</sup>



A second piece of evidence which would tend to discount the later claims that Peukert was in the pay of the police is a letter of July 20, 1884, written to Peukert by Neve shortly after his release from prison, thanking him for not revealing his identity in Hanau. In the letter Neve relates to Peukert that he was more concerned about Peukert's welfare than he was for his own because while he was in prison awaiting trial he received reports of the police in Austria arresting anarchists there. He related that prison officials had shown him a picture of Stellmacher whom he denied knowing or ever having seen. In the letter Neve also told that while his trial was in progress a telegram arrived from Vienna and he was able to see enough of the contents to know that it was concerned with Peukert. He expressed relief to Peukert that he had heard in prison, after the trial, that he had not returned to Vienna, but had gone to Switzerland.<sup>8</sup>

Other sections of the same letter reveal Neve's state of mind and the conditions that existed in Switzerland at the time he wrote it. He related that it was beyond hope that Freiheit could ever be published again in either Switzerland or England. Furthermore, he stated that he was disturbed by an article entitled "Zur Propaganda der That," which had appeared in one of the last issues of Freiheit (November 18, 1882), which he had read before being imprisoned in Austria. Neve thought that this was the wrong course of action to follow and was of the opinion that Most in advocating such a policy was placing himself on a collision course with the governments of all the European countries.<sup>9</sup>

Neve's apprehension for Peukert's safety was warranted. On Peukert's return trip from Hanau he was under close police observation while he was inside Germany. It was assumed by the German police that since Peukert was the editor of Zukunft he was the head of the Austrian anarchist movement as well. On his return he traveled through Schweinfurt, Rottendorf, and Würzburg, to Nürnberg where he held a brief meeting with a number of fellow anarchists. On the same night he crossed the border into Austria, going through Linz on the way to Reid for a conference with some fellow Austrian anarchists. The group in Linz had in their possession a letter they had received from Vienna which informed them that many of their comrades there had been arrested and that the office of Zukunft and Peukert's home had been seized by the police. They advised Peukert not to return to Vienna so he immediately retraced his route and

crossed over the German border into Bavaria and from there traveled to Switzerland.<sup>10</sup>

His stay in Switzerland was for less than two weeks, owing to the fact that he was informed, as discussed in the previous chapter, that Swiss officials were planning to extradite him to Austria; so immediately he left for Paris and then went on to London.

Thus in 1884 the paths of Neve and Peukert crossed and became increasingly bound together, as their names would remain for decades in the minds of German anarchists.

After his release from prison in Hanau on June 20, 1884, Neve went to Switzerland where he became associated with the German anarchist group which was interested in increasing anarchist and revolutionary activities in Germany and Austria, as well as smuggling anarchist literature into these countries. The German anarchist groups in Switzerland were trying to implement the decision taken at a secret congress which had been held in August of the previous year. This congress had decided in favor of forming small groups as opposed to forming a large international organization. The congress had decided to promote through all possible means the spread of anarchist propaganda in Germany and Austria.<sup>11</sup> In the summer of 1884 this proved to be a very difficult task. Anarchist cells in Austria were badly smashed; in Germany they were likewise in disarray, and Switzerland itself as a base of operations was rapidly vanishing before their eyes. Contacts with Austria and Germany were limited to private correspondence exchanged between a number of individuals in the movement. With boundless energy and great perseverance Neve tried to bring order into this chaos. In his work he was assisted by the Hungarian anarchist Karl Halbedl and the Austrian anarchists Leo Waleck and Jakob Nowotny. A congress of the German-speaking anarchists living in eastern Switzerland was called together by Neve for the purpose of increasing the smuggling of propaganda into Germany and especially into Austria. At the congress, held in the summer of 1884, Neve along with Josef Kaufmann represented Zürich. Kaufmann, it will be remembered, was a German anarchist turned police spy, so it can be assumed that the proceedings of the congress were known to the German, Austrian and Swiss police.<sup>12</sup>

The situation in Austria was beyond saving and Switzerland held out little hope for even such a stalwart anarchist as Neve. On December 15, 1884, he was forced to leave Switzerland.<sup>13</sup> From Switzerland he went to London. His activities in London have already been brought out in the previous chapter. Basically Neve was a worker and the petty infighting, which was going on in London, or the thought of being involved in a central bureau responsible for the distribution of literature on the continent held out little appeal to him. What is more, the real need was for a person who could smuggle literature and explosives into Germany. Such a person had to be crafty, courageous, if not even a little reckless. It was decided in London that the only man suitable for such a task was Neve. Another factor involved in Neve's decision to leave London was the fact that he was constantly hounded by police for the part he played in editing Freiheit. In November 1885 Neve left London for Belgium where he settled in Verviers and later in Lüttich.<sup>14</sup> In Belgium Neve took over the responsibility from Franz Gross of keeping the two main smuggling routes open. One went from Verviers to Aachen and the other from Verviers to Eupen. The principal contact men in Aachen were the carpenter Hubert Heinrichs, and Fritz Kirschner (Meyer). Neve's activities in Belgium were to be the final chapter in his career. His arrest there spelled the end to what solidarity still remained in the German anarchist movement.

In Belgium Neve worked at his trade and in his spare time smuggled Freiheit, Der Rebell, Die Autonomie and other anarchist literature over the border into Germany where he mailed bundles of newspapers and letters in Aachen and Cologne. The papers which Neve smuggled across the border were not yet addressed. Once inside Germany, at Aachen, Cologne, or Eupen, Neve met with his contact man and they would address the papers and remail them. The advantage of this method was that the contact man within Germany was the only person who had a list of addresses where the papers were sent. It would have been a risky venture for Neve to have crossed the border with newspapers which were pre-addressed in Belgium. His smuggling activities were not confined to propaganda materials; he also transported across the border dynamite, fuses and other explosive materials and destructive devices such as acid. The German police were fully aware that Neve was operating in Belgium. Berlin Police Chief von Richthofen noted in the summer of 1886 that for over half a year "one of the greatest fanatics,

the well known Neve, has been involved in the shipment of Freiheit into Germany."<sup>15</sup>

The problem with which the German police were faced was that no one in their organization could identify Neve. He traveled back and forth between Germany and Belgium by train using forged papers and various disguises. Other times he carried out his smuggling operations by crossing the border on foot and catching a train, once he was across the border, to Aachen or Cologne. What the German police needed was someone to point out Neve to them so he could be put under surveillance. The German police gave a number one priority to the apprehension of Neve and starting in mid-1886 launched an all-out campaign toward this end, because they considered Neve to be the most dangerous anarchist still at large. They succeeded in accomplishing this goal on February 21, 1887, when Belgian police arrested Neve in Lüttich on the charge of being a vagrant, even though he was employed at the time. Immediately after his arrest he was taken to the border and handed over to the German police who took him into custody for being an anarchist.

The arrest of Neve triggered a volcanic eruption in the German anarchist movement, an eruption which had been seething since 1884. The long simmering pot boiled over and extinguished what flame remained in the movement. The passionate exchange of charges and counter-charges which followed the arrest of Neve consumed what energy remained in the movement when it could least afford it as well as discrediting the leadership of the movement. The arrest of Neve was a blow to the movement in another respect, because it was impossible to replace him with an equally competent and dedicated person. The movement was running out of men of his stature and new men of talent were not being recruited to replace those lost. The loss of Neve was serious for still another reason because he was probably the only person who could have helped to heal the split in the movement. He did not place himself firmly in either camp; while it appeared that he tended to favor Dave's side, at the same time he remained on friendly terms with Peukert. In Belgium he was involved in smuggling into Germany the newspapers of both camps. Neve was loved and admired by all of the German-speaking anarchists and his loss to the movement, both as a worker and as a personal friend, was deeply felt by all. Perhaps this more than anything else explains the long period of bitter recriminations which followed his capture.

It is necessary to detail the events leading up to the capture of Neve in order to understand the rationale behind this intense bitterness which existed between the two camps over the capture of Neve. Generally Peukert has borne the brunt of the blame for the apprehension of Neve. At first it was assumed that he was a police spy who had turned Neve over to the Belgian police, but as the years passed and as tempers moderated, most anarchists arrived at the conclusion that Peukert had not done it deliberately saying, "He was not a traitor, only a harmless dumbell."<sup>16</sup> Freedom, ten years later, called the part played by Peukert "culpable negligence or asinine stupidity."<sup>17</sup> Max Nettlau<sup>18</sup> and Rocker are likewise convinced that Peukert's actions were only foolish or careless, and not treacherous. On two occasions Rocker relates that he tried, without success, to convince Dave that Peukert had not deliberately betrayed Neve. The bitter hatred that Dave and Most had for Peukert was taken to the grave with them, as was Peukert's hatred for the two of them.<sup>19</sup>

Peukert was the central figure in the Neve affair and the charges of betrayal leveled against him were serious. As the years passed, cooler heads did not believe these charges, but Peukert was ruined as far as playing any further role in the German-speaking anarchist movement. The question which arises is, if Peukert was not guilty of outright or betrayal, was he guilty then of carelessness, or plain stupidity? I propose to answer these questions in the course of this chapter. I am of the opinion that the part played by Peukert in Neve's apprehension has been exaggerated.

An examination of German police files makes it possible to determine who handed Neve over to the Belgian police and it was not Peukert, as has been assumed for so long. In order to understand Peukert's supposed involvement in the Neve affair it is necessary to introduce a new person into the picture, Karl Theodor Reuss, a spy in the pay of the Berlin Political Police. It is now known for certain that Reuss was a spy, but during the period of the Bruderkrieg the issue of whether or not Reuss was a spy depended on whether you found yourself in the Dave or the Peukert camp. In July 1886 Dave had exposed Reuss in Freiheit as a highly suspicious person, but Peukert was not convinced that Reuss was a spy and continued to maintain his friendship with him. The article by Dave implicating Reuss is too lengthy to quote, but a synopsis of the contents has to be introduced because on several occasions it will be referred to—this article

is usually used to show the carelessness or stupidity of Peukert.

Dave in the article relates that during the summer of 1885 he became suspicious of Reuss. In May of that year Reuss had invited Dave and Andreas Scheu to dinner at Buckhurst Hill near London where he was staying. On the way back to London, Scheu, who was highly impressed with Reuss, remarked to Dave that it would not surprise him if before long Reuss would be playing an important role in the anarchist movement. The next contact Dave had with Reuss was six weeks later at a meeting which was held in the first-floor salon of the Hotel Windsor on the Strand. Reuss had sent out letters to Dave and Neve inviting them to come to the hotel to attend a meeting he was going to hold. When they arrived they found Reuss had assembled a dozen anarchists from different continental countries. The meeting had been called by Reuss for the purpose of establishing an International Center in London for contacts with the continent. It was to be a secret group and each member of the group would be responsible for a share of the correspondence carried on with the continent. They would meet once a month in secret meetings. Two or three meetings of the information bureau took place, but in the end the plan did not materialize. Dave later concluded that more than likely it was designed to be an information bureau for the German police.<sup>20</sup>

A short time after this Dave took a trip to the continent with the intention of entering Germany. It was during this trip that Dave started to become suspicious of Reuss, because Reuss had been able to obtain his address on the continent and wrote him asking: 1) why he had not written? 2) was he on a political trip? 3) when did he plan to be in Germany? 4) what route would he be taking on his trip out of Germany? and 5) when would he be leaving Germany? Dave answered him by saying: 1) he did not have time to write, 2) the trip was very political, 3) he planned to go to Germany tomorrow, 4) he planned to return by a secret route, 5) he would be returning in the near future.<sup>21</sup>

In the article Dave also related that Reuss accompanied Trunk and Neve on a trip to Hastings and he had quizzed both of them regarding the purpose of Dave's trip, but they ignored his questions, because as Dave claimed, Neve had been observing Reuss for some time and was suspicious of his actions. According to Dave, Trunk and Neve had purposely led the unsuspecting Reuss on a wild goose chase to see if their suspicions, that he was a police spy, were founded.

The article contained a picture of Reuss's financial situation. Reuss told Dave that he was living on money which his wife sent him, claiming that she was a member of a wealthy family, but to other people he said he made his living by translating materials for the British Museum adding that he spent most of his time there, but Dave related that he only saw him there once. Reuss claimed that he had made a great deal of money by arranging a Wagnerian concert in England. It is true that such a concert had been arranged by Reuss, but most of the people who attended the affair had received free tickets from Reuss.

Another suspicious thing about Reuss was that he maintained several addresses. At the Socialist League in London, of which he was a member, he received by mail two copies of Der Sozialdemokrat, and two copies of Freiheit. At his home he received three copies of Freiheit, while a single copy of a Berlin newspaper was sent to him at a cafe on Oxford Street, and he received his registered mail at 3 Holborn Viaduct.

Dave also related that he had set a trap for Reuss by telling him that on a certain Thursday Neve would be in Berlin to visit a number of anarchists there; on the day of the supposed trip a police detective asked the wife of a Berlin anarchist if Neve had arrived. Neve had not planned such a trip and Dave said that only he and Reuss were aware of the plan which he had fabricated so he reasoned that Reuss must have informed the Berlin police.<sup>22</sup>

Another revelation in Dave's article was that Reuss had taken a trip to Germany in May 1886 accompanied by a singer. His first stop was in Belgium to visit Neve, telling him that Trunk and Dave had sent him. Neve immediately telegraphed Dave asking if this were true and Dave replied that he was not aware that Reuss was planning a trip. The reason Reuss had stopped to see Neve was to ask if he wanted him to carry any letters or packages of newspapers to Germany. According to Dave, Neve gave Reuss letters containing blank pieces of paper and several packets of newspapers; Reuss reported back to Neve later that he had mailed them in Germany.<sup>23</sup>

Shortly after Reuss returned from the trip he was thrown out of the Socialist League on May 10, for being a police spy. According to Dave, this action was prompted by the fact that the letters and bundles of newspapers Reuss had been given to mail in Germany never arrived at their destination. At this juncture,

May 19, Reuss wrote to Neve saying that Dave had accused him of being a police spy. Reuss told Neve that he had mailed the letters in Düsseldorf, and he could not understand why they had not arrived at their destinations. He admitted that he had lost one packet of newspapers in Neuss because a policeman on a telegram had boarded the train there and searched him. The policeman did not find the bundle of newspapers because they were hidden in the suitcase of his traveling companion; however, they found other compromising material on him and he was taken into police custody. Reuss wrote that he had been able to purchase his freedom by handing over to the police officials the thirteen pounds he had in his possession at the time. According to Dave on May 20 Reuss came to his home and claimed that he had been apprehended in Munich-Gladbeck and not in Neuss, as he had written to Neve. He told Dave that the singer with whom he was traveling was not aware that he was a socialist and that she probably still had the bundle of newspapers in her luggage where he had placed it. He related that he had been apprehended and questioned for hours, but had not been informed of the reason for his detainment. Reuss then produced a document which said that he had been held by the police in Munich-Gladbeck. Dave told Reuss that he was fully aware that the German government gave such documents to their police agents to give them an appearance of legitimacy. These remarks upset Reuss and he left immediately without further comment. On May 24 Reuss wrote Dave telling him that for the good of anarchism he was voluntarily withdrawing from an active part in the movement, but he wanted to remain on friendly terms with him, saying that his home was always open to him,<sup>24</sup> The decision to oust Reuss from the Socialist League was confirmed at the yearly conference of the League held on June 13, 1886.

This concludes the synopsis of Dave's article concerning his suspicions of Reuss. Actually little was known about Reuss because he was so new to the movement. He had entered the movement in London in February 1885, only three months prior to the dinner party mentioned in Dave's article. Reuss was a journalist and served as the London correspondent for several foreign newspapers. It appears that he was welcomed into the Socialist League where he played an active role. The nature of his work left him with a lot of free time which he used in League activities. He was a zealous member of the League and rose quickly to the position as a member of the Executive Committee of the League. Once he had attained this position it was not difficult for him to gain the confidence of many members of the



inner circle of the German anarchists in the First and Third Sections of the Kommunistischer-Arbeiterbildungsverein. It is a documented fact that he was well known in anarchist and socialist circles and even taught the English language to Germans in these groups. Early he worked his way into the confidence of Andreas Scheu, Sebastian Trunk, John Neve, Victor Dave, Josef Peukert, and Otto Rinke, and the anarchist and socialist groups in London. Most people, at first, knew him under the name of Charles Theodor, but later he started to call himself Karl Theodor Reuss. Nettlau, who was also a member of the Socialist League at the time remembers Reuss as having "a harsh voice, and a brash, aggressive nature.... He appeared to be more practical than the others, made himself useful, and always considered very carefully questions put to him by others."<sup>25</sup>

There was no reason, even after the publication of the Dave article, not to trust Reuss, because it was not until nearly a year later that substantial evidence could be produced against him. Dave's article merely indicated that there was something suspicious about him, but he could not say conclusively that he was a spy. Peukert called Dave's article against Reuss a web of lies, and Reuss asked permission from Most to print an article in Freiheit giving his side of the story, but was refused, so in effect Reuss was condemned by the Mostian camp without hearing.<sup>26</sup> Peukert's intense hatred for Dave and Most blinded him to the potential danger of Reuss. It was assumed by Peukert and others in the movement that the article about Reuss was just another chapter in the never-ending smear campaign which Most and Dave were conducting. The article, combined with Peukert's hatred for Dave, drove Reuss and Peukert together; their relationship prior to this time had at best been a casual one.

A few weeks after Reuss's expulsion from the Socialist League, Peukert took a trip to the continent. For some time a couple of his friends had been operating a secret laboratory in Paris, with the financial backing of Peukert and his followers. They were experimenting with the making of explosives and had now succeeded in developing a suitable product, but now the problem was how to get the "stuff" into Germany. Peukert's trip was for the purpose of arranging a transportation route to smuggle the explosives into Germany. An important stop on his trip was in Belgium where he visited Neve. Neve informed him that he would be glad to send all of the explosives they could produce across the border into Germany; noting further, that it

would be an easy matter to send the "stuff" from Germany into Austria. The route that was established went from Paris to a friend of Peukert's living in Belgium near the French border. He took the explosives across the border into Belgium and transported them to Neve, who smuggled them into Germany. According to Peukert this system, with variations, was in constant use until Neve's apprehension.<sup>27</sup>

During the time he was in Belgium Peukert talked at length with Neve. According to Peukert's account, Neve wondered what Most and Dave were doing because they had been promising him a great deal but delivering very little. Supposedly, Neve also told Peukert that the conference in Frankfurt-am-Main had taken place and was attended by 20 people, which led Peukert to conclude that, if Reuss had been a spy, as Dave claimed, everyone at the conference would have been arrested in view of the fact that Reuss claimed he had sent out the announcements of the conference. They also discussed the Reuss-Dave affair, which they felt would not lead to any good. According to Peukert, Neve was not in complete accord with Dave, because he said Reuss had actually mailed the letters and packets of newspapers for him. Peukert relates that Neve said Dave was wrong to accuse Reuss of being a spy without sufficient evidence.<sup>28</sup>

In the late summer of 1886 Peukert took another trip to Belgium to iron out a few kinks in the dynamite transportation system which had developed since his last visit. At this time, according to Peukert, Neve said he was certain that the police were aware he was there and he asked that two trustworthy people be sent to replace him in Verviers. Peukert claims that Neve gave him detailed information on his smuggling operations so that in the event he should be captured this information could be given his successor.<sup>29</sup>

Upon his return from Belgium Peukert started an all-out campaign against Dave by writing Trau, schau, wem! which was a severe indictment of Dave. This pamphlet contains many unsubstantiated charges against Dave; for example, Peukert maintained that Dave wanted to get all the threads of the movement in his own hands so he could control the movement.

In November 1886 Neve wrote to Peukert that 25 policemen had been brought in from Berlin to guard the border and it was becoming increasingly difficult to cross over into Germany. In December 1886 he wrote again to Peukert, this time asking

for help, reporting that the police in Verviers were becoming too vigilant. He related that the Belgian police were searching Verviers, and asked Peukert not to send him any more letters because it would endanger his safety. Neve concluded the letter with the request, "Send me one or two good people who are not compromised, because I do not know how long I shall remain free to move about."<sup>30</sup>

There can be little doubt that Peukert was fully aware of Neve's predicament and the delicate situation in which he was involved in Belgium. Peukert, himself, related in his memoirs how he discussed with Rinke suitable people who could replace Neve.<sup>31</sup>

Late in 1886 Peukert heard from Kirschner, or as he was called in London, Meyer, that a formidable weapon on which he had been working was finally perfected. The weapon was called the "scorpion" and consisted of a tiny bulb-like instrument, filled with poison, which had a hollow needle attached to it. It took only a light stroke to plunge the needle into a person causing almost instantaneous death. Peukert had talked with Neve about Kirschner's project during his last trip to Belgium and Neve was impressed with the idea and said he wanted one as soon as they became available.

About the same time two shipments of explosives, which originated from Paris, met with misfortune. One shipment going to Schesien was sent to the wrong address and one going to Magdeburg fell into the hands of the police.<sup>32</sup> In London Peukert had been given sufficient warning that all was not well in Magdeburg, but too late to contact Neve and stop the shipment of dynamite, primarily because Neve had changed his place of residence to Lüttich.

Near the very end of 1886 Peukert made plans to travel to Belgium to meet with Neve on New Years Day in Brussels to relate to Neve: the developments which had taken place in Magdeburg, the prospects for a replacement for him, the perfection of the "scorpion," and the trouble with the dynamite shipments into Germany. When Reuss heard that Peukert was planning a trip to see Neve he asked if it would be possible to accompany him. He wanted to rehabilitate his image from the stigma attached to him since the publication of Dave's article so he could gain readmission to the Socialist League. Reuss wanted to talk to Neve in the presence of Peukert so Neve could confirm that

what Peukert had said was true regarding the letters and newspapers entrusted to him on the trip he had taken with the singer. Reuss had tried to convince Dave of this but to no avail, so he wanted to see Neve personally and have him write a letter on his behalf to Dave. Peukert, whose powers of reason were undoubtedly blinded by his hatred for Dave, felt Reuss had been unjustly accused and agreed to take him along on the trip, but claims that he did not tell Reuss exactly where they were going to meet Neve.<sup>33</sup>

According to Peukert, between 10:00 and 11:00 P.M. on the 31st of December he told Reuss to be prepared to leave the next morning at seven, but he still did not divulge to Reuss the destination of the trip. Reuss was overjoyed at the prospect of going along but told Peukert that he had to be back in London in two days for a concert. In order that he could be back in that length of time the two men decided to take the express train with Reuss paying the added fare for the faster train. Peukert claims that Reuss still did not know the destination of their trip on the morning of January 1, 1887, when Peukert bought the tickets in the Charing Cross station; it was only after the train was underway that he told Reuss they were going to Brussels. Furthermore, Peukert told Reuss that he would have to follow his instructions implicitly, because he had important business to discuss with Neve and could not be bothered with him.<sup>34</sup>

On the evening of January 1 three people waited in front of the Gare du Midi in Brussels; Police Chief Möhling from Aachen, detective Dornerer, and von Mauderode of the Berlin police. At about nine o'clock the express train pulled into the station and Peukert and Reuss disembarked from one of the cars.<sup>35</sup> According to the account given by the police spy Max Trautner, as Peukert and Reuss were crossing the station, von Mauderode was able to indicate to Reuss through the use of face and hand signals that he had seen him. Peukert and Reuss left the train station by cab going to the Hotel Vienna. After a snack they retired for the night (Peukert said in his account it was already midnight), but according to Peukert he arose at 4:30 in the morning, while Reuss was still sleeping, and left the hotel. After he ate breakfast he went to look for a friend who was supposed to tell him where Neve could be located, but to his surprise, the friend knew nothing of Neve's whereabouts. Then he went to see a German anarchist named Wismann who was also waiting to see Neve, but he had no additional information on Neve, so he returned to the hotel where he told Reuss that he

would have to be patient and remain in the hotel room because he had to go out again. He retraced his earlier steps, going first to see his friend, who in the intervening period had heard nothing new, after which Peukert went once again to visit Wismann, with whom he remained until one o'clock, when the two of them went to the train station to meet the train on which they assumed Neve could be arriving, but he was not on board. Then Wismann sent a telegram to the German anarchist Schlebach in Lüttich asking why Jean, as Neve was called, had not come to Brussels.<sup>36</sup>

Peukert assumed that a misunderstanding had taken place, so accompanied by Wismann he returned to the hotel to ask Reuss if he wanted to go on any farther with him. Reuss was visibly agitated and asked if he would have enough time to get back to London for his concert; when Peukert assured him that this was possible he said he would go on with him, and the three men went to train station. According to Peukert, he instructed Wismann to purchase two tickets, so that Reuss did not know they were going to Lüttich until he was seated on the train.<sup>37</sup> Unknown to Peukert, in another car of the same train were von Mauderode, Möhlig and Dornerer.<sup>38</sup>

As a result of a misunderstanding Neve had not come to Brussels, because Peukert had informed him in a letter that he would telegraph him when he expected to arrive in Brussels, which he failed to do. Largely as a result of this oversight on the part of Peukert, Neve had avoided the trap which had been set for him in Brussels. According to Trautner, Berlin Police Director Krüger, who was staying in Brussels in the Hotel Cologne, thought he was about to apprehend Neve; Krüger said: "Now I've got him. This time he will not escape my grasp."<sup>39</sup> An elaborate trap had been set for Neve in Brussels and if he had shown there, it is doubtful if he could have escaped. The plans were made in late December when von Mauderode received an unsigned telegram from London dated December 30, which informed him that Peukert and Reuss were planning a trip to Brussels (this of course conflicts with Peukert's version of the story). Von Mauderode telegraphed Möhlig, and Möhlig and the detective Dornerer went to Brussels and set up the trap for Neve, and were later joined by Krüger and von Mauderode.<sup>40</sup>

Peukert and Reuss arrived in Lüttich toward evening, which left Reuss with only four hours before he had to catch the next express train going west if he were going to be in London in time for his concert. Reuss waited in the train station while

Peukert went in search of Schlebach to ask where he could find Neve, and he found both of them at Schlebach's home. A short conversation took place and Peukert told Neve that Reuss was waiting at the train station to talk with him regarding the Dave matter. Neve did not want to see him but finally agreed, "Then I'll talk with him and put an end to this business once and for all, but I am going to tell him exactly what I think of him."<sup>41</sup>

In the train station Reuss was waiting in a large waiting room which was empty except for one man who stood at the lunch counter eating and talking with the waiter. When Neve and Peukert arrived they sat down and Reuss had a lot of questions to ask Neve regarding the trip he had taken with the singer, and about the letters and packages he had mailed in Germany. Neve acknowledged what Reuss said was all true. Then Reuss took out a piece of paper and was about to ask Neve to write something on it when Neve said,

That is unnecessary. I will not have anything further to do with this whole bitter mess. First you idolize Dave—when you were with me you glorified Dave as a saint while insulting others; then two weeks later, to other people you insult Dave, calling him a miserable rogue, and now you want to prove that. You should be ashamed of yourself, you devil. You are a man without character.<sup>42</sup>

After that exchange Reuss shook hands with Peukert and Neve and boarded his train back to London. It was a clear moonlit night and Peukert and Neve walked and talked for an hour before going to an inn where they remained until it was time for Peukert to catch his train to Brussels.<sup>43</sup>

A week later Peukert received a letter from Neve asking him if he knew anything about the Belgian socialist Louis Bertrand's sending a telegram to Blenvalet, editor of the *Avenir in Lüttich*, which said that the dispatcher of *Freiheit in Lüttich* should not try to go to Germany because the police were waiting for him there. Neve was not mentioned by name in the telegram, but it was obvious that the message was intended for him. Blenvalet immediately telegraphed Pierre Gleuve in Verviers, where Neve was at the time, sending him the contents of the message. Gleuve in turn took the message and gave it to a young boy who took it to the Belgian journalist Oliver who passed it on to Neve.<sup>44</sup>

A few days later Neve received another telegram from Blenvalet that at nine in the morning that day five policemen had come to his home looking for a German, whom they refused to identify by name.<sup>45</sup> Neve then wrote to Peukert in London asking if he had taken Reuss to see Bertrand in Brussels, because in Neve's mind something was wrong. He thought that either Bertrand had informed on him or that a masterful piece of police work had been done, or that there was a police spy involved somewhere. He had a low estimation of police intelligence so he assumed that Bertrand was the guilty person. When Peukert received this letter he wrote to Wismann in Brussels asking him to see what he could find out about this matter there. He also wrote to Neve telling him what he and Reuss had done in Brussels, relating that Reuss had not met Bertrand.<sup>46</sup>

Toward the end of the same week that the letter arrived from Neve, the Gruppe Autonomie was invited to meet with the French-speaking anarchist group for the purpose of discussing the expulsion of Dave from their group. Dave, Trunk and a number of their friends came to the meeting armed with a letter which Neve had written to Trunk on January 14, in which he told about the meeting he had had with Reuss and Peukert in Lüttich. In the letter Neve also related that he noticed that on the previous Sunday as he was returning from Verviers he discovered that he was being followed by the police from the train station. He also told how police had occupied his former place of lodging in Lüttich and had posted a 24 hour watch there. The police, he claimed, were also watching him in the train station during a recent trip to Brussels. He asked Trunk to make inquiries whether Reuss and Peukert had arrived in London on January 3, as planned. When the reading of the letter was completed Dave said it was obvious from the contents of the letter that the visit of Peukert and Reuss to Neve was for the purpose of pointing him out to the police. Peukert retorted by attempting to demonstrate that during the course of the trip Reuss was never in a position to betray Neve.<sup>47</sup>

At this juncture Neve wrote letters to both Peukert and Trunk asking that his name should not be mentioned in the quarrel between Dave and Reuss. He also told both of them not to let Dave see the letters he had written to them.

On January 13 Bertrand wrote to Peukert giving him the information he had requested in his earlier letter to Wismann. Bertrand said that a reliable source (Trautner) had told him

that the Berlin Police Director Krüger with the assistance of several spies was in Belgium looking for Neve. This source told Bertrand that the next time Neve crossed over into Germany he would be arrested, since they were now able to identify him. Bertrand told that he knew that Neve lived in Lüttich at either 22 or 92 Rue de Pont d'Avry and wanted to warn him of the impending danger, but thought it would take too long to send him a letter so he telegraphed the information to Blenvalet. Peukert sent Bertrand's letter to Neve who replied that he thought the source of the information was Max Trautner, whom the Swiss Procurator General Eduard Müller had exposed as an agent provocateur. In his letter Neve also related that his lodgings in Lüttich were still under surveillance as was the train station in Verviers, and that the border was heavily guarded.<sup>48</sup>

Trautner, who went to Berlin after Müller forced him out of Switzerland, was reassigned to Belgium and in Brussels because a close friend of Bertrand. He was also on friendly terms with the former police agent in Paris Serreaux, the Social Democrat Karl Grillenberger, and some people claimed that Trautner cowered with Dave in London. In his writings on the Neve affair, Trautner relates that he was not interested in betraying Neve, for if he had been he could have done so a long time before because he said he knew where Neve lived. This is probably true because it appears that Trautner had no allegiance to anything other than money. His personal sympathies were not with the German police, but they paid him well for his services, even though he gave them as little information as possible. On the other hand, when he saw an opportunity to reap a windfall as a result of the part he played in the Neve case, he jumped at the opportunity and was promptly dismissed from his position with the police. This will be discussed in more detail below.

On February 21 Neve and a friend Franz Gross were seized by the Belgian police as they left the Phoenix Cafe in Lüttich and were charged with vagrancy. A short time afterward they were taken to the German border and handed over to the German police. It is doubtful if the charge of vagrancy could have been proven against Neve because he had worked steadily all the time he lived in Belgium; I am unable to determine whether this is true for the period after he came under police surveillance, but quite obviously it would have been difficult for him to work during this period. In Germany Neve and Gross were



imprisoned, while Neve awaited trial. The disposition of Gross will be revealed below in my comments on the trial.

Trautner said he observed the arrest of Neve and claimed to have overheard a conversation which took place between the Berlin Police Director Krüger and the Aachen Police Chief Möhlig, in which Möhlig said that it appeared that Neve had been warned and was not going to cross the border any more. Krüger asked him if he were certain of this and Möhlig replied that he was. Then Krüger said, "We must have him ... whatever it costs," relating that he had been instructed from higher up to get Neve, and if they were not successful someone would look bad. More than likely Krüger had received his orders from Bismarck. Most and many other anarchists assumed that the orders to apprehend Neve came from Bismarck, but there is no evidence to support such an assumption, even though it seems to be a reasonable one.<sup>49</sup>

The method used by the German police to capture Neve outraged the anarchists who approached Paul Singer, leader of the Social Democratic Party in the Reichstag, asking him to intercede on behalf of Neve, because they claimed that Neve had been illegally arrested and handed over to the German police at the border, which was true, but Singer refused to become involved in the affair because he did not want to endanger the Social Democratic Party by siding with the anarchists on this issue. Anarchists then approached Belgian officials protesting the unlawful seizure of Neve but got nowhere, nor were they successful in getting the Belgian Social Democratic Party to help them, because they were told by party officials that Neve was on their "black list."<sup>50</sup>

The trial of John Neve began in Leipzig on Monday, October 3, 1887, at nine in the morning, and lasted until October 10. He was tried before a tribunal composed of the Second and Third Criminal Sections of the Imperial Tribunal with Drenkmann, who had presided over the Reinsdorf trial, as President. The trial itself should have been held in the Reichsgerichts building but was held in Landgerichts building as a safety precaution. Neve was imprisoned in the Landgerichts building and it was feared that if it were necessary to transfer him every day from the Landgerichts building to the Reichsgerichts building someone might attempt to set him free.

The chief prosecutor for the government was Hermann Tessorf (1831-1895), who demanded that the proceedings be held behind closed doors on the grounds that undue publicity of the case might endanger the public safety. This demand was granted and the court room was cleared except for those directly involved in the case. The proceedings of the Neve trial were held in complete secrecy and a transcript of the trial has never been published, although some details of the trial were leaked to the press every day.

The specific charges against Neve were: violation of the dynamite law; advocating the murder of the Emperor, the Crown Prince, and others; *lèse-majesté*; and distribution of forbidden literature including Freiheit, Der Rebell, and Die Autonomie (He was also held accountable for the contents of these newspapers and the other pieces of literature he had smuggled into Germany); atheism; using a false name; failure to identify a known criminal; treasonable acts; and engaging in "propaganda by deed."<sup>51</sup>

The evidence against Neve was substantial, but all of it was given by people whom he had formerly considered to be his friends and co-workers in the anarchist movement. The weaver Palm, who was the key witness for the government at the Reinsdorf trial, was once again paraded in and he gave damaging testimony against Neve. There can be little doubt that most of the key witnesses were paid by the government in various ways for the testimony they offered, as will be brought out. This is undoubtedly why the proceedings were held in secret because the entire trial was such a travesty of justice that it could not possibly have been opened to the members of the press. Probably the trial of John Neve marked an all-time low in German Justice. The method used to apprehend him, the manner in which he was tried, even his sentencing and subsequent imprisonment were all accomplished in questionable fashion.

The first charge was that Neve had been smuggling dynamite into Germany, which he had. The evidence the prosecutor produced was that Neve had sent a box to Fritz Böhme in Sudenburg near Magdeburg, which was intended for the iron-turner Robert Drichel, who also lived in Sudenburg. The box was filled with dynamite, powder trains, other explosive materials, copies of Freiheit and Der Rebell, and letters for Drichel, the carpenter

Winkler and the iron-turner Sander. This box had been mailed by Neve in Aachen and was received by Böhme on September 20, 1886. Böhme turned the box over to Drichel, who took it to his place of lodging at the home of the widow Dietz and there part of the contents of the box were stored for his own future use and the remainder was set aside for the shoemaker Krause; namely three dynamite cartridges, a bottle of sulfuric acid, and a number of punk fuses. Winkler and Sander heard of the arrival of the box and stopped by to read their letters which they burned after reading. Unfortunately for Drichel and Krause the police were aware of the arrival of the box and they were soon arrested by the police and charged with violating the dynamite law and distribution of forbidden literature. Drichel was sentenced to five years and two months in January 1887. At his trial Drichel was used as a witness against several former comrades who had helped him distribute literature in the Magdeburg area: Klees, who received six weeks; Hurke, Neubern, and Habermann, who were given two weeks each; Günther, who got eight weeks; Meurer and Gentsch, who received nine weeks each; and Köster, who was given a year and a half in prison. It was proven that Drichel was working in close collaboration with Neve and had been Neve's contact in Magdeburg for several years. The explosives which he had received were for the purpose of blowing up the Police Headquarters Buildings in Magdeburg and Berlin. In May 1887 Krause, Dienemann, Brandt, and Wille were brought to trial in Magdeburg. The chief crown witness was Drichel. At the end of the trial Krause was sentenced to two years for violation of the dynamite law, while Dienemann received four months; Brandt, three months; and Wille, two months for the distribution of forbidden literature.<sup>52</sup>

At Neve's trial, Drichel, Krause, Winkler, Sander, and Böhme were all used as witnesses against him. Drichel testified that in August 1886 he wrote to Neve asking for dynamite, directing that it should be sent to Böhme's address rather than his own. Böhme said he did not want to accept the box, but only did it as a favor for Drichel. An unsigned letter from a police agent in London dated March 19, 1887, seven months before the trial, related that Drichel felt especially bitter toward Neve and wanted revenge. At the trial he obtained his revenge by implicating Neve in the shipment of dynamite and other explosives into Germany for the purpose of carrying out acts of "propaganda by deed." At the trial the prosecution introduced a number of letters connecting Neve with Drichel, Böhme and Krause.<sup>53</sup>

The prosecution evidently had made some sort of a deal with Drichel and Krause because a telegram sent by von Maude-rode, who was at the trial in Leipzig, to the Berlin Police President Bernhard Freiherr von Richthofen (1836-1895) on October 4, 1887, reported that Drichel and Krause were not cooperating like they should be and were trying to wiggle out of their earlier statements.<sup>54</sup> In the end though they gave the desired information against Neve and had their terms of imprisonment shortened. Drichel was released from prison in December 1887 after serving less than a year of a five-year and two-month sentence.

The weaver Palm also testified that Neve had supplied Reinsdorf with dynamite and had also supplied him with money for the 1880 attempt which never reached fruition.<sup>55</sup>

Also at the trial articles from Freiheit and Rebell were read to point out that the anarchists were plotting violence in Germany, specifically the murder of the Emperor and the Crown Prince as repayment for the death of Reinsdorf. It was also detailed how Neve wrote to the compositor Gustav Drobner in Leipzig and supplied him with newspapers and other literature which he in turn distributed.<sup>56</sup>

It was not difficult for the government to establish the part Neve played in the smuggling of Freiheit, Der Rebell and Die Autonomie into Germany. Considerable evidence implicating Neve had been introduced at Drobner's trial, but Neve's own trial produced an even more spectacular witness, one who could testify that Neve had been involved in the smuggling operations from 1882 to 1887, except for the period he had been imprisoned. The witness was the weaver Franz Gross who had been apprehended outside the Phoenix Cafe in Lüttich along with Neve. Gross (b. November 28, 1856 in Crimmitschau) had been involved in the anarchist movement since the late 1870's. He had met Neve in North America and also had been involved in the Mostian circle in London. Since September 1882 he had been active in Verviers and Einsival crossing the German border for the purpose of smuggling explosives and literature into Germany. He was in almost constant contact with Neve, except for the time Neve was imprisoned, and Neve considered him to be a close friend.<sup>57</sup>

When Gross was captured he had in his possession a notebook which contained a great deal of highly incriminating

evidence. In the notebook were listed the shipments in which Gross was involved of newspapers and other materials into Germany from Switzerland, Brussels and Luxembourg, for the period of January 1882 to January 1887. Also included in the notebook was information on the amount of money he had shipped out of Germany. The names of the actual people involved were not given, however; they were listed under code names assigned to each person. One name which appears throughout the notebook, except for the period Neve was imprisoned, is the name Even, which the German police quickly discovered was Neve spelled backwards. The notebook in itself would have been of little value, but Gross gave a detailed explanation of the document to the State Attorney, including the names and addresses of all the people listed in the notebook. He listed, in addition to Neve, Franz Bertram (b. April 18, 1852 in Aachen), Johann Sprenger (b. December 14, 1848 in Mainz), the weaver Friedrich Klauka (b. April 15, 1856 in Winkelburg), the weaver Franz Pagsack, and the weaver Felix Oehl (b. October 8, 1853) in Eisen.<sup>58</sup>

The postal clerk Glar from Aachen then took the witness stand and testified that on the evening of February 6, 1887, a man came into the Post Office and mailed three packages. The clerk said that this man was not Neve, but he looked suspicious so he turned the three packages over to the Chief of Police in Aachen, Möhlig, who examined them and found that they each contained about 90 copies of Freiheit and Die Autonomie. Packet number one was intended for Heinrich Schmidt in Ludwigshaven, packet two for Gottlieb Benx in Stuttgart, and packet three for Franz Rehör in Bittau. The man who had mailed the three packages was taken into custody and in his possession he had a letter from Neve directing him to mail the three packages in Aachen along with information to whom they should be sent.<sup>59</sup>

The Chief of Police in Magdeburg, Schmidt, also testified that Wilhelm Hoepfner had been remailing letters for Neve in Aachen and Max Pohlmann had been found guilty of the same offense in Magdeburg.<sup>60</sup>

The evidence which implicated Neve for the period 1882-1887 was particularly damaging when considered in conjunction with the other evidence introduced; however, the notebook was equally damaging to Gross himself. The German police were fully aware that Gross had been involved in the smuggling of literature and explosives into Germany for a period of five years, yet he was set free. The question that needs to be answered is,

why? He was guilty of the same charges brought against Neve but, unlike Neve, was never brought to trial. He admitted that he had been crossing the German border at various points on an average of twice a week. The last trip listed in his notebook occurred on January 19, 1887, over a month before the apprehension of Neve on February 21. It is my opinion that it was Gross who turned Neve over to the German police. My reasoning is as follows: as a result of the trip that Reuss had taken with Peukert the police were able to locate Neve and followed his activities for several days, but Neve realized that he was under police surveillance and was able to elude his would-be captors. This is demonstrated by the telegrams of January 9, which Möhlig sent from Lüttich and Verviers to Berlin indicating that they had lost sight of Neve.<sup>61</sup> Thus by January 9 the German police were back where they had been prior to Peukert's trip, except for the fact that they could now identify Neve. My assumption is that sometime shortly after January 19 Gross was apprehended while trying to cross into Germany with literature and/or dynamite because the border was being guarded closely waiting for Neve to make his move. Gross was already wanted for being a military deserter, an offense which had occurred many years before. Now Gross was in serious trouble because the German government could have brought all the same charges against him which were later leveled against Neve, plus the charge of being a military deserter. It is my belief that he struck a bargain with the German police to betray Neve. From Luxembourg he wrote to Neve that he wanted to come and see him. On the same day he arrived in Lüttich the two of them were apprehended outside the Phönix Cafe. The German police were not going to make the same mistake they had made earlier, that of waiting for Neve to cross the border and then losing sight of him. They decided to act immediately and he was seized by the Belgian police and within two hours, along with Gross, he was handed over to the German police at the border.

Gross, set free a short time after the trial, went to Aachen where he bought a factory, which Belgian anarchists claimed was purchased with funds he had received from the German police for the part he had played in the capture and conviction of Neve. My assumption, that Gross handed Neve over to the police, is reasonable because the charges against Gross were serious, and yet he was not brought to trial, even continuing to live in Germany after the Neve trial.<sup>62</sup>

Another charge against Neve was that he had lied when

he had been asked to identify Karl Schneidt on February 7, 1884. Schneidt had been apprehended in Potsdam, and was taken to Leipzig while a case could be developed against him. The charge they wanted to bring against him was that he had helped to edit Freiheit after Most's imprisonment, which was actually the case. The police officials brought Schneidt to Hanau for Neve, alias Stevens, to identify, but Neve denied ever having seen Schneidt. Schneidt was held for five months, but being unable to produce any substantial evidence against him, he was released. At his trial it was brought out how Neve had lied in this affair.<sup>63</sup>

It was also claimed at the trial that Neve was behind the Rumpf murder. On this point no conclusive answer could be achieved. It was demonstrated that Neve was responsible for many connections in Germany and Austria but no substantial evidence could be introduced to prove that he was actually involved in the Rumpf murder.<sup>64</sup>

Also introduced at the trial as evidence were two letters found in the possession of Otto Rinke when he was apprehended along with Balthasar Grün in Hanau on March 22, 1882. The two letters were dated February 17, 1882 and March 7, 1882, One was written in Woolwich, England, and the second came from London. The sender of the letters identified himself with an N., whom Rinke admitted under questioning to be Neve.<sup>65</sup>

When Rinke was apprehended he was in serious trouble because in addition to the above mentioned letters he was carrying other letters written in invisible ink, which firmly established that he was on a revolutionary mission in Germany. He was also carrying several copies of the March 18 issue of Freiheit and was traveling with a forged passport. When his true identity was established it was found that he was the same person they had apprehended using the alias of Rau in Mannheim in the late fall of 1880. It was also discovered that he had been sought since 1873 for military desertion.<sup>66</sup>

The letter of March 7 was exceptionally damaging for it said, "If appears that the beast of war will soon break out. If that should happen our place is not in Paris or London, but in Germany or better yet in Austria, where we must attack while they are preoccupied with the preparations for war."<sup>67</sup> This revelation, that Neve had planned to strike Germany a blow in the back in the event that the country went to war was particularly damaging to his case. This charge which was well

documented could be considered by itself to be treasonable. Neve's plan to destroy the country from within while Germany had her hands full fighting was used by the court to demonstrate the threat that he posed to the nation if he were allowed to go free.

The weaver Palm was called to the stand again and he testified that in 1882 Neve had been transformed from propaganda by words to "propaganda by deed" and that he believed in the use of violence, especially the use of dynamite and that Neve had taken a trip to Austria with Reinsdorf early in 1882 for the purpose of blowing up something there.<sup>68</sup>

The trial ended with Neve being found guilty of violating the dynamite law; violating several provisions of the Socialist Law by distribution of Freiheit, Der Rebell, and Die Autonomie; guilty of lying in not identifying Schneidt on February 7, 1884; and guilty of using a false name in 1883-1884. For these offenses he was sentenced to 15 years in prison even though the State Prosecutor Tessendorf had only asked for ten years.<sup>69</sup>

In prison at first Neve was allowed to work at his trade and to write one letter every three months. In January 1888 he wrote to Trunk that he was feeling well and that he had written the date 1902 on his cell door, saying that in that year the jail doors would swing open and he would be set free. This was the last letter anyone in the movement received from Neve.<sup>70</sup>

In 1890 plans were made to break Neve out of Halle prison where he was being held, but the plan never materialized because it was impossible to determine in which part of the prison Neve was being kept so the plan had to be abandoned.<sup>71</sup> Johann Most made several appeals to the German conscience trying to gain Neve's freedom. He also appealed to the Social Democratic Reichstag deputies, and addressed himself to the German sense of justice, but all to no avail.<sup>72</sup>

On December 28, 1896, the editor of Vorwärts received a telegram from Neve's sister in Flensburg telling that her brother had died a couple weeks before in Moabit prison. Neve had been transferred to Moabit on September 28, 1888, and his death there came on December 8, 1896, at 3:50 in the afternoon as a result of an acute case of tuberculosis of the lungs. He died in that section of the prison, located at Lehrter Strasse 3, where prisoners were kept who had lost their minds. How long



he had been in this condition prior to his death is not known.<sup>73</sup>

The arrest of Neve on February 21, 1887, was accompanied by increased feelings of hostility between the opposing camps of the Bruderkrieg. The arrest of Neve acted like a catalyst, turning former friends into enemies; this ensured the demise of the German anarchist movement. The speculation was that Neve had fallen victim to a spy plot, with Dave accusing Peukert of being the spy, while Peukert claimed that the paid informer was Dave. Dave, Trunk, and Most were allied against Peukert and Rinke and their followers. Already, before the arrest of Neve, some elements in the Dave camp, specifically Trunk and even Neve himself, began to develop feelings of hostility toward Dave, accusing him of being a tyrant. On the eve of Neve's arrest Trunk had hired an English private detective firm, Slaters, to investigate Peukert and Rinke to determine where their money was coming from, but the agency turned up no irregularities. This clearly demonstrates the depths of mistrust which existed among the German anarchists in London. Before long, Trunk and a number of others defected from the Dave camp to join forces with Peukert and Rinke.<sup>74</sup>

Then on May 13, 1887, a long unsigned article relating how Neve was apprehended was published in Der Sozialdemokrat. This article was too detailed not to have been written by someone who had been involved in the affair. It told how Police Director Krüger and a number of his agents came to Belgium for the purpose of capturing Neve, relating that they knew Neve had been living in Lüttich under a false name, but that they did not know exactly where. For the purpose of bringing him out of hiding Peukert brought Reuss over to visit him, using the pretext that Reuss wanted to see Neve. The article also described the meeting that took place between Reuss and Neve in the train station in Lüttich, but said that two Belgian policemen and two German secret policemen watched the entire scene. The article claimed that from then until he was apprehended Neve was under constant police surveillance.<sup>75</sup>

This article burst like a bombshell in the anarchist and socialist world and the finger of guilt was pointed at Peukert. On May 22 a meeting, which was open to all anarchist and socialist organizations, was held in the Club Autonomie. At this meeting Peukert gave a detailed description of the trip he had taken with Reuss, which satisfied those present. It was also decided at this meeting to convene an investigation commission

to examine the charges the article made against Peukert, because the article carried a strong inference that Peukert was a police spy. After six weeks the commission released the results of their investigation, finding Peukert innocent of the charges. Most and Dave, however, continued to maintain that he was guilty.<sup>76</sup>

The article in Der Sozialdemokrat evoked a storm of criticism and many letters poured into the paper saying that the writer of the article had to be a police spy. Many people thought that the author of it was Dave. Thus the unsigned article added considerable fuel to the flames of the Bruderkrieg.<sup>77</sup>

Peukert then wrote a series of three articles which appeared in Die Autonomie defending himself and pointing the finger of suspicion at Dave. He also revealed that the author of the article in Der Sozialdemokrat was the police spy Max Trautner and claimed that Eduard Bernstein had made a special trip to Paris where he paid Trautner 1000 francs for the story. Peukert also revealed that it was Trautner who warned Bertrand who in turn warned Neve. He also claimed that Dave had been on close terms with Serreaux, the French agent provocateur, as well as with Max Trautner.<sup>78</sup>

Bernstein answered Peukert's charge by saying that it was their own business where they had obtained the story on Neve, but assured him that it was from a reliable source.<sup>79</sup> Most reacted to the Peukert charges against Dave by printing the entire article the way it had appeared in Die Autonomie with his own comments which were highly critical of Peukert and his involvement with Reuss, adding that Peukert's position regarding Dave was entirely unjustified.<sup>80</sup>

On July 16 Peukert struck out again at Dave and Bernstein maintaining that both Dave and Bernstein were friends of Max Trautner, the police spy whom he claimed had written the article. For good measure he also added the name of Karl Grillenberger to the list saying that he too was a friend of Trautner. Peukert reiterated his charge that Dave was a close friend of Serreaux and called him the "number one police agent in London."<sup>81</sup>

Bernstein replied by saying that everything which Peukert had written was false and that the article which had appeared in Der Sozialdemokrat had not been written by Trautner, nor was

there a Social Democratic plot against him, as Peukert had claimed.<sup>82</sup>

Dave answered Peukert's charges point by point. He said they were without any foundation and it was evident that Peukert and Reuss were guilty. He said he did not know Trautner, and had not seen Serreaux since October 1880 or long before it was known that he was a police agent. Dave also denied going to Belgium and meeting with Trautner and Bertrand in the Hotel Vienna and then watching the capture of Neve, as Peukert maintained he had.<sup>83</sup>

Peukert's split with Reuss came in October 1887 when Reuss wrote a long article which appeared in the London Evening News on October 5, exposing the activities of the London anarchist clubs. In Die Autonomie Peukert branded Reuss as being in the same camp with Mottler, Trautner, Bernstein, Martin and Dave. A short time after this Reuss left London, returning to Germany.<sup>84</sup>

The argument between Peukert and Dave over the Neve affair went on for several years and weakened the German anarchist movement. All of the energy in the movement was expended fighting each other rather than in the dissemination of anarchist ideas in Germany. Dave was discredited and Peukert fell from the position he held as editor of Die Autonomie and his role in the movement was finished. In the late fall of 1887 Peukert left London because he was unable to find work and most of his former friends had turned against him. He went to Paris where he lived and worked under a false name. Hounded in Paris, he traveled to Bilbao, Spain, where he was able to obtain a contract for the interior decoration of an entire large hotel. It took him, with the help of four assistants, eight weeks to complete the job. When he left Bilbao on May 2, 1890, he had 450 francs in his pocket that he had earned decorating the hotel. He traveled to Bordeaux where he remained only a short time before going to London by the way of Paris. From London he sailed to New York, arriving there flat broke in June.<sup>85</sup>

The last 20 years of Peukert's life were spent in the United States arguing with Most, trying to remove the stigma from his name, and in various publishing ventures in New York and Chicago where he published German language newspapers orientated toward communist-anarchist ideology. An investigation commission was called together in 1893-1894 in Chicago.

The commission took an entire year to collect the evidence, letters, statements, and affidavits of everyone involved in the Neve affair; the results of the investigation were a complete vindication for Peukert.<sup>86</sup>

The Neve trial also did great damage to Rinke's reputation in the movement. The news of the two letters Neve had sent to Grün which were found in Rinke's possession when he was apprehended in Hanau in 1882, leaked out from the secret trial proceedings, opening up an old wound which had been festering since Grün committed suicide in Hanau prison in September 1882. Most brought out his heavy artillery and fired off a shot at Rinke, asking how could a person be so careless or stupid as to be caught with such damaging letters in his possession?<sup>87</sup>

It did not take Rinke long to answer Most's accusation. He admitted having the two letters, but said that they had not fallen into the hands of the police the way Most claimed they had. Rinke's story, which is a complete fabrication, is that during the summer of 1882 he was on an agitation trip in Germany. He knew only a few names and addresses so he wrote to Neve asking him to send the names and addresses of more people in Germany, and also to write him a letter of introduction which he could show to the comrades he visited, explaining the purpose of his trip in Germany. According to Rinke, he received the letter in Frankfurt-am-Main and then he went to Darmstadt to visit one of the people on the list that had been sent to him by Neve, a man named Seibert. It was evening when he arrived at Seibert's home and proceeded to show him the four-page letter Neve had sent him. Seibert looked at the letter for a long time, and then asked Rinke if he could keep it overnight in order to study the contents more fully. The next morning, which was Sunday, at about 11:00, Rinke met Seibert not far from the police station. He told Rinke that during the night his home had been searched by the police because a stranger had been seen there earlier in the evening. Rinke inquired about the letter and Seibert said he had hidden it well and that he would bring it to him at noon. Seibert and Rinke met at noon and Seibert told him that he had planned a meeting that evening with other comrades to whom he wanted to read the letter, but an hour later at 1:00 the police descended on him, and he and Grün were arrested. On Monday he was taken before the Magistrate of Inquiry who showed him the Neve letter which he had left with Seibert. Thus Rinke claimed that the Freiheit office in London had given him a list of police spies.<sup>88</sup>

This account is a lie from the start to the finish. The trip was undertaken in March and not during the summer as Rinke said, and the letters were written by Neve to Grün while he was still in Paris. By July Neve was no longer in London as Rinke claimed, but in Switzerland. Police files demonstrate that the letters were in Rinke's possession when he was arrested in Hanau on March 22 while trying to visit a man there named Wunderlich.<sup>89</sup>

The Rinke-Grün business was an issue which had been smoldering for a long time in the Bruderkrieg. Before the arrest of Neve, Dave wanted to bring the issue out into the open. In February 1886 he wrote to Neve saying he would like to print an exposé in Freiheit that "Otto Rinke was the central figure in the champagne bottle affair and that in Hanau, in order to save himself, he caused the death of one of the most noble anarchists."<sup>90</sup> Neve replied that it would be better not to stir up again the story of the robbery-murder. Like Dave, Neve was convinced that Rinke had talked the naive Grün into committing the murder, but did not take a direct part in it. Neve was also convinced that when the two were in prison the older Rinke had suggested to Grün the idea of committing suicide, because Rinke was afraid that Grün would reveal his implication in the murder.<sup>91</sup>

The police files do not corroborate Dave's contentions. It is true that Rinke lied about the letters because they were in his possession when he was apprehended, but it was Grün who confessed to the police everything he knew about Rinke. Grün had in his possession a formula for the making of dynamite which he had obtained in Paris. After repeated questioning he revealed Rinke's true identity (Rinke claimed he was Otto Rau) and told everything he knew about him so that his suicide probably did not occur as Dave claimed, at the suggestion of Rinke; it came after betraying his comrade. The true story of the affair was not known to Most and Dave and the recriminations over the letters and the revival of the suicide of Grün added fuel to the flame of the Bruderkrieg.<sup>92</sup>

Life for Rinke in London had always been difficult. He had a wife and two small children and usually was without steady work; in spite of the dire circumstances of his life, his home served as a meeting place for anarchists and Der Rebell was set up and printed there. Even Frau Rinke played a part in the movement by converting Peukert's illegible scribble into polished

manuscripts. After the Neve affair his fortunes bettered and he found steady employment in London and for the years 1888-1890 was reasonably well off, but he found himself being hounded by the police who were keeping closer surveillance on known anarchists. As a result of this he left England, rather than go to jail, and went to New York where he lived in Elizabeth Port for a while before moving to St. Louis. In St. Louis he was able to obtain a position as a foreman in a factory which produced electrical motors. Along with a small circle of friends he in St. Louis published a small communist-anarchist newspaper, Der Kämpfer, of which six numbers appeared between July 25 to August 29, 1896. After Rinke left London, like Peukert he no longer played an active role in the Movement.<sup>93</sup>

The loss of Rinke was a severe blow to the German anarchist movement, because after the arrest of Neve, and Peukert's subsequent withdrawal to France, Rinke had become the leader of the Gruppe Autonomie in London. He devised and directed the smuggling routes over which Die Autonomie and other literature was sent into Germany through Belgium and Switzerland. A favorite route crossed the border near Aachen, and newspapers once inside Germany were mailed to subscribers. It appears that Rinke was quite successful in his smuggling operations because Berlin Police President von Richthofen noted that during 1888 the police had not been able to seize many copies of Die Autonomie, nor were they able to arrest anyone for smuggling the paper into the country even though it was apparent that smuggling activities were being stepped up.<sup>94</sup> The route through Switzerland was also partially reopened and a considerable number of copies of Die Autonomie were finding their way into Germany and Austria over this route.<sup>95</sup>

The decision by the English police to hound Rinke until he finally went to the United States left the Gruppe Autonomie leaderless. After Rinke left London Die Autonomie declined, and efforts to smuggle it into Germany and Austria met with less success.

The arrest of Neve practically signaled the end of the distribution of Freiheit in Germany and Austria in large quantities. It became increasingly difficult to smuggle it into Germany because the paper was printed such a long distance from the continent of Europe. Neve had been the key link in the smuggling route and he was gone. Gone too was the organization in London which had received the papers from New York and then

reshipped them to Neve. Dave and his followers who had been the principal mainstays of Freiheit in London had fallen victims in the Bruderkrieg and were thoroughly discredited.

By late 1888 Die Autonomie had taken over the territory in Germany which had been formerly served by Freiheit. Die Autonomie was published nearer to Germany and was in closer contact with the German movement. As already noted, Rinke was successful in smuggling large numbers of the paper into Germany and workers there quickly turned to it while turning away from Freiheit. After the apprehension of Neve, Freiheit no longer had an adequate distribution system within Germany because nearly all the key figures in the organization fell along with Neve. In addition to this Freiheit had been in the United States since late 1882 and had lost touch with the movement in Germany. It was impossible for Most to try to print a newspaper in New York that would appeal to the workers in Germany. It was becoming increasingly apparent that Most wanted to dominate the movement and centralize the control of it in his own hands. Even though he had burning ambition and a flamboyant pen, it is virtually impossible for one man to run a newspaper. It was apparent even to the workers that the brand of anarchism which Most preached was not well thought out when they compared it to what they read in Die Autonomie. Die Autonomie was better written, contained the most recent ideas of communist-anarchism, and was more readily accessible in Germany. For these reasons by 1888 Freiheit was on the way out as an effective propaganda organ in Germany and Austria.

By nature Most was a bitter, spiteful, and vindictive person so he lashed out at his competition, claiming that Die Autonomie was printed with funds supplied by the Berlin police. Furthermore he said all of the troubles which had plagued and weakened the movement in the past few years could be attributed to Peukert. He called Die Autonomie an organ of repression, and said that Peukert had stolen the subscription list of Freiheit in order to increase their own circulation in Germany. What is more he claimed that Die Autonomie was partially responsible for the Neve affair and for the bitterness which accompanied it.<sup>96</sup>

The reply of the editors of Die Autonomie was a complete disavowal of the charges leveled at them by Most.<sup>97</sup> At the urging of the Gruppe Autonomie, a commission was called together to investigate the financial backing of the newspaper. On the commission were two members of the Berner Street Club from

the East side of London, and eight members of the First, Second, and Third Sections of the Kommunistischer-Arbeiterbildungsverein. Otto Rinke was able to get Peter Kropotkin to take part in the proceedings of the commission. The results of the investigation were made public on March 9, 1889. After a thorough examination of the books of the Gruppe Autonomie, as well as their sources of income, everything was found to be in order. Nothing could be found to substantiate the allegations that Most had leveled at Die Autonomie. The commission went on to say that it would be in the best interest of the movement if both factions of the German-speaking anarchist movement would put aside their differences and stop the senseless haggling, because there was room in the movement for both newspapers, even though they differed in ideology.<sup>98</sup>

This was a blow to Most because essentially it meant that he had been pushed to the periphery of the German anarchist movement. Kropotkin had for some time stood in silent opposition to what he considered Most's centralizing tendencies, but his silence was broken when Most published his charge that Die Autonomie was published with German police funds.<sup>99</sup> In public Kropotkin tried to appear neutral in the Bruderkrieg, but in private conversations he admitted that he stood on the side of Peukert against Most and Dave.<sup>100</sup> This is understandable because ideologically Kropotkin and Peukert were in agreement that the movement of the future would be communist-anarchism oriented and would not follow the vague concepts of revolution and centralization which Most portrayed in his writings.

Thus the arrest of Neve, resulted in more than the loss of a key man to the movement and the exposure of the smuggling route by which literature and explosives were brought into Germany and distributed there; it brought the Bruderkrieg to a climactic struggle in which the leaders of the movement fell victims to the senseless exchanges of vile allegations. The leaders of the movement were cut off, gone were Neve, Rinke, Peukert, Dave, Most, Trunk, Knauerhase and the countless subalterns who had manned the stations of the smuggling routes into Germany. The German government itself could not have done a more efficient job of destroying the German anarchist movement. The Bruderkrieg accomplished what the Socialist Law, Dynamite Law, the beheading of Hödel, Reinsdorf, Küchler, and Lieske failed to do—it destroyed the movement.

Nevertheless it was not in the best interest of the German



government to have anarchism completely duntrodden, because it would eliminate an important whipping boy who could be brought out as evidence of the need for more stringent measures against the anarchists and socialists. When it became apparent that the German anarchists did not plan to send a delegate to the anarchist congress being held in Verviers on April 21, 1889, the Chief of Police in Elberfeld, Kammhoff, informed the Minister of the Interior, Ludwig Herrfurth, that he had sent an agent to to the meeting representing the German anarchists. This person sent by Kammhoff was the only German delegate at the congress. He presented a plan at the meeting to assassinate the German Kaiser.<sup>101</sup> In effect an artificial anarchist threat was created where none existed. That is not to say that anarchist attempts at "propaganda by deed" were no longer carried out in Germany, they were and would be for several decades, but these acts were only residual effects of the old movement because the new movement, which was finding its footing around 1890, was not committed to a policy of "propaganda by deed," but nonetheless they had to live with the reputation that the old movement had given to anarchism.

The Neve case also did considerable damage to the Social Democratic Party. Part of the damage has already been discussed in relation to the part the party leaders played in the publication in Der Sozialdemokrat of the article by the police spy Max Trautner. Another facet of the damage to the Social Democratic Party resulted from the fact that the Neve trial, which began on October 3, 1887, coincided with the meeting of a secret party congress being held in St. Gallen, Switzerland. There was considerable interest in Germany in both events as evidenced by the coverage they were given in the German press.<sup>102</sup>

Up to this time the Social Democratic Party had not been successful in clarifying to the mind of the German public the difference between themselves and the anarchists. Attempts to do this were usually countered by articles in which they appeared to be supporting the anarchists--most recently in connection with the decapitation of Reinsdorf, which the Social Democratic Party abhorred.<sup>103</sup>

A good deal of the discussion at the St. Gallen congress centered on the anarchists and the need for the Social Democratic Party to distinguish itself from them. Liebknecht attempted to clarify the difference between the Social Democratic Party

and the anarchists, after which a resolution was unanimously adopted by the delegates to demonstrate their total repudiation of anarchism.<sup>104</sup>

The German government did not accept the resolution at face value, but continued to maintain that the extremists controlled the Social Democratic Party. The German ambassador in Bern, Otto von Bülow, wrote that the resolution against anarchism approved by the congress "was not taken seriously by intelligent people," because it was only a maneuver to make the meeting appear "harmless."<sup>105</sup> Dr. Paul Kayser, Vortragender Legationsrat in the Political Division of the German Foreign Ministry, seconded Bülow's interpretation in a memorandum of October 25, 1887, entitled, "Betriff die anarchiste [sic] Entwicklung der deutschen Sozialdemokratie," in which he declared that "concerning the anarchist development of German Social Democracy the difference between Social Democracy and anarchism is not qualitative but only one of degree."<sup>106</sup>

In German government circles in the late 1880's it was still widely held that there was not a great deal of difference between the Social Democrats and the anarchists. The Social Democrats themselves reinforced this idea on occasions by seemingly taking the side of the anarchists by condemning the illegal processes used to convict them. The case of the Chicago anarchist who allegedly perpetrated the Haymarket riot is a case in point.<sup>107</sup> On November 9 two days before the anarchists condemned in the Chicago proceedings were to be executed, Bebel, Liebknecht, Grillenberger, and Singer sent a telegram to the governor of Illinois, asking him for clemency in the case of the anarchists. This appeal was also carried on the front page of Der Sozialdemokrat.<sup>108</sup>

Der Sozialdemokrat was equally critical of the sentencing of Neve,<sup>109</sup> and reiterated that in the Lieske case the German government had murdered an innocent man on the scaffold.<sup>110</sup>

Obviously, despite their constant disclaimers to the contrary, it appeared that the Social Democratic Party was following a deliberate policy of duplicity; in their theoretical articles they sought to distinguish Social Democracy from anarchism, but when the government punished an anarchist their sympathies appeared to be on the side of anarchism. This was a problem with which the Social Democratic Party was going to have to wrestle for several more years before they were able to

establish, in the public mind, a clear distinction between themselves and the anarchists. Needless to say such confusion was to the benefit of the German government which wanted to see the growing Social Democratic Party constrained.

### Notes

1. Freedom. A Journal of Anarchist-Communism, No. 113 (February, 1897), p. 10.

2. Ibid., No. 115 (April, 1897), pp. 30-31.

3. Present at the conference in Bern were Kennel (Freiburg), Otter (Vevey), Schmelzbach (Zürich), the Berlin police spy Schröder (Lausanne), Heilmann (Biel), Deschner, and Czermaker. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Polizeipräsidium, Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 442 (12808), Vol. 9, "Die politische Zustände in der Schweiz 1882;" Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208 (11,969), Vol. 1, "Der Radakteur John Neve 1882-1885;" Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208 (11,970), Vol. 2, "Der Radakteur John Neve (die Reise Neves) 1885-1887." Hereafter cited as Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208 and the appropriate volume number.

4. These charges leveled at Der Sozialdemokrat by anarchists were answered by Eduard Bernstein who had been editor of the paper at the time the piece about Neve appeared. Bernstein claimed that accounts of the arrest of Neve had appeared in the popular press of Vienna. This was probably not the case because Zukunft (Vienna) (January 25, 1883) mentioned the arrest of Ernest Stevens. If the popular press did mention Neve's name it was more than likely that they said they had arrested a man who called himself Ernest Stevens but whom they suspected to be John Neve. It was common knowledge in anarchist and socialist circles that Neve used the alias Ernest Stevens. For Bernstein's letter defending his actions and the rejoinder to it see: Freedom, No. 114 (March, 1897), p. 21. Whether the article in Der Sozialdemokrat was of use to the Austrian or the German police is doubtful, but nevertheless it was an indiscretion on the part of the paper to print such a news item. But then as Bernstein later said, how could he have known that Neve was maintaining that he was really Ernest Stevens. At the time neither the Austrians nor the Germans succeeded in proving that Ernest

Stevens was John Neve, even though Der Sozialdemokrat had said he was.

5. "Versuch einer kritischen Darstellung der Verhaftung John Neve," Der Sozialist. Organ des Sozialistischen Bundes, No. 6 (March 15, 1914), p. 43.

6. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208, Vol. 3 (11, 971), Folder 292. The story which Neve told both to the Austrian and German officials was that he had been born in London. He said that his mother was a German and his father was Irish, but both of them had died while he was still young, so he was apprenticed to a German master craftsman who taught him the German language and German customs. In addition to this he did possess an English passport which had been issued in the name of Ernest Stevens and he spoke impeccable English.

7. "Versuch einer kritischen Darstellung der Verhaftung John Neve," Der Sozialist, No. 6 (March 15, 1814), p. 43. It should be noted that the money order specifies the case being heard was against Neve, not Ernest Stevens. There can be little doubt that German officials were quite certain that it was Neve they had in custody, but proving it was another matter.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid.

10. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 199; Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Polizeipräsidium, Tit. 94, Lit. P., Nr. 519 (12,276), "Der Maler Josef Peukert 1881-1914.

11. For the resolution approved by the congress see: Freiheit, No. 35 (September 1, 1883), p. 3; Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208, Vol 3 (11,971), Folder 243.

12. Langhard, Die anarchistische Bewegung in der Schweiz, p. 305.

13. Ibid., pp. 291, 472.

14. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr.

Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208, Vol. 3 (11,971), Folder 292.

15. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. II (13,088), Folder 413; Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208, Vol. 3 (11,971), Folders 234-250, 286-309.

16. Der Sozialist. Organ für Anarchismus-Sozialismus (Berlin), No. 1 (January 2, 1897), p. 1. An account of the event that is highly critical of Peukert is written by the police spy Max Trautner, Wie John Neve verhaftet würde. Ein Blick hinter die Coulissen des Herrn Josef Peukert (London, n.d. (1889).

17. Freedom, No. 115 (April, 1897), p. 30.

18. Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, pp. 343-344.

19. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 217. The sincerity of Most's hatred of Peukert is open to question though. In 1913 Max Nomad in a conversation with one of Most's ex-assistants regarding Peukert said, "after all Peukert was a fool rather than a traitor." The ex-assistant replied, "Guilty or not guilty, he was a nuisance and the charge of betrayal was the best way of keeping him out of the movement." Max Nomad, Aspects of Revolt (New York, 1959), p. 241. The Peukert-Most controversy was also to permeate and eventually disrupt the anarchist movement in the United States, with various groups siding with either Peukert or Most. A discussion of this topic, although interesting and worthwhile for explaining the development of anarchism in the United States, is nevertheless beyond the scope of this study.

20. Victor Dave, "Meine Beziehungen zu Charles Theodor Reuss," Freiheit, No. 27 (July 3, 1886), p. 6.

21. Ibid.

22. Ibid. Neve at the time was in Belgium having gone there to direct the smuggling of Freiheit into Germany. Reuss evidently heard of this and was able to obtain his address. Dave claimed that either Peukert or Rinke had given the address to Reuss but there is no evidence to substantiate this charge. The event referred to above occurred after Dave and Trunk became aware that Reuss had Neve's address. Rocker also relates that

a short time later Reuss showed up at Dave's home for the first time wanting to know where Neve was in Germany because he said he was planning a business trip there and would like to visit Neve. Dave told him that Neve planned to travel to Berlin, Augsburg, Nürnberg, Plauen, and Leipzig. Several days later three anarchists in Augsburg were arrested by the police, and in Leipzig the homes of suspected anarchists were searched and the wife of one such suspect was told by a member of the secret police to let him know when Neve arrived because he wanted to talk with him. According to Rocker Neve knew nothing of this fictitious trip that he was supposed to be on, but that it was fabricated by Dave and Trunk and told to Reuss to see what he would do. In their opinion he relayed the story to the Berlin Police. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 253.

23. Dave, "Meine Beziehungen zu Charles Theodor Reuss." In his memoirs Peukert claimed that 30 letters written on different types of stationery were given to Reuss who mailed them in Düsseldorf. The letters, he said, contained an announcement of a forthcoming anarchist conference that was going to be held in Frankfurt a.M. An investigation commission held in 1894 to look into the Peukert affair found that the letters had actually been mailed and that they contained such announcement. Rocker doubts this because Dave had told Neve in his telegram to be cautious and it must be remembered that Neve did not trust Reuss to the extent that he would have entrusted him with such important letters. According to Dave, Peukert and Rinke gave Reuss Neve's address, but in Peukert's account Dave is the one who gave the address to Reuss as well as a handdrawn plan of the city of Verviers showing where Neve could be located. According to Peukert, when Reuss returned from the trip he mentioned names and addresses in Mainz, Bielefeld, and other places where he had sent the announcements, names which were known only to Peukert and Rinke and to others in the inner circle such as Neve. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 253; Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, p. 224; Arbeiter-Zeitung (Chicago), (November 7, 1894).

24. Supposedly, according to Dave, he sent a reply to Reuss informing him that he was not interested in carrying on a relationship with him. Dave, "Meine Beziehungen zu Charles Theodor Reuss," p. 6. Rocker concludes that it was at this juncture that Reuss saw that any further relationship with Dave was impossible so he turned to Peukert and Rinke, both of whom hated Dave. Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 254-255. According to

Peukert, Reuss had assisted Dave in putting into acceptable English a series of articles which had appeared in the Central News, articles which were critical of Peukert and Rinke and which revealed information that was considered to be secret. Peukert related that Reuss admitted to Rinke that he had helped Dave with the articles, for which Dave had been paid six pounds by the Central News. Peukert also claims that Reuss showed him a copy of the original manuscript written in Dave's handwriting. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, pp. 224-225.

25. Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, pp. 333-334.

26. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 255.

27. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, p. 230.

28. Ibid. Unfortunately we can no more rely on Peukert's account than we can on the one written by Dave because Peukert's memoirs do contain a number of inaccuracies and false assumptions. An examination of police records on John Neve reveal that neither Peukert or Reuss was telling the truth. What actually happened, as reconstructed from records of the Berlin police, is as follows: Early in 1886 a move was made to set up better methods for the smuggling operations into Germany and the subsequent distribution inside Germany. Neve was critical of the anarchists within Germany, saying that they were too dependent on people outside the country. He thought that there should be a reorganization of anarchists living in Germany, that better lines of communication should be developed with London, and that efforts should begin to establish more small groups inside Germany. He called a conference in Berlin to discuss these ideas. It was attended by five or six people.

The Berlin meeting was followed by a larger conference which met in Frankfurt a.M. on June 13/14, 1886. Neve himself traveled to Frankfurt a.M. and personally sent out the invitation to the forthcoming conference. Invitations were sent to Aachen, Berlin, Ludwigshafen, Mannheim, Frankfurt a.M., Leipzig, Magdeburg, Elberfeld, Mainz, and Stuttgart. Attending the conference were representatives from Aachen, Berlin, Frankfurt a.M., Ludwigshafen, and Mannheim. The Leipzig group said they would send a representative but he did not show up. Magdeburg did not reply to the invitation, and Elberfeld, Mainz, and Stuttgart

replied that they thought the meeting was not necessary because, they reasoned, everything that needed to be done could be accomplished through exchanging letters.

Neve wanted to eliminate the carelessness of anarchists outside Germany who were endangering their comrades in the movement inside Germany by not taking due precaution in their exchanges of communications. He also wanted to organize the groups within Germany. The agenda for the conference was drawn up by Neve. The leadership of the conference was likewise vested in Neve's hands. Neve maintained at the conference that Germany was without any organization, complaining that there were not any permanent groups inside Germany, in the literal sense of the word, but only local branches. His plan called for an expansion of the number of groups inside Germany. He told the conference that he was in contact with groups in Magdeburg, Leipzig, Brandenburg, Berlin, Schönebeck, Ludwigshafen, Manneheim, Frankfurt a.M., Elberfeld, Aachen, and Stuttgart. His connection with Mainz, he related, had recently been broken and his relations with Braunschweig were very weak. Neve proposed to improve anarchists organization within Germany and to win new members for the existing groups. He also wanted to increase the number of groups. One method he suggested to increase the number of groups would be: if a member of an existing group were forced to move to another city to find work, he should take it upon himself to organize an "infant group there. The newly formed "infant" group would maintain contact with the "mother" group from which the member had come. All local groups in Germany were to be treated as equals and would be joined to London through Neve. There would not be a center of organization inside Germany; it would continue to be in London.

Another conference was held, on the first day of Christmas, 1886, to discuss Neve's ideas in more detail. Present at this conference, held in Cologne, were Neve, Schütz from London, and a number of people from Berlin.

Neve wanted to increase the number of groups within Germany, strengthen existing groups, and organize a communications network, both among the groups within Germany as well as through him to the London headquarters. Evidently the conferences did little to improve communications and organization within Germany. In one of the last letters Neve sent from Aachen, postmarked February 16, 1887, he asked: "Have you heard any news from Frankfurt? Every connection was broken off instantaneously. More evidence of faulty organization. The minute one or two people are lost a group ceases to exist, but that is how it goes, what has been laboriously put is once again lost."



It should be noted that Neve was above all a realist. He was never very optimistic for the eventual success of anarchism in Germany. In a letter of April 7, 1883, his pessimism is revealed: "In Berlin the people who are capable of agitation are very lazy. The operation of the police crudity has not failed to make an impression on the people. The Germans are too even-tempered; they are not Irishmen or Russians. Thus it is possible for the Social Democratic deputies to cast their ballots in the Reichstag, ostensibly representing the interest of the workers. This [allowing the SPD to sit in the Reichstag] is a deceitful trick. The [SPD] are nothing more than a first-rate rubber stamp for a police administration. You might as well say good-bye to agitation." Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Polizeipräsidium, Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208, Vol. 1 (11,969), Vol 2 (11,970).

29. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, p. 230.

30. Ibid., p. 238. Letters written by Neve to fellow anarchists in Germany substantiate Puekert's account. These letters fell into police hands and reveal that Neve was becoming increasingly worried that he would soon be captured by the German police. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208 (11,970), Vol. 2.

31. Ibid.

32. Ibid., p. 239. The package of dynamite going to Magdeburg had been sent to a person referred to in London as the "false brother." Peukert does not mention him by name but does say that he later testified against Neve at his trial, so it had to be Robert Drichel.

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid. The account given by the police spy Max Trautner, who played a part in the capture of Neve, does not correspond with that given by Peukert. Trautner related that the Berlin Police Director Adolf Krüger told von Mauderode to write to Reuss in London, telling him to arrange a trip to Belgium for the purpose of pointing out Neve to the police so they could watch his activities there. Toward the end of 1886 Mauderode relayed Krüger's request to Reuss, and a short time after this Reuss replied that he had been able to arrange to meet Neve

personally in Brussels on the evening of January 1, 1887. "Wie John Neve der preussische Polizei in die Hände geliefert wurde. Ein Beitrag zur Naturgeschichte der Polizei-Internationale und ihrer Helfershelfer," Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 20 (May 13, 1887), pp. 1-2.

35. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, p. 240. Peukert gives the time of arrival as eleven o'clock.

36. Ibid.

37. Ibid., p. 241. Wismann remained in Brussels.

38. "Wie John Neve der preussische Polizei in die Hände geliefert wurde. Ein Beitrag zur Naturgeschichte der Polizei-Internationale und ihrer Helfershelfer." Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 20 (May 13, 1887), pp. 1-2.

39. Ibid.

40. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit., N., Nr. 208, Vol. 3 (11,971), Folder 43.

41. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionäre Arbeiterbewegung, p. 242.

42. Ibid.

43. Ibid. It should be noted that Rinke later told that Reuss did make it back to London in time for the concert. According to Trautner the train station where the meeting took place was under observation by two Belgian policeman and two German secret policemen, one of whom was himself.

44. Ibid., p. 243.

45. Ibid. Möhlrig actually took up residence in Lüttich at the Hotel du Midi while waiting for an opportunity to apprehend Neve. For the telegrams sent to him from Berlin see: Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208, Vol. 3 (11,971), Folder 43.

46. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, pp. 243-244.
47. Ibid., pp. 237, 244-245.
48. Ibid., pp. 245-247.
49. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 266.
50. Der Sozialist, No. 2 (January 9, 1897), pp. 8-9.
51. For the complete indictment see: Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208, Vol. 3 (11,971), Folders 234-250. A documentary appendix is included in Folders 251-263.
52. Ibid., Folders 241-243. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol III (18,089), Folder 15.
53. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208, Vol. III (11,971), Folders 7, 288-289.
54. Ibid., Folders 227-232.
55. Ibid., Folders 127-128. See also the very interesting letter of April 5, 1887, from Dr. Hupertz, the State Attorney in Elberfeld, to Tessendorf in Leipzig in which he said that he could count on Palm to testify against Neve, Folders 130-132.
56. Ibid., Folders 243-244. Drobner was arrested in the fall of 1886 and sentenced to two and a half years in prison for his activities in the Leipzig area.
57. Ibid., Folders 19-20, 292.
58. Ibid., Folders 27, 101-109. The last shipment in the notebook attributed to Neve took place on January 18, 1887.
59. Ibid., Folders 304-305. The contents of the three packets of newspapers were:  
 Packet one:  
 29 copies Die Autonomie, No. 6 (January 15, 1887).  
 16 copies Die Autonomie, No. 7 (January 29, 1887).

20 copies Freiheit, No. 2 (January 8, 1887).

20 copies Freiheit, No. 4 (January 22, 1887).

Packet two:

25 copies Die Autonomie, No. 6 (January 15, 1887).

28 copies Die Autonomie, No. 7 (January 29, 1887).

15 copies Freiheit, No. 2 (January 8, 1887).

6 copies Freiheit, No. 3 (January 15, 1887).

29 copies Freiheit, No. 4 (January 22, 1887).

Packet three:

29 copies Die Autonomie, No. 6 (January 15, 1887).

15 copies Die Autonomie, No. 7 (January 29, 1887).

20 copies Freiheit, No. 2 (January 8, 1887).

20 copies Freiheit, No. 4 (January 22, 1887).

60. Ibid., Folder 293.

61. Ibid., Folder 43.

62. Arbeiter-Zeitung (Chicago), November 7, 1894.

63. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam,  
Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208, Vol. 3 (11,  
971), Folders 250, 306-307.

64. Ibid., Folders 138-139.

65. Ibid., Folder 291.

66. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam,  
Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. I (13,  
087), Folders 331-332.

67. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam,  
Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208, Vol. 3 (11,  
971), Folder 239.

68. Ibid., Folder 240.

69. Ibid., Folders 306-307.

70. Printed in Der Sozialist, No. 2 (January 9, 1897),  
pp. 8-9.

71. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 291.

72. For example see: Freiheit, January 26, 1895.

73. Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 291, 466; Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208 (11,972), Vol. 4.

74. Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 267-270. On May 14, 1887, a meeting of the First Section of the Kommunistischer-Arbeiterbildungsverein was held and Dave was forced to leave the organization for being untrustworthy. Immediately Most jumped to Dave's defense telling how he had served the movement and saying there was nothing untrustworthy about him; unfortunately though, for the movement, the character assassins had done a thorough job on him and he was finished so far as playing any further part in the movement.

75. "Wie John Neve der preussische Polizei in die Hände geliefert wurde. Ein Beitrag zur Naturgeschichte der Polizei-Internationale und ihrer Helfershelfer." Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 20 (May 13, 1887), pp. 1-2. For reasons already detailed above I do not subscribe to the belief that Neve was under constant police surveillance from the time of Peukert's trip until his apprehension.

76. Rocker, Johann Most, pp. 271-272. For Most's side of the story see: Freiheit, No. 26 (June 25, 1887), p. 1. For Peukert's defense of himself see: Die Autonomie, No. 16 (June 4, 1887), p. 4. Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 24 (June 10, 1887), p. 2, lashed out in a reply to Peukert's article saying that it denounced all anarchists and especially Peukert, pointing out that it was more than merely a coincidence that Reuss had accompanied him on a trip to see Neve and shortly thereafter Neve was arrested.

77. Rudolf Martin, the police spy in an article intitled, "Zur Verhaltung des Anarchisten Neve," Kölnische Zeitung, No. 154 (June 5, 1887), attributed the article in Der Sozialdemokrat to Dave and said that Dave was a police spy. The London newspaper The Anarchist, No. 3 (June, 1887), also believed that the article in Der Sozialdemokrat was authored by Dave. The Londoner Arbeiter-Zeitung, No. 29 (June 11, 1887) reprinted that article from the Kölnische Zeitung and on the next day, June 12, there appeared in the paper a letter to the editor denying that Dave was responsible for the article which had appeared in Der Sozialdemokrat.

78. Die Autonomie, No. 18 (July 2, 1887), p. 4.
79. Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 28 (July 8, 1887), pp. 3-4.
80. Freiheit, No. 26 (June 25, 1887), p. 1. It should be noted that the infighting in the German anarchists movement did not go unnoticed in Germany. A story in the Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung, No. 323 (July 15, 1887), gave detailed information on the struggle as well as the sidelights of the investigation commission which had been called together in London to determine the extent of Peukert's involvement in the Neve affair. The Vossische Zeitung, No. 328 (July 18, 1887) carried a story on the split in the German anarchist movement.
81. Die Autonomie, No. 19 (July 16, 1887), p. 4.
82. Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 32 (August 5, 1887), pp. 2-3.
83. Victor Dave, "Zu Peukerts Rechtfertigung, "Freiheit, No. 32 (August 6, 1887), pp. 2-3.
84. Die Autonomie, No. 26 (October 22, 1887), p. 4. Fricke concludes that Julius Mottler and Wilhelm Liebknecht were fully aware before the article appeared in Der Sozialdemokrat that Max Trautner was a police spy.
85. Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, pp. 283-285. In Paris Peukert met John H. MacKay, who at the time was working on his book Die Anarchisten. He asked Peukert to explain to him exactly what communist-anarchism meant to him. MacKay had also received information on this same subject from Rinke.
86. Arbeiter-Zeitung (Chicago), November 7, 1894. The members of the commission were: H. Weidenpesch, a Social Democrat; Fritz Bentin, a Social Democrat; Sigmund Neumann, Bankers Union; W. F. Osten, Painters Union; F. Trawgitsky, Fresco Painters Union. For Rinke's letter of April 22, 1894, to the commission see: Peukert, Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung, pp. 326-328.
87. Freiheit, No. 45 (November 5, 1887), p. 1.
88. Die Autonomie, No. 29 (December 3, 1887), p. 4.

89. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208, Vol. 3 (11,971), Folder 238.

90. Quoted in Nettlau, Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre, p. 327.

91. Ibid., Told to Nettlau by Dave in 1890.

92. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208, Vol. 3 (11,971), Folders 236-237. For an interesting poem which was supposed to have been written by Grün on September 11, 1882, only a few days before his suicide, see: "Zum Andenken an den Genossen Balthasar Grün," Freiheit, No. 5 (February 2, 1884), pp. 1-2.

93. Jahrbuch der freien Generation für 1910, p. 85. The St. Louis City Directory for 1893 listed Rinke's occupation as machinist and gave his address as 3318 Capitol Avenue.

94. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C., Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vol. III (13, 089), Folders 15-16.

95. Ibid., Folders 87-88.

96. Freiheit, No. 50 (December 29, 1888), p. 1; Rocker, Johann Most, p. 293.

97. Die Autonomie, No. 62 (February 23, 1889), p. 4.

98. Die Autonomie, No. 63 (March 9, 1889), p. 4.

99. See Kropotkin's letter of December 19, 1888, on the subject of Most, printed in Die Autonomie, No. 58 (December 29, 1888), p. 4.

100. Rocker, Johann Most, p. 282.

101. Lipinski, Die Sozialdemokratie von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart, II, p. 100.

102. For example see: Vossische Zeitung, No. 462 (October 4, 1887), and No. 467 (October 7, 1887); Berliner Bösen

Zeitung, No. 462 (October 4, 1887); Berliner Gerichts-Chronik, No. 23 (October 16, 1887).

103. An attempt to clarify the distinction is the pamphlet, Anarchismus, Sozial-Demokratie und Revolutionäre Taktik (Zurich, 1886).

104. Lidtke, The Outlawed Party, p. 271. See also: Verhandlungen des Parteitags der deutschen Sozialdemokratie in St. Gallen. Abgehalten vom 2. bis 6. Oktober 1887 (Hottingen-Zurich, 1888), pp. 40-45.

105. Quoted in Lidtke, The Outlawed Party, p. 272, from German Foreign Ministry Archives, microfilmed by the University of Michigan, Roll 104, Frames 794-795.

106. Ibid.

107. "Wie einen Justizmord," Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 44 (October 28, 1887), p. 1.

108. "Der Justizmord in Chicago," Ibid., No. 47 (November 18, 1887), pp. 1-2.

109. Ibid., No. 42 (October 14, 1887), p. 2.

110. "Lieskes Geist," Ibid., No. 28 (July 8, 1887), p. 3.





## Conclusion

Why did the early German anarchist movement wane in the late 1880's? One reason brought out was the Bruderkrieg which resulted in the loss of the leadership of the movement, as well as diminished connections the nerve center in London had with the continent. The adverse effects of "propaganda by deed," which undermined anarchist appeal to the mass of German workers, has also been mentioned. Another factor, over which the anarchists had little control, was also involved in the waning of the movement.

In the period 1830-1890 Germany became an industrialized nation. The great majority of the followers of anarchism came from the handicraft occupations which by the late 1880's were either being absorbed into industry or were being replaced by machines. The number of discontented handicraft workers was probably declining by the late 80's, although no firm evidence is available on this point. In effect, this meant that the number of recruits to fill anarchist ranks was diminishing and the anarchists were unable to make any significant inroads into the new industrial workers. Anarchism, which was largely confined to the cities, had little appeal to the rural population. Although Germany was becoming industrialized at a rapid pace, by 1890 still close to 40 per cent of the population lived in rural areas which included villages with a population of less than 2000. The rural population remained outside the effective realm of either anarchist or Social Democratic influence.

Even though there was a large exodus to the cities from the rural areas few of the new arrivals felt that anarchism could ameliorate their lot; they instead placed their reliance on the Social Democratic Party which underwent a rapid growth in this period.

That the Socialist Law hindered the development of anarchism in Germany goes without saying. It was extremely difficult to run a clandestine anarchist movement within Germany from London. In this respect the Social Democrats, who had their deputies in the Reichstag, possessed a distinct advantage over the anarchists. Also the SPD could present a more concrete

program to prospective members, as opposed to the vague concepts of anarchism.

Anarchism in Germany was in a state of limbo at the close of the 80's, but after the Socialist Law was not renewed in 1890 it started a slow, but perceptible rise, with a broadened base of appeal, which extended into the ranks of the industrial workers, as well as including a number of disenchanting intellectuals and discontented Social Democrats.

In the introduction a number of writers were cited who stated emphatically that anarchism was not important in the development of Germany. In the 11 chapters of this study the development of anarchism in Germany has been examined pointing out why anarchism played a significant role especially after the creation of the Reich. All of the points and arguments made in the body of this study will not be reiterated here, but briefly, in broad categories, a few remarks should be made to explain the long term significance that anarchism had in Germany.

The German anarchist and semi-anarchist thinkers of the 1830's and 1840's, although they developed no school of anarchism, nor did they have a following of any size, were nevertheless influential in forcing Marx and Engels to express their position. Most of the writing by Marx and Engels in the early period was in response to writings of anarchists. Few people would dispute the influence of Marx and Engels on the 19th and 20th centuries. Many people have been willing to accept their ideas uncritically, ascribing to these ideas the image of a set of immutable, well thought out laws, which, if followed, would result in a utopia on earth. The truth of the matter is that many of Marx's principles were not well thought out, but were written down in haste, during a fit of anger brought on by the publication of an anarchist article, pamphlet, or book. The writings of Marx and Engels were produced with the purpose in mind of demolishing their opposition. Objectivity was not one of their strong points. No grandiose guiding principle lay behind these diatribes. Writings of this period by Marx and Engels are more vindictive than scientific. Yet there are those in the world today who picture these discourses, produced when Marx and Engels were venting their spleen on an anarchist, as part of some sensible coherent system which would encompass the entire spectrum of what we call today the social sciences.

If Marx had not been goaded by the anarchists, it is doubtful if he would have done much writing. Usually the only time he could sit down and put his ideas on paper was when he was replying to something with which he disagreed. A good share of his writings were produced in this manner. Das Kapital is the notable exception, but this work was not finished in his lifetime in spite of constant prodding by his friends and family. Had it not been for the anarchists, the literature of Marxism would not be so vast, and perhaps Marx would have followed an entirely different route if he had not been put on the defensive so early in life.

The German anarchists during the decade of the 70's and 80's were not a large group, yet they exerted a force in Germany that was entirely out of proportion to their size. The attempts by Hödel and Nobiling enabled Bismarck to pass the Socialist Law, while at the same time breaking the back of the Liberal opposition. If it had not been for the assassination attempts on the Emperor, it is doubtful if such a measure could have been passed, or if Bismarck could have discredited the Liberal Party.

The adoption of a policy of violence and "propaganda by deed" on the part of the anarchists insured the renewal of the Socialist Law as well as the passage of more stringent measures against the use of dynamite. German anarchists in Switzerland and the London Congress of 1881 were instrumental in the adoption of this policy which dominated anarchism for nearly the entire remainder of the 19th century. The adoption of "propaganda by deed" was soon followed by the introduction of Bismarck's program of State Socialism designed to wean the workers away from socialism and anarchism. Although the connection is perhaps tenuous, it should be noted that Bismarck did not push for such legislation until the stepped-up campaign of terrorism and violence on the part of the anarchists.

The German anarchists discredited the Social Democratic Party. The public was confused over the difference between the Social Democratic Party and the anarchists, and Bismarck and other public officials capitalized on the confusion, using it to suppress the SPD. By the end of the 80's the Social Democratic Party was still in the process of attempting to clarify the differences between themselves and the anarchists, with mixed results.

They were not able to accomplish this until the decade of the 1890's.

The anarchists played a role in forcing the Social Democratic Party into supporting a policy of parliamentarianism that it would continue to follow down to the outbreak of World War I; a policy which concentrated on capturing as many seats as possible in the Reichstag. Unfortunately, such a policy was a futile one from the start, for under the existing system of government in Germany the Social Democratic Party had no prospect of ever playing an important role in the government of the Reich. By 1912 the SPD was the largest single party in Germany, but the responsibility for government lay in the monarch and his appointed officials. The government of Germany was not responsible to the Reichstag in the real sense of the word. The circles in which the decisions were made, which controlled the destinies of the Reich, were beyond the grasp of the SPD. As members of the Reichstag the Social Democrats could give their opinions on all proposed legislation and could even make contributions to the discussions on military matters, and they possessed considerable powers of the purse, but the upper bureaucrats, the army officers, and all the appointees of the monarch favored the existing order and resisted any substantial changes that the SPD would like to have implemented, and thus the SPD was helpless to change the existing system. What hope did the SPD have that the Emperor would appoint ministers or other officials from the Social Democratic Party? The SPD was following the only real alternative open to them—parliamentarianism. Germany was not a parliamentary state, however, but was governed by pseudo-constitutional absolutism; those in the power structure were proud of it and looked down on countries such as the United States, France, and Britain that were parliamentary in composition.

After the passage of the Socialist Law parliamentarianism was the only course open to the SPD. Any other policy would have meant complete destruction of the party. Parliamentarianism was in itself a blind alley of self-deception; the party leaders could point to the increased number of representatives in the Reichstag, but were any actual gains made in the area of the control that the party had over the destiny of the individual in Germany? The Social Democratic Party had to adhere to this policy of parliamentarianism—the only legal avenue open to them. To have done otherwise would have been to indicate that they were tainted with anarchism, as Bismarck and other public officials proclaimed them to be. The SPD was trying to disassociate

itself from the anarchists and the stain they had placed on the socialist movement. They made a conscious effort to stress the legality and peacefulness of their movement, perhaps too much.

The actions of Bismarck and the German government in the period under study are anything but admirable. Surely one could not agree with the methods and tactics of the anarchists, but on the other hand neither should the policy followed by the German government be condoned. It was not intended at the outset of this study that such a large portion of it would be concerned with Bismarck; the documentation and evidence determined the course followed in this study rather than any predetermined hypothesis. Bismarck emerges from this study greatly tarnished; he rigged the Nobiling affair to make it appear that the Social Democratic Party was responsible for the assassination attempt; he hired numerous spies who wrote inflammatory articles for anarchist newspapers, articles which were introduced as evidence for the necessity of renewing the Socialist Law; he made use of agents provocateurs to insure that the level of anarchist activity would be maintained at a level necessary to insure the continuance of repressive measures against the socialists. It was in the interest of Bismarck and the German government to always maintain the visible appearance of a potential anarchist threat. The bourgeoisie and the aristocracy, at whom the anarchist threats were directed, were frightened by the violence preached in the columns of the anarchist newspapers and were willing to accede to practically anything to insure their own safety. Bismarck realized this and played on their fears, by creating an artificial anarchist threat.

There are many historians who praise the accomplishments of Bismarck. They readily point out that he was able to avoid a general European war after 1871, but how do you explain his domestic policy, which was based on lies, duplicity and suppression. How do you rationalize using a spy to infiltrate an anarchist meeting for the apparent purpose of obtaining information that a crime is going to be committed, and then once you have the knowledge not only do nothing to stop it, but in fact assign agents who assist in the preparations for the crime to insure that it would be carried out so as to make use of the propaganda value that could be obtained from it. Is there any way to give a satisfactory explanation of why a government should subsidize a man, through a spy, to take part in a plot to kill the head of state, and then put him on trial and execute him as an example? Should not a responsible government put down immediately any threat

to its citizens to insure their peace of mind, rather than create an artificial threat to keep them in a state of uneasiness?

Much has been written about Bismarck, and there are thousands of volumes which try to explain what happened to Germany in the 20th century. One theme, which runs through much of this literature, is that Bismarck had the Reich on the proper course and William II steered it onto the shoals. One thing that is wrong with this line of reasoning is that Bismarck, before his fall from power, created the image of the Emperor and established the foundation stones on which the Reich was to be built in the next two and a half decades. If William II possessed more power than one man should have, it was to Bismarck that he owed his omnipotence. Bismarck's selection of the foundation stones of the Reich was unfortunate as his dealings with the anarchists demonstrate, because here he followed a deliberate policy of lies, duplicity and suppression of all opposition. This is not a firm basis on which to develop a government. Perhaps Bismarck was able to avoid a general European war, but what did his policies do to Germany?

Bismarck ran a tight ship and steered a straight course, but the German ship of state foundered in the storm of World War I; it came unglued and attempts to put it back together in the Weimar period ended in failure, followed by dictatorship. There are many factors involved in the failure of the Weimar Republic, but one stands out: the inability of the German electorate and politicians to replace the monarchy with a viable form of government. The immaturity of those in political life played a part in this because power was thrust into the hands of those who were not prepared to deal with it. The real cause of the failure of the political immaturity of the Weimar period is to be found in the decades of the 1870's and 80's. At this critical juncture in German development, Bismarck seized upon opportunities presented to him by the anarchists to suppress political life, especially the Social Democratic Party, forcing them to follow a policy of parliamentarianism. This policy was followed by the SPD to the outbreak of the First World War. The goals of the Social Democratic Party were unrealistic because they did not come to grips with the essential problem that faced Germany—the concentration of power in the hands of the Emperor.

## Appendix I

### FIRST GERMAN ANARCHIST PROGRAM, OCTOBER 2, 1875

Article One: Society as it is presently constituted is based on personal property and has as a political organization the state, which is only a weapon in the hands of the ruling classes. It must disappear and make room for the society of the future, which has as a political principle the free formation of groups of individuals and has as an economic foundation the common possession of the soil, the mines, capital, the great lines of communication, and the tools of work.

Article Two: Instructed by the lessons of history, which are not revealed in the Social Democratic Association, that in order to achieve the transition from the unjust society which is in decline, to the just society of the future whose establishment is taking place before our eyes in the form of trade unions and local groups, a violent solution will be necessary, which will be a social revolution.

Article Three: The association believes that in order to be prepared for this urgency, an alliance between all worker organizations is an unavoidable necessity, and is regarded under no circumstances as permanent; each individual group will continue to possess its complete independence, its absolute freedom. It appears to us that the best way to realize this alliance, particularly in countries that are somewhat free, would be through Article Thirty-One of the revised General Statutes (1873) of the International Workingmen's Association and Article Sixty-Four of the Federation Statutes of the Jura Federation. Nevertheless certain groups hesitate, at least in public, to place themselves on an international basis as declared by the association from Bern. Those resolutions taken at the Congress of Geneva will be put to use to make practical the moral and material solidarity of all workers' organizations.

Article Four: The Association as such will take no part in the elections in Switzerland; consequently, it should not express itself on the political division of votes. It leaves, however,



to its members complete freedom of action in this area. The most important method of agitation for the Association is through propaganda of both the spoken word and the press of the social-revolutionary principle, which all members support to advance. In the event that a social revolution is declared in some way or another in a country, the Association for its part will place at the disposal of the revolutionary organization of the country in question its determined support.

## Appendix II

### STATUTES OF THE GERMAN-SPEAKING COMMUNIST-ANARCHIST PARTY, JUNE 13, 1877

Article One: In order to unite the diverse elements of the German-speaking peoples who recognize the anarchist-communist principle, an anarchist-communist party is here-by founded for the German-speaking peoples who are associated with with the International Workingmen's Association.

Article Two: Whoever becomes a member of the party must acknowledge the program and the statutes as binding, where upon the person in question must apply through a reference in the form of a written declaration to the Correspondence Bureau, requesting that his declaration for membership be submitted to a vote of the membership.

Article Three: Selection is by a simple majority of the written votes.

Article Four: Each member is to make a yearly contribution of one mark which is to be paid upon admittance to the party and yearly thereafter, when it falls due, on December 31st of each year. Failure to do so will result in being stricken from the membership list.

Article Five: In order to examine a motion by one member for the exclusion of another member the Correspondence Bureau must submit the motion to the party membership for a decision.

Article Six: In order to maintain a continuous relationship between the individual members, one out of every three members will be appointed to the standing Correspondence Bureau. The number of places and members of this Bureau will be decided each year by a vote of the membership.

Article Seven: The Bureau has no authorized power. It has as its sole purpose the maintaining of communication between

members. It must submit all motions put forth by any of the members to a decision of all interested party members. It should also take the lead in important matters beyond this scope; in other countries it should work for the development of anarchist-communist ideas. It should instruct the members as frequently as possible through correspondence describing what is taking place. This correspondence should be maintained by the Correspondence Bureau and should be sent to the home of each member.

Article Eight: These statutes can be terminated at any time by a decision undertaken by the membership.

## Bibliography

Listed in the bibliography are the principal sources used in the preparation of this study. Literature on certain subjects peripheral to the topic of German anarchism is not contained here, but can be found in the footnotes. Many newspapers were used in this work and are listed by title only. Specific references to newspaper articles are to be found in the footnotes. Under the heading CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE are listed articles, pamphlets, and books written by those who played a role in the German anarchist movement either as a participant or as an opponent.

### BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Beck, Friedrich. "Zur Geschichte des Brandenburgischen Provinzialarchivs und heutigen Landeshauptarchivs in Potsdam," Archivmitteilungen, VIII (1958), 2-27.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Brandenburgischen Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam," Archivmitteilungen, IX (1959). 153-158.

Das Brandenburgische Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam, 3 Teile, (Berlin-East, 1963) (Archivalische Quellennachweise zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung, Bd. 3).

Budde, Herbert. "Quellen zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung in Archiven des Regierungsbezirks Osnabrück," Internationale wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung, Heft 9 (December, 1969), 1-24.

Drahn, Ernst. Johann Most: eine Bio-bibliographie. Berlin, 1925.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Die Presse der Anarchisten deutscher Zunge," Zeitungswissenschaft, IV (1929), 279-285.

- Enders, Liselott, et al. (eds.). Übersicht über die Bestände des Brandenburgischen Landeshauptarchivs, Teil II, 1808/16 bis 1945. Weimar, 1967.
- Kropat, Wolf-Arno. "Quellen zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung in Hessischen Hauptstaatsarchiv Wiesbaden," Internationale wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung, Heft 8 (June, 1969), 1-10.
- Lötzke, Helmut. "Zehn Jahre Deutsches Zentralarchiv," Archivmitteilungen, VI (1956), 33-41.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Deutsches Zentralarchiv Potsdam und Merseburg," Archivmitteilungen, IX (1959), 143-152.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "20 Jahre Deutsches Zentralarchiv (1946-1966)," Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft, XIV (1966), 1160-1163.
- Natale, Herbert. "Materialien zur Arbeiterbewegung im Staatsarchiv Sigmaringen," Internationale wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung, Heft 8 (June, 1969), 10-11.
- Nettlau, Max. Bibliographie de L'anarchie. Brussels, 1897.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Bibliographie der Anarchie in deutscher Sprache," Jahrbuch der freien Generation für 1911. Volkskalender und Dokumente der Weltanschauung des Sozialismus-Anarchismus, Neue Folge, II (Paris, 1911), 118-128.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Bibliographie der Anarchie in deutscher Sprache 1792-1897," Jahrbuch der freien Generation für 1913, Neue Folge, IV (Zurich, 1913), 121-127.
- La Première International Periodiques 1864-1877. Paris, 1958.
- Pross, Harry. Literatur und Politik. Geschichte und Programme der politisch-literarischen Zeitschriften im deutschen Sprachgebiet seit 1870. Freiburg i. Br., 1963.
- Richter, Gregor and Wolfgang Schmierer, "Quellen zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung im Hauptstaatsarchiv

Stuttgart und im Staatsarchiv Ludwigsburg," Internationale wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung, Heft 4 (June, 1967), 15-26.

Richtering, Helmut. "Quellen zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung im Staatsarchiv Münster," Internationale wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung, Heft 7 (December, 1968), 1-32.

Spezialinventar des DZA Potsdam-Abteilung Merseburg-zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung, 3 Teile, Berlin-East, 1964 (Archivalische Quellennachweise zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung. Bd. 2).

Stammhammer, Josef. Bibliographie des Sozialismus und Communismus. 3 Vols. Jena, 1893-1909.

Wheeler, Robert. "Quellen zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung in Archiven der DDR," Internationale wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung, Heft 9 (December, 1969), 25-66.

#### ARCHIVAL SOURCES

Staatsarchiv Potsdam (Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv Potsdam). Acta der Königlichen Polizei-Präsidii zu Berlin, Geheime Präsidial-Registratur (Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C), Tit. 94, Lit. A., Nr. 242, Vols. 1-4 (8613-8616), "Das Attentat des Dr. Phil. Carl Nobiling auf das Leben Sr. Majestät des Kaisers und Königs am 2. Juni 1878."

\_\_\_\_\_. Tit. 94, A., Nr. 248 (8626), "Das Attentat des Klempnergesellen Emil Heinrich Max Hödel gen. Lehmann auf das Leben Seiner Majestät des Kaisers und Königs am 11. Mai 1878."

\_\_\_\_\_. Tit. 94, Lit. A., Nr. 286, Vol. 1 (8641), "Die anarchistische Bewegung 1884-1885."

- \_\_\_\_\_. Tit. 94, Lit. A., Nr. 326, Vol. I (8720), "Die anarchistische Bewegung in Berlin 1880 bis 1886."
- \_\_\_\_\_. Tit. 94, Lit. A., Nr. 326, Vol. 2 (8721), "Die anarchistische Bewegung in Berlin 1886 bis 1892."
- \_\_\_\_\_. Tit. 94, Lit. B., Nr. 934, Vol. 1-2 (9015-9016), "Die in Mühlhausen i.e. erfolgte Beschlagnahme verschiedener Nummern der Zeitung 'Freiheit' und anderer verbotener Druckschriften 1879-1880."
- \_\_\_\_\_. Tit. 94, Lit. D., Nr. 398 (9582), "Victor Joseph Louis Dave 1880-1907."
- \_\_\_\_\_. Tit. 94, Lit. D., Nr. 421, Vol. i (9588), "Die Dynamit Attentate in Elberfeld, Frankfurt a.M., Rüdesheim und auf dem Niederwald."
- \_\_\_\_\_. Tit. 94, Lit. E., Nr. 211, Vol. 4 (9709), "Emmissäre der revolutionären Propaganda 1885-1887."
- \_\_\_\_\_. Tit. 94, Lit. F., Nr. 397 (9892), "Der Chemiker und Apotheker Wilhelm Ludwig Fleuron 1881-1898."
- \_\_\_\_\_. Tit. 94, Lit. G., Nr. 548 (10196), "Der Schriftsetzer Joseph Alfred Gfeller, recte: Friedrich August Reinsdorf 1880-1902."
- \_\_\_\_\_. Tit. 94, Lit. G., Nr. 548a (10197), "Die Ausweisung des Schriftsetzers Alfred Gfeller, recte: Friedrich August Reinsdorf 1881-1884."
- \_\_\_\_\_. Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208, Vol. 1 (11,969), "Der Redakteur John Neve 1882-1885."
- \_\_\_\_\_. Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208, Vol. 2 (11,970), "Der Redakteur John Neve (Die Reise Neves) 1885-1887."
- \_\_\_\_\_. Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208, Vol. 3 (11,971), "Der Redakteur John Neve (Die Reise Neves) 1887-1888."
- \_\_\_\_\_. Tit. 94, Lit. N., Nr. 208, Vol. 4 (11,972), "Der Redakteur John Neve 1889-1896."

- \_\_\_\_\_. Tit. 94, Lit. P., Nr. 519 (12,276), "Der Maler Josef Peukert 1881-1914."
- \_\_\_\_\_. Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 442, Vols. 4-20 (12,803-12,819), "Die politischen Zustände in der Schweiz 1879-1889."
- \_\_\_\_\_. Tit. 94, Lit. S., Nr. 1255, Vols. 1-8 (13,087-13,094), "Die Übersichten über die allgemeine Lage der sozialdemokratischen und revolutionären (anarchistischen) Bewegung 1878-1910."
- \_\_\_\_\_. Tit. 95, Sekt. 7, Lit. J., Nr. 4a, Vols. 1-4 (15,874-15,877), "Übersichten über die Lage der sozialdemokratischen und anarchischen Bewegung."
- Deutsches Zentralarchiv Merseburg, Rep. 77 (Ministerium des Innern), Tit. 2515, Nr. 8, Vols. 1-3, "Massregeln gegen die anarchische Bewegung 1881-1907."
- \_\_\_\_\_. Rep. 89, H (Geheimes Zivilkabinett), Abt. XXI, Generalia, Nr. 18, Vols. 1-2, "Die Sozialdemokratie und Anarchie 1872-1909."
- Geheimes Staatsarchiv Munich. Ministerial-Extradiction 1921 II, Deutschen Reich, Abteilung West I, Tit. II, Polizeiwesung A., Sozialdemokratie und Anarchismus, MA 76512, "Die sozialdemokratische und anarchische Bewegung."
- \_\_\_\_\_. MA 76516, "Die nihilistische Bewegung 1879-1899."
- \_\_\_\_\_. MA 76524, "Anarchisten in der Schweiz 1884-1885."
- \_\_\_\_\_. MA 76526, "Anweisung d.k. Gesandtsch. zur Berichterstattung über die sozialistische, kommunistische und anarchische Arbeiterbewegung, 1885-1893."
- \_\_\_\_\_. MA 76528, "Einschwärzung von Dynamit und anarchischen Schriften aus New York."
- Bayer. Hauptstaatsarchiv Abt. V., Staatsarchiv für Oberbayern, Ministerium des Innern, RA F. 3789, Nr. 16,835, "Anarchisten 1885-1915."
- Staatsarchiv Ludwigsburg. E 175/78, Regierung des Schwarzwaldkreises, 547, "Anarchisten 1884-1913."



- \_\_\_\_\_. F 181, Oberamt Ludwigsburg, 143b, "Umsturzlerische Elemente, Anarchisten, Linksradikale, 1880-1918."
- \_\_\_\_\_. F 201, Stadtdirektion Stuttgart, 627-628, "Erfassung Stuttgarter Sozialdemokraten und Anarchisten, 1877-1894."
- \_\_\_\_\_. F 201, Stadtdirektion Stuttgart, 632-633, "Anarchisten 1885-1898."
- \_\_\_\_\_. F 201, Stadtdirektion Stuttgart, 658, "Zeitungsverbote 'Der Rebell.'"
- \_\_\_\_\_. F 201, Stadtdirektion Stuttgart, 664, "Die Freiheit."
- \_\_\_\_\_. F 210, Oberamt Weiblingen, 531, "Überwachung der SPD und anarchistischer Organisation, 1832-1918."
- Bundesarchiv Koblenz. Abteilung P. 135, "Abwehr sozialdemokratischer Ausschreitungen."
- Niedersächsischen Staatsarchiv Osnabrück. Rep. 350 Osn. I-Amt Osnabrück I, Nr. 7, "Adresse an S.M. den Kaiser und König zur Berlin in Anlass des Attentats."
- \_\_\_\_\_. Rep. 450 Mep-Landratsamt Meppen, Nr. 29, "Bekämpfung der Sozialdemokratie und Anarchie 1873-1917."
- Hessischen Hauptstaatsarchiv Wiesbaden. A 8 Politische Parteien, 355, "Das Dynamitattentat im Polizeidienstgebäude zu Frankfurt, 1883-1887."
- \_\_\_\_\_. A 8 Politische Parteien, 1257, "Die Vereinbarung von Massnahmen mit der Grossherzogt. Hessischen Regierung zur Bekämpfung der sozialistischen bzw. anarchistischen Bestregungen, 1885-1887."
- \_\_\_\_\_. 407 Polizeipräsidium Frankfurt, "Sozialdemokratisches Organ die 'Freiheit' von Johann Most. Intus: Verschiedene Zeitungsexemplare, 1879-1894."
- \_\_\_\_\_. 407 Polizeipräsidium Frankfurt, "Untersuchung gegen den Sozialdemokraten Schuhmacher Joseph Breuder und Genossen in Frankfurt a.M. wegen Hochverrats, 1880-1881."

- \_\_\_\_\_. 415 Rheingaukreis (Rüdesheim), 11 "Sozialdemokraten und anarchisten, 1878-1918."
- \_\_\_\_\_. 418 Untertaunuskreis (Bad Schwalbach), 1275, "Sozialdemokratie, Anarchie, 1886-1914."
- \_\_\_\_\_. 424 Bürgermeisteramt des Kreises Wetzlar, 1121-1122, "Sozialdemokraten, Anarchisten, 1886-1914."
- Staatsarchiv Sigmaringen. Ho 13 Aberamt Hechingen, Nr. 828, "Sozialdemokratie, Anarchisten, Bolschewisten, Umruheschäden, 1872-1924."
- \_\_\_\_\_. Wü 65/4 Oberamt Balingen, Nr. 926, "Beschlagnahme sozialdemokratischer Druckschriften im Oberamtsbezirk; Überwachung der Anarchie und der sozialdemokratischen Agitation Verdächtigen Personen, 1878-1894."
- \_\_\_\_\_. Wü 65/20 Oberamt Münsingen, Nr. 1605, "Überwachung der Tätigkeit der Sozialdemokraten und Anarchisten. Statistik der Ortsbibliotheken, 1878-1913."
- Staatsarchiv Münster. 10 Parteien, A., Anarchisten und Kommunisten, Landratsamt Ahaus, 690, 466, 215, 245, 293, 145, 110, 159, 109, 112, "Anarchistische Bestrebungen und deren Bekämpfung, 1878-1934."
- \_\_\_\_\_. 10 Parteien, B., Sozialdemokratie, Oberpräsidium, 2694, "Sozialdemokratische und revolutionäre Bewegung, 1878-1894."
- \_\_\_\_\_. 10 Parteien, B., Sozialdemokratie, Regierung Münster, VII 43-1, "Übersichten über die allgemeine Lage der sozialdemokratischen und revolutionären Bewegung, 1878-1894."
- \_\_\_\_\_. 10 Parteien, B., Sozialdemokratie, Regierung Münster, 1026-1032, 1034-1036, "Ausschreitungen und Bestrebungen der Sozialdemokratie, Fahndung nach Anarchisten, 1878-1900."
- \_\_\_\_\_. 10 Parteien B., Sozialdemokratie, Beckum, 71-72, "Sozialdemokratie und Anarchisten, 1853-1910."

- \_\_\_\_\_. 10 Parteien, B., Sozialdemokratie, Lüdinghausen, 976, 625, 491, 429, "Sozialdemokratische, anarchistische und polnische Bewegung, 1883-1930."
- \_\_\_\_\_. 10 Parteien, B., Sozialdemokratie, Tecklenburg, 1113, 1735, 1958, "Sozialdemokratie und anarchisten, 1883-1921."
- \_\_\_\_\_. 13 Politische Polizei, Regierung Münster, 1920-1022, "Beobachtung und Verfolgung politisch verdächtiger Elemente, Anarchisten, Sozialdemokraten usw., 1870-1900."
- \_\_\_\_\_. 13 Politische Polizei, Siegen, 16, "Unterdrückung der Anarchie, politische Lage des Staates, 1848-1866."

Labadie Collection, the University of Michigan Library. Max Nettlau manuscript, "Victor Dave 1857-1922," Vertical File.

- \_\_\_\_\_. John Henry MacKay Correspondence. Vertical File.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Karl Heinzen manuscript of a speech. Vertical File.

#### PUBLISHED DOCUMENTARY SOURCES

Anarchistenprozess Reinsdorf und Genossen Verhandelt vor dem 2. und 3. Strafsenat des Reichsgerichts zu Leipzig vom 15. bis 22. Dezember 1884. Leipzig, 1885.

Anklageschrift in der Untersuchung wider Breuder und Genossen wegen Hochverrats und anderer Vergehen. Leipzig, 1881.

Bericht über die Schwurgerichtsverhandlung von 29. Juni bis 1. Juli 1885 gegen Julius Lieske. Leipzig, 1885.

Bericht über die Untersuchung betreffend die anarchistischen Umtriebe in der Schweiz an den hohen Bundesrath. Eidgenossenschaft erstattet durch Bundesrat Eduard Müller. Bern, 1885.

- Compte rendu des séances du congrès socialiste tenu à Gant 9-16  
Septembre 1877. No place of publication, no date of publication; printed privately.
- Compte rendu du huitième congrès général de l'association  
International des travailleurs à Berne du 26 au 30  
Octobre, 1876. Bern, 1876.
- Compte rendu officiel du septième congrès général de l'asso-  
ciation International des travailleurs. Verviers, 1875.
- Les communistes en Suisse d'après les papiers trouvés chez  
Weitling. Lausanne, 1843.
- Deutscher Reichsanzeiger und Königlich Preussischer Staatsan-  
zeiger.
- Das Dynamitattentat bei der Enthüllung des Niederwalddenkmals,  
in Hugo Friedlaender, Interessante Kriminalprozesse  
von kulturhistorischer Bedeutung. Volume 7 (Berlin,  
1912), 153-243.
- Der erste Hochverratsprozess vor dem Reichsgericht. Edited  
by G. Künzel. Leipzig, 1881.
- The 'Freiheit' Prosecution. The Trial of Herr Johann Most with  
Verbatim Rapport of the Address of Mr. A.M. Sullivan  
M.P. for the Defense. London, 1881.
- Die Geheim deutschen Verbindungen in der Schweiz seit 1833.  
Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Modernen Radikalismus  
und Kommunismus. Basel, 1847.
- Der Kampf der deutschen Sozialdemokratie in der Zeit des  
Sozialistengesetzes 1878-1890. Die Tätigkeit der Reichs-  
Commission. Edited by Leo Stern. Berlin-East, 1956.
- Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States  
1878. Washington, 1879.
- Pressprozess Edgar Bauers. Bern, 1845.
- Protokoll des Kongresses der deutschen Sozialdemokratie.

Abgehalten auf Schloss Wyden in der Schweiz, vom 20. bis 23. August 1880. Zurich, 1880.

Prozess gegen den anarchisten Hermann Stellmacher. Vienna, 1885.

Rapport général adressé au conseil d'état de Neuchatel sur la propaganda secrète et sur les clubs de la Jeune Allemagne en Suisse. Neuchatel, 1845.

Reichs-Gesetzblatt.

Stenographische Bericht über die Verhandlungen des Reichstags.

Die Vaterlandslosen Gesellen. Der Sozialismus im Licht der Geheimberichte der preussische Polizei 1878-1914. Edited by Reinhard Höhn. Volume I (1878-1890). Cologne and Opladen, 1964.

Verhandlungen des Parteitags der deutschen Sozialdemokratie in St. Gallen. Abgehalten vom 2. bis 6. Oktober 1887. Hottingen-Zurich, 1888.

Zentralblatt für das deutsche Reich.

CONTEMPORARY MATERIALS: INCLUDING ARTICLES

Belli, Joseph. Die rote Feldpost untern Sozialistengesetz. Stuttgart, 1912.

Einundzwanzig Bogen aus der Schweiz. Zurich, 1843.

Engels, Friedrich. Anti-Dühring. Moscow, 1954.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Progress of Social Reform on the Continent," No. II "Germany and Switzerland," The New Moral World, V, No. 21 (November 18, 1843), 161-162.

\_\_\_\_\_. Zur Wohnungsfrage. Zurich, 1872.

Feuerbach, Ludwig. "Über das 'Wesen des Christenthum' in Beziehung auf den 'Einzigen und sein Eigenthum,'" Wigands Vierteljahrsschrift, 11 (1845), 170-176.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Ludwig Feuerbach: Kleine Phil. Schriften 1842-1845.  
 Edited by Gustave Lange. Leipzig, 1950.
- Fischer, Kuno. "Ein Apologet der Sophistik und ein Philosophischer Reactionär," Epigonen (1847), 152-165.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Moderne Sophisten," Epigonen (1848), 277-316.
- Grün, Karl. Die soziale Bewegung in Frankreich und Belgien.  
 Darmstadt, 1845.
- Hess, Moses. Ausgewählte Schriften. Edited by Horst Lademacher. Cologne, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Philosophische und sozialistische Schriften 1837-1850.  
 Edited by August Cornu and Wolfgang Mönke. Berlin-East, 1961.
- Humboldt, Wilhelm, von. Die Ideen zu einem Versuch die Grenzen der, Wirksamkeit des Staates zu bestimmen. Berlin, 1792.
- Marr, Wilhelm. Anarchie oder Autorität? Hamburg, 1852.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Das junge Deutschland in der Schweiz. Leipzig, 1846.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Der Mensch und die Ehe vor dem Richterstuhl der Sillichkeit. Leipzig, 1848.
- Marx, Karl. Critique of the Gotha Program. New York, 1938.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Herr Vogt. London, 1860.
- Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. Werke. Vols. I-XVIII. Berlin-East, 1958-1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The German Ideology. New York, 1947.
- Most, Johann. Taktik contra Freiheit. Ein Wort zum Angriff und zur Abwehr. London, 1880.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Revolutionäre Kriegswissenschaft. Ein Handbüchlein zur Anleitung betreffend Gebrauches und Herstellung von

Nitroglyzerin, Dynamit, Schliessbaumwolle, Knallqueksilber, Bomben, Brandsätzen, Giften, usw. New York, 1885.

Peukert, Josef., Trau, schau, wem! London, 1886.

[Schneidt, Karl]. Die Hintermänner der Sozialdemokratie; von einem Eingeweihten. Berlin, 1890.

Stirner, Max. The Ego and His Own. New York, 1963.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Die philosophischen Reactionäre," Epigonen (1847), 141-151.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Recensenten Stirner," Wigands Vierteljahrsschrift (1845), 147-194.

\_\_\_\_\_. Stirners kleinere Schriften. Edited by John Henry MacKay. 2nd Edition. Treptow bei Berlin, 1914.

Trautner, Max. Wie John Neve verheftet wurde. Ein Blick hinter die Coulissen des Herrn Josef Peukert. London, n.d. (1889).

Vogt, Karl. Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung. Geneva, 1859.

Weitling, Wilhelm. Garantien der Harmonie und Freiheit. Vevey, 1842.

\_\_\_\_\_. Die Menschheit wie sie ist und wie sie seien sollte. Vevey, 1842.

Wagner, Richard. Gesammelte Schriften und Dichtungen. Vol. XII. Leipzig, 1907.

\_\_\_\_\_. Gesammelte Schriften. Vol. X. Leipzig, 1883.

## NEWSPAPERS

Allgemeine Literaturzeitung (Berlin).

Der Anarchist (Berlin).

The Anarchist (London).

- Arbeiter Zeitung (Chicago).  
Arbeiter-Zeitung (Bern).  
Der Arme Konrad (Berlin).  
Die Autonomie (London).  
L'Avant-Garde. Organ de la fédération française de l'association internationale des travailleurs (Chaux-de-Fonds).  
befreiung blätter für anarchistische weltanschauung [sic] (Mannheim).  
Berliner Bösen Zeitung.  
Berliner Fremdenblatt.  
Berliner Gerichts-Chronik.  
Berliner Zeitung.  
Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne.  
Deutsche Monatsschrift.  
Extrabeilage zu Eberhardts allgemeine Polizei-Anzeiger.  
Fanal. Organ der Anarchisten Vereinigung (Berlin).  
Frankfurter Gen. Anzeiger.  
Frankfurter Journal.  
Frankfurter Zeitung.  
Freedom. A Journal of Anarchist-Communism (London).  
Der Freie Arbeiter (Berlin).  
Die Freie Generation: Dokumente der Weltanschauung des Anarchismus (Berlin).  
Freie Literature. Monatsbeilage zur Wochenschrift 'Der freie Arbeiter' (Berlin).  
Freiheit (London, Geneva, New York).  
Le Gutenberg. Journal de la Typographie Belge (Brussels).  
Der Kämpfer (St. Louis).  
Kölnische Zeitung.  
Leipziger Tageblatt.  
Liberty (Boston).  
Litterarische Beilage zum 'Sozialist' (Berlin).  
Local Anzeiger der "Presse" (Vienna).  
Londoner Arbeiter Zeitung.  
Magdeburger Zeitung.  
National Zeitung (Berlin).  
Neue freie Presse (Vienna).  
Neue Züricher Zeitung.  
Neues Tagblatt (Stuttgart).  
Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung.  
Norddeutsche Blätter für Kritik, Literatur und Unterhaltung (Berlin).  
Die Post.  
Der Rebell (Geneva, London).  
Le Révolté (Geneva, Paris).



La Revolution Sociale (Paris).  
 Der Sozialist. Organ für Anarchismus-Sozialismus (Berlin).  
 Der Sozialist. Organ des Sozialistischen Bundes (Berlin).  
 Der Sozialdemokrat (Zurich).  
 Le Travailleur (Geneva).  
 Times (London).  
 Tribune (Berlin).  
 Volkszeitung (Berlin).  
 Vossische Zeitung.  
 Waldersee'r Wochenblatt.  
 Wochenblatt der Frankfurter Zeitung.  
 Die Zukunft. Die Sozialistische Revue (Berlin).  
 Die Zukunft (Vienna).

#### ENCYCLOPEDIAS AND ANNUALS

La Grande Encyclopédie. Paris, n.d.  
Der Grosse Brockhaus. Wiesbaden, 1953.  
Händwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaft. 4th Edition. Jena,  
 1924.  
The Annual Register.  
Schulthess' Europäischer Geschichtskalender.

#### PUBLISHED CORRESPONDENCE

Bismarck, Otto von; Die gesammelten Werke. Vol. 6c 1871 bis  
1890. Berlin, 1935.  
Bismarck, Otto von and William I. The Correspondence of  
William I and Bismarck. 2 Vols. New York, 1903.  
The Holstein Papers. Edited by Norman Rich and M.H. Fischer.  
 4 Vols. Cambridge, 1955-1963.  
Letters of Richard Wagner. Edited by Wilhelm Altmann. 2 Vols.  
 London, 1927.  
Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. Der Briefwechsel zwischen  
Friedrich Engels und Karl Marx. 4 Vols. Stuttgart,  
 1921.

\_\_\_\_\_. Letters to Americans 1848-1895. New York, 1953.

\_\_\_\_\_. Selected Correspondence. Moscow, 1953.

Hess, Moses. Briefwechsel. Edited by Edmund Silberner.  
S'Gravenhage, 1959.

Proudhon, Pierre Joseph. Correspondence de P.J. Proudhon. II.  
Paris, 1875.

Ruge, Arnold. Arnold Ruge. Briefwechsel und Tagebuchblätter  
aus den Jahren 1825-1880. Edited by Paul Nerrlich.  
Berlin, 1886.

Sorge, F.A. Briefe und Auszüge aus Briefen von Joh. Phil.  
Becker, Jos. Dietzgen, Friedrich Engels, Karl Marx  
u.a. an F.A. Sorge und andere. Stuttgart, 1906.

Zwischen 18. und 25. Jugendbriefe von Friedrich Engels. Edited  
by Hannes Skambraks. Berlin-East, 1965.

#### MEMOIRS AND BIOGRAPHIES

Andler, Charles. Nietzsche sa vie et sa pensée. II. Paris,  
1958.

Andrieux, Louis. Souvenirs d'un Prefect de Police. Paris,  
1885.

Anonymus Veritas (Johann Most). Acht Jahre hinter Schloss  
und Riegel. Skitzzen aus dem Leben Johann Most.  
New York, 1886.

Aranyossi, Magda. Leo Frankel. Berlin-East, 1957.

Bebel, August. Aus meinem Leben. Berlin-East, 1964.

Die beiden letzten Tage des Hochverrätbers Max Hödel.  
Kissingen, 1878.

Bernstein, Eduard. Sozialdemokratische Lehrjahre. Berlin,  
1925.

- \_\_\_\_\_. My Years of Exile. New York, 1921.
- Bismarck, Otto von. The Memoirs. 2 Vols. New York, 1966.
- Blumenberg, Werner. Kämpfer für die Freiheit. Berlin and Hannover, 1959.
- Brinton, Clarence Crane. Nietzsche. New York, 1941.
- Caille, F. Wilhelm Weitling theoricien du communisme. Paris, 1905.
- Carr, E.H. Michael Bakunin. New York, 1961.
- Erinnerungen an Marx und Engels. Berlin-East, 1965.
- Eyck, Erich. Bismarck and the German Reich. New York, 1964.
- Fermi, Laura. Mussolini. Chicago, 1966.
- Friedlaender, Jack. Max Stirner: Versuch einer Würdigung seiner Bedeutung. Hamburg, 1921.
- Goldmann, Emma. Living My Life. 2 Vols. New York, 1931.
- Guillaume, James. L'International: Documents et souvenirs 1864-1878. 4 Vols. Paris, 1905-1910.
- Heinzen, Carl. Erlebtes. Berlin, 1864.
- Huber, Hans. Karl Heinzen; seine politische Entwicklung und publizistische Wirksamkeit. Bern und Leipzig, 1932.
- Kaler, Emil. Wilhelm Weitling. Hottingen-Zurich, 1887.
- Kamenka, Eugene. The Philosophy of Ludwig Feuerbach. New York, 1970.
- Kautsky, Karl. Erinnerungen und Eroerterungen. The Hague, 1960.
- Kropotkin, Peter. Memoirs of a Revolutionist. New York, 1930.
- Luboc, Henri de. The Un-Marxian Socialist. New York, 1948.

- MacKay, John Henry. Max Stirner, sein Leben und sein Werk. Leipzig, 1898.
- Mayer, Gustav. Friedrich Engels: Eine Biographie. 2 Vols. The Hague, 1934.
- Mehring, Franz. Karl Marx. Ann Arbor, 1962.
- Messer, Max. Max Stirner. Berlin, 1907.
- Most, Johann. August Reinsdorf und die Propaganda der That. New York, 1885.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Memorien. Erlebtes, Erforschtes und Erdachtes. 4 Vols. New York, 1903-1907.
- Mülberger, Arthur. Studien über Proudhon. Stuttgart, 1891.
- \_\_\_\_\_. P.J. Proudhons Leben und Werke. Stuttgart, 1899.
- Neumann, Ernst. The Life of Richard Wagner. 2 Vols. New York, 1938.
- Osterroth, Franz. Biographisches Lexikon des Sozialismus, Band 1: Verstorbene Persönlichkeiten. Hannover, 1960.
- Peukert, Josef. Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung. Berlin, 1913.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Otto Rinke," Jahrbuch der freien Generation für 1910, Neue Folge, I (Paris, 1910), 83-86.
- Radidowicz, Simon. Ludwig Feuerbachs Philosophie. Ursprung und Schicksal. Berlin, 1931.
- Rich, Norman. Friedrich von Holstein. Politics and Diplomacy in the Era of Bismarck and William II. 2 Vols. Cambridge, 1965.
- Richter, Werner. Bismarck. New York, 1965.
- Rocker, Rudolf. Johann Most. Das Leben eines Rebellen. Berlin, 1924.

Ruest, Anselm. Max Stirner. Leben-Weltanschauung-Ver-  
machtnis. Berlin, 1906.

Seidel-Höppner, Waltraud. Wilhelm Weitling: der erste  
deutscher theoretiker und agitator des Kommunismus.  
Berlin-East, 1961.

Silberner, Edmund. Moses Hess Geschichte seiner Lebens.  
Leiden, 1966.

Spieß, Camile. Max Stirner. Nice, 1949.

Tiedemann, Christoph von. Aus Siebenjahrzehnten, II Sechs  
Jahre Chef der Reichskanzlei unter dem Fürsten  
Bismarck. Leipzig, 1909.

Wagner; Richard. My Life. New York, 1911.

Wittke, Carl. Against the Current. The Life of Karl Heinzen,  
1809-1880. Chicago, 1945.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Utopian Communist. A Biography of Wilhelm  
Weitling. Baton Rouge, La., 1950.

Woodcock, George. Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, 1956.

Zlociste, Theodore. Moses Hess, der Vorkämpfer des Sozialismus  
und Zionismus. Berlin, 1922.

#### HISTORIES AND INTERPRETATIONS

L'actualité de Proudhon colloque des 24 et 25 Novembre 1965.  
Brussels, 1967.

Adamiak, Richard. "The 'Withering Away' of the State: A  
Reconsideration," The Journal of Politics, XXXII (1970),  
3-18.

Adler, Georg. Geschichte der ersten sozial politischen Arbeiter  
Bewegung in Deutschland. Breslau, 1885.

- Adler, Max. Die Staatsauffassung des Marxismus: Ein Beiträge zur unterscheidung von sozialogischer und juristischer Methode. Darmstadt, 1922.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Wegweiser: Studien zu Geistgeschichte des Sozialismus. Stuttgart, 1914.
- Anarchismus, Sozial-Demokratie und revolutionäre Taktik. Zurich, 1886.
- Anonymus. Sozialismus und Anarchismus in Europa und Nordamerika während der Jahre 1883 bis 1886. Berlin, 1887.
- Arnim, Bettina von. "Die Auflösung des Einzigen durch den Menschen," Epigonen (1847), 189-251.
- Arvon, Henri. Aux sources de l'existentialisme. Max Stirner. Paris, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Proudhon e le radicalisme Allemand," Annales, VI (1951), 194-201.
- Auer, Ignaz. Nach zehn Jahren. Material und Glossen zur Geschichte des Sozialistengesetzen. Nuremburg, 1913.
- Avineri, Shlomo. The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx. Cambridge, 1968.
- Balin, Wilhelm. Ludwig Feuerbach, sein Werken und seine Zeitgenossen. Stuttgart, 1891.
- Bartel, Horst. Marx und Engels im Kampf um ein revolutionäres deutsches Parteiorgan 1879-1890. Berlin-East, 1961.
- Basch, Victor. L'individualisme anarchiste Max Stirner. Paris, 1904.
- Beer, Max. Social Struggles and Modern Socialism. London, 1925.
- Bernstein, Eduard. Die Geschichte der Berliner Arbeiterbewegung. 3 Vols. Berlin, 1905-1910.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Die soziale Doktrin des Anarchismus. Stirner. Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum," Neue Zeit (Stuttgart), 10 (1891-1892), I, 358-365, 421-428, II, 589-596, 618-626, 657-666, 772-778, 813-819.
- Bigler, Rolf. Der libertäre Sozialismus in der Westschweiz. Cologne and Berlin, 1963.
- Bloom, Soloman F. "The Withering Away of the State," Journal of the History of Ideas, VII (1946), 113-121.
- Bose, Atindranath. A History of Anarchism. Calcutta, 1967.
- Böttcher, Ulrich. Anfänge und Entwicklung der Arbeiterbewegung im Bremen von der Revolution 1848 bis zur Aufhebung des Sozialistengesetzes 1890. Bremen, 1953.
- Braunthal, Julius. Geschichte der Internationale. 2 Vols. Hannover, 1961.
- Braun-Wiesbaden, Karl. "Das Attentat auf dem Niederwald und der Hochverrathsprozess vor dem Reichsgericht," Nord und Süd, XXXIII (1885), 65-82.
- Brugger, Otto. Geschichte der deutschen Handwerkervereine in der Schweiz. Bern, 1932.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Werksamkeit Weitlings. Bern, 1932.
- Buber, Martin. Between Men and Man. London, 1947.
- Carus, Paul. Nietzsche and Other Exponents of Individualism. Chicago, 1914.
- Cohn, Norman. Pursuit of the Millennium. London, 1957.
- Cole, G.D.H. Socialist Thought. Marxism and Anarchism, 1850-1890. London, 1961.
- Conze, Werner and Dieter Groh. Die Arbeiterbewegung in der nationalen Bewegung. Stuttgart, 1966.
- Cuybers, W. Max Stirner als Philosoph. Würzburg, 1937.

- "Die deutsche Philosophie seit Hegels Tode," Gegenwart (1851), 292-340.
- Diehl, Karl. Über Sozialismus, Kommunismus, und Anarchismus. Jena, 1911.
- Dietrich, Richard. "Richard "Berlins Weg zur Industrie- und Handelsstadt," Berlin. Neuen Kapital seiner Geschichte (Berlin, 1960), 161-198.
- Dinger, Hugo. Richard Wagners geistliche Entwicklung. Berlin, 1902.
- Drachkovitch, Milorad. The Revolutionary International 1864-1943. Stanford, 1966.
- Drews, Arthur. Nietzsches Philosophie. Heidelberg, 1904.
- Duboc, Julius. Das ich und die übrigen. Für und wider Stirner. Leipzig, 1897.
- Eckert, Georg. Die Braunschweiger Arbeiterbewegung unter dem Sozialistengesetz. Braunschweig, 1961.
- Eltzbacher, Paul. Anarchism. New York, 1960.
- Emge, Carl. Max Stirner, eine geistig nicht bewältigte Tendenz. Wiesbaden, 1964.
- "Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum von Max Stirner," Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung (February, 1846).
- Engelberg, Ernst. Revolutionäre Politik und rote Feldpost 1878-1890. Berlin-East, 1959.
- Epstein, Klaus. The Genesis of German Conservatism. Princeton, 1966.
- Ernst, Eugen. Polizeispitzeleien und Ausnahmegesetze 1878-1910. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Bekämpfung der Sozialdemokratie. Berlin, 1911.
- Fabbri, Luigi. "Die historischen und sachlichen Zusammenhänge



zwischen Marxismus und Anarchismus," Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik, XXVI (Tubingen, 1908), 559-605.

"Feuerbach und der Einzige. Die Consequenzen Feuerbachs und ihr Kampf gegen die Kritik und den Einzigen," Wigands Vierteljahrschrift (1846), 123-138.

Förder, Herwig. Marx und Engels am Vorabend der Revolution. Berlin-East, 1962.

Fricke, Dieter. Bismarcks Prätorianer. Der Berliner politische Polizei im Kampf gegen die deutsche Arbeiterbewegung 1871-1898. Berlin-East, 1962.

Fricke, G.A. Woher kommt das anarchistische Treiben und wie ist ihm abzuhilfen. Leipzig, 1848.

Friedenburg, W. "Zur Geschichte des neuesten Philosophie. Max Stirner. Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum," Grenzboden, I (1845), 239-241.

Friedlaender, Benedict. Der freiheitliche Sozialismus im Gegensatz zum Staatsknechtsthum des Marxisten. Mit besonderer Beruckfechtigung der Werke und Schichsale Eugen Dührings. Berlin, 1892.

Fuld, Ludwig. "Die Ermordung des Polizeiraths Dr. Rumpf in Frankfurt a.M.," Nord und Süd, XXXIV (1885), 476-482.

Gay, Peter. The Dilemma of Democratic Socialism. Eduard Bernstein's Challenge to Marx. New York, 1952.

Goldmann, Emma. "Johann Most," American Mercury, VIII (1926), 158-166.

Grimm, Robert. Geschichte der sozialistischen Ideen in der Schweiz. Zurich, 1931.

Hannsson, Ola. Seher und Deuter. Berlin, 1894.

Hauptmann, Pierre. Marx et Proudhon, leurs rapports personnel 1844-1847. Paris, 1947.

- Hautz, K.A. Die Philosophie M. Stirners im Gegensatz zum Hegelschen Idealismus. Leipzig, 1936.
- Hellfaier, Karl-Alexander. Die deutsche Sozialdemokratie während des Sozialistengesetzes. Berlin-East, 1958.
- Helms, Hans G. Die Ideologie der anonymen Gesellschaft. Cologne, 1966.
- Hennequin, Amédée. Le Communisme et la Jeune-Allemagne en Suisse. Paris, 1850.
- Herzberg, Wilhelm. Sozialdemokratie und Anarchismus. Ludwigshafen, 1906.
- Herzfeld, Hans. "Berlin als Kaiserstadt und Reichshauptstadt 1871-1945," Jahrbuch für die Geschichte des deutschen Ostens, I (1952), 141-170.
- Hillquit, Morris. History of Socialism in the United States. New York, 1965.
- Hook, Sidney. From Hegel to Marx. New York, 1950.
- Horn, E. Max Stirners ethischer Egoismus. Berlin, 1907.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Max Stirner und der Anarchismus," Der Zukunft, II (1892), 252-256.
- Howe, Frederic G. European Cities at Work. New York, 1913.
- "The Ideals of Anarchy," Littell's Living Age, 211 (1896), 616-636.
- Jackson, J. Hampden. Marx, Proudhon and European Socialism. London, 1957.
- James, H.G. Principles of Prussian Administration. New York, 1913.
- Jankelevitch, S. "L'unique et le surhomme. Le probleme de la personnalité chez Stirner et chez Nietzsche," Revue de Allemagne (January-June, 1931), 27-40, 216-243.

- Jankte, Carl. Der vierte Stand. Die gestaltenden Kräfte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung im 19. Jahrhundert. Freiburg, 1955.
- Jensen, Jürgen. Presse und politische Polizei. Hamburgs Zeitungen unter dem Sozialistengesetz 1878-1890. Hannover, 1966.
- Jodl, Friedrich. "Max Stirner und Ludwig Feuerbach," Österreichische Rundschau, XXVI (January-March, 1911), 420-428.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Max Stirner und Ludwig Feuerbach. Stuttgart, 1916.
- Jöel, Karl. Philosophenwege-Ausblicke und Rückblicke. Berlin, 1901.
- Joll, James. The Anarchists. London, 1964.
- Kaff, Sigmund. "Der Philosoph des Egoismus," Sozialistische Monatshefte (1907), 141-148.
- Kahn, Gustav. "Stirner et l'individualisme," La nouvelle Revue, 104 (September-October, 1904), 131-136.
- Kampffmeyer, Paul and Bruno Altmann. Vor dem Sozialistengesetz. Krisejahre des Obrigkeitsstaates. Berlin, 1928.
- Kelsen, Hans. "Sozialismus und Staat," Archiv für den Geschichte des Sozialismus, IX (1920), 19-57.
- Kohn, Hans. The Mind of Germany. New York, 1960.
- Koigen, D. Zur Vorgeschichte des modernen philosophischen Sozialismus in Deutschland. Zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Sozialphilosophie des Junghegelianismus. Bern, 1901.
- Kollmann, Wolfgang. Sozialgeschichte der Stadt Barmen im 19. Jahrhundert. Tübingen, 1960.
- Kreal, August. Zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung Oesterreichs. Berlin, 1894.

- Kreibig, J.L. Geschichte und Kritik des ethischen Skeptigismus. Berlin, 1896.
- Kronenberg, H. Moderne Philosophen. Portraits und Charakteristiken. Munich, 1899.
- Kronenberg, M. "Der Philosoph des Anarchismus," Die Nation, Wochenschrift fur Politik, Volkwirtschaft und Literatur (Berlin), 16 (1898-1899), 48-51.
- Lachmann, P. Protogoras, Nietzsche, Stirner. Berlin, 1914.
- Landauer, Gustav. "Börne und der Anarchismus," Sozialistische Monatshefte (1899), 353-355.
- Langhard, J. Die anarchistische Bewegung in der Schweiz von ihren Anfänge bis zur Gegenwart. 2nd Edition. Bern, 1909.
- Laqueur, Walter. "Visionaries," Atlas, IX (January, 1965), 50-51.
- Latouche, Peter. Anarchy. An Authentic Exposition of the Methods of Anarchists and the Aims of Anarchism. London, 1908.
- Laufenburg, Heinrich. Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung in Hamburg, Altona und Umgegend. 2 Vols. Hamburg, 1911, 1931.
- Laveleye, Emile. "Le socialisme contemporain en Allemagne," Revue des deux Mondes, 156 (September 1, 1876).
- Levy, A. La philosophie de Feuerbach. Paris, 1904.
- Lichtenberger, Henri. "L'anarchisme en Allemagne. Max Stirner," La nouvelle Revue, 89 (July-August, 1894), 233-241.
- Lidtko, Vernon L. The Outlawed Party. Social Democracy in Germany, 1878-1890. Princeton, 1966.
- Ligt, B. de. Anarchismus und Revolution. Berlin, 1922.
- Linse, Ulrich. Organisierter Anarchismus im deutschen Kaiserreich von 1871. Berlin, 1969.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Der deutsche Anarchismus 1870-1918: eine politische Bewegung zwischen Utopia und Wirklichkeit," Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht, 20 (1969), 513-519.
- Lipinski, Richard. Die Sozialdemokratie von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. 2 Vols. Berlin, 1928.
- Lippert, Wolderman. Richard Wagners Verbannung und Rücklehr, 1849-1862. Berlin, 1927.
- Lombroso, Cesare. "Anarchy. The Status of Anarchism Today in Europe and the United States," Everybody's Magazine, VI (1902), 165-168.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Anarchisten. Hamburg, 1894.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Der Anarchismus," Deutsche Revue (October, 1894).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Paradoxical Anarchist," Popular Science Monthly, 56 (January, 1900), 312-315.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Illustrative Studies in Criminal Anthropology," Monist, I (April, 1891), 226-343.
- Lord, Robert H. The Origins of the War of 1870. Cambridge, Mass., 1924.
- Löwith, Karl. From Hegel to Nietzsche. New York, 1964.
- Lugghesi, Francois. La philosophie de Stirner. Paris, 1932.
- MacKay, John Henry. Die Anarchisten. Zurich, 1891.
- Maitron, Jean. Histoire du mouvement anarchiste en France (1880-1914). Paris, 1955.
- Malia, Martin E. Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism, 1812-1855. Cambridge, Mass., 1961.
- Martin, A. Weitere Aufsätze. Mit einem Anhang: Schiller und der Anarchismus, oder Ausruf aus Schillers "Über die ästhetische Erziehung der Menschen." In einer Reihe von Briefen. Dresden, 1907.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Max Stirners Lehre. Leipzig, 1906.

[Martin, Rudolf Emil]. Der Anarchismus und seine Träger.  
Berlin, 1887.

Mayer, Gustav. "Die Anfänge der politischen Radikalismus im vormärzlichen Preussen," Zeitschrift für Politik, VI (1913), 1-113.

Mehring, Franz. Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie.  
2 Vols. Berlin-East, 1960.

Merkel, Renate. "Zur Entwicklung der wissenschaftlich begründeten Auffassung über die Kommunistische Gesellschaft durch Marx und Engels in ihrer Schrift 'Die deutsche Ideologie' (Herbst 1845 bis Sommer 1846)," Beiträge zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung, Heft 5 (1970), 734-751.

Mülberger, Arthur. "Ein Wahlmanifest Proudhons. Ein Beitrag zu Vorgeschichte der Commune," Gegenwart, (1877), 251-262.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Die Theorie der Anarchie," Die neue Gesellschaft (Zurich) (March, 1878), 291-311.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Von und über Proudhon," Die Wage (Berlin) (1878-1879).

\_\_\_\_\_. Zur Kenntnisse Intum von Karl Marx. Aus Ernst Buschs Nachlass. Basel, 1894.

Müller, George. Richard Wagner in der Mai-Revolution. Berlin, 1919.

Nettlau, Max. Der Vorfrühling der Anarchie: ihre historische Entwicklung von den Anfängen bis zum Jahre 1864. Berlin, 1925.

\_\_\_\_\_. Der Anarchismus von Proudhon zu Kropotkin. Berlin, 1927.

\_\_\_\_\_. Anarchisten und Sozialrevolutionäre: Die historische Entwicklung des Anarchismus in den Jahren 1880-1886. Berlin, 1931.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Londoner deutsche kommunistische Diskussionen

1845," Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung, X (1922), 336-391.

"Neue Aphorismen," Die Zukunft, 32 (1900), 12-13.

Nomad, Max. Apostles of Revolution. Boston, 1939.

\_\_\_\_\_. Aspects of Revolt. New York, 1959.

Nordau, Max. Degeneration. London, 1914.

Noyes, P. H. Organization and Revolution: Working-Class Associations in the German Revolutions of 1848-1849. Princeton, 1966.

Pack, Wolfgang. Das parlamentarische Ringen um das Sozialistengesetz 1878-1890. Düsseldorf, 1961.

Pascal, Félicien. "Du romantisme a l'anarchie," Le Correspondant, 225 (November, 1906), 752-780.

Plechanoff, George. Anarchism and Socialism. London, 1895.

P. M. "Das Verbrechen am Niederwald," Preussische Jahrbücher, LV (1885), 113-124.

Pöls, Werner, "Staat und Sozialdemokratie im Bismarckreich in Berlin in der Zeit des Sozialistengesetzes 1878-1890," Jahrbuch für die Geschichte Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands, 13 (1964), 200-221.

Rau, Albrecht. "Ludwig Feuerbach and Max Stirner," Das Magazin für die Literatur des In- und Auslandes (Berlin), No. 41 (1888), 643-646.

Reed, Herbert. The Tenth Muse. Essays in Criticism, New York, 1958.

"Die Reise auf öffentliche Kosten," Epigonen, V (1847), 9-112.

Reust, Anselm. Stirnerbrevier. Die Stärke einsame. Max Stirners Individualismus. Der Einzige und sein Eigentum. Munich, 1911.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Stirner und Nietzsche. Ein Vorwort," Die Aktion. Zeitschrift für freiheitliche Politik und Literatur, I (1911), 916-917.
- Rein, Gustav Adolf. Die Revolution in der Politik Bismarcks. Göttingen, 1957.
- Ritter, Herhard A. "Die politische Arbeiterbewegung Deutschlands 1863-1914," Schriften der Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, I (1963), 3-26.
- Robertson, Priscilla. Revolutions of 1848. A Social History, New York, 1960.
- Romundt, Heinrich. "Max Stirner und die Nachkantische Philosophie," Preussische Jahrbücher, 133 (1908), 33-47.
- Roth, Gunther. The Social Democrats in Imperial Germany. A Study in Working Class Isolation and National Integration. Totowa, New Jersey, 1963.
- Roudine, Victor. "Max Stirner," Portraits d'hier (October 15, 1910), 65-95.
- Schaact, Michael. Anarchy and Anarchists. Chicago, 1889.
- Schellwien, Robert. Max Stirner und Friedrich Nietzsche. Paris, 1904.
- Schieder, Wolfgang. Anfänge der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung. Die Auslandsvereine im Jahrzehnt nach der Julirevolution von 1830. Stuttgart, 1963.
- Schneidt, Karl. "Vom jungen Anarchismus," Die Kritik (Berlin), III (1896), 583-591, 622-632, 665-677, 717-721, 767-826.
- Schuffenhauer, Werner. Feuerbach und der junge Marx. Zur Entstehungsgesichte der marxistischen Weltanschauung. Berlin, 1965.
- Schultheiss, Hermann. Stirner; Grundlage zum Verstandnis des Werkes 'Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum.' Leipzig, 1922.



- Schultze, Ernst. "Stirner'sche Ideen in einem paranoischen Wohnsystem," Archiv für Psychiatrie und Nervenkrankheiten, 36 (January, 1903), 793-818.
- Schuré, Édouard. "L'individualisme et l'anarchie," Revue des deux Mondes, 132 (August 15, 1895), 775-805.
- Schuster, Eunice. Native American Anarchism. Northampton, Mass., 1932.
- Schwaeb, Michael. "A Convicted Anarchist's Reply to Professor Lombroso," Monist, I (April, 1891), 520-524.
- Seillière, Ernest. "La morale imperialiste chez Stirner," Mercure de France, 60 (March 15, 1906), 179-198.
- Sergent, Alain and Claude Harmel. Histoire de l'anarchie. Paris, 1949.
- Skrzypczak, Henryk, "Engels an Meyer, Kaufmann und andere Beiträge zur neuen MEGA," Internationale Wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung, Heft 10 (June, 1970), 1-18.
- "Die Sozialisten und Anarchisten in der Schweiz," Die Gegenwart, Wochenschrift für Literatur, Kunst und öffentliches Leben, XXV, No. 12 (March 22, 1884), 177-180.
- Staurzh, N. Max Stirners Philosophie des Ich. Berlin, 1923.
- Steeffel, Lawrence D. Bismarck and the Hohenzollern Candidacy and the Origins of the War of 1870. Cambridge, Mass., 1962.
- Steckloff, G. M. History of the First International. New York, 1928.
- Stiekloff, Georg. Marx und die Anarchisten. Dresden, 1913.
- Steiner, Rudolf. "Max Stirner," Das Magazin für Literatur (Berlin and Weimar), 67, No. 26 (July 2, 1898), 601-605.
- Stoessl, Otto. "Die Lebensbeschreibung des 'Einzigel,'" Die Gegenwart, No. 26 (1899), 406-409.

- Strauss, Rudolph and Kurt Finsterbruch. Die Chemnitzer Arbeiterbewegung unter dem Sozialistengesetz. Berlin-East, 1954.
- Taubert, Inge. "Zur materialistischen Geschichtsauffassung von Marx und Engels. Über einige theoretische Probleme im ersten Kapitel des 'Deutschen Ideologie,'" Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung, Sonderheft X (1968), 22-50.
- Tilley, W. H. The Background of the Princess Casamassima. University of Florida, Gainesville, 1961.
- Tönnies, Ferdinand. Der Kampf um das Sozialistengesetz 1878. Berlin, 1929.
- Tuchmann, Barbara. The Proud Tower. Bantam Edition. New York, 1967.
- Tucker, Robert E. The Marxian Revolutionary Idea. New York, 1969.
- Ulam, Adam B. The Unfinished Revolution. New York, 1960.
- Valbert, G. "L'attentat du Niederwald," Revue des deux Mondes, LXVII (February 1, 1885), 669-680.
- "Das Verstandesthum und das Individuum," Evangelische Kirchenzeitung (1848), 48.
- Vizetelly, Alfred. The Anarchists. New York, 1911.
- Wendler, Wolfgang. Carl Sternheim. Weltvorstellung und Kunstprinzipien. Frankfurt a.M. und Bonn, 1966.
- Weller, E. Die Freiheitsbestrebungen der deutschen im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert, in Zeugnissen ihrer Literatur. Leipzig, 1847.
- Wille, Bruno. "Vom rothen Götzen," Die Zukunft, 7 (1894), 452-458.
- Woodcock, George. Anarchism. Cleveland, 1962.

Zenker, E.V. Anarchism. New York, 1897.

Ziekursch, Johannes. Politische Geschichte des neuen deutschen Kaiserreichs, II Das zeitalter Bismarcks (1871-1890). Frankfurt a.M., 1927.

Zoccoli, Hektor. Die Anarchie: ihre Verkünder, ihre Ideen, ihre Taten. Leipzig, 1909.

Zucker, A.E. The Forty Eighters. Political Refugees of the German Revolutions of 1848. New York, 1950.

## INDEX

- Adels, 260, 266  
 Agatz, Dr., 174  
 Alexander II, 213, 230, 231, 251  
 Allgemeiner deutscher Arbeiterverein, 80  
Anarchist, Der (New York), 329  
 Anders, Theodor, 283  
 Andrieux, Louis, 276  
 Anti-Authoritarian International, 80-87  
 Arbeiterbildungsverein (Dresden), 145, 162  
 Arbeiter Zeitung (Bern), 84-86, 87, 89, 90, 92-93, 97-98, 100, 149  
 Arnold, Hermann, 111  
 Auer, 191  
 Autmann, F., 182  
 Autonomie, Die (London), 93, 329, 337-338, 342, 348, 363, 365, 366, 369, 371, 372, 375, 377, 388-389  
 Bachmann, Karl, 288, 292, 293, 299, 314  
 Bakunin, Mikhail, 1, 2, 3, 16, 21, 22, 26, 31, 32, 35, 44, 67, 77, 78, 79, 119, 121, 216, 249-250, 276, 326, 327, 333  
 Ballerstedt, Heinrich, 53  
 Bamberger, Ludwig, 33  
 Bauer, Bruno, 25, 31, 33, 54, 56, 61  
 Bauer, Edgar, 31, 33, 54  
 Bauer, Freiherr von, 265  
 Baum, Hermann, 223, 224, 228  
 Bebel, August, 101, 104, 117, 118, 121, 124, 151, 153, 160, 165, 178, 179, 180, 182, 183, 185, 186, 187, 188, 191, 196, 199-200, 379  
 Beck, Adele, 83  
 Becker, Oscar, 131-132  
 Becker, Philip, 79  
 Benek, A., 182  
 Bentheim, Frau, 304  
 Bentin, Fritz, 391  
 Benx, Gottlieb, 366  
 Berger, Karoline, 261-262  
 Berkman, Alexander, 279  
Berliner freie Presse, 88, 97, 102, 127, 135, 143, 144, 145, 146, 165, 180, 181, 188  
 Bern Anarchist Congress (1876), 86-87, 249  
 Berner Arbeiter-Union, 88  
 Bernstein (August Reinsdorf), 149, 166, 311  
 Bernstein, Eduard, 101, 151, 153, 202, 371-372, 380  
 Bertram, Franz, 366  
 Bertrand, Louis, 259-261, 371, 372  
 Beugel (August Reinsdorf), 286  
 Birnbaum, Karl, 145  
 Bismarck, Herbert von, 127, 168  
 Bismarck, Otto von, 7, 77, 127-129, 132-133, 135, 136-137, 153-159, 161,

- 162, 168-169, 183, 184,  
 185, 186, 194, 208, 212,  
 231, 232, 245, 269, 273,  
 289, 290, 293, 313, 362,  
 397, 398, 399-400  
 Bitter, Karl H., 238  
 Blanqui, 23-24, 45, 187,  
 191, 192, 228, 327  
 Blenvalet, 359-360, 361  
 Blind, Carl, 132  
 Blind (Cohen), Ferdinand,  
 132  
 Blöck, 262-263, 272  
 Boell, Peter, 224, 228  
 Böhme, Fritz, 363-364  
 Börne, Ludwig, 14-16, 185  
 Bourier, Prof., 174  
 Bracke, Wilhelm, 101  
 Brandt, 364  
 Braun, Wilhelm, 225, 228  
 Breiten, 121  
 Bremeyer, 91  
 Breuder, Joseph, 223, 224,  
 228, 285  
 Brinkmann, G., 235  
 Brismeel, Mr., 145  
 Brochnau, Frau, 145  
 Brousse, Blanche, 83  
 Brousse, Paul, 79, 83, 84,  
 89, 92, 100, 148, 149,  
 162, 249, 276  
 Brussels Congress of the  
 Anti-Authoritarian Inter-  
 national (1874), 80-83  
 Buber, Martin, 10  
 Bucher, Lothar, 153-154,  
 168-169  
 Bühl, Ludwig, 54, 55  
 Bühler, Wilhelm, 232-233,  
 234  
 Bülow, Bernhard von, 127,  
 154  
 Bülow, Otto von, 379  
 Burtz, Agnes Clara Kuni-  
 gunde, 54  
 Cafiero, Carlo, 250, 327  
 Cavendish, Lord, 230, 231,  
 343  
 Cell Organization, 192, 196,  
 214-229, 237, 257, 284,  
 285, 344, 347, 384-386  
 Center Party, 158  
 Cercle d'Etudes Sociale de  
 Lavallois-Perret (Paris),  
 251  
 Chemnitzer freie Presse, 178  
 Christ, Hermann, 224, 228  
 Christian Socialists, 121-122,  
 124, 135  
 Club Autonomie, 336-337, 370  
 Club International, 251  
 Club Morgenröthe, 325  
 Commune (1871), 126, 144,  
 145, 147, 158, 167, 168,  
 178, 180, 184, 218, 276,  
 284  
 Communist-Anarchism, 249-  
 153, 257, 322, 324, 326-  
 328, 332-333, 372, 376,  
 377, 391, 403-404  
 Congress of Jura Federation  
 (1878), 249  
 Congress of Jura Federation  
 (1879), 249  
 Congress of Jura Federation  
 (1880), 250  
 Congress of Jura Federation  
 (1882), 253  
 Congress of Jura Federation  
 (1883), 253  
 Conservatives, 158, 160  
 Costa, Andrea, 276  
 Czerkauer, 245, 380  
 Dähnhardt, Marie, 55-56  
 Dave, Victor, 149, 214-221,  
 223-229, 235, 236, 241,  
 246, 256, 284, 285, 308-  
 309, 312, 320, 321, 324,  
 326-328, 331-336, 337,  
 338, 341, 342, 349, 350-  
 361, 370-372, 374, 376,  
 377, 382-383, 384, 390  
 Dentler, Paul, 148, 165  
 De Paepe, Cesar, 86-87  
 Deschner, 245, 380

- Deutsche Arbeiterbildungs-  
 verein (Schaffhausen), 210  
Deutsche Vereine, 79  
Deutsche Zeitung, 189, 190  
Devonshire Club, 164  
 Dienemann, 364  
 Dietrich, 122  
 Dietz, widow, 364  
 Dillich, Heinrich, 225, 228  
 Dornerer, 357-358  
 Dreijse, Mr., 146  
 Drenkman, 295, 362  
 Drichel, Robert, 363-365,  
 386  
 Drobner, Gustav, 365  
 Dühring, Dr. Eugene, 101-  
 102, 112-113, 181, 200  
 Duff, Mountstuart Grant, 164  
 Dutschke, Rudi, 65, 67  
 Dynamite Law, 272, 293-294,  
 363, 364, 369, 377, 397  
  
 Ebersbacher Conference, 224  
 Eckstein, Ernst (August  
 Reinsdorf), 284  
 Ehrhart, Franz J., 182, 209,  
 210, 221, 238  
 Eisenbacher, Johann, 335  
 Eisenhower, Theodor, 214,  
 221, 222, 223, 229, 241,  
 243, 287  
 Eisert, Heinrich, 261-262,  
 267, 274, 275  
 Emmerich, Karl, 195  
 Engel, August, 196, 204,  
 213, 240  
 Engel, Josef, 257-258  
 Engels, Friedrich, 25, 26,  
 27, 29, 31, 32, 34-39,  
 42-43, 45, 54-55, 61-65,  
 80, 101-104, 178, 181,  
 200, 296  
 Ensz, Abraham, 102  
 Erlenkoller, Friedrich, 318  
 Etter, Martin, 294  
 Eulenburg, Botho Graf zu,  
 127, 189, 208  
 Eulenberg, Friedrich zu,  
 136, 154  
  
 Even (John Neve), 366  
  
 Fackel, Die, 117  
 Falk, Dr., 133  
 Fallersleben, Hoffmann von,  
 54  
 F(v)ateral, Johann, 111  
 Faucher, Julius, 54, 65-66  
 Feuerbach, Ludwig, 20, 25,  
 48, 53, 54, 61  
 First International, 1, 3,  
 35, 176, 216, 326, 333  
 Fischer, Commandant, 232  
 Fischer, Kuno, 61  
 Fleuron (Peterson), 339  
 Fleuron, Wilhelm L., 221,  
 222, 242  
 Föllcke, C.W., 133  
 Fränkel, Dr., 105  
 Frankel, Leo, 146, 147,  
 148, 149, 167  
 Franz, G. (Theodor Eisen-  
 hower), 222  
 Free Conservatives, 158  
Freedom, 93, 350  
Freie Arbeiter, Der, 16  
Freien, Die, 54-55  
Freiheit, 182-187, 190, 192,  
 196, 199-201, 203, 205-  
 237, 250, 253-255, 256,  
 257, 264-265, 268, 270,  
 272-273, 276-279, 284,  
 286, 292, 303, 307, 310,  
 312, 317, 321, 324, 325,  
 327, 328-329, 331-336,  
 337-338, 342, 343, 344,  
 346, 348, 349, 350, 352,  
 354, 359, 363, 365, 366,  
 368, 369, 375-376, 386,  
 388-389  
 Freisinnige Party, 293  
 Freytag, Otto, 125  
 Fricke, Henry, 279  
 Fried, Jonas Julius, 262  
 Friedrich, Crown Prince,  
 124-125, 153, 154, 156,  
 157, 169, 288, 289, 313,  
 363, 365

- Friedrich, William IV, 131-132
- Fritzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm, 101, 152, 167-168, 191
- Frohme, 80
- Gautier, Emile, 257, 326
- Gauvain, Major von, 141
- Geismar, Martin von (Edgar Bauer), 31
- Gentsch, 364
- Gfeller, Joseph Alfred (August Reinsdorf), 285, 311
- Gigot, Philippe, 27
- Giskra, Dr., 177
- Glar, 366
- Gleuve, Pierre, 359
- Glück auf, 188-189, 190
- Godwin, William, 3
- Görges, G., 98, 111
- Goethe, von, 13, 58
- Goldman, Emma, 3, 173, 174, 330
- Goosens, J. A., 251
- Gotha Congress (1877), 99-100
- Gotha Program, 193-194
- Gotha Unity Congress (1875), 188
- Gottschalk, 298, 317
- Grave, Jean, 339
- Greulich, Hermann, 79-80, 86, 88, 90, 96, 103, 176-177
- Grillenberger, Karl, 273, 316, 361, 371, 379
- Gross, Franz, 348, 361-362, 365-367
- Group Autonomie, 93, 326, 336-337, 360, 375, 376-377
- Grün, Balthasar, 251, 323-324, 325, 339, 368-369, 373-374
- Grün, Karl, 14, 24, 26-30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 43
- Günther, 364
- Guillaume, James, 1, 95, 147, 249, 276
- Gutsmann, Bruno, 83, 91
- Guttman, 305, 308-309, 320
- Habermann, 364
- Hackel (August Reinsdorf), 286
- Hahn, 222
- Haide, Ernst von der (Karl Grün), 47
- Hake, Gustav von, 232, 269, 272, 303
- Halbedl, Karl, 269, 333, 347
- Hamburg-Altonaer freies Volksblatt, 194-195
- Hamburg-Altonaer Hafenzeitung, 190
- Hanthalder, Father, 133
- Hartling, 116
- Hartmann, 191
- Hase (Johann Eisenbacher), 335
- Hasenclever, 151, 182, 191
- Hasselmann, Wilhelm, 1, 158, 165, 187-197, 201-204, 214, 223
- Hauch, Frau Julius, 115, 123, 131
- Haupt, Christian, 232, 245-246
- Hauser, Peter, 247, 281
- Hegel, Georg W. F., 48, 53
- Heilbronner, 260, 266
- Heilmann, 245, 380
- Heine, Heinrich, 13
- Heinrich, H., 336
- Heinrichs, Hubert, 348
- Heinzen, Karl, 19-22, 39
- Hentschell, 241
- Henze, Carl, 251
- Herrfurth, Ludwig, 378
- Herwegh, 54
- Herzen, Alexander, 22
- Hess, Moses, 24-26, 31, 32, 54, 61
- Heufelder, 192, 202
- Hillmann, Carl, 193

- Hippel's Weinstube, 54  
Hirsch, Carl, 145, 183  
Hitler, Adolph, 19  
Hlubek, 260, 266, 267, 272  
Höchberg, Dr., 102  
Hödel, Charlotte Emilie, 116  
Hödel, Max, 1, 3, 98, 99,  
104, 105, 115-127, 129,  
130-131, 133-136, 139,  
142, 143, 146, 147, 148,  
149, 150, 152, 153, 154,  
155, 156, 160, 161, 162,  
166, 180, 181, 254, 283,  
298, 377, 397  
Hoepfner, Wilhelm, 366  
Hoffmann, W., 182  
Hohn, Balthasar, 251  
Hollman, 223, 225  
Holstein, Friedrich von, 168,  
273  
Holtfeuer, 140  
Holzhauer, Karl, 288, 299,  
315, 325  
Horsch, 223  
Hüber, 305  
Huff, Wilhelm, 270-272  
Humboldt, Wilhelm von, 13  
Hurke, 364  
Independent Socialists, 6  
International Anarchist Con-  
gress (London, 1881),  
249-253, 257, 275  
Jacobi, Heinrich, 224, 228  
Johl, 151-152, 153  
Jordan, Wilhelm, 33, 54  
Jura Congress (1876), 89  
Jura Federation, 77-106, 123,  
147, 149, 162, 249-250,  
268  
Jurschitzka, Franz, 283  
Kachelhofer, 84  
Kämpfer, Der, 375  
Kahn, Rudolph, 83, 87, 107  
Kaltenbach, A., 231, 264-  
265, 266, 267  
Kammerer, Anton, 231, 259,  
262, 263, 265-267, 324,  
325  
Kammhoff, 378  
Kampf, Der, 148, 166, 283,  
284  
Kamphausen, Frau, 305-306  
Kaufmann, Josef, 231, 233,  
234, 246-247, 259, 347  
Kaufmann, Solomon, 210, 239  
Kayser, Dr. Paul, 191, 379  
Kennel, Friedrich P., 231,  
233, 245, 246, 281, 380  
Kersten, Paul, 80  
Kierkegaard, Sören, 67  
Kirchhoff, F., 336  
Kirschner (Kürschner),  
Fritz, 251, 348, 356  
Kitz, Frank, 209  
Klauka, Friedrich, 366  
Klees, 364  
Kleist-Retzow, 160  
Knauerhase, Gustav, 235,  
308, 321, 333, 334-335,  
336, 341, 377  
Koditek, 262  
Köhler, widow, 116, 131,  
145  
Köppen, C. F., 54  
Köppen, H. L., 33  
Köster, 364  
Kommunistische Arbeiter-  
bildungsverein (London),  
145, 182, 216, 251, 324-  
325, 335, 336, 337-338,  
354, 377, 390  
Kopp, Christian, 53  
Kovalevsky, Maxim, 164  
Kratz, 308  
Krause, 364-365  
Krautz, 126  
Kristupeit, Gustav, 224, 228  
Krohn, Moritz, 283  
Kropotkin, Peter, 3, 4, 14,  
26, 79, 84, 93, 96, 98,  
243, 249, 250, 251, 253,  
283, 326, 327, 337, 377  
Krüger, Adolf H., 136, 203-



- 204, 232, 294, 358, 360,  
 362, 370, 386  
 Krüger, Carl, 116  
 Küchler, Emil, 288, 289-291,  
 293, 295-296, 298, 299,  
 300-301, 313, 314, 315,  
 318, 325, 377  
 Kullmann, 132-133  
 Kulpmann, Richard, 318  
 Kumics, Michael, 259, 260,  
 266  
 Kunhardt, Georg Ferdinand,  
 194-195, 203  
  
 Landauer, Gustav, 1, 3, 10,  
 345  
 Landsberg, N., 83  
 Lasker, 159  
 Lassalle, Ferdinand, 25,  
 136, 144, 176, 188, 327  
 Laterne, Die, 183  
 Lauter, Johann, 290  
 L'avant-Garde, 92, 93, 148,  
 149  
 Lechhause, 222  
 Ledochovski, Archbishop,  
 133  
 Legel, Martha, 225, 227,  
 228  
 Lehmann (William I), 209,  
 213, 238  
 Lessing, Gotthold, 13  
 Levallois, Perret, 339  
 Levashoff (Kropotkin), 109  
 Lichtensteiger, Albert, 224,  
 228  
 Liebe, Friedrich, 141  
 Liebknecht, Wilhelm, 96-97,  
 99, 103, 105, 110, 124,  
 149, 151, 165, 178, 179,  
 180, 181, 182, 183, 185,  
 187, 188, 191, 193, 312,  
 323, 345, 378-379, 391  
 Lielsky, Leon, 144  
 Lienhard, 260, 266  
 Lieske, Julius, 283, 302-310,  
 325, 377, 379  
 Lieske, Karl, 307  
  
 Lieske, R., 336  
 Lombroso, Cesare, 6, 7  
 Lubovski, 133  
 Ludwig (Carl Nobiling), 146  
 Luitpold, Prince, 289  
 Luther, Martin, 28  
  
 Mackay, John H., 42, 56,  
 68, 391  
 Madai, Guido von, 136, 144,  
 153, 189, 190, 192, 194,  
 209, 210, 212, 220, 228-  
 229, 231, 268, 270, 273,  
 284, 285  
 Madame Audinet, 218  
 Madame Gropius, 54-55  
 Maggion, 270-271  
 Mahr, Georg, 224, 228  
 Malatesta, Errico, 3, 327  
 Malherbe, Henri, 19  
 Mann, Friedrich, 33  
 Marot, Reverend, 55  
 Marr, Wilhelm, 14, 30-31,  
 45  
 Martin, Rudolf, 241, 308-  
 309, 330, 372, 390  
 Marx, Karl, 1, 20, 22-23,  
 24, 25, 26, 27-29, 31, 32,  
 34-39, 44-45, 54, 56, 61-  
 65, 70, 80, 101-103, 148,  
 164, 178, 179, 182-183,  
 200, 327, 396-397  
 Mauderode, von, 357-358,  
 365, 386  
 McKinley, William, 44  
 Mehlmann, P., 146  
 Meloun, 263  
 Merstallinger, Josef, 257  
 Merten, Wilhelm, 182, 230  
 Metzkwow, Maximilien, 225,  
 228  
 Meurer, 364  
 Meyen, Eduard, 54  
 Meyer (Fritz Kirschner),  
 348, 356  
 Meyer, F., 33  
 Meyer, Hermann, 200  
 Mildenerger, Carl, 287,  
 316, 318

- Milke, Friedrich, 210  
 Miller, Jean, 251  
 Milly, E., 324  
 Mitler, von, 289  
 Möhling, 357-358, 362, 366, 387  
 Moltke, von, 289  
 Mommsen, Theodor, 180  
 Moretti (Julius Mottler), 202  
 Most, Johann, 1, 5, 9, 44, 79, 88, 97, 98, 101, 102-103, 124, 165, 173-187, 191-194, 195-196, 197-201, 208-211, 214-215, 216-223, 227, 228, 229-237, 239, 241, 243, 246, 253-255, 257, 265, 267, 272-273, 275, 278-279, 281, 284, 285, 291, 292, 294, 302, 303, 307-308, 312, 318, 319-320, 324, 327-333, 337, 338, 343, 346, 350, 354, 355, 362, 368, 369, 370-374, 376-377, 382, 390, 392  
 Mottler, Julius, 202, 246, 372, 391  
 Mühsam, Erich, 1, 3  
 Mülenberger, Dr. Arthur, 33, 103-104  
 Müller, Dr. Arthur, 54  
 Müller, Eduard, 269, 270, 361  
 Müntzer, Thomas, 13  
 Mussolini, B., 67  
 Napoleon III, 132  
 National Liberals, 119-120, 128, 145, 154, 155-157, 158, 159, 397  
 Nau, Heinrich, 303, 304, 305, 308  
 Naumann, Otto, 322  
 Nettlau, Max, 5, 220-221, 241, 307, 308, 329, 339, 350, 554  
 Neubern, 364  
Neue Deutsche Zeitung, 195  
Neue Sozialdemokrat, Der, 136, 144, 201  
Neuen Bremer freien Zeitung, 190  
 Neumann, Oskar, 195-196, 210, 214, 216, 218-220, 221, 227, 239, 285  
 Neumann, Sigmund, 391  
 Neve, John, 182, 210, 220, 230, 231, 233, 234, 235, 236, 247, 251, 257, 278, 281, 311, 321, 332, 333, 334, 337, 338-339, 341, 342, 343-381, 383, 384-387, 390-391  
 Niederwald Dynamite Plot, 79, 288-291, 293, 294-301  
 Nietzsche, Friedrich, 57, 65, 66, 75  
 Nobiling, Carl, 1, 3, 98, 122, 123, 125, 139-157, 160, 161, 162-168, 180, 185, 191, 254, 283, 397, 399  
 Nomad, Max, 382  
 Nowotny, Jakob, 336, 347  
 Oehl, Felix, 366  
 Oliver, 359  
 Ondra, 303  
 Ondra, Johann, 260  
 Opitz, Theodor, 33  
 Orsini, Felice, 132  
 Osten, W. F., 391  
 Ottenfels, Baron von, 264-265, 267  
 Ottensossen, 132  
 Otter, 286  
 Otter, Arnold, 263  
 Otter, Victor, 245, 263, 380  
 Pagsack, Franz, 366  
 Palm, Carl Rudolf, 288, 289, 293, 295, 298, 299, 313, 314, 363, 365, 369, 388

- Parliamentarianism, 77, 80-83, 161, 184-187, 398-399, 400
- Patten, P. von, 35
- Paul, Kommissar, 231
- Peasant War, 13
- Pelzenbach, John (August Reinsdorf), 287, 292
- Peschmann, August, 225, 228
- Peterson, Carl, 211
- Peterson (Fleuron), 311
- Peukert, Josef, 231, 235, 246, 251, 256-257, 261, 262, 266-267, 268, 308, 309, 311-312, 321, 323, 324, 326-336, 337, 338, 341, 345-347, 349-350, 354-361, 367, 370-373, 374-375, 377, 382-384, 390-391
- Pfau, Ludwig, 33
- Pfeger, Franz, 257-258
- Philipshorn, von, 144
- Pichon, 339
- Pigeon, 339
- Pinday, Louis, 147, 167
- Pohlmann, Max, 366
- Police Spies, 192, 195-196, 202, 203-204, 209, 210-214, 216-219, 223, 231-235, 241, 246-247, 259, 268, 285, 288, 289, 295, 297-298, 299, 313, 317-318, 347, 350-354, 358-362, 365, 370-372, 380, 382-383, 386-387, 390, 399
- Porsberger, 290
- Possart, 174
- Prager, Hermann, 262
- Prinz, 336
- Progressives, 128, 158
- Propaganda by Deed, 80, 86, 95, 96, 105, 121, 149, 229, 231, 235, 249-276, 283-310, 328, 363, 364, 369, 378, 395, 397
- Proudhon, Pierre Joseph, 3, 13, 21, 24, 26-29, 31, 32-33, 35, 44, 77, 103-104, 144, 179, 326
- Puttkamer, Robert von, 213, 232, 237, 293
- Rabehl, Bernd, 51
- Radical Party, 257-258, 260, 262, 267-268
- Radikale, Die (Budapest), 262
- Rau, Anton, 304
- Rau, Otto (Otto Rinke), 104, 149, 323, 368, 374
- Rebell, Der, 93, 255, 268, 272, 279, 310, 321-324, 326, 329, 331-332, 334, 337, 338, 341, 342, 348, 363, 365, 369, 374
- Reclus, Elisée, 3, 250, 326, 327
- Reeder, August, 336
- Rehör, Franz, 366
- Reichel, A., 83
- Reinsdorf, August, 30, 43-44, 78, 79-80, 83, 84, 86, 87-91, 92, 97-101, 102, 105, 118, 120-121, 149, 162, 166, 183, 222, 236, 283-302, 305, 307, 308, 311-312, 362, 363, 365, 369, 377, 378
- Reinsdorf, Bruno, 301
- Reinsdorf, Franz, 301
- Reitzel, Robert, 19, 42
- Renoux, Céline, 323
- Reuss, Karl Theodor, 350-361, 367, 370-372, 382-384, 386, 390
- Révolté, Le, 14, 93, 250, 269, 272, 283, 303, 310, 326
- Revolution Sociale, La, 250, 276
- Rheinbach, Karl, 288, 299
- Richter, Eugene, 293
- Richter, Johann, 257
- Richthofen, Bernard Freiherr

- von, 348-349, 365, 375  
**Riesz**, Adolf, 33  
**Rinke**, Erich Otto, 78, 83, 84, 86, 87, 91, 92-93, 94, 97, 104, 110, 111, 148, 149, 251, 257, 308, 309, 321, 323-324, 326-327, 331-332, 334-335, 336, 337, 338, 341, 354, 356, 368, 370, 373-375, 376, 377, 382, 383, 384, 387, 391  
**Ritter**, Carl, 53  
**Ritter**, Heinrich, 53  
**Rocker**, Rudolf, 1, 3, 121, 216-217, 218-221, 224, 307, 308, 329, 338, 350, 382-383  
**Rorschach Congress**, 192  
**Roscher**, Wilhelm, 141, 145  
Rote Fahne, Die (Barmen), 188  
**Ruge**, Arnold, 20, 25, 31-32, 33, 54, 61  
**Rumpf**, Dr. Carl, 1, 223, 291, 292, 302-303, 305-310, 320, 368  
**Rupsch**, Franz, 288, 289-291, 293, 295-296, 297, 298, 299, 313, 315  
**Rutenberg**, Adolf, 54  
  
**Saevecke**, 210-211, 240  
**Sander**, 364  
**Sautermeister**, Adolf, 229  
**Sautermeister**, Friedrich, 229  
**Say**, J. B., 56  
**Schaffhauser**, Ferdinand, 260  
**Schaffle**, 181  
**Schaller**, Dr., 286  
**Schauftert** (Josef Peukert), 257  
**Schenk**, 269  
**Scheu**, Andreas, 217-220, 223, 351, 354  
**Schiebeck**, Johann, 317  
  
**Schiller**, Friedrich, 13  
**Schilling**, Johannes, 288  
**Schlebach**, 358, 359  
Schleswig-Holsteinische Volkszeitung, 189-190, 212  
**Schlöffel**, 65-66  
**Schlosser**, Adalbert, 111-112  
**Schlüter**, Hermann, 196-197  
**Schmelzbach**, 245, 380  
**Schmidt**, 305  
**Schmidt**, Elias, 231  
**Schmidt**, Heinrich, 366  
**Schmidt**, Johann Caspar (Max Stirner), 53  
**Schmitt**, Johann (August Reinsdorf), 292  
**Schneider**, 233, 234  
**Schneidt**, Karl, 189, 190, 194, 195, 196, 201, 204, 284, 368, 369  
**Schnitzer**, 225  
**Schramm**, 151  
**Schröder**, Karl, 231-233, 234, 245, 246, 259, 294, 380  
**Schütz**, 385  
**Schultze**, Karl, 281  
**Schultze**, Moritz, 182, 246, 268, 281, 324  
**Schultze**, Paul, 182  
**Schumm**, George, 19, 21, 42, 68  
**Schurz**, Karl, 31  
**Schwab**, Julius, 231  
**Schweitzer**, Jean Baptiste, von, 188  
**Schwelm**, 230  
**Schwitzgebel**, Adhemar, 81, 89  
**Scupin**, Karl, 341  
**Seeschlange**, 189, 190  
**Sefeloge**, Max, 132  
**Seibert**, 373  
**Seidel**, Robert, 199-200  
**Serreaux**, Citizen (Egide)

- Silleaux), 250, 276, 361, 371, 372
- Singer, Paul, 232, 233, 362, 379
- Smith, Adam, 56
- Social Democrats, 1, 2, 6, 10, 77, 80-83, 88-91, 93-97, 98-106, 117-120, 124, 127-129, 136-137, 142-143, 144, 147, 148, 149, 150-162, 165, 166, 170-171, 178-187, 188, 190-194, 211, 216, 228, 258, 261, 264, 273, 291, 296-297, 318-319, 325, 327, 361, 362, 369, 378-380, 386, 395-396, 397-400
- Socialist Law, 3, 77, 127-129, 132, 136-137, 150, 154-162, 180, 183, 184, 186, 188, 189-190, 191, 194, 195, 196, 208-209, 211, 212, 213, 224, 226, 228, 232, 237, 272, 273, 291, 293, 294, 345, 369, 377, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399
- Socialist League, 352-353, 354, 356
- Söhngen, Fritz, 288, 289, 299
- Sommer, Friedrich Carl, 143
- Sorge, Friedrich A., 35, 102-103, 183
- Southey, 288
- Sozialdemokrat, Der, 183, 186, 187, 200, 211, 264, 273, 291, 306, 307, 311, 335, 338, 344, 352, 370, 371, 378, 379, 380-381
- Sozialdemokrat, Der (Lasallean), 188
- Sozialdemokratischen Bulletin, 78
- Sozialdemokratischer Verein (Bern), 83, 88
- Sozialpolitische Verein
- Gleichheit, 111-112
- Sparig, Bruno, 119
- Sprenger, Johann, 366
- teinberg, John (August Reinsdorf), 88, 98, 100, 120, 285
- tellmacher, Hermann, 229, 231, 233, 234, 235, 259, 263-265, 266-267, 268, 303, 305, 316, 324, 325, 343, 346
- tephen, 322
- Stevens, Ernest (John Neve), 344-345, 368, 380-381
- t. Gallen Congress of SPD (1887), 378-379
- Sticht, Johann Caspar Martin, 53
- St. Immer Anarchist Congress (1877), 100
- tirner, Max, 2, 3, 25, 26, 35, 39, 49-50, 53-76
- töcker, Adolph, 121, 181
- trauss, von (Wilhelm Huff), 270-271
- Süddeutschen Volkstimme, 179
- Swiss Arbeiterbund, 86, 88
- Szimmoth, 336
- Tagwacht, 79, 90, 103
- Taylor, Bayard, 127
- Tessendorf, Hermann, 363, 369, 388
- Thiers, Louis, 276
- Tiedemann, Christoph von, 127, 154
- Tiedt, Rudolf, 192-193
- Töllner, August, 288, 289, 299
- Tolstoy, Leo, 3
- Traber, Johann, 116
- Trautner, Max, 357, 358, 360-361, 362, 371, 372, 378, 386, 387
- Travailleur, Le, 100
- Trawgitsky, F., 39
- Trunk, Sebastian, 182, 230,

- 251, 278, 308, 321, 332,  
 333, 334, 351, 352, 354,  
 360, 369, 370, 377, 382-  
 383  
 Tscheck, 131-132  
 Tucker, Benjamin, 3, 42  
 Uhly, G. C., 182  
 Ulrich, Karl, 210  
 Universal Socialist Congress  
 (Ghent, 1877), 93-97,  
 148-149  
 Vahlteich, Julius, 86, 87,  
 191, 201, 244  
 Verviers Anarchist Congress  
 (1877), 93-94, 249  
 Virchow, Rudolf, 126, 130  
 Vogt, Karl, 32  
 Volksstaat, 83, 86-87, 90,  
 95, 99, 102  
 Vollmar, Georg von, 183,  
 273  
 Vollmer, Franz Xaver, 229  
 Vorwärts, 99, 102, 103, 105,  
 117, 118, 120, 124, 151,  
 180, 181, 188, 191, 369  
 Wagner, Richard, 16-19  
 Waldhausen, R., 336  
 Waleck, Leo, 347  
 Waterstraat, Friedrich, 222,  
 225, 228  
 Weber, L., 182  
 Weblis, 122  
 Wechsel, 235  
 Weidenmüller, Wilhelm, 288,  
 293, 298, 317-318  
 Weidenpesch, H., 391  
 Weil, Dr., 304  
 Weishaupt, Adam, 40  
 Weiss, 231  
 Weiss, Guido, 160  
 Weiss, H. M., 328  
 Weitling, Wilhelm, 22-24  
 Weller, Kriminalrat, 231  
 Wentker, Wilhelm, 220  
 Werner, Emil, 78, 83, 84,  
 86, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92-93,  
 94-97, 98, 104, 118, 121,  
 122, 147-148, 149, 150,  
 162, 165, 166, 243, 253,  
 283, 321  
 Whitfield Club, 325  
 Wichmann, W., 196, 212-  
 213, 216, 223, 231, 240-  
 241  
 Wiemer, 191  
 Wiener, Georg Benedict, 53  
 Wigand, Otto, 61  
 Wilhelm I, 1, 3, 98, 99,  
 105-106, 115-118, 121,  
 122, 123, 131, 135, 139-  
 143, 146, 147, 150, 151,  
 152, 154, 157, 158, 161,  
 163, 167, 169, 180, 185,  
 194, 213, 274-275, 283,  
 288, 289, 290, 291, 293,  
 295, 300, 313, 363, 365,  
 397  
 Wilhelm II, 1, 131, 289,  
 400  
 Wilhelmly, 140  
 Wille, 364  
 Willemsen Restaurant, 292,  
 293, 295, 317  
 Winkler, 364  
 Winterberg, 192-193  
 Wirth, Max, 65-66  
 Wismann, 357-358, 360  
 Wissmann, W., 189  
 Wölky, 211, 240  
 Wolf, August Rudolf, 195-  
 196, 203-204, 212-213,  
 216, 231, 241  
 Wolf, Richard (August  
 Rudolf Wolf), 195-196,  
 203-204, 212-213, 216,  
 231, 241  
 Wübbeler, Ulrich, 294  
 Wyden Congress, 192-194  
 Young German Clubs, 30  
 Young Hegelians, 54-55  
Zeitgeist, 100

Zukunft, Die (Berlin), 102,  
124  
Zukunft, Die (Vienna), 256,  
261, 324, 329, 346, 380